

# The Sentinel

A Weekly Newspaper With Plenty of Backbone

Albert Bede and Elbert Smith Publishers  
Albert Bede, Editor

A first-class publication entered at Cottage Grove, Ore., as second-class matter

Business Office. 412 East Main

Subscription Rates  
One year \$2.00 Three months .50c  
Six months 1.00 Single copy .5c  
No subscription listed for less than 50c

Member of  
National Editorial Association  
Oregon State Editorial Association  
Oregon Newspaper Conference  
Willamette Valley Editorial Association  
Linn County Publishers' Association

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 1920

## AN EXPLANATION THAT REALLY EXPLAINS.

There has been so much thrashing around in an effort to explain the peace treaty and league of nations pact and the senate's proposed reservations, that The Sentinel gives space to an editorial from Harvey's Weekly, which rationally explains what the peace treaty does and why as Americans we must have the senate reservations. It is so logical and so worded that any man understand. Mr. Harvey, the editor, is the man given credit for making Woodrow Wilson, although he has since fallen out with the man he put in the White House. The editorial is as follows:

Let there be no misunderstanding! The treaty as submitted by the president is no longer an issue. It is dead. It cannot be resuscitated. All admit that. The treaty as modified by the senate is dormant but not dead unless the president so wills. That treaty is the issue. There can be no other.

What would ratification of that treaty involve—complete nullification or mere Americanization? There the line is drawn, sharp-cut and clearly defined.

"The resolution in that form," the president asserts as his opinion, "does not provide for ratification but, rather, for the nullification of the treaty."

"The reservations," Senator Lodge declares with equal positiveness, "are designed solely to Americanize the treaty and make it safe for the United States."

One or the other must be wrong. Which is right? Let us analyze and consider clause by clause. Take first the preamble.

Resolved (two-thirds of the senators concurring therein): That the senate advise and consent to the ratification of the treaty of peace with Germany

concluded at Versailles on the 28th day of June, 1919, subject to the following reservations, understandings and interpretations, which shall be made a part of the instrument of ratification, which ratification is not to take effect or bind the United States until the said reservations and understandings adopted by the senate have been accepted by an exchange of notes as a part and a condition of said resolution of ratification by at least three of the four principal allied powers, to-wit: Great Britain, France, Italy and Japan.

This is not rejection. It is acceptance. It "advise and consents" to ratification. The sole condition is that three of the principal allied powers shall signify acquiescence in certain "reservations, understandings and interpretations" to be enumerated. What can be the real objections to that procedure? The first is that it is unnecessary because under custom and precedent silence gives consent. Granted, with respect to ordinary treaties. But this, as Senator Brandegee said, is not an "ordinary peace treaty." It is a permanent engagement on the part of the United States to abandon the policy which it has maintained since its formation and to join a coalition of forty or more nations scattered over Europe, Asia and Africa.

Is there anything unreasonable in asking that the only terms under which the United States is willing to do this should be specifically recognized and accepted by three of the other powers concerned? If silence really does give consent equivalent to that of a signed note, why should Great Britain or France or Italy decline or hesitate to grant the written assurance of understanding to which under the circumstances we feel entitled? The way is made easy. No "opening up of the whole treaty" is called for—only an "exchange of notes" through ordinary diplomatic channels, which could be made in effect by cable in forty-eight hours.

But it is urged that Great Britain would not do this because she could not stoop to bind herself definitely to assent to a certain reservation which incidentally deprives her of exceptional privileges. What can this mean except that she has no intention of recognizing that reservation under the plan of tacit acquiescence?

It is argued further that Japan would take the same position respecting another reservation which only withholds the approval of the United States of a special territorial concession, to her carved ruthlessly out of another faithful ally. Obviously the query raised with respect to Great Britain here also applies with increased force.

Other disquieting portents, moreover, are visible—one notably of a most sweeping character. Only last week Colonel Robert R. McCormick, one of the proprietors of the Chicago Tribune,

cabled to his great journal from London: The London papers widely display the suggestion of the Presse de Paris that if America does not require the acceptance of the reservations in the peace treaty, the allies will allow the league to be formed and later refuse to recognize the validity of the reservations.

"Therefore," added Colonel McCormick, with peculiar urgency, "it is vital that the senate does not omit a clause requiring their acceptance. The majority of the league, otherwise, would demand obedience to those sections reserved against under penalty of war."

This is what America wishes to avoid beyond peradventure. She is not willing to take the remotest chance that her safeguarding reservations shall be treated as "scraps of paper." The pledge to recognize them, we are assured, is imbedded with binding force in assenting silence. Then why, asks the United States, Yankee fashion, not "put it in writing?" We stand ready to sign everything we agreed to. Why should not the others if they are indeed sincere? Are they so proud and haughty and superior that they will deign to put only inferences against our bond? Even for policy's sake might they not do well to heed the admonition of our self-designated apologist, Mr. Taft, who pleads with sufficient sycophancy, "You must be patient with the United States."

But though we be considered unduly meticulous in our contention and slightly impolite in our insistence, surely there is nothing in this simple preamble to warrant the president's interpretation.

It does not nullify. It does ratify. Nobody can deny that.

1. The United States so understands and construes Article 1 that in case of notice of withdrawal from the league of nations, as provided in said article, the United States shall be the sole judge as to whether all its international obligations and all its obligations under the said covenant have been fulfilled, and notice of withdrawal by the United States may be given by a concurrent resolution of the congress of the United States.

This is purely interpretative. Article 1 grants privilege of withdrawal if all international obligations have been fulfilled but it does not designate the judge of what constitutes fulfillment. The natural impression is that the league itself, like the senate or house of representatives, respecting its membership, would possess this power of determination. If so, withdrawal by the United States without endorsement by its eight fellow members of the council of its claim of fulfillment could be accomplished only through repudiation of its obligation and would involve a declaration of war against the league itself. If not, that is to say if the

United States should be the judge, as it is according to the president, the reservation only makes plain that which is implied. Again there is not a vestige of nullification.

2. The United States assumes no obligation to preserve the territorial integrity or political independence of any other country or to interfere in controversies between nations—whether members of the league or not—under the provisions of Article 10, or to employ the military or naval forces of the United States under any article of the treaty for any purpose, unless in any particular case the congress, which, under the constitution, has the sole power to declare war or authorize the employment of the military or naval forces of the United States, shall by act or joint resolution so provide.

Upon the fundamentals of this declaration there is no dispute. All admit that under the constitution the United States cannot engage in war "to preserve the territorial integrity or political independence of any other country" or "employ the military or naval forces for any purpose" except by affirmative action of congress. The sole point is one of moral, not legal, obligation and even here there is little, if any, differentiation. Both President Wilson and Senator Borah assert that a moral obligation transcends a legal obligation and that the United States would be in honor bound to recognize and abide by that admitted principle.

The vital difference lies between the two words "until" and "unless"—the congress proposed "shall so provide." The clause proposed by Senator Hitchcock as acceptable to the president includes "until," thereby retaining and conceding the moral obligation and making its application solely a matter of time. The Lodge reservation, on the other hand, through the use of "unless," holds strictly in congress its constitutional prerogative to act "in any particular case" that may arise without being hampered in the slightest degree by any moral obligation arising from commitment of the treaty-making branches of the government. (Concluded next week)

"Have your appendix removed; don't wait for appendicitis," advises a St. Paul physician. Along the same line of reasoning, remove your brains; don't wait for a brainstorm.

The love that will go through fire before marriage may not build the fire after marriage.

There is no need of a woman making her eyes talk.

As a person grows older he learns many things that would have been of some use to him when younger.

One half the world wonders why the other half lives.

If all the people go to heaven who expect to it may not be such an ideal place after all.

Sowing wild oats is not a part of the back-to-the-land movement.

It is poor policy to take your spleen out on the office force, but it's better to do that than to take it home with you.

Man wants but little here below except to know that his piece is secure above.

We have seen some men who could spend every evening with a sweetheart and still act perfectly sane and sensible during business hours. Some people have great recuperative powers.

A man makes a fool of himself over one woman, but there's not cure for him when he takes on two or three.

The high cost of living the lower the scale of living.

An aeronaut fell from his machine into a church. Deaths resulting from falling airplanes are so common nowadays that some novel or unusual feature like this must be arranged to insure its getting full position in the papers.

Too many children are born before marriage—and not enough afterwards.

Let not one wife know what the other wife doeth, saith the man from Utah.

## Do You Suffer? from Catarrh

This common ailment is the cause of much discomfort. It is debilitating and reduces efficiency.

### Catarrh Can Be Relieved

Treatment to employ for local use

### Rexall Catarrh Spray

used morning and evening with

MAXIMUM ATOMIZER \$1.50

General Treatment

REXALL MUCUTONE \$1.00

A reconstructive tonic, valuable in assisting the effectiveness of the local treatment and in rebuilding the system.

VALENTINES? Then Don't Forget Us!

### The Modern Pharmacy

Cottage Grove Oregon

The Rexall Store

Valentines on Sale

Stationery Bargains

# Go to the Fair Store For Bargains

We can save you money on a great many items. We have Children's Coats which we are closing out at cut prices—See them

A beautiful line of fine Waists at a saving to you Dress Skirts in the best styles always a little lower Outing flannel Night Gowns at \$2-\$2.25, Children's \$1.39 Baby caps, bootees, bands, blankets, sweaters, jiffy pants Everything for the baby New spring Hosiery just in Big shipment of spring and summer Underwear Bargains in Embroidery and Laces—New Collars

Blue Bird dishes, 42-piece set.....	\$10.95	Wax paper.....	5c	Toilet paper, roll.....	5c and 10c
Four-piece tea set in fine glassware.....	\$2.00	Paper plates, 20 in box.....	15c; 2 boxes 25c	Alarm clocks (tax included).....	75c
Other four-piece sets at.....	\$1.50	Knives and forks (6 of each), set.....	\$1.25	Extra good 10c envelopes, our price per package.....	8c or 2 for 15c
Blown glass tumblers, special per set of six.....	65c; dozen, \$1.25	Tea spoons, set.....	20c	Bluing, best grade, two large bottles.....	15c
Star cut glass tumblers, special for 6.....	\$1.15	Table spoons, set.....	40c	Broom bargains—also hundreds of other bargains at.....	5c, 10c, 15c, 25c up
See us about milk bottles and caps.....		Laundry soap, four bars.....	25c		
		Best matches, four boxes.....	25c		

Watch for Our Next Advertisements — Everybody Welcome

# THE FAIR Bargain Store