68TH CONGRESS : : : 1ST SESSION

DECEMBER 3, 1923 – JUNE 7, 1924

SENATE DOCUMENTS

VOL. 13

WASHINGTON : : GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE : : 1924

68TH CONGRESS
1st Session

SENATE

DOCUMENT
No. 125

PROMULGATION OF THE MONROE DOCTRINE

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

INTERNATIONAL CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION OF THE PROMULGATION OF THE MONROE DOCTRINE

HELD AT

RICHMOND, VA., DECEMBER 2–4, 1923

PRESENTED BY MR. FLETCHER

MAY 5, 1924.—Referred to the Committee on Printing

WASHINGTON
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
1924

SENATE RESOLUTION 242

REPORTED BY MR. FLETCHER

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
May 26 (calendar day, May 29), 1924.

Resolved, That the proceedings of the International Centennial Celebration of the Promulgation of the Monroe Doctrine, held at Richmond, Va., December 2 to 4, 1923, be printed as a Senate document.

Attest:

GEORGE A. SANDERSON,
Secretary.

CONTENTS

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

THE SOUTHERN COMMERCIAL CONGRESS,
Washington, D. C., April 30, 1924.

Senator DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR FLETCHER: The International Centennial Celebration of the Promulgation of the Monroe Doctrine was held in Richmond, Va., December 2–4, 1923.

An introductory session was held at William and Mary College, and the concluding exercises were conducted in Madison Hall on the campus of the University of Virginia.

I have the honor to transmit to you a copy of the proclamation issued by Hon. E. Lee Trinkle, Governor of Virginia, together with the addresses, eulogies, and other manuscripts presented as a part of the centennial program and interpreting from many angles the life and character and phenomenal political affiliations and achievements of James Monroe, fifth President of the United States.

Instructed by resolutions unanimously adopted by the participants in the centenary proceedings and the members of the Southern Commercial Congress, I beg on their behalf that the material be presented to the Senate of the United States and offered for publication as a document for the information and inspiration of the American people.

I beg to remain,
Cordially and sincerely,

CLARENCE J. OWENS, *President.*

PROCLAMATION

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA,
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE,
Richmond.

Whereas the Monroe doctrine was promulgated in 1823 as a death knell of the exploitation of the Western Hemisphere by foreign powers and as a challenge to the world in militant defense of the rights of nations; and

Whereas James Monroe, a son of Virginia, "The Mother of Presidents," followed in distinguished succession the administrations of Washington, Jefferson, and Madison in building the Nation; and

Whereas the doctrine of Monroe became the new declaration of America, under whose magic power 20 republics to the south have had their birth of freedom and their continuity of economic and political progress; and

Whereas the message of Monroe marks the new dispensation in the political history of old civilization, as it is the genesis of the national security in the New World; and

Whereas the Southern Commercial Congress, an organization of vital power that has rendered specific and constructive service to the South and the Nation, has planned to commemorate the centennial of the epochal doctrine in an international celebration at Richmond, the capital of Virginia, on December 2–4, 1923; and

Whereas the State of Virginia holds in sacred keeping the memory and fame and his mortal body, and with pride honors his achievements in the basic contribution to American history as in the record of Washington, "The Father of His Country," whose sword carved the way to American liberty; of Jefferson, whose pen struck off the Declaration of Independence; of Madison, revered as the "Father of the Constitution."

Now, therefore, I, E. Lee Trinkle, Governor of the Commonwealth of Virginia, proclaim to the citizens of the State the plans for the international centennial celebration, under the direction of the Southern Commercial Congress, and urge all patriotic and civic organizations and all agencies of government, local, county, and State, to cooperate in every practical service for the promotion of a memorial of dignity and honor. A genuine welcome awaits all who will come within the hospitable borders of the Commonwealth of Virginia, and grateful appreciation will be accorded all who honor Virginia's illustrious son and the deathless doctrine which he proclaimed.

Given under my hand and under the lesser seal of the Commonwealth, at Richmond, this 27th day of March, in the year of our Lord 1923, and in the one hundred and forty-seventh year of the Commonwealth.

[SEAL.]

E. LEE TRINKLE,
Governor of Virginia.

By the Governor:
B. O. JAMES,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

PROMULGATION OF THE MONROE DOCTRINE

Pursuant to the proclamation issued by Hon. E. Lee Trinkle, Governor of the State of Virginia, the Southern Commercial Congress organized and conducted the International Centennial Celebration of the Promulgation of the Monroe Doctrine.

December 2 was the exact centenary date, and on that day, it being the Sabbath, memorial services as a part of the centennial were held in churches throughout Virginia and in many parts of the Southland.

That afternoon at 3 o'clock a pilgrimage was conducted from the capitol in Richmond to the tomb of Monroe in Hollywood Cemetery.

At Hollywood Dr. Clarence J. Owens, president of the Southern Commercial Congress and past commander in chief of the Sons of Confederate Veterans, acted as master of ceremonies. Addresses were delivered by Hon. William Jennings Bryan, former Secretary of State of the United States, and Hon. E. Lee Trinkle, Governor of Virginia.

Floral tributes were placed at the tomb by the Governor of Virginia, the mayor of Richmond, and by representatives of the civic and patriotic organizations.

The program of the pilgrimage exhibiting the military and civic sections giving the names of persons and organizations officially participating is as follows:

MILITARY DIVISION

Brig. Gen. W. W. Sale, grand marshal.
Col. John A. Cutchins, chief of staff.
Lieut. Col. Joseph LeMasurier, adjutant.

AIDS

Brig. Gen. W. J. Perry, Staunton, Va.
Col. Hierome L. Opie, Staunton, Va.
Col. McChesney H. Jeffries, Norfolk, Va.
Lieut. Col. Robert E. Craighill, Lynchburg, Va.
Lieut. Col. Edward E. Goodwyn, Emporia, Va.
Lieut. Col. William W. Crump, Richmond, Va.
Lieut. Col. Sidney T. Moore, Wytheville, Va.
Lieut. Col. Howard G. Davids, Richmond, Va.
Lieut. Col. Frank B. Varney, Lynchburg, Va.
Major William McKee Dunn, Hot Springs, Va.
Major LeRoy Hodges, Richmond, Va.
Major William W. LaPrade, Richmond, Va.
Major Edwin P. Conquest, Richmond, Va.
Major John C. Henderson, Roanoke, Va.
Major Claude N. Rucker, Danville, Va.
Capt. G. L. Danforth, Richmond, Va.
Capt. D. E. Thebaud, Richmond, Va.
Capt. G. A. Greaves, Norfolk, Va.
Capt. Hansford H. Rowe, Richmond, Va.

Capt. William O. Hankin, Danville, Va.
Col. Charles H. Consolvo, Norfolk, Va.
Col. B. W. Salomonsky, Norfolk, Va.
Major C. L. Wright, Norfolk, Va.
Major Robert C. Bryan, Richmond, Va.
Detachment mounted police.
Grand marshal and staff.
Governor of Virginia and staff.
Distinguished guests.
Committee of One Hundred.
Representatives of press.
Band One hundred and eighty-third Infantry.
One hundred and eighty-third Infantry, Col. J. Fulmer Bright commanding.
Two hundred and forty-sixth Artillery, Col. Marshall M. Milton commanding.
Unassigned dismounted National Guard units.
Second Battalion, One hundred and eleventh Field Artillery, Maj. Bernard H. Baylor commanding.
V. M. I. color guard.
Band, John Marshall High School cadets.
John Marshall High School cadets.
The War Department represented by a squadron of Airplanes from Langley Field.
The Navy Department represented by destroyers *Breck* and *Lardner* and Eagles.

OFFICERS

Lieut. Commander F. E. P. Uberroth.
Lieut. Commander J. F. Melings, jr.
Lieut. H. J. Lang.
Lieut. E. C. Bain.
Lieut. H. R. Shaw.
Lieut. Lewis Gorman.
Ensign B. W. Fink jr.
Ensign C. O. Comp.
Ensign J. E. Murphy.
Ensign E. P. Hylan.
Ensign L. H. Libby.

GOVERNOR'S STAFF

Col. Hiram M. Smith, chief of staff, Richmond, Va.
Col. John W. Williams, Richmond, Va.
Col. John Q. Rhodes, jr., Louion, Va.
Col. Frank T. McFaden, Richmond, Va.
Col. I. Val Parham, Petersburg, Va.
Col. Peter Saunders, Rocky Mount, Va.
Col. Thomas P. Beery, Harrisonburg, Va.
Col. Robert R. Moore, Pulaski, Va.
Col. Thomas J. Randolph, Charlottesville, Va.
Col. Hill Montague, Richmond, Va.
Col. John Sinclair Brown, R. F. D. No. 4, Roanoke, Va.
Col. Harry R. Houston, Hampton, Va.
Col. J. Garnett King, Fredericksburg, Va.
Col. Earl C. Matthews, Norfolk, Va.
Col. Hiram Hall, South Hill, Va.
Col. Marvin L. Gray, Waverly, Va.
Col. Clyde H. Ratcliffe, Richmond, Va.
Col. Thomas A. Webb, South Boston, Va.
Col. Edwin S. Reid, Chatham, Va.
Col. James T. Disney, Richmond, Va.
Col. Robert A. Gilliam, Montvale, Va.
Col. Charles E. Burks, Lynchburg, Va.
Col. Garrott B. Wall, Richmond, Va.
Col. Kenneth W. Ogden, Alexandria, Va.
Col. Montello B. Rudd, Richmond, Va.
Col. James D. Tate, Chilhowie, Va.
Col. Harry C. Stuart, Blackford, Va.
Col. Walker Cottrell, Richmond, Va.
Col. Joel W. Flood, Appomattox, Va.
Col. Richard C. Stokes, Covington, Va.

LINE OF MARCH

Grace to Fourth Street; south to Franklin Street; west to Lee Monument; around Lee Monument; east on Monument Avenue to Lombardy Street; south on Lombardy to Grove Avenue; east on Grove Avenue to Linden Street; east on Park Avenue to Cherry Street; south on Cherry to Hollywood Cemetery.

PATRIOTIC AND CIVIC SECTION

STAFF

Chief marshal, Capt. John J. Wicker, jr., Virginia commander, American Legion.
Chief of staff, John C. Goode, Sons of Confederate Veterans.

MARSHALS

Gen. W. B. Freeman, commander United Confederate Veterans.
Col. W. McDonald Lee, commander in chief, Sons of Confederate Veterans.
W. L. Hopkins, adjutant in chief, Sons of Confederate Veterans.
Dr. Alex. Brown, Sons of Revolution.
E. H. Courtney, Sons of American Revolution.
R. A. Lancaster, jr., Association Preservation Virginia Antiquities.
Mrs. S. J. Dudley, Daughters of American Revolution.
Charles L. Weaver, scout executive, Boy Scouts of America.
Dr. Lawrence T. Price, Daughters of Confederate Veterans, Stonewall Jackson Chapter.
Mrs. Charles O. Saville, United Daughters of the Confederacy.
W. S. Forbes, United Daughters of the Confederacy.
John C. Werckert, United Sons of War Veterans.
Clarke W. Roper, American Legion, No. 1.
William A. Saunders, American Legion, No. 38.
Earl Lutz, American Legion, No. 137.
Arthur Bell, American Legion, No. 151.
Capt. L. O. Miller, Virginia commander, Sons of Confederate Veterans.
Mrs. E. D. Hotchkiss, American Legion, No. 1.
Mrs. George L. Hughes, American Legion, No. 38.
Mrs. Laurence Ingram, American Legion, No. 137.
Samis Grotto Band.
Sons of Revolution, George A. Gibson.
Sons of American Revolution, R. McC. Bullington.
Daughters of American Revolution, Old Dominion Chapter, Mrs. S. J. Dudley.
Daughters of American Revolution, Commonwealth Chapter, Mrs. W. J. Payne.
Daughters of American Revolution, Wythe Chapter, Mrs. Manly B. Ramos.
Colonial Dames of America of Virginia, Mrs. B. McCaw Tompkins.
Thomas Jefferson Foundation, Mrs. E. D. Hotchkiss.
Jefferson Memorial Association, Mrs. Virginia Blankenship.
Descendants of Signers of Declaration of Independence, Mrs. Harry Lee Watson.
Daughters of 1812, Mrs. W. A. Land.
Dorothy Madison Payne Chapter of 1812, Mrs. Peter J. White.
Association Preservation Virginia Antiquities, Mrs. St. George Bryan.
Lee Camp, Confederate Veterans, W. McK. Evans.
United Daughters of the Confederacy, Richmond Chapter, Mrs. N. V. Randolph.
United Daughters of the Confederacy, Lee Chapter, Mrs. John Bagby.
United Daughters of the Confederacy, Stonewall Chapter, Mrs. L. A. Conrad.
R. E. Lee Camp, Sons of Confederate Veterans, C. D. Hagan.
Stonewall Camp, Sons of Confederate Veterans, W. R. Lecky.
Manassas Battlefield Park, E. R. W. Ewing.
Fitzhugh Lee Camp, Spanish War Veterans, J. E. Failing.
Fredericksburg delegation, J. Garnett King.
Charlottesville delegation, J. C. Sprigg.
American Legion Post 1, Fergus McRee.
American Legion Post 38, F. F. Rennie, jr.
American Legion Post 137, Charles Maurice.

American Legion Post 151, J. Gordon Boisseau.
American Legion Auxiliary No. 1, Mrs. E. F. Horner.
American Legion Auxiliary No. 38, Mrs. John J. Wicker, jr.
American Legion Auxiliary No. 137, Mrs. Laurence Ingram.
Richmond Grays Auxiliary, Mrs. L. Milhiser.
Richmond Blues Auxiliary, Mrs. George L. Christian.
Richmond Howitzers Auxiliary, Miss Kate Myers.
American Red Cross, C. C. Pinckney.
Service Legion, Mrs. G. T. W. Kern.
Virginia War History Commission, Arthur Kyle Davis.
Virginia Historical Society, C. V. Meredith.
Girl Scouts, Miss Thelma Linton.
Richmond Bar Association, R. E. Peyton, jr.
Rotary Club, W. M. Anderson.
Kiwanis Club, W. Fred Richardson.
Richmond First Club, H. C. Messerschmidt.
Lions Club, Lee Paschall.
Civitan Club, Alexander Forward.
Virginia League of Women Voters, Miss Adele Clark.
Quota Club, Mrs. Edna P. Fox.
Bankhead Highway Commission, Col. Benehan Cameron.
Cooperative Education Association, Mrs. B. B. Munford.
Richmond Public Schools, James C. Harwood.

The addresses, poems, documents, and official papers presented at the Centennial Celebration of the Monroe Doctrine at William and Mary, at Richmond, and at the University of Virginia are given herewith:

Dr. Clarence J. Owens, president of the Southern Commercial Congress, who presided over the sessions of the International Centennial Celebration of the Monroe Doctrine, submitted for the record the inscription on the tomb of James Monroe in Hollywood. The inscription is as follows:

JAMES MONROE

Born in Westmoreland County, 28th of April, 1758.
Died in the city of New York 1 July, 1831.
By order of the General Assembly his remains were removed to this cemetery 5th July, 1858.
As an evidence of the affection of the State of Virginia for her good and honored son.

From the introductory address delivered by Doctor Owens, the following outline is herewith given covering the career of President Monroe. The epitomized facts are as follows:

James Monroe. Born April 28, 1758, Westmoreland County, Va.
Descended from Hector Monroe, Scotch cavalier, captain in the Army of King Charles I.
Student at William and Mary College when Revolution began.
Volunteered as cadet in Continental Army.
In New Jersey engagements, 1776; Battle of Trenton; wounded at Heights of Harlem; served as lieutenant; promoted to captain of Infantry for gallantry on the field of battle; aid-de-camp to Gen. William Alexander (Lord Sterling), with rank of major; upon recommendation of General Washington was made a colonel and was empowered to raise a regiment; in 1780 Jefferson sent him on military mission to investigate the condition of the United States Army in the Southern States.
Studied law with Jefferson, who was then Governor of Virginia.
Elected to Virginia Assembly by King George County in 1782.
Chosen by Virginia Assembly a member of the executive council of Virginia.
Elected a member of the Confederate or Continental Congress in 1783; served until 1786.
Actively participated in framing new Constitution; was chairman of committee that reported the provisions to the Congress for coordinating the States into a Union.

Engaged in the practice of law at Fredericksburg, Va.
Elected to the State legislature.
Chosen a delegate to the State convention of 1788 to consider the Federal Constitution.
Was defeated for House of Representatives by Madison.
Was elected to the Senate of the United States by the legislature in 1790; served three years.
Appointed by Washington as minister to France.
Returned to private life, but was again elected to the State legislature.
Elected Governor of Virginia in 1799; was reelected.
Sent by Jefferson in 1803 to Paris to negotiate purchase of New Orleans; so successful resulted in Louisiana purchase.
Appointed minister to England.
Sent as minister to Spain in 1804 for purposed purchase of Florida.
Returned as minister to England in 1805.
Declared Virginia's favorite son for the Presidency 1808; he withdrew his name.
Elected to legislature of Virginia in 1810.
In 1811 was again elected Governor of Virginia.
Secretary of State in the Cabinet of President Madison.
Secretary of War after the evacuation of Washington by the British.
Was practically Secretary of Treasury during War of 1812.
In 1816 was elected President of the United States by 128 electoral votes to 34 against.
In 1820 was reelected by practically a unanimous vote as only 1 electoral vote was registered against him.
His eight years were known as "the era of good feeling."

Doctor Owens also introduced the facts as to Monroe's relation to the purchase of Louisiana from France, the acquisition of Florida from Spain, the inspiration of the Missouri compromise, and the promulgation of the Monroe doctrine.

REMARKS OF DR. CLARENCE J. OWENS

Doctor Owens further said:

The eventful career of James Monroe may be characterized as a life of public service patriotically and successfully rendered as soldier, legislator (State and National), as Chief Executive (State and National), as diplomat in foreign countries, and as related officially to momentous questions without a parallel in the history of the United States and standing unique in the political history of the world.

There is no great life in political history about whom so little is known by the masses. His record is practically forgotten. For others there is the laurel of victory and the crown of glory, but for Monroe the chisel, the brush, and the poet's breath are yet to interpret in marble, on canvas, and in literature the ability, the leadership, and the achievements of this great son of Virginia.

On his tomb are no fulsome words nor even the brief mention of heroic action nor of statesmanlike qualities and service. Merely the words "Virginia's great and good son" tell his story, and this would be sufficient if the generations did not forget. But I fear they have already forgotten. If by this centennial celebration of the promulgation of his deathless doctrine we may produce the renaissance of interest and appreciation, it will have been a genuine service to this and succeeding generations.

We have so far forgotten that we have permitted New England historians to almost snatch from Monroe the one glory that has been

remembered by an association with his name, "the Monroe doctrine," as they have endeavored to give the credit for this international enunciation to Monroe's Secretary of State, John Quincy Adams.

But the records do not fail us, and this last chapter of the false historian has come to naught in the light of the true record of that tragic period in international relations.

Like Old Mortality, we must more deeply engrave the epitaph of his renowned record as we contemplate to-day that to a large degree the history of his country is the monument of his fame.

PRESIDENT MONROE AND HIS MESSAGE OF DECEMBER 2, 1823—ADDRESS OF REPRESENTATIVE R. WALTON MOORE, OF VIRGINIA, AT WILLIAM AND MARY COLLEGE, VIRGINIA, SATURDAY, DECEMBER 1, 1923

On such an occasion we can not refrain from conjecturing what would have been the political and social development of this country without the early transactions which took place in this locality and without the statesmen who received their training in this college. Jamestown was the place of the first settlement of our race in the New World, and there the institutions were founded and the principles determined which vitally influenced the entire future. Williamsburg, the capital of the colony, and later for a time the capital of the State, was also, in an unofficial sense, the capital of the Revolutionary movement. This was the environment where, as a student at William and Mary, James Monroe started on the course which will cause him to be always remembered. Born in 1758, he entered the college in 1774, when only 16 years of age. But he had already acquired the spirit which animated his father and his father's friends, who have given his home county of Westmoreland its lasting fame, among them the Washingtons and the Lees. Here he was near the spot where the first jury trial was held and the first legislature in America assembled, and where the Virginians, anticipating a far-distant battle cry, proclaimed that there was no power which could subject them to taxation without representation—a principle announced by Virginia four years in advance of the Petition of Right, which was the first announcement of that principle in England. And here there was fresh in the recollection of all the defiance of the royal authority in 1765 by the House of Burgesses, under the leadership of Henry, when that power was sought to be exerted, and of the many prophetic events marking the interval between that year and the separation from the mother country. A few months before his matriculation, in May, 1774, the members of the House of Burgesses, which had been dissolved by Governor Dunmore, met in the Apollo room of the Raleigh Tavern and adopted a resolution recommending that an annual congress of all the Colonies be called to deliberate on those general measures which the united interests of America might from time to time require, and soon the Congress convened. Listen to their indignant condemnation of the treatment of their Massachusetts brethren:

> We find an act of the British Parliament, lately passed, for stopping the harbor and commerce of the town of Boston, in our sister Colony of Massachusetts Bay, until the people there submit to the payment of such unconstitutional taxes, and which act most violently and arbitrarily deprives them of their

property, in wharves erected by private persons at their own great and proper expense, which act is, in our opinion, a most dangerous attempt to destroy the constitutional liberty and rights of all North America.

Two years later, in May, 1776, just as the young student Jefferson had listened to the stamp-tax debate of 1765, so Monroe doubtless witnessed the proceedings of the Virginia convention which passed resolutions instructing the Virginia Delegates in the Congress to propose to that body to declare the United States free and independent States, absolved from all allegiance to and dependence upon the Crown or Parliament of Great Britain, instructions that were speedily carried out. That spring day was notable in the annals of Williamsburg. The "Union flag of the American States" (that was its designation) was unfurled over the Capitol; there was a military parade; the resolutions were read to the soldiers, and at night the town was illuminated. The same convention adopted the Virginia Bill of Rights and Constitution, the first complete written instrument of government ever put in force. It would take hours to narrate all that occurred at Williamsburg leading up to the Revolution and giving it definite direction in the decade that followed Henry's matchless speech, which raised against him the cry of treason, and of all that swiftly followed during Monroe's student days. A scientist has stated that a shadow never falls upon a surface without leaving a permanent trace, a trace which might be made visible by resort to proper processes. What a picture would be presented if there could be reproduced the forms of those who day by day passed before the eyes of the young student and inspired his life of service to his country!

Monroe began his first term as President on March 4, 1817. Behind him were long years of almost continuous activity in public affairs, beginning with his service in the Revolution. He left the college as a soldier and went into the northern campaign as a lieutenant in the regiment commanded by Col. William Washington. It is said that he was the first to cross the Delaware River in the attack on Trenton. It is certain that, with his commanding officer, he was at the very front at the critical moment of the assault. The bullet which inflicted the severe wound which he then suffered he carried in his body to the day of his death. No one has ever questioned his courage as a soldier. No one, so far as I know, has questioned the skill he showed as a very youthful officer in the Army of the Revolution, except Aaron Burr, who is quoted with apparent satisfaction by one of a group of comparatively recent writers who have sought to belittle not only Monroe but the great Virginians with whose names his will always be associated. But whatever has been written by those who disparage him, it is incredible that anyone not possessing great qualities of intellect and character could throughout his life have held the confidence and support of his own people in the age when Virginia statesmanship was predominant. Glance at the record. Before he was 30 years old he was military commissioner from Virginia to the southern Army, a member of the Virginia Legislature and of the State executive council, and a conspicuous Member from Virginia of the Continental Congress, and again a member of the legislature. Before he was 35 years old he was a member of the State constitu-

tional convention that passed on the Federal Constitution, and United States Senator from Virginia. Subsequently he was a third time elected to the Virginia Legislature and four times at intervals elected to the governorship of the State. This is not the time to discuss his diplomatic career, but it is also incredible that a man not deemed to possess great qualities would have been commissioned to represent his country in dealing with matters of extraordinary importance in France, Spain, and England. During most of Madison's administration he was Secretary of State, and for several months while the war with England was in progress he was likewise Secretary of War, and there is no question as to how he was regarded by his chief and by Congress in those years which, far from being tranquil, tested his capacity and fitness for the higher office he was soon to fill. As Jefferson, who loved him, had rejoiced at the election of Madison as his successor in the Presidency, so he rejoiced at the election of Monroe to succeed Madison. His friendship for Monroe, his confidence in Monroe's ability and unselfish patriotism, notwithstanding they sometimes differed, as with respect to the treaty of 1806 with Great Britain, which Monroe assisted in negotiating and which Jefferson disapproved, was never shaken from the time when Monroe, Jefferson's junior by some 15 years, was a student in the latter's law office. Jefferson in a letter about another said:

> For honesty he is like our friend Monroe; turn his soul wrong side outward and there is not a speck on it.

Monroe's freedom from sectional prejudice or undue partiality to his own State is shown by his decision to appoint a northern man as Secretary of State. He wished, as he wrote to some of his friends before his inauguration, to remove the mistaken idea that the South was making unreasonable claims and that Virginia was seeking to retain the chief office in the Cabinet as a stepping-stone to the presidential succession. His choice fell upon John Quincy Adams, then minister to England, whose ability and experience were unquestioned. Another Massachusetts man, who had served Madison as Secretary of the Navy, he chose for that office. The three other Cabinet positions were filled by men of unusual strength, Crawford of Georgia as Secretary of the Treasury, Calhoun of South Carolina as Secretary of War, and Wirt of Virginia as Attorney General. Considering what has been the not uncommon fate of our Presidents, it is nearly an exceptional tribute to Monroe that those who gathered about his council table were from first to last not only his zealous supporters but his friends and admirers. There is, I believe, not a word of really adverse criticism from any of them. On the other hand, there are numberless expressions lauding his wisdom, firmness, and devotion to the country. Shortly after Monroe's death, at the invitation of the authorities of Boston, his Secretary of State, who had a better opportunity than any other of estimating Monroe, delivered an address on his life and character at the Old South Church in that city. In that address Adams, who was in contact with Monroe day by day for years, working with him to solve problems of gravest importance, described him as always honest, sincere, and pure in his purposes and intentions. He spoke of his "labors outlasting the daily circuit of the sun and outwatching the vigils

of the night," a point stressed in the Adams diary, which mentions how often the Secretary saw the light shining in the President's office after midnight. His, said Adams, was "a mind anxious and unwearied in the pursuit of truth and right; patient of inquiry; patient of contradiction; courteous even in collision of sentiment; sound in its ultimate judgments; and firm in its final conclusions." Calhoun wrote of him, "He had a wonderful intellectual patience, and could, above all the men I ever knew, when called upon to decide an important matter, hold the subject immovably fixed under his attention until he had mastered it in all its relations. It was mainly to this admirable quality that he owed his highly accurate judgment. I have known many men much more rapid in reaching a conclusion, but very few with a certainty so unerring." Reading these comments, there come to mind the words of Halifax, that the man who is master of patience is master of everything. No President escapes criticism, often as severe when undeserved as when deserved. Monroe did not escape, but it is remarkable to what extent the opinion of him entertained by the members of his Cabinet was echoed by most of those who surveyed his career within the more than a generation following his death. For example, in the Life of John Quincy Adams, by William H. Seward, there is the same picture of Monroe as given by Adams and Calhoun. Says Seward, "He was emphatically a great and good man."

It was at a late date, much after the Civil War, that the opinion of those connected with Monroe's administration and of such detached investigators as Seward began to be decried by certain writers whose attitude toward Jefferson and Madison, as well as Monroe, represents a substantially new conception of what they were and what they did. It is rather surprising that several of these writers, who are bent upon reversing the considered views and judgments of the past, are of Massachusetts, when it is remembered, so far as Monroe was concerned, that he was acclaimed by the people of no other State more heartily on his northern tour in 1817 and that Massachusetts joined all of the other States in favoring his reelection. Some of them are members of the very distinguished family to which the Secretary of State belonged, who seem to forget that to disparage Monroe is to discredit Adams. Edward Everett Hale, whose book was published in 1902, derisively speaks of the Presidents between 1801 and 1825 as the "Virginia dynasty, their failures and follies, their fuss and feathers, and folderol," claiming that the authentic history of that period "never got itself written down until 12 years ago"—that is to say, until 1890—when a true historian appeared to take the place of the "chattering crickets" who had preceded him, and only then the world was enabled to see what a wretched performance was staged by the Virginia dynasty; that Jefferson, Madison, and Monroe were most inferior actors; that the audience which applauded should have hissed; and that those who, looking back and reviewing, had agreed with the audience were completely deluded. All of which is quite as absurd as it would be to try to obscure the fact that Massachusetts had a great part in the Revolution and in creating and carrying on the Government and developing the life of the Republic and has in every era con-

tributed illustrious names to the roll of American leadership. As her renown is established beyond the chance of obliteration, so no writer or set of writers can obliterate the achievements of the Virginia dynasty. What are some of the outstanding facts? When Jefferson became President we had 827,000 square miles of territory and 17 States had been organized, none of them beyond the Mississippi River. When Monroe left the Presidency the area was 2,000,000 square miles and there had been added to the list of States Maine, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Indiana, Missouri, and Illinois. In the period of 24 years the area was more than doubled, the westward movement was well under way, and at the end there were 24 stars on the flag. The population increased from about 5,000,000 at the beginning of Jefferson's first term to about 10,000,000 at the end of Monroe's second term. Correspondingly, industries expanded, domestic and foreign commerce grew, and in every field of intellectual and moral effort there was unexampled activity and progress. With respect to the one matter of spreading the advantages of education, a little incident illustrates the personal interest in that subject of those who composed the Virginia dynasty. I have read the minutes of a meeting of the board of visitors of our university, signed by Jefferson and Madison, who were in retirement near Charlottesville, and by Monroe, then President, who had made the trip from Washington to join in doing whatever might be possible to promote the success of the institution, which was then struggling forward. It is not to be overlooked how the principles of democracy were extended and the democratic spirit fostered. This was no weakening process. Before the dynasty left the scene the Government, which it had striven to make not simply a Government for the people but more of a Government by the people, felt itself sufficiently strong to challenge the combined power of the monarchies of continental Europe. In the Adams address is a bare summary of what was accomplished in the Monroe administration. He speaks of him as "strengthening his country for defense by a system of combined fortifications, military and naval, sustaining her rights, her dignity, and honor abroad; soothing her dissensions and conciliating her acerbities at home; controlling by a firm, though peaceful, policy the hostile spirit of the European alliance against republican South America; extorting by the mild compulsion of reason the shores of the Pacific from the stipulated acknowledgment of Spain; and leading back the imperial autocrat of the north to his lawful boundaries from his hastily asserted dominion over the southern ocean."

The extract just quoted gives the only allusion in the address to the most memorable act of Monroe's career, the statement of national policy contained in his message, the one hundredth anniversary of which occurs to-morrow. One of the immediate causes leading to that statement was a controversy with Russia, relative to her claims in the Northwest, as to which it is enough to say that she had already been notified that the United States would contest the right of Russia or any other European nation to establish any new colony on this continent. The other cause was connected with events that had taken place following the close of the Napoleonic wars. There had come about a general recrudescence of absolutism in continental Europe, while at the same time the Latin-American communities

were endeavoring to free themselves from Spanish domination. In September, 1815, the sovereigns of Austria, Prussia, and Russia signed a document in which, asserting that they were discharging their religious duty, they agreed to cooperate with each other on all occasions and in all places, and invited other nations to unite with them. In November of the same year England, having accepted the invitation, the four nations entered into a treaty binding themselves to work together in restoring France and managing European affairs, and three years later France became the fifth member of the Holy Alliance, which was relentlessly dominating Europe. For instance, in 1821 the allies announced that they had taken Europe into their holy keeping, and any changes in legislation and administration of the States must emanate alone from the free will, the reflected and enlightened impulse of those whom God had rendered responsible for power. England withdrew from the alliance, unwilling to sign the new treaty framed in November, 1822, at Verona, which provided for upholding the principle of divine right, and putting an end to any system of representative government; for the suppression of the liberty of the press, and for the support of religious establishments. Spain had erected a constitutional government, and after England's withdrawal from the alliance, and in spite of her protest, that country was invaded, her government overthrown, and the "legitimate sovereign" installed. The menace to the Latin-American States was obvious. They faced the probability that the powerful combination that had worked its will on Spain would attempt to subject them again to Spanish dominion. The sympathy of the people of this country for those States was due to most of them having set up republican governments, and to the conviction that the designs of the alliance could not be executed without ultimate peril to ourselves. Our Government was deeply concerned. Its concern was shown in many ways, including the appointment during the latter part of Madison's administration, and from time to time in Monroe's administration, of commissions and agents to ascertain and report upon conditions in the South. Monroe, engrossed with the subject, was full of anxiety. Adams did not reach Washington until the autumn of the year of the inauguration. On September 20, 1817, two days before taking the oath of office as Secretary of State, Adams called on the President, who at once directed the conversation to affairs in South America. This is noted in the Adams Diary, which also tells how that topic was invariably given prominence in his conferences with the President and at Cabinet meetings. The expediency of recognizing the independence of the southern governments was heatedly discussed in Congress and in the newspapers. The diary relates a conversation in March, 1822, between Adams and Henry Clay, who was an insistent advocate of recognition. Adams held off largely because of his lack of faith in the stability of the new governments. Finally, he remarked to Clay that, while he never doubted that the outcome would be their entire independence of Spain, he believed it to be equally clear that it was our true policy and duty to take no part in the contest. In that year the problem was dealt with by recognition of the independence of the States which had been under Spanish rule, and of Brazil, which had thrown off the Portuguese yoke, and in a short time the administration, with the full and active concurrence of the

Secretary of State, was to take a very definite and decisive step touching the threatened contest. After the act of recognition by the United States George Canning, the British Prime Minister, several times indicated to Richard Rush, our minister at London, the willingness of his Government to enter into an agreement for resisting any attempt of the Holy Alliance to intervene in South America, and Rush kept the administration advised of his conversations and correspondence with Canning. Monroe wrote Jefferson, and Jefferson replied that the question presented was "the most momentous which has ever been offered to my contemplation since that of independence. That made us a Nation; this sets our compass and points out the course which we are to steer through the ocean of time opening on us."

Back of all that had reference to Russia and the Latin American communities, many of our statesmen had from the beginning perceived the importance of strengthening and insuring the territorial integrity of the United States as indispensable to insuring the well-being and permanence of the Government. When the revolution was over, bordering on the comparatively small part of North America which fell to the ownership of the United States under the confederation and under the Constitution were the vast possessions on this continent of the European powers, whose possessions also covered South America. Monroe was one of those most solicitous to decrease the danger of European aggression in this hemisphere by improving our territorial situation. As a Member of the Continental Congress he evinced a keen interest in the failure of the British to evacuate territory which the treaty of peace had conceded to the United States, and he made a trip to the Northwest, one of the objects of which was to obtain reliable information as to the meaning of the delay. Along with Livingston, he conducted the negotiations and signed the treaty for the Louisiana Purchase. As Secretary of State he held out against the contention of Spain for the ownership of a portion of that purchase, and during his administration Florida was acquired. The boundary dispute with Great Britain was left to be settled by a future administration, but it was in his administration that the agreement assuring the neutrality of the Great Lakes was reached, which was the first effective disarmament proposition. Here we can not fail to remember that in the administration of John Tyler, another honored son of this college, a treaty with Great Britain satisfactorily disposed of many, but not all, of the claims of that nation to territory in the Northwest; that a firm stand was taken on the Oregon question; and that the resolution was adopted which authorized the annexation of Texas. To what was said a moment ago about the comparatively small area of the United States prior to the advent of the Virginia dynasty, namely, 827,000 square miles, I may add that the total area is now three and one-half million square miles, exclusive of our island possessions. Adams, in his address, looking at the map of the United States as it was in 1783 and the map as it was at the time he was speaking, declared with unmistakable emphasis that "the change, more than of any other man living or dead, was the work of James Monroe."

Monroe's message of December 2, 1823, written by his own hand, was not delivered in person but was read in each House of Congress. It will interest you to know that one of the Virginia Senators and

eight of the Virginia Representatives in that Congress were men who had been educated at William and Mary. It was a lengthy document, and the paragraphs embracing the statement of a national policy which from that day to this the United States has cherished and been ready to defend, are widely separated from each other in the context. Here are the essential portions of the clauses that proposed the policy which through a century has enormously affected the destiny of the world and been the theme of almost endless discussion, friendly and unfriendly, as evidenced by innumerable official utterances, by the publication of some 50 books treating of it specifically, and by a great additional mass of essays and addresses representing nearly every civilized country and almost every language. Referring to the Russian claims, Monroe said:

> In the discussions to which this interest has given rise, and in the arrangements by which they may terminate, 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 maintained, are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European powers.

Referring to conditions in the South, he said:

> We owe it, therefore, to candor 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 interfered and shall not interfere. But with the governments who have declared their independence and have maintained it, and whose independence we have, on great consideration and on just principles, acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them or controlling in any other manner their destiny, by any European power, in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States.

What name is given to the statement is of little consequence. No name was given it by Monroe himself. In the long debate of 1826 in the House of Representatives on the Panama mission it was praised by Webster, Buchanan, McDuffie, and others as "Mr. Monroe's declaration." It was referred to by President Polk as "The principle avowed by Mr. Monroe." When or by whom it was originally called the "Monroe doctrine" a search has not disclosed, but that precise term, though it had long since come to be officially and popularly used, no President seems to have used in addressing Congress until President Grant's special message on the "Annexation of the Dominican Republic."

Any impression that the importance of the message was not quickly appreciated is dispelled by examining the newspapers of the time. So far as I can discover, all of the American papers stressed its significance, and with a single exception, gave it their approval. The English press, headed by the London Times, was almost as unanimous to the same effect. Across the Channel, as might be expected, in the main it met with severe ridicule and criticism. It was enthusiastically welcomed in South America.

Some have credited the message to Canning, notably Charles Sumner, who wrote in his Prophetic Voices "The Monroe doctrine as now familiarly called proceeded from Canning. He was its inventor, promoter, and champion, so far as it was against intervention in American affairs." The opposition of the English peo-

ple to the despotic aims of the Holy Alliance and the strengthening influence of the general attitude of the English Government, of which our Government was advised by Rush, must always be accorded the weight to which they are entitled, and which is not diminished because the time arrived in Cleveland's administration when the doctrine had to be enforced against England herself in the Venezuelan dispute. But it is plainly shown by a letter from Canning to Bagot, the British minister to Russia, not long ago brought to light, that the message gave Canning no satisfaction. He could not know, he writes, how far "that part of the speech of the President which relates to Spanish America may * * * have been prompted by a knowledge of the sentiments of His Majesty's Government upon that subject." But, he continues, if the message "is to be construed as objecting to an attempt to recover her dominions on the part of Spain there is again an important difference between his view of the subject and ours, as it is possible to conceive," and further, "it is hardly necessary for me to add that the principle (if principle it may be called) prohibiting all further colonization of the continents of America is as new to this Government as to that of France." He was also displeased that the United States had acted alone instead of in conjunction with the British Government.

Some have given the entire credit to Adams. It is true that the Secretary of State urged that the United States should independently of England announce its opposition to any interference with the Latin-American States. On that question at the start there was a division of opinion in the Cabinet. Wirt doubted and hesitated, and Adams asked the President to consider carefully the Attorney General's apprehension that throwing down the gantlet to the Holy Alliance might precipitate a war which this country might have to fight single handed. The conclusion of the President was arrived at after protracted consultations with his Cabinet, and it was his own conclusion, reached with full knowledge of the entire situation and upon a consideration of every fact and argument. It may be that Calhoun's recollection was accurate when he said, 25 years after the event, that the colonization proposition was not considered at a Cabinet meeting, but, of course, it represented the President's own deliberate conclusion.

The answer to those who decline to attribute anything of initiative and leadership to Monroe is that he alone was in authority and capable of final decision and action on a subject of supreme importance which hung in a trembling and perilous balance, and that his alone was the responsibility for boldly proclaiming, as the Chief Magistrate of the Nation and the leader of the people, a policy which was certain to encounter formidable antagonism and might involve the country in a war or a series of wars. Had an armed conflict occurred and the commerce of the country been seriously involved, can it be doubted that Monroe would have been the victim of the same sort of bitter attack and by the same interests which was directed against Madison and himself in connection with the War of 1812? Anyone who wishes to know of the effort at its flood to exalt Adams at the expense of Monroe should read the address of the historian, Ford, before the Massachusetts Historical Society at its meeting in January, 1902, and

the remarks made at the close of the address by the president of the society, himself an Adams. The latter said that it was apparent that the Monroe doctrine had "originated almost verbatim, literatim, et punctuatim, as well as in scope and spirit, with Monroe's Secretary of State." Not content with that sweeping asseveration, he proceeded to say "As to President Lincoln's Proclamation of Emancipation, the second most memorable presidential address of a century, it is a fact, though one which has not yet found its fully recognized place in history, that Monroe's Secretary of State was hardly less closely identified with it than with the hardly less memorable and famous address of 40 years previous." Thus, though John Quincy Adams was dead, his voice sounded down through the years to Lincoln and proved convincing. At that meeting nothing further seems to have been claimed on behalf of Adams! On the other side is the very dignified and satisfactory reply to the Ford address made before the American Historical Society at Washington in 1905 by the historian, Schouler, a native of Massachusetts, who was educated at Harvard. Hear the last paragraph of that address:

> In short, as history may in fairness conclude, the United States at this time had a President who held up no trumpet for his Secretary of State or any other member of his Cabinet to blow into, but sounded his own sufficient blast and flung out his challenge as a self-poised and self-respecting head of this Nation, whose simple word carried the weight of world-wide reputation, and who, in talents, public experience, and nobility of character, was the peer of any crowned monarch of his time in all Europe.

The meaning of the Monroe doctrine was recently set forth with characteristic precision and clearness by Secretary Hughes. "Properly understood," he said, "it is opposed (1) to any un-American action encroaching upon the political independence of American States under any guise, and (2) to the acquisition in any manner of the control of additional territory in this hemisphere by any un-American power." Considering the intent of the message, and that it has been, and must be, interpreted in the light of changing circumstances and conditions, I do not believe that the correctness of Mr. Hughes's definition can be disputed. On the point that the spirit and not simply the letter is to be regarded, take two illustrations: President Grant, in his Santo Domingo message, presenting a view previously stated by other Presidents, said it was now proper to assert the equally important principle that hereafter no territory on this continent shall be regarded as subject to transfer to any other European power. But this, in the opinion of Mr. Root and others, is but a corollary of the policy as originally announced. Again, at the date of the message, there was no prospect that any nation of Asia might attempt in America what was forbidden to the nations of Europe, but that prospect having arisen, the policy becomes as applicable to Asia as to Europe, and has been so held by our Government.

By the doctrine, the United States voluntarily fixed a rule of conduct for itself, which affects all other nations without regard to whether they approve or disapprove. It is an affirmative declaration of a continuing purpose, by the use of such force as may be essential, to prevent Old World powers from action in this hemisphere which might lessen and might finally even destroy the terri-

torial and political safety of the United States. Its validity and strength spring from the fact that it represents an exercise of the natural right of self-protection and for that reason has the undivided support of all the people. It links with the older declaration in proclaiming a method by which independence is to be guaranteed and maintained, and the country will never turn away from the policy announced by Monroe in 1823 unless it should become so helpless and hopeless as to turn away from what was declared in 1776.

The doctrine is not written in the Constitution, but it is more fundamental than the Constitution itself. It has never been thrown into the form of a statute, though something of that sort was unsuccessfully attempted as early as January, 1824; but no statute is so authoritative and enduring. It is not intercontinental law, as Clay called it, but a unilateral policy applicable to two continents. It is not international law, since it does not depend upon the consent of any nation of the Old World, to all of whom it says, "Thou shalt not," or any of the other nations of this hemisphere; and it is not given the character of international law, because of having been expressly accepted by all of the powers that are members of the League of Nations. It carries no thought of suzerainty or overlordship and is devoid of any ambition inconsistent with the rights and interests of other American nations. While it does not threaten them, it promises them nothing. If the United States should ever attempt to seize by force, whether wisely, or unjustly and foolishly, any American territory not now under our flag, the Monroe doctrine would have no bearing upon the issue. The transaction would not be chargeable to the doctrine. It would be altogether outside the field in which the doctrine operates.

There is no opportunity to enter into the controversies, often attended by the utmost confusion of thought as to its real meaning, which have arisen as to the interpretation of the doctrine, or even to enumerate the occasions when its practical value has been demonstrated, for that would require details that are now impossible. I may, however, mention one episode, not important but interesting. It is reliably stated that in the last year of our Civil War and preliminary to the Hampton Roads conference it was seriously proposed that the settlement of the differences responsible for the war should be postponed, with the prospect that they would later be satisfactorily disposed of, so that the armies of the two sections might unite in vindicating the Monroe doctrine by expelling Maximilian from Mexico.

It may be worth while to refer to the persistent contention that by the Monroe doctrine the United States is pledged not to participate in the political affairs of foreign nations. Only a few weeks ago a London audience was informed that such is the case. To use the language of the speaker, the doctrine means, among other things, "no participation by the United States in the political broils of Europe." It is true that Monroe in his message reiterated what had been stated by Washington, Jefferson, and others relative to the disposition of the United States not to involve itself unnecessarily in the concerns of European nations. But there was no suggestion by any of them that our Government should subject

itself to a perpetual restriction, regardless of any and all changes that might occur, and there has been no pledge to that effect made to ourselves or other nations. The Monroe doctrine is a single, comprehensive inhibition under which the United States has placed the nations of the Old World, while leaving itself complete freedom in any contingency that may arise to decide whether it will or will not relate itself to their affairs. This could not be otherwise, because the thing described as participation is incapable of definition or limitation. This was clearly the view of Monroe, for in the message itself he took a positive stand on the contest then in progress to establish a revolutionary government in Greece. It was the view of Webster, who, in January, 1824, made his first great speech in Congress, advocating the recognition of Greek independence and the appointment of an agent or commission to that country. Webster referred to the theory of nonparticipation. "As it is never difficult," he said, "to recite commonplace remarks or trite aphorisms, so it may be easy, I am aware on this occasion, to remind me of the wisdom which dictates to men a care of their own affairs and admonishes them, instead of searching for adventure abroad, to leave other men's concerns to their own hands * * *. All this and more may be readily said; but all this and more will not be allowed to fix a character upon this proceeding * * *. Let it be first shown that in this question there is nothing which can affect the interest, the character, or the duty of this country." The view thus long ago intimated by Monroe and expounded by Webster has repeatedly governed the action of the United States, and in each instance the transaction was outside the scope of the Monroe doctrine. Acquiring and holding the Philippines is participation in the political affairs of Asia. For the sake of assuring humanity everywhere, if possible, a more peaceful existence, the United States has lately become a party to treaties which immediately affect the political affairs of both Asia and Europe. But whatever the opinion of some as to the expediency of all this, there has at least been no violation of the Monroe doctrine. Nor was it violated when we entered the World War. And, in passing, let me say that we were not then influenced by a mere conception that our material interests were in peril and must be protected. Who can forget how Roosevelt, urging that we embark in the struggle at its commencement, cried out that the Nation might lose its very soul by failing to perform what seemed to him its imperative duty? And will not the lamp of history everlastingly illuminate that scene on the evening of April 2, 1917, in the Capitol at Washington, when President Wilson proclaimed to Congress the reasons why the United States should take part in the awful conflict then raging across the ocean? He was not unmindful of protecting our own security, but, like Webster and Roosevelt, his thought went far beyond that, and he spoke of the preservation of popular liberty, of the vindication of the principles of peace and justice, and of such "a concert of purpose and action as will hereafter insure the observance of those principles." Nor was the issue with respect to the League of Nations within the scope of the Monroe doctrine, as accurately defined by Secretary Hughes. He and Mr. Root, two of the ablest men who have held the portfolio of State, believed, as they informed the country, that the active and constant participation of the United States in the

political affairs of other nations, which membership in the League of Nations would have made inevitable, would be wise, with an explicit acknowledgment of the permanence of the Monroe doctrine, which was conceded, and with certain reservations not intended to avoid participation but to guard its extent. They were not deterred, as Webster was not, by "trite aphorisms," nor have they been deterred from recommending that the United States should become identified with the Permanent Court of International Justice because of the fact that thereby our country would be drawn closer to other countries and their political affairs.

I have detained you too long, but may be permitted, in conclusion, a further reference to Monroe. Having gone into retirement, he received from the people of Virginia, who had already so lavishly honored him, one further mark of their confidence and affection. He was elected president of the constitutional convention of 1829–30, in which served the most eminent men of the Commonwealth, which then extended to the Ohio River. James Madison placed him in nomination and John Marshall and Madison escorted him to the chair—a great triumvirate. But his health and strength had then waned and the shadows were gathering about him. His talents, his time, and his means had been so completely expended in the public service that nothing was left him as he neared the end, which came on July 4, 1831, except a record which had won him the general and deep respect and gratitude of his countrymen. Without exaggeration there might be applied to him the inscription over the grave of another Virginian, who rests yonder at Yorktown, "He gave all for liberty."

ADDRESS OF EPPA HUNTON, JR., ST. PAUL'S CHURCH, RICHMOND, VA., DECEMBER 2, 1923

We begin to-day, under the auspices of the Southern Commercial Congress, the international celebration of the one hundredth anniversary of the promulgation of the Monroe doctrine.

One hundred years ago to-day this great doctrine was declared by President Monroe in his message to Congress.

The doctrine thus announced may be briefly summarized as follows:

First. The American continents are not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European power.

Second. If any European power attempts at any future time to extend its political system to any part of this continent "for the purpose of oppressing" nations, or "controlling in any other manner" their destiny, we will regard such action "as dangerous to our peace and safety."

These were bold words and a clear and courageous statement of a great principle, the promulgation of which made a profound impression in this country as well as upon the other great nations of the world.

This doctrine has never been enacted into law by Congress, nor has it ever been embodied in our treaties with other countries or formally recognized by them; nor is it recognized in international law, except as it may be a part of the right of every nation to

protect and defend itself. It simply rests upon its promulgation by Monroe in his message.

Since that date this great principle has dominated our foreign policy and has been frequently invoked and insisted upon.

England alone of all the European powers sympathized with us in our position, though she took no action publicly to express her sympathy. It has been said that with the exception of the Declaration of Independence and the proclamation of President Lincoln abolishing slavery, the enunciation of the Monroe doctrine is the most important event in the history of this country.

That message declaring this great doctrine was the crowning glory of the splendid career of James Monroe.

History has done scant justice to this great son of Virginia, who, with many of her other sons, made such rich contributions to the public life of this country in its infancy and formulative period.

He has been unfortunate in his biographer, who has incorporated into his life every failure and every criticism, and has minimized the credit due him for his splendid and brilliant achievements. Only lately have Monroe's writings been collected. He first comes into the public eye when a mere boy he was an officer in the Revolutionary Army. He shed his blood on the field of Trenton. We next see him representing his State in Congress when only 24 years old, and thereafter he held practically every office, except judicial office, in the gift of Virginia or of the United States. He was a number of times a member of the Legislature of Virginia, was four times its governor. He represented his State not only in the House of Representatives but in the United States Senate and was a member of her constitutional conventions. He was Secretary of State during Madison's administration, during which was the war with Great Britain, and for several months during the war he was also the head of the War Department. A great authority has said "Mr. Monroe was the war." As envoy extraordinary to France, he, with our resident minister, negotiated the Louisiana purchase, and in like capacity he began the negotiations for the acquisition of Florida, which, however, were not consummated until after he became President. He was minister to the Court of St. James. He was twice elected President of the United States, and the last time only one electoral vote was cast against him; and the story is told that that vote was occasioned by the electors' unwillingness for any one to share with Washington the honor of a unanimous election as President.

That Monroe conceived this great doctrine and after conference with Jefferson and Madison and of course with his Cabinet, proclaimed it, was unquestioned for more than three-fourths of a century; but within the last 25 years the claim has been made by Massachusetts writers that Mr. John Quincy Adams, his Secretary of State, conceived the idea of this doctrine. It is also claimed by Massachusetts writers that Lincoln's emancipation proclamation also originated in the mind of John Quincy Adams. It is also claimed by these same writers that Richard Olney, of Massachusetts, Cleveland's great Secretary of State, is entitled to the credit for the former's splendid Venezuelan message in which he so vigorously asserted the Monroe doctrine in a boundary dispute between an

English colony and Venezuela. One of the most splendid and brilliant tributes I have ever read was paid by Mr. John Quincy Adams himself to Mr. Monroe, and while not bearing upon the point at issue, should silence forever his critics and detractors. Doubtless, Mr. Adams, as Secretary of State, bore his full part in that critical and eventful period, but I am convinced that an impartial and thorough investigation will demonstrate that the Monroe doctrine was conceived by Virginia's illustrious son and was proclaimed by him after conference with Jefferson and Madison, and, of course, after conferring with his Cabinet.

It seems to me that this occasion should be not only the celebration of a great event in the history of our country but should arouse Virginians to see that full and complete justice is done her great and brilliant son, and that the honors which are his—and through him Virginia's—are not given to others.

ADDRESS OF GOV. E. LEE TRINKLE, AT THE TOMB OF MONROE, DECEMBER 2, 1923

In consonance with the impressive ceremonies of this day, when the whole Government pays glad tribute to the worth and memory of Virginia's distinguished dead, it is fitting that the Old Dominion, Mother of States and of Presidents, should lay this wreath at the tomb of James Monroe.

To-day the centennial of the announcement of that principle of American diplomacy known as "the Monroe doctrine" sees our Western Republic leading the nations in prosperity, security, and power.

Let us not believe that this happy circumstance is fortuitous.

Washington secured us our national independence; Jefferson endowed us with religious liberty; Marshall interpreted for us our Constitution; but Monroe guaranteed the benefits which were to accrue from the patriotism and wisdom of the founders and fathers of our liberal Government by providing protection against foreign penetration into our western world.

Antidating the American Declaration of Independence, the nations were ruled by kings. Monarchs governed by virtue of the time-honored theory of the divine right.

Under this doctrine a child, an idiot, a profligate, might exercise almost unlimited authority.

In England this theory had been rudely shaken by the execution of Charles I, the dethronement of James II, with the expulsion of the Stuart dynasty.

Yet even England was not prepared for an expression of the fundamental fact set forth in the American Declaration of Independence, that governments existed only for the good of their subjects, "deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

Those primal causes bringing forth the pronouncement of the Monroe doctrine, together with those circumstances which justified and which will continue to justify it, are matters of history familiar even to our children.

It is nevertheless a fact that mankind is prone to withhold just praise from its benefactors until the records of its leaders have been tested by time and submitted to the critical verdict of succeeding generations.

In recent years we have witnessed a revival of world homage to Washington.

Only a few days ago the Masonic leaders of the 48 States, with the head of our Government and other notables, assembled at Alexandria to take part in the laying of the corner stone to a four million dollar monument to the Father of His Country.

The Nation is to-day actively engaged in the prosecution of plans looking to the perpetuation of Monticello, the home of Thomas Jefferson, as a national shrine.

What more natural sequence than that the people, placing just value on the services of patriots, should express their desire of doing honor to Monroe, another among those intellectual giants sprung from Virginia, and called by the people to lead the Nation.

Here, in this sacred spot, this "God's acre" surrounded by all that is mortal of thousands of illustrious Virginians of the past, among which is included the name of a second President of the United States, rests James Monroe.

No sweeter spot could have been selected for that long sleep of death, which comes to all earth's children, be they humble or be they great, than here, on this elevation, rising above the gentle music of the James River.

And if no monumental mausoleum as yet lifts its imposing and majestic pride over the eternal slumbers of this immortal guardian of our Government, still the memory of Monroe, embalmed in the love of the Nation, will prove more enduring than marble, while the body of the statesman rests for the final trumpet of resurrection here within the sheltering bosom of the State which gave him birth.

ADDRESS OF HON. GEORGE AINSLIE, MAYOR OF RICHMOND, DECEMBER 2, 1923

I welcome you who have come to pay tribute to the memory of an American statesman and to make your acknowledgments of the benefits political, social, and material which became the priceless heritage of the peoples of this hemisphere from and forever after the promulgation of the doctrine which bears his name.

For a full century those peoples have worked at the solution of their own problems without interference from the nations of the Old World, because on this day a hundred years ago James Monroe proclaimed in a message to the Congress that "the American continents, by the free and independent position which they have assumed and maintained, are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European power," and that any attempt to "extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere" would be regarded by the United States as "dangerous to our peace and safety," and would be opposed accordingly. Thus did this Virginian, whose memory and whose greatest deed we assemble to honor, underwrite in the name of our country the freedom and independence of all peoples whose lot cast them upon this side of the ocean, and for these hundred years the United States have steadfastly adhered to the policy of neither trespassing themselves nor permitting other nations to trespass upon the territory or political institutions that belonged to them or their neighbors.

Where could we more appropriately celebrate this centennial than here in Monroe's native State, the State he served in every political capacity from assemblyman to governor, and from which he went abroad as a diplomat, and finally to the exalted station of President of the United States; the State which was the stage of the final scene of the great drama of the emergence of the thirteen Colonies as an independent Republic of sovereign States, and likewise of the latter one when out of the crucible of civil strife there came a reunited Union; the State in the bosom of which rest at last the ashes of him we come to honor, there on the bank of the river on which was first permanently planted on this hemisphere that civilization his soul yearned to protect for all time.

The State, the Nation, aye, the world itself, were his field of action in life, and though he died and was buried far away from home Richmond finally became his sepulcher. Here he awaits the resurrection among those who still struggle for Virginia and the Union, and who revere his name and honor his deeds and his memory as those of a man who shed imperishable luster upon the pages of American history and gladdened the hearts of all lovers of liberty.

ADDRESS OF GOV. E. LEE TRINKLE, SUNDAY EVENING, DECEMBER 2, 1923

Virginia feels a just pride in the international celebration of the promulgation of the Monroe doctrine. As a mother holds dear to her heart the life and devotion of a faithful son, so Virginia is stirred with emotion and cherishes with a love that shall never die the imperishable record and contribution to world history of her good and honored son.

As the chief magistrate of this Commonwealth I extend to my fellow citizens of this State a welcome to the capital city for this historic occasion, and I join with you in expressing a genuine welcome to all who come within our borders from other States and from other nations to mingle in patriotic association for the sacred purpose of honoring a name dear to our hearts and an ideal that marks an epoch in the political history of the world. In the invitation we proclaimed to you, when we wooed you to come, is a welcome far more eloquent than words that I might speak to you.

No area on earth can claim so much of history and tradition, of patriotism and glory, associated with the birth of political freedom, and the establishment of a Government based upon the ideals of liberty and justice, as the Old Dominion. Here we have the record of Washington, the "Father of his Country," whose sword carved the way to American freedom; of Jefferson, whose pen struck off the Declaration of Independence; of Madison, the "Father of the Constitution"; of Marshall, the profound interpreter of that great charter of our rights; of Mason, characterized by an authority as "the greatest political philosopher produced by the Western Hemisphere"; of a host of immortals, associated with the statesman, the object of our veneration on this centenary occasion, soldier, legislator, Chief Executive of State and Nation, diplomat, and champion of fundamental principles in national Government and in international relations, the author of the deathless doctrine that bears his name, James Monroe, of Virginia.

The Monroe doctrine was promulgated in 1823 as a death knell to the exploitation of the Western Hemisphere by foreign powers and as a challenge to the world in militant defense of the rights of nations. Under the magic power of the Monroe doctrine, the Central and South American Republics and other Latin countries to the south have had their birth of freedom and their continuity during the century of economic and political progress. It is the guaranty of national security in the New World, as it has been the inspiration in the Orient as well as the Occident in marking new paths of political independence.

The Pan American Union, the "League of Nations" of the Western Hemisphere, a federation of 21 American Republics, really found a basis for the Union of American States in the unity of the security based upon a fundamental idea enunciated by Monroe a hundred years ago. In referring to the Old World, he said:

> Of events in that quarter of the globe—

Referring to Europe—

> with which we have so much intercourse and from which we derive our origin, we have always been anxious and interested spectators. The citizens of the United States cherish sentiments the most friendly in favor of the liberty and happiness of their fellow men on that side of the Atlantic.

But he directed attention to the differences in the political systems of the Old World and America. He said:

> This difference proceeds from that which exists in their respective governments; and to the defense of our own, which has been achieved by the loss of so much blood and treasure, and matured by the wisdom of their most enlightened citizens, and under which we have enjoyed unexampled felicity, this whole Nation is devoted.

And then Monroe proclaimed the doctrine of championship on the part of the United States, of the integrity of the territory of the entire hemisphere, with a masterful dignity and with a militant heroism that his words were reckoned with as symbols of power, respected through the sweep of the years; respected by monarchy as well as democracy; respected in every era of history through the decades down to the treaty of Versailles. Monroe declared:

> We owe it, therefore, to candor 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 interfered and will not interfere. But with the governments who have declared their independence and maintained it, and whose independence we have, on great consideration and on just principles, acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny, by any European power in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States.

Thus Monroe gave the pledge of the resources and power of the United States for the protection of the sovereignty and independence of the nations of the western world. Had there been a European doctrine respected by the nations of the Old World as the Monroe doctrine in the new, or if there had been a Pan European Union similar to the Pan American Union, I doubt seriously if a World War would have been possible.

In this hour of international reconstruction; in this hour of opportunity and destiny, with a reconsecration in this centennial cele-

bration, to the ideals of the past and the dogmas of political truth and the orthodoxy of democratic constitutional government, as we honor ourselves in honoring a master mind in statecraft and the ideals of internationalism that he promulgated, let us also consecrate ourselves with a new devotion to the obligation of the hour in the solution of our domestic problems and in rendering again the contribution of America in ideals and devotion and service to the cause of humanity, to the throttling to the death of the agencies that provoke the peoples of the earth to misunderstanding and strife, unifying them in that finer relation of amity, comity, and fraternity, thus responding to the slogan of the ages, "Peace on earth, good will toward men."

IN MEMORIAM—ADDRESS OF CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM D. UPSHAW, DECEMBER 2, 1923

Mr. Chairman, Governor Trinkle, and fellow Americans—

> There are moments, I think, when the spirit receives
> Whole volumes of thought on its unwritten leaves;
> There are hours that hold in their compass of thought
> The measureless triumph of a century wrought.

This solemn pilgrimage of Virginia's youth and beauty, her chivalry and her patriotism, from the historic capitol of the Old Dominion to the grave of the author of the Monroe doctrine, typifies at once not only the centennial tribute of a grateful continent, but that inspiring human crown which lofty virtue wears. Perhaps the chiefest lesson for these patriotic Americans who have marched—citizens actual and embryonic—from the gray-haired defenders of our firesides and the sturdy citizen-legionaires to the smiling thousands of boys and girls who refresh us and thrill us with the kindling glories of their youth, is found not only in the international triumph of the deathless doctrine which Monroe proclaimed, but in the security and the purity of that vibrant and inspiring American atmosphere where individualism in citizenship finds its loftiest coronation. We see again James Monroe, the modest purposeful youth of 15 on the playground of that humble schoolhouse at historic Fredericksburg, lighting the torch of his early ambitions by the pioneer camp fires of colonial development; we see him a thoughtful student at William and Mary College throwing down his books to answer the battle cry for colonial freedom; we see him enduring with heroic fortitude the privations of the Revolutionary soldier, and "knighted" on the field of battle for conspicuous bravery at the hands of the immortal Washington; we see him again practicing law in Fredericksburg, and so poor in this world's goods that a generous kinsman buys for him a town lot in order that the community council might have the benefit of his wisdom and his constructive fellowship. Ah—

> So nigh is grandeur to our dust,
> So near is God to man;
> When conscience whispers low "I must,"
> The youth replies "I can."

And under this sublime impulsion we see the young Virginia statesman leap forward to halls of state and national legislation; then

three times to the governorship of his State on the very spot where he had read law with the father of the Declaration of Independence.

Now, we see James Monroe illustrating the citizenship and the ideals of the lusty young nation of the Western Hemisphere as a poised and accomplished diplomat at the proudest courts of Europe, while gilded monarchs look with wonder akin to awe at the manner of master men produced by the new-born Republic; and now—thank God for "the era of good feeling" which his great leadership brought in—we see this many-sided statesman become the fifth President of the United States. Verily, he "came to the kingdom for such an hour as this"—rather, I should say, to the helm of state—for the clear vision and stalwart hand of James Monroe shattered the schemes and dreams of European despots concerning the continents of the Americas.

It was the hour of power and kingcraft. The Holy Alliance proved itself very unholy by its frightened frenzy at the march of democracy. Indeed, it was formed to crush out the free spirit of democratic individualism. The War of the Revolution had not only freed our American colonies from the autocracy of the German-speaking George III, King of England, but, according to David Lloyd-George, he saved king-driven England from herself. Democracy in England was coming into flower; and the mother country, walking in the liberating radiance of such noble spirits as Pitt and Burke and Canning, and really proud of the achievements and prospects of the new American Republic, proposed a joint declaration that would warn European despots against further designs upon the Americas.

EMANCIPATION OF THE AMERICAS

Monroe's hour had come—the hour for the independent, dynamic initiative which not only meant the full and final emancipation of all republics in both Americas, but gave an electric thrill of hope and purpose to that spirit of free democracy that was fighting upward throughout the world.

Just 100 years ago to-day President Monroe gave his epoch-making declaration to Congress that all American soil must be kept forever inviolate from European aggression. It was the essence and the triumph of greatness in leadership that America preferred to stand grandly alone as she flung this startling dynamic of democracy into the faces of the wondering despots of Europe. Whatever of peril that mild defiance might bring, the young nation stood ready to face and endure; whatever of glory that ringing declaration of American sufficiency might win, it should be concentrated in one resplendent crown on the brow of the young international pioneer. Thus the United States of America—a daring pathfinder on an "uncharted sea," stood alone and yet not alone, in the blended poverty and power of a "revised and enlarged edition" of American independence—an independence that laughed at "the breath of kings," while it rejoiced in the well-earned increment of a new neighborly gratitude and the supporting enrichment of a new American fellowship. In one marvelous and mighty hour the new American Republic leaped from the wilderness of national un-

certainty and the valley of speculation and experiment to the commanding height of serene consciousness and decisive power among the nations of earth.

> Like some tall cliff that lifts its awful form,
> Swells from the vale and midway leaves the storm,
> While round its feet the lowering clouds are spread,
> Eternal sunshine settles on its head.

And toward that sun-crowned mountain peak the eager eyes of the oppressed, liberty-loving peoples of earth began to look, and their tired feet began to move—for they thought of America evermore as—

> The land of the free and the
> Home of the brave.

SUBJECTIVE FAITH AND OBJECTIVE POWER

It has been said that "the ideal citizen is one who thinks what others only dream, who says what others only think, who does what others only say, and who glories in what others dare not do."

With this ideal true in the individual citizen, surely it is doubly true of such a leader of men and nations as James Monroe proved himself to be. This inspiring subjective consciousness brought with it the inevitable resultant of objective power. It warmed and purified and energized the heart of the new-born nation like "a second work of grace" that follows the miracle of regeneration in the heart of the individual, and comes with a new sense of intelligent dedication to the cause of God and humanity.

The immediate aftermath of the promulgation of the Monroe doctrine constituted a sense of national revival in ethical ideals and spiritual values, it brought a new baptism of inward peace and passion and a new and radiant horizon for the redeemed national soul. And it was not long until the restless ambitious nations of Europe began to calm their fevered pulse beneath the steady light, pure as crystal, that gleamed from the American lighthouse across the sea. While the lessons learned by the lesser American Republics and the watching nations of Europe were not, of course, instantaneous and universal, they have become increasingly stable and pacific.

The blood of our American neighbors to the south of us, heated by its proximity to the Equator, has occasionally broken out into a fight before breakfast, but before the sun went down the fiery protagonists would look up into the peaceful, disapproving face of their big brother, "Uncle Sam," and then lay down their arms, ashamed of themselves, and go back with the rising of another sun to the constructive pursuits of peace, happiness, and national prosperity.

JAMES MONROE AND WOODROW WILSON

And, ladies and gentlemen, let me, without equivocation in this high and ardent hour, put into shining italics the great world lesson of the Monroe doctrine; even as this spiritual compact of understanding and fellowship among the Americans has largely held in leash the forces of destructive war on these two continents and absolutely stopped European aggressions upon American soil, so it was the spirit of vision of the Versailles treaty to make a great

international handclasp the bulwark against international conflicts forevermore. The very fact that the understanding impulsion of the Monroe doctrine has made the resort to arms unnecessary in the prevention of European aggression, cries aloud to the makers and the breakers of the Versailles treaty that if all the allied nations that fought to overthrow military autocracy had clasped hands in peace to keep that autocracy overthrown, all autocratic belligerents would have been awed forever into a stammering hush. This could have been done without pulling down the American flag 1 inch before any foreign power. The main thing I liked about that Great World War, ladies and gentlemen, was its geographical position. It was 3,000 miles away from your American home and mine; and we rejoice in the blended wisdom and heroism of statesman, soldier, and sailor that united to keep that terrible war 3,000 miles away from American forces. And whether it shall be the dream and the prayer of that stainless Christian statesman—the Gladstone of America—William J. Bryan, who did so much to bind the world together in pacts of enduring peace; or whether it shall be the dream and the plan of that great President and now Chief Justice of the United States, William Howard Taft, who stood long and valiantly at the helm of the League to Enforce Peace; or whether it shall be the crystallization of the dream and the plan of that brilliant seer and world citizen, Woodrow Wilson, who fell on the firing line and almost gave his wonderful life that he might give constructive, enduring peace to a staggering world; or whether it shall be the dream and the plan of our late lamented and beloved President, Warren G. Harding, who sought the same great end through a World Court and an association of nations, you know and I know and God knows that whether it be a 4-power pact or a 44-power pact, the famished, sorrowing, heart of a war-torn world is anxious—prayerfully and desperately anxious—that something shall be done in consonance with the ideals of the Prince of Peace that will make it unnecessary for a great pacific Nation like the United States of America to spend more than 90 cents out of every dollar of the people's money to provide for the ravages of war, past, present, and to come. No truer, wiser words ever fell from human lips of a friend of peace than that immortal utterance of President Harding at the opening of the disarmament parliament: "There is something fundamentally wrong in any scheme of civilization that spends the major part of its means and its energies on the scientific destruction of human life."

As we stand by that new-made grave at Marion, as we gather in annual pilgrimage before that mecca of international peace on S Street in Washington, as we stand to-day in reverent centennial tribute before the "vocal dust" of the author of the Monroe doctrine, let us resolve all differences incident to the limitations of human wisdom and partisan bias as we approach the supreme objective in our Christian civilization—peace, constructive peace and happiness and progress for all the peoples of all the world.

And as a patriotic, God-fearing American citizen, I confess that I am jealous—righteously, loyally jealous—to see my country, preserving both her independence and her unselfish spirit of international benevolence, take her indispensable place in international leadership toward universal righteousness and everlasting peace.

The Monroe doctrine, in its last and best analysis, is not provincial. Its uncringing, stalwart stand for American integrity and American development constitutes its highest possible contribution to the peace and prosperity of other nations.

And beholding the man which was healed standing with them they could say nothing against it.

This convincing declaration concerning the healing of the man who, as a cripple had lain long at the beautiful gate of the temple, is America's own answer and inspiration to all nations impoverished by the cruel carnage and the desolating waste of war.

"Look at the heights serene on which I stand." Thus saith America to the restless, disheartened nations of earth. "Look at the incontestable fact that my flag has never led my people into a selfish war, and therefore, thanks to the god of nations, I have never known defeat. Peace has been my passion and war my painful protest. Look at my unexampled prosperity that has crowned my program of peace, and come up—higher—come up higher above the deadly miasma of national hate and the fog and fury and the death and dearth of war." Humbly, proudly, triumphantly before the god of nations and the sons and daughters of men—this is the meaning and the message of this centennial—this is America's national and international evangel.

FROM PRESIDENT TO JUSTICE OF PEACE—CALLING AMERICAN YOUTH TO UNSELFISH SERVICE

I must be pardoned—if pardon is needed—for bringing my first and final message to Virginia's youth—America's youth, strikingly called by Jacob Riis "the to-morrow of the Republic." If, as Reynold E. Blight has declared, "Next to the glorious Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States, the Monroe doctrine is America's most important and significant contribution to the well being and progress of humanity," then surely the youth of America must hear a new and clarion call to the glory of service for the sake of service in the almost startling disclosure of history that James Monroe, the far-famed author of this immortal doctrine, rich in the highest honors which two continents could bestow upon him, chose to crown life's beautiful evening by serving his community in the thoroughly honorable position of justice of the peace. He believed in the glory of service—humble, faithful service, rather than the empty glory of self-centered renown. This great God-fearing builder of a nation's grandeur believed in the uplifting doctrine that would "sweep a street to the glory of God." If he could speak to-day to the thousands who, in the beauty of their plastic youth, have made this pilgrimage to his tomb, and to the millions of students in the schools and colleges of America who are sharing in the grateful thought of this centennial tribute, he would declare with Tom F. McBeath:

> God gems thy path with opportunities,
> Thick as the summer dewdrops on the grass,
> Rich with his promises;
> But, mannalike, they must be gathered
> Ere the sun be risen

And used upon the instant—
Else they breed within the heart
A never-dying brood of worms,
Armed with stings of vain regret,
And to a loathesome hell of torment
Turn the Paradise of memory.

It is because this brave, purposeful American youth went into America's teeming harvest fields and "came not back with empty hands" that he built a pyramid of truth and light that will pierce the ages as they over it roll. It is verily the crown that America knighthood wears—

The crown that shall new luster boast
When victor's wreath and monarch's gems
Shall blend in common dust.

THE MONROE DOCTRINE—ABSTRACT OF SPEECH OF HON. WILLIAM J. BRYAN, DECEMBER 2, 1923

The one hundredth anniversary of the announcement of the Monroe doctrine is a day that well deserves observance. The doctrine which our fifth President, James Monroe, proposed to Congress and to which his name has been given marked the beginning of an important epoch in our Nation's history, and the capital of the State of Virginia is the place where the event can be most fittingly celebrated. This great Commonwealth gave to the Nation four of its first five Presidents—Washington, the Father of his Country; Jefferson, the father of the Declaration of Independence; Madison, the father of the Constitution; and Monroe, the father of the Monroe doctrine—four of America's immortals.

Jefferson and Monroe share together the honor of formulating the Monroe doctrine, although they do not monopolize the credit for its promulgation. Foreign Minister Canning of Great Britain suggested a joint policy for his country and ours in anticipation of possible action of the holy alliance that would be hostile to both Europe and America. In August and September, 1823, Canning proposed four times to the American minister in London, Richard Rush, a joint declaration of the two countries against any intervention by European countries in the affairs of North and South America. According to Professor Hart, of Harvard University (Encyclopedia Americana), John Quincy Adams, then Secretary of State, "convinced the President that it would be better to make an independent declaration." Professor Hart is also authority for the statement that "Adams' papers show that he not only suggested but formulated most of the important presidential message of December 2, 1823, several passages in which, construed together, constitute the original and genuine Monroe doctrine."

While Professor Hart credits Secretary Adams with a preponderating influence in the form of the declaration, it is only fair to Thomas Jefferson to say that he urged upon President Monroe the announcement of the principles involved in the Monroe doctrine as soon as Canning's suggestions were received. And it must be remembered, too, that the advice of Jefferson had greater weight with Monroe than that of any other person consulted.

In this connection, it is proper to state that Monroe was, in a sense, a protégé of Jefferson. At the age of 22 he began the study of law

under Thomas Jefferson, then Governor of Virginia. This was the beginning of a life-long friendship between these two great Virginians. In 1782, two years later—at the age of 24—he was elected to the Virginia Legislature. From 1783 to 1786 he served in the Congress of the federation, where he soon became a conspicuous leader in the movement to strengthen the federation's powers. When he left Congress to become again a member of the Legislature of Virginia, Jefferson wrote him, "I regret your departure from Congress. I feel, too, the want of a person there to whose discretion I can trust confidential communications and on whose friendship I can rely against the designs of malevolence."

In 1786 Jefferson paid Monroe the following superlative compliment, "He is a man whose soul might be turned wrong side outward without discovering a blemish to the world."

In 1799 he praised Monroe again in a letter to John Taylor, saying, "Many points in Monroe's character would render him the most valuable acquisition the republican interest in this legislature (Congress) could make."

In 1803 Jefferson wrote a letter to Gen. Horatio Gates, crediting Monroe with important service in connection with the Louisiana purchase.

In a letter to William Duane in 1812, Jefferson showed his continued appreciation of the talents of Monroe:

> I clearly think with you on the competence of Monroe to embrace great views of action. The decision of his character, his enterprise, firmness, industry, and unceasing vigilance would, I believe, secure, as I am sure they would merit, the public confidence and give us all the success which our means can accomplish.

In 1819 Jefferson wrote to Nathaniel Macon as follows:

> I have had, and still have, such entire confidence in the late and present Presidents (Madison and Monroe) that I willingly put both soul and body into their pockets.

These quotations from Jefferson's correspondence are given to show the long and intimate friendship existing between him and President Monroe. They explain why Monroe submitted to Jefferson (in October, 1783) the letters in which Minister Rush communicated to the President the proposition submitted by Foreign Minister Canning.

In the Jeffersonian Encylopedia, the bible of democracy, will be found Jefferson's reply to Monroe, indorsing unreservedly the proposed policy. He fully appreciated its vital importance. He said:

> The question presented by the letters (of Minister Rush) you have sent me, is the most momentous which has been offered to my contemplation since that of independence. That made us a nation, this sets our compass and points the course which we are to steer through the ocean of time opening on us. And never could we embark on it under circumstances more auspicious. Our first and fundamental maxim should be, never to entangle ourselves in the broils of Europe. Our second, never to suffer Europe to intermeddle with c's-Atlantic affairs. America, North and South, has a set of interests distinct from those of Europe, and peculiarly her own. She should therefore have a system of her own, separate and apart from that of Europe. While the last is laboring to become the domicile of despotism, our endeavor should surely be, to make our hemisphere that of freedom. One nation, most of all, could disturb us in this pursuit; she now offers to lead, aid, and accompany us in it. By acceding to her proposition, we detach her from the bands, bring her mighty weight into the scale of free government, and emancipate a continent

at one stroke, which might otherwise linger long in doubt and difficulty. Great Britain is the nation which can do us the most harm of any one, or all on earth; and with her on our side we need not fear the whole world. With her, then, we should most sedulously cherish a cordial friendship; and nothing would tend more to knit our affections than to be fighting once more, side by side in the same cause. Not that I would purchase even her amity at the price of taking part in her wars. But the war in which the present proposition might engage us, should that be its consequence, is not her war, but ours. Its object is to introduce and establish the American system, of keeping out of our land all foreign powers, of never permitting those of Europe to intermeddle with the affairs of our nations. It is to maintain our own principle, not to depart from it. And if, to facilitate this, we can effect a division in the body of the European powers, and draw over to our side its most powerful member, surely we should do it. But I am clearly of Mr. Canning's opinion, that, it will prevent instead of provoke war. With Great Britain withdrawn from their scale and shifted into that of our two continents, all Europe combined would not undertake such a war. For how would they propose to get at either enemy without superior fleets? Nor is the occasion to be slighted which this proposition offers, of declaring our protest against the atrocious violations of the rights of nations, by the interference of any one in the internal affairs of another, so flagitiously begun by Bonaparte, and now continued by the equally lawless alliance, calling itself holy.

It will be noticed that Jefferson builds his argument on two propositions: First, "never to entangle ourselves in the broils of Europe;" and second, "never to suffer Europe to intermeddle in cis-Atlantic affairs." These two propositions were embodied in almost the same language in Monroe's message to Congress two months later—they are the two pillars upon which the doctrine rests.

Jefferson said, "While the last (Europe) is laboring to become the domicile of despotism, our endeavor should surely be, to make our hemisphere that of freedom." Monroe points out that "the political system" of Europe is "essentially different" from ours and should not be extended to "any portion of this hemisphere."

As further evidence that Jefferson's influence was felt in the formulation of this policy, it may be recalled that years before, in discussing the navigation of the Mississippi, he wrote to Gouverneur Morris to intimate to the British ministry that our Nation could not be indifferent to a transfer of Spain's American possession to Great Britain—a thing thought possible at the date of his communication.

In the letter to Monroe, from which an extended quotation has been made, Jefferson referred to a possibility that had long been in his mind, namely, that Cuba might some day become a part of the United States. But he was willing to abandon the hope of acquiring Cuba in order to protect the Western Hemisphere from European aggrandizement.

It is no reflection upon Monroe that, in a matter of so momentous importance, he should have consulted the highest living authority on American affairs, as well as his closest friend. Reference to Jefferson's part is made that history may accord to him his fair share of credit for the adoption of a national policy which has been of such inestimable value not only to our own country and Latin America but to the whole world.

This assumption of guardianship of the smaller republics of the Western Hemisphere, made possible by the fact that Great Britain found it to her interest to recognize our claims to primacy in North and South America, can be justified on several grounds.

First. It was conducive to peace, as Jefferson pointed out in his letter to Monroe; it prevented war instead of inviting it.

Second. It made our own Nation more secure by precluding colonization which might, in time, have menaced the welfare of our republic.

Third. It reserved the Western Hemisphere for the uninterrupted development of governments republican in form and democratic in spirit.

Fourth. It gave to the smaller republics the benefit of our strength, so that they could employ their energies in the development of their several countries, which would have been difficult, if not impossible, if they had been compelled to keep armies and navies in readiness for defense against European aggression.

While in 1826 the United States informed the Latin American republics that the Monroe doctrine did not relieve them from their part in self-defense, our Nation has, as a matter of fact, assumed entire responsibility for the protection of all Central and South America from European powers. In 1865 France was warned against interfering with the Government of Mexico. In 1869, President Grant, following the precedent set by President Polk, warned Europe that no territory in America could be transferred to any European power regardless of willingness or unwillingness of the inhabitants. A little later, President Cleveland, through Secretary Olney, compelled an arbitration of differences between Great Britain and Venezuela. Under President Roosevelt, Germany was forced to acquiesce in our Nation's right to prevent the European occupancy of land in South America.

In the development of the Monroe doctrine, our Nation's right to exclusive control of the Panama Canal has been admitted by Great Britain, and its right to aid the smaller republics when their governments are menaced by outside influences has also been recognized.

In extending protection to the Republics of Central and South America, our Government has inaugurated a policy before unknown in the world's history. Other protectorates had been burdensome and costly to the nations protected; nations that had acted as guardians had not only charged for their services but had utilized their power to secure advantages for themselves. The United States has given its weaker neighbors the benefit of its strength without asking for our Government or its citizens concessions or special privileges. While proximity to the nations protected has naturally given to the United States a large share in the development which has been made possible, and while the friendship which has been cultivated has, to some extent, had a commercial value, our Government has been content to accept that which was voluntarily given. Instead of capitalizing our geographical position and making it the basis of enforced favoritism, we have adopted as our motto, "The Lord has made us neighbors; let justice make us friends."

The appreciation shown by Latin America is as creditable to their sense of justice as to our fair dealing. The Monroe doctrine has strengthened the ties that bind the western republics together; it recognizes similarity of governmental ideals, proclaims a community of interests, and cultivates a friendship built upon reciprocal benefits.

It is not in military protection alone that our Nation has been a benefactor to Central and South America. We have by advice and by the exercise of our influence with the investment companies secured for the smaller Republics rates and terms that they were unable to secure for themselves. We have secured the elimination of harsh conditions and the substitution of more reasonable provisions, but we have not gone as far as we can go and, in my judgment, should go in rendering aid to our neighbors on the south.

If I may be pardoned a reference to my own experience when Secretary of State, I venture to outline a plan that would, I feel sure, be of tremendous benefit to the smaller Republics without injury or even risk to ourselves. While we have been of great service in preventing the making of unfair contracts and the collection by force of exorbitant interest, our Government has not attempted to do anything itself in the way of lending its credit to these Republics.

The rate of interest is determined, first, by the market value of money, and second, by the risk incurred. The value of money can be determined by examining the rate charged on loans where the risk is negligible, as in the case of bonds of the United States Government. Wherever the rate is higher than this the excess may be explained as measuring the amount of risk incurred (real or alleged).

I found that it was customary for money-lending corporations to charge on loans to the smaller countries a rate of interest considerably above that paid on the bonds of the United States. This difference was excused by the companies on the ground that the risk was greater. But as soon as the loans were made, the loan companies would appeal to our Government to eliminate the risk as far as possible by the use of its power to persuade, if not to coerce.

It occurred to me that by removing the risk first we could give to these countries an opportunity to secure, at the lowest prevailing rates of interest, the money necessary to fund existing debts and make needed internal developments. I have, therefore, for nearly a decade, been advocating the underwriting of the loans of these countries by the United States. Our bonds draw only about 4 per cent, which is considerably lower than the interest charged to the southern Republics. Our Government could, without any risk to itself, loan its credit to these neighboring governments, linked to us as they are by similar forms of government and by the closest material interests. Our bonds are sold without discount or cost of brokerage; if to secure United States bonds issued in their behalf these countries deposited their bonds drawing, say, one-half of 1 per cent interest more than ours, this difference, after subtracting the slight cost of bookkeeping, would in a comparatively few years retire the principal.

The best service that an established business man can render a young friend is to enable him to start in business for himself on money secured at a low rate of interest. This service could be rendered by our country to the Latin American Governments. It would furnish a tangible evidence of our friendship, and this friendship, manifested in helpful service, would not only increase the affection of these Republics for their benefactor but would bring a return in dollars and cents, because as a neighbor we would share in the increased prosperity which greater development would bring.

Since this plan was first proposed in 1914 our Government has advanced enormous sums to allies in war. Why not advance small sums to companions in peace?

Everything is desirable which will draw the United States and the Spanish-speaking Republics nearer together. It is worth while therefore to consider whether a language tie may not be devised for increasing the intimacy between the residents of North and South America. Difference in language is an obstacle that it is difficult to overcome, especially where the languages are growing ones, as the English and the Spanish languages are. It is not unreasonable to expect that, next to the English language, the Spanish language will spread farther and more rapidly than any other during the next century, because it is the language of that section of the earth which will witness the greatest development. It is not to be expected that all of the people of the United States will learn Spanish or that all of the people of Spanish America will learn English, but it is possible to introduce into the English language the most frequently used words of the Spanish and into the Spanish language the most frequently used words of the English, so that the people of the different countries will be increasingly able to communicate with each other. If, for instance, five hundred or a thousand of the words most commonly used in each language were introduced into the other language as synonyms for words of the same meaning, it would tend to familiarize the people in each group with the language used in ordinary conversation by the other.

The interchange of students would greatly facilitate acquaintance. There should also be an exchange of professors, which in itself would tend to increase the number of students.

Travel between the two continents of this hemisphere should be encouraged and trade routes should be established.

In this connection, I venture to suggest that our own country has not lived up to its possibilities in the cultivation of mutual acquaintance and the exchange of ideas. The Canal Zone ought to be utilized for the bringing together of the best in the civilizations of the Republics of the Western Hemisphere. At present the Zone is little more than an Army post; we thrust the mailed hand of this peaceful Nation into the very center of Latin America, when we should exhibit here the institutions which have given us our standing in the world. We should have a great institution of learning there where the students of all these countries could mingle and become acquainted under the most stimulating conditions. Every moral agency of our Nation should be encouraged to establish a center there in order that an interchange of ideas may give to each nation the best that the other nations have developed.

But whatever may be done, whether it be military protection, the interlacing of the languages, the exchange of students and teachers, the encouragement of travel and trade between the countries, or the extension of financial assistance by this country in the way of credit, every energy of all the Americas should be bent toward increased acquaintance and strengthened friendship that each may contribute as much as possible to the welfare of all the others.

There is but one philosophy that will stand the test of time and experience, namely, the philosophy embodied in the commandment, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." While it is the essence

of justice and the basis of brotherhood, it is also a far-sighted selfishness. We best secure our own rights when we respect the rights of others; we can only rise permanently when we lift up the level upon which all stand. Prudence as well as right compels cooperation among the joint tenants of the Western Hemisphere.

"What, therefore, God hath joined together, let not man put asunder."

THE PERSONAL GENESIS OF THE MONROE DOCTRINE—ADDRESS OF HON. WILLIAM A. MacCORKLE, FORMER GOVERNOR OF WEST VIRGINIA

The discussion that the Monroe doctrine originated from John Quincy Adams rather than President Monroe had its beginning in the finding by Mr. Worthington Ford of some papers of John Quincy Adams at Quincy, Mass. Mr. Ford, in his statement to the Historical Society of Massachusetts, says:

> The notable enunciation of the doctrine that America was no longer open to colonization by any European power is hardly touched upon in the papers now printed. It was a doctrine that admittedly came from John Quincy Adams and there never has been any doubt as to its authorship. With what remains of the Monroe doctrine as reasonable doubt has been maintained; but I think the documents now published will show that no member of Monroe's Cabinet, except his Secretary of State, held a positive opinion on the general phases of Canning's proposals and on the Russian communications, or succeeded in attaining a position which was defensible from every point of view. Monroe, himself, has long been judged as unlikely to take so extreme a stand in the face of allied Europe, for he was by nature a timid man and was at this time in poor health.

This statement was accentuated by the address of President Angell, of the University of Michigan, made at Harvard, in which he says:

> * * * standing here on the ground made sacred by the presence, the life, the teaching of that great Harvard statesman, John Quincy Adams, to whose matchless courage and farsighted wisdom we owe the declaration which we call the Monroe doctrine, but which might more justly be called the Adams doctrine, I, for one, can not understand how any American citizen, and especially how any Massachusetts man, can recall except with a thrill of gratitude and admiration that the great Secretary of State was able to inspire the slow-moving and lethargic President to fling out the challenge of 1823 into the face of the allied sovereigns of continental Europe. James Monroe held the trumpet, but John Quincy Adams blew the blast. The notes have never died upon the air. They were heard in full force when another Massachusetts man, Richard Olney, sat in the chair of the Secretary of State. Nor are they likely to die so long as Harvard successors to John Quincy Adams hold that executive chair.

This view very quickly took root, as is evidenced by the statement of Charles Francis Adams, made immediately after the statement of Mr. Ford:

> In the paper just read, Mr. Ford has shown that, though called by the name of Monroe, the famous doctrine set forth by the message of 1823 originated almost verbatim, literatim et punctuatim, as well as in scope and spirit, with Monroe's Secretary of State.

In this same address credit is given Mr. Adams and labored proof adduced to show that Mr. Adams originated the basic idea of President Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation.

With only two or three exceptions this view of the genesis of the Monroe doctrine has been followed by the scholars and writers living

in the East. The South does not agree to this position but believes that the accepted theory of a hundred years—that to James Monroe should be ascribed the credit of the promulgation of the Monroe doctrine—is founded upon the most secure historical foundation.

The line of attack generally seems to be:

(1) That President Monroe was timid, lethargic, and incapable of grasping the great question at issue.

(2) That the views previously held by Mr. Monroe were not in accord with the Monroe doctrine.

(3) That he actually did not conceive or write the doctrine.

Let us discuss briefly the three heads—first, that President Monroe was timid, lethargic, and incapable of grasping the great question at issue.

James Monroe filled more great places than anyone in the history of this Government. There was not a great position outside of the judiciary which was not occupied by him with eminent distinction. His life in the history of the diplomatic, the executive, and the legislative departments of the American Government is absolutely unique. He was a member of the legislature of his State; of the lower House of Congress; of the Senate of the United States; judge for settling the boundary dispute between two great States; officer in the Army, filling important places; twice governor of his State at a time when this position was, next to the Presidency, the most important in the country; minister, respectively, to England, France, and Spain; member of the executive council of Virginia; member of both Virginia conventions, and president of the great convention of 1820, composed of the most distinguished men in Virginia; Secretary of State during the Presidency of the greatest master of the Constitution; Secretary of War, Secretary of State, and practically Secretary of the Treasury during the War of 1812, and twice elected President of the United States, thus showing the boundless regard in which he was held by the fathers of our country as well as by the people who had just passed through the great struggle for liberty. He was the fifth President of the United States, and was thought worthy by the people to sit in the seat occupied by Washington, Jefferson, Adams, and Madison.

Mr. Ford said that he was a timid man and was at that time in poor health. Let us examine briefly the life of President Monroe to see if he was one likely to hold the trumpet for this or any other man to blow any doctrine to the worlds.

In the darkest hour of the days of the Revolution, James Monroe, a mere boy, became one of the army of patriots attempting to perpetuate the liberties of this country under the form of a representative government. He was wounded at the Heights of Harlem, he was at Trenton, and was promoted for gallantry in the field, was made an aid-de-camp to Lord Sterling in 1777 and 1778, and was a distinguished soldier in the battles of Brandywine, Germantown, and Monmouth. He was trusted to raise a regiment of troops by General Washington; he served as a soldier of Virginia, and Thomas Jefferson sent him to the South on a most important mission to investigate the condition of the Army in the Southern States. In 1782 he was elected a member of the Legislature of Virginia, and by the legislature he was elected as one of

the executive council of the State. In 1783, when he was only 24 years of age, he was elected a Member of Congress of the United States, and as Mr. Adams says, "He had already performed that in the service of the country which would have sufficed for the illustration of an ordinary life." He served for three years as member of the Confederate Congress, and during these three years of association with the fathers of the Republic he took a leading position and was the chairman of the committee which reported to Congress the provisions looking to the coordinating of the States of this Union under a government with sufficient power to insure united action and life. So high had become James Monroe in the opinion of his country that when he was but 26 years of age he was made one of the judges in Congress to settle the great controversy between Massachusetts and New York.

One of the great questions was whether the United States should carry their vastly increasing commerce upon the Mississippi River. Says John Quincy Adams:

> In all the proceedings relating to the navigation of the Mississippi, from the reception of Mr. Gardoqui, till the acquisition of Louisiana and its annexation to the United States, the agency of Mr. Monroe was conspicuous above all others. He took the lead in the opposition to the recommendation of Mr. Jay. He signed, in conjunction with another eminent citizen of the State of New York, Robert R. Livingston, the treaty which gave us Louisiana, and during his administration as President of the United States the cession of the Floridas was consummated. His system of policy, relating to this great interest, was ultimately crowned with complete success. That which he opposed might have severed or dismembered the Union.

When, by the Articles of Confederation, he was no longer eligible to serve in Congress, he was elected again to the Legislature of Virginia, and immediately thereafter to the convention which was to settle Virginia's position as to the Constitution of the United States. Mr. Monroe was a member of the convention in which were the greatest patriots and the most enlightened sons of Virginia, and in this convention he took a prominent place. So high were his abilities considered that, although he was in the minority both as to party and as to his views concerning the ratification of the Constitution, the Legislature of Virginia in 1798 elected him a Senator of the United States, and he served with distinguished ability until President Washington nominated him minister of France.

At home the differences in political views were more than accentuated by the conditions in France, and France was a seething volcano. Mr. Monroe's views did not agree with those of President Washington, and it would have been impossible for anyone (in view of the conditions brought about in France by the treaty of Mr. Jay with England) to have satisfied either the French people or the administration at Washington. Notwithstanding the questions brought about by Monroe's retirement, he was immediately reelected to the legislature of his State and thence to the governorship of Virginia, filling this office with the most eminent ability and success.

In 1803 he was appointed by Mr. Jefferson on the extraordinary mission to France—the mission that had for its purpose the acquisition of the Territory of Louisiana. This treaty, giving us the great Territory of Louisiana, was signed by Robert Livingston and James Monroe. So great were Monroe's abilities considered by the

President that he was immediately sent to England as minister of the United States, and to Madrid, where, with Mr. Pinckney, he was to settle the question of Florida. The great question of the embargo of our commerce had arisen, and, says Mr. Adams:

> From that day to the peace of Ghent, the biography of James Monroe is the history of that struggle, and in a great degree the history of this Nation, an eventful period in the annals of mankind; a deeply momentous crisis in the affairs of our Union.

A great authority observes that—

> An examination of his services in Spain shows exceptional qualifications as a diplomatist; prudence, self-restraint, courtesy, dignity, tact, energy, familiarity with treaties and international law, ability in argument, devotion to his country's honor and interests, marked in a conspicuous manner his public life in this most difficult of all courts. Judge Wharton, more familiar than any other person with our diplomatic history, says in reference to his negotiations with England, that "in ability, candor, and fairness, Mr. Monroe's papers stand in the front rank of diplomatic documents."

Mr. Pinckney and Mr. Monroe, by reason of a change of government, were not successful on that mission, and Mr. Monroe returned to private life. He was again elected governor of Virginia, filling the place with conspicuous ability; and so great was the confidence in his ability, experience, and statesmanship, that President Madison in 1811 appointed him Secretary of State. He held this great office during the remainder of the two terms of Mr. Madison's administration, and great part of which time John Quincy Adams was the minister of the United States.

During the term of Mr. Madison occurred the war with Great Britain. Says a great authority:

> Mr. Monroe was the war. He found a condition of absolute despair, with want of ability in the War Department, with divided counsel, with a triumphant enemy, and a depleted Treasury.

Mr. Monroe, trusted by the administration, in addition to his arduous duties as Secretary of State, took upon his shoulders the administration of the war, and immediately infused into this great conflict his whole life and energy. Mr. Adams says:

> It may suffice to say that, until the war broke out, and during its continuance, the duties of the offices held by Mr. Monroe, at the head, successively, of the Departments of State and War, were performed with untiring assiduity with universally acknowledged ability, and, with a zeal of patriotism which counted health, fortune, and life itself, for nothing in the ardor of self-devotion to the cause of his country. It is a tribute of justice to his memory to say that he was invariably the adviser of energetic councils; nor is the conjecture hazardous that, had his appointment to the Department of War preceded by six months its actual date, the heaviest disaster of the war, heaviest because its remembrance must be coupled with the blush of shame, would have been spared as a blotted page in the annals of our Union.
>
> England was exultant, its hands were practically free, its soldiers were plentiful, its money was abundant, and on the side of the United States were divided counsel, an impoverished Treasury, a weak administration of the War Department, and it was due more largely to him than to any other agency that the war was brought to a triumphant conclusion. It was his duty, in addition to presiding over the State Department and the War Department, to provide the funds for the successful contest of the war. He cared not for popularity or the effect of his acts, so long as they were for the good of his country.

This unprecedented series of great affairs as part of his life, the people of this country, whose Government had been presided over by

Washington, Adams, Jefferson, and Madison, chose him as the one worthy to sit in the seat of these mighty spirits. He was reelected by the unanimous vote, except one, of the whole country.

With these vast services to his credit, it is idle to attribute timidity to a man who wrought the great work that James Monroe laid to his hands. And it is more than unkind to subject one to the criticism of timidity who could write to the governors of the Southern States in the war of 1812:

> Hasten your militia. Do not wait for this Government to arm them. Put all the arms you can find into their hands. Let every man bring his rifle with him. We shall see you paid.

Second. That the views previously held by Mr. Monroe were not in accord with the Monroe doctrine.

President Monroe has even been unfortunate in his biographies, notably is this the case with President Gilman, but President Gilman grudgingly concedes:

> The one idea which he represents consistently from the beginning to the end of his career is this, that America is for Americans. He resists the British sovereignty in his early youth; he insists on the importance of free navigation of the Mississippi; he negotiates the purchase of Louisiana and Florida; he gives a vigorous impulse to the prosecution of the second war with Great Britain, when neutral rights were endangered; finally he announces the "Monroe doctrine."

In a letter to General Jackson in 1818, speaking of the Spanish-American colonies, President Monroe says:

> * * * We partake in no councils whose object is not their complete independence. Intimations have been given us that Spain is not unwilling and is even preparing for war with the United States, in the hope of saving them. Her pertinacious refusal to cede the Floridas to us heretofore, though evidently her interest to do it, gives some coloring to the suggestion. If we engage in a war, it is of the greatest importance that our people be united, and, with that view, that Spain commence it; and above all, that the Government be free from the charge of committing a breach of the Constitution.

In a letter to Mr. Adams of date August 27, 1818, directing a change in Mr. Adams's letter, he speaks as follows:

> The alterations which I propose are in the second and third paragraphs, to omit the latter part of the first, and simply to state, after saying that we considered the parties engaged in a civil war, to add, that the colonies had invariably enjoyed that advantage in the United States. I have thought it would be better to omit the expression of sentiment that we would engage in no war for interests other than our own, lest in the captious spirit which sometimes shows itself our motive might be represented as manifesting a disposition peculiarly unfriendly to the colonies.

In his message of December 3, 1822, occurs the following:

> * * * That it may promote the happiness of both nations is the ardent wish of this whole people to the expression of which we confine ourselves; for whatever may be the feelings or sentiments which every individual under our Government has a right to indulge and express, it is nevertheless a sacred maxim equally with the Government and people that the destiny of every independent nation, in what relates to such improvements, of right belongs and ought to be left exclusively to themselves.

A year before Mr. Adams expressed the same doctrine, James Monroe announces the doctrine to Congress. We allow Mr. Adams full mete of praise, but it appears that years before the doctrine had ever been discussed in the Cabinet that this man, alert, cautious, and vigorous, and alive to the great question which was confront-

ing him, needed no prodding on the part of his Secretary of State to enable him to see these questions to which he, with the fathers of the Constitution, had been giving years of thought. This doctrine was long in the heart of the people. It was contemplated and adverted to by Mr. Madison in his draft of Washington's farewell address. Mr. Jefferson had repeatedly mentioned it in letters and public papers and it came up for direct controversy upon the question of the holy alliance. President Monroe was vigorously in favor of the acknowledgment of the independence of the Spanish colonies in South America, and on October 24, 1817, at a Cabinet meeting, Mr. Adams says:

> The President said he desired to consult on South American affairs. He should put the question whether we should not acknowledge the government of Buenos Ayres.

In the discussion of the holy alliance, let us discuss the fact as to whether Mr. Monroe did actually conceive or write the Monroe doctrine. His distractors say:

Third. That he actually did not write or conceive the doctrine.

Now, it came up for consideration of Mr. Canning's letter to Mr. Rush, in which Mr. Canning discussed England's attitude and wanted to get the attitude.of America, and he wrote a letter. Now that letter was submitted to the President, and in the reply to Mr. Canning the position of the United States is stated. Mr. Adams merely amplified Mr. Canning's letter, which was submitted to Mr. Monroe and Mr. Monroe modified Mr. Adams's statement and prepared an amendment, which was adopted by Mr. Adams. The principles of Mr. Adams's draft was a reply to the five principles set out by Mr. Canning. They were all conceded by every member of the Cabinet after discussion, and Mr. Adams but amplified the statement of Mr. Canning in the discussion, and he added the historical statement that the United States had recognized the independence of the colonies, and given the conclusion therefrom, and Mr. Monroe insisted upon a modification of Mr. Adams's letter, setting out the absolute determination of this Government as the permanent freedom of the South American republics, and insisted that the English Government recognize the independence of the new republics, and advised that while a perfect understanding should exist between the English and American Governments, that separate action should be taken. In other words, Mr. Adams's closing section of the letter was a working out of the thought of Mr. Monroe in diplomatic form by Mr. Adams. In a popular address it is impossible to present all the papers which are conclusively presented elsewhere.

A part of the argument of these gentlemen is based upon the communication, oral and written, to Baron Tuyl, the Russian minister. The Russian Emperor had written two letters, setting out his views as to the South American colonies, and his conclusions not to allow representation by the Russian Government to those colonies. In his last letter he gave his view as to the different systems of government. This is a subject of very minute discussion by Mr. Ford; and his object is to show that by the papers among Mr. Adams's manuscripts (one of them a statement prepared by him in reference to these negotiations, which was to be submitted to the President) that Mr. Adams was the real moving influence in the enunciation of this principle.

This paper and the proceedings thereon show that after many conferences with the President and Cabinet Mr. Adams prepared a communication which was discussed carefully and frequently by the Cabinet and the President, and by the President and Mr. Adams alone. Mr. Adams's statement was not agreed to, and the communication was made to the Russian minister along the lines preferred by the President. The President was directly in charge of the matter. He had vigorous and earnest views as to the subject matter of the controversy, and his effort was to maintain the rights of the United States and of the colonies, and at the same time prevent such a criticism of the Emperor as would lead to, perhaps, a rupture between the Governments.

His letter to Mr. Adams, which shows his interest in this phase of the matter, is as follows:

> DEAR SIR,—I am inclind to think that the second paragh had better be omitted, & that such part of the 3d be also omitted, as will make that paragh stand, as the second distinct proposition, in our system. The principle of the paper, will not be affected by this modification, & it will be less likely to produce excitement anywhere.
>
> Two other passages, the first in the first page, & in the second, in 3d are also marked for ommission.
>
> You had better see the Baron immediately.
>
> Novr. 27, 1823. J. M.

In his position he was supported by his Cabinet, among whose members were John C. Calhoun and William Wirt. These various Cabinet meetings all occurred after the arrival of Mr. Adams and the President, from November 7 until the meeting of Congress in December. As a matter of fact, the three questions (as to the message, the answer to Baron Tuyl, and to Minister Rush for Mr. Canning) went along generally together, and the manuscripts discovered by Mr. Ford only show that there was the most painstaking care on the part of the President, and that his views prevailed instead of those of Mr. Adams.

The one proposition is absolutely predominant; that is, that President Monroe did not sit quiescent and allow Mr. Adams to prepare these different communications, but, on the contrary, the whole doctrine and the manner of placing it before the world were carefully prescribed by the President, and the subject was one of the most engrossing care on his part. Even the naturally one-sided statement in the diary of Mr. Adams shows that the question was one that was continually before the President and in every possible phase. From this diary the one proposition is clear that the President was in control of the situation and intended that nothing formulated either by Mr. Adams or anyone else in the Cabinet should go to the world without his absolute direction and agreement.

In the summer and fall of 1823 Mr. Monroe and Mr. Adams were absent from Washington. In the early summer of 1823, Mr. Monroe wrote Mr. Jefferson and in the letter he said:

> * * * Can we, in any form, take a bolder attitude in regard to it, in favor of liberty, than we then did? Can we afford greater aid to that cause, by assuming any such attitude, than we now do, by the form of our example? These are subjects on which I should be glad to have your sentiments. * * *

He also wrote Mr. Jefferson asking his views on the Russian minister's letter, and among other things said:

* * * My own impression is that we ought to meet the proposal of the British govt., to make it known, that we would view an interference on the part of the European powers, and especially an attack on the Colonies, by them, as an attack on ourselves, presuming that if they succeeded with them, they would extend it to us. I am sensible however of the extent & difficulty of the question, & shall be happy to have yours, & Mr. Madison's opinions on it. I do not wish to trouble either of you with small objects, but the present one is vital, involving the high interests, for which we have so long & so faithfully, & harmoniously contended together.

And in another letter to him says:

My own impression is that we ought to meet the proposition of the British government and to make it known that we would view an interference on the part of the European powers and especially an attack on the colonies by them, as an attack on ourselves. Presuming that if they succeeded with them they would extend it to us.

This showed his own views before any consultation with his Cabinet and especially with Mr. Adams, and was written to the two men to whom he was nearest and whose advice during a long lifetime he had considered of the highest value. On October 24, Thomas Jefferson replied to this letter, and, says Schouler:

It is one of the grandest letters he ever wrote, and he so considered it. We are not to ignore that letter nor pass it carelessly by. In its flaming sentences we see illumined, like a beacon light, the whole long pathway of the doctrine in its noblest development, which Monroe presently uttered and meant to apply, as a doctrine which should add to the nonintervention in European affairs, already imbedded in our policy, the prohibition of all European intervention in affairs cis-Atlantic, so that this whole New World might be held sacred henceforth to systems among congenial republics and dedicated under our lead to the liberty and the rights of men. * * *

In this letter he says:

* * * Our first and fundamental maxim should be, never to entangle ourselves in the broils of Europe. Our second, never to suffer Europe to intermeddle with cis-Atlantic affairs. America, North and South, has a set of interests distinct from those of Europe, and peculiarly her own. She should therefore have a system of her own, separate and apart from that of Europe. * * *
* * * But the war in which the present proposition might engage us, should that be its consequence, is not her war, but ours. Its object is to introduce and establish the American system, of keeping out of our land all foreign powers, of never permitting those of Europe to intermeddle with the affairs of our nations. It is to maintain our own principle, not to depart from it. And if, to facilitate this, we can effect a division in the body of the European powers, and draw over to our side its most powerful member, surely we should do it. But I am clearly of Mr. Canning's opinion, that it will prevent instead of provoking war. * * *

Mr. Madison replied in like manner.

To prove that James Monroe did not comprehend the significance of his action when he announced the Monroe doctrine, with its principles that America should be for Americans ringing in his ears, in a direct reply to his request for advice made by him to the greatest living American statesmen, appears to be a hard task. In view of this great interest on the part of Mr. Monroe, and the direct advice from his two most trusted counselors, is it not somewhat unreasonable to say that, however vigorous and earnest was Mr. Adams, it was through his action that the President was induced to announce the doctrine, or that the theory was conceived and the principle carried to its fruition practically by Mr. Adams? The President's mind was

made up, as is clearly shown above, long before Mr. Adams returned to Washington.

On November 7 the first Cabinet meeting was had after the summer vacation. The question arose on the letters of Mr. Rush and Mr. Canning and the answer to the Russian minister. The President, so far from evincing any timidity, or showing any wavering of his determination to preserve the prestige of America, in the language of Mr. Adams, "was averse to any course which should have the position of taking any position subordinate to that of Great Britain, and suggested the idea of sending a special minister to protest against the interposition of the Holy Alliance." And again, at the same meeting, "The President, referring to instructions given before the Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle, declaring that we would, if invited, attend no meeting relative to South America of which less than its entire independence should be the object, intimated that similar limitation might be assumed now."

On the 21st, the President read the sketch which he had prepared for his message, and instead of its showing any timidity or fear, as Schouler says:

> His first draft of his message sounded an alarm of war like a thunderclap.

And Mr. Adams expressly says at the numberless meetings of the Cabinet:

> In the discussion of the letter to be directed to Baron Tuyl, the paper itself was drawn to correspond exactly with the paragraph of the President's message which he had read to me yesterday and which was entirely conformable to the system of policy which I have earnestly recommended for this emergency.

Through the numberless meetings and discussions in the Cabinet it was manifest that James Monroe was the active, controlling, dominating power in his administration, and that he himself was replete with more political experience than any man of his day, and in a letter which he forwarded to Jefferson in December, 1823, after the message was delivered, he says:

> DEAR SIR,—I now forward to you a copy of the message, more legible than that which (was) sent by the last mail. I have concurred thoroughly with the sentiments expressed in your late letter, as I am persuaded, you will find, by the message, as to the part we ought to act, toward the allied powers, in regard to So. America. I consider the cause of that country as essentially our own. * * *

And in another letter of December, 1823, he confirms and discusses the details of the transaction in which our Government had taken its own initiative, separate and distinct from Great Britain, and giving our position greater strength with allied Europe, and that they were his own views and he so specifically says, all of which it is impossible to insert in a popular address, but shows that throughout the discussions James Monroe was the head of his Government.

Even if we should grant—which is not necessary in this case—that Mr. Adams had written a phrase, or given form to an expression in the message, still would it be fair that to him should be given the credit for the enunciation of the doctrine? The administration was Monroe's; he was responsible for its policies, and a fair reading of his letters and of the events leading up to the announcement of the principle shows what was the supreme object of his mind, and that he carefully, by statement and direction, actually set out that object. If the

method of criticism adopted of giving to a subordinate the credit for the action of the administration, shall we not attribute to Hamilton and James Madison the authorship and the high credit of Washington's farewell address? Shall we not attribute to Seward and to Stanton the credit of the enunciation of Lincoln's proclamation of emancipation? It is admitted that these great documents were the result of a thought here an expression there, made by this official, or penned by this chief of a department, but all coalescing in the enunciation by the head of the Government of the principles contained therein and announced to the people. And to the one in control of the Government, by the fair concession of history, universally has been given the credit for the courage of enunciating principles and for making them part and parcel of his administration. We think, however, we have shown by actual proof the personal activity in and about and the control by the President of the situation as to the doctrine, both as to its conception and its enunciation.

I have devoted myself to quoting passages which show conclusively that to this great man should be ascribed the conceiving and the enunciation of this great doctrine, and it is idle to say that a man who was Monroe's subordinate for nearly 15 years in office should be ascribed this great doctrine. The man who was chosen by James Madison, the father of the Constitution, did not need to have anyone furnish the trumpet through which he would blow this doctrine to the world. President Monroe has been singularly neglected by makers of history. That is due to the fact that the history of that period is largely furnished by the diary of John Quincy Adams, and that nothing except public documents emanating from Monroe are extant. This has been remedied and his writings are being published, and the world is beginning to understand the patience, the commanding ability, the vast experience and political sagacity of one of the greatest Presidents that ever lived, a product of the soil of old Virginia.

VIRGINIA'S ESTIMATE OF HER DISTINGUISHED SON—ADDRESS OF ARTHUR KYLE DAVIS, CHAIRMAN OF VIRGINIA WAR HISTORY COMMISSION

James Monroe had a remarkable life of public service. It covered half a century of our formative period and his activities constitute a notable part of the history of that era. It is not easy to form a true estimate of the value of his work. Although we have a century of perspective, it is still true that we are just beginning to realize the importance of some of his contributions to American thought and to American life. Of course this is notably true of the Monroe doctrine. In other national matters, however, where the inherent importance of certain facts and movements has long been realized, we are just beginning to know the value of Monroe's contribution to the historic result.

Thus it may be said in general terms that full justice has not yet been done to Monroe's personality and influence. Was he "the last and least of the great Virginians," as has been said, or was he really the "profound man" of Lord Holland's estimate? His seems to be a personality and a career that it is not easy "to keek through wi' critical inspection." We may accept Jefferson's eulogy that Monroe was "a soul without a blemish," but we may be slow to

accept Wirt's phrase of "a sincere and artless soul." Perhaps Benton has given us the best outline of his life and work, as his statement nowhere falls into mere eulogy and frankly states Monroe's failures as well as his successes.

Monroe was the greatest "repeater" in American history. Most of the important facts of his life went in pairs. Twice he was a Member of Congress; twice he had part in campaigns of the Revolution; twice he was a member of a great constitutional convention; twice he was sent on missions to France; twice he had a leading part in the transfer of great territories to America; twice he was Governor of Virginia; twice he was President; twice he was buried; twice he has had his centennial—first of his birth and to-day of his doctrine.

This tendency to duplication may be said broadly to be observable in many striking features of his life. His name is indissolubly connected with two great institutions of learning of Virginia; two Presidents of the United States were perhaps the strongest influences in his life; he made two journeys into the West; in the era of good feeling he made two presidential progresses; he had part in two wars; and he has the rare distinction of holding two portfolios at once, since he was Secretary of War at the same time that he was Secretary of State. Most charming duplication of all, he had two daughters whose descendants grace this occasion.

Monroe shares with Jefferson the distinction of carrying through the two greatest real estate deals in the history of America. In 1784, along with Jefferson and two others, he transferred to the new Nation Virginia's gift of the Northwest Territory. In 1803, as Jefferson's agent, he acted with Livingston in the purchase from Napoleon of the Louisiana Territory. It was a notable bit of real estate dickering, with Napoleon, Talleyrand, and Marbois on one side and Jefferson, Monroe, and Livingston on the other.

It was not by accident that Monroe was associated with Jefferson on these notable occasions. At the beginning of his career Monroe deliberately made his decision to be a follower of Jefferson. After his service with the Army he deliberated whether he should study law under Wythe or should associate himself with Jefferson, and an interesting letter is extant in which his uncle advised him to cast in his lot with the latter. Monroe was an associate and a follower of Jefferson through all his life, but not a servile follower. With Jefferson, as with Madison, he kept his independence, and it was probably Monroe's fearless and logical independence that most endeared him to Virginians.

This independence and fearless assertion of his own views is evident throughout Monroe's life. Whatever opinion one may hold as to his mentality or as to the correctness of his views, there can be no question as to the sincerity and vigor with which he maintained his stand on public questions. Incidents without number might be mentioned. He was opposed to the ratification of the Federal Constitution and fought against it with vigor until the adoption of the Virginia amendments that he thought essential. He was perhaps the strongest early advocate of the free navigation of the Mississippi, so that Jefferson himself said "Monroe is the man" when that position was to be maintained. He was consistently a critic of Washington's appointments and was opposed

to his administration. It is true that Washington appointed him minister to France to succeed Gouverneur Morris and that he accepted the appointment, leaving the Senate for this purpose. Both the appointment and the acceptance, however, were due to the desire to conciliate France at a critical period. Washington recalled Monroe, and it was perhaps a wise decision; but Monroe did not tamely submit to the implied rebuke. Promptly he published his 500-page "View of the conduct of the Executive," which certainly showed his sincerity and his independence. It is interesting to note that in this "view" Monroe used the method of "14 points," later made more famous by President Wilson.

Years later, after a second diplomatic trip to Europe, when Jefferson pigeonholed the treaty that Monroe and Pinkney had negotiated with England, Monroe did not hesitate to defend his own position even as against his friend and chief, Mr. Jefferson. What he believed, he believed deeply and sincerely, and he fought for his beliefs without fear and without favor. His "Defense of the mission to England" was as bold a protest against Jefferson as his earlier "view" had been against Washington.

It seems clear that Monroe's failure in his mission to France, to England, and to Spain was inevitable. He simply could not accomplish the impossible. Who could have cajoled France into liking Jay's treaty with England? Who could have persuaded England to give up the impressment of seamen? And who could have induced Spain to give up the Floridas a dozen years before the time was ripe?

American history does not record a more complete vindication than was Mr. Monroe's. Had he been a vindictive man, he might have gloated over the revenges brought in by the whirligig of time. The national convention in France would not deal with him in 1794, but the first consul in 1803 dealt with him in a concession that he could not have dreamed of a decade before. England would not meet his diplomacy in 1807, but five years later she had to meet a war in which Monroe was the prime mover and the organizer of American resistance. Spain refused his overtures for the Floridas in 1805, but in 1819 she ceded the Floridas to the Nation of which Monroe was President. In each of these incidents it was not a coincidence, but historic justice that made Mr. Monroe a protagonist in the climax of three great quarrels. In diplomacy, in legislation, and in war he was for years the foremost representative of the "Greater America" policy, and it was from this advanced position that he took the momentous forward step of "America for the Americans."

This is not to say that Mr. Monroe was gifted with eminent political sagacity. It has been said that he has not the prophetic vision of Jefferson or of Calhoun or of John Quincy Adams. His strength lay in the depth of his convictions rather than in his breadth of vision. He had tenacity rather than capacity, insight rather than foresight. History seems to approve Lord Holland's saying that Mr. Monroe's opinions were "firmly rooted and deeply considered." He was a robust and sturdy patriot, but he was not a prophet or a seer in matters political. In one respect, however, he was a leader of American political thought, standing shoulder to shoulder with Jefferson in his plans for American expansion and

going far beyond him in his final assertion of American independence in the Monroe doctrine.

Thus Monroe has the unique distinction of being the only American that saw the beginning and the completion of American independence. There were five stages or steps from the Colonies to the Nation, and Monroe took them all. With the patriots of 1776 he helped to oust England; with Washington he helped to avoid entanglement in the European quarrels, with Jefferson he loosened the grasp of Spain and of France upon America; with Madison he lopped off the tentacles of England; and finally in his famous message he proclaimed in good round terms America's right to entire freedom from the domination of Europe. In each of these steps Monroe was not merely a participant but a propulsive power. De Quincey said of Socrates that he was the "long man" that connected the two great periods of Grecian history, the bar that bound together into a dumbbell the two balls or spheres of Greek wits. So Monroe's was the long life that bound together the cycle of the Revolutionary period and the cycle of the national period, and his own active life is firmly imbedded in each of the two cycles.

There were failures in Monroe's life that can not be omitted in any fair account. Twice he returned from Europe discredited or disapproved. He fell "from the top to the bottom of the political ladder," as Benton says. The first fall may have been due to the hazards of our foreign relations and the second to the exigencies of home politics, but in either case it was a real fall after an initial success. Yet when he fell, he fell upstairs. The landing from which he rebounded in both instances was the General Assembly of Virginia and the governorship of Virginia. As soon as he touched his native soil, he found new strength and a fresh sanction. When he was first chosen Governor of Virginia in 1799, the Richmond Federalist declared it "A day of mourning," but none the less Monroe was twice reelected, holding office till 1802. When he was again chosen governor in 1811, he was called from that office to the Cabinet of Madison, and his progress to the Presidency was unbroken.

The omissions of Monroe's life were as surprising as were his falls and recoveries. A fairly complete account of his life might be written with barely a mention of the burning questions of Slavery and Union. Yet it was during his Presidency that the Missouri compromise was passed! The fact seems to be that domestic questions interested Monroe only in relation to the Constitution. He did not hear Jefferson's "firebell in the night." Calhoun and Adams foresaw the effect of the slavery question and both were willing to break up the Union to solve it. Monroe was a logical and unswerving advocate of the Union, but his battles were not fought in its defense. He seems to have been too busy in adding to the Nation in its plastic state and in separating it from the European mass to study any rifts or lines of cleavage in the matter, or to see the need of cementing the parts into a whole. Monroe was a maker rather than a mender, an artificer rather than an artist, a robust pragmatist at all times. Yet it remains a surprising fact that he found the Cumberland Road a bigger question than the Missouri compromise.

As there were two falls and two omissions in his political life, so there are two matters still in debate among his many activities.

The one relates to his activities in the Battle of Bladensburg in the War of 1812, and the other relates to the disputed Rhea letter, touching Jackson's activities in the Seminole War. These seem to be the only two episodes in Monroe's life where there is any lack of source material on which to base a definite judgment, and both were matters of secondary importance. We do not need the details of Bladensburg to prove that Monroe was a gallant soldier. His patriotic record and his Monmouth wound in the Revolution and his vigorous action in defense and in offense in the War of 1812 are sufficient evidence of his bravery and initiative. As to the Rhea letter, it acquired its importance only in the political jockeying for position in the Jackson presidential campaign. As the letter was never produced and as Monroe said that he never wrote it, the matter may be left in silence, especially since Monroe's diplomacy smoothed over the difficulties with Spain and England caused by Jackson's impetuous Florida campaign.

There has been a tendency to decry Monroe as a diplomat, but his activities in many fields of political action seem to show that in his maturity he deserves high rank among American diplomats. His enthusiasm as a young man and his readiness for combat in his middle period limited his success as a diplomat. But in his maturer age he had "a disciplined travail of judgment" and a wide knowledge of public affairs that brought unqualified success to his larger efforts.

He had an ideal training for the Presidency. Much has been said of the qualifications of John Quincy Adams and of his wide and successful experience in public affairs. Monroe's training, on the whole, was no whit inferior to that of Adams. It is a fair comment to say that Monroe's training was in two respects superior. In his European experience Monroe dealt with political questions either when they were at red heat, as in France, or at white heat, as in England, whereas Adams dealt with matters not so dangerous to touch or to handle. In his American experience Monroe's training and outlook, his knowledge and insight, were perhaps superior to those of Adams. Certain it is that through years of turbulent political life Monroe held the unswerving confidence of his native State, that he aided Jefferson, that he prompted Madison, that he held the loyal support of a Cabinet of strong men—including Adams, Calhoun, Crawford, and Wirt—that his administration was approved by a reelection practically unanimous, and that his great pronouncement of the Monroe doctrine was received with approval by America and with respect by the world.

Who was the father of the Monroe doctrine? It stated in definite form a policy that had been implied and inherent in the writings of Monroe's predecessors in the presidential office. Interesting evidence has been brought forward from time to time to support the several claims that the real credit of formulating the doctrine belongs, not to Monroe, but to some one of half a dozen others. The difficulty here is one of too many claims and too much evidence. Neither Canning's proud boast that he had brought in the New World to redress the balance of the Old, nor the quotations of the Adams advocates to prove that Mr. Monroe's Secretary of State drew up the famous message can outweigh the fact that the Monroe doctrine is the epitome of Monroe's lifelong

convictions and actions. It is the Monroe doctrine not only because he promulgated it in 1823 but because he had lived it and worked for it and fought for it for 20 years. What is indubitably and everlastingly to Monroe's credit is that he saw the great moment and used it.

So the Virginia estimate of Monroe places him as the peer in accomplishment of Jefferson and Madison—second only to Washington himself in the quartet of the early Virginia Presidents. In the whole range of the Nation's history, it is perhaps fair to say that Monroe is one of the four leaders of our Nation that have won world fame. Of these four world figures of our history—Washington, Monroe, Lincoln, and Wilson—three were Virginians. To Washington and Lincoln it is probably true that the verdict of history will award the highest place for rugged strength and for personality that amounted to genius. Yet the Monroe doctrine and the Wilson idealism sum up to-day America's contribution to world policies. And Wilson's idealism was the blooming of the century-plant of Monroe's pragmatism.

ADDRESS OF DR. EDWIN A. ALDERMAN, PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA

James Monroe was the fourth and last of the great Virginia dynasty that molded the life of this Republic during the first quarter of a century of its existence. We are engaged here to-day, in the capital of the State which gave him birth, in celebrating the centenary of the political doctrine which bears his name and in paying just tribute to his name and fame, as one of the builders of this great governmental fabric known as the United States of America.

Monroe did not possess the majestic balance and poise of George Washington or the myriadmindedness and philosophic insight of Thomas Jefferson or the learning and lucidity of James Madison. He was neither a brilliant writer nor a great debater. His strength lay in a spotless character, a robust common sense, and a pure and complete patriotism. By the exercise of these elemental virtues, and through the enunciation in his message to Congress on December 2, 1823, of the purpose of the young Nation to preserve forever "America for Americans" and to consider any attempt on the part of European nations to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety, Monroe enrolled himself among the great never-to-be-forgotten Presidents of the United States.

It is idle to deny credit to James Monroe for this fundamental theory of our relation to foreign governments. It is true that the essence of the doctrine was in the air of the time and again and again upon the lips of great Americans like Washington and Jefferson. It is true that George Canning, fearing the effect of the holy alliance upon British interests, suggested that United States and Great Britain come to an understanding in the matter of European aggression in South America. It may be true that John Quincy Adams actually framed the sentences in the message announcing the doctrine. James Monroe bore the responsibility for this comprehensive statement. It passed before his eyes. His judgment weighed

its implications. The authorship, in any intelligent sense, is his, and it is no accident but the operation of logic and common justice that his name attached to this momentous governmental principle has gone about the earth a stumbling block to the designs of despotism and a beacon light to the aspirations of freedom.

It is not my function nor my purpose here to-day to discuss the influence of this theory of international relations upon our national development, nor to appraise the present status of our international position. That is to be done by others, but I may say, in conclusion, that the Monroe doctrine is not a statute nor a treaty nor a constitutional provision nor a fraction of international law. It is to-day as it was when Monroe scanned its statement, after repeated reassertions by various executives and statesmen, what Secretary Hughes well calls an integral part of our national thought which even the upheaval of the World War has not uprooted or changed. It is not a policy of ambition and aggression but rather a far-reaching purpose of national security.

How can we cooperate effectively with other nations in the great affairs of liberalism, justice, and peace and still maintain the Monroe doctrine unchanged is a great question for the statesmen of the future. The United States by becoming a world power must interfere with the affairs of other nations. Can it insist upon refusing the right to other nations to meddle in its affairs? Human conditions have been and are being changed by science and invention. Must the Monroe doctrine be changed in its application in accordance with these great fundamental changes? It is difficult to see how iron regional doctrines can be maintained in a great world cooperative scheme facing toward peace and international understanding. The Monroe doctrine was in its origin an heroic, unselfish proclamation. Shall it or can it be so interpreted as to constitute for all time a shield of national security, a guarantee of racial freedom, and a charter of international justice and understanding?

Without any doubt the Monroe doctrine has, for a century, been the supreme achievement and triumph of American statesmanship. It has exercised a salutary and far-reaching influence on all the new world. It has saved South America from invasion. It is, to-day, more permanently fixed in the mind and conscience of America than any mandate of the Constitution next to the Declaration of Independence. It has sunk into the very roots of the Nation. Construing it as a great doctrine of security rather than hegemony for ourselves and of self-government for our neighbors, let us have faith that American statesmanship will so adapt it to the changing social order that it will continue in the future a mighty instrument for the preservation of peace and the assertion of national integrity.

TWO INTERNATIONAL LESSONS FOR THE AVERAGE AMERICAN—ADDRESS OF DR. HENRY LOUIS SMITH, PRESIDENT OF WASHINGTON AND LEE UNIVERSITY

The events of the past 10 years have disproved, we trust forever, two widespread fallacies which have long mislead the "average American." Even the shallowest observer no longer believes that

years of peace and industry make men and women weak, effeminate, and cowardly. Never in all the history of war did men face death in such ghastly and terrifying forms with such universal and sublime bravery as the citizen armies of our most peaceful and peace-loving nations during the World War.

The second and even more harmful fallacy is that a great country like ours, in this modern era of world-wide interdependence, can of her own will remain isolated from the rest of the world. Those who watched our long-continued and desperate struggle to keep our beloved land out of the fires of hell 10 years ago and still believe that we can remain neutral and isolated in the future are incapable of reason, argument, or foresight.

Even the average American must know now, in spite of outgrown shibboleths and ancient maxims, that this is the twentieth century, and that whenever the European storm, now breeding before our very eyes, bursts again, our ship of state will again be dragged into its hellish vortex in spite of party platforms and peace-loving Presidents.

But the average American seems still to think that the present price of wheat is a far more important matter than international cooperation to prevent war; that a universal love of peace among our people will insure its indefinite continuance; that modern England is an insidious opponent of modern America, and that the League of Nations, being a strictly party question, must not, therefore, be even named in mixed assemblies.

Thus, like chattering magpies on a floating raft, we are drifting again, as we were 10 years ago, toward another Niagara of international war, and thanking heaven that, when we have allowed our best friends and customers to strangle one another into helplessness and starvation, we will be generous enough to take up collections and send shipments of condensed milk for their dying babies.

On this centennial anniversary, therefore, of our first open and effective interference in the affairs and policies of Europe, let me remind the average American of two urgent and practical lessons taught by recent events. The first is this: That unless war between civilized nations is very soon controlled or abolished, our Christian civilization is doomed. Our recent amazing advance in knowledge and applied science, unbalanced by at least this much of an advance in social wisdom and organized morality, will soon destroy the civilization which engendered its monstrous agencies of destruction. Our tiny bodies and their habitations and defenses can not withstand the thunderbolts of modern science. In awful and immediate effectiveness our scientific agencies of destruction have far outrun our processes and possibilities of repair and reconstruction.

If human brotherhood had but kept pace with advancing knowledge and invention; if the improvements in medicine, sanitation, agriculture, manufactures, and transportation had been dedicated to the common good; if the colossal expenditures dictated by hate had been invented in the service of love; if the death-dealing monsters and explosives of mutual destruction had been used to upbuild rather than to destroy; if human greatness had been measured in terms of human service and the giant forces of nature

utilized through modern organization for the common welfare—in other words, if man's moral nature had but kept pace with his advancing knowledge and power, utilizing both for the good of all, the civilized nations of Christendom would by now have lifted their people to such heights of culture, comfort, productivity, and widely diffused happiness as were never approached or imagined in all the ages of the past.

Instead of this our marvelous advance in science and invention has culminated in a cataclysm of murder, hatred, anarchy, and human misery, involving in a common ruin the very nations whose advance in material civilization has been most amazing, and who proudly call themselves by the name of the Prince of Peace, the divine embodiment of love.

Christian civilization, in our modern swarming interdependent communities, can no more be based on universal, legalized and permitted warfare between its constituent nations than world-wide commerce on legalized piracy, domestic business on legalized robbery, or home government on legalized revolution.

Christ abrogated forever the law of the jungle and substituted the law of mutual brotherhood, and if our so-called Christian civilization is to escape the fate of its pagan predecessors, it must abandon their pagan practice and substitute the principle of organized cooperation for the devilish law of universal warfare.

Unless this is accomplished in the very near future, civilized mankind has nothing before it but increasing hatred, poverty, and misery, culminating in blood-red anarchy or pitiless despotism. This is the first and greatest lesson of the greatest war. To refuse to learn it is folly.

The second lesson, drawn from the hellish aftermath of World War hatreds and conflicts, is still more insistent and momentous. It is this: That since the United States deserted her allies and allowed Europe to plunge into its present chaos, the only present and immediately effective method of restoring peace and stabilizing Christian civilization is through the united effort of the two great Anglo-Saxon empires.

They, and they alone, have at present the wealth, the power, and the political experience needed to control European hatreds and discords, and set our imperiled civilization on its feet again.

Never have war's hellish cruelties bred such a world-wide harvest of devilish hatreds. From the lofty heroisms and self-sacrifice of a few years ago the nations have slidden back into the old foul mire of isolation and jealousy and savage greed and still more savage hate and fear. Our modern civilization, tottering on the brink of the abyss, cries aloud for sympathy and practical help, for wise and firm restraint, for enlightened and unselfish leadership. Oh, for the sublime moral leadership of America, the high idealism, the lofty consecration of those momentous months when war's red thunders shook the world! Those were the days when selfishness and greed and jealous partisanship disappeared in the pure white flame of a universal altar fire.

When German militarism, nurtured to giant strength and satanic ferocity, was hacking its bloody way through France and Belgium; when the night of medieval tyranny seemed settling back upon the earth; when the hopes and institutions and blood-bought liberties

of Anglo-Saxon civilization hung trembling in the balance; then the two great Anglo-Saxon Empires, waked by the Spirit of God as from an evil dream, realized at last their essential unity, the littleness of their past and present differences, the height and depth and strength of their old-time kinship. Fighting and dying side by side, they learned, for all time we trust, that blood—warm, living, sacrificial, brothers' blood—is thicker far than water. Would God the English-speaking nations might rise again and forever to those lofty heights of international cooperation for the common good! Why should these two halves of a world-wide empire stand idly and selfishly and ineffectively apart till the rising fires of hate and anarchy make their joint task impossible?

With our unmatched English tongue now clearly destined to become the chief vehicle and treasury of the world's civilization; with our wealth of English literature centering in and radiating from our blessed English Bible; with our common reverence for the purity of womanhood, the sanctity of the home, and the rights of the weak; with our common admiration for unselfishness and the spirit of service; our universal Anglo-Saxon instinct for justice and passion for liberty; our common recognition of the imperative of conscience, the rights of the individual, the fatherhood of God and the essential brotherhood of man—with these multiplied and mighty bonds, so recently softened in the furnace of a common suffering and welded anew on the hard anvil of war, this is a world-friendship that, I trust, has come to stay, and may the God of England and America doom to speedy destruction every effort and agency that attempt to weaken or undermine it.

Surely never in human history has an imperial race been confronted with such a combination of appalling need, of sublime opportunity, and of manifest and unique fitness for the great task.

Even amid the world-wide devastation of the great war not a single English-speaking nation has seen its government overthrown, its territory ravaged, or its economic machinery wrecked by revolution. As a group they are to-day industrially more powerful, more able to upbuild a wrecked world than ever in their history.

They are also incomparably the wealthiest group of nations ever known in the history of the world. In spite of their individual debts and losses they hold more wealth at their disposal to-day than before the World War—wealth which, if wisely invested, could lift a bankrupt and prostrate world into profitable production again and at the same time still further enrich its owners.

Their power to-day in world politics is as conspicuous as their wealth. If cordially united in a common purpose, no power on earth could seriously hinder, far less successfully oppose, their joint program. And they are not only at peace with one another all round the world, but are warm friends and recent allies, with a common language for immediate and universal intercommunication.

They are also, as a group, the most enlightened, widely educated, scientific, and progressive of all the nations of the earth, owning and controlling the great scientific inventions which have given to mere man almost supernatural powers.

With a common racial kinship, a common religion, and similar ideals of character and conduct, obeying the same general code of laws, accustomed to the same modes of self-government, and utiliz-

ing the same methods of business organization, they are to-day by far the most homogeneous group of nations ever known on earth.

Their common and universal instinct for justice and fair play, their equally universal capacity for sympathy and pity, their habitual generosity and regard for the weak, their religion of brotherhood and unselfish service, their long and successful experience in guiding, restraining, and developing backward races—all these, by the divine planning of divine wisdom, have especially fitted the Anglo-Saxon nations for controlling and rehabilitating a wrecked and bewildered world.

The World War, by shattering the traditions and institutions of human authority, has transferred to unprepared and restless millions the fatal gifts of power without knowledge or experience, and liberty without morality or self-control. In this imminent crisis the Anglo-Saxon nations, and these alone, are able to teach these groping, experimenting, revolting masses the true meaning of liberty and democracy.

Their specialty is combining liberty with law, diffusing intelligence among all classes, subordinating military to civil authority, and training all to attain their ends by argument rather than by force; while they alone of all earth's races have the present power to arrest the processes of destruction and hold these restless millions in check till they and their newborn governments have gained experience and wisdom and stability.

We boast of our business ability and Anglo-Saxon genius for organization. Why not use them in this world crisis for this stupendous task? We are proud of our economic wisdom and scientific efficiency. Why shall we go on talking war and building battleships and battleplanes for a world that is homeless and diseased and naked and famine stricken? Why not prove our claims and fill our coffers by manufacturing what earth's suffering millions need and want?

Our modern specialty is sanitation and preventive medicine. Shall we stand idly by and see a new and more awful world war bred in the very same Rhine-plague spot where Franco-German hatred originated the other?

It is impossible for England, bled white by the World War, to control and disinfect that plague spot alone. With our help it could easily be done and the next inevitable war prevented. Since the English Empire is eager for such cooperation, is it not the tragedy of the century that the peace of Europe, and therefore of the world, rests with a group of our party politicians scrambling for office and their unthinking millions of selfish and slavish adherents? May the God of human brotherhood, the Prince of Peace whom we profess to follow, wake our blinded Nation to its heaven-sent duty, its sublime opportunity.

That increasing intercommunication should but increase international hatred, that the gains of research and the wonders of invention should be forever prostituted to the arts of murder, that we should bankrupt ourselves and our children paying war's dread tuition fees of blood and tears and taxes, yet with childish obstinacy refuse to learn her most elementary lessons, that we should, with endless and futile toil, save and build that war may waste and destroy, and stagger forever to our daily tasks under its hellish and unnecessary burdens, that we should forever rear our homes and cities for the

torch and our precious children for the slaughter pen—this is the sum of all human folly and wickedness.

That the cause of humanity and Christian brotherhood and world peace shall be trampled forever under the dirty heel of party politics in Christian America is unreasonable, unthinkable, intolerable; and with the help of our newly enfranchised womanhood it shall yet be made impossible.

The art of cooperative self-government shall yet emerge from its crude and experimental infancy. Our giant newborn democracies shall yet outgrow this child era of unreasoning fickleness and credulous ignorance and infantile hysteria, and some day become mature and sane and wise and self-controlled.

Believing, as I do with all my heart, in the moral government of God and the ultimate triumph of righteousness on earth, I am sure that the present clouds and darkness are the morning, not the evening twilight, of our Christian civilization. In spite of morning clouds and morning storms and the crude incompleteness of morning work, the spirit of unselfish brotherhood is still working its daily miracles among the hearts of men and of nations, and this old earth of ours, battle-scarred, crime-stained, tear-drenched, tempest-tossed, and never more tear-drenched and tempest-tossed than now, is yet rolling her darkened continents out of our present hatreds and horrors toward that blessed, though far-off, noonday, when love and brotherhood shall be the law of human life and sacrifice and service the test and measure of human greatness.

ADDRESS BY DR. J. A. C. CHANDLER, PRESIDENT WILLIAM AND MARY COLLEGE

During this year 1923 all America has turned its attention to a study of the Monroe doctrine in its bearing upon world history. It is very generally conceded that this doctrine, as enunciated by President James Monroe in his message of December 2, 1823, and as interpreted by our American statesmen, is beyond a doubt the most important principle promulgated by an Executive and maintained by any government now in existence, though it is not the part of any constitution and has never been put into any legal form.

James Monroe, the fifth President of the United States, has frequently suffered at the hands of the historians, and even so eminent a statesman as Theodore Roosevelt maintained that Monroe was not great in himself but simply had greatness thrust upon him. Some historians without vision have accepted this point of view. The painstaking American historian, Dr. James Schouler, however, maintained that history has not been fair to James Monroe as an individual or a statesman, and that no American has ever rendered as great service in foreign affairs as Monroe.

The origin of the Monroe doctrine may be found in the life and experiences of James Monroe. With this in mind, let us briefly review his career. As a boy of 16 he entered the College of William and Mary. After less than two years at college he responded to the call of the Colonies, and in '76 joined the Continental line. Though only a boy of 18 when he entered the service as a lieutenant, he attracted the attention of General Washington. He was among the first to cross the Delaware, and at Trenton Capt. William Washing-

ton and Lieut. James Monroe were wounded. Later Monroe served as volunteer aid, with the rank of major, on the staff of the Earl of Sterling, and took part in the battles of Brandywine, Germantown, and Monmouth. This temporary promotion caused him, however, to lose his place in the Continental line, and Washington recommended him to a place with the Virginia troops. Of him Washington said:

> The zeal he discovered by entering the service at an early period, the character he supported in his regiment, and the manner in which he received a wound, induced me to appoint him to a captaincy in one of the additional regiments. This regiment failing, from the difficulty of recruiting, he entered into Lord Sterling's family and has served two campaigns as a volunteer aid to his lordship. He has in every instance maintained the reputation of a brave, active, and sensible officer. As we can not introduce him into the Continental line, it were to be wished that the State could do something for him.

With the close of the Revolutionary War, Monroe debated whether to reenter William and Mary and study law under George Wythe as John Marshall had done, or whether to read law under Jefferson. Acting on the advice of his uncle, Judge Joseph Jones, he pursued the latter course, and thus a great intimacy was formed between Jefferson and Monroe.

After having served his State as legislator and governor, he was called into the service of the Federal Government as minister to France. This appointment came from President Washington. Immediately upon reporting in Paris in 1794 Monroe began to make observations which showed very clearly that his idea of dealing with European countries was one of trying to remove the United States from the baneful influence of European diplomacy and avarice. He found France in the midst of a revolution, ostensibly for the purpose of establishing a Republic not unlike that of the United States.

Monroe was a real friend of republican government; moreover, he had received instructions from the Secretary of State as follows:

> You will let it be seen that in case of war with any nation on earth we shall consider France as our first and natural ally.

In pursuance of these instructions, Mr. Monroe almost committed himself to a firm alliance with France, which was an occasion of considerable worry to him afterwards. He was reprimanded by his Government for having delivered such a fervent republican speech to the French convention, and was finally recalled. On returning to France he vigorously defended his position. His wrath was aimed at the Federalists, and even at Washington himself.

In the meantime history had been moving rapidly. Napoleon had come into power in France and Jefferson was President of the United States. It looked as if Napoleon would close the Mississippi River to the young United States of America. President Jefferson selected Monroe to go as a special representative to France to join Livingston in negotiations with Napoleon. Going beyond all instructions, he and Livingston agreed to buy the entire Louisiana Territory from France. This was the first definite step by the American Republic toward the elimination of Europeans from the Western Hemisphere. Livingston was always jealous of the part that Monroe played in the purchase of the Louisiana Territory. I think at this date that we are inclined to give credit to both for

their determination to develop the United States of America, but I feel that to Monroe particularly is due the credit for constantly emphasizing the removal of all European countries from American soil, thus preparing the way for an American civilization unfettered by European governmental policies.

From Paris Mr. Monroe went to England as special envoy in an endeavor to settle some disputed points of our commercial rights and the freedom of the seas for our ships and seamen. Later he went to Spain in regard to the Florida boundary, but in England and in Spain and in France he learned of the jealousy of those governments and of the Machiavellian policy of most of the diplomats. Though Monroe was absolutely shocked at the English orders in council which disregarded every right of America in commerce, he came to have a higher regard for the English than for any other nation in Europe.

Lord Holland, in his story of the Whig Party, spoke kindly of Monroe, saying:

> Mr. Monroe, afterwards President, was a sincere Republican, who, during the revolution in France, had imbibed strong predilection for that country and no slight aversion to this. But he had candor and principle. A nearer view of the consular and imperial government of France and our constitution in England converted him from both of these opinions. "I find," he said, "your monarchy more republican than monarchial and the French Republic infinitely more monarchical than your monarchy." He was plain in manners and somewhat slow of apprehension, but he was a diligent, earnest, sensible, and even profound man.

In spite of the fact that Monroe felt that England's attitude toward American commerce was thoroughly selfish and unjustifiable, his residence in England caused him to feel that for stability in government more dependence could be placed upon England than any other European country. Monroe's mission to England and Spain had practically failed, and America so regarded it, but still he felt that the American point of view was correct, and he bent every energy to establish our commercial rights and looked forward to the day when Spain would have no territory in North America.

He returned to America just before the end of Jefferson's second term as President. Many of his friends felt, because of his knowledge of foreign affairs, he should be made President. But his party finally declared in favor of Madison. Hardly had Madison become President before it was seen that war was to follow with England on account of impressment of seamen. For two years Robert Smith, of Maryland, was Secretary of State, but on the very eve of war Madison made Monroe Secretary of State. The dispatches to England at this time bear out the contention of Lord Holland that Monroe was a profound man. The War of 1812 did not progress favorably for America and the Secretary of War, Doctor Eustace, was blamed for our failures. When he retired, Monroe, the Secretary of State, was put in charge of the War Department ad interim, until General Armstrong was appointed to the post.

On July 15, 1815, Monroe addressed a long letter to the President with reference to the mismanagement of the War Department and even went so far as to urge the removal of the Secretary of War, and after the battle of Bladensburg, General Armstrong was

forced to retire. Monroe immediately assumed the office of Secretary of War, Washington City was defended, Baltimore was rescued, and Fort McHenry was saved.

According to Doctor Gilman, Monroe appears at this time at his best aspect—enthusiastic, determined, confident of the popular support, daring. "Hasten your militia to New Orleans," he wrote to the governors near the seat of war in Louisiana. "Do not wait for the Government to arm them. Put all the arms you can find in their hands. Let every man bring his rifle with him; we shall see you paid."

The close of the war found Monroe the most popular of our statesmen, and he became the natural successor to Madison. He came to the office March 4, 1817. He was elected for a second term and received every vote except one, which was cast for John Quincy Adams. It is said that the delegate from New Hampshire who voted against him did so in order that Washington might go down into history the only President who had been unanimously elected by the Electoral College.

Many things could be said regarding Monroe's administration. I desire, however, to emphasize the fact that, first of all, in spite of the second war with England, Monroe in his attitude toward England felt that that country could be trusted to a greater extent than any other country in Europe. Second, he felt it his duty to remove quickly every barrier to the progress of the United States. While 12 years before he had failed to secure a satisfactory settlement of the Florida boundary, he was now able to negotiate a treaty with Spain by which the United States acquired Florida, and thus he figured in the second territorial acquisition of the United States. The treaty for the purchase of Florida was negotiated in 1819. Pari passu with the negotiations for the acquisition of Florida, Monroe was watching carefully European affairs. First he noted a tendency to destroy popular government and second a wish to prevent the Spanish-American countries from existing as independent States.

Washington had made a declaration at the close of his administration advising American isolation. He warned against permanent alliances. Washington said:

> The great rule of conduct for us in regard to foreign nations is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little political connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith. Here let us stop—it is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliance—taking care always to keep ourselves by suitable establishments on a respectable defensive posture, we may safely trust to temporary alliance for extraordinary emergencies.

It was Jefferson who said in his first inaugural address—"Peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations—entangling alliances with none."

With these declarations made by his predecessors in office, Monroe had wrestled in his diplomatic relations with foreign countries. He saw a European alliance in 1813, established for the overthrow of Napoleon. But when its purpose had been accomplished this alliance attempted to be a kind of league of nations and held meetings annually in different parts of Europe. It claimed as its objective the maintenance of peace. Its idea was to keep down

revolutions and to prevent the establishment of popular governments everywhere. However, against this European alliance there came a popular protest in certain parts of Europe and first one revolution and then another occurred, particularly in Greece, Italy, and Spain. Then came the Holy Alliance signed by France, Austria, Russia, and Prussia, one principle of which was to "put an end to the system of representative governments in whatever country it may exist in Europe where it is not yet known." England protested, but nevertheless the Holy Alliance proceeded to destroy constitutional government in Piedmont, Naples, and Spain. In the meantime, practically all of the Spanish-American colonies had revolted, and by 1822 it was very evident that if Spain was to again come into control of her South American colonies she would have to receive aid from other European countries. Monroe had acknowledged them practically as independent States. In the summer of 1823 European powers were invited to a conference at Paris to consider how best to deal with the Spanish-American countries. The American Ambassador in London was Richard Rush, and George Canning called him into conference with an idea of proposing joint action against the Holy Alliance. Rush, of course, had no authority to negotiate, but at once communicated with President Monroe.

Five years before this Monroe had a cabinet meeting and propounded the question:

> Whether the ministers of the United States in Europe shall be instructed that the United States will not join in any project of interposition between Spain and the South Americans, which should not promote the complete independence of these provinces and whether measures shall be taken to ascertain if this be the policy of the British Government, and if so, to establish a concert with them for the support of this policy.

Such being the view of Monroe. Rush was instructed to have an interview with the British Government on the subject, and to inform that Government that the United States would do nothing except on the basis of the independence of the colonies.

The dispatches in the summer of 1832 from Rush informing the President of England's wish for concerted action as to the Spanish-American colonies was in accord with the point of view of Monroe in 1818. England had now come to a point of preventing European interference with Spanish-American countries. Should the United States enter into an alliance with England on this important matter?

Monroe felt the gravity of the situation and immediately consulted two of his predecessors in office, Jefferson and Madison. In his letter to Jefferson, Monroe said:

> My own impression is that we ought to meet the proposal of the British Government and to make it known that we would view an interference on the part of the European powers and especially an attack on the colonies by them as an attack on ourselves, presuming that if they succeeded with them they would extend it to us.

Jefferson approved Monroe's suggestions and replied:

> Our first and fundamental maxim should be never to entangle ourselves in the broils of Europe; our second not to suffer Europe to intermeddle with cis-Atlantic affairs.

The proposal was a peace measure and not a war measure and Mr. Jefferson said:

I am clearly of Mr. Canning's opinion that it will prevent instead of provoke war.

Madison approved most heartily, and he went even further and urged that the President's message should express disapproval of the interference by the holy alliance with the affairs of Spain and with the efforts of Greece to gain independence of Turkey. All that John Quincy Adams seems to have had to do with the Monroe doctrine was to suggest in the Cabinet meeting that the action be taken independently of Great Britain. On December 2, 1823, Monroe sent to Congress, written in his own hand, his famous message which had three distinct statements of policy which were with reference to European powers:

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 maintained, are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European powers.

We owe it, therefore, to candor 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 interfered and shall not interfere. But with the governments who have declared their independence and maintained it, and whose independence we have, on great consideration and on just principles, acknowledged, we could not view any interposition, for the purpose of oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny, in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States.

Our policy in regard to Europe, which was adopted at an early stage of the wars which have so long agitated that quarter of the globe, nevertheless, remains the same, which is, not to interfere in the internal concerns of any of its powers; to consider the government de facto as the legitimate government for us.

This, in brief, is the Monroe doctrine. It is not the purpose of this paper to discuss its application. We conceive of it as an idea which had been developing in the mind and consciousness of Monroe through a period of 30 years, beginning with his first mission to France, and accentuated by his second visit, and finally taking definite shape in his famous message of 1823. It is not to be regarded as a real declaration to promote peace, a declaration to give small independent States an opportunity to develop governments which in their judgment would be best suited to their needs. The Monroe doctrine was promulgated without the authority of law, asking first all nations the right, so to speak, to maintain their own form of government without interference from other nations. Quote Professor Latane's view expressed in his book, "From Isolation to Leadership." President Monroe said, in effect, that the Western Hemisphere must be made safe for democracy. He announced that we would uphold international law and republican government in this hemisphere, and as a quid pro quo he announced that it was the settled policy of the United States to refrain from all interference in the internal affairs of European States.

THE MONROE DOCTRINE FROM THE LATIN AMERICAN POINT OF VIEW—ADDRESS OF SENOR DR. DON RICARDO J. ALFARO, MINISTER TO THE UNITED STATES FROM THE REPUBLIC OF PANAMA

Mr. Governor, ladies and gentlemen, it is with great pleasure and deep gratitude that I have accepted the invitation to make an address in the solemn commemoration of the centennial of the Monroe doctrine, as this occasion has afforded me the opportunity of visiting this chivalrous land of Virginia, full of historical interest, annointed with the prestige of a glorious past that can be traced back for centuries, resplendent with the vigor and creative activities of modern life, and haloed with the glory of being the cradle of the eminent man who signed the immortal document to which we devote to-day our reverent remembrance.

I must, above all, return my thanks to the organizers of this celebration for their kindness and hospitality to me, and I also wish to pray the indulgence of this distinguished audience, for my shortcomings will prevent me from coming up to the level of their probable expectations. As a mere student of history of diplomacy I have come here with no other aim than that of paying my humble homage to the memory of an event deserving the praise and admiration of at least those who realize the beneficial influence it has had in the destinies of this hemisphere. In doing so I do not expect to say anything that has not been said before, but I am willing, nevertheless, to offer my tribute, thus adding a grain of sand to the pedestal of historical appreciation upon which the figure of James Monroe will shine forever as one of the most legitimate glories of American statesmanship.

It happens with the Monroe doctrine what happens to all things great, that it can be viewed from many angles, and therefore can present a great variety of aspects to the eyes of interested observers. The message addressed by President Monroe to Congress in December, 1823, is undoubtedly the most discussed document that has ever come out of the pen of an American statesman. Rivers of ink and mountains of paper have been used in writing articles, speeches, pamphlets, and books in an endeavor to expose, elucidate, discuss, and comment upon the meaning and scope of that famous declaration.

The fundamental principles laid down by James Monroe can be expressed in just a few words of his message: "We owe it, therefore," he said, "to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those (the European) 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 interfered, and shall not interfere. But with the Governments who have declared their independence and maintained it, and whose independence we have, on great consideration and on just principles acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them or controlling in any other manner their destiny, by any European power, in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States."

Such was the transcendent utterance that for a century has had so great an influence in the international thought and the international life of the Western Hemisphere. But in this short statement there is contained a whole world of ideas, and it opened in the future of the continent an immense field of political consequences. It is necessary to look back for 100 years in the annals of the New World to measure the importance and the historical value of that statement.

In 1823 the democratic outlook was far from being bright all over the world. Great Colombia, the creation of Bolivar's genius, had achieved her independence and a magnificent nation had been formed with the territory of what is to-day Venezuela, Panama, Colombia, and Ecuador. Mexico and the five Central American Republics had also attained their emancipation, while farther south Argentina and Chile had won the battles that assured their independence, as well as that of Uruguay and Paraguay. But with all this, Spain was not still totally beaten, and the Crown maintained two powerful strongholds which were a serious menace to the new-born Republics; one was in Cuba and threatened the new American democracies on the north; the other one was in what is to-day Peru and Bolivia and held sway in the south. There the republican armies had one more year of hard fighting, as in fact it was not until December, 1824, that the great battle of Ayacucho sealed forever the political liberty of South America.

With respect to conditions in the Old World we all know how the defeat of Napoleon and the restoration of the Bourbons caused a fresh outburst of absolutism that took an alarming expression in the deliberations of the Congresses of Vienna and Verona; in the formation of the so-called holy alliance; in the bloody policy of persecution carried out by the monarchists of France, Austria, and Spain; in the overthrow of the constitutional form of government in the latter nation, and in the threats against the liberal doctrine and the principles of democracy. The pronouncement of President Monroe in the midst of these circumstances deserves the admiration of posterity, because, aside from the fact that it was a measure of self-preservation and national defense, it was an act of bravery. It was a challenge to the liberticide tendencies of the holy alliance at a time when the United States did not have the strength that they have lately developed, and when the European powers had an overwhelming influence in the affairs of the world. It was not only a defiance of the colonial ambitions of France, Spain, and Portugal, but it was also a defiance of British ambitions. It is a mistake to believe, as many do, that the British premier, Mr. Canning, was in favor of the doctrine such as it was proclaimed. Canning, true, aimed at the destruction of the great Spanish empire in America. He purported not to allow France to get a foothold in the Spanish colonies of America, as she had gotten in the peninsula. He gave valuable moral support to the new-born Republics and no doubt was instrumental in securing their independence by a benevolent relaxation in the enforcement of the officially proclaimed neutrality. He showed a keen interest in affirming their political as well as their economic life. But while, in carrying out his policy, he greatly favored the political liberty of the continent, his motives were above all the commercial interests of his own

country, and the purpose of avoiding that the balance of power should be broken to the detriment and danger of Great Britain; and it was in the furtherance of this aim that he made to Mr. Rush, American minister to London, his well-known proposals in favor of the Spanish colonies struggling for their independence. But it is a proven fact in history that when the energetic dictum of Monroe was known by him he was very emphatic in stating that the doctrine proclaimed by the American President was unacceptable to Great Britain.

The intent and scope of the Monroe doctrine is indeed a complicated subject, and it is in this respect that writers and statesmen entertain most diverging opinions. On the side of the North Americans we find those who, possessed of a rather imperialistic trend of mind, entertain the wrong idea that the Monroe doctrine is some sort of principle that makes the United States the sovereign of the whole continent, while others maintain the correct view that nothing was further from the mind of Monroe and his chief advisers, Adams, Jefferson, and Clay, than the idea of a policy of aggression on the continent.

On the part of the South Americans there are those who adhere to this latter view, while to others the Monroe doctrine was simply the inception of a policy of continental predominance which has developed into a universal pretext for interference in the political life of the nations south of the Rio Grande; and that when expressed by the motto "America for the Americans," is understood to mean "America for the North Americans." It would be utterly impossible to analyze or even to quote the numerous contradictory views that have been maintained with reference to the Monroe declaration. As a matter of fact, the task would require the pages of a book, rather than the limited space of a short address.

But irrespective of the mass of opposite opinion, of unlearned criticisms, of biased contentions and misconstrued facts, when the history of the Monroe doctrine is carefully and conscientiously studied, one can not but be impressed with the consistency and courageous determination with which the United States have given actual application to the principles laid down by their President in 1823.

The first test of the doctrine came up as early as 1825, when Henry Clay, then Secretary of State, took pains in emphatically declaring to England and France that the United States would not consent to the exercise of sovereignty over Cuba by any other European power than its actual, three-century-old possessor, Spain. This intimation was subsequently repeated from the State Department, by Van Buren in 1829 and 1830, by Forsyth in 1840, by Webster in 1843, by Buchanan in 1848 and 1851, by Marcy in 1853, by Seward in 1867, and by Fish in 1870. With equal firmness the United States rejected propositions tending to a joint guarantee of the neutrality of the island with France and England. They also declined to recognize the right of visit and search by French ships on Cuban waters and to sanction the hypothecation of the island to France as a guarantee of loan to Spain; and it is gratifying to note how all conflicts with European powers regarding the fate of Cuba finally resulted in the addition of a new sister republic to the family of nations.

New tests followed in the subsequent years. In 1835 a proposed arrangement seeking a British or Spanish protectorate by British

settlers in the Bay of Honduras was opposed by the United States. In 1848, when the project of the people of Yucatan of incorporating their territory with the sovereignty of the United States, France, or England was made known, the United States disclaimed any intention as to themselves and strenuously opposed any project whereby either of these two powers might get control of that peninsula. In these same days when General Flores, who had been President of Ecuador, organized an expedition in England in an attempt to invade that country and reannex it to the Crown of Spain, with whom it was then reported that he had been in negotiations, the American ministers in Madrid and London were instructed to inform the respective cabinets that the United States would not view with indifference the carrying out of the purposes attributed to General Flores. In 1851 the attitude of the United States was instrumental in preventing the British from gaining a foothold in Nicaragua through the creation of the so-called Kingdom of Mosquitia under British protectorates. In 1858 strenuous objections were made against the disembarking of the French and English naval forces in San Juan del Norte under the pretext of repelling illegal expeditions against the same country at the request of its Government.

In 1866, when war broke out between Spain on one side and Chile, Peru, and Bolivia on the other, the United States, while announcing that they would be neutral in the conflict, obtained securities from Spain that her hostilities against these countries would not be pushed to the political point and would not by any means lead to the reacquisition by Spain of any part of the territories of these countries. In the same spirit, when Spain announced the intention of occupying the Chincha Islands, the Secretary of State, Mr. Seward, hastened to announce to the Madrid Government that should Spain persist in that idea, the United States must not be expected to remain in their present attitude of neutrality. In 1870 President Grant opposed the cession to Italy of the Island of St. Bartholomew, one of the lesser Antilles, by the Kingdom of Sweden and Norway, and in 1880, Evarts, Secretary of State, manifested his opposition to England's obtaining from Honduras the Bay Islands, which it was rumored at the time she was seeking. In 1885 Frelinghuysen took the position that the United States would not allow Haiti to cede to France the Mole St. Nicholas or the Island of Tortuga, and the same declaration was made two years later with respect to the Island of Tortuga, when it was announced that Great Britain intended to seize it. In 1888 Secretary of State Bayard made an equal announcement to France when the negotiation of a protectorate over Haiti was publicly announced as a forthcoming possibility.

There is only one case of importance in which the action of the United States may be considered to have been weak in the presence of an accomplished fact entailing the acquisition of American territory by a European power. That was in 1861, when a political movement took place in Santo Domingo which resulted in the reannexation of that Republic to Spain, a state of things that lasted until 1865. The cause of this deviation from the firm policies followed before and after that period is not difficult to find; the event took place exactly at the same time the terrific struggle of the North with the South was going on, and the existence of the

Nation as a union was at stake. Evidently the United States could not push its exigencies in accordance with the Monroe doctrine to the extreme of using against Spain the naval and military forces so badly needed in the Civil War. As it has been aptly said "when your own home is afire you can not be expected to help in putting out the fire in your neighbor's home." But in the midst of the distressing circumstances the principle was saved, for the United States did not fail to enter their protest and to reassert the fundamental principle of 1823.

The Civil War no doubt was a dominating factor in the amount of vigor used in enforcing the Monroe doctrine during the years of that tremendous struggle. Besides the case of Santo Domingo, the establishment of the Maximilian empire in Mexico under the pressure of French bayonets affords a striking example. From the beginning of the controversy between that country and England, France, and Spain, the United States made strenuous representations to the three powers in an endeavor to avoid their armed intervention. However, Veracruz was occupied by the combined fleet of the allies by the end of 1861. The United States obtained assurances that the Europeans had no political aims, but after the withdrawal of the British and Spanish forces in 1862 the French remained in the country and constituted the main support of the throne offered to the unfortunate Austrian prince. Diplomatic negotiations were continued with unfailing vigor, but after 1865, when peace had been reestablished in the United States and troops were available for military action, if necessary, the pressure upon Napoleon III became stronger every day and the withdrawal of the French troops was effected when 50,000 American soldiers were massed along the Mexican frontier, ready to uphold the principle that the American Continent had been closed in 1823 to the political control of European nations.

The whole course of the United States in the Mexican crisis and the stand taken by President Cleveland in 1895 in the conflict between Venezuela and Great Britain over the boundaries between the former country and British Guiana and by President Roosevelt in 1902 in the crisis of the European pecuniary claims against the same Republic are assuredly two instances in which the Monroe doctrine has been upheld in a most brilliant, just, firm, and victorious manner. I feel that I have taken too much of your time in making these recollections, but what I have said is sufficient to show that the Monroe doctrine has achieved results for which it is entitled to a respectful recognition of its great value.

I believe the hour approaches when the application of the Monroe doctrine will be looked upon more as a subject of historical interest than as a problem of high concern. With the growing stability—political as well as financial—of the southern nations; with the increase of continental solidarity and the tightening of trade and intellectual bonds between Latin-Americans and Anglo-Americans; with the consolidation of the United States as a great power, whose attitude is decisive as to the momentous questions of the world; with the sovereign influence which public opinion exercises in the policies of civilized peoples and the continuous efforts of public associations, centers of education, jurists, and publicists to enlighten that public

opinion and promote the cause of international justice, there is every hope that within a few decades no more cases will arise where an enforcement of the principles laid down in 1823 will be necessary or where the same may be wrongfully invoked for any purpose. When that day will arrive, the principle will continue to live but the problems will cease to exist, and the Monroe doctrine exalted by its traditions of honor, justice, and valor, will continue to receive in the forthcoming centuries the glorification we are giving it to-day.

I thank you.

MONROE DOCTRINE AND THE BALKANS—ADDRESS OF M. TSAMADOS, CHARGÉ D'AFFAIRES AD INTERIM FROM GREECE

It is a truism that the outstanding events in the drama of history can seldom be accurately appraised by their contemporaries, whether these be the few chief actors or the multitude of the spectators. Columbus died a heartbroken man, disappointed because of his failure to find a new route to Asia and quite ignorant of the fact that his discovery revolutionized the history of the world. The far-reaching effect of the purchase of Louisiana was not fully realized either by Livingston, the American negotiator, who felt very apologetic about the $15,000,000 which he consented to pay, and expressed the hope that the United States would some time be able to resell a portion of it, nor by Napoleon, although the latter dimly felt that he had given England a maritime rival that would sooner or later humble her pride. On the other hand, the dramatic landing of the same Napoleon in Egypt, which loomed so large in his own eyes and those of his contemporaries, though pregnant in immediate results, has been quite sterile of lasting consequences. Indeed, it is very often that we find in the annals of history events and names that appeared big to the contemporaries dwindle when tested in the crucible of time; while occurrences which almost passed unnoticed assumed with the passing years epochal proportions.

This description of the workings of history, however, does not quite cover the momentous event the centennial of which we celebrate to-day. When President Monroe delivered his memorable message on December 2, 1823, he was fully aware of the significance of the step he was taking; while his fellow countrymen, including the illustrious veterans, Madison and Jefferson, the autocratic Governments of Europe, to which the message was indirectly addressed, as well as the peoples who were struggling for freedom on both sides of the Atlantic, realized that the pronouncement of the American President was destined to make history; and it did make history at such a rapid pace that soon afterwards George Canning, the British foreign secretary, was able to declare with rather grandiloquent boastfulness that he had "called the New World to redress the balance of the Old."

It would be presumptuous for a Greek to dwell at any length upon the far-reaching and beneficent effects of President Monroe's message on the destinies of the American continents during the last hundred years. That will doubtless form the subject of the addresses of other and more competent speakers. On the other hand, I feel that it would not be out of place for me to call attention to the influence exerted by that masterly formulation of American

policy upon the course of events in Europe, and particularly in my own country. Let me begin by recalling that when President Monroe delivered his message the Greek war of independence was approaching its third year. The news of the insurrection of the Greeks against the Sultan of Turkey had fallen like a bombshell in the chancelleries of the European powers. The governments of these powers, having finally succeeding in overthrowing Napoleon, were committed to a policy of unmitigated reaction which aimed at the maintenance of the international status quo established by the congress of Vienna and the suppression of liberalism in every country of Europe by recourse, if necessary, to armed intervention.

This interventionist principle, to which President Monroe was to issue such a crushing rejoinder, was thus formulated at the congress of Tropau (1820) by the powers that formed the holy alliance, States which have undergone a change of government due to revolution, the results of which threaten other States, ipso facto cease to be members of the European alliance and remain excluded from it until their situation gives guaranties for legal order and stability * * * if, owing to such alterations, immediate danger threatens other States, the powers bind themselves by peaceful means or, if need be, by arms, to bring back the guilty State into the bosom of the great alliance. It was in accordance with this principle that an Austrian Army crushed the insurrections in Piedmont and Naples in 1820, and that a French Army restored absolution in Spain two years later. That the revolt of the Greeks against what the reactionary Governments of Europe regarded as their legitimate ruler, the Sultan, called for the application of the same principle, was perfectly plain to Matternich, the moving spirit of the so-called holy alliance. But armed intervention by the European powers against a nation struggling to free itself from Turkish rule was too monstrous a step to be tolerated by what was left of public opinion in Great Britain, France, and Russia; and Matternich had to content himself with a policy of neutrality in which he could acquiesce all the more readily because he was confident that the Greek insurrection, pitted as it was against the might of the Ottoman Empire, would soon "burn itself out beyond the pale of civilization."

Thus the Greek revolution, having occasioned the first rift in the concert of the European powers, became the rallying point for the forces of liberalism, nationalism, and democracy, the bogeys of post-Napoleonic Europe. To these forces, gazing impotently upon the unequal struggle of the Greek insurgents against overwhelming odds, President Monroe's message brought an invaluable accretion of strength. For, when the American President said that the United States would consider any attempt on the part of the European powers to extend their system to any portion of the Western Hemisphere as dangerous to this country's "peace and safety," he dealt Metternich's interventionist policy—already weakened by its nonenforcement against the insurgent Greeks—a blow from which it never recovered. When he further declared that "with the governments who have declared their independence and maintained it" this country could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner

their destiny, by any European power, in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward itself, he was enunciating a principle of national self-determination which could be applied not only to the nascent Republics of South America but also to the small, valiant nation in southeastern Europe which was struggling to resuscitate something of the glory that was Greece. The immediate effect of President Monroe's message was to weaken the forces of reaction and to strengthen, correspondingly, those of liberalism and nationalism in Europe. The balance of the Old World has been redressed through the intervention of the New, and George Canning, the author of this celebrated phrase, was soon able to initiate a friendlier policy toward the insurgent Greeks in which he was soon joined by Russia and France. The culmination of this new departure which, incidently, broke up the sinister concert of post-Napoleonic reaction, occurred four years later when the Greek war of independence was virtually brought to a successful end by the destruction of the Turkish fleet at Navarino. No American participated in that naval engagement which decided that a small portion of the national heritage of the Greek race should be restored to freedom. But, as the representative of the Greek nation, I gratefully acknowledge on this solemn occasion that that happy consummation was considerably hastened by President Monroe's unmistakable espousal of the cause of national independence at a time when it was in eclipse and was menaced with irretrievable ruin.

In the course of the 100 years that have elapsed since, the principles enunciated with such clearness and boldness by President Monroe have received such wide application and universal recognition, that they have come to constitute the foundation stone of the foreign policy not only of the United States but also of all other countries toward the American continents. Now it is perfectly true that not every part of President Monroe's message has been strictly adhered to. "In the wars of the European powers, in matters relating to themselves," President Monroe said, "We have never taken any part, nor does it comport with our policy so to do," yet, six years ago, urged on by an overwhelming emotion and moved by a genuine crusading fervor, the American people disregarded this rule—if rule it was meant to be—laid down 100 years ago, and Europe, in spite of her gaping wounds, is on the whole much better off to-day than she would be if America had clung to her traditional aloofness. Nor has the Government of this country consistently recognized de facto Governments in Europe although President Monroe declared it to be a principle of American foreign policy "to consider the government de facto as the legitimate government for us and to cultivate friendly relations with it." But when all has been told, when all these deviations have been recorded it nevertheless remains true that the crux of President Monroe's message has become the law governing this country's foreign policy, a doctrine, as it is very aptly called, vested with something of the sanctity and immutability of religious dogma.

What is it then that has bestowed universal recognition upon what is after all a unilateral formulation of policy when so many treaties and covenants solemnly entered into by two or more parties have been trampled under foot and the political conditions which

they have created have been overturned? When President Monroe declared that the American continents were not to be considered "as subjects for further colonization by any European powers," and when he further enjoined these powers from attempting to "extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere," he was proclaiming the independence of North and South America in much the same way that the thirteen Colonies had declared their independence half a century earlier. But the thirteen Colonies could only make good their declaration after a long and sanguinary war. What mystical quality was there about President Monroe's pronouncement that compelled the great nations to which it was addressed to respect it? True, at the time it was made it was considerably reinforced by the friendly attitude of Great Britain. But what is it that has allowed the United States to reaffirm it on so many occasions since? We can answer this question very simply by saying that the Monroe doctrine delivered its strength from the ever-increasing power of this young and vigorous Nation. It was the might of the United States, which has since grown by leaps and bounds, that has vested the unilateral declaration of an American President with international sanction. What were the sources of this might? "The extent of our country" wrote Washington in the draft of a farewell address in 1792, "the diversity of our climate and soil, and the various productions of the States consequent to both may render the whole, at no distant period, one of the most independent nations in the world."

But even if to these potent factors, which make for economic self-sufficiency, we add the Atlantic Ocean, which makes for comparative immunity from aggression, we have yet to mention what is in the last analysis the main reason why the Monroe doctrine has been respected by the other nations, in other words, why the independence of the peoples of America has been preserved. And that reason is to be sought in the existence on this hemisphere of a politically united Nation so high minded as to be willing and so powerful as to be able to become the guarantor and guardian of that independence. The most formidable challenge to the Monroe doctrine was the expedition of Napoleon III to Mexico. And it was surely no more coincidence that the expedition was launched at a time when the guardian of America's independence was "a house divided against itself," and that it was brought to an inglorious and tragic confusion as soon as the Governor of the United States was able once more to speak in the name of the whole American Nation. I am not detracting from the admiration which is due to the people of this State and of the historic city whose guests we are honored to be on this occasion for the unexampled fortitude and devotion they displayed two generations ago in defense of what they believed to be a just and sacred cause, when I say that not only this great Nation and all the nations of America but also the entire world is better off because those heroic efforts failed to attain their aim. What happened during the Civil War, all that has happened since, has conclusively demonstrated that the fundamental prerequisite to the enforcement of the Monroe doctrine, formulated by one of Virginia's many great sons, is and always will be a united and, because united, powerful American Nation.

In closing this address may I point to one great moral lesson which I, as a European and as the representative of a Balkan

State, shall take away from this inspiring commemoration of a historic event? It is that the best hope for lasting peace on the continent of Europe lies in the formulation and enforcement by the various groups of European States of policies based on the principles embodied in the Monroe doctrine. The Balkan Peninsula, composed as it is of several small States which could easily be made into an economic and geographical entity, would appear to lend itself admirably to the application of such a policy. Hence, when the average internationally minded American hears it described as the cockpit of European strife, he is very apt, in his impatience, to attribute this state of affairs to the inherent belligerency of its peoples. The truth is that probably no part of the world needs a Monroe doctrine as imperatively as the Balkan Peninsula. If the Balkan States had proposed to the Austrian ultimatum to Serbia in the summer of 1914, a declaration to the effect that they would consider any attempt on Austria's part to extend her system to any portion of the peninsula as dangerous to their peace and safety, it is very probable that the great war would have been avoided. It was because Austrian diplomacy dreaded such a contingency that it exhausted all its resourcefulness to wreck the Balkan league. That league, during its all too brief lifetime, demonstrated the feasibility of a policy based on the slogan, "the Balkan Peninsula for the Balkan people," so similar to President Monroe's principle, "the American continent for the American people." The fact that the miracle was wrought once encourages the hope that it can yet be repeated.

But, meanwhile, foreign observers should not be too impatient at the delay. Americans, in particular, should not be too quick to jump to erroneous conclusions from false analogies. Southeastern Europe does not enjoy to anything like the same extent either the geographical isolation or the economic self-sufficiency of America, and, what is more important still, it has an entirely different historical background. To mention the most telling difference, the principle of nationality has engendered a state of things in America diametrically opposed to that produced by the same principle in Southeastern Europe. On this side of the Atlantic, as also in Italy and in Germany, nationalism has meant integration; i. e., the merging together of many States into one powerful nation, a result, be it remembered, that was not achieved without a long Civil War. Over there, on the other hand, nationalism has meant disintegration; i. e., the breaking up of the Ottoman and Austro-Hungarian Empires into their component racial groups held together for centuries by the compulsion of superior force. In the very course of things, the next step should be a process of reintegration; i. e., the voluntary federation of groups of these newly born States for the purpose of self-defense and of economic and cultural development.

The Balkanization of Europe, which a school of so-called liberal political thinkers so deeply deplore, is, after all, only a state of transition, an intermediate step between continental imperialism based on force—a state of things, let us hope, belonging to the past—and continental federalism, based on community of interest—the international policy of the future. Already from the ashes of the Austro-Hungarian Empire is rising the Little Entente and the

resuscitation of the Balkan league, which worked wonders during its brief existence, may be nearer at hand than pessimists imagine. In working toward that end, and the Balkan peoples can have no better source of inspiration than the example of America, a nation that owes its greatness to the soundness of the principles on which it was founded and to its readiness and ability to defend those principles whenever they were in serious jeopardy. That the Balkan nations also know how to fight for their freedom they have repeatedly demonstrated, and their ability to do so will be sufficiently enhanced to preserve the peace in that part of the world, if they also achieve the second postulate of America's greatness, union, liberty through union, that is the example of America; an example which, if followed, is sure to bring about such momentous changes as to justify more than ever the statement that the New World has redressed the balance of the old.

ADDRESS OF SEÑOR DON RICARDO JAIMES FREYRE, THE MINISTER PLENIPOTENTIARY OF BOLIVIA

Ladies and gentlemen, the declaration of Monroe initiates a continental policy. Its spirit, its text, its history, and its interpretation by eminent statesmen of this great Republic make it a national thesis, a formula for self-defense, enunciated by one sole Nation; a plan of her political conduct before the face of the Old World countries. It is a doctrine of the United States, but has been throughout a century the shield or defense of the Americas.

It initiates a continental policy, because all the peoples who were born to liberty at the dawn of the ninteenth century saw in the words of Monroe an affirmation of their sovereignty; because they declared the inviolability of the independent Republics of America and of the institutions which may be freely given them; because they announced the existence of a bond of union between all those who had passed through the same periods of conquest and colonial life and had undertaken the wars against their mother country in order to assure their right to self-government.

A century has passed. The menace of the Old World commences to be an historical souvenir. The remains of European territorial dominion on the American Continent lack significance and importance The new nations have raised themselves to a level of equality with the old ones; international law protects them all, and, nevertheless, the Monroe doctrine maintains its position as the political standard of the United States, and it should be maintained as a profession of faith for the other American peoples.

And its meaning is graver and more important when it is considered as the starting point of the accord and bond of union of the 20 nations of the American Continent. An Americanism exists, and it had its first expression in the phrases embodied in the celebrated document whose centenary we are commemorating.

Americanism exists, based on historic laws from whose influence it can not possibly be separated. The occidental world is free from the secular problems which agitate the old; it has thrown off all ancestral prejudices; it has not reaped the inheritance of political and racial conflicts which have been disturbing Europe for the last 20 centuries,

and it is elaborating a new international law whose basis is more solid, because it is more in accordance with justice.

When our glance runs over the vast extent of the continent it sees in all the countries the same ideals realized and the same principles triumphant, as it finds in all of them the same memories, the same traditions, the same origins, and the same struggles for liberty.

That is the reason why an Americanism exists which has created the amphictyony of America; but it is an Americanism that is open and ample, where the sciences, arts, letters, and work can always find the respect, sympathy, and stimulus to which they are entitled, from whatever region they may come to us, whatever may be the point of the planet from whence they irradiate. Our exceedingly free institutions, our faith in the combined efforts of all human associations, are a guaranty of our sincerity. But we exact from nations, as from individuals, reverence for our sovereignty, respect for our laws, and an honest intention.

And thus we may be enabled to give a continental meaning to the Monroe doctrine. Without lessening or extending its original significance, which belongs exclusively to the United States, to convert it into the doctrine of the Americas.

Our harmony with all the civilized world is evident. We do not close the doors of our countries, or of our spirits to the current which during four centuries has flowed to us, but we do not desire that it brings with it the ambitions of the past or the obscure problems of the present.

America has its own peculiar destiny, and perhaps a mission within the precepts of future humanity—nothing that can oppose this will find support among us.

And when the bond of union of all the continent shall have become an indestructible fact, when the last vestige of selfishness and injustice shall have disappeared from it, when the most recent and still bleeding wounds shall have been healed, no obstacle will arise to the fraternal union of the people of America, which can offer itself to the world as the home of peace and the refuge for all men of good will.

And next to the doctrine of the great President there shall be raised up another doctrine which will read thus: America safeguards America.

LESSONS FOR ASIA FROM THE AMERICAN MONROE DOCTRINE—ADDRESS OF MIRZA HUSSEIN KHAN ALAI, MINISTER FROM PERSIA TO THE UNITED STATES

On this auspicious and solemn occasion, when we are met to celebrate the one hundredth anniversary of the promulgation of the Monroe doctrine, under the auspices of that important organization, the Southern Commercial Congress, I am particularly gratified to have the privilege of being with you, not only as minister of Persia, accredited at Washington, but as the representative of the continent of Asia.

It is eminently fitting and proper that the peoples of Asia should join with the great and noble American Nation in testifying to the very high respect and admiration which they entertain for the memory of the great statesman whose Presidency was called "the

era of good feeling," of the unflinchingly honest patriot who was the author of a beneficent doctrine which has been a powerful force in preserving peace; a doctrine which, as Governor Trinkle, of Virginia, has well said in his proclamation was a challenge to the world in militant defense of the rights of nations.

A century has passed since President Monroe proclaimed to the world his famous doctrine as the national policy of the United States. It was founded on the principle that the safety of this Republic would be imperiled by the extension of sovereign rights by a European power over territory in this hemisphere.

Uttered at a time when your neighbors to the south had won their independence, and were gradually adapting themselves to the exercise of their newly acquired rights, this doctrine became for those struggling nations a shield against the great European powers which, in the spirit of the age, coveted political control over the rich regions which those new-born States had made their own.

Out of the Monroe doctrine grew up the feeling that the countries of this hemisphere constituted a group united by common ideals and common aspirations. It is the same feeling which, founded on sympathy and mutual interests, exists among the members of a family. This feeling is called the Pan American spirit. If the sovereignty of any one of the American countries is menaced by any European country, the united power of the American Republics will constitute a bulwark which will protect the independence and integrity of their neighbor from unjust invasion and aggression.

Now it seems to me that the peoples of Asia, who are wide-awake and fully conscious of the responsibilities and privileges which are theirs as sovereign and independent States, might well take for their protection this spirit and this feeling as an example and an inspiration, for they, too, have most of them been, for the last hundred years, the prey of certain great powers of Europe, who have sought to encroach upon them, create zones of influence, monopolizing the resources of Asia to their own exclusive advantage.

If the countries of Asia had united under a doctrine and spirit such as yours and offered a strong front to the aggression and penetration of certain European powers, they would certainly not have suffered so much nor been hampered in their development and progress. A pan-Asiatic spirit should exist similar to pan Americanism.

The Monroe doctrine is the national policy of the United States; pan Americanism is the international policy of the Americas. The motives are to an extent different, but the ends sought are the same. Both can exist without impairing the force of either. Pan Americanism extends beyond the sphere of politics and finds its application in the varied fields of human enterprise. The essential idea manifests itself in cooperation and therefore necessitates a better understanding between the peoples of this hemisphere.

Unfortunately, that cooperation and that understanding do not yet exist between the countries of Asia. Persia knows very little about China, Siam, and Japan, and not enough about Turkey, Afghanistan, and India; reciprocally those countries have, several of them, no diplomatic relations with, and a very meager comprehen-

sion of Persia. It is vitally necessary for us, as it is for you in this hemisphere, to understand one another, comprehend our needs; we must study the phases of material and intellectual development which enter into the varied problems of national progress.

In order to illustrate my statement that Asia has a lesson to draw from the Monroe doctrine, I will, with your indulgence, draw for you a rough sketch of Persia's unhappy plight before the Great War, during the war, and since that terrible catastrophe—a plight which might have been mitigated had the other Asiatic countries come to her rescue. I will also demonstrate to you the contrast between American cooperation and the imperialism of certain countries of Europe, as these have affected my country. Finally, I will show that with your friendly assistance and moral support Persia is now on the road to rehabilitation and prosperity, proving that the unselfish influence of the United States does not confine itself to the improvement of the New World but that it usefully exerts itself in rejuvenating one of the most ancient Empires, the cradle of the Aryan race from which you are sprung.

Russia, in the early part of the nineteenth century, wrenched away from Persia the Caucasian Provinces, converting the Caspian Sea into a Russian lake, and imposing upon us the treaty of Turkmantchai in 1828, which treaty has now, since the collapse of imperialistic Russia, been abrogated. England, on the other hand, was not idle in extending her hold on the Persian Gulf and penetrated into the south of Persia. Step by step the Muscovite Empire extended its tentacles into Persia, appropriated large tracts of land on the Turcoman frontier, seized strategic bases on the Caspian Sea, obliged the Shah to take Russian officers into his employ, to train a brigade of Cossacks, thus obtaining a hold on the armed forces of the country, obtained concessions for roads, harbors, railways, telegraphs, mines—never exploiting these to Persia's advantage, but merely holding them to prevent any other power helping toward Persia's salvation, preventing transit of foreign goods through her territory into Persia with the avowed object of monopolizing Persian markets—in short, using every conceivable means by cajolery and menace to increase day by day its influence at the court of the Shah. The people, led by the more enlightened statesmen, members of the clergy, and the intellectual classes, became extremely apprehensive lest the imperialism of neighboring countries, their intrigues to control the sovereign and his court, their policy of obtaining concessions for big enterprises covering vast areas, might ultimately lead to the subjection of Persia to foreign domination. They saw real danger in the concentration of all the power in the hands of an autocrat and his minions who were always liable to fall within the orbit of strong, pushful neighbors.

The people therefore revolted and clamored for a constitution. They insisted upon their right to have a voice in the government of the country. The Shah yielded to popular pressure and to the great influence of the clergy. He granted, in 1906, a constitution providing for a Madjless, or House of Representatives. Soon after this Mozaffer-ed-Dine died and his son, Mohammed Ali, succeeded to the throne. This prince at first displayed friendliness toward the new régime and even signed a more comprehensive body of fundamental laws, virtually establishing parliamentary government,

a constitutional monarchy, but later, urged on by Russia, who had all along been hostile to the democratic movement, he resorted to a coup d'état, and with the help of the Russian minister and the Russian officers in his employ he bombarded the Parliament House in 1908. Meanwhile, in 1907, the Anglo-Russian agreement, creating zones of Russian and British influence in Persia, was signed, to the intense indignation of the Persian people, who saw in this arbitrary action of neighboring powers a great infringement of their sovereignty and another manifestation of imperialism. The flames of nationalism were again fanned by this foreign aggression, and when the Shah tried in 1908 to dispense with the Madjless or Parliament a second revolution, much more serious than the first one, broke out. Nationalist forces from the north and south joined hands, captured Teheran in 1909, obliging the Shah to abdicate. His son, Sultan Ahmed Shah, our present sovereign, then only a boy, was acclaimed as King and a regent was appointed.

But Russia was determined to prevent the regeneration of Persia. When the legislature and the executive, acting in harmony, determined as they were to improve conditions, obtained the services of Swedish officers for the organization of a gendarmerie, and of American advisers for the straightening out of the finances, Russia tried to block these reforms and finally by actual threat of armed occupation of the capital of Persia, bringing troops right up to the gates of Teheran, they, in conjunction with Great Britain, compelled the Persian Government in 1911 to discharge Mr. W. Morgan Shuster and his American associates. This was a great blow to the national aspirations, but other blows followed in quick succession. The ex-Shah was encouraged by Russian help to make a raid on Persia and distract the attention and resources of the Government from useful reforms. The Persian Government was forced by Russia and Great Britain to recognize the Anglo-Russian Convention of 1907; that is, the virtual partition of the country. Russian consuls arrogated to themselves the rights of governors in Persia, they interfered in judicial and financial mattters; prominent Persians, nationalists, and priests were hanged by the Russian soldiery occupying our important cities; Russia did not even shrink from bombarding the mosque of Imam Reza at Meched, the glory of the Shah world, the most sacred place of pilgrimage in our land. It is therefore not surprising that when the World War began the hearts of all Persians were filled with bitterness and resentment against Russia. There was no feeling of friendship for Germany or Turkey, but a distinct desire to see the enemies of Russia triumph. Nevertheless, we remained neutral throughout the war, but that neutrality was violated from the first by Russia and later by Turkey and Great Britain. Persia was devastated; she became the Belgium of Asia. Her fairest Provinces were given over to fire and sword; her foodstuffs and beasts of burden were commandeered by foreign armies; she suffered famine and epidemics. In this gloomy and desperate situation a ray of light came from America. The lofty principles advocated by President Wilson for the readjustment of the world reached our ears. An American relief commission arrived in Persia and ministered help and succor to the sorely tried people. The collapse of imperialistic Russia—the Russia of the Romanoffs, which had kept us under

its heel for so long—was also a godsend to Persia. The old order changed in 1917, yielding place to a régime which reversed the policy of its predecessors by returning to the Persian people all the rights extorted from them by the Tzars; treaties, conventions, arrangements, protocols, concessions, wrenched from us under duress, were by one stroke of the pen rendered null and void. Russian troops which had occupied our territory and wrought such havoc were removed and we began to breathe again.

But we obtained no redress in 1919 at the Paris Peace Conference, whither the Persian Government sent a delegation, of which I was a member. Influence was exercised at the conference table to prevent our obtaining a hearing, and meanwhile the Anglo-Persian Convention of 1919, which made Persia virtually a British protectorate, was put through. But there was such a storm of protest against it both inside and outside of Persia that the convention was finally abrogated in 1921 by mutual agreement with Great Britain. The stand taken by the American Secretary of State Lansing against this cynical policy greatly strengthened Persia's hands in throwing overboard such an unpopular and baneful compact.

You will therefore see that since 1921 Persia's political horizon has become brighter. Direct foreign interference, as a result of a new spirit in international relations introduced by the United States, and of the awakening of the East, has ceased, and I may here say that the East is wide awake but not in hostility toward the West, rather in resentment against certain powers of Europe, and in the full determination to insist upon respect of the independence and sovereignty of its component parts. Being at last after centuries of coercion given a chance to put our house in order, we lost no time in organizing a small but efficient homogeneous military force in place of the heterogeneous forces imposed upon us. This army under the leadership of a strong and patriotic Minister of War, Reza Khan, has reestablished order throughout the land, repressing agitation and unrest largely encouraged by foreign interference and intrigue, and restoring in the Provinces the authority of the central Government which had been impaired by the presence of foreign troops. The Persian Parliament, or Madjless, as we call it, met again in June, 1921. Its first care was to vote measures tending toward the rehabilitation of the country after its terrible experiences and sufferings during the war. America's helpful policy toward China, her advocacy of the open door and equality of opportunity, her great achievement at the Washington Conference for the Limitation of Armament, inspired Persia with such confidence in her altruistic motives that we naturally turned to you for the technical and financial assistance required to upbuild Persia after her terrible sufferings. Among other steps was the employment by Persia of a group of American financial advisers under the leadership of Dr. A. C. Millspaugh, former economic adviser of the Department of State. For nearly a year now the finances of the Persian Government have been under the control of these American administrators. The powers of the American group are derived ultimately from the Persian Parliament, whose comprehensive grants of authority give the American administrator and his assistants adequate powers and immunity from political vicissitudes. The efforts of Doctor Millspaugh have already borne fruit in a steady improve-

ment of the nation's financial condition, and, in his opinion, the Persian Government is now in a position to contract one or more foreign loans. Accordingly, the Parliament has recently sanctioned negotiations for loans not exceeding $40,000,000 in the aggregate, destined in large part for public utilities and industrial developments to be carried out by American firms. Evidence of the confidence of the Persian people in the American mission and in the United States in general was furnished by a stipulation in the law that the loan must be placed with American bankers. With the exception of the southern oil fields, one of the world's richest producing areas, the great natural resources of Persia have, as I have already said, scarcely been touched.

Under the general direction of the American advisers later to be appointed for the Ministry of Public Works, it is expected that American capital will find lucrative employment in road, railway, and bridge building, irrigation construction, mineral and oil exploitation, and other means of developing Persia industrially and economically. The budget for the fiscal year 1923–24 has, under the supervision of the American advisers, been balanced. As compared with almost any other country, the debt of Persia, both gross and per capita, is practically negligible. The result is a national burden phenomenally small as compared with the potential and even the present wealth of the nation. There is and there has been no inflation whatever in Persian currency. Persia is one of the few countries to-day whose currency is not debased nor depreciated. I repeat that Persia is in a state of domestic peace. Her roads were never more safe for commerce. Her Provinces are loyal to the central Government. Tranquillity throughout the country is assured by a strong, regularly paid gendarmerie, which is entirely free from foreign intrigue or influence. This force acts as a national constabulary and gives its constant support to the work of the American financial administrators. I have already said that the political situation has completely changed. Soviet influences do not touch the masses of the people, who are economically, religiously, and temperamentally unfitted for communist propaganda. The dominance of Moscow is in no way likely to be felt in Persia. On the other hand, Great Britain has withdrawn all of her forces from the country and definitely abandoned any attempt to control Persia politically. In short, Persia is ready to take the place to which her brilliant history entitles her among enlightened and progressive nations.

The time is propitious for American participation in the economic development of Persia and the Near East. Coupled with their appreciation of America's financial strength is a faith shared universally among Persians, Turks, Afghans, in her political disinterestedness and her economic efficiency.

Never before have the peoples of Asia so fully realized the significance of the high principles for which your great country stands. Never have the need and benefit of peace and fraternity and international cooperation in every form of human activity been so evident as they are to-day.

If we seek the dominant ideas in world politics we will find that individualism first absorbed men's thoughts and inspired their deeds. This idea was generally supplanted by that of nationalism, which found expression in the ambitions of conquest and the greed of terri-

tory, so manifest in the nineteenth century. Following the impulse of nationalism, the idea of internationalism began to develop. It appeared to be an increasing influence throughout the world when the recent war of empires, that great and terrible manifestation of nationalism, stayed its progress in Europe, and brought discouragement to those who had hoped that the new idea would usher in an era of universal peace and justice.

Pan Americanism, born of the Monroe doctrine, is an expression of this new spirit—the idea of internationalism. America has become the guardian of that idea which will, in the end, rule the world. The American principle is that as between nations equality is the only principle of justice, and that the weak nations have just as many and the same rights as the strong nations. The feeling that penetrates every American is that there is a great future, that a man can handle his own fortunes, that it is his right to have his place in the world.

These are the principles and feelings which certain countries of Europe have not yet understood but which the people of Persia uphold.

The spectacle of 21 sovereign and independent American nations, bound together by faith and justice, firmly cemented by a sympathy which knows no superior and no inferior, but which recognizes only equality and fraternity, is indeed a great lesson and an example for the peoples of Asia to follow.

ADDRESS OF MAJ. E. W. R. EWING, PRESIDENT OF THE MANASSAS BATTLEFIELD CONFEDERATE PARK AND FOR EIGHT YEARS HISTORIAN IN CHIEF OF THE SONS OF CONFEDERATE VETERANS

The memorial, now well under way, on the historic battlefields of first and second Manassas, as generally known to the South, or Bull Run as more often called in the North, was presented, by invitation, before the centennial celebration of the Monroe doctrine under the auspices of the Southern Commercial Congress at Richmond, December 3, 1923. The speaker, a widely known attorney of Washington and Virginia, was Maj. E. W. R. Ewing, president of the organization which is serving as trustee for the people. Major Ewing is also one of the delegates representing Virginia, commissioned by Governor Trinkle. This organization is the Manassas Battlefield Confederate Park and is incorporated under the laws of Virginia. Incorporation, since there must be a trustee to hold for the public, gives greater perpetuity, assures certainty of action and the most careful supervision by State authority. In part Major Ewing said:

THE MEMORIAL ON THE BATTLEFIELD OF MANASSAS OR BULL RUN IN HONOR OF ALL CONFEDERATE SOLDIERS AND TO BE DEDICATED TO THE MEN OF BOTH ARMIES WHO FELL ON THOSE FIELDS

An inspiring Confederate memorial on the battlefields of Manassas will soon reflect the soul of a great people. This Congress is concerned because interested in any important expression of sentiment. This Congress is interested in commerce, in material development; but its concern is with commerce which has a soul, growth which involves head and heart. This centennial of the

doctrine promulgated and enforced by our own Monroe, at whose tomb a great throng bowed in appreciation on Sunday, is evidence that this Congress is interested in the sentiments of the people. We of the South join all loyal Americans in recognizing the Monroe doctrine as a most valuable national asset; but we entertain for James Monroe sentiments beyond appreciation of that doctrine as a mere asset. To us of the South it means much that Virginia gave him and his great doctrine to the world. It is, therefore, of great significance that the most profound sentiments of a great body of Americans are to weave their expression into a symbol which will stand on two great battlefields with the result that it will be at once practical and modern and commemorative. Thus into this expression of appreciation and love, sterling practical value will blend with irresistible charm and the whole will be softened by the fact that here, amid the roar and shriek and hiss and howl of terrible battle, great numbers died.

To us of the South this memorial will be what Gettysburg is to our friends of the North. To us of the South it is much more. Especially to those of us descended from sturdy Confederate ancestry, this memorial will speak of fight for honest right and in the defense of the incomparable women of the South, the defense of the southern home; and to us this memorial will be an appreciative tribute to the sterling manhood which brought our fathers to their grim protest—not against the government of the Constitution—but a protest against the partial enforcement of that Constitution. This memorial, built by the South, within 32 miles of the Capitol of this great Nation, will help the future better to understand that it was the individual interpretation of that Constitution and the lack of a proper enforcement by the Federal authorities which destroyed the domestic tranquillity of the South. This symbol on these historic fields will be a visible reminder that to better secure the domestic tranquillity of each State the Union was formed, domestic tranquillity being one of the six cornerstones upon which the formers of the Union of sovereign States built this federation. The South can never make it too emphatic that it was the unpardonable unlawfulness against the southern people which forced upon the States some action to restore domestic tranquillity and to safeguard their homes.

Hence from both the standpoint of the causes of the war of which those battles were a part and the high sense of patriotism, though divergent, shown by both armies, the thousands of graves left by those who made the supreme sacrifice are "where honor proudly sleeps"; and it is but the simple duty of North and South to see that "in those graves there are names that shall not be forgotten." This is true of all of our battle fields. To all red-blooded Americans they are the most sacred shrines. As history, for their inspiration, for their light upon future conduct, they should no longer be neglected. Let us mark and monument them and preserve accurately their history; and in the spirit of the following lines, much will be accomplished of the greatest good:

O God! that men would see a little clearer,
Or judge less harshly where they can not see;
O God! that men would draw a little nearer
To one another; they'd be nearer Thee—
And understood.

Through the generosity of broad-minded Americans, this memorial will consist of 150 acres, the main unit of which is the famous Henry land. On this land decisive parts of both battles occurred. There on the hill in the first battle, July 1, 1861, the gallant Confederate general, Bee, of Texas, rallying the out-numbered boys of Johnson and Beauregard against McDowell's flanking movement, fell, exclaiming, "See, Jackson and his Virginians standing like a stone wall." It was up the Henry hill that Ricketts's famous artillery, supported by the red uniformed Zouaves of New York, charged so brilliantly to meet the irresistible Stuart and the Black Horse Cavalry of the theretofore untried Confederates. In closing the second battle, August, 1862, the Confederates, led by the matchless Lee and inspired by Jackson and Longstreet and Ewell, the army positions now reversed, charged up the hill down which they went in the first battle; and the men of the North, led by Pope, McDowell, Kearney, Ricketts, Sigel, Hooker, Banks, and Porter, surrendered to the Confederates on largely the same field, a second brilliant victory. We have mentioned the fewest of the worth-while incidents which occurred there. Every inch of this land has a thrilling story, an uplift of inspiration for any American youth. For the most part an upland, the Bull Run Mountains in the distant blue to the westward, fine farms in the foreground, there is no spot of more charming environment or of finer historic atmosphere.

Every foot of the Lee Highway, leading the 32 miles out of Washington to this memorial park, is rich historically; the Key Bridge, suggesting the Star Spangled Banner, Arlington and its memories of the Lees and Custises, Washington's church at Falls Church, Fairfax Court House and its Washington will, its atmosphere of colonial days and reminiscent of the Fairfaxes, and then the many true stories of daring Mosby and his Confederate raiders; next is Centerville and its famous Braddock Road, built to carry the British red coats on the ill-fated expeditions of 1755; and a few miles yet westward along the Lee Highway for many years known as the old Warrenton turnpike, and we reach the eastern gateway to the battle fields, the interesting old Stone Bridge, first built in the rule of King George. Two miles yet westward and we drive into the central unit of the park. Visiting the little museum and the many points of inspiring interest, we follow the Lee Highway, battle field to right, battle field to left, over there where a Confederate unit, out of ammunition, beat off the Federals with stones, on left the hillside once red with uniforms of dead and dying Zouaves, the result of their never-to-be-forgotten charge against the Confederates—but we can not inspect these fields now. Along the highway we pass Haymarket, westward of the memorial a few miles, and 2 miles farther we reach scenic Thorofare Gap in the Bull Run Mountains. On the ridge to the right lie, in unmarked forgotten graves, men of the North who made the supreme sacrifice in an effort to prevent Lee and Longstreet from joining Jackson who had, a few days before, audaciously stole into Pope's rear, burned his stores and fired the signal for that terrible second battle. Through the Gap and yet to the westward we may visit the birthplace of the great Chief Justice John Marshall, unsurpassed by any constitutional jurist of this or any other country—the great expounder of the American Constitution. Then back into the Lee

Highway at Warrenton, "The capitol of Mosby's Confederacy," unequaled in splendid local history; and thence beyond the tumbled hills and ragged heights of the Blue Ridge into the charming valley of the Shenandoah.

At a cost of $25,000 for the land of the central unit, the memorial is in possession, operating in the rebuilt Henry House the nucleus of a battle-field museum. Ten thousand dollars of this purchase money were contributed by such men as Hon. Wm. G. McAdoo, Hon. John Barton Payne, Mr. Thos. F. Ryan, Dr. Clarence J. Owens, and in smaller donations by hundreds of others from New York to Florida and to the Pacific, gathered by Hon. R. Walton Moore, Member of Congress from Virginia, Hon. Eppa Hunton and Mrs. Dr. Beverly R. Tucker of Richmond, Mr. L. B. Robertson of Manassas, Hon. Joseph B. Anderson of Danville, Hon. J. T. Ramey of Marshall, Va., and many others. The State of Virginia, by act of her recent legislature and the signature of her progressive governor, Hon. R. Lee Trinkle, made another $10,000 available as an earnest expression of her appreciation and indorsement of this work. Title to the property is held by a corporation formed under the strict laws of Virginia. Chartered under the educational and cemetery laws of the State, this organization issues no stock, pays no dividends and no salaries or compensation to any officers or to any member of any committee. All who serve do so from the highest patriotic motives.

To take advantage of the appropriation made by the Virginia Legislature, there must be paid $5,000 more by June, next. About $4,000 more is needed to purchase smaller tracts of land to bring that already bought to abut the Lee Highway. And unless this expression of a great people is to be inadequate, we must have at once publicity funds. The central unit of the park, plans for the whole providing for something even surpassing the famous battle field's markings of Gettysburg, will have an observation tower which will command both fields; executive building, a fireproof museum; and outing accommodations will make of an important area a modern park where tourists may pause as they drive along the Lee Highway, and where all visitors may get back to inviting nature, all the more worth while for its atmosphere of the historical past. As a park alone this project will be worth far more than its cost. The National Fine Arts Commission has indicated a willingness to suggest regarding its artistic features; and experts of the Department of Agriculture agree to plan the landscape work. As a shrine, sanctified by the blood of the men of the South and of the North, this tribute by people who honor their soldiers and who never forget their women, will be an invaluable national asset.

In the main, the officers of the trustee corporation are members of the general organization of the Sons of the Confederate Veterans; and the leadership of the important committee numbers members of the Daughters of the Confederacy and of the Southern Confederated Memorial Association. These are aided by the most prominent men and women from all parts of this country and from the ranks of all parties.

The Southern States, through their governors and other leading men and women, are splendidly cooperating. The South proposes its part in this work as a distinctive tribute to all Confederate soldiers and to the women of the South of that era. Yet, let it be made

emphatic, this work is not being done in any narrow or partisan spirit. While this is primarily a Confederate tribute, do not forget the brave men of McDowell or the staunch heroes of Pope. It is proposed that the main positions of both armies in each battle shall be marked; and the memorial invites Federal monuments and markers and will care for all such as for any other. After the order of Gettysburg, spacious avenues along the battle lines are proposed; and from brier and bush and sad neglect the few markers and monuments now in place will find rescue. New York Federal units have built three of the four present Federal monuments now on the field of the second battle, beautiful and imposing granite creations in memory of the famous New York Duryee Zouaves and the New York Volunteers. At this time they are not easily accessible and stand lonely in unkept surroundings. As part of this Confederate Park, plans call for a boulevard making these Federal monuments and many other points of the greatest historical interest accessible, and we hope to be permitted to give all Federal monuments the care they so richly deserve; and if we may, shall give them the supervision any Confederate monument shall receive. These wishes on the part of this Confederate movement are meeting a happy response. For instance, only last week the secretary of the Tenth New York Volunteer Association, which owns, as trustee, the land on which one of the most imposing Federal monuments stands, wrote me:

I have consulted with the executive committee of our regimental association, and, as representatives of the association, the committee and myself are ready to accept the proposition that the Manassas Battlefield Confederate Park (Inc.), act as trustee for the proper care of the monuments dedicated to those of the Tenth New York Volunteers who fell upon that field, August 30, 1862.

Then in fine spirit of cooperation he closes:

We appreciate the friendly feeling which has prompted your association in this matter.

In this connection, and on behalf of this organization, I have pleasure in expressing appreciation of many valuable courtesies rendered by Mr. Charles A. Shaw, of the New York Monuments Commission. Among other things he writes to me:

It is gratifying to know that at last the fields of Manasses have a superintending agency.

Years ago, from far-away Massachusetts, survivors of those battles brought a huge bowlder inscribed in memory of their gallant Colonel Webster, who fell in the second battle, and planted it at the fatal spot. To-day it takes a searching party and a compass to find that stone. If we may, this organization will drive away the concealing bushes, cut a boulevard by this tender tribute from Massachusetts, and bring it into such accessibility as it, too, richly deserves. This is but another illustration of the broad plans along which this park is operating. In fine cooperative spirit, representative of other Northern States, Gov. Channing H. Cox, of Massachusetts, wrote me:

I am obliged to you for calling my attention to the condition of the Massachusetts memorial in honor of Colonel Webster. I wish you would give me further details as to what other States are doing and what you would like to have Massachusetts do.

Each governor of all the States has been asked to name a commission to determine what representation its State shall have. This opportunity is meeting response. Gov. Walter M. Pierce, of Oregon, to cite another instance of representative cooperation, writes:

I have appointed a committee of three to have charge of Oregon's part in marking the Confederate battlefield.

In brief, something of which the entire Nation will be proud is proposed. The ultimate cost, it is estimated, will be near one and one-half millions. The cooperation of men and women everywhere, who believe in the fullest historic truth, who recognize valor whether clothed in blue or gray, who believe in preserving to the future the glorious inspiration which the epochal fields of first and second Manassas so splendidly furnish, is invited. In the greatest confidence this memorial reaches out to the South, of whose high ideals and splendid courage these fields speak in burning eloquence; and which, as our own Virginia Governor has so well said, typifies "the imperishable glory of Southern Arms." To North and South this Confederate memorial comes in the faith that a "land without ruins is a land without memories—a land without memories is a land without history."

Yes, give me the land where the ruins are spread
And the living tread light on the hearts of the dead;
* * * * * *
Yes, give me a land that hath story and song;
Enshrine the strife of the right with the wrong;
Yes, give me a land with a grave in each spot,
And names in the graves that shall not be forgot.
Yes, give me the land of the wreck and the tomb;
There is grandeur in graves—there is glory in gloom;
For out of the gloom future brightness is born,
And after the night comes the sunshine of morn;
And the graves of the dead with the grass overgrown
May yet form the footstool of liberty's throne,
And each single wreck in the warpath of night,
Shall yet be a rock in the temple of right.

CENTENARY OF THE MONROE DOCTRINE—ODE WRITTEN BY MRS. MINNIGERODE ANDREWS AT THE REQUEST OF THE COMMITTEE

What is one century, in history?
'T is but a pebble on the shores of time.
Yet in the travail of humanity,
We count one hundred years
Of hopes and fears,
Of prayers and tears,
Of devastating crime
And sacrifice sublime
As great, in purport and in magnitude.

What vast reactions swing men
To new creeds—
New policies—new faith
And new ideals!
New needs arise, complexities increase,
And that which was, is not.
To-day discards the robe of yesterday.
To-morrow may, in turn, scorn the to-day.
Yet in this shifting world, kaleidoscopic,
Some old foundations stand.
Some visions still are true.

We witness the removing of such things
As may be shaken.
It is better so.
Under the chariot wheels of progress, fall
Full many a thing and thought into the dust.
Opinions vary;
Principles endure.
And what time can not shake doth still remain!

Hearts open, as a nation's power expands.
Commerce brings contact,
Contact, understanding.
And those who once were "strangers"
Are our friends;
And unfamiliar shores become well-known
As village streets of home.

This was an act of most consummate daring,
Far-seeing wisdom, in that early age
When tidings could not be exchanged and action
Could await the tedium of delay.
A certain elasticity of judgment
Marks nations, in the making. That young blood
Seized on a golden opportunity
To serve its country and extend her power.

As President, Monroe displayed such wisdom
That his administration bore the name,
A holy name—"The Era of Good Feeling."
Would that the world might blazon it abroad.
His famous doctrine, that this infant nation
Should follow certain national policies,
That all may come in peace, but none in war,
Has held America for her own children,
Until her powers and resources, full-grown,
Permit her to assume the world-wide burden,
And share in human suffering everywhere.
Yet she is ever judge; she stands committed
To no participation in affairs
Political, beyond her own wide borders.
And this has been, thus far, the nation's bulwark;
The Monroe doctrine gave them time to grow.

Government, learning, art, diplomacy,
Science, religion, and philosophy,
War, traffic, work, love, and maternity,
Are but God's lanterns on the eternal way;
And the dear light of patriotism shines
For men most clearly, when the lamp is lit
By minds untainted, free from sordid aims,
And held aloft in hands unstained and clean.

To-day we gather, when one hundred years
On time's slow-moving wings have joined themselves
To seven thousand years of yesterdays,
Welcoming generations of his race,
Daughters and sons of daughters and of sons,
His name, his blood, who never saw his face:
Assembling in this city which he loved,
And where his sacred ashes rest to-day,
To honor James Monroe, and to hold fast
The faith his life and doctrine made so clear.
The evolution of America
And the distresses of a bleeding world
Permit us and require us to accept
Our place among great powers now, and bear
Our share in human suffering everywhere.
America, full-grown, will play her part,

Knowing her nursery days are past, thank God
The Monroe doctrine gave us time to grow,
The Pan-American democracies,
Shielded the infant States till they were strong,
Strong for great purposes and fit to judge,
Brave to accept the politics of Christ.

The inspirations of our fathers hold:
Their lofty principles are ours to-day;
Despite the passing of so many years,
And changes of this twentieth century.

The evolution of America
Shows how a few stout hearts have, under God,
Become the arbiters of great affairs,
And hold the craz'd world's balance in their hands,
The hope of ancient dynasties undone,
And hungry hordes in desolated lands.

Bright names do sprinkle all the firmament
Of history in our continental world;
Generous, astute, far-seeing, Edmund Burke
And other English statesmen, then did throw
The glow of honest English thought and purpose
On the bright pages of our independence.

Jefferson, called the Sage of Monticello,
Wrought out the policies that shaped the State,
Adding to the great contracts of the past
A document immortal, based on them—
Based on the law of God, to Moses given;
Based on the Magna Charta, that all men
Are, and must still be, brothers; born in freedom,
And equal in their opportunities.

George Mason, thoughtful by the broad Potomac,
Washington, Franklin, Hamilton, and Adams,
Payne, Madison, Monroe, and Patrick Henry,
Set their own seals and souls upon the Nation
New born, to teach mankind democracy.
Absolved from all allegiance but to Heaven,
And to each other, patriots true and tried,
They pledged themselves, their lives and all their fortunes,
Their sacred honor and their utmost power.

Through all vicissitudes, the stanchest friendship
Bound Jefferson, Monroe, and Madison.
Such men, united in integrity,
Swing many to their views of public good.

When authorized to deal with France's Emperor,
And buy New Orleans for this Government,
That brilliant boy whom Jefferson befriended,
That younger statesman, that "beloved disciple,"
Monroe, with Robert Livingston, in Paris,
Without instructions, bought—Louisiana.

THE MONROE DOCTRINE—BY HORACE C. CARLISLE, BIRMINGHAM, ALA.

Back when America was young,
  There came a shadow stealing
From out the distances afar,
Like clouds of night across a star,
To menace, minimize, and mar
  The Era of Good Feeling—
If possible, to set at naught
The peace for which the fathers fought.

Monroe, conservative and kind,
  Yet daring in his dealing,
Poured out his being into thought
Against the agencies that sought
By waste and war to set at naught
  The Era of Good Feeling—
And, with his customary care,
He wrote the Monroe doctrine there.

The Monroe doctrine, down the years,
  Concealing, yet revealing
The automatic, higher plan
That guarantees a peace to man,
Is that which happily began
  The Era of Good Feeling—
When hate and war were set aside,
And men with right were satisfied.

When nations all shall realize
  The urgent need of kneeling
In consecrated, fervent prayer
To God for his abiding care,
There will continue everywhere
  The Era of Good Feeling—
Which, lengthened by the Hand Divine,
On like the stars shall shine and shine.

FOREWORD AND CONVOCATION—BY N. E. WOODWARD, NEW YORK CITY

To James Monroe, fifth President of the U. S. A.:

On December the twenty-third, eighteen hundred and twenty-three—one hundred years ago to-day!—that "edict of the Western Hemisphere," the Monroe doctrine, came to birth. (Under peculiar stress of circumstance, and exigency of the day; an emergency! expedient perhaps for all time.) Amicably, this messenger went forth, o'er the "Seven Seas," heralding its cause to the world. The "Americas are no longer to be violated by an exploiting foreign government!" And to this day that proclamation has afforded us a sense of security, and a safe refuge.

Americans, South as well as North, I admonish you, let not the radical propaganda of a vacuous, vagary-minded populace, nor the elusive ridicule of a renegade subject, conjure your feality.

For progression and fulfillment are the fruits of sagacity.

E. W.-W.

CONVOCATION

To ex-President James Monroe, U. S. A.

1

Compatriot, will you hear, even to-day,
The approaching multitude? They come
Out of the silence of years; a century now
Gone, bringing their tribute of praise.
Unto a soldier, a statesman!
Our patron, magnanimous, acclaimed!
Your beneficent foresight, has glorified
America's crucial age!

2

At Trenton! We see you there, wounded,
Yet, patient, and brave.
Pursuing in battle these noble aims,
That had sent you from college to war.
We follow you on, in your missions to France,
Insurmountable barriers passed.
Your fertile brain has engraved your name
In America's golden book of fame.

3

It is eighteen twenty-three!
Our blackened hour; you come
And "fling your gauntlet in the ring."
A humane soul, a comprehending mind,
Firm hand, a voice of steel,
A steady, measured tread
That gave the challenge to the issue paramount!
Columbia's Paean! Yet, resounding o'er the waves.

4

Who dares profane with petty,
Selfish bigotry, malign this name with trivial
Accusations? All normal life inherits.
His is the grandeur; a sculptured,
Yet, a living thing. Not a stone that's dead.
For it's legions, there I hear,
The multitudinous symphony
Of the Western Hemisphere.

(N. E. Woodward, New York City, originally from Louisville, Ky.; pen name, Edmon Wolfe-Woodward.)

ADDRESS OF DR. WILLIAM M. THORNTON, DEAN DEPARTMENT OF ENGINEERING, UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA

Ladies and gentlemen, in the absence of the eloquent and gracious president of the University of Virginia, the honor of welcoming these pilgrims of patriotism to the chosen home of James Monroe has fallen to one who for many years has dwelt beneath the roof which once sheltered the illustrious author of the Monroe doctrine. I call it his chosen home because his birth in Westmoreland County was an act of destiny and not of choice; because his legal début in Fredericksburg was a mere bivouac in his swift march to public honor; because Albemarle County even then held in Monticello the shrine of his youthful loyalty, of his personal affection, and of his political faith.

Little has been published, probably little will ever be known, of James Monroe's earliest years. A country lad, he doubtless grew to manhood amidst the wholesome simplicities of old-fashioned Virginian country life. They tell us that he was 6 feet tall, rather ungainly, round shouldered, with deep-set gray-blue eyes, a kindly face prematurely lined, and features delicately molded. He entered William and Mary College in 1774 at the age of 16, withdrew in 1776, at the end of his second session, enlisted in the Third Virginia Regiment, and for four stirring years marched with George Washington, fighting all the way from Harlem Heights to Monmouth. Swift promotions came to him. In 1776 he was a lieutenant; in 1779, at the end of his campaigns, on the recommendation of Washington himself, he was lieutenant colonel in the Revolutionary Army.

In 1780 Monroe came under the stimulating influence of Thomas Jefferson. First we learn that the young soldier is reading law under Jefferson's personal tuition, and then that he is swept into the current of politics. He is elected to the Virginia House of Delegates and receives an appointment to the governor's council. In 1783 he wins his seat in the United States House of Representatives. His term of service in Congress ended, he marries Elizabeth Kort-

wright in 1786, and establishes himself in the practice of law in Fredericksburg. Within a year he is back into politics again, in the Legislature of Virginia, then in the Virginia convention to ratify the new Federal Constitution, and, finally, in 1790 he is sent to the United States Senate, where he wins notice as a disciple of Thomas Jefferson and a vigorous opponent of the administration of the great general, whose battles he had been fighting 10 years before.

It was in 1790 that Monroe chose Albemarle County as his home. He came here to be near Thomas Jefferson, purchased a house in Charlottesville, bought a small farm lying west of the town, and in the farmhouse made his new home. Here he lived until 1793, when he secured an additional tract adjoining Monticello, built for himself a tiny dwelling, and called his place "Ash Lawn." His first home was afterwards purchased by Jefferson as the seat of the new university, and the house inhabited by Monroe still stands, the oldest house on university grounds. It is called in his honor Monroe Hill, and the fine harmony of its simple lines, the broad, green lawns shaded by a vast walnut tree that might well be of Monroe's own planting, the noble curve of the Blue Mountains shining in the west seem to hold proud memories of Virginia's heroic age.

In the crowded public life of Monroe there was scant leisure for quiet days on his Albemarle farm. Twenty-five years elapse between his removal to the neighborhood of Monticello and his elevation to the Presidency of the United States. Within this period fell two terms of service as Governor of Virginia, two missions to Europe (one as minister to France at the bidding of Washington, and one as envoy extraordinary to France, to Spain, to Great Britain, under Jefferson's auspices), and six years of service as Secretary of State to President Madison. Yet during all these years he maintained his residence in Albemarle, his intimate association with Thomas Jefferson, and his close alliance with Madison and Jefferson in political thought and in public action. Even when the full burden of the Presidency of the United States rested on his shoulders he accepted an appointment on the board of visitors of Central College and bore an active share with Madison and Jefferson in its organization and in the work of construction. His name appears on the list of subscribers from Albemarle County to its endowment fund, and the letter from the visitors to the speaker of the house of delegates, offering the new college to the State as the nucleus of its projected university, bears Monroe's name as the first of the signers. Still later, in 1826, after his retirement from the Presidency, he accepted an appointment as one of the visitors to the university and served on the governing board until, in 1831, death ended his earthly labors. It is not without reason that the University of Virginia pays honor and love and reverence to the memory of James Monroe. She does not forget that Jefferson and Madison and Monroe together laid her corner stone, formulated her policies, launched her earliest endowment fund, guided her infant years by their counsels, and laid down her service only with their lives.

The history of politics offers no example of friendship so beautiful, so exalted, so unselfish, so harmonious as that which united these three great statesmen. If Jefferson was the man of deep political vision and Madison the man of serene political wis-

dom, Monroe was surely the man of broad political common sense. It is this which explains his swift success in difficult negotiations, his capable conduct of executive functions, his fortunate divinations of the public mind. We count him the first to bring into the White House genuine Americanism. As far back as 1785 his youthful ardor pressed upon a reluctant Congress the peculiar importance of the control of the Mississippi to the prosperity of the new Republic. Sent by Jefferson to France as antidote to the timid caution of Livingston, he exhibited the courage and intuition needed to stretch the bands of the Constitution and complete the Louisiana Purchase. Presented by Congress with a national road bill which would have established Federal jurisdiction over national highways to the detriment of the rights of the States, he promptly returned it with a veto message which has controlled the policy of the Government even down to our own day. By some strange sixth sense this genuine American President, with little of Jefferson's imagination, with less of Madison's learning, could yet interpret the heart of the American people and guide their destiny into the highway of future greatness.

The story of the genesis of the Monroe doctrine is too intricate for brief handling. The writers of alleged American history are transforming it more and more from simple fact into decorated fable. Yet some things are ascertained as beyond dispute, and these are noted here because of the light they throw both on Monroe's character and on this beautiful and memorable friendship. It was in the late summer of 1823 that a conference of European powers was called to consider the attitude of the Holy Alliance toward the revolting colonies of Spain in South America. Our minister in London, Richard Rush, apprised by Canning of this movement, at once communicated with Monroe, and the President, not even waiting to submit the documents to his own Cabinet, forwarded copies of them to Monticello and asked the advice of Jefferson and Madison. In his letter of the 17th of October, 1823, transmitting the papers, Monroe wrote as follows:

> My own impression is that we ought to meet the proposal of the British Government and to make it known that we would view an interference on the part of European powers and especially an attack on the colonies as an attack on ourselves.

To this Jefferson replied, 24th of October, 1823, advising that we should "most sedulously cherish a cordial friendship" with Great Britain, and adding "that nothing would tend more to knit our affections than to be fighting once more side by side in the same cause." Madison was willing to go even further and suggested explicit disapproval of interference by European powers with the revolting Greeks in favor of their Turkish oppressors. The matter then came before the Cabinet, in which the Secretary of State took strong grounds against any alliance with Great Britain. Adams advised that we "make an American cause and adhere inflexibly to that." The event remained uncertain until Congress was about to assemble. Monroe in the meantime doubtless showed himself "conspicuous for patient considerateness to all sides." Adams himself ascribes to him "a mind sound in its ultimate judgments and

firm in its final conclusions." Canning, with "zeal much abated of late," weakened the force of his proposal by hesitating to extend full and immediate recognition to the new South American Republics. Then came the message of December 2, 1823, announcing to all European powers the American policy of nonintervention in the political affairs of Europe, but warning them 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.

As for the newly enfranchised American Republics—

> We could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them or controlling in any other manner their destiny by any European power in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States.

As we thus bring together Monroe's first "impression" and the final draft of his famous message, we seem to get a clearer vision of the operation of the President's mind, which after patient consideration of all sides reached its ultimate judgment and stood firm on its own final conclusion.

There have been writers who strove to belittle James Monroe. In the constellation of great Americans then shining in our western skies his was not, perhaps, the most luminous star; but the record set down below surely stands for greatness:

Lieutenant colonel on Washington's nomination before he was 21.
Member of United States Congress before he was 25.
Member of the Virginia convention before he was 30.
Minister to France (Washington's appointment) before he was 35.
Governor of Virginia before he was 41.
Minister to France (Louisiana purchase) before he was 45.
Secretary of State (Madison's appointment) at 53.
President of the United States at 58.
Reelected with but a single opposing vote.

May we not rightly add to this list his formulation of a great political doctrine, drawn from the calm depths of his own quiet spirit, rising higher than the wisdom of his political counselors and guides, and destined to serve humanity as the model of a national life whose aims are justice and peace?

ADDRESS OF DR. J. GARNETT KING, MAYOR OF FREDERICKSBURG, VA.

Ladies and gentlemen, it is my pleasant task to-day to speak, as a fellow townsman of James Monroe, of his connection with the city of Fredericksburg, where he once lived and practiced law. It was his home and it was from within its precincts that he went to war, to high offices, and to the White House. Among the many things of which it is proud, not the least is that James Monroe once owned his home there and was a participant in its social and civil life.

It does not seem to me that it is inapropos here while speaking of this patriot of America's infancy to remind you of one or two of the men who were his contemporaries in Fredericksburg and who, although older than he, he numbered among his friends. For although I am not here to speak of Fredericksburg save as it is connected with the name of James Monroe, it is hard to picture

his life in that old roadside village of bygone days without speaking of the men who were among the foremost of his fellow citizens.

It is an astonishing thing, even to those who have often heard it related; it is, indeed, an almost unbelievable coincidence, that from this small town there should have gone forth three men who were destined to write their names in the boldest letters upon the pages of American history, each the maker of an epoch, each the founder of a fact, each to become essential to the establishment and continuance of American liberty. These three men—nor are they the only great men whom Fredericksburg has produced—were George Washington, who led the American Armies to victory when it is doubtful if any other living man could have done it in the face of toryism, starvation, and disloyalty; John Paul Jones, that strange genius whose ships rolled under swelling sails through the seas that washed England's shores and who won for his adopted land the freedom of the ocean against the greatest maritime power on earth; and James Monroe, who as fifth President of the United States proclaimed the doctrine that bears his name and thus forever forbade European conquest in North or South America.

James Monroe came to Fredericksburg when he was about 16, leaving his home at the head of Monroe Creek in Westmoreland to make his home with an uncle, William Jones, in the town, where he could get educational advantages which he sought, and in 1774, when he was 16, he left it to go to William and Mary College. During those first years he met in Fredericksburg John Paul Jones, then residing there; George Washington, whose mother still lived in the town, although he had gone with his wife to Mount Vernon; Hugh Mercer, later to become his commander; and at least three other men who were to be generals in the Revolutionary Army in which he served as a lieutenant. He remained at William and Mary until shortly after the guns of freedom boomed their challenge at Lexington. Then, with John Marshall and other students of that old college—already established more than 115 years—he left to take up arms, and coming back to Fredericksburg he entered the Continental Army and was made a lieutenant in the First Virginia Regiment, commanded by Hugh Mercer, erstwhile an apothecary in his home town.

Going north with the Army he took part in the campaign about New York, and with Weedon, Mercer, Wallace, and Washington, everyone from the same town, he crossed the Delaware when that forlorn hope ventured forth against the British Army, staked on a night march the whole future of America—and won. With William Washington he led the advance of the Army into Trenton and in the heat of the fighting was wounded in the shoulder.

Others may tell the detailed story of Monroe's life, of his military service with Lord Sterling, of the work he did as military commissioner in the South and for which he was made a lieutenant colonel. It is my part, I think, to speak more of those events which in some way related him to the town which he had adopted for his home, and so I shall pass over that and come to the year 1782, when his military career ended, and coming "back home" he was chosen a delegate to the Virginia Assembly from the district of which Fredericksburg was a part.

He went from the assembly to the Continental Congress and there, although he was but 25 years of age, he held his own on the floor of that memorable body, in which were gathered the greatest intellects of America, with statesmen far more experienced in government and politics than he, a mere youth, could possibly have been.

It was while here that he married Miss Kortwright, of New York, and when he again came to Fredericksburg his bride came with him and they prepared to make their home in the little village straggling along the banks of the Rappahannock, with board sidewalks and worn and rutted roads for streets. A village that to-day would appear to be a forlorn and hopeless place, but that in that time was a progressive center, an important shipping point for tobacco, flour, and grain, where thrifty Scotchmen had built up a world trade and sent out their own ships to ply the seas. He bought a lot and put a house on it, and the house stands to-day, labeled "The Home of James Monroe," although it has been moved from the place where it stood when the young lawyer and his bride came to take up their residence in it, and then he opened his law office in a small brick building that is also standing, now in the center, but in that early day on the outskirts of the town. And for the next two years, from 1786 to 1788, he traveled to the county courts throughout eastern Virginia, as was the custom, and pitted himself against the great lawyers of that day, among whom were such men as Patrick Henry and John Marshall.

But for some reason James Monroe's fellow men had long since singled him out for their servant, and at the end of two years he left Fredericksburg again, this time chosen a delegate to the State convention to consider the ratification of the United States Constitution that had been drawn at Philadelphia after months of wrangling by the delegates of the Thirteen States. And in this State convention, heeding the voice of that august statesman, George Mason, whose vision saw slavery casting far before it the shadow of civil war, and of Patrick Henry and Tazewell, who lent their eloquence to Mason's pleas, Monroe opposed the acceptance by Virginia of the Constitution as it was, and urged his native State to stay out of the Union until a new constitutional convention met and drew a paper in which the importation of slaves was prohibited, and in which freedom, by a gradual process, was assured the negroes then held in bondage, and a method was provided to pay the slave owners for the property they lost when the slaves were set free.

Monroe, like Mason and those elder statesmen who plead with the convention day after day to stay out of the Union until the delegates dealt fully with the slavery issue, saw ahead the danger in slurring over this question, the danger that, because the voice of himself and those who sided with him was not heard, was in time to break over America in a deluge of blood and leave dead on its battle fields and its camps one white man whose average age was 22 years for every negro man, woman, or child held in slavery; that was to bring bitterness and poverty, and was to cost ten times the value of all these slaves. And seeing it, he asked Virginia to go into the Union only when the New England States and the far Southern States consented to forego their agreement, which Washington called a "dirty bargain," and to consent to the plea of the Central States for the abolition of slavery. But against his protest and against the

advice of men like Henry, Mason, and Tazewell, the convention by a majority of 10 accepted the Constitution. Eighty years after their descendants paid for it in blood and agony.

It is a splendid commentary on the foresight of this group of men that the first 14 amendments to the Constitution are expressed in the exact words they advocated when the document was drawn. Had the Virginia convention of 1788 listened to their words of warning, America would not have had a Civil War.

But although Monroe was with the defeated in the convention, he had hardly reached home when his country called him again, this time by appointment to the United States Senate to fill the vacancy created by the death of William Grayson. He served here until 1794, when, at the age of 36, he was sent as ambassador to France, and when he had finished that mission, an unfortunate one for him, because he spoke more freely of liberty in France than the Secretary of State desired him to, and he received a severe reprimand, he came home and his fellow Virginians proved that to them liberty was as dear in France as it was in America, and that they approved his words of encouragement to a nation struggling from tyranny into freedom through a sea of blood, by electing him governor of their State.

There were many steps in Monroe's remarkable career that took him from a farm in Westmoreland County to the highest offices in the land.

He was a town councilman in the city of Fredericksburg, a lieutenant and a lieutenant colonel in the Army, a military commissioner in the South, a member of the Virginia Assembly, delegate to the Continental Congress, member of the State constitutional convention, minister to France, special envoy to France to conclude the Louisiana purchase, governor of Virginia, ambassador to England, special envoy to Spain in connection with the purchase of west Florida, again governor of his native State, Secretary of State, Secretary of War, and finally was chosen to the highest office within the gift of his fellow men, the Presidency of the United States.

It was the remarkable career of a versatile and able man. Nothing save sheer ability could have raised him from his comparatively lowly station—for his was not a rich and landed family like that of the Washingtons, the Lees, and the Masons—to the high eminence he attained, save his aptitude for government, his fearlessness, his devotion to his country, and finally, that untarnished honesty that caused him, in spite of the offices he held and the power he attained, to die in New York a poor man without property or money save what was sufficient for his modest needs.

He gave himself to his country. He took nothing from it for himself. He put the good of posterity above his personal gain. He left, in the story of his devoted life, a lesson for Americans and a standard of patriotism that, were each citizen to adopt it to-day, would remove from our national life the murmur of discontent and bring us back that better and more glorious unity that our forefathers knew when America was young and weak, and the world's hand was ready to raise against her if her patriots faltered or her great men substituted greed of wealth and power for ideals of liberty, freedom, and equality.

ADDRESS OF MISS MARY BOYCE TEMPLE, PRESIDENT WOMAN'S AUXILIARY, SOUTHERN COMMERCIAL CONGRESS

We have met together to celebrate a world event. We have come to pay homage to the memory of a great Virginian, and to celebrate the centennial anniversary of the pronouncement of one of the three greatest instruments of our national life, the Declaration of Independence, our Constitution, the Monroe doctrine. We have assembled here in Richmond, on Virginia soil, the home State and home city of the three great authors of these three great factors, without which we would not to-day be a Nation—the great and shining Nation of the earth, standing luminously forth, sought after and looked to by all other peoples of the globe.

The occasion is so notable and so fraught with deep significance in the history of our country, and of the Western Hemisphere, nay, even of the world, that here are assembled all local, national, and international Government representatives—the chief executive of the State of Virginia, Governor Trinkle; a personal representative of the President of the United States; and the distinguished foreign diplomats—all to add luster to the memory of a former great President of the United States. In this outstanding national and international occasion I have wanted the women of the South and of the Nation to have a part. During this momentous century, from 1823 to 1923, with its potential history of astounding changes and developments, industrial and commercial expansion, political adjustments, rise and fall of nations, and wiping out of powerful dynasties, the life of the people of the earth has been revolutionized. The whole plan of living has been changed by the amazing and startling inventions and scientific discoveries.

In these marvelous changes and rebirth, what, may we ask, has been woman's part? Down through the ages there have been brilliantly exceptional cases of women shining forth as profound students, such as Hypatia, Marie Agnesi, and as dominating rulers. However, formerly, almost insurmountable obstacles were encountered by women. But during the last one hundred years her emancipation has become complete. Even before the accomplishment of suffrage, the most liberal spirit toward her animated the civilized world. To-day, the open door to triumph, according to her ability, in almost every occupation, is her's. In education, along both old and new lines, her advancement has been unmistakable. One of the great steps forward—the throwing open of the doors of nearly all the old established men's colleges and universities—give her in every land almost the same access to learning enjoyed by her brothers. Coeducation has made it possible for every woman to have the highest advantages for self-improvement. In teaching, from kindergarten to highest specialization, she has achieved striking success. Domestic science and household economics are distinct sciences developed by her, which have led to the health of the Nation and thus to its greater happiness and prosperity. In the sciences of astronomy, medicine, physics, and physiology such names as Maria Mitchell, Miss Whitney, Mrs. Ellen H. Richards, Dr. Annie G. Lyle in discovery of scarlet fever serum, Madam Curie herself of our Sister Republic of France—and Miss Sullivan in her new method of teaching defectives, can be named with extreme pride. Woman's advance in art, from the fine art of painting and sculpture

to the practical work of design, in its manifold forms, is almost phenomenal. Glancing at the work of Cecelia Beaux, of Mary MacMonnies, of Mrs. Kenyon Cox, Kate Carl, Enid Yandell, Julia M. Bracken, we see the exalted place woman's genius has given her in the art world. We point with exultation to the great triumph of women and to their brilliant achievement along every line of usefulness—physical, mental, and moral.

Women's expansion into the new life of the century has been markedly shown, and though by no means giving up the ornamental and social she has yet demonstrated her right to be recognized in the broader realm of discovery, invention, and politics. She has everywhere entered man's chosen paths, except in naval and military operations, and she now boasts of holding the balance of power politically. And in this century of superb and stupendous triumphs in economic and liberal arts, in electricity, in history, in science, in architecture, in agriculture, in machinery, in archæology, in education, and in fine arts, woman's progress has been such as to be suggestive of untold and signal possibilities for the future.

We, the women's auxiliary of the Southern Commercial Congress, are here to show our high sense of the significance of such a patriotic occasion as this; to take our place in the pilgrimage to the national shrine sacred to the memory of James Monroe, one of those who helped to build our Nation. Virginia is rich in its background of mighty men and mighty events. Her wealth of history is glorious and enthralling—embracing so much that was crucial and supreme in the annals of the early years of the Colonies and of the Republic.

We pause in reverential memory of those magnificent men and of their glorious deeds. We come here, where the air is redolent with that noble past, to receive anew the inspiration of Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, Patrick Henry, Marshall, and a score of others; to be aroused by their words and deeds, all inseparably intertwined with the formation of our Nation and with the luminous pages of success and victory in the perilous early days.

Such splendid occasions as this lead to the formation of a strong national spirit, the spirit that each of us should cultivate. There is great need for our emulating the physical staminum, the intellectual strength, and the spiritual power that made giants of those Virginians of a century or more ago.

By our presence here we are performing a patriotic and exalted duty. We pledge ourselves anew to the upbuilding of the true American spirit. To this we rededicate ourselves, that we may courageously and unfalteringly serve the Nation we love so well; that we may incite and kindle in all others a supreme and unselfish devotion to flag and country.

And though we have only the memory of James Monroe and of his epoch-making message to Congress, we have with us here to-day, as the honor guests of this notable celebration his descendants. In them with the distinguished Monroe blood has been united much other notable blood, especially that of one of the most prominent and striking of the old New York families—the Gouverneurs. The character, usefulness, efficiency, and brilliancy of these descendants is an honor to their great progenitor.

I have the pleasure of presenting to you Miss Maud Gouverneur, who is active in all good works, both public and private. Mrs.

Gouverneur, the mother, was a writer, and her reminiscences attracted wide interest at the attractive and much-frequented home on Rhode Island Avenue, Washington, where, on the weekly reception day, could be met around a table groaning with the most delicious of confections, cakes, and salads, the most sought-after people of Washington's then most exclusive social set, those prominent in official and diplomatic life, in literary and scientific circles. An atmosphere of culture and intellectuality pervaded the drawing room and made it indeed a salon, in which Miss Gouverneur was a guiding spirit.

In introducing to you Mrs. Rose Gouverneur Hoes of Washington City, president of the Society of the Monroe Descendants, I present to you a great woman. Mrs. Hoes is an untiring worker in all church and charitable endeavors, also in the Colonial Dames, and in many public enterprises, especially in the Monticello Foundation. She is an assistant to the Government in preserving at the Smithsonian Institute the dresses of the wives of the Presidents of the United States, first ladies of the land. This has been an arduous undertaking, but Mrs. Hoes, with her perseverance, energy, enthusiasm, and tact has accomplished what possibly no other woman could have done—and a beautiful inestimable service to history and to the Nation. And as a writer, a speaker, and as a student of history Mrs. Hoes stands forth among the shining lights. While as a social leader her charm of manner and inherited gifts make her preeminent. I have the pleasure of presenting Mrs. Rose Gouverneur Hoes—who will speak for the descendants of her honored great great-grandfather, President James Monroe.

I have messages and regrets from Mrs. Roosevelt, Mrs. Wilson, Mrs. Larz Anderson, and a message from Lady Astor.

LETTER AND MESSAGE FROM LADY ASTOR

4 St. James Square, S. W. I.,
November 9, 1923.

Miss Mary Boyce Temple,
President General, Woman's Auxiliary,
The Southern Commercial Congress,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Miss Temple: I find it impossible to say no to your suggestion, which I deeply appreciate, that I should join your committee as an honorary member. An appeal to take part, even if it can only be in spirit, in an occasion so bound up with Virginia's past and present greatness is irresistible and, although I know you will understand that my share must inevitably be only a nominal one, I do very gladly and gratefully accept your invitation.

Sincerely,

Nancy Astor.

MESSAGE FROM LADY ASTOR, MEMBER OF THE BRITISH PARLIAMENT

I wish it were possible for me to be in Richmond for an occasion so eloquent of Virginia's great history, and so full of hope for the future which the South has before it. I am convinced that the way of true progress does not lie in despising the past nor in ignor-

ing the lessons of the past, but in being loyal to the past in the light of present and future needs. Our forefathers had great and bold ideals for the South, and it is being faithful to the spirit of their love for the South that we can most worthily commemorate them.

I do especially believe that the women of the South have great traditions of courage and service to fulfill. They have already proved in history that they have the qualities of mind and heart which a nation can not afford not to use to the full in public as well as in private life. I think we have drawn an unnatural distinction in the past between these two spheres and have failed to see that a right home environment depends on right laws and administration as well as on what are generally known as domestic virtues. I know the women of the South will not fail to respond to the needs of to-day for women's help in a wider sphere, because they will know that by so doing they will be true to the best traditions of our past.

LIST OF MEMBERS OF SOCIETY OF DESCENDANTS OF JAMES MONROE

Mrs. Rose Gouverneur Hoes, 1410 Twentieth Street, Washington, D. C.

Miss Maud C. Gouverneur, 1410 Twentieth Street, Washington, D. C.

Laurence Gouverneur Hoes, 1410 Twentieth Street, Washington, D. C.

Minor Fairfax Heiskell Gouverneur, 8 St. Johns Road, Baltimore, Md.

Mrs. Mary Fairfax Gouverneur, 8 St. Johns Road, Baltimore, Md.

Miss Esther Gouverneur, 8 St. Johns Road, Baltimore, Md.

Mr. Harry Freeman Clark, 2264 Cathedral Avenue, Washington, D. C.

Mrs. Harry Freeman Clark, 2264 Cathedral Avenue, Washington, D. C.

Lieut. Gouverneur Hoes, 1904 Spruce Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

Mrs. Green Clay Goodloe, 1814 S Street, Washington, D. C.

Mrs. William Crawford Johnson, Court Square, Frederick, Md.

Miss Emily Crawford Johnson, Court Square, Frederick, Md.

Monroe Johnson, 5311 Seventh Street, Washington, D. C.

Mrs. Monroe Johnson, 5311 Seventh Street, Washington, D. C.

Mrs. John L. Richardson, Belair Md.

Lloyd Nicholas Richardson, Belair, Md.

John Monroe Richardson, Engineer's Building, 1716 California Avenue, Denver, Colo.

Mrs. John W. Stork, 112 Roland Avenue, Roland Park, Md.

Mrs. Marian Gouverneur Thelin, 1 Harvest Road, Baltimore, Md.

Miss Elizabeth Kortright Monroe Emory, 1 Harvest Road, Baltimore, Md.

Mrs. Edwin Sefton, Hotel Berkeley 7 Avenue Matignon, Paris, France.

Fairfax Heiskell Gouverneur, 64 Meigs Street, Rochester, N. Y.

Mrs. Caroline Jeffers Gouverneur, 64 Meigs Street, Rochester, N. Y.

Minor Fairfax Heiskell Gouverneur II, 64 Meigs Street, Rochester, N. Y.

Mrs. William M. McIntire, 722 Gladstone Avenue, Roland Park, Md.

RESPONSE BY MISS ROSE GOUVENEUR HOES, PRESIDENT OF THE SOCIETY OF DESCENDANTS OF JAMES MONROE

Mr. President, Miss Temple, and fellow citizens, it is my very great pleasure as president of the Society of Decendants of James Monroe to make an address on this very happy occasion, and I have taken for my subject James Monroe, a fearless Virginian.

I am sure that you will pardon me in my pride of birth if I dwell for a few moments in the beginning on the ancestry of Monroe which has recently been published by one of the family, but I regret to say not a descendant.

James Monroe was born in Westmoreland County, Va., on the land granted his great grandfather, Andrew Monroe, by the Crown. The homestead was a modest one, well in keeping with colonial days, and was situated on the banks of Monroe Creek, a stream named in honor of the family, a tributary of the Potomac River. The history of Andrew Monroe, the immigrant, is picturesque in the extreme. He was the third son of David Monroe and grandson of Robert Monroe, fourteenth Baron of Fowlis, a house which has for nearly 800 years existed in Scotland in uninterrupted line of male descent. He fought at the Battle of Preston with the rank of major, and when the Scotch Army was defeated he, with 3,000 others, was taken prisoner. Some of these captives were sold for slaves and others were sent to the plantations in America. Andrew Monroe had the good fortune to land in Virginia. And it is decidedly an interesting fact that a son of his, John Monroe, a Virginia planter, remembered his father's old home in Scotland and called his plantation "Fowles."

At 16 James Monroe left the home of his childhood to enter William and Mary College. Williamsburg must have seemed like a place of considerable importance to the unsophisticated country lad, and a feeling of homesickness must have occasionally crept over him in the midst of his strange surroundings. Such childish sensations, however, were soon to be thrust aside by more startling ones. In every colony electrifying news was in the air, the war clouds hung heavy, and soon every student was echoing and reechoing Patrick Henry's immortal words, "We must fight." Musty schoolbooks were hurriedly thrust aside and muskets took their places. News came that the British marines had broken into the Williamsburg magazine, a stone octagon built by Governor Spotswood about 50 years before. That same day a company of students was formed on the green, and there was scarcely a vacancy in the rank and file of the college boys. One startling event followed another, and history records that one week after the Battle of Bunker Hill, on June 24, 1776, Cadet James Monroe, assisted by five other students, moved the gunpowder from what was known as the "palace" to the powder house. Six months later a body of college students marched north to join the Continental Army, and James Monroe, one of the number, had just passed his eighteenth birthday.

Thus it was that James Monroe, barely out of his teens, participated in the battles of Harlem Heights, White Plains, Trenton, Brandywine, Germantown, and Monmouth. It was at Trenton that he particularly distinguished himself, showing on this battlefield a fearlessness quite worthy of record. It is generally conceded by historians that Lieut. James Monroe was the first man to cross the Delaware. He was sent across the river to Penningtons Road by his commanding officer, Capt. William Washington, on scout duty with a piece of artillery, and after all night service joined the army the next morning. Almost before dawn the British soldiers were entering Trenton, pell-mell, in such haste, in fact, that it might be likened to the rush, fright, and confusion which will likely occur when the last trump sounds. Some of the Hessian guns stood in the open streets, where they were manned and ready to deliver fire, when with his captain Lieutenant Monroe rushed upon these gunners in the face of a terrific fire and captured the pieces. He was wounded in this exploit by a ball which hit him in the shoulder and cut an artery. For "bravery under fire" Monroe was promoted by Washington on the battlefield to the rank of captain.

It was in 1794 that Monroe was sent to France by President Washington as second United States minister. He arrived in Paris just after the fall of Robespierre, and found France in the most turbulent state. In sending Monroe to France, President Washington was trying the experiment of carrying on his administration on a nonpartisan basis, which, however, he learned in time was a mistake, and he was also trying to appease Jefferson. Monroe from his earliest political career was Jefferson's protégé and friend, but he and his distinguished preceptor did not belong to the Washington party. From the very beginning of his diplomatic career the administration at home was making affairs very uncomfortable for the young Virginia statesman. It seemed a case almost of "there was nothing right he said, and there was nothing right he did." Suddenly he was recalled by Edmund Randolph, the Secretary of State, in the most summary fashion. Monroe, smarting under the indignity and injustice of the situation, with fighting blood in his veins, reached home full of wrathful indignation, and was given a cordial greeting in the form of a dinner party where such men as Vice President Jefferson, Dayton, the Speaker, and Chief Justice McKean and other conspicuous men were present, and his native State, Virginia, thoroughly indorsed his foreign course by electing him almost immediately governor.

Monroe immediately set to work writing a book of 500 pages in justification of his conduct which he entitled "Monroe's views of the conduct of the Executive." This work was a scathing denunciation of his treatment by the Washington administration, and naturally created a sensation, as it was at a time when Washington was at his highest pinnacle, the idol of the American people. Washington felt it and wrote to Timothy Pickering under date of August 29, 1797, "Colo. Monroe passed through Alexandria last week but did not honor me with a call." A few days later he again wrote, "What, as far as can be guessed at, is the sentiment of Monroe's voluminous work which I have not seen yet but have sent for it?" In the library at Mount Vernon for many years there was a copy of this book with the margins of the pages covered with annotations made by the great chieftain. The publishing of this book was a fearless act.

A few years later, in 1803, President Jefferson sent Monroe on his second mission to France as special envoy in connection with the great Louisiana Purchase. Robert R. Livingston was resident minister there at the time, and he and Monroe were empowered to act together. Napoleon chanced at the time to be in a very receptive mood, but for a while it was an anxious season for the Americans. Finally through the joint efforts of the two men the treaty was signed, and it came to pass that this great tract of land which extends from the mouth of the Mississippi to the mouth of the Columbia River became "part and parcel" of the United States. The price paid was 80,000,000 francs, and the story of the negotiation which terminated this sale is full of romance. England stood ready to seize the coveted prize, and it therefore can be understood how eager both sides were for the transfer. After all the business transactions were over, Napoleon declared, "I have given to England a maritime rival which sooner or later will humble her pride." In view of the tremendous amount of land involved Livingston and Monroe have facetiously been spoken of as the largest real estate dealers in the world.

In their negotiations for the purchase of Louisiana the two Americans showed a fearlessness quite characteristic, as they far exceeded their instructions, which were more to negotiate than to buy or receive. Fortunately for them at an extra session of Congress called by President Jefferson, John Randolph, of Roanoke, moved that a provision be made for carrying out the treaty which was adopted.

Coming down the line of Monroe's career to the war of 1812, when he was Madison's Secretary of State and Secretary of War at the same time, he urged the President to allow him to take under his command the active leadership of the troops. Madison took the matter under consideration, but declined on the ground that in his opinion it was not in keeping with the dignity of the offices.

I listened last evening with the most intense interest to the address made in the Richmond Auditorium by William Jennings Bryan on the Monroe doctrine, and as a student of history it can readily be imagined my surprise when I heard him claim the Monroe doctrine for Thomas Jefferson. He based his claim entirely upon a letter written by Jefferson to Monroe, dated October 24, 1823, and utterly failed to give the letter from Monroe which called this letter forth. I understand that Mr. Bryan is an ardent follower of Jefferson, and I admire him for his good taste, but he was rankly unjust to Monroe in his zeal for Jefferson. And to all admirers of Thomas Jefferson I should like to say there is no necessity to attempt to rob another statesman of his just dues. The great Jefferson is sufficiently strong to stand upon a pinnacle alone made up of his own remarkable achievements, and he would have been the last man under God's shining sun to claim an achievement not due him.

At the close of Mr. Bryan's address, which was, of course, in exceedingly bad taste, as he was a guest of the Monroe celebration, I approached him and said, "Mr. Bryan, you seem to me to be a fair-minded sort of man; will you please explain to me in all fairness to the memory of James Monroe, in quoting so liberally from the letter of Jefferson's, why did you not speak of the letter written by Monroe, in which he outlines the Monroe doctrine, and which called forth the

letter of Jefferson's which you have quoted so vigorously?" Imagine my surprise as well as consternation when Mr. Bryan replied, "I did not know that such a letter was in existence." My reply to this astonishing statement was forcible. I said, "Then you had no right to attempt a historical speech upon a subject which you had not investigated." I will say, in justice to Mr. Bryan, he seemed worried by my words, but I fear no one, and from this time forth I want to challenge the man or woman who claims the Monroe doctrine for anyone but the man to whom the credit is due—James Monroe—the fearless Virginian.

The facts of the case are these: Monroe's chief counselors, especially in foreign affairs, were his two great predecessors in office. Jefferson, Madison, and Monroe formed a bulwark of strength, a unit of power, which will never be seen again. Virginia was then steadily at the helm of affairs of state, and it is not therefore surprising to read a concluding sentence of a letter of Monroe's to Jefferson these words: "I shall be happy to have yours & Mr. Madison's views upon it (the Monroe doctrine). I do not wish to trouble either of you with small objects, but the present one is vital, involving the highest interests, for which we have so long & faithfully & harmoniously, contended together. Be so kind as to enclose (Mr. Madison) the dispatch with the intimation of the motive." It seems to me strange under the circumstances considering that Monroe also consulted Madison on the advisability of the Monroe doctrine, and as the latter's answer is in existence, that admirers of James Madison do not claim the credit of the great doctrine for him. It would certainly be quite as logical as Jefferson's claim to it.

About two months before Monroe sent his message to Congress he again wrote to Jefferson and Madison. This letter in which is embodied a summary of the Monroe doctrine was written at his home, Oak Hill, Loudoun County, Va., and is dated October 17, 1823, and is as follows:

I transmit you two dispatches which were received from Mr. Rush, while I was lately in Washington, which involve interests of the highest importance. They contain two letters from Mr. Canning, suggesting designs of the holy alliance, against the independence of So. America, & proposing a co-operation, between G. Britain & the U. States, in support of it, against the members of the alliance. The project aims in the first instance, at a mere expression of opinion, somewhat in the abstract, but which is expected by Mr. Canning, will have great political effect, by defeating the combination. By Mr. Rush's answers, which are also enclosed you will see the light in which he views the subject, & the extent to which he may have gone. Many important considerations are involved in the proposition. 1st. Shall we entangle ourselves at all, in European politicks, & wars, on the side of any power, against others, presuming that a concert by agreement, of the kind proposed, may lead to that result? 2nd. If a case can exist in which a sound maxim may & ought to be departed from, is not the present instance, precisely that case? 3ly. Has not the epoch arrived when G. Britain must take her stand, either on the side of the monarchs of Europe or of the U. States, & in consequence, either in favor of despotism or of liberty, & may it not be presumed that aware of that necessity, her government. has seized on the present occurrence, as that, which it deems the most suitable, to announce and mark the commencement of that career.

My own impression is that we ought to meet the proposal of the British Govt. and to make it known, that we shall view an interference on the part of the European powers, and especially an attack on the Colonies, by them, as an attack on ourselves, presuming if they succeeded with them, they would extend it to us.

I have tried to show you some of the fearless acts of James Monroe's life, which seem to stand out more in bold relief than others, but in the humble opinion of his descendants who are here to-day to do honor to his memory, and help celebrate with you 100 years of the Monroe doctrine, the most fearless act of all. In fact, the crowning glory of his life was the day, after reaching the highest pinnacle of fame, he stood, figuratively speaking, with a great trumpet in his hand and defied the whole world.

ADDRESS OF HON. MINOR FAIRFAX HEISKELL GOUVENEUR, VICE PRESIDENT OF THE SOCIETY OF THE DESCENDANTS OF JAMES MONROE

I have briefly touched on the importance to the United States of the Louisiana Purchase, but the results of this fortunate transaction were so far reaching that I should like to add a few more words.

The territory comprised an area west of the Mississippi equal to one-third of the present area of this country on the Continent, excluding Alaska, and three times the area of the thirteen original States. Its acquisition at the time of transfer confirmed the possession of the young and struggling country in the territory on the east side of the Mississippi, which would have been in dispute if the west side of the river had remained in foreign hands. The Mississippi Valley in itself is the richest valley in the world, but when this fact is coupled with its strategic importance, lying between the territory of the original thirteen States and the Spanish and Mexican possessions to the west, and to the Pacific, which we afterwards acquired through the possession of Louisiana, the vast consequences as a direct result of the purchase of Louisiana may be realized. The transfer was made at the most fortunate time for us. Throughout our history, always supremely lucky, this was certainly the most fortuitous event in the history of the Western Hemisphere. It occurred at exactly the right moment. All Europe was at war. None of the powers realized the immense value of the wild regions. Every European country was so occupied with its own vital concerns that little attention was given to America. We did not ourselves realize the value of our purchase or dream of what it would lead to. The Encyclopædia Britannica says: "Livingston alone of all the public men concerned showed before the event a conception of the feasibility and desirability of the acquisition of a vast territory beyond the Mississippi"; but Livingston in a letter to Madison proposed to keep New Orleans and sell the western country to some "friendly power." We were chiefly concerned in the right to navigate the Mississippi River, and at the time had a temporary treaty covering this and a three-year agreement to use New Orleans as a port of deposit for goods which were brought down the river to be reshipped in ocean vessels. The treaty was about to expire and this caused great anxiety to our commercial interests, and our minister was instructed to endeavor to negotiate a treaty covering the perpetual right to navigate the river and to purchase New Orleans, if possible.

The importance of the use of the river and of a port of deposit was recognized by everyone, but there our interest ended. Our minister was limited by his instructions. He was making but slight head-

way. At this stage Monroe was sent to France as envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to put through the treaty, and with somewhat more latitude and greater authority. When Napoleon, hard pressed for funds, offered the whole of Louisiana, "the American minister, without instructions, boldly accepted for the country a territory approximating 1,000,000 square miles in area—about five times the area of continental France. For this imperial domain, perhaps the richest agricultural region in the world, the United States paid about $15,000,000," about 2 cents per acre.

The Encyclopædia Britannica says:

There is some justification for the saying of Thiers that the United States were "indebted for their birth and for their greatness"—at least for an early assurance of greatness—"to the long struggle between France and England." The acquisition of so vast a territory proved thus of immense influence in the history of the United States. It made it possible for them to hold a more independent and more dignified position between France and England during the Napoleonic wars; it established forever in practice the doctrine of implied powers in the interpretation of the Federal Constitution; it gave the new Republic a grand basis for material greatness; assured its dominance in North America; afforded the field for a magnificent experiment in expansion, and new doctrines of colonization; fed the national land hunger; incidentally molded the slavery issue; and precipitated its final solution.

It is generally agreed that after the Revolution and the Civil War, the Louisiana Purchase is the greatest fact in American history. In 1904 a world's fair, the Louisiana Purchase Exposition, was held at St. Louis in commemoration of the cession. After 100 years the wilderness then acquired had become the center of the wealth and power of the Union. It contained in 1903, 15,000,000 inhabitants, and its taxable wealth alone was four hundred times the fifteen millions given to Napoleon.

Consider for a moment what would possibly have happened if Louisiana had remained a French possession until the final defeat of Napoleon in 1815. In the division of the spoils England would have almost certainly taken New Orleans and the west bank of the Mississippi to Canada. Russia would have joined Alaska with the Oregon country and northern California, and the balance might have fallen to Prussia, Spain, and other European powers. Thus a condition might have been brought about similar to that of South America, or even Europe itself, and this country might have become and probably would have become the scene of continual war and constant turmoil due to conflicting interests, and the jealousies and greed of foreign powers, instead of the homogeneous, peaceful, prosperous, and most powerful of nations.

MESSAGES RECEIVED BY DR. CLARENCE J. OWENS, PRESIDENT OF THE SOUTHERN COMMERCIAL CONGRESS

I am glad to know that Richmond and Virginia are taking the lead in a fitting observance of the centennial of the Monroe doctrine. As one of the great contributions of American statecraft to the determination of relationships between the New World and the Old, it has proved a factor of the first importance in a very broad range of international concerns, and well deserves the nation-wide attention which your celebration is attracting to it.

CALVIN COOLIDGE,
President of the United States.

MONSIEUR LE PRESIDENT: Je Regrette sincerement de ne pouvoir assister a la celebration du centenaire de la Doctrine de Monroe que la "Southern Commercial Congress" a eu L'Heureuse Pensee D'organizer. Pour repondre, toutefois, au desir que vouse avez exprime, je dirai que cette doctrine, pour

avoir largement favorise le developpement de L'epript de solidarite naturelle entre les pays du nouveau monde et contribue a la constitution de cette veritable societte de nations qu' est L'union pan Americaine, vaut a L'illustre President Monroe de'etre considere comme L'un Dex Glorieux promoteurs du pan Americanisme Bien entendu. J' Ai L'Honneur D'Etre, Sincerement.

LEON DEJEAN,
Haitian Minister.

The Republic of Colombia happened to be the first South American country whose independence was recognized by the Government of the United States and this highly important act was accomplished during the administration of President Monroe, just a few months prior to the proclamation of the doctrine which carries his name. The addresses exchanged on the occasion of the recognition between President Monroe and the first diplomatic agent of Colombia in Washington are documents of a cordial and sincere friendship between the two peoples, and are an expression of the course followed afterwards by the Republics of this hemisphere united by Pan-American sentiments. It may be said that these documents were like the anticipation of a policy destined to tighten the bonds of friendship among the peoples of America. When the Monroe presidential period terminated, the Vice President of Colombia, General Santander, addressed to the distinguished citizen who for eight years had directed the destinies of the American Union a letter expressive of admiration, respect, and friendship, containing the following:

"Your administration will mark a notable epoch in the history of the United States and South America. You were the one who announced the justice of admitting Colombia to the rank of nations and who shook the thrones of monarchies intimating that their intervention in the affairs of the former Spanish colonies would not be indifferent to the American people. These statements issued with courage, supported with firmness, and backed by your fellow countrymen, without resort to arms or force, are one of the many brilliant acts which will immortalize your administration and make you deserving of the esteem and gratitude of the Colombia people."

The quoting of these words of one of the founders of the Colombian nation serve me on this memorable occasion to pay homage to President Monroe when the centennial of the doctrine proclamated by him is celebrated.

ENRIQUE OLAYA,
Minister of Colombia.

I can not, however, allow this opportunity to pass without paying a tribute of respect to the great American soldier, diplomat, and statesman whose wisdom and foresight set bounds to political systems foreign to the soil, beyond which they were not permitted to pass. Thus the principles of democracy have had time to become firmly established, grow, and flourish until the whole world now feels the influence of its vitalizing spirit. The Republics of the earth owe a debt of gratitude to Monroe.

GAO KE ALFRED SZE,
Chinese Minister.

ESTIMADO MR. OWENS: Me es forzoso declinar la honrosa invitación de la Southern Commercial Congress, y de la General Centennial Committee, para las fiestas que celebra el Estado de Virginia en Richmond, en conmemoración de la proclamación de la Doctrina de Monroe. Siento que no me sea dable, en persona, rendir tributo de respeto a la memoria del estadista eminente autor de la declaración que, como apropiadamente la ha interpretado el Gobernador Trinkle, fue el genesis de la seguridad nacional en el Nuevo Mundo, y expresar también el sentimiento de honda simpatía que me inspira el Estado de Virginia, que guarda con reverencia y orgullo los restos de hijo tan ilustre. Ruégole ser intérprete de estos sentimientos cerca del Southern Commercial Congress y de la General Centennial Committee, y reciba la seguridades de mi mayor estimación."

EMILIO S. JOUBERT,
Ministro de la Republica Domininciana.

When a hundred years ago President Monroe promulgated his doctrine, Bulgaria was an unknown country, being a part and province of the Turkish Empire. I am quite sure that the people of Bulgaria did not know at the time anything about the promulgation of the docrine, as it did not concern them in the least. Nor does the doctrine affect Bulgaria of the present day one way or another, for she has not, you may be perfectly sure, the remotest idea of making any territorial conquests in the Western Hemisphere, establishing colonies or dependencies, or interfering with the existing forms of Government. All that the Bulgarian people cherish is most friendly feelings for all the American Republics and most sincere wishes for their progress and prosperity.

The Monroe doctrine, in my opinion, has been of great service to the young American Republics that a century ago were coming or about to come into existence by giving warning to any power that might wish to interfere with their rise and growth that such an interference will not be tolerated by the United States. It is evident from the words of President Monroe's declaration that in taking this step he was actuated by no ulterior motives of selfishness or imperialism, but by a desire to save the western continent from political intrigues and complications and from the ambitions and designs of imperialistic powers. Succeeding Presidents of the United States have laid strong emphasis upon the spirit of the Monroe doctrine, declaring that the chief concern of the doctrine is the independence and prosperity of the American Republics. Thanks to the Monroe doctrine, these Republics have been able to develop and progress, undisturbed by outside encroachments upon their liberty or independence. This has been possible, because the policy of the greatest Republic in the Western Hemisphere has, in the words of ex-President Wilson, "retained unabated the spirit that has inspired us throughout the whole life of our Government and which was so frankly put into words by President Monroe."

S. PANARETIFF,
Bulgarian Minister.

On behalf of my country, we join the world in admiration for your great statesman, James Monroe, and we appreciate the freedom and economic and political integrity secured in the Western Hemisphere through his doctrine.

ARTHUR B. LULE,
Consul of Latvia.

The wisdom and foresight of President Monroe and his associates should be commended by all patriotic Americans. The Monroe doctrine probably did more for the security and development of our country than any other single act in our history. Friendly relation and freedom from war between nations of Western Hemisphere unique in history and largely result of Monroe doctrine.

A. A. O. PREUS,
Governor of Minnesota.

The Monroe doctrine as promulgated by President Monroe has served as the foundation for peace, growth, and prosperity of the American continents, and in these years of storm and stress which have followed the World War it stands out as the hope and beacon of humankind.

GEORGE W. P. HUNT,
Governor of Arizona.

I feel that however great significance the Monroe doctrine may have had at various times in its relation to the policies of the European powers, its importance to-day is founded on its positive attitude of friendliness toward South America more than on its limitation and circumscription of the foreign policies of the European States. In my opinion, its present value lies in the fact that it is a candid expression of a sympathetic foreign policy toward the Latin Republics.

GIFFORD PINCHOT,
Governor of Pennsylvania.

I can assure you the people of Indiana fully appreciate the importance of the doctrine promulgated by James Monroe which saved America for Americans. The action of this great president has doubtless had more to do with the history of the United States than any other single act, and therefore we are ready to yield all honor to this great character.

WARREN T. MCCRAY,
Governor of Indiana.

I am glad to have the opportunity to state that I regard the services rendered by James Monroe directly to his country and indirectly to the world of far-reaching importance, as being the corner stone in the foreign policy of the United States of America.

The doctrine of James Monroe has often been a matter of discussion at Swedish law schools and subject for academic treatises. I use this opportunity to transmit herewith to you such a treatise, which I hope can be of value as a sign of the great interest shown for the Monroe doctrine even from the Swedish side.

V. ASSARSSON,
Counsellor of Swedish Legation.

Virginia is, and of right ought to be, proud of her many sons who contributed so mightily in securing our liberties and creating a constitutional form of Government.

The services and ceremonies on Sunday next and following do honor to the memory and public achievement of two of those great sons.

It is interesting to recall to our memories that the author of the Declaration of Independence in his eighty-first year received from President Monroe at Monticello for his consideration and advice the papers transmitted to the President from our Minister to Great Britain, Richard Rush.

So, too, is it interesting, aye, profoundly so, that in his own handwriting Jefferson should have written the wonderful letter of advice in respect to the Monroe doctrine which is to be found on the last pages of the fifteenth volume of the memorial edition of Jefferson's Letters and Public Papers.

It is interesting, too, that Jefferson should have taken advantage of the occasion to advise that our people should sedulously cultivate cordial relations with Great Britain.

ALTON B. PARKER, *New York.*

One hundred years of peace n the New World, freedom from foreign aggression, and the growth and advancement of North and South America testify to the wisdom and vision of James Monroe. Your observance of the centennial of the promulgation of that historic policy should make more impressive to those participating the great service rendered to the Americas by a son of Virginia.

E. F. MORGAN,
Governor of West Virginia.

The Monroe doctrine represents one of the greatest landmarks in the history of America and of the world and is only one of the many other important events which happened during the administration of President Monroe. The final treaty for the limitation of armament on the Great Lakes was proclaimed by him, and during his administration Florida, east and west, was acquired by the United States, thus completing Louisiana, making another State of the Union, Florida, and ending a long dispute with Spain and, incidentally, France and Great Britain.

I only mention these two but many others could be mentioned.

W. O. HART,
Attorney and Counsellor at Law, New Orleans, La.

In a brief note it will be impossible to give an expression which the significance of the Monroe doctrine has for any right-thinking American citizen, nor is such expression necessary.

In the ordinary press of everyday life we are prone to forget many of the vital things which have occurred in the past and which, correlated with other important historic matters, have resulted in great American development and achievement.

For that reason an occasion, such as you contemplate in the invitation that I have before me, is of great importance in that it brings before us the deeds and policies of the Fathers of the Republic.

JOHN D. JONES, Jr.,
Commissioner of Wisconsin Department of Agriculture.

ECONOMIC DIVISION, MONROE CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION ENTERTAINMENT

The economic session was presided over by Dr. Clarence J. Owens, president of the Southern Commercial Congress.

The addresses reviewed the problems and achievements of the century in the economic history of the country.

The addresses were delivered by—

Hon. George W. Koiner, commissioner of agriculture of the State of Virginia.

Hon. Robert A. Cooper, farm loan commissioner and executive officer of the Federal Farm Loan Bureau.

Col. Benehan Cameron, president of the Bankhead Highway Association.

Col. Harvie Jordan, managing director of the American cotton Association.

Hon. Oliver J. Sands, president of the American National Bank, Richmond, Va., and managing director of the Tobacco Growers' Cooperative Association.

Hon. Aaron Sapiro, organizer and adviser of cooperative marketing organizations.

ENTERTAINMENT

GOVERNOR'S MANSION

A reception in honor of descendants of James Monroe and distinguished guests and delegates, was tendered by Gov. and Mrs. E. Lee Trinkle.

VIRGINIA STATE LIBRARY

Monroe and Jefferson exhibits, under the direction of Dr. H. R. McIlwaine, State librarian, assisted by Morgan P. Robinson, State archivist.

An address was delivered by State Librarian McIlwaine.

The Virginia State Library was open Monday and Tuesday, December 3–4, and citizens of Richmond and delegates visited the Jefferson-Monroe Exhibition, arranged for the centennial.

The ceremonies were interspersed with vocal solos rendered by Madame Henriette Coquelet, of Washington.

Pilgrimages to Charlottesville, Va., for an official visit to Monticello, the home of Jefferson; Ash Lawn, the home of Monroe; and to the University of Virginia, was conducted Wednesday, December 5th.

Mrs. E. D. Hotchkiss, general chairman of pilgrimage.

Hon. J. C. Sprigg, chairman Charlottesville committee for the pilgrimage.

THE SOUTHERN COMMERCIAL CONGRESS

Dr. Clarence J. Owens, president.
Hon. William D. Upshaw, vice president.
Mr. Charles A. Douglas, general counsel.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Dr. Clarence J. Owens, Maryland.
Hon. William D. Upshaw, Georgia.
Hon. William Jennings Bryan, Florida.
Mr. Charles A. Douglas, District of Columbia.
Hon. Harry Hartwell, Alabama.
Hon. John M. Parker, Louisiana.
Col. Thomas R. Preston, Tennessee.
Hon. C. R. Breckenridge, Arkansas.
Mr. G. A. Northcott, West Virginia.
Col. Finley L. Williamson, North Carolina.
Mr. St. Elmo Massengale, Georgia.

THE VIRGINIA COMMITTEE

Hon. Eppa Hunton, jr., general chairman.
Hon. H. C. Stuart.
Judge Daniel Grinnan.
Hon. R. E. Byrd.
H. W. Jackson.
Dr. Charles R. Robins.
John Stewart Bryan.
C. C. Barksdale.
H. W. Cobb.
W. H. Schwarzschild.
De Soto FitzGerald.
Hon. James. A. Moncure.
S. L. Slover.
C. W. Culp.
William T. Redd.
Fred. E. Nolting.
J. M. Ball, jr.
E. L. Bemiss.
Henry W. Anderson.
John A. Coke, jr.
L. H. Jenkins.
Thomas B. McAdams.
T. Garnet Tabb.
M. C. Patterson.
R. R. Patterson.
F. D. Williams.
W. Meade Addison.
Eugene C. Massie.
T. C. Williams, jr.
Alexander Forward.
Dr. H. R. McIlwaine.
R. H. Smith.
John M. Miller, jr.
H. E. Litchford.
Judge R. Carter Scott.
Judge D. C. Richardson.
I. J. Marcuse.
E. T. D. Myers.
John T. Wilson.
Langbourne M. Williams.
Charles G. Wilson.
Walter Holladay.
J. Scott Parrish.
O. E. Parrish.
Oliver J. Sands.
George C. Gregory.
A. P. Wilmer.
Dr. Douglas Freeman.
H. M. Smith, jr.
Jacquelin P. Taylor.
Branch Johnson.
W. B. Cridlin.
P. E. W. Goodwin.
J. H. Binford.
John Rutherford.
Dr. E. L. Woodward.
John G. Walker.
W. G. Stanard.
H. W. Rountree.
R. L. Montague.
Dr. T. D. Merrick.
R. H. Harwood.
C. B. Richardson.
G. MacLaren Brydon.
A. O. Swink.
W. H. Adams.
Dr. H. D. C. Maclachlan.
Lewis C. Williams.
Coleman Wortham.
W. W. Hoxton.
S. S. P. Patteson.
J. J. Leake.
C. V. Meredith.
Charles A. Peple.
Col. John R. Saunders.
George J. Seay.
James Mullen.
E. B. Sydnor.
J. A. Gawthrop.
George Ainslie.
Julien Gill.
R. C. L. Moncure.
Dr. John Dunn.
W. S. Forbes.
O. H. Funsten.
Hunsdon Cary.
T. S. Weelwright.
Allen Potts.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Charles G. Wilson, chairman.
W. Meade Addison.
Henry W. Anderson.
John Kerr Branch.
George Bryan.
John Stewart Bryan.
S. D. Crenshaw.
W. T. Dabney.
DeSoto FitzGerald.
Eppa Hunton, jr.
Herbert W. Jackson.
I. J. Marcuse.
John L. Patterson.
Oliver J. Sands.
T. Garnett Tabb.
John Skelton Williams.
Coleman Wortham.
John T. Wilson.

WELCOMING COMMITTEE

I. J. Marcuse, chairman.

RECEPTION COMMITTEE

T. Garnett Tabb, chairman.

FINANCE COMMITTEE

Oliver J. Sands, chairman.

PRESS COMMITTEE

John Stewart Bryan.
S. L. Slover.
Douglas Freeman.
Robert Ford.
C. P. Hasbrook.
Allen Potts.

THE WOMANS AUXILIARY OF THE SOUTHERN COMMERCIAL CONGRESS

Miss Mary Boyce Temple, president general.
Miss Belle Perkins, chairman Richmond committee.

NATIONAL BOARD

HONORARY MEMBERS

Mrs. Calvin Coolidge.
Mrs. William H. Taft.
Lady Nancy Astor.
Mrs. Willis Van Deventer.
Mrs. E. T. Sanford.
Mrs. Henry Wallace.

EXECUTIVE

Mrs. Robert Lansing.
Mrs. Edwin A. Alderman.
Mrs. J. Carroll Frazer.
Mrs. Archibald Hopkins.
Mrs. Gibson Fahnstock.
Mrs. Violet Blair Janin.
Mrs. Minnigerode Andrews.
Mrs. Cary Grayson.
Mrs. Albert T. Knowlson.
Mrs. Delos Blodgett.
Miss Callie Doyle.
Mrs. Ben A. Norton.
Mrs. Thomas Carter.

RICHMOND COMMITTEE

Miss Belle Perkins, chairman.
Mrs. E. Lee Trinkle.
Mrs. Eppa Hunton.
Mrs. L. L. Lewis.
Miss Ellen Glasgow.
Mrs. William H. White.
Mrs. William R. Trigg.
Mrs. William Reed.
Mrs. E. Donald Cameron.
Miss Frances B. Scott.
Mrs. John Bagby.
Miss Mary Lyons.
Mrs. William J. Payne.
Mrs. Henry Baskerville.
Mrs. Charles Antrim.
Mrs. Taylor Ellyson.
Mrs. Egbert Leigh.
Mrs. N. V. Randolph.
Mrs. Fred. W. Scott.
Mrs. John Skelton Williams.
Mrs. Christopher Tompkins.
Mrs. Westmoreland Davis.
Mrs. Sydney Dudley.
Mrs. Kenneth Gilpin.
Mrs. Edwin Goffigon.
Mrs. Lillie Hamberlin.
Mrs. J. Alston Cabell.
Mrs. W. H. Slaughter.

○