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PREFACE.

The five letters now published in this pamphlet were originally reproduced by an influential newspaper of New York. They were written at and sent from Constantinople, where impartial and correct information was accessible. The author, in republishing these letters, together with further evidence, has only one wish in view, and that is to impart to his readers a true and thorough knowledge of the present Armenian troubles. He believes that the whole atmosphere on this subject has been polluted with falsehoods and exaggerations, and trusts that the present short and condensed pamphlet will help in bringing some light on a question so often misrepresented.
ARMENIAN TROUBLES AND WHERE THE RESPONSIBILITY LIES.

I.

The Turkish Government has never denied that serious disturbances have taken place at the district of Sassoun. What it has denied is the accusation that there was a premeditated massacre; and yet this is the absurd basis upon which is built the whole Armenian agitation, both in America and Europe. The mere idea that the Sultan would order a massacre of his Christian subjects, Armenians or no Armenians, is ridiculous in itself, and denotes a credulous belief in the falsehoods and calumnies propagated by the Armenian revolutionary committees.

People cannot understand here in Turkey how serious American newspapers could accept and print in their columns assertions made with the object of throwing odium on the legitimate authority of a friendly power. Mere affirmations ought not to be considered as sufficient. Proofs ought to be asked above everything else. If such were the case, the most wild absurdities about Turkey would never appear in the daily press. What, however, has surprised some people most is to see the boldness and fanaticism of not a few American clergymen, who try to impart a religious and fanatical tendency to a question that is, and ought to remain, a political one.

That Turkey does not make any religious distinctions between her subjects is shown by the fact that Armenians, who, as a race, are certainly much inferior to the Turks, occupy very high positions in Turkey. While this is the case with Mohammedan Turkey, may we ask who are the Christian governments that reward their Jewish subjects, for example, with corresponding honors and influence? And yet the Jew-
ish race is indeed a great one, for it has left a mark in the history of mankind.

What Turkey wants is peace, and she is determined to have it. The Sassoun disturbances were brought about by the Armenian revolutionary committees. Turkey as an independent State had to put down these disturbances. She did it with a severity less great than the one displayed by England in similar circumstances. As regards now the demand for reforms, let it be remembered that reforms are needed in every country, and not in Turkey alone. We have not heard that the Irish question has been solved, and yet nobody recommends to England to abandon her sovereign rights and independence. Turkey will stick to the same rule, for she has the same rights and the same independence. In the meantime, it would be well for American public opinion, instead of showing an implicit faith in Armenian falsehoods, to let these Armenian Christians know that they ought, for their own sake, to abandon their seditious agitation. The rest will necessarily follow.

II.

In our previous letter we affirmed that the Sassoun troubles were brought about by the criminal efforts of Armenian revolutionary committees, and that no reliance whatever ought to be placed on Armenian testimony and assertions. We now propose to prove these two affirmations, not by Turkish—that is to say, Mussulman—testimony, but by American and European; namely, Christian testimony.

The man who, above all, gave the most explicit and true account of the Armenian revolutionary movement is the Rev. Cyrus Hamlin himself. On the 23d of December, 1893, or, in other words, only a few months before the revolt of Sassoun, he published in the Congregationalist a truly prophetic statement, the perusal of which is absolutely necessary for an impartial understanding of the case. Here is this statement:

"An Armenian 'revolutionary' party is causing great evil and suffering to the missionary work and to the whole Christian population of certain parts of the Turkish Empire. It is a secret organization, and is
managed with a skill in deceit which is known only in the East. In a widely distributed pamphlet the following announcement is made at the close:

"This is the only Armenian party which is leading on the revolutionary movement in Armenia. Its centre is Athens, and it has branches in every village and city in Armenia, also in the colonies. Nishan Garabedian, one of the founders of the party, is in America, and those desiring to get further information may communicate with him, addressing Nishan Garabedian, 15 Fountain Street, Worcester, Mass., or with the centre, M. Beniard, Poste Restante, Athens, Greece."

"A very intelligent Armenian gentleman, who speaks fluently and correctly English as well as Armenian, and is an eloquent defender of the revolution, assured me that they have the strongest hopes of preparing the way for Russia's entrance into Asia Minor to take possession. In answer to the question as to how, he replied: 'These Huntchaguist bands, organized all over the empire, will watch their opportunities to kill Turks and Kurds, set fire to their villages, and then make their escape into the mountains. The enraged Moslems will then rise and fall upon the defenseless Armenians and slaughter them with such barbarities that Russia will enter, in the name of humanity and Christian civilization, and take possession.'

"When I denounced the scheme as atrocious and infernal beyond anything ever known, he calmly replied: 'It appears so to you, no doubt, but we Armenians are determined to be free. Europe listened to the Bulgarian horrors, and made Bulgaria free. She will listen to our cry when it goes up in the shrieks and blood of millions of women and children.' I urged in vain that this scheme would make the very name of Armenian hateful among all civilized people. He replied: 'We are desperate; we shall do it.' 'But your people do not want Russian protection. They prefer Turkey, bad as she is. There are hundreds of miles of conterminous territory into which emigration is easy at all times. It has been so for all the centuries of Moslem rule. If your people preferred the Russian Government, there would not now be an Armenian family in Turkey.' 'Yes,' he replied, 'and for such stupidity they will have to suffer.'

"I have had conversations with others who avow the same things, but no one acknowledges that he is a member of the party. Falsehood is, of course, justifiable where murder and arson are. In Turkey the party aims to excite the Turks against Protestant missionaries and against Protestant Armenians. All the troubles at Marsovan originated in their movements. They are cunning, unprincipled, and cruel. They terrorize their own people by demanding contributions of money under threats of assassination—a threat which has often been put into execution.

"I have made the mildest possible disclosure of only a few of the abominations of this Huntchaguist revolutionary party. It is of Russian origin; Russian gold and craft govern it. Let all missionaries, home and foreign, denounce it. Let all Protestant Armenians everywhere boldly denounce it. It is trying to enter every Sunday-school and deceive and pervert the innocent and ignorant into supporters of this craft. We must, therefore, be careful that in befriending Armenians we do nothing that can be construed into an approval of this movement, which all should abhor. While yet we recognize the probability that some Armenians in this country, ignorant of the real object and cruel designs of the Huntchaguists, are led by their patriotism to join with them, and while we sympathize with the sufferings of the Armenians at home, we must stand aloof from any such desperate attempts, which contemplate the destruction of Protestant missions, churches, schools, and Bible work, involving all in a common ruin that is diligently and craftily sought.
Let all home and foreign missionaries beware of any alliance with, or countenance of, the Huntchaguists."

No one really knows whether the Rev. Cyrus Hamlin is considered to be a prophet in his own country, but his prophetic faculties as far as the last Armenian revolt is concerned are not denied in Turkey. They are simply marvellous; for, months before the occurrence of the Sassoun troubles, the Rev. Cyrus Hamlin had exactly and minutely shown what they would be. And yet, after the fulfilment of his own prophecy, the Rev. Cyrus Hamlin was bold enough to say that the above statement was written by him only "to show the absurdity of the revolutionary plotters." The reverend gentleman must have a candid and innocent soul. Otherwise he would not have attempted to prove to fair-minded Americans that the "bloodthirstiness" of the Armenian revolutionary plotters is synonymous with their "absurdity." We suppose that the Rev. Cyrus Hamlin will also attribute to the "absurdity of revolutionary plotters" the following statement, showing his past guilty interference in Turkish affairs. One of these Armenian "plotters" made some time ago to the Boston Herald this extraordinary admission, which, for the honor of Robert College, if not for his own, the Rev. Cyrus Hamlin ought, if he can, to contradict:

"Several years ago," writes the Armenian, "I heard him lecture at Amherst, Mass. How proud he was to tell his audience the important part taken by the Bulgarian graduates of Robert College in securing the freedom and independence of their country! I ask the Rev. Cyrus Hamlin if he was not aware of the existence of patriotic societies among his Bulgarian students," etc.

But in order to show that the Rev. Cyrus Hamlin's prophecy holds good, let American readers reflect on the following passage of a letter written by the special correspondent of the Associated Press, who visited Turkey after the Sassoun revolt, and who, although bitterly opposed to the Turkish Government, wrote as follows:

"It is a fact that certain of the Armenian conspirators arranged to murder the Rev. Edward Riggs and two other American missionaries at Marsovan and fasten the blame upon the Turks, in order that the United States might inflict summary punishment upon the Turkish Government, thereby making possible Armenian independence. One will search
a long time in the pages of history for a more diabolical plot than that. Moreover the missionaries would have been murdered had not an Armenian friend warned them. Dr. Riggs has unselfishly given his life to the education of Armenian youth in the missionary schools, and done more than any Armenian has ever tried to do toward making Armenians worthy of autonomous government. Yet the revolutionary conspirators apparently gave that fact little thought. . . . It is, of course, impossible to say to what extent radical ideas prevail among the revolutionary propagandists, but the plans of some of the leaders are shocking in the extreme.

"In brief, their plans are to commit outrages upon Turks, in order that the infuriated Turks shall shock the Christian world by the fiendish outrages of their retaliation. When remonstrated with in regard to these un-Christian plans, the men who are responsible for them merely say:

'It may seem to you cruel and barbarous, but we know what we are doing, and why we are doing it.'

"The financial methods of these men are almost as ingenious as their plans of political agitation. Certain Armenians of a lower grade of mental ability are required to furnish so many thousand piastres to the committee, and the means of obtaining the money are plainly mapped out. Here is a case in point.

"A wealthy Turk in the service of the Government in Constantinople received a letter one morning, saying that unless he deposited 12,000 piastres in a certain place within twenty-four hours he would be killed. An investigation led to the discovery of the fact that the letter was written by an Armenian who had been in his employ as a trusted servant for several years. The servant confessed his guilt, but he asserted in self-defense that revolutionary agitators had compelled him to write the letter under penalty of death. It was a case of choice of wills, and the poor wretch saved his life at the expense of a long term of imprisonment. It is believed that a great deal of money is raised in this way, but whether or not this money gets beyond the pockets of the revolutionary agitators, no man pretends to know. There is a theory that this money is used in the purchase of rifles and ammunition, but that is a matter known only to the agitators themselves."

The reason why English public opinion is generally in favor of the Armenians is both political and religious. No real esteem for the Armenians themselves exists in England. Besides, everybody admits in Europe that Armenians are, as a race, much inferior to the Turks. Armenians, even in olden times, showed no greatness. Their influence in the world has been absolutely nil. In science, in art, in literature, in war-like achievements, they have left no trace. But they are Christians; and this is one reason why English public opinion is in their favor. The political reason lies in the fact that England wishes to harass Turkey for the just opposition of the latter to English scandalous encroachments on Egyptian territory, which, after all, belongs legitimately to the Sultan. It is just as if England had taken possession of one of the American States, and at the same time were fomenting dis-
content for, and disapprobation of, the treatment of the Indian race which Columbus found supreme on this continent.

Such being the real state of things, we consider that it is quite time for public opinion in the United States to see how erroneous and even anti-American is the policy which consists in helping England in her political aspirations in the East. American public opinion ought to remain aloof from European intrigues. It ought especially to learn to estimate correctly the value of Armenian assertions and of the Armenian moral standard.

"If," writes the Associated Press correspondent above quoted, "the detailed facts of the Sassoun massacre are ever established, it must be independently of Armenian testimony, or their value may be seriously questioned. In the first place, every Armenian with whom it has been my lot to come in contact seems to have a very vague idea of the value of truth. In the second place, in his anxiety to make out a case against the Turk, he is willing to publish as fact any grotesque rumor that he may chance to fall over in the street. In the third place, he does not really know what actually took place in the Sassoun mountains, but his vanity will not permit him to acknowledge it, and so, to be up with the times and to help along the cause of his people, he embellishes the rumor that he hears, and frequently says that he is in secret communication with friends in Moosh and Bitlis, who are harboring Sassoun refugees. The average Armenian cannot be believed on oath."

In this deplorable condition of Armenian honesty, we find a true explanation of the following remarkable incident, an account of which was given at the time, as follows, by all the newspapers:

"The story which has been thrilling the world for some time past, of the wife of the Armenian leader Grego, who, rather than suffer dishonor at the hands of her Turkish persecutors, threw herself, with her child in her arms, into an abyss, and was followed by other women until the ravine was filled with corpses, has been exploded, as many persons predicted it would be, at the time it was sprung upon the public. It has been discovered that the horrible narrative is a reproduction, with additions and embellishments to suit the occasion, of an old tale told in poetry by Mrs. Hemans years ago, under the title of 'The Suliote Mother.'"

In the face of all the innumerable Armenian falsehoods of this kind, word has just reached us that Mr. Gladstone, in his Chester speech, asserted that the world is in possession of independent American testimony favorable to the Armenians. No greater error has ever been made. Mr. Gladstone ought to have known better. There is absolutely no American tes-
timony regarding the Sassoun troubles. And the reason is very simple. No American was at the Sassoun district at the time of the revolt. The Rev. F. D. Greene, it is true, published a slanderous pamphlet on the "Armenian Crisis in Turkey," in which he printed a few documents supposed to be well authenticated. But as no American-born citizen saw anything of the Sassoun disturbances, it follows necessarily that said documents were written either by Armenians or by American missionaries, under the inspiration of Armenians. Therefore the Rev. F. D. Greene's pamphlet is based upon Armenian falsehoods. This makes it utterly and completely valueless. Mr. Gladstone owes to us to show where and how he was able to find a single genuine American document favoring the Armenian allegations; that is to say, the allegations of a people who "cannot be believed on oath." Facts, however, have very seldom disturbed Mr. Gladstone's fanaticism. We trust that Americans, having no political views on Turkey, will see how dangerous it is to encourage, either by word or by moral help, Armenian revolutionists for the simple reason that they are Christians. "Armenia," wrote some time ago the correspondent mentioned above, "is preparing for war. The revolutionary party has now both money and guns. During the past eight weeks money has poured into the revolutionary treasury in a steady stream from the Armenian colonies in Batoum, Tiflis, Baku, Erivan, Etchmiadzin, and other places in Russia, and from Rescht, Kazvin, Tehran, Tebriz, Khoi, and other cities in Persia. I have not visited the Armenian colonies on the north coast of the Black Sea, nor the large colony at Isphahan in Southern Persia, but I am reliably informed that revolutionary agents have been as busy there as elsewhere. I have myself seen a considerable sum of this money raised publicly, and I am told that the wealthy Armenian merchants in the cities I have named have made large private contributions, with promises of more for future use if needed. "The money raised publicly has been obtained by means of balls, social entertainments, theatrical performances, and lotteries. These functions were ostensibly for the 'benefit of the Sassoun refugees.' But it was a very thin disguise. It
was thoroughly understood what the money was wanted for, and that the Sassoun refugees would not see a penny of it except in the shape of rifles and ammunition."

The cries, therefore, in favor of the Sassoun refugees and the famished are either based on Armenian falsehoods or uttered by those who have political aims to further and attain. Could Americans be deceived by such a very "thin disguise"? We doubt it.

III.

**Lord Salisbury**'s assertion in his speech on the address—namely, that Turkey's independence "exists by reason of the agreement of other powers that they will not interfere with it, and that they will maintain it"—may sound well to the ears of Turkey's detractors, but, if true, the same assertion may also be considered as applying with equal force to every power on earth. And the reason is simple enough. Suppose, for argument's sake, that the European powers, one and all, were to combine their forces, by land as well as by sea, and, with a unity that necessarily would become overwhelming, were to fall upon all British possessions: where would the "independence" of the British Empire be? No doubt it would speedily vanish.

An "agreement," therefore, tacit or not tacit, always exists between civilized nations, an agreement the purport of which is that they will not "interfere" with each other's "independence," and that they will "maintain" it. Otherwise there would be no stability in human affairs, no political life among nations, no progress. Now, Lord Salisbury may think, if he chooses, that England is an unassailable power, whose first serious defeat from a coming foe would not be the certain signal of her collapse and dismemberment. He may assert that Turkey is, on the contrary, a vulnerable power. But let him ask the Russians what they think of the Turkish soldiers. Let the whole world answer to this. Turkey's "independence" is as certain as England's. To
break down her "independence" Turkey's enemies must fight first. Words are misleading when they do not correspond to facts.

It seems, however, as if Lord Salisbury had lost the memory of some facts especially concerning English cruelty. His non-reference to the Indian mutiny of 1857, and his abstaining to compare it with the Sassoun revolt were most characteristic. Anybody who knows anything about English history and English tenderness of heart remembers with what savage cruelty, with what streams of blood, the English soldier put down the rebellion of that year. Even Armenian falsehoods as applied to Sassoun were below the truth in comparison with the English application in India of an imperial policy of extermination and death. Such words as "butchery," "hellish deeds," "piteous moans," "piercing cries," "shrieks," "screams," "vain voices of blood and agony," and the like, that fill Mr. Dillon's article on Turkey which has just appeared in an English magazine, apply a thousand times more to the British repression of the Indian mutiny of 1857 than to the Turkish repression of the Armenian revolt of Sassoun of 1894.

Even to-day, if there were to manifest itself in India an agitation equal to the one described by the Rev. Cyrus Hamlin himself as having existed eighteen months ago in Asiatic Turkey among Armenians, the same English soldiery would use absolutely the same cruel means for preserving the "integrity" of the British Empire. And yet no Christian power would think of raising its voice against such a policy. No public meetings would take place in America to condemn a Protestant country. The past has shown us that such would be the case. And even in the present time, who in Europe or in the United States sends a word of sympathy to those Mussulmans, to those Mussulman women and children, to those Mussulman villages that are being plundered and outraged by savage Bulgarians?

Whatever the cause of this conduct may be, nothing, we consider, will be found more instructing and more edifying than the perusal of a remarkable letter published by Mrs. S. L. Baldwin, in the New York Tribune. Every impartial
American will surely judge Turkey with more charity after reading the following passages of said letter:

"Let us be correct and fair in our records. There is cause for us Americans not to be too free with our exhortations, epithets, and threats. The Chinese are not sinners above all others. If you will grant me space in your paper, I will give you reliable details of such outrages against the Chinese in the United States—not in interior cities, but that have taken place in Boston, New York, and Brooklyn, as well as in San Francisco, San José, Sacramento, Tacoma, Denver, Seattle, and other places—that at least ought to make us silent as well as sad in our present grief over the Ku-Cheng cablegram. I know of no terrible massacre in China in 1885; but I can give the most horrible details of one that occurred right here in our honorable (?) country. I had the painful duty of writing the only detailed account of it published in the East, and had to lay down my pen and leave my desk three times before I could go through with it. I had the triple official documents—Chinese, United States, and Union Pacific Railroad—from which to make my painful, reliable record.

"In that massacre, which does distinguish 1885 in our history, more Chinese were killed, shot down, burned alive, in one awful hour, that day in September at Rock Spring, Wyoming, than were English and Americans killed in China in twenty-five years. For the Ku-Cheng outrage men will be arrested and executed, officers will be removed and degraded, and all destroyed property will be made good. For the Rock Springs massacre of fifty perfectly innocent people—so all authorities, our own Messrs. Cleveland and Bayard among them, declared—up to this date of August 6, 1895, no human being has been arrested, much less punished. All the hard-earned gains of these fifty people were stolen or destroyed, for which our highest authorities declared that 'in justice' there was no claim for indemnity, but 'ex-gratia' it might be given; but even 'ex-gratia' it was not granted until, a few years later, our own West China Mission was raided—no one hurt—and we wanted $25,000 for our destroyed property, and our Government had enough shame left to hurry up and pay the 'ex-gratia' sum before it shook the American flag before the Chinese Government and threatened a gunboat if the said Chinese Government—so infamous—did not right our fearful wrongs, and 'in justice,' not 'ex-gratia,' pay up quickly! Again I say, let us be fair!

"I conclude with a question: Is it a greater offence to 'Our Father' for His American, English, and French children to be killed in China than His Chinese children to come to a like tragic end in the United States? If an offender's sin is to be judged by the light he has, what must the answer be? I am in deep grief for the beloved friends thrust out of life in Ku-Cheng, and I am and have been these many years in as great sorrow for my Chinese friends so brutally robbed and killed in this land filled with gospel light."

IV.

Word has just reached here from Kara-Hissari-Charki that a band of Armenians attacked Nedjib Effendi, substitute to the Attorney-General, when on his way to Sivas, accompanied
by gendarmes and by Rami Effendi, chief of the correspondence at Tchoroun. Rami Effendi, as well as the gendarmes, were dangerously wounded, while Nedjib Effendi was carried to the woods and murdered.

It is by deeds similar to the above that Armenian revolutionists, according to their own admission, expect again to bring about very serious troubles in Asiatic Turkey. In addition to the above, it may, perhaps, be of interest to give also the following facts, taken out of many, and showing the criminal work of the Armenian revolutionary committees:

1. An Armenian priest, suspected of spying, was quite recently murdered at Scutari, just opposite Constantinople, by Armenian agents of the revolutionary party.

2. Thirteen pupils of the American College at Marsovan, having been expelled last year because their fathers were suspected of being mixed up in the Armenian movement, suspicion has fallen on the college, and among the list of persons condemned by the Armenian committee are five professors of the college, two being Americans.

3. An Armenian named Garabed Agha was assassinated at Marsovan, close to the church door, as he was going to attend early service. He was the chief man of the Protestant community, and Chairman of the Council of Thirty, which is responsible for the peace of the city. It was alleged that he had given the Government information in regard to the revolutionists.

Commenting on the murder of Garabed Agha, the Rev. George E. White, an American missionary at the Congregational School at Marsovan, wrote as follows:

"There are two parties of Armenians. Some say: 'We must be loyal to the Turkish Government. We cannot effect a revolution. We are too few.' Others say: 'We will assassinate and stir up until we overturn this Turkish Government.' And these revolutionists are ready to kill any of their brother Armenians or missionaries who do not help on the rebellion. They killed Garabed Agha because he would not help the rebellion."

4. The Rev. Dr. Dwight, a leading American missionary, made recently the following statement, which shows not only what Armenian agitation means, but also the praiseworthy
efforts of some Turkish Governors tending to prevent the outbreak of a fresh Armenian revolt:

"More than a year ago," said the Rev. Dr. Dwight, "sixteen persons at Marsovan received written notice that they would be killed unless they would cooperate with the Armenian revolutionists. President Tracey and Professor Riggs, of Marsovan College, were two of these. They had incurred the ill-will of the revolutionists by refusing to receive in the college the sons of certain men suspected of being revolutionists. Garabed Agha and another man were two of the sixteen who received notice, and both were assassinated. A Turkish guard was furnished, at the request of Mr. Terrell, to protect the American families from the assassins. The local governor informed the Armenians, after the killing, that he intended to arrest all suspected persons; that their object was to provoke Turkish vengeance in order to secure the sympathy and intervention of Christian Europe, but that they would not succeed, as he had caused to be preached in the mosques for months that such was their object, and that any Turk who killed a Christian would be the worst enemy of Islam."

5. The Rev. James I. Barton, one of the Secretaries of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, reported the following incident:

"At the graduation exercises at the American College at Karpoot, after the distribution of diplomas, it was intended by the Faculty to have an address read thanking the Sultan, in the name of the people of Karpoot. The address was to have been read by an Armenian graduate. When the Armenians heard that the address was in their name, they protested, and warned the student who was to read it that if he did so he would lose his life. This made him afraid, and he refused to deliver the address. At last the American missionaries prevailed upon an Armenian teacher, Nigoghoss Tenekejian, to read it. When the day selected arrived, and as the teacher arose to speak, the populace began to sing the most radical of all Armenian revolutionary songs. The uproar was so great that the missionaries could not get the address read. The day following the incident, ten shots were fired into the house of the Armenian member of the college, and a placard placed on his door which read: 'If you continue your present course, be sure your life will be taken away.'"

Facts like the above have opened the eyes and aroused the indignation of unprejudiced men of all countries. But no more able description of that feeling of indignation can be found than in the following passage of a fearless American newspaper, the perusal of which will surely give satisfaction to the sense of justice of many impartial readers:

"It appears that the Armenian conspirators are ready to threaten, or, if need be, to assassinate, all who refuse to join in their conspiracy, and that from this scheme of violence they exclude neither their own people nor the American missionaries who have gone to Asia Minor to labor for their advancement. They have already murdered a number of Armenians, many of them priests, and it is no longer a secret that they
have threatened the lives of American missionaries whom they suspect of a lack of sympathy with their plans of bloodshed and disorder. The truth appears to be, as The Post has insisted all along, that the whole trouble is due to the Armenian incendiaries and to their programme of organized agitation. Thousands of intelligent and law-abiding Armenians dwell peacefully in Turkey, receiving the impartial protection of the law. They practically control the commerce of the country; they are bankers, merchants, professional men; they hold office under the government, and are esteemed and respected accordingly. But these pestiferous firebrands—meaning the desperate criminals who make the trouble at home, and their accomplices in England and America who distort and misrepresent the facts to prejudice the outside world against Turkey—these indefatigable criminals whom we are now beginning to see in their true colors, deserve no sympathy from civilized people anywhere, and should not longer be permitted to mislead honest men with their falsehoods and their impudent pretensions.

But Turkey's detractors insist that there was a premeditated massacre at Sassoun. They willingly and intentionally leave aside the fact that the Armenian committees were the real instigators of a serious revolt there, which had to be put down by the Turkish Government. All Christian governments, like Russia, England, and even the United States, surely had at times to employ brutal force in order to suppress disturbances and rebellion.

When the great "de Maistre" was asked why he showed such an earnest opposition to the abolition of capital punishment, he answered by these words: "Que Messieurs les assassins commencent!" In the same way, let Armenian committees cease their criminal intrigues and assassinations; let them abandon revolt, and, soon enough, repression on the part of the Turkish Government will stop. What Armenians need most at the present moment is, we think, good advice. What they get is, unfortunately, bad advice. We consider, for instance, as constituting very bad advice, all the hatred, all the exaggerations, all the slanders that abound in the Rev. Frederick Davis Greene's pamphlet on Turkey. This agitator—for he is one—undertook the task of proving his story by so-called "genuine" testimony. With that aim in view, he published in his pamphlet some anonymous letters, about which, however, he wrote in an "explanatory note" the following: "It must be borne in mind that no writer was an eye-witness of the actual massacre. . . . The letters are largely based on the testimony of refugees from that region, or of Kurds and soldiers who participated in the butchery,
and who had no hesitation in speaking about the affair in public or private.”

It follows, therefore, that the testimony given us by Mr. Greene is a second-hand testimony, or, rather, solely an Armenian testimony, for only children could believe Mr. Greene’s assertion that genuine Kurds and genuine Turkish soldiers gave to American missionaries the details that Armenian agitators and their friends were striving to obtain. As for Armenian testimony, in one of our previous letters we have already shown that, according to the opinion of the best friends of the Armenians, the latter cannot be believed “even on oath.”

V.

A convincing proof that the Constantinople riots were premeditated and organized by the Armenian revolutionary committees is to be found in the fact that Armenian newspapers, published out of Turkey, announced a few weeks before the occurrence of said riots that they would take place at Constantinople. The Turkish authorities knew besides from other sources that such would be the case, and they were fully prepared to meet any emergency. Provocation and intimidation seem to be the plan of the Armenian revolutionists—provocation to the authorities and intimidation to their co-religionists. Bloodshed is the crowning result of their criminal efforts, supported, we are sorry to state, by English and American public opinion.

Admitting that Americans have no direct interest in European politics, the partiality shown by them toward the Armenian instigators of disorder has no excuse. The reason of such partiality must be because the Armenians are Christians. Still, this is certainly a bad reason; for, in spite of their Christianity, the Armenians are certainly an inferior and unreliable race, which was just as inferior and just as destitute of any sterling qualities or fame at an epoch when it had its own government in Asia. In the present day, Armenians are scattered about all over Asiatic Turkey, and they constitute in any Turkish province the minority of the population, which fact alone makes the use of the word “Armenia”
simply preposterous. There may be an Armenia out of Turkey, but surely there is no Armenia in Turkey. There are Armenians there, and that is enough. A New York newspaper, the enmity of which to the Turkish Government is not denied, wrote lately the following:

"The statement has been made and repeated until it has become trite, without, however, having any apparent effect upon some people, that there is no country now existent which can fairly be termed Armenia. Historical Armenia included the southwestern Caucasus, a section of northwestern Persia, and that portion of eastern Turkey now included in the provinces of Erzeroum, Van, and Bitlis, with part of those of Diarbekir and Harpoot. The Caucasus section is still predominantly Armenian in population, but under rigid Russian rule. The Persian Armenians are comparatively few in number, and are found chiefly in the plain of Salmas and in the city of Khoi. In the Turkish provinces there are but four sections, of limited area, that would even ten years ago be fairly called Armenian—the plain of Moosh and Harpoot, the City of Van, and the Passen and Knus region, near Erzeroum. Already the Kurds, Circassians, and other Moslem tribes were driving them out, and within the last five years they have so nearly accomplished their purpose that to-day they probably far outnumber the Christians in those very sections. Where, then, are the Armenians? All over the empire."

To state, therefore, that there is an Armenia in Turkey is to make an erroneous statement. But erroneous statements on this Armenian question are so many that to contradict them all would be almost an impossibility. All these false statements originate from the Armenians themselves, whose veracity is an unknown quantity. If Constantinople had been a small town in Asiatic Turkey, the Armenians would unmistakably have asserted, and such men as W. W. Howard, Dillon, and the Rev. F. D. Greene, basing their assertions solely on Armenian testimony, would have promptly affirmed, that the Constantinople riots had as instigators not the Armenians, but the Turks, and that during those riots thousands upon thousands of Armenians, women and children included, were tortured and killed by Turkish soldiers. Constantinople being where it is, even the Daily News, of London—that is to say, a newspaper whose policy is to try to ruin, if possible, and to destroy Turkey—was obliged to remark:

"Two points ought, in justice to the Turks, to be noted. First, that it is beyond doubt that a large number of those Armenians who took part in the demonstration on Monday were armed. Secondly, the Government has not employed troops, nor allowed rifles to be used. The police were armed with revolvers, but the soldiers have only been employed as patrols, and I am not aware of any allegation of misconduct against them."
When, therefore, a European delegate, attached to the Commission of Inquiry that has been conducting an examination at the district of Sassoun into the alleged atrocities committed in that part of Asiatic Turkey, says, as he does, that the allegations of Mr. Dillon and his Armenian friends are gross exaggerations, his statement must be true. Said delegate asserts most positively that the stories of wholesale massacre and violations of women, those connected with the number of killed—which number fluctuates, strange to say, in one and the same pamphlet (we mean the slanderous pamphlet of the Rev. F. D. Greene) between 3,000 and 25,000—and those in relation to the finding of forty bodies buried in a pit at Gheliguzan, and to the throwing of Armenian women over a cliff to escape dishonor: all those ridiculous stories that made such a deep impression on credulous people already prepared to hate the Turk are, one and all, absolutely fictitious. The delegate, moreover, contends that the Armenians, instead of being remorselessly butchered while in a condition of helplessness, made a spirited stand against the troops, and were, just as during the Constantinople riot, armed. The European Commission of Inquiry has also proved that, instead of 30,000 Christians having been driven into exile, as alleged, the entire number of inhabitants of the disturbed district, Moslem and Christian, did not exceed 4,000.

However the administration of distant Turkish provinces may be, if even it were bad—and in that case it could be reformed—the fact now remains that the so-called Sassoun massacres have never existed. We do not say that no excesses have taken place there. In time of revolt, especially at places where the central government is powerless to exercise its influence, excesses do always take place. But the responsibility of those excesses lies with the criminal instigators of disorder, and that is precisely what the European and American public opinion, influenced by a huge religious agitation, refused to see and to admit. One of the most prominent Armenians living at Constantinople, but who deprecates the foolishness of this Armenian agitation, gave, according to the New York Sun, the following true version of the Sassoun revolt:
"It was a regular battle, begun by our people attacking the Hamidie Kurdish troops (that is, committing an act of high treason), and perpetrating horrible cruelties on such Kurds as fell alive into their hands. These barbarous acts were the work rather of Armenian brigands, whom the revolutionists pressed into the ranks, than of the villagers themselves, who by no means are addicted to cruelty. Well, the fortune of war was favorable to the Armenians, who, partly armed with rifles, drove the Kurds before them like a flock of sheep. They resolved to wipe out the Kurds once for all, and would have done so if they had not been stopped in time; indeed, God only knows what would have happened. All Kurdistan would have been in revolt had it not been for the foresight and energy of Zekki Pasha, who ordered troops to march to the scene of the disturbance and soothe the ruffled spirits of the Mohammedans and Christians. Then, to be sure, certain excesses were committed, mainly by Kurds, who were thirsting for revenge."

The increased agitation since Sassoun, on the part of the Armenian revolutionists in the Turkish provinces, and in Constantinople itself, proves in a forcible and clear manner that the above assertions are true to the letter. But, unfortunately, it is a very hard thing to convince people who are guided by secular prejudices or by political motives. Even Americans fail to perceive the political side of the Armenian intrigues in England. The Armenian agitation in the United States is not, it is true, political. It is merely religious, based not upon the intrinsic merits of the Armenians, which are totally lacking, but upon the fact that they are Christians. The result is that Armenian intrigues are upheld, both by English and American public opinion, although fatally tending to an armed rebellion in Turkey. The Missionary Boards are, we believe, to a great extent to blame for this disturbance of the sense of fairness on the part of Americans. The missionaries evidently trust that, by helping the Armenians in this emergency by organizing relief funds, and by having the money distributed to the Armenians alone, to the exclusion of any other nationality—which latter fact is a very curious one, supposing that there is a general famine out there—they would increase later on the field of their operations and usefulness, which means that they would make more converts to Protestantism, although the Armenians are already Christians. What would Europe and America say if the Turks were to exercise—which they do not—the doctrine of proselytism? Would they call it persecution?
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The Boston Advertiser of May 21, 1895, published, about Admiral Kirkland’s special report on Armenian affairs, the following telegram:

"WASHINGTON, May 20.—The Navy’s investigation of the recent Armenian troubles throws doubt on the reports that atrocities were committed.

The report of this investigation, which has just been received at the Navy Department, is made by Rear-Admiral Kirkland, Commander-in-Chief of the European Squadron. The ships of this squadron are now on their way to Gibraltar from the Mediterranean coast of Asia-Minor, where they have been cruising, attempting to substantiate the reports that the Sultan’s soldiers outraged Armenians.

The report is dated at Alexandriatta, the latter part of April, and states that at all the ports the Marblehead and San Francisco, the vessels comprising the squadron, called at, they found American citizens working at their usual avocations, and apparently undisturbed by acts of molestation on the part of the Turkish Government. Their interrogation by the officers of the ships developed the fact that nothing had occurred to disturb them in their occupations, and that they had not been interfered with in any way.

Admiral Kirkland states that rumors of atrocities in the Armenian country had reached the ports, but they lacked verification. Some of the most improbable stories of cruelties were told, but when they were traced to their origin it was found that there was nothing in them. He examined a number of people in the hope of obtaining some substantiation of ‘cruelty’ reports, but his examination invariably failed, and he gave it as his opinion that the reports had been very much exaggerated.

The Admiral exonerates the Sultan from all blame in connection with the trouble between the Kurds and Armenians. ‘The Sultan had as much to do with this trouble,’ he says, ‘as had the Governor of Massachusetts.’

‘His conclusion that there were no atrocities is concurred in by the diplomatic representatives of the United States with whom he came in contact during the cruise.’"

The New York Herald of August 18, 1895, published, about Admiral Kirkland’s opinion on American missionaries in Turkey, the following telegram:

"LONDON, August 17, 1895.—The United States cruiser San Francisco will on Tuesday next proceed to Havre, where she will go into dock to be cleaned and overhauled. The work will take at least a fortnight, and much longer unless the vessel is ordered away by the United States Navy Department.

Rear-Admiral Kirkland, commanding the European station, whenever
he speaks upon the subject, is emphatic in his condemnation of the missionaries in Turkey. He says that he has found that one of the most prominent Sunday-school teachers in Syria spent three years in the Penitentiary at Pittsburg, Pa., and that, taken altogether, they are a bad lot. The cause of all the trouble, Admiral Kirkland asserts, is that, relying upon the protection of the American Government, the missionaries defy the local laws, and do not merit the despatch of a war-ship at every appeal made by the missionaries, most of which appeals are not true."

Extract from the Boston *Globe* of November 2, 1895:

Rev. Judson Smith, Secretary of the A. B. C. F. M., talked with a *Globe* reporter last evening, in regard to the reported attempt to burn the American college at Marsovan, Asia Minor. He said in substance:

"While I have no definite information in regard to the details of the reported incendiary attempt, I doubt if the Turks themselves are responsible. Strange as it may seem, we have more to fear continually from Armenians than we have from the Mohammedans.

"The reason for this fact is found in the imical feeling aroused among members of the Armenian revolutionist society who have been expelled from the college at various times during several years past, because we cannot approve of their political course, and are consequently unwilling to be held in any way responsible for their unlawful measures or actions.

"American missionaries have always been loyal to the Turkish government and laws, and have avoided everything in any way calculated to indicate sympathy with Armenian revolutionary plots. Those revolutionists are like the Russian nihilists, and cannot accomplish any good purpose. The Armenians, as a people, lack the cohesiveness and singleness of purpose necessary for success; they have not the political sense that made it possible for Bulgarians to become a nation.

"The whole aim of the Armenian revolutionists seems to be to keep up such a perpetual broil in the Turkish Empire that eventually Europe will feel compelled to break up the power of the Turk. Whether Armenians commit crimes, or are themselves the victims of Turkish outrages, is all the same to the revolutionists; whoever is the victim, their game is still played. This sort of thing is abetted by Armenians in America and elsewhere, and it is a great pity they could not all be kept in their native land. Members of this society will get into our college sometimes, and we feel obliged to expel them, hence incurring their enmity and threats.

"I am not surprised," continued Mr. Smith, "at the reported assassination of Mr. Garabed, who was understood to be a marked man by the revolutionists. He was a Protestant Armenian, and one of the most prominent citizens in his community, as well as a good friend of the missionaries. It is quite likely he was murdered by Armenians; but I am sure it must be a mistake when it is reported that he was or had been one of the revolutionists and had been expelled from the college on that account. I am very sure that he was too old a man to have been a student there at any time since the college was started, in 1886.

"This is not the first attempt to burn the institution. Threats have been made against the principal officials of the college for years, and about five years ago a new building connected with it was burned. It
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was the girls' building, although I don't think that fact had anything to do with its selection for destruction, but rather its situation, which gave better opportunity for the incendiary to escape without detection.

"We have already suspected the Armenian revolutionists of being guilty of that offence, but we never absolutely fixed it upon any individual. There was evidence, however, of the presence of Turkish police officials, under such circumstances as to render it almost certain that they were at least indifferent spectators of the affair, and, although very unwillingly, the Turkish Government was brought by the United States to regard the matter that they ultimately gave us over $2,000 toward a new building."

Mr. Smith says the college has now about 180 young men students and 100 girls. Dr. C. C. Tracy, who has been in charge since its foundation, and Prof. Edward Riggs have been especially marked by members of the revolutionary party, and the Turkish Government some years ago granted them a guard for their better protection.

Mr. F. Hopkinson Smith, the artist and writer, told to a New York Tribune reporter the following about Armenians in Turkey:

"The turning point of the entire difficulty in this Armenian matter is this: No subject of Turkey can leave his country without first obtaining a government permit so to do. This is easy enough to secure if he can show that he has business interests calling him away, and armed with it he can go away and remain as long as he desires and ultimately return to his home. But those Armenians are not doing this. In one way or another, they make their way out of Turkey clandestinely, and at once come to the United States. Here they remain long enough to secure their declaration of citizenship. Then they secure passports as American citizens and at once return to their homes, with the sole purpose of acting as agents for one of the many revolutionary societies. If caught, which they are sure to be, they claim the protection of the American Minister, hoping thus to save their heads. It is in this that the United States are at fault. Under no other government can they carry out such a design. They cannot do it in England, or France, or Germany, or Russia—only in America.

"How they get out of Turkey I am not prepared to say, although there are numberless methods to be adopted. They can get down to Athens, or go by way of Sofia, or possibly they might be able to work their way up through Bulgaria. Anyway, the fact remains that they do elude the vigilance of the Government, and with only one object in view. Why, just before I left Constantinople an Armenian was arrested, having a passport. He had in his possession forty-one revolutionary documents when arrested, and was armed besides. Yet Minister Terrell secured his release. This man in his trial before the Minister declared that he had come to this country simply to secure immunity from punishment by appeal, in case of arrest, to the American Minister, and that his purpose was to aid the revolutionists. I consider it a distinct outrage that this should be permitted.

"Another thing. There is not the slightest hope for the Armenians in
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case of an uprising. The Turks outnumber them in any part of the country three to one, and this reminds me of still another thing, which should be forcibly brought to the attention of the various missionary societies. They should be warned in time of the danger of sending missionaries over there, for in case of trouble they will assuredly be killed. Nothing can save them. An illustration of the hopelessness of the Armenian cause is to be found in the recent massacre at Stamboul. I was in Stamboul only two days before that massacre occurred. The Armenians had gone up ostensibly to present a peaceful petition to the Grand Vizier. Yet nearly every one of them was later on found to be heavily armed, and when the officers tried to disperse them, as being where they had no right to assemble, under Turkish law, they resisted, and the rest is known. The officials were clearly in the right.

"It is a saying in Constantinople that one Hebrew is good for two Greeks, a Turk is good for two Hebrews, and an Armenian can dispose of all of them. The Armenians are looked upon as the terrors of the community. They are the serving people of Turkey. The men act as porters, and I have seen two of them place an upright piano on their backs and walk straightaway up a hill with it. The thing seems hardly conceivable, but I have seen them do this on the hill of Pera. They are canny boys, I can tell you, and very muscular; but they are in a hopeless minority, and the Mahommedans hate them as they do the devil. I feel assured that England will one day regret the attitude she has taken on this question, but I am naturally more interested in the position of the United States. Judge Terrell, our minister here, is working night and day. He is indefatigable and upright and just. He has the respect of the Sultan, too, to a remarkable degree; but then America is held in high esteem by the Sublime Porte. I was sufficiently long in Constantinople to study these things with some degree of care. At first I did not pay much attention to them, for my profession is far apart from the consideration of such matters; but insensibly I was drawn into it, and I can safely assure the Tribune that I am telling only the bare facts as they exist."

The following contains Mr. F. Hopkinson Smith's opinion on Turks and American missionaries:

"I've just returned from Constantinople," said Mr. F. Hopkinson Smith, the author and artist, to a Boston Herald representative in New York two or three days ago. "While there I had an opportunity, through talks with Minister Terrell and two of the Sultan's aides, to learn all the inside facts about the Armenian atrocities. The whole matter has been grossly misunderstood, if not misrepresented, in this country. The root of the trouble lies in the missions sent out to Armenia from England and America. Instead of trying to help the people, they teach them that they are ill-treated, and sow the seeds of discontent and rebellion. They have started all the difficulty, and when the blame is properly placed it will rest upon their heads.

"We hear a great deal in this country about 'the barbarous Turk.' Now, I have travelled and painted all over the globe, and know pretty well the inhabitants of all countries; and let me tell you that I never met a more civilized, humane, intelligent, cleanly, pious, and chaste man than the typical Turk. He is quiet and respectable; he is preeminently kind and good to his family, and his religion enters into every part of his life. On my former visit to Constantinople, four years ago, I met a good many Moslems, and during my recent visit I came to know many more Turks of the best classes; and I make that statement without hesitation."
"For instance, I spent several days painting in the streets of Constantinople. The Sultan would not give a permit to do this, because he had refused such a privilege to divers Englishmen, and he did not wish to establish a dangerous precedent. He sent an official to accompany me on my trips, and every day that man left me three times and went into the mosque to say his prayers. Just think of the power of a religion which makes every man of a whole nation lay aside his business three times every day and prostrate himself toward Mecca in prayer!

"Go out here in Wall Street and try to persuade the people to go to church three times a day. You couldn't club them into it. The best of them only attend service once or twice a week. What are we, as a religious nation, that we should attempt to force our religion upon every other nation on earth? We might as well start out to make silk hats for the world, and club every head into the right shape to fit them.

"See how humane the Turks are to animals. I don't know how many hundred thousand dogs there are in Constantinople, but probably there are fifty to each block. Every few minutes, if you are watching what goes on around you, you will see a Turk go over to a bake-shop, buy a bit of bread, or something else that the dogs will eat, and feed them. Nobody owns these creatures. They have been common property for a thousand years, I suppose; yet, ugly and mangy as they are, they never go hungry. Nor do they ever suffer violence. Striking a dog in the streets of Constantinople means imprisonment for a year. Why, I've seen a team come along one of those narrow streets when a dog was lying in the way, and the driver would stop his donkeys and lift the dog out of the way, rather than run the risk of hurting him. I never saw any one beat or kick a donkey in Turkey. The people recognize that these creatures are their faithful servants, and treat them kindly. The love existing between the Turk or the Arabian and his horse is proverbial.

"What have we in the way of religion to teach these people? Nothing. It's pure bumphtiousness for us to try to 'convert' them. They neither want nor need our religion. They've got a better one of their own. Better for them, I mean, not for us. They are already more religious, as a people, than we are.

"Another point. What order of men are they whom the English and the American religious bodies send out as missionaries? If you have ever noted closely the students in our training-schools for the ministry you must have discovered that as a class they are far from representing the best, or even a very good, type of American manhood. Many of them are young men from country towns and villages who could not make a decent living in any other calling. They go to these schools, in many instances, because they can get their education at half price, or free. Of course their poverty is no disgrace; but they are poor in every sense of the word. They hear a sermon by some returned missionary, who wishes to arouse interest in the country in which he has lived, and straightway they are called to labor in the same field. Such sermons are apt to take hold of the less intelligent and more impressionable men, and it is often the men who are not fitted to take the high rank among the ministry in their own country who feel themselves drawn to work in a foreign land. The result is that we send out the most incapable specimens of our rural population—men of uncouth manners, who have learned a little Latin and Hebrew, the representatives of half a dozen religious sects, which are at constant war with each other about their creeds—to convert a cultured, courteous, pious, humane, temperate race, whose unified religion enters as much into the life of its members as does their business.

"Now and then we hear of some girl in a country town who thinks she has a mission to do good to the heathen. She had far better go down
to the factory in her own village and minister there; but no, there is no glamour about that. Imagining that she is a new Joan of Arc, our hysterical friend tells some missionary body all about it, and they send her over to Turkey. You can picture to yourself the amazement and disgust with which the Turks regard such missionaries. Superb specimens of physique, they look upon these little, wizened, dried-up, spectacled women with infinite contempt; just as they scoff at the idea of adopting a religion of which the various schools cannot agree.

"Well, colonies of such boors and cranks go over to Armenia, or somewhere else, and found schools. The children come to be taught, and eventually they join some one or another Christian church. They are pariahs as long as they live—marked boys and girls, branded men and women, who have lost caste among their fellows. What have they gained? 'Christianity,' you may say. Very true; but if they would lead pure and noble lives under the religion of Mohammed, how are they better off? We surely cannot believe that heathen who lead good lives according to their lights do not go to heaven.

"Pretty soon some one comes along and hits an Armenian over the head. The missionaries keep telling their converts and the poor people that the Turk did it. They tell them that they are abused, and stir them up to rebellion. The result is bloodshed, as you have seen. Here on my desk is a letter just received from Mr. Terrell, with whom I had many conversations when in Constantinople. He says: 'We have certain information that 10,000 have been killed within a month.' That official statement, of course, includes those slain on both sides.

"He adds another statement, equally significant, to the effect that, so far as can be learned, not one American missionary has been injured. The Turks like the Americans who come to Constantinople far better than the Englishmen, and they like America better than England, partly because as a nation we do not meddle with their affairs. When I have been painting in the streets I have never been subjected to discourtesies from the crowd which always assembled to watch me, except two or three times; and on those occasions the reason was that they supposed that I was an Englishman. When they learned that I was an American they ceased to annoy me, and even apologized for their rudeness. And they carry this esteem for Americans to the point of sparing our missionaries, even when the latter have sown the seeds of discontent in the hearts of their subjects."

Taken from the pamphlet, "Kurds and Armenians," by S. Ximénèz:

"Without wishing to extol the Kurds, although it seems to be the fashion now to charge them with all kinds of outrages, and to describe them as most savage hordes, I may state that I know them thoroughly, as I have seen them closely and lived with them for months. I met the first Kurdish tents one day's distance from Angora, and since then I never lost sight of them until I arrived in Lazistan. I saw, on my journey through Galatia, Cappadocia, Mesopotamia, and the districts which are situated in a northern direction towards the Black Sea, sometimes Turks, and at other times Armenians, Arabs, Chaldeans, Greeks, and Kopts—but I never was one day without seeing Kurds. I was thus enabled to observe that the Kurds belonging to the great nomad tribes are harmless, whilst the Kurds settled in villages are sometimes to be blamed, and often to be pitied. In my opinion it is not absolutely necessary to look at humanity from an exclusively religious point of view. The idea of impugning sys-
tematically the Mussulmans in the name of I do not know what principle, and merely because they are Mussulmans, strikes me as being quite out of place in this philosophical and tolerant century. In the present condition of the Asiatic provinces of the Ottoman Empire, nothing is more unfair and wicked than to try and create privileges for the sole benefit of one special population. Such questions ought to be considered more liberally and from a higher standard. When I knew Anatolia only by what was published in European papers or said in the clubs at Pera, I must own that I shared some of the widely spread opinions, which appeared logical because brilliant and delusive. I had a somewhat vague notion of an Asia which must have been laid waste and given up to rapacious marauders; of periodically ransacked Christian villages, where any one who was not a Mohammedan could not possibly live; and I thought that I understood then the great crusades undertaken on behalf of the oppressed, the appalling stories circulated by itinerant preachers, and the emulation of so many people who seem so anxious to play the part of victims whereby they might secure a handsome income. Well, I do not pretend that on the Anatolian tableland every one is happy; it is about the same there as it is even in the most civilized countries, where the government is proceeding smoothly, and where almost every day some new progress is recorded. Whatever the admirers of the Turkish Empire, who would let us believe that everything is as well as it can be beyond the Bosphorus, may say to the contrary, I am of opinion that there is a crisis in Asia Minor, that some modifications are necessary, some of which are gradually carried on, whilst some others are prospective. But a great fact, which appears in a vivid light to all who have travelled through Asia Minor, is that happiness as well as sorrows are the common lot of every people, whatever their race and creed may be. Any other estimate of the difficulty merely displaces the question without settling it. Every one knows that the Turks are not exterminators. All the different people under the Ottoman rule have been able to preserve their own traditional way of living, with their special features, manners, hopes, and creeds. After so many centuries they are still integral—more integral, no doubt, than they would be if they had been independent; but also with intestine quarrels, or with struggles against a foreign enemy belonging to the same religion. I will not quote names, but it would not be difficult to mention a certain people which, having been most corrupt and devoured by its own vice, owes its salvation and the flattering advantage of being able now to consider itself a nation, to the Ottoman conquest. And if the Turks did not exterminate the conquered nations at a time when no one would have asked them to account for massacres, what use is it now to ascribe tendencies to them which are in opposition to their own interest and character?

"I have travelled much, and I do not know of any country where greater toleration prevails than in Turkey. A collection of isolated facts which have happened at more or less long intervals of time, and in regions more or less isolated from each other, may, when cleverly compiled under the form of a general report, help to the making up of a crushing Blue Book. Until now it never occurred to any one in Europe to select from any police record all the murders, rapes, and robberies committed in one town during a defined period, and to draw the conclusion therefrom that the said town is exclusively composed of brigands and murderers. Yet these are the proceedings employed in regard to the Turkish Empire when some busybodies want to interfere with Turkish affairs. Instead of sifting the question thoroughly and taking into account the social condition of the country, with a view of remediying by logical means some unavoidable evils under particular circumstances, the
critics are busying themselves with such compilations, to which they are careful to add gross exaggerations, coarse language, and serious charges, which, while redundant and fetching, fail however to bring about a solution, and are often the cause of conflicts. It has become an easy task, one which is well received by the public, to shriek in the name of humanity; such shrieks are always resounding, and if hollow they are noisy. They are more eagerly listened to by sympathetic crowds than logic and reason and impartial statements, which require a full knowledge of facts and a thorough mastery of the subject. It would be interesting to ascertain how many really searching and substantial papers have been published on the Armenian Question since it has been debated in the English press. Amongst various travellers who have lately been through Asia Minor, one only, Mr. Lynch, has written on the matter, and it is to be wished that any one approaching the subject should expatiate upon it with the same passionless and unbiased judgment as this distinguished writer, who contributed such remarkable articles to the Contemporary Review a few months ago on that question. Although I do not agree with all he says, I cannot help owning that Mr. Lynch did not waste his time during his travels to Erzeroum, Van, Moosh, and Bitlis, and that his conclusion is both instructive and commendable. Another writer, Mr. Richard Davey, who recently sojourned in Constantinople, studying all the texts in regard to the affairs in Asia Minor, has just written an article in the Fortnightly Review which in my opinion is far-reaching, as he boldly exposes the part played by the British element in the Turco-Asiatic conflicts. The article in question is noteworthy for its fairness and impartiality. Great and influential English Reviews, however, with contributors boldly expounding their opinions, are less in touch with a certain portion of the public than some small Boston papers, for instance, which are replete with reports about the Turks cutting open the head of an Armenian, wherein they introduce poisonous and maddening flies, a kind of torture which causes the greatest indignation amongst those who are simple enough to believe such wild stories. And the detractors of the Porte are always sure to be successful slanderers when they vituperate the Kurds, whose very name seems to have become synonymous with savage cruelty."

Taken from the pamphlet, "A Few Facts about Turkey Under the Sultan Abdul Hamid II."

"It is a fact that faithful and law-abiding Armenians are not only protected, but also employed in very high official positions, one of them even being, at the present moment, a Minister of the Imperial Crown. The fact is, also, that the Armenians in Turkey, numbering a little over 900,000 (for they are no more), have their own schools, that their language and literature are preserved, that their nationality is respected, that their leading men are promoted in the scale of high honors and positions, while Christian Europe and America have no care for the Jews, and while Catholic Spain has not allowed a single Mussulman family to remain on its European territory, and has centuries ago expelled them all. The reason of this colossal difference lies in the fact that Islamism is indeed a religion essentially and radically tolerant. If it were not, Turkey would not have had at the present moment a single Christian subject in any part of her vast dominions, and, for the benefit of the Turks, there would not exist now what is called the Eastern question. Turks suffer in our days from the tolerance that forms an intrinsic and essential part of their religion. Europe and America ought to be thankful to them,"
Instead of that, we see not a few eloquent Christian fanatics who countenance in Turkey what certainly they would not encourage in their own countries, namely, insubordination and revolt. Is this justice?

"The same spirit of injustice to Turkey is shown in regard to the policy of Turkey toward the Armenians naturalized in the United States on their return to the country of their birth, and many unfair accusations are made against the Sublime Porte for its insisting, in the absence of any naturalization treaty between Turkey and America, upon applying a law which is both wise and necessary, and which had been promulgated long before these Armenian troubles had begun. A short statement of facts as they really are, and not as disguised by Turkey's detractors, will, it is trusted, be deemed useful for the understanding of the case.

"The law concerning Ottoman naturalization is dated January 19, 1899, and is as follows:

"'Article 1.—Every person born of Ottoman father and mother, or only of an Ottoman father, is an Ottoman subject.

"'Art. 2.—Every person born on Ottoman territory, of foreign parents, may, within three years after attaining majority, claim as of right the character of an Ottoman subject.

"'Art. 3.—Every major foreigner who has resided during five consecutive years in the Ottoman Empire may obtain Ottoman nationality by applying, directly or through an intermediary, to the Minister of Foreign Affairs.

"'Art. 4.—The Imperial Government may, by extraordinary act, confer Ottoman nationality on the foreigner who, without having fulfilled the conditions of the preceding article, should be deemed worthy of this exceptional favor.

"'Art. 5.—The Ottoman subject who has acquired a foreign nationality with the authorization of the Imperial Government, is considered and treated as a foreign subject; if, on the contrary, he is naturalized as a foreigner, without the previous authorization of the Imperial Government, his naturalization shall be considered as null and of no effect, and he will continue to be considered and treated in all respects as an Ottoman subject.

"'No Ottoman subject can, in any case, naturalize himself as a foreigner, except after having obtained a certificate of authorization issued in virtue of an Imperial irade.

"'Art. 6.—Nevertheless, the Imperial Government may declare loss of the character of an Ottoman subject against any Ottoman subject who shall have naturalized himself in a foreign country, or who shall have accepted military functions under a foreign government, without the authorization of his sovereign.

"In this case the loss of the character of an Ottoman subject shall entail ipso facto the interdiction of the return to the Ottoman Empire of the person who shall have incurred it.

"'Art. 7.—The Ottoman woman who has married a foreigner may, if she become a widow, recover her character of an Ottoman subject by making declaration to that end within three years following the decease of her husband. This provision is, however, only applicable to her person. Her property shall be subject to the laws and general regulations controlling the same.

"'Art. 8.—The child, even when a minor, of an Ottoman subject who has naturalized himself as a foreigner, who has lost his nationality, does not follow the status of his father, and remains an Ottoman subject. The child, even when a minor, of a foreigner who has naturalized himself
an Ottoman, does not follow the status of his father, and remains a foreigner.

"Art. 9.—Every person inhabiting the Ottoman territory is reputed an Ottoman subject, and treated as such, until his character as a foreigner shall have been regularly proved."

"Armenians and their friends in America have witnessed publicly that the law, a copy of which has just been given, is applicable solely to Armenians, and to Armenians naturalized in no other country but in the United States. The very perusal of the law shows these accusations to be meant to misguide public opinion. The law is for all former Turkish subjects, with no reference to their nationality and creed, who might have been naturalized either in the United States or in any country in Europe. Armenians, however, have no wish to seek for a European naturalization. The reason is threefold: First, Europe knows well the Armenians, while America does not. Second, The endeavors made by American missionaries to convert the Armenians, and to give them a certain education, considered by Mr. Ximénez as inimical to the Turkish Government, prompt the latter to give their preference to the United States. Third, Armenians consider the American law on naturalization more advantageous to their secret plans and intentions, for American passports do not, for instance, contain the following clause, that is always to be found on English passports:

"'This passport is granted with the qualification that the bearer shall not, when within the limits of the foreign state of which he was a subject previously to obtaining his certificate of naturalization, be deemed to be a British subject, unless he has ceased to be a subject of that state, in pursuance of the laws thereof, or in pursuance of a treaty to that effect.'

"If such a wise clause were put on all American passports, Armenians who wish now to become American citizens, in order to hide themselves behind the protection of the United States Government, would very promptly abandon American citizenship altogether, to the great relief of the State Department of Washington. The proof that Armenians almost never get naturalized in good faith, but, with perhaps no exception, in order to make use, if possible, of the United States Government against Turkey, is shown by the following extract of an official report of the present able United States Minister at Constantinople, Mr. Alexander Terrell, who, under date of September 29, 1893, writes:

"'The European emigrant in the United States generally naturalizes in good faith; the Asiatic very rarely does. I am in a position to know that it is the rule, rather than the exception, that the Armenian returns soon after he is naturalized, and goes back with the intention of remaining.'

"The statement was made above that American missionaries side, on the whole, with Armenian revolutionists against Turkey. This statement is based on the written declarations made lately by the American Board of Control for Foreign Missions, who, instead of advising the Armenians to be law-abiding subjects of the Sultan, and to preserve a dignified silence until the result of the investigation about the Sassoun troubles is made known, considered more to the point to affirm the existence of cold-blooded massacres, when that Board ought to have known that no cold-blooded massacres of any kind are countenanced by the Turkish Government, and that the very presence in Turkey of American mission-
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aries and American schools, missionaries and schools existing principally for the conversion of Armenians to Protestantism, proved beyond doubt the tolerant spirit of the Turkish institutions. If American missionaries continue to side with discontented Armenians in Turkey, they will follow a policy contrary to the wish of the American Government and people. Turkey, at all events, must have peace at all cost in her own possessions. She cannot allow foreign intrigues on her territory, and she is justified in resenting the following admission made by an Armenian about the participation of Americans in the Bulgarian affairs of 1875:

"'I see of late,' writes that Armenian to the Boston Herald, 'Rev. Cyrus Hamlin has been writing letters of sympathy and support to the various meetings held in this country in behalf of the Armenians, in unmistakable terms as to his present attitude toward their cause. Several years ago I heard him lecture at Amherst, Mass. How proud he was to tell his audience the important part taken by the Bulgarian graduates of Robert College in securing the freedom and independence of their country! I ask Rev. Cyrus Hamlin if he was not aware of the existence of patriotic societies among his Bulgarian students, etc.'

"According to a French saying, we are only betrayed by our friends. Let American missionaries and their Board realize that it is not their duty and mission to help in 'securing the freedom and independence' of any nationality in Turkey, or to countenance secret societies, or to accuse before the world the Turkish Government of massacres that have not and cannot have any existence in reality. Their duty is simple enough. It consists in confining their policy and utterances to the strict observance of the laws of the country that gives them hospitality. While, therefore, it is to be wondered why American missionaries, instead of devoting all their energies and good intentions on American Indians or on American negroes, choose to go to Turkey to educate in a certain fashion, and to convert, if possible, Christian Armenians to Protestantism; and while it is a fact that the Sublime Porte, thanks to the teachings of tolerance of its predominant religion, is willing to allow them, under its laws, to pursue their work; no one in all fairness could blame Turkey for manifesting uneasiness for the public utterances and written statements inimical to her government, made lately by the Board of said missionaries, and tending fatally to encourage further revolt and further disturbances on her territory. The United States would certainly not allow such a guilty manifestation on the part of any foreign missionaries that might come here to educate and convert our Indians, for example, especially if the latter were implicated, as Armenians acknowledge themselves to be, in revolutionary schemes. What is right for the United States, why should it not be right for Turkey? The Armenian agitation, based on falsehoods and exaggerations, and also on a pre-arranged plan, as described by Rev. Cyrus Hamlin himself, has been supported and intensified by many people for the only reason that the Armenians are Christians, which fact tends to prove that mere fanaticism animates Turkey's detractors. If this were not the case, the irresponsible and wild allegations of revolutionary Armenians would never have been believed and commented upon by people who call themselves impartial, without corresponding and convincing proofs. Turkey, therefore, sees now that she cannot implicitly rely on impartiality and on justice."

The following is a letter which will be read with interest as containing further evidence of the guilty interference on the
part of American missionaries in Turkey. It was addressed to the Boston *Herald*, and signed by Mr. F. Hopkinson Smith, already quoted:

"In an interview with one of your reporters some days since, I made some statements regarding the condition of affairs in Turkey which came under my immediate notice. These remarks have created some astonishment and no little anger among many good people interested in the cause of foreign missions.

"The interview was, in the main, correct, certain allowances being made for a picturesque style of delivery more the reporter's than my own, and for certain conflicting statements in regard to the Sultan being a humane man and at the same time giving permits to murder his subjects—the first of which is true and the last, of course, absurd. I am often astonished at the memory of the reporter, and slips like these are common to all interviews. I must disclaim, however, all reference to our missionaries as 'cranks and boors.' It has never been my habit to speak of a woman earning her bread in any department of life, missionary or otherwise, in any such terms, and I do not propose to begin now.

"As many of my statements have been charged to insufficient information on the condition of the Turk, dense ignorance of the past and present results of missionary work, mental bias, etc., I add to them the following data:

"In support of my statements that 'the missionaries sow the seeds of discontent and rebellion,' I quote first from a distinguished Spanish traveller, Señor Ximénez, fellow of the Royal Geographical Society of England, who, on his return to London, immediately after the Sassoun troubles of a year ago—the first of these disturbances—was quoted as follows in an English journal:

"'Señor Ximénez is disposed to lay much of the blame for the disturbed condition of Armenia on the American Methodist missions in Asia Minor. He says that they give the Armenians a superficial education out of all proportion to the needs of the community. The pupils of these missions, he adds, are never satisfied to return to their homes and work their land. They continually speak of American liberty, and in nearly every case, says Señor Ximénez, the Armenian agitators are shown to have been pupils of the Methodist missions.'

"Second, as regards the helpless and law-abiding Armenian, I quote from a letter written by Rev. Cyrus Hamlin, published as far back as Dec. 23, 1893, in the *Congregationalist*, which, in view of recent events, is prophetic. Dr. Hamlin says:

"'An Armenian 'revolutionary' party is causing great evil and suffering to the missionary work and to the whole Christian population of certain parts of the Turkish Empire. It is a secret organization and is managed with a skill in deceit which is known only in the East. In a widely distributed pamphlet the following announcement is made at the close:

"'This is the only Armenian party which is leading on the revolutionary movement in Armenia. Its centre is Athens, and it has branches in every village and city in Armenia, also in the colonies. Nishan Garabedian, one of the founders of the party, is in America; and those desiring to get further information may communicate with him, addressing Nishan Garabedian, No. 15 Fountain street, Worcester, Mass., or with the centre, M. Beniard, Poste Restante, Athens, Greece.'"
'A very intelligent Armenian gentleman,' continues Dr. Hamlin, who speaks fluently and correctly English as well as Armenian, and is an eloquent defender of the revolution, assures me that they have the strongest hopes of preparing the way for Russia's entrance to Asia Minor to take possession. In answer to the question as to how, he replied: 'These Hunthugust bands, organized all over the empire, will watch their opportunities to kill Turks and Kurds, set fire to their villages, and then make their escape into the mountains. The enraged Moslems will then rise and fall upon the defenceless Armenians, and slaughter them with such barbarities that Russia will enter, in the name of humanity and Christian civilization, and take possession.'

'When I denounced the scheme as atrocious and infernal beyond anything ever known, he calmly replied: 'It appears so to you, no doubt; but we Armenians are determined to be free.' Europe listened to the Bulgarian horrors and made Bulgaria free. She will listen to our cry when it goes up in the shrieks and blood of millions of women and children.' I urged in vain that this scheme will make the very name of Armenian hateful among all civilized people. He replied: 'We are desperate; we shall do it.'

'Third, as regards the superiority of the Mohammedan religion for the Mohammedan over any religion we can give him, I quote from Hon. Robert Curzon's 'Armenia,' published by Murray in 1854, pages 234-235. Curzon was the British member of the commission appointed by England, Russia, Turkey, and Persia in 1842, for fixing the then uncertain boundary between Turkey and Persia:

'The superiority of the Mohammedan over the Christian cannot fail to strike the mind of an intelligent person who has lived among these races. The Turk obeys the dictates of his religion, the Christian does not; the Turk does not drink, the Christian gets drunk; the Turk is honest, the Turkish peasant is a pattern of quiet, good-humored honesty, the Christian is a liar and a cheat; his religion is so overgrown with the rank weeds of superstition that it no longer serves to guide his mind in the right way. It would be a work of great difficulty to distinguish the pure faith preached by the apostles from the mass of absurdities and strange notions with which Christianity is encumbered in the belief of the villagers in out-of-the-way places, among the various sects of Christians in the dominions of the Sultan. This seems to have been the case for centuries, and it has produced its effect in lowering the standard of morality and injuring the general character of those nations who are subjects of Turkey and not of the Mohammedan religion. For, of two evils, it is better to follow the doctrines of a false religion than to neglect the precepts of a true faith.'

'I also quote from an interview with a leading Armenian, published two weeks since in the New York Tribune:

'If any people can know what real Christianity is, we are the people; and we are proud of our faith and of the heroism of our ancestors, who fought and died and were martyred for the cause of Christ. But the missionarics are not satisfied with our style of Christianity, and insist on converting us to their form of belief. Their work, while it has added so many thousands of names to their list of proselytes, has also brought discord to homes, has disrupted families, and has given rise to strife and controversy.'

'No one need lose his temper over this matter, and abuse is neither logical nor courteous. Much more additional data could be given, but the above is sufficient to convince reasonable people that there are two sides to the Armenian question.'