

WEILER BROS.
Home Furnishers Since '62

Beds

**Substantial
Plain
Massive
Elegant**
—and little priced.

ed at \$30

etter than they used
elegant—little useless
like these styles and

ffer are interesting—
or less than you can

it should. Let us
s, priced at \$30.

O \$120

Dresser and Stand
Mahogany finished—\$25.00

or \$25 this is an ex-
cellent value. Dresser
has two large and two
small drawers, oval
bevel plate mirror.
Nicely finished in ma-
hogany finish. Stand
to match. The two
pieces priced at only
\$25

This is just a sample
from a big stock of low-
priced bedroom furni-
ture items to be found
ere. Easy to have your
bedroom comfortably
furnished from this
stock.

Kind Now



an expert staff of

ASES—Big choice of de-
cor. Priced at per yard
40¢
ES—Some new patterns
designs, 52 inches wide
75¢

At This Shop



**FURNISHERS
of
HOMES
CLUBS**



RICHIEU

The name of Richelieu holds a prominent place in the history of France and Europe. Armand Jean DuPlessis, Duc de Richelieu and a cardinal, was born in Paris on September 5, 1585. He was of good family, and his brother was Bishop of Lucon. Armand was intended for the army and was educated for that purpose, but foreseeing that the bishopric held by his brother was likely soon to become vacant, he directed his attention to theology, and when the Bishop retired in 1606, the youthful prelate was appointed to the position and formally consecrated in the presence of the Pope. That he should have been selected for such a post when not twenty-one years of age shows the abilities of the man as nothing else could. Conceding as much as one may choose to political and other influences, there is no reasonable probability that the Pope would have consented to his consecration if he had not been satisfied of his great talents. His conduct attested the wisdom of his appointment. He administered his diocese with consummate skill, and as a preacher he had few, if any, equals. For eight years he appears to have devoted himself closely to his episcopal duties, but in 1614, when he was twenty-nine years of age, he attended the States-General as a representative of the clergy, and an address delivered in the presence of the youthful King, Louis XIII., so attracted the notice of the Queen-mother, Maria de Medici, that he was invited to enter into the service of the State as Secretary for War and Foreign Affairs. The favorite minister of the King was De Luynes, and he was jealous of his rival, so that Richelieu was compelled to retire temporarily to his bishopric. Meanwhile the country was overwhelmed in confusion owing to the persecutions of the Huguenots, and the prestige of France was suffering greatly by the growing ascendancy of Austria. When things looked very dark and De Luynes had died, the King was persuaded to recall Richelieu to the council, and he was created a cardinal. This was in 1624, so that in his thirty-ninth year the sagacious prelate became the virtual ruler of France.

His first step of importance was to establish friendly relations with England, and this he accomplished by arranging a marriage between the King's sister and the Prince of Wales, afterwards Charles I. Richelieu seems to have been almost wholly without religious prejudices, and he dealt with the Huguenots not as a religious sect, but as a political organization. Many of the proudest nobles of France were Huguenots, and they had the sympathy of Spain and Austria, both strong Catholic powers, who saw in their influence a means whereby France could be torn asunder by internal dissensions, and of England which was naturally inclined towards Protestantism, and lent a willing ear to Buckingham, minister of Charles I., who believed he saw in the espousal of the Huguenot cause a means of making himself politically strong. The Huguenots declared La Rochelle their headquarters and openly declared war against France. Richelieu's sagacious eye perceived that once this town was taken, the end of the rebellion was assured, and therefore he caused siege to be made, which was continued for fourteen months. In the end it was successful, and the cardinal-minister had the wisdom to conciliate rather than punish the rebels.

Richelieu's first success outside of France was in Piedmont, where he completely overthrew the combined forces of Spain and Austria. He was at this time carrying on a remarkable campaign. He was opposing the Protestants at home, and was encouraging them in Germany. He recognized that, with France divided on a religious question, it could not possibly become strong; and he realized that by strengthening the hands of the Lutherans, he curbed the power of Austria. His plans suffered a temporary check through the serious nature of the problem presented by the Huguenots; but after the capture of La Rochelle, he felt free to act.

The liberty of action came none too soon. Austria was gaining in power with tremendous rapidity. Wallenstein was driving the Protestant princes before him. Spain had recovered from the effects of defeat in Piedmont, Italy was in a hostile mood, and everything seemed to indicate that the hour of France's degradation and of Austria's supremacy was at hand. Then the genius of Richelieu shone out resplendent. He checked the efforts of Spain; he conducted a brilliant and highly successful campaign in Italy, and he organized the principalities of northern Germany to resist the aggressions of Austria; he effected an alliance with Gustavus Adolphus of Sweden, and aided by Capuchin Father Joseph, who throughout his career was his one confidential and trusted adviser, he inspired the Catholic German princes with jealousy of the Austrian emperor and compelled the removal of Wallenstein from the command of the Austrian forces. We have seen in the sketch of the career of Gustavus Adolphus how the plans of Richelieu succeeded and Northern Germany became permanently Protestant, and it seems a very notable thing that such a consummation was due in very large measure to a Roman Catholic statesman, who was a cardinal of that church.

Though Richelieu was so successful abroad he was not without enemies at home, and at one time his influence seemed likely to be overthrown by a court intrigue. Many

of the great nobles thought that the Cardinal was the virtual king of France, and they plotted to overthrow him, with the full sanction of the Queen-Mother. Civil war broke out, but the Cardinal was equal to the emergency. He placed himself unreservedly in the hands of the King, who in return gave him care blanche; but Richelieu was too sagacious to abuse his great power, and while he promptly subdued every sign of insurrection, he did so in a manner that left as little bitterness as possible in the minds of his opponents. At this period of his career he was created a duke. Shortly after Gustavus Adolphus was slain in battle, and his death left the way clear for the Cardinal to shape the destiny of Europe. In 1634 he renewed the alliance of France with Sweden and the German Lutherans and persuaded the Dutch to take the field against Spain. Then followed a brilliant series of campaigns, which ended with the policy of the Cardinal triumphant, with Spain and Austria weakened, and the ambition of the latter effectually blocked by the Protestant princes in the north, and France easily the dominant power in continental Europe. Richelieu died in 1642 in the height of his career and only fifty-seven years of age.

What France owes to this great man cannot easily be measured. It has been said of him that he was practically the creator of France, as we understand that term today. At the same time he was in a sense responsible for many of the calamities which overwhelmed his country in after years. He was the very incarnation of absolutism. His overthrow of the Huguenots, while essential to his plans, proved in the end a great source of weakness, for it deprived the nation of that independence of political life, which otherwise would have held in check that absolute autocrat, Louis XIV. He gave France glory and prestige; but he robbed her of independence of thought, enormously increased the burdens of the people and abnormally added to the powers of the King. While Richelieu was alive to administer these vast powers with prudence and sagacity, all went well; but when he died, and the power passed into the hands of Louis, who delighted to be regarded as le grand monarque, disaster was ensured. Richelieu was absolutely devoted to his country. It has been said of him that all men admired but none loved him; that he thought nothing of the people but everything of the state, and that his idea of the state was the concentration in the hands of one man absolute power to deal with the persons and purses of all the others. There is no doubt that he found France on the verge of anarchy; but there is also no doubt that in placing her upon a firm foundation, he went too far in the other direction and sowed the seeds of even worse confusion. Few men have been the subject of more discussion than he. Of one thing all his biographers seem convinced, namely that he was utterly unscrupulous; on the other hand all concede that he employed none of his powers for his personal ends, except so far as the retention of office for the sake of his policies may be called personal. He has been made to say: "I venture on nothing without first thinking it out; but once decided, I go straight to my point, overthrow or cut down whatever stands in my way, and finally cover it with my cardinal's red robe." Whether or not he ever said these words, they not unfairly represent his character. He was much interested in literature, and was himself an author of some merit. It is said of him that his chief wish was to become known to fame as a great writer, but his efforts in this direction were not conspicuously successful. What they might have been, if he had not been so deeply immersed in affairs of state, must remain a matter of surmise. He was certainly one of the most picturesque figures in European history, one of the most skillful of all diplomats, one of the ablest of councillors and an undoubted patriot.

THE ORIGIN OF ETHICS

If a man were cast alone upon an uninhabited island, could he commit what we call a sin? It is not worth while attempting to answer this question, and it is propounded only as introductory to the statement that if a second man should come upon the island, there would arise an immediate possibility of wrongdoing. In the case of Robinson Crusoe, his life was not only blameless, when he was alone on his island, but the very possibility of his doing wrong was, to say the least, exceedingly remote; but when Friday appeared on the scene, there at once arose a distinction between right and wrong. To the solitary man everything that he could do was right; to the man with a companion some of the things that he might wish to do would be wrong. It is hardly necessary to make an argument to establish that proposition. Hence we reach the fundamental proposition that the test of wrong is the effect of an act upon others, and from this there is logically deducible the Golden Rule, that we should do unto others as we would have them do unto us. In other words, this great principle of human action is the logical consequence of natural conditions, a principle that humanity would itself evolve from the exigencies of mankind. Therefore if we claim that Christianity, as a practical religion, is founded upon the Golden Rule, we must admit that its basis would, under normal conditions, be evolved from the very necessities of organized society.

Often one hears asked some such question

as this: Why is such and such a thing, which seems perfectly natural, regarded as wrong? The answer seems to be that everything is wrong which tends to interfere with life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness by others. If one takes the trouble to apply this principle to the ordinary acts of men, it will be readily seen to forbid the doing of the things forbidden in the Ten Commandments. The moral law, so-called, is thus shown to be natural law, and thus we see how it has come about that in all the great religious systems the fundamental ethical principles are the same. For example, we find the same principles as are contained in the Golden Rule laid down by Buddha, Zoroaster, Confucius and others. No inspiration was needed to demonstrate to mankind that regard for others was right and disregard for others wrong. The respect wherein Christianity, as a rule of conduct, seems to differ from natural religion, is that it enjoins the active principle of love, namely, the doing of good to others simply for the sake of doing good; which is vastly different from forbearing to do injury to others. The latter is the law of human existence; the former is the consummation, or the fulfilling of this law. It takes the natural law and rounds it out full, substituting for forbearance through fear a spirit of altruism based upon an active appreciation of the principle that we owe our neighbors more than a mere recognition of their rights. The latter contains no incentive to spiritual progress; the former does. When once we begin to recognize that we owe a positive duty to those around us, spiritual progress becomes possible.

Some people talk as though the Ten Commandments were the foundation of the moral law; and as if, before their promulgation on Mount Sinai, men were at liberty to do as they pleased; but there were codes of ethics before Moses led the Children of Israel out of Egypt, and men had evolved the rules of right and wrong out of the necessities of human existence. The idea that wrongdoing is a transgression of a divine law, to be followed by punishment in another life, is a comparatively modern invention. This is not to say that it is not correct, for that is neither here nor there for the purposes of this article, the object of which is to show that the distinction between right and wrong rests upon no fable, as some may call the Mosaic story, nor upon inspired narrative, as others may regard it, but upon the absolute necessity of the race. Let us go back to the case of Crusoe and Friday. If each of these men had not recognized the rights of the other, strife would have arisen between them and one or both would doubtless have perished. And so we may say the whole human family. We have no evidence of the existence of a time when respect for the rights of others had not been developed. It is true that the Icelandic poems, in telling the story of Ragnarok say that "brother" made war on brother, and all the earth was filled with anguish. Conceding if we may, that man lived before the Glacial Period, it is easily conceivable that in the strife for existence during that age there could have been no place for altruism. If we give imagination a little rein we will realize that under such conditions as must then have existed there must have been a ceaseless struggle during which men would have been brutalized, beyond anything of which we can now form any estimate. Might surely have been right, for regard for the interests of others could have little part in the minds of those who were fighting in the face of death for some means of preserving a miserable life. So if we are justified in accepting the theory that mankind lived before the Ice Age and survived it, in view of the fact that this Age was many centuries long, we seem driven to the conclusion that humanity would emerge from it on a plane immeasurably inferior to that occupied by the lowest type of the race today. Assuming this to have been the case, it is easy to see how as conditions improved, or as men became accustomed to their awful privations, there would arise the conception of property in things, defended at first by pure force, and coming after many years, perhaps many generations, to be recognized as something to be respected. There is absolutely no necessity of supposing an external influence of any kind to account for the development of organized society and regard for the rights of others. These would come about of themselves through the operation of the fundamental law of self-preservation. Humanity of itself would determine that certain things were right and certain other things wrong, and the test would not be whether the act was in conformity with or an infraction of some divine law, but solely if it were opposed to those rules which the common consent of mankind had determined were necessary for the preservation of society. To violate these rules would be to sin against ourselves and our fellows.

We have seen in previous articles that civilization dates back at least twelve thousand years. The remains of ancient structures prove conclusively that ten thousand years before the birth of Christ a certain degree of progress had been made, a progress not wholly like that which we have today, but apparently in some respects greater. It is said that upon ancient clay tablets unearthed in Babylonian ruins, have been found not only the same rules as are laid down in the Ten Commandments, but a form of supplication similar in all essential particulars to the Lord's Prayer. As it is not proposed to consider herein the development of religion and the conception of a Supreme Deity, no reference will be made to this an-

cient form of supplication. The interesting thing to know is that centuries before Moses was born a code of laws, similar to those which he promulgated among the Children of Israel, was recognized as of authority. Other ancient codes have been discovered. To the Code of Manu millions of men through many centuries have referred for authority in respect to human action. Traditions assigning these codes to divine origin are many, but there seems to be no reason to assume that they would not have been evolved through human necessity.

What is said herein has no bearing upon the nature of religion, but it does suggest why it is that throughout all the world the code of ethics is much the same. It shows why all the great world teachers have laid stress upon the principles of the Golden Rule as the surest guide to human happiness. It shows that the man, who willfully transgresses what we call the moral law, is sinning against himself and all his fellows; is setting at naught all the lessons learned by mankind in all the ages that have passed.

The Birth of the Nations

XXXIV.
(N. de Bertrand Lugan)

THE BRITISH

IV.—The Conquest of the Normans

The life of William the Norman has been dealt with in these pages, and the Battle of Hastings, the result of which made him Conqueror of England has been described. It only remains to take a brief look at the country under the new order of monarchs before dismissing the interesting subject of the early peopling of Britain.

Up to the time of the Norman conquest there had been no real national union in England. There had been great kings, but even in Aelfred's time the country was more or less disturbed by tribal jealousies. It was only when Englishmen felt the pressure of a foreign yoke that a mutual sympathy was to unite them, and petty jealousies and difficulties between the different provinces were to be thrust into lasting oblivion, before the dignity of a great calamity, that threatened their freedom for all time. For a hundred and fifty years England was to be ruled by foreign kings from Normandy and Anjou and during that time the people were to learn severe lessons at the cost of much suffering. Nevertheless the lessons were a necessary discipline, to a certain extent, to ensure the good results that we see in England today. "The wrong that had been done by the degradation of the free landowners into a feudal dependency was partially redressed by the degradation of the bulk of the English lords themselves into a middle-class as they were pushed from their place by the foreign baronage who settled on English soil; and this social change was accompanied by a gradual enrichment and elevation of the class of servile and semi-servile cultivators which had lifted them at the close of this period into almost complete freedom. The middle-class, which was thus created, was reinforced by the upgrowth of a corresponding class in our towns." The rule of the foreign kings was just for the most part, and they gave every encouragement to trade and commerce, which enhanced the political importance of the merchant. At the beginning of this period of foreign rule the country was dotted all over with small villages, which, under the new regime, were to grow into rich and prosperous boroughs, able to buy their liberty from the crown at the end of a few generations. England was moreover brought into closer touch with the continent to the enrichment of science and art and a stimulus to intellectual endeavor. The very bitterness of the suffering of the people under the foreign oppression made them look to a higher power for consolation and guidance, and their religion became a necessary and a vital thing.

The new times brought many noteworthy men to England, and among those whose lofty example was to do much towards elevating the people was Anselm, the famous primate. Anselm was an Italian by birth. He had grown up amid the solitude of the Alpine Hills, and devoted his youth to philosophical study. Prior to his crossing to England to take up an enforced residence there, he had been abbot at Bec, which under his intellectual and moral influence had become the first seat of learning in Europe. William Rufus was king of England, and when the abbot came over on business with the convent lands, he detained him under one pretext or another for a year. The detention amounted almost to imprisonment, but at the end of that time William, having been seized with an illness, and fearful lest his death would ensue, called the abbot to his bedside and endeavored to make amends for his extraordinary treatment by offering to appoint him archbishop of Canterbury. There is a story connected with these incidents which give them some flavor of excuse, but it is too long to tell here. At all events Anselm had no desire whatever to remain in England, and the dignity of Archbishop was literally forced upon him. Finding himself powerless to do otherwise, he accepted the position with as much grace as possible, and it was during his tenure of office that he married Matilda to Henry I., and thereby hangs a romance.

When Henry had assumed the sovereignty of the country he did all in his power to win the allegiance and love of the people he was to rule. He granted them a charter, the precedent of the Great Charter of John, in which the rights of the people were recognized to a limited extent, the barons were made to deal justly with their under-tenants, and to make no further tyrannical demands upon them, as they had been privileged to do in the Conqueror's time. The King promised to restore order and, in so far as it was possible, the old constitution of the realm, but more than all this, he determined to make an alliance that would give him lasting popularity.

Matilda was the daughter of King Malcolm of Scotland and Margaret, the sister of Aedgar Aetheling. She it was whom King Henry desired to wed; but Matilda had been brought up in a convent by her Aunt Christina, its abbess, and had already taken the veil when the King asked her hand in marriage. The girl was young, beautiful and romantic, and desired with all her heart to marry her royal suitor; so Henry appealed to Anselm, the archbishop, to help them in their difficulty. Matilda was called before his court to make her plea.

She had been forced to take the veil, she asserted, for from her earliest infancy she had stood in pitiful fear of her aunt.

"But oh!" she cried passionately, "it has no religious significance for me, and I only wore it when in her presence; her very look inspired me with a dread I could not overcome, and I felt I must obey, or seem to obey. As soon as I could get out of her sight, I used to snatch it from my head and throwing it on the ground trample it under my feet. Surely such a veiling has no binding religious meaning."

So the young maid was freed from her vows, and soon after was married to her royal lover. Henceforth by this act were the two peoples, Norman and English, united, and at the end of a century the very word Norman had ceased to be used, and the nation was as one in its allegiance to its King.

Mr. Arthur Tubb sends us the following extract from an old history, which will be interesting in this connection:

The Abbey of Glastonbury was the burying place of King Arthur. Of this there can be no doubt. He died, it is generally understood, at the battle of Camlun in Cornwall in 542, and was conveyed by sea to this abbey, there buried and in process of time the spot was forgotten and lost.

When Henry VI. was passing through Wales on his way to Ireland 1172, he delighted the Welsh with his politic compliments on their service in the Irish wars and they compared him with King Arthur, whose exploits were sung to him as he dined and mention was made of his burial place between two pyramids in the churchyard of Glastonbury. When he returned to England, search was made, and fortunately we have an eye witness, a chronicler, Giraldus Cambrensis.

Four feet below the surface of a large, broad stone was found, with a small, thin plate of lead in the form of a corpse and bearing in rude letters and laborious style, the Latin inscription: "His jacet sepultus inclitus Rex Arturius in Insula Avalonia." Nine feet deeper they found the object of their search in the trunk of tree. The remains of Arthur himself were displayed to their eyes and by his side lay the remains of his wife, Guinevere.

The bones of the King were of extraordinary size; the shin bone, fastened against the foot of a very tall man reached three fingers' breadth above his knee. The skull was covered with wounds ten distinct fractures were counted), one of great size, apparently the effect of a fatal blow. The Queen's body was strangely whole and perfect, the hair neatly platted and the color of gold burnished, but when touched it fell suddenly to dust.

The discovery appears to have excited so great and permanent an interest that Edward I. could not be contented until he had seen the remains himself, so he came hither with Queen Elinor and the ceremony of exhumation was very solemnly performed. The skulls were then set up in the treasury to remain there, the rest of the bodies were returned to their place of deposit, Edward endorsing a description reciting the circumstances.

The stately monument erected over Arthur and his wife was destroyed at the Reformation and with it disappeared all traces of the contents.

NORDICA'S SEASIDE HOME

In contemplation of home-coming with his bride, Mme. Nordica, George W. Young, the New York banker, has a hundred men erecting his \$25,000 bungalow at Deal Beach, N. J.

The Young estate is the largest, it is said, in Monmouth County, having a front of two and a half miles long.

The building will somewhat resemble the shape of a Greek cross. A feature is a hallway, or rather promenade, extending along the inside north wall the length of the whole structure; so that the entire interior can be thrown open as one room when occasion necessitates. Many drives lead to the bungalow shaded with rare and indigenous trees. To the west is a vast flower garden, and at the proper distances are the houses of employees and barns and garages.—Musical America.