

undertakings by this nation abroad was most wise. Even now any "jingo" or "Crown Colony" policy on our part would be imbecile. Yet only stupor prevents us from modifying, in the light of modern development and events, that mythical portion of the Monroe Doctrine. Steam and electricity are rapidly reducing the size of our globe. Nations jostle one another like pedestrians on a crowded street. Strictly there is no such thing as a "foreign" nation any more.

The Monroe Doctrine itself, cannot be maintained permanently save by a foreign policy which dares look abroad. Territory lying near us will sooner or later tempt hither the old world's powers, when we shall be forced either to abandon the doctrine or fight to uphold it. Alliances will then likely be welcome even should they threaten to be "entangling" and in spite of ourselves we shall become parties to the European system.

Should we in some kind and conservative way lift the stars and stripes near enough to Central America to put all Europe's national colors in the shade there, the act would not necessarily have an imbecility, and emphasizes certain others, moral meaning. A number of the Spanish-American governments have done very well since they ousted Spain, but not so with all. Few if any of those between Mexico and the Isthmus have shown appreciation of liberty. They make no progress. They do not develop the immense natural resources of their territory. The rights of individuals among them are little regarded. Revolutions follow one another there with shocking rapidity. Land titles are uncertain. The

amassing of capital is fatally discouraged by bad laws and feeble administration.

The original Monroe Doctrine was wise. From a re-imposition of the Spanish yoke anywhere on this side the Atlantic nothing good was to be hoped. But, viewing the negative results of freedom in the middle regions of Spanish America, I wonder that some historian does not arise, trying to make out that the policy of the Holy Alliance was after all kindly and wisely meant, and that, could it have gone into effect and not been thwarted, by our President Monroe with his cruel "Doctrine," these states would have been by this time much more prosperous and even much more free than they are. It is strange, I say, that some one does not broach and seek to maintain such a thesis. One arguing so could make out a considerable case. Now, clearly, by whatever verisimilitude such a contention would have, in that degree the United States would appear as the actual foe of the republics which by uttering the Monroe Doctrine we pretended to befriend. Should the power wishing to take hold of them be England instead of Spain, our insistence on the Monroe Doctrine would be morally indefensible save on the condition that we ourselves should undertake, in some friendly way, to start upon an upgrade the almost desperate fortunes of those states.

I do not wish conquest or believe that it will be necessary, yet, let the emergency suggested come and we shall act as boldly as need be. The alternative clearly being: the Union Jack shading our southern border as it now does our northern, or a more scientific southern frontier for ourselves, the people