

without Mr. Rockefeller's permission. Because Mr. Rockefeller feels it best to refuse permission to workers whose views on trade unionism differ from his own, strife has arisen. This was inevitable under existing economic conditions. If these conditions are to be continued, the Federal government will continue to be put to trouble and expense through the policy of individuals who insist on enforcement of the legal power conferred on them. It may be possible some time to urge with more success than has met the recent effort, that men like Mr. Rockefeller generously refrain from making full use of their power. But would it not be better to destroy the privileges which make them powerful?

S. D.



Rationalizing the Monroe Doctrine.

New conditions require new policies. Principles remain the same, but the application varies with the varying factors. That the western continent should be kept free of the machinations of European politics is just as important today as it was in the time of President Monroe; but that the means to that end, the so-called Monroe Doctrine, has become painfully inadequate has been apparent to those who would see. A policy that saved the nations of Central and South America, while they were too weak to defend themselves from the domination of Europe, has, now that some of those countries have themselves reached maturity, become humiliating and irritating to a degree that has nullified all its good influences, and given rise to a train of evils that has left us more hated than the countries from which we sought to save them. No course of conduct, it is safe to say, that results in estranging those whom we would serve can be considered wise, or result in permanent good to them or ourselves.



The United States contained at the time the Monroe Doctrine was announced in 1823 but little over ten million people. Chile now has more than a third that number, or more than either Denmark, Norway or Greece. Argentina has over two-thirds as many inhabitants as we then had. And Brazil has two and a third times as many as we had. Yet we assume to hold them in leading strings as though they were immature and irresponsible nations. And when questions arise concerning the smaller and weaker countries we exercise our self-imposed rights of suzerainty in utter disregard of their desires or wishes. Yet some of our people are surprised that we are hated in Central and South America!

It is this situation that must be borne in mind to appreciate the importance of the tender and acceptance of the good offices of Argentina, Brazil, and Chile, the "A. B. C." countries, to act as mediators between this country and Mexico. It is possible that their services will come to nought so far as Mexico is immediately concerned; but the resultant effect throughout the western hemisphere both now and in the future will be of inestimable value. By this single act we abandon our exalted post of suzerain, and descend into the ranks of democratic nations. We have taken the first step toward international fellowship. Let it be followed by the logical course as it opens up before us, and we shall soon re-establish international friendship. It was not that we were of the Teutonic strain, while our southern neighbors were of the Latin that has kept us apart; it was our arrogance, our conceit, our assumed superiority that has led to the estrangement. They have been afraid of us; and where there is fear there can be no friendship. No matter if we do the very thing they know should be done, still they will hate us for doing it *for* them, instead of *with* them. Co-operation will lead to confidence, and trade will bring understanding; and out of these will come a mutual appreciation that will lead to international peace.

S. C.



Neighborly Confidence.

The tales of violence to Americans, and the destruction of their property, that have come from all parts of Mexico convey far more than a disregard for human rights on the part of some Mexicans. It is not natural for any man to quarrel with a friendly neighbor. Americans have been in Mexico, but not of Mexico. They have gone there for the purpose of exploiting the country. They have bargained with those who exploited the Mexicans before them, they have fraternized with them, and they have in every way held themselves aloof from the people at large. They have received big wages in companies that have paid big dividends, while the peon has continued to live at the point of bare subsistence. The time of reckoning came. The revolution pitted the peon against the aristocrat; and the moment civil authority was withdrawn, the stored-up wrath of the despised laborer was visited upon the head of the arrogant foreigner. Those who would receive justice in time of strife should accord justice in time of peace.

S. C.



What Would Be Gained?

How much better off would Mexico be if it had