

THE OPEN COURT.

A WEEKLY JOURNAL

DEVOTED TO THE RELIGION OF SCIENCE.

No. 438. (VOL. X.—3.)

CHICAGO, JANUARY 16, 1896.

{ One Dollar per Year.
{ Single Copies, 5 Cents.

COPYRIGHT BY THE OPEN COURT PUBLISHING CO.—Reprints are permitted only on condition of giving full credit to author and publisher.

OUR CLEVELAND CHRISTMAS.

BY MONCURE D. CONWAY.

TO-DAY—Christmas Day—England is at peace. The choirs are chanting ancient anthems of peace on earth, good-will to man, amid hearts calm in the consciousness that the year now closing has witnessed increasing efforts of their country to promote peace at home and abroad, to relieve suffering within its borders, and to stay the hand of cruelty abroad. The thunderbolt launched by the President upon this government, while it was engaged in negotiations with Venezuela, has evoked no thunderbolt in reply, nor even ruffled the temper of the nation. Americans here have been treated with the same kindness that has always been extended to them. English credit has not been disturbed; not a failure has occurred; a few speculators may have suffered, but British securities have even been enhanced in value. The President's thunderbolt has fallen on his own subjects—for are we not subjects of a man who by a stroke of his pen can destroy our resources, break down our credit, make our country a laughing-stock, make us hang our head with shame? Our lips are closed, for we cannot criticise our sovereign in a foreign land; but our faces can be read; and we cannot escape the humiliation of meeting eyes that silently sympathise with us for the disgrace they know we are suffering.

Our country has chosen out of its sixty millions one man to be placed above all other Americans. The President is presumably the flower of our race, the culmination of American wisdom and virtue. Through him America has (theoretically) spoken. With what result? Monarchy has been denounced, and every monarch sits more easily on his throne. There is not one among them—neither king, emperor, czar, nor sultan—who could dream of exercising half the arbitrary power now proved to be lodged in the hands of this President of a professed republic. Where is the monarch whose single word could cost his people a thousand million dollars? In America alone. One hundred and three years ago the crowns of Europe formed a league to crush the new-born republic of France. They might have saved themselves the trouble. A popular superstition of leadership led to the enthronement of personal autocrats,—Marat, Robespierre, Napoleon,—

who out-tyrannised every crowned tyrant, and gave the nations object-lessons in the despotism that may disguise itself as "republicanism" which strengthened every throne. History is now repeating itself. The people of Europe, really republican at heart, are now shown that an American president is not only a *König im Frack*, as the Germans say, but a potentate in whom usurpation is privileged. The President is sworn to maintain the Constitution and laws. His executive powers are defined and limited by a written Constitution. But there is nothing in the Constitution, nothing in any law, about the Monroe Doctrine. Nay, at this very moment, Congress dare not attempt to frame that "Doctrine" in a law, for it would become a Bedlam of clashing theories and policies. But under his technical right to propose measures to Congress the President enjoys the right to insult other countries, to ruin the credit and finances of his country, and to promote selfish or partisan ends. This privilege of usurpation renders him, even if a well-meaning man, an easy tool of corrupt "rings." The uneasy feeling which still prevails in the business centres of Europe continues because of a suspicion that the President has not suspicion enough, and that he is being "buncoed" (to use a police phrase) in this matter. I remember, just after President Cleveland had appointed an unfit man to a high office, asking one of his (Cleveland's) political supporters how it happened. He answered that a small clique in a certain city had "buncoed" the President, who received hundreds of letters from all parts of the nation urging the appointment of that individual. The letters, posted in the different States, were all written by a few persons in one city. I know not if this be true, but it is evidently possible, where great power is entrusted to one man, that some clique, for instance, some Venezuelan or gold-hunting "ring," may from one small den of conspiracy have the chieftain overwhelmed with jingo letters from all parts of the country, which he may be dull enough to regard as expressing public feeling. The White House is so morbidly sensitive to public opinion that designing letters are considered there. A letter written under a feigned name to President Johnson,—a letter of merest personal spite against Motley, while Minister at Vienna,—led to such a pres-

idental insult to the historian that he resigned his post.

Whatever may be the invisible agencies seeking to involve us in war, it is certain that no conspiracy of crowns against the United States, were such conceivable, could in many years have damaged us as much as our President has in a day. A leading Paris journal, influential in the commercial world, says: "It must be recognised that the United States is not a safe country to deal with." It is an impression that has not grown up in a day, though it has received its definite stamp and currency in a day. And it will outlast the occasion that elicited it: it will last as long as the American presidency.

For some time now our beloved but misgoverned country has been unconsciously mounting as if on a stage a succession of tableaux which tell more effectively on the eye of the world than all tall talk about free institutions tells on the ear. Let me mention some of the contrast between the talk and the facts.

Representative Government: exhibited in the equal legislative power of small with large populations (e. g., Delaware with New York); this preservation of the rotten borough system, long extinct in England, forming a non-representative Senate able to impose tariffs and money-bills on the people.

Self-government: the absolute helplessness of all branches of the Government to pass any measure whatever if a half dozen senators conspire to prevent a vote being taken, by talking against time.

Independence: the sovereign right of a State to appropriate the property of its citizens and repudiate payment, without amenability to any suit, because of its sovereign majesty, which can "do no wrong,"—an irresponsibility unknown in any European State.

Equality: the helplessness of our national Government to protect its citizens from being disfranchised, lynched, or even burnt alive,—a large photograph of the late Texas burning being now shown in the cities of Europe.

Separation of Church and State: illustrated by exemptions of church property, which increase the taxes of all citizens; also of chaplains salaried in violation of the plain letter of the Constitution.

Religious Liberty: exhibited in the Sabbatarian chains of New York and other communities; and the bibliolatry in public schools.

Republican Institutions: a president insulting a constitutional monarchy, in which no king or queen has for two centuries attempted anything so monarchical as the said president's manifesto.

Such is the "Republic" which European peoples have been beholding on the stage of the New World, and it is a delusion to suppose that any monarch has an interest, *qua* monarch, to interfere with it. The

"republican" propaganda in Europe has been arrested by the American exemplifications. Thirty-two years ago, when I first visited England, there was a large and bold republican party and organisation, aiming to "Americanise" English institutions. The House of Lords was to be superseded by a Senate, the throne by a presidency, and so forth. In the course of one generation all that has disappeared. The English people have in that time secured institutions quite as free, and quite as representative, as those of an American State, but no one claiming the title of "republican" is left. This is the effect of the above tableaux,—the incompetency, repudiations, inability to protect personal liberty, displayed by our federal government across the Atlantic. And at the same time there has been a steady growth and increase of friendship for Americans. Their learning and literature have been more highly appreciated, their scholars have been honored by English universities, and their citizens have been welcomed in the best English society. They have paid a compliment to Americans in the blank incredulity with which Cleveland's outbreak and Olney's billingsgate have been received, and their calm expectation of the truer American voice, which did not disappoint them.

And is this not what is going on in America also? Do not Americans of culture and refinement feel that they are not really represented by the political jockeys at Washington, whose "legislation" from one four years to another looks only to win in the presidential finish? Greedy partisans, trust-rings, silverites, lobbyists, may not pause in their eagerness for the stakes to see what the world sees, but are there not gentlemen who have still that decent regard for the opinion of mankind, to recall the Declaration of Independence, which can recognise the outrage that has been done?

Good heavens! Think of the ruler of a great nation insulting another nation, and then appointing a commission to find out whether he may not be wrong and the other nation right! The whole thing could have been examined just as well before as after the affront, and the ruinous smashing of his own furniture. Are Americans so ignorant as to be deluded by antiquated cries and names? If so, they are far behind European intelligence. European nations are not very fond of England, in most cases because of her freedom, but they can all discover the contrast between an imperial President proclaiming war for nothing, and a constitutional Prince returning, by permission of a ministry, the message of peace and goodwill.

Serious people in America should think of these things. They will hear the truth from any European. The English people, who really love Americans, will never run the risk of offending their susceptibilities by

criticising our institutions. Even Mr. Bryce covers over his comments with so much sugar that his work has an effect of flattery. In other countries the opponents of republicans are quite willing to have American politicians continue to render European populations increasingly content with their old-fashioned systems, which are steadily brought into harmony with their needs and aspirations. Under such conditions Cleveland's and Olney's spread-eagle screams have a droll sound of proceeding from some President Rip Van Winkle who went to sleep during our Revolution and supposes George III. still on the throne of England. But Europe sees King George to be on the American throne. And it is to be hoped that enough Americans recognise that indisputable fact to make his White House Majesty's—or shall we write it *Mad-jesty's*—suicidal fulmination a point of departure towards a real Republic.

If Americans would leave off inoculating school children with errors, by teaching them from ignorant school-histories, which dwell on the follies of an insane king and an extinct England as if they were still characteristic; if instead of this our children were taught something about our own faults, our presidential robberies of Mexico, our oppression of negroes and Indians, we might see a rising generation able to deal with the organic faults which have rendered such things impossible.

But even now one may hope that the intelligence of our people, assisted by the financial victims, will institute an inquest, and inquire whether their pre-scientific last-century Constitution, even with all its patches (several that make the rents worse) is worthy of them. The Constitution, even when made, was acknowledged to be a makeshift; it was framed under urgency of danger, it had to compromise with slavery, with colonial jealousies, and with monarchical superstitions. The mongrel instrument has necessitated a long reign of slavery, culminating in civil war; it has given us a succession of monarchs of whom very few can bear the light of true history; it has seen the achievements of the nation's martyrdom saved from overthrow by a drunken traitor, Andrew Johnson, only by a congressional violation of the Constitution; and it has lived to witness the Cleveland Christmas.

How long is our so-called Republic to be in this puerile condition of subserviency to a man? If American thinkers, scholars, patriots, rise to this occasion, the close of this century will witness the end of the outworn Constitution; a national convention is now the only possible compensation for the humiliations and disasters which the antiquated instrument has cost us; we have a right—nay, mankind have the right—to see a real American Republic greet the dawn of the twentieth century.

THE MONROE DOCTRINE IN 1895.

BY PROF. E. D. COPE.

IN A republic every citizen has a vote, and as the majority of votes are cast, so the policy of the government is directed. Opinions control votes, so every citizen is more or less responsible for any influence which his opinions may have. In matters involving serious consequences, every conscientious man must endeavor to reach such opinions as will make for the good of the world, and contribute to its progress, so far as the material in his possession enables him to do so.

In the dispute with Great Britain over the Venezuela boundary we have had a great deal of expression from all quarters, some hasty, some careful; some cool, and some excited. In the following paragraphs some of these opinions are passed in review, and an attempt is made to sift wheat from chaff. The writer permits himself to do this, not because of any especial qualification for the task, but because he endeavors to look at the subject rather more coolly than some of those who have contributed to the discussion.

Senator Lodge in the United States Senate, and Dr. J. B. McMasters, Professor of History in the University of Pennsylvania, in the columns of the *New York Times*, have given us a concise history of the Monroe Doctrine up to date. These documents show to those not already familiar with the facts, that however private opinions may have differed on this question, the government of the United States has maintained it consistently as a definite policy from 1823, the date of its promulgation, to the presidency of James Buchanan inclusive. And it is also well known that it was maintained by President Lincoln in the year 1865 with reference to the French occupation of Mexico. President Cleveland in maintaining it in the year 1895 is therefore only continuing the policy of the United States for the last seventy-two years. Under these circumstances Congress has unanimously supported the President.

In endeavoring to carry out this policy with reference to the supposed attempt on the part of Great Britain to seize territory belonging to Venezuela, successive administrations have been for about eighteen years endeavoring to secure from the former country her consent to a commission to arbitrate the question. Our proposition has been peaceable, but Great Britain has rejected it. She has refused to furnish to our government the opportunity of going over with her the evidence for and against her claim. She takes the position, *ex cathedra*, that the Monroe Doctrine does not apply in this case. Nothing remained to our government then, but that it should make the investigation alone, and so President Cleveland asked Congress for a commission, a request which was immediately

granted. The President has now appointed the commission.

The English people and press have been much agitated over the action of the President and Congress, ascribing various motives to him often far from the true ones. They have however discovered that there is such a thing as the Monroe Doctrine, and that it is the settled policy of the United States to maintain it. A good many people in the United States, however, have taken alarm at the possible results to follow from the course of the President and Congress, and are uttering through the newspaper press and otherwise, more or less vigorous objections to it. These objections come under three heads. First, that the present case of the Venezuelan boundary is not related to the Monroe Doctrine; second, that the Monroe Doctrine is itself untenable. These are rational grounds of objection which are bound to be met. There is, however, a large third class of irrational objectors, who are evidently actuated by feelings of sentiment, etc., and which may be briefly referred to here first.

We are reminded that the tract of land in dispute is small (say equal to the State of New York), and that it is not worth quarrelling about. The size of the territory is, however, quite irrelevant in a matter of principle. Moreover, it is extremely fortunate that the tract is not larger or more important, as in that case the recognition of the Monroe Doctrine, if applicable, would be less readily admitted. We are reminded also that the inhabitants are of a race inferior to the English, and not related to us by ties of blood, as are the latter. But this also is irrelevant. Should the English at any future time outpopulate the Spanish stock in any South American country, they could, since the form of government of the latter is republican, acquire control of it by constitutional methods. This would be a good thing for the world, and the Monroe Doctrine would in no way obstruct the result. If the forms of government in South America were monarchical or aristocratic as those of Europe, this result would not be so readily attained; witness the position of the English inhabitants of the Transvaal. We are also told that the Monroe Doctrine has never been recognised as international law. This is no reason, however, why it should not become so. Whether it should become so or not will depend on its inherent merits or demerits. If it is important for good reasons that the United States should maintain it, we will endeavor to introduce it into the Laws of Nations. I will consider its merits later on.

The weak objection that the British will not respect the result of the deliberation of the Commission appointed by President Cleveland, is also irrelevant. That nation has its administration to thank that the

Commission is not international in character. Moreover, the Commission was not constituted for the purpose of furnishing Great Britain with information, but for furnishing it to the government and people of the United States. If any information is conveyed to Great Britain on the subject it will not be by the Commission, but by the government of the United States. An objection more feeble in substance, though vehemently made, is that the form of the President's message was not conciliatory. But all parties will forget the matter of form, when they get to considering the questions involved, in a serious and rational frame of mind. This is the burden of the published letter of Professor James of Harvard University, which vigorously condemns the President, while admitting that his contention is a just one. Neither the American nor British nations will sacrifice themselves to a matter of form, as Professor James seems to think both will now surely do. If as Professor James believes the President's message is inflammatory, it behooves him, and all of us not to be too ready to be ignited by it to too active combustion.

We may now consider whether the Venezuelan boundary question, as it is now before us, comes within the scope of the Monroe Doctrine. To this question the answer must be, that we do not certainly know. It is to ascertain the truth of this matter that the Venezuelan commission has been appointed. Until the commission has reported the facts all confident assertions are premature. But it is to be understood that the action of the United States will be in accordance with its findings. This brings us to the question as to whether the Monroe Doctrine is a policy which this country does well to sustain, even at the risk of armed conflict.

This, the ultimate question, which is the root of the whole matter, must be approached with due modesty, in view of the truth of the general proposition that any form of government is good, if administered with due regard to human rights. It is also true that any form of government administered without regard to those rights is bad. There are faults inherent in the republican form, as there are in the monarchical or oligarchical. With the exception, however, of a few citizens of our larger cities, Americans are generally of the opinion that a republican form is better than any other, because it contains within itself the conditions for an administration more in accordance with human right than any other, and is therefore more likely to be so administered. Of course, those Americans who do not believe that our form of government is the best cannot be relied on to sustain the Monroe Doctrine. In support of their contention these citizens join with foreigners and point to the rule of Tammany and its chiefs, Tweed and Croker,

and to the corruption of municipal rule in some other cities. But both our internal and external critics forget that the large cities are the centres of concentration of the offscourings of Europe; of people who are the legitimate product of the European system, whose existence in Europe furnishes the *raison d'être* of absolutism. New York and Chicago especially, with their forty-five per cent. foreign population, cannot be regarded as representative American cities. Europeans generally mistake the sentiment of New York for that of the United States. They should, however, remember that the disloyalty of that city at the opening of the Civil War had no appreciable effect on the opinions of the country, and did not delay the suppression of the rebellion by a single day. The disloyal expressions recently heard there will disappear with equal rapidity. The New York *World* represents nothing American, and it was a lamentable minimisation of the effect of the good intentions of the Prince of Wales, that he should have been inveigled into sending a friendly despatch to the American people through its scandal-stained columns. It was a mistake quite as bad as his adoption of friendly relations with Richard Croker, the Tammany boss, who represents nothing but what Americans detest and despise. Perhaps, however, it gives a hint of the natural affinities between persons who belong to privileged classes in all countries.

The gist of the objections to the European systems of government is that they are, excepting that of France, much too largely administered by and on behalf of privileged persons and classes, and not sufficiently on behalf of the people. In the government proper of England, this condition is rather less conspicuous than in the continental systems; yet their aristocratic social system rules the British people with a grip quite as effective as any autocracy could do. The stratigraphy of the Englishman's mind is notorious, and while the English claim to be the freest people of Europe, many of them are saturated with an idea of human relations thoroughly false and unjust, and as oppressive and suppressive in its way as the military despotisms of the Continent or of South America. As a whole, the aristocratic systems of Europe are not so far removed from the products of our semi-European municipal systems as might at first sight appear. We have seen how the Europeans who live in them permit themselves to be governed by Tweeds and Crokers, *et id omne genus*. Is there any reason to doubt that were the American element absent, this class of robbers would soon become the legitimate aristocracy of those cities, and administer their governments perpetually by hereditary right? Such is at all events the history of the origin of most of the personnel of the aristocracies of all countries.

Their privileged position is due either to unwilling or complaisant submission of the great bulk of the population to the robberies and pretensions of their ancestors or themselves.

The difference between the systems of America and Europe is this: that in this country we call a spade a spade, and stealing we call stealing. In Europe the robberies of the most enterprising robbers have been legitimised, and have become a part of the system under which the people live. Thus have arisen established royal families, nobilities, and churches. Under this system enormous sums of money are taken from the people and spent on persons either of no or small utility. The greater part of the land is possessed by but few people. Thus fifty thousand persons out of England's thirty-six millions own nearly all the land. In an aristocratic country a man's family is as unsafe as his purse, not through the prevalence of rape, but because of the enormous leverage offered by false social standards. And the serious part of all this is that it cannot be changed without a stupendous expenditure of blood and treasure. In a republican system, on the contrary, when evils creep in we can remedy them if we choose. The men who feel privileged to rob us we send to jail or drive from the country, sooner or later. And we do it with more or less ease as the percentage of European population is less or greater. Boss Tweed never accumulated as much money as have most European monarchs, and no American official ever possessed a tithe of the wealth of some of the English dukes.

In a word, the aristocratic and monarchical systems of the world are a crystallisation and establishment of the system of robbery of which we so much complain in our municipal governments, and they are tolerated by the same inferior class which constitutes a large part of the population of Europe. They represent an inferior stage of human organisation, but one which it is probable is only temporary. It is probable that the people of several European countries are not yet adapted to a republican form of government, while it is equally probable that some other countries are ready for it. But will the governing classes step down and out with a good grace when the time arrives, or must each of those countries have its revolution after the manner of the French? We cannot tell.

Meanwhile let us save as much of the world to republicanism as we can. We probably need for our own existence that we shall sustain as far as possible the efforts of mankind to liberate themselves from the permanent rule of privileged classes. These classes hate America and everything American. They would suppress us if they could. We have no quarrel with the liberals and republicans of Europe, but unfortunately, except in the case of France, they do not con-

trol their governments. It is absolutely necessary that we encourage every republic, however rudimental may be its republicanism, in order that the republics of the world may acquire sufficient weight to enforce toleration and peace. In this lies our interest in the South American republics. Now that the last monarchy has left that continent, the Western Hemisphere is devoted to republicanism, and in a short time the aggregate of its peoples will be so great as to secure them from molestation from any quarter whatsoever. No matter if some of them be more or less turbulent; their condition is full of hope. Their systems are not crystallised and everything is possible to them. In Mexico we have an illustration of the progress on which Spanish America has entered. Excellent schools abound and industrial enterprise is active. The fine arts are cultivated with more success than in the United States. The calm and industrious Mexican Indian has quite as often improved as injured the Spanish immigrant race.

Besides the extreme importance of preserving all America for the republican form of government, still another reason exists why the Monroe Doctrine is of great moment to the Western Hemisphere. The peculiar geographical positions of the peoples of Europe, their histories and policies which have grown out of them, are totally foreign to the American peoples. The relations of the European nations are complex, and are liable to become strained or hostile at any time. We cannot enter into their affairs and we desire that their mutual quarrels shall not involve us in any way. This they will surely do if they are permitted to partition South America as they are doing Africa and Asia. We must insist on the doctrine of mutual non-intervention. Of course we cannot interfere in cases where just causes of grievance exist, excepting to insist that indemnities paid by American to European countries shall not consist of land. Thus the Corinto affair did not come within the scope of the Monroe Doctrine because no attempt at territorial seizure was made.

Finally it remains to dispose of one more objection to the Monroe Doctrine as a live policy of our Government. It is alleged that we must become involved in the revolutions of South American countries, and in their wars with Europe. A rational view of the Doctrine makes it clear that this is not the case. The sole practical application of this Doctrine is the restraint of European countries from acquiring territory and hence political power in America, and it extends to nothing else.

The maintenance of the Monroe Doctrine is of great importance to the future of republican institutions, not only in America, but throughout the world. It is especially the function of the United States to

lead in this great reform, and we should not shirk the responsibility which is clearly ours. No better opportunity than the present can well be thrown in our way. Europe is tied up with her mutual antagonisms. England cannot leave the Hellespont and India unguarded, and Germany cannot leave the Rhine provinces open to France. For Italy and Spain we care nothing, and Russia is not interested, for she has Asia on her hands. Why should we hesitate? We have not hesitated, and it will be to the honor of President Cleveland and his administration, and of this Congress, that they have accepted the responsibility. Let us hope that before another change in the Government takes place, Cuba will be added to the republican system of the United States.

The preceding pages express the thoughts of the author as to the principles involved in the Venezuelan dispute. As usual, besides the irrelevancy of much that has been said and written on the subject, a certain amount of bad feeling has been injected into the discussion. This is to be greatly deprecated, as it is the worst form of irrelevancy. The judgments on the part of some men of civilised races on other nations and races do not differ from those of savages. Because some Englishman has done wrong, or has been rude to us, therefore all Englishmen are hateful. A German hates a Frenchman, because a very few Frenchmen precipitated a war with Germany. A Frenchman hates all Germans, because the war ended unfavorably to the interests of France, etc., etc. Nothing is more absurd than national likes and dislikes. As an American, the present writer has learned to admire and respect men of all nations. Englishmen are at least as deserving of these sentiments as the people of any other nation. We should restrict our hostility to the man or the class of men who affront or injure us, and it is safe to say that for all of our disputes with England we are chiefly, if not entirely, indebted to the privileged or aristocratic class. We can expect nothing else from them, as our system is a standing proof to the world that a nation may be successful and happy without a class corresponding to theirs. If we oppose them even to the point of arms we should remember that we are contending for a principle, rather than to gratify a feeling of hostility to a people, the great majority of whom are desirous of remaining friendly to us, and to whom we are bound by many ties that make for peace.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE MONROE DOCTRINE.

THE history of the Monroe Doctrine, which is admirably set forth by ex-Gov. Gustav Koerner,¹ is one thing, and its significance as a political maxim another.

¹ See *The Open Court*, No. 294, pp. 3623-3625.

The latter may be a misconstruction of the former ; nevertheless it exists and we must reckon with it.

What the Monroe Doctrine is in the minds of the people has been sufficiently shown by the official acts of President Cleveland, which have (and there cannot be the slightest doubt about it) the moral support of the great majority of our citizens. The Monroe Doctrine means that the United States should pursue the policy which President Monroe proclaimed in his annual message of 1823. President Monroe said :

"We owe it to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and the allied powers to declare, that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety. With the existing colonies of any European power we have not interfered, and shall not interfere ; but with the governments which have declared their independence and maintained it, and whose independence we have, on great consideration and principles, acknowledged, we could not view an interposition for oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny by any European power, in any other light than as a manifestation of an unfriendly disposition towards the United States."

The Monroe Doctrine is no international law ; it is simply an aim or plan of policy pursued by the United States. It is not based upon a treaty with any of the powers, nor is it a pledge to interfere with the peaceful or hostile relations that may originate between the South American republics and any one of the European governments. The fact is that Napoleon III., taking advantage of our weakness during the Civil War, attempted to create an empire after the pattern of European monarchies in Mexico, and had the Confederacy of the Southern States succeeded in gaining and in maintaining their independence, what would have become of the United States and its broad and humanitarian ideals ?

As soon as the Civil War was over the government of the United States openly declared its intentions to invade Mexico unless the French troops were withdrawn. The United States had as little business in Mexico as they have now in Venezuela, but they cannot remain indifferent to the introduction of monarchical or aristocratic principles of government into either continent of the two Americas. Considering the complications that may arise in the course of time, they have unequivocally and openly declared it to be "dangerous to their peace and safety," and those powers who care to preserve the amicable relations with them must respect this declaration.

Such is the Monroe Doctrine as it lives in the souls of a great number of American citizens, and in this sense must be interpreted President Cleveland's policy, who after the cool refusal of his offer of arbitration in the Venezuelan question, proposed in his message the appointment of a commission to definitely settle the

claims of England. Now the questions arise, (1) Is the Monroe Doctrine based upon international justice? (2) Is it a wise policy? and (3) Would it be right to risk a war on account of a dispute between England and Venezuela, concerning a territory of comparatively little value ?

As to the justice of the Monroe Doctrine we must remember that it is not a question of law but of policy. It is a question of power, not of right or wrong. The United States have abstained from any interference in the politics of the European powers, because they do not wish to be implicated in their affairs and hope thus the better to preserve for themselves their own sphere of influence. The United States certainly have the right to pursue a policy as much as any other State, and they may, as much as England or any other country, set a limit to their ambition, and may declare how far they mean to extend the sphere of their pretensions. This has been done in the Monroe Doctrine, and it was done at the suggestion of a great English statesman, who should have foreseen that the ghost could more easily be raised than laid. The Monroe Doctrine is at least as right as the hoisting of the English flag in a new territory ; nay, it is unquestionably more right, for it is not based upon the intention of conquest, it is nothing but a proclamation of sympathy with the preservation and integrity of our American sister-republics, and a hint that we would be willing to assist them in case of any "intervention for the purpose of oppressing them or controlling in any manner their destiny." This is the intention of the Monroe Doctrine, and as such it is known in England as the policy of the United States of America, for even so thoroughly an English work as the *Encyclopædia Britannica* says (XXIII., p. 762):

"The 'Monroe' Doctrine has remained the rule of foreign intercourse for all American parties."

The Monroe Doctrine does not imply that the United States are pledged to go to war whenever an American republic should get into trouble with a European power ; it leaves the United States a free hand to decide whether or not in each particular case it would be wise to interfere, but it declares openly and without reserve on which side our sympathies will be.

Whether or not it would be wise to press the Monroe Doctrine at the present time and against so formidable a naval power as England is a question of politics which I do not wish to discuss ; it certainly teaches us that in order to meet all emergencies we should preserve the financial credit of the nation. American securities have fallen on account of the war rumors, but they rose again, although slowly, and would have risen more quickly if our currency were not endangered by the shortsighted debates and dubious attitude of our Senate. The financial question is a great issue in it-

self and has directly nothing to do with the Monroe Doctrine, which latter simply means, and will always mean, whether or not the United States are willing to fight for the ideal of preserving America (so far as it is not in the hands of European powers) for independent American republics.

At any rate, if England encroaches upon the territory of any one of the American republics, she ought to know what to expect, and has no right to complain about a president of the United States who simply pursues the well-known traditional policy of his country.

This is an impartial statement of the situation, which in our opinion is radically misrepresented by our esteemed contributor Moncure D. Conway, whose denunciations of President Cleveland appear to lack all foundation. There is no jingoism in President Cleveland, nor is he the tool of rings and political jockeys. His good-will toward England and his love of peace cannot be doubted. His decisive stand in the Hawaiian question proved that he can turn a deaf ear to the temptation of extending the territory of the United States, but if for that reason the English government imagined that he would abandon all attempts whatever at pursuing a foreign policy, allowing the traditional aspirations of his country to die out, they were gravely mistaken in him.

As to Mr. Conway's wholesale attack upon American institutions, we submit that every good American citizen knows how far we still are from having attained the ideal of a truly republican administration. There are grievous diseases in our body politic, but he who denies that much progress, although it may be slow, has been made and is still being made, is not familiar with the state of things on this side of the Atlantic. England certainly cannot, nor can any one of the European nations, boast of being free from faults. The faults of England are partly the same as ours and lie partly in other fields. The text-books of history officially used in the schools of England and other European countries are not less falsified than those of the United States. Was there never a sudden rise or fall of securities consequent upon the actions of European prime ministers, such as Bismark, Palmerston, and others? If the President's sympathy with the wrongs which he cannot help supposing a weak little State has suffered from the hands of powerful England, be an affront, what shall we think of Emperor William who, a crowned monarch himself and a grandson of the Queen of Great Britain, could not refrain from congratulating the president of a small republic in the interior of Africa for having again repelled the encroachments of English usurpation? The Boers are anxious to remain Dutch Boers, and object to being governed by an English gold-mining com-

pany and their officials. Much may be said in favor of either side, the Boers and the English; nonetheless, both questions, that of Transvaal and that of Venezuela, are not simply monarchy versus republic, but independence versus intrusion. However, there is this difference, Emperor William yielded to an outburst of sentiment, while President Cleveland obeyed the call of duty as understood by himself and by the nation that he represents.

The new nation that is coalescing here from the various ingredients of European countries, is more than five-sixths Teutonic and almost half Anglo-Saxon. No wonder that we have a deep-seated feeling of kinship toward England, as also toward Germany and other European countries; but this feeling of kinship can only be preserved on the condition that our national ideals and aspirations are respected.

And we have the confidence that both the English Government and the English people will respect them, so much so that President Cleveland has as yet found it unnecessary to make preparations for war.

There is certainly no need of defending President Cleveland for upholding the Monroe Doctrine. The question was simply whether or not the nation would stand by him; and the Senate as well as the people were not reluctant with their endorsement.

The endorsement of Cleveland's policy by the nation came not in the form of chauvinistic outbursts but in the quiet determination of being willing to take the consequences, whatever they might be. P. C.

THE OPEN COURT

"THE MONON," 324 DEARBORN STREET.

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, Post Office Drawer F.

E. C. HEGELER, PUBLISHER.

DR. PAUL CARUS, EDITOR.

TERMS THROUGHOUT THE POSTAL UNION:

\$1.00 PER YEAR.

\$0.50 FOR SIX MONTHS.

N. B. Binding Cases for single yearly volumes of THE OPEN COURT will be supplied on order. Price, 75 cents each.

CONTENTS OF NO. 438.

OUR CLEVELAND CHRISTMAS. MONCURE D. CONWAY 4775

THE MONROE DOCTRINE IN 1895. PROF. E. D. COPE 4777

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE MONROE DOCTRINE.

EDITOR 4780