

mended the occupation of territory in Yucatan, declaring that "we would not consent to a transfer of this domain and sovereignty to either Spain, Great Britain, or any other European power."

Our population at that time was about 20,000,000, and certainly a policy we then boldly asserted can now be firmly maintained. So far from receding from the strictest construction of the doctrine laid down by Monroe, my views are that the United States should extend its policy and look to the establishment of depots and naval stations around which American colonies would locate, sufficiently strong to encourage and protect our trade and commerce. England's success in extending her trade and commerce is largely due to her first establishing colonies or footholds in countries the trade of which she sought to secure. American toil now produces substantially 30 per cent. of the staple products of the world; we have but four per cent. of its population, and foreign trade has become an essential outlet for American products. The principle of the Monroe doctrine did very well in 1823.

President Polk advanced a step in 1848. We must take another step forward in 1895. I would deplore any action which would endanger our amicable relations with England, but we must realize that they are largely due to our allowing that nation a practical monopoly of the most valuable trade and commerce of the world, and Americans must understand that friction will certainly follow any material invasion of English markets by American products.

JOSEPH WHEELER.

II.

THE United States should plant itself immovably upon a just and intelligent definition of the Monroe doctrine in defining its attitude toward the Venezuelan situation. The position taken by our government at the time of the occupation of a part of Mexico by Maximilian, acting as the agent of the French Government, re-affirmed the Monroe doctrine in unmistakable terms, and our position was accepted as the true one by the nations of the world. But recently the course of our government has, upon several occasions, cast doubt and uncertainty over our probable

future attitude, and the time has now come when the United States should make clear and unmistakable the purpose to maintain the position taken in the Mexican case; or we should cease to discuss the subject and abandon the Monroe doctrine permanently, and give public notice thereof. To temporize is cowardice, to equivocate dishonor.

That England has violated the Monroe doctrine, or in other words, that England has done acts which challenged the opposition of the United States, is plain and undeniable. It may be said that she did not seize any territory at the time of her controversy with Nicaragua; that is, she did not attempt to acquire and annex Nicaraguan territory. But it is true that she committed acts of oppression, based upon a technical claim, and punished an inferior American Republic with brutality. The United States should have protested then and have demanded explanation and satisfaction. That we did not, has encouraged the subsequent aggressions in Venezuela.

The original declaration of the Monroe doctrine, as made on behalf of our government, contained this important statement: "But with the governments who have declared their independence and maintained it, and whose independence we have, on great consideration and on just principles, acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny, by any European power, in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition towards the United States." The levying of an unjust assessment is in the nature of blackmail upon a helpless State. The seizure of her ports by an armed force was an invasion of the principle of the Monroe doctrine, and it was weak and cowardly on the part of our government to submit to it without protest. The action of the United States amounted to a waiver of our position hitherto, and it may be well urged by Great Britain as amounting almost to an estoppel if we reassert the doctrine.

The proposition of England, as recently announced by Sir Julian Pauncefote that England will arbitrate the question of her right to territory which she admits she holds by doubtful tenure, but will refuse to arbitrate questions in regard to territory which she is pleased to say she holds by indisputable title, is a simple repudiation of all recognition of arbitration what-

ever, and it indicates the hypocrisy of the movement by which a member of the British Parliament paraded himself across the ocean and came to Congress in the last session with his arms full of petitions in favor of an international system of arbitration. We have lost standing among the nations of the earth by the course we have already taken, and in the failures already manifested, and we had infinitely better surrender all pretence of adherence to the Monroe doctrine and abandon the American Continent to the ravages of European aggression than to any longer pretend to uphold it and yet be guilty of the failures of the past two years.

Our attitude should be that of unflinching and unfaltering devotion to the principles and practices of this government hitherto, and in so doing we shall not bring war upon the United States; but we shall protect ourselves against war by securing respectful recognition of our national purpose by all the nations of the world.

At this time England seems to have special interest in South American affairs. Her efforts to secure trade belonging legitimately to her commercial rivals, have been supplemented by an interference in the Mosquito country which clearly manifests a disposition to control, if possible, the ownership of the great trans-Isthmus Canal. England should not be permitted to succeed in this scheme. The building and control of that gigantic artery of international commerce should be the dearest object of American statesmanship.

The attitude of the United States towards the Venezuelan question should be that of determined opposition to any movement of England, the result of which would impair or weaken our ancient declaration of support of the Monroe doctrine. Our construction of the scope of that doctrine should be proclaimed and adhered to. Once proclaimed, a faithful adherence to and recognition of our construction by the nations of the earth should be the conditions upon which alone friendly relations with us can be maintained.

CHARLES H. GROSVENOR.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

A PRACTICAL USE OF VERSE.

THE impracticability of using telegraph lines for communication between Army Posts in a rugged country which was the seat of continual warfare between the United States troops and so cunning and daring a foe as hostile Indians, must be apparent to any layman; and taking a lesson from the enemy, who for ages had been skilful in long distance signalling through a line of stations, the government decided upon the experiment of sending messages by means of heliography, or the transmission of letters forming words by means of the flashes of light from mirrors.

Colonel Wm J. Volkmar, Assistant Adjutant-General and Chief Signal Officer of the Department of Arizona, was put in charge of this work and had occasion to congratulate himself upon the hearty support of the Chief Signal Officer of the Army, Brigadier General H. W. Greely, and the cheerful co-operation of the regimental officers.

On November 1, 1889, instructions were given to the officers commanding the various posts on the proposed line from Whipple Barracks, Ariz., to Fort Stanton, N. Mex., together with all branch stations, to prepare for the work. The result was that early in May, 1890, signals had been flashed and successfully read between all contiguous stations.

The total distance covered was 2,544 miles, and was taken from a table showing the stations occupied, their connections and minimum flash distances as estimated by horizontal projections measured by scale upon the map.

About 2,000 miles were operated connectedly during the two weeks' practice immediately following the completion of the lines.

During this practice all former records of communicating between two points by flash signal were broken.

On May 13 signals were successfully interchanged between Mts. Reno and Graham, Arizona, a distance of 125 miles. Lieutenant Wittenmeyer, Ninth Infantry, was in command of the former, and Lieutenant Dade, assisted by Lieutenant Peterson, both of Tenth Infantry, of the latter station. All were under the immediate direction of Captain Murray, Fourth Cavalry.

In referring to the remarkable and satisfactory results following the order of November 1, 1889, Colonel Volkmar says in his report of May 31, 1890: "To all the officers and operators praise is due for patient, untiring work in face of difficulties involving privations and hardship. The burning heat of the deserts, the cold and snow of lofty mountain tops, the painful daily climbing and descent of rugged peaks by stony trails taxing physical powers to the utmost, were all borne without complaint.