

The Curlyzation of the Seas.

R. Traquair
Dept of architecture
McGill University
Montreal
Que

The Civilization of the Seas.

It is not so many years ago that geography was the very dullest of many dull subjects taught in our schools. Many of us must have memories of capital cities with their populations, their imports and their exports and their principal rivers. And if geography was dull, History was nearly as dull, lists of kings with their queens and their dates. Names and numbers which remained just names and numbers of no possible interest, but things which had to be learned.

But today we are learning that geography and history cannot be separated, that indeed geography is the mother of history. We are beginning to see that the characteristics of any people have been moulded by the shape of the country in which they live. Before we can understand history, we must know geography for history is to a large extent made by geography.

To take a practical instance, Norway and England have large seaboards with plentiful and good harbours, they have a small, almost enclosed sea rough enough to require skilled seamanship, yet not too rough, so the Norsemen and the English have always been seamen. Seafaring is a risky occupation and an adventurous one; so these northern people have always been adventurers and wanderers in every part of the world.

Ireland is again a very healthy country for young animals, it is a very great stock-raising country, but the climate which makes the young foal grow well makes the human baby healthy too. So Ireland produces great numbers of healthy men and women who are compelled by pressure to emigrate and, as a result of ~~her~~ soft damp climate of their land, the Irish are amongst the great emigrant people of Europe.

What is true of the British Isles is true of the rest of the world: climate and geographical formation have been the leading influences in the history of mankind.

Where man first made his appearance on this world is much disputed, but still unknown. The weight of evidence seems to be in favour of Central Asia - probably climatically a very different Asia from what it is today. Civilized man however is first found at three points not very far from one another, in Mesopotamia, in Egypt and in the Island of Crete.

For this I think we may give good reasons. In the Tropics the fight against nature is very severe. Man can indeed live there as an animal, but he cannot master nature and become civilized. The heavy vegetation prevents travel, fields cleared with difficulty return to jungle in a single season of neglect, whilst the intense heat and the drenching rains do not tend to produce a race energetic enough to cope with this overluxuriant life. Even civilized man, with all his advantages, finds it impossible to maintain his energy in the tropics.

In the extreme north on the other hand, the barrenness of Nature is as crushing as is her luxuriance at the Equator. The Eskimo can never develop a high culture, it is all he can do to live. Even in more temperate zones, in Northern Europe or America, primitive man had to lead a struggle against an inclement climate to develop freely.

But in Mesopotamia, Egypt and ~~the~~ the Eastern Basin of the Mediterranean man found a climate where the labours necessary to life were not too severe where nature rewarded his toil without checking him out, where in fact he could make nature his servant in place of his tyrant.

So, in these favoured places man rose beyond savagery and commenced his long conquest of nature.

Early civilizations rose also in such places as China or India, but it is now very generally considered that these civilizations are later, by some thousands of years, than those I have

mentioned.

Now, until very recently, our European Civilization was ~~regarded~~ considered to have risen from the old people of Babylonia and Egypt.

These were both of them civilizations founded upon rivers, in the one case upon the Tigris and Euphrates, in the other on the Nile. They were river-bank empires, depending entirely upon the river waters for the fertility of their land, for their means of transit, for their very existence.

So it was often assumed that man advanced in civilization by a series of steps. from nomadic he became riverine, then continental, and now has spread over all lands.

This theory, or point of view, regards man as living on a particular piece of land, it regards the world as a number of continents separated by ~~seas~~ oceans.

So Mr Mackenna, in his very interesting writings on Geographical history, can speak of the world island meaning the combined mass of Asia and Africa and can consider world movements from the point of view of land.

But there is another view, not indeed ignored but which I venture to think is of greater importance than the land view. it is the view of civilization as lying round about a sea. and it is of this which I wish to speak this evening.

In 1900 Sir Arthur Evans began his excavations in the Island of Crete, led thereto by the many Greek stories and legends which told of a mighty power once centred in that land. The legend of the Minotaur the bloodthirsty man-bull, the legend of King Minos, of Cretan Zeus, of Daedalus the ingenious artificer, all these legends pointed to some long forgotten power mysterious because forgotten, which had once ruled the Grecian seas.

He was, as we know, richly rewarded. He discovered that there had existed in Crete a sea-empire as old and as civilized as the river-empires of Greece or Babylon. He, and other excavators in Crete, found great Palaces, with stairs of many flights, corridors stores + rooms. The walls were painted with coloured frescos of great beauty, their painted pottery was decorated with flowers and sea designs of fish and water plants.

He was able to prove that this great and powerful empire had been utterly destroyed about 1400 years before our Era.

How these people first reached Crete ~~was~~ is of course unknown. The voyage either from Asia Minor or from Greece is not very long. but circumstances vouch for the fact that they became a very ~~great~~ powerful sea empire.

On the walls of many of the old Egyptian buildings are representations of a strange people called Kheftiu who approach the Pharaoh bearing curious, unegyptian vases and cups. They, and their vases, are exactly like the people whom we find painted on the walls of Knossos in Crete. So the old Creteans traded with Egypt two thousand years before Christ, and this is a long open-sea voyage.

Thucydides tells us of Minos the King of Crete, that he was a sea king - This is of course only legend - but the cities of Crete were quite undefended - they had no fortification walls. Now the Mediterranean swarms with pirates always when not under strong rule, and Mediterranean cities were in consequence always fortified in troublous times.

The people who ruled the seas from Crete must have been strong enough to put down piracy in the Aegean and that means a sea empire. When, in 1400 B.C. they lost that empire their cities were destroyed.

It has been conjectured that the legend of Atlantis, the legendary land lying out to the west, which has vanished beneath the waves, was in reality a legend of Crete, the civilization that vanished so suddenly from the seas, and that, as time went on, and the seas became better known, the position of this now legendary empire moved further and further west, until it lay eventually in the Unknown Atlantic.

Though destroyed, yet Crete left a further mark on the But the Empire of Crete was more than the Island itself. All round the Aegean Sea, and extending even into the Levant we find remains of Colonies, at Mycenae and Tiryns in Greece, at Troy in the Hellespont. It was at one time thought that these were primitive Greek settlements, but we know now that they were Minoan Colonies which survived their mother land by some three hundred years. The recent excavations in Palestine go far to prove that the Philistines, who for so long held the Hebrews in subjection, were either Cretans or at least deeply imbued with Cretan culture. These cities were all heavily fortified, set on commanding strong places - a proof that, with the fall of Crete came troublous and practical times in the Mediterranean.

But all our evidence goes to show that from very early times up to about 1100 B.C. the Eastern Basin of the Mediterranean was held by a warlike people, traders and pirates, who settled in coastal colonies but never penetrated far inland.

It has been very clearly shown too that the later Greek Civilization derived its beginnings not from Egypt or from Babylon, but from Crete. The legends, the art, even to some degree the religion of Classic Greece all point to this.

So the history of our own civilization begins not in Egypt, or in Babylon, but in the Sea, with

the sea-empire of Crete some 3000 years before Christ.

This is the oldest continuous civilization in the world, for those of Egypt and Babylon are dead and those of China or India are modern in comparison, ~~and it is~~. The culture of art and of thought which we inherit today can be traced step by step back to these old Seakings of Crete.

We use the word "race" often very loosely. You will hear for instance of the Teutonic race, the French race and so on. Now Ethnologists are really only agreed on three races in Europe and these have nothing to do with modern Nations. They are the Mediterranean man, the Alpine man and the Northern man - or Nordic. But today all three of these are so closely connected, so intermingled that it is absurd to draw any very strong distinctions of race between them. The civilization of Europe is one, and all races in Europe are capable of high civilization. So, although we do not know to what race these Cretans belonged, yet we do know that they were in no way alien to ourselves. It is indeed a striking fact that whereas we do feel that the Ancient Assyrians or Egyptians were in some way alien to ourselves, the more one studies the remains of the Ancient Minoan People, the more we feel that we are studying people very like ourselves.

Now, a great many years ago, I was given advice by a very inspiring teacher. He said "Our maps should be maps of the seas, with the lands which lie round about them. Look at the Seas" So beginning with Ancient Crete I wish to trace our modern civilization from sea to sea down to our own day. We are all well accustomed to think of people as living on the land, now I wish you to think of them as living round the edges of a sea.

When the Minoan Empire collapsed, its fall was followed about three hundred years later by that of its colonies. The story of the Trojan war seems to be some echo of these wars. There then followed a dark age in the Mediterranean until the rise of Greek Civilization about the seventh century B.C.

But meanwhile, about 1600 B.C. we find another seafaring people in the Levant, the Phoenicians.

This mysterious people, of whom we really know very little, lived in coast cities, set on small islands or strong points on the coast of Palestine - Arvad, Sidon, Tyre and Tripoli. They lived further north than the Philistines, and their cities were evidently the ports from which the through which the Mesopotamian trade flowed to Egypt, and other points in the Mediterranean.

Of their riches and splendour in the days of their greatest ~~power~~ prosperity the Prophet Ezekiel gives a vivid picture (Ch 27)

Say unto Tyre, Thy Borders are in the midst of the seas, thy builders have perfected thy beauty. They have made all thy ship boards of fir trees of Senir, they have taken Cedars of Lebanon to ~~be~~ make masts for thee ... Fine linen with bordered work from Egypt was that which thou spreadest forth for thy sail ... The inhabitants of Sidon and Arvad were thy mariners. thy wise men, oh Tyre, were thy pilots. Tarshish was thy merchant with silver, iron, tin and lead they traded in thy fairs. They traded the persons of men in thy market.

There is no mention of corn, of agriculture. These were purely traders - and slave dealers.

From Palestine the Phoenicians spread through the southern boundaries of the Mediterranean. About seven hundred years before Christ they founded the great City of Carthage. At the summit of their power they had

established posts in southern Spain and probably traded for tin as far as Britain. Carthaginian merchant ships were familiar to the ancient Greeks, indeed until the rise of the Roman Empire they were the ~~great~~ seafaring people of the Mediterranean.

Though a great manufacturing people, with a keen commercial sense, yet they had apparently no artistic or creative ability. They were devoted entirely to the search for wealth, they originated very little and when they fell they vanished so completely that today we have only a few potsherds and a chapter of Ezekiel to tell of their one time splendor.

The Greek alphabet, from which our own is derived, is usually accredited to the Phoenicians, but it seems probable now that they had themselves derived it from the Cretans. But they probably handed down some of the Cretan culture, as well as some skill in seamanship to the Greeks. They are a link in the first dark age of our civilization.

About 1300 to 1100 the Eastern Mediterranean was invaded from the north by the people whom we know later as the Greeks. They swept out or absorbed the old Minoan people and established themselves in Greece, on the shores of the Aegean Sea. From there they spread to Sicily and Southern Italy so, by 700 B.C. the Eastern Mediterranean was divided between the Greeks and the Phoenicians - the Greeks in the north, the Phoenicians in the south.

We are apt to think of classic Greece as the modern peninsula of Greece, but historically Hellas is the Eastern Mediterranean and the lands which lie about it. There were more Greeks in Asia Minor, in South Italy, in Sicily in Egypt and Cyrenaica than ever there were in Greece itself. And, although their literature almost ignores it, yet

The Greeks were then, as now, a trading and a seafaring people. The wares which the Greek Merchants exported from Athens 400 years B.C. are still found in Italy, her trading colonies extended from the Crimea in the Black Sea, to Marseilles in the south of France. Her legend, from the Wanderings of Ulysses to Jason and the Argonauts is a legend of the sea. Hellas is the name of a sea rather than of a land. Even to this day one important cause of the perpetual unrest in Eastern Europe, is the fact that Greeks inhabit all the coasts of the Aegean Sea and of the Levant and these coasts are perpetually demanding union with Greece. The modern political divisions quite ignore the actual distribution of the Greeks. They divide up this Greek Sea-state between many land states, and fiction is the natural result. The classic Greeks of course lived in many free cities all up and down the coasts.

Twice in classic times attempts were made to found great land empires in this part of the world. In the VI century B.C. the Persians under Darius and Xerxes conquered Mesopotamia and spread as far as Egypt and Greece. Xerxes was defeated by the Greeks at Plataea, nor did the Persian domination of Egypt last long.

Again Alexander the Great attempted to found a great land empire stretching from Greece to India. He conquered Greece. He swept the Persians out of Egypt. He founded Greek kingdoms almost in India itself - yet, at his death, all this vast empire fell instantly to pieces.

So two attempts were made, one from the East and one from the West to form a land empire. Both failed but the civilization of the Mediterranean continued to grow.

A new people now rise in the Western basin of the Mediterranean. Beginning as a small trading port on the Tiber, Rome expanded through Italy and in Sicily

Came into contact with the Greeks and the Carthaginians.

The Greek culture was in no way alien to the Romans, it was absorbed easily enough.

But the Carthaginian empire at this time extended along the whole southern coasts of the Mediterranean. All southern Spain was a Phoenician colony, and this powerful Phoenician empire was essentially alien to Rome.

Had, for instance, the Greek lands been powerful to spread westwards, had Greece absorbed Rome instead of Rome conquering Greece. It is doubtful if our civilization today would have been widely different from what it is.

But had Carthage conquered Rome in the Punic wars our civilization would have been utterly changed.

There is an old saying. "Greece conquered conquered Rome" The Romans handed down to us the light of Greek thought and art and added to it Roman law and organization. The Carthaginians would probably have destroyed both.

And the conflict between Carthage and Rome was not easily decided. For long victory seemed to favour Carthage but Rome eventually created for herself a fighting sea power and Hannibal that great general who attempted to conquer Rome by land attack, was defeated when Rome became mistress of the sea. So, after a century of conflict Rome ruled the Mediterranean and began to expand.

Just as we think of Greece as the modern peninsula of that name so we sometimes think of Rome as ~~modern~~ Italy.

But the Roman empire included Egypt, North Africa Spain. Greece as well as Gaul and Britain. A Roman was not necessarily a native even of Italy; Paul of Tarsus boasts himself a Roman. The Emperor

Constantine was born in York, in England. Diocletian was a Dacian, Septimius Severus and Galba were Spaniards. Imperial Rome was a cosmopolitan state centred on the Mediterranean; a kind of bureaucratic republic with a perpetual president, for the Emperor

has simply the chief executive. Could we imagine today a great state, including all America Europe and Africa, governed from London by a President who was sometimes an American sometimes a Frenchman, that would be something like the Roman Empire during the Pax Romana. For the Mediterranean was to the Roman very much what the Atlantic is to us.

Perhaps this needs a word of explanation. Today Canadian wheat takes about a fortnight to get to the London Market, a passenger from New York can get to Europe in about six days, a message in as many minutes. This is the size of the Atlantic.

In Roman times a merchant ship would pass from Messina to Alexandria in six days with favourable winds. So the Corn of Egypt took seven or eight days to get to Rome, if the wind was favourable, if not it might take forty, or more. Passengers and news took the same time. So the ~~regular stream of traffic in the Roman Mediterranean~~ ~~was~~ ~~like~~ ~~probably~~ ~~about~~ So ~~the~~ Roman Merchant or Tourist must have looked upon a voyage to Egypt or Greece much as we look upon a voyage to Europe. The ~~the~~ Roman Mediterranean indeed was rather larger than the Modern Atlantic, and we must give unstinted admiration to the organising genius which united it into one Empire. The Mediterranean was a Roman Lake. With a definite sense of Roman nationality and unity.

From Rome we have inherited our law, our art and our religion.

For, though we often hear the Christian Religion spoken of as Oriental, yet it is well to remember that the Jews too lived in the Mediterranean, that Christianity is deeply shot through with Greek

philosophic thought, and that it became a European Religion in Rome. The Christian religion is a product of the Mediterranean and it is quite unnecessary to postulate for it any oriental origin.

Just as the first sea Empire of Crete fell before the invasions of the northern barbarians, who became the cultured Greeks, so the Empire of Rome fell before those northern Barbarians who are our immediate ancestors. In neither case was the thread of culture lost. We inherit the foundations of our civilization from the Romans.

But there was a long period of darkness, from about 400 AD to say 800 AD, and during that time of disruption and reformation an alien people invaded the Mediterranean. We shall never know quite what we lost in the fall of the Roman Empire, or indeed what we gained, but undoubtedly our general grade of civilization was set back about fifteen hundred years. One of the greatest gifts of the Classic Civilization was freedom of thought, the conviction that we are entitled to apply our minds and our reason to any problem without limit or hindrance by custom or tradition. This right almost vanished from Europe between say 400 AD to 1000 AD.

In the fourth century Rome was disrupted from the North, in the seventh the Moslem people overthrew the remnants of Roman organization in the South and occupied North Africa and Southern Spain. It is noteworthy that the Mediterranean Moslem empire corresponded almost exactly to the older Mediterranean Phoenician Empire.

They held the gates of Gibraltar and so barred the road to the under seas, only in Constantinople was the light of Roman Culture held aloft. The Crusades had many motives, religious, commercial and economic, and under them all I think that we can see the unformulated desire to drive this alien people from the Middle

The Crusades failed, though they checked the Moslem. Even today he is the source of constant fiction, the Spanish war in North Africa is due to the same causes as the Greek wars with Turkey, ~~and possibly the English troubles~~ in the desire of the Mediterranean people to control their sea.

So, unable for the time to expand fully in the Mediterranean culture spread northwards.

The map shows us how much the North was dependent upon the North Sea. Across it from Denmark and Friesland came the Angles to colonise England. Later from Norway came the Norsemen to conquer France and eventually England too. Round the north sea grew up ports. The Hansa Towns of North Germany, London Norwich Hull Leith Dundee in Great Britain, Paris Rotterdam Christiania on the South. The Mediaeval prosperity of England is concentrated on her eastern coasts and who shall say how much of the troubles of Ireland are due to her having been cut off, in this great mediaeval period of formation, from the influences of the North Sea.

Let those who would doubt the unifying influences of the sea consider that Orkney Shetland and Caithness in the North of Scotland are more akin in race and tradition to Norway than to Perthshire, only a few miles distant across the land. Northern France is more akin to Southern England than it is to Provence. The lines of culture follow the seas.

But the North Sea and a disrupted Mediterranean were too narrow for the growing culture of Europe.

All through the Middle Ages European Travellers had attempted land voyages, penetrating further and further into Asia. These culminated perhaps in the Marco Polo's journeys. This was in fact a period marked by land travelling and therefore of very slow expansion. The old Norsemen indeed had colonised Iceland and creeping from land to land in the north had undoubtedly penetrated as far as America.

But the Atlantic was still too

too broad for their boats. It must be remembered that the art of tacking, + of sailing against the wind was unknown until the XV century, when it was discovered by an English mariner. The old boats could only sail with the wind. To go into this at present would take too long, it is however perhaps of interest to mention that the defeat of the Spanish Armada was probably due to the fact that the English ships knew how to tack and to sail into the wind, whilst the Spaniards did not. The development of modern maps, fairly accurate delineations of the sea coasts, occurs first in the beginning of the XIV century, and the first real maps are not land maps, but sea charts. The earliest known, the Pisan Cartolano is a map of the Eastern basin of the Mediterranean. It was not until long afterwards that land maps of any accuracy were known + our maps worked inwards from the sea coasts, not outwards from the land. ~~So navigation advanced and, by 1520 men knew~~ ~~that~~ From Phoenician times traders had crept ~~up~~ through the straits of Gibraltar, the Portuguese explored later the African coasts ~~until eventually navigation~~ advanced out to them all Europe was bounded on the west by ocean boundaries + unknown. By 1520 however men knew that the Atlantic existed, a sea with lands lying round it and began to colonise the shores of that sea. Columbus discovered the Atlantic.

The Atlantic

The result of the Atlantic colonisation was to turn Europe round. Hitherto the important ports had faced inwards to the Mediterranean or the North sea. Now Venice, Pisa, Constantinople ~~Italy + Dundee~~ must decline before the new ports of Bristol, Liverpool + Glasgow.

Whilst London and Hamburg found their outlet through the English Channel.

So the European Side of the Atlantic may be regarded as penetrated by two deep inlets, or gulfs - one on the North, entered by the English Channel, one further South entered by the Straits of Gibraltar. The Mediterranean has become a Gulf of the Atlantic.

This corresponds on the opposite side to the Great Gulf of St Lawrence, and the Seaward ports of Boston, Philadelphia, New York and others.

Progress since the sixteenth century has lain in the extension Westwards of the American seaboard until now all the shores of the Atlantic which are fitted for European Occupation, are filled by a people of one culture who look to the Atlantic for their home sea.

Today we, whether we call ourselves Americans or Europeans, really live on the Atlantic. The three or four thousand miles which intervene between America and Europe are miles of union, not of separation. The Atlantic is today an inland sea, and very much what the Mediterranean was to the Roman Empire. This community of Atlantic nations has as yet no name of its own, its essential unity has not yet been ~~sufficiently~~ recognised clearly enough for that, and it has been torn by family quarrels, yet it exists and we can I think see very clearly in our everyday politics its actual influence upon our national affairs. We may try to keep separate from Europe but I think that we will find it impossible. The unity of interest is too powerful.

This reading of history has a bearing in this way upon recent events. The recent war was of course a family quarrel between European nations, not as it is often called a "World War". Before the war Germany had no ~~idea~~ of dreams of expansion one, the "drang nach Osten". The "Drive to the East" was typified by the penetration of Turkey and the Baghdad Railway. It was an effort to found a great land state. It was perhaps a pity for the Atlantic nations that this

was not allowed to go on, for it would have occupied the full attention of the central powers and in the end would have failed, even as did the earlier efforts of Darius and of Alexander. The Empire of Kublai Khan was the greatest land empire that ever existed, and it did not last long.

Now it is often said that the railroad today makes possible land empires. In so saying we forget that sea transport has made advances parallel to those on land. Montreal, at the end of the sea route, is still more important than Quebec or Halifax at the end of the land one. Sea travel is still more important than land, and will probably continue to be so.

So the second German dream, typified by the Emperor William's announcement of himself as "admiral of the Atlantic" was a more important one. It was a dream of ocean domination which had to be resisted by all the other Atlantic people. America entered the war to defend the Atlantic.

So the old tradition of American isolation, true enough perhaps in the days when it took six weeks to cross the ocean, had to give way before the facts.

Eastern America certainly belongs to the Atlantic Union of Nations, and her destiny is utterly involved with that union.

I have said "Eastern America" and this brings us to the geography of our own continent.

Now, of course the division between Canada and the United States is purely political. It has no real basis in geography. We can all I think acknowledge that without faulting in patriotism and without any desire to abolish it. But, in considering the history of culture we simply ignore the international boundary.

North America is divided by Nature into three parts by mountain ranges running from North to South. Firstly there is the Atlantic Coast from Labrador to the Gulf of Mexico. This includes the Gulf of St. Lawrence and its connections and the old seaboard states of the

United States. It is bounded on the West by the Alleghenies and is part of the Atlantic, and indeed is quite well aware of it.

Secondly there is ~~the~~ great Valley basin of the Mississippi with its tributaries. This extends to the North as far as the Great Slave Lake and includes the Prairie Provinces of Canada.

It is bounded on the East by the Alleghenies and on the West by the Rocky Mountains and must be almost the largest enclosed valley in the world. To consider its position and its future we must look at other valley states of the past. — Ancient Egypt, the Nile valley, Mesopotamia, China the valley of the Hoangto and the Yang-tze-kiang Russia the valley of the Volga and Central India the Valley of the Ganges.

All these civilizations have had the same character, they have often risen to a very high culture but they have never expanded. They have always tended to be hermit states, living in isolation from their neighbours.

So for instance, Ancient Egypt. We have several stories from the papyrus of Egyptians who travelled from Egypt as far even as Syria, or Arabia. They all breathe the same spirit, — an intense longing to get back to the happy land of Egypt and an intense pride in being Egyptians.

Foreigners are inferior creatures, only in Egypt was civilization. A sea people are more tolerant for they know the foreigner better.

So we know how the Chinaman longs to send his remains back to sleep in his motherland, we know too how the Chinese for long regarded foreigners — foreign devils inferior creatures unworthy of consideration. Yet both Egyptians and Chinese were very highly civilized.

This is simply the attitude of a Valley state, and we must not despise it because it is not that of a sea-state. Valley states are often highly civilized, happy & contented usually unaggressive but also stationary, isolated deeply conservative and suspicious of foreigners.

Now I think that we would agree that the Mississippi Valley is the most American part of America, here if anywhere is the home of 100% Americanism, the policy of

Non-intervention and also, the home of a rising literary and artistic school of definitely American quality. Did not Mark Twain come from the Mississippi. I would not venture to criticize these characteristics, only to point out that they are the natural qualities of a Valley people.

Of course the Great Valley is now connected by railways to the ~~Atlantic~~ sea on both sides. Here I would only remark that the connection is much stronger to the Atlantic than to the Pacific. But practically how much connection do these railways give.

Our papers in Canada, and possibly here also, have been very full of the Chicago Water diversion. Montreal depending for its existence on an Atlantic connection calls this a water theft and protests on behalf of the St Lawrence Navigation.

But Chicago protests equally loudly on behalf of sanitation and of the Navigation of the Mississippi. Chicago belongs to the Mississippi valley, Montreal belongs to the Atlantic and their interests necessarily clash.

Finally we have the Pacific Coast, a very narrow strip lying between the Ocean and the Rocky Mountains and this brings us to the great problem of the Pacific.

This, the greatest of all the seas, was unknown ~~until~~ to Europeans until Balboa gazed westwards from Darien. At about the same time a Portuguese squadron was entering Malacca. So the seafaring Europeans came from both sides to the ends of the Earth and being seafarers they joined the ends. Magellan crossed the Pacific from America to Asia in 1521. five hundred years ago.

But here Europe found native civilizations, some of which could not be overridden or destroyed. An imperfect civilization of the Pacific, incoherent but I think existing. We must consider briefly this early pre-European culture - or cultures.

On the western shores of the Pacific, in the North lies the Mongolian civilization of China and Japan, an old civilization, strong, coherent and active. To the south was the curious, half barbaric civilization of ~~some~~ Polynesia

and on the Eastern side the Amerindian civilizations of British Columbia with further south the Indian States of the Toltecs and the Aztecs in central America, and the Incas in Peru. We can take these up in order of importance

The culture of Polynesia is singularly uniform. From New Zealand to Hawaii, in Samoa Tahiti and the Marquessan Islands practically the same language is spoken. The culture, even as far as Easter Island is the same, and it is not the culture of the Northern Mongols. The Polynesians have neither bows nor pottery. But this culture has been completely checked by European invasion and today Australasia and Polynesia represent rather a European Colony on the Southern Pacific.

~~On the North western coasts is the Mongol Civilization of China and Japan~~

On the Eastern shores are the Native cultures of America, and of them we may note one curious point. They all face the Pacific. There were no high Amerindian culture centres on the Atlantic.

The Indians of British Columbia were by far the most civilized of the Northern People, their art has a distinction unknown in the East. Further south the Indian Empires of Central America and Peru were Pacific Coast empires. This, in conjunction with certain peculiarities of their art as shown in the paintings of the Haidas of British Columbia and the Stone carvings of Yucatan and Peru, has led archaeologists to conjecture that America was first colonised ~~by~~ from Asia, by way of Alaska, so that a Pacific civilization was growing, though very slowly.

European Intervention cut this short, it destroyed the American cultures entirely, it prevented further growth in Polynesia and left the Mongol Civilization of China and Japan isolated. But China and Japan are still strong, stronger indeed than they were some years ago. So the question is bound to rise "If it is true that cultures rise around seas, what

Culture will eventually arise in and dominate the Pacific? This question is of course at present unanswerable and we can only make conjectures in the light of past history.

We see at present grouped round the Pacific two cultures. On the East and South European on the North West Mongolian.

Now from Alaska to Cape Horn the mountains come close down to the sea, leaving only a very narrow strip of cultivable land. There are no great navigable rivers, no deep gulfs, ports are few and as compared with those on the Atlantic, poor. There seems to be only one place in all this coast adapted to be the seat of a large population, and a strong Pacific state and that is the district from the Columbia River to the North end of Vancouver Island. Here are a number of growing cities and at least one good port. It is interesting to note how instantly colonisation has seized upon this district and the rapidly with which it has grown, yet this should not blind us to the fact that it is, after all a small territory. But it has minerals, including coal and it has a climate favourable to Europeans.

Further south San Francisco, Los Angeles or Valparaiso may be great marginal ports, gateways from Central America to the Pacific, but it may be doubted if they will ever be the centres of great industrial or agricultural areas. Central America
The Isthmus of Panama
is too tropical for Europeans.

But indeed the Americas, both North and South evidently face the Atlantic today - not the Pacific.

With this in view we may consider two modern and much discussed problems - the Yellow Peril, and the Control of the Pacific, both of which really concern themselves with the Mongolian civilization of the North Western Pacific.

The Chinese are a valley people and peaceful as all valley people tend to be. Even when they do make war they are not really very good at it. They are

very hard to rouse, they have never been pioneers, they only settle in lands already opened up by other and more active people. The great wall is the symbol of China, it keeps the Chinese in and the foreigner out.

In all the four thousand years of their existence the Chinese have never yet shown themselves an aggressive people and it is very unlikely that they will do so now. To suppose otherwise is to judge them by ourselves and we, a seafaring people, are the most aggressive and quarrelsome people in the world.

But Japan is an island kingdom. Now, when the first Europeans came to Japan, its people showed themselves ready to welcome them. In 1610, and in 1614 Japan sent embassies to America and to Europe in the effort to open up communications. It was only when the danger of this course to herself became quite plain that Japan closed her doors.

The comparative backwardness of Japanese expansion as compared with that of Europe may be explained on several grounds.

Firstly the Mongolian Civilization seems to be at least a thousand years later than our own.

Secondly, the sea of Japan is by no means as favourable a growing ground for a young people as was the Mediterranean. It is stormy, with dangerous currents, and so the people who lived on it never developed very good seagoing ships.

~~We must remember that it took our own civilization some three thousand years to master and outgrow even so favourable a sea as the Mediterranean.~~

Thirdly, the Pacific was too big for them. We owe a great deal to the Mediterranean which led our early seamen step by step to the conquest of the Indian Ocean waters. Even at that it took our ancestors some three thousand years to master and outgrow the Mediterranean.

I might ask whether ~~from~~ the British Isles would ever have become great had there been no Mediterranean.

Yet, as is natural in an island people, the Japanese have easily adapted a more aggressive and

active culture. They are undoubtedly destined to play a very important part in the Pacific, but the idea that they may or can ever expand beyond that ocean strikes one as fantastic. Japan can never expand into the Atlantic.

The "control of the Pacific" is often discussed, always from the point of view that some one nation or power is to control this ocean from outside - presumably by the possession of a couple of Naval bases and a strong fleet. So we have Singapore, and the Philippines.

In this way an outside nation is to compel the Pacific people to act as she wishes, to receive her financiers and merchants under threat of bombardment in case of refusal.

There would then of course be no Pacific culture, only a state of things difficult to distinguish from Pacific Piracy. The only previous people, so far as I know, who attempted to live on naval bases, were the Phoenicians, and they came to a bad end.

But if my thesis has any foundation in fact, if cultures are attached to seas, and to the lands which lie about them, is it not more probable that the Pacific is eventually destined to control herself, and to create her own civilization, in which all those nations which live on her coasts may have their parts.

There is constant talk of war between America and Japan, what could either America or Japan gain from such a war?

In the case of American victory do we propose to colonize China or Japan? They are full already. Do we propose to trade with them? We can do so already. Do we propose to exact a large indemnity? Well - I had thought that indemnities and reparations were rather exploded today. Do we propose to put all their industries their customs, their trade under the control of our financial interests so as to provide ourselves with foreign markets for our goods. This sounds all right until we realize that it really means making our own people work to supply the needs of China and Japan - who, by the way, will have no money to pay for the ~~and~~ ~~good~~ manufactures.

If we were completely victorious over the Japanese we would find ourselves able to make treaties + agreements and to write screeds of conditions, but we would not find ourselves able to gain anything excepting a rather doubtful glory.

In the case of Japanese victory, what could they do? They could not hold or colonize the American Pacific coast. It simply would not be worth their while. They could not attack the Atlantic coast for to do so would at once involve them in a war with the other Atlantic powers of Europe, and in certain defeat. They could, and would expel Europeans from China and Japan, but that would not affect our civilization very much.

War between America and Japan can only come through some emotional outburst on one side or another and could lead to no permanent advantages to either, and it is the business of our statesmen to keep us out of it. More, it is the business of every educated man and woman to look at this matter from all sides, to realize that we are not the most peaceful or reasonable people in the world, and to hold the country on a base of reasoned thought. I make no distinction, as I have said, between America and Canada for the interests of both are identical tho' I confess that the repercussions of such a war on Canada strike me as utterly uncalculable.

The only possible gainers by such a war would be Australia and New Zealand. It might make them the dominant economic powers of the Pacific.

But it is better to think that the Pacific will be allowed to develop its own life in its own way.

I have tried to set before you a point of view. I have traced the history of our own sea civilization from 400 B.C. to the future. I would not claim that the point of view is the only one, or the precast correct, but it is a well defined way of looking at ourselves and at the world and as such I offer it to you.