

policy, patiently, persistently, remorselessly pursued. We ought to know that the causes of it are partly race hatred, partly trade jealousy, partly religious animosity.

“In his birthplace and cradle the Turk is Asiatic. He came to Europe centuries ago with his drawn scimitar. He came a barbarian, a robber, a brigand, and he has stayed in Europe ever since, a robber, a murderer, and a brigand. He is as barbaric to-day in the heart of him as he was in the centuries gone by. Whatever evolution has done for other races, it has not done anything for him. He is a Turk still. The Turkish Empire is composed of heterogeneous populations under the subjection of the scimitar of the Turk. He has never made any attempt whatever to affiliate these populations, to bring them into fellowship with himself, or to do them equal justice: he has simply held them by the throat with one hand, while he has rifled their pockets with the other. The Turkish Empire has used its power simply in taxing men; and it has taxed them, not that it might give them a good government, but that it might rob them for its own purposes. The idea of the Turk is the idea of the old Roman imperialism—subjugate the province, that you may take as much out of it as possible.

“Now, this Turk has seen in successive years these subject populations improving in spite of him. They have grown wiser, more intelligent, more virtuous, more prosperous. He has seen the Greek and the Nestorian and the Syrian and the Bulgarian, and now the Armenian, enter into places of profit, of industry, of advantage, and his race hatred has been intensified by his trade jealousy. This massacre of the Armenians is not a new thing in

Turkish history. ‘In 1822 not less than 50,000 Greeks were massacred in the Islands of the Aegean Sea; in 1850, 10,000 Nestorians were butchered around the headwaters of the Tigris; in 1860, 11,000 Maronites and Syrians perished in Mount Lebanon and Damascus; in 1876 upwards of 15,000 were slaughtered in Eulgaría.’ That is the Turk. That is what he has been doing all the time.

“And this race prejudice, this trade jealousy, have been intensified and embittered by what we are pleased to call his religion. What is religion? If it is consecration, devotion, enthusiasm, regardless of the One to whom the consecration is made, regardless of the object of devotion, regardless of that which excites the enthusiasm, then the Turk is religious. Then the Phoenicians, who caused their own children to be sacrificed to the cruel gods, were as religious as the Israelites. Then Torquemada, in lighting the torch and presiding over the tortures of the Inquisition, was as religious as the men who burned beneath the flames or were tortured on the rack. Then the Duke of Alva, with his unsheathed sword putting thousands and tens of thousands to death on the plains of Holland, was as religious as William of Orange ‘fighting for patriotism and his native land. Then Catherine de Medici summoning to Te Deums over the slain, was as religious as the massacred martyrs whose bodies filled the streets of the European metropolis.

“Religion is of two kinds—the aggressive and the non-aggressive. And of the aggressive religions there are two—the Christian and the Mohammedan. The one does it by the cross, the other by the sword; the one by love, the other by hate; the one by assimilation,