

revolting province must not be recognized while any show of force is made and the government of such must be competent and authorized to act. In the recent rebellion the United States interfered, preventing the Colombians from landing troops or shelling the city. We really helped Panama. The treaty of New Granada forbids our interfering with revolutions, as we have just done. We should only preserve neutrality as to exterior violence, but our intervention has been like that of France in our Revolution or of what a foreign nation might have done in the Civil War. There could, moreover, be no *de facto* government in the ten days after which we received the envoy from Panama. No matter how excellent the citizens, a stable government cannot be set up, nor has a people demonstrated its ability to rule itself in so short a time.

The affirmative said that as long ago as 1865 Secretary Seward made the remark that the United States was ready to undertake the transportation of goods for the world at the Isthmus. Since war must have occurred on neutral land had the Colombians landed, we could not permit them to land. It is evident that a *de facto* government is liable to recognition by established nations at any time. Now a nation must decide for itself whether a state is established and if fighting has ceased. As in our estimation this had occurred in Panama, we rightly recognized it. Seward in 1864 said it was the Chief Executive's prerogative to make this decision. In his decision the President is supported by legality.

The negative compared the relation of Panama and Colombia to that of ourselves and England in the Revolution. England declared war with France for recognizing us prematurely. We have committed an equal breach of law. Our only attempt at justification is on a selfish and material ground, *i. e.*, that the world and the United States need such a canal and propose to have it at Panama.

There are three ways we might legally have secured a canal. Had Panama won in her rebellion (unaided by our interference), a treaty would have been consummated. If Colombia had won, the same would in time be true. If both these failed, there still remains a perfectly feasible route, involving nothing more than the expenditure of a few extra millions. If we had considered the Nicaragua route sincerely, Colombia would come to terms.

What does a difference of \$45,000,000 mean when it indicates a retrogression on the part of a leading world power towards the times when might was right? Universal peace is the result of international law. The United States has taken a step backward in using force on a smaller country.

The rebuttal, while equally as interesting as the debate, was only a more definite statement and further development of the question.

Our Yell.

The topic of the last debate before the Christmas recess was as follows:

Resolved, That the present Tech Yell shall be abolished. The yell to which reference is made should be understood to be the one beginning "We are happy." The subject was announced to the participants very shortly before the debate, and, there being so little time for preparation, much of the matter discussed was hardly of great interest.

A number of arguments, however, were of extreme importance in connection with the present question of abandoning the yell. The point was made by the negative, among other arguments which were difficult to refute, that the yell has now become really a tradition here; that it would be difficult to persuade the men to abandon anything handed down as this has been. The yell is much more distinctive of Tech than the regulation M. I. T. yell, which is no more than a copy of other well-known college and university yells. If we desire to give a real Tech yell, here is one which is honored by popularity and by tradition. If the yell were really objectionable another would have been devised long since. It is short and to the point, and an equally good one would have to be invented to take its place. The flat failure of the Y. M. C. A. "Tech-e-te-tech" yell shows the difficulty of doing this.

The undisputed point of the negative was the undeniable popularity of the yell. The sentiment of the majority of the undergraduates is, as yet, decidedly *not* in favor of abolishing it. If it is asked who will abolish the yell it is plain that only through the approval of the men themselves can it be accomplished. Hence its abolition is at present impossible. As illustrations of its popularity, the refusal of the upper classes to regard seriously the