

forced by self-interest to seek his co-efficients.

But the most striking example of this tendency is that which has cast reproach on the very word "combine" and made "trust" a term of distrust. Of this, perhaps, only an expert should speak at all. But some reference to it could not well be foregone, as there are those who regard it as the essential factor in the transition to the goal (industrial and commercial and, it may be, social), of our age's revolution. Besides, it is at this moment almost the most obtrusive of platform questions in the United States.

"All work and no play," says the old proverb, "makes Jack a dull boy." The importance that "play," in every sense, has attained in our time makes it second to none of the subjects to which that criterion of public interest—the daily press—devotes its most attractive columns. It is, however, to its international character as a witness to the existence of that tendency to draw together by which our age is signalized that it is mentioned here. Perhaps if we recall the revival in these latter years of the Olympic Games—not merely as a bond of unity to the Hellenic race, but as a centre of athletic interest for civilization—we may indicate the universality of it. Practically, a mention of our international yacht, cricket, boating, football or lacrosse contests, or those sporting tours which make the whole globe their playground, and every stage of which is eagerly watched from thousands of club-rooms and newspaper offices, may make the illustration more true, if less Pindaric. The fact is the main point, and the fact is ubiquitous.

With the centripetal force so strongly exerted in ways so manifold, one might deem it strange that the forecasts of perennial peace, so largely indulged in when the half century began, had proved fallacious. With so many causes drawing men together, with science and art, philanthropy and religion, invention and industry so active in levelling the barriers that make men strangers, what is it that still makes

them enemies, eager to rush madly at each other's throats? The answer to that question is for future consideration. Meanwhile, although the promises of abiding peace have proved premature, it is some gain to know that humane enterprise has endeavoured to mitigate the horrors of war. The Geneva Convention, the St. Petersburg Declaration, the Brussels Conference and the great Peace Conference at the Hague have all tended to impress on rulers the true character of warfare, and to assuage, as far as practicable, the ferocity of combatants and the sufferings of war's victims. The Crusaders' cross was never more worthily borne in the great vain struggle with conquering Saracen or Ottoman than it is by the brave and tender cross-bearers of to-day.

The attempt to substitute arbitration for war, though it has not been greatly successful, and, where the peaceful method has been adopted, has not always given satisfaction or entirely removed international irritation, has, nevertheless, produced a considerable moral effect. The least promising phase of the relations to each other of modern states is the maintenance of immense land and sea armaments, which make a great part of the civilized world like a vast camp, while the harbours and coasts of all the continents bristle with mighty implements of destruction. This system of armed peace—which the late Prince Bismarck professed to regard as the only feasible plan of policing warlike nations—may be said to date from 1879, when the Dreibund or Triple Alliance was devised by the wily Chancellor in order to guard, on the one hand, against a French vendetta, and, on the other, against Russia's resentment for the checks of the Berlin Congress. The Hague Conference, a conception of Czar Nicholas II, failed to effect the purpose of his Majesty—the contraction within more modest limits of those swelling armaments. Count Tolstoi, the novelist and reformer, is said to have asked the Czar to show his sincerity by setting Europe the ex-