

READ THIS FIRST

Preface

This facsimile book is a collection of eleven prophetic articles originally published in the *Review and Herald* in 1909, authored by Percy T. Magan. These articles provide crucial insight into one of the most significant and controversial prophetic subjects of our time: the identity of the King of the North, and the role of Turkey in the final events of earth's history.

In light of widespread speculation and confusion regarding this topic, this compilation sets forth a clear, historical, and biblical foundation. The first five chapters present the necessary historical context. If history is not your usual interest, resist the urge to skip ahead. These chapters are essential for understanding the prophetic developments that follow.

The book pivots at chapter six. From that point forward, the prophetic scenes become strikingly relevant to our current world affairs. However, if you bypass the historical groundwork, the prophetic conclusions will lose their clarity. **Begin at the beginning. Read it all.**

After completing the book, we encourage you to search recent news regarding Turkey and the Middle East. You will find that the prophetic groundwork laid in these articles is more relevant today than when first published. The stage is set. The final movements are rapid ones.

The call is urgent. Time is short. The perfection of Christian character must be accomplished quickly. Probation is closing. Christ is soon to cease His intercession and return in glory. To delay obedience is to choose disobedience—and to risk eternal loss.

Choose ye this day whom ye will serve.

The Turkish Revolution — No. 1

PERCY T. MAGAN

An Unexpected Event

THE month of July would seem to be fated for revolutions. On the fourth, the people of the United States celebrate the signing of the Declaration of Independence. The fourteenth is the great national holiday in the republic of France, when young and old take part in gladsome pageant and parade, in commemoration of the fall of the hated Bastile.

To the revolutionary calendar of this month there was last year added another birthday of liberty—the twenty-third, when Sultan Abdul Hamid of Turkey drained to the dregs the cup of bitterness, and proclaimed the restoration of Midhat Pasha's constitution.

It is said on good authority that Abdul spent the previous night in unceasing telegraphic communication with the German emperor, hoping that at the eleventh hour the Wilhemstrasse would lend him substantial support for the

perpetuation of his absolutism. In the small hours of the morning, however, fresh despatches from many parts of his dominions convinced this past master in crafty statesmanship that the disaffection was general, and resistance useless. Then, and not till then, with the advice and consent of his "great and good friend" in Berlin, did he yield to the inevitable.

The most extraordinary thing in connection with the Turkish revolution was the suddenness and unexpectedness with which it came. For fully one hundred years the world has been watching for the dissolution of the Turkish empire.

On Jan. 9, 1853, the Archduchess Helen gave a party in her palace at St. Petersburg. There Czar Nicholas I met Sir G. Hamilton Seymour, the British minister, whom he drew aside, entering into conversation with him relative to the future of Turkey, and the arrangements which it might be necessary to make regarding it. Few conversations have enjoyed a greater degree of fame than this one. As long as the Ottoman empire shall stand, so long will there cling to it the name of "the sick man." And that name was to that con-

versation born. "We have on our hands," said the czar, "a sick man—a very sick man. It will be a great misfortune if one of these days he should slip away from us before the necessary arrangements have been made."—"*History of Our Own Times*," Justin McCarthy, Vol. I, chap. 25, par. 10.

But Turkey—the sick man—has not slipped away. Many argue that he has not only recovered from his sickness, but that he has become rejuvenated. On the face of it, this would almost appear to be so; for who would ever have dreamed during the early months of 1907 that by midsummer the empire of the sultan would receive a constitution?

"Yesterday Turkey was ruled by a medieval despotism. The sultan was emperor and pope, the head of the state and the head of the church. The law of the prophet contained in the Koran and in the Multeka was the law of the land. To-day Turkey is a free, modern democracy, ruled by the great principles which were enunciated by the French philosophers of the eighteenth century. The words liberty, equality, fraternity, are on everybody's lips, and they may be seen emblazoned in the towns and

villages all over Turkey. The people are rejoicing. Happiness and harmony have taken the place of strife. The races, nationalities, religions, and sects which were at war are fraternizing. The sultan is ruler only in name. . . . Never in the world's history has there been so complete and so rapid a revolution, or one so bloodless. Youthful enthusiasts have hastened to tell us that the decrepit Turkey which we knew so well has disappeared forever, and that a rejuvenated and progressive Turkish empire is being created, which will be an empire indeed."—*"The Future of Turkey," J. Ellis Barker, in the London Fortnightly Review, October, 1908.*

It is difficult to discover how there could occur a much more totally unlooked-for event in the history of the world than the Turkish revolution. Of literature, both lay and official, on the "Turkish question," there is literally heaps. "There have been blue books, yellow books, green books, and other books, an unending succession of volumes in all colors of the spectrum. Not a single word can apparently be found in these compilations which could be taken as foreshadowing the possibility

of what has occurred. No ambassador warned his government. Baron Marschall, in Constantinople, is one of the ablest and most experienced figures in the diplomatic service of any nation. But it is clear that the Wilhemstrasse was as much surprised as the foreign office of any other nation. There were consuls everywhere, but they gave no hint. All the most important journals in Europe have correspondents in Constantinople, and in the Balkans. Many of them are men of long experience and keen observation. Even they did not foresee what was coming, though to follow political events and tendencies is the chief part of their profession. It need not be said that earnest tourists who produced large volumes after a six-weeks' tour, were quite certain that they had missed nothing, though no syllable to suggest the possibility of a Turkish revolution will be found in their pages. One specimen production of this order, published in the last two years, and written from the point of view of the Macedonian Committee, describes the Young Turkish Movement, in a casual sentence, as 'ineffective and innocuous.'—*The Turkish Revolution,*

Viator, London Fortnightly Review, September, 1908.

Even the brilliant and able Sir Charles Elliott, who is one of the most keen observers of events Turkish, failed utterly to estimate the spirit which gave birth to the revolution. Hear him, in his latest and most admirable work:—

“Of all those Liberals and Young Turks, there is not one who, when the time for talking is over, and the time for action comes, will not submit to his [the sultan’s] will. Though much has been talked and written about revolution by the so-called Liberal party, nothing has ever been done. . . .

“One can not help wondering why the Turks themselves let so strange a government continue. The majority of them are, in their own way, honest, patriotic, God-fearing men: some of them are intelligent and energetic. Why will they not reform? One answer is that no changes seem to make the Turkish government any better. Perhaps the greatest reform ever introduced into Turkey was the abolition of the janizaries. Yet it has not altered the general character of the administration,

and probably no change which would alter it would be acceptable to the Turkish people. Many, particularly of the younger men, profess to be anxious for 'reforms,' and are commonly known as Young Turks, or *la jeune Turquie*. Their ideal is some form of constitutional government, such as the parliament of 1877; but I do not know that any section of them are sufficiently definite or practical in their organization to have *any detailed program*. They and their literature are the objects of the special suspicion and severity of the Ottoman government, and a Christian rising creates less alarm than a conspiracy among Ottoman schoolboys."—*"Turkey in Europe,"* by Sir Charles Elliott, pages 112, 152, 153.

But leave foreign observers and critics out of the count. It would seem as if the Bulgars, Greeks, Serbs, and Rumanians, whose contributions to the bibliography of the "Eastern question" have been almost countless, would have been able to give us some hint as to what was coming. But they failed as completely as the foreign ambassadors at Constantinople and the consuls at Salonika. Evidently they did not appre-

hend the slightest possibility of so stupendous and mighty a revolution.

Again: it looks strange that Sultan Abdul Hamid himself was not better informed of what was taking place in his empire. He possessed a most numerous corps of spies. A terrible system of espionage was in unceasing operation all over his dominions. His secret emissaries were everywhere; in the public offices, in homes and in harems, in bath-houses and on the street, in bedrooms and in kitchens, these fawning satellites were ever ready to report.

And to the art and science of espionage and surveillance Abdul Hamid had devoted the strongest powers of his intellect. In that realm he justly considered himself without a peer. He had used his private fortune for the organization of this terrible piece of machinery. "Through it no father could trust his sons, nor a master his servants, for Abdul Hamid had proved that no one was above suspicion or beyond temptation."

And all of this conspired in making people timid in the matter of inaugurating new movements of any kind.

It produced a feeling of constraint. It engendered a constant terror. The hearts of men and women were impregnated with fear and horror. Many men had disappeared. Their kinsmen could only vaguely guess what had become of them. The cold waters of the Bosphorus undoubtedly have closed over many. Perhaps the word *oubliette* sums up their fate better than any other.

And yet in spite of all this, the work of revolution went on. It went on and on, till millions of people were party to it, and no man gave away the secret till, when the morning of the event dawned, the sultan and the camarilla were taken completely by surprise.

The preceding political facts have deeply impressed one thought upon the cabinets and chancelleries of the world; viz., the utter "*inability of human intelligence* to predict what a day may bring forth." One noted writer tersely states the case when he says: "There never could have been a stranger instance of the fallacy of judging present affairs too much by past experience, and of the matchless absurdity of prophecy in politics."—*The Fortnightly Review*,

London, September, 1908; Art., "Turkish Revolution," by Viator.

The importance of the impression which these things have made upon the minds of statesmen can not be overestimated. Noel Buxton, the chairman of the Balkan Commission, tells us that "no one is entitled, since the revolution of the twenty-third of July, to speak of more than facts. . . . The world is watching a new phenomenon."

But while men feel that they are powerless longer to prophesy relative to the "Eastern question," there is One who sitteth in the circle of the heavens, who is able to prophesy as to the ultimate outcome of the "Turkish question." And that One has prophesied and has written it all down in his Book. To that Book statesmen, as well as men of low degree, must turn, if they would understand. The study of those divine pages makes clear the otherwise dark phenomenon of the suddenness of the Turkish revolution. Four brief chapters in the Bible not only light up with brilliant revelation the events of the recent past, but they illuminate the shadowy path of the future of the "Turkish question."

The Turkish Revolution—No. 2

PERCY T. MAGAN

The Young Turks

ON June 25, 1861, Abdul-Aziz was proclaimed sultan of the Ottoman empire. His was an unfortunate reign for Turkey. He first placed himself completely under Russian control, and later, by his extravagant administration, he plunged his country into an indebtedness of over one hundred million dollars. For the expenditure of this vast sum of money he had nothing to show.

The bad state of the national finances for which his rule was responsible cost this monarch his throne. He was deposed May 29, 1876, and was succeeded by his nephew, Murad V. The wretched Abdul-Aziz committed suicide a day or two later.

It was during the scandalous reign of Abdul-Aziz that the Young Turk party first came into prominence. Its first beginnings date back to a somewhat

earlier period — the early fifties of the last century. At that time Zia Bey, Shinassi Effendi, and other patriots began to realize that unless there were radical reforms both in the state and in the social system, the knell of Turkey's doom had sounded.

From these beginnings has grown the *Young Turkdom* of to-day. And the Young Turkdom of to-day is no insignificant affair; for "every one who feels Turkish, and speaks Turkish, is a Young Turk."

During the reign of Abdul-Aziz these Young Turks demanded that the absolute power of the sultan be abrogated, and that in the place of it there be promulgated a constitution and a liberal form of government.

Murad V sympathized with the Young Turk party. This at once angered the Sheik-ul-Islam, the officials, and the entire court camarilla. These felt that drastic action must be taken to stop the growth of liberalism. On Aug. 31, 1876, the Sheik-ul-Islam declared Murad insane. He was deposed, and Abdul-Hamid II began that long and eventful reign which has just come to an end.

Abdul-Hamid II succeeded to the throne of the Osmanlis at a more unhappy period than any of his predecessors. He was without training for the difficult position which had fallen to his lot. Of trustworthy friends he had none. His empire was bankrupt and in a state of rebellion, and its integrity was menaced from every quarter. During the later days of Abdul-Aziz insurrection had become rife in Bosnia, Herzegovina, and Bulgaria. During the brief reign of Murad, Servia and Montenegro had declared against Turkey. It took only until October to bring the Servian uprising to an end. The matter was attended to with brutal severity.

The Bulgarian insurrection, however, was destined to fan the flames of hatred against the misrule of the Turk. The sultan sent large numbers of Bashibazouks and other irregular forces to repress it. Not content with doing their legitimate work, these devoted themselves to wholesale massacre. Twelve thousand men, women, and children were ruthlessly slaughtered in the district of Philippopolis alone. Mr. Baring, the English consul, saw "whole masses

of the dead bodies of women and children piled up in places where the bodies of no combatants were to be seen."

What followed these revelations in the British empire, was described by the great John Bright as "an uprising of the English people." The Tories were at the time in power. Mr. Disraeli, soon to be made the Earl of Beaconsfield, was prime minister. He and his cabinet championed, in part at least, the cause of the government of Turkey.

Then it was that Mr. Gladstone emerged from his semiretirement and became the head and front of the agitation against Turkish misrule. He made speeches in the Commons. He addressed monster open-air meetings. He issued his long-since famous and never-to-be-forgotten pamphlet, entitled "Bulgarian Horrors and the Question of the East." In this he climaxed his appeal with that plea which will remain as a classic as long as there shall be a Turkish question: —

"But I return to, and I end with, that which is the omega as well as the alpha of this great and mournful case. An old servant of the crown and state, I

entreat my countrymen, upon whom far more than perhaps any other people of Europe it depends, to require and to insist that our government, which has been working in one direction, shall work in the other, and shall apply all its vigor to concur with the other states of Europe in obtaining the extinction of the Turkish executive power in Bulgaria. Let the Turks now carry away their abuses in the only possible manner, namely, by carrying off themselves. Their zaptiehs, and their moodirs, their bimbashis, and their yuzbachis, their kaimakams, and their pashas, one and all, bag and baggage, shall, I hope, clear out from the province they have desolated and profaned. This thorough riddance, this most blessed deliverance, is the only reparation we can make to the memory of those heaps on heaps of dead; to the violated purity alike of matron, of maiden, and of child; to the civilization which has been affronted and shamed; to the laws of God, or, if you like, of Allah; to the moral sense of mankind at large.”—“*Bulgarian Horrors and the Question of the East*,” by the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, M. P.,

pages 61-63; London, John Murray, 1876.

Such is the historic "bag-and-baggage" paragraph, so much misquoted and misunderstood. By the Tories it was denounced as 'a demand for the expulsion of the Turks — all the Turks, the Turkish men and women — out of Europe. That, however, was not what Mr. Gladstone had said, and that was not what Mr. Gladstone intended. It could not have been, for to keep the Turkish people in Europe was one of his own pet policies. "What Mr. Gladstone meant was that the rule of Turkish officialism should cease in the Christian provinces; that these provinces should have autonomous governments subject to the sultan; not that all the individual Turks should be turned out."—*Justin McCarthy, in "History of Our Own Times," Vol. II, chap. 64, par. 1 from the end.*

Mr. Gladstone's pamphlet and speeches and the "uprising of the English people" greatly alarmed the sultan. He feared that the British, who had saved the Turkish empire in the Crimean War, were about to desert him. No other power would assist him, and war with

the Russian Bear loomed big across the frontier. His exchequer, thanks to Abdul-Aziz, was empty, and as for the national debt, he could only default in paying the interest on the coupon. A wall of Russian bayonets menaced him from the north and east; the Greek army threatened from the south; and the Austrian sabers rattled on his western flank.

In his despair, Abdul-Hamid summoned to his assistance the famous Young Turk leader, Midhat Pasha, and this truly great statesman became grand vizier. He counseled his sovereign that the only thing that could save the Ottoman empire from complete destruction would be the granting of a constitution and a liberal form of government.

Abdul-Hamid was an autocrat, wedded to absolutism. Nevertheless he deemed it the course of prudence to follow the advice of Midhat Pasha. Consequently, Dec. 23, 1876, amid salvos of artillery and fanfare of trumpets, the new constitution was proclaimed.

This constitution, which is the one proclaimed again July 23 last, was the work of Midhat Pasha, who, as previously stated, was one of the first of the

Young Turks. "With singular sagacity he realized that the equality of the races before the law was the sole prospect of salvation remaining to Turkey."

It is frequently asserted that Oriental peoples and popular forms of government are not suited to one another. All the trustworthy contemporary authorities, however, assert that Midhat Pasha and the other leading Young Turks of the day behaved with remarkable moderation and cool judgment.

Again it must be borne in mind that constitutional government is by no means a new thing in Islam. Anything more democratic than the doctrine of the Arab prophet would be difficult to find. True it is that only the first four caliphs adhered strictly to the text of the Koran and the Sunna. Their successors made the caliphate into a sultanate. They sacrificed the spirit of democracy to the personal will of the ruler.

The first attempt, already mentioned, upon the part of the Turkish people to obtain free institutions and to curb the power of the sultan, was nipped in the bud. The constitution and the parliament called into existence by virtue of

it soon passed away. The parliament held but two sessions. It met first in March, 1877, and came to an end in February, 1878. This was by order of the sultan, who, under the constitution, had power to dissolve both houses of parliament. Abdul-Hamid used the war with Russia as a pretext for suspending the constitution, and suspended it remained till 1908. He was aided in this nefarious work by the machinations of the Christian powers.

With the suspension of the constitution, Midhat Pasha fell from office, and the Young Turk movement went into hiding for a while. Some of the leaders preferred voluntary exile to remaining in their native land. Others chose to stay, so that when the time was ripe for action again, they would be upon the ground.

The history of the Young Turks during the period intervening between 1878 and 1908 is difficult to narrate, from the fact that it is shrouded in secrecy. During the nineties there was some activity. From time to time it has become known that committees of progressive men of various blood, speech,

and faith, came into existence, both inside and outside of the Ottoman empire. Headquarters were established at Paris and Geneva. Literature was sent out from these centers. The Ottoman Committee of Union and Progress called upon all good men to stand with it on the platform of racial and religious equality in Turkey for every blood and creed. It was this Midhatian plank that brought the jarring faiths and nationalities together.

The oaths subscribed to by members of the Young Turk organization were, like most of those in vogue among secret societies, picturesque in the extreme. A revolver and a knife were laid upon the Koran, which was held to the brow of the new member, as he solemnly repeated,—

“I swear in the name of God and Mohammed that I will fight for nationality, freedom, and truth while a drop of blood remains in my body.”

After taking this oath, the member next undertook to provide himself with a rifle, and to be prepared to abandon work, family, and friends at a moment's notice, and fight for the cause. During

the time when the attention of the world was centered upon the political revolution in Russia, the Young Turks transferred their headquarters from Paris to Salonika. From this point they directed operations until the revolution was an accomplished fact.

But what happened for a long period after this is what no man has yet undertaken to tell. A cloud of impenetrable darkness enshrouds their operations, with only the merest rift at big intervals in its inky blackness. Suffice to say that later we find a vast conspiracy ramifying throughout Macedonia.

In Macedonia organization seems to have been brought to a fine point. Adherents were admitted upon the stringent and terrible oath elsewhere recorded in this paper. Then they were divided into sections of five, of whom one alone was informed as to other members. "Each had to subscribe two per cent of his income. Communications were carried in person, and many were the devices for sending news to the capital or distributing revolutionary matter. Leading men stood, disguised as hawkers, in the streets of Salonika, to sell a

match-box or deal out a paper from Paris, as occasion served; others took service as coachmen, to keep watch on dangerous pashas. Papers from Europe were essential. How could they be obtained without detection? First, the post-office staff was 'educated;' then the staff of the viceroy. The latter ordered the papers in the viceroy's name; when they arrived, a clerk at the post-office took them to the conspirators."—*Noel Buxton, Chairman of the Balkan Commission, in the Nineteenth Century, January, 1909.*

Such is the story of the men and party that have upset all the calculations and plans of the chancelleries of Europe. The regeneration of Turkey has ever been thought to lie in joint control by the concert of the powers. The powers had been interfering in Turkish affairs for nearly a century, but the Ottoman government remained as vicious as ever. "Diplomacy despaired of the task. The Young Turks accomplished it in a week."

The question now arises, What will be the attitude of the powers toward Turkey under the new régime? Writing

on this point, Prof. Arminius Vamberry, the greatest living authority on the Turkish question, truly says:—

“If the near East is to continue to be what it has been for the last three hundred years — *the wrestling ground for the intrigues of the diplomatic West*; if by continual and useless interference disorder is caused in the still loose joints of the constitutional structure; or if by forwarding individual interests the seeds of discord are sown afresh, and the work of reformation is impeded, *then all our hope for better things will end in delusion.*”

To us it would appear as if the powers of Europe have already begun to answer the professor's query, and to answer it in such a way that all the friends of Turkey and of peace can only conclude that “all our hope for better things will end in delusion.”



The Turkish Revolution—No. 3

PERCY T. MAGAN

“Hurriet,” and “How It Came About”

“HURRIET” is the Turkish word for liberty. Until the revolution its use was forbidden. Recently a patriotic play has been upon the boards in the Turkish theaters, bearing the significant title, “How It Came About.” The object of this article will be to tell how Turkish liberty came about, and to outline a few of the most striking features of the revolution.

As a rule, revolutions are not unaccompanied by bloodshed. France, polished and refined, shed blood in torrents. In Turkey, supposedly one of the most barbarous lands in the world, a practically bloodless revolution seems almost inconceivable. We have been wont to hear of the “unspeakable Turk.” Horrible massacres have taken place so often

in that unhappy land that minds have become satiated with their scarlet story. We have read of Armenian massacres, and Macedonian massacres, and Bulgarian massacres in an almost unending succession. How then a bloodless revolution in Turkey — Turkey which to most Westerners has seemed the hotbed of all that is fiendish and horrible? Nevertheless such is the fact. There has been practically a bloodless revolution in Turkey.

Last week I traced the story of the rise and organization of the Young Turk party. After a period spent in "educating" the country, this party decided that physical force might be necessary, and so determined to capture the army, and started their work with the Third, or Macedonian, Corps.

This was a wise selection, as the Third Corps in question was quartered in disturbed country, and the men were greatly disaffected on account of being held beyond legal time with the colors, and besides, their pay was constantly in arrears.

It is agreed by almost all authorities that the explosion took place sooner than

the revolutionists had planned. The cause of this will be discussed in a subsequent paper. The immediate cause, however, was a flattering invitation to Enver Bey, the prime mover in the plot at Salonika, to visit his royal sovereign in Constantinople. He wisely concluded that his plans had been discovered, and that he had been betrayed to the sultan. He fled to his friend Niazi Bey, the commandant of Resna. This officer had strong Albanian connections. Niazi resolved to act at once, and with a band of picked men threw himself into the hills.

Shensi Pasha was detailed to quell the mutiny. He was murdered. Osman Hydadet attempted in barracks to plead the cause of the sultan, and fell amid a hail of bullets. The Second Army Corps soon joined the Third. Between them they held districts on both sides of the Bosphorus. The troops of Anatolia, which were ordered to Monastir, refused to fire on their mutinous comrades. Threatening messages were received from Adrianople.

The army at once demanded the proclamation of Midhat Pasha's constitution

of 1876. The ground was now crumbling rapidly beneath the feet of the supporters of the Hamidian régime. Messages to Yildiz from all parts of the European provinces announced that the game of absolutism was lost. Even the Albanians fell into revolt. All Macedonia was in the hands of the Young Turks. And when the vali of Monastir proclaimed Midhat's constitution in the presence of the troops, it was felt that the game was up. Then it was that Abdul-Hamid, after a lapse of two and thirty years, proclaimed again the great statesman's constitution.

The rest we know. In twenty-four hours the press was free. July 25 brought amnesty to political prisoners. By Saturday evening every house was decorated. Side by side with the Ottoman star and crescent was the Greek cross and stripes. The Greek newspaper *Proa*, declared: "The whole nation was drunk, was suffering from headache (*kraipale*) from the intoxication of joy. Luxuriating in the boundless radiance of liberty and equality, they could only cry, in ecstasy, 'Long live the friend of liberty, the Sultan Abdul-Hamid.'"

The members of the camarilla and ministers of state who had practised extortion began at once to leave the country. The stories of their exit are somewhat amusing. First went Habili Efendi Melhame. It was said at first that he went on a special mission for the sultan. Maybe — but he went in his sleeping attire, and with signs of great haste. Next went Selim Melhame, minister of forests and mines. He appears to have been detested on account of his extortions.

“On August 1 it was announced that ‘the chief inspector of military schools, otherwise chief spy, otherwise chief hypocrite, Ismail Pasha,’ having presented himself at the Salamlik, on the previous day, was compelled to retire in disguise, ‘the presence of such miscreants being no longer tolerated.’ Another, ‘most dishonorable of all the spies,’ Kabasll (Coarse Beard), Mohammed Pasha, who had caused the death of many thousands, having likewise been dismissed from the palace, had gone home on foot and in tears, whence, after saying to his family, ‘This is the consequence of my crimes,’ he took ship for

Brusa, accompanied by the execrations of the populace.”—*London Fortnightly, October, 1908; Art., “Constantinople at the Declaration of the Constitution,”* by D. S. Margoliouth, who was an eye-witness.

One of the greatest causes of joy was the cashiering of the spies. “How large a portion of the public revenue had been annually expended on these persons will perhaps never be known; the lowest estimate placed is about a million sterling. The profession was staffed by persons of varied nationalities and social status; an Englishman is said to have practised it with success till his countrymen contrived to get him exiled. The Armenian Patriarch Ormanian was regarded by his countrymen as a spy, and they clamored for his resignation. He complained to the grand vizier of the language of the press, but was told that the press was now free. He tried to fly with a forty-thousand-pound check in his possession, but was arrested and brought back to the patriarchal palace, where he was kept a prisoner.”

But now these industrious spies were out of employment. On Sunday, August

2, they assembled at the palace door, and demanded that they be given some appointments, that they might "eat a piece of bread." They were paid what was due them on salary, and sent on their way.

But let us turn to the happier phases of the revolution. I will record some of the scenes which took place, in the language of Englishmen who have made Eastern affairs their lifelong study, and who were on the ground at the time. Here is the record of one of these:—

"An enormous tyranny was swept away. The Hamidian despotism disappeared in a night. Its tools were prisoners or fugitives. Yet only seven lives are believed to have been sacrificed to vindicate passion. Of those one was Fehim Pasha, torn to pieces at Brusa at the end of a career infamous and insolent compared with the worst known even in connection with palace politics in the East. In Macedonia Turkish soldiers make common cause with the insurgent bands. Albanians fraternize with Serbs. With more mental reserve, and yet with as much cordiality as could be expected even in these circumstances,

Bulgars and Greeks fall upon each other's necks. Salonika becomes a picturesque and jubilant Babel, filled not with discord, but with the harmony of the garden of Eden. Brigands of miscellaneous nationality weep for joy. All the fierce figures in romantic costumes, who seemed lately in their passions and their deeds to be the nearest political approach to the limbo of hell, are seen in the streets of Salonika, as one observer puts it, 'laughing together, dancing together, drinking endless coffees together.' In Constantinople Turks have kissed the earth which covers the victims of the Armenian massacres, and the Armenians have suddenly acquired an interest second only to that of the Turks themselves *in preserving the integrity of the sultan's dominion*. No one in the capital but was moved to the depth of the soul by the calm, serene, yet electrical temper of the crowd, incomparable in its simple dignity and self-control, perfect in its humanity. High and low warned each other against extravagance and excess, against all outbursts whether in word or deed, that might seem unworthy of the new reign of law. The

first natural movements of popular vindictiveness were successfully suppressed. All the faults of the sultan's reign were attributed to his advisers. The padishah was proclaimed the father of his people, as Louis the Sixteenth was for a time proclaimed the 'restorer of liberty.'

"And across the Bosphorus, in the Asiatic dominions of the sultan, there were scenes even more wonderful still, if that might be. Take the picture of what happened at Beirut when the new régime was inaugurated in the closing days of July. Only five years before, the city had been given over to mob violence, the Christians fled for their lives, and only the presence by chance of three American war-vessels prevented massacres. Here the most impressive feature of the present demonstration was the vehemency, the continued reiteration of the sentiment of brotherhood of Moslem and Christian, who were to live together in peace in this new era. No such utterances were ever heard before in Turkish history. Any one predicting such a possibility a month ago would have been treated as a visionary. But here were a hundred turbaned Moslem

speakers ringing the changes on this theme, until we seemed like those standing in a dream. Then is described a venerable sheik, who, with green turban and flowing robes, told how, before the Hamidian tyranny, the Christian and Moslem mothers used to nurse each others' children, and the young men called each other brethren. And now 'again and again the Moslem speakers gave the salutation, *Es salaam alaikum ya akhwy* (Peace be with ye, O brethren!), which had been held from the Christians for so many years by all but the most liberal and enlightened Moslems.' Nor was this all. Many times during the day the people pushed Christian priests and turbaned Moslems into each other's arms, and made them kiss each other. More still. The Mohammedans, with the commander of the troops, many officers, and the military band, attended the Armenian church, and bewailed that wave of blood by comparison with which St. Bartholomew itself was but a pin-prick."—*The Fortnightly Review*, London, September, 1908; Art., "The Turkish Revolution," by Viator.

That such scenes should take place in Turkey, of all places on earth, is almost beyond belief; for Turkey has to rule over an immense variety of races and creeds. These are all more or less jumbled together in a comparatively small area. Ordinarily these different sects and races agree in nothing except their hatred of Ottoman domination. Worse than this, it is a fact that among themselves there is perpetual bitterness and strife. The Slav has ever loathed and feared the Greek. The Greek views the Slav with the most supreme contempt. The Moslem Albanian holds the Catholic Albanian as one of the most odious of mortals. And so it has been all the way through. How such a medley of peoples, so utterly at variance with one another, could ever have been brought together under the rule of the one they hate most on earth, and this without bloodshed, but in the best of spirit, is almost beyond human understanding.

Nor has the work of the revolution raveled out with time. Many feared that after the first frenzy of fraternization, old passions would arise. But for-

eign consuls are not reporting that murderers and violators go unpunished. The suppression of crime is the crucial test. If the Young Turks fail here, they know that the confidence of the world will be lost. Already they have hanged Turks for killing Bulgars, and Albanians for killing Serbs. Thus far they have demonstrated that they have the power to keep order. In the Turkey of to-day the peasant can cultivate his fields without fear, and gather his harvests without danger to his life. One year ago there was wholesale emigration to America; already thousands have returned. A year ago the fishermen of Lake Yenidje dared not, for terror of assassination by murderous bands, follow their calling. Now they are back in their boats. For months together during the winter of 1907-08 little children spent the hours of darkness shivering in the fields, for fear they would be attacked in their homes; now this is changed.

Such is the condition of Turkey under the new régime; and the question now arises, What will be the attitude of the Young Turks toward the great powers?

and what will be the attitude of the great powers toward the Young Turks? This is the crux of the whole situation. Will the general situation in Europe be rendered better or worse by the change of affairs in Turkey? The discussion of these questions must be left for future consideration. They will be found of vital interest.



The Turkish Revolution—No. 4

PERCY T. MAGAN

The Ottoman Idea

IN the last issue of the REVIEW we studied the rise and history of the Young Turk movement, and sketched the main features of the remarkable revolution which that movement has effected. In this article I shall endeavor to make plain the fundamental causes which have inspired all this recent activity in Young Turk ranks, and which have prompted the thought of revolution at this particular time,

The battle of Marathon was fought in the year 490 B. C. On one side were eleven thousand Europeans—Greeks. On the other side were one hundred ten thousand Asiatics—Persians. The event of the day was an overwhelming victory for the European, or western, nation. The Persian army was utterly

routed, and forced to retreat to Asia.

This battle was one of the decisive battles in the world's history. The result of it was supposed to have settled for all time the white man's superiority over the yellow, the brown, and the black man. From that day forward it was presumed to be an incontrovertible fact that no Asiatic race could stand before Europeans.

The world-shaking victories of Japan over Russia have sent this theory tumbling down the abyss. The verdict of Marathon has been annulled. A small nation of Asiatics humiliated the arms of a great European power into the very dust. Forever in the Oriental mind is the idea shattered that he must be ground down beneath the mailed heel of Europe. Orientals have determined that the exploitations of their territories by Western powers must cease. The marvelous successes of the Japanese have awakened the "Asiatic spirit." If, they say, the doctrine is to prevail of "Europe for the Europeans," and "America for the Americans," then it shall be the "Orient for the Orientals." It is this which has stimulated China, with her

history of forty centuries, to renew her youth. It is this which has brought about the "awakening of China." It is this which has produced the "unrest in India," and a feverish determination upon the part of the Hindu people to bring to an end forever the rule of Great Britain in their land. In the near future the "kings of the East" intend to force a settlement on this question. See the two remarkable works treating upon this subject — "The Reshaping of the Far East," and "The Truce in the East and Its Aftermath," by Henry Putnam Weale, the Macmillan Company, New York.

Now there is no question but that the extraordinary successes of Japan, and "China's energetic pulling of herself together" have had a remarkable and electric effect upon the Mohammedans of the Ottoman empire. "The heathen Buddhists, formerly despised as blackest infidels, now appear as shining lights and examples in their eyes."

To the deeds of the people of the far East — the Japanese — must be attributed the vision of liberty, and freedom from interference by the great powers,

toward which the people of the near East — the Ottoman Turks — are striving.

All Islam is awakening, and is determined to come into her own, politically and nationally as well as religiously. I have already mentioned the manifestations of this spirit in the popular "unrest in India," which ever since the Russo-Japanese War has given the British government so much concern. Then there are the nine million Mohammedans of the Nile lands. These "are unbounded in their enthusiasm at the revival of the constitution in Turkey." True, the Turks have never enjoyed much popularity with the Egyptians. At the present moment, however, they all join together in longing for the restored sovereignty of the constitutional calif.

Among the Russian Mohammedans, i. e., the Tartars, the same spirit is moving. Their national consciousness has been roused by the Russian Talmi constitution. It is difficult to describe their delight at the revival which has taken place among their fellow tribesmen and coreligionists in Turkey. So manifest is this exultation, that the Mo-

hammedan faction of the Russian Douma has sent a congratulatory address to the Turkish Parliament, the appended text of which is instructive:—

“The Moslem faction of the Russian Douma desires to offer this day, the day of the opening of parliament, hearty good wishes to their Osmanli fellow tribesmen and coreligionists. We congratulate the deputies, and through them the whole Ottoman nation, on this happy day. We heartily hope that Turkey, awakened to a new existence, may grow and flourish under the protection of freedom. We feel and realize how great must be her joy on this day, and it finds an echo in our hearts.”—*Tewkileff, President of the Mohammedan Faction.*

From India and from Java and from Sumatra like messages of congratulation have been received. All of these breathe words of joy and enthusiasm over the successes of their brethren in the Turkish empire.

In other words, this Pan-islamic sentiment, this determination of the followers of the Arabian “prophet” to come together and make themselves a dominant factor in the world’s affairs, is

traveling everywhere with an almost incredible celerity and tremendous power. It must be taken into account, for in the near future it will have to be reckoned with. It is a part of the very quintessence of "the Eastern question." It is one of the signs that "the Eastern question" is getting acute, and that it will soon be up for settlement.

What now is that which has come to be known to the cabinets and chancelleries of Europe as the *Idée Ottomane*, i. e., the Ottoman idea? What are the visions, the ideals, of the Young Turks? What do they aim at, as far as the larger matters of government, and the relation of Turkey to the great powers, are concerned?

First and foremost it must be understood that the members of the Young Turk party are most intensely patriotic. Above all else, they are Nationalists. One of the great cries with which they have rallied the people to their support has been, "Reform from within; hands off from without." Stated in another way, they are endeavoring to marshal the entire Turkish population beneath their banner, over the issue that the

Turkish empire shall be "one and indivisible." Everywhere they have raised the campaign cry, "One flag; one people." *"The foreign situation, and the temper of a large number of the Turks themselves, alike make it certain that the Ottoman constitution can not be again destroyed without destroying the Ottoman empire as it exists."*—*Editorial in the Fortnightly Review; London, January, 1909.*

Can the ideal of the Young Turks of a great and powerful united Turkey be realized and made even semipermanent? The internal difficulties which beset a favorable solution of this problem, and which confront the Young Turk statesmen, are enormous. "If the Christian states of Europe can only with the greatest difficulty keep together and govern an ethnically disjointed political body, how can this be accomplished in a state where, besides the ethnical differences, the poison of religious antagonism frustrates all attempts at agreement?" The warring and the jarring, the mutual antipathies of the races in the Turkish empire, are not at bottom chargeable to the form and maladmin-

istration of its late government. On the other hand, they are directly traceable to certain permanent and fundamental factors.

Briefly stated, these factors are as follows: There was a day when the world was the domain of the Arab, and when the Turks held dominion over Europe. Not without cause have the great Mohammedan empires of the past declined and decayed. For while the Mohammedans have known how to conquer, they have never known how to govern. They have proved themselves strangers to the art of preserving, organizing, civilizing, and nationalizing the peoples over whom they were victorious in arms. "In Asia, Africa, and Europe the ruling Mohammedans have remained strangers among strangers in a conquered land." The cause of this peculiar state of affairs lies in the teachings of the Koran. A great authority has summed up the case as follows: —

"The Koran is at the same time a gospel of conquest and of peace; it commands war, yet it enjoins civic and religious toleration. The followers of the prophet are to propagate his gospel

with the sword, and to slay those who resist them, but to spare the vanquished and to respect their religion. Following the prophet's precepts, the Mohammedans neither proselytize by means of the church, nor nationalize by means of the school, as do the Christian nations. Hence the nations which were conquered by Mohammedans could preserve their language, religion, and national individuality; and the consequence of this short-sighted policy of toleration and noninterference on the part of the conquerors has been fatal to Mohammedan rule. Owing to this fundamental mistake, Mohammedanism has created everywhere, not nationally organized and homogeneous states, but merely strong military settlements among alien nations, which were allowed to remain alien nations. Although these nations have revolted against Mohammedan rule whenever opportunity offered, the followers of the prophet have not altered their policy in the course of thirteen centuries, for to them the Koran is law.

“The foregoing makes it clear that the difficulties of the Turkish empire, as those of the ancient Arab empires, have

sprung from the fundamental principles of Mohammedan statecraft and policy which were laid down by the prophet, and the consequences of that policy may clearly be seen in the Turkish empire. European Turkey has about six million inhabitants, of whom only about one third are Turks, and in Constantinople itself the Turks are in a minority. Turkey in Asia and Africa has about nineteen million inhabitants. Of these three millions or four millions are Christians and Jews; and several millions of the Mohammedan inhabitants, such as Arabs and Kurds, are constantly in a state of revolt or of war with their Turkish masters. Turkey is a state, but not a nation. The Bulgarians, Greeks, Serbs, Albanians, Arabs, etc., in the Ottoman empire have no affection for the Turks. They are Turkish citizens only by compulsion, and although they have been inhabitants of Turkey during many centuries, they do not consider themselves citizens of Turkey, but members of a conquered race, and they sigh for their liberty."—*The Fortnightly Review*, London, October, 1908; Art., "The Future of Turkey," by J. Ellis Barker.

In view of all this, the question now arises, Can the Young Turk party maintain, in the midst of such a situation as this, a constitution and a liberal form of government? Can the Turkish statesmen give to these various races and creeds the liberty for which they clamor, and for which the Young Turk party stands? Can the Young Turks do this, and at the same time preserve the Turkish empire?

The task is sufficient to strain the resources of the loftiest public spirit and the most accomplished statesmanship. Few men believe that in the ultimate the Turkish government will be able to weather out the problem. And if by any possible chance Turkey should be able to do so, another, and an even more serious problem will confront her. And if she fails, her failure means the end of her rule in Europe.



The Turkish Revolution – No. 5

PERCY T. MAGAN

A Triangular Question

FOR more than half a century the Seventh-day Adventist people have maintained that the Scriptures plainly teach that in the last days the Ottoman empire in Europe will come to an end, and that following this there will be world-wide war — “a time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation, even to that same time.” And we have further declared that according to the Word of God this universal war would terminate in the battle of Armageddon, the end of the world, and the coming of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Amid all the ebb and flow of international events affecting the disorganization or the integrity of the Turkish empire, this people have unwaveringly and unfalteringly warned all men that the empire of Turkey would, in the language of Holy

Writ, "be dried up,"—that is, would come to an end,—and that this is one of the great signs of the coming of the Son of man.

And now that the Turkish question has become the question of the hour, now while it is the subject under discussion in all the cabinets and chancelleries of Europe, and the theme of diplomatic and political treatises in the great dailies and the magazines, should not every Seventh-day Adventist be awake to the situation, and as never before make manifest the deep and hidden meaning of all these things?

The question before us now is, What is the relation of the Young Turk movement—the Turkish revolution of July 23, 1908, and the present revolution in Turkey—to the general question of the coming to an end of the Turkish empire?

This brings us to a study of some fundamental, international facts. The near Eastern question is a triangular one. At the top of this triangle is the Russian government at St. Petersburg. At one angle of the base is Constantinople and the Sublime Porte, and at the other the British Foreign Office in

Downing Street, London.

Between these three powers, for the past two centuries in particular, a three-cornered struggle has been going on. Turkey has been fighting to maintain her position in Constantinople. Russia has been fighting to put Turkey out of Constantinople, and gain that long-coveted position for herself. England, while caring little for the Turk, *per se*, has fought to hold him in Constantinople for the purpose of keeping Russia out.

Ten times—in other words an average of *once in every twenty years*—during the past two centuries, has Russia been in deadly combat with Turkey. In the majority of these wars she has been the aggressor, “and seven of them she has fought single-handed.” See Monroe, “Turkey and the Turks,” page 302.

The questions at once arise: Why is Russia so often at war with Turkey? Why does the Muscovite government so earnestly desire to possess Constantinople? Is Russia the national and eternal enemy of Turkey? The fundamental principles which dictate Russian policy will answer these questions.

A glance at the map of Europe will

shed some light on this subject. In all Europe there are approximately 3,861,156 square miles. Of this number 2,123,626 square miles belong to Russia. Only 1,739,067 belong to all the other nations of the European continent put together. These figures will give some idea of the tremendous size of Russia, as compared with any other European power.

But now look at another set of figures: The entire coast line of Europe approximates 21,177 miles. Of this, Russia owns only 5,550 miles, while the other powers own 15,627 miles. Thus although Russia is greatly superior to all the others combined in point of territory, she is greatly inferior to them in point of coast line.

To be sure, the seas which lave the Russian shores are many. On the north is the Arctic Ocean, which by the vast reaches of the White Sea penetrates deep into the country. Half of Russia's coast line is on these two bodies of water. But they are navigable during only a few months of the year,—from June to September. At the best they are practically useless for naval purposes in time of war. Next comes the Baltic Sea, with

the gulfs of Bothnia, Finland, and Laponia. But the Baltic, also, in its two most northern gulfs is frequently frozen. Armies have crossed upon its ice with all their heavy ordnance and stores, and navigation is stopped from November to April.

Russia has a war fleet in the Baltic. The freezing of the waters of this sea, however, make dependence upon this naval arm a doubtful quantity. Besides this, the "Baltic is full of treacherous shallows; the passage through the narrow channels which separate the Danish islands is at all times difficult and dangerous for ships of large draft, and if the Danish islands should be seized in time of war by a third power,— a comparatively easy undertaking,— Russia would find her northern squadrons bottled up and useless."

The Caspian Sea also washes Russian shores. But it can not be seriously considered at all from an international standpoint. Besides, it is also often frozen, especially in its northern half, which includes Astrakhan, its most flourishing port. There is also the Sea of Azof; but this in places is little better

than a marsh.

Lastly comes the Black Sea. Russia first planted herself on its shores in 1696, when Peter the Great captured Azof. But to that most famous empress of Russia, Catherine II, must be credited the scheme to make the Black Sea a Russian lake. "*She resolved that the possessions of the sultans should become the heritage of the czars; and, as an expression of her faith in Russian destiny, she christened a grandchild Constantine, and had a gate at Moscow, that opened toward Turkey, named 'The Way to Constantinople.'*"—*Id.*, page 303. Had not death interfered and removed this ambitious woman, she would undoubtedly have accomplished her aim. Her son Paul was almost as much of a woman as his mother was of a man, and did not find it to his taste to press the battle against the Osmanlis.

But the scheme of the audacious Catherine is just as much a part of the Russ program to-day as it was in the time of its conception. Russia is now firmly established on the shores of the Black Sea. Here she has fine warm-water ports. Why, then, is she not con-

tent? Why should she be so determined to drive the Ottoman power from off the Bosphorus and out of Constantinople?

At this juncture the conformation of the map of Europe must be borne in mind. The Black Sea, with the exception of one little outlet at its southwestern extremity, is a vast land-locked lake. That one small channel is the Bosphorus, or the Strait of Constantinople, as it is more properly termed. Russia and Turkey between them surround the entire Black Sea with their territory. Consequently, if the straits of the Bosphorus be closed, Russia is literally locked into the Black Sea.

A narrow channel is this Bosphorus—approximately seventeen miles in length, and in places scarce half a mile in width. Its waters are deep, however, so that ships of war can steam close inshore on either side. In its course it passes between the city of Constantinople and its Asiatic suburb of Scutari.

The Bosphorus in turn opens into the tiny Sea of Marmora, out of which the way westward is through the Dardanelles. The Dardanelles is the only passage into the archipelago, and thence

passage into the archipelago, and thence into the Mediterranean. Like the Bosphorus, the Dardanelles is very narrow and very deep.

A glance at the map will reveal the fact that the status of these straits is of the greatest moment to both Russia and Turkey. If these straits be closed against naval vessels, the Ottoman capital is secure from assault by sea. This gives the Turk a tremendous advantage in the defense of his European stronghold. On the other hand, if these straits be closed to ships of war, the Russian fleet in the Black Sea is debarred from the waters of the Mediterranean and from all the oceans of earth.

Now this very "closed" condition is the status of the Dardanelles and the Bosphorus. Almost from the horizon of Turkish history have the Dardanelles and the Bosphorus, being such narrow channels, flanked on either bank by Turkish territory, been regarded in a different light from "high seas." For centuries the sultans have claimed the right to exclude foreign men-of-war from both the straits. This status is a part of the international law of Europe, and the subject of a host

of treaties.

The Treaty of 1809, between Great Britain and Turkey, confirmed by engagement "the ancient rule of the Ottoman empire" forbidding vessels of war at all times to enter the Canal of Constantinople. The Treaty of Unkiar-Skellessi, between Russia and Turkey, contained a secret clause, binding the Porte to close the Dardanelles against all war-vessels. Later, when the great powers combined to regulate Turkish affairs, the famous Treaty of London, made July 13, 1841, provided that even in times of peace no foreign ship of war should be admitted into the straits of the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles. The Treaty of Paris, in 1856, which settled up matters at the close of the Crimean War, still further affirmed this doctrine. And the same was still further provided for in the Treaty of Berlin, in 1878.

By all of these treaties the Black Sea fleet of Russia has literally been made a Black Sea fleet. It is prohibited from operating elsewhere than in the Euxine. It can not reach the Mediterranean Sea, or contend with the fleets of other powers in the Atlantic or the Pacific.

Viewed from this standpoint, the position of Russia is intolerable. As long as it shall continue, her supremacy in eastern Europe will count for little. Consequently, considered from this angle of vision alone, it is the most natural thing in the world that Russian ambition should tend toward the ultimate possession of Constantinople.

In all her attempts to gain control or possession of Constantinople, England has been Russia's consistent and constant enemy. England, Russia, and Turkey resemble one another in one respect — they are all Asiatic as well as European powers. But Turkey could never prove a menace to British interests in the Orient. She is too decrepit and decadent. On the other hand, there has seemed to be something akin to a natural antagonism between England and Russia in the East. From the days when the Northern Bear first lifted his shaggy strength onto the horizon of Europe, England has feared for her Indian empire. And the Indian empire is one of the fairest jewels in the British crown. Then there were ever stories of Russian intrigue in Afghanistan, and in the re-

gion of the Persian Gulf. These apprehensions and alarms may not have been just or reasonable, but they certainly counted for a great deal in determining the attitude of England toward Turkey and Russia. It was in great measure out of these alarms that there grew up among certain statesmen and classes in England the conviction that the maintenance of the integrity of the Turkish empire was part of the natural duty of England. Sharply defined, the condition of things was this: "Russia, by reason of her sympathy of religion or race with Turkey's Christian populations, was brought into chronic antagonism with Turkey; England, by reason of her Asiatic possessions, was kept in just the same state of antagonism to Russia."—*Justin McCarthy, "History of Our Own Times," Vol. I, chap. 25.*

Consequently England sought to shut up Russia in the Black Sea, knowing full well that, divested of the power of the sea, Russia could never prove herself an antagonist of the first magnitude to British designs and interests in the Orient. This policy upon the part of England began in the days of William Pitt, who

in 1791 called upon the Commons to furnish the sinews of war for the purpose of rescuing Turkey from the clutches of the Empress Catherine. See Stanhope, "Life of Pitt," Vol. II, chap. 25. And from that hour down to the summer of 1907 that policy was a part of the platform of every British ministry without respect to party.



The Turkish Revolution—No. 6

PERCY T. MAGAN

Constantinople: Europe's Dinner — Russia's Life

THE Turkish question is the international question of the hour. The platform rings with it, and the press teems with it. One thing has been effected by the recent revolutions in the Ottoman empire,—men have ceased to “prophesy” as to what will happen next in Turkey. The situation, say the authorities, “is inscrutable.” Noel Buxton, the chairman of the Balkan Commission, tells us that “no one is entitled, since the revolution of the twenty-third of July, 1908, to *speak of more than facts.*” He declares that “no one has more to report than the things that have happened and the talk of the town,” and that “the world is watching a new phenomenon.” See Noel Buxton, Art.

“Young Turks,” in *Nineteenth Century and After*, January, 1909.

From these and many other similar statements by the most learned and brilliant students of the “near-Eastern question,” it is evident that they have no certain philosophy to advance relative to the future of the Ottoman empire. They admit that the situation “is inscrutable.” They agree that they can not fathom it.

But on the Eastern question, as on a thousand other problems, the Word of God furnishes a sure philosophy. Biblical prophecies explain worldly politics. The Bible says of the Turk that “he shall come to his end, and none shall help him.” Abdul-Hamid or Mehmed V, Young Turk or no Young Turk, Salonikans or no Salonikans, palace camarilla or no palace camarilla,—the Turkish ship of state steams steadily into the whirlpool, in the vortex of which she will go down in defeat amid “a time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation even to that same time.” This is the all-overwhelming thought, the crowning inspiration in the preaching of the Eastern question. Forever let it be settled that we are dealing with pro-

phetics and not with politics, and that the Turkish question now upon the hearts and lips of hundreds of thousands — yea, of millions — of men and women, is God's great sign that the seven last plagues and the end of the world are at hand. The Eastern question is a mighty weapon in our hands by means of which to convict men and women and lead them to the salvation that there is in Jesus Christ.

In last week's REVIEW I endeavored to make plain the undying ambition of Russia to obtain free access to the sea; and that by international law, through a long train of treaties, this was impossible so long as the Turk sat upon the Bosphorus. While free access to the oceans of earth for her navies via the Bosphorus is all-important to Russia, there are other formidable and gigantic reasons of state why she can never rest until the long-coveted waters of the Bosphorus are her very own.

Divested of humanitarian considerations, the question of the future of the Ottoman empire is the question of the possession of, or the control of, Constantinople with the Dardanelles and the

Bosporus.

From the standpoint of military and naval power, Constantinople occupies a position of prime importance. Constantinople is the great gateway of two continents. Here was the spot which the great Darius had chosen to connect Asia and Europe with his bridge of boats. Napoleon Bonaparte once remarked that "the nation which holds Constantinople possesses the mastery of the world." Be this as it may, it is beyond question "*that the power which holds Constantinople dominates Russia.*" Flanking the shores of the Black Sea, lie the garden lands of Russia. It is here that her richest and most fertile, and her most densely populated, provinces are situated. It is into the Black Sea that her mightiest rivers flow. The products of the soil and of the shop and the factory always follow the most natural and the cheapest means of transport, the course of the navigable streams. Thus the south of Russia is likely, more and more, to become the citadel and source of her wealth and power. Commerce as well as war seeks a free way to the high seas, and from the view-

point of commerce and war alike, Constantinople is the natural heritage of the czars. A great authority has correctly stated the Muscovite situation relative to the possession of the imperial city of Constantinople:—

“He who is at war with Russia can, if he controls Constantinople, attack her in her most vulnerable part. He may bring Russia to her knees without great military exertion by closing the Bosphorus to Russia’s foreign trade, which is now a far more important factor in Russia’s economic life than it was at the time of Napoleon I, or of the Crimean War, when Russia’s foreign trade was quite insignificant.”—*J. Ellis Barker, Art. “Future of Turkey,” in Fortnightly Review, October, 1908.*

In the days of old, Constantinople was the center of the world’s commerce, when by overland caravan the riches of Asia were hauled to the ports of South Europe, and when European goods were transported to the heart of the Orient via Egypt and the countries skirting the shores of the Black Sea. The sea is the route now taken, but with the phenomenal growth of railroads in the re-

gion south and east of the Black Sea, Constantinople, humanly speaking, is destined to become, once more, one of the greatest marts and most important distributing points on earth.

Constantinople would be a very desirable possession for any Central European power. But it is a vital necessity to Russia. Central European powers on one side, and Russia on the other, with Constantinople as a prize between them, is a situation very much akin to that almost overshadowing challenge which Germany has hurled across the narrow seas to the empire of Great Britain,—“Supremacy on the ocean may be Germany’s *dinner*, but it is Britain’s *life*.” In the case between the Central European powers and the Russian empire, Constantinople may be their dinner, but it is *Russia’s life*.

“Nearly all her great wars were waged for the possession of Constantinople, and she is not likely to abandon her aim now, when the possession of Constantinople is to her far more important and necessary than it has been at any previous period of her history. It is an extremely humiliating and an in-

tolerable position for the greatest state in the world to be denied free access to the sea."—*Id.*

In the past the Austro-Hungarian empire and Great Britain have resisted Russia's endeavors to obtain control or possession of Constantinople. Field Marshal Radetzky, by far the most statesmanlike Austrian general of modern times, has stated the case as between his country and Russia in the following masterly terms:—

"Owing to her geographical position, Russia is the national and eternal enemy of Turkey. The huge territory of that empire can send its produce only through the narrow gates of the Baltic or the Bosphorus. Russia must therefore do all she can to take possession of Constantinople, for its possession gives to her the security she requires, as well as territorial completeness.

"Russia's geographical position makes it indispensable for her to keep open the Bosphorus and the Sound. She can secure the former object only by dividing its shores between two independent powers, or by taking possession of it. Austria might permit the former, and

might also permit Russia to possess an isolated fortress on the straits similar to Gibraltar. But Austria can never tolerate that Russia should incorporate Turkey in part or whole, for in that case Austria would be hemmed in and controlled by Russia. The Danube is Austria's main artery. Its lower reaches in the Black Sea are as necessary to Austria as the Sound and the Dardanelles are to Russia; and in order to utilize the Danube freely, Austria requires also the free use of the Dardanelles. Hence it follows that the conflicting interests of Austria and Russia must lead to war unless both nations arrive at an agreement with regard to Turkey."

There is still another and most potent reason from the Muscovite angle of view why Russia must drive the Turk off the straits, and generally disrupt his empire and terminate his rule. Russia is brought into eternal conflict with the Ottoman government from a racial and religious standpoint. There are vast numbers of men and women of the Slavonic race who owe their civil allegiance to the Turkish star and crescent. The religion of these people is the same as

that of the Russians — the Greek Orthodox Church. On these two counts they are affined to the Russian people by a most powerful dual bond of race and faith. Consequently the manner in which Turkey rules her Christian subjects is a prolific cause of irritation between herself and her northern neighbor.

Now the Russians are a profoundly religious people. Consequently there is something intolerable to them in the thought of a population of their own blood and creed being misruled and persecuted by the Moslems. Popular sentiment in Russia frequently runs so high over this matter that the hand of the government is forced to action.

Thus Russia feels indeed that "Constantinople is the key to her house." Without this strategic spot her war fleet is as good as useless, her trade and commerce is hindered and handicapped, and her foreign trade is in direct danger in time of war. Add to this her deep and almost organic interest in the ever-present alien and religious problem which the Turkish empire involves, and it will readily be seen that sooner or later Russia must float the cross of Saint Andrew over the citadel of the sultans.

The Turkish Revolution—No. 7 Turkey in Prophecy

PERCY T. MAGAN

“Seven Plagues: The Last in Order”

IN the six preceding articles upon “The Turkish Revolution,” I have endeavored to make plain a few of the most salient historical facts connected with that extraordinary and world-startling movement.

In this paper, and in others which will follow, I desire to present some prophetic facts which link the Eastern question of to-day with Sacred Writ penned more than two thousand years ago. This exposition will show that the Eastern question and the Turkish revolution are vitally connected with the close of human probation and the end of the world.

It will be made plain that the Eastern question is one of God’s great signs that the consummation of earth’s history is at hand, and that the age of ages is about to be ushered in. At the present hour

it is undoubtedly the most striking sign of all, the one which is engrossing the minds of kings, ministers of state, chancellors, and the general public more than all others combined.

In the minds of diplomats and statesmen it has come to be what the late Prince Hohenlohe of Prussia would term "the black point." And by this he meant that it was the one dark question beyond which no way leading to light and peace could be discovered. And this great Prussian prince has not been the only statesman who has thus viewed the Eastern question.

For nearly two hundred years the cabinets of Europe have fully realized that when the question of the Turk comes up for final settlement, there is the greatest danger that all the world will become involved in a conflict more bloody and calamitous than any that has heretofore afflicted the children of men.

This is the one fell international war-cloud, of which it can be truly said that it has no silver lining. This is the one dark night on the ever-troubled seas of international affairs beyond which no statesman sees a dawning. Concerning

most questions men feel that while darkness may enshroud their settlement, yet there is light beyond. Concerning this, few men venture an opinion save of the deepest gloom. Thus the settlement of the Turkish question has become one which the statesmen of Europe have dreaded to broach. But now to the Scripture:—

In Isa. 28: 21, 22, it is written: “For the Lord shall rise up as in mount Perazim, he shall be wroth as in the valley of Gibeon, that he may do *his work, his strange work*; and bring to pass *his act, his strange act*. Now therefore be ye not mockers, lest your bands be made strong: for I have heard from the Lord God of hosts *a consumption*, even determined upon the whole earth.”

This is the only statement in the Bible attributing to God the doing of a work different from that which he habitually does. The character and ordinary manifestations of God were once proclaimed by the Lord himself to Moses: “And the Lord passed by before him, and proclaimed, The Lord, The Lord God, merciful and gracious, long-suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping

mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin, and that will by no means clear the guilty; visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, and upon the children's children, unto the third and to the fourth generation." Ex. 34:6, 7.

Then this is God's character as ordinarily manifested. But when God rises up to do "his work, his strange work," and "his act, his strange act," we must perforce look for manifestations far different from those brought to view in the verses already quoted.

The fifteenth and sixteenth chapters of Revelation contain the story of this "strange work" and "this strange act." In them the seven last plagues are enumerated and described.

The first of these chapters opens with the words: "And I saw another *sign* in heaven, great and marvelous, seven angels having the seven *last* plagues; for in them is *filled up* the wrath of God." Rev. 15:1.

First, let it be noted that these plagues are a *sign*. A sign is something which notifies concerning the presence or advent of something else. This sign, as

subsequent scriptures reveal, is one which gives warning that the coming of the Lord is right at hand.

'Again: this verse reveals the fact that these plagues are the "last" plagues which God will ever visit upon the world. It is said that in them the wrath of God is "filled up," i. e., completed, finished. In other words, these plagues are the expression of the completed wrath of God. Elsewhere they are styled "the wine of the wrath of God, . . . *without mixture,*" in "the cup of his indignation." They are, to borrow the language of the prophet Jeremiah, "the wine-cup of this fury." They are said to be "full of the wrath of God." See Rev. 14: 10; Jer. 25: 15; Rev. 15: 7.

Since, therefore, these plagues are "full of the wrath of God," and since that wrath is said to be "without mixture," it is clear that there can not possibly be any mercy, forgiveness, probation, or salvation mixed with the wrath which they contain. Often in Scripture story, divine wrath commingled with *mercy* has been visited upon men. The chastisement was to lead men to repentance and salvation.

With the "seven last plagues" it is different. Since these plagues are "filled up" with "the wrath of God," and are "full of the wrath of God," it is clear that there is no mercy or salvation for any man after they begin to fall. All the dwellers upon earth who live during the time of these plagues must make sure of salvation before these plague angels start upon their mission.

This entire line of reasoning is made still more clear by the English rendering of the Syriac text: "And I saw another prodigy in heaven, great and wonderful, seven angels having seven plagues, *the last in order, because with them the wrath of God is consummated.*" See Syriac Peshitto Version, Murdock's translation, Rev. 15:1.

The word translated plague means "wound" or "calamity." The Greek word from which it is translated is derived from a word meaning to "pound" until the thing pounded is "flattened out."

It is clear, therefore, from all the above, that these plagues are the judgments by means of which God pours his fury upon a world that has given itself

over to atheism and anarchy, and refuses to be saved. They are "the last in order" because with them "the wrath of God is consummated."

Other scriptures substantiate these. "The mystery of God" which is revealed through the gospel "is finished" before this day of "indignation," "wrath," and "fury" begins. Rev. 10:7. Again, it is written that when "the seven angels came out of the temple," "the temple was filled with smoke from the glory of God, and from his power; *and no man was able to enter into the temple, till the seven plagues of the seven angels were fulfilled.*" Rev. 15:6, 8.

Now the only way that men are able "to enter into the temple" in heaven is through the mediation of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, who pleads his righteousness in our behalf, in that most holy place. Heb. 8:1; 9:24. But when the angels start upon their mission with these seven final judgments, Christ himself leaves the heavenly sanctuary. There is, then, no more mediation. No man can enter the temple through Christ, because Christ is not there. The serv-

ice in the temple of God comes to an end, and there is no service for the forgiveness of sins and the cleansing of iniquity while these plagues are being poured out.



The Turkish Revolution—No. 8
Turkey in Prophecy
Six of the Seven Last Plagues

PERCY T. MAGAN

LAST week we spoke of some general features relative to the seven last plagues. This week we desire to present six of these plagues; viz., the first five and the seventh, and to notice especially one striking feature prominent in all of them.

The opening verse of the sixteenth chapter of Revelation relates the commission which is given to the angels having charge over the seven last plagues: "And I heard a great voice out of the temple saying to the seven angels, Go your ways, and pour out the vials of the wrath of God upon the earth."

The word "ways" would indicate that all these angels do not go the same way. Some go one way, and some go another way. In other words, these plagues are not universal. Some fall upon one place, and some upon another.

“ A Noisome and Grievous Sore ”

“ And the first went, and poured out his vial upon the earth; and there fell a noisome and grievous sore upon the men which had the mark [brand] of the beast, and upon them which worshiped his image.” Rev. 16: 2.

From this it is evident that the first plague falls without any warning. Men will awaken to the fact that a new disease —“ a noisome and grievous sore ”— is working devastation and death. There is no train of events beforehand which indicates the approach of this malady. It is, to use a legal phrase, “ an act of God,” that is, something which is in no sense the act or deed of men. It “ falls,” says the scripture; it falls as the rain. Men suffer from it; but beyond this they have no part in it. It is a judgment of God upon men, but it is not the deed of man. Ever since the fall of the human race, God, from time to time, on account of their sins, has visited judgments upon the inhabitants of the earth. Frequently in the administration of these punishments, God uses one nation to scourge another. Thus he used Assyria to scourge Israel. Hence the words,

“Woe to the Assyrian [margin], the rod of mine anger, and the staff in their hand is mine indignation.” Isa. 10: 5.

But this plague, this visitation of judgment, is of a different character; no man or men are used as agents for the chastisement of their fellows. The pain and torture of this plague are an inevitable necessity arising by reason of the operation of God, unaided and unmixed with human agency of any name or nature. The plague is wholly and altogether an “act of God.”

This plague falls upon those who have the mark, or brand, of the beast, and upon them who worship his image. The specific sins which call down this judgment are definitely stated.

“As the Blood of a Dead Man”

In nature and kind the second plague resembles the first: “And’ the second angel poured out his vial upon the sea: and it became as the blood of a dead man: and every living soul died in the sea.” Rev. 16: 3.

There is no indication that this plague gives any warning of its advent. Ships will be sailing the ocean as they have

since the time of the flood, when the water will become, or, more literally, be "congealed," "as the blood of a dead man." This also is an act of God in which no human agency is used.

There has been, according to the Scriptures, great persecution. Men have slain saints and prophets, and this is why God gives them blood to drink. And the third plague is similar, affecting the rivers and fountains of waters.

"And the fourth angel poured out his vial upon the sun; and power was given unto him to scorch men with fire. And men were scorched with great heat, and blasphemed the name of God, which had power over these plagues: and they repented not to give him glory." Rev. 16:8, 9.

This plague, therefore, is caused by the sun being so hot that men are scorched with fire. Scorching is the very next thing to burning. And this is also an "act of God," without the employment of any human instrumentality to administer it.

A Kingdom Full of Darkness

"And the fifth angel poured out his vial upon the seat of the beast; and his

kingdom was full of darkness; and they gnawed their tongues for pain, and blasphemed the God of heaven because of their pains and their sores, and repented not of their deeds." Rev. 16: 10, 11.

This "act of God" is localized. It falls upon "the seat of the beast and his kingdom." The beast is the papacy; consequently Rome, the city of the Vatican, is the seat of the beast. The term "his kingdom" may apply to Roman Catholic countries, or to that territory formerly embraced by the Papal States, but which was made a part of United Italy under Victor Emmanuel in 1870. A plebiscite was held in the Papal States, Oct. 2, 1870. Out of 167,548 votes, 133,681 were cast for union with the kingdom of Italy, and 1,507 against such union. The remainder of the votes were not cast. From this it will be clear that the entire movement was a popular one. It was the people against the pope.

Nevertheless, the papacy has ever held that the whole transaction was a most iniquitous one. It was likened to the taking of Naboth's vineyard by the wicked Ahab. See "Life of Pius IX,"

Mgr. Bernard O'Reilly, chap. 34, par. 11. From that day to this there has been a constant agitation emanating from the Vatican, clamoring for the restoration of the temporal sovereignty of the papacy. Present events would indicate that it is not at all beyond the realm of possibility that the papacy may yet succeed in her endeavors to possess herself of the much-coveted civil scepter in the near future. The event of the plague, however, will make manifest the exact extent of its operation.

Voices, Thunders, Lightnings, Earthquakes

Passing by the sixth plague, for the present, we come to the seventh and last. "And the seventh angel poured out his vial into the air; and there came a great voice out of the temple of heaven, from the throne, saying, It is done. And there were voices, and thunders, and lightnings; and there was a great earthquake, such as was not since men were upon the earth, so mighty an earthquake, and so great. And the great city was divided into three parts, and the cities of the nations fell; and great Babylon come in remembrance before God, to

give unto her the cup of the wine of the fierceness of his wrath. . . . And there fell upon men a great hail out of heaven, every stone about the weight of a talent: and men blasphemed God because of the plague of the hail; for the plague thereof was exceeding great." Rev. 16: 17-21.

Let it be noted that there are a number of separate and distinct acts in these plagues; but all of them, like the five plagues already considered, are acts of God without the use of any human agency. There are voices, and thunders, and lightnings. There is a great earthquake, such as never was since men were upon the earth. The cities of the nations fall. Great Babylon comes in remembrance before God. Islands flee away, and mountains are not found, and great hail falls from heaven.

It is very evident that when this plague is poured out, the destruction of this old earth has arrived. Certainly when there is an earthquake such as was not since men were on the earth, when islands are fleeing away, and mountains can not be found,—certainly when all this is going on,—the foundations of the earth are giving way, and everything

is going to pieces. In short, with this seventh plague comes the end of the world; for, according to the seventeenth verse, this plague is poured out into the air. This is the time when the heavens depart as a scroll when it is rolled together, and a great voice from the throne speaks the words, "It is done."

Now all the things which occur under this plague, considered by themselves, come without warning. How true this is of "voices, and thunders, and lightnings," and of earthquakes, of the disappearance of islands and mountains. In fact, to come without warning is in the very nature of all these things.

Nowadays men scoff at the idea that earthquakes are divine judgments. We are told that a good and merciful God would not cause his creatures such suffering, sorrow, and death. Such a course is supposed to be utterly out of harmony with the nature of a divine and beneficent Creator.

But God himself, in the Inspired Book, distinctly and specifically takes the responsibility for these very things. "For a fire is kindled in mine anger, and shall burn unto the lowest hell, and shall con-

sume the earth with her increase, and set on fire the foundations of the mountains." "The mountains quake at him, and the hills melt, and the earth is burned at his presence, yea, the world, and all that dwell therein. Who can stand before his indignation? and who can abide in the fierceness of his anger? his fury is poured out like fire, *and the rocks are thrown down by him.*" Deut. 32:22; Nahum 1:5, 6, R. V.

Yea, verily all of these things are "acts of God." Men may reason that they are *strange acts*. Aye, aye, they are; the Scripture styles them so: "For the Lord shall rise up as in mount Perazim, he shall be wroth as in the valley of Gibeon, that he may do his work, his *strange work*; and bring to pass his act, his *strange act.*" The entire record makes it clear that these plagues are *his act, his strange act*. They are strange because they are so different from God's ordinary way of dealing with the human family. They are strange, for they are not commingled with mercy. They come only when divine patience is exhausted, when the limit of God's forbearance is reached, when the Lord God of hosts

hath "determined" "a consumption" "upon the whole earth." They do not fall until the fiat has gone forth: "He that is unjust, let him be unjust still: and he which is filthy, let him be filthy still: and he that is righteous, let him be righteous still: and he that is holy, let him be holy still." Rev. 22:11.

Will there be no warning? no way by which men can tell when these terrible calamities are nigh at hand? Has God left the human family to sail an uncharted sea into the vortex of this Charibdis? — O, no; for "the Lord God will do nothing, but he revealeth his secret unto his servants the prophets."

And in a most striking manner, and by a most wonderful way — marvelous because of its simplicity — God has provided a sign whereby men may know when these things are close at hand.

That way is made clear in the story of the sixth plague, the only one of the seven not considered in this article. It will be the subject of the next article.



The Turkish Revolution—No. 9 Turkey in Prophecy

PERCY T. MAGAN

The Great Sign Plague

IN our last article we studied the seven last plagues, with the exception of the sixth. Bible proof was given that each of these, considered by itself, comes without giving any warning of its approach. It was also shown that each and every one of these plagues is an "act of God"—wholly an operation of God, unaided by human agency. Concerning the sixth plague, the record says:—

“And the sixth poured out his bowl upon the great river, the river Euphrates; and the water thereof was dried up, that the way might be made ready for the kings that come from the sunrising. And I saw coming out of the mouth of the dragon, and out of the mouth of the beast, and out of the mouth of the false prophet, three unclean spirits, as it were frogs: for they are spirits of devils, working signs; which go forth unto the

kings of the whole world, to gather them together unto the war of the great day of God, the Almighty. (Behold, I come as a thief. Blessed is he that watcheth, and keepeth his garments, lest he walk naked, and they see his shame.) And they gathered them together into the place which is called in Hebrew Har-Magedon." See Rev. 16:12-16, R. V.

First let it be noted that this plague is entirely different in nature and character from the five which precede it, and the seventh, which follows it. Whereas all of those are acts of God, administered without the use of any human instrumentalities, this one, while a judgment of God, is in a large degree the act of men,—of kings and their armies. It involves action upon the part of "the kings of the East," and of "the kings of the earth," and of the kings "of the whole world."

Under this plague all of these and their military forces are to be gathered together into a place called in the Hebrew tongue Armageddon.

These kings and their armies are to come from the north, and the south, and the east, and the west. Briton and Ger-

man, American, Japanese, and Chinese are all to be there. From one end of earth to the other is to be a tremendous movement of troops and munitions and ordnance of war. There is to be a battle royal, in which all the kings of the earth are to take part. The agencies which gather all of these to this great battle, are said to be three unclean spirits, which possess the power of working miracles.

Now the lining up of nations for battle; the grouping of world powers for war; the preparation of stores, ammunition, and artillery for world-shaking battle, all take time. Political and diplomatic events and misunderstandings of one kind and another must take place, and these can not occur in a moment. Circumstances must be generated on account of commercial or territorial reasons, which result in national suspicions and frictions. These take months and years to develop.

This, therefore, is the only one of the plagues which is not, in the legal sense, "an act of God." It is a judgment of God; but it is a visitation, or calamity, in which human instrumentalities and

human agencies act a part. And in this particular it differs altogether from the rest of the plagues.

Consequently this plague is the only one which can be seen in the making. It alone can be observed shaping up. It is the only one that men can watch in the course of preparation.

Therefore the sixth plague is the *great "sign" plague*, to give warning, not only of itself, but of all the plagues; for when men see this plague in the making, they must know that not only is the pouring out of it near at hand, but that the five others which precede it are nearer still. This world-wide war and strife which culminates in the battle of Armageddon, is the sixth plague in order. The plague of the "noisome and grievous sore," of the turning of the sea into "the blood of a dead man;" of the transforming of the rivers and fountains of water into "blood;" of the scorching of men with great heat by the sun; and of darkness upon a certain portion of the earth,—these, one and all, fall prior to the pouring out of the sixth.

Now into the very heart of the record of the sixth plague is injected a notable

verse, the fifteenth: "Behold, I come as a thief. Blessed is he that watcheth, and keepeth his garments, lest he walk naked, and they see his shame." This scripture would appear at first sight to be out of its proper place. But let it be noted that the verse is in parentheses in the Revised Version, and in most versions aside from the King James Version. Let it be noted that there is no verse of similar import anywhere in the record of the other plagues. There is not a line of like character to be found in any of them. Now why is this verse thrown into the bosom of the story of the sixth plague? It begins with the word "Behold," which is a command, not only to look, but to watch, and to watch intently. It signifies an order to gaze steadfastly at a thing, and to study it earnestly.

This verse calls upon men to watch. We are to watch the garments of our characters, and especially and particularly are we to watch this sixth plague. We are to behold it, and to watch and observe its progress, and as we see it approaching, prepare our souls for the great day of God, which it ushers in. This is the only plague the coming of

which men can watch. And that is why this fifteenth verse is embedded in the heart of its story.

For the time being, then, the sixth plague is the all-important one to watch and study and understand. In the ultimate, this plague is a war — “the war of the great day of God.” See Rev. 16: 14, R. V. “The kings that come from the sunrising,” and the kings “of the earth,” and of “the whole world” are involved in it. What more striking sign of the second coming of Christ could God give than this? War, perhaps more than anything else, attracts the interest and fastens the attention of all mankind. And universal war, in the very nature of events, is the thing of all others in which all mankind are interested. It affects more than any other earthly condition, the necessities of life, the commerce, the wealth, the homes, and all the most sacred ties of the human family.

The scenes of this plague close with the great battle of Armageddon, or the battle of the great day of God Almighty.

Let us now begin to examine the scripture which describes this plague, and learn what we can relative to the events

which are there outlined, and which lead up to the last great battle of the great day of God Almighty. In the international events of to-day we shall distinguish the things portrayed in the story of the plague. Great race questions are now pending. Are these the things prophesied? Are events now taking place which will prepare the way for "the kings of the East,"—the kings that come from *the sunrising*?

Here are the opening words of the plague: "And the sixth angel poured out his vial upon the great river Euphrates; and the water thereof was dried up, that the way of the kings of the East might be prepared." See Rev. 16: 12.

The Euphrates is the largest river in Western Asia. It rises in Armenia. Armenia is now and has been ever since the sixteenth century, a part of the Turkish empire. This river is first mentioned in the Bible in Gen. 2: 14. It is one of the four streams mentioned in connection with the garden of Eden. The Hebrew word rendered Euphrates literally means "to break forth." And it may be of passing interest to note

that it was in the vicinity of this body of water that our first parents fell, when the long night of sin and sorrow first broke forth and had its beginning. And it would appear from the prophecy that in the Turkish territory, where the Euphrates rises, and through which for many a mile her waters flow, the long night of earth's history is destined to come to an end forever, at the great battle of Armageddon.



The Turkish Revolution—No. 10

Turkey the Flash-Point

PERCY T. MAGAN

IN the last issue of the REVIEW, under the title "The Great Sign Plague," it was made clear from the Word of God that the sixth in order of the seven last plagues is the only one that can be seen taking shape and coming into being. It was further established that this plague has to do with the operations of "the kings of the East," or, as the Revised Version reads, "the kings that come from the *sunrising*," and with "the kings of the earth and of the whole world," and that all of these are to be gathered to "the battle of that great day of God Almighty." And again it was made manifest that the lining up of the world powers for the final fray constituted God's great sign that human probation is about to close, that opportunity for salvation is soon to cease.

It is therefore all-important that every point in the Scripture bearing upon this plague be thoroughly and clearly understood. I quote again the story of this plague as it is in the Scripture:—

“And the sixth poured out his bowl upon the great river, the river Euphrates; and the water thereof was dried up, that the way might be made ready for *the kings that come from the sun-rising*. And I saw coming out of the mouth of the dragon, and out of the mouth of the beast, and out of the mouth of the false prophet, three unclean spirits, as it were frogs: for they are spirits of devils, working signs; which go forth unto the kings of the whole world, to gather them together unto the war of the great day of God, the Almighty. (Behold, I come as a thief. Blessed is he that watcheth, and keepeth his garments, lest he walk naked, and they see his shame.) And *they* gathered them together into the place which is called in Hebrew Har-Magedon.” Rev. 16:12-16, R. V.

Now notice that the closing scene in this plague is the “war of the great day of God,” and that by means of the

agency of unclean spirits, "the kings that come from the sunrising," and "the kings of the whole world," are gathered together for the battle of Armageddon. And notice again that the starting point of this entire drama, the opening scene in the plague, is laid around the river Euphrates,—is the drying up of the water of the great river Euphrates.

Whatever this is, it is the flash-point of the whole international situation. It is the thing which touches off the powder in the world-wide magazine. For it is when the water of the great river Euphrates is dried up that the way of the kings that come from the sunrising is made ready — made ready for them to do battle with "the kings of the whole world."

What, then, does the prophet mean by saying that the water of the great river Euphrates is to be dried up? and what is portrayed in the expression, "the great river, the river Euphrates"?

The Euphrates River plays a prominent part in Bible history. It is called "the river" (Ex. 23:31), and "the great river" (Deut. 1:7). The breadth of this stream varies from two hundred

to four hundred yards, and the general depth of its upper waters is approximately eight feet. "It is shallow enough in some places for loaded camels to pass in autumn." See Bible Encyclopedia, edited by Rev. Samuel Fallows, Art. "Euphrates."

Now this literal river Euphrates, which rises in the Armenian mountains and empties into the Persian Gulf, has been crossed and recrossed by kings and their armies times without number. Eight feet of water could not for a moment be expected to check the onward march of a twentieth-century army, with all the modern bridge equipments. There is no reason why "*the kings that come from the sunrising*" should be stopped for any appreciable length of time by this river.

Does the prophecy, then, refer to the literal flowing waters of the Euphrates? — We think not. Many things referred to in the book of Revelation are referred to by means of symbols. The book is largely one of signs and symbols. This is made clear from the first verse of the first chapter: —

"The revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him, to show unto his

servants things which must shortly come to pass; and he sent and *signified* it by his angel unto his servant John."

The word "signified" is only *signified*. Signifying is letting a person know a certain thing by means of a sign. Is it fair interpretation, then, to hold that the "great river, the river Euphrates," and the drying up of the water thereof, are symbolic, rather than literal terms?

First, is a river ever taken in the Bible to represent the nation, or power, or empire, which occupies the territory contiguous to its waters? That this is a fact can be proved from a number of scriptures. It can be shown in the case of several rivers, and of none more clearly than of this very river Euphrates. Note the following texts:—

"And now what hast thou [Israel] to do in the way of *Egypt*, to *drink the waters of Sihor*? or what hast thou to do in the way of *Assyria*, to *drink the waters of the river*?" Jer. 2:18. In this text the expression "the waters of Sihor" is clearly synonymous with Egypt. Sihor was the ancient name for the river Nile. Therefore the waters of the river Nile are taken to represent the

Egyptian nation. And the same principle is seen in the latter part of the verse —“Or what hast thou [Israel] to do in the way of Assyria, to drink of the waters of the river?” Here again the Assyrian nation is referred to as “the waters of the river.” And the great river of the land of Assyria was the Euphrates. But note again:—

“Now therefore, behold, the Lord bringeth up upon them [Israel] *the waters of the river, strong and many, even the king of Assyria, and all his glory*: and he shall come up over all his channels, and go over all his banks: and he shall pass through Judah, and he shall overflow and go over, he shall reach even to the neck; and the stretching out of his wings shall fill the breadth of thy land, O Immanuel.” Isa. 8: 7, 8.

There can be no possible question as to the meaning of the expression, “the waters of the river, strong and many,” in this verse, for it is explained immediately after its use by the words, “even the king of Assyria, and all his glory.” This is so clear on the face of it that it scarcely needs any comment.

And the same characteristic of Scripture imagery is seen in the following:—

“Let not the swift flee away, nor the mighty man escape; they shall stumble, and fall toward the north by the river Euphrates. *Who is this that cometh up as a flood, whose waters are moved as the rivers? Egypt riseth up like a flood, and his waters are moved like the rivers;* and he saith, I will go up, and will cover the earth; I will destroy the city and the inhabitants thereof.” Jer. 46:6-8.

Here again the words “river” and “flood” and “waters” are taken to describe the Egyptian nation. And from all these it must be clear that the practise of signifying a country and nation by the name of its great river was a common custom in that elder day. There is, therefore, nothing strange in the fact that the book of Revelation should describe the nation and people dwelling in the territory contiguous to the Euphrates River as “the great river, the river Euphrates.” Indeed, the term can hardly be truthfully described as symbolical. It is simply the use of a very common piece of Bible imagery.

But even if this be not proof sufficient, let it be noted that "waters" are plainly stated in the very next chapter of the book of Revelation to signify "peoples, and multitudes, and nations, and tongues." Rev. 17:15. And therefore, from all of the above, it is evident that the word "waters" in this plague signifies the people and the power which dominate the territory adjacent to the Euphrates River. Now these people are none other than the Turks, and this power no other than the Ottoman Turkish empire.

It is this Ottoman empire, then, which is to be "dried up." It is this power which is to come to an end in order that "*the way might be made ready for the kings that come from the sunrising.*" It is the drying up of this Turkish empire which is the signal for the coming of these kings from the rising of the sun to do terrific battle with the kings of the earth and of the whole world. In other words, it is the passing of the Turk which acts as the flash-point, and brings about the long-looked-for universal war.

In all seriousness let it be asked, Are there signs in the political and diplomatic

world that the Turkish empire is liable to come to an end almost any day? And are there also signs that the *kings from the rising of the sun* are preparing for world-shaking combat with the powers that lie to the west of the Turkish empire? Are the mutterings of battle-storm to be heard in the far East,—in the lands of the rising of the sun? Did not the deathless fame of Nanshan, the splendid victory of Liao-yang, the Mukden triumph which set the world quivering; the failure of Muscovite against Japanese at Port Arthur, and the annihilation of the Russian battle fleet in the Straits of Tsu Shima,—did not one and all of these cause the heart of every child of the Orient to leap, and to believe to the very depths of his soul that the verdict of the battle of Marathon had at last been reversed, and that it had now been demonstrated that Orientals could conquer Caucasians, and that the hour for the yellow men and the brown men, and for all the dusky sons of the East, to come into their own had at last struck on the great clock of time?



The Turkish Revolution.—No. 11
Statesmen and the Turkish
Question

PERCY T. MAGAN

IN a previous number of the REVIEW I showed that the sixth plague is the great sign plague,—the only one of the seven last plagues which can be seen shaping up,—the one which gives warning of the coming of all the plagues, and of the close of probation.

In the last issue of this paper it was made clear that the opening scene in the drama of this scourge is laid by the waters of “the great river, the river Euphrates,” which expression was shown to refer to the nation having for its domain the territory adjacent to this stream—the Ottoman empire.

Then from these premises it was established that when the “water” of “the great river, the river Euphrates,” is “*dried up*,” i. e., when the passing of the

Turk comes, this is the signal for a tremendous movement on the part of "the kings that come from the *sun-rising*," viz., the Oriental powers, who join in battle with "the kings of the whole world" at a place called in the Hebrew tongue, Armageddon.

Thus the settlement of the "Turkish question" is, according to the Scripture, the pivot around which the universal war program revolves. It is, as indicated by the Word of God, the flash-point of the situation.

Such is the prophecy of Sacred Writ, penned, under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, two thousand years ago. And now it may properly be asked, Do the statesmen indorse the position of the Scripture? Do kings and prime ministers, chancellors and chief secretaries for foreign affairs, agree with the Bible writers that the Turkish question is the flash-point?

To state that they do seems almost unnecessary; for all the world, to say nothing of statesmen, is talking about the Eastern question, and has been talking about it for nearly two centuries. Any man who has paid any attention at

all to the international history of the last two hundred years knows that this is so. Any living man of ordinary information and intelligence knows that the "Eastern question" in our day has proved itself almost perennial. The "Turkish" is, and has been for years, the one great international "question." There is no British question, or German question, or French or United States question, but there *is* a Turkish question, and so much so that the expression has become a household phrase the world over. And in proof of all the above, if proof be needed, let me introduce the language of a great student and statesman — a noted figure in near-Eastern politics: —

"The Eastern question, which began with Constantine and Theodosius, stretches through the centuries. It is ever old and ever new, like a figure in mythology, or a siren who exercises a mysterious and irresistible attraction and destroys the victim she draws into her clutches. In vain it seems from time to time extinct like a volcano, or stifled by stratagem or brute force. After a rest, sometimes long and sometimes short, it comes to life again, often with

greater vigor than before. Thereupon every one looks anxiously to the East; for the interests at stake are so important and complicated that Europe and Asia, and even America, can not stand by as unconcerned spectators of the struggle which recurs century after century for the possession of the Bosphorus, the Hellespont, and the Ægean Sea. The East has been the goal of every ambition of the Christian and barbarian powers alike. The Eastern question gave the spur to the politics of the twelfth, thirteenth, and fourteenth centuries, as much as to those of the fifteenth, sixteenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth, and bids fair to provide plenty of material for the diplomatists of the twentieth century. . . .

“Frederick Barbarossa and Baudoin, Stefan Dochan and Mohomet, Soliman and Charles V, John Sobieski and Peter the Great, Joseph II and the Empress Catherine, Napoleon and Alexander I, Lord Palmerston, Napoleon III, and the Czar Nicholas, Prince Gortschakof and Lord Beaconsfield, each tried in his own way to find a solution for this dangerous problem, and, what is still more significant, each one failed, each one sacri-

cant, each one failed, each one sacrificed in vain some of the best years of his life, and most of them the blood of valiant soldiers. When they thought they were on the point of reaching their goal, they fell on the way, and their work did not survive the influence of their political genius. Could there be more instructive lessons than these for the politicians of to-day if only they would allow themselves to be guided by the precedents of history?"—*Mil. R. Ivanovitch, Art. "The Future of the Balkans," in London Fortnightly Review, June, 1909.*

And there is a reason, a mighty reason, why the Eastern question is, like the poor, ever present with us. Not without reason is it "ever old and ever new." Not without purpose is it a fact that "in vain it seems from time to time extinct like a volcano, or stifled by stratagem or brute force." There can be no question over the statement that "after a rest, sometimes long and sometimes short, it comes to life again, often with greater vigor than before." Magnificently has Ivanovitch stated the truth when he tells how the greatest statesmen of Europe,

from Frederick Barbarossa at one end of the line through John Sobieski and Peter the Great to the Earl of Beaconsfield at the other, have "each tried in his own way to find a solution for this *dangerous problem*, and, what is still more significant, each one failed."

Why, then, is the Eastern question, among all the great international complications, which from time to time have risen into prominence, the only one which, like the brook that turns the mill, goes on forever?

It is because God has set it for the great sign of the close of human probation and of the end of the world. He tells all mankind that it is the sign that the cases of all men living are soon to be decided, and their everlasting destiny sealed for weal or for woe.

God desires to warn all the world of this fact. He uses this sign to reveal to every man and woman on the earth where we are in the stream of time. He longs to save the children of men, and so he sets up and displays mighty, gigantic, and world-shaking events as signs, that men may know that now or never must they prepare to meet their God.

And this is why the Eastern question will not down. For years God has kept it ever before us. He has done this that by reading the Scriptures and watching the lining up of all the world powers around the Eastern question, which is the vortex of the whirlpool, we may know and realize that the unmingled wrath of heaven is about to fall; for when the Eastern question comes up for final settlement, events most vital to each individual soul will have been forever settled. But hear the historical authorities and the statesmen further:—

“During the war between Russia and Turkey in 1828-29 the Russian General Diebitsch marched his troops across the Balkans and proceeded straight to Adrianople. Here he was only one hundred twenty-five miles from Constantinople, the Ottoman capital. At the same time Paskerditch, another Russian commander, took Erzerum, in Asia; and a great authority says that “the two generals would doubtless have joined hands in Constantinople, but for the efforts of diplomacy, and the fear of a general conflagration.”—“*Historians' History of the World,*” Vol. XVII, pages 544-545.

Prince Bismarck, chancellor of the German empire, speaking in the Reichstag in 1888, declared that it was only the Congress of Berlin that prevented the Russo-Turkish War of 1877-78 "from putting the whole of Europe in a blaze."

In 1895, during the dark days of the Armenian massacres, the Emperor Franz Josef of Austria exclaimed, when a certain move was proposed: "No, that would set fire to the powder."

On Nov. 9, 1895, the late Marquis of Salisbury, then prime minister of England, made a remarkable speech at the Mansion House in London. These Mansion House speeches by British prime ministers are always intended to give to the world the policy of the British government relative to questions of universal interest. The world had been on the tiptoe of expectancy for several days, watching eagerly for the summing up of the Eastern situation, and in the following remarkable language did the chief minister describe it:—

"Turkey is in that remarkable condition that it has now stood for half a century, mainly because the great powers of the world have resolved that for the

peace of Christendom it is necessary that the Ottoman empire should stand. They came to that conclusion nearly half a century ago. I do not think they have altered it now. The danger, if the Ottoman empire fall, would not merely be the danger that would threaten the territories of which that empire consists, but that the fire there lighted would spread to other nations, and would involve all that is most powerful and civilized in Europe in a dangerous and calamitous contest. That was a danger which was present to the minds of our fathers when they resolved to make the integrity and independence of the Ottoman empire a matter of European treaty, and that is a danger which has not passed away.”
—*Published by the Armenian Information Bureau, London, 1895.*

From all the above it is clear that statesmen of our own day realize very fully that the Turkish question is the flash-point. Their view of the situation tallies with the prophecy of the Scripture. And more than this, the emperor of Germany has publicly stated that when the Turk goes, it will be the signal for the Oriental nations to make their

mighty move to try out conclusions at arms with the Western powers. Space will not permit of this quotation in this paper. Suffice to say that at least one European potentate sees in the destruction of the Turk the making ready of "the way of the kings that come from the sunrising."

And more than this, the statesmen know that all the moves which have been made to stay off the evil day of settlement of the eternal Turkish question are altogether temporary and artificial.

This was made very clear by Lord Salisbury in a conversation with Chedo Mijatovich, one of Serbia's greatest statesmen. On this point he expressed the following opinion:—

"The Berlin treaty is altogether artificial. It created artificial conditions which probably, as you say, can not last very long. But what human work, and more especially what diplomatic work, is not artificial? Not only diplomacy, but history also creates artificial conditions. The Berlin Congress had to deal principally with Turkey in Europe,—not only an artificial, but an unnatural creation in itself,—complicated with the tem-

porary results of the last war, and with the more permanent international jealousies. If you wish to know my personal opinion, I will tell you that the only natural, logical, and healthy Balkan policy for Great Britain would be that one formulated by Mr. Gladstone: 'The Turks ought to be driven out of Europe with all their bag and baggage.' Unfortunately, the Eastern question is so complicated, and the European system so artificial, that I as Her Majesty's principal secretary of foreign affairs, can not apply the policy which I consider the only true and natural one."—*Chedo Mijatovich, in the Fortnightly Review, December, 1907.*

A great prime minister of Medo-Persia,—Daniel, the author of that book in the Bible which bears his name,—five hundred years before the birth of Christ, had written of the time of the passing of the Turk: "And at that time shall Michael stand up, the great prince which standeth for the children of thy people: and there shall be a time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation even to that same time: and at that time thy people shall be de-

livered, every one that shall be found written in the book." Dan. 12:1. And John, the seer of Patmos, told how the passing of the Turk would be the signal for the long-looked-for coming of the kings from the rising of the sun to do battle with the kings of the earth and of the whole world.

Almost indeed do the words of Chancellor Bismarck of Germany; Emperor Franz Josef of Austria; and the Marquis of Salisbury, premier of Great Britain, seem to be but the answering echo of the prophetic utterance of the Hebrew Daniel, the chancellor of that empire of the elder day. The one said that when that time came, there would be a time of trouble such as never was since there was a nation on the earth. The others said it would start the conflagration, set Europe in a blaze, set fire to the powder, and that the fire that is lighted by the demolition of the Turkish empire would spread to other nations, and involve all that is most powerful and most civilized in a dangerous and calamitous contest.



The Advent Review and Sabbath Herald July 8, 1909
The Advent Review and Sabbath Herald July 15, 1909
The Advent Review and Sabbath Herald July 22, 1909
The Advent Review and Sabbath Herald July 29, 1909
The Advent Review and Sabbath Herald August 5, 1909
The Advent Review and Sabbath Herald August 12, 1909
The Advent Review and Sabbath Herald September 9, 1909
The Advent Review and Sabbath Herald September 16, 1909
The Advent Review and Sabbath Herald September 30, 1909
The Advent Review and Sabbath Herald October 7, 1909
The Advent Review and Sabbath Herald October 14, 1909



The Turkish Straits (Turkish: Türk Boğazları) are two internationally significant waterways in northwestern Turkey. The Straits create a series of international passages that connect the Aegean and Mediterranean seas to the Black Sea. They consist of the Dardanelles and the Bosphorus. The straits are on opposite ends of the Sea of Marmara. The straits and the Sea of Marmara are part of the sovereign sea territory of Turkey and are treated as Turkish internal waters.



The ongoing Russia-Ukraine war aims to secure Russia’s access to the Black Sea. Russia lacks viable southern seaports due to geography, while its northern ports remain frozen and unusable for most of the year. Ultimately, Russia seeks control over Turkey and the Dardanelles and Bosphorus straits to gain unrestricted access to the world’s oceans.