

United States in that it furnishes an excuse to any imperialistically inclined administration to engage in a war of conquest. The present administration may be trusted to refrain from such a policy, but who can safely predict that none of President Wilson's successors will be too conscientious to take advantage of this clause? s. D.



Another Fly in the Ointment.

It is much to be regretted that an achievement such as the construction of the Panama Canal should have been preceded by unfortunate international political complications; and should have been concluded in the midst of treaty controversies. It stands as the world's greatest engineering feat, both in magnitude, and in brilliance of execution; yet at the very moment of its completion we fall to wrangling over a treaty having to do with its inception. For months we have wrestled with the question as to whether or not we should abide by our treaty with Great Britain; and no sooner is that settled than we face the Colombian Treaty.



This is likely to prove one of those altruistic acts that, however much it may be lauded in history, is likely to meet with little encouragement from contemporary politicians. It runs counter to the my-country-right-or-wrong sentiment; and hence it will receive little consideration on its merits. Just as men disputed over our rights and obligations on the tolls question, so they will contend over our obligations to Colombia. This much, however, may be said in behalf of the aggrieved State to give color to her claim: While the Colombian Senate was discussing the terms of the Hay-Herran treaty, which had already been ratified by the United States Senate, a popular uprising took place in one of the six districts of Panama, and although there was no representation from the other five districts, no formulated statement of grievances, no congress, no army, no navy, no courts of justice, this country forbade the movement of Colombian troops, already in the country, to the scene of the uprising; and one day, seventeen hours and forty-one minutes from the revolt, Panama's independence was recognized. Even should the right lie with us, this haste in dismembering a nation with which we were at peace, arouses suspicion; and the resultant gain to us from the act gives color to our opponent's claim.



Ethically considered, Colombia was in the

wrong in demanding a price for permission to dig the canal. Politically, we were in the wrong in resorting to force in imposing our judgment upon a helpless nation. The earth belongs to the people of the earth; and while nations, as well as individuals, have the right to maintain their individuality, and work out their destiny, no nation and no individual has a right to hold idle a natural resource of the earth, when such resource is needed by other nations or individuals. Colombia could not dig the canal, yet the world needed the canal, and the United States was ready to do the work. Our plain duty was to appeal to the world. The decision of the nations would have been received by Colombia in a far different spirit from that in which she received our decision. Two things prevented this obvious course of action, the Monroe Doctrine, and President Roosevelt. A certain class of Americans had made a fetish of the Monroe Doctrine, and the President was so constituted that he could brook no opposition from a weak opponent.



The Taft administration sought to evade Colombia's claims by delay, instead of meeting her in the Peace Court at The Hague, or submitting the matter to disinterested arbitrators. The Wilson administration undertook to re-establish amicable relations between the two countries, but it, too, failed to take advantage of the Peace Court, or of disinterested arbitrators. In attempting a settlement by treaty agreement the Administration has been embarrassed by a desire to be generous to an injured neighbor, and the necessity of placating native prejudice; the result is a treaty that stands little chance of endorsement by the United States Senate. Should the Senate refuse to confirm the treaty, the whole matter should be taken to The Hague. If the world is ever to disarm, it will be only when the nations are ready to submit questions to an international court; and this is a good opportunity to establish a precedent for others to follow.

s. C.



Successful Seamanship.

Horace Greeley, when asked how he knew he had delivered a successful lecture, answered: "When more of the audience remain than go out." This seems to be the test that Congress is asked to apply to seamanship. The La Follette Seaman's Bill, which is backed by the American seamen, provides for "boats for all," passengers and crew; but the House committee on Merchant