

the Irish,' and that 'the Irish are one with us.' But let Mr. Viereck and *The Fatherland* speak for themselves. 'Germany,' says the German organ, 'did not discover Ireland until 1913. She did not discover England until 1914. Germany did not sympathise with Ireland, because she did not know Ireland. Germany advocated an understanding with England, because she did not know England. To-day Germany knows her friends. She knows her enemies. The advocate of an Anglo-German Alliance would be swept off his feet in Germany to-day by a wave of popular indignation. We do not believe that Germany will ever come to an understanding with England, until the fate of Ireland is settled. Germany will not give up Belgium unless England liberates Ireland. If England indemnifies Ireland, Germany will indemnify Belgium. England cannot be safe, while Belgium is in German hands. Germany cannot have free access to the high roads of the ocean while Ireland is enslaved. If the Irish Republic had lasted a little longer, Germany could have recognised Ireland as a belligerent. If the Irish Revolution should break out afresh, if the Irish should again hold their own capital and establish a government, Germany would be able, under international law, to recognise the independence of Ireland. She has already prepared the way. She has sent arms to Ireland. She is willing to send men. The passport of Roger Casement read: Roger Casement, Irishman. This in itself was a recognition of Ireland as a nation. . . . Roger Casement had the vision of a statesman. He clearly enunciated that the freedom of the seas and the freedom of Ireland are one and inseparable. Professor Muensterberg, in a much-discussed article, recommends future co-operation on the part of Germany with the United States and Great Britain for the maintenance of peace. He prefers an alliance of the Germanic races to a combination dominated by Russia and Japan. We have no doubt that so far-seeing a scholar did not overlook, even if he did not state, the fact that the problem of Ireland must be settled before there can be peace in Europe. Neither can there be an alliance between the United States and England until the wrongs of Ireland are righted. . . . *The Fatherland* and its readers feel that the cause of the Central Powers and the cause of Irish freedom are one, and to indicate our attitude unmistakably, we shall add to our creed: Fair Play for Germany and Austria-Hungary, the insistent demand: Freedom for Ireland.'

These touching but newly-developed sentiments are obviously 'springs to catch woodcocks,' and even the most violently anti-English of the Irish American papers, the *Irish World*, will have none of such vague and delusive promises. In vain is the snare spread in sight of the bird. 'Mr. Viereck,' says our Irish American contemporary, 'tells us that if Ireland should raise an army that would keep the field, Germany would recognise her belligerency. It would be very kind of Germany. Then we might expect that, if the Irish army occupied London, Germany would acknowledge Irish independence. But the Irish have tied up an English army in Ireland. They have kept Mr. Wilson from entering the war on England's side. In return what has Germany done? Sent a shipload of captured Russian arms which never arrived. Now, will Mr. Viereck tell us what there is in international law, supposing there be such a thing as international law left after England's assaults upon it, to prevent Germany from declaring that, when she makes peace, she will insist upon the freedom of Ireland, or of Poland or of Finland, or of any other small nation? It is not a question of recognising their independence, it is one of demanding that they be set free as a condition of peace. What is there against it? So far as we can see, nothing unless there be a desire for an ulterior alliance with England. On the contrary, such a declaration would immeasurably strengthen Germany morally and politically, and it would as inevitably weaken the Entente. Again we ask, what are Germany's intentions regarding Ireland? The Irish

American paper has hit the nail squarely on the head; and it will ask in vain for a declaration of Germany's intentions which will satisfy the searching condition it has laid down.

The Landing at Salonica

At the time of writing, General Von Falkenhayn is stated to be making a swift descent upon Monastir; and however it may fare with General Sarrail in the coming encounter—and in view of the chaotic situation in Greece his position is not altogether an enviable one—the fact that he is there at all to meet the invader is sufficient to show that the landing and mobilisation at Salonica has been amply justified. The Salonica scheme to checkmate German ambitions in the Balkans is said to have originated in the mind of M. Briand: the French prototype of Mr. Lloyd George—and when the expedition was first announced it was keenly discussed and criticised, nor were there wanting those who predicted that it would prove a second Dardanelles. The prediction has not been verified. Even now the effects of the move can be seen, for had the Allies not landed at Salonica Serbia's valuable if sorely-tried little army would surely have been wiped out; the whole of the Near East would have been over-run by the Teutons; Greece would have been definitely out on the side of Germany; and Rumania would never have joined the Allies: if, indeed, she had not been compelled to come in against them. Some of the further advantages that have been or are expected to be derived from the landing are thus set forth by the *London Spectator*: 'It has prevented the Germans from descending upon Salonica and establishing a submarine base there. It is a visible pledge of vast political importance that the Allies mean to prevent Germany from devouring the Balkan nationalities in her projected giant-stride to the East. And finally, the presence of the Allies means a great military camp established athwart the line of that advance. It must be a constant nightmare to the Germans. No German who travels in the *Balkanian Express* can fail to think of that menace on his flank, and to reflect that his visions of the *Mittel Europa* of the future are still subject to the sanction of the Allies. The geo-political destiny of Germany with which around German political philosophers console themselves and their attentive readers is not, after all, so very consoling while that wretched toothhold of the Allies at Salonica has to be painted the wrong color on the war maps. The natural strength of the Salonica position, with its circumambient hills and lakes and rivers, is so great that the Germans and Bulgarians did not dare to attack it even when the defences were only being prepared. And now they have a proper dread of the expansive forces which may be extruded from that mysterious and haunting fortress of hills which have the supply-giving sea behind them, and on the sea the ships of the Allies commencing freely with all the world.' The statement as to the 'nightmare' and 'dread' experienced by the Germans is palpably overdone, but the above considerations are certainly sufficient to confirm the Allies in the opinion that they did right in going to Salonica.

AN HISTORIC LANDMARK

A press despatch published in the American papers state that the celebrated hill of Notre Dame de la Garde, on which rises the famous basilica crowned by its great statue of our Lady, a landmark to all who enter or leave the harbor of Marseilles, is at last to be classed as an historical monument. Three great quarries which have been at work for some years honey-combed the hill with galleries and passages. The clergy several times protested, as they saw the church was threatened with destruction. But it needed a vigorous press campaign to save the monument beloved by thousands of Catholic pilgrims, the world over. This campaign was commenced by *La Croix*. The Catholic press was assisted by the local journals. After two years of ceaseless effort the quarries have been closed.