

ing the fact that we have no army to send into Mexico. We must get one as quickly as possible, and then use it. Another man, prominent in business, insists not only upon intervention, but upon annexation. "I have been an advocate of annexation for years," he says, "and the idea is rapidly gaining strength among the most thoughtful people of our country."

One flash of reason appeared among the interviews, and from a source that some would least expect. The Rev. Thomas V. Shannon, editor in chief of the *New World*, official organ of the Catholic archdiocese of Chicago, who claims extensive acquaintance among the Mexican clergy, declares that in spite of all their discomforts on account of the revolution, they are against intervention by this country. "They cherish the sovereignty of Mexico," he says, "and fear to see it despoiled. Aside from their patriotic motives they refuse to sanction any plan that would entail bloodshed."

Will not these good people remain patient a little longer? America has set up a new ideal in international statecraft, and until it has been tried as long at least as the old plans that have so signally failed, it is not fair or just to denounce it as a failure. There is confusion in Mexico. The country lacks a stable government. But we may now be upon the very threshold of a return to law and order—plus justice. There is at present little real fighting; the people appear to be tiring of it; and when they settle down to law and order of their own accord it will be in a different mood from that which would follow our intervention. Comparing Europe with Mexico today, who will say that watchful waiting has been a failure? Just a little more patience, gentlemen!

S. C.

### Barbarism No Cure for Barbarism.

The murder of an American in Mexico furnishes the jingoes with renewed zeal for intervention. The demand comes chiefly from the same crowd that has all along desired that protection be furnished American monopolistic interests. But even if this were not the case there would be no justification for the sacrifice of lives to punish a murder, no matter what the nationality of the victim may be. Foreigners in Mexico were warned long ago of the risk they assume in remaining in the country while trouble lasts. If, to protect their financial interests or for any

other reason, they persist in taking risk, then their countrymen at home can not reasonably be required to assume the burden of protecting or avenging them. Conditions which render life and property unsafe will prove far more injurious to citizens of the country where these conditions prevail than they will to foreigners. No punitive expedition is needed to avenge the murder of McManus. It is not necessary that the individuals guilty of the crime be murdered in turn. The crime will surely bring its own punishment. Should it not result in adoption by Mexicans themselves of means to prevent further acts of the kind, disorder and insecurity will prevail from which the chief sufferers will be the natives. Aggressive war is no remedy for barbarism practiced by individuals who commit a single murder.

S. D.

### United States of South America.

So accustomed have we become to hearing of the Yellow Peril, of British Greed, and German Tyranny, that it comes almost as a shock to hear of Yankee Grabbing. Yet this thought runs through the minds of a great many people living between the Rio Grande and Cape Horn. And the warning cry of Mr. Santiago Perez Triana, a well known South American publicist, that "Yankee Imperialism and German Militarism must be crushed," awakens a significant response from various points in South America. Mr. Triana urges a Spanish-American union, rather than a Pan-American alliance; the United States of South America should be the answer to the United States of North America, in order that those weaker countries can be sure of their rights. The Maracaibo Fonografo, commenting favorably on Mr. Triana's proposition, points to the despoiling of Colombia in taking Panama from her as evidence of what other weak countries may expect when our interests conflict. The Fonografo notes the difference in the utterances of President Wilson, and some of his predecessors, but adds that there is often a wide separation between words and deeds. It calls attention to the fact that even under this administration, "the United States has assumed the administration of the customs of Santo Domingo, and has endorsed the proposals of a syndicate of American bankers whereby the finances of Nicaragua pass into the hands of Wall Street."

It is little less than tragic that a country whose dominant opinion leans so much toward idealism, and whose leading men and women of affairs oc-

copy such a high moral plane regarding international comity, should be looked upon by its weaker neighbors as a peril. Mr. Triana probably looks upon the United States with the same dread and distrust that Mr. Hobson looks upon Japan, and sees the same urgency for meeting the threatened danger by adequate military preparation. All countries have their Hobsons, their Jingoos, and their demagogues; but America, of all nations, has least excuse to offer. The despoiling of Mexico was scarce lived down in the half century following, when we stripped Spain of her colonies, and that was quickly followed by the dismemberment of Colombia. Can we wonder at the doubt some Spanish-Americans have of our integrity? Fair professions we have always made, but to the weaker peoples who lie within our power, our actions are apt to speak louder than words.



It was not until the present Administration that our words have had the ring of sincerity. When President Wilson declared that this country would not take another foot of territory by force, and followed it by accepting the mediation of the A. B. C. powers of South America and the voluntary withdrawal of our forces from Vera Cruz without claiming territory or indemnity, he did more to establish the integrity of the United States in the eyes of South Americans than all the preceding administrations had done. But it still remains to be shown whether the ideals raised by Mr. Wilson will be accepted by his own people. Jingoos and the demagogues even now cry for the annexation of Mexico, and refuse to give up the Philippines. Who can say with full assurance that the man who follows Mr. Wilson in the White House will not repeat Mr. Roosevelt's act in despoiling Colombia? The treaty making amends to that country still remains unratified, which leaves us open to various imputations from our enemies. If America wishes to play the role of peacemaker, and exert in international affairs an uplifting influence, she must come with clean hands.

s. c.



### Pension Profligacy.

One of the omissions of the 63d Congress, for which a large number of people will feel grateful, was its failure to pass the special pension bill for the widows and minor children of soldiers and sailors of the Spanish war and "Philippine Insurrection." The present law provides for the widows and children of men killed in the war, or dying from disabilities due to service in that war. But

the bill that failed of passage in the 63d Congress provides pensions for widows and children of soldiers and sailors who served in those wars for ninety days, regardless of how they died. And while the estimated expense of such a bill is estimated to be only two and a half million dollars a year, experience warns us that this is merely the beginning; and that it will grow year by year until we have the dollar-a-day pension for all participants of that war. The bill failed in the last session, but it will be reintroduced in the next Congress; and unless a vigorous opposition is offered by those having at heart the real welfare of the country, it will be added to the enormous burden the country already bears. Forty-six million dollars have already been paid in pensions on account of the Spanish war and Philippine insurrection. Nearly four and a half billion dollars in pensions have been paid on account of the Civil war. And there seems to be a determination in some quarters to maintain our maximum pension roll of a hundred and seventy million dollars a year, by enlarging the list from the later wars as fast as the victims of the earlier wars disappear. One should not grudge such comfort as a pension may bring to the widow of a soldier dying while serving his country, or to the soldier himself when crippled; but to put on the pension roll the names of men, who served but three months, and suffered no harm—possibly never getting beyond the training camps—is placing patriotism on a pretty low level. If this is to be the line of future legislation, there should be a distinct understanding that the men who enlist do so purely for the monetary consideration involved, wholly aside from any sense of patriotism.



If there is no way of stemming this tide it were better that Congress established a general system of old age pensions. A system of government aid that permits one man to qualify by three months of service in a training camp, and denies another who has spent forty years in a shop or mine, has little to commend it to any except the beneficiaries. Everyone conversant with affairs at Washington during the past forty years knows the terrorizing effect of the cry: "Favors for the old soldiers." No one begrudged aid to the families of the men killed in the war, nor to the men who were injured; but unscrupulous politicians seized upon it as a means of furthering their own ends, and played upon the feelings of the old soldiers until it became an evil influence in legislation. And yet men are talking of Mexican intervention, which military men say would