

devoted himself to those political problems, in which national economy is involved. It is true, the fundamental law of economy is not so easily traced in the vast and complicated relations of international trade, but this is the case with all the laws which govern the world, in external nature as well as in human society. The simplest laws of motion are ordinarily never seen in isolation. Watch a snow-wreath as it winds itself fantastically during an easterly storm. Could the profoundest mechanist analyse with certainty the various forces, under the operation of which the wreath assumes the particular shape that is gradually piled up before your eyes? And yet no one doubts that the common laws of motion are at work in producing the elaborate result. So no scientific economist doubts that the common law of economy is at work in producing the most complicated results in the economical intercourse of nations. There could, in fact, be no Economical Science, if economy were something so vacillating in its nature as to be capable of meaning two directly opposite lines of action, just as there could be no Moral Science if Right sometimes meant the same thing as Wrong. All our leaders of our Opposition know that their promises of what is misnamed Protection are in direct contradiction to the lessons of Economical Science; they know that unless that science is an illusion, the policy which they advocate would sap the foundations of our national wealth. There are many other aspects in which the policy of the Opposition should be reprobated; but even if the policy of a nation should have no other object than the increase of the national wealth, science and common sense alike compel us to reject the proposal of excluding ourselves from the most remunerative markets of the world as the most anti-national policy that could be proposed. If any political party is willing to lend itself to such a perilous political experiment, the elector, to whom the interests of a nation are dearer than the success of a party, has no choice but to oppose such recklessness by all the political influence in his power. All the more willing must his opposition in the present case be, that such experimenting upon the national welfare is so utterly hostile to that valuable spirit of conservatism, the preservation of which has formed the most useful historical service of the great political party which our Opposition claim to represent.

J. CLARK MURRAY.

"TURK" ON THE TURKS—A REJOINDER.

"Turk" has written a second article, ostensibly in defence of his first, called "A Plea for the Turks," in answer to my few remarks bearing on his previous production which was published in the SPECTATOR a week or so since. He has thought fit to reaffirm, with considerable additions, what he said in the earlier article, and to address some personal remarks to myself for presuming to criticise his ideas, or rather the fustian which he has substituted in place of them. Methinks if he had rested content after writing his first "Plea," he would have done better, notwithstanding its extreme lameness and debility. Now, the author of "A Plea for the Turks" has lost his temper, and he has committed himself by misrepresenting and garbling; and moreover, he has failed to earn the little reputation for impartiality and humanity which the nature of his "Plea" might otherwise have allowed him. This unexpected result to him, is not very surprising however to others, when they consider how the party in England, with which "Turk" professes to sympathise, has set him such a sublime example of integrity in exalting a barbarian race for political purposes at the expense of humanity and in defiance alike of expediency or necessity. "Turk" has, however, gone much farther than even his friends the Tories would care to go. I venture to say the most unscrupulous Tory in England would hardly dare pen such a monstrous misrepresentation of slavery in Turkey as "Turk" has done in his "Plea." If he did he would bring upon his head swift retribution, for how many are there in England credulous enough to believe that it "partakes largely of the patriarchal spirit, the slave being more an humble member of the family, than simply the property of his master?" Any one capable of reading could, in half an hour, gather sufficient damning evidence as to the utter untruthfulness of the assertion that would overwhelm even the Father of Lies himself. Doubtless "Turk" fancied he was writing the truth, and did not mean to set down nonsense.

In looking over his "self-defence," the most notable thing to be found is the plaint that I look at the Turk, "not from the proper point of view, but through the prejudices of our different civilization, and what we deem our superior enlightenment," and "through this medium he is apt to appear a passingly strange, and therefore objectionable, abominable, being." This may be very true, but it is altogether wide of the mark. I don't object to the Turk living and breathing on the earth by himself, I simply object to a barbarian fanatic domineering over peoples whom he has had the luck to conquer, making of them hewers of wood and drawers of water to his profit, lolling in abject laziness while they administer to his wants, when, if they could but free themselves from his grasp, they are able to rise into independent, progressive nationalities, appreciating freedom, and helping on civilization, which their master is wholly incapable of doing.

The "proper point of view" that "Turk" wishes me to select in order to judge his brethren is in the Bible. He desires me to stand in his shoes and affect—like himself—to see in the "grand, old patriarchs"—"that wonderful Jewish people," whose "simple, primitive form of life is full of beauties, and is redolent of the sweet, (sic) pure, clear air of the desert," some reflection of the Ottoman Turks. What that reflection may be beyond "polygamy, concubinage, despotism and slavery," he does not inform us. He leaves us to draw the inference, if we choose, that the Ottoman Turk is a reflection of the Hebrew because the latter, besides possessing the above-named social characteristics, put his Ammonite captives under saws and under axes of iron, and made them to pass through the brick-kiln, and then he exclaims with warmth that he will claim for his brethren "some faint reflection of those ancient glories." I may misapprehend his meaning, because I happen to agree with him exactly, if he allows the paragraph to stand as it now is. I expect, however, I shall have to read between the lines to get at the real meaning he intends, which, no doubt, is the direct opposite to what he has expressed. In his uncouth fashion he wants us to notice that the Mohammedan Bedouin of the desert of to-day is

in some respects a likeness of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob and their successors, as depicted in the Bible. I should like to know what this has got to do with the Turk, even if I admit its truth. He says that to no people is the world more deeply indebted than to the Hebrews, and he wants us to draw the inference that we are to a corresponding extent indebted to the Bedouin Arab. What utter nonsense!

At all events, the drift of the argument is not to the point. Can enough be said in favour of the Ottoman Turks to justify their remaining in Europe? I do not think there can. No doubt the race viewed as barbarians would not suffer by comparison with other barbarians, but could they be compared advantageously to themselves with any civilized race? Incredible as it may seem, "Turk" not only believes that they can, but he believes we here in Canada would have but little to boast of if such a comparison were made with us. His words are: "How can Mr. Douglas and his school bestow so much violent indignation upon the Turks on account of their sensuality in view of the terrible dimensions of our own 'social evil,' the ill odour of which goes up to heaven from every city and town and village in our midst? Is not this Canada of ours full of abominable abortions, and seductions and rapes? How can Christendom afford to taunt the Mohammedan world with its vileness in this regard?" "Turk" would probably put a stop to this terrible state of things in our midst by instituting polygamy and concubinage; then, doubtless, we should approach as near his ideal of perfection as possible. The slander, however, is too apparent to render us uneasy. "Turk" knows it to be pure nonsense, and he knows also that if it were true it would not advance his argument a hair's-breadth. If we are bad in the way "Turk" designates we are sinning at the expense of our standard of morals, which is not true equally of the Turk, because his standard has been made on purpose to sanction his sensuality. But I deny that the prevalence of crime in Canada has reached "terrible dimensions." It has never been in any way remarkable, nor is it now on the increase, and therefore I cannot deem the way "Turk" has coupled us with his brethren, anything but sheer and uncalled-for impertinence; in the first place it is foreign to his argument, and in the second place it is untrue.

"Turk" admits in his first article that his brethren are brutal, fanatical and lazy, but in his second he claims for them three sterling qualities: they are temperate and truthful and honest. It is scarcely worth while to stop and ascertain how far the bad qualities overbalance the good, but it is worth notice that so little can be said in their favour by even their friends, and even that little not wholly true. Anyway, there can scarcely be two opinions about this: barbarians who are temperate, truthful and honest, but are brutal, fanatical and lazy, are not the people precisely where they ought to be when encroached among aliens, superior in almost every respect to themselves, whom they retard in their legitimate growth towards the civilization which their kindred under better auspices have attained long ago. This in itself is sufficient to justify the bag and baggage policy which very many would like to see enforced.

The Turks may be temperate and truthful and honest among themselves, but they have dropped the two first qualities in their dealings with Infidels and retained the latter with terrible effect. They have certainly been sincere enough in their convictions in appropriating for themselves everything they could lay hold of belonging to other people. To the follower of Mahomet has been given the whole world—if he can take it—and thus by virtue of the divine favour he deems it perfectly in accordance with all that he holds sacred, to lie and pillage and slaughter to his heart's content, provided he do these things in the interests of Islam. The Turk is rendered an aggressive and dangerous animal by his religion, although he was originally bad enough. Take this view of him and his religion by a writer in the *Princeton Review*, and bear in mind that it was drawn by a scholar: "History stamps the original Turk as brutal, sensual, savage, deceitful at the core of his nature, reckless in physical courage, a born robber and tyrant. The Arab will tell you: 'Avoid the Tartar if you can; he will eat you in his love, or hack you to pieces in his hate.'

"His religion has not improved him; rather it has developed the worst parts of his nature. Mohammedanism at the best, as Neander has shown, suppresses wholly the sense of relationship and communion with God, and so prevents the developments which are the glory of the Christian civilisation. The marvellous pictures given in these days, of the devout communion of the Mussulman with God, are the merest fancy sketches. He has no sense whatever of the presence of God. Major Osborne, who confirms this fact, shows that there is no possible element of progress in Islam. Add to this the fact of the divine sanction it gives to the darker and lower passions of man's nature, and its degrading character, even at the best, becomes manifest. It must brutalize man.

"But the Turk has not had Mohammedanism at its best." (I hope "Turk" will profit by this.) "He has always followed the system of Abou Hanifa, the second of the four great orthodox imams or founders of the schools of doctrine. It is the Mohammedan Jesuitism. Hanifa's system was reached by deducting from the Koran, and was intended to meet the exigencies arising from the lax morality of Koufa, a commercial city. It assumes that whatever can be deduced from the Koran is true. There is a verse in the second sura of the Koran which says: 'God has created the whole world for you.' That text, say the Hanifite jurists, is a deed which annuls all other rights of property. The 'you' means, of course, the true believers. He then classifies the whole earth under three heads: 1. Land which never had an owner. 2. Land which never had an owner and has been abandoned. 3. *The persons and the properties of Infidels.* From this third division the same legist deduces the legitimacy of slavery, privacy, and a state of perpetual war between the faithful and the unbelieving world. These are all methods whereby the Moslem enters into the possession of his God-given inheritance."

Had not this quotation been interesting as well as true I should not have transcribed it, because, however true and lucid it may be, "Turk" wears before his sight a pair of dark spectacles which will effectually prevent his seeing it thus, and therefore if I had intended it for his edification I should have had simply my labour for my pains. But I address myself to a larger constituency, and it will be very strange indeed if it fails to perceive that the logical outcome of the above system has not been fully exemplified in the history of the Turks. They have always shown themselves to be aggressive, fanatical and barbarous.