

on nature be our guide in this matter, it is not thence that we can draw the moral that evil is to be encountered, and good sought, only on condition of not destroying the lives and works of men. We humbly trust, and we are learning slowly to perceive that the pestilence that walketh by noonday, and smiteth the thousands in our cities, is sent on a mission of healing, sent expressly to slothful and carelss men, whose neglect of the laws of health is entailing incessant loss of life and deterioration of human and bodily powers. The plague smiteth fiercely, but with a passing blow; if we learn our lesson its good effects last forever. Men are fallible and God is allwise, it may be answered, and men must not imitate the awful agencies of their Maker, because they cannot be sure that they will use them aright. To which we reply that man must act by the best light he has, and that the powers given him are lawfully used if used with righteous purpose; and that when other means of suppressing wrong have been tried in vain, we have no alternative but to let wrong prevail, or to meet and conquer it by armed force. This appears to us a conclusive argument against banishing war from amongst the legitimate means of resisting evil. Mere destruction is no more the real and ultimate object of war than it is of the Arctic expedition, the exploration of Africa, or other noble enterprises in which life is risked. The real object of all justifiable war is to secure the triumph of what is assumed to be right, where human diplomacy has failed to apply the agency of the Law and that *combined force* of all against one, which is the strength of Law. Not could the theorists who condemn war, irrespective of its cause or motive, find it easy either to "justify the ways of God to man," or to approve of any of those enterprises in which life is staked against success, for surely men are no less bound to regard their own lives as sacred than those of others. How, too, will they justify capital punishment, or any punishment that inflicts bodily pain, and injures health? Even the ordinary social mechanism, if strictly probed, the common occupations of men, the systems of labor that accumulate wealth at the expense of the health and vigor of the laborer, would scarcely stand the consistent application of the Peace theory. Upon the whole, it would appear, looking into these considerations, that the common sentiment about war needs some revision. Men naturally abhor blood and wounds, pains and mutilated limbs, and regard with instinctive awe the departure of the spirit from its home of flesh—an awe that is vastly deepened