

copious literature has discussed or even stated. The Zionist rightly appeals to history; but his appeal must be decided on wider and more complicated considerations than he advances—not only the Jewish associations and achievements in Palestine, but Jewish limitations and failures as well, along with the rights that other races and faiths have undoubtedly earned in that doubly and trebly sacred land.

It is not true that "Palestine is the national home of the Jewish people and of no other people." It is not correct to call its non-Jewish inhabitants "Arabs," or to say that "they have left no image of their spirit and made no history—except in the great Mosque." We may rule out the Franks, their brief discipline of Syria and the many monuments of this that remain. But what of the native Christians, Syrian and Greek? They doubtless claim that their faith is the moral heir of all that was best in ancient Judaism.

If agreement on that question is impossible, there remains the other, which we cannot evade, of the fact of the living Christian communities. Have they not been as long in possession of their portions of the land as ever the Jews were? Is not Palestine the birthplace of their faith also and its fields as sacred to Christians as to Jews? Has Christianity "made no history" and "left no image of its spirit" on the Holy Land?

These are legitimate questions stirred by the claims of Zionism, but the Zionists have not yet fully faced them. In short, the Jewish question in the Holy Land cannot be decided by itself, nor merely upon general assurances that "the rights of other creeds and races will be respected" under Jewish dominance. Obviously a very great deal of difficult detail has still to be thought out by the Powers of Europe—and the democracies of Europe educated in the thinking thereof—before the future of Syria can be settled on lines of justice and security for all nations and creeds alike.