

(6) A mere war of conquest, in which a nation or its ruler fights simply for material aggrandisement, is obviously unjust: it is an offence against humanity, and as such deserves the censure both of God and man. Nor can it be objected that the chosen people of God acted in this fashion, for 'the exercise of His supreme sovereignty by God as between the Israelites and other nations was altogether a special dispensation, which has no existing parallel under the natural or international laws.'

(7) On the other hand, a war in which a nation defends its fatherland, or its legitimate possessions, is altogether just and righteous. 'It is sweet and glorious to die for one's country' has always been the thought of the noblest, and to their judgment God Himself does not refuse His sanction.

(8) Taking these two instances into consideration it might seem safe to draw a broad distinction between defensive and offensive warfare, and to insist that the former is always, the latter never, justifiable. And there would be a certain element of truth in this position. But the statement needs to be qualified. In the first place not all defensive war can be said straightway to be justifiable. There must be some proportion between the rights threatened or actually violated and the damages likely to be caused by the war. It would be wrong for a nation to fight absolutely without hope of success, or to maintain a hopeless conflict. It is not easy of course to say in every case when a nation is altogether outclassed by a more powerful enemy, and a brave people might quite lawfully fight, for honor's sake, on the off-chance of winning. Analogously a woman to defend her chastity may risk her life to any extent so long as the barest chance of escape discriminates her action from suicide. Two illustrations may make this point clearer. When the City of the Popes was invaded in 1870 by the 'Italians,' it soon became evident that the defenders could not possibly hold out for any length of time. Pope Pius IX. thereupon surrendered. His action was in every way correct. His armed defence of his lawful possessions showed the world that he was the victim of unjust aggression, while his surrender to vastly superior forces was prompted by a noble feeling on the part of a ruler to spare the useless shedding of blood. Belgium at the present moment is fighting for its independence, and it is admitted on all sides that it is engaged in a perfectly just war, for the neutrality of the country had been guaranteed even by the invading nation. But what hope of success could Belgium have in face of so powerful a nation as Germany? None at all, and Belgium's ruler would not have been justified in offering any resistance, did he not know that he could count on the effective aid of equally powerful nations who were bound by treaty to preserve the integrity of the State. Neither in the second place can it be said that every offensive war is unjustifiable. A nation need not always wait until it is attacked: it might easily happen that a nation, certain of an approaching unjust attack, could hope to find safety only in taking the offensive. In the Franco-Prussian War of '69-'70, the French struck the first blow, but they always maintained that the situation was forced by their opponents.

You'll best please the "best little woman in the world" if you smoke GOLDEN EAGLE—it doesn't "hang about the curtains"! Every puff will linger with you as a pleasant memory thought! Try a PLUG to-day!

Drs. JONES & WHITEHEAD

DENTAL SURGEONS

Barlow's Buildings, Colombo Street
CHRISTCHURCH.

Open Evenings :: 7.30 to 9 p.m.

TELEPHONE 1161.

THE FUTURE OF PALESTINE

(For the *N.Z. Tablet*, by the VERY REV. DEAN MAHONEY, Onehunga.)

Among all the speculations rife concerning the future of the Turkish Empire there is one portion of its territory which, so far, I have not seen discussed, and that is Palestine. It is now generally recognised that the Sick Man of Europe is moribund—sick unto death from an acute attack of German measles, coming on a constitution already enfeebled by the Balkan war, and after this present war the Ottoman Empire ends. Turkey will in future be numbered among the Asiatic Powers, and instead of being spread over three continents, she will be confined to one. The province of Anatolia, the Mysia and Bithynia of the ancients, will be the chief centre. The future capital of Turkey, no doubt, will be Smyrna, that is the political and commercial capital, for the religious capital, the seat of the Caliphate, will be Mecca. Smyrna is known to many people to produce principally figs and earthquakes. When I was there in 1891, the Cathedral had a huge crack in the wall behind the high altar, the effect of a quake a short time before, but the clergy thought nothing of it, as it did not seem to affect the stability of the structure. As the city possesses the finest harbor in Asia Minor, it ought to excel Constantinople in commerce, as under the Greek emperors it rivalled the capital in trade and importance.

And so the shadow of Islam is lifting from the beautiful dome of St. Sophia, where it has hung for four and a-half centuries, and on the walls of Stamboul will soon be written 'Ichabod'! The magnificent Church of Justinian is fated once more to pass into schismatic hands. For exactly 400 years St. Sophia was the Cathedral of the schismatic Patriarch of Constantinople, and for 461 years it has been the chief mosque of the Moslems in Turkey. Whether in God's mercy it is to remain much longer separated from the centre of unity, who knows? Will there ever resound within its walls, *Oremus pro Pontifice nostro Benedicto*, which words, or their Greek equivalent, were last heard nearly 900 years ago, when the eighth Benedict sat on the throne of Peter?

But if European Turkey is to pass once more under Christian rule, what about Palestine? It hardly seems congruous that the cradle of Christianity should any longer be left in the hands of the infidel. That is a matter of vast interest to the whole of Christendom. Or, is it to become a second Albania? As a nation it is just as little homogeneous as Albania is. If the Allies decide upon wresting it from the Turk, which of the three great Powers is to be paramount? I am assuming that Italy, which has of late years extended her influence very much in the Holy Land, does not join in the war. Will Russia, France, and England divide it into different spheres of influence, or establish a tripartite control? Another factor to be considered is the influence of the great Jewish financiers who are providing in great part the sinews of the present war. The Zionists may try to realise their dreams of restoring the Kingdom of Israel. To that Russia will never agree. She has promised a great deal to the Jews who are fighting in her ranks, just as she has promised the Poles to restore their kingdom, but the German and Austrian Poles seem to realise the value of such promises for they still go on fighting Russia.

Were a Jewish state to be formed, composed of Hebrews from every nation where they are at present found, there would be two difficulties at least to face at the outset. The first would be as to what form of government would be best suited to people who had lived under every form from autocratic to democratic, from the tyranny of Russia to the tolerance of the United States. A return to the ancient theocratic form would be out of the question in these days, when the laws of God enter so little into the polity of modern nations. It would be considered an anachronism. The second difficulty would be the language question. Outside of the synagogue the Jews of different nationalities

J. R. WOOD
CHEMIST & OPTICIAN

Prescriptions accurately dispensed with best drugs, under personal supervision. Oculists' Orders filled. 'Phones 116 and 537.

WALDEGRAVE'S BUILDINGS, THE SQUARE, PALMERSTON N.