

"The nave of the great church of Da Sinchell was converted for the occasion into a banqueting hall, where Margaret herself inaugurated the proceedings by placing two massive chalices of gold, as offerings, on the high altar, and committing two orphan children to the charge of nurses to be fostered at her charge. Robed in cloth of gold, this illustrious lady, who was as distinguished for her beauty as for her generosity, sat in queenly state in one of the galleries of the church, surrounded by the clergy, the brehons, and her private friends, shedding a lustre on the scene which was passing below, while her husband, who had often encountered England's greatest generals in battle, remained mounted on a charger outside the church to bid the guests welcome, and see that order was preserved. The invitations were issued, and the guests arranged, according to a list prepared by O'Connor's chief brehon; and the second entertainment, which took place at Rathangan, was a supplemental one, to embrace such mean of learning as had not been brought together at the formal feast."

(To be continued.)

LET GOVERNMENTS BEWARE!

(By AUSTIN HARRISON, in the *English Review*.)

Whatever kind of a peace the "Big Four," or, more correctly stated, the "Secret Three," arrive at, or think they have arrived at, this truth will remain: that until some working equation is found for the accommodation of revolutionary Russia the League of Nations will be a mere mechanism and the League itself will be a futility. Russia constitutes the major part of Europe. Russia is, in fact, the key to the New Order, and on the solution of the Russian problem will depend stability in Europe and all hope of progress.

Great lies have been systematically fostered about the whole Bolshevik movement, and so to-day we have this utterly shameful paradox, that the democracies of Europe are blockading and starving not only the nation which militarily saved them in 1914-1915, but using the soldiers of liberty and free government to reinstate in power the forces which would restore the old Tsarist, bureaucratic order, and who, if ever they came back into power, would victimise their peoples in pogroms and holocausts of blood. Now, I know something of Russia, having lived there for a year during the revolution of 1905. I propose to state a few leading facts which sooner or later we shall have to learn.

Now the revolution of 1905 was a bourgeois movement, as was the Cromwellian revolution. In no wise can it be called a people's rising, for the peasantry remained for the greater part listless, and it was led entirely by the so-called intellectuals. It was suppressed. I wonder how many of us realise how? Listen. It was crushed under just when, through the constitutional action of the Duma, it was about to win through by the financial aid we and the French gave to the Tsar. Allied money stifled the freedom of Russia in 1906. We paid the Tsar to smash the liberating movement, and so the Duma became a puppet show and thousands of Russians went to their death in Siberia, were shot or removed, and thousands fled the country.

When we talk of the terrible crimes of Bolshevism, we do not consider the terrible crimes committed for two hundred years by the Tsars. We do not pause to remember that only our money saved the Tsar and his police rule in 1906. We do not understand that Bolshevism in its Russian or physical form is a quite natural reaction, the back-play of a people exasperated and driven mad by years of the most brutal tyranny, corruption, extortion, and oppression, and that the real wonder is not that Bolshevism is so terrible, but rather that it has not been infinitely more terrible. The French in 1789 were far more drastic. Indeed, so far as bloodshed is concerned, I seriously doubt whether more lives have been taken by the Bolsheviks than were taken in any two years under the late Tsar's

régime, for we must not include battles in an estimate of bloodshed. We must not forget that the Bolsheviks are being attacked North, South, East, and West by other Russians supported, financed, and armed by the Allies, and that this loss of life cannot be reckoned on the Bolshevik account.

I was present at Petrograd in 1905, at the first public meeting of the University in the name of liberty. A more orderly meeting could not be imagined. Every day on my walks I saw gangs of prisoners marching through the streets—handcuffed and roped together like animals—on their way to the prisons. I have seen the Cossacks lashing the people with their whips. Every night men were seized and transported to the mines without trial. Anything more pitiful than the enforced enslavement of these long-suffering Russians in those awful years I cannot picture. Daily men were cut to ribbons in the police yards—flogging was a recognised thing. The Tsar triumphed, thanks to our financial aid, and yet they fought for us in 1914 with an enthusiasm that surprised all parties in Russia. The people thought it was a war for liberty. All Russia joined in the crusade, and we will only understand the significance of this when we realise that the army was hated in Russia, that the soldiers were despised as the instruments of persecution, that war is temperamentally alien to the Russian psychology.

And these Russians saved Europe.

Badly armed, corruptly led, suffering fearful privations, they died by the million and unquestionably prevented the Germans in the two critical years of the war from using their major strength in the West. The battle of the Marne in 1914 was won because the Germans had to send such large forces against the Russians to save East Prussia.

Our great blunder was made over Kerensky. Instead of understanding that Russia was on the verge of collapse and that only a full, regenerated, democratic Russia could re-enter the war effectively, we made them fight, thereby causing the inevitable *débâcle*, leading automatically to Bolshevism. Bolshevism originally meant the land for the people—communism. We answered it by negative war and the blockade. To-day, five months after the Armistice, we are still fighting the Russians and blockading them. And we wonder that they are starving! We wonder why Lenin's power is growing! We wonder why the Russians regard our protestations of democracy with suspicion! We wonder that brutalities are perpetrated under the goad of famine!

Does any man know why we have left a forlorn band of men freezing in the perpetual darkness of the Murmansk regions? Can any man explain why we are keeping soldiers, who joined up in 1914 to fight the Germans, at Baku? Will any man be able to give a coherent account of the Japanese-Allied Army in Siberia? Why it is there at all, in support of Royalist Russian forces? Yet I suppose some policy motives this condition of semi-war. What is it? And how can we make peace or talk about a League of Nations while this war is on—this shameless war of capitalism?

For that is its reason, no other. We who entered the war for freedom are fighting our former Ally in the interests of money, in the interests of the old Russian expropriators of the soil and the people; we are fighting the peasants because the land has been given to them. And the root cause of it is *fear*—the fear of capitalism.

Governed now ourselves by secret propaganda and secret conclaves, we swallow the lies about the Bolsheviks and their women as we swallowed the Kadaver lie. The public do not know. They are deliberately led to regard the Russians as outlaws and fiends, and almost every day some propagandist falsehood appears in our press, which in reality only discredits us. We cannot continue this game. Either we make up our minds to conquer Bolshevism—that is, to fight the Russians back into bondage and serfdom—or we develop a policy of reason. Now the military way would lead to ruin—absolute bankruptcy—for America would not support us. The other way demands statesman-