

ASSYRIA AND PRUSSIA : AN HISTORICAL PARALLEL.

LEWIS BAYLES PATON, Ph.D., D.D.,

Professor of Old Testament Exegesis and Criticism in Hartford
Theological Seminary, Hartford, Conn., U.S.A.

THE one problem that engrosses our attention at present is the war. Thinking men in all lands cannot help asking what is its meaning, and what will be its issue? There are no seers among us to-day who can forecast the future, and the only way in which we can answer our questions is by the study of history. History repeats itself, and whenever conditions arise in one age that resemble those in a previous age there is reason to believe that the outcome in both cases will be similar. This is the reason for comparing the growth of ancient Assyria with that of modern Prussia. The historical development, the ideals, and the methods of the two empires bear the closest resemblance; a comparative study, accordingly, cannot fail to shed light upon the meaning of the present world-war and upon its ultimate results.

1. *The Colonial Period.*—Assyria was founded as a colony of the old Babylonian empire to spread Babylonian civilisation and to defend the frontier against the barbarians. In Gen. x. 10 f. we read: "The beginning of his (Nimrod's) kingdom was Babylon. Out of that land went forth Assyria, and built Nineveh." This event occurred as early perhaps as 3000 B.C. The Assyrians spoke the same language as the Babylonians, had the same religion, and down to the latest times recognised their cultural and ecclesiastical dependence upon the mother-country. This early colony stood under the rule of military governors who were directly responsible to the Babylonian emperors.

In like manner the Mark of Brandenburg, the nucleus of modern Prussia, was founded about A.D. 930 by Henry I.,

the last of the Carolingian emperors, as a bulwark of the Holy Roman Empire against the heathen Prussians and Wends. Its ruler, the Markgraf of Brandenburg, was a minor official who owed direct allegiance to the Emperor. The original Prussians were a Lettish race, and the name Pruzi, or Prutheni, by which they called themselves, means "the intelligent ones." It appears thus that the modern Prussian claim to possess the only true *Kultur* is of ancient origin. They were the most obstinate opponents of Christianity among the European peoples. They persecuted and plundered their Christian neighbours, until in 1230 the monastic military order of the Teutonic Knights conquered the region, and imposed a superficial Christianity upon its inhabitants.

2. *The Period of the Governors.*—The governors of the city of Asshur early showed an ambition to increase their power at the expense of their neighbours. They gradually brought Calah, Nineveh, and Arbela, the other ancient colonies of the land, under their domination, and extended their territory into Mesopotamia. As early as 2000 B.C. they had forced the Babylonian emperors to recognise Assyria as a state equal in importance to the old city-states of Babylonia, and to confer on them the title of *Patesi* or "Prince."

Similarly, the Markgrafen of Brandenburg, of the so-called Ascanian line (A.D. 1134–1319), united all the towns of the North Mark under their rule, extended their authority into Prussia, occupied and fortified Berlin (A.D. 1240), and eventually made it the capital instead of Brandenburg. In 1356 the Mark was strong enough to be recognised as one of the chief states of the empire, its ruler obtained the title of Elector, and this dignity was made hereditary in the house of Hohenzollern.

3. *The Period of the Princes.*—As soon as the rulers of Assyria had become Patesis they began to aim at independence from Babylon. An inscription of Tiglathpileser I. (ca. 1100 B.C.) mentions Ishme-Dagan and his son Shamshi-Adad, Patesis of Asshur, who lived seven hundred years before his time. Inscriptions of these and of other Patesis have come to light through the recent German excavations on the site of the city of Asshur. These princes strengthened their armies, developed their resources, enlarged their borders by conquest, and eventually as early as 1700 B.C. ventured to throw off allegiance to Babylon. Ashirrimnishesu is the first Patesi who is known to have assumed the title of King.

In like manner the Electors of Brandenburg early manifested a determination to secure their independence.

Frederick I. offered himself as a candidate for the imperial throne in 1438 against Albert II. of the house of Hapsburg. Frederick II. (1440-1470) deprived the free cities of his dominion of their liberties, conquered the Neumark of Prussia from the Teutonic Knights, and would have annexed Lusatia and Pomerania if the Emperor had not stopped him. Albert (1470-1486) gained territory from Mecklenburg and Pomerania, and took the important step of establishing primogeniture in the dynasty of Hohenzollern. Through this measure the territory of the Electorate was kept intact, and the absolutism of its rulers was confirmed. John (1486-1499) still further curtailed the liberties of the cities, and secured his succession to Pomerania on extinction of the ducal line. Joachim I. (1499-1535) promoted education, and unified the heterogeneous elements of his dominion by the introduction of imperial Roman law.

Joachim II. (1535-1571) embraced the Reformation, and thus placed himself in open conflict with the Emperor. He made himself the head of the Protestant Church in Brandenburg, and diverted the ecclesiastical endowments to military uses. He also secured his succession to the duchy of Prussia in case of failure of the male line. John George (1571-1598) filled the offices of state with members of the petty nobility, and thus gathered about himself an aristocracy pledged to his support. Joachim Frederick (1598-1608) introduced the *Staatsrath*, or ministerial cabinet, and thus laid the foundation of the modern Prussian bureaucracy. John Sigismund (1608-1619) inherited the duchy of Prussia after the death of Duke Albert in 1618, and from this time onward Prussia became the main constituent of the dominions of the Hohenzollerns. George William (1619-1640) made treaties with the Protestants, or with the Catholics, as seemed most advantageous at the moment, and broke these when it suited his convenience. Carlyle says of him: "Where the Titans were bowling rocks at each other, George William hoped by dexterous skipping to escape share of the game."

Frederick William, "the Great Elector" (1640-1688), developed such an efficient army that at the peace of Westphalia he was able to add to his territory the whole of Pomerania and the ecclesiastical principalities of Magdeburg, Halberstadt, and Minden. In the second Swedish war in 1655 he helped the Swedes to defeat the Poles, and received in return recognition as the independent ruler of Prussia. Then he deserted his ally, and helped Poland to defeat the Swedes, receiving as his reward the recognition of the inde-

pendence of Prussia by Poland. In 1666 he added to his domain the Rhenish duchies of Cleves, Mark, and Ravensberg. In 1677-78 he drove the Swedes out of Northern Germany, capturing Stettin and Stralsund. At his death the territory of Brandenburg had increased from an original 11,000 square miles held by the first Elector to 43,000 square miles, the revenue had increased fivefold, and the army was one of the finest in Europe. On the strength of these facts Frederick I., his son (1688-1713), forced the Emperor Leopold I. in 1701 to grant him the title of King. From this time onward Prussia was independent of the empire, and took its place as one of the great powers of Europe.

4. *The Period of the Kingdom.*—When Assyria had secured her independence, she at once began to aim at the establishment of an empire. This involved, first, the extension of her territory by conquest, so that she might become stronger than Babylon; and second, the overthrow of Babylon. For centuries there was war between the two countries, with success now on one side, now on the other. Burnaburiash I., king of Babylon (ca. 1508 B.C.), had to yield territory to Puzur-Ashir, king of Assyria. Karaindash I., king of Babylon, was compelled to make a treaty with Ashirbelnisheshu, king of Assyria, and to establish a boundary line between the two countries. Asshurballit II. (ca. 1400 B.C.) compelled Burnaburiash II. to marry his daughter Muballitatshirua, and thus obtained a controlling interest in the politics of the southern kingdom. When the Babylonians revolted against Karakhardash, the son of the Assyrian princess, and slew him, Asshurballit intervened with his army and seated Kurigalzu II., another grandson, on the throne. His successor Ellilnirari defeated Kurigalzu II. and compelled him to cede a large part of Mesopotamia. Arikdenilu (ca. 1310 B.C.) conquered the Gutu on the east and the Aramæan Sutu on the south. Adadnirari I. (ca. 1300 B.C.) defeated the kingdom of Mitanni in the west and annexed part of Mesopotamia, in consequence of which he assumed the title "King of Hosts." Nazimaruttash, the contemporary king of Babylon, feared his growing power and attacked him, but he was defeated and was compelled to acknowledge Assyria's claim to Northern Mesopotamia. Shalmaneser I. established military colonies in the regions that his father had conquered, and carried his arms beyond the Euphrates as far as the Amanus mountain range. As a result of this campaign the kingdom of Mitanni, which had been a formidable obstacle to Assyrian progress, was destroyed. He moved the capital from Asshur to Calah in order to bring

it nearer the centre of the kingdom. Tukultininib I. (*ca.* 1290 B.C.) extended the borders of Assyria still farther on the north, east, and west, defeated Kashtiliash II., and entered Babylon in triumph.

After his death Assyria passed through a period of quiescence. Internal disorders and the revival of Babylonia stripped her for a time of her newly conquered provinces, but under Tiglathpileser I. (*ca.* 1100 B.C.) her irresistible forward march began once more. He regained all that his predecessor had lost, and added much new territory to the kingdom.

The death of Tiglathpileser I. was followed by a second period of quiescence until in 885 B.C. Assurnasirpal III. came to the throne. From 885 to 879 B.C. he was occupied in reducing to submission the tribes on the border of his kingdom. In 878 he began to push westward. The Aramæan kingdom of Bit-Adini, which had taken the place of the old kingdom of Mitanni, was conquered. In 876 the Euphrates was crossed, and he marched as far as the shores of the Mediterranean. Here he received the tribute of Tyre, Sidon, Gebal, Arvad, the Amorites, and other districts which dreaded his advance and sought to buy him off. His son Shalmaneser III. (856–824 B.C.) made almost yearly campaigns with the purpose of conquering Damascus, the chief power in the west. He records successes, but he annexed no new territory, and it is clear that in Damascus he for the first time met a foe who could oppose him on equal terms. In 854 Ahab, king of Israel, fought on the side of Benhadad, king of Damascus, and in 842 Jehu, king of Israel, was constrained to pay tribute to Shalmaneser III. These are the first points of contact of Israel with Assyria.

After the death of Shalmaneser III. in 825 B.C., Assyria entered upon a third period of quiescence, but the career of conquest was again resumed under Tiglathpileser IV. (745–727 B.C.). In 732 B.C. he captured Damascus and deported its inhabitants. This event was followed immediately by an expedition against Babylonia which ended in the capture of Babylon. Tiglathpileser then took the step toward which all the kings of Assyria for a thousand years had been aiming. On New Year's Day 728 B.C. he went through the ancient ceremony of grasping the hands of the god Marduk, and thus became the Holy Babylonian Emperor.

The development of the Assyrian monarchy from Ashirrimnishesu to Tiglathpileser IV. that we have just traced has its complete analogy in the development of the Prussian monarchy from Frederick I. to William I. It is

noteworthy that Frederick took his royal title from Prussia, that part of his territory which did not owe feudal allegiance to the Emperor; and that he did not call himself *König von Preussen*, but *König in Preussen*, which suggested that his kingdom was not to be limited to Prussia. From this time onward the Hohenzollerns aimed to take the leadership of Germany away from the Hapsburgs. In order to accomplish this, their first need was to enlarge their territory and their military resources by new conquests.

Frederick William I. (1713–1740) replenished his treasury by the strictest economy, and was able to maintain one of the largest and best-drilled armies in Europe. He added Guelders to his kingdom after the Peace of Utrecht in 1713. He expelled the Swedes from Pomerania in 1715, and after the peace of 1720 annexed the province of Vorpommern. In the treaty of Berlin in 1728 he agreed with Austria to support the Pragmatic Sanction, while the Emperor Charles VI. agreed to recognise his claims to the duchies of Jülich and Berg; but the Emperor played him false, and therefore in 1739 he formed an alliance with France. This is the first break between the houses of Hohenzollern and Hapsburg, and marks the beginning of the struggle for supremacy between the two dynasties that is the central feature of European history for the next hundred years.

Frederick II., "the Great" (1740–1786), absorbed East Friesland in 1744, and conquered Silesia from Austria in 1745. During the next ten years he replenished his treasury and his army so successfully that in the Seven Years' War he maintained himself victoriously against an alliance that included nearly all the states of Europe. In 1772 he joined with Austria in the first partition of Poland. During his reign the territory of Prussia was extended from 43,000 square miles to 75,000 square miles. He also formed in 1786 the *Fürstenbund*, or league of German princes, under the leadership of Prussia, to antagonise the ambitions of Austria. Frederick William II. (1786–1797) took part in the second and the third partitions of Poland (1793 and 1795), and thus nearly doubled the area of his kingdom.

Under Frederick William III. (1797–1840) Prussian ambition received a temporary set-back through the victories of Napoleon in 1806; but after his downfall in 1815 she regained nearly all of her former territory, and acquired new Germanic regions in the place of Slavic regions that she surrendered. Frederick William also established a customs-union of German states under the leadership of Prussia, which

was another blow at the supremacy of the house of Hapsburg. Frederick William IV. (1840–1861) was offered the imperial crown by the Diet at Frankfurt in 1849, but did not dare to accept it on account of the opposition of Austria.

Under William I. (1861–1888) Prussia began again the career of conquest that had been temporarily interrupted by the Napoleonic wars. In 1863, after the death of Ferdinand VII., king of Denmark, Prussia and Austria laid claim to the duchies of Schleswig, Holstein, and Lauenburg, in spite of the fact that both had signed the Treaty of London in 1852 in which the succession of Denmark to these duchies was guaranteed. These provinces were conquered from Denmark, Prussia taking Lauenburg and Schleswig, and Austria Holstein. In 1866 Prussia broke her agreement with Austria and annexed Holstein. Austria declared war, but was utterly unprepared, while the Prussian army was in the highest state of efficiency. Within seven days Austria was defeated, and was forced to cede Holstein and to pay an indemnity of 20,000,000 thalers. Prussia thereupon forcibly annexed Hanover, Nassau, Hesse-Cassel, and the free city of Frankfurt. As a result of this war the leadership of the Germanic nations passed from the Hapsburgs to the Hohenzollerns. The North German Confederation was then formed under the leadership of Prussia.

Prussia now saw that the time was ripe for the assumption of imperial dignity. The only obstacles were the opposition of France and the jealousy of the South German states. Both could be overcome by a war which should at the same time break the power of France and unite the German principalities in a common cause. Accordingly, it was determined to provoke France on the earliest possible occasion. On the trivial pretext of the succession to the Spanish throne, Bismarck managed to embroil the two countries; and finally, by giving out to the press a garbled telegram of the King, he goaded Napoleon III. into a declaration of war. Prussia was ready and France was unprepared. Within a few months the French armies were defeated and Paris was besieged. On January 18, 1871, King William of Prussia was proclaimed German Emperor at the palace of Versailles, and a few days later Paris surrendered and the new emperor made his triumphal entry. France was condemned to pay a war indemnity of five milliards of francs and to cede to Germany Alsace and part of Lorraine. Thus on the ruins of the Holy Roman Empire the new Prussian Empire arose.

5. *The Period of the Empire.*—When Assyria had defeated

Babylon on the south and Damascus on the west, and had crowned her king Emperor of Babylon, her ambition was not yet satisfied. She began at once to lust for the conquest of the world. From Tiglathpileser IV. to Assurbanipal there was no pause in her effort to bring all the nations beneath her rule.

A similar development has gone on in Germany since the year 1871. No sooner did Prussia obtain the leadership of the German states than she began to aim at world-empire. William I. did not adopt the title *Kaiser von Deutschland*, which would have suggested a territorial limitation of his rule, but that of *Deutscher Kaiser*, which asserted that he was the heir of Charlemagne and of the Cæsars. The utterances of Prussia's military experts, of her historians and philosophers, have been unequivocal, that might makes right, and that Germany has the might and therefore the right to rule the other nations. "Might," says von Bernhardi, "gives the right to occupy or to conquer. Might is at once the supreme right, and the dispute as to what is right is decided by the arbitrament of war. War gives a biologically just decision, since its decisions rest upon the very nature of things" (*Germany and the Next War*, Eng. trans., p. 23). *The Army and Navy Review* for August 14, 1915, reports the remarks of Count von Goetzen to an American army officer immediately after the battle of Manila as follows:—

"About fifteen years from now my country will start her great war. She will be in Paris about two months after the commencement of hostilities. Her move on Paris will be but a step to her real object, the crushing of England. Everything will move like clockwork. We shall be prepared, and the others will not be prepared. I speak of this because of the connection which it will have with your own country. Some months after we finish our work in Europe we will take New York, and probably Washington, and hold them for some time. We will put your country in its place, with reference to Germany. We do not propose to take any of your territory, but we do intend to take a billion or more of dollars from New York and other places. The Monroe Doctrine will be taken charge of by us, as we will then have put you in your places, and we will take charge of South America, as far as we wish to."

In the light of the numerous utterances, both public and private, of men high in authority, there can be no doubt that Prussia has long planned the conquest of France, Great Britain, and America, and the extension of her empire eastward "from Berlin to Bagdad."

In order to accomplish her designs of world-empire, Assyria's first care was to strengthen her army. Every native Assyrian and every citizen of the conquered provinces was compelled to serve. A huge standing army was built up, consisting of infantry, cavalry, and chariotry. All these branches of the service were brought to the highest pitch of efficiency, and were kept in constant readiness.

In like manner Prussia's chief effort for the last fifty years has been to build up her fighting forces. Every German subject has been compelled to serve three years in the barracks, unless he has been able to pass the university examinations, in which case he has been allowed to take military drill in connection with his higher studies. Those who have completed the three years have been placed on the reserve, which is liable to be called out in case of war. Thus the entire population has been converted into one vast military camp. The navy has been built up in a similar manner, and strategic railways have been constructed on the eastern and western frontiers. Overtures looking toward the diminishing of armaments by the nations of Europe, or toward the settlement of disputes through the Hague tribunal, have been systematically rejected by Prussia.

In order to increase the strength of their armies the Assyrian emperors claimed absolute powers. Ancient rights and privileges of the clergy, of the nobles, and of cities were abolished, and the government was centralised in the person of the monarch. He was not only commander-in-chief, but also head of the church, chief executive, and supreme judge.

Similarly the Hohenzollerns, in order to promote military efficiency, have been absolutists. They have been compelled by the march of civilisation to grant constitutions and popular assemblies, but they have always managed to circumvent these impertinent upstarts. Nominally there has been universal suffrage, but by a system of plural votes of the conservative classes the working men have been practically disfranchised. The ministers of state have not been chosen by the people, but appointed by the Emperor, and their function has been adroitly to play off one group of the Reichstag against another so as to secure a majority for the government. There has been no liberty of the press, for newspapers have been censored even in time of peace; and there has been no liberty of speech, for at every public assembly a police official has presided who could dismiss the meeting if any remark were made that he regarded as improper. While the present writer was a student in Berlin, an old workman was severely punished for speaking

of Kaiser Wilhelm I. as "der greise Kaiser" (the venerable Emperor), Kaiser Friedrich as "der weise Kaiser" (the wise Emperor), and Kaiser Wilhelm II. as "der Reise Kaiser" (the travelling Emperor).

The Assyrian emperors realised that victory depended not only upon the army but also upon economic preparedness. Accordingly, they taxed the nation to the limit of endurance, and put forth every effort to foster industry and trade.

Prussia also has perceived that military success depends upon economic prosperity. She has fostered scientific research. She has developed industry, trade, and commerce. She has adopted socialistic schemes for the betterment of the working classes. She has organised production so that the output of the nation is increased to the maximum and the expenditure is reduced to the minimum. Commercial prosperity has brought the possibility of larger taxation. The burden has been increased year by year to meet the ever-growing cost of the armament, and to fill up the war-chest in the tower at Spandau; and in 1914 the extreme step was taken of levying a special super-tax upon the capitalists of the empire.

The Assyrian emperors recognised that they must have the sympathy of their subjects in their ambition for world dominion. Accordingly they inaugurated a campaign of education that is without a parallel in antiquity. The inscriptions that they carved on the walls of their palaces and public buildings, and set up in every city of their domain, had the aim of imbuing their people with the idea that Assyria was the greatest nation, that she was destined by the gods to rule all lands, and that her enemies were knaves and fools who could easily be conquered. In the inscriptions foes are constantly called by such contemptuous terms as "sinners," "disregarders of the divine laws," "sons of nobody," "men without understanding," "men whom the gods had made mad, that they might oppose my majesty and might perish," "hostile, rebellious men, who did not fear my rule, whom the gods had forsaken."

Prussia, like Assyria, has also realised the military importance of education. A large part of the indemnity received from France after the Franco-Prussian war was spent on institutions of higher learning. Along with the development of scientific and technical training there has gone a unique cultivation of beliefs and ideals. Through supervised teaching in the schools, the universities, the press, and the pulpit the German nation has systematically been brought to believe that it is the greatest, wisest, and most virtuous people on

earth; that its *Kultur* is the only one worth having; that its language is the most beautiful and expressive in the world, and is destined to become the speech of all mankind; that English in particular is "the bastard jargon of a race of pirates"; that it is Germany's duty to conquer the other nations in order to bring to them the blessings of civilisation; that Russia is so corrupt politically that she can make no defence; that France is a nation of degenerates; that England is so rent with political dissensions as to be helpless; that America loves only the dollar, and will not fight for her honour; that large parts of the United States and of Brazil are so filled with German colonists that they can already be indicated on the map as *Deutsche Gebiete*. These propositions have been drummed into the minds of the Germans so constantly for the last fifty years that they have become axiomatic. This accounts for the extraordinary unanimity of the nation in the prosecution of the war. Their minds have been trained to agree with the government just as their bodies have been trained to obey the drill-master.

When Assyria was ready to advance she created occasions for war. The other peoples desired peace and feared to provoke her, but this did not prevent her attacking them. She had made treaties with the smaller nations promising to leave them in peace if they paid tribute; but she had no hesitation in breaking these treaties when it suited her convenience. 2 Kings xviii. 13-16 tells us how Sennacherib received from Hezekiah, king of Judah, three hundred talents of silver and thirty talents of gold, and promised to withdraw; then broke his promise and demanded the surrender of Jerusalem—a perfidy that called forth from Isaiah the indignant protest: "Woe to thee who spoilest, though thou wast not spoiled; and dealest treacherously, though they dealt not treacherously with thee" (Isa. xxxiii. 1).

Once more the analogy with modern Prussia is complete. When Prussia had finished her military preparations, and had built her strategic railways to the Belgian frontier, and when she thought that Britain was so rent by political strife as to be unable to interfere, then she struck her blow. She did not wait for a cause of war, she manufactured one. No neutral nation believes that the Serbian episode would have precipitated a catastrophe unless Germany had decreed that the time had come for which she had so long been preparing. No neutral believes that Germany was attacked by the Allies. The absurdity of the claim is shown at once by the fact that Germany was ready while the Allies were not. The war was

not necessary to secure economic independence. Germany already led the world in educational, scientific, and technical development. Her young men were taking business positions away from Englishmen and Americans in their own cities because of better preparation. Her merchants were crowding out competitors in the markets of every land. Germany was already conquering the world by her superior science; but she was not content with this peaceful victory, she must needs conquer also with the sword. War was not necessary to secure the "freedom of the seas": Germany had that already. Her ships were in every harbour, and a large proportion both of British and of French goods were carried in her vessels. The only reason why the war broke out was that Germany wanted it, and thought that she was ready for it.

When that time came, no weak considerations of justice were allowed to stand in the way of her plans. She had guaranteed the neutrality of Belgium, but that made no difference. The Imperial Chancellor pronounced the promise "only a scrap of paper," and declared in his speech before the Reichstag, August 4, 1914: "We are now in a state of necessity, and necessity knows no law. Our troops have occupied Luxemburg, and perhaps have already entered Belgian territory. This is a breach of international law. . . . The wrong—I speak openly—the wrong we thereby commit we will try to make good as soon as our military ends have been attained." But the building of railways on the frontier shows that the occupation of Belgium was no sudden necessity, but a long-intended plan. General von Bernhardt in his *Warfare of To-Day* had said already, "The neutrality of Belgium will not stop us"; and the *Deutsche Kriegs-Zeitung*, September 2, 1914, declared: "The plan for the invasion of France was thoroughly thought out a long time ago. It was necessary for its success that it should take place in the north by way of Belgium."

In the prosecution of their wars the Assyrian kings displayed relentless cruelty. Their policy was to strike such terror into the hearts of their enemies that they would not dare to fight; or, if defeated, would not dare to rebel. In their inscriptions they gloat over these atrocities. They tell how wounded enemies were mutilated, captives of war were blinded, flayed alive, impaled on stakes around the walls of beleaguered towns in order to frighten them into submission, or thrown to wild beasts to devour. Cities taken by storm were given up to every species of ignominy and torture. Neither age nor sex nor rank was spared. For such an

empire the only appropriate symbol was a furious wild beast. "Where is the den of the lion, and the cave of the young lions, whither the lions went, the young lions affrighted by none? The lion is rending for his cubs, and strangling for his lionesses, and fills his dens with prey and his habitations with plunder" (Nahum ii. 11 f.).

In the conduct of the present war in neutral and un-offending lands Germany has imitated the Assyrian policy of terrorism. This policy has been inculcated in the manuals prepared for the instruction of officers. "Ruthlessly to employ the necessary means of defence and intimidation is not only a right but a duty for every commander of an army" (*Kriegsgebrauch im Landkrieg*, 1902, p. 115). To the troops who were starting for China the Kaiser said: "Behave like Huns and Vandals." Carrying out this principle, the civil populations of the Belgian towns that lay nearest to the German frontier have been slaughtered without mercy in order to frighten the inhabitants of remoter cities into prompter submission. In violation of the customs of civilised warfare and the terms of the Hague Convention, unfortified towns have been shelled, buildings devoted to religion, to charity, and to science have been destroyed, private property has been stolen, and non-combatants, particularly women and children, have been subjected to outrage and murder. The official reports of the British Committee presided over by Viscount Bryce and of the Belgian Commission by Henri Davignon leave no doubt in the minds of neutrals as to the fact of German atrocities in Belgium.

For the massacres of the Armenians in Asia Minor Prussia is also morally responsible, since Turkey, like Austria, is now a vassal of the German empire. Letters from American missionaries bear repeated testimony that German officers not only witnessed but also assisted in these massacres and in all the unspeakable horrors that attended them. The Armenians loved liberty. Many of them had been trained in American ideals. Therefore they stood in the way of German imperialism, and must be slain like the freedom-loving citizens of Belgium.

Along with the Assyrian outrages there went a pompous religiosity that described these as done in the name of the gods and for their glory. Of himself Tiglathpileser IV. says: "Who, in the service of Asshur, his Lord, shattered all those who opposed him like earthen vessels, swept them away like a cyclone, destroyed them like a tornado; the king who marched in the name of Asshur, Shamash, Marduk, the great

gods, from the sea of the rising sun to the sea of the setting sun." Sargon calls himself "the chosen of Anu and Bel, the favourite of the great gods, whom Asshur and Marduk called, and caused the fame of his name to go forth to the ends of the earth." Sennacherib calls himself "the good shepherd, the favourite of the great gods, the protector of justice, the lover of righteousness, the establisher of order, the bringer of help, the dispenser of blessings, the perfect ruler." Esarhaddon says: "In order to display the might of Asshur, my Lord, before all peoples, I hung the heads of Sanduarri and of Abdimilkutti upon the necks of their prime ministers, and with singing and music I marched into the suburbs of Nineveh."

The same flood of pious cant issues from the mouths of the modern Prussian scourges of mankind. As their soldiers go about the work of murder, rape, and arson in Belgium they bear on their belts the motto "Gott mit uns," and the Kaiser in his speeches rings the changes on the thought, "God will bless us, and give us success in our righteous war for the defence of our liberties." The historian Carl Lamprecht remarks: "Who will deny that there is even now a Christian German God, and that sometimes he reveals himself to aliens as a strong and jealous God?" It is hard to see wherein this religion differs from the old Assyrian cult of Asshur, the war-god, who led his people to victory over their enemies.

6. *The Outcome of the Struggle.*—The gloomy predictions of the Hebrew prophets were soon fulfilled. Under Shalmaneser V., the successor of Tiglathpileser IV. (727–722 B.C.), the great world-war began. He conquered Phœnicia and besieged Samaria, the capital of Israel. Sargon II. (722–705 B.C.) captured Samaria and deported the people of the northern kingdom. He also annexed Philistia, and quelled revolts in Babylonia and in Syria. Sennacherib (705–680 B.C.) devastated the land of Judah, and would have captured Jerusalem, if a pestilence had not broken out in his army that compelled him to abandon the undertaking. He also defeated an alliance of North Arabian peoples, and so opened the way for the invasion of Egypt. In 689 he punished a revolt of the Babylonians by capturing and burning their holy city. He moved the capital of the empire from Calah to Nineveh. Esarhaddon (680–668 B.C.) invaded Egypt, captured Memphis, the northern capital, and divided the land into twenty-two Assyrian provinces. Assurbanipal (668–626 B.C.) destroyed Thebes, the southern capital of Egypt, and conquered Elam, the region now known as Persia. This was the high-water mark of the Assyrian empire. Her territory now extended

from India to Ethiopia, and from the Caspian Sea to the middle of Asia Minor. It was the greatest empire that the world had ever seen, and it had no rival in later times, except in the dominions of Alexander and of the Romans.

At this point, however, the decline of Assyria began. The empire had grown too large for one man to govern, and Esarhaddon had divided it between his sons, giving Assurbanipal Nineveh and the northern regions, and Shamashshumukin Babylon and the southern regions, with the intention that the two should reign conjointly; but rivalry soon developed between the brothers, and years were spent in a bloody struggle that ended with the sack of Babylon and the slaughter of Shamashshumukin. Assyria never recovered from this disaster. After the death of Assurbanipal in 626 all the provinces threw off the yoke. Nabopolassar founded the New Babylonian empire, and Josiah declared the independence of Judah. All the other princes of Western Asia hastened to follow their example. Asshuretililani and Sinsharishkun, the two feeble successors of Assurbanipal, were unable to regain the lost territory, and saw their monarchy reduced to the region that had first been ruled by the ancient Patesis of Asshur. In 606 the Medes and the Babylonians united in an expedition against Nineveh, and succeeded in destroying it. They slew the population, carried off the plunder of a thousand years, and razed the city to the ground. So thoroughly was their work done that the site of Nineveh was forgotten, and remained unknown, until in modern times the spade of the excavator recovered it. Assyria ceased to be a nation, and only its name lingered in legend, until in our own day the boastful inscriptions of its emperors were discovered and deciphered. Thus the expectation of Nahum was realised: "Thy shepherds slumber, O king of Assyria; thy worthies are at rest; thy people are scattered upon the mountains, and there is none to gather them. There is no assuaging of thy hurt; thy wound is grievous; all that hear the rumour of thee clap the hands over thee; for upon whom hath not thy wickedness passed continually?" (Nahum iii. 18 f.).

The parallelism between Assyria and Prussia has been complete up to the beginning of the present war. Will that parallelism continue during the period that is just opening? Prussia has been successful thus far. She has occupied Belgium and Luxemburg, and has annexed part of France. She has taken Poland, and pushed her battle-line far into Russia. She has conquered Serbia, and terrorised Bulgaria into submission, so that the way is now open to Constantinople. Will

she continue her career of conquest? We hope and pray not, but who can tell? If that line of defence in France and in Flanders gives way, France is lost. If France is defeated, the conquest of Russia and of Italy will be easy. Then Britain can hardly hope to defend herself in splendid isolation. If Britain falls, it is certain that America will be invaded in a few months. The Germans hate us for our prosperity, and they bitterly resent our attitude in the matter of the *Lausitania*, and our supplying of munitions of war to the Allies. They will not wait for us to get ready, they will strike us at once. It may be that our cherished Anglo-Saxon liberties are destined to be destroyed, and that we must bend our necks to the yoke of Prussian militarism. It may be that we shall live to see a Hohenzollern prince ruling at Washington, and our states administered by German military governors.

If that time should come, which may God forbid, one thing is certain: the final scene in the parallelism between Assyria and Prussia will soon be ushered in. The German empire, composed as it then will be of Arabs and Turks, and Slavs, and Latins, and Anglo-Saxons, and Americans, as well as Teutons, will be a pyramid standing upon its apex. Sooner or later such an empire, created by brute force, must topple. For a while it may be possible through terrorism to keep the conquered nations in submission; but some day the discipline will relax, and then the enslaved races will break their bonds. The day of reckoning will come, and the Prussian empire will fall just as completely and as terribly as did ancient Assyria.

LEWIS BAYLES PATON.