

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 Uncleaness, 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

expenditure per head of population than France, and twice that of any other country in the table. As a matter of fact, the basis of comparison is not thoroughly fair to England, whose colonial population should to some extent be taken into account in any comparison between population and military expenditure. Nor do these figures give any just idea of the burden imposed upon the different countries, as M. G. de Laveleye remarks in the *Moniteur des Intérêts Matériels*. The figure of \$1.91 for Russia probably represents a more burdensome effort, in the existing industrial conditions of the country, than that of any other nation in the whole column. The different items of civil service present an interesting study. The Treasury Department costs more than one-third of the whole, the Department of Public Works about one-quarter, Education and Church one-seventh, the Department of the Interior a little less, and the Department of Justice about one-twelfth. The other expenditures are of comparatively trifling importance. The Treasury Department is relatively most expensive in Austria; the Department of the Interior in England; that of Church and Education in France; that of Public Works in Germany. It need hardly be added that Russia is the country which spends the most for its prisons; in fact, Russia loses by its prisons many times the amount which it saves by the absence of parliamentary expenses.

It is easy to exaggerate the importance of these figures; but it is none the less true that their general results are in the highest degree significant.

#### LEROY-BEAULIEU ON THE STATE OF EUROPE.

PARIS, March 8, 1888.

EUROPE is in that nebulous state which the modern astronomers represent as having preceded the formation of stars and constellations. One constellation is formed already. Since the publication of the treaty made between Prussia and Austria, and the revelations made on the subject of Italy, we cannot be ignorant of the existence of what is already called the new Triple Alliance. But in the face of this great constellation formed by the two German empires and by Italy, many eyes have already seen the lineaments of another constellation formed by France, Russia, and perhaps even a third power. There is a fable of Florian's, in which figures one of those astronomers who operate in the streets, and permit the public, for a small remuneration, to see the moon and the rings of Saturn and all sorts of fine things. A rat has entered the telescope, and obstructs the rays of light. When the astronomer says to the man who looks in the glass, "Now, don't you see the fine comet with its tail?" the man timidly answers, "Je vois bien quelque chose, mais je ne distingue pas bien." That is exactly the experience of those who have been watching the formation of that new constellation, France and Russia; they see something, but they cannot say exactly what.

The subject has been thought of sufficient importance for the insertion in our *Revue des Deux Mondes* of a mysterious article, without a signature, on the subject of the Franco-Russian alliance. The author begins by showing the character of the Triple Alliance, and makes great efforts to prove that it has not the solidity which Prince Bismarck attributes to it. The elements of frailty are found in the constitution of the Austrian Empire, in the multiplicity and variety of interests of the populations of this empire; they are found also in the state

of the Italian peninsula, in the divisions of its parties, in the finances of Italy, etc. These critical considerations are not without importance, but the author has perhaps exaggerated their value. Of course it is difficult to tie together millions of men for any length of time; but when the compact is made merely for defensive purposes, when it has only, if I may say so, a negative character, when a constant appeal can be made to the love of peace of the populations—the small differences disappear, and the alliance does not incur the dangers which it would incur if it had positive objects, and was intended for conquest and territorial changes.

The author of the article which I mention has rendered a service in telling the truth about the relations of France and Russia. These relations have a friendly character, but there is no treaty of alliance between the two countries; there has not been any negotiation preparatory of such a treaty. There are newspapers in both countries which advocate a common action, and try to show a community of interests between Republican France and autocratic Russia; but on one side France, as a whole, may be said to be intensely pacific; and on the other the Emperor of Russia is equally pacific, and, in his empire, the press has no influence whatever. Prince Bismarck, in his last great speech, spoke of it with contempt; he said that he had the greatest confidence in the pacific assurances of the Emperor, and he had this part of his speech only telegraphed to all the foreign ministers of Prussia.

It would be most dangerous to deceive the French people by the promise and the assurance of a Russian alliance; it is always better to know the exact truth. The Emperor of Russia lives in complete isolation, like one of the gods of Wagner: he sees at very rare intervals his Minister of Foreign Affairs, M. de Giers; at much rarer intervals the ambassadors of the great powers. He is probably almost wholly ignorant of all the noise which has been made on this question of a Franco-Russian alliance. Everybody expected that, after the speech of Prince Bismarck, he would be beside himself, and do something; he has done nothing. The diplomatic correspondence of M. de Giers has gone on as usual; we have had the same perpetual appeal to the Treaty of Berlin, but no active resolutions have been taken. Russia can wait, and the words of Prince Gortchakoff are still true: "La Russie ne boude pas, elle se recueille."

In the present state of Europe, it is of the highest interest to know what England thinks. The anonymous writer in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* (who is now known to be M. Leroy-Beaulieu, the author of a book on Russia) does not say much about England; but England is a free country, and it is easier to know what is thought in London than what is thought in St. Petersburg. In the freest countries in the world, however, there are things which cannot be said too loudly. It is generally thought now that some time ago Prince Bismarck made an effort to induce England to join the Triple Alliance; it is said, also, that Lord Salisbury was not as adverse to this policy as were other members of his Cabinet. Lord Randolph Churchill is considered as having made the strongest objections to the adhesion of England to an alliance which might force her, under certain circumstances, to become as active in the affairs of the Continent as she had been in the time of Napoleon I. Without being absolutely an advocate of non-intervention, as a political doctrine, he thinks that the new House of Commons, elected by larger constituencies, is more pacific than its predecessors, more de-

sirous to circumscribe the questions and interests which England must consider vital.

Lord Randolph Churchill's recent journey has been much remarked; and so has the recent speech in the French Chamber of Deputies of the young Marquis de Breteuil, who also made recently a journey to Russia, and who was there received by the Emperor. M. de Breteuil, in his maiden speech, did a very bold thing; he made an *exposé* of the whole European situation, and, as he had just come from Russia, he was listened to with much curiosity by the Republican majority as well as by the Monarchical Right, to which he belongs. (The Deputy from the Basses-Pyrénées is the grandson of M. Fould, who was the Finance Minister of Napoleon III.; he is also the great-grandson of the Breteuil who played a part at the time of the French Revolution, and was one of the favorites of Queen Marie Antoinette.) The French Minister of Foreign Affairs made no answer to M. de Breteuil's speech, having been asked no questions. We must therefore look upon this maiden speech merely as a sort of academic discourse. I have mentioned it only as a sign of the desire which exists in some circles to bring about an understanding between France and Russia, and to induce England to enter this new combination of political forces.

This last attempt seems to me quite chimerical. England, it is true, was always opposed to the predominance of a single power in Europe; history shows her as the constant defender of the European equilibrium. She has in turn opposed the hegemony of Spain and of France; is it time for her to oppose the hegemony of Germany, a power to which she is attached by so many ties? Can the present policy of Prince Bismarck be compared to the policy of Napoleon I.? We don't know what may happen under the reign of another Prussian monarch, if he should be an ambitious man, if he should lend an ear only to the military party. For the present, the sentiments of Germany are well described in the last speech of Prince Bismarck: she feels more threatened than threatening; she probably feels more threatened than she really is. England has nothing to fear from her. It is said at times that, on the death of the present King of Holland, Germany will try to bring the Netherlands under her hegemony, in some form or other; she is said to look on Amsterdam, Rotterdam, and even Antwerp with envy. It is said that she will eventually annex the German-speaking part of Switzerland. All nations have such dreams; but accomplishment is another thing.

At the present moment, England has preserved entire liberty of movement; her hands are free, and it is well worthy of remark that Mr. Gladstone did not endorse the opinions of Mr. Labouchere when the latter recently attacked the foreign policy of Lord Salisbury's Administration. It is difficult to see what reasons could induce England to accept undefined responsibilities; she has theoretically nothing to object to alliances of which the aim is peace, but she would be very unwise if she entered into any compact which could impose on her the necessity of war. The Triple Alliance is a positive fact, a brute fact; all the combinations which we have spoken of are, so far, mere aspirations.

#### EXCAVATIONS IN ATTICA.

ATHENS, February 16, 1888.

It will perhaps be remembered that, for two years before the beginning of the current year, the American School at Athens had busied itself with excavations. The small theatre of Thoricus, a remote township of Attica, was