

was larger than seemed necessary, was endangering the paramountcy of England in this portion of the globe. He also endeavored to draw a parallel between the actions of the United States in Cuba, and England in the Transvaal, thus closing the regular debate for the affirmative.

The negative was opened by Mr. Landis, who tried to prove that England, because of her breaking of treaties by aiding the natives to the north and by encroachment on territory, could find nothing in international law that justified her action. International law grants that war may be levied only after all peaceable means to settle the questions in dispute are exhausted. And he claimed for the negative that England had not used all means possible before the war and that she did refuse to peacefully endeavor to settle the matter on an impartial basis.

Mr. Taylor for the negative argued that England could find no justification because of the fact that England had not the right of suzerainty with regard to the Transvaal Republic, proving that by England's own action she had forfeited that right. He quoted from the speeches of Chamberlain in which this Englishman had stated that England's actions in South Africa were unjust. He proved that some of the grievances claimed for the Outlanders were only imaginary.

Mr. Tuholski, for the negative, endeavored to show that England's real motive for her actions in South Africa was greed and avarice. In proof he cited the actions of the Chartered Company in South Africa, the Jameson raid, and England's action in Alaska and her dealings with Venezuela.

He showed that her action was a scheme to get control of the riches of Transvaal and that she was by her own diplomacy free to move in South Africa as she wished because of her friendly understandings with Russia, France and Germany.

The rebuttal of the negative embraced the following