

Toryism and Turkey.

The story that Lord Salisbury in an interview with Rustem Pasha, the Turkish Ambassador to the Court of St. James, threatened the dismemberment of Turkey is intrinsically improbable. It was scarcely worth while for the Ambassador to deny it. No man in his senses doubts that the dissolution of the grossly misgoverned Ottoman empire and the division of its subject races among civilized European powers would be an immense gain to the cause of humanity and progress. The awful atrocities which have shocked the world in Armenia are only a sample of the way in which the Turk treats the Christian whenever he has the power to rob and the inclination to murder. These fearful tragedies are a blot on the nineteenth century, and they undoubtedly justify the compulsory partition of Turkey and the final obliteration of what is prob-

ably the most depraved and cruel government in the world. But it is most unlikely that Lord Salisbury, the Tory Premier of Great Britain and the apt pupil of the Earl of Beaconsfield in diplomacy, should give the signal for such a revolution.

British Toryism has been the firm friend of the unspeakable Ottoman. Gladstone and the more radical section of the Liberals have fiercely denounced the Sultan's misrule and have repeatedly shown that they would welcome its abolition, even if this meant the fulfillment of the dream of Peter the Great and the conquest of Constantinople by Russia. But this would mean, in all likelihood, the eventual loss of India, of Egypt and of all those Eastern possessions which England has won with such lavish expenditure of blood and money, and which she holds with the unyielding grasp of a master hand. The Conservative party is irrevocably committed to the preservation of the Anglo-Indian Empire and to a policy of stubborn resistance to Russian ambition in Europe and Asia. Turkey, decrepit and demoralized though she is, can still muster a formidable army of fanatical fighters, and her maintenance as a buffer against Russia is one of the cardinal doctrines of British imperialism.

It is incredible, therefore, that Lord Salisbury, who is a jingo of the jingoes, should have used the language attributed to him. As a man of naturally humane instincts, he doubtless regrets the hapless condition of the Armenians. But combinations of justice and compassion have as little place in England's imperial policy as they had in that of Rome. It may safely be taken for granted that all the power which the British Government is capable of exercising will continue to be relentlessly used to uphold Turkish authority as a bulwark against the aggressions of the Czar.
