

pletely it will supplant and stamp out mine. The better I help you to make it, the more effectually I destroy what I have spent my life in building up—my reputation as your historian. And this nobody but me can do. No literary man has the military knowledge; no military man has the literary experience; no literary or military man living, not one of your old staff even, has one tithe of my knowledge and experience on this subject, the result of twenty years' study and devotion and labor."

Military men will judge of the relative stations of Grant and Badeau as captains. Our judgment is that Grant's literary work is as much superior to Badeau's as his military services were more important than Badeau's in the war of the rebellion. The present correspondence only serves to heighten the contrast.

But the value of this correspondence arises from the fact that Gen. Grant's eyes were opened at last, and before they were closed for ever, to one of that series of mistakes of judgment which made his two terms of the Presidency a burning shame to his country. It is not an agreeable task to recall these things. Perhaps we had best let Senator Hoar of Massachusetts do the summing up under this head. In his speech on the Belknap impeachment case, May 6, 1876, Mr. Hoar said:

"My own public life has been a very brief and insignificant one, extending little beyond the duration of a single term of Senatorial office, but in that brief period I have seen five judges of a high court of the United States driven from office by threats of impeachment for corruption or maladministration. I have heard the taunt, from friendliest lips, that when the United States presented herself in the East to take part with the civilized world in generous competition in the arts of life, the only product of her institutions in which she surpassed all others beyond question was her corruption. I have seen in the State in the Union foremost in power and wealth five judges of her courts impeached for corruption, and the political administration of her chief city become a disgrace and a byword throughout the world. I have seen the Chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs in the House, now a distinguished member of this court, rise in his place and demand the expulsion of four of his associates for making sale of their official privilege of selecting the youths to be educated at our great military school. When the greatest railroad of the world, binding together the continent and uniting the two seas that wash our shores, was finished, I have seen our national triumph and exultation turned to bitterness and shame by the unanimous reports of three committees of Congress, two of the House and one here, that every step of that mighty enterprise had been taken in fraud. I have heard in highest places the shameless doctrine avowed by men grown old in public office, that the true way by which power should be gained in the Republic is to bribe the people with the offices created for their service, and the true end for which it should be used when gained is the promotion of selfish ambition and the gratification of personal revenge. I have heard that suspicion haunts the footsteps of the trusted companions of the President. These things have passed into history. The Hallam, or the Tacitus, or the Simondi, or the Macaulay who writes the annals of our time will record them with his inexorable pen; and now, when a high Cabinet officer, the constitutional adviser of the Executive, flees from office before charges of corruption, shall the historian add that the Senate treated the demand of the people for its judgment of condemnation as a farce, and laid down its high functions before the sophistries and jeers of the criminal lawyer?"

The picture drawn by Mr. Hoar was less than the truth, much less. He made no reference to the Leet & Stocking scandal, the then pending Babcock scandal, the San Domingo embassy, the Cramer embassy, the Black Friday gold speculations, or to the long train of "mind-poisoning" which led the General

to treat every man as his personal enemy who ventured to protest against any of the rascalities that were going on under the protection of his shield and buckler. The revolt of 1872, although unsuccessful and covered with ridicule, was one of the most respectable events in all our political history, and would easily have carried the country if Adams or Trumbull or any man of that stamp had been nominated instead of the erratic Greeley. It was an honest, manly protest against the things that Senator Hoar at a later day opened his lips to condemn, and was only prevented from being successful by one of those ironical accidents which so often bring defeat and humiliation to the better cause.

We have always maintained, however, and we now repeat, that the Republican party rather than Gen. Grant was to blame for those misfortunes and scandals. By taking a simple and inexperienced soldier, honest and faithful, but whose training had been wholly in the tented field, and whose mind knew only the one rule of obedience to those above him and obedience from those below him, the party became responsible for whatever flowed naturally from such premises. While the occasion seems to call for some reference to these things, nobody can read the General's letter to Badeau, written in his pain and weakness, and almost in the presence of death, without infinite pity, and renewed admiration for the really great qualities of the man.

#### BOULANGER AGAIN.

At the recent elections in France, Gen. Boulanger was found to have been a candidate in various constituencies, and to have received heavy votes, and he was suspected, with more or less foundation, of having actively promoted his own candidacy. This brought him once more to the surface as the idol of the Parisian Radicals, who began to prepare demonstrations, or, as they call them, "manifestations," in his honor, and leave of absence to visit the capital was, therefore, refused him. He appears, however, to have got the political bee in his bonnet to such a degree that he disregarded the refusal, and came to Paris three times, twice in disguise. This extraordinary performance on the part of a general officer in high command has led to his being deprived of his command. There was nothing else to be done with him. As a soldier, he appears to have been ruined by politics, and into politics he will probably now go, head and ears, and perhaps start an Anti-Poverty Society.

His career furnishes a striking illustration of the great difficulty of working Republican institutions in the presence of a large standing army—and of glorifying the soldier's trade on all public occasions, as French statesmen are obliged to do—without creating or fostering the popular demand for a military hero. It is much easier now for soldiers to dabble in politics than it was at the time of the *Coup d'État*, because now almost the whole male popula-

tion is either put into the army or brought into the closest connection with it. The old Napoleonic army, small in size and largely composed of substitutes and old soldiers, is a thing of the past. Every able-bodied man in France is now either in the regular force, or in the reserves, or in the "territorial." Consequently, in a certain sense, the army is the nation, and the nation is the army. In most French newspapers there is as much space given to military news and gossip as ours give to Washington correspondence or theatrical news. Therefore a general who wants to cut a figure in politics has only to make himself popular with the troops by displays of an easy, indulgent temper, or of great concern about their physical comfort, in order to make himself available as a candidate for some sort of political honor. The worst of it is, too, that when a soldier gets into politics in France, he is rarely fit to deal with any but military affairs, and has to maintain himself by the display of zeal for the efficiency of the army. To do this, he is obliged on all occasions to magnify the dangers to which France is exposed at the hands of foreign enemies, and to dwell on the necessity of being constantly ready for a terrible conflict, or, in other words, to fan the flame of hostility to or jealousy of some foreign Power, which has so long been the curse of France, and in 1870 came near being her ruin.

Moreover, the necessity of having a soldier always for the Ministry of War gives the military demagogue a pedestal, as it has done in the case of Boulanger. It would mortally offend the army in France, as, indeed, in every country of the European Continent, to put a civilian at the head of the War Department. The tradition which makes any commissioned officer the moral, if not the social, superior of all civilians, or "pékings," as they are called in French military slang, is not as strong in France as in Germany, but it is very strong. The spectacle of a man in a black coat giving orders on military matters to a man in uniform runs counter to all French notions of propriety. Consequently, the Minister of War has always to be a general. If he be a modest, quiet man without ambition, and with a proper respect for the civil power, and no disposition to magnify the army, his office brings him little fame or profit. He passes unnoticed from the stage with the crowd of Ministers whom the French Chambers employ and dismiss every year with so little respect or compunction. If, on the other hand, he determines to make it a stepping-stone to something else, he does as Boulanger has done—"organizes" with feverish activity, and pretends that Bismarck is coming, and that the future is uncertain, and that France needs some sort of redemption, and that the friends of peace are in the pay of the foreigner.

The decision and energy which the Ministry have shown in dealing with Boulanger is very commendable, but then it must be admitted that he has delivered himself into their hands by playing the mountebank. Whether they would be equally successful in disposing of a shrewder and more cautious military schemer, remains to be seen,

DR. DIX ON IMPURITY.

THE annual outburst of indignation against the morals and manners of New York society in which Dr. Dix of Trinity Church indulges, is this year more than usually severe. We are sure he means well, and is animated by a real horror of vice and immorality—that is, that he draws these dreadful pictures of our social life with a view to the promotion of purity. This being so, no apology is needed for calling his attention to two or three considerations which he has evidently overlooked. Nothing needs more careful handling, either in the pulpit or in the press, by any one who aims at moral reform, than the vice known as licentiousness. As we pointed out when Mr. Stead began his crusade against it in England, it differs from all other vices in that if you describe it with any minuteness, no matter how many opprobrious adjectives you throw in, you promote it. It appeals to the imagination in a way which no other sin does. Consequently, the preacher who thinks he is making his invective more potent by describing the wickedness at which it is aimed, saws off the branch on which he is sitting. He makes two sinners for the one he brings to repentance.

We cannot say that Dr. Dix has made this mistake, but he has fallen into that of exaggeration, to which the preacher on this subject is even more prone than the mistake of minuteness. Impurity has been a favorite theme of preachers ever since the foundation of Christianity, but probably no man ever became the deadly and active foe of this vice without becoming feverish over it. Human nature asserts itself by magnifying in his mind the horrors which he seeks to extirpate. All the saints who made the best fight against licentiousness were perpetually pursued by the Devil of Uncleanness, and always pictured the society in which they lived as wholly given over to him and his works. Dr. Dix is evidently not exempt from this hallucination. He feels so strongly about impurity that he evidently sees traces of it in nearly every man and woman he meets, and detects it lurking in all the manners and amusements of his time. He is even able to follow it into "the unchaste slumbers" "of the silly fool dreaming of her admirers." Consequently his rhetoric about it is very fervid, and yet on no subject should speech be calmer and more careful in order to be effective. He forgets that every one whom he can possibly influence knows fully as much as he knows about the extent to which society is stained by this vice—probably most people a great deal more than he knows; and if they find him exaggerating or indulging in unmeasured accusation, they close their ears against him. They say that he looks at the world through the windows of his imagination, and that through this medium everybody sees what he expects to see.

Finally, let us add, Dr. Dix, in telling his congregation about the dreadful illustrations of ancient impurity to be found in Clement of Alexandria, forgot that Clement was telling Christians about the practices of the heathen. Dr. Dix in his lecture was

telling the heathen about the practices of the Christians. One effect of this, we fear, will be that our heathen, hearing from so good an authority what the state of morals is among professedly religious people, will take fresh heart, and pursue their own abominations with renewed vigor. Tens of thousands of pagans, we are sure, on reading the highly colored account Dr. Dix gives of the state of things within the Church, will flatter themselves that they have still a very respectable balance at the Devil's bank, which may be exhausted without bringing their credit any lower than that of the bulk of attendants on public worship.

In fact, one can never watch attacks on this particular vice with which Dr. Dix is contending without being struck by the enormous dangers of failure to recognize, that in attacking it we are trying not to extirpate, but to restrain within reasonable limits. We make these criticisms on his methods with reluctance, because we believe he is fighting the battle of high thinking and plain living against greater odds than a preacher of righteousness has ever had to meet in a great capital. In no capital that we know of does the cause of religion and morality derive so little support against luxury from intellectual interest or activity of any description. This interest has its place here, but it leads a sickly existence as yet under the shadow of great wealth which cares not for it.

RECEIPTS AND EXPENSES OF THE GREAT NATIONS.

At the last meeting of the International Institute of Statistics, a detailed comparison of the revenues and expenditures of seven of the leading States of Europe was given by M. Cerboni, Superintendent of Accounts (or, perhaps, we should rather say, Auditor-General) for the kingdom of Italy. The total receipts and expenditures for the different nations for the year 1885-86 were as follows:

	Receipts.	Expenses.
Austria.....	\$380,000,000	\$382,000,000
England.....	465,000,000	480,000,000
France.....	602,000,000	583,000,000
Germany.....	477,000,000	478,000,000
Italy.....	282,000,000	286,000,000
Russia.....	613,000,000	624,000,000
Spain.....	167,000,000	175,000,000
Total.....	\$2,986,000,000	\$3,008,000,000

The budget for Germany includes that of the smaller States of the German Empire; the figures for Hungary are included in those of Austria. All figures are reduced on the basis of five francs to the dollar.

We subjoin those of the United States for purposes of comparison:

	Receipts.	Expenses.
United States...	\$336,000,000	\$242,000,000

The sources of income (classified for convenience' sake on a slightly different basis from that of M. Cerboni) are as follows:

Land tax.....	\$281,000,000
Income tax.....	216,000,000
Other direct taxes.....	93,000,000
Total direct taxes.....	\$590,000,000

Customs.....	\$415,000,000
Tobacco.....	216,000,000
Spirits.....	483,000,000
Administrative & stamp taxes.....	346,000,000
Other indirect taxes.....	282,000,000
Total indirect taxes.....	1,742,000,000
Post-office.....	193,000,000
Railroads (net earnings).....	111,000,000
Other public property.....	158,000,000
Miscellaneous receipts.....	192,000,000

The difficulty of classifying the income in the different States of the Union makes American figures unavailable for comparison.

The income from property is by far the greatest in Germany, where it constitutes more than one-third of the total receipts. Austria and Russia have property whose income is in each case somewhat less than one-quarter that of Germany, while the figures of the other countries for this head are only trifling. The proportion of direct taxes is, on the whole, more constant than that of any other item in the budget. Of indirect taxes, the figures for England and Russia are made much larger than the others by the tax on spirituous liquors, which produces over \$200,000,000 in Russia, and about \$120,000,000 in England.

The expenditures are divided under the following main heads:

Fixed charges.	Total.	P.ct.
Interest and pensions...	\$1,052,000,000	35
Army.....	620,000,000	20½
Navy.....	190,000,000	6½
Civil and miscellaneous.	1,146,000,000	38

Comparing the same expenses in the United States, we find the following results:

	Total.	P.ct.
Interest and pensions...	\$114,000,000	47½
Army.....	34,000,000	14
Navy.....	14,000,000	5½
Civil and miscellaneous (including Indians)...	80,000,000	33

The interest on the public debt of the different countries is as follows:

Austria.....	\$118,000,000
England.....	119,000,000
France.....	201,000,000
Germany.....	72,000,000
Italy.....	104,000,000
Russia.....	149,000,000
Spain.....	54,000,000
Total.....	\$817,000,000

The interest on the public debt of the United States for the year named was 50½ millions, or less than that of any of the countries in the table. This fact, however, means little, on account of the failure to include State debts in this total. It is significant that the United States spends for pensions more than any of the countries in the list, and about two-fifths as much as all of the seven put together.

The most interesting part of the whole exhibit is that with reference to the war expenditures (army and navy combined):

	Total.	Per cent. of budget.	Am't per inhab.
Austria...	\$63,000,000	16½	\$1.61
England...	174,000,000	36	4.69
France...	161,000,000	27½	4.22
Germany...	111,000,000	23	2.36
Italy.....	68,000,000	23½	2.28
Russia....	198,000,000	31	1.91
Spain.....	35,000,000	20	2.06

The last column shows certain rather surprising results, England having a greater