

into the pure truthfulness of enduring practice. Yet he is in this but a humble copyist of that fulness of the Godhead bodily, who said and *lived* the truth: "As ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them." That maxim, at least, is applicable to all our fellow-men of whatever creed or opinion, and does not exclude either the Roman Catholic Church or the Roman Catholic Hierarchy. They too are entitled to liberty both of opinion and action, and there is no excuse in the fact that they do *not* do to us as we would that they should, for us to do to them *exactly* that which they do to us. Yet such is the spirit of Toleration taught, for theory and practice, in the article referred to. Now, such is not the example set before us by the Divine-Humanity. We, like Him, are to do right, *and take the consequences*. There is no road other than that. If we be followers of Him, we must not shirk the right for fear of consequences. Neither for gain to ourselves, which is the internal meaning of "expediency," nor yet to avoid bloodshed, ought we to shrink from that path in which He walked before us. If to be an Orangeman—if to worship God and thank Him for the victories we commemorate—be to some men both duty and love to God, why do they not *do* it, fearless of those who kill the body, but after that have no more than they can do? Only by doing the right and taking the consequences have great victories, either moral or physical, been accomplished in the past—only thus shall they be accomplished in the future. If the liberty we claim be right let us *take* it. If in doing so we hasten the close of our earthly life what matters it? Life is but begun—not ended, and our power for good or evil is not thereby diminished, but increased. But to take away the liberty of others, to fetter their thoughts, to bind their life by physical force opposed to physical force, is useless. What good is it to restrain men's physical acts while the spiritual force of will which guides these remains unchanged? Sooner or later the flood of interior iniquity will o'erleap such physical barriers and bring these very barriers themselves of so-called law and order as instruments to work their evil will—witness Mayor Beaudry and his semblance of laws. The spiritual life is immeasurably stronger than the physical, yet men hope to fight both with merely physical weapons, instead of spiritual. Real actual Goodness—Love carried out into thought, word and deed—is the God-derived power which alone can meet and conquer evil. God made this possible when, nearly nineteen centuries ago, veiled in that form of humanity which evil men rested not till they had slain, He walked on earth. Still God lives, and His Love and Wisdom are abroad in all that really has Life. That Divine Life can animate us also to do or dare any thing that comes to us in treading feebly, in our lesser degree, the path He trod, denying no man liberty or life, but simply doing good to all, drawing forth thereby from each love or hatred, according to the quality of will or life which animated their inner nature. Fear of consequences has no place in such a life.

The power of absolute goodness—intense love towards every man that breathes on earth—has yet, we fear, to be tried by Christians. Try it ye who bear that name. Be not faithless, but believing. Give liberty, but hold your own liberty to do good to all. *Live the life* of self-sacrifice, yet swerve not from the right for any man. If you believe in God, if you believe that God is Love—that God is Life—live the life He lived, and you will win for yourself and others that fullest liberty which must yet follow, when none shall hurt or destroy because of the elevation the race will attain by means of the love drawn forth by such lives towards the one God who shall thus live in you. To do *this* is to progress. To fetter man's thought, to threaten deprivation of civil rights to a church or people, however evil, and deprive them of *their* life, because they seek to deprive us of ours, is to fight against God, to stifle His light, and turn it to darkness. The true path to peace and purity is "to love your enemies, to bless them that curse you, to do good to them that hate you, and pray for them who despitefully use you and persecute you." Nor does prayer for others mean anything if it end in mere words, and does not take form and shape in *deeds* of kindness. By *living* the prayer you shall indeed heap coals of fire upon the heads of your enemies; which simply means that in their guiding principle you will develop faculties capable of sustaining and retaining the glow of love which you will thereby infuse into them. Therein lies the cure for intolerance—the reason, the usefulness of toleration. Yet *toleration* is simply stolid indifference in which there is no fructifying power. Love shown without heat—pure intellect without the animating power of love. Love shown in a life of goodness towards all *is* fruitful and *will* multiply and replenish the earthy element in men's natures, drawing forth into bud, blossom and fruit the good there is in them. Governments can do but little in this direction; but individuals, God helping them, can do much, by the exercise of the noblest charity and consideration towards all to call forth the mutual exercise of a universal

"CHARITY."

"TURK" IN SELF-DEFENCE.

"R. W. Douglas" assumes, in the last issue of SPECTATOR, a lofty and overwhelming attitude in regard to my poor little article,—"A Plea for the Turks." There is a peculiarity, too, about his affected superiority which is worthy of notice. Mr. Douglas would, and he wouldn't.

From his superior mental altitude he views with disdain this puny attempt to say a word for the Turks, and severely questions the capacity and qualifications of the author. Nevertheless, he feels compelled to notice it, and somewhat testily puts his foot upon it. Dame Nature, it seems, with her wonted generosity has, by way of compensation, endowed inferior animals with quite a formidable power of irritating their brethren of larger growth.

Mr. Douglas, in his magnanimous attempt to set matters right, roughly divides the public in its comprehension of this Eastern question into two classes—the intelligent and the non-intelligent. The intelligent includes Mr. Douglas and people of his way of thinking; the non-intelligent comprises all who presume to differ from him.

Now, this is hardly a modest way of disposing of those who differ from us, and one would certainly expect something crushingly brilliant and original from a critic who claims so exceptional and invidious a power of discrimination. But what do we find? Nothing but a stale echo of partisan tirades against the Turks, which have been of late repeated *ad nauseam*, and replied to over and

over again, clinched by a couple of quotations from such notoriously onesided historians as E. A. Freeman and Goldwin Smith.

I just put forward my plea for the Turks simply as a protest against what appeared to me too sweeping a condemnation of that people. My main point was to shew that they were not the devils Mr. Bray so broadly hinted them to be. And in my anxiety to avoid the partiality I was condemning I was careful to minimise rather than otherwise what could be said in their favour. Really a great deal more can be said for them.

Mr. Douglas will doubtless feel greatly astonished at my audacity in coupling him with that famous but intolerant "navvy" whose amiable reception of an individual unknown to him was: "A stranger! 'eave 'arf a brick at 'im." But he stands in much the same relation to the Turk. He looks at him, not from the proper point of view, but through the prejudices of our different civilization, and what we deem superior enlightenment. Viewed through this medium the Turk appears a passingly strange, and therefore objectionable, abominable being. Away with him!

Let us try and get a view of him from a fairer standpoint.

Mr. Douglas quotes the works of two contemporary historians of considerable eminence and authority. I will refer him for a fair estimate of the Turks to a Book which, I imagine, he reverences as of still greater eminence and authority,—viz., the Bible.

Let him look back upon the old civilization so graphically and vividly set before us in the earlier Books of that wondrous collection, and he will find a striking resemblance between that ancient mode of life and that of the Turk. In religion he will see the same monotheism and fatalism. In social life and government the same polygamy, concubinage, despotism, and slavery. But with these, to us, incomplete modes of thought and repulsive ways of life, were there no redeeming features? Were those grand old patriarchs, that wonderful Jewish people, no better than devils? I trow not. That simple primitive form of life is full of beauties, and is redolent of the sweet, pure, clear, air of the desert that gave it birth. And to no people is the world more deeply indebted than to the Hebrews, a kindred race to the Ottomans.

I do not claim for these latter equality with their kinsmen, but I do venture to claim for them some faint reflection of those ancient glories. I would recommend to Mr. Douglas and people of his fanatical way of thinking in regard to Mahometanism a study of that masterpiece of biographical painting, Carlyle's "Mahomet." They will find there an exaggerated picture perhaps, but one pregnant with the deepest insight into human character, and rendered for ever memorable by its philosophic grasp and power.

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? Or is the spirit of brutality and oppression wholly eliminated from our midst? The fact is we must either admit that the Ottoman power has had a great and God-given mission in the world, or be driven to the ugly inference that the Almighty made an enormous mistake in giving it so large a lease of power on this earth. Inferior as Mahometanism is to Christianity, it is vastly superior to heathenism, and who shall say that its grand doctrine of the oneness of God, and its better code of morality are in no sort a preparation for the higher faith?

The renowned Eastern traveller, Palgrave, who has perhaps seen more of Mahometanism and its effects upon the world than any other living man, almost does disrespect to Christianity by the eminence he gives to the kindred faith. In my former article I freely admitted the Turk's vices, I will now mention more particularly his virtues.

The Turk has three sterling qualities. I speak of him individually, and not as represented by a corrupt government. He is temperate, and truthful, and honest.

Take the following comparison between him and the much lauded Christian whom he oppresses. I quote the *Pall Mall Gazette*, unintelligible to Mr. Douglas, but not without information for other people:—

"In the bazaars it makes all the difference in the world, both to your purse and your composure, whether you enter the shop of a Turk or of a Christian, the latter, if a Greek, begins by overcharging; then he lowers his price; he coaxes and jibes; he runs after you in the street to bring you back by the sleeve. If he has commenced by offering you a pair of babouches at ten times their value he will not cease worrying until he has got you to take them at 80 per cent. reduction, and will be a gainer by the bargain after all. The fellow is so base and grasping, so impudent and loquacious that he is not to be shaken off by entreaties or threats. But with the Turk there is nothing but peace and candid dealing.

"The Frank who has had dealings with the Greek next door may think that six purses (£24) are too much, and may betake himself to the door, but if he does the Turk will not follow him. He has asked his price; he will not reduce it by a piastre; and, above all, he will not run after anybody, seeing that it lies with Allah to determine whether he shall sell his shawls or not. Turkish tradesmen seldom make fortunes, but they have not yet reached the high culture which consists in selling shoddy; they do not cheat you, and they scarcely ever become bankrupt; so that on the whole they may claim that Allah sends them as much prosperity as they need."

And in mitigation, by way of comparison, of Turkish atrocities I would ask what Mr. Douglas thinks of the reports, too well founded apparently, which are coming in of Bulgarian and Russian retaliatory atrocities.

And now as to one or two other points which my critic has condescended to notice.

With an air of lofty pity truly edifying, he commiserates the infatuation which could have prompted my repudiation of the assumption that England's Government cared nothing for the welfare of the Christian subjects of Turkey, and asks what was the value of a sympathy that did not go to war on behalf of the object pitied. And, pray, is England to spend her blood and treasure for every oppressed nationality? And was the Conference which immediately preceded the late war, and at which England made the most strenuous efforts to induce Turkey to institute the desired reforms, no evidence of good will? I repeat that England declined to go hand in hand with Russia because she had ample evidence of the utter insincerity of that Power, and knew that it was Russia's secret intrigues more than anything else that fomented the insurrections that were put down with such terrible severity.

Who knows that the Turk would not have held out against the combined