

THE  
DUTY OF  
THE UNITED STATES

✻ TO ✻

AMERICAN CITIZENS  
IN TURKEY



BY  
EVERETT P. WHEELER

THE UNITED STATES

AMERICAN CITIZENS

IN TURKEY

EVERETT & FLETCHER

DR 475  
W 5

Copyright, 1896, by  
FLEMING H. REVELL COMPANY

---

THE NEW YORK TYPE-SETTING COMPANY  
THE CAXTON PRESS



THE DUTY OF THE  
UNITED STATES OF  
AMERICA TO AMER-  
ICAN CITIZENS IN  
TURKEY

AN ADDRESS

DELIVERED BEFORE THE AMERICAN BOARD OF COMMISS-  
IONERS FOR FOREIGN MISSIONS, AT TOLEDO, OHIO

OCTOBER 7, 1896

BY  
*Everett P. Wheeler*  
EVERETT P. WHEELER, A. M.

OF THE NEW YORK BAR, AND AUTHOR OF THE MODERN LAW OF CARRIERS

"A government touches the lowest point of ignominy  
when it confesses to an inability to protect the lives  
and property of its citizens"

FISKE

61344  
Nov. 9. 1896  
FLEMING H. REVELL COMPANY  
NEW YORK CHICAGO TORONTO

1896

## PREFATORY NOTE

THOUGH the following address was delivered before the American Board, yet I was in no sense the spokesman of that board, and disclaimed all authority to speak as such. I submit the arguments and precedents contained in the address for the consideration of the national administration and of the American people.

The address has been criticised on the ground that the Turkish government is poor and that it would be oppressive to insist on an immediate payment of indemnity. True, the Turkish government is poor in the sense that any spendthrift is poor who impoverishes his resources and wastes his substance in riotous living. Undoubtedly it is short of ready money, but this does not seem to be a good reason for compelling American citizens to make a forced loan to the Turkish

## PREFATORY NOTE

government of the value of their property, which has been destroyed by violence, which the Turkish government failed to prevent, actually encouraged, and has not punished. Yet, if the Turkish government would now punish those who committed or connived at these outrages, and would thereby ensure security for the future to the hundreds of innocent American citizens now in Turkey, we could well afford to wait a little for the payment of indemnity. What the Turkish government actually does is best stated in an extract from a private letter, which I have received since the address was delivered. I omit the names in order that my correspondent may not be subjected to oppression.

“The Wali was in —— in May, accompanied by ——, who had not only not been called to account for his misdemeanors, but had even been appointed to a responsible and important office as superintendent of construction of roads. His return with the honor conferred upon him greatly emboldened the Kurds, so that they began again the impositions upon the Christians, which they had broken off when he was summoned to ——. He himself did some plundering, and naturally his retainers followed his example, so that the state of affairs seemed likely to become worse than ever.”

I will only add that my statements as to what

## PREFATORY NOTE

has been done to our citizens in Turkey are made on the authority of eye-witnesses, with whom I have conversed or from whom I have received private letters.

EVERETT P. WHEELER.

NEW YORK, October 29, 1896.



## ADDRESS

FOR seventy years American citizens have been engaged in a labor of love among the native Christians in the Turkish Empire. They have founded schools and colleges, have established hospitals, published and sold books, fed the hungry, clothed the naked, taught the ignorant—in a word, have brought light to those that sat in darkness and in the shadow of death.

Even before the treaty of 1830 between the United States and the Ottoman Empire, American citizens had taken up their residence in various parts of Turkey, particularly in the neighborhood of Constantinople and in Asia Minor. Under the protection afforded by that treaty, the number of our citizens resident in Turkey has greatly increased, and the investment of property there has risen to the extent of over nine million dollars, exclusive of the floating capital which may from time to time be employed solely for purposes of gainful trade. These American citizens have

## THE DUTY OF THE UNITED STATES

engaged in the business which I have described, and provided in various ways for the education and health of native Christians, subjects of the Ottoman Empire. As far as was permitted by the Turkish government, this business has extended itself to Mussulmans, and no discrimination has been made against them; but the principal activity of these American citizens has necessarily been confined to the members of the ancient Christian churches of Asia, who have adhered to their faith in spite of persecution and suffering, and with scarcely any opportunities for education or improvement. During the last few years the liberty which our citizens engaged in the business just mentioned had previously enjoyed has been seriously imperiled; their property to the amount of about two hundred thousand dollars has been destroyed; houses belonging to American citizens and occupied by them have been attacked and fired on by mobs, who were supported and encouraged by Turkish troops and government officials; false accusations have been made against American citizens for the evident purpose of making their residence so uncomfortable that they would be compelled to leave the country, and some of them have been driven away. The Turkish government has refused to grant to consuls duly accredited from this country the *berat* or *exequat*ur which is usually granted to consuls;

## TO AMERICAN CITIZENS IN TURKEY

no redress whatever has been made for the injury to property and to person, nor have the perpetrators of the injuries been punished.

The present administration has repeatedly brought these grievances to the attention of the Turkish government and demanded redress, but none has been made. More and more the conviction is being forced upon us that the whole fabric, which we have erected with unspeakable toil and many prayers to God, is in danger of destruction, and that the lives of our citizens in Turkey are in extreme peril.

The situation is grave and demands our most careful consideration. Let us first consider what our rights are, and then what duty demands.

Our rights in Turkey begin with the treaty of 1830. Let me read the first four articles of that treaty.

“ART. 1. American merchants who shall come to the well-defended countries and ports of the Sublime Porte shall pay the same duties and imposts that are paid by merchants of the most favored friendly powers, and they shall not in any way be vexed or molested.

“ART. 2. The United States may appoint their citizens to be consuls or vice-consuls at the commercial places in the dominions of the Sublime Porte, where it shall be found needful to superintend the affairs of commerce. These consuls

## THE DUTY OF THE UNITED STATES

or vice-consuls shall be furnished with berats or firmans, they shall enjoy suitable distinction, and shall have necessary aid and protection.

“ART. 3. American merchants established in the well-defended states of the Sublime Porte for purposes of commerce \* \* \* shall not be disturbed in their affairs, nor shall they be treated in any way contrary to established usage.

“ART. 4. Even when they may have committed some offense, they shall not be arrested or put in prison by the local authorities, but they shall be tried by their minister or consul, and punished according to their offense, following in this respect the usage observed toward other Franks.” \*

You perceive that the extent of our rights under this treaty depends upon the meaning to be given to the words “merchants” and “commerce.” It has been claimed that these words must be strictly construed and that they apply only to those who are carrying on a gainful trade.

This definition of the words used in the treaty is not justified either by the language of the treaty or by the practice under it. The rule on this subject is thus stated by the highest authority, the Supreme Court of the United States, as follows: †

\* “Treaties and Conventions, 1776-1887,” edition of 1889; “Senate Ex. Doc. 47, 48th Cong., 2d Sess.,” pp. 798, 799.

† *Ross vs. McIntyre*, 140 U. S. 585.

## TO AMERICAN CITIZENS IN TURKEY

“It is a canon of interpretation to so construe a law or a treaty as to give effect to the object designated, and for that purpose all of its provisions must be examined in the light of attendant and surrounding circumstances. To some terms and expressions a literal meaning will be given, and to others a larger and more extended one. The reports of adjudged cases and approved legal treatises are full of illustrations of the application of this rule. The inquiry in all such cases is as to what was intended in the law by the legislature and in the treaty by the contracting parties.”

The practical interpretation given to this treaty and the objects for which it was negotiated alike show that it was the intention of the government to secure protection for all our citizens residing in Turkey. The treaty of 1862 \* strongly confirms this view of the subject. The first article of this treaty contains the following provision :

“ART. I. All rights, privileges, and immunities which have been conferred on the citizens or vessels of the United States of America by the treaty already existing between the United States of America and the Ottoman Empire are confirmed now and forever, with the exception of those clauses of the said treaty which it is the object of the present treaty to modify.”

There has been made a question whether the

\* “Treaties and Conventions,” p. 800.

## THE DUTY OF THE UNITED STATES

latter treaty has been terminated. In the discussion regarding its termination, the principal question that has been debated has been the effect of the treaty, or its termination, upon the duties upon merchandise. It has never been claimed that the rights, privileges, and immunities conferred on American citizens by the treaty of 1830 were to any extent limited to those engaged in gainful trade, and no such limitation is to be found in the language just quoted. This question came under the consideration of our government in 1855, and the attorney-general (Hon. Caleb Cushing) gave the opinion that "commerce in the treaty means any subject or object of residence or intercourse whatever." \*

This construction has been acquiesced in by the Ottoman Porte for many years. It has in effect been written into the treaty and is as much a part of it as the original language. No rule of statutory construction is better settled than that the practical construction which is given by both governments to a particular clause in a constitution, or treaty made in pursuance of it, is as much a part of the text as if it was expressly stated therein. In the interest of American citizens this rule should be adhered to, and our government should be astute to construe treaties liberally for the protection of its citizens.

\* 7 Op. Atty.-Gen. 567.

## TO AMERICAN CITIZENS IN TURKEY

It can hardly be contended that the business of publishing and selling books, of educating children, of curing the sick, is not as much entitled to protection as the business of selling sugar or petroleum or wheat.

Indeed, the necessities of the natives have become such that American citizens residing in Turkey have gone on a very large scale into the business of making clothing for them, and are now actually manufacturing and supplying clothing to thousands of persons. It certainly would be extraordinary if in 1896 this government should recede from the position taken by it in 1855, and refuse to its citizens when it is great and powerful the protection that it assured them when it was comparatively weak and poor.

In the learned opinion of Attorney-General Cushing, already quoted, reference is made to the treaties between Turkey and governments other than our own, and to the provision in Article 3 of the treaty of 1830, that

“American merchants established in the well-defended states of the Sublime Porte for purposes of commerce shall not be disturbed in their affairs, nor shall they be treated in any way contrary to established usage.”

The attorney-general shows that this established usage is that American citizens in Turkey have the “privilege of extraterritoriality,” that is

## THE DUTY OF THE UNITED STATES

to say, that they have the right of having controversies between themselves and the Turkish government determined in a consular court.

We do not need, however, to rely upon this opinion of the attorney-general. The Supreme Court of the United States has thus stated the rule :

“The practice of European governments to send officers to reside in foreign countries, authorized to exercise a limited jurisdiction over vessels and seamen of their country, to watch the interests of their countrymen, and to assist in adjusting their disputes and protecting their commerce, goes back to a very early period, even preceding what are termed the middle ages. During those ages these commercial magistrates, generally designated as consuls, possessed to some extent a representative character, sometimes discharging judicial and diplomatic functions. In other than Christian countries they were, by treaty stipulations, usually clothed with authority to hear complaints against their countrymen and to sit in judgment upon them when charged with public offenses. After the rise of Islamism, and the spread of its followers over western Asia and other countries bordering on the Mediterranean, the exercise of this judicial authority became a matter of great concern. The intense hostility of the people of Moslem faith to all other sects, and particularly to Christians, affected all their inter-

## TO AMERICAN CITIZENS IN TURKEY

course and all proceedings had in their tribunals. Even the rules of evidence adopted by them placed those of different faith on unequal grounds in any controversy with them. For this cause, and by reason of the barbarous and cruel punishments inflicted in those countries and the frequent use of torture to enforce confession from parties accused, it was a matter of deep interest to Christian governments to withdraw the trial of their subjects, when charged with the commission of a public offense, from the arbitrary and despotic action of the local officials. Treaties conferring such jurisdiction upon these consuls were essential to the peaceful residence of Christians within those countries and the successful prosecution of commerce with their people." \*

It is obvious that the privilege thus given by the treaty, and confirmed by the Supreme Court of the United States, cannot be enforced unless a sufficient number of consuls are provided to enforce it. The question is not, as pointed out very clearly in the decision just cited, whether we should have a right to insist upon sending a consul to one of the civilized Christian countries of Europe against the consent of the government. Our relations with Turkey are, it is true, governed by the general rules of international law,

\* *Ross vs. McIntyre*, 140 U. S. 585. To the same effect is *Dainese vs. Hale*, 91 U. S. 13.

## THE DUTY OF THE UNITED STATES

but where those rules have been modified by treaty or by established usage the treaty must control. The stipulation of the treaty, as has been shown, is express, and in insisting upon stationing consuls at any places in Turkey where our citizens live and carry on affairs in which protection is important to them, this government is simply insisting that the Turkish government shall observe its solemn agreement.

The United States in this matter asks from Turkey nothing but what we have asked and received from other countries. President Cleveland's message of December, 1895, states this so clearly that I cannot do better than read what it declares upon this subject :

“There have occurred in widely separated provinces of China serious outbreaks of the old fanatical spirit against foreigners, which, unchecked by the local authorities, if not actually connived at by them, have culminated in mob attacks on foreign missionary stations, causing much destruction of property, and attended with personal injuries, as well as loss of life.

“Although but one American citizen was reported to have been actually wounded, and although the destruction of property may have fallen more heavily upon the missionaries of other nationalities than our own, it plainly behooved this government to take the most prompt and de-

## TO AMERICAN CITIZENS IN TURKEY

cided action to guard against similar, or perhaps more dreadful, calamities befalling the hundreds of American mission stations which have grown up throughout the interior of China under the temperate rule of toleration, custom, and imperial edict. The demands of the United States and other powers for the degradation and punishment of the responsible officials of the respective cities and provinces who by neglect or otherwise had permitted uprisings, and for the adoption of stern measures by the emperor's government for the protection of the life and property of foreigners, were followed by the disgrace and dismissal of certain provincial officials found derelict in duty, and the punishment by death of a number of those adjudged guilty of actual participation in the outrages.

“This government also insisted that a special American commission should visit the province where the first disturbance occurred for the purpose of investigation. This latter commission, formed after much opposition, has gone overland from Tientsin, accompanied by a suitable Chinese escort, and by its demonstration of the readiness and ability of our government to protect its citizens will act, it is believed, as a most influential deterrent of any similar outbreaks.

“The energetic steps we have thus taken are all the more likely to result in future safety to

## THE DUTY OF THE UNITED STATES

our citizens in China because the imperial government is, I am persuaded, entirely convinced that we desire only the liberty and protection of our own citizens, and redress for any wrongs they may have suffered, and that we have no ulterior designs or objects, political or otherwise."

What China has granted Turkey has refused. "Indemnity for the past and security for the future" are our right. But courteous requests, followed by persistent demands, have obtained neither redress nor security. What, then, is the duty of America? I cannot claim on this point to speak as the representative of the American Board; but I thank you for the opportunity of presenting the case as it appears to an American citizen who loves his country and desires most earnestly that her honor be unstained and her citizens be secure. In the position in which Turkey has placed us, is there any course consistent with honor or duty but to support our demands by an adequate armed force? The American government should send a powerful fleet to the Mediterranean, accompanied by a sufficient number of regular troops, and should demand at the cannon's mouth what has been refused to milder requests. In no other way can either redress or security be obtained. Unless we do this we expose our citizens to further outrages and their property to destruction.

## TO AMERICAN CITIZENS IN TURKEY

By this I do not mean that we should engage in war or bombard Turkish cities. I do mean that, unless redress and security are both assured, we should take possession of Smyrna and other ports and collect their revenues until indemnity for the past is obtained and the cost of our occupation reimbursed. Moreover, we must place a guard wherever American citizens are in danger. We go to save men's lives, not to destroy. This is what Vattel and Wheaton\* designate as reprisals, and what they advise as an alternative preferable to war and to be adopted whenever just demands for reparation meet with long-continued neglect or refusal.

Let us consider briefly the objections that have been made to this proposition. I will endeavor to satisfy you that it has the support not only of the

\* On this subject Vattel says (Vattel's "Law of Nations," book ii., chap. xviii.):

"Whenever a sovereign can by the way of reprisals procure a just recompense or a proper satisfaction, he ought to make use of this method, which is less violent and less fatal than war."

Our great American authority, Wheaton, quotes Vattel as to reprisals with approval (Wheaton's "International Law," part iv., chap. i., sec. 3, pp. 509, 510, second edition, by Lawrence), and uses the following language:

"If a nation has taken possession of what belongs to another, if it refuses to pay a debt, to repair an injury, or to give adequate satisfaction for it, the latter may seize something belonging to the former and apply it to its own advantage till it obtains payment of what is due, with interest and damages, or keep it as a pledge till the offending nation has made ample satisfaction."

## THE DUTY OF THE UNITED STATES

traditions and precedents of this government, but of well-established principles of international law.

First, it is said that this government has no power to undertake anything of the sort. This somewhat disgraceful argument is not supported by the facts. The fleet we already have is far more than a match for the Turkish fleet. The army we now have is more than a match for any troops that the Turks could send against us. The whole Turkish Empire is in a state of absolute unrest; in every part of it troops are required to keep down the native population, who would be only too glad to rise against their hated oppressors; most of the Turkish troops are mutinous and either poorly paid or not paid at all. And why should we expect resistance? An American soldier or marine on Turkish soil would not go as an enemy. He would not wage war, but preserve the peace. He would not assail the Mohammedan religion, nor seek to dethrone the sultan. He would go to prevent violence, which the sultan has always disavowed, and to give that protection which the sultan is either unable or unwilling to afford. But if it were otherwise we should not hesitate. One of the richest and most powerful nations in the world will never listen for a moment to the unworthy argument that it has not the power to redress wrongs committed on its citizens.

## TO AMERICAN CITIZENS IN TURKEY

As Mr. Fiske, in his review of our early history,\* justly said, "A government touches the lowest point of ignominy when it confesses to an inability to protect the lives and property of its citizens."

But more. This argument is strangely forgetful of American history. Even in colonial times the New England colonies sent an expedition by sea to Louisburg and besieged and took from France the strongest fortress on the continent. Again, in 1846 and 1847, we conquered California and governed it by a military governor. We sent cavalry and cannon over the land and ships and troops by sea. Either journey occupied over a hundred days. Sherman with his troops was two hundred days on the voyage. From New York to Constantinople is a voyage of twenty-one.

Doniphan's ride from Texas through Mexico to join General Taylor will long be famous in history. Mountains and plains as difficult as those of Asia Minor, and enemies as formidable as the Turks, were successfully overcome.

During the same war we sent twelve thousand men by sea to Vera Cruz, landed them there in one day, marched through the mountain passes to the City of Mexico, and conquered it from forces which often outnumbered ours four to one. General Grant says of this campaign: "Twelve

\* John Fiske's "Critical Period of American History," p. 161.

## THE DUTY OF THE UNITED STATES

thousand was a very small army with which to penetrate two hundred and sixty miles into an enemy's country, and to besiege the capital, a city at that time of largely over one hundred thousand inhabitants. Then, too, any line of march that could be selected led through mountain passes easily defended."\* Yet, in spite of all, we marched to Mexico and captured the city.

This expedition to Mexico in 1847 was ten times as difficult as an expedition now to Asia Minor would be. The time required was greater, the obstacles also greater. Steam and the telegraph have almost annihilated distance and have made it possible for us now to intervene perfectly to protect every one of our citizens within the Turkish dominions. I do not think that an expedition of this sort would bring on war. I cannot doubt that the Turkish government would yield at once to a show of force. But until that force is shown it will do as its Mohammedan cousins in Africa did at the beginning of the century, and despise our treaties and ourselves.

The next objection, and one deserving more careful consideration, is that such a course is opposed to the traditional policy of our government not to interfere with the quarrels and internal affairs of the nations of Europe.

\* "Memoirs," vol. i., p. 129.

## TO AMERICAN CITIZENS IN TURKEY

This is undoubtedly the policy of our country, but it has never been construed to forbid our giving ample protection to the persons and property of our citizens residing in foreign countries or doing business with them. On the contrary, when we were weak and feeble, sparsely settled States scattered along the Atlantic coast, we accomplished a task far exceeding in difficulty and magnitude what I now propose.

During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the powers of Europe allowed their commerce to be preyed upon by the cruisers of the Barbary states and submitted to pay tribute for the ransom of their citizens who were taken captive by these pirates. There was an order of priests called the Mathurins, "the object of whose institution is the begging of alms for the redemption of captives. They have agents residing in the Barbary states, who are constantly employed in searching and contracting for the captives of their own nation, and they redeem at a lower price than any other people can."\* This statement is contained in a letter from Jefferson, written when he was the minister for the confederation at the French court. In a subsequent letter, dated September 18, 1787, in which he communicates his negotiation with the general of this order for prosecuting through their means

\* Jefferson's Works, edition of 1854, vol. ii., p. 93.

## THE DUTY OF THE UNITED STATES

the ransom of American captives, he says: "I must add the injunctions of the General of the Mathurins, that it be not known that the public interest themselves in the redemption of these prisoners, as that would induce the Algerians to demand the most extravagant price."\*

At this time the confederation thought itself too weak to protect our citizens abroad. Jefferson endeavored to convince the home office that the payment of tribute was a disgraceful alternative, to which even a weak people should not submit. Let me remind you of the words of Pinckney, memorable in our early history, but which in these days of wealth and material prosperity we seem to have forgotten: "Not a cent for tribute, millions for defense."

As early as December 13, 1784, Jefferson writes to General Gates: † "We cannot begin in a better cause or against a weaker foe." And again, January 12, 1785, he writes to General Greene: "When this idea [tribute to the Algerians] comes across my mind, all my faculties are absolutely suspended between indignation and impotence." ‡

In the following February he writes to Monroe: § "The motives pleading for war rather

\* Jefferson's Works, edition of 1854, vol. ii., p. 270.

† Jefferson's Works, Ford's edition, vol. iv., p. 424.

‡ *Ibid.*, p. 25.

§ *Ibid.*, p. 32.

## TO AMERICAN CITIZENS IN TURKEY

than tribute are numerous and honorable; those opposing them are mean and short-sighted."

Shortly after these letters the Constitution of the United States was adopted, the new government was inaugurated, Jefferson returned to this country to become Secretary of State, and the question again recurred as to whether a tribute should be paid to the Barbary pirates for immunity from their depredations. Some attempt was made to secure for our vessels in the Mediterranean the protection of the Portuguese government. Respecting this, our resident at Lisbon, Colonel Humphreys, writes to the Secretary of State, December 25, 1793:\* "If we mean to have a commerce we must have a naval force to defend it. It appears absurd to trust to the fleets of Portugal or any other nation to protect and convoy our trade." And yet I find that in 1896, during the massacre at Van, our citizens obtained from England the protection that our own government failed to give. "Major Williams, the British consul, was indefatigable in his efforts to preserve the peace, placing his flag upon the mission premises, thus making these premises the consulate."†

But to return. The new government had so many domestic difficulties to contend with, and its relations with France became so unsatisfactory,

\* Frost's "Book of the Navy," p. 76.

† "Missionary Herald," September, 1896, p. 355.

## THE DUTY OF THE UNITED STATES

that little or nothing was done for the protection of our citizens from the depredations of the Barbary pirates until 1801, when Captain (afterward Commodore) Bainbridge was sent to the Mediterranean with a frigate. So subservient had the nations of Europe become to these Mohammedan powers that Bainbridge felt himself compelled, following their example, to take a present from the Dey of Algiers to the Sultan of Turkey and to actually hoist the Algerian flag at his masthead. This, however, he hauled down as soon as he got out of port. He gave the present to the sultan and returned to Algiers. The Dey had sworn to make no further demands upon him, but no sooner had he returned than he found how little the promises of the Mohammedan could be relied upon. Bainbridge writes:

“The Dey had forgotten the oath he swore not to make any further demands after the first voyage was performed. After such a disregard of his solemn declaration he [Bainbridge] could not doubt his disposition to capture the frigate and enslave her officers and men if she were again in his power.”\*

Our whole experience in negotiation with these pirates shows the justice of what Maclay says in his “History of the Navy”: † “All the subterfuge

\* Maclay’s “History of the Navy,” vol. i., p. 225.

† *Ibid.*, p. 224.

## TO AMERICAN CITIZENS IN TURKEY

and craft known to Oriental diplomacy were brought into play." That subterfuge and craft are playing with us to-day.

When Jefferson became President he determined to carry out the views that he had formed when our minister at Paris, and in 1803 sent a squadron of seven vessels to the Mediterranean. The result of our previous submission is well stated by Commodore Rogers in a letter to the Secretary of the Navy: \*

"All the Barbary states, except Algiers, appear to have a disposition to quarrel with us unless we tamely submit to any propositions they may choose to make. Their demands will increase and be such as our government ought not to comply with."

These demands continued and brought on the war with Tripoli. To this war we sent a fleet of twenty vessels. The first notable exploit was the gallant assault by Decatur upon the frigate *Philadelphia*, which had grounded and been taken by the Tripolitans. On the 12th of July, 1804, Commodore Preble bombarded the city.

Later in the year William Eaton was appointed our naval agent in the Mediterranean, and made an agreement with Hamet, who was the elder brother of the Bashaw of Tripoli, by which Hamet

\* Frost's "Book of the Navy," p. 97.

## THE DUTY OF THE UNITED STATES

agreed to furnish an army, and the United States "to supply cash, ammunition, and provisions," for a land attack.\*

Eaton was accompanied by an American lieutenant of the navy and two American midshipmen. He and Hamet got together a small force of five or six hundred men, who marched five hundred miles across the desert to Derne, which was the most important city of Tripoli on the east. They there met two vessels of the United States navy, who bombarded the citadel; the place was taken by storm; and the American flag hoisted upon its walls.

The result of these operations was an honorable and successful peace. The representatives of the European powers residing in Tripoli said that "no other nation has ever negotiated with the present Dey on such honorable terms." †

The Pope publicly declared that "America had done more for Christendom against the barbarians than all the powers of Europe united." ‡

Sir Alexander Ball, the admiral in command of the British fleet in the Mediterranean, wrote to Commodore Preble: "You have done well in not

\* A full account of this expedition is given in President Jefferson's message, January 13, 1806, Jefferson's Works, vol. viii., p. 54.

† Maclay's "History of the Navy," vol. i., p. 302.

‡ Cooper's "Naval History of the United States," vol. ii., pp. 79, 80.

## TO AMERICAN CITIZENS IN TURKEY

purchasing a peace with money. A few brave men have been sacrificed, but they could not have fallen in a better cause."\*

Jefferson himself, appreciating the great importance and value of what our navy had done, writes to Judge Tyler, March 29, 1805 :

"There is reason to believe the example we have already set begins already to work on the disposition of the powers of Europe to emancipate themselves from that degrading yoke. Should we produce such a revolution there, we shall be amply rewarded for what we have done."†

It thus appears that at a time when the population of this country was small, its resources limited, its finances scarcely recovered from the disorganization caused by the depreciated currency of the confederation, we had the courage to undertake and the skill to achieve a complete deliverance of our citizens from degrading submission to the exactions of these cruel and treacherous Mohammedan powers. No adherence to treaties can ever be expected from them, except as it is secured by ample force.

In this connection let me draw attention to the precedents of other nations in their dealings with Turkey. The one most in point is that of the French in 1860. The massacres in Syria by the

\* Frost's "Book of the Navy," p. 110.

† Jefferson's Works, edition of 1854, vol. iv., p. 574.

## THE DUTY OF THE UNITED STATES

Turks upon the native Christians, and in which French citizens had suffered, induced the French government to send a fleet and six thousand troops to Beirut. The redress which diplomacy had failed to attain was immediately granted. The sultan sent Fuad Pasha, one of his most energetic ministers, into Syria. Sixty of the ringleaders in the massacres were put to death. The French obtained what they asked, and not only did they obtain this redress, but the memory of their intervention has given security to Syria and to French citizens in Syria ever since.

Another argument that has been brought forward, and which I believe has influenced the administration, is the apprehension that other nations would prevent our interference in the manner suggested. To this argument I reply, What possible motive could any European government have for interfering to prevent this exercise of our just rights? "It is perfectly understood," to use again the language of President Cleveland, that "we desire only the liberty and protection of our own citizens, and redress for any wrongs they may have suffered, and that we have no ulterior designs or objects, political or otherwise."

To hold Armenia or any other part of the Turkish dominions permanently as an American colony would be opposed to all the traditions of

## TO AMERICAN CITIZENS IN TURKEY

our government, and no one would think even of suggesting such a measure. The reason why the powers of Europe have been jealous of one another in this matter is that each has, or is supposed to have, designs upon a part or all of the Turkish dominions. Russia has feared that England might establish herself at Constantinople. England has feared the same of Russia. Both have been apprehensive of Austria. But no such reasons could exist for opposition to the interference of America. Indeed, every sentiment of humanity in these countries would rejoice at our interference. Our defense of our heroic citizens, who with no motive of private gain have periled their lives for the oppressed Christians of Armenia, would appeal to the chivalry of mankind. It is not possible that in the year of grace one thousand eight hundred and ninety-six, any Christian power would interfere to prevent the United States, free as we are from any suspicion of desire for territorial aggrandizement in Turkey, from protecting the rights, the persons, and the property of our own citizens. How could they justify such an act in view of the precedents to which I have referred? Has it come to this, that the fear—the baseless fear—of foreign powers should prevent the United States of America from protecting our own citizens in foreign countries? If other nations should interpose, the question would

## THE DUTY OF THE UNITED STATES

undoubtedly become a very serious one. We are a peaceful nation ; we do not desire war with any one. When that question comes we will meet it like men. England and America united would be a force that the continental powers would not care to encounter. They do not desire war and we need not fear it.

To use again the language of Jefferson:\* “To those who expect us to calculate whether a compliance with unjust demands will not cost us less than a war, we must leave as a question of calculation for them also, whether to retire from unjust demands will not cost them less than a war.”

But I repeat, this question does not now arise. The matter we have now in hand is to deal not with continental Europe, but with Turkey. Let us not through cowardly and unreasonable fear of possible opposition, refrain from the pursuit of our just rights or from redressing the wrongs that have been inflicted upon our own people.

The time has come for us to guard the imperiled lives of our heroes in the Orient and to stay the tide of blood that threatens to engulf them.

One argument remains to be considered, and I am persuaded it is that which has most influenced our statesmen. It has been said the American

\* Jefferson's Works, vol. viii., p. 36, annual message, November 8, 1804.

## TO AMERICAN CITIZENS IN TURKEY

citizens in Turkey are missionaries and go where they are not wanted. What right have they to embroil this country in war for the sake of giving protection to them? This argument has been answered so fully by the venerable Dr. Hamlin in the current number of the "North American Review" that it hardly seems necessary to add anything to what he has said, and said so well; but yet I will briefly state some considerations that seem to me controlling.

In the first place, the argument rests on a false assumption. Our citizens are wanted in Turkey. It is true the Turks do not want them, but the Turks do not constitute the whole of the people of Asia Minor. They exercise by force of arms a government which they won by force, but which they have not had the moderation to retain by dealing justly with the subject races. The great Roman historian tells us that provinces are won by force, but are kept by just government. This the Turks have never learned. These subject races are an important part of the people of the Turkish Empire. To them the presence of American citizens, bringing education, bringing hope, bringing medicine and relief in sickness and aid in undeserved distress, is most welcome. Fellowship in suffering, the sympathy and help freely given by England and America, have brought the native Christians and their American

## THE DUTY OF THE UNITED STATES

neighbors into the closest brotherhood. It were base to desert our citizens, who, with the full consent of the Turkish government, with rights guaranteed by sacred treaties, have gone to perform imperative obligations of humanity; it were most base to desert them and leave not only our own, but those whom they have benefited, exposed to the cruelty and oppression of the Turk.

When Lieutenant Greely went on an expedition of scientific interest to the polar regions, did we desert him and his followers? No; we spared neither men nor money; we sent expedition after expedition. The President, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, vied with each other in their efforts to succor our citizens in their need. Is humanity less sacred than science? Is education less important than the study of the arctic currents? Are the school and the college less entitled to our care than the barometer and the theodolite? Is the discovery of the pole more imperative than the protection of Christian civilization?

But let us not stop with general statements. All general statements can best be brought to the test of particular instances. The most notable of these is that ever memorable incident in the history of our citizens in Turkey, Corinna Shattuck at Oorfa. There, in her single person, she stood for all that the American government stands

## TO AMERICAN CITIZENS IN TURKEY

for—for righteousness, for justice, for law. There she had been sent by your board; there she had been established with the consent of the Turkish government; there she had acquired a home and used it for the education of children and their parents, and for the relief of the suffering and distressed. When a cruel Mussulman mob sought to outrage and slay the native Christians, they found refuge with her. Her little inclosure was packed with the innocent victims of Turkish outrage and Turkish rapacity. She faced the howling mob. To every demand that she should yield and allow them to pass, she interposed the dignity and authority of her womanhood, and the sacredness of treaty rights, secured for her and all our citizens by the government of her native land. During the massacre, she writes: "Our house was full; two hundred and forty found refuge. We began to have refugees Monday and Tuesday, and all our houses and school-room are full of widows and orphans and wounded. How willingly would I have died, could my death have spared parents to their children! I remain here for the present; I could not leave our orphaned people."\*

If the American Board, with all its outlay of money and time and thought, with all its memorable and precious history, had accomplished

\* "Our Heroes in the Orient," p. 12.

## THE DUTY OF THE UNITED STATES

nothing but to put Corinna Shattuck at the door of her house in Oorfa, standing as she did as a protection and shield for hundreds of innocent Christians, that result of itself would more than repay all the toil and expenditure of the past. Wherever this gospel shall be spoken of throughout all the world, there also that this woman hath done shall be told as a memorial of her. Nor she alone. A noble army, whose courage and heroism shed undying luster on the American name, have endured hardship as good soldiers of Jesus Christ. One of them, President Gates of Euphrates College, writes:

“For three days we have looked death in the face hourly. We have passed by the mouth of the bottomless pit, and the flames came out against us, but no one in our company flinched or faltered. We simply trusted in the Lord and went on. . . . If we abandon the Christians they are lost.”\*

Citizens of the United States, if you abandon Corinna Shattuck and Gates and all our heroes in the Orient, you are lost—lost to honor, lost to duty, despised of man, and criminals before God. May He, in infinite mercy, preserve us from such shame!

And now, my friends, we have considered briefly the arguments that have been presented to deter our government from adopting the hon-

\* “Our Heroes in the Orient,” pp. 6, 7.

## TO AMERICAN CITIZENS IN TURKEY

orable, the manly, the American course, that every obligation to our own citizens, and every consideration of our own honor, not only in Turkey, but in other countries, demands of us. These things have not been done in a corner; they are perfectly well known to the nations of the world. America is on trial to-day before the great international court. If we submit tamely, if we allow the rights of our citizens to be outraged with impunity and without redress, how can we ever expect them to receive protection in any country in the world? In such case we should become the scorn of the great nations and the prey even of the small. Turkey is one of the smallest and weakest of them all; her only strength lies in the propping of opposing forces. She is in a state of unstable equilibrium. The slightest derangement of the forces that keep her in her place will bring her to the ground. The time is ripe for us to intervene. Let us not think it a small incidental advantage that the protection we give to our own citizens in Turkey will be recognized by the Turks as a protection to the native Christians. They understand very well that the interests of the one are identical with those of the other. Wherever the native Christians have suffered our citizens have suffered; wherever our citizens have been protected the native Christians have been protected. Let us

## THE DUTY OF THE UNITED STATES

therefore assert the place to which our wealth and our power justly entitle us; let us secure to the American citizen the protection which the Roman citizen enjoyed in the days of the Roman Empire. I know it is sometimes said that ministers of the gospel of peace should not ask protection from the civil authorities; but that is an abuse of the teachings of our Lord. St. Paul did not disdain to invoke the protection of the Roman law, nor to assert his right as a Roman citizen. The gospel of peace, it is true, forbids wars for territorial aggrandizement; it forbids wars to gratify the pride or the jealousy of kings or of republics. Such wars are crimes and stain the pages of history. But war in a good cause, and to redress the wrongs of the innocent and the suffering, is always a right; in the present case it may become a duty. Not that I believe war would come. The whole history of the Turkish government for the last century shows that it will yield to a resolute show of force which is understood to be backed up by adequate power. But in this business it is essential to success that it should be understood not only by the Turks, but by other nations, that we do not fear war, and that if we are obliged to draw the sword in a just cause, we will never lay it down until that cause is vindicated and the object of the war is accomplished.

## TO AMERICAN CITIZENS IN TURKEY

Congress has pledged to the President its support in the most vigorous action he may take for the protection of our citizens in Turkey. Let us pledge him ours.\*

\* "Statutes of the United States, First Session Fifty-fourth Congress, Concurrent Resolutions," pp. 3, 4. "*Resolved* further, That the Senate of the United States, the House of Representatives concurring, will support the President in the most vigorous action he may take for the protection and security of American citizens in Turkey, and to obtain redress for injuries committed upon the persons or property of such citizens." Passed the Senate January 24, 1896; passed the House of Representatives January 27, 1896.

## Standard Works.



**Persian Life and Customs.** With Incidents of Residence and Travel in the Land of the Lion and the Sun. By Rev. S. G. WILSON, M.A., for 15 years a missionary in Persia. With map and other illustrations and index. *Second Edition*, 8vo, cloth, \$1.75.

"This is not merely a book of travel, but of long observation in Persia. The author has studied with much care the condition of Persia and its future possibilities."—*N. Y. Tribune*.

**A Cycle of Cathay, or China, South and North.** With Personal Reminiscences. By W. A. P. MARTIN, D.D., LL.D., President Emeritus of the Imperial Tungwen College, Peking. With 70 illustrations from photographs and native drawings, and a map. 8vo, cloth decorated, \$2.00.

"No student of Eastern affairs can afford to neglect this work, which will take its place with Dr. Williams's 'The Middle Kingdom' as an authoritative work on China."—*Outlook*.

**Chinese Characteristics.** By Rev. ARTHUR H. SMITH, D.D., for 25 years a missionary in China. With 16 full page original illustrations, and index. *Sixth thousand*. 8vo, cloth, \$2.00.

"The best book on the Chinese people."—*Examiner*.

**From Far Formosa.** The Island, its People and Missions. By Rev. G. L. MACKAY, D.D., 23 years a missionary on the island. Well indexed. With many illustrations from photographs by the author, and several maps. *Fifth thousand*. 8vo, cloth, \$2.00.

"Undoubtedly the man who knows most about Formosa."—*Review of Reviews*.

**Foreign Missions After a Century.** By Rev. J. S. DENNIS, D.D. *Third Edition*. 8vo, cloth, \$1.50.

"A broad, philosophical and systematic view of missionary work in its relation to the living Church."—*Independent*.

**A Concise History of Missions.** By Rev. E. M. BLISS, D.D. 16mo, cloth, 75 cents. *In press*.

A systematic and thorough historical study of missions in all ages, by the editor of the "Encyclopedia of Missions," an acknowledged expert.

---

*Descriptive lists of Missionary Books free on application.*

---

**Fleming H. Revell Company**

NEW YORK: 112 Fifth Ave.  
CHICAGO: 63 Washington St.  
TORONTO: 140 & 142 Yonge St.

**REVELL'S POPULAR RELIGIOUS SERIES**

Published Weekly, \$13.00 per Annum

Entered at Chicago Post Office as Second-class Matter

**VOL. I. No. 66. OCTOBER 17, 1896**

