

Greek Church. Turkey changed and changed again, accepted and repudiated, for she was sure of alliance with England and France, and wanted to strike at her ancient foe with their help. It would be easy to show that the English Government encouraged Turkey in its determination to go to war. Turkey was advised to accept certain conditions, and when these conditions were offered was advised to reject them. And you know the result—the Crimean War, in which England spent the treasure of her people and the blood of her sons. Nicholas died and peace was declared. The treaty was drawn up and signed at Paris in 1856, providing for the free navigation of the mouths of the Danube, and adding the southern part of Bessarabia to Moldavia, doing away with the right of Russia to interfere in the internal affairs of the provinces under any pretext of protecting Greek Christians, destroying the preponderance of Russia in the Black Sea. But something more was decided by that treaty. It was decided that Turkey should set herself at once to redress the inveterate evils and abuses of her government, and extend to all her subjects the blessing of civil and religious liberty. Turkey held a most favourable position for carrying out those reforms. Her empire was made secure against naval, military and diplomatic attacks. She was admitted into a place in the great European system. She had but a small debt at a low rate of interest. She had pledged herself to carry out some practical reforms which would be for the interest of her people. But what did Turkey by way of reforms? Nothing at all. A feeble effort was made, but nothing accomplished. No rights were accorded to the Christians or taxation improved. Women were allowed to waste the national revenues, and favourites to hold the highest posts in the empire. During the reign of Abdul Aziz, in the year 1875, the attention of the English House of Commons was drawn to the financial and administrative condition of the Turkish empire. It was then shown that all the promises made by Turkey at the peace conference in 1856 had been broken, and that misgovernment and tyranny and corruption prevailed as ever.

In the summer of 1875 the Christians, or Rayahs, as they were called, of Bosnia and the Herzegovina, revolted against the intolerable evils and misgovernment of the Turks. Were they wrong? Who shall say so? Surely there is a point beyond which human endurance may not go. Surely there is a time when men should risk all for the rights of their manhood. I know of nothing more unworthy of men and more contemptible than the policy of craven submission to the powers that be. The Christian subjects of Turkey had juster right to rebel than any people who have risen up in rebellion for the last five centuries. The rule of the first Charles in England, with its "divine right of Kings" ideas, its Star Chamber and imposts, was not half so grievous as that of every Sultan in Turkey. And the English rose, with great Cromwell at their head, and took the divine rights of the people. Have you ceased to approve that act, and to respect the memory of that uncrowned king? I trust not. Then you must approve the rising of the rayahs of Bosnia and the Herzegovina against the intolerable evils of Turkish misgovernment. All Europe sympathized with them, and entered upon some diplomatic action to secure their relief. A scheme of reforms, framed by Austria in concert with Russia and Germany, known by the name of the Andrassy note, was agreed to by England, or partially agreed to—not fully. England waited to see what Turkey wanted, and seemed bent on helping Turkey in any case. So the Turks interpreted English action, and went on their brutal way. It was officially intimated by Turkish ministers that they quite understood that Turkey and England were rowing in the same boat. The Andrassy note was presented and most gracefully accepted by the Porte. Everything demanded was yielded. Everything asked for was promised and promised. But that was all. It came to nothing more than a promise. Not an effort was made to relieve the intolerable condition of the Rayahs, and those Rayahs knew quite well that no effort would be made on their behalf, and they determined to keep their own cause in their own hands. Then came the Berlin memorandum, concerted by the Chancellors of the German, Austrian and Russian empires, which asked for a suspension of arms for two months, and then the carrying out of the reforms long before promised. At the conclusion of the memorandum was a significant hint that it might be necessary to coerce Turkey into the work of reform so that peace might be established. The English Government offered a firm opposition to that—in effect declared that it would not see Turkey coerced by anybody. Great efforts were made by every one of the five great European Powers to persuade England not to make impossible, concerted action. It was plain enough that the word given by the Powers of Europe for Turkish reforms would have been attended to at once. What could Turkey do against Europe? She would not try. But the English Government refused to say the word. It was a fearful time in Europe—death was in the air; every nation seemed to be under the influence of a great excitement. It was felt that if the English Government would join the other powers, those terrible atrocities in Bulgaria would be brought to an end, and a European war prevented. But the English Government would not; pretended to have no faith in the reports of Bulgarian horrors, and talked in a loud and menacing way. It seemed as if the Earl of Derby had decided to wait on Providence and the Turk, and as if the Earl of Beaconsfield was anxious to be baptised into his name with the blood and tears of England's sons and daughters. Russia plainly declared her intention to see justice done to the Rayahs, and at once there was the old talk about Russian aggression, and the English Government gave evidence of their intention to fight Russia on behalf of the integrity of Turkey. Servia declared war against the Turks too hastily, and very unwisely as it seems to me, for it made peace proposals more difficult and increased the excitement and the danger of a European war. But the Earl of Beaconsfield and his followers were not the English people. In England there is a great public sentiment—a public opinion—and when that is ascertained and spoken no Minister will dare to resist it. That greatest statesman of modern times, the honest man, the highminded patriot, the eloquent speaker, the rightful leader of the people, William Ewart Gladstone, came out of his retirement and called the English people to their duty. And the nation rose and spoke out its purpose. It was demanded that at least England should be neutral, and not be forced into war to support the infamous Turk. The peace party had help in the Cabinet itself. The Earl of Salisbury is a noble Englishman in every sense of the word. The people prevailed, the Government yielded, and England was watchful but neutral. All

were glad of that. British interests did not suffer, except as commerce must always suffer when nations are at war. Russia declared war with Turkey, and in my opinion, and in the opinion of others more capable of judging, Russia alone has been true to her promises concerning the Christians of Turkey. The war itself has been a surprise; the Turks have developed a martial spirit and material resources for which we gave them no credit. It has been a most disastrous war. Brave men on both sides, and incompetent officers on both sides. For months it was a slaughter, and every battlefield was a very shambles. The end of the war has come, and Congress is in session. Russia can only listen to proposals by Turkey granting what was originally demanded, and the powers of Europe agreeing to act in concert, by physical force if necessary, to compel Turkey to fulfil her engagements. The actual result of the war no one can tell, it is hardly safe to predict. Russia will triumph whatever the price, but she will be crippled for long years to come. But this is certain—the wrongs of the Christian subjects of Turkey will be redressed. The cry has gone up to the heavens, and God rules. Humanity has a sacred instinct of justice deeper than any thought of material interest. The English people will see more and more that "righteousness exalteth a nation," and they will demand that all things shall be put under man's rights. The Turkish Empire in Europe must break up and disappear. With all my heart I revive and adopt that prayer of the old Latins, only leaving the comet out of it, "O Lord, save us from the Turk and the devil, send them away out of Europe, and if it may be, let them both go together."

A. J. BRAY.

HERETICAL OPINIONS.

BY A LAYMAN.

Is there a concealed heresy in the suggestion that the present division of humanity into the three great classes of "Men, Women and the Clergy" is abnormal, and neither natural nor necessary? A reference to the *fact* in a recent editorial in the columns of the SPECTATOR has aroused some thought.

In this age of enquiry, in which every landmark of religion as well as politics has to stand the test of reconstruction and possible correction, one is encouraged to hope for a peaceable hearing, at least, to any fresh theory which would even seem to spring from the one great fountain-head of Truth, and is therefore not antagonistic to the higher forms of practical goodness.

Need "the clergy" be a class separate and distinct from either "men" or "women"? Is it desirable that their pursuits or aims in this life be in any wise different from those of the other two classes? Ought they not to be one and the same? Nay, may not one go even further in these days of "Women's Rights movements," and hazard the question, Is the destiny of Man so different from that of woman as to necessitate separate classification so marked as at present exists? Does not "Perfect music set to noble words" convey exactly the same thought when rendered thus, "Noble words expressing themselves in perfect music," or thus, "Perfect music uttering itself in noble words"? Harmony in the complex ensues because of harmony in the nature or essence of each. Is not any sharp distinction which does exist between the character of man and woman largely owing to that "lopsidedness" which is too frequently and justly complained of in both? Both have will and intellect; both have purpose and a certain quantum of strength to carry it out. But in the one sex the intellect—i.e., the strength—is encouraged and cultivated, the will or love principle taught to be subservient to these and to be ruled thereby, if not repressed altogether into working by mental line and plummet and not from the warm and living heart within, welling up into natural congenial life. In the other sex, the love and longing, the purity of purpose, are encouraged and commended; but the intellect repressed, uncultivated, or narrowed, till but little is found to work on or with. These find their outlet only in the narrowest channels of a circumscribed, so called home life. Now it is true, no doubt, as a German writer has said, "that the care of children is a business of angels," and few will care to dispute that it is therefore none the less appropriate to women. But there are other children in the world besides one's own. There are motherly hearts that warm towards *all* children, yet who have none of their own. There are children of a larger growth, born in sin, who have shaped themselves into something very like iniquity, whose errors and miseries demand a larger scope for woman's efforts than the narrow home circle, ere she can have room enough to reach and save them. Would not we men also be none the worse, but much the better, as men of the world and citizens, if the womanly element in us were a little more cultivated and permitted freer play till it permeated and revived both our intellect and our strength? A new hope for the salvation of the world lies concealed in that thought. Man and woman are not two, but one. Already progress speeds along that line and, as the real unity of the sexes is a law of nature written in our constitution by our Maker, therefore real life is rapidly evolving it. Some of the results may at first be a little surprising, but the ultimate will surely come, and the world will welcome it as the advent of a new and joyous era, when no masculine pursuit shall be too rough or impure for woman to share in, and no woman's work be viewed as too trivial or degrading for man to undertake if he is best fitted to do it well. The question of natural or acquired fitness for any particular class of work should be the *only* consideration in employing either men or women, whether as a class or individually. But before that principle can be thoroughly carried out as regards both sexes, we men, who at present have the control in matters terrestrial, must, by raising our standard of purity of thought and deed far above its present level, make it possible for women to toil alongside of us, in work-room, warehouse, counting-room or platform, without suffering in such contact one thought, look, suggestion or careless word which need offend *her* purity or *our own*. Millennial days these, no doubt! but when they do come they will demonstrate by practical achievements that there is no distinction of class between the sexes—no essential difference of genera or species—equal power. To plan and execute are inherent in both, waiting only a true condition of society to appear in ripened fruit, though only now in blossom.

The third class, "the clergy," forms a more inviting study, because a more immediately practical one. Here, at least, it requires no strong faith to foresee that the day is not far distant when they will cease to exist as a distinctive