indeed, comparatively, it would be just as unreasonable to judge thus of the acts of Cortez; for did he not live more than three hundred years ago, when the Spaniards were merely a semi-civilized nation?

Here is a very good specimen of the opinions which many hold in respect to Cortez—"An unprincipled adventurer, at the head of a few hundred Spaniards, who lands in Mexico, is received in great friendship by the unsuspecting momarch, Montezuma, who is soon after slain and Mexico with its immense treasures is speedily subdued. Near a million of the inoffensive Mexicans are butchered." Many may take this for the exact truth. For my part I cannot look at it in this light.

"An unprincipled adventurer." If he was unprincipled, what then shall we say in regard to his cotemporaries; for in judging a Spaniard, we must compare him with other leading men of his nation and time or the comparison amounts to nothing. It would be impossible to find another Spanish conqueror at that time more, or even as humane as Cortez. Pizarro turned his victories into inhuman butcheries, for which he had no excuse; while Cortez, on the other hand, never shed more blood than was absolutely necessary to accomplish his purpose, which was merely to make the Mexicans loyal subjects of the Spanish crown and to establish the Catholic faith.

But it may be asked what I intend to do do with the thousands that were butchered while Cortez was in Mexico. To make the conquest he necessarily slayed his thousands; but the butcheries were done by his subordinates, in his absence -for which they were severely reprimanded by their commander-or else by the victorious natives, fighting on the side of Cortez, whom he was unable to restrain when once in motion. To conquer the natives and establish the Catholic faith, was considered by Cortez as holy an undertaking as the conversion of sinners by our ministers of to-day, and in this enter-

we take into account all influences bear ing upon him. The Catholic faith, the national religion, was so instilled at that time into the semi-civilized natures of the Spaniards that the priests had absolute control of the acts of the nation and also of all individual adventurers. All Spaniards were taught to believe that the conquering of infidel tribes and nations (as they termed all others not of the Catholic faith) was a holy cause. So we see that he career of Cortez was shaped, to a great extent, by religious infatuation. His first attempt after subduing a tribe was its conversion, thus showing that he had this uppermost in his mind. Even from our standpoint, the conquest of Mexico was not so great an evil or act of inhumanity as some imagine. The Mexicans were not so highly civilized a race as some would have us believe. Indeed, in one respect they were in the deepest stage of barbarism and instead of advancing in civilization were retrograding. They had not generated their civilization, but had merely received it by supplanting a nation much more advanced than they, and from the day they received this enlightenment they continued its debasement until the custom of offering captives as sacrifices and then turning cannibals by feasting upon the bodies had become a national institution. Then was it not a blessing to turn a nation of cannibals into one of Catholics even as the faith then existed? We undoubtedly think it was.

If Cortez slayed his thousands, it was in the belief that his cause was a holy one. If he leveled the walls and edifices of the ancient city, Mexico, it was only to build palaces and erest a far more substantial and imposing capital.

of Cortez, whom he was unable to restrain when once in motion. To conquer the natives and establish the Catholic faith, was considered by Cortez as holy an undertaking as the conversion of sinners by our ministers of to-day, and in this enterprise he can be absolutely justified when