

league. But in their commercial policy the two nations at present are diametrically opposed to each other; Great Britain being for free trade, America being for protection. That Great Britain will ever renounce free trade, under which her wealth has multiplied, seems about as likely as that the Thames will reverse its course. Mutterings of reaction, political rather than economical in their source, and local rather than national, are heard from time to time; but they die away.

Americans are exhorted to embrace "the strenuous life." Is it not a strenuous life that has produced the United States with all their marvels of wealth, intelligence, and civilization? Is nothing strenuous but external aggression?

The American constitution is not suited for playing the British game. In England foreign policy remains in the same hands enough to preserve its continuity and the general identity of its aims. A Foreign Minister, retiring from office, still sits in Parliament and still has his voice in the councils of the State; while the Foreign Office is largely in the hands of permanent officers of the highest class. But an American Secretary of State, retiring from office, hardly ever takes his seat in Congress, so that the thread of an Imperialist policy would be abruptly broken off every four years, and there could hardly be community of design or continuous co-operation with the Foreign Office of Great Britain. Instead of unity of counsels, angry divergence might result. Nor does it seem likely that the democratic character of the American Republic could be so completely eliminated from its diplomacy as to make it an apt yoke-fellow for a monarchical and aristocratic country like Great Britain. The monarchical and aristocratic influence in Great Britain has been considerably strengthened, as it was sure to be, by Imperialism