

that Louis Pasteur, the Man of Science, led the poll, receiving 1,838,103 votes; while Victor Hugo came next below him, by somewhat more than a hundred thousand votes, and Gambetta was put third in the list. Napoleon received only the fourth place of honor in the estimate of fifteen millions of the French of these days.

About a year later the same change was betokened in a hardly less significant way, by a speech from the Prime Minister of France. The occasion of the address was the inauguration of a monument to M. Scheurer-Kestner, who had been vice-president of the French Senate when the Dreyfus Iniquities began to be dragged out of darkness into light, and who was one of the few men in public life then who strove heroically to have the truth ascertained and justice done. Scheurer-Kestner was an Alsatian, and this fact gave Premier Clemeuceau an opportunity to break silence on the sore subject of the loss of Alsace, which French statesmen have not ventured to refer to since the heart-breaking surrender of 1871. His breaking of that silence was meant to break, and assuredly does break, the long brooding of revengefulness in French hearts which has been a menace to the peace of Europe for nearly 40 years.

"I do not fear," he said, "to call up the memory of that bloody past. I am mindful of the responsibility which belongs to my office, and I can speak without constraint of events which have entered into history. I can proclaim feelings which we cannot repudiate—which we cannot even hide without lowering ourselves." And this is his open proclamation of the feeling to which France has come, in its thought of Alsace:

"We received France issuing from frightful trial. To rebuild her in her legitimate power of expansion as well as in her dignity as a great moral person, we have no need either to hate or to lie, nor even to recriminate. We look to the future. Sons of a great history, jealously careful of the lofty impulses native to us, in which the civilizing virtue of France was fashioned, we can look in quiet of soul on the descendants of strong races which for centuries have measured themselves with the men of our lands in battlefields beyond numbering. Two such great rival peoples, for the very honor of their rivalry, have a like interest to keep their respect, the one for the other."

A. D. 1907-1909.—German Opposition to the "Navy Fever," in High Circles as well as Low.—Views of Herr Von Holstein and Admiral Galster.—How far the naval ambitions and costly naval policy of Germany are supported by public opinion is much of a question. It is certain that they are a cause of wide discontent in the industrial classes, and no less certain that the weightiest influence behind them is that of the Emperor, who stimulates the exertions of a powerful Navy League. That there is an effective disapproval of the policy in high political circles has been shown lately by the publication of some expressions on the subject by the late Herr von Holstein, who was for many years the chief of the Political Department of the German Foreign Office,—the mentor and prompter from behind the scenes of several successive Chancellors of the Empire. In some reminiscences of this important official, by an intimate friend, Herr von Rath, who published them in September, 1909, he is quoted as

having, in 1907, denounced what he called "navy fever" in Germany in these strong words:

"This dangerous disease is fed upon the fear of an attack by England, which is not in accordance with facts. The effect of the 'navy fever' is pernicious in three directions—in domestic politics on account of the intrigues of the Navy League, which also produce the greatest ill-feeling in South Germany; in the finances on account of the prohibitive expenditure; in foreign politics on account of the mistrust which these armaments awake. England sees in them a menace which keeps her bound to the side of France. At the same time, even with taxation strained to the utmost limit, the construction of a fleet able to cope with the united fleets of England and France is entirely out of the question. From the menace which everybody in England sees in German naval construction the present Liberal Government in England will not draw serious conclusions. It will be different when the Conservatives come into power. The danger of war between Germany on the one hand and England and France on the other is even today playing a part in the political calculations of other countries. Against armaments on land nobody will offer any objection, because they are justified by the needs of defence. In our naval armaments several Powers see a perpetual menace.

"Even among Parliamentary Deputies there are many who condemn the 'navy fever,' but no one of them will take the responsibility of refusing to vote ships, a responsibility which would recoil upon him in the event of a defeat at sea. Anybody who to-day makes a stand against the prevailing 'navy fever' is attacked from all sides as wanting in patriotism, but a few years hence the justice of my opinion will be established."

According to Herr von Rath, Herr von Holstein declared in February, 1909, three months before his death, that the navy question transcended all others in importance. He is said to have watched with approval the campaign which is still more or less vigorously carried on by Vice-Admiral Galster and others against the "big ship policy," and to have said, with reference to one of Admiral Galster's pamphlets:—"The main thing is to expose the lying and treacherous fallacy expressed in the statement that every fresh ship is an addition to the power of Germany—when every fresh ship causes England, to say nothing of France, to build two ships."

The Vice-Admiral Galster here referred to contends that submarines are more effective for defence than Dreadnoughts, and he labors to persuade his fellow countrymen to be satisfied with defensive armament, repudiating what creates suspicion of offensive designs.

A. D. 1908.—School Peace League. The American.—"The American School Peace League [organized in 1908] aims to secure the coöperation of the educational public of America in the project for promoting international justice and equity. . . . It is hoped that every teacher in the country will subscribe to the purposes of the League by becoming a member. Much of the work will be done by committees, five of which have been organized up to the present time. . . .

"The Committee on Meetings and Discussion