

Battle of the Languages: An Examination on Latin and Germanic Culture and Language

Salvatore D'Armetta

Latin and Germanic Languages have dominated the world for Millenia. Today, there are over 2 billion people who speak English either as a first or second language. The numbers are impressive for native speakers as well: Spanish with about 500 million, and English with about 400 million. Taking into account other variations of Latin, such as Italian and French, the numbers for Latin are even larger. This is obviously a result of Roman dominance in ancient history. At its height, Rome had an empire that spanned 2 million square miles. Its influence was unmatched by other cultures, other than the Greeks who managed to conquer a similar amount of land. However, Germanic people managed to cut a slice of their own pie when it came to world domination. At first, there was a lot of struggle for Germanic people to maintain their land, mostly by the persistence of Romans to have them join their empire (either willingly or unwillingly). The history of Germanic and Roman battle is undeniable. However, they managed to reach an amicable conclusion with the beginning of the Holy Roman Empire. The Holy Roman Empire was, in some ways, a collaboration between Germans and Romans. The Romans had power with the Church, and the Germans had power with nobility. Together, they formed a harmonious relationship which conquered mainland Europe. Through the Holy Roman Empire, Romans were able to extend their leadership beyond the days of the Ancient Roman Empire. Despite falling to the Germans, they recovered and managed to expand their influence even more through the centuries. However, with the advent of the English Language came another culture that would soon dominate the world. The English were Germanic people in a sense: the English Language has roots in German. English eventually developed as a separate language from German, which remained in mainland Europe. However, its roots in German meant that English was mainly a Germanic Language, before development by isolation allowed the Anglo-Saxons to perfect their language. In order to understand the culture and traditions of Germanic and Latin cultures, we must study the history going as far back as Classical Greece. Then, we will determine the cultural differences, and why English has grown to dominate in both culture and schools of thought. Ultimately, America has managed, with its outsized influence, to influence other countries, even in Europe, to adopt their philosophy. Europe, which is still outdated as a continent, yet partially developed, still remains with old schools of thought in most countries. I have witnessed this as an Italian by heritage. I am also familiar with Italian culture, having visited Sicily many times, and for many months at a time, throughout my life. While the argument will be mainly based on Language, the behaviors and traditions of the two opposite cultures I grew up in, Italian and American, will be included. However, rather than describing these cultures by the nationalities I grew up in, I will only mention them by the name of their dominant languages: German and Latin. Nationalities have ruined the identity of different cultures, because while Americans and British are two different nations, they both speak the same language and are of the same people. Additionally, we can consider other nations such as Australia, which we call Australians rather than English, though they are dominantly English by language. Alternatively, Latin speakers can include Spanish and Italian, and in many ways Spanish is a different language from Italian, like English is a different


language from German. Which is why, rather than disjoining these languages when discussing cultures or traditions, we will join them with German and Latin. Then, another discussion will

commence where we discuss the development of these languages and something I like to call, “The Battle of the Languages”. This will be an interesting topic to discuss, and what I believe is an entirely new idea viewing history through a different perspective. Before we discuss “The Battle of the Languages”, we must discuss the history of the two dominant languages of recent times: German and Latin.

We begin our dive into history with Ancient Greece, what many consider the first major civilization in Europe. Ancient Greece was primarily tribal in its early days, as many would expect before the development of a major civilization [1]. Eventually, these tribes grew to form city-states throughout Greece. Greece was mostly harmonious, with the exception of Philip II and then his son, Alexander the Great, who is more widely recognized for his military campaigns. The struggles between Ancient Greek civilization and the Persians are also notorious. Persians often attempted to conquer the Greeks, and the Greeks would often rebel. Unfortunately, I am not as familiar with the Persian language as I am with Latin or German. However, I will consider that the Persians have probably influenced the Latin language, while the Greeks have primarily influenced the German language. This will be discussed in the context of migration, much of which occurred during these ancient times due to struggles between different people. The city-states of Greece, then, were primarily harmonious except for Sparta, who’s military subjugated Athens during the Peloponnesian War [2]. Eventually, after a period of Spartan hegemony, Boeotians rebelled in the Battle of Leuctra and Spartan dominance ended. Here, then, we have an early example of a major struggle between two people. Athens and Spartans probably began what would later become the growth of two very different cultures which are at the center of this paper: Germans and Latins.

The claim that Spartans evolved into Latins and Athenians into Germans could be considered if we take into account the struggles and migratory behavior of people during these struggles. Firstly, Greece was made up of many dialects during its Ancient history [3]. Spartans spoke a Doric dialect and Athenians, who were victimized by the Spartans in the Peloponnesian Wars, spoke Attic. These two dialects developed from the Greek language to form two different people, with two different political structures. Sparta was mainly an oligarchy [4], while Athens was a democracy. We can see, then, why the struggle between these two city-states was so profound. What led to these two very different cultures, and how is language involved? While we will discuss the evolution of language and its effect on people, first let’s consider the migratory behavior that may occur during a struggle, either by ostracization or as a response. If we look back a bit before the Peloponnesian wars, we inevitably come to the story of Harmodius and Aristogeiton. Harmodius and Aristogeiton were two lovers in Ancient Athens, who assassinated the brother of Hippias. Hippias was the leader of Athens at the time. This assassination would begin what is a centuries long struggle between the Athenians and Spartans. The dispute, which Thucydides wrote about in a book on the History of the Peloponnesian War, was based on a homosexual love triangle between Harmodius, Aristogeiton, and Hippias’ brother, Hipparchus. Harmodius and Aristogeiton, who were lovers, were executed after assassinating Hipparchus for his jealous reaction to Harmodius’ rejection. What likely happened in the aftermath is that the families of Harmodius and Aristogeiton fled south, where they would eventually reach Sparta and begin the struggle between the Spartans

and the Athenians. This is where the two cultures began to split; Athenians and Spartans probably had two very different opinions on the story. Athens evolved into a democracy, while Spartans evolved into an oligarchy. Taking the characteristics of oligarchy versus democracy, one is heavily based on structure, while the other on freedom, respectively. This is most likely where the dispute of sexuality began; Spartans decided that homosexuality was wrong. The Athenian families of Harmodius and Aristogeiton probably attempted to gain the favor of Spartans for protection, or revenge. However, the Spartans did not agree with the relationship Harmodius and Aristogeiton had, as well as the involvement of a third man, Hipparchus. Hippias, Hipparchus' brother and leader of Athens, most likely felt devotion towards his brother and took the side of freedom in this dispute. The Spartans, structure, instead, and preferred love affairs to be between a man and a woman. The Spartans were most likely Persian by heritage as well, and adopted parts of their language, culture, and traditions. This is obvious when considering their alliance during the Peloponnesian Wars. If this wasn't the case before the Peloponnesian Wars, then it is most likely the case after when their alliance would have brought Persians to Spartan shores.



Continuing, the matter of this dispute brought democracy and oligarchy, freedom and structure, liberal and conservative, a dispute that still lasts in modern times. It is hard to guess the line of thinking the Spartans may have had in deciding that homosexual relationships should no longer exist (if it existed at all in their society). Perhaps the violent nature of the love triangle that existed between the three aforementioned Athenians led them to believe that homosexual relationships are dangerous. Perhaps, homosexual relationships were uncommon, and this was a totally new aspect of human nature. Or perhaps, Spartans believed that love affairs should only be between a man and a woman, due to the inability of two men to conceive. Whatever the case, this dispute seems to have origins in the love triangle between three men, which evolved into war and a generations long battle between two peoples. The Persians frequently participated in these battles, often supporting Sparta and other Greeks in different battles. Due to the conflict, Greeks in Athens would have migrated North in the face of persecution against the Spartans and the violent environment they were subject to. Macedonia involved themselves in the dispute with Philip II and his successor, Alexander the Great, about a century later, which is why Macedonians, especially of Athene origins, would have fled North. Therefore, while Spartan military and citizens would have fled through the sea southward or westward, Athene military and citizens would have fled North, towards Macedonia and, eventually, what is modern-day Northern and Central Europe.

Taking these theories into account, we should consider that Spartans most likely landed on the shores of Sicily, where they would find their friends and allies in Syracuse. Syracuse was an ally of Sparta during the Peloponnesian Wars, and given their close proximity to each other it is fair to conclude that Spartans had already been living in Syracuse. Ultimately, the migrations of Spartan and Athene people westward and northward, respectively, led to the development of Latin and German, also respectively. Why did this happen and how? Simply, as a circumstance of isolation, a people can develop a language entirely their own. We've already discussed that Spartans and Athene people spoke two different Greek dialects. We've also discussed that the cultures and political structures that grew out of these two city-states were almost entirely opposite. This being the result of an tyrannicide at the hands of two homosexual men, involving a third homosexual man. Then, we can conclude that if these two

peoples of different city-states migrated to areas where they would be isolated from others, then the language would remain consistent and develop to resemble more like itself. That is, the defining characteristic of any of the dialects in existence, specifically Doric and Attic, would have been further developed with its continuous and consistent use in isolation of other languages. Therefore, we can assume that Attic most likely resembled German in a basic sense, while Dorian resembled Latin, when taking into account the people that migrated to those areas. An alternative theory would be that the fleeing Athene people, who were afraid of persecution and the relentless pursuit of the Spartan or Macedonian military, developed an entirely new language in order to hide. Therefore, Germanic languages were born as a means to survive. For the purpose of this paper, we will assume that German developed out of the Attic dialect of Athens, given that many ideals from Athens continued to exist beyond Greece amongst these people.

Finally, we can begin to consider the structure of the languages in argument and how they differ, how they force a certain structure to exist, either outside or inside a given group, and how they

evolved. Let's begin with the Latin language. Since I am familiar with Italian, a language derived from Latin and still with many of its characteristics, we will consider the main difference between Germanic and Latin languages: pronunciation. Latin and German differ wildly in pronunciation. The two languages are undeniably different. The key difference between these two languages is in the way they end their words. Italian ends all its words in a vowel. English, a Germanic Language, has the ability to end a word in either a vowel or a consonant. Even when a vowel is present at the end of a word, it is often unpronounced. Therefore, Germanic Languages place stress on the soft sound of a consonant, while Latin Languages place stress on the loud sound of a vowel. Why did these two languages develop with these differences?

Considering again the Spartans, we see a history of military and physical importance. In other words, the society gave importance to its military in ways that other city-states occupying Greece did not. This began with Lycurgus, a lawgiver of Sparta in ancient legend [5]. Legend says that Lycurgus reformed Sparta into a militaristic state, with laws and values that stressed physical fitness. Since the Spartans were ambitious in their military, it is likely that their dialect evolved into shouts for orders. By placing more emphasis on words that end in vowels, which is the sharpest part of any sentence, the Spartans were able to communicate more effectively with their military. It is hard to organize a military with language that is soft. Shouting is almost inevitable, whether communicating with a large group of people, at a distance, or in battle. Therefore, it is safe to assume that the Doric dialect evolved with this in mind, and since placing vowels at the end of sentences makes communication clearer, the Spartans were able to more effectively win in battle. However, while ending your sentence in a vowel is useful in this scenario, it is useless in many other scenarios. We will discuss further what I mean at a later point in this paper, when I demonstrate the differences in culture and tradition amongst Latin and Germans.

At this point, we have concluded that Spartans most likely migrated to the Italian peninsula by way of Sicily, while Athenians migrated to the North and Center of Europe. These migrations led to the development of languages deriving from two dialects of Greek, one which placed more stress on consonants and another which placed more stress on vowels. Attic

dialect was likely soft in sound, while Doric dialect was likely clear to take advantage of its military. By bringing these two dialects on opposite sides of a continent, in isolation, the languages grew to form their evolution, Latin and German. Now, we continue with history of cultures and tradition. Since, in the matter of Harmodius and Aristogeiton, there was a disagreement between Spartans and Athenians on how humans should conduct their affairs. These values were most likely brought with them and passed down to their offspring in the respective lands they migrated to. It continued through generations, until the Romans would begin their conquest outside the Italian peninsula not long after the Battle of Leuctra that freed the Greeks from the Spartans. The Romans, descendants of the Spartans, formed the Roman Republic only five short years after the deaths of Harmodius and Aristogeiton, in 509 B.C. The years that followed were mostly military campaigns by Rome to conquer the Italian peninsula. It was only a short century after the defeat of the Spartans at the Battle of Leuctra, that the Romans would conquer Greece.

Due to the militaristic nature of Sparta, it is safe to assume that Rome was founded by Spartans, or at least heavily influenced by them. Rome began as a Republic in name, but very much was an

oligarchy, which was the political structure of Sparta. Moreover, the Roman Empire was undeniably militaristic. Its expansion was always conducted through war, and they were indeed a formidable army. With a language that makes orders easy to communicate, as well as a culture of battle and physical fitness, the Romans, or rather the Spartans, were able to command a territory of millions of miles at the peak of its reign. The Romans were clearly a dominant society. Even its most famous historical figure was a military general, Julius Caesar. Since the Latin language gave the Romans an advantage on the battlefield, the Romans were able to conquer through military power much of its surrounding regions. The Spartan culture that had existed only in a tiny section of Greece had grown into an Empire. The success of the Romans did not end there. They are recognized widely for their first-in-kind infrastructure, such as aqueducts, roads, and cities. This is another advantage of the language which they developed. Since Latin was communicated easily over a distance or over vast groups of people, projects in infrastructure were easier to accomplish. Given their physical fitness as well, their ability to accomplish enormous tasks such as building roads or aqueducts was possible. Therefore, the Latin language and the culture that developed from it expressed what can only be described as one thing: power. The Latin culture was all about power, and without the construction of the language to emphasize vowels over consonants, or clear sounds over soft ones, many of these accomplishments would not have been possible.

With the formation of the Roman Republic and its ensuing military campaigns, the Romans eventually conquered much of mainland Europe to its West and East. However, the Roman never quite managed to conquer the people of Germania, to the North and Center of Europe. The struggle between these two people lasted centuries and, despite the ease with which the Roman military had in conquering other territories, they never get the upper hand against the Germans. The Latins had different names for the Germans, the most famous being “barbarus”, or “barbarians”, in order to describe the red-beard of the Germans. The “barbarus” were viewed unfavorably in the eyes of Latin people due to their seemingly uncivilized nature. Even in battle, Germans never formed the lines that the Roman military had grown to battle in. The Romans described them as “wild” often and in many contexts. However, to understand the battle forces of the Germans, we have to understand first the cultures and traditions that

evolved from its use of soft sounds over loud ones. By placing a consonant at the end of a word or phrase, the Germans were able to communicate effectively by placing emphasis on ideas, rather than orders. This is because, in the context of conversation, while a loud sound is often responded to by an even louder sound, soft sounds remain neutral. Therefore, the discussions between two people of either a Latin or German language differ wildly. This is evident in many of my observations amongst Latin or German speaking people. Viewing Italian conversations as an example of Latin, we can observe that the conversations often end in shouting. There are many examples of this through media. Italian media, especially, is dominated by arguments that end in shouting. Even more impressive is the mediators’ responsibility to intervene in order to prevent the conflict from getting out of hand. On the other hand, a stern response in English is enough to subdue an English shouter from any violent tendencies. Viewing an American debate, for example, is wildly different and much more composed. Any debaters that shout will end their shouting abruptly, as if to be silenced immediately. On the other hand, Italians shout over each other, attempting to gain favor in the argument. This is where the languages differ. Since the words and phrases of the Germans end in soft sounds, a lovely intellectual debate is able to take

place without shouting. Rather than getting louder, the words are more eloquent and the debate rises to a battle of wits in order to determine who has better command of the idea in question. Therefore, rather than disorderly, like the Romans often viewed the Germans, the Germans were rather orderly, because their arguments led to a conclusion on who had better command of an idea. Any clip in media will obviously show that Italians have loose command of their language, but better command over its sound. Therefore, amongst Italians, debates will often be won by who is the loudest. This is advantageous in the context of military, because a military leader who spoke softly would be incompetent, at least when considering the Romans and the age in which they existed. Therefore, Latin leaders were loud and belligerent, while German Leaders were soft and intellectual. Their “wild” nature was only because the army was not commanded by a single, belligerent individual, who shouted orders and assembled armies, rather than thinking and creating an idea. Battle plans by Romans were carried out in a predictable manner, while the Germans had an element of surprise. Therefore, by being unpredictable, the Romans never gained the upper hand over the Germans and eventually fell to their language, when the Germans finally invaded the Italian peninsula in the Sack of Rome.

Finally, we have arrived at the conclusion of the rivalry that spanned centuries between what began as two Greek city-states, Athens and Sparta, which then grew into two peoples, Latin and Germans. The Latins fell at the hands of the Germans, due mainly in a failure to have the dominant functioning language, and therefore lost its outsized influence in the continent shortly. After about 400 years, the Germans joined forces with the Latins when Charlamagne was crowned Emperor by the papacy. This went on to form what is now known as the Holy Roman Empire, the first alliance between Latin and Germanic-speaking people. The conclusion of this period arrived at the fall of the Western Roman Empire and, consequently, the beginning of the migration of Anglo-Saxons to Britain, which would later lead to the development of the major modern English Language.

Before we conclude, we should consider the theory mentioned earlier that a new language was developed by Athenians when they fled. In order to hide, Athenians invented an

entirely new language indistinguishable from any in existence. It was called Celtic. The Celtic language is an interesting language because it is similar in sound to English, with mumbling and juttering of words. To many, it sounded like gibberish. However, what likely occurred is that, while the language was loosely defined, it helped the Germans develop a better understanding of words and sounds in combination with each other. Which is why German and English had so many sound shifts historically. This happens even today, at a slower pace. The reason the pace is slower is because the sound is mostly achieved, and now, in a sense, humans are developing new systems of humor and ridicule. However, we will discuss this matter as it evolves. Instead, we will focus on the paper shifting the world geometry by making the language history a thing of the past. Historically, language has only been viewed as a means of communication. However, in truth, language evolved to be a means of war. This happened when the English began to dominate the world economy. The English had the superior language, not only in Europe, but abroad as well. Which is why the English ultimately won the struggle over the Spanish in America, despite the Spanish having a time advantage. We can see the development of the language as evidence of this happening. Spanish, spoken widely in South America and Spain in Europe, is mostly a failed language. The reason it failed is because it was frantic. The Spanish

had a language very similar to Latin, and probably was not that different until the European expansion to the Americas. By joining the expansion, the English began a race. The English and the Spanish began to colonize the Americas in search of wealth. Gold was an attractive item to both the English and the Spanish, though the English preferred fertile land over the Spanish. Which is why most of their colonies remained on the coasts, as opposed to land west of the equator. The Spaniards eventually concluded that they could not beat the English in a race, despite them having a language that sounded faster. "Fast-Speech" in Spain still exists today, view any media and you will see the Spanish speaking at a fast pace, especially in arguments. The arguments had to arrive at a conclusion quickly, in order to make a decision. However, since the arguments were still loud in nature, the Spanish likely failed the race and began to lose against the English. To make up for this, the Spanish began to end some of their words with consonants to sound like the English, which is why they caught up. However, the English had already won by the time, because by remaining on the coast, the trade that developed with Europe made them wealthy. The Spanish today are mostly poor, despite having more land than the rest of us. The reason for this is because combining loud sounds with soft ones only causes confusion and disorientation, which is why systems of governance in Spain are so powerful. By having a system of government, the people with the most power are the ones that lead, rather than the people that gain the most wealth. But this is only if the language has failed the people to communicate with the government effectively. We see this in Italy as well, which decided to not add consonants to its language like the Spanish attempted to. As a result, Italy is viewed as old and the population has mostly begun to migrate to other countries, leaving communities stranded.

Since fast-speech could not work, the consonant seemed like a proper solution to the Spaniards in order to conquer territories and expand over the English. In fact, the Spaniards did manage to conquer more territory and move faster. However, they encountered resistance with the Native Americans, who viewed them as fragile and weak. The Native Americans, on the other hand, respected the English because they managed to convince them they could work together to gain favor over other tribes. By manipulating this relationship, the English were able

to conquer more land to the east, and the Native Americans were wiped out. However, what likely occurred is that the Native Americans viewed each other as savage, which is why they could not get along despite their ways. The savageness of the communities was only an illusion, though, because the English managed to convince the Native Americans that they were evil because they did not trade with each other. What is likely the reason the Native Americans did not trade with each other is that the language was not properly developed yet to form new systems of trade. The human colonization of the Americas did not last long because the Europeans beat them before they could develop. Therefore, the migration westward by Sea was quicker than the expansion eastward by foot, probably because there was more land west than east. The land could not be explored quick enough because there was so much land to be covered, which meant that humans were continuously leaving their tribes to find better sources of food and land.

By coexisting with the English, the Native Americans began to maintain their relationships better and form alliances. However, these alliances were likely weaker due to the technology of their time. Gunpowder offered a new solution to the English to overcome the Native Americans, and

receive less casualties. By keeping a distance between them and the Native Americans, the Native Americans could not beat the English in battles and the weapon of choice became guns, despite being slow to load. However, guns got better with time, and eventually the Native Americans could not keep up and gave in. They began to join English society, and took land that would help them gain wealth, rather than fight to win back their land. Further in time, the Native Americans succeeded to keep land to themselves, but these areas are small and the Native Americans only exist in small communities.

The Latin expansion went southward as a result of their failure north. Despite conquering land that held undiscovered gold, the English soon proved when they started the Gold rush, that there was wealth to be had in the West too. However, the Latin were greedy because they saw the English success with the coast to the east and wanted that success for themselves. What likely occurred is that they believed they had a claim to the land despite discovering the Caribbean first. Thus, they battled, and the Native Americans fought back. The Native Americans were great warriors, and the Latin could not beat them even though they were more savage. The Latin also had swords, but the Native Americans had bows and arrows and horses, given by the English. The horses helped them trample the Latin and win battles with ease, and the Latin gave in because they could not bring enough horses in time to their land. But the Latin tried anyway, which is why the Native Americans eventually used guns. Their failure in keeping up with the technology of the time caused them to spread southward and remain there, because there was no more land to be had.

The English continued to dominate and so did their language, and eventually America was formed. However, American disputes began when their slave trade brought Africans to the South. Slaves were still viewed favorably because the transaction was mutual. That was the claim the English likely had, because slaves could be fed, and, in return, the slaves would work. This was the kind of exchange that slaves had throughout their history, even volunteer slaves existed in order to survive. However, the Africans did not volunteer because what likely happened is that the Africans were fooled. By convincing Africans that slaves were better than money, Africans decided that selling their slaves could also bring about wealth to their land, which they had little of. However, what they failed to understand is that their language

was not developed, and therefore what the English did was trick them. By tricking them, the English were able to bring slaves to American shores, and what happened is that the English became wealthier. The persuasion that occurred was a matter of religion, because that's what the South believed. The South had heavily invested in religion because their line of thinking was that slaves were better than gold, when really they wanted more gold. Slaves had wealth because they could work, and hard work was the gate to paradise. By working hard, slaves could keep their wealth and live in fertile land. Therefore, slaves were better than gold. The Africans, who were faithful, as evidenced by their past in Egypt, decided that selling their slaves benefitted them rather than harmed them. What they didn't expect was the discrimination that followed. Which is why Americans began a Civil War. The Africans were in better shape and better form than the English. This is because their diets kept them lean and fit. By being lean and fit, the English viewed Africans favorably for their land and decided that slaves who were African were better than other slaves, but not good enough to be free. The English to the North did not like the idea of superiority, because they had fought for those ideals throughout their history. They believed

the Africans were only misfortunate, because they held the belief that Africans could not see past their ways. Religion was a thing of the past in America, in fact, however the English to the South still tried to force their religion onto people in order to keep their slaves. Rather than lose their slaves and keep their religion, the Confederacy decided to battle and the Union ultimately won.

Today, we still see matters of discrimination however they are mostly a thing of the past as well. What happens now is a discrimination in economy, because the wealthy believe they are more capable than others. While this is true for some, the truth of the matter is really that wealthy people hold an advantage. Their advantage in economy NOW is the use of debit and credit. In the past, it was true that a capable or lucky person could become wealthy. By lucky, I mean striking gold or striking oil. However, these endeavors still required manpower and manpower could only be gained with people who agreed on good ideas. Thus, the smartest people held the most wealth, and the wealth eventually fell when it was gone. However, since gold was slow through space, gold could not be used as money any longer. The speed of transactions had to happen quicker, so that people could find more gold or more oil. Gold was cumbersome, and did not rely on its properties to be hard, as rare items are described today. Therefore, oil was used as currency. But oil could still not be measured except in pounds, which meant that the English had to find better ways to transact. Paper money entered the equation here, introduced in Europe during the French Revolution. But the English knew what the French did not, that gold was hard money because it was rare. The English decided that paper money backed by gold could work, so they began to issue notes redeemable for gold. This lasted a century, because eventually the English were asked to give back their gold when the Europeans realized their wealth had been taken from them decades after the Bretton Woods Conference. However, the English decided the gold was theirs to keep, and instead fooled the Europeans into believing that systems of credit and debit could work. Which is why the past 50 years have been riddled with inflation and wealth, wealth that was stolen by systems of credit that did not work. The rich got richer, and the poor got poorer because paper money was given to them more frequently so they could work. They could only work for paper money, and paper money became the wealth that the nation used. The

English at this point had such a considerable lead due to their language and time spent in isolation, that their inventions had bested the entire human race. Guns got faster, communication got faster, and so did travel. When people realize language is at the center of information, and information is at the center of wealth, wealth will be accumulated by who is the smartest. And the smartest people do not reside in America, they reside all over the world where there are countries and humans who speak language, only they are using the wrong one. Therefore, language must change to a technology, and that technology is English. Bitcoin is a technology of information and a technology of time, because it is faster than all money in existence. Therefore, while the English cheated by fooling the Europeans to believe their money was faster with credit and debit, their money was actually being made faster by a group of people who loved mathematics. Mathematics that existed in Athens, by way of the Greeks. And the Greeks conquered the world by existing as a people, for the people. Which is why English is really not Greek or German. English is Celtic and German and Greek, and Latin is not. Latin is only Greek, with a dialect that changed to be louder and louder. Therefore, war was fought and the language with better technology won, and that is technology that was invented as a new language in order to hide. The Athenians not only invented Mathematics and Philosophy, they invented everything.

So the Greeks that decided they were not to be persecuted won the mentality of the human race, while the Greeks that were not decided they were Latin. Latin because they did not follow with the Athenians, who deserve the name King. But, really, it is the ingenuity of humanity that wins. Because without human ingenuity, the human race will never lead its people to the stars, which is where the Gods gave us their wisdom. Athens was the city of wisdom, because Athena was the goddess of wisdom. And wisdom, really, is the king.

References

1. John Boardman and Nicholas Geoffrey Lemprière Hammond. *The Cambridge Ancient History Volume 3, Part 3: The Expansion of the Greek World, Eighth to Sixth Centuries B.C.* Cambridge University Press, 1992, p. 261
2. Thucydides, *History of the Peloponnesian War*
3. Horrocks, Geoffrey. 2010. *Greek: A history of the language and its speakers*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, p. 24-40
4. Cartledge, Paul. 2002. *Sparta and Lakonia: A Regional History 1300 to 362 B.C.* (2nd ed.)
5. Plutarch, *Lycurgus*