

TOURISTS

which all tourists and visitors and tourist indeed who doesn't travels. This establishment is offers hundreds of items not

high protective tariffs all but to have you spend some time

and Mirrors

English New Arrivals

st floor showrooms offer you the interesting new arrivals in a items suitable for wedding prizes, etc. The assortment of ink wells, stationery racks, racks, paper holders, writing New and decidedly attractive personally selected. Values are We listed some items the but here are a few more just

errors—"Gold plated" frames design. Mirrors are bevel square, round and oval Priced at \$3.50, \$3.00, \$2.75

Some splendid styles are Here is a great value:—4

ver design, with lady's head

Lead Well \$1.50

Camel Well \$2.50

Letter Clips: goose bill de

Letter Clips: owl design

frames, in "gold plated" and

ass" at \$1.50, \$1.25 and \$1.00



Comfort Couch Value

VOICE OFFERED HERE

ong should make you feel one of these comfortable are ideal for all seasons desirable when winter you to spend more time

a great choice of styles. ad, too. There is a style lit your home and you. ne up to the third floor, shown and see how com-ly are.

couches covered in velour or Priced at \$22, \$20, \$16, \$14,

frame, upholstered in green

English finished oak frame,

anish leather, \$55

en oak frames upholstered

\$70 and \$65

ants Today Be Cleared

two or some loose covers We have a quantity of rem- Summer's big business— would ask if they were of

ou'll like. The pieces meas- ould visit the second floor find these priced from 15¢

OS.

B. C.

FURNISHERS
of
CHURCHES
SCHOOLS

BUNKER HILL

There stands a monument in Boston, which has been described as unique because it is the only one ever erected by a people to commemorate a defeat. As a battle the fight at Bunker Hill was a matter of no great importance, and the advantage, such as it was, rested with the English troops but it changed the American rebellion into a revolution, and made impossible a peaceful settlement of the difficulties that had arisen between England and her colonies. There was no valid reason for a lasting breach between the two branches of the English family. Indeed it was their rights as Englishmen, which the colonists asserted and to defend which they took up arms. Perhaps there is no matter of history about which so great misconception has occurred as about the breaking of the ties between the two countries. There was justice on both sides. It was just that the colonists should bear some share of the cost of the war with France, for it had been waged to a large extent in their interest. None of the leaders of the Americans offered any objection to contributing. It was also just that the colonists should have a right to say for themselves how they should contribute. So far as can be gathered from correspondence of the period, there was no difference of view on the western side of the Atlantic on this question, and the best opinion on the other side was to the same effect. It was little more than the stubbornness of George III., a king whose intellectual qualities were never very high, and whose only definite object was to live up to his mother's injunction, "George, be a king," that precipitated a crisis. The Loyalist party, as they called themselves, or the Tories, as they were called by their opponents, did not defend the course of the King; they were only opposed to the course of the dominant section of the colonists. They contended that the remedy for the undisputed ills, to which the colonies were subject, was within the Empire and not out of it. Later they came to be known as United Empire Loyalists, the name signifying the principle which underlay their action. Both the Rebels and the Tories, to use the names they applied to each other, appealed to the British Constitution in justification of the course taken by them. Time has shown that the Loyalists were right and that within the Empire there was ample scope for the fullest development of the principles of self-government and individual liberty. But this was not as obvious then as it is now; and it can be said with truth of the revolutionary leaders and the people who followed them, that they were as readily caught by phrases as any people of whom history tells us anything. An impartial student must concede that there were faults on both sides, and yet he must admit that the colonists would not have shown themselves worthy of the stock from which they came, if they had not opposed force to force. Nevertheless it is quite possible that the Loyalist element would have prevailed, and that mutual concessions would have resulted in the retention of British sovereignty, if it had not been for the folly exhibited by the home government in sending foreign mercenaries to impose the will of the English King upon an English people. Whether Lord Chatham ever used the words attributed to him by Dr. Johnston and declared, "If I were an American, as I am an Englishman, and a foreign force were landed on my shores, I would never lay down my arms, never, never!" it is certain that thousands of people in England felt as he did, and that the employment of the Hessians was regarded with deep disfavor by the Loyalists.

There is another aspect of the American Revolution which cannot wholly be disregarded. It was to a large degree a struggle of the democracy against the aristocracy. Sabine, himself a resident of Massachusetts, in his History of the Loyalists, says that undoubtedly these people constituted the majority of the educated and refined element of the community. They resented the assumption of the lower ranks of the community of the right to control its affairs. Yet they were jealous of the right of self-government, and in the new homes where they sought refuge after the war was over, they were prompt to assert it to the fullest degree. There had grown up in the colonies under the laxity of pioneer life many conceptions of individual freedom, which are not entertained in any settled community to-day. It may be remembered that when the Tsar promulgated a Constitution for Russia many of his subjects supposed it to mean that it conferred upon them the right to do exactly as they pleased, and some of them began to kill Jews, and others to take timber and other property of their landlords. While things were not quite as bad in the revolted Colonies, it is undisputed that many of the colonists understood the Declaration of Independence to mean that thereafter there was to be no government, but that each person was to be a law unto himself. The treatment accorded to the Loyalists in numberless instances shows that the rebellious element was lacking in appreciation of the simplest principles of fair play. This same spirit of individual independence was largely in evidence in Washington's army and did much to hamper his operations. Mention of Washington's name recalls the fact that he himself was an aristocrat by birth, education and instincts. He is one of the few conspicuous instances in which men of his class actively espoused the revolutionary cause. There is reason to believe that he would not have been unwilling to have returned to his former allegiance, if an honorable settlement could have been reached, and if it could have

been possible to have secured the consent of the people who were intoxicated with their new-found and little understood liberty. Washington's strength of character, his uncompromising manliness and his lofty patriotism undoubtedly saved his country from a period of anarchy, the outcome of which might not have been very different to that of the French Revolution, when absolutism in the person of Napoleon enthroned itself upon the ruins of democracy.

The battle of Bunker Hill was fought on June 15, 1775. It was not the first collision between the royal forces and the Colonists, two minor engagements having occurred earlier in the year at Lexington and Concord. In the same year an expedition was sent to invade Canada under the command of Montgomery. It met with some success, but was defeated at Quebec, where Montgomery was slain. On May 15, 1776, a congress, composed of representatives of the several Colonies, declared that the authority of the Crown had ceased. This was largely due to the landing of 17,000 Hessians in the country. On June 7 the Congress declared the Colonies independent, and on July 4 the Declaration, as written by Thomas Jefferson, was proclaimed. The New York delegation refused to vote for independence. Hostilities continued with varying success. In 1778 a French fleet and land force came to the assistance of the Americans. Military operations dragged along until October 19, 1781, when Lord Cornwallis, hemmed in on the land by the Americans and French, and cut off from the sea by the French fleet, surrendered. This ended the war, although the formal treaty of peace was not signed until September 3rd, 1783. It is worthy of passing notice that the forces of France contributed to the success of the Colonies, although the first strain upon the relations between them and the Mother Country arose out of the wars waged by the latter to defend them from France.

The number of Loyalists who left the United States during and after the war was between 40,000 and 50,000. Most of them went to New Brunswick and Ontario, although some made their homes in Nova Scotia and others went to England. It was stipulated in the treaty of peace that the Loyalists, if they wished, might remain in the country, and Congress undertook to carry the agreement into effect, but was unable to do so because of the opposition of the State governments. The majority of the Loyalists did not, however, wait for any such action, but sacrificed everything they had and left the country. It is known that Washington greatly desired their repatriation, but even his great influence was unable to bring it about.

REIGNING HOUSES

The Royal House of the United Kingdom is in some respects unique. We have seen in the references to continental reigning families that there has been in every case a founder of a dynasty, a man whose commanding ability and great achievements secured the recognition of persons already occupying sovereign positions, or else they were able by reason of their own strength of character to impose their rule upon a people. In the case of the United Kingdom there has been nothing of this kind. At every stage in the development of the British monarchy we find the will of the people asserted in one way or another, going even so far as to change the line of descent. The King rules by a parliamentary title. Personally, he inherited the crown, as did his successors for nearly two hundred years but his title and theirs rests upon an Act of Parliament. The nature of this will be considered in its proper place. In tracing the history of the family it will be necessary to refer from time to time to the means by which the succession to the throne has been decided, and this can be done better in connection with the individuals immediately concerned than in any other way.

Edward VII. is son of Queen Victoria and Francis Charles Augustus Albert Emmanuel, Prince of Saxe-Coburg-Gotha. He has no claim to a royal position in the United Kingdom by virtue of his father's lineage, but it may not be uninteresting to note in passing that he is descended in this line from the reigning family of Saxony. At the time of the Reformation, the Ernestine branch of the Saxon family occupied the throne, but was deposed because of its adherence to that movement, and the succession passed to the younger branch, which has continued to occupy it. This family traces to Count Conrad of Wettin, who in 1123 obtained possession of what is now Saxony and established a line of princes that has remained unbroken to the present. If His Majesty has any surname it is Wettin, for that is the family name of the House of Saxony.

Victoria was daughter of Edward, Duke of Kent, fourth son of George III., and a daughter of the Duke of Saxe-Coburg-Saalfeld. Therefore on her mother's side she traced back to the Ernestine branch of the Saxon royal family. This Saxon house was identified with the Guelphs in the famous struggle with the Ghibbelines, which for a long time disturbed Europe, and this is one reason why the British royal family is frequently spoken of as the Guelphs.

George III. was grandson of George II., his predecessor. His mother was a princess of Saxe-Gotha, and therefore sprang from the same lineage as gave kings to Saxony. His grandmother, wife of George II., was a daughter of Margrave of Anspach, who was of Hohenzollern descent, that is, of the family

from which the German Kaiser is descended. George II. was son of George I. He was son of Ernest Augustus, Elector of Hanover, and Sophia, granddaughter of James I. of England. His mother was declared heiress to the throne of England by the Act of Settlement passed in the year 1701. The Elector Ernest was descended from Henry the Lion of the famous House of Guelph, whose descendants founded the House of Brunswick, which is the official designation of the Royal Family of England. The Duchess Sophia's mother was Elizabeth, daughter of James I., of Great Britain. Her father was Frederick V., Elector Palatine and King of Bohemia. Thus it is seen how the Royal Family is traced out of Germany into England and Scotland, for, as every one knows, James I. of England was also King of Scotland. It will also be seen that the lineage of the King does not embrace either Anne, William and Mary, James II., Charles II., or Charles I. This is the reason why certain people yet hold that while he is king de facto he is not king de jure.

James I. united the crowns of England and Scotland. He was son of Mary, Queen of Scots, and her husband Darnley. Darnley had royal blood in his veins, his grandmother being Margaret Tudor, daughter of Henry VII. Mary was of the great Scottish House of Stuart. This family traces its descent to Alan, a Norman baron, who came to England with William the Conqueror. One of the Stuarts married a daughter of Robert the Bruce, and his son ascended the throne of Scotland in 1370. The Bruces were descended from Robert de Brui, a Norman knight, who accompanied the Conqueror to England. It is impossible to trace the space at our disposal to trace the descent of Bruce through David I. and the descent of Bruce through David I. and the long list of ancestors. It can be carried back with fair accuracy to Kenneth Macalpine, who assumed the crown in A. D. 844, and united the Picts and Scots under one rule. The story of Scotland antecedent to this time is one of romantic obscurity and may be told in another occasion. For the present it is sufficient to say that students claim to be able to trace the royal house of the Bruce to a very remote date. It is said to have come from Ireland, bringing with it the Coronation Stone of Scone, which now has its place in Westminster Abbey, and upon which all the British Kings are crowned.

James I. was held to be entitled to the crown of England by virtue of his descent from Henry VII. His title was parliamentary, but he had overthrown his predecessor, Richard III., before having his right to the crown sanctioned by the representatives of the people. He claimed the right to succession because his mother was granddaughter of John of Gaunt, Duke of Lancaster, son of Edward III. On his father's side he was of Welsh descent, whereby a strain of the ancient British race was introduced into the royal house of England. Edward III. was son of Edward II., who was son of Edward I., who was son of Henry III. The last named was son of John, son of Henry II., who was grandson of Henry I., who was son of William the Conqueror. Thus the Royal Family is descended in one line from the Norman Duke Rollo, a famous Norse chieftain, whose lineage is a matter of fact. Henry I. married a daughter of Malcolm Canmore, King of Scotland, whose wife was granddaughter of Edmund Ironside, who was descended from Alfred the Great, and thus was descended from back to the Saxon kings. His Majesty's incomplete review shows that the descent of the Royal House of Britain is indeed remarkable. If space had permitted to follow out the family history on the female side previous to the time of Edward III. it would be seen that the line of descent ramified into nearly every dynasty in Europe before the rise of the present Continental reigning houses. Thus, while at several stages such for example as after the victory of William the Conqueror at Hastings, that of Henry VII. at Bosworth Field, and at the time of the Act of Settlement in 1701, as well as on other occasions, Parliament exercised its unquestioned right to determine the succession, the crown has remained in the same line of descent from the Saxon kings of England, the Scottish kings of Scotland and the ancient sovereigns of Ireland. It is a wonderful story and it makes the lineage of every other ruler of today seem like a story of yesterday.

THE SHADOW OF THE ALMIGHTY

"He that dwelleth in the secret place of the Most High, shall abide under the Shadow of the Almighty," with these strong words the Ninety-first Psalm begins. We do not know with certainty who wrote it, but there is no reason for disputing the claim that David, King of Israel, was the author of that wonderful poem. The Most High is also referred to therein as a refuge and fortress, and is likened to sheltering wings. The Seventeenth Psalm is directly attributed to David and there we find a prayer that he may be protected beneath the wings of the Almighty. We find the same thought of divine protection in the blessing which Moses gave the Children of Israel before his death. "The Eternal God is thy refuge and under thee are the everlasting arms." Throughout the Psalms we find the same idea put forward, so that it may be said to be one of the fundamental principles of the Jewish religion. The thought that one abides under the Shadow of the Almighty is an inspiring one. Of course the expression is a figurative one, and indeed, very many of the great truths of religion have been set forth in figures. A little thought will show that this

must necessarily be so. When we speak of the relation between the Almighty and humanity, we are driven to employ words intended to describe the relations between men or between men and nature. Language has its limitations. We must describe new things or express new thoughts in old words, and every one advancing a new proposition feels the inadequacy of words already in use to express exactly what he has in his mind. Herein is the source of much profitless disputation. Things are called by certain names and there is not quite an agreement between people as to what the names mean. Often in the end there is found to be harmony where once there was discord. Religious people would do well to bear the insufficiency of language in mind, for often what they condemn as new and unwarranted is only something that is old stated in a new way.

One has to think a little of the topographical and social conditions of Western Asia to appreciate just what the royal poet had in mind when he spoke of the Shadow of the Almighty. Isaiah speaks of a man being "as the shadow of a great rock in a weary land." In a part of the world where there were long stretches of arid land upon which the merciless rays of the sun shone down for days together, the shadow of a great rock would be welcome to the weary traveler, and in communities where violence and warfare were common, the shelter of some rocky natural fortress would be of inestimable value. When we think of these things we gain some conception of the nature of that which the poet had in mind when he used the words with which this article opens. He desired to convey the idea of the perfection of protection.

And now for a moment let us consider if it is all a mere figure of speech. Is there a "secret place of the Most High," wherein man may abide as if under "the Shadow of the Almighty"? Or, to state the thought in prosaic terms, is there a divine Being who will be a protection to those who look to him for protection? We think that the majority of people fail to find an affirmative answer to this question, because they are unwilling to open their minds to the operations of the Divine Spirit. When Jesus was on earth it was said that in certain places he could do no mighty works because of the unbelief of the people. There seems to be reason for thinking, apart from anything contained in the Bible, that a certain atmosphere—to use the word as signifying environment—is necessary before men can get themselves fully in touch with the Power, which is the only manifestation of the Deity which we are capable of comprehending. This atmosphere may pertain to an individual only or to a number of individuals simultaneously, but there seems good reason to claim that until it has been created the sense of a Divine Presence is impossible. It is hopeless for man to conceive of God as a creator, for we are unable to grasp the idea of a beginning of things. Neither can we grasp the idea of a God who is all-wise, all-knowing, everywhere present. These things are beyond the comprehension of human intelligence. Neither are we able with our limited understanding to explain how the existence of evil is compatible with the existence of an Omnipotent God of love. We cannot hope to measure the infinite with our finite standards. But unless the experience of humanity through the centuries is to be wholly discredited, it is possible for us to realize the idea of a Divine Protector. There are too many witnesses to the fact that there is a Shadow of the Almighty, wherein one may abide, to permit any one to deny it. And the proof is not a matter of belief; it is a matter of individual experience, not one for argument. If a person says his head aches, we believe him, though he cannot show us the ache. If he says his heart aches, we believe him though physicians may tell us that the heart cannot experience emotions. Why then should we not believe one who says that he is conscious of abiding under the Shadow of the Almighty? It is perhaps beyond all question that mankind has missed happiness because we all look for it at a distance and as attainable only by ceaseless toil and endeavor, whereas it is near at hand. We need only to step within the Shadow to be protected from all evil.

The Birth of the Nations

XXXV.

(N. de Bertrand Lugm)

The Poles

The very name of Poland is sufficient to awaken sympathy in the hearts of all patriots no matter what their nationality. Nowhere in history can we find a sadder story than the one of this country's fall from greatness and her final overthrow and absorption by the state which once owned her as its sovereign. There are said to be at present nearly ten million Poles, but Russia refuses to recognize even the name of the kingdom of Poland and has tried to obliterate it, referring to it always in official documents simply as the Vistula government. Nothing dies harder than loyalty to one's country, if indeed it can ever be said to die at all, and even today when Poland has become simply a part of Russia, her people will not relinquish their hope for eventual freedom and independence. Therefore are the number of her revolutionaries many, and the number of her suspects still greater. Therefore are the penal settlements of Siberia the home of many hundreds whose noble wish to

be a savior to their people, and to give back to their beloved land a little of the prestige she was lost, are the sole reasons for their imprisonment.

The Poles, in common with all the Russians belong to the great Slavonic race, which has a great many branches, and which originally spread itself as far west as northern Germany. Even now though the Slavs have lost in Western Europe they have gained in the East as "Russia has encroached upon the Ugro-Finnish tribes of the northern and eastern portions of the empire and many of those races are in various stages of Russification." The Slavs came from Asia and probably settled in Europe either at the same time or shortly after the arrival of the Teutonic families. As proof of this, Schafanck tells us that the Slavs were always spoken of by the early writers as if the race were an ancient European nation. Besides, had a great horde of people arrived in Europe at a comparatively recent date, history must bear some record of the fact, which it does not.

As early as the second century after Christ we find the Polish branch of the Slav race mentioned by the geographer Ptolemy, who designated them as Bulars. They were a quiet, industrious people, very different from the fierce and wandering Teutonic tribes. They cultivated the land and lived a pastoral life in villages which had a tribal government. Originally there does not seem to have been a class of serfs, but when war ensued and prisoners were taken in battle, the latter were reduced to the condition of slaves, and this was probably the birth of the different social classes of the community. Later on there were three divisions. It is a curious fact, and one that seems to prove the fallacy of some of the doctrines of socialism, that no matter what conditions a people may have to start with—if every man be equal to his neighbor in regard to birth, position and wealth—given time, they must resolve themselves into three distinct classes, which briefly may be termed the high, the middle and the low. Human nature is bound to vary and Ruskin was more correct than most of us care to admit when he insisted upon maintaining the difference in social position. Oliver Wendell Holmes was no less correct, however, when he said: "Our social arrangement has this great beauty that the strata shift up and down as they change specific gravity, without being clogged by layers of prescription." The division of the Poles was as follows: I.—The nobility, who throughout Polish history constituted the nation so-called; II.—A peasant class, who were free, but obliged to perform certain services, and were called the Polish Kmiec; III.—A lower class of peasants, who had no rights or privileges and who were virtually the property of their masters. Gradually the nobles attained absolute power over the other two classes, and thus formed a proud military aristocracy which had complete control of the country and the king.

Polish history proper begins with the reign of Miecyslaw I., 962-992. He was a very brave and able sovereign and said to have been possessed of all the manly virtues. The king of Bohemia had a charming daughter and the Polish king and the Bohemian princess, having met, fell in love with one another. Dabrowna, the princess, had become converted to Christianity however, and Miecyslaw was a pagan, therefore, the girl feeling that in justice to her religion she could not marry her royal lover refused him with many tears. The Polish king went back to his kingdom sorrowfully enough for the old gods called him to be faithful to them, and yet his love for the princess was strong. Finally love triumphed and in 965 Miecyslaw consented to become baptized and the two were immediately afterward married. Their reign was one of peace and prosperity. Boleslow, their son succeeded them.

With Boleslow began the trouble with Russia for the new king was eager to aggrandize himself at the expense of the latter country. The trouble thus begun over a thousand years ago has never ended.

Among the Polish heroes no name stands forth with brighter prominence than that of John Zobieski. Indeed, he may be described as one of the grandest figures in all history. He had already distinguished himself in the wars against the Turks when he was chosen king of his country. Michael, the former king, had died, poisoned, no doubt, and the diet had met at Warsaw to nominate a ruler. Zobieski, fresh from glorious victory entered the council chamber. He nominated as king, the Prince of Conde, but one of the nobles called out "Let a Pole rule over Poland. Let John Zobieski, the greatest of our countrymen, be chosen king." So the famous general was made ruler over the country he had served so well, and as his exploits have been treated on this page no more need be said, except that under him Poland enjoyed many peaceful years, and that before he died he distinguished himself as the leader of the victorious forces in one of the greatest battles ever fought.

Upon his deathbed he is quoted as saying, with that mysterious prophetic insight sometimes observed in those about to die, that he could foresee the downfall of the country he loved. His words proved too true. With him sank the glory of Poland, never to rise again.

"I'm sure I don't know why they call this hotel The Palms. Do you? I've never seen a palm anywhere near the place."

"You'll see them before you go. It's a pleasant little surprise the waiters keep for the guests on the last day of their stay."