

the brutal indifference which Lord Salisbury's jaunty treatment of the matter in his public speeches seemed at the moment to fasten upon it. Count Goluchowski, with entire indifference to consistency, goes on to characterize the Armenian massacres as a stain on the nineteenth century, although apparently Austria did all that she could to give the Sultan a free hand. The Austrian Chancellor now declares, however, with great plainness, that Turkey is doomed unless the Sultan carries out the reforms which he has promised. There must, he said, be reforms in the Turkish Provinces, and above all in Crete, where the convention of Halepa must be restored. Under that convention Crete was guaranteed a nominal autonomy, but so long as the island is garrisoned by Turkish troops that autonomy has no real stability. The Chancellor's words seem to convey a direct intimation, with a penalty attached, to the Sultan. It remains to be seen whether the Sultan will pay any attention to it, or whether he will try in Crete the same policy which he has tried in Armenia, depending upon the jealousies of the Powers to give him the same freedom in that island which he secured in Asia Minor. It is improbable, however, for reasons already stated in these columns, that a systematic slaughter will be permitted in Crete. The Chancellor also declared that cordial relations existed between the Austrian Government and the other Governments which are parties to the Triple Alliance.



## The Great Debate

We count it a distinct and serious disadvantage that such an experience as we are now entering upon is called a campaign, and the language of battle is employed in describing it, and the accouterments and movements of a mimic war are used in carrying it on. The inevitable result is an impression, sometimes sedulously cultivated, sometimes carelessly permitted to form itself, that the opposing party is an enemy—an enemy to the country, a personal enemy. Evil motives are imputed, and the imputation by some anonymous gossip is first treated as though it were a definite accusation by a responsible accuser, and then as a conviction on evidence and after trial. Men are condemned for crimes against the State which ought forever to disfranchise them and to expel them from all honorable society, not only without a trial, but without even a definite accusation by a responsible accuser. Charges of bribery are bruited about against honorable men; stories are circulated of wholesale purchases of delegates or voters—without even a sponsor for the circulation. Of course they fall upon deaf ears; of course they produce a paralysis of the conscience; of course the public, doubting some tales and discounting others, ends by treating them all alike with indifference. Where open charges of crime are not made, evil motives are imputed. The free silver coinage advocates are called by unsavory epithets and charged with a desire to make unjust profits out of the Government or to escape the payment of just debts. The gold monometallist is scurrilously called a gold-bug, and charged with speculating out of his country's misfortunes.

Doubtless there is a great deal of selfishness tainting the best of our patriotism. Our self-interest modifies our opinions. But the heart of the American people is honest. The East is as honest as the West; the West as honest as the East. What the American people want is justice. What they desire to accomplish is what is for the interest of the whole country. What the voters need is light, not heat. What the country needs is to realize that we are on the eve,

not of a great campaign, but of a great debate. Let us respect each other's motives, honor each other's character, weigh each other's arguments, substitute reason for vituperation and argument for epithets, and so move forward, with charity toward all and malice toward none, to a better understanding, for ourselves and our neighbors, of the Nation and its needs.



## George Adam Smith

The Outlook presents to its readers in this issue the portrait of one of the most distinguished of living Biblical scholars. Professor George Adam Smith has been in this country for several weeks. He came at the invitation of Johns Hopkins University to deliver a course of lectures on Biblical themes. Since then he has lectured before Union Theological Seminary, and in various other institutions of learning, and has been in constant demand both as lecturer and preacher. Professor Smith is perhaps the most prominent Old Testament scholar in the Free Church of Scotland. Hardly forty years of age, he has published three works of eminent and enduring value. It is no exaggeration to say that his volumes on the Book of Isaiah, which form a part of the "Expositor's Bible," are the ablest and most popular on that subject which have appeared in the English language. His second great work was the "Historical Geography of Palestine," which has almost superseded Dean Stanley's famous "Sinai and Palestine." His latest Commentary, a book of equal value, on "The Minor Prophets," has just made its appearance.

The first few years of Professor Smith's professional life were spent as a pastor. He is now a professor in the Free Church Theological College. As a student of the Hebrew Scriptures he accepts the results of modern criticism, and belongs to the same class of scholars as Professors Briggs, G. F. Moore, President W. R. Harper, and others equally prominent in this country. Both as a lecturer and preacher he emphasizes the positive side of Christian truth. Full of vitality and vivacity, a tireless worker, an accurate thinker, a vivid and picturesque writer, it is not surprising that he has already made for himself a large place in the department of Biblical and theological scholarship. In his own country he belongs to the same intellectual and theological group as Drs. Stalker, John Watson, the late Professor Elmslie, of London, and such writers as Barrie and Crockett. If we mistake not, all these men were friends in the University and are friends in their maturer manhood. Professor Smith is a co-worker with Professors Marcus Dods and A. B. Bruce, who are better known only because they are older. Indeed, it would be hard to find in any Church in the world three more eminent scholars, or more noble and spiritual Christian teachers, than Marcus Dods, Alexander B. Bruce, and George Adam Smith. It is an interesting fact that, in literature, theology, and the pulpit, Scotland leads England. Of the younger school of British authors nearly all were born north of the Tweed. It is only necessary to recall the names of Barrie, Stevenson, Crockett, and John Watson to show the prominence of Scotland in modern letters. The same is true among preachers and theologians. Dods and Bruce, Stalker and Alexander Maclaren, the Cairds of Glasgow and Balliol, Fairbairn, and a host of other sturdy thinkers, were all born in the north, and all in their writings show both their ancestry and the environment in the midst of which their early days were spent.

It is interesting to observe among the leaders of northern Presbyterianism their great hospitality to modern learning. In this country the most stubborn opposition to the appli-

cation of scientific principles to the study of the Bible and theology is found among Presbyterians. In Scotland, however, the Presbyterian leaders are all its champions; and they are at the same time as positive in their religious convictions as any other body of Christians in the world. When, for instance, Professor George Adam Smith was lecturing at the Summer School at Oxford on the Miracles in the Old Testament, he did not hesitate to recognize the difficulties in the way of the acceptance of some of them as historical; neither did he hesitate to say that the value of the Scriptures as a guide to the spiritual life is not affected by the interpretation given to them. Few things are more difficult for Scotch Presbyterians to understand than the feeling that the teachings of men like Professors Briggs and H. P. Smith are a peril to Christianity. Probably time will work the same slow and sure revolution in this country that it has in Scotland, where those who invoke the aid of the most advanced criticism in the study of Holy Scripture lead in plans for promoting the spiritual life and improving social conditions.

A characteristic of these Scottish scholars is that they are more than mere scholars; they are interested also in public affairs and social life. Some of the best addresses which Professor Smith has given in this country have proved him to be an accurate observer and careful student of the social and religious condition of his country. One statement which he is reported to have made is worthy of the attention of those who discount the Church as an evangelizing agency. He said that in Scotland no great evangelistic movements, like those under Mr. Moody, or John McNeill, or the Salvation Army, have reached the lowest classes; that what has been done for them has chiefly been through the ministry of the churches. In other words, the work which Thomas Chalmers began is still carried on in such cities as Edinburgh and Glasgow. Professor Smith, we believe, remains for some time yet in this country, being under engagement to speak at numerous Chautauquas. Those who know him best believe that his work as an interpreter of the Bible to our modern life has but just begun, and that greater things may be expected from his pen than have yet appeared. Ample scholarship and a devout and reverent spirit are in him combined in a rare degree. These qualities have made a profound impression wherever he has preached or lectured; and when he returns to his home he will leave behind him not only ardent admirers of his abilities, but also a large number who will feel richer because they have learned to know and love him as a man.

### Quietness of Spirit

There is in some natures a beautiful serenity which seems to exhale calmness and repose. Men and women who have attained to the harmony of character which establishes peace between aims and work, between desire and opportunity, between tasks and abilities, between individual ideals and conditions which must be accepted, bring into the restlessness and agitation of the world a prophecy of the ultimate peace. They seem to see beyond the narrow horizon of the moment; they seem to rest in a final acceptance of the conditions which life imposes upon all who share it, rather than in any provisional successes or achievements. This quietness implies strength, not weakness; it suggests fixity of purpose and continuous energy of will, not compromise and surrender. It is consistent with the most thorough radicalism in dealing with existing conditions; it often characterizes the most aggressive and masterful spirits. One who has had unusual opportunities

of knowing said, not long ago, that the most terrible fighters he had known among the leaders of armies in Europe were very quiet men—men who carried an atmosphere of peace with them. Noise is so often mistaken for the kind of sound which counts; restlessness is so constantly confused with energy, and violence of feeling and exaggeration of speech are so often identified with vigor and force, that men are slow to understand the repose of the great spirits, just as they are slow to recognize the greatness of a masterly work of art. Agitation and hysteria make an instant impression on the unthinking and ignorant; the reposeful and quiet strength of a great book or picture or building must educate those who finally understand it. An immature and crude play like "The Robbers," with its exaggerations and excesses, takes Germany by storm; but the balanced and harmonized work of later years gets no such applause. The greater a work is, the deeper the education required for its real comprehension; the higher the character, the finer and more tempered the strength, the quieter and calmer the spirit.

### A Great Failure

The collapse of the English Education Bill is one of the outstanding events in the Parliamentary history of this century. It is, in fact, almost without a parallel. On May 13 the bill was read a second time in the House of Commons by the positively unexampled majority of 267. Yet, seven weeks later, Mr. Balfour had to admit to the House that it was impossible to carry it through its two remaining stages; to confess that the Opposition was too much for the Government; and that for the session of 1896 the measure must be abandoned. It is a long time since any leader of the House of Commons has been in such an ignominious position. In 1894 the Gladstone Government was compelled to withdraw the Employers' Liability Bill after it had been successfully carried through the House of Commons. But the abandonment of that much-needed measure was due to amendments made in the Lords, which the Liberals regarded as destructive of the principles of the bill, and in which they refused to concur. In connection with the Education Bill the House of Lords offered no obstacles. The Liberal peers do not number more than forty. Lord Rosebery's speeches in the constituencies had made it plain that he would offer a most strenuous opposition to the Education Bill when it reached the Upper House; but with the small support he could count upon, the bill was in no danger. It might have been delayed a week or two; but the Lords would have passed it in much the same shape as it left the Commons.

All the troubles of the Government over the Education Bill arose in the country, and in the House of Commons, where, notwithstanding the recent reverses at by-elections, it has still a majority of 147. In this instance, however, a great majority could not be counted upon to secure a legislative success, or to overbear the determined opposition offered to the bill. To those who have followed the discussions on the bill in the House of Commons and in the country, the breakdown is not, after all, surprising. As soon as the bill was introduced, it became evident that there was no general demand for it, no general welcome for it, and that it had comparatively few friends to give it a whole-hearted support. It was not introduced to meet any well-considered demand made by sincere and practical educationists, or by parents of children attending the common schools. It originated solely with the bishops and clergy of the Church of England;