

REVIEWS

De Monroe à Roosevelt, 1823-1905. Par le Marquis de BAR-RAL-MONTFERRAT. Paris, Plon-Nourrit et Cie, 1905.—xv, 356 pp.

Essais d' Histoire Diplomatique Américaine. Par ACHILLE VIALATE. Paris, E. Guilmoto, 1905.—iii, 306 pp.

As an historical work, the first of these books would be worth scarcely more than a passing notice, were it not for the fact that it appeared originally in the *Revue d' Histoire Diplomatique*, which is the official organ of the Société d' Histoire Diplomatique, of which society the author is the secretary. The preface, too, is written by the Comte d' Haussonville, a man of some note in literary circles in France, a member of the Academy and the representative in that country of the banished house of Orleans. The thesis of the book is republican territorial expansion, and, as might perhaps be expected, the subject is treated from the alarmist's point of view. Let the distinguished pre-facer speak first.

The Comte d' Haussonville recalls a journey which he made to the United States twenty-four years ago, as a representative at the Yorktown centennial of an ancestor who participated in the Revolution. He says that he has a vivid recollection of a "conversation had with a certain M. Blaine, forgotten to-day." Speaking of the construction and neutralization of the Isthmian Canal, Mr. Blaine is represented as saying, "We shall never consent to Europe concerning itself in guaranteeing its neutrality. You may pierce the isthmus if you like, but we must hold it." Disquieting as this announcement was, the writer's apprehensions did not lead him to foresee the day when "the United States would contest with us the right of guaranteeing with them the neutrality of the Panama Canal, and perhaps concern themselves in guaranteeing that of Morocco." How "this young power" has come to mix little by little in the affairs of the old world, he says, M. de Barral's book shows. Samoa, Hawaii, Cuba, the Philippines, the Russian Jewish question, intervention in China, Syria and Morocco were but stepping-stones to the higher walks of world politics. The personification of this policy is Mr. Roosevelt, leader of a "party ready to seize every occasion, indeed every pretext, to mix in the politics of the old

world." And there is still another source of apprehension for the Comte d' Haussenville—the "yellow peril." This thought leads him to inquire: "What will become of Europe pressed, as between the jaws of a vice, in the west by the United States, in the east by Japan?"

The quotations from the preface indicate the spirit and purpose of the book. It discusses the acquisition of Texas, New Mexico and California (which the author styles the "phase of encroachment"), the Cuban question (styled the "aggressive phase") and the acquisition of Samoa, Hawaii and the Philippines ("the world phase"). As would be expected from a book by a Frenchman, much space is given to the interoceanic canal. The recent Venezuelan imbroglio with the allied European powers, the Santo Domingo affair and the expedition to China close the historical narrative. The last chapter is chiefly made up of extracts from the speeches and messages of President Roosevelt, quoted in order to show that Mr. Roosevelt is "completely the echo of the American mentality," which, as the earlier pages have declared, is characterized by a spirit of aggression most dangerous to the rest of the world.

If the preface is tinged with a somewhat deeper shade of melancholy than the body of the book, it is no doubt due to the fact that the preface did not, as he says of M. de Barral, write with the "documents in hand." But a casual examination of M. de Barral's work will show that the "documents" must frequently have slipped out of hand, or that they were often made to carry a meaning which does not belong to them. Many of the errors and misstatements, which are thickly sprinkled through the pages, might have been avoided if the writer had taken the trouble to read carefully a standard history of the United States and to refer to some of the usual authorities. Thus, filibustering expeditions are frequently mentioned for the purpose of showing the supposed character of American expansion, and McGregor, of Amelia Island fame, is made (p. 30) to lead an expedition into Texas in 1816. Possibly M. de Barral confuses him with General Lallemand, who was engaged in such an enterprise about that date; but Lallemand was not an American. It is asserted (p. 17) that the United States enjoyed a "perfect tranquility" during the Napoleonic wars, from which it would seem that the Orders in Council and the Berlin Decrees are also "forgotten today." In speaking (p. 35) of President Polk's message on Yucatan of April 27, 1848, the writer apparently confuses it with Mr. Polk's earlier declaration in the annual message of 1845, which had nothing to do with Yucatan; and he says that when the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo was before the Senate, the president sought to have a

clause added to it, giving the United States the right to occupy Yucatan. But the treaty received the sanction of the Senate seven weeks prior to the date of the Yucatan message of April 29, and a reference to the executive proceedings of the Senate will show that no such a proposition was ever suggested or considered. The real significance of Polk's declaration as an enlargement of the scope of the Monroe Doctrine appears to escape M. de Barral entirely. Comparing (p. 86) the North and the South at the outbreak of the Civil war, he states that while the North was "of the Protestant religion," the South "belonged in part to the Catholic religion and the Latin race"—a comparison which is obviously misleading. Referring (p. 92) to the treaty of October 31, 1861, between Great Britain, France and Spain, relating to the joint expedition to Mexico, the writer charges the allies with a secret intention to place Maximilian on the throne of Mexico, in spite of the declaration in the treaty inconsistent with that intention. There is nothing in the published correspondence to show that the British government, at least, entertained any such sinister purpose. On the contrary, the instructions to her diplomatic representatives were to hold strictly to the terms of the joint treaty, and the reply of Earl Russell to the French ambassador, when he announced the intention of the emperor strongly to reinforce the French contingent in Mexico, was that he "very much regretted the step."

Perhaps the most absurd charge which the author brings against American expansion is contained in the account of the recent difficulty between Brazil and Bolivia over the Acre territory. The government of Bolivia granted to an Anglo-American syndicate a concession in the disputed territory conferring rights similar to those exercised by the chartered companies familiar in English colonial history. The writer adopts and puts forward as solemn truth a rumor, current in South America at the time, that the concession only concealed the designs of the American government to "plant itself in South America." Indeed one of the purposes of the book appears to be to strengthen in Latin America the idea that these countries are in danger of ultimate absorption by the United States.

It is a relief to turn from the work of a pamphleteer to grave historical writing. Professor Viallate, the author of the *Essais d'Histoire Diplomatique Américaine*, is a member of the faculty of the École des Sciences Politiques, where he gives a course of lectures on the history of the United States. He has the advantage, therefore, of writing with a general knowledge of his subject. He also shows an evident desire to state the facts impartially and to comment but sparingly on the motives

and policies of succeeding administrations. This characteristic is apparent in his first essay, "The Territorial Development of the United States." Within the space of about fifty pages he reviews rapidly the history of our territorial expansion, beginning with the treaty of peace with Great Britain in 1783 and ending with that with Spain in 1898. It is doubtful if there exists anywhere in English, within the same compass, a clearer or more comprehensive statement of this phase of our history. In fact it is a model of its kind.

The second essay, "The United States and the Interoceanic Canal" is the longest of the three contained in the volume. In a space of 150 pages, Professor Viallate reviews the diplomatic history of the question, using as a basis certain diplomatic correspondence of the United States, the messages and papers of the presidents and certain secondary authorities such as Keasbey's *Nicaragua Canal and the Monroe Doctrine* and Latane's *Diplomatic Relations of the United States and Spanish America*. It contains little that is new to American students of the question, but it has the advantage of bringing the subject down as late as the canal treaty with Panama in 1904. Moreover, the very judicial spirit in which the subject is examined should not fail to give European readers a juster view of the whole question. The year 1870 is indicated correctly as the date which marks the transition from the policy of neutralization (adopted for the purpose of blocking European ambitions in Central America) to the modern policy of control or ownership of the canal by the United States alone.

The story of the treatment accorded to the Hay-Herran canal treaty at the hands of the Colombian Congress and of the subsequent revolution on the Isthmus, is drawn almost exclusively from the published diplomatic correspondence and messages of the president. It is therefore based on the most trustworthy sources now at hand, and it is impartially written.

The final essay, "The Spanish-American War and the Annexation of the Philippines," follows closely the published diplomatic correspondence of the United States and Spain. The result is probably as satisfactory as the existing sources of information at present permit. Thinking possibly that the subject of the enforcement of the neutrality laws of the United States, during the last Cuban insurrection, involves primarily the examination of a legal rather than a diplomatic question, the author barely alludes to it.

The chapter relating to the peace negotiations at Paris in 1898 is probably the least satisfactory of any part of the essay. It appears to be based almost exclusively on the telegraphic correspondence between the

American commissioners and the State Department during the sessions of the conference, and practically not at all on the official protocols of the conference and similar documents.

The methods of Professor Viallate are those which are familiar in the standard French writers on diplomatic history. It is, in the main, *précis*-writing of the best class, summarizing successively diplomatic correspondence, presidential messages and other state papers.

JAMES F. BARNETT.

GRAND RAPIDS, MICH.

Philippine Life in Town and Country. By JAMES A. LE ROY.
New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1905.—x, 311 pp.

The title of this book hardly does justice to the contents. It understates the scope of a work which, though modest in intent and volume, is much more than a surface sketch of facts obvious to the eye in our eastern dependency or even ascertainable by an observer more deeply versed in the external social phenomena of the Philippines. The book deals with the ethnic and historical background of present conditions as well as with those conditions themselves, with a clearer insight into the philosophical relation of the past to the present and a juster appreciation of the respective values and functions of the three great factors in the Philippine problem—native society, Spanish tradition and American ideals—than any other work that I have seen upon the subject. The author has written in a spirit of academic honesty, with a delicate sense of truth exceeding the merely reportorial honesty which pervades much of our Philippine literature. There has been no disposition either to overlook obvious duty in recording disagreeable facts or to scrape up intimacies with untoward and not fairly representative incidents. In a word, the book is written with candor and good faith, and though it contains statements and opinions in matters of detail that may still be subject to controversy, it gives the truest general view of Philippine conditions, and probably the one most easily understood by an average reader, that has yet been presented to Americans.

There is at the outset a frank recognition of the early achievements of the Spanish colonial policy—a policy inspired by a higher ideal than that of the modern materialistic school of colonial theorists—but there is also a clear statement of the limitations which made that policy unfitted for the Philippines of today. In some spheres of influence Spain accomplished more in the Orient than has either England or Holland.

The fact that the Filipinos should have progressed under Spanish rule to the point where they should formulate demands so unique in the Orient