

seen that they would be so great as first to threaten the existence of the republics of South America, and inevitably to draw the United States into complications with European states.

In this debate we have shown that the position of the affirmative is too broad to be statesmanlike; that it means the abandonment of a policy which we have shown our right to maintain; that it subverts rather than favors the cause of arbitration; that in every case it means actual war. We have shown that the award might be collected without actual war; that no nation would take this expensive means of enforcing the award unless the land was wanted as an opening wedge; and lastly that the practical difficulties and serious consequences would be so great as to threaten the very existence of the South American states and inevitably draw the United States into conflicts with European governments.

FIRST REBUTTAL SPEECH FOR THE NEGATIVE

Ladies and gentlemen: The gentlemen of the affirmative have said that our interference in South America would inevitably result in war. I would point out to you the fact that we have interfered in South America twenty times in the past and war has never come. We have interfered to prevent one European nation transferring its own territory to another nation and war has never come. And I ask whether any one in this audience to-night can believe that any European nation would risk a war with the greatest power in the Western hemisphere merely to collect a few dollars which it could collect without a war by waiting. I could show you that all the European nations have recognized the justice of our policy, and are they going to make war now against a policy they have recognized to be just? The affirmative must prove that war would result in every instance where we interfere, for unless they prove that war would result in every instance they would be maintaining that because war might happen