follow Mgr. Duchesne into the sad history of the Papacy when family ambitions decided Papal elections and two bad women, Theodora and Merozia, were using their baleful influence. The Emperor Otho I. (936-973) brought the beginnings of better things, but was quite unable to become a second Charlemagne. A greater reform was started by Gregory VII. in conflict with the Emperor Henry IV. (1073-1080), who continued the struggle against Victor III., Urban II. and Paschal II. (1073-1106). Then Henry V. imprisoned Paschal II. and his Cardinals till they yielded investiture rights, which afterwards they could not conscientiously confirm. The compromise was the Concordat of Worms, 1122, when Calistus II. was Pope. There followed the Conflict of Frederick I. against Hadrian IV. and Alexander III. (1154-1180) and that of Frederick II. against Honorius III., Gregory IX. and Innocent IV. (1216-1250). Here in a substantial sense may be said to have ended the long duel between *Sacerdotium* and *Imperium*, with the defeat of the latter and with a severe wound left in the former.

J. Rickaby, S. J.

Stonyhurst, England.

ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE EASTERN QUESTION.

ONCE more the attention of the world is directed toward the East, and its eyes are fixed upon Constantinople. Although it was known that the party of "Young Turkey" had been at work for a long time, we could hardly expect such a complete, though peaceful revolution, and such a complete emancipation as we have witnessed in the last months. Newspapers and magazines have kept us busy with rumors of war in Turkey and the neighboring provinces, and it is hard to foresee what is in store for the Turkish Empire and, consequently, for the Mahomedan world.

I shall endeavor to give a bird's-eye view of the history of what was once the Empire of Byzantium, and thus lead up to the events of the present year.

The early history of Hellas, and of that more ancient people that

---

titem, etiamsi altera pars refragatur, ad episcoporum judicium cum sermone litigantium dirigatur. Omnes itaque causa quae vel praetorio jure vel civili tractantur, episcoporum sententiis terminatae, perpetuo stabilitatis jure firmantur, nec licet alterius tractari judicium, quod episcoporum sententiae decident." Charlemagne also took up the old rule of Chalcedon (Mansi, VII., 981), that a civil law which contravened the canons should be invalid.

preceded it, the Pelasgi, is, like the history of most of other nations, buried in obscurity and entirely impenetrable except to the researches of the archæologist and philologist. When the dawn begins to break it is obscured by the fables of mythology. The exploits of Hercules, the golden fleece and the voyage of the Argonauts, as well as the siege and downfall of Troy, belong to this fabulous age, though beneath it all, no doubt, underlies a substratum of truth. When, finally, the sun of Grecian history rises we find Hellas, with its three principal tribes of Æolians, Dorians and Ionians, split up into a number of small States, kingdoms or republics, with the Amphycthionic Council as their congress and band of unity. Sparta and Athens are the rising stars among the Grecian cities, but Hellas is of wider extent than the territory of Greece proper, for wherever Hellenes are found there is Hellas. Greeks or Hellenes inhabited the shores of Asia Minor, whence their brethren had crossed over to Europe, and they had colonized Sicily and southern Italy. Legislation, internal politics and feuds occupy the several States of Hellas until the beginning of the fifth century before Christ, when the great Persian wars begin. The three great Eastern empires of Chaldæa, Assyria and Babylonia had passed away, Nineveh had almost disappeared and Babylon was in a state of irreparable decay. Persia, with Cyrus at its head, was the ruling power of the Orient. Unlike the Turks, the mediæval enemies of the Hellenic race, the dwellers on the plains of ancient Oran, the Medes and Persians, belonged to the same great branch of the human family as the Greeks; they were Aryans. The representatives of autocracy in Asia and the lovers of freedom in Greece appear in collision in the reign of Darius I., who had succeeded Cambyses, son of Cyrus. Several of the Greek cities of Ionia in Asia Minor which had been subjugated by Cyrus had endeavored to throw off the Persian yoke, and the Athenians encouraged them in this revolt. Thus in 499 B. C. and in 1897 A. D.—that is, with an interval of 2,396 years—we find Athens sending forth an armed force to help its kinsfolk beyond the seas, and on each occasion a war is precipitated. In 1897 the Greek fleet and army intervened to help Crete against Turkey, and in 499 B. C. the Athenians sent twenty ships and a small force to aid the Ionian insurgents against the Persians. There was then, however, no European concert to check the designs of the Athenians, but they had the mighty Persian monarchy to encounter, and Darius determined to take vengeance on them for the burning of Sardis. Macedonia was invaded and subjugated, but the expedition could not push forward its successes, the fleet having failed to coöperate, owing to a fierce storm which shattered it off Mount Athens. Darius now sent heralds to demand the submission of the

Hellenic States. The cities on the islands generally made their submission, as did many of the continental States.

It was at this critical juncture, when Hellenic civilization was threatened by Eastern despotism, that two champions arose in Athens and Sparta. Their conjunction aroused the spirit of Hellas, and a defensive league was formed, in which most of the lesser States joined. The Persian army sent by Darius landed in the bay east of Attica, and on the immortal plains of Marathon it was encountered by the Greeks under Miltiades. How gloriously different the campaign of 490 B. C. from that of A. D. 1897! The Athenian army of 10,000, reëforced by 600 from Platæa, met a Persian army ten times its number, defeated it and saved Athens. How different from the battle of the Milouna Pass and the rout at Larissa.

Ten years passed, and Persia again invaded Greece. Xerxes had succeeded Darius, and Sparta now stood at the head of the Hellenic League. It is noteworthy that the Persian invasion of Greece under Xerxes covered nearly the same ground as that of the Turks in the campaign of 1897. The Asiatics advanced westward through Thrace and Macedonia, and then, turning southward, rushed through Thessaly upon Attica. Another analogy between the campaign of Xerxes, and that of Edhem Pasha we find in the fact that the Asiatic invasion was a complete success. In the ancient campaign, however, the tide was soon completely turned, and victory perched upon the banners of the Greeks. When the Persians came pouring into Greece the Greeks determined to take their stand at Thermopylæ. A small force of only 7,000 troops, under command of the Spartan King Leonidas, was sent to defend this mountain pass against the vast host of Xerxes. For two days they held the enemy at bay, until a traitor pointed out to the Persians a mountain pass by which they might turn the position of the Greeks. Most of the Greek officers now proposed retreat, but Leonidas, with his three hundred Spartans and seven hundred Thespians, resolved to die at their post. The rest of the allies were permitted to retire. The heroic band, advancing into the open space, were soon surrounded by the enemy, and they perished to a man, leaving an immortal memory to their country. Alas! 2,359 years later occurred the retreat from Larissa.

Athens, deserted by its population, was reduced to ashes by the Persians, but all was not lost for Greece. The naval victory of Salamis discouraged Xerxes, as much as it raised the spirits of the Greeks, and the Persian monarch retreated to his own dominions, leaving a force of 300,000 men, under Mardonius. The following year the victory of Platæa, gained by the Spartan leader Pausanias and the Athenian Aristides, routed the enemy, while the battle of

Mycale, in Asia Minor, destroyed the remnant of the Persian fleet. The battles of Salamis, Platæa and Mycale decided the war, and the Persians never again invaded Greece. Europe was thus saved from Oriental despotism, and this is one of the many debts it owes to little Greece.

The half century that now follows forms the most glorious period of Athenian history. It was the golden age of Pericles. But, alas! it was also in this age that the seeds were sown of that internecine strife that was to prepare the way for the downfall of Grecian freedom and for Macedonian supremacy. Pericles lived to behold the outbreak of the Peloponnesian war, that great struggle between oligarchy and democracy, Athens heading the Ionian, or democratic, and Sparta the Dorian, or aristocratic party. Athens fell, and Sparta became the greatest power in Greece, to be succeeded by Thebes.

Philip of Macedon now enters into Grecian politics. Acknowledged a member of the Ampyctionic Council, his ambitions grew until at last he became master of Greece, and Hellenic liberties fell. Since that day the Grecian people have never entirely recovered their liberties. The spirit of ancient Hellas is broken. Under Alexander, the son and successor of Philip, Greece again met Asia, this time as the aggressor. The Persians were obliged to encounter their old enemies in the heart of their own kingdom. The Persian monarch, Darius Codomanus, was overthrown, Persia acknowledged the dominion of Alexander the Great, and the short-lived Macedonian Empire arose on the ruins of the great Persian monarchy. Though this mighty empire crumbled after the death of its founder, yet its results were lasting. Grecian culture imposed itself upon Asia, and Greek became the predominant language of the civilized world. Less than two centuries later, Greece was merged into the Roman Empire, after the downfall of which it was to pass into the power of the Turks.

The name of Turk first appears in history in the fifth century of our era, in the reign of the Emperor Justinian. We find the Turks the most despised portion of the slaves of the great Khan of the Geougen (Jouan-Jouan), working the iron forges of their masters on the slopes of the Altai Mountains. Under the leadership of Bertezena they vindicated their rights as a separate tribe, and, sallying forth from their mountain home, they began to wage war against the neighboring tribes. Proceeding from victory to victory, they established in Tartary the powerful emipre of the Turks, which entered into relations of peace and war with the Romans on one side and with China on the other. This great empire lasted a period of two hundred years, and then vanished from history, leaving,

however, the Turks masters of the great Asiatic steppes. Supplying the Arab dynasty of the Samanis as well as the Saracen Khalifs with mercenary troops, they again slowly came forth into the light of history, and in the eleventh century, once more founded a great empire, that of Seljuk, which aided greatly to propagate the doctrines of the Prophet of Mecca, which Seljuk and his descendants had now embraced. First as slaves, then as a military aristocracy and, finally, as conquerors, the Seljukian Turks absorbed Persia and the whole empire of the Khalifs. Togrul, the grandson of Seljuk, and Alp-Arslan, the successor of Togrul, consolidated their empire and began to encroach upon that of the Romans. Under Malek Shah the frontiers of the empire were still further extended. Soliman added to his dominions a new kingdom, that of Roum, or of the Romans, which was formed from the dominions of the Byzantine empire in Anatolia, or Asia Minor, and Nice became the capital of the Sultan. Finally Jerusalem fell into the hands of the Seljukians. The yoke of the Fatinite Caliphs had weighed lightly on the Christians of Palestine, but that of the Northern Barbarians became galling. The cries of the persecuted Christians reached the ears of their brethren in the West, and the voice of Peter the Hermit stirred Europe to its very depths. The Council of Clermont followed, and the Christian nations of the West poured forth their thousands for the relief of the Holy Land. The Crusades saved the West from the Seljukian Turks, and gave to their empire a blow from which it never recovered.

In the middle of the eleventh century of our era, the Turks of the dynasty of Seljuk first appear in collision with the Byzantine empire. Under the leadership of Togrul, the grandson of Seljuk, the Turkish horse overspread the Greek frontier of over six hundred miles, and the blood of one hundred and thirty thousand Christians was poured out without any lasting result for the invader, whose arms were met by the bravery of the Romans, as the Greeks of the lower empire loved to style themselves. Alp Arslan, the successor of Togrul, was more successful, and Armenia and Georgia were wrested from the Byzantine empire. The brave Emperor, Romanus Diogenes, fought with courage, but the resources at his command were insufficient, and the heroic Emperor, a prisoner in the hands of his enemies, was forced to subscribe to the exorbitant demands of his conqueror. The Seljukian Sultan dictated then to Romanus Diogenes, as the Ottoman Sultan a few years ago dictated to Greece. A ransom of a million, and an annual tribute of three hundred and sixty thousand pieces of gold were demanded.

The Asiatic provinces of the Greek empire gradually fell into the hands of the Seljukian Turks and the Holy City of Jerusalem finally

became subject to them. It was this last event that aroused the Western nations and began that gigantic uprising which history has handed down to us as the Crusades, a movement which though it did not succeed in rescuing the East from Mahomedanism, at least saved Europe from the Seljukian Turks.

The Ottoman Turks first appear in history in the thirteenth century. In the last year of that century, the Caliph Othman invaded Greek territory. His son and successor, Orchan, subdued the province of Bithynia as far as the shores of the Bosphorus and the Hellespont. The Byzantine empire was now verging to its fall, which the intestine divisions of the Greeks themselves only served to precipitate.

The great Mongol invasion under Zingis Khan swept like a tidal wave over the East and over a part of Europe, and when it rolled back, death and desolation lay in its path. Still the Seljukian line survived. It was mid the excitement of this invasion, that the Ottoman Turks first came into notice. The Seljukian Sultan of Iconium being one day hard pressed by the Mongols, a small body of unknown horsemen reversed the fortune of the day, and the Seljuk gained the victory. The strangers had accidentally come upon the battle-field of Angora, and at once declared for the weaker side. Only 400 in number, they belonged to the Oghuz family of Truks, and Ertoghrul, son of Suleyman, was their leader. More than six centuries have passed since then, and the family of Ertoghrul still exists. Thirty-five Princes in the male line, without a break in the succession, separate Abdul Hamid, the present ruler of Turkey, from his ancestor Ertoghrul.

A small district was given to these new auxiliaries of the Seljukians, and there the foundations of the Ottoman empire were laid. Here, in 1258, was born Othman, the son of Ertoghrul, from whom the present Turkish race has taken its name. This territory lay in the old Seljukian kingdom of Roum, and when at the end of the thirteenth century the Seljukian dynasty became extinct, it was one of the ten States that arose upon the remnants of the Seljukian empire. Gradually the Ottomans gained by the sword the ascendancy over their rivals, and Othman bequeathed a growing empire to his son Orchan. The attacks on the Byzantine empire continued, and in a short time a considerable portion of Asia Minor was in the hands of the Turks. Before the middle of the fourteenth century they had crossed the Hellespont. Under Murad I., Orchan's son and successor, Macedonia and Thrace succumbed and Adrianople became the European capital of the Turks. Alas, the age of the Crusades was over and the Turks were permitted to gain that foothold in Europe which they have held to this time. The enemy sub-

dued the province of Thrace from the Hellespont to Mount Hæmus and Adrianople became their European capital. The empire of the Greeks dwindled away to the small strip of land on which Constantinople stood and the end was near. Bajazet, the Turkish Sultan, might indeed write to the Emperor Manuel that beyond the walls of Constantinople he had nothing left.

For a while the Turks felt that if they attempted to take Constantinople they might provoke a coalition of the Christian Powers of Europe, more formidable even than the Crusades. In view of recent events, I deem it useful to cast a glance at the action of those powers in the downfall of the Eastern empire. One factor must not be lost sight of in the relations between the East and the West—namely, the schism. The differences existing between the Latin and Greek Christians were far less important than those which divide Catholics from Protestants, yet they were vital. In point of doctrine the faith of the Greeks was, with the exception of a few points, identical with that of the Latins, yet these differences were essential. The doctrine of the procession of the Holy Ghost in the Blessed Trinity and that of the supremacy of jurisdiction of the Roman Pontiff opened a chasm which could not be bridged over, and Greeks and Latins looked upon each other with undisguised contempt. The Latin nations, centred around the Pope, were a unit, while the venerable patriarchates of Antioch, Jerusalem and Alexandria were in the power of the Mahometans. Constantinople alone held out, and, as Gibbon remarks, in its four last centuries its friendly or hostile attitude towards the Pope and the Latins may be observed as the thermometer of its prosperity or distress. When the Seljukian Turks threatened Constantinople, the Emperor Alexius implored the protection of the Pope, and the Crusades were the answer to his supplication. No sooner is the danger past than the Greeks throw off the mask and again exhibit their hatred of the Latins. Various fruitless negotiations between Greeks and Latins follow, the union effected at Lyons does not prove lasting and, finally, the Greek empire approaches its agony. John Paleologus goes to Rome in person; he enlists in his favor Urban V., but the age of the Crusades has passed, and, unlike the other Urban, whose appeal had stirred Europe to its inner depths, the Pope fails to move the Powers of Europe in defense of Constantinople. Thirty years later Manuel, his son and successor, made another appeal in person to the Christian powers. He traveled through Italy, France, England and Germany. He was everywhere received with the highest honors, but his efforts to obtain assistance came to naught. The time could not have been less propitious. It was the period of the great schism. The Council of Florence, held later on, proved as ineffectual as that

of Lyons had been, the union was short, and in spite of the fidelity of the Emperor himself, the great body of the Greeks remained obstinate in their schism. The end came at last, and while the nations of Europe looked on with indifference, Constantinople fell. Venice, Genoa, Naples and the Pope alone made a feeble effort to aid the Greeks in their final struggle.

It is true the Hungarians, reinforced by Christians from various countries of Europe, made a heroic attempt to stem the tide of Mahomedan invasion, but their King, Sigismund, was defeated by Bayazid, the successor of Murad. Hungary, however, continued to be the bulwark of Christendom, and finally saved Europe. The victory of Timur, the Tartar, over Bayazid granted a lease of life to the Byzantine empire. Under Mohammed I., the Ottomans soon regained their vitality, and in the reign of his successor, Murad II., we begin to hear of the glorious and immortal Hunyadi, whose victories have rendered him one of the most romantic figures of that age, though he was not always successful.

We now come to the saddest period of Byzantine and the most glorious of Ottoman history, that of the fall of Constantinople. Two figures loom up above the darkness of that awful day, when the empire of Constantine came to an end—one the victor, the other the vanquished, Mahomet II. and Constantine Paleologus. The son of Murad II. had enjoyed a most liberal education, including the knowledge of five languages. Among his virtues his sobriety was attested, but this was more than counterbalanced by his cruelty and unnatural lust. He could stoop from the heights of ambition to the basest arts of dissimulation and deceit, and while peace was on his lips war was in his heart. He was a soldier, yet he does not deserve to rank among the great conquerors of the world, for his forces were always more numerous than those of his enemies, and he frequently suffered defeat. Such is the estimate Gibbon forms of the character of Mahomet II.

Constantinople had fallen, and the echo of its fall went ringing throughout Europe, filling the hearts of Christians with consternation. Yet Christendom could not be aroused from its lethargy. The heroic age of the Crusades were a thing of the past, and the voice of Peter the Hermit was silent. The powers of the earth were too much occupied with their own selfish interests and the spirit of chivalry was dead. In vain did Nicholas V. attempt to rouse the dormant spirit; the political power of the Papacy was on the wane, and the noble-hearted Pontiff died while the Turks were menacing Christendom. In vain did the fiery Spaniard, the energetic old man, Calixtus III., on the day of his accession to the Papacy register a solemn vow that he would devote his life to the recon-

quest of Constantinople and the downfall of the Turks; in vain was the crusade preached by his order throughout all Christendom; in vain did he himself prepare armies and fleets. The masses were aroused, but the powers of the earth remained deaf. The Italian States could not agree. Alfonso of Naples evaded the difficulty by all manner of subterfuges; the empire deliberated, but did nothing. England was too much distracted by civil strife, and France positively declined to enter into the Pope's views. One country alone took part in the work, Hungary, and in that country three heroic figures stand towering above the rest as beacon lights of chivalry in a dark age. The names of Cardinal Carvajal, the Pope's Legate, the intrepid Hunyadi, and the humble friar, St. John Capistran, stand boldly inscribed in the annals of history as the champions of the Church. By their efforts, the Crusade was inaugurated, and the army of the Crusaders, hardly better equipped than those that had followed Peter the Hermit, gained the decisive victory of Belgrade, which broke the power of Mahomet II. on the continent, and hurled back the force of Mahometan invasion. Another heroic figure of this age is that of the mountaineer Skanderbeg, who for years after the downfall of Constantinople, held the Turks at bay in Albania. An attempt made by Mohammed to drive the knights out of Rhodes failed, and the following year the conqueror of Constantinople was no more.

The reign of Bayazid II. was inglorious for the Turks, but his successor, Selim I., extended the bounds of the Ottoman empire, conquered Egypt and paved the way for the reign of his son, Suleyman the Magnificent. In the beginning of his reign, Rhodes, the last bulwark of the Christians in the East, fell, and the knights capitulated on honorable terms. The year previously, Belgrade had been captured, and the way lay clear before the Turks. Hungary fell, and in 1529 Soliman and his army were before Vienna. The Ottoman empire had now reached its highest power. Had Vienna fallen, heaven only knows what the result would have been. But Divine Providence intervened, Vienna was saved, and the Sultan beat an inglorious retreat. With the death of Suleyman the long decline of the Ottoman empire began. The immortal victory gained by Don John of Austria at Lepanto over the forces of Selim II. contributed to decrease the Turkish power at sea, and the Ottomans never regained what they had lost. From the death of Murad IV., in 1640, until the beginning of the present century, the Turkish Sultans were but figureheads. The real rulers of the empire were the Grand Viziers, and one is reminded of the last days of the Merovingian dynasty. The principal wars of Turkey were now with Austria. The Poles, under John Sobieski, gained two crushing

victories over the enemies of Christendom, but the direct advantages to the Christians were slight. Once more Vienna was threatened, but the gallant Sobieski was at hand, and for a second time Vienna was saved, and to the present day we commemorate the victory of the noble King by the feast of Our Lady of the Rosary. By the peace of Passarowitz, in 1718, the Turkish frontier on the north was drawn on nearly the same line on which it remained until the Congress of Berlin.

Meanwhile Russia had appeared on the scene, and for a long time had been in occasional conflict with the Turks. Peter the Great had his eyes fixed on Constantinople, and Catherine II. continued to pursue his policy, gaining various advantages over Turkey. Again and again war broke out between Russia and Turkey, and the end is not yet. In 1808, Mahmoud II. ascended the throne and the rule of the Grand Viziers came to an end. The new Sultan found his country at war with Russia and Bonaparte at the height of his power. The latter had come into contact with the Turks as early as 1798, in the days of the Directory. Invading Egypt, he gained the battle of the Pyramids over the Mamelukes, who held the country for the Sultan, but his fleet was destroyed by Nelson at the battle of the Nile. The Sultan now declared war against the French Republic, and Bonaparte conceived the bold design of overthrowing the empire of Constantinople. His Syrian campaign was, however, a failure, and he returned defeated to Egypt, whence his troops some time later were sent back to France. At the peace of Tilsit, in 1807, a secret understanding was arrived at between Napoleon and the Russian Czar, which left Turkey to the mercy of the latter. The intrigues of Napoleon and his designs for the partition of Turkey were frustrated by Canning, the British Minister to Constantinople, who brought about peace between Russia and Turkey and the treaty of Bucharest in 1812.

Mahmoud II., when the external dangers that threatened his empire had been removed, determined to inaugurate a series of reforms and mould his government upon a European model. The all powerful body of janizaries stood in his way. For a long time they had been ruling Turkey, and like the Roman Praetorian Guard in the days of Rome's decadence, making and unmaking Sultans at their pleasure. Mahmoud determined to deal them a deathblow and exterminate them at one stroke. Their last mutiny was that of 1826. By a bold determination of the Sultan the barracks were blown up, and 40,000 janizaries perished. Never did the Sultan need an army more than at this critical juncture, for the Grecian revolution had been in progress since 1820.

This event is of supreme importance in the history of modern

Europe, as it began the dismemberment of the Turkish empire and added Greece once more, after the lapse of many centuries, to the family of European nations. Greece proper, the home of the great heroes of Hellas, became independent, although the capital of the Byzantine empire still remained in the hands of the Turk. For a brief period the Morea had been in possession of the Venetians, but it again fell into the power of the Turks, and the fate of the Greeks was worse than ever. In their distress they turned to Russia, but though the growing empire of the Czar pretended to encourage them, the aid received was more apparent than real. Meanwhile the secret society of the Hetairia began to exert a widespread influence for Hellenic freedom, and the Grecian patriots, under Prince Ipsilanti, began to invade the Danubian provinces. Russia failed to help them, and they were defeated by the Turks in 1820. The next year the rising became general. The Turkish garrison was driven from all Athens, but the Acropolis, and the Suliots rose in Albania. The Greeks were, however, defeated at Thermopylæ by an overwhelming force under Omar Pasha. In 1822, Prince Mavrocordato was elected President of the Greek Republic and the Greeks gained great successes in Albania. At sea the patriots, aided especially by their fire ships, did great execution among their enemies.

The constancy and heroism of the Greeks were reëchoed over Europe and America, and they found a response in many hearts. The cruelty of the Turks also gained friends for the cause of Greece, but, unfortunately for the latter, the Greeks too often imitated their enemies and rendered themselves guilty of acts of barbarism. Parties of young men calling themselves Philhellenes began to enlist in the cause of Grecian freedom, and an illustrious ally was obtained in the person of the English poet, Lord Byron. The mutual jealousies of the Greeks themselves and their want of discipline tended, however, to frustrate his intentions and to make him regret the step he had taken. Before he was able to effect anything in the cause of Grecian independence the poet died at Missolonghi, in 1824. Though the Greeks fought with heroic constancy, they proved to be their own greatest enemies by their internal divisions, although the English admiral, Lord Cochrane, and the English general, Church, did much to keep peace among the parties. A battle fought between General Church and Ibrahim Pasha resulted disastrously for the Greeks, the Acropolis was taken and nothing remained to the patriots but the citadel of Corinth and Naupliae. Their cause seemed hopeless, when England, France and Russia determined to intervene. A combined fleet of the three powers entered the Mediterranean, intending to treat with the Turks, but, accidentally as it were, a battle was precipitated which ended in the

destruction of the Turkish fleet. This engagement, known as the battle of Navarino, saved Greece, for Ibrahim Pasha, son of the Viceroy of Egypt, evacuated the Morea, while General Church drove the Turks back to the northern parts of Greece. The war ended with the declaration of the independence of Greece, and the establishment of the kingdom of the Hellenes under the protection of the powers, with Prince Otho of Bavaria as King.

The year after the massacre of the janizaries, the battle of Navarino was fought. Turkey was blockaded and the French helped to expel the Egyptians from the Morea. In 1828 war again broke out between Turkey and Russia, and in the Treaty of Adrianople the Sultan was forced to grant the independence of Greece.

Shortly after this event the Viceroy of Egypt, the Sultan's vassal, arose in rebellion, and pushing his conquests across Syria threatened the Bosphorus. Russia, whose vigilant eye is ever on Constantinople, intervened and saved the capital. As a recompense for its aid the Treaty of Hunkiar Iskelesi gave to the empire of the Czar the exclusive right of way through the Dardanelles.

While the war with Mehemet Ali, the Egyptian Viceroy, was in progress Mahmoud passed away, leaving Turkey to his son, Abd-ul-Medjid. Mahmoud II. may be ranked among the great successors of Ertoghrul, and perhaps he may be regarded as the greatest Sultan since Soliman the Magnificent.

The year 1841 is important in the history of Turkey, for in that year the English fleet, having taken Acre, Mohammed Ali was confined to his Egyptian possessions, under the zuzerainty of the Sultan. The latter himself became a ward of the great powers who assumed a protectorate over Turkey.

The greatest figure in Turkish history during the period which now followed was the British diplomatist Stratford Canning. No Christian ever exercised such influence over the Turks, and he succeeded in obtaining many reforms, while the Young Turkish Party was striving to bring Turkey up to the level of the Western nations.

In 1849 a warcloud passed over Turkey, when Russia and Austria demanded the extradition of the patriot Kossuth and others, which the Turks, advised by Canning, refused to grant. The English and French fleets at the entrance to the Hellespont prevented, however, an open rupture.

Five years later, the Crimean war broke out, the remote cause of which were troubles among the Christians in the East and the claim of Russia to a protectorate over the members of the Orthodox Greek Church. The direct occasion of the war was the sinking of a Turkish fleet by the Russians. This memorable conflict, which began in

March, 1854, ended with the fall of Sebastopol in September of the following year, and the Treaty of Paris in March, 1856.

In the Crimean war, Greece would have gladly sided with Russia against her old enemies, but England and France prevented her by force. The hatred of Turkey continued, however, to exist, and from time to time the ominous rumbling of the storm was heard, while the Eastern Question, like a black cloud, remained hanging over Europe. The frightful massacres of Scio or Chios and of Constantinople still rankled in the heart of every Greek, and the Armenian horrors have merely shown that Turkish ferocity is not dead and that the "tiger has not changed its skin."

In 1861, five years after the Crimean war, Abd-ul-Medjid, under whom so many important reforms had been obtained for Turkey, died. His successor, Abd-ul-Aziz, was destined to disappoint the hopes that had been conceived at his accession, for under the influence of his mother, the Valideh Sultana, Turkish corruption increased to an alarming extent and the empire was brought to a state of insolvency. His deposition and mysterious death, in 1876, placed his brother, Murad V., on the throne. The reign of the latter was shortlived, for, whether justly or unjustly, he was soon deposed as an imbecile and succeeded by his brother, Abd-ul-Hamid, the present Sultan. It is, perhaps, difficult to form a just estimate of the character of Abd-ul-Hamid, so different have been the judgments passed upon him, but it must be admitted that the massacres in Armenia and Constantinople, still fresh in our memory, have placed him in a most unenviable light. His reign from the beginning has been troubled. When he came to the throne, rebellion was rife in the Danubian principalities. The efforts at mediation made by the great powers failed, and Russia, separating from the European concert, declared war on Turkey in April, 1877. At first the Turks held their own, and even defeated the Russians in Asia. Ottoman Pasha defended Plevna with heroic resistance for five months, but, finally, the fortress fell, though it cost the Russians 50,000 men. The Turks had proved that their old vitality was not quite extinct. The Russians now crossed the Balkans, and pushed their way on to Adrianople. Only a short distance separated them from Constantinople, and the venerable city of the Byzantine Emperors was on the point of falling into the hands of the Czar. But Europe would not permit it, and the war ended with the Treaty of San Stefano, signed in March, 1878. The result of this war was a great decrease in Turkish territory.

In the last decade of the nineteenth century, a storm which for some time had been brewing burst over the Ægean Sea. The first thunderclap was heard in the Island of Crete. Again the brave

and fierce islanders were in rebellion against the Sultan. The echo of their swords' clash was wafted over the waters, and a chord of sympathy was touched in the kingdom of Greece. The Cretans wished for annexation to that kingdom, and Greece lovingly extended its arms to the sea-girt isle, longing to clasp it to its bosom. The great powers of Europe, jealous one of the other and fearful of a general conflagration, protested. Much blustering and bullying was done, and to intimidate the little Hellenic kingdom, England, France, Germany, Italy, Austria and Russia sent their ironclads to Cretan waters. But popular enthusiasm was aroused in Greece, great pressure was brought to bear upon King George, and, in spite of the protest of the powers, Colonel Vassos was sent with his little army under the escort of Prince George's little navy, and the Greek troops took possession of Crete on February 15, 1897. The sentiment which inspired this action was one of humanity, for the Greeks of the mainland feared, and justly, a repetition of the Armenian massacres on the island. Yet it must be confessed that the act in itself was implicitly a declaration of war against Turkey, and a defiance flung into the face of the Sultan. Yet we cannot but feel admiration for Greece, that alone dared face the storm and teach to egotistic Europe the broad principles of humanity, upon which the powers, absorbed in their own petty interests, had failed to stand on the occasion of the Armenian atrocities.

The powers, to coerce Greece, threatened to institute a blockade, but such was the current of events that it became unnecessary, for in the month of April the flames of war had burst forth on the northern frontier. Alas, nothing succeeds like success. Had the Grecian arms been victorious, the world would have been ringing with the praises of the heroic little kingdom. But Greece failed, and then we heard the cry of imprudence, rashness, want of preparation, misplaced enthusiasm, and so forth. What could Greece have done? By taking the first step it became necessary to take the second. The occupation of Crete was a premise, warlike preparations on the frontier a consequence, and war with Turkey the natural conclusion.

We know the sad result, which is still fresh in our memory. After the warlike agitation, of which the "Ethnike Hetairia" was the soul, and some desultory skirmishing, actual war began. The Greeks were defeated at the Milouna Pass on April 18 and 19, and then began that disgraceful retreat from Larissa, which may be described as a complete rout. Grecian successes after this were few and unimportant, while the Turks followed up a series of victories, which might have resulted in a complete annihilation of Greece, had not the opportune armistice intervened.

We may now philosophize on this disastrous outcome of the war. We have already disposed of the question as to the rash conduct of Greece. It may now be asked, to whom is the blame to be attached? Who stands accused before the public, the King, the commander-in-chief of the army, or the army itself? It cannot be denied that things looked rather dark for Greece. The Hellenes rushed into war with flying colors amid the greatest enthusiasm, and they rushed out of it with still greater haste. Yet, laying aside all passion and prejudice, we may come to the conclusion that Greece is not culpable, and that the blame is to be attached rather to the Greek character, their want of organization, and to the force of circumstances. I think it is generally admitted that King George of Greece during his reign, a period of more than forty years, has satisfactorily acquitted himself of his duties. In the difficult position in which he was placed he did not shrink from the task before him. Toward the powers he was not defiant, yet, on the other hand, he gave no evidence of cowardice. His was a most trying position, placed as he was between Scylla and Charibdis, the European concert on the one hand, and the Greek people on the other. To reconcile them was impossible, and every impartial judge will admit that his action was the only one consistent with the safety of his dynasty, and perhaps the dictates of humanity.

Exception may, perhaps, reasonably be taken to the appointment of Prince Constantine as commander-in-chief. I doubt whether he possessed the necessary qualifications for such an important position, when the welfare of a nation was at stake, and certainly the result of the war did not place his generalship in a very favorable light.

The greatest cause of the failure of Grecian arms must finally be sought for in the Greek character, and in the poverty of their resources as compared with the Turks. The Greek is not a coward; this he has proved in many instances in his history, and though the blood which now courses in the veins of the modern Greek may no longer be the pure blood of the heroes of Marathon and Thermopylæ, yet there is enough of it left to fill him with the spirit of his ancestors, although centuries of oppression have not failed to leave their mark. The greatest defect of the modern Greek, from a military standpoint, lies in his individuality. He is brave, enthusiastic, romantic, but the spirit of the modern army, the spirit of drudgery, of discipline, in a word, the spirit of the machine is alien to him. He makes a splendid guerilla fighter, he can stand any amount of fatigue, he can swoop down with irresistible force upon an enemy from his rocky fastnesses, and pick him off from his ambuscades, but the stern monotony of that iron system called the

modern army is not in accordance with his character. Herein, I think, lies the reason why the Greeks were unable to cope with their better disciplined enemy, the Turks.

The form of Turkish government, until quite recently, was one of Oriental despotism. Supreme head of Church and State, the Ottoman Sultan was an absolute and irresponsible sovereign, whose power was limited only by the commandments of the Koran. Two subordinate officers aided him in his administration—the Grand Vizier, who was his lieutenant in the temporal administration of the empire, and the Mufti, who took his place in matters connected with religion and law. Since the reforms inaugurated in the present century, the Sultan had also his Cabinet of Ministers, which, however, was subject to his constant control. The Reis Effendi was Chief Secretary of State. The successor to the throne is the Sultan's oldest male relative. His brothers were generally kept secluded in the palace.

The Turkish empire is divided into a number of provinces styled Vilayets, each being under a governor general, with the title of Wali. At the head of the judiciary stands the Sheik-ul-Islam, or elder of Islam, whose duty it is to interpret the laws according to the precepts of the Koran. He is to be consulted in all important matters of state. The Nobles or Sherifs are the recognized descendants of Mohammed in the Turkish empire.

Nicholas I. called Turkey the Sick Man, yet it may not be quite so sick as the outer world is inclined to imagine, and, as the Greeks learned in their last war, to their great discomfiture. In the many wars waged by Turkey in the present century, when not taken at a disadvantage, as in the period which followed the massacre of the janizaries, Turkey has given cause for reflection to the rest of Europe. Our old enemy may appear to be dying, but there is sometimes much vitality left in a dying lion. It must be remembered that Asia Minor is the recruiting ground of the Turks; that the Asiatic hordes are still available for the service of the Crescent, and that the voice of the Sheik-ul-Islam may still summon the Mahommedan world to arms and rally it around the standard of the Prophet. It is, also, important to note that the Turks have had in their pay German officers and that the German army ranks high for military discipline. There are several military colleges in Turkey with a commendable curriculum of studies. The army consists of the standing army, the reserves, the levée en masse and the auxiliary troops. The standing army, divided into several corps, is scattered over European Turkey and the Asiatic dominions, from Constantinople to Arabia. The auxiliary forces are, perhaps, the most dreaded of the Turkish military system. They are formed of

the bashi-bazouks and various contingents from the barbarous tribes of Asia, such as the Kurds and the Arabs. These tribes are commanded by their own chiefs, who have unlimited power over their men.

At the period of the last Russian war the Turkish forces on a war footing consisted of 666,530 men, 51,009 horses, with 624 guns, a force not to be contemned. The regular army is recruited from the Mussulman population by conscription.

Since the war with Russia, it appears that the Turkish navy has considerably declined. The Turks seem to have entirely neglected it, and in the recent struggle with Greece it did not figure at all.

The Sultan is the supreme head of the land and naval forces, and next to him comes the Grand Vizier. The Minister of War, or Seraskier, directs the various services.

When we compare the present dimensions of Turkey with its frontiers in the days of its power we cannot but feel that the end is approaching. In its old extent, the empire consisted of European Turkey and the Danubian principalities, Greece and the islands, the Crimea and a portion of southern Russia, Asia Minor to the borders of Persia, Egypt, Syria, Tripoli, Tunis, Algiers and Arabia, or about 2,000,000 square miles. After the war with Russia this territory had dwindled down to 680,000 square miles, with a population of about 16,000,000.

Such is the synopsis of Turkish and Grecian history, exclusively of recent events, the consideration of which I reserve. I may now be permitted to retrace my steps for a better understanding of the Eastern question, which seems to resolve itself into this: "What is to be done with Turkey?"

When the Western empire of Rome had at last fallen under the repeated blows of the barbarians, new States arose upon its ruins, and a new order of things slowly came forth from chaos. The Eastern empire continued its existence for several centuries, but in the West the Ostrogoths, Visigoths, Lombards, Celts, Franks, Anglo-Saxons and Slavonians began to settle into the condition which has brought forth our modern nations. In the East, again, a new power arose, Mahommedanism, which for a time threatened Christian civilization, while by the empire of Charlemagne the Christian nations of the West were brought into closer relationship. Out of Charlemagne's empire grew Germany, France and Italy. The ruler of Germany was also King of Italy and Emperor of the West. During the greater part of the Middle Ages, the feudal system held sway and the King's power was greatly limited by that of the powerful barons around the throne. There were no standing armies, and the monarchs depended almost entirely on the loyalty of their vassals.

The nation was, as it were, a system of confederated principalities, of which the King was the head. Relations among States were fewer than they afterwards became, but the appeal to the sword was more frequent. The Pope grew to be the central figure in international politics. In the twelfth century, the movement began which drew the nations of Western Europe closer together. The existence of a common enemy caused them to lay aside for a time their mutual enmities and to unite against Mahomedanism in the East. Thus the Christian nations were brought into closer relationship, commerce obtained a new development, and the ideas of men were broadened. The sale of old feudal estates began the downfall of feudalism; nations became accustomed to large armies, and the power of the King began to increase.

International marriages, which we find in Europe as early as the period of the Merovingian dynasty, increased as time went on and contributed one of the many sources of complications. Towards the close of the Middle Ages, feudalism fell, standing armies were created, the military arm was strengthened and a wave of absolutism swept over Europe. At the same time, the old Roman Empire passed from history at the downfall of Constantinople. Contemporary with this event we have to record the intellectual awakening of Europe known as the Renaissance, which turned the minds of men to the study of the classical works of antiquity, and produced the observation of natural phenomena from which modern science was born. Two events came now to assist this intellectual movement, and bring the nations into still closer relationship either of peace or of war. I mean the printing press, and the discovery of America. By means of the former, knowledge became universally diffused, and the discoveries of one nation in any department of human wisdom became the common property of the race. The discovery of America enlarged the horizon of men's vision, and afforded a new field of operations upon which the great maritime nations of the world—Portugal, Spain, France, England and Holland—began to display their energies. The constant contact into which they were thus brought necessitated more systematic relations; diplomacy became a science, and we begin to hear of resident ambassadors at the various courts. The affairs of one nation began to exercise a greater influence on those of its neighbors in proportion to the greater international relations which now existed. States looked with interest upon events that did not directly concern them, but the reaction of which they might feel. Thus did William III. of England become implicated in the wars of the Spanish succession, and the influence of the sea-girt isle of Albion made itself strongly felt in continental affairs.

We begin now also to hear of the balance of power. The central-

ization of national power in the monarch might easily endanger the peace of the world by raising one sovereign at the expense of others. Such has often been the case in the world's history, and it was witnessed when our century dawned with the star of Bonaparte in the ascendancy. The policy of the balance of power aimed at an equal distribution of force by means of alliances, treaties and congresses, in order that no State should have a preponderating influence over the others.

This balance of power became greatly disturbed at the great upheaval of the French Revolution, in which democracy gained a bloody triumph over absolutism, to yield in its turn to the passing despotism of Bonaparte. At Waterloo, the star of the modern Alexander set, to rise no more, and the man before whom Europe had been crouching found himself a prisoner at St. Helena. The Congress of Vienna that followed became the dividing line between the past and the present. It rearranged the States of Europe upon a new basis. Shortly before this, the Holy Alliance had been signed at Paris by Russia, Austria and Prussia, and subsequently nearly all the sovereigns of Europe joined it. Though originated by Alexander I., influenced by Madame de Krüdener, as a means of strengthening the Christian bond amongst the nations of the earth, it soon degenerated and became the weapon of absolutism against democracy. Metternich grew to be its leading spirit.

We may probably date from this period the enormous rise of plutocracy which this century has witnessed. Although ever since money has been used as a medium of exchange, it has exercised immense power over men, and the great usurers of the Middle Ages were personages to be feared, yet history has never witnessed such an accumulation of wealth in the hands of a few men and the power connected with this wealth. Until the great impulse given to trade by the maritime discoveries of the sixteenth century, nations had been accustomed to look to their own internal resources. It is true, that the Crusades had paved the way, yet foreign commerce remained for a long time the monopoly of a few cities. With the increase of foreign trade, manufacturing industry began to flourish, more capital was needed and more capital was accumulated, while with the downfall of feudalism and the increasing expenses of the concentrated government of nations, more money was required in the royal treasuries.

The earlier rulers had been accustomed to apply to their faithful subjects for aid, and not always by gentle means. This system might be kept up as long as the needs were comparatively small and as long as absolutism lasted, but with the increasing power of the people it became impossible. In Holland autocracy had been over-

thrown, and in England the Commons gained the ascendancy. From this period we begin to hear of a national debt, of which William III. of England may be called the originator. The French Revolution could only emphasize the principle thus brought into politics, and the money lenders became thus a power not to be overlooked. At the Congress of Vienna, the Rothschilds, the great financiers of modern times, were rising and their influence has remained to the present day. They are the power behind the throne. As early as 1804, Mayer Anselm Rothschild had begun to lend money to States, Denmark being one of the first to profit by his financial aid. Between 1815 and 1830, the Rothschilds had lent nearly one thousand million thalers to England, Russia, Austria, France and Prussia.

We now come more specially to our predominant subject—Turkey. The Eastern question may be said to date from the fall of Constantinople. At first a menace, the Turks were gradually admitted to the family of European nations, and to-day they are an incubus with which no one seems to know what to do. Perhaps the greatest factor in Eastern politics is Russia. Since the days of Peter the Great, the empire of the Czar has had its eyes on Constantinople, and its agents have been actively engaged abroad in promoting Russian interests.

The day when Constantinople falls into the hands of Russia, as it finally may, the world will be revolutionized. Constantinople, the key to the Orient, will become the European mart, and Asia, with its resources, will be opened up by means of a well developed railroad system to commerce and Western civilization. England, whose dominion stretches over a great portion of the Asiatic continent, and who thus far, by means of the Suez Canal, has held undisputed possession of the far East, naturally looks with a jealous eye upon these ambitions of Russia, and the rivalry between these two great powers is a clue to the understanding of the Eastern question.

The Crimean war brought the two powers into conflict. For a long time, France had been regarded as the protector of the Latin Christians in Palestine. This privilege had been accorded her by the Sultan as early as the days of Francis I., and to France was also granted the privilege of protecting the holy places in Palestine. On the other hand, in spite of this agreement with France, the Greek Church also obtained concessions, and the Greeks finally claimed as much right to take care of the Palestine sanctuaries as the Latins. Disputes arose in consequence, and, of course, France sided with the Latins, while Russia stood up for its coreligionists. Besides, Russia, extending the meaning of a clause of the Treaty of Kuchuk Kainarja, signed in 1774 between Catherine II. and the Ottoman Porte, claimed a protectorate over all the Christians of the Greek

Church in Turkey. This claim was, however, not admitted by Turkey nor by the other powers. The dispute regarding the holy places of Palestine was easily settled, as the Turk did not care one way or the other, but on the second matter Turkey held its ground. Russia invaded the Danubian principalities; the Crimean war was the result. Since 1841, Turkey had been under the tutelage of the great powers. At the Crimean war the great powers separated, France and England espousing the side of Turkey against Russia. The result of this war was the Treaty of Paris. The provisions of this treaty guaranteed the independence and integrity of the Ottoman empire, abolished the Russian protectorate over the Danubian principalities and Servia, which had existed for a long time, destroyed the Russian monopoly over the Black Sea, which was opened to merchant ships of all nations, and closed the Bosphorus and Dardanelles to foreign ships of war, while the Porte should be at peace. The powers pledged themselves not to meddle in the internal affairs of Turkey, and the Sultan promised reforms in his administration and a better treatment of his Christian subjects. Russia had thus been the loser, but it was only for a time, for when in 1870, France had been crippled by her war with Germany, the vital part of the treaty concerning the neutrality of the Black Sea was repudiated by the Czar, and in 1871 Mr. Gladstone's government consented to this breach of good faith.

Shortly after the Crimean war, it may be said that the disintegration of the Turkish empire began, in spite of the Treaty of Paris, which had guaranteed its integrity. In 1858 Moldavia and Wallachia became practically independent. United as Roumania, they obtained a hereditary prince in 1866. In 1874 Herzegovina rose in revolt and Bulgaria attempted to shake off the yoke in 1876. The Bulgarian massacres were the result, and in 1877 Russia declared war against Turkey. England would not permit her to occupy Constantinople if, indeed, she had intended to do so, and the Treaty of San Stefano was signed.

In virtue of this treaty, the Christian provinces obtained almost complete independence of Turkey and a new Bulgarian State was to be created, with a seaport on the Ægean Sea. England refused to recognize the treaty, and the Congress of Berlin met. The two great English statesmen and rivals were at variance on the Eastern question. Disraeli, Lord Beaconsfield, was for supporting Turkey at all hazards as a bulwark against Russia. Mr. Gladstone maintained that it was the duty of England not to stand sponsor for the crimes of Turkey. The one occupied the selfish, utilitarian standpoint of political economy, the other stood on the broad platform of humanitarian principles. Such was the division of sentiments at

the Congress of Berlin. Jealousy of Russia prompted the one side, disgust with the atrocities of the Turks the other. Had the policy of Mr. Gladstone been adhered to, the Bulgarian atrocities would never have been followed by the Armenian and Constantinopolitan massacres.

When the dogs of Europe gathered around the Turkish bone at the Berlin Congress the pledges of 1856 were forgotten and the hollow name of "Integrity of the Turkish Empire" was thrown to the winds. There was a great scramble for the spoils, and England, as usually, did not come out last in the race. Servia, Montenegro and Roumania were declared independent. Bulgaria was divided into two portions, one autonomous, the other governed by Turkey. Thessaly was given to Greece, but that part of the treaty was not at once put into execution. Russia retained her recent conquests in Asia, and regained the strip of Bessarabia she had lost in 1856. England could not refuse the choice morsel which Turkey offered her in reward for her kindness in saving a life that had been on the point of being extinguished. Cyprus was the reward for her activity, which she was to hold in fee of the Sultan and for which she was to pay tribute. At the same time she was to assume a protectorate over the Asiatic dominions of the Sultan. This was the "peace with honor" of Lord Beaconsfield.

The Armenian massacres are not the first with which Turkey has stained its hands in this century. In 1821, in the reign of Mahmoud II., because a Greek captain had plotted to murder the Sultan and begin a revolt of the Greeks in Constantinople, thousands of Christian families were slain in that city. The Patriarch of Constantinople was barbarously put to death and massacres began throughout Turkey. The massacre of Chios or Scio alone should suffice to show what tigers the Turks are when aroused. Because two Greek captains chose to attack a Turkish garrison, dire vengeance was taken on the peaceful island that had not meddled at all with the war. The Turks killed the Greeks without mercy. Men, women and children were indiscriminately put to death. Forty thousand people were carried off into captivity, the rest being nearly all killed. Out of a population of 120,000 Christians the Turks left only 1,800 on the island.

Of what epoch is this event recorded? Does it belong to the conquests of Zingis or the inroads of the Huns? Alas, it is an occurrence of the century that gave us birth! But then it occurred in a period of war when passions were dreadfully inflamed; it belonged to the beginning of the century when the horrors of the French Revolution were still fresh in the minds of men. Such things can never occur again. Vain illusion! What did Bulgaria

witness in 1876, when the Kurds and bashi-bazouks were let loose upon the defenseless inhabitants? What has Armenia, what has Constantinople, still reeking with the blood of its most industrious inhabitants, witnessed in the old age of the preceding century?

The insurrection in Crete in 1896 was the ninth since 1669, when the island fell into the hands of the Turks. It is generally admitted, wrote Mr. Botassi in the *North American Review,* that Crete has been always one of the worst governed provinces of Turkey. The Turks at various times promised reforms, but the promises remained a dead letter, and in July, 1896, hostilities broke out between the Mussulmans and Christians. Had it not been for the intervention of the powers Crete would probably have been freed. The so-called European concert, which was really European jealousy, stood as a barrier to the liberty of the struggling island. Europe feared that if Crete became part of the Grecian monarchy other Turkish provinces might follow its example, and thus the Eastern question might be reopened.

There are those who behold another influence at work in the European concert to preserve the so-called integrity of the Turkish empire. I mean that of the moneyed powers of the world. We have seen how this force has gradually increased, especially in our times. There can be no doubt that to-day it is indeed a power behind the throne. It is well known that in the first half of the century Baron Anselm Mayer Rothschild in Frankfort controlled the money market, while the London firm of the same family wielded also an omnipotent influence. Anselm Mayer was truly king of finance, while the other banking houses were his vassals. Nathan Mayer Rothschild in England beheld the representatives of nearly all the States of Europe proud of his friendship, and the wealth of the whole Rothschild family was consolidated by intermarriage. To enter into the details of the Rothschild business would be to give the financial history of Europe during a great part of the century. Together with the Rothschilds numerous powerful banking houses have risen into power, and to-day a complicated net of finance encircles the earth. Governments that cannot carry on their operations without immense sums of money are to some extent at the mercy of these powers.

You may ask, what had this to do with the Turkish question? Well, Turkey was in debt. If the empire had fallen, who would have been responsible for this debt? This is something the creditors would like to know. The money power is a compact organization; it wields immense influence. May not this influence be wielded to uphold Turkey?

What was the secret of the Greek reverses in 1897? Was external

influence brought to bear on Greece? Was the war manipulated? Was some secret foreign influence active in Greece? Some seem to think so. I know not. For myself, I prefer to behold in the Greek disasters neither intrigue nor treachery, but the natural result of a lack of generalship and organization on the part of the Greeks. As for the integrity of the Turkish empire, it is merely a fiction, as Mr. Botassi pointed out some years ago in the *North American Review*—a fiction upheld by the mutual jealousy of the powers and by the moneyed interests of the world.

CHARLES WARREN CURRIER.

Washington, D. C.