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FIRST among all the settlements which peace must make is the settlement of the fate of the small nationalities. In the swift and fateful debates which preceded the blast from hell-deeps of war, the rights, powers and duties of the small countries loomed largest. Even now the fate of Serbia, of Holland and Belgium, of Armenia, of Ireland, rouse more passion and debate than the fate of the greater lands drawn into the conflict by the problem of the destiny of the small ones.

"Self-determination of all nationalities" was written into the principles of diplomacy by the Russian revolution. This pungent phrase has been enlarged upon by President Wilson in his various speeches and papers, until one would think that the whole war arose out of a desperate determination on the part of all the Great Powers to protect their smaller brethren against all comers.

As we look back through history we find that the small nationalities of today are an old, old problem, with a new face. There are certain striking resemblances about the fates of all of them. As we study the history of the small nationalities which have been turning-points in war and peace, they come to resemble triggers which when pressed explode a tremendous charge of dynamite.

Each of the small nationalities whose fate is so much at stake is—or has been—the occupant of a disputed locality, a territory or gateway whose possession was sought by conflicting and more or less equally balanced powers. Belgium has since the dawn of European history been the battleground on which Germanic and Latin peoples fought for possession of the mouth of the Rhine. Serbia sits astride the land route to Constantinople and Saloniki. Armenia occupies the Cross of Taurus, the crucial land between four seas through which lead all the ways between Europe and India. The ancient cases of the Jews and the Irish are profoundly tragic, for they mark conflicts not so much between rival powers as between theories of social organization which are enemies to the death.

Each of the Martyr Peoples is a battle-ground between rival Empires, or Balances of Powers. Each owes its misery to the ambitions of its imperial neighbors. Martyrdom is the product of Imperialism. The question, then, Whence comes Imperialism, and how can it be ended? runs through the problem of the fate of the Little Nations. There are only two possible solutions; either the world must be given over absolutely to the domination of one Empire so completely sovereign than none shall dare dispute it; or Empires must be abolished. Whether the Empire maintain itself by gold or the sword, so long as one nation seeks
Concerning this, H. H. Powers says, in “America among the Nations”; Page 244.

“Of the score or more of countries which make up modern Europe, the majority are popularly regarded as negligible in any consideration of our national defense. They are too small, too poor in resources, or too handicapped by situation or other circumstances to give us any concern. Such are the Scandinavian countries, the Balkan states, Portugal, Belgium, Holland, and perhaps Italy and Spain. Our peaceable relations with these countries are important and mutually profitable. But if these relations should be strained to the breaking point, the advantage would be overwhelmingly with us. No doubt this is the prevailing opinion in America. Our relation to the minor powers of Europe, as regards problems of national defence, gives us no concern.

“It may be doubted, however, whether this complacency is justified. It is based on the mistaken assumption that these nations are separate units, and to be dealt with singly in any emergency which may arise. They are, on the contrary, nearly all of special strategic importance in the European scheme of things. We have to deal, not with them alone, but with their backers.

“As regards the problem of our national defense, our interest in these powers lies in their relation to these backers, into whose plans they enter, and whose bidding they are likely to do. Such states as Belgium, Portugal, Albania, and Turkey, are not natural states at all, but artificial creations or unnatural survivals, maintained by the great powers in the interest of their national defense.

“The same is true, if in less degree, of nearly all the lesser powers of Europe. We are stronger than they, but we have not to deal with them alone. By themselves they are negligible, but as auxiliaries of the greater powers, willing or unwilling, they may turn the scale. Was not Belgium Germany’s undoing? Did not Greece thwart the plans of the Allies?

“There is more than one way in which a little nation may play the decisive role in great events. It may be the protege of a great power, voluntarily making common cause with it. Such is Portugal in relation to Britain, such Germany asserts Belgium to be in regard to Britain and France. Again, it may be an inevitable victim in the line of imperialistic aggression, and may yield, be it ever so unwillingly, a strategic site which is vital to the great schemes to which it itself is sacrificed. Such is the relation of Belgium and Holland to Germany, of Serbia to Austria, and of Turkey to Russia. And finally, to vary the case just mentioned, it may possess dependencies which it cannot defend, and which, when seized by a greater power, quite change the
relation of the latter to other powers. Thus Denmark, though completely helpless as against Russia or Britain, was none the less their deadly menace by virtue of her possession of Schleswig Holstein, so vital to Germany's schemes. Similarly, moribund Turkey held Egypt, and China held Korea, each indispensable to the supremacy of the powers into whose hands they have since fallen."

"The possession of Belgium would give to Germany so great an advantage over France and England as to make her the paramount power in Europe, and make it impossible for other powers effectually to oppose her designs. What country could be more remote from American interests than Bulgaria? Yet the control of Bulgaria by Germany is an important link in the continuous chain which she expects to extend through the Balkans and across Asia Minor and Mesopotamia to the Persian Gulf. Bulgaria may be our undoing. Equally and more, Turkey has sites in her possession which are the key to the entire balance of the modern world. Our interests in Turkey are more than mission schools. Broadly stated, the minor powers of Europe hold the balance of power in the world. Powerless for independent action, they are capable of tipping the scale into which their weight is thrown, either by choice or compulsion. In but few cases is it possible to anticipate their action, the more so as their freedom of choice is so limited. They remain as residual unorganized material among the growing aggregations of Europe.

"For the moment they are the object of the knight-errantry of Europe, guided, as humanity loves to be, by the instinct of self-preservation and the sincere pretext of generous chivalry. Their independence, tenaciously maintained and chivalrously upheld, has its place, but it can hardly continue. Slowly, involuntarily, imperceptibly, half unconsciously, it may be, these little peoples, scarce one of whom represents an ethnic unity of a seriously distinctive culture, will range themselves under the larger banners. The result is likely to be momentous. It is one to which we cannot be indifferent."

When one comes upon such an interpretation as this, self-determination of nationalities simply means a choice as to which empire the little peoples will join. And that is no longer a matter of choice, but of the arbitrament of battle. Seen in this light, we were fighting to give the small nationalities a freedom which they cannot enjoy beyond the day they get it. What savage sarcasm is this?

Yet Professor Powers speaks from facts. Let us examine a while and see what this self-determination means: Who are the nationalities whose independence is at stake? why do they remain independent?

These questions are vital, for our President once assured us that it was for these things that we fought. — March, 1919.
Lecture 1.

Israel: The Crucible of God

When General Allenby at the head of the British army from Egypt marched into the city of Jerusalem, Te Deums were sung in Christian Churches all over the world, and the impulse toward a Palestinian Jewish state received a great impetus. It was only a short time thereafter that General Townsend, who had been captured by the Turks at Kut-el-Amara, was sent to negotiate for the surrender of the Turkish army; and but a little while after that the Great War came to an end. Now the control of Palestine, and of Syria, to which it is the key, is a subject of much dispute between the French and British diplomats.

For, mark, control of Holy Palestine is the key of the Berlin-to-Bagdad railroad on the one hand, and of the Suez Canal on the other. Plans for the establishment of a Jewish state include a protectorate by some one of the Great Powers, and the issue as to which of the Great Powers it shall be is sharply debated.

Every Empire the world has seen regarded control of Palestine as the cornerstone of its greatness. Long before the curtain of history lifted, the great empires of the Nile and Mesopotamia fought bloody and forgotten wars over the control of the Keystone of the great Arch of Power. Rome's swift eastward expansion and her tremendous increase of wealth was secure only when Pompey had captured Jerusalem. Persia could not remain an empire without control of Palestine, nor could Alexander strike at Babylon without having secured the allegiance of the high priest Jaddua. The Crusades were fought to wrest control of Jerusalem from the great Mohammedan Empire, whose first blow was struck for Damascus, and whose second blow was at Jerusalem. Louis XIV. sought Palestine; Napoleon aimed at Egypt and thence Palestine; and England's Eastern policy has hinged on the control of the Suez Canal, and as a means thereto on control of Palestine.

"The pledge of the British Government to establish a Jewish National home in Palestine has made a very deep and wide impression” says “Palestine”, the official organ of the British Palestine Committee, in its issue for November 24, 1917. It has, indeed; and “Palestine” quotes on its first page the reason.

“The British Palestine Committee seeks to reset the ancient glories of the Jewish Nation in the freedom “of a new British Dominion in Palestine.” And “Palestine” quotes “The Spectator”
as saying "If Lord Beaconsfield had freed the Holy Land and re-
stored the Jews, as he might have done, instead of pottering
about with Roumelia and Afghanistan, he might have died Dic-
tator."

A free Palestine under a British Dictator is a conception not
new: save for the nationality of the Dictator. Freedom for
Palestine, under the domination of the German Dictator, was the
proud boast of the German Emperor; it was the offer of Louis
XIV. and the effort of Napoleon; and all through history dictators
of one empire or another have based their hopes of security on
the possession of "free" Palestine.

This organ goes on to give reasons for the British anxiety
in words which, if a German had written them, would have been
denounced as a despicable Hohenzollern lie. "The establishment
of a Jewish National Home in Palestine", it says, "is recognized
to be a great political and a great moral end. It is a great poli-
tical end because it is the ideal solution of the vast problems
bound up for the British Empire with its sea-way between East
and West. When the war began the true character of these
problems was generally misapprehended. It is easy to understand
why. For over a century certainly, (since 1791 when Pitt
threatened war on Russia) British policy rested on the assump-
tion that the best bulwark of British communications with the
East was Turkey. (!)"

Abdul Hamid, known familiarly as Abdoul the Damned, was
held in power by British gold, until 1908, when the Kaiser won
the Young Turks away from England.

Confirmation to this is given by E. W. G. Masterman, M. D.,
F. R. C. S., one of the official propagandists of the British Gov-
ernment, in a booklet called "The Deliverance of Jerusalem" pub-
lished by George H Doran & Company. "The British Govern-
ment" he says "had all along made it known that they had no
desire for any change that would lead to dismemberment of the
Turkish Empire. Undoubtedly it was the wish of the British
Government circles to do nothing to break up the Empire, or
annex any part of it."—Not even Egypt?—"At the beginning
of the war with Germany the British Ambassador was instructed
to inform the Turkish Government that it would guarantee the
integrity of the Turkish Empire at the end of the war, if Turkey
would remain neutral."

All the massacres of Armenians to the contrary notwith-
standing. Only when Turkey threw in her lot with Germany did
the Turks become the enemies of the human race, because they
no longer guaranteed the security of the Road to India.

"It was not generally seen that after the Congress of Berlin,
and notably after the British occupation of Egypt," says "Palest-
tine", "Turkey began to drift steadily away from England toward
Germany. Even when Turkey allied herself with Germany
against us, there were many English public men and publicists
who found it difficult to shake off an exhausted tradition. All
that is now definitely past. The Government and all men of
weight, unless there still survive a few melancholy faithful of the old school, now know that our new world situation demanded a revolution in policy.

"We no longer lean on the Turk. We rest on the revival and the restoration of the nations and the lands over which the Turk tyrannized—Armenian, Arab, Jew." Rest on it—for what? Why, the security of the overseas route to India. But this remarkable proclamation goes on;

"The British Government's declaration in favor of a Jewish Palestine is, in the eyes of the whole world, a new and most remarkable reaffirmation of the moral purpose and the justice of the Allied cause! And that, as it makes the glory of England, burns the brand deeper upon Germany."

And a little further down; "the Allies have, in obedience to the ideal, also struck upon the road to political advantage."

Happy coincidence!

It is evident that the disposition of Palestine is a very vital matter to the settlement of the war. Indeed, it was one of the vital causes of the beginning of the war. For the power which controls Palestine controls the Way to India; and over that prize empires have fought since Empires began. What is the goal of that high moral and political Ideal, which involves freedom for Palestine under a British Dictator?

"During Great Britain's hundred years of sway in India, there have been nineteen million deaths due to starvation and famine; only 8 per cent of the people are literate; 75 per cent have but one meal a day," declared Anant Gurjar, a graduate student of the University of Chicago, lecturing at the University of Chicago Thursday Feb. 13, 1919. "England's commercial policy has practically annihilated Indian manufactures, and the provinces which enjoy local autonomy are much in advance of the others."

This high moral idealism which sets Palestine free under a British dictator is intended to keep a tight hold on India. But such is the history of Palestine's stormy career, and such is the secret of the history of the Jews; for Palestine is the root and ground of all the Empires the world has ever seen, and from it went forth the three religions which dominated the minds of men of all the western world—Judaism, Christianity, Islam.

Wherever we look through history, at crucial moments a Jew has been there. Luis de Torres, a Jewish interpreter, first leaped from the little boat of Columbus to talk to the natives of San Salvador. Disraeli, as prime minister, introduced a bill declaring Great Britain an Empire. Haym Salomon loaned to the American Revolution sufficient money to carry it through the darkest of its winters. At the present time Karl Liebknecht, Leon Trotsky, Louis Brandeis, Kuhn Loeb & Company, loom large in the world's eye; Karl Marx is a name now on every tongue.

And yet there are but eleven million Jews in the world today.

In every Christian Church the Jewish Scriptures occupy the post of importance and honor, and the names of the Jewish prophets and of the apostles—all Jews,—form the cornerstone of
the edifice of faith. Islam venerates the Jewish writings as much as the Christians do. When one speaks of “The Chosen People”, every one understands that the Jews are meant.

THE CRUCIBLE OF GOD.

To most of us, “religion” means the Bible. Nor is there in existence a book which so perfectly illustrates all the stages of religion, from the lowest to the highest. One question which much perplexes the student of religious history is this: Why did the religion of the Hebrews become the dominant one? Christianity, Islam and Mohammedanism—all of these revere the Old Testament as the origin and foundation of their faith, and the narrow ground of Palestine as their Holy Land. But why should the religions of Persia, India, Greece, the Teutons, have given way to this dominant strain—the religion of the Jew?

Every race of people who had any religion at all, have always regarded themselves as the chosen and beloved nation of their God, selected by him to carry his laws and customs to the rest of the world. Not one of them but believed that out of their Zion should go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from their own Jerusalem. Even the most barbarous of tribes habitually refer to themselves as “the people,” and to the rest of mankind as “barbarians” or “those others”. But why, out of all the claimants for this title of the Chosen People, were the Hebrews so long allowed to arrogate to themselves so great a spiritual victory?

This question remains a riddle, or the irresponsible whim of an inscrutable Deity, until the geography of the Holy Land is given its due weight.

Look, then, at the theater of rise and fall of the empires of the ancient world. The valley of the Nile, the valley of the Euphrates, the valleys of the Indus and the Ganges, the Isles of Greece, the peninsula of Rome—here was the seat of empire, and here rested the spotlight of history, during all the long centuries that our religion was in the making.

It was between the land of the Pharaohs, the land of Babylon, Chaldea, and Assyria, the land of the Greeks and of Romans, of the Persians and of the many-peopled Hindus, that the early course of the race was run.

Earliest of all known seats of civilization were Egypt and Mesopotamia. Midway between them lies Palestine.

Great highways traversed the deserts and the plains between Egypt and Mesopotamia, from the very dawn of history. These passed through Palestine. Caravans laden with the goods of the Egyptian valley and the good of the merchants of the Tigris and the Euphrates plodded down the Way of the Sea, and up across the passes of the Lebanon, long before recorded history began. Down as far as India the caravans went, and far up to the sources of the Nile. Nearly all of them passed through Palestine.

Canaan’s plains were debatable land. Over them the cohorts of Thothmes swept, driving back the legions of Hittite and
Hyksos. Then came the armies of Assyria and Babylon, adding fresh ruins to those piled by the long centuries of tribal warfare before them. Alexander's phalanxes marched to the gates of Jerusalem, and Aristotle met the Pharisees at Joppa, believing them to be Brahmins. Roman armies tramped across its soil. Napoleon's soldiers followed the Crusaders, and but now the British and the French bombarded the Austrian, the German and the Turk, upon the plains of Esdraelon and the slopes of Golgotha.

Palestine has felt the heel of whatever government strove for the mastery of the world. Back and forth over it swept the wash and backwash of every eddy of civilization, each one leaving its deposit of ruin. Whatever system of laws sought headship, tried to establish dominion in Palestine; not because of the value of the land, but because it commanded the highways of international trade.

Being in the midst of all these tides of life, Palestine is cut sharply off from them. To the south is the Desert. To the East lies the valley of the Jordan, deepest in the world, terminating in the Dead Sea; and beyond the Jordan again lies the desert. To the North are the snowy ranges of the White Mountains, the chains of Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon. And to the Westward lies the Great Sea.

In the midst of the world, yet cut off from the world, was the Crucible of God. And furthermore; no rivers water the plains of Palestine. The "ancient river, the river Kishon" is but a brook, which dries up in the summer, when it is most needed. Palestine depends on the rain. Its face is forever turned upward to the sky for its daily sustenance. If God giveth not the early and the latter rain, then indeed his wrath lights upon it, and there is a year of famine.

In the midst of the world, cut off from the world, and with its face turned ever to the skies, lies Palestine. Into this land, old with the relics of many civilizations, was projected a fierce desert race, out of the rocky triangle of Arabia.

Between the two river-valleys where empire began lies this vast desert, which never has been and never will be civilized. It was the cradle of the Semites, of the race whence came the three religions which have dominated the world. An arid, rocky wilderness, mountainous and forsaken, it has been inhabited since the dawn of time only by loosely confederated tribes, roaming in search of pasturage. Because the demand for subsistence was so much greater than the supply, they were continually at war with one another. Clan loyalty was always at white heat among them; the only bond they knew. They are the great religious geniuses of history, for earth holds little to charm them, and their gaze is forever fixed upon the solemn desert stars. Between sand and sky their choice is cast, and their thought dwells upon the sky. Subsisting upon their flocks and herds, they have no set abiding place, but drift hither and yon across the desert, seeking pasturage in the infrequent oases. Hence they have no earthly patriotism to chain them to one spot. Freedom is theirs, not only from kings
but even from a fatherland. No artificial government sways them. The father is king; "patriarchal"—the rule of the ancestor—their system of life is called.

At a crucial moment in the history of the world, this wild race from the desert was injected into the highly-civilized country of Canaan. There, under historical observation, their evolution went from the lowest to the highest possible stages of religious belief. Every stage is recorded in the pages of the Bible. As a deep shaft may pierce through strata showing every geological epoch, with fossils of the living creatures of every epoch embedded in the hard rock, so the books of the Bible show us the customs and the beliefs of each stage in religious evolution, preserved forever in the Canon of Holy Writ.

Nothing similar to this exists in any other sacred writing. The Koran was the work of one man. It might be compared to one of the prophetic writings, say the book of Ezekiel. Likewise the Analects of Confucius, the poems of Homer, the Zend Avesta, the Nibelungen Lied. The Upanishads are entirely unhistorical; the Bhagavad Vita is the philosophy of a single writer. Nowhere else has a book like the Bible been produced. Nowhere else have the geographical and the historical conditions been anything like those of the Palestinian land. From just such a spot must indeed have come that concentrated essence of the world’s hopes and fears that should be fused under terrific pressure to form the world-religion.

Such was the land. But the People are unlike any other. The Hebrews were a race impossible to assimilate. Egypt cast them out, Assyria could not swallow them, nor Babylon fuse them into her own blood; Greek culture with its extremest cruelties could not exterminate them, nor could the iron heel of Rome stamp them down. Medieval persecutions strengthened their bond one with another, and their unlikeness to the rest of the world was but deepened.

Through all the clashing centuries they preserved their individuality; and yet their strange religious genius took from every race with which they associated living pictures of the best things in outside religions, and grafted them indivisibly upon their own original conceptions. They met the Egyptians and the Chaldaeans, and took from them a deep tinge and color. From Persia they took Satan and the Angels, from the Greeks the Logos, or the Wisdom; from Rome they took the idea of a Canon. Mixing with all, yet distinct from all, they have preserved to this day the ever growing deposit of the struggles of mankind to search out God; based upon the fundamental groundwork of their original conception; that blood brotherhood—clan solidarity—is a greater thing than territorial brotherhood.

Behind and beneath and running all through the story of the Jews is the story of the primitive character of the Arab tribes, out of which they came.
SONGS OF THE WILDERNESS.

Pictures of that wild race which inhabited the great desert of Arabia during all the rise and fall of the splendid empires which surrounded them, may be gleaned from their descendants of today. Little change occurs in the thought and in the customs of a people reduced so completely to the simplest possible forms of life as are the dwellers of the desert. A great reservoir of primeval life, preserved unchangeable out in the wilderness, to be poured at successive intervals into the seething caldron of sedentary civilization, is formed by the Garden of Allah which lies so close to, but so immeasurably far away from, the very center of history.

"Upon Arabia," says George Adam Smith in one of his lesser known works, the "Early Literature of Israel," "Nature has bestowed few gifts but that of breeding men. A ribbon of fertility around the coast line, broadening on the Indian Ocean, encloses a high broken plateau of absolutely barren rock and shifting sand." Across this sand between the oases wander the flocks of goats and camels, with men living as true parasites on their milk and flesh. Embedded in the Bible, as its lowest substratum, is a collection of the folk-songs of these wandering tribes, which give us a glimpse of their thoughts on men and God.

There are so many more people than there is pasturage that the struggle over the means of life is incessant and fierce. This economic strife, both with nature and men, determines their immemorial character. With them the clan is everything, the individual nothing. In their life the one regulating principle, the only law, is that of blood revenge. The Vendetta, the Feud, is the guiding principle. From the simple code enunciated in the Covenant with Noah:

Whoso sheddeth man's blood,
By man shall his blood be shed,

they developed a system of revenge of which the ultimate results might be incalculable. If one man is killed, whether by accident or design matters not, his nearest relative, the "Goel" or "Redeemer" is the person divinely appointed to kill the man who killed him, or some other member of the murderer's group—it matters not whom. No matter how reluctant the kinsman may be to assume the duty of vengeance; how strong or terrible the slayer, or how just the quarrel in which he slew, the Redeemer is made by a divine decree, without the formula of election or special appointment, the executioner of the ancient blood-revenge. If the slayer cannot be found, every kinsman to the fifth generation is liable to pay the debt of blood; if none of these are within reach, every ally or client of the tribe, any person from the same district, or any one who has been formally entertained as a guest at the slayer's house, is presumed to be tainted with the guilt, and may be slain as the penalty.

Nor is the right to slay confined to open warfare. Under the law of blood-revenge all kinds of assassination may occur, even
under the name of religion—except in a holy place, or upon a holy day. Our own Kentucky feudists illustrate to a remarkable degree of similarity the workings of this law of blood-revenge. With them any person who appeals to the law of the land makes himself an outlaw even to his own kin.

This is what poor Job meant, when, tortured beyond endurance by the sudden visitation of the Almighty; harassed and driven like a leaf before the storm, he cried to his comforters:

"I know that my Avenger liveth!"

Somewhere, somehow, the great Kinsman would arise who would prove his integrity and clear his name of dishonor. When Moses promulgated the law "An eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth", he taught a revolutionary principle, which limited the right of revenge to the exact equivalent of the injury suffered. This law of Moses was taken from the stone tablets of Hammurabi, drawn up a thousand years before.

A song illustrating this thirst for unlimited revenge is that known as the Song of the Sword, in Genesis 4:23. Sheikh Lamech has just been mentioned as the father of Tubal-cain, who first taught to the wild nomads the use of metals. He is given the proud title of "instructor of every artificer of brass and iron." Sheik Lamech, sitting at the mouth of his goats-hair tent, has just received from his son the gift of a new, bright, shining sword. And he sings to his two wives, exultantly:

"Adah and Zillah, hear my voice;  
Ye wives of Lamech, hearken to my speech;  
For I will slay a man for wounding me,  
And a young man for bruising me.  
If Cain shall be avenged sevenfold,  
Truly Lamech seventy-and-sevenfold!"

When Jesus bids his disciples to "forgive" seventy times seven, he is referring to and upsetting this ancient chant of blood-thirsty Lamech. To this present day, says G. A. Smith, "It is common to hear an Arab Chieftain swear to have 100 lives of a hostile clan for one life taken by them." The idea seems to be the same as that of "unlimited reprisals" in the European war, to teach the enemy not to kill, or to bombard from the air, or to sink from the sea. But in the desert it had this additional sanction, that every person killed diminished the demands upon the food-supply, always precariously short.

Introduction of metal weapons into Arabia occurred within historic times. Early Egyptian monuments show us pictures of Arabs armed only with wooden boomerangs; and a well-known Egyptian story describes the weapon-smith's journeying to the Arabs out of Egypt. In any case the narrator evidently intended to use Lamech's song at this point to show the connection between the new art of metal-working and the greatly increased powers of revenge of which the song boasts.
Science and invention made a great step forward, doubtless, when metal displaced wood as a weapon of warfare: But this modern science was put to the service of immemorial hate. Nor have we in this age come to a point where we can afford to look upon Lamech's boast as barbarian. How many times have the newspapers chanted paeans of joy over some new invention which would give into the hands of one side or the other in the Great War, in creased powers of vengeance.

"If Hindenburg shall be avenged seven times,
Truly Pershing seventy times seven!"

Another discovery of what might be considered a scientific nature is immortalized in the little refrain of Genesis 5:29, which is likewise attributed to Sheik Lamech, at the time of the naming of his son Noah. There are two distinct characters of Noah; one is that of the patriarch who built the ark and survived the flood. The other is that of the thirsty wanderer who discovered wine, and the effects thereof. The word "Noah" means "Comforter", and seems to have been applied to wine itself; and it appears that the personified Noah was the patron of the juice of the grape. From the little story of 9:20 we should judge that something of the character of the Roman Silenus attached to this jovial deity. The rollicking jingle said to have been composed by Lamech on the birth of the "Comforter", runs as follows:

"This shall comfort us
From the toil of us
From the pain of the hands of us
Out of the ground
Which Yahweh hath cursed!"

The Hebrew words are a prolonged rhyme, with a sort of hoarse shout at the end, in the very spirit of Omar Khayyam.

But the themes most familiar to the Bedouin wanderers of the desert were those of their daily life; the long stretches of dusty plain, the barren rock, the ashes of old camp-fires, ringed round by the stones which held down the edges of the tents; the fierce warfare, the night surprise, the joys of the early morning, and the terrors of the thunder storm. For every people's dearest songs are naturally those which reflect their life.

Travellers narrate how, when the day's march is over and the camels are watered and picketed and the desert repast is eaten, and the men begin to take their rest, one of the number will often improvise a fragmentary epic recounting the march of the day, the names of the places passed, and the events which transpired during the march. Nor is the custom peculiar to Arabs. Many a time I have heard negro road-builders entertain themselves for hours in this way, one of their leaders reeling off in a plaintive tenor the list of places where he had worked and of the things which happened to him there, while the rest, keeping time with the heavy thud—thud of their steel tamps or their pickaxes, joined with an occasional minor chorus picked out of his chant.
Some such reminiscence perhaps inspired the fragment attributed to the “Book of the Wars of Yahweh”, in Numbers:

“Waheb in Suphah
And the Valley of Arnon
And the Cliff of the Valleys
Which stretches to Ar's— seat,
And leans on the verge of Moab,”

a road-song which seems to be an ancient variant on the theme embodies in “Tramp, tramp, tramp, the tribes are marching.”

But of all the experiences and phenomena of the Desert, the Thunderstorm is the most thrilling. There is small change in seasons, there is no sea to enchant with its ever varying moods; nothing but the changeless sand and the impassive skies. To the awe-inspiring spectacle of the storm-clouds and the wind, there was added for the Hebrew nomads the belief that Yahweh, their god, dwelt in the thundercloud, and was personally present when the storms came. Israel met its god in the Thunder-cloud at Sinai, and Israel hailed its god in every storm thereafter. All of the great victories were won in connection with some great cataclysm. Deborah and Barak routed the hosts of Sisera because of a storm which flooded the valley of the Kishon. Joshua routed Midian in a thunderstorm; and David’s men waited until they heard the “sound of a going in the tops of the mulberry trees”—the whistling of the wind prior to a storm. In Genesis, the voice of Yahweh is heard walking in the Garden “in the wind of the evening.”

Another chorus-fragment bears strongly upon the history of this people. It is the invocation of Moses when the day’s march was about to be begun:

“Arise, O Yahweh, let thine enemies be scattered;
And let them that hate thee flee before thee!”

Israel, having met its god upon the mountain, carried him with them. In the sacred Ark, borne upon the shoulders of priests, was the dwelling-place of Yahweh. They had not to wander long distances to their shrine. “The shout of a king is amongst them,” said Balaam. God was in their midst, therefore they were confident that they should never be removed. No fixed abode made a certain place holy; it was with his people that their God dwelt. It was this conception that made Israel great. Not the land, but the people, was the inheritance of Yahweh. A different Baal ruled over every country of the heathen, but wherever Israel went it carried its divinity. It was this belief which made their religion able to survive the destruction of their Temple.

Because of the lack of central authority, the Arabs to this day depend upon the sense of shame for their social legislation. Women bore the chief part in that matter. It was they who from the hilltops watched the bearing of their heroes in battle, and it was they who cheered the brave with praise and shamed the cowards with their scorn. The area of an ancient battle-field was
small; not a great deal larger, sometimes, than a modern football field; and the rooters on the sidelines and the bleachers at a modern athletic contest fulfill admirably the ancient function of the women in battle. When the women of Israel sang their chorus:

"Saul hath slain his thousands
And David his ten thousands"

it rent the kingdom asunder. Apparently the women were the "moshelim" or makers of sarcastic songs; the editorial writers, let us say, who anciently performed the function of overthrowing a cabinet or stirring up a revolution.

Hence it is that the great songs which mark epochs in Biblical history are songs composed by women; or in which, at least women carried the chorus while the prince led.

"Sing ye to Yahweh, for he hath triumphed gloriously;
The horse and his rider hath he thrown into the sea—"

with this chorus, sung by Miriam and her women to the improvised chanting of the exultant Moses, the national life of Israel began. When the confederacy of tribes went forth for the first time to do united battle against a common adversary, it was Deborah, the "Bee" who dwelt beneath the Palm-tree, whose fierce hot words exalted the bravery of Zebulun and Naphtali, and heaped scorn upon the searchings of heart of Reuben and Dan. Hannah's song marks the rise of the Kingdom under Samuel; and the cradle-hymn of Mary is the beginning of the Gospel.

The Hebrews had but one art, that of music. Sculpture and painting were forbidden them by their religion, and literature was limited in its scope. But music was all their own. Popular melodies that caught the general fancy swept across the tribes even as they now sweep across our forty-eight states. When pilgrimages to Jerusalem became the fashion, it was not only religion that drew the pilgrims out of the sunny nooks and hidden byways of Palestine. There was life at Jerusalem. There one might meet visitors from Rome and Babylon, from Alexandria and Athens, and in later days from Tarshish and Britain, or from Sinim—from India and China. There one heard the news of the world and the songs of the nations. Reunions with old acquaintances, high festivals among the elite of the city—there was much at Jerusalem besides the Temple.

At the top of many of the Psalms in our present Bible are the names of the tunes to which they were sung. Psalm 45 is set to the tune of "Lilies of True-Faith." Then there is the "Song of Loves," "Doves of the Distant Terebinths," "Destroy not," and "Hind of the Dawn." The "Song of Songs which is Solomon's" is a collection of love-lyrics, or marriage songs, contrasting sharply with the lovesongs of other nations, most of which, drawn from the unclean sex-worship of the Canaanites, were vile. The psalms which appear in our collection were chosen out of a great variety—war-songs, hymns, laments, exultant shouts of victory, and
dirges after defeat. They are reminiscences of refrains that swept through the tribes, on the march to battle, at great festivals, or in the heat of some conflict with hereditary foes.

Upon them all is stamped the indelible impress of the desert out of which they were born. Delving into the meaning of these songs, often strange and barbaric in their seeming to us, one can gain a vision of the nature of that strange race, hurled against the civilization of two empires at the point where they were in perpetual conflict; sustaining themselves in the pressure of Egypt against Chaldaea and of Chaldaea against Egypt, long after all the other nations that surrounded them had been swept away; and falling heir finally to the spiritual treasures of all the generations.

And as we study and ponder over these familiar paragraphs and verses, strange gleams and coruscations begin to shine out beneath the deadening polish of many careless generations. In the sacrosanct and customary hymns we catch echoes and refrains of the worshippers of Marduk and Nebo, of Bel and Ishtar and Osiris and Isis and Horus; the forms of the elder gods cluster around the throne of Yahweh, and their souls melt and grow together into the likeness of Truth which all the nations have sought, and which not even we have succeeded in grasping for our especial own.

Of such parentage then was the race of which came the children of Israel—a race that has influenced history as few others have. There is a reason back of every step in their career.

Their first great entrance upon the field of public notice was the brick-maker's strike, led by Moses and Aaron, familiarly known to us by the Greek name "Exodus". This simply means "Walk-Out", and forms the second book of the Bible.

Into Egypt came certain Bedouins of the Great Arabian Desert. There had been a great drouth over the pasture-land of the wilderness, and they sought corn in Egypt. There they were made to work, with hours ever longer and conditions ever worse. One of the handsome Bedouin slaves attracted the attention of the "king's daughter of Egypt", probably Hatshepsut. In course of time the king's daughter of Egypt announced with delighted surprise that she had found a baby among the bulrushes beside the Nile where she went to take a swim. The child was called Ra-Messu, after the king of Egypt, her father; in later days he dropped the heathen "Ra", and was known simply as "Moses." He was trained up in "all the knowledge of the Egyptians." When he became a man he learned of his kinship with the race of brick-makers; and seeing a policeman beating a striker one day, he killed the policeman. When this became known Moses fled by night into the wilderness; and there occurred the desert romance on which much subsequent history has turned.

Moses came to an oasis, and sat there among the palms. At sundown seven shepherdesses came, driving their flock of dusty desert sheep, to water their flocks. But a group of rough-neck
ranchmen, as we would call them, were there before, and drove the girls away. Whereupon the young Egyptian prince took the part of the distressed damsels and vanquished the ranchmen in single combat.

The girls reached home much sooner than usual; and when their father inquired the reason. Zipporah, the eldest, shyly replied, "There was a very handsome young stranger there, who delivered us out of the hand of the shepherds; and moreover he drew water for us, and watered the flocks."

And their father very naturally inquired, "And where is he? Why is it that ye have left the man? Call him in to dinner." So Zipporah went to the door and called; and Moses came from behind a palm tree and ate dinner with the family.

Jethro, the father, took a strong liking to him; and after dinner, as they sat on the sand watching the stars of heaven come out in the infinite blue sky above, he made him a proposition.

"I have no son," said Jethro, "only these seven girls; and I need a young man for a partner. What do you say?" Moses replied, "It depends on Zipporah." And Zipporah said, "I am willing." So they were married, and Moses became a partner in the sheep-ranching firm of Jethro & Moses, at which occupation he remained for "forty years."

On one expedition Moses followed his flocks as far as Mount Horeb; and there he saw a vision. Around the desert peaks between the Red Sea and the Mediterranean the storm-clouds always eddy and hover, with frequent lightning and thunder. Moses, while in Egypt, had never seen the lightning, nor heard the thunder, for in that land it never rains. And Jethro was a priest of his tribe, whose divinity was Yahweh, the god who dwells in the thunder cloud. Coming out of this suffocating air of Egypt, with its great crowd of beast-headed deities, into the clear air of the desert, wherein his forefathers had lived, Moses heard the call of his ancestral faith; and his heart yearned for his fellow-Hebrews bound in the hot slave-pens of Egypt.

Back into Egypt he went, and to and fro among the mud huts where his countrymen lived he travelled by night, preaching that freedom lay in the desert. And one night, they struck, and a vast mixed multitude, composed of Egyptians, escaped prisoners, and discontented workmen of many nationalities, went out with them.

A strong patrol closed the way at the Brook of Egypt, and the state troops pursued the rebellious strikers to the shores of the Red Sea. And then a wind came from the desert peaks where Yahweh dwelt, and blew a pathway dry for them. They waded across in the night, and on the morning when the sea returned to his strength the Egyptian troops which attempted to follow were drowned in the sea.

THE OLD COVENANT.

Then Moses led them to the Mountain where he had first received the call; and when they saw the black thunderclouds ed-
dying round the rocky peak, and heard the thunder and saw the lightning flashing down the jagged slopes, they fell on their faces; for Moses told them “Behold, your God!” There a covenant was made between the deity who had let them safely into the desert, redeeming his word, and the people who thus achieved their liberty; and this was the Covenant which made Israel a world power.

For the essence of the religion of Israel was that the nation, being the body of which Yahweh was the soul, must do as he would do. And it was plain to be seen that here was a god who loved the poor, the workers, the oppressed, the captives, for he had chosen them for his own while they were enslaved. He was a god who kept his word, for he had promised them deliverance, and had come to their rescue when they were hard pressed by their foes. All through the psalms, and the prophets, and the proverbs of Israel, this continual note recurs; “For ye were slaves in the land of Israel;” and that other note, “He keepeth his promise for ever.”

After a period of wandering in the wilderness, (“forty years” according to the record; but the Arabs call every number over ten “forty”) they took possession of the land of Canaan. It was a period when Egypt was rent in twain by the revolution of Amenhotep and the reaction therefrom; and when Mesopotamia was likewise rent in twain by the warfare between Assyria in the north and Babylon in the South. All during the centuries the Valley of the Nile and the Valley of the Twin-Rivers had fought for control of Palestine, the toll-gate along the highway. For whatever power controlled Palestine controlled the rich traffic along the Way of the Sea between the great empires. Only this temporary paralysis of their power, simultaneously occurring as it had never occured before, enabled the Hebrews to establish their foothold in their “own land”.

For a time they were subject to the lowlanders, the Philistines; until Samuel organized the dancing dervishes which abound in every Oriental land into a great order of “Sons of the Prophets,” preaching national independence and the ownership of tools by him who used them. The strength of the Philistine consisted in the fact that “there was no smith found through all the land of Israel; for the Palestines said, ‘Lest the Hebrews make them swords or spears’; but all the Hebrews went down to the Philistines, to sharpen every man his share, and his coulter, and his ax and his mattock, when they were blunt.” Samuel fanned the smouldering flames of nationalism, and crowned a king for them; and first under Saul and then under David the desert wanderers became independent, and levied tribute upon the caravans that passed along the Way of the Sea between Egypt and Assyria.

Then the great Valley of Mesopotamia consolidated itself under the Assyrian power, and moved down against the little states which had formed along the border country—Moab, and Ammon,
and Damascus—during the period of internal strife. One after another they were crushed out until the power of Mesopotamia overcame that of Egypt, and its caravans moved untaxed.

THE FIRST INTERNATIONALISTS.

Meanwhile a race of men had arisen in Israel unparalleled elsewhere; the first nationalists, the Prophets of Israel. They perceived in the giant cruel might of Assyria, a weapon in the hands of Israel's own god to punish their ruling classes for the sin of oppression. First Amos and Hosea, then Micah, Isaiah, and Jeremiah, proclaimed that the God of Israel, being the God of the poor, had his people in every land; but that he had specially chosen Israel to be an example to the rest of the world what a working-class nation, governed in the interest of the producers, could be. And since the judges and the chief priests of Israel had been false to this trust they were to be punished; in order that “The Law of the Lord might go forth from Jerusalem to the ends of the world.”

There is not a Prophet or a singer in the canon of Holy Scripture who does not base his message upon this theory. The God of Israel had shown himself to be a lover of the oppressed and the poor in the very act of the Exodus, and in every great event since. The Psalms celebrate his love for the poor and his hatred for the rich; the sages and prophets based their teaching concerning his nature and will on this conception. And this is the secret of the separateness of Israel, and also the secret of the enduring power of its religion. For in every other nation and every other religion, the basic theory was that the gods loved the rich and hated the poor. Israel's faith was based upon the proposition that God loved the poor and hated the rich, and that the “meek”—what we call the “proletariat”—should inherit the earth in the day of that Great Revolution which they called “The Day of the Lord.”

All too soon the day of Jerusalem's independence came to an end; but the hope of its restoration has never ended. Into Babylon's mud-flats and slimy canals where the conqueror brought them in their heart-broken thousands, they carried the hope of the returning remnant. Their eyes turned ever to the hills, “whence cometh our help.”

Out of the mountains to the North and East, came Cyrus, whose legions also believed in a God of the Mountains, a God of truth. Cyrus overcame Babylon's cruel power by drying up the river Euphrates, even as Moses had led them out of Egypt by the drying up of the Red Sea; and in this circumstance they hailed the fulfilment of the prophecies, and Cyrus as the Christ of God.

The Great Recognition, in which Isaiah of Babylon hailed Persia's god as a manifestation of that of Israel, set the seal of permanence upon their faith. For thence forward they held it as certain and true that the gods of all the other lands are but manifestations of Yahweh, or else demons of the imagination; “No-gods.”
Up to this point Israel's religion had grown with every change in its circumstances. Their conception of their God, beginning in the vision of the Thunder cloud, had broadened and deepened with the passing of every tyranny and the upheaval of every defeat.

With the return from exile, their faith became fixed, and the figure of Ezra the priest is stamped indelibly upon them even today.

Sheshbazzar, prince of Judah, with all the treasures of the Temple, set out under the protection of Cyrus. Perhaps the magnificent panegyric of Isaiah II., concerning the safe passage across the desert, led him to attempt the way through the Arabian wilderness with insufficient escort, and he fell a prey to the wild robbers of the desert. The books of Ezra and Nehemiah are in a hopeless chronological confusion. We only know that one hundred and fifty years after the Exile, Nehemiah, cup-bearer to the Shah of Persia, received the royal permission to go and build up the sanctuary which had fallen down. Nehemiah took hold of the scattered, broken, disheartened and disorganized colonizers, who had seen their latest attempt result in a new disaster; and in a vigorous government of twelve years duration he inspired them with his own indomitable courage, completed the walls of the city, and set Judah upon its feet again.

Ezra, priest and scribe, followed Nehemiah to Jerusalem. With his work begins the history of Judaism proper. Ezra believed, and taught, that all their humiliation had befallen the chosen people because of their mixed blood. He began an agitation against "hyphenism" in Israel. The disasters which have happened to us, he said, are due to the presence among us of Canaanits-Israelites, and Hittite-Israelites, and Perizzite-Israelites, and Jebusite-, Ammonite-, Moabite-, Amorite, and Egyptian-Israelites. "There must be no more hyphens. Pure and unadulterated Israelism is the only thing which can save our nation!"

A HUNDRED PERCENTER.

Ezra's teaching was of the stern, 100% patriotic, Puritan variety. All our misfortunes, he reasoned, have fallen upon us because we worshipped strange gods; and this was done because our blood was mingled with the blood of other nations, through the intermarriages. Hence stringent rules must be adopted, forbidding the marriage of any Jew with any enemy alien. If the holy seed is kept pure and undefiled, the religion can be kept pure and undefiled also; and when the nation is thus rendered pleasing to its God, he will restore our tribal fortunes and give us the dominion of the world. "Deport all undesirable aliens!" became his watchword, as it is that of Wilson's administration.

The Book of Ezra records how the princes told Ezra that the princes and rulers had been chief in the trespass; and how when Ezra heard these things, he "rent his robe and his mantle and plucked off the hair of his head and of his beard, and sat down
astonied. And he sat astonied until the evening oblation." This was, one might think, a little overdone; for the intermarriage process had been going on since the days of Joshua. Perhaps Ezra did it with the Rooseveltian idea of producing a great dramatic effect at little cost.

For the proposal which he advanced was sufficiently sweeping; it was nothing less than to put away, in a wholesale divorce, all the foreign wives and all the children that had been born of them. A great assembly was proclaimed, and the penalty announced that whosoever came not within three days, all his substance should be forfeited and himself excommunicated. So the great conference was held in the ninth month, on the twentieth day of the month; and "all the people sat in the broad place before the House of God, trembling because of the matter, and of the great rain."

The record of this assembly has a suspicious ring. As related in the official journal, it happened thus:

"And Ezra the priest stood up, and said unto them, "Ye have trespassed, and have married strange women, to increase the guilt of Israel. Now, therefore make confession unto Yahweh, the god of your fathers, and do his pleasure; and separate yourselves from the peoples of the land, and from the strange women."

"And the people answered and said with a loud voice "As thou hast said, so we must do. But the people are many, and it is the time of much rain; we are not able to stand without, neither is this a matter of one day or two; for we have greatly transgressed in this matter. Let now our princes be appointed for all the congregation, and let all that are in our cities which have married strange women come at appointed times, and with them the elders of every city, and the judges thereof, until the fierce wrath of our God be turned away from us, until this matter be dispatched."

"And the children of the captivity did so, and they put away the wives of other nations, and the children, which they had borne."

Such a measure as this, to uproot practically every household in the land, to pass an act of wholesale divorce and disinheritance, could not have been proposed and accepted in the free-and-easy way that Ezra records. It looks very much as though the law were jammed through without debate and with insufficient publicity, and that Ezra laid the blame on the "Great Rain" in order to prove that Yahweh himself had intervened in order to prevent delay. Beneath the records there is evidence of a fearful struggle over the proposal. The book of Ruth was written, most scholars agree, as a sort of historical-novel pamphlet in opposition to Ezra's proposal, in order to prove that David himself, the greatest of the kings and heroes of the nation, was born of a Moabitess; and that so far from distaster having fallen upon the nation because of intermarriages, it was from such alliances that its greatness had arisen. The Book of Jonah likewise was a political pamphlet, in which the exile in Babylon was likened to the swallowing of Jonah by a great fish; and his selfish shutting himself up within his own meditations in his hill-top was likened to Israel's attempt to cut itself off from the outside world. Ezra's clever handling of the records would have been of little avail without the rough-and-ready intervention of Nehemiah with his mailed fist. The account of the Tirshatha is much blunter;
"In those days also," he remarks, in chapter 13, "I saw Jews that had
women of Ashdod, of Ammon, and of Moab; and their children spake half
in the speech of Ashdod, and could not speak in the Jews' language, but ac-
cording to the language of each people. And I contended with them, and
smote certain of them, and plucked off their hair and made them swear by
God, saying "Ye shall not give your daughters unto their sons, nor take
their daughters for your sons, or for yourselves. Did not Solomon King
of Israel sin by these things?"

"And one of the sons of Jehoiada, the son of the high priest, was son-
in-law to Sanballat the Horonite; therefore I chased him from me. Re-
member them, O my God, because they have defiled the priesthood and the
covenant of the priesthood and of the Levites. Thus cleansed I them from
all strangers, and appointed wards for the priests and for the Levites, every-
one in his work; and for the wood offering, at times appointed, and for the
first-fruits.

"Remember me, O my God, for good."

So ends the book of Nehemiah. And here Judaism begins,
whose central precept was that the holy seed must be kept pure,
for to them were the promises made, that they should inherit the
earth.

It was Ezra, and the priestly school which accompanied and
followed him, who drew up in their due form and order the book
of Leviticus, and the Priestly Writings which form so large a
portion of the structure of the Old Testament. It was they
who
laid such stress on genealogical tables and minute observances of
ceremonial.

Since the monarchy was gone, and since a son of David no
longer sat upon the throne; the priesthood, the Temple, the Sab-
bath and the Law were the bond which held the nation together.
Instead of a community of farmers, interested in world-politics
headed by a high-priestly King, the nation became a group of
people chiefly interested in observance of precepts and ceremoni-
als, and headed by a kingly high-priest. In order to protect the
Law from any infringement, even the slightest, a "hedge" was
created about the Law, composed of many minute directions and
precautions intended to prevent even the possibility of uninten-
tionally violating a major precept. Books were written to prove
that the Law—by which was meant the first five Books of Moses
—had existed before the creation of the world, and that God spent
four or five hours a day in the study of the Law.

This extreme tendency created a shell, a hard crust of
Legalism around the race. It was the only thing which could have
saved it from extinction in the chaos and confusion of the swift
conquest of Alexander and the slow and ponderous rise of Rome.
Only this insistence on the observation of the Law in all its de-
tails could have kept intact the truths that Judaism held in trust
for the world.

We have not dealt fairly with the Pharisees and Sadducees,
nor with the Scribes. The legalism of the Jewish religion did re-
sist the swelling of the new sap of Christianity; but it kept the
trunk of the tree intact during the fearful storms that preceded
it. For the Jews had no political or economic independence. They
had nothing to fall back upon except their Sabbath and their Law.
Had it not been for the Sabbath and the Law, the worship of One God and the hope of a Redeemer which they had achieved in their brief summer, would have been blighted and perished in the hard winter that followed. But secure in its possession, the Dispersion which scattered abroad, and the Children of the Captivity which built up Jerusalem, knew themselves for one brotherhood. They were one family—a family Consecrated from the beginning of the world. It is this consecration of the Family to the worship of the One God which makes the Jewish race one of the strangest spectacles in history.

THE SACRAMENT OF THE PSALMS.

It is untrue that the formalistic, “legalistic” religion of the worship of the Law killed the spirit of communion with God, as has so often been charged by Christian critics. The Law became a sacrament. The Psalms are full of expressions of the delight which a devout Jew felt in the scrupulous observance of his Law, not, as Montefiore says, “for any personal benefit to come from it, since it often led to persecution and torture; but for the joy of keeping the Commandment of God.”

I feel bound to stress this point, for the Gospels, in their emphasis on the struggle between the Law and the Sabbath on the one hand, and the new Gospel on the other, have led many of us to feel that the Scribes were wholly bad. Jesus condemned them as hypocrites, because they “said, and did not;” but they performed a service in keeping alive the sayings, even though they did not fulfill them.

One of the Psalms amounts almost to the dignity of an epic poem. It is that numbered 119 in our English bibles, the Psalm of the Saints, which forms so large a part of the daily offices of the monastic orders; the one which begins “Blessed are those that are undefiled in the Way, and walk in the Law of the Lord.”

This is an acrostic poem, composed of twenty-two divisions of eight verses each. The twenty-two divisions correspond to the 22 letters of the Hebrew alphabet. The verses of each begin with the same letter, and every verse contains a Hebrew rhyme; that is, it contains either the word “Law” or some other expression which echoes it, not in sound, but in meaning; such as “Statute”, or “Commandment,” or “Word”, or “Way”, “Testimony” or “Judgments.”

This Psalm is a sublime glorification of the Torah, the Law of Yahweh, the Sacrament of Communion with their God during the long ages when sacrifice was forbidden.

“I have had as great delight in the Way of thy Testimonies as in all manner of riches.... My soul breaketh out for the very fervent desire that it hath always unto thy Judgments.... The same is my comfort in my trouble, for thy Word hath given me life.... It is good for me that I have been in trouble, for so have I learned thy Statutes....

“Lord, what love have I unto thy Law; all the day long is my study in it.... Thou through thy commandments hast made me wiser than my enemies; for they are ever with me.... O how sweet are they unto my throat; yea, sweeter than honey in my mouth.... I opened my mouth, and drew in my breath, for my delight was in thy Commandments!”
It is Pharisaism—which refuses its meed of honor to the Pharisees. Jesus condemned no one for loving the Law; he did condemn them for twisting the Law, and thus losing the whole point of it.

"Woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites; for ye take tithes of mint, and anise, and cumin; and neglect the weightier things of the law, Justice, Mercy and Faith! These ought ye to have done, and not to have left the other undone." They had kept the shell, but neglected the kernel.

When Alexander the Great was marching against Egypt, he turned aside to subdue Jerusalem. But, the story goes, the high priest Jaddua came forth to greet him, clad in his sumptuous robes of office; and Alexander remembered a dream in which such a man had appeared to him as a messenger of heaven. So Alexander offered sacrifice in the Temple, and was shown the prophecy of Daniel, which spoke of him. Aristotle, tutor of Alexander and master-philosopher of the world, met a Pharisee whom he took to be a Brahmin, because like the Brahmins of India he wore white, muttered many prayers, and constantly washed himself. This Jew interviewed. Aristotle and his fellow-philosophers, making trial of their wisdom; but, says Aristotle, "he imparted to us more than he got". This trial of the wisdom of the Jews left traces all over the philosophy of Aristotle. But the story of the conflict between Hellenic civilization and Judaism must be taken up elsewhere. Suffice it now to sketch roughly what the Jews have suffered for their Law and the hope it held out to them.

Under Antiochus Epiphanes, successor of Alexander in the empire of Syria, the Greek spirit sought to root up and destroy the Jewish nation. Antiochus planned to exterminate the Jews, in order to unify his kingdom by purifying it of an element that could not be assimilated. The Temple was dedicated to Zeus Pater, and unclean sacrifices of swine were offered in it. Refusal to sacrifice to the gods of Greece meant torture and death, and thousands met death gladly in the sacred cause. Rather than fight on the Sabbath, they allowed themselves to be slaughtered without lifting a hand. But the seven sons of Mattathias the priest, headed by Judas the Maccabee, in a series of exploits with hardly a parallel in history defeated the Syrian armies and reclaimed the Temple to the worship of the Law.

Heroic as this great uprising is, it is not included in the sacred books of the Jewish Canon, nor in the Protestant Bible. The reason is that inspiration was authoritatively defined as having been limited to the period between Moses and Ezra by the Jewish synod of Jamnia, 99 A. D. Besides, the books of Maccabees are written in Greek. But by omitting these records from our Bible, we lose the inspiration of one of its most heroic epochs.

Then came the Roman domination: Through the assault of the armies of Pompey on the Sabbath day, the conquest of Jerusalem was achieved. Although they saw the enemy advancing upon them sword in hand, the priests remained at worship untroubled, and were slaughtered as they poured libations and
burned incense. And there were Jews among the murderers of the 12,000 Jews that fell.

Rome ruled Jerusalem until the year 70 after Christ. Then, provoked by an insurrection in protest against the robbery of the Temple Treasury by Gessius Florus, Roman procurator, the armies of Vespasian and Titus marched against Jerusalem and took it with horrible slaughter. The town was then destroyed and sown with salt; thus fulfilled the mournful prediction of Jesus who, weeping on the summit of the Mount of Olives, foretold that not one stone should be left upon another.

THE BACKGROUND OF THEOLOGY.

Up to that time, Christians had worshiped with Jews in the Temple, distinguished only by their observances of the spiritual injunctions of Jesus. Profiting by the warning of Jesus, the Christians who were in Jerusalem at the time of its investment by the armies fled to the city of Pella. With the fall of Rome, the resemblance, to the Roman eye, between Jew and Christian ceased.

Without the background of this calamity, it is impossible for us to understand the development of either the Christian or the Jewish faith. The Gospel of St. Luke and the Acts of the Apostles were written apparently as two parts of a three-volume work intended to show the transfer of the seat of God's chosen people from Jerusalem to Rome; for the Acts of the Apostles ends in a manner manifestly incomplete with the arrival of Paul at Rome and his dispute with the Jews there. The Epistle to the Hebrews shows the doctrinal crisis which was precipitated by the fall of Jerusalem, both among Jews and among Christians; for until that time the hope of both had been the sovereignty of the city of Jerusalem over the whole world. The fall of Jerusalem forced the transfer of these hopes to the heavenly Jerusalem. The Christians, having lost the sacrifices of the Temple, developed their own sacrificial system centering at every altar, with worship modelled on that of the Temple.

But as for the Jews, the fall of the Temple drove them back again upon the Sabbath and the Law. When Constantine took over the Christian Church because it was better organized and had more honest and capable administration than the Empire had, Judaism became unfashionable, and during the long period of the Medieval ages the revenge of Christianity for the hostility of the Jew wrought its full course.

That quality which roused the hatred of the Gentiles then as it has ever since, is the extreme and exasperating tenacity of the Jewish race. They never quit. Take for example the fall of the fortress of Masada, which for three years after the destruction of Jerusalem resisted the armies of Rome. At length it became evident that there was no hope of relief. Each man slew his own wife and children. Ten of the men were elected by lot to slay the rest. This being done, one of the ten was elected to slay the nine others. Having accomplished this, this man set the place afire and then fell on his sword. When the ruins finally were
captured by the Romans, the total garrison consisted of two old women and five children who had hidden themselves in caves. No wonder the Romans were angry at so barren a victory.

In the year 132 the Emperor Hadrian sought to root out the "Jewish superstition" by forbidding the rite of circumcision as being an act of illegal mutilation. He also rebuilt a pagan city, which he called Aelia Capitolina, on the ruins of Jerusalem, and erected a temple dedicated to Jupiter on the site of the Temple of the Lord. Then arose a man who claimed to be the Messiah—Bar Cocheba, the Son of a Star—he was called—and headed a last revolt. In the desperate fighting which was then launched, incredible numbers of the Jews fell. One historian puts the numbers of the slain at 600,000, besides those who died of famine, fire and disease. Rome's iron heel stamped out the last surviving flickers of the Jewish national existence.

When Bar Cocheba fell, Israel renounced the sword. Until that time a warrior race, it definitely abandoned the use of force, and from that time on down through the dreary centuries it bowed the head—and endured. The Law was sword and shield, hope and memory alike. All the sanctity which had belonged to priesthood, temple, sacrifice, and the royal line of David, was now transferred to the Law and the Sabbath. Clinging to these, the race of Israel waited patiently, if sullenly; let the fierce blasts of a world-wide hatred thunder and shriek over it—and endured.

THE INTERNATIONAL BANK.

For if Israel had laid aside the sword, it found another weapon whereby it mastered the world. The Temple was more than a center of worship—it had become, during the brief period between the Return under Nehemiah and the Destruction by Vespasian, the financial center of the world. While a few of the zealous nationalists returned to Jerusalem to rebuild it, many others remained behind in Babylon, practising their trades and plying their business pursuits. These contented themselves with sending yearly tributes to the Temple to maintain its expensive sacrifices and support its numerous priesthood. It was a matter of pride with every Jewish family to send its half-shekel per capita yearly to Jerusalem, no matter where it might be located and whatsoever misfortunes might have overcome it. As the Dispersion grew and spread, the half-shekels poured in from China, from India, from Persia, from Babylon, from Egypt; Rome and all its provinces contained Jewish colonies; Gaul and Britain were prosperous fields for enterprising Jewish business men.

Ezra's law of strict family integrity made all this widely-scattered race one great family. All were descended from Abraham, and all were numbered, or claimed to be numbered, in some of the twelve tribes. It was hard for a non-Jew to gain admission into the race. There was a long period of discipline and probation for the proselyte of the gate before he could become a proselyte of righteousness. Consequently a Jewish merchant in China or
India could, by a brief investigation, be fairly certain of the standing of a Jewish merchant in Britain or in Gaul.

Further; every year the Pilgrimages gathered delegates from every Jewish colony in the world to Jerusalem. The feasts of the Passover, of the Tabernacles, of Pentecost, of the Dedication, brought delegates from the ends of the world to the common center at Jerusalem. These delegates of course brought with them the tribute money from their colonies; and they also brought notes-of-hand, promissory notes, credit memoranda—all the paraphernalia of banking, in primitive form, to the great clearing-house at Jerusalem.

The Roman state gathered huge quantities of money in taxation; but it spent huger quantities on its armies and its navies and its administration. The Jewish nation had no army to maintain, no navy to support, no administration to pay. It did keep its priesthood, but the living afforded them was slender, and was eked out with trades of their own and with little gardens and vineyards. Hence the Temple Treasury grew and accumulated and under the careful administration of the high priests and of the Sanhedrin began to be the balance wheel of the trade of the Graeco-Roman world.

The system was perfect. No such combination of circumstances had ever been seen before, nor since until the days when the gold and silver mines of Mexico and Peru poured their bloody tribute by way of Spanish adventurer and English pirate to form the Bank of England. Little of this vast accumulation was spent in Temple services. Some of it was available for faithful Sons of Israel who desired to launch new businesses, or to equip fleets of merchant ships for some promising voyage to Ophir or to Britain, or to outfit a caravan for the Trade with India.

In this fact lies the key to much of the world's history, as well as to a very large share of the world's theology. The Jews formed the credit machinery of the Graeco-Roman empire. Guglielmo Ferrero, in his "Greatness and Decline of Rome" tells how Rome's state-devouring policy and her ultimate conquest of all the nations surrounding the Mediterranean sea, resulted in the breakdown of all economic barriers, the abolition of pirates and land-robbers, and the phenomenal stimulation of trade throughout the whole of Rome's territory. Where previously there had been jealousy and friction between nations, tariff walls, special alliances and treaties, now there was universal free trade and unlimited demand for all that could be produced. To meet this sudden expansion of trade, some provision for financing had to be found. It was found in the Jewish national family, with their unlimited financial resources at the Temple in Jerusalem and their outposts and trading stations scattered throughout the known and habitable world.

These huge sums of money tempted the rapacity of the Romans, who secured their profits by the simple process of plunder. Time and again the Temple treasury was robbed. One of Cicero's greatest orations is in defense of Valerius Flaccus,
who robbed the Temple Treasury. Julius Caesar owed five million dollars when he went into Gaul. Shortly after becoming Dictator he issued an edict conferring high favors upon the Jewish high-priest Alexander and King Hyrcanus, for some benefit received. Caesar's quarrel with Pompey and his crossing of the Rubicon were all about the suits brought against him for repayment of his huge debts, and about his continual efforts to stay in office a while longer so that he could not be brought into court. Who was it that finally furnished him the money to pay his debts? The deeds of other emperors tell. The Jews were the bankers of the Caesars. Whenever the debt grew unpleasantly large, the Caesars ordered the banishment of the Jews from Rome. One of these banishments caused the expulsion of Priscilla and Aquila, whom Paul met at Ephesus, whom he joined in partnership in a small tent-making establishment, and who doubtless fired his ambitions to proceed to the capital of the world and attempt its conversion.

In this way the special immunities and privileges of the Jews under the Caesars become explicable. And here again is the explanation for that problem which Ferrero dismisses as insoluble—the reason why Nero blamed the Christians for having set fire to Rome.

**PAUL'S CRIME.**

Paul was preaching a religion which would have disrupted the great International Credit system. He, a Pharisee, bred in the strictest sect of the Jews, wanted to admit any one—any stranger, any Gentile, any outlander into the sacred circle of the Family of Abraham if he would only pronounce the words “Iesous Kyrios” —Jesus is Lord! He would have discarded the whole fabric of Law and Sabbath, Circumcision and Sacrifice, to substitute simply the principle of Faith—namely, sharing in the purposes for which the Jewish race was founded! The thing was incredible, preposterous. It would unsettle business; it would destroy commerce; it would strike a blow at Finance! Their indignation is precisely like that of the American newspapers who demand the deportation or imprisonment as “undesirable aliens” of all who demand that the fundamental principles of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States be taken seriously.

In every city the rich Jews persecuted Paul because he was interfering with the Financial Credit System. And in Rome they had more at stake than in any other city; for there Caesar dwelt. Nero Caesar was constantly in debt. Tiberius and Augustus were frugal, abstemious, even parsimonious; they based their appeals to the leading Roman families on the theory that “Thrift will win the war.” But Nero spent money lavishly; and he got it from the Jews. Paul was in Rome, organizing the slaves and the artisans into this pestilent new sect of his which would destroy the Jewish monopoly on international finance. They wanted his agitation stopped, not because they were monsters, or loved cruel-
ty, but simply because Paul was threatening the whole fabric of International Credit. They may not have laid the blame for the fire which destroyed Rome on the Christians; but Nero, bettering their suggestion of proscription and exile, proceeded to burn the Christians and feed them to the lions.

I have no doubt that the horror which overcame the Jewish bankers of Caesar when they saw the way in which their well-meant suggestion was taken up was scarcely less than that of the Christians themselves. The Jews were not lovers of cruelty. They had suffered too much themselves. But Nero was a degenerate beast, and ruled over a city of degenerates. Fed on gladiatorial combats in Rome and wholesale massacres of conquered cities abroad, the Roman people loved spectacles of horror. Hence the protest against the Christians, first made by the Jewish bankers, left a deep-rooted belief in the Roman mind that the Christians were a race of monsters who should be wiped off the face of the earth. Their churches had no images, therefore, said the Romans, they are atheists. They met at night, or before the dawn; therefore, said the Romans, they must be adulterers and shameless lovers of darkness. They speak of eating the body and blood of a man; therefore, said the Romans, they are cannibals. "Christiani ad leonos!" was their cry.

It is no accident that the destruction of the Temple was so closely followed by laws seeking to root out Judaism by abolishing the essential rite of circumcision. Nor are the laws recognizing Judaism as a legal religion, but forbidding the making of converts, aimed altogether at the Jews. The emperors found the arrangement convenient. All manner of severe laws were passed against the Jews, not to be called into play except when the rulers, having borrowed largely of the Jews, avoided payment by the simple process of banishing their creditors.

All during the Middle Ages the alternate persecution and tolerance of the Jews is a persistent and remarkable phenomenon. That extreme tenacity of the Jews which prevented their assimilation lies, of course, foremost in the popular aversion. For everything that is persistently separate and unlike, is always disliked. It is a fundamental trait of human nature to resent that which is stubbornly different. The ways in which the Jews did not resemble their fellows were many. Pestilence swept across Europe, arising largely from unclean conditions in every city. From these pestilences the Jews were frequently free, because they kept the sanitary laws of Moses, and its efficient quarantine system made them the healthiest of races. But their neighbors laid this to witchcraft, and stoned the Jews for their good digestions.

Christian law laid many restrictions upon the occupations of Jews. In many places—indeed, at all places at one time or another, they were forbidden to own land. Even had they been permitted to own it, they had to be prepared always to flee before some sudden burst of persecution. Their property had therefore always to be portable; if possible, in the form of readily salable jewels.
But Christian law also laid restrictions upon the occupations of Christians. For the Mosaic Law, which had prohibited usury, rent or profits, in our modern sense of profits derived from ownership of another's tools of production—was made applicable to all Catholics. So Jews might not exact usury of Jews, nor Christians of Christians, but Jews might collect it of Christians. In fact this was the only occupation left open to most of them. Exorbitant risks made the rates exorbitant. They had to demand a high interest, for their danger was great. And whenever the Jews, by this means, got in their possession an undue proportion of the wealth of their Christian brethren, the government, or the Church, which was much the same thing, declared them to be outlaws and confiscated their treasuries.

Abrahams, a Jewish historian, says "The Jews were unwilling sponges by means of which a large part of the wealth of the subjects found its way into the royal exchequer. Hence, though this procedure made the Jews intensely obnoxious to the people, they were the more necessary to their rulers." And hence their strange situation of alternate tolerance and persecution, is not capricious. Persecution of the Jews was the means whereby the rulers of church and state plundered their own people through an unwilling medium that bore the hatred of both.

Feudal society based itself on birth and descent. As one was born, so must one die. There were then two great international unions: one Christendom, the Catholic Church on its religious aspect, the Holy Roman Empire in its civil aspect, with the Pope and the Emperor as the bond of union, controlling politics and religion, highways and education. The other was the Jewish race, bound together by the Law, controlling finance. Between these two unions there was bound to be friction, although they recognized one another and dealt with one another as units.

But with the coming of the Renaissance and the Reformation, the breakdown of the old static feudal society, and the substitution of Capital for Birth as the basis of social standing, the Jewish International began to rise. The papal power became more and more fiercely intolerant. In 1492 all the Jews and the Moors were banished from Spain, and the anti-Semitic fury spread all over Europe. But in Europe the Rothschilds gradually obtained the place of power. In 1847 Baron Lionel de Rothschild was sent as the first Jewish member in Parliament.

In Austria as far back as 1781 the doors of the trades, handicrafts and arts were thrown open to the Jews; academies and universities admitted them.

When the British Empire wished to send a representative to the United States at the most crucial period of the world-war it sent Lord Rufus Isaacs. A Jew, Nathan, was Mayor of Rome when Pius X lay dying—the last reach of reaction from the medieval intolerance which barred Jews from the very precincts of the Holy City.

In Russia the pogroms, or slaughters of the Jews, were used by the Czar as a means to distract the attention of Orthodox work-
ingmen from the sufferings which they endured at his hands.
It was a quarrel over the passport rights of American Jews that
led this country to abrogate its treaties with Russia.

THE VOICE OF THE PROPHETS.

But as the Jews had risen to leadership of the International
Financial system, so Jews have led the other International, the
Socialist movement. Karl Marx was of Jewish descent; so was
Ferdinand Lassalle. So is Morris Hillquit. So is Trotzky, so was
Liebknecht. And the twin children of Israel, the two aspects of
Internationalism, the bond of Money and the bond of Revolution
against the money power, are led by sons of Abraham.

In recent testimony before the United States Senate Com-
mittee charged with the duty of investigating Russia, more than
one witness deposed that most of the leaders of the Russian re-
volution, and especially the Soviet movement, are Jews. So far
from being strange, this is the most natural thing in the world;
for the Russian revolution and the decrees and enactments which
it has evolved, are simply putting into effect the hopes and aspira-
tions of the Prophets of Israel. There is scarcely one of the
Soviet decrees which is not simply a translation into law of some
one of the prophecies of the Old Testament in regard to the King-
dom of God. Nationalization of the Land, nationalization of the
banks, dictatorship of the proletariat, exclusion of the clergy
from the vote,—every one of these laws is taken from the pages
of Holy Writ and put into practise in Holy Russia. And for this
crime of taking seriously the root principles of the world’s reli-
gion, the Soviets are branded as “atheists!”

Out of the wreck and chaos of the world war, the gigantic
shadows of its true heroes emerge;—not the Lilliputian figures
of Pershing and Foch, but the sky-towering grandeur of Isaiah
and Amos, the first Hero-Prophets of the Poor, appear above the
dust of falling empires; and men behold as victors in the world
conflict the first Internationalists, the Prophets of Israel.

What is the future of the Jewish race?
It has preserved through all history, from the period of its
childhood, in the rocky wastes of Arabia, to the present time,
a theory on which the world now turns toward revolution. The
essence of the religion of the prophets, that the God of Truth
chose the working-people to inherit the earth, is the faith that
now throbs and burns in tens of millions of hearts through the
world, in every nation and kindred and tongue. And when the mis-
sion of Israel is fulfilled, when the Law of Yahweh, which pro-
claimed that there can be no peace until the cause of war—
private possession of a public necessity—is removed; when that
Law is accepted in every land, then the Jewish race will merge it-
self into the International Brotherhood which shall know no
boundaries of space nor time, through its kinship with the eternal
Creative Power out of which all things proceed.
OF all the tragedies in this world-tragedy none is more poignant than that of Serbia. It was a pistol shot fired by Gavrillo Prinzip at the Archduke Francis Ferdinand which loosed the sea of torture upon mankind; and the quarrel in which that shot was fired originated in Serbia. So, at least, Austria charged.

The slain man was heir to the throne of the Hapsburgs. Austria was not as other countries; it had no constitution, save the person of the reigning monarch. It claimed, therefore, that its very life and integrity demanded the stamping out of the Pan-Slavic propaganda which aimed at reuniting the Serb people on both sides of the Valley of Division under the crown of the Serbian king. Russia encouraged Serbia to resist the demands of Austria. Germany came to the side of Austria; France stood up alongside of Russia; Belgium was invaded; England came to the aid of France; Italy, Japan, and a host of small Latin republics came to the aid of the British allies against the allies of Germany. Finally we joined the conflict—twenty-three nations were ranged against four in the bloodiest conflict of all time, in order to determine, primarily, whether or not the pistol shot which killed the Archduke of Austria was justified.

It is with something of a shock that one reads, in a proclamation issued by the Pan Serbian Committee, statements concerning "the war against Germany and Austria waged by Serbia and Montenegro—and their heroic allies." In the eyes of a Serbian the Allies are an adjunct to the tiny armies of the Jugo-Slavic states, in whose aspirations after unity the great war began.

Now the great Allies are sorely puzzled over one of the aims of the conflict, the creation of a Jugo-Slavic state, which shall embrace all the people of Slavic race outside of Russia who inhabit the south of Europe. What manner of people are these, whose unrest and whose aspirations after unity have disturbed the peace of the world for these many centuries? What is it that has kept them asunder, if they desire to be united? And of what vital interest was it to Russia and Austria, whether the Serbs living on one side of the Valley of Division were united
with those living on the other side, or whether they were organized in separate states?

The story of the Jugo-Slavs—or South Slavs; the word "Jugo" is Slavic for "South"—reaches far back into Roman antiquity, like the history of every other European land; and the tragedy of the divided Slavs begins with the Emperor Diocletian and ends with the Serbian pigs.

THE PIGS OF SERBIA.

Rt. Rev. Monsignor Francis C. Kelly, President of the Catholic Church Extension Society, is editor of the Catholic Extension Magazine. In the issue of that magazine for June, 1917, there is an editorial by Bishop Kelly, under the title of "The Pigs of War", which runs thus:

"A few days after his arrival at home in Chicago, the American Minister to the Balkans (C. J. Vopicka) addressed the Irish Fellowship Club in a most diplomatic and careful speech, discussing some of the horrors of that part of the war which he had seen. After having briefly sketched the causes that led to the first outbreak, His Excellency went further back than most of us in studying the beginnings, and referring to the underlying reason of bitterness between Serbia and Austria, which, he said, was simply a question of trade. Austria has been the principal, almost the sole market for the one product that Serbia offered for sale outside of her own borders. Hungary began to compete for this market. As the latter formed part of the Dual Monarchy, Austria by tariff regulations favored her. Serbia, anxious to reach other markets, then sought to secure the port of Durazzo, so as to give her an outlet to the Adriatic Sea. Austria objected. The Serbians believed that the greatest Austrian opponent to their national ambitions was the Archduke Francis Ferdinand. So the Serbians assassinated the Archduke—and the war was on.

"What was the Serbian product which caused the first disagreement, and thus really brought on the war? The Minister mentioned it in the most casual way. It was—PIGS.

"Ellis Parker Butler leaped to fame by writing a comic sketch called "Pigs Is Pigs". But the Serbian pigs were really pawns on the chessboard of war. To their aid came Emperors and Anarchists, Kings and Socialists, Archdukes and Grand Dukes, Presidents and Bishops, clerks, peasants and generals, Big Wigs and Big Money Bags—all following where the Pigs of Serbia led.

"Were the Serbian pigs worth it?

"New issues have pushed and are pushing back the problem of the pigs of Serbia. International questions of honor, of nations, freedom of the seas, rights and languages and nationalities, demands for liberty, disputes over boundaries, questions of state, of dynasties, of national allegiance, have come to the front, but through these serious and momentous difficulties, the pigs of
Serbia still run riot. Their porcine ghosts have broken into dumas and reichstags and parliaments and congresses. They rush unchecked into the chambers of deputies and senates. They have soiled the marble floors of palaces with their filth, and have trampled over the soft beds of the rulers; for the questions of state rights and human rights were forced on the consideration of the world by the question of the rights of pigs.

"When will thy stop, these pigs of Serbia? When will they go back to their own swineherd kings?—How can any one tell how long it will take to devour civilization? It took centuries to win what we have of it, but the pigs of Serbia could eat it all within a few short years; and there cannot be many more years left in which to finish their meal. And after that?—

"For every great war have nations coined honors for those who fought. For the heroism of every great event in history have the rulers struck medals, founded orders, to perpetuate the glory or adorn the breasts of the great. Each military order has its emblem; for one the eagle, for another the lion, for another the elephant, for another the Lamb of the Golden Fleece. What shall be the world-accepted emblem to commemorate this, the greatest and bloodiest of world wars, with its deeds of heroism unparalleled, its record of generous and unselfish service?

"If we seek the emblem that best expresses its ignoble beginnings, its disregard for individual life and rights, the grasping greed, the broken covenants, the ruthless repression, go to the devastated fields of Serbia and pick out the skeleton head of one oof Serbia's pigs."

Thus Bishop Kelly. But surely it is evident that neither the shot that killed the Archduke nor the pigs who desired to rush into the sea can fully explain how either the one or the other could plunge the world into its years of awful horror. The story is not told, indeed, until one understands the fateful secret of the Valley of the Drina River—most fateful of all the valleys through which rivers seek the sea; for its secret is the secret of the self-destruction of Europe; and the hand that rent the world asunder was the hand of the Emperor Diocletian.

THE VALLEY OF DIVISION.

Few harbors dent the rocky coast of Illyria, which forms the long eastward sweep of the Adriatic shore. But midway down it the river Drina rises among the Serbian mountain ranges and flows into the great Danube river. Few of us are interested in the Valley of the Drina. Most of us do not even know of its existence. And yet through the Valley of the Drina the River of Destiny has flowed for sixteen centuries. For down that water-course ran the line of division which separated Eastern Rome from Western Rome; a division whose deep cleavage, rending asunder empires, races and religions, has brought us finally to the great clash and horror of the world war.
Mark its course narrowly. One side of it lies Serbia—on the other side, Austria. Bosnia and Herzegovina stretch down to the western bank. Serbia begins on the eastern side. In the clash between Austria and Serbia over the two provinces of Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Archduke Ferdinand was shot. Russia came to the aid of Serbia, Germany stood by the side of Austria—and the war was on.

Between Russia and Austria an ancient enmity existed, an enmity that traces back to the days of the Great Division. The Czars of Russia claimed to be inheritors of the temporal and spiritual sovereignty of the Caesars of Constantinople; the Emperors of the Holy Roman Empire for many centuries were Austrians. One extended his protection over the Eastern Orthodox Church, and one over the Roman Catholic Church. Between the pull and haul of these respective protectors the states and peoples of central and southeastern Europe have been rent asunder; and out of the Valley of Division arose the strife which now has set the whole wide world afame.

Diocletian the Emperor drew the dividing line that severed east from west. Diocletian Caesar it was who determined where Rome should divide from Rome. And to get at the roots of the evil matter which now engulfs the world, we must comprehend a little of this man, whose hand was so potent with fate that the line he drew is the world's battle line of the present hour.

From the days of Nero to the days of Constantine were two hundred and fifty years. In that time the Church and the Empire were at war for one hundred and twenty nine years, and were at peace for one hundred and twenty. From Nero's persecution, which began in 64 A. D., to that of Decius, in the year 250, the edicts of the emperors were directed against individuals who were found to be Christians, and not against the Church as an organization. Up to that time there were, indeed, no special laws passed. The old Roman laws against unauthorized religions were used as sufficient to suppress this new sect. Yet the result was severe enough.

THE BEGINNING OF PERSECUTION.

Tacitus, in his Annales, xv: 44, says: "So to stifle the report (of his having set fire to Rome) Nero put in his own place as culprits and punished with every refinement of cruelty the men whom the common people hated for their secret crimes. They called them Christians. Christ, the author of this name, had been put to death in the reign of Tiberius by Pontius Pilate, the procurator, and the pestilent superstition was checked for a while. Afterwards it began to break out afresh, not only in Judaea, where the mischief first arose, but also at Rome, where all sorts of murder and filthy shame meet together and became fashionable. In the first place some were seized and made to confess; then on their information a vast multitude was convicted, not so much of arson as of hatred of the human race. And they were not only put to death, but put to death with insult, in that they
were either dressed up in the skins of beasts to perish by the worrying of dogs, or else put on crosses to be set on fire, and when the daylight failed, to be burnt for use as lights by night. Nero had thrown open his gardens for that spectacle, and was giving a circus exhibition, mingling with the people in a jockey's dress, or driving a chariot. Hence commiseration arose, though it was for men of the worst character and deserving of the severest punishment, on the ground that they were not destroyed for the good of the state, but to satisfy the cruelty of an individual.”

So began the bloody terror. Pliny, who was in the year 111 sent on a special mission to Bithynia, wrote to the emperor Trajan a letter, still preserved, which illustrates his bewilderment as to what it was of which the Christians were guilty. He tells how the captives whom he tortured “confessed to this as the sum of their crimes, that on a fixed day they assembled before daylight and sang by turns a hymn to Christ as God; and that they bound themselves by an oath, not for any crime, but not to commit theft or robbery or adultery, not to break their word, and not to deny a deposit when it was demanded. After this was done, they departed, but met again together to take food, but ordinary and harmless food.” This he calls a “wicked and arrogant superstition”, and says: “Whatever it is that they confess, in calling themselves Christians, their obstinacy deserves the severest punishment.”

What roused the chief resentment of the Romans was that so many of the Roman bishops were slaves in daily life, and practically all of them were workingmen. This upset the whole aristocratic tradition of Rome. Furthermore, the Christians claimed to be citizens of the heavenly Jerusalem, and merely sojourners in Rome. This irritated those who held Rome to be eternal.

By the Emperor Caracalla, who reigned from 211 to 217, the privilege of citizenship was extended to all who were born within the limits of the Roman Empire. This measure changed the face of the world. Caracalla was a proletarian dictator. He was a “bloodthirsty tyrant”, but his thirst was directed against the Roman aristocracy, whom he sought to overthrow, and this universal franchise was a step in that direction. Caracalla has been as roughly handled by past historians as Nikolai Lenin is likely to be by historians of the future.

After him came Maximin, a rough soldier, who re-inaugurated the persecutions mainly because of the earthquakes which terrified millions into believing that the gods were angry with Rome. Maximin was killed, and Julia Domna, wife of Severus and mother of Caracalla, put on the throne Elagabalus, a Syrian priest of the Sun-God. This strange character during his inaugural procession walked backward through the streets of Rome, bowing before a black pyramidal stone which represented his divinity. Elagabalus decreed the marriage of the Sun-God to Pallas Athene. The Sun-god objected in some decisive astronomical way, and Elagabalus thereupon decreed his divorce and remarriage to the Moon Goddess, which was a much more suitable match.
After him came Alexander Severus, a tolerant ruler who had a private chapel in which were statues of all the Roman Gods including Moses, Abraham, Christ, Appolonius of Tyana, Orpheus and all of the Emperors. He rendered a famous decision concerning a piece of public land which had been occupied by the Christians for a church, but was claimed by certain saloonkeepers. The emperor awarded it to the Christians on the ground that it was better to have it used for worshipping the gods in any form than used for an inn.

Then came Philip the Arabian, said by Eusebius and St. Jerome to have been the first Christian emperor. On the last vigil of the Paschal feast before his death, he desired to be admitted to the Church, but the bishop would not admit him until he had confessed and received absolution, which he refused to do. Philip celebrated the games with all the old pagan rites and ceremonies. If he was a Christian, he was a Christian as Philip the Arabian, but a pagan as Philip the Emperor.

THE REGISTRATION OF DECIUS.

After this long line of Oriental emperors, Philip was overthrown by Decius, a Roman of the ancient aristocratic blood. That old stock had been aroused by the disasters which had befallen the Empire during the rulership of the Easterners. Goths were breaking through in the North, Moors were attacking the African provinces, Persians were active in the East, and plague, pestilence and earthquakes had occurred throughout the world. Everywhere men were perplexed as to the cause of these things. The Romans laid it to the anger of the gods, aroused by the toleration of foreign and outlandish sects. Because Elagabalus and Philip had favored the Christians, they vented their anger and indignation against the dead emperors upon the Christians.

Decius was methodical in true Roman style. He adopted a system of registration as rigorous as that of Provost-Marshal Crowder. On a certain day, throughout the vast extent of the Roman Empire, everybody, irrespective of age, sex or condition of life, must offer incense to the heathen gods. Unless one could show a ticket, or registration card, as we would say, certifying that he was a 100 per cent heathen, he was to be executed as a Christian "slacker". There was to be no hiding and no escaping. In every city and village the altars to the emperor were set up; those who refused to offer incense or sacrifice were killed.

Some Christians escaped, through the favor of registration boards or through various means of hiding. But the effect on the church was crushing. A vigorous dispute arose afterward as to what was to be done with those who had lapsed and offered sacrifice, a dispute which almost rent it in twain.

The result was to drive the Church, especially in Rome, underground. Persecutions continued spasmodically until the time of Diocletian. By the time he came to the throne, Rome's boundaries had extended enormously, and the volume of business
which came before the Emperor was vast indeed. Diocletian therefore established a new custom. There should be two Augusti, who should rule the Empire as the two consuls had ruled the City. To assist them there should be two Caesars, considered as apprentices to the post of Augustus. Between these four the world was divided.

Diocletian was a native of Illyria. Perhaps because of his fondness for his native coast, Pannonia and western Illyria, or Dalmatia, were assigned to the prefecture of Italy, Thrace to that of the Orient, while the whole center of the Balkan peninsula from the Danube to Greece, constituted the prefecture of Illyria. In this way the dividing line between Italy, or the West, and Illyria, or the East, ran from the lake of Scutari to the Valley of the Drina, whose course it followed until the river Save was reached in the North. One Augustus and one Caesar was assigned to the Eastern Empire and one Augustus and one Caesar was given the West.

According to Lactantius, Diocletian's reason for dividing the Empire was to create more jobs for the faithful, in the true style of William J. Bryan rewarding the "deserving Democrats", with diplomatic plums. "He was the man", says Lactantius in his book on the Persecutions, "who overturned the whole world partly by avarice and partly by cowardice. He made three partners in his government, dividing the empire into four parts, so that the armies were multiplied, because each of the four Caesars endeavored to have a much greater number of soldiers than former emperors had when they ruled the state alone.

"Thus the receivers of taxes began to be more in number than the payers, so that by reason of the consumption of husbandmen's goods by the excess of land-taxes, the farms were left waste, and tilled lands turned into forests. In order too that all places might be filled with terror, the provinces also were cut up into fragments, and many Presidents and sundry companies of officials lay heavy on every territory, and indeed almost on every city; and there were many receivers besides, and secretaries and deputies of the prefects.

"All of them very seldom had civil cases before them, only condemnations and continual confiscations and requisitions—I will not say frequent, but unceasing—of every kind of property, and in the levying intolerable wrongs. Even these might be borne if they were intended to provide pay for the soldiers; but Diocletian in his insatiable avarice would never let his treasures be diminished, but was always heaping up extraordinary aids and benevolences, in order to keep his hoards untouched and inviolate. Again, when by various evil deeds he caused a prodigious scarcity, he essayed by law to fix the prices of goods in the market. Then much blood was shed for trifling and paltry wares, and through fear nothing appeared in the market, so that the scarcity was made much worse; till after the law had ruined multitudes it was of sheer necessity abolished.

"In addition to this he had an unlimited taste for building, and levied of the provincials unlimited exactions for the wages
of workmen and artificers, and the supplying of wagons, and
everything else that was wanted for the works in hand. Here were
public offices, there a circus, here a mint, there a factory of arms,
here a palace for his wife, there one for his daughter. On a sudden
a large part of the city is turned out of doors. they all had to
remove with their wives and their children, as if the city had
been taken by its enemies. And when the works had been fin-
ished at the cost of ruin to the provinces ‘They are not done
right’ he used to say: ‘Let them be done another way.’ So they
had to be pulled down and altered, perhaps only to be demolished
again. Thus he always played the madman in his endeavor to
make Nicomedia equal to the city of Rome.

“I leave untold how many perished on account of their
estates or wealth, for by the custom of evil men this was become
frequent and almost lawful. Yet the worst of it was this, that
wherever he saw a field more carefully tilled or a house more
elegantly adorned than usual, straightway an accusation and capi-
tal sentence was prepared for the owner, as though he could not
spoil his neighbors goods without shedding of blood.”

This account leads to the interesting speculation whether the
vast increase of taxation because of this waste of fine buildings—
corresponding in a striking way to what we know as the Pork-
Barrel of our Million-Dollar Congresses—had not somewhat to do
with the vast increase of the Christian church, just as the So-
cialist party augments through the economic oppression of im-
perial taxation today. For the vast sums lavished on libraries
and privately endowed universities and millionaire palaces are
obtained through private taxation by the corporations, who con-
trol public necessities, and the ruin of competitors, much as Dioc-
letian obtained the money for his architectural extravagance.

Under Diocletian began the last and greatest of the persecu-
tions. He regarded himself as divinely commissioned to restore
the Empire to its strength. On one occasion, when consulting
sacrifices to discover the will of the gods, with all his court present,
the entrails showed no indications whatever. One priest said:
“There are Christians present, making the sign of the cross; the
gods are affronted, and will not answer while such things are
being done!”

Diocletian, horrified by the sacrilege, ordered every one of
his household to sacrifice to the gods, under penalty of scourging.
Astonished at the number of Christians thus discovered, he next
ordered that Christians should be driven out of all official positions.
Then the army was ordered purified by dismissing all soldiers who
refused to sacrifice to the image of Caesar.

Galerius, his son-in-law, urged the Augustus further than he
intended at first to go; and the result can best be told in the words
of the Christian historians, Eusebius and Lactantius.

“In the nineteenth year of the reign of Diocletian (303) in
the month Dystrus, which is called March by the Romans,” says
Eusebius, “as the feast of the Savior’s passion was approaching,
imperial edicts were published everywhere, commanding the
churches to be levelled with the ground and the Scriptures to be
destroyed with fire, and ordering that those possessed of honor should lose their position, and that they of Caesar’s household, if they held to their profession of Christianity, should be deprived of freedom. Such was the first edict against us; and before long by other edicts following it was ordered that all the rulers of the churches everywhere should first be committed to bonds, and afterwards by every art be made to sacrifice.”

It was on the feast of the god Terminus, in the year A. D. 303, that the edict of Diocletian was to take effect. The festival of the Terminalia was one of oldest of the highly utilitarian festivals of ancient Rome, for he was the divinity who presided over landmarks and secured each man in the possession of his own lands. He had resisted the encroachments of Jupiter and all the newer gods, and kept Jupiter out of his temple. On his festival the soldiers, early in the morning, seized all the furniture, sacred books and vessels of the churches, and burned them. The historian records how greatly puzzled the Roman soldiers were at finding no statues of divinities in the churches, for the heathen mind could not conceive of worship without images. The edict was published on the morning after it took effect, very much like the edicts of Postmaster General Burleson. Other edicts followed. The substance of them ran thus:

1. All churches and temples of the Christians were to be destroyed.
2. All holy books and scriptures were to be given up and burnt.
3. Christians of high rank were to be degraded and rendered infamous; if they persisted, they were to be tortured, and every suit at law decided against them, without reference to the merits of the case. They were debarred from pleading in cases like adultery and theft, were to have no citizenship and no suffrage. Those who were not Roman citizens were to have no rights.
4. All Christians who were slaves were incapable of manumission.

It was thought that this would be enough. But the Christians promptly tore down the published edicts. Insurrections and fires broke out everywhere. The second edict soon followed. This provided that all clergy of all ranks, even acolytes, were to be seized and thrown into prison. But the faithful who remained outside came and ministered to them in prison, and instead of recanting they gloried in their imprisonment. This again finds a parallel in the behavior of the American Socialists, who nominated for some office every man indicted or convicted by the Government under the co-called Espionage act.

The third edict therefore followed; that the clergy should all be tortured until they recanted. This failing of its results, it was ordered that all Christians who failed to sacrifice to the gods were to be put to death. But against all these tortures the resolution of the Christians remained unshaken; and the Empire’s fury was defeated by the patience of the Church.

In the year 305 Diocletian, who had caught a fever while in Rome attending the celebration of the twentieth anniversary of
his reign, retired from his post and compelled Maximianus, his
colleague, to do likewise. Diocletian retired to his Illyrian farm,
and spent the remainder of his days there. This left Constantius
and Galerius as the Augusti, with Severus and Maximinus Daza
as Caesars. Civil war resulted, because the sons of the Augusti
were ignored in this arrangement. Severus was deposed, and
Constantine, son of Constantius, was made Caesar in place of him.

Constantius and Constantine stopped the persecution in the
West in 305. But Galerius and Maximinus continued the persecu-
tion in the East, and made it more rigorous by enacting the
ancient statue of Decius, that on a certain day every man, woman
and children in the Empire must sacrifice to the gods or die.

There were a great many apostasies. Hundreds of the church
officials, instead of being killed, were sent to the copper mines,
where their eyes were put out and the sinews in their left ankles
cut. Others were compelled to take part in prize-fights with
leaded gloves against trained prize-fighters. When the Council
of Nicea was summoned, many of the bishops appeared with the
scars of the copper mines, with eyes gouged out and with ham-
strung ankles, as relics of this last great persecution.

In 308 Maximinus issued the fifth edict, which was really a
confession of failure. It is an expression of spitefulness and
annoyance; the official pagan recognition that Christianity could
not be killed. It provided that all heathen temples should be rebuilt
and the altars set up by Christians; that all things exposed for
sale were to be sprinkled with sacrificial blood; that all public
baths were to have men stationed at the doors with sacrificial
libations, and every one who entered or came out were to be
sprinkled with sacrificial blood. This in addition to ordering the
enforcement of the first four edicts.

But in 311 Galerius, by his edict of Toleration, confessed
himself defeated by the “obstinacy” of the Christians, and ordered
that they should be allowed to “exist again, and to establish their
meetings, yet so that they do nothing contrary to good order.
By another letter we shall signify to magistrates how they shall
proceed. Wherefore, in accordance with this indulgence of ours,
they will be bound to pray their god for our good estate, and that
of the commonwealth, and their own, that the commonwealth
may endure on every side unharmed, and they may be able to live
securely in their own homes.”

By 313 Constantine had destroyed all his rivals for the
imperial power, and ruled alone, with Licinius at first as his Caesar.
By the Edict of Milan, in 313, Christianity was established as a
legal religion. Heathen customs and sacrifices were kept up for
centuries in the country, or “pagan” districts—a pagan simply
means a country dweller.

Eusebius the Historian recounts that Constantine himself
related to him the events of his conversion. In his Life of Con-
stantine, 1:28, he says, concerning a conversation with the emperor:

“He said that about noon, when the day was already begin-
ning to decline, he saw with his own eyes the trophy of a cross
of light in the heavens, above the sun, and bearing the inscription "Conquer by This". At the sight he himself was struck with amazement, and his whole army also, which followed him on this expedition, and witnessed the miracle. He said, moreover that he doubted within himself what the import of this apparition could be. And while he continued to ponder and to reason on its meaning, night came on; then in his sleep the Christ of God appeared to him with the same sign which he had seen in the heavens, and commanded him to make a likeness of that sign which he had seen in the heavens, and to use it as a safeguard in all engagements with his enemies."

So ended the persecutions of Christians by the Empire. The course of events showed that it was a question of which organization was the stronger—one built from the top down or one built from the ground up.

The numbers of martyrs killed in the 250 years of persecution cannot be counted. The catacombs in Rome alone are 900 miles in extent, and are filled with graves to the number of millions. Seven million is given as the number by authentic historians. Burial in the catacombs stopped when the persecutions ended. The Christians kept no minutes. Thousands suffered and died unemployed.

The majority of the Christians were not in Italy, but in Asia Minor, Armenia, and Thrace;—a great majority of them lived in and around Antiochene Syria, Egypt, Cyprus, the southern half of Italy, in proconsular Africa, the coasts of Greece and Spain, in southwest Gaul, the Christians formed an aggressive minority. They were weak in Palestine, Arabia, Mesopotamia, Macedonia, and in inland towns of Greece. Northern Italy and Western Africa had very few Christians. Britain, Philistia, the Black Sea regions, very few; Germany and Rhesia, none at all.

For five centuries the history of the Church is largely limited to the Eastern end of the Mediterranean. In Rome the Church was Greek. Latin theology began in Africa.

While Constantine was in supreme command, he divided the empire among his three sons, Constans, Constantius and Constantine. Still the dividing line between East and West ran through the Valley of the Drina. But the great majority of Christians were east of the Valley of Division. Hence when Constantine summoned the bishops of the Church to decide on its discipline and faith, the meeting place was in the East, at Nicea, near Constantinople; although the president of the synod was Hosius, of Cordova in Spain.

Matters of discipline took up much of the time of the Council. Canons prohibiting self-mutilation; forbidding a clergyman to have as his housekeeper any woman save one of his own kin; and sternly forbidding any taking of usury—that is, any form of interest for money—are included among the canons of that famous council which we think of solely in connection with its formulation of a Creed. Matters of precedence of bishops, or, the proper observance of Sunday, were in grave need of settlement. The Creed was formulated not as a new thing, but as a defense
of the proletarian character of the Gospel against the heretical novelties of Arius of Alexandria, who held the Greek Gentleman-God idea that a true divinity could not possibly have become incarnated in the vulgar body of a working-man.

THE STORY OF CONSTANTINE.

Constantine presided at this Council in his character of Caesar. A little more concerning Constantine is of interest here. A romance preceded him.

On a pleasant day in the year 288, the Caesar Constantius rode amid a band of his horsemen down the great Way of Egnatius to the bridge across the River Morava, where lay the ancient Celtic town of Naissus. An inn stood there, where the young Caesar and his comrades dined and slept. A surpassingly beautiful daughter had the innkeeper, a daughter who peeped shyly at the imperial Caesar clad in all his purple as he ate of her father's provender. Caesar saw her, and the young blood in his own veins bounded at the look in her eyes. After some days—or weeks, perhaps—he rode on. Months later, the innkeeper's daughter sent word to Constantius Caesar: "Thou hast a son". The son was Constantine, later called The Great; the innkeeper's daughter was Helena. Constantius, returning, made Helena his wife.

The boy was left as a hostage with the Eastern Caesar Galerius, while Constantius was in Gaul. Then followed the spectacular ride of eighteen-year-old Constantine to his father's side at Boulogne, to escape the threats of Galerius. Clear across the continent of Europe he went, driving the post-horses of each station ahead of him to prevent pursuit by Galerius. With his father Constantius, Constantine sailed for the shores of Britain and engaged in the war against the Picti. Constantius breathed his last at Eboracum, or York, and the army which he led proclaimed the young Constantine as Caesar in his stead.

There followed a confused time when there were six emperors, three in the east and three in the West. Their names are confusing; Maximianus, Maximin, Maxentius, Constantius, Constantine, Constans, another Constantine and his brother Constantius.

Out of the welter of the warfare with Licinius Constantine the Great emerged as ruler of the world, without a rival, in the year 324. But in his own family there was nothing but unhappiness and jealousy. He put to death his eldest son Crispus because of the complaint of his wife Fausta. Later, becoming convinced of his son's innocence, he put his wife to death for the horrible perjury.

Helena, his mother, has been confused with the Helena who was daughter of Old King Cole, after whom Colchester in England is named. It was the Empress Helena, mother of Constantine, who visited the Holy Land and sent home to her son two of the nails with which she claimed the crucifixion was accomplished;
but the Emperor, to show his disbelief of this pious tradition, made them into a bit for his horse.

Such a man was Constantine, whom the Greek Orthodox Church proclaims to be “Isapostolos”—equal to the Apostles. He was convinced by the failure of Diocletian’s persecution that the Church was better organized than the Empire. His edict of toleration did not at first establish Christianity as the official faith of Rome. Heathen sacrifices and heathen rites were kept up for years in the country districts. But the favor of the Emperor, and the many evident advantages of the new faith, speedily made it supreme; and by the end of that century the religion of Jesus was the faith of the Empire. But hardly had it triumphed, when its unity was rent asunder. The East and the West could not remain permanently as one.

THE GREAT DIVISION.

By the end of the fourth century, the tension between Eastern and Western Rome had reached an impassable pitch. Theodosius the Great was the last ruler of an undivided Empire. On his death, in 395, Arcadius and Honorius made permanent that division which Diocletian had begun. All East of the Valley of the Drina belonged to Constantinople—all west of it to Rome. The language of the East was Greek; that of the West was Latin. The Church of the East looked to the Patriarch of Constantinople, who ruled over many millions more believers, gathered in churches far more rich and splendid, than did the Pope of Rome, to whom the Westerners appealed. And when Arcadius and Honorius split Rome, the Church too—though more slowly than the Empire—rent asunder. With the peculiarity of the Greek temperament, which prided itself on being rational, the Eastern Church called itself Orthodox—the Right-Teaching. But with Roman pride of power the West called itself Catholic—the Universal.

Those differences which impress us most today between the Eastern church and the Latin church are incidental. Even the excommunication of Photius by John VIII., centuries later, only marked the final consummation of a long-standing split. Questions such as whether there should be an Iconostasis in front of the altar, or a Reredos behind it; whether priests shall be bearded or smooth-shaven; celibate or married; whether one may venerate statues or only pictures carved and painted in high relief—these are incidental products of the long quarrel. Not even the burning question of the Filioque—whether the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son, or from the Father alone—lies at the root of the matter. The issue was really joined on a much more simple point: whether one lived East or West of the Drina river; whether one were nearer to Constantinople or to Rome. And by this test the future history of the two Churches was determined.

Rome faced foes from without; Constantinople faced foes within. From the Northern forests Goths swept down across the
Alps and stormed the gates of Imperial Rome. The armies of the emperors could not keep them back, but the Bishop of Rome did. Arrayed in his pontifical robes, Leo the First went forth through the city gates and met Alaric at the head of his tribes, as the high priest of Jerusalem had met Alexander. Alaric the barbarian turned back and spared the city. By his spiritual dominion the Bishop had succeeded where the emperors had failed. Thenceforward through the wretling chaos of the Folk-Wandering, the “shining golden miter of the Bishop of Rome gleamed amid the darkness”, says White in “Eighteen Christian Centuries”, “as the one fixed and certain point to which men’s eyes might turn as to their hope of safety”.

But in the East Constantinople, impregnable beside her straits, was assailed by foes within. Because of its location, the new Capital had become the center of the grain trade; and since that was the life of the empire, all of the vast commerce of the Mediterranean and the Black Sea and the heavy traffic along the great high-roads poured its wealth upon her wharves.

A thousand years before Constantine with its own hands plowed the furrow which marked the limits of the New Rome, a band of wandering Megarians seized upon the site and called it Byzantium, after the name of their chieftain. Legend says indeed that the quarrel between Greeks and Trojans which gave rise to the cycle of the Iliad was a quarrel over the right of the ships of the islanders to pass through those narrow straits to the Black Sea for their grain; and that it was not Helen’s face which “launched a thousand ships, and sunk the topless towers of Ilium”, but a dispute over the tariff to be paid to Priam’s customs collectors by the navies of the Achaean league. Which, indeed, seems to make the conflict more reasonable.

Constantinople controlled the straits—never more than five miles wide—which connected the great grain-bearing steppes with the Mediterranean. The city also sat astride the great highway from Europe to Asia. The absence of tides in its harbor, the wealth of fisheries, and its impregnable situation, gave it command over the whole seaborne traffic of the East. Trajan had settled his legionaries in what is now Roumania to hold the grain fields for Rome from the Scythians; but the neck of the bottle was at Constantinople.

Immediately after its foundation—which took place on May 11, 330 A. D.—this city became a Mecca for speculators and money-lenders, a combination of Pittsburgh and Chicago, with a strong dash of old-time San Francisco and midwinter New Orleans. Every one with money to make or to spend resorted thither. Many thousands lived on the chariot-races; other thousands lived on speculation in grain and munitions. The usurers made a rich harvest.

Now among the Canons of Nicea was one usually overlooked by modern commentators—one which renews as part of the law of the Universal Church the ancient Jewish canon that usury is theft. The usual rate, one percent a month, is specifically men-
tioned and forbidden. Any cleric taking usury was to be deposed from his office.

Into the seething center of luxury and idle graft a new Bishop was precipitated by Eutropius, chancellor to the emperor Arcadius. John of Antioch, whom later ages have surnamed John of the Golden Mouth, John Chrysostom, was kidnapped from his hermit cell in Antioch and against his will made Patriarch of Constantinople. In his lonely years of communing with God in his wind-swept cave on the top of the Anti-Libanus range, Chrysostom had learned contempt of man. His sermons rang with imprecations against the foes within the Church who made of none effect the oracles of God. Bankers, speculators, cornerers of grain and wine and oil, all such as these he denounced with an eloquence never surpassed.

They did not stand it for long. John was seized and banished, but a popular rebellion forced the weak emperor to summon him back. A second time he was seized and banished, and this time he died. From that time on the Church of the East became the fawning lackey of the Caesars.

In the West the Papacy rose and sank, staggered and fell and recovered itself again, until the great wave of reformation that spread out from the Abbey of Cluny, under the stern Hugh, lifted into the papal Chair Hildebrand the monk of Cluny as Gregory VII. How well these men are named! Leo, the Lion, who turned back Alaric from the gates; Chrysostom, the Golden-Mouthed; Gregory—the Watchful One! Seeing the fate of Constantinople, Gregory proclaimed the Church to be above all kings and lords; and with this giant power he reenacted the ancient laws of Moses, protecting the Laborer against usury. The Orthodox Church remained true to its creeds, but the Catholic Church remained—for a time—true to its poor. Benedict has parallels in the East; Francis of Assisi, who broke down the feudal power with his Third Order, which rendered any man or woman who joined it independent of feudal lords, has none.

COMING OF THE GOTHS.

But although Constantinople itself was spared, the great wealth of the Balkan peninsula and especially of Constantinople located at its extremity tempted Goths and Huns to ever recurring invasions, which laid the country waste. The natural road to Constantinople lies down the middle of Serbia. For the mountain ranges which flank the Peninsula extend in ranges parallel to the sea, barring access from the Adriatic. The immemorial highway from the Northwest to old Mesopotamia crosses the Danube at Belgrade, which was a town of the Celts under the name of Singidunum before it became Romanized. It follows the valley of the Morava as far as Nish, the ancient Naissus; thence it branches off eastward, going through Sofia and again crossing all Bulgaria to reach Constantinople, while the route to the sea at Salonika goes down the rivers Morava and Vardar.
The Balkan provinces were added to the Empire by the Emperor Trajan, whose colonists and legionaries were thickly planted along the shores of the Black Sea to care for and protect the great grain harvests there. Amid the storming surf of the ever-recurring inroads of the Slavic barbarians, the Roman colonists held fast to their descent from Rome, and modern Rumania emerges with its head above the waves a proud claimant of the title of daughter of Romulus.

It is impossible to count the number of times the tide of invasion and devastation swept southward over the unfortunate peninsula. As a result of these invasions, says Nevill Forbes in "The Balkans" the Balkan peninsula, which had been raised to a high level of security and prosperity during the Roman dominion, gradually relapsed into barbarism. The walled towns, such as Salonika and Constantinople, were the only safe places, and the country became waste and desolate. The process continued unabated throughout three centuries; Huns and Goths, Avars, Bulgars, Slavs, swept over the land in an endless succession. One is driven to one of two conclusions; either that these lands must have possessed very extraordinary powers of recuperation to make it worth while for the invaders to pillage them so frequently, or, what is more probable, there can have been after some time little left to plunder, and consequently the Byzantine historian's account of enormous drives of prisoners and booty are greatly exaggerated.

Emperors and generals did what they could; but as they had to defend an empire stretching from Armenia to Spain, it is not surprising that they were not more successful.

THE SLAV SETTLEMENT.

It is in the sixth century that the Slavs first appear from their original home, which was upon the vast plains north of the Carpathians in Galicia and Poland. "They were," says Forbes "a loosely knit congeries of tribes without any single leader or central authority; some say that they merely possessed the instinct of anarchy, others that they were permeated with the ideals of democracy." In any event they came in company with the Avars, a Mongol tribe of horsemen. The Avars plunged in brilliant charges against the Byzantine armies and in course of time were annihilated, disappearing as suddenly as they had come; but the Slavs gradually settled all over the country south of the Danube, the rural parts of which, as a result of incessant invasion and retreat, had become waste and empty. The warriors complained that while they fought the Greeks, the Slavs occupied all the best farms. The Slavs said nothing, but stayed where they were. During the second half of the sixth century all the energies of Constantinople were diverted to Persia, so that the invaders of the Balkan peninsula had things much to themselves. But in 626 a concerted attack was made against Constantinople by
Persians, Avars and Slavs, which was defeated by the walls of the city and the ships of the Greeks.

The Avars disappeared upon their fleet horses, but the Slavs remained upon their well tilled farms. "It was the custom," says Forbes, "of the astute Byzantine diplomacy to look on and speak of lands which had been occupied by the various barbarian invaders as grants made to them through the generosity of the Emperor. By this means, and also by means of lavishing titles and substantial incomes to the invaders chiefs, by making the most of their mutual jealousies, and by enlisting regiments of Slavic mercenaries in the imperial armies, the supremacy of Constantinople was regained far more effectively than it could have been by the continual and exhausting use of force."

CONVERSION OF THE SLAVS.

But a better method and a more enduring force of alliance was found in the extension of the church to the Slavs. The Bishop of Rome had entrusted the conversion of the Slavs of Moravia and Pannonia to the Bavarian hierarchy. But Prince Boris of Bulgaria, who ruled in 852 to 888, became a convert to Christianity of the Eastern form through the influence of his sister, who had spent many years at Constantinople as a captive. The Emperor Michael sent two brothers, Cyril and Methodius, Greeks of Salonika who had considerable knowledge of Slavic language and customs, to introduce Christianity to all the Slavs. They, finding many sounds among the Slavic peoples which could not be expressed in either Greek or Roman letters, invented the Cyrillic alphabet which is in use today in all the Eastern Slav countries—Russia, Bulgaria, Serbia, and Montenegro, and in many parts of Austria-Hungary. It is based on the Greek alphabet. With these letters to aid them, they translated the Scriptures into the Slavic tongue. It is for this reason that they are venerated so greatly by all members of the Eastern church who regard them as the founders of their civilization.

All of those tribes who lived in the Eastern half of the Empire were converted to the Orthodox form of Christianity; all who lived in the Western half received their religion and their politics from Rome. And because the Church of Constantinople had adopted the principle that the State is superior to the Church, and the Emperor greater than the Patriarch—wherever a separate or independent kingdom was established among the Slavs, a separate and independent Church was likewise recognized.

During the reign of Simeon, second son of Prince Boris, the first Slavic State, Bulgaria, reached the height of its power. Simeon had passed his childhood at Constantinople, and had become spellbound by the splendor of the Byzantine empire; and thereafter his life was spent in a vain endeavor to conquer the city of the Eastern Caesars and be proclaimed as Augustus. He did indeed succeed in forcing a recognition of himself as "Czar"
or Caesar—a title which by that time had become a common ornament granted by the Greeks to relatives of the Emperor or to distinguished men. But in 921 Simeon proclaimed himself Basileus and Autocrator of all the Bulgars and the Greeks—a title which nobody else recognized. It was the long-delayed reflection of this glory of Czar Simeon which led Ferdinand of Bulgaria, ten centuries later, to proclaim himself Czar of Bulgaria in 1908, that fateful year in which the trains of powder were laid all over the Balkans which later were to explode—at Sarajevo.

Meanwhile in Serbia events had been shaping toward the establishment of a national sovereignty. Stephan, founder of the Nemanja dynasty, extended the power of the central Serbian state of Raska to the south when after the death of the Greek emperor Manuel Comnenus in 1180 the Byzantines fell into strife. Toward the end of his life he abdicated the throne in favor of his younger son Stephan Nemanjic, and became a monk. In the monastery on Mount Athos he found his youngest son Sava, and with him established a new monastery. This Sava, or St. Sava as he is known, was really the creator of the national spirit of the Serbs; for he organized the Serbian national church, and as its head crowned his brother Stephan Nemanjic as king of the new State, and thus this Stephen Nemanjic is known in song and story of the Serbs as "First-Crowned." Under a succession of Nemanjic kings the state grew and strengthened until the days of Stephen Dushan, first and greatest of Serbian emperors—and almost the last.

Between 1331 and 1334 Stephen Dushan subjected all of Macedonia, all of Albania, of Thessaly and Epirus to the Serbian rule. He married the sister of the Bulgarian ruler, and brought that neighboring country completely under his power. The height of his country’s glory was reached when in 1345 he proclaimed it an Empire. At Constantinople the house of the Eastern Emperors had fallen into petty quarrelling, and was in a state of perennial anarchy. So when Stephan summoned a special council of the Eastern Church, at which the Patriarchs of Serbia, of Bulgaria and of Ohrida crowned him Czar of the Serbs, Bulgars and Greeks—the Byzantine empire could do nothing but curse.

In the west, however, the King of Hungary undertook a crusade against orthodox Serbia in the name of the Catholic Church, to punish these assumptions; but Stephan gloriously defeated him at the frontier of the Danube. Later he conquered the southern half of Dalmatia, and extended his empire as far north as the river Cetina. Meanwhile this remarkable man had set about devising a code of laws, which should combine Slavic customs with Roman and Greek precedent; and this code, published in 1349 and enlarged in 1354, is his greatest monument to enduring fame.

After Dushan came a succession of weaklings. Meanwhile the Turks had been sweeping around the walls of Constantinople from the East; in 1354 they had taken Gallipoli, and in 1361 had conquered Adrianople, the city of the Emperor Hadrian. In the year 1371 the Serbs met them in battle at the Maritsa river, and
were completely crushed. Czar Urosh, who had succeeded to the throne, died shortly after the battle of Maritsa—and with him died the dynasty of Nemanjics, and the empire of the Serbs.

THE PLAIN OF KOSSOVO.

Still the Turks continued their all-conquering advance. Far in their rear Constantinople still held out against them; but pouring in from one side and the other, they thundered far up the immemorial road to hammer at the gates of Austria. Facing this peril, the Slavic countries gathered together all their forces. Forgetting rivalries and jealousies, all the Slavs—Bulgars, Serbs, Montenegrins, and Bosnians—joined together in the defense of their country and their religion in the great battle of Kossovo, the Plain of the Blackbirds.

For a long time the issue of this battle was in doubt. At the critical moment Vuk Brankovich, son-in-law of Prince Lazar, turned traitor and fled at the head of his troops; and the day was lost. Prince Lazar was captured and killed; the Sultan, Murad, was slain in his tent by another Serb leader, Milosh Obrenovich. This man had been accused of treason by his fellows, and had vowed to prove his good faith with his life by killing the Turkish leader.

But Bayezid, son of the Sultan, rallied the Turkish troops and swept them on to victory. As a price of this Serbian defeat, Princess Milica, wife of the slain Lazar, was forced to give her daughter to Bayezid in marriage; and her son, grandson of Lazar and son of his conqueror, ultimately claimed possession of Serbia by right of inheritance.

Thus ended the glory of the Southern Slavs. In battle after battle they were forced back, and the Turks pressed on and on, until in 1496—the year of the second voyage of Christopher Columbus—the little province of Zeta was ceded to them by Venice; and the Turks ruled over the whole of the land of the Jugo-Slavs, as the Tartars had ruled over Russia.

STORY OF THE BOGOMILS.

When religion is used as a convenient badge of political allegiance, and when that political allegiance is mainly employed as a cover for trading concessions, there will always be a certain number who will become disgusted both with that sort of politics and with that sort of religion. And consequently along the Valley of the Drin there had always been great discontent with both the Church of Rome and the Church of the East. A new conquest from either side meant a change of religion from one imperial church to the other. In the tenth century, when the wars between East and West lashed over the Valley of Division like waves from a cross-currented sea, a certain Jeremiah Bogomil, making his headquarters in the town of Philippopolis, began preaching the
doctrine thereafter identified with his name, which defied the authority of both churches and both empires. The Bogomils denied that either Orthodox or Catholic Church were of divine origin, and that neither Rome nor Constantinople had any right to rule over them. They denied the validity of oaths, and refused recognition to any human laws. They refused to pay taxes, or to fight, or to obey orders; they sanctioned theft—or rather, they held to a primitive communism in which one took what one needed, which naturally looked like theft to those who had more than they needed—and they denounced punishment as bodily coercion and therefore un-Christian. They discountenanced marriage, and were strict vegetarians. Naturally a heresy so alarming in its individualism incurred the vigorous enmity of both churches, who while they hated each other reserved a fiercer hatred for the Bogomils.

Bosnia was the chief seat of the Bogomils because it lay directly between the contending empires. One of the kings of Bosnia, Stephen Thomas, who reigned from 1444 to 1461, was himself a Bogomil—strange confession for a King!—until the Pope and the King of Hungary won him over to their side. He became a Catholic and began to persecute his former co-religionists, for all the world like Spargo and Simons denouncing the Socialists, or a distinguished “peace-without-victory” advocate announcing his determination that all pacifists must be exterminated.

Stephen Thomas brought about a revolution. The Bogomils of Bosnia fled to the south, to the lands of one Stephen, in whose territory stood the ancient monastery of St. Sava, the founder of Serbian independence and organizer of the Serbian Church. This Stephen gave them shelter, proclaimed his independence of Bosnia, and called himself the Herzog, or Duke, of St. Sava. Ever since that time—1448—that territory has been called—Herzog-ovina, or the land of the Herzog.

Because of this heresy, perhaps, but despite their many promises, the Pope and the King of Hungary forgot their alliance with Bosnia when the Turks came. The Bogomils embraced Mohammedanism with great alacrity; and the Bosnians were defeated in 1463 by the Turks, who slew their king. The land-owning class, in order to save their property, also turned Mohammedan, although great numbers of the poorer Serbs emigrated from the country rather than apostatize. The wealthier ones had, perhaps, changed so often from Orthodox to Catholic that one more change, which looked as though it might be a permanent one, made little more difference.

And thus for nearly three centuries the lands of the South Slavs were subject to the Turk. A certain degree of independence was retained by their rulers, subject to the sovereignty of the Sultan, and the Orthodox Churches were allowed to remain untouched; but the headship of the East in religious matters was claimed by Russia, whose Czar had proclaimed himself the heir of the Caesars when Constantinople fell. Those Slavs who lived within the border of Austria—the Croats and Slovenes—were Roman Catholics, and looked to Austria as the protector of their
faith. Those who were East of the Valley looked to Moscow, and later to Petrograd.

For this reason, perhaps, the persecution of the Christians at the hands of the Turks was no whit more severe than their treatment at the hands of Christians of other faiths. In the year 1717 Prince Eugene of Savoy captured Belgrade, and by the treaty of 1718 Turkey left a large part of northern Serbia in Austria's hands. "But the Serbs soon found that alien populations fare little better under Christian rule, when they are not of the same confession as their rulers," says the history before quoted, "than under Mohammedan. The Orthodox Serbs in Dalmatia suffered thenceforward from bitter persecution at the hands of the Roman Catholics. In Austria-Hungary itself the Serbs found that the Austrians, when they had beaten the Turks largely with the aid of Serbian levies, forgot all their promises. Austrian rule soon became more oppressive than the Turkish, and the Serbs had added to their other woes the woes of religious persecution."

A systematic persecution of the Orthodox Serbs in southern Hungary and Slavonia was begun under Maria Theresa, in 1740 to 1780. The purpose of this was to prevent the possibility of a resuscitation of the Serbian nationality, which threatened the rule of the Hapsburgs. As a consequence of this persecution, a hundred thousand Serbs emigrated to southern Russia where they founded "New Serbia" in 1752 and 1753.

But as the centuries wore on, the persistent nationality of Serbia began to assert itself against Turkish rule, which was growing weak. And one of the strangest by-plays of history is the story of how the South Slavs began to regain their independence. The story is the story of Montenegro.

THE LAND OF THE BLACK MOUNTAIN.

During the troublous times of the eleventh and twelfth centuries when the power of Byzantium and of Bulgaria waxed and waned intermittently, the coastal strip of the Serb country attained a measure of independence. Prince Bodin formed the Zeta river district into a principality known as "Pomorje," or country by the sea, while the "Zagorje," or country behind the hills, included most of modern Bosnia. Zeta, on the coast, became the political rallying ground of this "Pomorje". After the death of Czar Urosh, in 1371, it broke away from the Serb confederacy and proclaimed its autonomy. But it was subdued under the hand of the Turks.

From the beginning of the eighteenth century, Montenegro began to assume ever greater importance in the extremely gradual revival of the national spirit of the Serbs. For while it was ruled by the Turks, its mountain fastnesses were so inaccessible and the spirit of its mountaineers ran so high that the Turks left them pretty much to themselves. The country was ruled by a prince-bishop, and its religious independence gave it a strong sense of
national unity, though its independence was largely of thought and not of action—like an imprisoned radical.

But when Peter the Great, Czar of Russia, began to press against the Turks from the north and to champion the cause of the Balkan Christians, he found the mountain fastnesses of Montenegro, a flambeau of the ancient Serbian spirit, a rocky temple where the fires of nationality had remained alight during the Turkish darkness. He therefore developed intercourse with the prince-bishop of the Black Mountain, and regular formal visits were paid by the Vladika, or Bishop to the court of Moscow. Thus the great Russian bear extended a friendly hand to the tiny principality on the Adriatic as a brother of the blood—one of the quaintest giant-and-pigmy alliances in history.

In the year 1787 an alliance was made between Russia, head of the Orthodox Eastern Church, and Austria, champion of the Roman Catholic Church, for a war against Turkey, the common enemy of both. But the Emperor Joseph II, who had seemed for a time to be about to revive the ancient glories of the line of Holy Roman Emperors, died in 1790, and with him died the crusade. Peace was made in that same year leaving Turkey in possession of all the lands in question.

But here occurred one of the curiosities of history. Montenegro, which was a Serb state under Turkish domination, had valiantly flung herself against the Turks, under the militant leadership of their Bishop, Peter I. When the treaty of peace was concluded, Montenegro was not mentioned. Austria forgot to mention her because she was an Austrian ally; and so, not being included in the treaty of peace, the Montenegrins continued fighting long after the Turks had quit. When the Turkish empire awoke to the unpleasant fact that war still existed, the tiny mountain fastness had accomplished what Austria and Russia together had failed to do—she had defeated the Turks in two decisive battles in 1796, in which the Turks were driven back to Scutari. And with this victory the independence of Montenegro was force recognized by Turkey; the Emperor Paul of Russia decorated the Prince-Bishop Peter with a Russian order of nobility, and the first of the Serbian peoples to recover its liberty had lifted its face into the sunlight of the new day.

Serbia had thus before its eyes the example of an independent sister-nationality. This leaven worked powerfully. In the year 1804 an uprising was headed by George Petrovich, known as Kara-George, or Black George. Among his confederates was Milosh Obrenovich. All of northern Serbia was freed from the Turk, and in that same year Russia formally opened negotiations with the Serbs as a government. In 1811 Kara-George was elected Gospodar, or sovereign, by a popular assembly; but Serbia as a whole still continued to be a Turkish province, though enjoying a large measure of autonomy. Russia meanwhile kept up the pressure from the north.

But the shadow of Napoleon loomed large over these proceedings and Russia was obliged to conclude a hurried peace with
Turkey, and in so doing left Serbia at a disadvantage. The Congress of Vienna met in 1814 and 1815, to partition Europe out among the nations. Napoleon's return from Elba broke up the congress, leaving Serbia still Turkish. Immediately Milosh Obrenovich, the former aid of Kara-George, headed a new rebellion, which was partially successful.

For a long time the Serbian struggle for independence was seriously hampered between these two leaders, Kara-George and Obrenovich, who fought among themselves as much as they fought against the Turk. Kara-George was a partisan of the Eastern Empire and had the backing of Russia, while Obrenovich was an Austrian sympathizer. Not until 1830 did the Sultan issue a hatti-sherif recognizing Serbia as virtually independent; and this was only because of the crushing defeat inflicted upon the Turks in 1828.

But these struggles were like the gathering of steam in a boiler whose valve has been screwed shut. For in 1815 Austria had awakened to the meaning of the struggles of the Serbs for possession of the sea-coast of the Adriatic; and at the Congress of Vienna her influence was so strong that to Austria was awarded complete possession of the whole sea-coast of Dalmatia, thus effectively excluding the whole Serbian population of the interior of the Balkans from their natural outlet to the sea. Possession of this sea-port on warm water was the real reason that lay back of Russia's agitation among the Southern Slavs; and the age-old jealousy between Orthodox and Catholic as to control, through their political representatives of the coastline of the Valley of Division receives its most pointed meaning from this pressure of the interior lands for a seaport through which the whole world would lie open for their products.

This economic pressure constantly grew stronger with developing capitalism.

Again a crusade against Turkey was inaugurated by Russia in 1877, aroused by the Bulgarian massacres of the previous year. The Bulgarians and Serbs rallied to the standard of their great Orthodox champion, and fought the Turks to the very walls of Constantinople. At Adrianople, in 1878, Ignatiyev, the Russian minister, dictated the terms of the Treaty of San Stefano. By this treaty a Greater Burgaria was created, stretching from the Danube to the Aegean Sea and from the Black Sea to Albania, including all of Macedonia, and leaving to the Turks only the district between Constantinople and Adrianople and the town of Salonika. Had this been carried out, the Southern Slavs would have been practically united in an Empire which would have approached the dimensions of that of Czar Simeon, nine hundred years before.

But Disraeli was guardian of England's interests in the Balkans, and Germany was jealous likewise for her future power. Disraeli tore up the Treaty of San Stefano and summoned a Congress of Berlin, wherein England ardently championed the cause of Turkey against all Christendom. In this fateful treaty were laid the seeds of the great conflict. Northern Bulgaria was made autonomous; Roumelia was to have a Christian governor appoint-
ed by the Turks; Macedonia was left to Turkey; and the Dobrudja—Trajan's ancient garrison-land—was given to Roumania.

It is true that Serbia and Montenegro were made completely independent; but between them a wedge was driven under the joint control of Austria and Turkey—the famous Sandjak of Novi-Pazar. Bosnia and Herzegovina were handed over "temporarily" to Austria, to be governed by her, although belonging to Turkey!

But this unnatural balance could not last. In 1908 occurred the revolution of the Young Turks, which overthrew Abdul Hamid and placed on the throne his imbecile brother, Mohammed V. Simultaneously two other long-planned events occurred; Bulgaria proclaimed its complete independence, and Austria, who had "temporarily" governed Bosnia and Herzegovina, both Mohammedan states, for thirty years, announced that they were incorporated into the Austro-Hungarian Empire.

Thus the Serbs were cut off on all sides. To the east lay Bulgaria, which although a Slav state professing the Orthodox religion was frightfully jealous of its eminence; to the West lay the Austrian provinces populated by Slavs, some Mohammedan and some Catholic in religion, but under foreign domination.

But another and stranger result followed the revolution of 1908. For many years the horrors of Macedonian misrule had been the pivot on which Europe's politics hinged. Macedonia was a sort of hash of many scrambled nationalities; the French named after it a pudding whose specialty is that it consists of many ingredients, none of which can be identified. The Young Turks granted all the Macedonian reforms which had ever been asked, and thus deprived the perennial diplomatists of their regular job. The result was the formation of the Balkan League. The states of the Peninsula resolved to be no longer the catspaws of the Great Powers, torn between Orthodox Czar, Catholic Kaiser, Eclectic England and Mohammedan Sultan, but to act for themselves as a unity. On September 23rd of 1912 the formation of this league was announced, and in the following month the four governments, Serbia, Greece, Montenegro and Bulgaria, opened war on Turkey. The Germans had been busily training the Turkish troops, who were commanded by von der Goltz—created a Pasha by the Sultan. Before the infuriated armies of the League the German-trained Turks were scattered. The Serbs overwhelmed the Turks at the battle of Kumanovo, and thus the fateful Battle of Kossovo, the Plain of the Blackbirds, was avenged. On November 9 the Greeks entered Salonika, and the Serbs entered the goal of their centuries' ambition—the port of Durazzo.

The Conference of Peace met in London. And then was the hand of the Great Powers revealed; for the interest of every government in Europe was considered before that of the victors. For months and months the weary negotiations dragged their way. The Balkan emissaries grew weary of waiting, and assaulted Turkey again, driving the German-trained troops even out of Adrianople, their ancient capital.

But the Great Powers again balked the Balkans. The State of Albania was created, specifically to deprive Serbia of her outlet
to the sea. Thus cheated, the Serbs tried to take from the Bulgarians and Greeks slices of the territory awarded them. While the arbitration was going on, the Bulgarians suddenly, at midnight, assaulted the Serbs. Every one expected that the Bulgarians, whose army was Germain-trained and whose king was a Hohenzollern, would wipe up the ground with the Serbs. But the wine of success had tasted sweet to the people of Karageorge, and they drove the Bulgarians back across their boundaries with great loss. Meanwhile the army of Rumania had marched into Bulgaria to within a few miles of Sofia, and demanded for herself large territory, which she gained without a blow.

Serbia, though victorious, was thus robbed of all the fruits of victory. Her coastal port had been taken away by Austria, and Greeks, Bulgarians and Turks retained possession of territory she coveted as her own. There seemed but one way—to unite all the South Slavs into one nationality which should be the master of its own destiny, without continual interference from the Great Powers or jealous neighbors around it.

A NATIONAL RELIGION.

Disregarding, then, these contending religions by means of which the great Empires sought to sway their politics, the Serbs began developing their own national faith, which goes by the name of Pan-Slavism; a faith whose saints are the heroes of the Jugo-Slavs, and whose prophets are the poets and the singers of the people. Greatest of these prophets has been for the past twenty years, one Ivan Mestrovics, a sculptor, around whom the Pan-Slav movement in Austria eddied and centered, as the poets and dramatists of Ireland awoke the ancient spirit of that Celtic race from its slumber of centuries.

Ivan Mestrovics, as a shepherd boy on the Dalmatian plains, learned from his father to carve wood and plaster after the immemorial style of the Serbians, who, says a writer in the Century Magazine for January 1918, “preserve some of the characteristics of their dim Chaldaean past.” From his father and from the poet singers of the mountains Ivan learned also the past glories of his race. At the age of 17 he went to Spalato, and began to work as an apprentice to a marble-cutter. After a year his powers as a sculptor had so developed that the town council of Spalato paid his expenses to Vienna, where he entered the studio of Mentzner. Immediately he began to attract wide attention in that art-loving town.

At the International Exhibit in Rome in 1911 the Serbian pavilion, designed by Mestrovics, challenged the attention of the world. “Gray in the midst of sunny courts” it aroused the art-lovers of the world by its portrayal of the greatness and the sufferings of this people. He dreamed of a great national Pantheon on the Plain of Kossovo, that battlefield of the Blackbirds where the Empire of Stephen Dushan had gone down to the dust before the whirlwind of Turkish scimitars. In that Pantheon he was to
erect heroic statues of Prince Lazar, of Karageorge and Milosh Obrenovich, of the Sultan Murad who had been slain and of the Prince Bayezid who had married the daughter of the defeated Prince. Models of these statues were exhibited in Vienna and in Rome.

Gazing on them, the divided Serbs felt their breasts quicken with an allegiance which was older and deeper than the religions which divided them. Whether Catholic, Orthodox or Mohammedan, they felt pride in their heroic ancestors. The smouldering embers of Jugo-Slavic fervor leaped into flame as they gazed. Croatian, Slovenian, Montenegrin, Serbian, Bulgarian—all of these had been represented at Kossovo; Bosnian and Herzegovinian had fought there against the Turk whose religion they had later accepted.

Mestrovich became the head of the Serbo-Croatian group. He leaped into political activity. A demonstration against the annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina and the cruelties of Count Hedervary resulted in his arrest and imprisonment; but Austria found that one of the world’s great sculptors could not be so summarily extinguished. Rodin had acknowledged the Serbian as a compeer, and the world of art knew him for one of the greatest. He was released and continued his agitation.

Austria feared him; but more than him it feared the rekindling flame of which he was the symbol. That loose empire subsisted on internal jealousies. If the Jugo-Slavs joined hands across the Valley of Division, Austria would explode. And they were joining hands.

THE WEALTH OF SERBIA.

Serbia contains great wealth, coveted by all Europe. Gold, silver, iron and lead mines were worked by the Romans, whose operations can still be traced. Even more ancient is the Avala mercury mine near Belgrade. During the later middle ages the Serbian mines brought in a large revenue to the merchant princes of Ragusa. During the 14th century they prospered greatly, but the Turkish rule put a stop to this industry after 1459. Rich coal and lignite seams were worked by Belgian companies. Antimony, copper, nickel, manganese, graphite, marble, sulphur and oil are found in various parts of the country, but the mineral resources remain undeveloped—largely because of the lack of a seaport.

Serbia’s wealth was in her forests. Relatively to her population she possessed greater numbers of sheep and pigs than any other country in Europe. Despite American competition and Austrian tariffs, the swine of Serbia remained her greatest wealth—until the explosion began. For it was to secure access to the sea for her pigs that Serbia was chiefly troubled; and to prevent that access Austria barred the way—and the archduke fell, and Europe. Austrian tariffs, the swine of Serbia remained her greatest wealth. Road to India. And this is the reason for the profound alarm with which Italy viewed the formation of the Jugo-Slav state, and for the crucial character of the negotiations regarding Dalmatia.
What manner of people are they who have endured through the centuries such a torture of twisting and division? The Avars a state which, as some of them dream, shall include Bulgaria, Serbia, Montenegro, Bosnia, Herzegovina, Croatia, Carinthia, Carnolia, Dalmatia, Albania. The royalists speak already of a Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes; the Republicans would include the Bulgars in a South Slavic federation.

If this state is ever formed, it will control the wealth of the world. It will rule the connection between Europe and Asia; it will dominate the Adriatic and the Black Sea; it will control the Road to India.

What manner of people are they who have endured the centuries through such a torture of twisting and division? The Avars with whom they came, the Goths and Huns who preceded them, vanished. The Greek Empire fell, and the Latin Empire likewise. Charlemagne, after whom they name all their kings, Carol, or Kralj, blazed like a meteor and disappeared. But the South Slavs remain.

A PEOPLE OF THE SOIL.

The Slavs are a people of the soil, as the Vikings were people of the sea. More than four-fifths of them always were farmers, and the great majority of them cultivate their own land, and not the land of another. Holdings were generally small, not exceeding an average of 20 acres for each household. And the strength of the Jugo-Slavs consisted in this—that their ancient and unshakable law forbids absolutely, as a crime against the nation, the selling or mortgaging of the whole of any man’s land. The law forbids the alienation for debt or any other cause of a peasant’s cottage, his garden, or the last six yutara of his land; his plow and the implements necessary for working his farm may not be taken away from him, under penalty of vengeance. One yutro is the amount of land two oxen can plow in one day; and thus what two oxen can plow in one week remains inalienably the property of the farmer, and no mortgage nor debt nor folly nor conspiracy can tear the peasant from his land. So spoke Stephen Dushan, in that code which made immortal the ancient love of the Slavic people for their mother, the earth.

All of their country was organized in the “zadruga system,” which is a series of clan-communities, in which each cluster of cottages is occupied by a family group. Rule over these clusters is held by a house-father and a house-mother, the heads of the family in true patriarchal style. The buildings are enclosed in an immense palisade, which surrounds the orchards as well as the homes. In the center is the community dining hall, kitchen, and social hall of the clan. Here all the members assemble in the evening for conversation and amusement, while the children are at play.

Within recent years this system has been replaced by a modernized form of cooperative community, along the Danish plan
of Raffeisen. In 1900 there were 500 such cooperatives, and they grew almost day by day.

In communities such as these the Southern Slavs kept their nationality intact during all the centuries. Avars, Tartars, Huns, Greeks, and Turks, Austrian and German have thundered over their heads; but the zadruga has remained. What shall become of Serbia now?

The world is concerned with the future of the Serbs, and their fellows of the South Slavic races. But that future depends on their finding a basis of unity which shall replace the old causes of division. Greek Orthodox and Roman Catholic and Mohammedan are names that divide Slav from Slav. What shall unite them?

The family system of cooperative agriculture gave place for a race of poets. "The Serbs," says Guslari, "are a nation of poets; their bards keep alive the memory of the great days of their history." But what does the memory of the past serve, except to light the way to a better future?

This cooperative principle is embedded deep down in the heart of the Slavic people. In it their salvation has lain in all the ages of the past. Certainly it is here that their salvation must be found in the ages that are to come. Serbia must own Serbia's wealth, and the Serbians who toil must be they who reap of the results thereof. The cooperative system in agriculture can be—must be—translated into the cooperative system in industry. In the ownership by the people of the land, inalienably, of all that their land holds, the jealousy and rivalry of other empires for control of their national politics can be ended; for it is wealth that empires seek. The South Slavic Federation must be a Socialist federation, a group of kindred peoples owning the sources of their own lives; thus only can the tragedy of the past be ended, and a new day dawn for all the nations of the world.
Lecture III.

IRELAND

The Sorrowful Mother

For two hundred years the fate of Ireland has been of intense interest to the American people. Since the flag of the Sinn Fein Republic has flown from the Mansion House at Dublin, the daily drama of that beleaguered land has been watched with burning hopes and breaking hearts by the millions of men and women of Irish blood who dwell within these shores. Deep beneath all superficial comment the tide of heart-hunger rolls; and the whole American nation demands, in the case of Ireland, an exemplification of what the Allies claimed they were fighting for.

Fierce passions are aroused by this problem of Ireland, on whichever side of the question one stands. This emotion springs out of a conflict deeper, far deeper, than any recent history can explain. It is a conflict not between two races, merely, but between two epochs, two world theories, between the whole constitution of a vanished age and one which is now about to disappear.

In the days of the great famine, Walt Whitman wrote:

Far hence amid an isle of wondrous beauty
Crouching o'er a grave, an ancient sorrowful mother.
Once, a queen; now lean and tattered, seated on the ground,
Her old white hair drooping dishevelled round her shoulders
At her feet fallen an unused royal harp.
Long silent she, too long silent, mourning her shrouded hope and heir,
Of all the world her heart most full of sorrow, because most full of love.

To Irishmen who know the story of their land, it seems fitly summed up in the saddest of all the medieval Latin hymns, still sung at the Stations of the Cross:

Stabat Mater dolorosa
Juxta crucem lacrimosa
Dum pendebat Filius!

For Ireland, blessed above all the lands of Europe in fertility and pleasant climate, has for centuries been the sepulchre of her people. Not unfitting was it that the curtain raiser of the terrible drama of the world war should have been played on this tragic soil; that on Ireland's ground the plot should have been laid which linked with that fateful murder in the streets of Sarajevo loosed upon the world the horror of destruction.
That impatient solution by the man-in-the-street of the Irish question "Oh, leave the Irish to settle it between them" or the dictum of Lloyd George—"when the Irish agree among themselves unanimously, we will abide by their decision," is as reasonable as requiring the citizens of Belgium and the German garrison in Belgium to reach an unanimous decision in regard to the relation of their countries.

THE CURTAIN RAISER.

For consider the situation just prior to the outbreak of the world war:

A liberal government was in power in England, pledged to give Home Rule to Ireland. On the strength of that pledge John Redmond, leader of the Irish Party in the House of Commons, had kept that government—with Asquith at its head—in power for four years, and had enabled it to pass not merely the act for curbing the power of the House of Lords, but many others, such as the insurance act, in which Ireland had no interest or which were actually detrimental to Ireland.

Meanwhile Sir Edward Carson led, armed and drilled a force of 80,000 men, armed with rifles secured from Germany, and pledged to resist by force any act of Parliament granting Home Rule, whenever such an Act should be passed. They openly in speeches and newspapers stated that they would greatly prefer the rule of the German Emperor to Home Rule.

After two years of this, the Nationalists of the South of Ireland began doing likewise—that is, began drilling, but with the avowed and sole object of supporting the Act of Parliament granting Home Rule, whenever it should be passed. One month after the Nationalists began imitating the Carsonites, a law was passed by the British Government, prohibiting the importation of arms into Ireland.

Both regions started gun-running. The Ulsterites were allowed to import arms, to violate the law, without molestation. For the same offense, Nationalists were assaulted, bayoneted and massacred.

Sir John French and Major Gough, together with practically all the officers of the English army in Ireland, when ordered to enforce the edict against the Ulsterites, laid down their arms and resigned their commissions, rather than obey the law.

Such a thing had never been heard of. A whole division of the British army saw its officers desert in defiance of an order to enforce against one section of the country a law which was being vigorously enforced against the other section. In Germany they saw these things and took note of them. T. P. O'Connor and John Dillon charged, in a letter to President Wilson, that the Kaiser and his military chiefs, believing England to be helpless in the face of such a catastrophe, took advantage of the opportunity to
force the great conflict for which they had been preparing for forty years. Certain it is that the Great War followed immediately.

Now mark! Sir Edward Carson was appointed first Attorney General, then First Lord of the Admiralty of the British Government which he had defied; Sir John French was made commander-in-chief of the British Army in France. His incompetence having been clearly demonstrated, he was brought home and placed in command of Ireland. Meanwhile Sir Roger Casement, an English knight, was hanged for complicity in bringing arms into Ireland for the Nationalists.

Carson and French were given the highest honors in the gift of England—for defying the Government. Casement was hanged—for preparing to support it in keeping its promise!

T. P. O’Connor’s charge continues thus, in his letter to Wilson, published in the Chicago newspapers of August 25, 1918:

“It was the action of Carson when opposing home rule and preaching the doctrine of revolution, and then accepting a place in the Cabinet, which transformed Ireland from enthusiastic support of the war to its present attitude of a sullen detachment.

“In every avenue leading to peace the formidable figure of Sir Edward Carson stands blocking the way. When Sir Edward Grey tried to persuade Germany to desist from loosing the clams that have deluged the world in blood, the shadow of Carson, promising a distracted and impotent England, haunted and deranged the Kaiser’s judgment.

“When the British people, in election after election, signified their desire to give Ireland and England peace, Sir Edward Carson blocked the way. When the House of Commons twice carried Home Rule, Carson blocked the way. When Premier Lloyd George wanted to carry Home Rule, Carson blocked the way.

“Every time our ambassador at Washington seeks to bridge over the gulf between his country and the millions of the Irish race in America by statesmanship and tact, Carson has blocked the way.

“When a greater person than these, in the person of the President of the United States, the true leader of the world’s democracy today makes his constant and consistent appeal for the rights and liberties of small nations, Sir Edward Carson blocks the way.”

What strange trick of fate has given this dark and sinister rebel the power to control the policy of England, to check the policy of America, to cast his ignominious shadow across the whole world’s stage?

It is no trick of fate. Carson embodies the whole long process of horror which has covered Ireland with blood and hate. For he represents that fatal system of land-tenure by feudal right which Norman kings sought to impose on Celtic Ireland; that system of landed aristocracy against which Ireland has struggled for eight centuries now; which has cursed England with starvation
for her poor and exile for her rich; and which would rather see the world drowned in its own blood than to see its ancient iniquity done away.

A WAR BETWEEN CLANS.

A long survey of Irish history brings us to an astonishing conclusion. It was the German upheaval in prehistoric times which overthrew the empire of the Celts. It was the Normans, or Frenchified Norsemen, who invaded Ireland, and it was the Anglo-Saxons who devastated Ireland. During the Wars of the Roses, when Lancastrian and York seemed about to destroy one another, the Irish chieftains almost secured their freedom once before; and now in the War of the Races, while Teutonic Anglo-Saxon and Teutonic Prussian struggled for the mastery of the world, perchance that ancient Celtic dream of freedom may at last come true, while two low-German tribes are at each others' throats.

It is hard for "Anglo-Saxons"—like myself—to read such things as the history of the "Anglo-Saxon" rule in Ireland. We hate to read them for fear we may perchance find them true; as in the case of the Irishman who was asked by a friend why he did not eat spinach.

"I don't like the stuff," he said, "and it's glad I am that I don't; for if I'd like it, I'd ate it—and I hate it!"

The roots of this present tragedy lie deep down in that epochal antagonism in which the history of Europe is written. It is the story of the Celtic Empire, of its glory and of its destruction; of the struggle between Roman and German; of the reconversion of Europe to Christianity by the Celts after Roman and Goth had desolated the world between them; of the rise of Capitalism; of the struggle between the new and the old world-order; and finally of the rise of that great new system which we see beginning to blossom here and there with promise of a fairer fruit—the system which shall replace all the old forms of production—the system of INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY.

THE GLORY OF THE CELTS.

For five centuries prior to the Christian era, the chronicles of the classic nations make frequent references to the Celtic empire. By the Greeks the Celts were called Hyperboreans—dwellers beyond the North Wind. Herodotus speaks of them as dwellers beyond the pillars of Hercules—that is, in Spain. Aristotle refers to them as "dwellers beyond Spain", and of their having captured Rome.

It was about the year 500 before Christ that the Celts captured Spain from the Carthaginians. A century later they took Northern Italy from the Etruscans, and their blood intermingled largely with those Italian nations which were later welded into the empire of Rome. Vergil, greatest of Latin poets, was a Celt
by birth. Toward the year 300 B. C. they took Illyria and settled there in large numbers. The province of Galatia in Asia Minor, takes its name from the Gaels, or Gauls, or Celts, who established a kingdom there. The Galatians, or Irish Greeks, were the most troublesome of St. Paul's converts, as we see by his Epistle to the Galatians. St. Jerome says that Gaelic was spoken in Galatia until the year 400 A. D.

All of these wars were undertaken in alliance with the Greeks. By their wars with Carthage the monopoly of trade with Britain held by that people was broken down, and as far back as 600 B. C. the port of Marseilles was founded by the Greeks as the start of the overland route to Britain. Not only tin, but jewelry of the richest sort and enamel work of wonderful beauty, was exported in great bulk from the Celtic cities to the beauty-loving Greeks.

In the chronicles of Alexander the Great of Macedonia it is told that the secret of his ability to leave his home land undefended and sally forth to conquer the world lay in his alliance with the Celts, concluded in 334 B. C., which is narrated by Ptolemy Soter. When the Celts, tall, blue-eyed, golden-haired men, came before Alexander, he asked them what thing they feared most.

"Only one thing we fear," said they; "that the sky may fall down and crush us." Alexander whispered to his nobles "What vainglorious people are these Celts!" But this boast contains a fragment of an old Celtic myth, a part of their Druid religion. In the Book of Leinster the heroes declare to their king "Unless the sky fall on us with its showers of stars, we shall not give ground before our enemies."

CAPTURE OF ROME.

About the year 400 B. C. the Celtic Empire reached its height in that supreme act of their military glory, the conquest of Rome. They had concluded a treaty with the Romans against the Etruscans. Pouring down through the Alpine passes upon the Etruscans, they found the Roman ambassadors fighting in the ranks of the enemy at the battle of Clusium in 391 B. C. The ambassadors were the three sons of the Chief Pontiff Fabius, which made the breach of faith all the worse. Satisfaction was demanded of the Roman people, and this was refused by the Senate. Whereupon the Celts abandoned Clusium and marched straight against Rome. All the provincial towns along the way they left unmenaced, shouting to the guards upon their walls "We are bound for Rome."

On July 18, 390, the Celtic army met the Roman army at the River Allia, and in a desperate charge annihilated the soldiers of Romulus. Three days later they were in Rome, and for a year remained the masters of the city. On the anniversary of that
shameful defeat for many a decade the Roman people kept a
day of national humiliation, known as the "Dies Aliensis", per-
petuating in their calendar the memory of the deepest shame
that Rome had ever known,—a fit punishment for their breach
of faith. The leader of the Celts in this campaign was one
"Brennus"—a Latinized form of O'Brien.

For a century after this Celt and Roman lived at peace. Julius
Caesar in his commentaries has much to say concerning them.
Indeed he begins his book with a reference to these ancient ene-
mies of his people.

All over Europe, during the Greek and early Roman ascend-
ancy, the Empire of the Celts flourished. Indeed it has been
traced further east. Mucha, the Bohemian designer, was a
convert to the theory of the Celtic Christ. David is spoken of in
the Old Testament as being red-haired and of fair complexion.
Evidently then he was not a Semite. Whence came he? "Galilee"
sounds as though it might be a derivative of Gaul, or Gael; and
the myths of the Irish are full of legendary encounters between
the wandering ancestors of Irish and Jews in the deserts of
Arabia. The Harp of David and the Harp of Tara; the golden
serpent of Moses and the absence of serpents from Ireland—what
could be more conclusive? "Scot" the ancient name of the Irish,
is derived from "Scythian"; as "Briton" was derived from Brutus
in the early days of English legendary lore.

I have also heard it claimed that the Pitman system of
shorthand was invented by the ancient Druids, who wrote their
chronicles on stone pillars in dashes and curves which varied in
their meaning according to the distance of the character from
the edge of the stone—the "Ogham letters" of the antiquarian.
It was the Milesians, later comers, who brought to Ireland the
Phoenician alphabet which forms the basis of the Gaelic letters.
When the Milesians—"sons of Miled"—landed, they found there
the Tuatha de Danaan, or clan of the Danaan people, in the land.
Their science and art astounded the invaders, who thought them
to be magicians. According to the legend the Danaans made
themselves invisible, but still live in the fairy mounds in the form
of the "little people."

Certain it is that in the burial mounds of the British isles
are found jewelry and ornaments of exquisite workmanship.
Bracelets, armlets, finger-rings, torques, crescents, gorgets, neck-
lets, fibulae, diadems, all of solid gold and cunningly set with
jewels, have been discovered and placed in the Dublin museum
as relics of that wonderful art which supplied the Greeks with
most of their jewelry for five centuries before Christ.

Evidences for the diffusion of the Celts in mid-Europe is
found in the place-names, in the relics of early Celtic art, and
in the repeated references to them in all classic literature. Celtic
art was pure decoration of line and color, intricately interwoven
and delicately contrasted. The art of enamelling was invented
by the Celts. Dr. J. Anderson, in the "Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland", quoted by T. W. Rolleston, writes: "The home of the art of enamelling was Britain, and the style of the pattern, as well as the associations in which the objects decorated with it were found, demonstrated with certainty that it had reached its highest stage of native development before it came into contact with Roman culture. But Gauls as well as Britons practised enamel working before the Roman conquest. The enamel workshops of Bibracte, with their furnaces, crucibles, moulds, polishing stones, and with the crude enamels in all their various stages of preparation, have been recently excavated from the ruins of the cities destroyed by Caesar and his legions. But the Bibracte enamels are the work of mere dabblers, compared with the British examples."

In Guglielmo Ferrero's book "Characters and Events of Ancient Rome" astonishment is expressed at the rapidity with which Gaul, newly conquered by Caesar's armies, developed into the wealthiest province of the Empire. The wonderful speed with which what we would call art-craft work was perfected by them, calls forth his unbounded admiration. But the explanation is simple; the Gauls, or Celts, as in their own language they were called, had practised these arts for many centuries before Rome became powerful, and the dull-witted Romans were simply discovering what the Greeks had known long before.

"For," says Rolleston, "the Celtic warrior loved display. Everything that gave brilliance and the sense of drama to life appealed to him. His weapons were richly ornamented, his horse trappings were wrought in bronze and enamel, of designs as exquisite as any relic of Mycenaean art, his raiment was embroidered with gold. Collars and bracelets of gold were worn when every other adornment was laid aside. When the Gauls were defeated at Alesia, Vercingetorix, their chieftain, clothed himself in his richest raiment, decked his horse with its most gorgeous trappings, and after riding thrice around the Roman camp, went in to Caesar alone and delivered to him the sword of Gaul.

"But their love of splendor and art was mixed with much barbarism," this same writer relates. Strabo tells how the warriors rode home with the heads of fallen horsemen hanging from their horse's necks. In the saga of Cuchullain, he drives back from a raid into Connaught with the heads of his enemies hanging from his chariot rim, instead of saving them, like the civilized Romans, to be slaughtered at gladiatorial shows at so much per admission ticket. Indeed few things are funnier than the horror expressed by so many commentators on the brutality of the Druids in offering human sacrifices, which the "humanitarian Romans" ordered stopped. "Humanitarian Caesar" slaughtered five million Gauls, men, women and children; the humane emperors took the captives whom the Druids would have offered to their gods as a solemn sacrifice, and tore them to pieces with wild beasts to furnish amusement for the blase loungers of the Appian Way.
HISTORY OF THE IRISH BULL.

The habits of the Gauls furnished endless sources for speculation and comment among Roman writers, which are strikingly modern in some of their angles. Strabo, for instance, remarks that the “educated Celts are fond of expressing themselves in enigmas, so that the hearer has to divine the most part of what they would say.” This is the oldest reference to the Irish bull. This staid and sober definition by Strabo is matched by another, by M. Porcius Cato, who remarked: “There are two things to which the Gauls are devoted; the art of war and subtlety of speech.” Which is commonly said of the Irish today, only in terser form—that they love a good fight and a good joke.

According to Jim Larkin the Irish have no sense of humor. “They merely say in English what they think in Irish, and it sounds funny,” that gentle strafer told me once. There may be some subtle Gaelism whereby the “Irishman’s flea”—“Faith, ye put your finger on him and he isn’t there” is a regular figure of speech; but it struck the severely logical Greek with amazement, and the Roman into dumb wonderment. Then there is the story of the Irish landsman who was told to see which way the wind was blowing by the way the smoke was carried, and who reported “Sure, there’s a turrible gale blowing straight up.” But the most characteristic Irishism I remember is that of the Chicago politician who was induced, much against his will, to take a ride in a captive balloon at the World’s Fair. He clambered in, with much trepidation, and the rope was let out so that he rose high from the ground. Leaning over the edge of the basket he shouted, “Lave me out!” The jokers on the ground only let out more rope. “Lave me down!” he shouted again with a similar result. Then he leaned far over the basket and shook his fist at them, shouting, “Lave me down, or I’ll cut the rope!”

The characteristic of this “Irish bull” is that you can tell what the man means, although there isn’t any sense in what he says. The member of Parliament, for example, who after an impassioned speech denouncing the Irish sat down on his hat, which he had thoughtlessly left in his seat, was congratulated by an Irish member thus: “Mr. Speaker, may I congratulate the gentleman that when he sat down on his hat, his head was not in it,” knew perfectly well what the Irish member meant, though there was no sense in what he said.

THE DRUID SCHOOLS.

But that which struck Caesar most forcibly, and which indeed is the key to much of the history of the Middle Ages, is the institutions of the Celtic religion. “The Druids,” said Caesar, “maintain vast schools, attended by thousands of the dominant race.” In these schools a high order of instruction appears to have been maintained, according to his description in Book VI, chapter 14.
“In these schools,” says he, “the Druids discuss and impart to the youth many things respecting the stars and their motions, respecting the extent of the universe and of our earth, respecting the nature of things, respecting the power and the majesty of the immortal gods.

“They who are interdicted (excommunicated) for refusing to obey Druidical sentence are reckoned in the number of the vile and wicked; all persons fly and avoid their company and discourse. The Druids are generally free from military service, nor do they pay taxes with the rest. Encouraged by such rewards, many of their own accord come to their schools, and are sent by their friends and relations. They are said there to get by heart a great number of verses; some continue twenty years in their education; neither is it held lawful to commit the Druidic doctrines to writing, although in almost all public transactions and private accounts they use the Greek characters.”

Strabo tells how the Gauls were eager for education, and how the Greek letters and culture spread rapidly among them. This was written in A. D. 24 und 25, but it seems condescending without knowledge, in view of the long acquaintance of the Celts with the Greeks before Rome was heard of.

DOWNFALL OF THE CELTIC EMPIRE.

What became of this vast Celtic empire, which dominated Northern Europe completely, and yet disappeared without leaving a trace except in the records of other peoples? The story is so wonderful as to be weird. Shortly after Caesar’s time Celts disappear, and Germans come. The Germans are first mentioned by Pytheas, a Greek traveller, about 300 B. C. About 190 B. C. they were vanquished by Marius in their invasion of Italy, under the name of Cimbri or Teutones. From that time on they become increasingly evident on the field of history, while the Celts correspondingly diminish.

The theory of ethnologists is this. Under the Celtic Empire the Germans were held in subjection. Two centuries or more before the Christian era the Celtic empire was rent asunder by a rebellion of the Germans. Rolleston says:

“Two things the Celts would not or could not impose on the subjugated German tribes—their language and their religion. In these two great factors of race-unity and pride lay the seeds of the ultimate German rising, and the overthrow of the Celtic supremacy. The names of the German gods are different from those of the Celts. Their funeral customs were directly opposed. The Celts buried their dead, while the Germans, like the Greeks, burned theirs.

“What exactly took place at the time of the German upheaval we shall never know. Certain it is, however, that from about the year 300 B. C. onward the Celts appear to have lost whatever political cohesion and common purpose they had possessed. Rent
asunder, as it were, by the upthrust of some mighty subterranean force, their tribes rolled down like lava-streams to the south, east and west of their original home. Some found their way into Northern Greece, where they sacked the sacred shrine of Apollo at Delphi in 273 B. C. to the horror of their former allies, the Greeks. Other attacked Rome again, and perished in vast numbers at Sentinum and Lake Vadimo. One detachment penetrated into Asia Minor, and founded Galatia, where as St. Jerome attests, a Celtic dialect was still spoken in the fourth century after Christ.

"A tumultuous war of Celts against Germans went on all over Europe. When this ended, Gaul and the British Isles remained the sole relics of the Celtic Empire.

"By the commencement of the Christian era, Gaul and Britain had become Romanized. Only Ireland remained entirely outside of the influence of Rome's armies. Until the close of the 12th century Ireland maintained her independence against all comers."

Ireland was never even visited, much less subjugated, by the Roman armies. Therefore Ireland carried the Celtic civilization, art, institutions, and language straight across the great gulf which separated the ancient from the modern world. Irish is the oldest form of the Celtic language, philologists attest.

Why was it, then, that Ireland remained untouched by the power of all-conquering Rome? The reason is even stranger than the fact. Ireland is the last outpost of Europe toward the setting sun. It lies on the edge of the Gulf stream, bathed in its warm waters; it is a land of wonderful fertility and pleasant climate. Classical writers refer to it as the blessed isle of Ierne.

But there are constant references in the writings of the Romans to the Islands of the Blessed, which lie toward the sunset beyond the Pillars of Hercules. Procopius tells how the fishermen of Brittany at certain seasons are awakened by knocking at the doors, and go out at midnight to find their ships loaded down with invisible guests, which are magically borne to the Islands of the Dead. A mysterious dread is apparent in references to Ireland. For four hundred years Britain was a part of the Roman empire. It was thoroughly Romanized, with a civilization which even now underlies the German civilization erected upon the Celto-Roman foundation. Yet in all that time Rome never crossed the narrow strait and set her foot in Ireland.

The Romans were not particularly superstitious. Yet they regarded Ireland as holy soil, and forbore to land upon it. Perhaps even they thought that this extremity of the world might be the abode of the Blessed Dead, whom it was unwise to disturb in the placid enjoyment of the apples of Hesperides in that land of the sunset sea. If this is so, then Ireland was the land, not only of the Dead, but of the Resurrection; as will be told hereafter. For
of all the marvellous stories in world history, the story of the conversion of Europe by Ireland is surely without a parallel.

THE STORY OF THE DRUIDS.

Whence came the Druids? And what manner of people were they? Rolleston gives the following answer.

The Celtic Empire consisted of several very different kinds of peoples. There were the Mountain Celts, the Lowland Celts, and the Megalithic people. These Megalithic people were the builders of the dolmens, or cromlechs, found all over Western Europe from the Straits of Gibraltar north to the North Sea, and all over the country west of that line. Each of these dolmens is a hill of earth enclosing a stone vault, built roughly in the form of a ship. On practically every one of these stone vaults is roughly engraved the figure of a ship, bearing the Sun upon it, sailing westward. Within the vault are discovered the bones and relics of chieftains and of kings.

The Megalithic people were black haired and swarthy skinned. They are the progenitors of the Iberian race, the Basques, the "black Irish" and the dark Englishmen. Their origin is traced back to Egypt, from which the symbol of the Ship of the Sun was undoubtedly taken.

When the Celts got to Western Europe, ethnologists say, they found there a dark people with a powerful priesthood, a ritual, and imposing religious monuments; a people steeped in magic and mysticism and in the cult of the Other-World. The Egyptian doctrine of the immortals was far more cheerful than that of the Greeks or Romans; and from them the Celts took their idea of a glorious immortality, which enchanted the Romans. From the Megalithic people the Celts took the religion of the Druids and the mystic doctrines of that strange faith, which had its origin in prehistoric Egypt. All over Europe the Druids held their colleges, and tens of thousands of the dominant race of Celts attended their schools. The British Isles, and especially Ireland, were to the Druid religion what Rome is to the Catholic Church. But this religion was Celtic; it was never shared by the Germans.

In Ireland the Druid colleges had their greatest development. When the Gothic wave beat down the defenses of Rome, Ireland remained outside the circle of destruction. And as soon as the Gothic invasion began to settle down into some sort of rude order—changed epochally from that which had preceded it—the land of Ireland became the beacon-light of the new world.

This phenomenon is so extraordinary that it requires some little study to appreciate it. Histories of Ireland and of Europe are full of references to it, but its vast importance is only beginning to be adequately realized.
THE RESURRECTION OF EUROPE.

Be it realized, first, that it was the Druid priesthood which held the Celtic empire together. Among the Greeks and Romans it was loyalty to the City or the Republic which formed the bond of union. Among the Germans it was fealty, loyalty to a personal chief, which held the tribes together. But among the Celts it was this priestly order which formed their bond of cohesion.

When the German revolt came, and the Celtic empire, weakened of its warriors by the massacres of the Romans, was dismembered, the Druids were cast out of their place of power. To them in their island seat came Christian missionaries, preaching the Gospel of the resurrection of Christ. And the conversion of the Druids was almost instantaneous. It was a conversion, first, of the priestly body, and secondly—a long time after—of the people; this the legends and records show plainly. Long before the time of Patrick, Christianity had been preached in Ireland. All that Patrick did was to Romanize them to a certain extent. But even he failed to overcome the native Celtic system of organization—far different from anything else existing either in the Orthodox Church of the East or in the Catholic Church of the West.

Very soon after the preaching of Christianity in Ireland we find the country covered with monasteries, whose complete organization and vast enrollments seem to indicate that they were Druid colleges transformed. Already the arts and sciences and philosophy of the Druids, together with Greek characters and literature, and the elements of a Graeco-Roman commercial education, were given in these vast schools. Their Christian teachers added another element to the superstructure already existing.

As early as the year 450, Prince Enda founded a college at Aranmore, which attracted scholars from the whole of Ireland. Findian of Clonard, living from 470 to 548, spent some time in Wales; then returning to Ireland he founded the famous monastery at Clonard, about the year 520, in which three thousand students are said to have received instruction at one time. His college consisted of countless huts of wattles and clay, or of beehive cells of stone, built by the pupils and enclosed by a ditch like a permanent military camp. The pupils sowed their own corn, fished in the streams and milked their own cows, like a highly modernized Agricultural college of the Middle West today.

Meanwhile, the whole of Europe was being laid waste. In the year 406 hordes of Vandals from the upper Rhine invaded Gaul, ancient Germany, and Burgundy, and settled on the left bank of the Rhine, while the Huns under Attila made inroads upon these, and the Franks from the Lower Rhine burst into Gaul, making an end of Roman rule in that country. Angles and Saxons had devastated Britain, and what remained of Roman civilization in Upper Italy under the Heruli and Ostrogoths was destroyed by the Langobards and their allies. So vanished in the sixth century, at the hands of the German barbarians, the last
remains of Roman culture which had lingered on during the first
invasions.

Milman, in his “History of Latin Christianity” says: “It is
difficult to conceive of a more dark and odious state of society
than that of France under the Merovingian kings, the descendents
of Clovis, as described by Bishop Gregory of Tours. In the con-
fusion of coalitions of barbarism with Roman Christianity, bar-
barism had introduced into Christianity all its ferocity, with
none of its generosity, or magnanimity. Its energy shows
itself in atrocity of cruelty and even of sensuality. Through-
out, assassinations, parricides, and fratricides mingle with adul-
teries and rapes. That king Clotaire should burn alive his rebellious
son with his wife and daughter is fearful enough, but we are
astounded at the fact of a bishop of Tours, even in these times,
having burned a man alive to obtain the deeds of an estate which
he coveted. Fredegonde, wife of Chilperic I, one of the grand-
sons of Clovis, sends two murderers to assassinate Childebert, and
these assassins are clergymen. She causes the Archbishop of
Rouen to be murdered while chanting the service in church; and in
this crime a bishop and an archdeacon are accomplices. Marriage
was a bond contracted and broken on the slightest occasion.”

Under such circumstances learning on the continent had
sunk almost to an eclipse. Gregory of Tours, the most learned
man in France at that period, confesses that in writing Latin
he confounds the genders and the cases of words, and is embar-
rassed by numerous other grammatical difficulties. Even in Rome,
Gregory the Great found that learning had sunk very low. But
in Ireland great universities were meanwhile flourishing, in which
Greek and Latin classics were taught with a tradition of learning
derived without interruption from Ambrose, Jerome and Augus-
tine. Virgil’s works and the Greek poets and philosophers of pre-
Christian days were discussed and loved here, while on the con-
tenent a learned bishop could hardly rise to the level of a first
year high school student of these days.

THE IRISH MISSIONARIES.

When the heathen darkness of Europe was at its worst;
when the Goths had lost their own stern heathen morality and
had failed to grasp the virtues of that religion which they adopted
but did not understand—then began the pilgrimage of light.
A stream of missionaries from Ireland began to flow across to the
continent. In 543 Columbanus of Leinster went forth with
twelve companions, and established first a monastery, then a
university, at Bobbio and at Luxeuil, in Southern Gaul. Settle-
ments were also left by him at Anagratum, in the Vosges moun-
tains. The university at Luxeuil was established within a deserted
Roman bath. Bobbio, which is in what is now Italy, at the foot of
the Apennines between Milan and Genoa, continued throughout
the Middle Ages as a seat of culture and high learning. The Irish
monk Gallus founded the university of St. Gall, the chief seat of learning in ancient Germany. Cataldus established a monastery and College at Tarentum; Virgilius at Salzburg, Donatus at Fiesole, Kilian at Wuerzburg. At the beginning of the eighth century (about 725) a long chain of Irish missionary monasteries and universities stretched from the mouth of the Meuse and the Rhine to the Rhone and the Alps. These monasteries were not only universities, but agricultural and industrial settlements, teaching the arts of civilization along with the Gospel of Christ.

Around these universities and settlements grew up cities, and around the cities states were developed. It is claimed, not without truth and reason, that the modern states of Europe owe their origin to the monasteries founded by the Irish saints who went forth from Ireland in the days of the Great Darkness.

By this means the sons of the Druids recovered what their fathers before them had lost. The German destroyed the empire of the Celt; but the Celt, combining with the Roman, converted the German again. Into the farthest north, into Iceland and all over the Orkneys and the Hebrides, the Irish missionaries went. And wherever they went, a conflict later arose.

For the customs of the Celtic Church differed widely from those of the Romans. Celtic Christianity dated from the second and third centuries. Patrick, who came in 432 as a missionary bishop to Wicklow, introduced Roman methods which soon died out. But when Gregory the Great began sending missionaries out, he found Christians of the Celtic order, who resisted the customs of Rome. Augustine of Canterbury adopted a haughty and dictatorial attitude to the British bishops, who thereupon disregarded him; and his mission soon collapsed. Theodore of Tarsus, a Greek sent later by Pope Vitalian as Archbishop of Canterbury, had better success. He met the British bishops at the synod of Whitby, where Edwy, king of the West Saxons, presided. The debate between Celtic and Roman churches went on to a wearisome length, until the king intervened.

"Do the British churches admit," said he "that Rome is the Church of St. Peter?" To this they agreed. "And has St. Peter the keys of heaven?" They also assented to this. "Then I give my voice to the Romans," said King Edwy "lest when I get to the gates of heaven St. Peter will lock me out."

This was the last stage in the struggle between Celt and Roman. For the Celtic Church, Druid as it was, had looked upon Ireland as the center of its faith, and struggled against recognizing Rome. The chief difference between the two churches was, first, the tonsure, and, secondly, the date of Easter. The Druids had shaved the hair all off the top and front of their heads; the Romans shaved a round patch in the back of theirs. The Romans kept Easter always on a Sunday; the Druids, on whatever day of the week the fourteenth of Nisan might fall. When the voice of the king was given to the Romans, the last stronghold of the
Druid Christian church was Ireland, which held it maintained until the coming of the Plantagenet kings.

About the time that Charlemagne began to centralize power in Europe again and to restore some semblance of authority and peace, the Danes began their invasion of Ireland. Before the wave of their persecution the scholars fled to the courts of the European kings. John Scotus Eriigena—a name which means "John the Scot Born-in-Ireland" and Alcuin of York, both Druid-Christian priests, were the shining lights of the age of Charlemagne.

Heinrich Zimmer, in a book called "Irish Elements in Medieval Culture," has given a careful history of the work of the Irish saints in reconstructing Europe. But the great tragedy of a study of this kind is that we are seeking a lost trail. The Druids left no trace of their teaching because it was strictly forbidden to commit their doctrines to books. Yet, on becoming Christians, they taught the world the art of illumination. Books made in Ireland were the most highly prized possession of a European establishment. From the libraries and archives of the ancient monasteries of Switzerland, Italy and Germany, precious documents are being dug out which show to what a height the Irish learning attained. But in Ireland the blackness of desolation covers that glorious record. And why?

There is no greater tragedy in history than the story of how not only was the Mother of Learning despoiled of all the records of this glorious past, but how her conqueror set herself to root out all memory of and all pride in this splendid history. England determined not only to subjugate the Irish armies, but to exterminate the Irish race, on the ground that they were barbarians; and this although Ireland preserved the culture of the world when England was a welter of barbarism. But from the records which are left in other lands we can comprehend enough of the situation to begin to rebuild the stately structure of Irish civilization at its height, What the Germans did to Belgium and Northern France, their kinsmen, the Anglo-Saxons, did to Ireland. But Ireland lived through it all; and it may well be that a stranger story than has yet been written, will be the outcome of the present world-disaster.

In a fascinating book called "The Poem-Book of the Gael" Miss Eleanor Hull has published many of the old romances and ballads of the high period of Irish literature. In it she pictures certain curious elements revealed by these old songs.

"On the border of some grave manuscript, such as a Latin copy of St. Paul's epistles, or a transcript of Priscian," she says, "a stray quatrain may be found jotted down by the tired Scribe in Gaelic letters, recording in impromptu verse his delight at the note of a blackbird whose song has penetrated his cell, or his amusement at the gambols of a cat watching a mouse." Such a poem, for example "The Student and his Cat," likens the student
The Irish monk showed no such inclination, and suffered not such terrors. His joy in nature grew from loving association with her moods. He refused to mingle the idea of evil with that which God had made so good. If he sought for symbols, he found only symbols of purity and holiness. The pool beside his hut, the rill that flowed across his green, became to his watchful eye the manifestation of the divine spirit washing away sin. If the birds sang sweetly above his door, they were the choristers of God. If the wild beasts gathered to their nightly tryst, were they not the congregation of intelligent beings whom God himself would most desire? The friendly badgers or foxes of the wood that came forth, undismayed by the white or brown robed figure that seemed to have taken up his lasting abode amongst
them, became to his mind fellow-monks, authorized members of his strange community."

In strong contrast to this frame of mind was that of the German and the Roman. Augustine in his conflict with Pelagius, or Morgan, fitly symbolized the conflict between Roman ideas of absolute law and the Celtic idea of poetic beauty. Augustine's doctrine of total depravity of the human soul and the irresistible calling of divine grace won a formal victory over the Pelagian doctrine of the free will of man responding to the divine love. Pelagius was banned as a heretic; and ever since the Roman church has been trying to outlaw Augustine's doctrines while it exalted his name. Augustine's doctrines eventually worked out into the barren lovelessness of Knox and Calvin, while Morgan's more human doctrine has always remained the religion of the people, let the church say what it would.

This Celtic frame of mind was the natural result of Ireland's pleasant climate. In the stern Northern tempests a wilder faith was born, a passionate fury which saw hell and purgatory in its most horrible forms. Roman Logic and Gothic sword built the superstructure of the Church of the Middle Ages; but the spirit of it was the spirit of the Druids.

Ralph Adams Cram, in his book "The Substance of Gothic," finds himself unable to explain how the wonderful structure of Gothic art arose out of the barbarism of the Gothic tribes. For three or four centuries after the destruction of Rome, the barbarian tribes seem to have no impulse toward creating anything new. "Then, suddenly, the Gothic civilization arose; perfect, exquisite, unlike anything which had preceded it."

The answer seems to be found in the Celtic grace which welded together rugged German and legal Roman into a structure whose variety of beauty exceeds the beauty of Greece, and which is the greatest sacrifice claimed by the holocaust of today. For it is on the foundations laid by the Celtic monks that the cathedrals of Europe arose. And it is the Celtic love of the little beasts of nature, the Druid adoration of the forests, which distinguishes Gothic styles. Classic styles were entirely artificial. Greek ornament must be so conventionalized that it lost its meaning. The Romans were too stupid to make anything but poor imitations. The Germans were barbarians pure and simple. But the submerged Celtic genius came to its own in the Cathedral-building ages. The same spirit which wrote poems about a mousing cat on the margin of St. Paul's gloomiest epistles and illustrated them with intricate beauty of line and color, carved those same beloved little beasts into the wood and stone of the Cathedrals which reared their vaulted shafts like the aisles of a Druid sanctuary among the forests.

Not only the outward embodiment, but the whole interior economy, of the Medieval church was far other than that of the first four centuries. A church which was produced by a Jewish infiltration into a Greek-Roman empire must necessarily differ
from one produced by a Druid infiltration into a Gothic empire erected on the ruins of a Roman defeat. One was a city church, with metropolitan’s "big-city bishops" for its rulers; the other was a country church, with monastic foundations for its rulers.

THE GUILD SYSTEM.

Within the past few years modern Americans and Englishmen have been discovering, with something like a gasp of wonderment, what this society of the Middle Ages was like. William Morris, Celt from Wales, led the way; Gilbert K. Chesterton in England and Ralph Adams Cram in this country are following at the head of a growing host of “guildsmen” and “craftsmen” in exploring that great order of civilization in which all persons were born into a wide unity called “Christendom”. This was neither a Church nor an Empire, but a frame of society; with the Church as its religious department, or aspect, and the Empire as its political aspect, and with the whole process of productive life carried on in an industrial democracy known as “guilds”. “Corpus Christi” was the most highly religious of medieval feasts—and it was the International Labor Day. The test of a man’s loyalty to his guild, or union, was the faithfulness with which he fulfilled his part at the Corpus Christi feast.

“The modern critic of medievalism,” says Chesterton in “A Short History of England”, “commonly looks only at the crooked shadows and not at the common daylight of the Middle Ages..... The truth is that it is precisely in the arts of peace and in the type of production that the Middle Ages stand singular and unique. What was really arresting and remarkable about the Middle Ages was precisely that positive social scheme of production, of the making, building and growing of all the good things of life. The dynasties and the parliaments passed like a changing cloud across a fruitful landscape. Men banded together in guilds and parishes, long before the state existed. All work beyond the primary work of agriculture was guarded by the vigilance of the equalizing guilds. A Guild was, very broadly speaking, a Trades Union in which every man was his own employer. A man could not, that is, work at any trade at all unless he would join the league and accept the laws of that trade; but he worked in his own shop with his own tools, and the whole profit went to himself. A master-workman meant, not a boss, not a master of the workmen, but a master of the work. And here is the melancholy difference between the Guild system and our present method. The owner of a ship need not know the bowsprit from the rudder, like the Bellman in the “Hunting of the Snark”; the owner of a goldmine may never have seen the ore. But a Master-Craftsman must be a better workman than any of his apprentices or journeymen.”
The aim of the guilds was not so much to establish a monopoly of the business as to save the guildsmen; to "cobble the cobbler's, strengthen the weakest link, go after the hundredth sheep," as Chesterton expresses it. They insisted upon a high standard of craftsmanship, not spawning of mediocrities with a high average of production; and their craftsmanship still astonishes the world with its remnants. And it is certain that it was around the guilds that the towns were built, and that the heads of the guilds were the heads of the state. The government of these medieval times rested, not upon the arms of the soldier, but upon the tools of the worker, and to an extent astonishing to us to discover the Church itself was mainly built upon an agricultural and industrial foundation.

This medieval society of craftsmen was the extension, over the Germano-Roman Empire, of the Celtic clan-crafts system. And the contribution of the Anglo-Saxon race to democracy was a destruction of this genuine industrial democracy, and the erection of a talk-shop, "Parliament", in the place of the craft-shops which it ruined.

When we read that Edward I. summoned a congress of burghers and from them formed a Parliament, we are not, perhaps, aware that "burgher" is another term for master-guildsman. And when we read further that the Great Council of the Guilds, in the days of Henry VIII., decreed the destruction of the guilds of the towns, if we know what it is that we read, we bow the head with a shame too deep for words to voice. For when the armed men of the Parliament proceeded to the sacking of the guilds, when the medieval Craft Unions were struck down, their buildings destroyed, their treasuries confiscated by the new nobility of Henry—then the triumph of the barbarism of the new order completed the destruction of the Goths upon Rome. The Celt had converted the barbarian for a while; but with the new armor of gold stolen by torture from the natives of our own America, this conversion was undone and the horror known as industrialism, represented in a central Parliament whose representatives are chosen from those who own for a living instead of working for a living, smote upon the world with a blackness which is only now beginning to lift. And it is because this great destruction occurred first in England, that England is known as the "Mother of Democracy."

When the craftsmen of England had been ruined, the craftsmen of Ireland remained to be dealt with. And the horror of that dealing is reflected in the pages of Edmund Spenser, gentlest of poets, who saw Ireland converted into a desert wherein starvation was king.

The horrors now to be recounted are known to English historians as "bringing the blessings of civilization to the wild Irish."

But when we discover that Ireland was not a half-savage country, but the most highly educated and cultured country
then on the globe, and that it was the English who were sunk in barbarism—then we discover that this policy was not a "mistaken and blundering one" but a well-calculated and persistently followed one. It was the genius of the Saxon system attempting to abolish the genius of the Celtic system, knowing that it could not live unless this were done. The genius of the Celtic system was industrial democracy; and the genius of the Saxon-system—or the Anglo-Saxon system, to give it its true name, for the Saxons never reached such a pitch of degradation in their own land—was landed aristocracy, or feudalism, passing into that money-aristocracy which we now call Capitalism.

When we read of Elizabeth’s soldiers tossing Irish children on the points of their bayonets, crying “Nits will be lice!” or of Cromwell’s soldiers with sword and Bible in their hands, killing Irish children and Irish women by burning, starvation, drowning, shooting, or disembowelling—we are not reading of the temporary aberration of Englishmen gone mad; we are reading of the scientific methods adopted by the budding Capitalist system to exterminate its deadly rival, the system of Industrial Democracy.

Let us then understand something of this Celtic system which reached its flower in Ireland.

Milesian Kings had established a central government at the Hall of Tara, where triennial oenachs were held for making laws, hearing new songs and poems, and discussing matters of policy. The Brehon laws, or laws of the judges, recognize women as legislators on all subjects dealing with women and children and with education. The women met in separate assemblies, and no man could enter the women’s assembly under pain of death. The Brehon courts met in the open air, and all the men and women present heard the evidence. If they approved the sentence of the court, they proceeded to enforce it by excommunication; that is, the druidic interdict. No one would speak or be seen with, give water, fire or food to one adjudged worthy of punishment, until the time his sentence expired. If they disapproved it, they hooted the court until he changed his judgment.

This Brehon sentence was the origin of the modern boycott, which is so terrible a weapon against one found worthy of it that the courts, modelled as they are on Saxon instead of Celtic law, have promulgated horrible rules against those who exercise it. The boycott originated in Ireland, as a spontaneous protest of the tenantry of an English landlord against his rule. It was the old Brehon judgment rising from the grave of centuries. This fear of the courts, giving rise to the extraordinary severity of their judgments against boycotters, is well founded; for if the boycott prevails, the whole system of Saxon laws, founded on property rights and property punishments, will go by the board, and the Celtic system or organization will supersede it. It is an ominous shaking of thrones!
The Druids, however, broke down the Hall of Tara by their curse. King Diarmait O'Neil in the year 561 twice seized and punished murderers who had claimed sanctuary at the shrine of St. Brendan and St. Columba. Whereupon the Druid-priests St. Ruadan and St. Brendan solemnly pronounced the curse against the Hall of Tara, from which time it was abandoned. Shortly after this, in 580, the Assembly of Drumcet greatly curtailed the number of bards. At that time the poets, or seanchaidhe, had grown to so great a number that one third of the freeman made their living by singing the deeds of kings and nobles, telling stories and lampooning those who refused their demands. A sarcastic song by a bard caused the ruin of any judge or king against whom it was directed. It was this excess of power which caused the order to be reduced; but the struggle for its privileges nearly rent the kingdom of Ireland in twain. And yet if the power of the singers laid Ireland low, they have nobly atoned for it; for in these last decades it is the power of the singers which has brought Ireland back to life again.

THE CELTIC SYSTEM.

Among the Irish Celts, the tribe or the clan owned the land and the industries. All that was necessary to the life of the clan was owned by the clan. The chieftain was its representative only, and could be disciplined or dismissed by his people for infringing their rights.

"In the Brehon Laws," says Edmund Crosby Quiggin, of Cambridge, "the land belongs in theory to the tribe...... The members of a sept claimed common descent from the same ancestor, and the land belonged to the freemen." Succession to the kingly office did not pass from father to son by hereditary right, but was determined by the tribal conference during the life-time of the king.

There was no authority except public opinion working to enforce the decrees of the Brehon court, confirmed by the assembly. At the Oenach, the Fair summoned by the King, which had the character of a national assembly, the laws were publicly promulgated and rehearsed; councils dealt with disputes and matters of local interest; popular sports such as horse-racing, running and wrestling; poems and tales were recited, and prizes were awarded to the best performers of every dan, or art; while at the same time foreign traders came with their wares, which they exchanged for native produce, chiefly skins, wool, and frieze.

The noble professions invariably ran in families, so that members of the same household devoted themselves for many generations to the science of poetry, history, medicine or law. The heads of the various professions in the tuath receive the title of Ollam. It was the rule for such men to have paying apprentices living with them. The literary Ollam, or fili, the harper, the metal-worker, and the smith were also provided with mensal
or tribal land, in return for which they rendered to the tribe their skill and product of their labor as customary tribute. It was to this system of industrial democracy that the extraordinary development of Irish trade, commerce, and industrial art was due. And it was this system which the Norman kings and the commercial bourgeoisie of England determined to destroy.

The foundation principles of the Gaels was that the people own in common all their sources of food and maintenance. The foundation principle of the Saxons was that all these things are owned by the overlord, and the people hold it from him on condition of vassalage. One was the principle of tribal democracy; the other was the principle of feudal autocracy.

Feudalism had conquered the rest of the world, but failed to touch Ireland, until the end of the twelfth century. There the ancient Celtic system still held against all odds. And then began an act of treachery that loomed monstrous even in the days when treachery was an art.

An Englishman sat on the Papal throne in the year 1171—Nicholas Breakspear, whom his colleagues in the cardinalate elevated to the chair of Peter under the name of Adrian IV. It was he who was driven from his city of Rome by Arnold of Brescia, the fiery Republican monk who preached the doctrine that the Pope and his cardinals should take to themselves the injunction of Christ to own no money nor property. It was Adrian who delivered Arnold over to be burnt by the young Emperor as price for that wretched betrayal. And it was Adrian, the Englishman, who delivered Ireland over to the King of England, Henry Plantagenet, in the year 1154, because the Irish Church, which had rescued Europe from the barbarians, was not sufficiently submissive to the Roman See.

The invasion came about thus. Dermuid McMurrough, king of Leinster, was by descent and location much mixed up with foreigners, and generally in a state of hostility to the high kings. He was a tyrant and a bad character. In 1152 Tigernan O'Rourke, prince of Briefne, was dispossessed of his lands by McMurrough, together with O'Connor. McMurrough also stole Derbforgaill, wife of O'Rourke. An insurrection was raised by the dispossessed husband, and McMurrough in fear burnt his castle of Ferns and fled to England to seek the help of Henry II.

Henry at that time was in Aquitaine, seeking to secure possession of the land in France which he claimed as a Plantagenet. But he gladly gave letters to Dermuid, authorizing him to raise money and forces in England to replace himself on the throne, with English aid.

Dermuid had a large supply of gold, extorted from his former subjects in Leinster. With this he enlisted the support of Richard de Clare, Earl of Pembroke, a Norman noble who had gambled away all his possessions and was ready for anything. Earl Richard made a bargain with McMurrough, that he would reconquer Leinster for him, in consideration for the hand of McMurrough's only child, Eva.
According to feudal law which ruled in Saxon England, and Norman France, by his marriage with Eva, Earl Richmond—whom later generations have known as Strongbow—became the rightful heir of all the lands of Leinster. But Irish law recognized no estates of inheritance, and Eva "had no more right to the reversion of Leinster than she had to that of Japan", says Richard Bagwell, Commissioner of Education for Ireland. "It is likely," he continues, "that Strongbow had no conception of this, and that his first collision with the tribal system was an unpleasant surprise."

THE LANDING OF STRONGBOW

About the first of May, 1169, Strongbow, with Robert Fitz Stephen and Maurice Fitzgerald, and the recreant wife-stealer McMurrough, landed on the Wexford shore with a small force. According to agreement, Dermuid granted to Fitzgerald and Fitzmaurice the territory of Wexford, which had never belonged to him; and here began the conflict between feudal and tribal law which was destined to deluge Ireland with blood. Strongbow himself landed near Waterford on the 23rd of August, 1170, with 200 knights and 1,000 men.

"The natives," writes Bagwell, "did not understand that this invasion was quite different from those of the Danes." King Henry, alarmed by the growing strength of his vassals in Ireland, invaded Ireland in person in 1172, with 500 knights, 4,000 men and 240 ships.

From that time on for five centuries the English adventurers were fully occupied in attempting to make good their claim to their land titles. There were constant battles and unrest, because of the refusal of the tribesmen to recognize the right of a feudal lord to bequeath to his heir the land which they still regarded as their own. Continually we read of expeditions to Ireland either to conquer new land or to reconquer what had been lost. Yet during those years the English pale was a narrow circle around Dublin. When the English fell to fighting among themselves, the Irish contracted the circle. When they were united, and the Irish fought among themselves, the English pale expanded to include a larger territory. It was in the time of the Wars of the Roses, when York and Lancaster deluged the soil of England with blood for thirty years, that Ireland seemed almost on the verge of clearing her soil from the invader, and of re-establishing clan right.

But then came the time of Henry VIII. and Elizabeth. To the two ancient causes of dispute—land tenure and foreign kings—was added another, a deeper and deadlier cause. This masqueraded under the aspect of a new church seeking to win the land away from its old allegiance. But the Reformation was really the destruction of the medieval social system and the erection of a new one, based not on mastery of a trade but mastery of cash, far more than it was a dispute about cleansing certain ecclesiastical abuses. What the kings and bishops fought about was more or less immaterial; there was always some cause of
quarrel, to which the people as a whole paid little heed, so long as the general method of gaining a livelihood went on uninterrupted. But this was something new. And it was accompanied with new horrors.

Elizabeth determined to make a complete end of Irish opposition. She sent over Earl Ormonde accompanied with Edmund Spenser and Walter Raleigh; one the mirror of poets, one the courtliest of chevaliers, to preside at the massacre.

A force of Spaniards landed at Smerwick and Kerry. Raleigh, Spenser and Earl Grey surrounded them; they surrendered—and were butchered in cold blood. Then began the burning of Irish crops; the massacring of men, women and children; the killing of cattle—the Book of the Four Masters says, ‘the lowing of a cow could scarcely be heard from Cashel to Kerry.’ Ormonde claims to have killed 5,000 men within a few months. Spenser says that famine slew far more than the sword. “They looked like anatomies of Death; they did eat the dead carrion, and one another soon after, inasmuch as the very carcasses they spared not to scrape out of their graves. They flocked to watercress and shamrock as to a feast.”

“The last stand of the Irish nation for religion and independence,” says A. M. Skelly, “led by the great chiefs of the North, Hugh O’Neill and Red Hugh O’Donnell, had been stifled in blood, after the great fourteen years war for religion and nationality had resulted in the triumph of Elizabeth. Dauntless Red Hugh was stricken down by poison in Spain, whither he had gone to obtain the help of the noble Spanish nation, administered to him through the treachery of the Lord President of Munster, Sir Henry Carew, who received therefor the cordial thanks of Elizabeth herself. The whole of Munster was devastated with fire and sword, till, as related by the English historians themselves, “you might travel for fifty miles of that hitherto populous province without meeting a soul on the way.” Lecky says, “After the Pacification of Ireland, the Virgin Queen had little to reign over in that country but ashes and carcasses. Famine and pestilence were an outcome of the Elizabethan wars; children fed on the flesh of their dead mothers; mothers fed on the flesh of their dead children.”

Why this savagery? Darrel Figgis, in an article entitled, “A Nation in Ireland” in the Forum, writes of this:

* There is only one ghastlier passage in Irish history, save that of Cromwell. And that is the story of the vice-regal festivities at Dublin Castle, at the beginning of the third year of the famine of 1847-48. John Mitchel, from his prison, wrote thus:

“In the light of that mock throne on the hill over the Liffey there vibrate now all the bedizened atomies of happy Ireland. Glittering Captains, silvered Lieutenants, epauletted puppyism in every grade and phase and fashion, wigged debasement fresh from a public hanging and gowned simony, flock around delighted at “The flourishing condition of the State.” No whisper of death, no shadow or desolation breaks over the crowd….and so begins the third year of uninterrupted famine.”
"The Irish tribes were the centers of crafts and industries, even as they were the centers of the arts and learning; and the Irish towns, most of them with close corporations, traded with their produce. Clearly, therefore, if it was impossible to affect the health of the nation by direct edict, the same end could be more easily served by driving a wedge in between the tribes and the towns. Consequently it was made a crime for any English merchant to attend any fair in town or country. All the poets, historians and brehons were declared outlaw, since they "by their Irish gifts and minstrelsy provoke the people to an Irish order." Similarly the schools, that had won for Europe the basis of much of its culture and the new beginnings of much of its learning, were sought out and uprooted. Not only schools but all the manuscripts were destroyed. "The English burned," says Lynch, "with savage rage for the annihilation of our Irish documents."

Anything that could preserve the ancient Celtic order was marked for destruction—the poet, the brehon, the schoolmaster, the tribal organization, the land tenure. "The weaver at his loom, the tradesman with his commerce, the scholar at his books, the historian at his manuscripts, the brehon administering the equity of an old and intricately devised law on a hilltop in the presence of a confirming people, and the poet with his poems, that were the result of many years study and discipline—all were broken, ostensibly in the name of government but truly by shameless avarice, and the hatred with which the oppressor inevitably hates the victim whom chance has placed in his power."

But though these could be banned, the sense of them remained; the racial genius which could organize them, could devise means of overcoming any restrictions. And hence—the race must go! Ireland must be extirpated, because its presence menaced English prosperity, with the certainty of superexcellence if allowed to exist so near.

At last, in the year 1663, a few days after the death of the Queen, a treaty of peace was agreed to with the Irish chieftains, guaranteeing to them their lands and the free exercise of their religion, on condition that they submit to English customs and tenure, and that British law should run within their territories.

Unhappily, as has nearly always been the case in the dealings of the Irish with their English conquerors, the English did not keep faith with the conquered Irish; and then was begun that system of persecution and confiscation of the lands of the Irish septs which changed the face of the country. James the First began the "Plantation of Ulster", importing Scotch families who were given the lands of the earls. To the robbery of the ancient inhabitants by the confiscation of their lands and goods were added many other outrages, the chief of which was the proscription of their religion. And at last the "Confederation of Kilkenny" rose up in a rebellion, which, says Lecky, "represented the accumulated wrongs of ten generations."
THE SLAUGHTER OF CROMWELL.

This rebellion was ended by Oliver Cromwell, in a slaughter which had no parallel since then, until the extermination of the Armenians by the Turks under the guidance of the Germans imitated the attempted extermination of the Irish by the Anglo-Saxons. More than two out of five of the whole remaining population—616,000 out of 1,500,000—perished at the hands of the champion of the Commonwealth.

Bishop Dupanloup of Orleans, in an oration delivered in Paris in 1860 for the relief of the Irish tenants, spoke thus:

"The simple truth—the terrible truth—here it is; that there is a people on the earth whose life-blood during three centuries has been running out drop by drop, who are dying by slow degrees in the horrid agony of misery and hunger, in the face and at the hands of a mighty nation. And this in Europe, in the full sunlight of Christianity and in the middle of the nineteenth century!"

The Anglican bishop, Berkeley, one of the greatest of English-speaking philosophers, spoke in 1734 thus:

"I ask whether there be upon earth any Christian or civilized people so beggarly, wretched and destitute, as the common Irish; and if nevertheless there is any other people whose wants may be more easily supplied from home." The Duke of Wellington proclaimed likewise in the House of Lords, a century afterward, "There never was a country in which poverty existed to so great a degree as in Ireland."

The English historian Leland acknowledges that the favorite dream of the English statesman was the "extirpation, the extermination of the Irish race."

In the year 1880 the Chicago Times sent a representative named Redpath to visit Ireland and report on its condition. Here are in part his words:

"Every sod of its ancient soil is wet with the dew of human tears. Every murmur of its dripping brooks is accompanied with a chorus of sighs from the breaking human hearts. Every breeze which sweeps across its barren moors carries to its mountain tops, and I trust far beyond, the groans and the prayers of a brave but despairing people. The sun never sets upon their sorrows except to give place to the pitying stars which look down there on human woes, countless as their own constellated hosts. I can but paint those woes; I cannot portray their sorrows. As often as I try I fail. When I think of the woes I have witnessed and the laws which produced them, my blood boils with indignation. When I think of the sorrows I have seen and how many must yet be borne, my heart dissolves in tears."

In the year 1835, twelve years prior to the famine of 1847, the poor law commissioners stated to the English government that "in Ireland at that time there were 2,325,000 persons exposed to die of hunger." In that year a Frenchman, Gustave de Beaumont, visited Ireland and wrote a work on his experiences. He describes thus the parish of Newport-Pratt, in the County of Mayo:
"Among 11,767 inhabitants of this parish, there are 9,538 whose only bed is straw and grass. There are in Donegat about 4,000 adults of both sexes obliged to go always barefooted in the snow. Often the same clothes serve for two. When one goes out the other remains at home."

But the black year of 1847-48 will forever stand as the bottommost reach of horror. "My Father," says Rev. A. M. Skelly, "had a large field of turnips, and the poor starving people were accustomed to come in droves, some of them seven miles, to appease their hunger on the raw tubers." How many millions died of starvation in those two awful years there is no knowing. And yet, while the heart of the whole world was touched, Ireland's produce was being shipped across to England, to the value of tens of millions of dollars. In 1846, the amount of grain alone exported to England was valued by Thom's Almanac at 1,875,393 quarters. In this same Almanac, an official directory of the British government, we find, says Father Skelly, in the report of Captain Larcom, government commissary in 1847, the estimate of the produce of Ireland during that year—the year of the great famine—16,248,934 quarters of wheat and 8,785,144 tons of potatoes, besides cattle, fowls, and other foodstuffs. This was all consumed—but not by the Irish.

On October 3, 1847, the London Daily News stated that in the London markets the "oats consisted chiefly of the last harvest of Ireland." The Examiner for October 4, 1847, says that in one day there came from Ireland to London 11,050 quarters of grain. The Drogheda Argus states that in one week ending October 3 there were shipped off from Drogheda 1,200 cows, 3,500 sheep and pigs, 2,000 quarters of wheat, 211 tons of meal, 130 boxes of eggs, besides butter, pork, etc. Waterford during the same week exported 250 tons of meal, 1,100 sheep and pigs, 308 horned cattle, 5,400 barrels of flour and oatmeal, 7,700 firkins of butter, and 2,000 fletches of lard. This was in the midst of the famine.

From Newry there left for England in the course of five days, in the end of September, eleven vessels laden with wheat, not to speak of the steamboats that left four times a week carrying cattle, eggs, and butter.

All of this was in the year of the great famine, when millions of Irish died for lack even of raw turnip-roots to keep their souls and bodies together.

THE RACK-RENT SYSTEM.

Concerning the evils of rack-rent, much has been said. Here is a vivid picture of it, again from the pen of Father Skelly:

"Well do I remember (in 1889) having seen seventy-five families, containing some hundreds of members, all my own dear people, flung upon the roadside within a few short weeks. I re-
member how one morning when the neighbors awoke they saw fifteen cabins in conflagration. The brigade of constables came down on the sleeping inmates during the night; flung them out on the road, together with their poor furniture and effects; cut down the rooftrees; poured petroleum on the thatch; applied the torch; and in a few minutes the dear houses built by their own hands went down in flames. I have seen over sixty of their young men handcuffed and carried off to jail, because they dared to put up poor shanties for the evicted on a neighboring farm.... Do you know how many cabins in Ireland were thus destroyed in ten years, from 1841, to 1851, according to official statistics? Two hundred and seventy thousand.

"And in one single year, the year following the famine of 1847, how many families were evicted and thrown out upon the road? Fifty thousand."

No wonder that the population of Ireland has been reduced from eight million in 1841 to barely four million in 1914!

And yet through all of this the Celtic humor was unextinguished. There is a story of a group of Irish tenants who waited for their hated landlord’s agent to return through a dark lane at midnight; each of them had a club and a blunderbuss. They waited and waited, but still he did not come. One of them called softly across the hedge to the others:

"Whisht, boys! Ye don’t suppose anything has happened to the poor man?"

Now what was the cause of this unbelievable savagery? What is it that has made Ireland a martyr nation? To what was she a martyr? Her religion? Hardly; for the Plantagenet conquest was undertaken in the name of the Pope. And the enforcement of the rackrent and tenancy-at-will laws was as harsh against Protestant as against Catholic.

James Connolly, first vice-president of the Irish Republic and one of the martyrs of the Easter Rebellion of 1916, writes:

"Here we have the astounding spectacle of a land blessed with a fertility greater than that of any other European country, which has been the abode of famine for eight centuries. We see a race which, before the dawn of history was famous for its commerce, manufactures and shipping, reduced to a condition called “thriftlessness.” We see the people which restored learning to Europe reduced to ignorance. Why is it?

"Ireland’s forty harbors are the finest in Western Europe. For centuries before Christianity an extensive shipping passed constantly to Greece and Phoenicia. But Ireland’s harbors are empty, and severe penalties attach o any attempt to use them."

Dean Swift, writing on the Navigation Laws, said: "The convenience of ports and havens which nature hath bestowed so liberally on this kingdom is of no more use to us than a beautiful prospect to a man shut up in a dungeon.” Only a year before the war the ships of the American Line ceased to call at Queenstown, and when the North German Lloyd proposed to make these calls they were kept from it by the influence of English trade.
Connolly saw hope for the future only in one direction. He writes:

"In the re-conversion of Ireland to the Gaelic principle of the common ownership by a people of their sources of food and maintenance the worst obstacles to overcome will be the opposition of the men and women who have imbibed their ideas of Irish character and history from Anglo-Irish literature. That literature was born in the worst agonies of the slavery of our race. It bears all the birthmarks of such an origin upon it; but, irony of ironies, these birthmarks of slavery are hailed by our teachers as 'the native characteristics of the Celt.'"

"One of these slave-marks is the belief in the capitalist system of society; the Irishman frees himself from such a mark of slavery when he realizes that the capitalist system is the most foreign thing in Ireland.

"Hence we have had in Ireland for 250 years the remarkable phenomenon of Irishmen of the upper and middle classes urging upon the Irish toilers as a sacred national and religious duty the necessity of maintaining a social order against which their Gaelic forefathers had struggled, despite prison cells, famine and the sword, for over 400 years."

It is significant that the first scientific Socialist of modern times was not Karl Marx, but the master whom Karl Marx acknowledged as his predecessor, William Thompson, of Clonkeen, Rosscarberry, County Cork. In 1824 he published a work entitled "An Inquiry into the Principles of the Distribution of Wealth," wherein he gives the first clear and convincing modern elucidation of what has since been known as Marxism. His definition of Capital; his description of the Class Struggle; his clear analysis of the Economic Basis of history—in all that modern Socialism has followed strictly in line with the economics of William Thompson. But Thompson based his theories on the application of the Celtic principle of clan-democracy to the situation which he found at the beginning of the nineteenth century, as Karl Marx applied the Jewish principles of tribal democracy to the theories promulgated by the Celt.

Socialism has attained its majority, therefore, upon the combination of the Celtic with the Jewish principle of tribal democracy. Its enemy, Capitalism, is the application to modern conditions of that Teutonic theory of aristocratic rule, whereby the lord owns the land and the lives of the tribe.

Ireland's oppression is not religious oppression. The laws which are called Religious Laws in Ireland, were really aimed, not at the conversion of Irishmen to the Protestant religion, but of Catholic property to Protestant hands. "A son could deprive a father of all his property, or a wife her husband, by simply taking the Protestant oath. A Catholic could not own a horse worth more than five pounds. If he did, any Protestant could take the horse away from him in full day, and give him five pounds in full payment thereof. On the head of a Catholic schoolmaster, or a Catholic priest, the same price was put as on the head of a
wolf. Catholic religion was an illegal thing; yet the priests gathered the children round them in 'hedge schools' and taught them not only their faith, but reading, writing and such little arithmetic as could be handed on in such fashion. Catholic religion gained a hold on the people as rapidly as the French and Italian churches lost theirs, although in France and Italy the Catholic church was the dominant state religion; a fact worth noting” adds Connolly, “by those Catholics who are asking for the endowment of their institutions from state funds.

‘On the other hand, class lines were drawn far more strictly than religious lines. Archbishop Whately says, ‘Many instances have come to my knowledge of the most furious Orangemen stripping their estates of a Protestant tenantry who had been there for generations, and letting their land to Roman Catholics, at an advance of a shilling an acre. These Protestants so evicted were the descendants of those men who had saved Ireland for King William and Protestantism as against King James and Catholicity, and the evictions here recorded were the rewards of their fidelity.’”

These cruelties, senseless as they seem, fruitless as they evidently were—except in the hideous harvest of endless horrors with which Ireland has been cursed since the beginning of the Capitalist system—were the determined struggles of the Saxon system of aristocratic feudal tenure to crush out a competitor system based upon clan democracy. Saxonism cannot exist, with the Celtic system so close a rival. Follow the steps by which one industry after another was taken up by the Irish, brought to a flourishing prosperity,—and destroyed by the English government at the insistent request of English rival industries. Shipping was very great in the ancient times from the forty harbors of Ireland to all of the Mediterranean lands. In 1663, when England’s navy began to flourish, Ireland was excluded from the Navigation acts, and her whole shipping industry sternly suppressed. Since the earliest days Ireland’s west coast had done a rich import trade with the wine-bearing districts of the south of Europe. In the time of the Tudors a heavy duty was put upon wine, but that duty was doubled if it were carried in ships other than English. Early in the reign of Henry VI. the city of Chester found that the speediest method of communicating with Spain was through Ireland; for Spanish merchants desired Irish linens, wools and leather and would not take the English substitutes. Not only this, but Irish linens, wools and leather invaded England; and the Parliament passed a law, first forbidding the Irish to trade with England, and then forbidding them to trade anywhere else. In 1669 Parliament presented to William III. a petition begging him to suppress the woolen industry in Ireland, in the following words:

‘Wherefore we most humbly beseech your most sacred majesty that your majesty would be pleased in the most public and effectual way that may be, to declare to all your subjects in Ireland that the growth and increase of the woolen manufactures
there has long been, and will ever be, looked upon with great jealousy by all your subjects of this kingdom, and if not timely remedied, may occasion very strict laws totally to prohibit and suppress the same.” The King answered that “he would do all that in him lay to discourage the woolen manufactures of Ireland.” And soon afterwards acts were passed by Parliament and signed by the King, obliging the Irish to send their wool to England to be manufactured in Yorkshire; and from that time forward the English manufactured their clothes in peace, and sold what they liked to foreigners and to the Irish. For the Irish were forbidden by law to wear their own spinnings—in the interest of English trade.

And this series of enactments, following with relentless brutality every attempt of the Irish to create an industry with an act suppressing that industry—has been known to all English historians as “bringing the blessings of civilization to the wild Irish.”

Stabat Mater Dolorosa
Juxta Crucem Lacrimosa
Dum Pendebat Filius!

And yet—after seven centuries—has come the resurrection from the dead. For the system of aristocratic lordship has fought itself to death in the world-war; and a new system is arising, whose foundation principle is the cornerstone of the life of the Celts—the ownership, by the community, of the sources of its maintenance.

And this resurrection, from the tomb of seven centuries, of the ancient Celtic order has come at the sound of the voice of the harpers and the poets.

“This whole movement,” says Darrell Figgis, referring to the silent tremendous reassertion by the Irish of their ancient form of life within the past ten years, “rose concurrently with the making of a new literature for Ireland, the attention given to the old myths and legends, the research among the old records scattered throughout Europe and forgotten for many a day, and the revival of the Gaelic tongue and the old customs..... It arose out of the revival of poetry and the arts; it was inspired by a poet and an artist; and it proposes to recreate a system which, when it held sway once before in the nation, held together society and economics, crowning them with the making of arts and the acquisition of learning..... This is none other than the recreation of the national organization. As we have seen, throughout the country memory is stirring in her vaults of sleep.”

The movement to which Darrell Figgis refers is known to the world in its practical aspects as the Irish Agricultural Organization Society, first created by Sir Horace Plunkett, and inspired by that prophet in Ireland, the poet, painter, seer and agricultural economist, George Russell, better known under the pen name of “A. E.” When the pictures of A. E. were exhibited in this coun-
try a short time ago, a thrill ran through those who saw them as of something eerie, fairly fantastic, something new in art. But A. E. is not only an artist; he is a prophet as well.

"The central idea of the I. A. O. S. which was originally devised to provide the farmer with cheaper manure and to sell his dairy produce more cheaply by cutting away the middleman, has become the creation of a rural civilization, a true social order, which shall provide for three things—for economic development, for political stability, and a desirable social life."

"Strictly considered," says Figgis, "comparing the treatment given to the makers of beauty in the modern State with that which was accorded to them in the older and simpler states, it provides the only organization in which a personal sense of beauty may thrive, or the passion for beauty which builds the Temple of Art. And who is he who has provided this inspiration for Celtic souls to find themselves again? A poet, a seanchaidhe. Who are they whom he has for a following, and with whom he gathers? Poets, seanchaidhes, and doctors of learning."

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF SINF FEIN.

And these poets and singers have quietly formulated a new social order which cuts away the Parliamentary system and the whole modern conception of a centralized machine. It "completely sets aside the industrial, financial and commercial conceptions of a people's existence, which prevail in modern States, and which stultify intelligence and ruin physique, which quench the divinity in man, and blister the fair bosom of the earth into monstrous cities that are three parts slumdom, or turn beautiful counties into vast cinder patches, wherein revolt constantly breeds. Instead of this mad and monstrous world a new order is being erected, in which production shall be crowned with beauty."

Now this is the significance of Sinn Fein; and this is the reason for the horror which is manifested regarding that outbreak in Ireland in Easter Week of 1916,—an outbreak which elected as its President a poet, Padraic Pearse, who had named his school after that young Prince Enda whose hands in 450 founded the college at Aranmore, which "drew scholars from the whole of Ireland." It was not merely a sporadic revolt; it was the outbreaking of the ancient tuathal democracy, which if it be once allowed to live, dooms to an unrecoverable burial the whole fabric of capitalist "democracy" that curses the world by a division into bankers and slaves.

And here is the cause for that strange situation presented by the Irish crisis. If Ireland is allowed independence she will at once transform her political independence into economic independence; and her products, built upon love and craftfellowship, will destroy England's market for the products that are
built upon pauperism and wage-slavery. If Ireland is allowed indepen-
dence, the Capitalist system is doomed, for a new and more beau-
tiful civilization will have won its life; and the rest of the world will follow—each nation according to its ancient genius—the light of that new order.

For Ireland has been crucified, upon a cross of gold; but that ancient life is rising from its tomb, to bless the world with a new vision of happiness—and peace.
Lecture IV.

Belgium: The Storm Center.

Julius Caesar, in opening his justly celebrated “Commentaries on the Gallic War”—remarks: “Gallia est omnes divisa in partes tres; unam quam incolunt Aquitani, aliam Belgae, aliam qui in lingua sua Celtae, in nostri Galli appelantur.” Roughly translated, the Belgians inhabit one third of Gaul. After that vast territory had been partly pacified and partly depopulated by Caesar’s humanitarian sword and torch, Augustus Caesar in the year 15 B.C. formed the province of Gallia Belgica; which is the first emergence of Belgium into the troubled waters of history. Part of the remainder was known as Gallia Bracata—roughly translated, “Gaul in Pants,” from the habit of the inhabitants.

Ever since Caesar’s day, it has been the battleground between two empires—first Rome and the Teutons, then France and Germany. Belgium and Holland have gone through history linked as the Netherlands, with Holland as the Germanized side of the debatable land, and Belgium the Frenchified area. Since the days of Rome, and for all we know, for lack of history, for ages before, it has been fought over by the swaying armies of these two empires, embodying two distinct principles and two racial antagonisms, until in the days of August 1914 it was the maelstrom of the greatest tempest of blood and fire that has ever yet been loosed upon the world.

The secret of its importance and of its tragedy is that through the Netherlands flow the mouths of three great rivers, Rhine, Scheldt and Meuse. The Rhine is not only the natural boundary between France and Germany, it was for centuries the extreme limit of Rome’s territories, beyond which the Northern forests stretched unconquered and unconquerable. And there is a further greatness also to the Rhine; in that it, with the Danube, forms part of that highway from furthest Asia to furthest Europe along which the traffic of the world has flowed since recorded history began, generating empires like the foam on the changing sea.

The Meuse is the chief river of Northern France, and the Scheldt’s great mouth forms one of the principal harbors on the North Sea. These three rivers, and the enormous consequent importance of the traffic of the cities located at their mouths, have made the Netherlands crucial territories all through the long wars to decide the mastery of Europe between the North and the South.
The "tragedy of Belgium" did not begin with August 1914, and will not end with November of 1918. That little neutral country is neutral, when it is so, because the two giant civilizations which have been struggling for it have come to a deadlock again, and not because of the sanctity of any treaties, torn or otherwise.

To comprehend this, let us glance at the map of Europe—as so often becomes necessary. The southern boundary of it is composed of the Mediterranean sea and the Black sea, connecting through the narrow pass at Constantinople. On the north the Baltic connects with the North Sea through the narrow pass of the Skager Rack. Between these sea-boundaries lies a long continental belt, narrow in proportion to its width. To get from the Black sea to the Baltic one must either go by sea around the Pillars of Hercules, or else cut across by land. From Petrograd to Odessa by sea, for example, is 5240 miles; by land, 930 Miles.

Now in ancient times there was much traffic between the Greek states of Asia Minor and the Aegean Sea, and the coasts of the Baltic where the much-admired amber was found, and also between the Greeks and the Celts of the British isles, whose jewel-work was greatly sought after. Not only amber and jewelry, but also furs and skins were brought overland from the northern seas to those of the south.

Very ancient coins, Arabic, Greek and Roman, have been found in comparative profusion along the Baltic coast, and also along the old established trade routes which led there. These trade routes were naturally determined by the configuration of the land; and the most important features of the land, from this point of view, are the river valleys.

From the Black Sea the Danube river leads in a broad and fertile basin straight through the heart of the Austrian plain to a point near Strassburg. Very near it rise the headwaters of the Rhine. And thus the greatest trade routes from the Greek settlements along the Black Sea to the Gothic-Celtic lands along the North Sea and in the British isles led straight across the continent by those two valleys. And from the Greek settlements along the Black Sea opened out the illimitable wealth of the empires of the Mesopotamia Valley, which led down into India.

Modern history has been so greatly preoccupied with wars and treaties that it fails to give us the reason for these wars and treaties. This straight river course, cleaving the heart of the world, has been the moving cause of more wars and treaties than any other route known to man, except that through which three converging streams of traffic met; the roads that led from Egypt to Mesopotamia, from Mesopotamia to Europe, and from Europe down into India.

The Netherlands countries thus commanded one end of one of the world's greatest trade routes; they commanded also the river which divided Northern Goth from Southern Roman. It was they which led the world in the Crusade to recover their ancient rights of trade from the Ottoman Turks. From Belgium, also, have come an altogether disproportionate number of the
rulers of the world; a fact which only goes to demonstrate the close connection between trade and empire.

Roman legions marched as far as the Rhine; and there their encampments remained, though foraging expeditions pierced further north. But in the marsh lands between the Scheldt and the Ems rivers a war-like tribe, the Frisians, remained unconquered by the arms of the Senate and People of Rome save for a brief period between A. D. 47 and 70. Not until Charlemagne, inheritor of the title of Augustus, marched with his armies of conquering Franks, did the Frisians yield with a bad grace to be baptised.

With Charlemagne begins the list of illustrious Belgians who have dominated Europe; for he was born in Ghent, and to the end of his days Aix-la-Chapelle, otherwise known as Aachen, was his northern capital, and is the place where the great king lies buried. Of Charlemagne therefore somewhat must be said.

CHARLEMAGNE.

Of all the tribes which poured across the Rhine from the German forests into the Roman plains, the Franks were the only ones who retained their tribal name as the name of a kingdom. And this was because instead of cutting off their connection with the home, as did the Vandals, the Visigoths, the Heruli, and others, they maintained intercourse with the main body left behind. Clovis, or Chlodovech—whose name became Ludovicus in Latin, Ludwig in German and Louie in French—succeeded by a series of masterly treacheries in making his tribe of Salian Franks dominant over the territory between the Rhine and the Pyrenees. But his descendants, called Merovingians after his grandfather Meroveus, became loafers, going under the name of “Do-Nothing Kings”, or “Rois Faineants.” Because of their extreme indolence the Mayors of the Palace, who answered to what we know as Private Secretary to the President, became the real rulers; and in the days of Pippin the Great, the Pope of Rome signified that he who had the power should bear the name of King; whereupon the last of the Do-Nothing kings was shut up in a convent and Pippin was known as King of the Franks.

Pippin’s sons, Carloman and Carl, were to have divided the kingdom between them; but Carloman early entered a monastery and died there, so that Carl, known as Charlemagne, inherited the sole title of King of the Franks. Among the Germanic tribes who had conquered Rome the Franks were the only ones who were Catholic; the others having been converted by Arian missionaries.

Thereupon in his distress the Pope called upon the Frankish chieftains to aid him against his adversaries; and more particularly did Leo III. call upon Charlemagne; for the reason that it was one of Charlemagne’s love affairs which led to the gravest peril of the Pope.
Charlemagne had married Desideria, daughter of Desiderius, King of the Lombards. But being dissatisfied with her he sent her back to her father with a divorce. This enraged the Lombard King, and in order to get even with Charlemagne he sallied from his fortress and attacked the Papal lands which Pippin, father of Charlemagne, had granted to the Pope to hold as his temporal lieutenant. Whereupon the Pope sent an urgent message to the King of the Franks to defend him in this family quarrel. Charlemagne came in haste, drove away the Lombards, and was crowned as Emperor of the Romans by Pope Leo on Christmas Day, 800. Behind this lay another courtship and much tangled ecclesiastical history, which properly belongs in the annals of France.

However, from that moment Charlemagne had two capitals, the imperial city of the Caesars, Rome, and his own chief city, Aachen. Little of his time was spent, indeed, in Rome, but the proud title of Roman emperor made him easily the dominant figure of the world, save perhaps the Caliph Haroun al Raschid, beloved hero of the Arabian Nights, with whom he exchanged presents. Haroun sent to Charlemagne a white elephant, which died of starvation in the emperor's court; peanuts having not yet been discovered in the Holy Roman Empire.

Charlemagne died, and his son, Louis the Pious, inherited the kingdom. It did him little good, for his three sons embittered his whole reign by quarrelling among themselves how they should divide the kingdom when their father should be kind enough to die. Louis did die, eventually, and the vast empire of Charlemagne was divided into three parts. Lothair, as the elder, took the title of emperor and the two capitals of Aachen and Rome; Charles took France, and Louis took Germany. Thus was the Holy Roman Empire divided; and never again was it all united under one crown.

Now mark: Lothair's choice gave him a long narrow strip running from the North Sea to Italy, containing the two imperial capitals. This was known as "Lotharii regnum"; which in course of time has been softened down by the Germans to Lothringen, and by the French to the more euphonious "Lorraine." Out of this far-stretching Lorraine, which has ever since been debatable territory, the border states of Europe have been formed; Belgium, Holland, Luxemburg, Alsace, Lorraine, and Switzerland.

The two brothers of Lothair were divided by this territory, but united in enmity, and at the city of Strassburg they made a covenant to combine against him. This oath was taken in the presence of both armies, and each brother swore in the language of the other's soldiers, that all might understand. This is the first appearance in history of the modern French and German languages, and shows the beginning of their divergence by comparison with the Latin original; thus:
Louis, king of the East Franks, swore thus:
“In Godes minna ind in thes Christianes folches ind unser bedhero gehaltnissi fon thesemo dage fremmordes so fram so mir God gewizci,” etc.

Charles, king of the West Franks, swore:
“Pro Deo amur et pro christian poblo et nostro commun salvament dist di in avant in quant Dues savir,” etc.

Translated, both run thus: “In God’s love and for this Christian people and our common salvation, from this day forward so far as God gives me knowledge,” etc.

So languages begin.

THE CRUSADES

From the time of the dissolution of the empire of Charlemagne onward the story of the Netherlands is one of desperate struggle against invaders from both sides. During the 9th and 10th centuries the Northmen lit upon the shores of this rich country with especial fury because it was so near. In the centuries following, in the constant strife between lords to the north and lords to the south the Netherlands were a group apart. Cities at the mouth of the Rhine began to establish themselves again as trading centers, and when the Turks interrupted the traffic of western Europe with the Orient, it was the chiefs of the Flemish cities who placed themselves at the head of the attempt to break that barrier.

That vast host of the First Crusade moved along the valley of the Rhine to the Danube, thence down the Balkan valleys from Belgrade to Constantinople, where they alarmed the Greek Emperor with their innumerable multitude. At their head went Godfrey of Bouillon, a Belgian, who became ruler of Jerusalem. His brothers in arms, Baldwin of Edessa, Count Robert of Flanders, and Eustace of Boulogne are only less famous than he. The third Crusade numbered among its leaders Floris III. of Holland, Philip of Flanders, Otto I. of Gelderland and Henry I. of Brabant. The Fourth Crusade in 1204 overthrew the Greek Empire of the East, and placed the crown of the Empire of the East on the head of Baldwin of Flanders, hailing him as successor of Constantine. It was thought that by this means the Netherlanders would control both the mouth of the Rhine and the mouth of the Danube, and thus the great central highway of Europe would be all “in the family” so to speak; but the Latin Empire of Constantinople came to a speedy and inglorious end.

And yet the two rivers of the Danube and the Rhine felt the result in a great volume of traffic. Returning knights brought back with them such stories of the splendors of the East that they kindled in all at home a desire to share such luxuries; and the merchants who ventured on that long journey were well repaid by the prices their wares commanded in the barren stone castles of Germany and France. Silks, spices, carpets, metalware which had long been undreamed of began to appear in the cities
and decorate the cold fortress of the feudal lords. Soon it began to occur to the artisans of the West that they could make these things, as well as import them, and manufacturing interests began to arise, to satisfy the demand which the Crusades had produced.

In the thirteenth century the towns of Ypres, Bruges, and Ghent had become dominant over the trade of Western Europe. Charters were obtained from feudal lords, frequently by pressure of the need of money to equip them for their crusades. Municipalities frequently became self-governing republics, though owning a shadowy allegiance to some feudal lord. In the middle of the thirteenth century, large towns in Flanders contained as high as 200,000 people, mostly employed in the weaving of cloth from the wool obtained from England. Bruges became the center of the world's commerce.

**RISE OF THE GUILDS**

Here, then, took place the first emergence of the western world from the long shadow of feudal, that is of hereditary, right. For the wealth of the Lowlands depended on the labor of the workmen; and they began to organize themselves in craft guilds, which demanded a share in the government of their cities. Weavers, fullers, dyers, smiths, leatherworkers, brewers, butchers, bakers, and others—led by the weavers, by far the most powerful craft—rebelled against the exclusive privileges of the patricians, and drove them from power. Trade unions elected their members as rulers of the towns, and chased the proud possessors of hereditary privilege from the confines of cities that rejoiced to call themselves “free.”

At the town of Courtrai on the Lys—where many thousands gave their lives during the back-and-forth swaying of the War in 1915—there was fought one of the most notable of the battles for democracy the world has seen. For the Belgian nobility, being ousted from their “rights”, called in the help of the chivalry of France to aid them. The King of France appointed the Count of Artois, chief of the nobles of that land of chivalry, to lead the army of divine right against the armies of the guilds. And on the 11th of July, 1302, the army of labor and the army of heredity met in a conflict which has ever since been known as the “Battle of the Spurs.” For the regiments of weavers, dyers, fullers, and tanners, organized in their unions and with the emblems of their crafts as their standards, hurled back in crushing defeat the proudest chivalry of Christendom; and from the dead bodies of seven hundred of France’s boldest knights the golden spurs were stripped and hung up as trophies in the Abbey of Courtrai. Six thousand of the nobility were slain; and Philip the Fair found it necessary to create new nobles by the thousand in order to replenish his destroyed chivalry.

Thus was the first clear-cut issue fought and won; for the Flemings, although they recognized Counts and Nobles as their
rulers, took counsel with their counts through the organizations of their trade. And this brings in the story of the Guilds, which is that feature of the medieval commonwealth concerning which we have most forgotten.

In the days of the Emperor Diocletian the artisans had long been grouped into guilds, which was the association of all the workingmen of one sort in a given place. All the bakers in a City belonged to the bakers’ guild; all the masons to the mason’s guild, etc. A guild regulated the methods of work, and had great control over its members. But by the Emperor Diocletian each artisan was bound to his guild by law. Their condition became desperate. An edict of Diocletian regarding prices and wages shows that a workman received not more than one tenth as much as an American workman of like grade; while food and clothing cost at least one third as much, leaving the Roman workingman three times as badly off as his American brother.

But for all the evil effects of this guild organization, the recollection of the fact that there had been a time when the workingman had rights gleamed like a lost paradise upon the dusky horizon of the worker of the dark ages, under the chaos and destruction of the Folk-Wandering; and when the Church began to knit again the bonds which had once held the whole world together in the name of Rome, the Irish Christian missionaries, who had a guild system of their own, organized their converts into guilds which grew and strengthened until, as they began to come into power, the Reformation threw the terror of great darkness over the world of industry again.

The medieval guild was the actual basis of industrial organization. The farms were grouped together into manorial estates, whose owner called himself count, or marquis, or earl, or duke, in accordance to the number of farms from which he could take tribute. But in the towns, the workers were banded together in craft guilds. One street was the street of the armorers, another of the goldsmiths, another of the tanners; and each craft had its own parish church, or its own chapel in the parish church of a mightier guild. Attached to the great churches was a “Guild Hall” in which the craft union held its gatherings.

Prof. M. L. Spencer, in his book “Corpus Christi Pageants in England” remarks: “The presentation of the Corpus Christi plays was entrusted under certain conditions to the trade guilds, whose chief marks of separate and individual existence seem sometimes at least to have been only the individual candle in the church, a stated position in the Corpus Christi procession, and a separate pageant in the play-cycle. . . . The condition of membership in a craft and even of citizenship in a town, came to be a willingness to wear the required livery and to contribute toward the expenses of the pageant. In the town of Beverly in 1493 it was enacted as a municipal statute that no Gentleman, yeoman or craftsman should be “taken to worship of the town”, except he helps bear the charge of the Corpus Christi pageant.”
Corpus Christi, or the festival of the Body of Christ, was thus the great Labor Day of the Medieval World.

Every craft guild contained three classes of members, masters, journeymen and apprentices. It is from “master” that our common word of courtesy “Mister” came. But with them, as Chesterton remarks, a “master-workman” was not a master of the workmen, but a master of the work. He owned a shop, probably part of the house where his family lived, and employed one or more journeymen, besides a band of apprentices.

Apprentices were not members of the guild, except in prospect, but they lived in accordance with its rules. They were boys, bound for a term of years by their parents, to learn the mastery or “mystery” of a trade. They lived in the master’s house, ate at his table, frequently married his daughters, and learned all he knew.

After their college course in the home of their master was over, the term being three, five or seven years, or sometimes ten years in the case of a difficult trade, the apprentice became a journeyman, whose duty it now was to travel from town to town, see the world, practice his trade in different cities, and perfect himself in his art. If he could save the small amount of money needed he could set up as a master.

Long and fierce were the struggles between the guilds merchant, which were selling associations, and the craft guilds, which were unions of the producers; and in the course of centuries the craft guilds had become successful. But their monopoly, being based on a hand tool production, became obnoxious; and was overthrown by the introduction of machinery. And yet while it existed in its full glory, it made Flanders, where it grew to its full height, the richest part of the world.

Guilds were organized to prevent competition, to prevent monopoly and to uphold the standard of production. Thus they protected both producer and consumer. They were also fraternal insurance societies, providing assistance for all needy members, attended to the burials of their deceased, and paid pensions to wife and children if a member died poor.

When the counts of the Crusading period required money to fit out their expeditions to save the Holy Sepulchre, of whom should they obtain it but of the Guilds? And in return they granted many privileges. In the strife between the nobles of Germany and those of France the towns of Belgium became possessed of higher privileges than those of any other town in Christendom. Even until the Great War loosed the fateful fury of destruction upon them, the Cloth Hall of Ypres and the Town Hall of Bruges were peerless in their beauty.

At the close of the 14th century, Belgium was to the rest of the world what Manhattan Island is now. And then came its downfall.
THE DUKE OF BURGUNDY

From time to time we read of the Duchy of Burgundy as a powerful influence affecting the rest of Western Europe; but it is never possible to tell just where Burgundy was. From the days of Gondibraud, uncle of Clotilda, it stretched and shrank like a child's toy balloon. Philip the Bold and his son Charles who inherited his father's title "the Bold" with his lands, carried Burgundy to its greatest height, and all but succeeded in reviving the Middle Europe of Lothair as the Kingdom of Burgundy, which would have made their land the dominant factor of that perplexed period.

By force, by purchase, treachery and marriage Philip became possessed of the Countship of Flanders, together with a very miscellaneous collection of earldoms, duchies, countships, bishoprics, stretching from the mouth of the Rhine very nearly to the Mediterranean sea. It was his desire to amalgamate these into a single nationality. In order to do this he must destroy the independence of the Flemish cities. But by so doing he deprived himself of his principal source of income. Either he must kill the goose which laid the golden egg, or hear its cackle call to a perpetual revolt. And at the battlefield of Bruges and the "Red Sea" of Gavre, near Ghent, the independence of the town began to be stripped away.

Duke Philip's court was the richest in Europe. A reminiscence of its splendor exists in the "Order of the Golden Fleece," still the proudest of the decorations of the monarchs of Europe, reserved for those of royal blood. It was instituted by Philip on the occasion of his marriage with Isabel of Portugal in 1430; and it commemorates the very prosaic fact that the richness of Flanders depended on the wool which was clipped from the back of the sheep of England by the horny hands of the shearer's guild. Somewhat as though, let us say, the Mayor of Chicago should confer as the proudest decoration in his gift, a golden pig studded with jewels, to remind them that the greatness of Chicago's commerce depends largely upon the packing trades.

Had the Dukedom of Burgundy become the Kingdom of Burgundy, then it and not France would have been the dominant power in Western Europe. For the title of "king" carried with it a sentimental value which was a very real political asset. Knowing this, Charles the Bold, son of Philip, set himself to carry out the ambitions of his father. He had a crown nicely made, of gold set with jewels in the latest approved style of kingly crowns. He also had quite a splendid set of kingly robes made, and made an appointment to meet Frederick III, Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire, at Treves in the year 1477, with a view to securing from the Emperor the title which should consolidate the dominions of Burgundy.

In Frederick III, the Holy Roman Empire reached its lowest pitch. This monarch, bearing the title of "head of the human race" and "Caesar of Christendom" was reduced to such a depth
of poverty that he frequently had to beg for a handout at the
door of a monastery, and never knew from one day to another
where his next meal would come. He also drove about his im-
perial dominions in a cart drawn by a team of oxen because he
could not afford horses.

Charles of Burgundy was, on the other hand, the richest man
in Europe. His dominions included Flanders as well as Burgundy;
one, the wealthiest industrial center of the world, and the other
the fairest stretch of farm and vineyard land in Europe. Charles
the Bold, richest man in the world, met Frederick III, poorest
ruler at large, and asked from him the title of King. It was a
similar request that led the emperor Sigismund to give the title
of King of Prussia to the Margrave of Brandenburg, and founded
the House of Hohenzollern.

Frederick very naturally asked what Charles had to offer.
Charles replied that his beautiful daughter Mary, heiress to the
throne and the riches of Burgundy, could become the wife of
Maximilian, son of the Emperor, and thus unite imperial wealth
with imperial power, if the title of King was granted him. But
Frederick demanded more. He required a large cash donation
at which Charles hesitated. While he took a night off to think it
over, Frederick stole out of the back door, mounted his gallant
ox-cart, and drove away; and Charles had to pack up his kingly
crown and royal robes and bring them back to Burgundy in great
humiliation and wrath. Frederick, his biographers report, was
both greedy and suspicious. He thought Charles would seek him
out again with a better bargain, and he also cherished a fear that
the King of Burgundy would dominate Europe to the exclusion
of his own Austrian dominion.

Frederick retired from his unsuccessful administration of the
imperial office, and spent his declining years in the study of
"algebra, alchemy and botany" in his garden near Vienna. He
used to inscribe all his books and belongings with the mystic
symbol "A. E. I. O. U.," which is said to have meant "Austriae
est imperare orbi universo"—"To Austria it belongs to rule the
universal globe."

MARY OF BURGUNDY.

Charles the Bold, disappointed and humiliated, undertook
wars against his Swiss subjects, and was killed in a battle with
the mountaineers at Nancy in 1477. His beautiful daughter Mary,
then 20 years of age, was left sole heiress of his dukedom.

Then the emperor emerged from his seclusion again and
sought to arrange the match which Charles the Bold had pro-
posed. Maximilian of Austria, his young and handsome son, of-
fered his hand to Mary of Burgundy.

Mary was one of those unfortunate persons on whom the pivot
of empire turns, grinding them to powder in the process. Thrust
into regal power at the age of twenty, she was promptly arrested
by her loyal subjects of Flanders and kept a prisoner in Ghent
until she consented to sign a treaty restoring to the burghers of
the Lowlands the privileges from which her father and grand-
father had excluded them.

This Great Charter provided that she must marry the man
her burghers picked out for her, must not declare war nor con-
clude peace without the consent of the merchant princes, and
must not raise taxes without their consent. Shortly after this
two of her councillors were seized and beheaded, despite her tear-
ful entreaties, on the ground that they were writing letters to
the King of France; and in desperation she accepted the hand
of Maximilian of Austria, becoming thereby the mother of the
House of Hapsburg, whose long and stormy fortunes convulsed
Europe with wars until it fell in the great ruin of the Great War,
with the resignation of Carl of Austria.

Maximilian of Austria was a handsome and accomplished
husband, but Mary’s period of happiness with him was short, for
in March of 1482 she was killed by a falling horse, leaving an in-
fant son.

Maximilian was elected Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire
in 1494—two years after Columbus discovered America; and
the boyish son of the unfortunate Mary, Philip the Fair, ascended
the throne of the Netherlands at the age of fifteen.

Two years later Philip married Juana, daughter of Ferdinand
and Isabella of Spain, and heiress apparent to the throne of Spain.
In the year of 1500 Juana bore a son named Charles, round whom
the whole world was to center. For this was the Emperor Charles
V. whose sway extended over more territory than any other mortal
man before his time, and whose life spanned the transition from
the Old World to the New as did that of no other single man
on whom time has yet set the seal of empire.

CHARLES V.

For Charles V, a Belgian by birth, inherited the lands of Bur-
gundy at the age of six by the death of his father Philip. At the
age of fifteen he became King of the Netherlands; at the age of
sixteen he became king of Spain; and at the age of 19 he was
elected Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire. By the discov-
eries of Columbus and Cortez and Pizarro he became the over-
lord of a whole new continent in the Western Hemisphere, and
claimant to huge unknown territories in the shadowy sunrise sea
beyond India. And in his life began that disruption of Christen-
dom known as the Reformation, whose whirlpool of blood eddied
and centered about the unfortunate Netherlands.

Charles was born and raised in the Netherlands, and did not
understand his Spanish subjects. His son and successor, Philip,
was born and raised in Spain and did not understand his Nether-
landers. But stern necessity held these two lands together—or
so they thought—in order to curb the rising power of the French
despotism.
When the Emperorship fell vacant in 1519, there were three candidates for the post—Henry VIII of England, at that time a staunch Catholic, and one of the most popular princes in Christendom,—and Francois I of France, besides Charles. But the money of Charles' subjects in Flanders purchased the election for their young king, and in so doing, they purchased for themselves damnation.

As lord of Spain, Italy, Germany and the Netherlands, and titular political head of the whole of Western Christendom, Charles found himself elected to a life of strenuous warfare, both military and theological. It was one of the young Emperor's first duties to preside in the council of Worms in which the dispute between Martin Luther and the Pope of Rome was voiced, and in which the Reformation on its theological side begins.

As a result of his wars, the Emperor was compelled to demand from his Flemish subjects, who held the world's purse-strings, larger and larger subsidies. When they revolted he visited them with severe punishment, and in the year 1540 he visited Ghent with a large army, annulled all its charters and swept away its guilds.

But the Reformation grew and spread, in spite of edicts providing for the burning alive of heretics; for the ground which kept the Reformation alive was only in part a religious rebellion against abuses.

COMMERCE AND PERSECUTION.

Spain had in one and the same year driven the last of the Moorish kings from her dominions, and become the mistress of an illimitable empire in the Western seas. In her wars with the Moors the Catholic religion had been the badge of her Crusading armies; and the people of Spain looked upon the gift of the New World as a reward from God for their redemption of all Spain to the Holy Faith. In order to reap the full value of this reward, Spain's careful monarchs, Ferdinand and Isabella, had enacted that all trade with the Indies should be carried on through the Chamber of Commerce of Seville, under heavy regulative penalties. And the fact that the King of Spain was also Emperor lent the sanction of the Holy Roman Empire, of which the Pope was a twin head, to these commercial monopolies of the Chamber of Commerce of Seville.

But the people of the Netherlands had looked upon the leadership of the world of trade as theirs by natural right; and an attempt to give Seville the leadership over the towns of Antwerp and Bruges seemed to them as an attempt to shut out New York from the South American trade in favor of Mobile or Galveston would seem to us. So they organized navies and, together with the English and French, scoured the seas of the East Indies as well as the West, seeking trade and profit wherever the intrepid mariners of Spain or Portugal had blazed the way.
Spain attempted to use her headship of the Holy Roman Empire to her own commercial advantage. Those stout merchant princes of the Netherlands, England and Germany, retorted in kind and the commercial discontent added fuel to the religious unrest created by the manifold abuses of the medieval church, which were brought to a head by the theological disquisitions of Martin Luther.

Luther's followers went far beyond him. The monk of Wittenberg himself had in his mind when he tacked up his challenge upon the door of the college chapel no thought other than to propose an intellectual exercise for debates with visiting schoolmen. The excitement caused by his challenge amazed him beyond all measure. He wrote thus to Pope Leo X:

"By what unlucky chance it is that these propositions of mine should go forth into nearly all the earth, I am at a loss to know. They were set forth here for our use alone...I let them go forth, most blessed Father, under your name and under the shadow of your protection. Save or slay, call or recall, approve or disapprove, as it shall best please you, I shall acknowledge your voice as the voice of Christ."

But the authority of the Pope and the Emperor, which went together, was irksome to the North of Europe. Many princes became Lutheran in order to seize church lands or to appropriate church revenues. Many peasants took seriously the promises which they found in their Bibles that the "meek inherit the earth"; and they found in the teachings of the prophets and apostles, and above all in the words of Christ himself, the revolutionary spark which kindled their souls. The Peasants rose in arms against the cruel oppression of their feudal lords, demanding the abolition of serfdom and the right of every parish to choose its own priest.

Luther required the protection of the princes, and to gain it he betrayed the peasants into their hands, calling loudly upon the princes to "stab—smite—slay the rebellious peasants. It is better that they all should perish rather than that a hair of one of the princes' heads should be hurt." And more than a hundred and fifty thousand peasants were slaughtered in cold blood or in battle, as a foretaste of that religious freedom which Luther came to bring.

For twenty-three years Charles V was occupied with wars against France and against the Turks. During this time Lutheranism, which was a movement of the merchant classes backed by the princes, grew too strong to dislodge. By the Peace of Augsburg in 1555, Charles was compelled to accede to the proposition that each ruling Prince of the Empire should decide his religion for all his subjects. The rule was "Cujus regio, ejus religio"; or in English, "The Church follows the King."

But this was a blow against the very theory and constitution of the Holy Roman Empire. Disheartened and chagrined at his failure to preserve the integrity of that great structure of Christendom which had captivated the minds of men for fifteen hundred
years, Charles in that same year laid down the crown of Augustus and retired to the Convent of San Yuste, in Estremadura, in Spain, bequeathing the diadem of Empire to his brother Ferdinand of Austria, and the crown of Spain and the Netherlands to his gloomy son, Philip. Thereafter he shot pigeons and made clocks in the monastery grounds, while the splendor of this world’s glories faded around him.

Thus there were two Hapsburg houses, one in Spain, one in Austria, and France feared that she would be crushed between them. But for the Netherlands, the terrors of Spain opened a period of horror with few equals in the world.

Philip was an admirable bookkeeper, but a poor king. During the first years of his reign Charles his father perpetually interfered in the government which he handed over to his son. The world’s imagination has been fascinated by the picture of the great Emperor, mightiest of all the world’s rulers, putting aside the gorgeous revelries of his court for the gloomy cell of a penitent in a Spanish monastery. But in truth the abdication of Charles V was more like the retirement of a successful businessman to a country estate, whence he continually annoys his chosen successor by unsolicited advice. The monastery of San Yuste owned extensive farms and pleasant woods, and the cottage of the former Emperor was far more cheerful than the tent in which he had spent so many years of a warrior’s uncertain life; and the fire by his hearth glowed more cheerily through the dusk, as he trudged home from a day’s healthful exercise in the convent woods, than had the tarnished splendors of an empire which he had failed to maintain. Charles was one of the bravest of men, but he was afraid of spiders and of mice. Lacking the vigorous exercise of his warrior years, he developed acute attacks of indigestion; and it was in one of these fits of pain that he advised Philip his son to “exterminate the root and ground of the pest,” meaning the heresy of Protestantism.

Philip, a bloodless creature bred up by a Jesuit priest in the art of infinite correspondence, seemed to have few human qualifications. In the year 1559 he left the Netherlands, never to return; but he sent to represent him his half-sister Margaret, duchess of Parma, an illegitimate daughter of Charles V, who spoke only Italian.

Margaret’s first scheme was to increase the number of bishoprics in the Netherlands from three to eighteen, three of them being archbishoprics. Immediately the country was in arms; for the Netherlanders believed—and with good reason—that this was an initial step to the introduction of the Spanish Inquisition, to carry on the work of torture for the salvation of the souls of the merchant princes of the Lowland towns. In December of 1563 the Council of Trent, called to reform the Roman Church from within, finished its labors of sixteen years; and in the following year, Philip, regarding himself as the Most Catholic King, resolved to enforce its decrees throughout his dominions. Execu-
tion of these decrees he placed in the hands of the Jesuit order, a new society formed by a Spanish soldier, and composed largely of Spaniards.

In protest against these edicts the nobles of the Netherlands approached the Duchess Margaret to present to her a petition for the remission of such decrees. She, being frightened by their stern air, was reassured by her Counsellor, Barlaymont, who said "What, Madam, are you afraid of these beggars?" Thereupon the term "beggars," or "Gueux" was adopted as the proud title of a patriot.

Meanwhile the reaction against Spain, the Empire and the Church, made rapid headway. Anabaptism, communism, and all sorts of religious and political vagaries were preached. Bands of rioters attacked churches and religious houses, wrecking altars, smashing windows, and carrying off sacred vessels. In August of 1566 these disorders reached their climax when the Cathedral of Antwerp was devastated by a mob.

THE INQUISITION.

Philip thereupon sent an army of Spaniards under the Duke of Alva to stamp out the anarchist uprising. For the "anabaptists" were far more than a religious sect. Having read the Bible for themselves, in accordance with the injunctions of Luther, and having discovered that in the early Jerusalem days the Christians held all things in common, they came to the conclusion that such was the bounden duty of all Christians even yet. And to emphasize this they maintained that all believers must be thoroughly immersed, in order to indicate that they were devoted, body and soul, to the cause of the Brotherhood, and placed all that they had in a common stock. Anabaptism therefore was another name for Communism; and both the Catholic merchants and the Protestant merchants turned with savagery upon the holders of these doctrines.

The Council of Blood began the extermination of Protestants. By public burnings, by burying alive men and women who had once relapsed into Protestantism, though they had abjured these errors, by public beheadings to the number of thousands, the Duke of Alva and his three associates on the Council strove to instill affection for the Church and the Empire.

But for all his most vigorous efforts, the Netherlands thrrove in the foreign markets. Spain's attempted monopoly of the gold and silver mines of Mexico and Peru was sharply challenged by the English, who fitted out privateers to take from the Spaniards what they had taken from the Indians. Spain's attempted monopoly of the Spice Islands was challenged by the Dutch, whose East India Company captured the markets, while Spain was justifying her theory. The naval supremacy of the world rested upon the masts of Holland's ships. One hundred thousand of her men lived always upon the sea in mercantile fleets, and her navies, under the name of "Sea-Beggars" met and
defeated the navies of the Empire. On the 18th of December, 1873, Alva, disgusted by his defeats at the hands of the Dutch and his neglect at the hands of the king, resigned. After him came Don Luis Requesens, with fresh armies and more money.

But the Dutchmen had an infallible ally against whose power the armies and the navies of Spain were alike helpless. That was the Sea. Time after time when the forces of the Empire and of Spain had worsted the stout armies of the Lowlanders, the dikes were cut, and the sea destroyed both invaders and invaders. For four months the city of Leiden held out, even though invested by an overwhelming force; until a tempestuous flood enabled the Dutch fleet with an army of relief to reach the beleaguered city, and the investing force was driven to retreat. In honor of their heroic resistance, Leiden was given the choice of a great subsidy or of a great university, and to its eternal honor chose the university. And the University of Leiden became, and still remains, one of the great centers of the world's learning.

WILLIAM THE SILENT.

Out of the terror and devastation a man arose against whose sagacity and imperturbable resolution the artifices of the Conquistadores were in vain,—William of Orange, known as The Silent, from his extraordinary ability to mind his own business until the proper time came. Pitiiless publicity was no part of his pretense, nor of his practice; but beneath his silence the courage of the Dutchmen gathered, until the Northern provinces proclaimed themselves independent.

Don John of Austria, victor of Lepanto, was appointed Governor-General in the hope of recalling the Northern provinces to their allegiance. On the first of May, 1577, Don John of Austria made his state entry into Brussels, as von Bissing made his entry nearly four hundred years later; only to find, as he reported to the king, that William the Silent was the real ruler of the land—like Cardinal Mercier.

"The prince of Orange," he complained, "has bewitched the minds of all, so that they keep him informed of everything, and take no resolution without consulting him." In vain the fiery young soldier strove to break loose from the shackles of impenetrable silence which surrounded him. Only two months later Don John of Austria, victor over the Turks in the greatest sea-battle of all ancient times, was forced to leave Brussels suddenly, taking a few of his troops, and without a battle to own himself defeated.

William of Orange was invited by the unanimous voice of the Netherlands to assume the office of "stadtholder," on the theory that he represented the authority of the Emperor.

THE GREAT DIVISION.

But the division of race, of sentiment, of religion between the north and the south of the Netherlands was too deep to be
spanned by any one man. In the year 1579 the Northern provinces arrayed themselves together in the Union of Utrecht as a Republic, and the Southern provinces in the League of Arras, as loyal subjects of the Catholic king. The North, being largely German in blood and thoroughly Protestant in sympathies, could not permanently ally themselves with the South, which was Catholic in religion and French in blood. Thereafter the story of the Netherlands involves a constant struggle by rich relations to wed together two temperamentally uncongenial peoples who persisted in seeking a divorce.

The fact that the two together commanded the most strategically important location in Western Europe is responsible for their continual miseries; for self-determination of peoples is anything but acceptable to those who profit by divisions.

When Charles V, as a candidate for the title of Emperor, used the money of his Flemish subjects to purchase the crown for himself, they thought that he would naturally reside in Flanders and make Aachen again the capital of the world's trade. This purchase brought with it the enmity of France and England. France had succeeded in consolidating into the hands of the king all the power of the State; and, finding herself between Spain on the south and the Netherlands on the north, sought to make common cause with England.

To prevent this, Charles on his way to Aachen to be crowned, landed in London and offered large bribes to Cardinal Wolsey, who was popularly supposed to be the real ruler of England, in order to induce him to prevent Henry from making an alliance with France. But Henry and Francis met on the field of the Cloth of Gold, to cement an enduring friendship between the two peoples. Henry is renowned in history for being the "founder" of England's national church. He is more justly famous for being the founder of England's navy, which set out to challenge the supremacy of the navy of Spain. Being disappointed in securing the post of Emperor, and therefore of head of Christendom, and finding that the sanction of Pope and Emperor alike was given to the attempt of Spain to monopolize the wealth and traffic of the new world, Henry withdrew from the Empire and the Church, and creating a navy of his own set out to secure for England her just share of the plunder.

Henry died, leaving some confusion on account of the unusual number of wives he had employed in the attempt to make the succession sure in the male line. The only male result of his many attempts was Edward, a weakly boy of nine, who died within a very short time. Then Mary, his daughter by his first wife, Catharine of Aragon, an aunt of Philip V, succeeded to the throne of England.

Mary was thoroughly disgusted with the Reformation both for personal and religious reasons. The occasion for the secession of England from Church and Empire was the claim that her mother's marriage was not valid; which implied that she was not
legitimate. Therefore she passionately sought to drive England back into the fold of her mother's Church; and married Philip II of Spain in order to gain his help.

But Bloody Mary was as unfortunate in her descendants as in her parents; she had no children, and died within two years after her marriage. Whereupon Elizabeth, daughter of Anne Boleyn, came to the throne.

Elizabeth was opposed to Mary in every point. Her own legitimacy depended upon the success of the Reformation; and her throne depended upon the repudiation of the Empire. Philip, pale and gloomy despot that he was, raised a huge navy, the Great Armada, consisting of more ships than Europe had seen in Western waters since the Phoenicians first passed the Gates of Hercules, and sailed portentously down upon the coasts of the Island kingdom. Against this vast fleet armed with the authority of the Empire and the Church, which still held a shadowy ascendancy over the minds of men, England could only gather a fleet of small privateers, manned by the gentlemen adventurers of the Spanish main. For a week these light vessels darted around the huge bulk of the Spanish galleons; until a great hurricane swooped down from the north upon the fleets, and the Great Armada was scattered by the tempest from on high.

This destroyed Spain's claim for the mastery of the seas. Immediately England and the Netherlands, who had first formed an alliance with Spain to destroy France's power, and had then formed an alliance between themselves to destroy Spain's naval power, fell to fighting one another for the final mastery; very much like St. Patrick's snakes.

In the year 1600 the Dutch East India company had been formed, which rivalled the British East India company for the trade of India. The West India company was formed in 1621 for the purpose of maintaining a fleet of privateers to exploit the Western Hemisphere. In 1628 they captured a Mexican treasure fleet, and enriched themselves to the extent of millions of dollars. They conquered from the Portuguese a large part of Brazil, and set up a flourishing Dutch dominion there, a dominion which has since been reduced to Dutch Guiana.

Spain's last remnant of naval power was destroyed in the battle of the Downs, in which a Dutch fleet attacked and abolished a Spanish fleet which had taken refuge in a British harbor. Seventy-seven vessels and 24,000 men, the last remnants of Spain's sea-power, were routed and burned, except seven vessels which with Admiral Oquendo escaped under cover of fog. This was in 1639.

But this roused the fierce jealousy of the British; and the Dutch and British naval war, beginning in 1652 and lasting, with some intermissions, until 1667, raged in all the seas of the world, till one June 22, 1667, a Dutch fleet made its way up to Medway as far as Chatham and burnt the English fleet as it lay at anchor. Peace was signed at Breda on July 31, 1667, on terms largely favorable to the Dutch.
CAPTURE OF NEW YORK.

During the intermission between the first Dutch-English war, and the second of that name, and while a treaty of peace was in effect, an English fleet, with a calm disregard of treaties, sailed to the colony of New Netherland and captured the town of New Amsterdam by an act which, if any other nation had performed it, would be famed in English history as one of bottomless treachery. Since it was the English fleet which did it, it was, of course, a great and honorable feat. When the peace of Breda was signed, England kept New Amsterdam, which had been renamed New York, in exchange for Surinam, which Holland was allowed to retain.

Next year Holland made an alliance with England and Sweden to check the ambitious designs of Louis XIV. But Charles II during the making of this treaty, sold himself for a large sum of money to the French King; Sweden retired; and the Netherlands were left unaided to face the vengeance of France. Again, if any other king had done this, we would be reading about it in large black letters in every school history as an act of monstrous perfidy. Since it was an English king, it, of course, was a gentle and praiseworthy act. Again the Sea was called in to aid the Dutch armies against the French king, and by cutting the dikes and flooding the land the armies of the Grand Monarque were held at bay.

As a result of the war, William of Orange, leader of the forces of the Hollanders, married his cousin, the princess Mary, daughter of the Duke of York. When the Duke of York came to the throne as James II, and when the Revolution of 1688 promptly drove him from the throne, William of Orange and his wife Mary came to the throne of England. We have a permanent memorial in the William and Mary College in Virginia, at which Thomas Jefferson and many others of our Revolutionary leaders were educated, and also in the William and Mary settees, two chairs made into one, which grace so many of our Grand Rapids furniture style books.

THE RELIGIOUS KALEIDOSCOPE

In all of these wars, religion was frequently invoked as a badge of the warring armies; but this sometimes led to inextricable confusion. For example in the time of Richelieu, the Dutch Protestants came to the aid of the French Catholics, to enable Richelieu to crush the Protestant Huguenots at La Rochelle. With French Catholics' aid, the Dutch Protestants then attacked the Catholic Hapsburg in order to prevent the Protestants of Germany from being crushed by Catholic Austria.

And yet they all protested vigorously against the growth of unbelief.

During the Thirty Years War, in which Spanish gold taken from Mexico and Peru was poured into the coffers of the Hapsburg emperors to pay for armies to drive the seceding states of
the North back in the Catholic League of Nations, and in which English and Dutch gold kept Protestant armies in the field, there was much desolation in Holland; but it was nothing to what happened in Germany.

Then came the Cataclysm of the French Revolution, which swept away the last vestiges of the Dutch Republic. The French armies invaded Belgium and Holland, forcing the Netherlands to participate in their wars, and the result was a total temporary ruin of Dutch commerce. In the peace that followed Waterloo, the Congress of Nations established the Kingdom of the Netherlands, under William I.

But Belgium was still Catholic, and Holland still Protestant. The Dutch were a commercial and sea-faring people, with interests in distant lands and colonial possessions. The Belgians were an agricultural race, except where the abundance of minerals in their soil made them industrialists. In the period when Belgium was known as the Spanish Netherlands, and was exposed to the revengeful fury of the Hollanders and the French, grass grew in the streets of the former world's capital. Bruges and Ghent were very nearly deserted, and the trade of Antwerp was transferred to Amsterdam. Thereafter a cardinal principle of Dutch policy was to keep the mouth of the Scheldt closed to the Belgians, and thus prevent a revival of the trade monopoly of Antwerp. This trade jealousy between the Northern and Southern half of the Netherlands persists all through their history. In 1579 the Walloon "Malcontents" signed allegiance to the King of Spain and the Catholic religion. This made them a battleground between France and the Dutch. The War of the Spanish Succession, which resulted from the attempt of Louis XIV to place on the throne of Spain his grandson with stipulations as to the sovereignty of France, was fought out largely on the soil of Belgium. It was an integral part of France during Napoleon's career; and it was on the soil of Belgium that the battle of Waterloo, which ended the power of the French Emperor, was fought.

When the independent state of the Netherlands was set up in 1815, with William I as the king, the Dutch formed one third of the population of the United Kingdom, but they claimed six out of seven of the cabinet positions. This led to the Belgian revolution of 1831, following and consequent upon the French revolution of 1830. The Great Powers intervened, and in the year 1839 the State of Belgium was established, under King Leopold I, with its neutrality guaranteed by a treaty signed in 1839.

It was this treaty whose violation by Germany led to England's entrance into the War, according to the explanation given by her ministers. It is important, therefore, to note its provisions.

When the Provisional Government of Brussels met on October 4, 1830, a resolution was passed declaring "The Belgian provinces separated from Holland shall form an independent state."
When the five Great Powers met in 1831 to establish the independence of Belgium, they formulated and signed a treaty known as the "Treaty of the 18 articles," of which the 5th article stated "Belgium shall form a perpetually neutral state," and that the "five contracting powers guarantee the perpetual neutrality as well as the integrity and inviolability of its territory."

This treaty also recognized Belgium's right to "defend herself against all foreign aggression" without forfeiting neutrality.

A later treaty signed by the same great powers and accepted by Holland in April, 1839, embodied the same provisions with the addition of six others, so that this treaty is known as the "Treaty of the 24 articles." It was signed by representatives of the Queen of Great Britain and Ireland, the Emperor of Austria, the King of France, the King of Prussia and the Emperor of Russia. It provided that Belgium should not only be regarded as a neutral state, but should be required to observe this neutrality in respect of all other states.

"Belgium was not, properly speaking, a neutral state, but a neutralized state," says Colonel F. Feyler, editor of the Swiss Military Review. "But she is also an armed state, with the reservation that she is armed exclusively to defend herself in case of an attack."

In the year 1870, when France and Prussia were at war, England signed treaties both with France and with Prussia, which provided that if either France or Germany violated the neutrality of Belgium, England would associate herself with the other power to punish any infraction of the treaty.

**THE GREAT INVASION.**

In the light of these facts, when war between Russia and Austria over the question of the pigs of Serbia seemed inevitable, Germany, as the ally of Austria, was moved to consider the question of war with France, the ally of Russia. On August 2, 1914, the Imperial German legation in Brussels sent word to the Belgian government, under the heading "Very Confidential," seeking an agreement in case Germany should be "compelled" to enter Belgian territory. Germany offered to guarantee, at the conclusion of hostilities, the possessions and independence of Belgium in full; to evacuate Belgian territory, to pay a cash payment and to make good by an indemnity any damages caused by the invading troops. The ultimatum concluded with these words: "Should Belgium oppose the German troops, and in particular should she throw difficulties in the way of their march by a resistance of the fortresses on the Meuse, or by destroying railways, roads, tunnels, or other similar works, Germany will, to her regret, be compelled to consider Belgium as an enemy. In this event, Germany can undertake no obligations towards Belgium, but the eventual adjustment of the relations between the two states must be left to the decision of arms."
This ultimatum was decisively rejected by King Albert and his counsellors. The German Government thereupon moved its troops into Belgium, and encountered at the fortresses of Liege and Namur the fierce and bloody resistance which gave France sufficient time to rally her army of defense.

Germany admitted that the invasion of Belgium was a violation of the treaty in the words of Herr von Bethman Hollweg, on August 4, 1914:

"We are now in a state of necessity, and necessity knows no law. Our troops have occupied Luxemburg, and perhaps have already entered Belgian territory. That is a breach of international law. It is true that the French Government declared at Brussels that France would respect Belgian neutrality as long as her adversary respected it. We knew, however, that France stood ready for an invasion. France could wait, we could not. A French attack on our flank along the lower Rhine might have been disastrous. Thus we were forced to ignore the rightful protests of the Governments of Luxembourg and Belgium. The wrong,—I speak openly,—the wrong we thereby commit we will try to make good as soon as our military aims have been attained. He who is menaced as we are and is fighting for the highest possession can only consider how he is to hack his way through. We stand shoulder to shoulder with Austria-Hungary."

WHAT ARE BUFFER STATES?

And Belgium became once more the storm-center, this time of the wildest hurricane of blood which ever burst across the world of men. For four and a half years the world has heard the story of the wrongs of Belgium. We have perhaps derived the idea therefrom that Belgium is the first little country which has suffered from the contention of two empires. But this is the reason why little countries are created and held in power by the Great Powers; so that they shall form, as the term is, "buffer states" between greater powers. "Buffer states" is a hideous term; it means that the little country so unfortunately placed shall receive the first blow of invasion, and thus take off the shock and the edge of it before the big country is reached.

Napoleon said "Antwerp is a pistol pointed at the heart of England." So Germany thought also. The Netherlands are situated where the great powers of North Western Europe, France, England and Germany, touch shoulders. Holland by an exercise of ingenuity and patience managed to keep clear of the conflict; although this was quite as much due to the fact that she bordered only on Germany and not on France, as it was to the tact of her queen.

But in all these wars that have swept over Belgian land since the dawn of European history, one fact stands out clear; that this particular little country has been the converging point where empires fought, using religions as a cloak for commercial advantages.
Never can the little countries be safe until the greed of the big countries is done away. And imperialism is rooted in exploitation.

Belgium had one other distinction. She was the center of the Socialist International. The Communist Manifesto was written in Brussels for a group of Belgian workingmen. And in 1913 the Belgian general strike for the extension of the suffrage was won by the concerted operation of the trade unions with the Socialists. Huysmans, international secretary of the socialist movement, is a Belgian.

Since its independence, Belgium became the most thickly populated country in Europe. Its mineral wealth has been found to be enormous, and its air was filled with the smoke of the factories erected over its mines. Its population on December 31, 1913, was 7,658,000 souls. The country was covered by a network of railways, 2,899 miles in length, carrying annually 100,000,000 passengers, together with what are called subsidiary railways, covering 2,608 miles. Many canals and navigable waterways cover the country also. Antwerp, in spite of rivalries and difficulties, shipped in the year 1913 more than 16,000,000 tons of commodities, produced in Belgium, to all the ports of the world. Her annual foreign trade amounted to $1,750,000,000, or 250 dollars per man, woman and child, of her inhabitants. This gave Belgium fifth place in the statistical table of the world's commerce.

In the world of art Belgium was rapidly recovering the place which she had held at the close of the Crusades. Commandant de Gerlache de Gomery, in his book "Belgium in War Time" says:

"The Hotels de Ville, the belfries, the guild halls and market houses, the ancient churches, and all those stirring records of the past with which our native soil is covered, are so many masterpieces of the art of architecture.

"And what inestimable jewels in these superb caskets—what wonders too in our museums. The works of the Brothers Van Eyck, the inventors of oil painting; of Van der Weyden, Memling, Quentin, and other masters of the primitive Flemish school; the works of the fertile enchanter Rubens, of the graceful Van Dyck, and of the Breughels—a long and glorious line of painters; the works of Jordaens and Teniers, eloquent of the joy of life, which is another characteristic of the Belgian soul, the works of De Vos, Snyder, and of many another master whose famous name no Belgian can pronounce unmoved. How many other specimens of national art; tapestries, laces, stained glass window, household furniture, altar-screens; and how many more specimens carefully treasured up, which make Belgium one of those corners of the world in which is collected the greatest abundance of artistic wealth.

"As for music here again, as a learned German writer upon music has so truly said "this little out of the way corner of the northwest of Europe, this land of alluvial deposits, a land of laborious industry and flourishing commerce, is the veritable
home of the most bewitching of all the arts.” Polyphony was of Belgian origin. Ludwig van Beethoven was of Flemish origin.”

Among modern sculptors, the first place belongs to Constantin Meunier; a Belgian reared in the mines, learning painting after he had grown to manhood; who during his long sojourn in a Trappist monastery devised those superb glorifications of Labor in bronze and marble at which the world gasped and wondered as at a new thing in art, art which had been bound so long in the Aristotelian tradition of the glorification of idleness. Maurice Maeterlinck founded a school of mystics, and Cesar Franck shines foremost among living musicians. In the domain of science likewise, high place belongs to many natives of Belgium. Mercator, who invented mathematic geography, and whose system of projections is still employed for marine charts; Vesalius and Van Helmont, who created anatomy and physiology respectively; Stevin, who invented the decimal calculus; Minckelers, who invented coal-gas in its application to lighting, these were all Belgians.”

IN THE WHIRLPOOL.

Being caught in the center of the whirlpool of international conflicts, Belgium naturally thought long and deeply of international law. The Institute of International Law was born of the initiative of a Belgian, Rolin-Jacqemyns. The International Law Association was founded in Brussels in 1873.

Being the international storm-center, Belgium was also the center of that international movement which seeks to prevent the recurrence of storms. Being perpetually menaced by imperialist greed on every side, Belgium developed rapidly the knowledge of the foe of imperialist greed, the Socialist and labor movement. And now that the clouds of that great storm have rolled away, it may well be that in Belgium again shall be the center and seat of the international guarantee against war which shall not seek to restrain imperialistic greed by treaties, but by removing the cause of imperialism—which is, and has always been, the capitalist system.
Lecture V.

Poland: Land of the Four Eagles

One of President Wilson’s Fourteen Points, which were the basis of the armistice signed on November 11, 1918, and thus terminated the Great War, was a “free and independent Poland, with unrestricted access to the sea.” Great were the rejoicings of the Poles when this was made known to them, and immediately they began to form their new government. The rest of the world—that part of it, at least, which took words at their face value—heaved an immense sigh of relief. “At last” said they “the Polish question will be settled.”

The Partition of Poland remained in the memories of men as one of the standing crimes against humanity. The Three Eagles—Austria, Germany and Russia—that had plucked the heart of Poland’s White Eagle from its quivering breast, were now themselves dead. Poland, like Prometheus, when the vulture which tore out his heart was slain by the lightning, might spring from the icy precipice to which she had been chained.

“Free self-determination of all peoples” was the slogan under which the Allies had won the war; and the Poles, proceeding to act upon the assumption that words meant what they said, chose a Cabinet composed of Socialists.

Then came the awakening.

Frederic J. Haskin in a despatch from Washington printed in the Chicago Daily News of February 13th, 1919, tells the story of that awakening thus:

“The Poles, overjoyed at the prospect of freedom from the rule of despised nations, forgot about the other nations which were victorious. Poland as an international factor was lost in the immediate glory of Poland as a nation. Thus the Poles heedlessly appointed a Socialist regime, when they suddenly met with an abrupt check.

“They could not float a loan in any of the allied nations!”

“Then Paderewski arrived in Warsaw, and challenged the new Government. What message the great pianist brought from Paris is not known, (!) but evidently it was significant...It was agreed that the existing cabinet did not represent all the
Polish people, and that a new coalition government must be appointed, with Paderewski as President—a Government which could command the support of the Allies.”

Self-determination of the free and independent people of Poland—by the votes of the bankers of the Allies!

Let us look a little further into this matter; for it throws a brilliant light on the causes underlying the peace, and consequently on the causes underlying the war.

Haskins says, in the same dispatch:

“The territory which has been restored to Poland consists of Russian Poland, formerly controlled by the Russian government, the province of Galicia, formerly belonging to Austria, and the Polish provinces of Posen, West Prussia, and Silesia, formerly under the control of the German Government. If you will glance at the map of Europe, you will see that this combined territory has a large area. The New Poland is by no means a small nation, but ranks fifth in size among the nations of Europe. If your map shows you the general topography of the country, you will also observe that most of this land is flat, the word “Poland” meaning “plain land,” or “flat land,” like Latium.

“This stretch of Plain Land is like the neck of a bottle to the rest of Europe. Its strategic value to the Allies is obvious. For an independent Poland, backed up by Allied Capital, will act as a barrier to two elements which western Europe hates and fears—the spread of bolshevism from the north and the Germanic aggression in the East.”

The map of ancient Poland bears a remarkable similarity to that of the Free and Independent Republic of Texas, with its Panhandle stretching far up into what is now Kansas; for Poland’s access to the Sea is secured by a long and narrow strip stretching along the valley of the Vistula to its exit at Danzig.

**FRYING PAN AND HANDLE.**

This strip divides East Prussia from West Prussia, and its possession by Poland menaces the integrity of Germany. Will Danzig belong to Poland or Germany? Can the frying pan retain its handle?

Over this question Europe has been rent asunder since the fateful year of the Millennium, when Poland was born in a rosy glow compounded half of the exultant hope of the immediate appearance of the Returning Christ in the skies, and half of the despairing fear of a sin-stained world of the bursting forth of the sulphurous hell-fire of the Day of Judgment.

For the Frying-Pan, composing the body of Poland, is a vast and fertile territory, abounding in mineral wealth. Silesia is rich in iron and coal mines, and the Poles demand it as a necessity to their commercial existence. But the majority of the in-
The inhabitants of Silesia are Germans. Likewise the province of West Prussia, which contains the Pan-Handle at whose tip sparkles the bright jewel of the Port of Danzig, is overwhelmingly German in population. Germany boasts that she has brought her Polish provinces up to a high state of agricultural and industrial prosperity. Without them her east flank is exposed, about one-fifth of her empire is lost, and she is in the class of second rate powers. German resistance to the Polish invasion of Posen brought about the threat by the Allies of the resumption of the war. Although Posen is German in population, it is commercially necessary to Poland. Which interest shall dominate—blood or commerce? This is the question.

The Glories of War.

In his book "The United States of Poland" Dr. A. Syski of the National Polish Department of America gives a frightful picture of the desolation of Poland during the Great War. He says:

"On the tremendous battlefield extending from the Baltic Sea to the southern slopes of the Carpathian mountains, almost the whole of Austrian and even a portion of Prussian-Poland have been totally ruined.

"Three hundred towns, 2,000 churches, 20,000 villages have been wiped away. An area equal in size to the states of Illinois, Pennsylvania, New York and Maine put together has been laid waste. What could remain of a country where in many districts those huge armies of millions of men were moving forward and backward for over three years? Over three years of continuous fighting, of incessant danger, of uninterrupted anguish and pain imposed upon an innocent nation! Millions of homeless peasants, of unemployed workmen, of humble Polish and Jewish shopkeepers have been driven into open wastes. Millions of bereaved parents, of breadless, helpless widows and orphans, have been wandering about in the desolate land, hiding in woods or in hollows, happy when they found in an abandoned trench, next to the body of a fallen fighter, some decaying remnants of a soldier's food. Forced from their homes to escape the ruthless fury of the invaders, thousands of these unfortunates died of starvation, leaving their bodies upon the roadside to mark the line of march of a stricken people."

Poland was not, however, the only district of which so horrible a thing could be told. Yet there is more: Frederick Wolcott says that both sides of the road along which he motored were completely lined, for 23 miles, with mudcovered and rain stricken clothing. The bones had been cleared by the crows. The Prussians came along, gathering the larger bones, for these were useful as phosphate and fertilizer. The little finger and toe bones were left, with the rags of clothing. Little wicker baby baskets were there, by hundreds and hundreds. Mr. Wolcott started to count them for the first mile or two, giving it up in despair—
there were too many of them. He saw no building in that whole stretch of 230 miles. Everything had been destroyed. Nothing but the bare black and charred chimneys were standing. No live stock, no farm implements, no sign of a living being in all that vast area.

"War," said Theodore Roosevelt, "brings out all the best qualities there are in man."

The ghastliest part of the tragedy which desolated Poland was that in each of the three contending armies, that of Russia, that of Austria, and that of Germany, there were many hundred thousand Poles. Poles slaughtered Poles all through Poland, in the armies of three Kaisers, all of whom were utterly alien to the blood and the spirit of Poland.

Which things are an allegory; for the same is true of every war in which workingmen have fought against workingmen for the glory and profit of alien oppressors.

But Poland has been, since the days of its creation, a battle-field on which this ghastly tragedy has been repeated again and again. Situated on what was for a thousand years the border of Eastern Europe, separating two different worlds, Poland was the rampart that safeguarded Western Christianity from the Turks and Mongols. The long struggle against these invaders was begun in 1241 by King Henry the Pious at the battle of Lignica, and John Sobieski in 1683 struck the death blow to Turkish power before the gates of Vienna.

Through Poland runs the Line of Division which separated Eastern from Western Rome in the days of Diocletian, and has divided Europe ever since; and the story of her crucifixion is the story of the Double-Headed Eagle.

THE DOUBLE-HEADED EAGLE.

The Eagle was the symbol of Rome's imperial power. When the business of Rome became so enormous and widespread that one capital would not suffice, Constantinople shared with Rome the dignity of Imperial city. In order to represent this, the eagle was given two heads; one representing Constantinople, looking ever to the East, and one representing Rome, looking ever to the West.

But the sentinel heads became jealous one of the other; and each turned its beak against its fellow head instead of toward the surrounding barbarians. Thus the strife waxed to and fro across the valley of the Drina river which divided their lands, until Goth in the West and Slav in the East broke through the walls of the Empire. Frankish and then German kings took up the title of the Caesar of the West; the Grand Princes of Moscow took up the title of the Caesar of the East. Thus was the strife between the Caesars extended northward, and the fratricidal war that had reddened the valley of the Drina now involved also the Valley of the Vistula, where the twin beaks of the Eagle plucked the flesh
from the bones of that Christendom of which they each claimed to be the rightful guardian.

Between the Black Sea, which in the earliest times was covered with the fleets of the enterprising Greeks, and the Baltic sea, where amber and furs and some minerals were to be secured, there was heavy traffic. This overland traffic followed the Valley of the Dneister to the Valley of the Vistula, the caravans meeting and transshipping at what is now Lemberg.

Domination of the Valley of the Vistula became of the greatest importance to the monarchs who ruled in the East and in the West. As the surest means of retaining their allegiance missionaries were sent into the forests of the Plains of Poland. Those which came from Moscow brought the Orthodox faith, and those which came from the Holy Roman Empire of the West brought the Catholic faith; and between these two faiths, which implied commercial and political union as well, the Valley of the Vistula was rent in twain.

Very little is known in regard to the Poles until about the dread Millennial Year, in which, amid the heart-shaking fears of expectant Christendom, Poland was born. It is related that they were driven from the Danube by the Romans, and settled in the impenetrable marshes around the upper waters of the Oder and the Vistula, where they lived in more or less anarchic communities, as hunters, herdsmen and tillers of the soil, until the pressure of enemies from either side compelled them to combine for their own defence.

These expanding Germanic states on the West regarded their heathen neighbors very much as the Spanish Conquistadores regarded the people of the Incas and the Montezumas, or as the first American settlers regarded the North American Indians. To defend themselves against these attacks, the Slavonian kings accepted Christianity as a measure of political protection. Orthodox monks from the Eastern Empire first preached the new religion, but Prince Mieszko accepted the Roman form of it from the chaplain of his wife, the Bohemian princess Dobrawa, and the people followed their prince. This brought Poland within the circle of Christendom and thenceforward no inconsiderable part of its chronicles is devoted to her woes.

Mieszko's son, Boleslaus, came to the throne in 992 and reigned until 1025. He it was who secured from the Emperor Otto III the title of King, a possession so valued that almost anything was frequently offered in return for it. By skilful maneuvering Boleslaus secured the recognition of the Church of Poland as a national and independent religious body and as a further safeguard of this he translated to Gnesen the relics of the martyr St. Adalbert of Prague, which became a great national shrine.

THE BIRTH OF POLAND.

It was in the year 1000, a time when all Christendom looked with anxious and terrible expectancy for the Second Coming of
Christ and the end of all of this world's pomp and glory, that Boleslaus was crowned King of Poland at the hands of the Emperor.

"Otto III, the Emperor, was half Italian by blood, and wholly so by training. He was an enthusiastic but exceeding impractical boy, who became "king" at the age of three, took the work of government into his own hand at sixteen, planned grandiosely to unite Latin and Greek Christendom by arms, lived his few brief years at Rome in a court of Oriental pomp, and died at the age of 22, wandering helplessly about Italy as a fugitive from a petty uprising of the Roman populace." Thus briefly does Robert Nisbet Bain tell the story of the Emperor from whose hand Poland received its life.

But Bryce, in "The Holy Roman Empire" gives a more sympathetic picture. His, says Bryce, was "a short, sad reign, full of bright promise never fulfilled. His mother was the Greek princess Theophano; his preceptor the illustrious Gerbert, later Pope Sylvester II., whom he named to the throne of Peter in the Millennial Year. Through his mother he felt himself connected with the old empire, and had imbibed the absolutism of Byzantium. Through the other he had been reared in the dream of a renovated Rome, with her memories turned to realities. To accomplish that renovation, who so fit as he, who with the vigorous blood of the Teutonic conqueror inherited the venerable rights of Constantinople?

"It was his design, now that the solemn Millennial Era of the Founding of Christianity had arrived, to renew the majesty of the City and make her again the capital of a world-embracing Empire, victorious as Trajan's, despotic as Justinian's, holy as Constantine's. His young and visionary mind was too much dazzled by the gorgeous fancies it created to see the world as it was; Germany rude, Italy unquiet, Rome corrupt and faithless.

"In the year 995, at the age of fifteen, he took from the hands of his grandmother the reigns of government, and entered Italy to receive the crown and to quell the turbulence of Rome. There he put to death the rebel Crescentius, in whom modern enthusiasm has seen a patriotic Republican, who had ruled as consul or Senator, sometimes entitling himself Emperor. The young monarch claimed the privileges of Charles and Otto—perhaps extending them; for he nominated successive pontiffs, first Bruno, his cousin, as Gregory V; then Gerbert, whose name of Sylvester II recalled significantly the ally of Constantine, founder of old Christian Rome; Gerbert, the tutor of Otto, whose learning was so unusual in that age that he was later in legends pictured as a magician who at the price of his own soul purchased preferment from the devil, and was by Satan at last carried off in the body."

With the substitution of these men, German by birth, disciplinarians by temper, for the profligate priests of Italy who had made sport of the Papal throne, began the Teutonic reform of the Papacy which raised it from the degradation and abyss of the tenth century to the point where Hildebrand found it. Otto's
reforming zeal laid the foundations for that great revival of the Papal power which was the undoing of the Empire.

Gerbert’s reign began in that Millenial Year to which men had looked forward with mingled fear and hope; and hand in hand with him the young Emperor began the “restitution of all things” which was to make the world ready for the Second Coming of Christ. He had an intense religious belief in the Emperor’s duties to the world. In his proclamations he calls himself “Servant of the Apostles” and “Servant of Jesus Christ.” His fiery imagination, kindled by the memorials of the glory and the power he represented, was coupled with an administrative ability rare indeed in his time.

Setting out on his last journey to Rome in the Millennial Year,—a year which filled kings and peasants alike with dread and fear and fanatic hope,—he went to Aachen, in whose splendid Basilica the body of Charlemagne still sat upon its marble throne, robed in a magnificent cloak and with the Crown which had been set on his head by Pope Leo two hundred years before, still resting on his embalmed head. Otto opened the tomb and gazed upon the stately corpse of the old Emperor, with the Gospel book open before him; and there, touching the dead hand of Charlemagne, the young Emperor had unclasped from the neck of that august body the golden Cross which it wore, and hung it around his own neck; thus taking the investiture of the Empire from the hand of him who had restored it. The seals of Otto bore the same legend as that which Charlemagne had written on his own; “Renovatio Imperii Romanorum.”

But two years after this mystical investiture, Otto fell a victim to the jealous spite of Stephania, widow of that Crescentius, whom he had put to death. She like Delilah had ensnared him by her beauty, and slew him by a lingering poison; and he fled from Rome racked with burning pain to die in his twenty-second year wandering homeless around his Italy.

“They carried him across the Alps,” says Bryce, “with laments whose echoes sound faintly yet from the pages of the monkish chroniclers, and buried him in the choir of that basilica at Aachen, some fifty paces from the tomb of Charles, beneath the central dome.”

So ended the dream of Otto, third of that name, the “wonder of the world” as his own generation called him; for he died childless, and with him ended the line of Otto the Great.

What might have happened had Otto lived, none can tell. But with his fall, anarchy reigned supreme again.

“Short as was his life, and few his acts, Otto III. is in one respect more memorable than any who went before or came after him” says Bryce. “None save he desired to make the seven-hilled city again the seat of dominion, reducing Germany and Lombardy and Greece to their rightful place of subject provinces. No one else so forgot the present to live in the light of the ancient order; no soul was so possessed by that fervid mysticism
and that reverence for those glories of the past whereon rested the idea of the medieval Empire."

Seeking to carry into effect this stupendous dream, Otto granted to Boleslaus, duke of Poland, the title of King, in the same year that Gerbert was raised to the papal throne. He released the Dukes of Poland from their obligation of direct tribute, and entrusted the guardianship of the Holy Roman Empire in the Northern forests to the hand of Boleslaus. And thus, Poland born of a Millennial dream, cherished as a mystical tradition the White Eagle, single-headed between the double-headed eagles of Russia and Austria, in token of that dream of an Empire again ruled from a single Rome. After the death of Otto, Boleslaus, in the year 1025, crowned himself King a second time. His reign, which ended with his second coronation, was one of uninterrupted war. When he died he had formed a vast kingdom from the Baltic to the Carpathians and from the Elbe to the Bug. But this vast structure rested upon the flimsiest foundation; and in less than twenty years after the death of its founder Poland had collapsed before a united attack of all her enemies, from every direction at once.

Simultaneously the people, who had been Christianised by the sword, turned as a body to the paganism of their forefathers. "Poland became a smoking ruin, and wild beasts made their lairs in the ruined and desolated churches," says the ancient chronicler of nine centuries ago.

THE PARTITIONAL PERIOD.

His two successors, Boleslaus II. and III. extended their dominions somewhat. But Boleslaus III. at his death divided his territories among his four sons, in the good old Teuton style; whereby the process of division was again begun. At the end of this "partitional period" as historians call it, Poland was simply a mass of bitterly hostile fragments, twenty or twenty-five in number, varying in their number as they did in their alliances. Poland lost all political significance, and became merely an easy plucking ground for her foes.

Then, in the year 1241 the Tartar tribes appeared on the Eastern horizon, and swept across the already desolated land, leaving behind them once again a smoking wilderness. They were defeated by the stout opposition of the Moravian king at Olmütz, and disappeared as suddenly as they had come, with Poland but a land of corpses where the Tartar had set his foot.

But this fertile land offered great attractions to the peoples dwelling in the German lands; and the Polish King, Bela IV, invited German farmers, handicraftsmen and merchants to settle in his realms, offering them high privileges. They came, but on their own terms, securing exemption from taxation and municipal self-government. These German traders intermarried with the Polish people who were left, and became heart and soul de-
voted to their adopted country. They became an important counterpoise to the land-owning gentry, enriching the land by developing its resources, and promoting civilization by raising the standard of comfort. They developed also the traffic between the Baltic and the Black Sea.

But these were not the only Germans with whom the young state, fast rising from its ashes, had to deal. In the year 1201 the Knights of the Sword, one of the numerous orders of Crusading military monks, had been founded to convert or exterminate the pagan Letts. In the year 1208 the Teutonic Knights, originally formed to protect German travellers in Palestine, were invited by Duke Conrad of Masovia to settle in Kulm—roughly corresponding to East Prussia of the present time—to protect his lands against the incursions of the savage Prussians, the “white savages of the North,” originals of the Blond Beast of whom Nietsche is so fond.

The Teutonic Knights formed one of those military orders—the Knights Templar, the Hospitallers, the Knights of Malta, the Knights of Rhodes—in whom Christianity paid the supreme compliment to Mohammed by adopting his method of evangelising the heathen. They proclaimed “The Mass or the Sword” instead of the original “The Koran or Death.” These great orders combined the virtues of the priestly caste with the sterner qualities of the warrior. Originally founded as protectors of pilgrims, they became the chief bulwark of the Crusading armies against the infidels. By their constant acquisitions of wealth and power they came into violent conflict with their home governments. The Templars were dissolved by the King of France, their lands confiscated and their leaders burned as the result of a trial in which perjuries of the most astounding nature and variety were introduced.

The Teutonic Knights escaped this fate and prolonged their existence for centuries by eagerly accepting the invitation of the Duke of Masovia.

The cause of Christendom in Palestine was already seen to be a losing cause; and the Teutonic Knights welcomed an opportunity to found a new Christian principality in the North. The Emperor, Frederick II, and Pope Gregory IX united in confirming to the Teutonic Knights title to all the lands they should conquer from the heathen, on payment of a small tribute.

In 1231 the first detachment of the Knights entered Prussia and began the work of conquest or extermination among the Lithuanian tribes which inhabited it. In spite of their smaller numbers, their superior arms and discipline gave them an immense advantage over the disorderly hordes which opposed them. As each district was reduced to submission a fortress was built to enforce obedience and to serve as a base for further operations. Their conquests extended rapidly, and in 1237 the Knights of the Sword formed an alliance with the Teutonic Order.

Then began a period of bitter controversy with the Duke who had invited them, and the bishops whose districts they were sup-
posed to hold faithful. But the Pope and the Emperor supported the warrior priests against the Duke and the Bishops. Crowds of recruits flocked into the ranks of the knights, moved both by the indulgences offered to those who undertook the pious duty of converting the heathen to Christianity by the gospel of the sword, and also by the rich temporal rewards which came to them as a result of the victory: for the knights lived in sumptuous style. Between 1280 and 1281 the Slav population rose in rebellion and were sternly suppressed by the knights; with the result that Poland was once more a "smoking ruin" in the interests of Christian civilization.

One hundred years the Teutonic knights dominated the whole Baltic coast, save for the territories still held by the obstinate Lithuanians, and their status as a military order fighting for Christendom brought no small gain to their members from the pious donations of Central Europe as well as from the enforced tribute of the subjected provinces.

But there was another and very modern side to their crusading zeal. They found that the pagan Lithuanians and the un-Christian Poles, while despicable heathen, were very good customers. Like the Y. M. C. A., they went into the war to make the world safe for Christian civilization, and found many an opportunity to turn a sanctified penny in the process. Commanding as they did the sea-coast of the Baltic, they controlled the rich valley trade of all Eastern Europe, and all the profits of their venture bore the blessing of the holy cause in which they had invested both cash and creed.

So long as the Lithuanians and Poles remained pagan, their trading rights were secure; for the Four-Hour preachers of their order who spoke in all the churches of Europe besought the good Christians of every part and land to send their pennies to make the boys happy in the trenches. Had the people of Europe been able to read as well as were the American people of 1918, no doubt the United War Work Campaign placards of the Teutonic Knights and the Knights of the Sword would have decorated every telegraph pole, urging all to "Give until it hurts" so that the field secretaries of the orders might draw their fat salaries on time.

But history foretold itself in the case of the Teutonic Knights; the evangelists were hated even as American doughboys went to Europe hating the Kaiser and came back hating the Y. M. C. A. At the moment when the Teutonic Knights seemed secure of a prosperous existence fighting the heathen, the heathen struck at them a deadly blow.

It was in 1382 that this terrific blow was struck, which rendered them as furious as it made them impotent. The Lithuanians against whom they fought accepted Christianity, and deprived them of the very reason for their existence. Jagiello, grand prince of Lithuania, was offered the crown of Poland together with his own if he would accept the faith and marry the princess Jadwiga, or Hedwig, daughter of Louis, king of Hungary...
and Poland. Jadwiga, it is true, was already betrothed to William of Austria; but this was annulled, and for this sacrifice of her affections on the altar of duty she is forever after renowned as St. Hedwig. Jagiello, as prince of Lithuania, ordered his people baptized promising to each one who accepted the faith a change of woolen clothing—and the people who had resisted the Teutonic Knights with fire and sword marched through the rivers of baptism in their thousands to be sprinkled with holy water by the bishops who stood there waist deep in the water.

Thus were united the Poles with the Lithuanians, under a prince who ranks with the great men of the medieval times. There was a difficulty in the way, which loomed later; that the Lithuanians, in becoming Christians, had accepted the faith of the Orthodox Church of the East rather than that of their hated foes, the Teutonic knights. But for the time, the Teutonic knights were in parlous way.

"Now that Prussia was surrounded by a ring of Christian states" says Lodge, in "The Close of the Middle Ages," "there could no longer be any pretext for a religious war; and foreign princes and nobles were not likely to take an active interest in what became from this time a purely political struggle. The stream of auxiliaries and gifts from Europe was dried up at its source, and the order had to hire its troops." Thus they were filled with all the rage reformers and Charity Organization societies feel for the Socialist who would abolish the necessity for their labors—and their incomes.

Concerning the Lithuanians, Bain says: "The origin of this people is the most baffling of ethnographical puzzles. They dwelt amid the marshes and forests of the Upper Niemen. Thanks to the impenetrability of their fastnesses they preserved their original savagery longer than any of their neighbors, and this savagery was coupled with a valor so tenacious and enterprising as to make them formidable to all that dwelt near them. The Russians fled at the sight of them "like hunted hares." The Livs and Letts were as much the prey of the Lithuanians "as sheep are the prey of wolves." The German chroniclers describe them as the "most terrible of all the barbarians." But by Jagiello’s plan they were made good Christians—temporarily.

On the 15th of February, 1386, Jagiello, prince of Lithuania, was crowned King of Poland at Cracow, as Vladislas II. and three days later he took Jadwiga to wife. But the Teutonic knights, though deprived of the original reason for their existence, were still there; and they controlled the sea-coast of the Baltic, shutting out both Lithuanians and Poles from sea-borne traffic; for the order had become a great trading corporation, making treaties with the King of England and the merchants of Lubeck and Hamburg in regard to the markets and the tariffs; and the interests of the inland kingdom suffered particularly by the treaty of 1409 with the King of England.

In the next year 1410 Jagiello combined forces with Witowt, to whom he had surrendered the Grand Duchy of Lithuania; and
the two armies met the forces of the Teutonic knights at the terrible battle of Tannenberg, or Grunewald. How terrible a conflict this was, one may gather from the inscription in the chapel built at Grunewald in which it is declared that “Sixty thousand Poles and forty thousand of the army of the knights were left dead upon the battlefield.” The banner of the Order, its treasury, and a multitude of prisoners fell into the hands of the enemy, who shortly after marched against Marienberg, capital of the Order, and besieged it. Several of the bishops and fuedatories of the Teutonic knights made their submission to the King of Poland.

So stinging was this memory that in 1915, when the armies of Field Marshall von Hindenburg met and defeated the armies of the Czar marching under Grand Duke Nicolas, on that same battlefield of Tannenberg, the Emperor William proclaimed that at last the stain was removed from the armies of Prussia, and the Teutonic knights were avenged; and he erected at the gates of Tannenberg a memorial of this avenging victory—a memorial shortly after torn down, when the Kaiser fell:

So well had Pole and Lithuanian fought side by side at the battle of Tannenberg that the Treaty of Horodlo, concluded in 1413, provided that henceforth Lithuania was to have the same order of dignitaries as Poland; her grand duke was to be the equal of Poland’s king, and neither country should choose a ruler without the consent of the other.

But equality between the nobility of Lithuania and that of Poland was made contingent upon the Lithuanians adopting the Catholic form of the Christian faith, experience having shown that difference of religion meant difference in politics. Since the majority of the Lithuanian boyars had been converted to the Orthodox church they leaned always toward Moscow.

Poland was not yet done with the Teutonic knights. Their form of government rigidly excluded the people in their territories from any share or voice in their own administration. As the knights were sworn to celibacy, their numbers were continually replenished from the outside, and each new governor had to learn the people over whom he was set afresh. Abuses and resulting discontent continued to multiply, until in 1453 the so-called Prussian League was formed by the merchants, gentry and townsmen, demanding a share in the Government of the country.

But by the terms of their deed of tenure, the Pope and the Emperor had granted to the knights exclusive sovereignty over the lands which they conquered. This demand of the townsman savored of rebellion against the decrees of the double heads of Christendom. Therefore in that same 1453, Pope and Emperor issued a simultaneous ban against the rebellious Prussian League. Immediately they placed themselves under the protection of the King of Poland, who in March of the following year issued a manifesto incorporating the provinces of Prussia with Poland, at the same time granting them autonomy and free trade.
Thereupon for twelve years the fury of a desolating war was again hurled upon the towns and cities who so insolently demanded self-government. For twelve years the armies of the knights and the armies of the King of Poland marched and fought across the plains of East Prussia. Eighteen thousand of their 21,009 prosperous villages were destroyed, 1,000 churches were razed to the ground, and the population was diminished by more than a quarter of million.

How ancient is war! These figures from the years of five centuries ago were almost identically the same as those for the year 1916.

A legate of the Pope intervened to induce the knights to accede to a Peace which was a peace of exhaustion. By the terms of the Treaty of Thorn, the Knights ceded to Poland almost all of the Western portion of their dominions, retaining only a portion of Eastern Prussia, with Koenigsberg for their capital. The Grand Master of the knights acknowledged himself to be a vassal of the King of Poland, with the title of Prince and Counsellor of the Realm.

This gave Poland that outlet to the sea which the knights had so fiercely fought. And thus began the downfall of the knights. Yet further did the mighty fall. In 1497 they lost their possessions in Sicily through the enmity of the Pope and the King of Aragon. In 1511 Albert of Brandenburg was elected Grand Master. In his time the order fell to pieces, many of its members becoming Lutherans. Albert himself went to consult with Martin Luther who advised him to forget all that nonsense, and go get married, as the order which had been founded to convert the heathen Mohammedans and then to exterminate the heathen Lithuanians, and had then become a great trading corporation, was no longer of any use to God or man. And so Albert, last Grand Master of the Teutonic knights, followed this sage advice, married the princess Dorothea of Denmark, resigned his dominions into the hands of the King of Poland, and received in return the title of Hereditary Duke of Prussia. Two centuries later Prussia became a kingdom; and nearly two centuries after that, the head of the German Empire. Thus was it with the Teutonic knights. But how fared it with the Poles?

Twelve years of horror and desolation had devastated the provinces over which the knights and the boyars had fought. Twelve years! Yet the war need not have lasted twelve months, says the Chronicler, had the nobles of Poland been sane enough to act together in support of their wise and statesman-like King. But the wars of Casimir IV. bring out into the sharpest possible relief the tragedy of Poland, the character which has made her history one long agony; and that is the incredible selfishness of her landlord class, the Szlachta, who stood like an impenetrable wall of anarchy between king and people, and made the bright promise of Poland's ascendancy a mockery.

During the "partitional period," when for two centuries every little prince had his own little court, the Szlachta, or land-
lords, claimed and obtained special privileges for their services in the field. In 1374 King Louis of Hungary agreed to exempt the Szlachta from all taxation, except two Polish groschen per hide of land, and to compensate them for the expenses of all military service rendered beyond the confines of the realm. Fortified in these privileges, the Szlachta bitterly opposed every step made by Casimir, for fear that he might in some way step upon their rights.

Acquisition of the Prussian lands was vital to the very existence of Poland. It meant the excision of an alien element which fed like a cancer on the body politic; it meant the recovery at little cost of the command of the principal rivers of Poland, the Vistula and the Niemen; it meant the obtaining of seapower and world-wide commerce.

And yet Casimir could get no help in this great enterprise except from half a dozen of the local diets of Poland, which extorted from their distracted sovereign, in his helplessness, fresh privileges for every subsidy they grudgingly granted. Besides, the soldiers which they did furnish were worthless, and Casimir had to employ Czech mercenaries.

"Indeed" says Bain "the Polish gentry took very good care from first to last to pay and fight as little as possible." It was the valor of the Hussite infantry, coming from those parts of Prussia in which enmity to the Teutonic knights had given rise to a strong anti-Catholic movement under the leadership of the doctrines of John Huss, which at last gave success to Poland. More than 170,000 of these Hussite Infantry are said to have perished in the war.

And now, with her command of the Baltic Sea assured, Poland as the guardian of the transcontinental trade route was in a fair way to become the richest country in Europe. Already, as early as 1400 we find that the city of Cracow, singularly favored by her position nearly central to the principal trade routes, was one of the wealthiest cities in Europe. All the great trade guilds were established there, and the cloth manufactured at Cracow was eagerly sought after from Novgorod to Prague. So wealthy indeed did Cracow become, and so independent as a result thereof, that Casimir the Great felt it necessary to restrain the luxury of her citizens by sumptuary ordinances in the spirit of H. C. Hoover.

With control of the Baltic in her hands, Poland reached southward after control of the Black Sea as well. But hardly had the Treaty of Thorn been signed than the Turks moved upon the southward terminal of the great Trade Route which would have made Poland supreme could she have controlled it. In 1484 a Turkish fleet captured the strongholds of Kilia and Akkerman, commanding respectively the mouths of the Danube and the Dnieper. All of Central Europe was alarmed, for the rich overland trade that emerged by Hamburg and Bremen was menaced as well as that which made Cracow and Danzig rich. A general League against the Turks was formed, and in 1485 the Polish King at its head captured Moldava and besieged Kolomea.
Casimir IV, died in 1492, the same year that Columbus sailed, the same year that Granada fell. In that year began the internal revolution which took away from Poland, as it happened forever, the opportunity of becoming Central Europe. For Casimir the Great had raised Poland to her dignity of new power by threatening the privileges of the szlachta; and when his third son, John Albert, was elected in his stead, these nobles took good care to make certain that no future King should have such rights. John Albert was forced to sign a humiliating pledge, known as the "Revolution" a mockery on the name!

This revolution was both anti-monarchical and anti-democratic, depriving both the monarch and the people of power, and placing it all in the hands of the landlords. John Albert could get no money and no soldiers. After him came Alexander, fourth son of Casimir, who fared even worse at their hands. He surrendered his authority to obtain his crown; and found himself at the mercy of an ignorant aristocracy whose sole idea was systematically to humiliate the monarch and oppress the lower classes. Under Alexander's hand the Polish ship of State has been well described as a "rudderless ship in a stormy sea, with nothing but the grace of God between it and destruction."

For example; from Casimir IV. the szlachta extorted the privilege of self-taxation and of declaration of all wars. Under John Albert they passed laws granting subsidies to be raised entirely by taxation on the towns and the peasantry, and from which the country landlords were entirely free. The szlachta were to be permitted to import and export goods entirely free, to the great detriment of town merchants; not only that, but the town merchants were forbidden to own farms and thus enjoy the privileges of the szlachta. Peasants were bound to the soil by laws forbidding emigration; plebeians were forbidden to become bishops. It was like perpetual rule of Texas landlords.

Thus Poland was doubly rent asunder. Her greatness rested upon the alliance between Lithuania and Poland. But more than two-thirds of the people of Lithuania were Orthodox Greek in religion, and thus were separated by a wide and deep cleavage from the Catholics of the West. To this cleavage was added the profound cleavage between the landlords and all other classes—the king, the merchants and the tenant farmers or peasantry.

When Sigismund II. died, the national convention assembled at Warsaw in April, 1573, to choose a new king. Five candidates for the throne were already in the field, when the adroit and energetic French ambassador, well provided with funds, secured the election for Henry of Valois, duke of Anjou, brother of the King of France. Funds were an integral necessity in any electioneering among the szlachta. On the death of John Sobieski, who reigned as John III. there were eighteen candidates in the field, and the successful competitor was Frederick Augustus, elector of Saxony, who renounced his Lutheran religion for the Catholic faith in order to gain the crown, and who won the day because he happened to arrive last of all with fresh funds after the other seventeen candidates for the crown had spent all their money.
Henry of Valois was escorted to his new kingdom by a cavalcade of Polish noblemen in rich attire of furs and gold chains. But when he reached Poland, he was presented with the Constitution under which he was to reign. This provided that the king was to have no voice in the choice of his successor; was to marry the wife selected for him by the Senate; was neither to seek for a divorce nor to give occasion for one; was to be neutral in all religious matters; was not to lead the militia across the border except for three months at a time, and then only with the consent of the szlachta. And, in addition to this, the Senate appointed a committee of sixteen to be in constant attendance upon him in groups of four, day and night. All his actions were to be supervised by them. To these provisions was added one other which was the very enthronement of anarchy; should the king fail to observe any one of these conditions, the nation was ipso facto to be absolved from its allegiance!

Thirteen months of this sort of kingship was enough and too much for ambitious Henry of Valois. He escaped from the vigilance of his Committee of Sixteen by dropping from a back window of his palace at night, and fled across the borders of his kingdom on a fleet horse, with his enraged and indignant subjects thundering after him, determined to bring back their king at all hazards! But Henry managed to escape his kingship with his life; and thereafter Poland slid down to the gulf of destruction with frightful speed.

Between the years 1587 and 1632, Poland had the chance fairly thrust upon her of becoming the dominant power in Central Europe. To east and west of her the two heads of the Roman eagle were consuming themselves. The Reformation and the Thirty Years War destroyed Germany, and paralyzed Austria, and the collapse of the Muscovite Czardom rent Russia asunder in the East. Had there been the slightest intelligence displayed by any one in Poland capable of rallying any sort of national feeling or intelligence around him, that wonderful land would have become what Germany so recently dreamed of becoming, the Central Power that should rule the world; and we would all have had to learn Polish in our schools instead of German or French; for which deliverance fate be thanked.

But at the end of that period Poland, which might and should have become an empire, was moribund, existing simply because no one cared enough about it to kill her, not worth, as the common expression is, the powder to blow her up.

This decisive split between the szlachta and all other classes is most curiously evidenced in a book by Antoni Choloniewski, called “The Spirit of Polish History,” in which he makes the claim that the election of the king was based on the principle of universal suffrage. “It is true” he goes on, that the nobility alone took part in the elections, but being numerous, they really represented the will of the people!”

The nobility of Poland was not formed of a very small proportion of the population, but was made up of a very considerable
part of it, larger, in fact, than in any other of the European countries. A Mexican army, with ten generals and a private, had nothing on the "gray nobility" of Poland, of whom Mr. Choloniewski says:

"Economically these nobles differed little from the peasants, and were even inferior to some of them—the peasants on the royal domains, for instance, who were not subject to forced labor. At a still lower round of the ladder there were a multitude of gentlemen without any property whatever, who worked in different capacities for the great landlords, attached themselves to the rich magnates, or sometimes slipt into cities, there to follow a trade or enter commerce.

"The majority of the Polish nobility was made up of these "working nobles" without land.... The creation of this nobility was due to different causes. Sometimes it happened that the entire dependent population of a village was ennobled, but more often they were descendants of old and rich families who had become impoverished through successive divisions of the land, through the right of descendants. There were also in this class nobles who had been ruined by war or other calamities. Villages and even entire districts were occupied by these poor nobles." Even while plowing the soil these poor devils of noblemen never left off the sword that was the sign of their high birth, and proudly repeated the proverb that so well characterized them "With bare feet, but with sword at side."

And then Choloniewski proudly and somewhat childishly remarks "This, together with the fact that the nobility formed such an immense part of the population was a phenomenon without analogy". Indeed, the world never saw the like. "So it was really not without some reason" he adds, "that the nobles, conscious of their privileged position and of their number, considered themselves not only a noble class, but also a nation of nobles."

Everyone of these nobles was on an absolute equality with the King and with any other noble, and was far superior to any tradesman or farmer, who had no title but might have plenty of money.

"Whole villages were ennobled as a reward for military service. Thirty thousand Tartars settled in Lithuania were given the liberties of nobility but were allowed to keep their Mohammedan religion....Thus", says this patriot "the affairs of the nation were not carried on by a handful of despotic nobles in possession of great liberties and exercising a decisive influence on the affairs of state, but by a great part of the people, a mass numbering millions."

The root of Poland's incompetence lay in the unheard of "Constitution" extorted from Kings and peasants, centering around the provision of the "liberum vero" by which every member of the assembly was endowed with the right of killing any bill by simply exclaiming "nie pozwalam"—I forbid. As a result of this, before any measure could be adopted by the diet, an absolute unanimity must be secured, in an assembly of some five
or six hundred members. But this was carried still further; any deputy could at any time dissolve the assembly by one-man adjournment; when all measures previously passed had to be re-submitted to the following diet for its approval! The spectacle presented by debates under such a rule as this passed into the German proverb—"wie ein Polska Reichstag" for a Donnybrook Fair.

This measure seems to have been devised originally for the cutting short of interminable debates; but it was generally used by highly placed criminals to avoid an inquiry into their misdeeds, or by malcontents simply desirous of embarrassing the executive. Before the end of the seventeenth century it was used so freely and recklessly that all business was brought to a standstill. It became the tool by which foreign ambassadors dissolved any diet which seemed likely to be troublesome in the revival of the national spirit, for some deputy could always be bribed to exert his veto. In the quarrels between the rival houses of Bourbon and Hapsburg, money was used freely, and all Europe was divided into two hostile camps. Louis XIV is said to have spent fifty million livres a year for bribing purposes, and the court of Vienna was hardly less liberal. Poland's magnates, having got all they could out of their own country, looked eagerly for what could be secured abroad; and, hirelings of either France or Austria, they sold their country for bribes of foreign kings.

Reform after reform was attempted, and peril after peril, invasion after invasion, made the imperative need of reform piercingly evident. Tartar, Cossack, Russian and Austrian invaded and desolated the country; but the enthroned landlords knew nothing beyond their farms, and every attempted reform was met by a "counter-revolution" in which the szlachta rose vehemently against any attempt at curtailing their "ancient liberties"—liberties, which meant the destruction of their country.

Throughout the period when Poland might, undeterred by the weakness of Turkey on the South, Russia, on the East, Austria and Prussia on the West, have attained world-hegemony, this wretched quarrel kept her weak. By the middle of the eighteenth century, that is by 1770, Russia, Prussia and Austria were strong enough to administer the first blow to the Royal Republic of Poland.

In February of 1769 Prussia first suggested to the Empress of Russia that Poland should be divided among her neighbors. In the following summer Joseph II of Austria and Frederick of Prussia met at Neisse in Silesia and again at Neustadt in Moravia, discussing ways and means. In the following year Frederick discovered that there was a cattle plague in Poland, and he surrounded the provinces in which it occurred with a "sanitary cordon", like that which France proposed to establish around Russia. Minister Kaunitz, acting for Austria, occupied the county of Zips. The treaties which confirmed these and the later and larger shares which each country took were signed in February and August of
1772. By these treaties Poland lost one fifth of her population and one-fourth of her territory.

In return for this spoliation the surrounding powers presented Poland with a new constitution, far superior to anything she had previously enjoyed. A revolution in May, 1791, carried through a still better one, which had some chance of making Poland a real country. But even yet the landlords held out for their "rights" and invitations were extended to the Czarina. Russia invaded the country, and the new constitution was thrown away as a "dangerous novelty." Prussia poured into Poland from the other side; and in the Second Partition, Poland was reduced to one-third of her original dimensions, with a population of about three and a half million.

A revolution, led by Kosciusko against the Second Partition had no other result than to hasten the Third Partition, by which the ancient country was completely absorbed by Prussia and Austria and disappeared entirely from view as an independent state.

Before the Chateau of Rapperswill, in Switzerland, that shelters the Polish National Museum—the exiled Museum—there stands a memorial pillar bearing the dates of each of the Polish insurrections. There is a strange and fateful fact in connection with most of these insurrections that they were rebellions of Polish nobles protesting AGAINST the liberation of their serfs.

Then came the Great war. Beginning in a quarrel between little Serbia, lying east of the Valley of Division, and her huge neighbor Austria, lying to the west of it, the conflict swiftly extended northward and swept Germany and Russia into it. That quarrel, indeed, was precipitated by the enmity of the northern powers. Poland lay between them, and across the Valley of the Vistula the fury of destruction swept once again, as in the ancient day of the enmity between the Teutonic Knights and the Lithuanian kings.

A free and independent Poland became the object of great solicitude among the Allies. Dr. E. J. Dillon says "Unless a new Poland, strong and independent, is created, the Allies will lose the war, even though at the Peace Congress they shall have appeared to win it." Indeed, says Dr. Dillon, "there would have been no war if independent Poland had remained a Baltic Power possessed of a fleet in the Gulf of Danzig, and of a country traversed by a network of strategic railways. One of the indispensable safeguards of a future peace is the establishment of strong frontier guards in north and south to bar the Teutons' road to Constantinople and the Black Sea." Because, with access to these ports, Germany might be able to trade in the markets of the Orient and to undersell by virtue of direct transportation and superior manufacture the commercial powers which have accomplished her defeat.

Therefore, while the war was still raging, the Polish American Congress met at Minneapolis, with a program and list of speakers carefully selected and O. K.-ed in advance by the financial
backers of the Allies. No one was allowed to speak or introduce a resolution without the sanction and approval of the Committee self-constituted, of which Ignace Paderewski was the head.

The Polish Socialists, who had gone through the horrors of invasion and of defense, were overthrown by the edict of the financial backers of the Allies, when they presumed to set up a government containing a majority of Socialists; a government elected by the people themselves, instead of by the ancient nobility. Paderewski gave out a remarkable interview on his accession to the throne.

"The New Poland", he said, "must be a continuation of what she has been; otherwise she cannot find again the ideal which she has in her soul. Her ideal has in itself all the elements of vitality and progress, and is so deeply rooted in the nature of the Polish people that it forms the psychological necessity of their existence."

This seems to refer to the ancient Polish nobility and their rights; in which case Poland, rising from the grave, is certain to endure another crucifixion. Paderewski's government is a government of the Szlachta.

The Republic of Poland is situated between two fires; between Soviet Russia and Socialist Germany. And as such all the finances of all the banks in all the Allied lands are pledged to maintain her as a dividing barrier between two nations which, if they are permitted to form an alliance, will sweep the rest of the world with them into the light of a genuine liberty.

But the Polish peasantry have had enough of war. Even the dullest of them cannot forget what launched them into this war; and the false fires of a selfish and exclusive nationalism are already paling in the light of a fiercer, stronger, day—the sunlight of international Socialist fellowship of all the nations of the world.
Lecture VI.

Armenia: Crucifixion of the Soul

Armenia is the land of Mount Ararat, on whose summit the Ark of Noah is fabled to have rested. As this mountain is 17,000 feet above sea-level, the Flood must have raised its angry waves more than that height, more than three miles and a half above the level of the sea in repose. But another Flood has drenched the land of Armenia with ceaseless torrents since the day that the waters abated from the face of the earth; a deluge of blood which were it all collected at one time, would, it seems, rival the Flood of Noah.

For Armenia is the home of massacres. From the days when Chaldaean strove with Egyptian for the mastery of the world, Armenia has been the land which bore the heavy burden of their mutually-avenging wrath. The sad story of Armenia is written in its geography, for the land forms a Cross on which its people have been through all the ages crucified.

Armenia is the land of the cross-roads. It lies between the Black and the Caspian seas on the North, and between the Mediterranean and the Persian Gulf on the South. It is a high rocky plateau, through which pass all the roads between Europe and Asia and Africa. The Berlin to Bagdad Railroad passes through it; the Mesopotamian highway passed through it; the Way of the Sea from Egypt to Chaldaea passed through it; every road, except the Desert Road, which links together the three Continents at the place where they all join, goes through Armenia.

The essence of Empire is control of transportation. And Armenia has been the battle ground between all the empires of the past and of the present. Its melancholy story is contained in this pregnant paragraph in one of its best known histories:

'The history of Armenia has been largely influenced by its physical features. The isolation of the valleys, especially in winter, encouraged a tendency to separation, which invariably showed itself when the central power was weak. Its rugged mountains have always been the home of hardy mountaineers, impatient of control, and the sanctuary to which the lowlanders fled for safety in times of invasion. The country stands as the
open door between the East and the West. Through its long valleys run the roads that connect the Iranian plateau with the fertile lands and protected harbors of Asia Minor, and for its possession nations have contended from the remotest past."

From the remotest past!

We are accustomed to think of Armenian massacres as being peculiarly a product of German gold working upon Turkish deviltry. But looking back a few years prior to the Great War we find that even when Turkey was the bosom friend of England, Armenian massacres continued just the same; and that the British ambassador while presenting regular protests to the Sublime Porte against these inhuman deeds, just as regularly prevented any nation from taking measures to stop them. We find that Pompey and Lucullus indulged in Armenian massacres; we find that Assur-bani-pal and Nebuchadnezzar massacred Armenians; and in the records of the oldest intercontinental warfare, that between Egypt and Babylon, the Armenians felt the brunt of the wrath of the kings of both sides.

Why? Because the Roads that link the Continents run through valleys fringed with mountains. Mountaineers have always been hardy and independent. They are so in Switzerland, they are so in Scotland. The reason is not that they are of a special breed of men, but that Imperialism cannot control mountaineers because it cannot bring its armies through the mountains. But when a hardy spirit of independence, fostered by the inaccessibility of the hills, menaces the transcontinental routes which pass through the dwellings of the hillmen; then the hillmen must be subdued, not by constant tyranny, but by spasmodic outbursts of brutality.

Such is the fate of Armenia.

Most of the towns of Armenia lie high, some 4,000 to 6,000 feet above sea-level. The villages are usually built on gentle slopes, in which the houses are practically excavated, "dug-outs" as they are called on our Western plains, for protection against the severity of the weather.

Armenians themselves have always been noted for their industrial skill and their cleverness in trade. "They are skilled artisans, bankers and merchants, and are remarkable for their industry, their quick intelligence, their aptitude for business, and their enterprising spirit which led them in Roman times to trade with Scythia, China and India. The Armenians are an essentially Oriental people, like the Jews, whom they resemble in many respects, especially in their exclusiveness and widespread dispersion, a remarkable tenacity of race and faculty of adaptation to circumstances. They are frugal, sober, industrious and intelligent, and their sturdiness of character has enabled them to preserve their nationality and religion under the sorest trials. They are strongly attached to old manners and customs, but have also a real desire for progress which is full of promise...."
Why should such a race as this be marked for slaughter? Are they not possessed of the qualities that would make them valuable members of the society of nations?

Alas, indeed! Too valuable. The reason why Germany conspired with Turkey to massacre the Armenians is given in a brilliant article in the Saturday Evening Post:

"If the Armenians remain anywhere near the Berlin to Bagdad Railway, their cleverness will put them in control of it; for they are more intelligent than the Turks and more clever than the Germans."

A race gifted with high intelligence is in command of the Cross-Roads of the World. They are an independent breed, and will not yield readily to Imperialistic designs. Therefore—let them be crucified!

-Prof. J. L. Myres of Oxford divides the white races of Western Eurasia into three great classes; the Mediterranean, the Alpine, and the Northern or Boreal man. The Mediterranean man, of which the Greeks are typical; the Boreal, of which the Germanic tribes are the representatives, and the "Alpine," or "Armenoid" type, are the three great families in whom is written the history of the Western world. Armenia is the Eastern home of the "Alpine" race, which dwells in the mountain lands. Their convergence from the South and Southeast into the colder, moister regions which have been released since the Ice Age closed, is one of the great world-movements. This Armenoid type seems intolerant of lowland life, and fades out rapidly in the foothills. That ancient kingdom of the Hittites, whose power looms more and more upon our imaginations as our discoveries of the ancient world progress, was built by Armenian kings.

Armenia first becomes a part of ordinary history, however, in the campaigns of Lucullus the Roman, founder of the imperial theory, against Mithridates, King of Pontus, and Tigranes, or Dikran, king of Armenia. Dikran surrendered to Pompey under the walls of his new capital, Dikranocerta, in 66 B.C., and thence held Armenia as a vassal state of Rome.

This was the furthest East that Rome ever reached; and Armenia became the battle ground upon which the wars of the Persians and the Romans were fought for four succeeding centuries. Armenia, though politically dependent upon Rome, was connected with the Parthian empire, successor to the empire of the Great Kings of Persia, by language, intermarriage, dress and faith, as well as by close geographical location. Armenia was never Hellenized by the successors of Alexander. The Roman provincial system was never applied to it, and the policy of Rome was never consistent toward it. The country became the battle ground upon which the East and West contended for mastery, until the struggle ended for a time with the partition of Armenia between Rome and Parthia in 387 A.D. Thus was the race divided.
GREGORY THE ILLUMINATOR.

But a unifying force came into Armenia even while the division was in progress. St. Gregory the Illuminator converted and baptized King Tiridates in or about the year 261, while the Church in Western Rome was still reeling from the shock of the Registration and the Persecution of the emperor Decius. Tiridates established Christianity as the religion of Armenia fifty years before Constantine adopted that same step; and thus the Church of Armenia claims half a century precedence over the Church of Rome as a “religio licita.”

Shortly after the Partition of Armenia, the Armenian alphabet was invented, and the Bible and service books were translated into the vernacular. Services were held in Armenian, instead of Greek or Syriac, and this creation of a National Church kept the national spirit of Armenia alive during all the troubled centuries which succeeded.

St. Gregory the Illuminator is said to have boasted that when he came to Armenia there were only 17 Christians; and when he died there were only 17 non-Christians. Tradition represents the progress of the great missionary as a triumphal march. But the means whereby this conversion was secured are interesting. The priests of the ancient Armenian religion heard that this new God, preached by command of the king, involved no sacrifices, and they sent to ask Gregory how, if this were the case, they were to live, for until then the priests and their families had been sustained by their share of the sacrificial victims and other offerings reserved to them by pagan custom.

Gregory replied “If you will join the new religion, not only shall the sacrifices continue, but the priests shall receive a larger share than before.” Hearing this, the priesthood went over in a body.

Thus the Levitical rite of the Jews was preserved in Armenia long after the destruction of the Jewish temple and the cessation of the priestly office among the Jews. Well into the fifth century we find that animals were sacrificed every Sunday and on the feast days in fulfillment of private vows, in expiation of the sins of the living, and, even more, of the sins of the dead.

No one might be his own butcher, and thus deprive the priest of his share of the meat; except in the chase, when no priest was present.

As late as the 12th century, the theologians of the Armenian church vehemently denied that the mass could expiate the sins of the dead, unless the sacrifice of an animal accompanied it. Perhaps even today the worst fate that can befall an Armenian villager after death is to be deprived, not of the commemoration of the requiem mass, but of the victim, the goat or kid, slain for his sins. And even today the keenest weapon of the Armenian priesthood is to threaten to refuse to offer a “matal,” or bloody sacrifice, for a man when he dies.
Another peculiarity of the Armenian church is the priestly caste. The son of a priest becomes a priest after his father, and no one who is not a member of the priestly caste can hope for ordination.

These striking differences of religion are more patriotic than they are theological. The Armenian Church held together the race which was divided between Rome and Persia. The Eastern Emperor employed the Orthodox Church as the symbol and extension of his power. In order to bring Armenia under the control of the Eastern Empire therefore, the Armenian Church must be subdued. But this was an impossibility.

The Arab invasion drove many Armenians to Constantinople, where they rose to high power. Artavasdes, an Ardzrunian, usurped the throne of the Byzantine emperors for two years, Leo V and John Zimisces, both Armenians, were elected to the imperial throne. Manuel became the foremost general of the empire.

The Emperor Basil II in 991 and again in 1021 invaded Armenia, seeking to annex it to the Empire. His policy was to "make the great Armenian fortresses, garrisoned by Imperial troops, the eastern line of defense of his empire against the Persians." But his feeble successors thought more of converting the heretics of Armenia than of defending its frontiers, and this attempt drove them to revolt which hurled the invading legions back.

Seljukian Turks began to come in their millions from the vast plains of Turkestan, and between the raids of the Seljuks and the harrying of the Byzantine soldiers, the miseries of the people were extreme. But every fresh outrage inflicted upon the Armenians was regarded by the Imperial Orthodox church as so much gain to the true faith, for these heretics were but suffering for their perversity.

For more than three centuries after the appearance of the Seljuks, Armenia was traversed by a long succession of nomad tribes, whose one aim was to secure good pasturage for their flocks on their way to the richer lands of Asia Minor. Cultivators were driven from the plains; agriculture was destroyed; the country was seriously impoverished; and then under the fire and sword of the frightful Timur, its ruin was completed.

COMING OF THE CRUSADERS.

Many Armenians embraced Islam; others fled to Cappadocia or Cilicia, where a small Armenian principality founded in 1080 extended gradually until it became Lesser Armenia.

Bitter hostility to Islam on the East and to the Orthodox Church on the West still marked the Church of Armenia; and when Latin Crusaders poured down the long valley of the Danube to Constantinople, and crossed the Bosphorus to Asia Minor, they found welcome assistance in the Armenian Church against the hostility of the Greek emperor and of the Sultan of the Saracens.
Valuable support given to the Crusaders was rewarded by profitable treaties with the commercial cities of Italy, who hated the Greek religion only a little less than they despised the faith of the Mohammedans, since both stood in the way of commercial supremacy.

Lesser Armenia existed for three hundred years, until in the fateful year of 1375 the Latin or “Lusignan” kings attempted to make their subjects accept the Pope and Emperor of Western Rome as their overlords; which drove the rebellious Armenians into the arms of Egypt at the battle of Cilicia.

A different policy from that of the Greek emperors was pursued by their conqueror, Mohammed II, when in the year 1453 he entered Constantinople behind his Janissaries, and proclaimed the doctrine of Islam from the pulpit of Sancta Sophia. He organized his non-Moslem subjects into communities, or Millets, under ecclesiastical chiefs to whom he gave absolute authority in civil and religious matters, and in all criminal offenses that did not come under Moslem law. Under this system the Armenian bishop of Brusa was appointed by the Sultan patriarch of Constantinople, and made the head of the Armenian millet. This “imperium in imperio” secured to the Armenians a recognized position before the law, the free enjoyment of their religion, the possession of their churches, and the right to educate their children and manage their municipal affairs; but on the other hand, it converted their national clergy into simply the agents of a foreign government, making them politicians rather than priests, and encouraging bribery and intrigue.

In the year 1839 the tradesmen and artisans freed themselves from clerical control; and in 1862 the Sultan granted to them a representative assembly of 140 members, from which Roman Catholics and Protestants were excluded. This became known as the “national assembly.”

Catholics were represented in the “Katoluk Millet” or Catholic community, with their own religious head. This was accomplished at the instance of France, which ever since the Crusades had regarded herself as the protector of the Roman Catholics of Syria. Following this example, the British Ambassador secured the formation of a “Protestant millet,” composed of the members of the Evangelical Church of Armenia, largely made up of converts secured by missionaries from Protestant lands. Thus the Turkish Sultan had secured a better solution of the Armenian question than Roman or Greek or Persian had ever done.

Then Abdul-Hamid came to the throne of the Sultans in 1876, and with him began the “Armenian question.”

Then came the war of 1877-78, in which Russia conclusively destroyed the Turkish armies and concluded a treaty at San Stefano. Russia compelled Turkey to agree to carry out deep and far reaching reforms in Armenia, and to guarantee their security against the Kurds and Circassians. But by the Treaty of Berlin, which Disraeli and Bismarck forced on Russia and Turkey instead of that of Stefano, the “six signatory Powers” took the place of
Russia. England insisted that Russia should evacuate the occupied Armenian territory before any of these reforms were introduced, and thus by England was destroyed the sole security for their introduction. The Treaty of Berlin was regarded as placing the Armenians under the direct protection of Great Britain; but it was an obligation which Great Britain fulfilled only through periodical protests after each massacre, coupled with a determined resistance to any proposal to prevent the massacres.

This failure of Great Britain caused the rise among the Armenians of strongly nationalistic societies, secret organizations which sought by pamphleteering and underground agitation to work for Armenia's independence. Concerning this the Encyclopaedia Britannica says, indignantly, "They represented the ordinary incidents of Turkish misrule to Europe as serious atrocities." How dared they protest against Turkish massacres of Armenians, conducted under the protection of Great Britain!

It was not until the Germans secured control of Turkey, through the Young Turk revolution of 1908, that the Armenian massacres attracted the unstinted indignation of the British press. These new massacres were an attempt to repress the growing nationalistic spirit of the Armenians.

Germany's pet project of a Berlin-to-Bagdad Railroad would be seriously menaced by a strong and independent nationality controlling the Cross-roads of the Continent. Armenians, intelligent and industrious as they are, would soon get the control of the railroads into their own hands, and thus peril Germany's control of the "corridor to the East." The Great War began very largely over the question of control of this railroad.

Then began that chapter of horrors which is almost without parallel. The deportations of the Armenians, in which upwards of a million men, women and children were taken to the desert to die, or drowned by hundreds, or butchered with axes in droves of three and four hundred at a time, was a deliberate attempt on the part of the commercial forces behind the Berlin to Bagdad Railroad to obviate the danger of an independent state controlling the cross roads. The massacres were a commercial speculation.

Armenia's territory is full of mineral wealth. The nation which controls it will have an inexhaustible supply of precious metals and industrially necessary resources. But Armenians live in the mountains, and the mountaineers are incapable of easy control. For all the centuries that history has existed they have stubbornly clung to their independence, to their nationality, to their industry and frugality; and because they are located at the very Crossroads of the World, their continuance in that native habitat is a menace to Imperialism.

There can never be an end to the Martyrdom of Armenia until the system which gives rise to Imperialism is ended: that system whereby one nation or the controlling classes of one nation can profit at the expense of the destruction of any other nation. And that is the system we know as the Capitalist system, where-
by the tribute of the ends of world is laid at the feet of the
speculators who control the armies and the navies which menace
all who will not submit to their demand for tribute.

Secure in their mountain fastnesses the Armenians have
defied all Empires since time began. And now comes the question
—shall they survive?

Not unless that enemy which seeks their downfall is over-
thrown. That enemy is not the Turk, nor the German; it is
Finance; it is the Capitalist system.

To save the Armenians, as to save the Jews, and the Serbs,
and the Irish, and the Belgians, and the Poles—Imperialism
must die.

The means whereby it can be slain is not the power of the
sword and the strength of armies, but the clear spreading light
of intelligence and understanding and the organizing together of
the workers of all the nations in a LEAGUE OF SOVIET RE-
PUBLICS which shall cut the root from under Imperialism in
all its forms.

Let there be light!
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