

sought, is, perhaps, far from realization by such a course of events. The art of war along modern lines is capable of indefinite expansion; indeed, it may be we are only beginning to learn how to take human life and destroy property. Experts in ordnance inform us of probable domains yet unexplored in the making and use of high explosives. The dynamite bomb may be a toy when compared with the infernal machine of the future. When aerial navigation succeeds, we shall have flying batteries against which no defense now in use will avail, and no known precautions can be taken. A rain of dynamite and steel upon a city would be such as no Sodomite ever witnessed.

Is war, under any circumstances, justifiable? I think it is. I think John Ruskin has shown in his lecture entitled "War" when armed conflict is right and when it is wrong. Our two wars with Great Britain were right from the American side, and wrong from the English side. Our war for the preservation of the Union was right in so far as it preserved the Union and liberated the slaves. Our war with Mexico was wrong, and no specious argument can ever justify it. Some of our Indian wars have been waged in the cause of right: more of them have been unholy and shameful conflicts in defense of wrong.

War has played an important part in the progressive drama of civilization. If waged for liberty, it is noble, because the object sought is dearer than life itself. In resisting the invader and in breaking the power of the oppressor, war has brought to light some of the highest examples of true heroism. It cannot be denied that there are instances where the ultimate effect of war has made men more humane. But because war reflexively has done much good, it does not follow that war, for the most part, is anything less than a crime against society. Its whole tendency is backward and downward into barbarism and lust.

Who may recount and call the roll of those vast armies of the dead slain in war?

Think of Julius Cæsar whispering to a friend that his triumphant celebration of his conquest of Gaul cost one million human lives! Three millions of men under Xerxes slain; one million men, women, and children slain in the siege of Jerusalem; Troy, with her one million five hundred thousand dead; but what are these to that awful record of Genghis Khan, the chief of all butchers, who, within less than fifteen years, caused the death of more than sixteen millions of human beings? Within authentic time, fifty millions have fallen in war or as the consequences of war.

There are no authentic figures showing the number of men killed in our Revolutionary War. Of the War of 1812, reports show that 1,887 men were killed and 3,737 wounded, or a total of 5,614. In the Mexican War 1,547 men were killed or died of their wounds, and 3,420 were wounded. The statistics of the Civil War are very imperfect, but the collation up to date shows that 110,070 were actually killed in battle, 249,485 died of disease, etc., and 275,175 were wounded, making a total of 734,630. It is believed that the number reported killed in this war is quite too small, since no account is taken of the thousands reported "missing," and the many who died from disability soon after their discharge.

The cost of wars in the United States has been as follows:

Revolutionary.	\$135,193,703
War of 1812-15.	107,150,003
Mexican War.	100,000,000
Rebellion.	6,189,929,908

The estimated cost of Indian wars from 1776 to 1886 has been \$696,339,277.

Lieutenant-Colonel William Ludlow, military attaché of the United States embassy to the Court of St. James, has made a careful study of the military systems of European