

history, through the teaching of Treitschke, and modern philosophy, through the teaching of Nietzsche, is the historical and philosophical vindication of the deeds of these heroes. (It is true that the 'European' Nietzsche regarded with fastidious loathing the Junker Bismarck. Still Bismarck represented Nietzsche's superman in the drab world of everyday politics.) But these theorists, having based on Bismarck their ideal, failed to profit by the teaching of that shrewdest of masters. Bismarck was throughout a thorough opportunist. If he had come to believe, as he never seems actually to have believed, that world-empire was a necessity for Germany; that Great Britain lay in the way of her necessary expansion, and that, to attain his object, the sea power of Great Britain must be rivalled, if not surpassed, he would have taken good care that his policy, on the continent of Europe, furthered this aim. He would not, by a truculent and aggressive diplomacy, have thrown Russia, as well as France, into the arms of England. The rulers of modern Germany were not filled with the caution of Bismarck. They sought, under wholly different conditions, to recall the ambitions of Napoleon, being themselves wholly destitute of the Napoleonic inspiration.

The continental position of Germany might not in any way affect the British Dominions; but, when she sought—as it is now clear that she did seek—to gratify imperial ambitions overseas, the whole situation, so far as they were concerned, became wholly altered. Considering the painstaking nature of the German character and the sums freely expended upon secret service, it is astonishing how crass has often been the ignorance displayed by Germans of the facts of the contemporary history around them. Thus, having postulated that the British race