

The Editor tells me that one of THE WEEK's contributors, at present in England, will shortly publish simultaneously in London (Methuen & Co.) and New York (Stone & Kimball) a volume of verse entitled "The Gods Give My Donkey Wings." The author's *nom-de-guerre* is "Angus Evan Abbott." He is a Canadian and well known under his real name as a clever and delightfully humorous writer.

Dr. Sandford Fleming, Chancellor of Queen's University, has issued a circular-letter stating that the late Professor Williamson has bequeathed the residue of his estate to the endowment of the University. There are many old students and friends of Dr. Williamson who would like his name associated with some permanent memorial, and it is proposed to ask the trustees to allow the bequest (which will be under \$2,000) to form the nucleus of a fund, to be supplemented by voluntary subscriptions sufficient to establish a fellowship or lectureship which would forever be known by his name. Those in favour of the proposal are requested to communicate with Dr. Fleming as early as convenient, stating the sum they are disposed to contribute.

DIAGENES.

\* \* \*

### The Monroe Doctrine.

THE Monroe doctrine is the flag of American Jingoism. It is used to voice American jealousy of British power, American fear of British influence, and American rivalry with British interests. From a principle suggested and supported by Canning to protect South American States against despotism as represented by the Holy Alliance, it has become the embodiment of American aggressiveness and hostility towards Great Britain.

On the 4th of July last ex-Governor, James E. Campbell, of Ohio, in addressing Tammany Hall, declared that:

"He would confine his remarks to the Monroe doctrine, than which there was no more popular subject to the American heart. The meaning of the Monroe doctrine was, that we should extend our territory in the Western Hemisphere whenever the opportunity was presented, and confine the nations of Europe to the possessions on this continent which they already hold. Any attempt to seize a foot of soil on this continent should be treated by the United States as a declaration of war."

About the same time, in the columns of the Times-Herald of Chicago, ex-Senator Ingalls declared himself not a Jingo, but added that "Eventually we shall rule the North America Continent, and by the assertion of the Monroe doctrine direct the destinies of the entire Western Hemisphere." Senator Lodge, of Massachusetts, took the same occasion to observe that he did not approve the annexation of Mexico and Central America, but thought that "Cuba should be annexed, and also Canada, Newfoundland and Hawaii," while, under the Monroe doctrine, "any attempt on the part of any European power to seize territory other than that which they then held in North and South America should be regarded as an act of hostility towards the United States." And then he concluded:

"The supremacy of the Monroe doctrine should be established and at once—peaceably if we can, forcibly if we must. It will be the duty and the privilege of the next Congress to see that this is done."

Such is the present view of the Monroe doctrine. It is one which is founded upon error, built upon prejudice, and impossible of maintenance. The original doctrine had no more likeness to this modern Jingo conception than Patagonian barbarism has to English culture. The United States, it must be remembered, was founded amid considerable surrounding difficulties. During almost the first half century of its existence, South America was largely in the hands of the most despotic and alien power in Europe; British America was looked upon, wrongly, I think, as the outpost of British hostility; and Central America was regarded as a possible field for the operation of those influences which the despotic continental governments of that day were apparently anxious to extend. Hence the general belief, outlined in Washington's farewell address, enunciated by Jefferson and John Quincy Adams, and elaborated by Monroe in 1823, that the extension of European power upon the American continent was dangerous to the liberties of the United States, and must therefore be opposed. Writing on June 17th, 1785, from Paris, Jefferson, who was then Minister to France, asked that his testimony be added to that of every thinking

American "in order to satisfy our countrymen how much it is their interest to preserve *uninfected by contagion*, those peculiarities in their government and manners to which they are indebted for those blessings."

Writing again on March 18th, 1801, he says that the powers of Europe "have so many interests different from ours that we must avoid being entangled in them." And again: "We have a perfect horror at everything like connecting ourselves with the politics of Europe." And in 1823 at a moment when there was a riot of reaction in Europe; when free institutions had been crushed for the time in Spain and the Bourbons seemed all-powerful; when the Spanish colonies in America were trying to throw off the yoke, and an effort was on foot amongst the powers of the Holy Alliance—Russia, Prussia, and Austria—to join Spain in their subjugation; when the Congress of Laybach had affirmed that by divine law European nations had the imprescriptible right to put themselves in open hostility to states, which, by a change in their institutions or government, offered a dangerous example; when Jefferson had just declared that "in the great struggle of the epoch between liberty and despotism, we owe it to ourselves to sustain the former, in this hemisphere at least"; at this moment President Monroe enunciated his famous doctrine.

The text is found in his Annual Message to Congress, December 2, 1823, and reads as follows:

"The occasion has been judged proper for asserting, as a principle in which the rights and interests of the United States are involved, that the American Continents by the free and independent condition which they have assumed and maintain, are henceforth not to be considered subjects for future colonization by any European power. . . . The political system of the allied powers is essentially different . . . from that of America. This difference proceeds from that which exists in their respective governments. We owe it, therefore, to candour and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those 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 or dependencies of any European power we have not yet interfered, and *shall not interfere*. . . . It is impossible that the allied powers should extend their political system to any portion of either continent without endangering our peace and happiness."

Such was the original Monroe doctrine. One more point there was, however. To quote the additional words of President Monroe: "In the wars of the European powers, in matters relating to themselves, we have never taken any part, nor does it comport with our policy to do so." In this position he was most fully borne out by other founders of the Republic. Writing to Jefferson on January 1st, 1788, Washington declared that "an energetic general government must prevent the several states from involving themselves in the political disputes of the European powers." And on October 24th, 1823, Jefferson himself declared that "Our first and fundamental maxim should be never to entangle ourselves in the broils of Europe." A summary of the Monroe doctrine, therefore, gives us this result:

- I. It was enunciated at a time when the Republic was weak and was threatened by an alliance of despotic European powers.
- II. It opposed primarily the extension in South America of that extreme monarchical system known as Bourbonism.
- III. It opposed further colonization by European powers.
- IV. It was directed in the main against Spain, and in so far as that was the case, had the support of Great Britain.
- V. It was essentially and absolutely non-aggressive and was based upon non-interference in European affairs or with existing European or British interests in America.

The Monroe doctrine as now presented by fire-eating Jingoism has not the slightest basis of danger to free institutions anywhere from any despotic power whatever. It has no excuse in any weakness of the United States to protect its own institutions or maintain its own liberties. The "contagion" is the other way. It is directed almost entirely against Great Britain and British interests. It is aggressive, and instead of claiming merely to compel European non-interference in a struggle between Spain and her American colonies, is intent mainly upon preventing Great Britain from protecting its own interests when in conflict with independent Southern countries. It opposes entirely the original principle of non-intervention abroad and finds room for