

A CENTURY OF EXPANSION, DESCRIBED BY AN AMERICAN JOURNALIST.

Willis Fletcher Johnson, A. M., L. H. D., one of the members of the staff of the *New York Tribune*, has published a book under the tille *A Century of Expansion*,<sup>1</sup> in which he familiarises his readers with American history from the view-point of its continual growth. He recapitulates in terse outlines the significance of the discovery and colonisation of America. He shows how the doors were opened to the world, and how the Spanish influence was gradually overcome by the English colonists, how the nation first grew, and how it expanded through and with its constitution. The principle of self-defence forced this youngest nation of the territories, not only over the continent but also to the Spanish Islands and mid-sea possessions. The spirit of the book is best characterised in the author's own terms, who says in the preface:

"The purport of the term 'expansion' is sometimes carelessly misunderstood. It is, apparently, supposed to apply to nothing but acquisition of territory, and to that of recent date; to wit, our annexation of Porto Rico and

<sup>1</sup>New York: The Macmillan Company. London: Macmillan & Co., Limited. 1903. the Philippines. Such a conception is inadequate and misleading. Expansion is no new thing, and it is not measured by any geographical scale. Its history begins with the history of the nation, and both its causes and its effects are intimately intertwined with almost every fibre of our national being. The expansion of the human body is a process of physical growth which is maintained incessantly so long as vitality is in the ascendant. When growth ceases the man begins to die.

"The same principle is applicable to the state. Territorial expansion increases power, enlarges the sphere of activity, adds to responsibilities and duties, creates new problems for solution, leads to new relationships, and thus induces constitutional—that is, intellectual and moral—development of the nation. This is generally true of growing states. It is especially true of a new country under a constitutional government, in which the process of expansion began, practically, with the foundation of the state and has been maintained at intervals ever since. The history of American expansion is therefore something far more than a record of geographical extension, or even of wars and treaties. It involves the history, in large measure, of constitutional development and interpretation, of domestic institutions, of foreign relations, and of our whole national life.

"It aims to present the salient features of the great story, succinctly yet with sufficient comprehensiveness, at least, to suggest where it does not instruct. It aims, moreover, to deal justly with the varying phases of the checkered story. For it is not all pride and sunshine. The nation has not always acted wisely and well. There are things to condemn as well as to commend. Acts are not always necessarily right, just because our country performs them. The best that we can claim, and we can truly claim it, is that, on the whole, our expansion has been a sound and beneficent growth, contributing to elevation of mind and spirit as well as to enlargement of area on the map of the world."

In the retrospect and prospect, Mr. Johnson gives a sensible explanation of the Monroe Doctrine, the spirit of which he describes as follows:

"Europe must not meddle with the domestic interests of the Americas, and in return the United States will not meddle with the domestic affairs of Europe. That is all. There is nothing in it that forbids European powers to make treaties with or wage war against American states, and as a matter of fact such treaties have been made and such wars have been waged without our protest. There is nothing to prevent European powers from collecting debts due them from American states, or from holding the latter responsible for the discharge of international obligations, which also they have repeatedly done. Such affairs are not domestic to America, but are international in scope. Neither does the doctrine bar America from a certain participation in European affairs. 'In the wars of the European powers, in matters relating to themselves, we have never taken any part.' No. But we had taken part in European wars in matters relating to ourselves. We had sent fleets and an army to the Mediterranean, and to those North African states which were much more nearly a part of the European system than is eastern Asia.

"The Monroe Doctrine, therefore, does not in either letter or spirit bar us out of Asia, unless we are to consider Asia a part of Europe, which would be absurd. Asia is left a neutral ground between Europe and America, in which the latter has equal rights with the former, in both peace and war. America, just as much as Europe, is entitled to an open door in Ásia for peaceful commerce, and, in emergency, she has an equal right to exert physical force upon Asia for the attainment of her ends. This America has already done, more than once. The 'opening' of Japan was acquiesced in by European powers, which profited from it. The 'opening' of Korea was not reckoned a violation of the Monroe Doctrine. Neither has our acquisition of the Philippines traversed that Doctrine in any sense. It is from it a matter entirely apart."

His view of expansion may be considered as commonly accepted by the nation; at any rate the policy of the United States is forced to take the consequences of the situation. We cannot help growing, and so the old notion of restricting territorial acquisitions must be considered as antiquated. Mr. Johnson says:

"The notion that America should refrain from taking part in so-called world politics is as mistaken as it is futile."

Under these principles the Spanish war and the acquisition of the Spanish islands, the protectorate of Cuba is fully justified. As to the other islands of the West Indias Mr. Johnson says:

"The second island of the West Indias in point of size, Hayti, is now divided between two independent republics. They are pursuing a troubled course, which may decline into hopeless anarchy, or may happily lead upward into tranquil prosperity. If the latter, we shall be pleased to see them remain forever independent. If the former, it may become necessary for the United States to intervene and even to establish its authority over them. In any case, there must be an inexorable American prohibition of anything like European conquest or control of them. They must remain independent, and justify their independence, or else become territories of the United States."

The book is decidedly timely and is written in the proper spirit which neither echoes the sentiments of Jingoism nor the narrowness of the antiexpansionist who has no idea of the conditions of national growth and the duties of national life.

## THE HEBREW SECULAR LAW IN THE LIGHT OF COMPARATIVE JURISPRUDENCE.

In the Jewish Conservator for June 17, A. H. Godbey discusses "The Making of Hebrew Secular Law," arguing that a new source should be recognized in the literary criticism of the Hebrew records. He suggests that the method heretofore pursued, of treating the laws for daily secular life as emanating from the same element in society that produced the primitive religious law, and as possessing equal authority, is open to criticism.

"We know enough of simple clan and tribal life in all parts of the world to be able to trace with accuracy some phases of human development. In this primitive stage, the line between secular and sacred things is fairly distinct. The functions of the chiefs, the elders, or the popular assembly, are quite definite. Intertribal wars, internal disputes, petty crimes and misdemeanors, divisions of property, are matters that concern the popular courts. The sacred class is concerned with its taboos, its magic, and its rituals. It