SAN DOMINGO.

Cantinual from First Page.

The loss of a screw occurred to prevent this warbreathing perambulation. The Nipsic did not go beyond Portan-Prince: but Lieutenant-Commander Selfridge, in his report, under date of July 14, 1869, lets drop an honest judgment, which causes regret that he did not visit the whole island. Thus he

"While my short stay in the Island will not permit me to speak with authority, it is my individual opinion, that if the United States should annex Hayti on the representation of a party, it would be found an elephant both costly in money and lives."

(Ibid., p. 5.)
The whole case is opened when we are warned against annexation "on the representation of

Still the scheme proceeded. On the 17th July, 1869. Still the scheme proceeded. On the 17th July, 1869. General Babcock sailed from New York for St. Domingo, as special agent of the State Deparament. The records of the department, so far as communicated to the Senate, show no authority to open negotiations of any kind, much less to treat for the aequisition of this half island. His instructions, which are dated July 15, 1869, are simply to make certain inquiries; but, under the same date, the Secretary of the Navy addresses a letter to Commander Owen of the seminole, with an armament mander Owen of the Seminole, with an armament of one 11-inch gun and four \$2-pounders, of 4200

pounds, in which he says:

"You will remain at Samana or on the coast of St.
Domingo while General Babcock is there, and give
him the moral support of your guns" (tbid., p. 6.)

The phrase of the Secretary is at least curious.
And who is General Babcock, that on his visit the
navy is to be at his back? Nothing on this head is
said. All that was know from the record is the result. said. All that we know from the record is that he was to make certain inquiries, and in this business "guns" play a part. To be sure, it was their "moral support" he was to have; but they were nevertheless "guns." Thus in all times has lawless force sought to disguise itself. Before any negotiation was begun, while only a few interrogatories were ordered the State Department, under which he acted, the moral support of guns" was ordered by the

Navy Department, Here, sir, permit me to say, is the first sign of war.

heing an undoubted usurpation, whether by President or Secretary. War is hestile force, and here it is ordered. But this is only a squint compared with the open deciaration which ensued. And here again we witness the contrast with Old Spain.

But the "guns" of the Semmole were not enough to support the plenipotentiary in his inquiries. The Navy Department, under date of August 23, 1869, telegraphed to the commandant at Key West:—
"Direct a vessel to proceed without a moment's "Direct a vessel to proceed without a moment's delay to San Domingo City, to be placed at the disposal of General Babcock while on that coast. If not at San Domingo City, to find him." (Ind., p. 8.)

Here is nothing less than the terrible earnestness of war itself. Accordingly the Tuscarora was dis-patched, and the plenipotentiary finds himself to a commodore. Again the contrast with old

How many days the Tuscarora took to reach the coast does not appear; but on the 4th of September the famous protocol was executed by Orville E. Babthe famous protocol was executed by Orville E. Bablency General Ulysses S. Grant, President of the
United States of America," where, besides stipulating the annexation of Dominica to the United
States in consideration of \$1,500,000, it is further
provided that "his Excellency General Grant,
President of the United States, promises privately to use all his induence in order that the
idea of annexing the Dominican republic to
the United States may acquire such a degree of
popularity among members of Uongress as will be
necessary for its accomplishment," (Hatch., San Dopopularity among members of Congress as will be necessary for its accomplishment," (Hatch., San Domingo Report, Senate, No. 234, p. 183, Forty first Congress, second session.) Such was the work, which needed so suddenly—"without a moment's delay"—a second war ship, besides the Nipsic, which was already ordered "to lend the moral support of its guns." How unlike the condition when old Spain boasted that there was not a Santian bettern the boasted that there was not a Spanish bottom in th

Returning to Washington with his protocol, the plenipotentiary was now sent back with instructions to negotiate two treaties, one for the annexation of the half-island and the other for the lease of the bay of Samana. How this business sped appears from the State Department. The report of the Navy Da partment shows how it was sustained by force. By a letter under date of December 3, 1839, on board the ship Albany, addressed to Commander Bunce on board the Nantasket, the pienipotentiary, after an nouncing the conclusion of a treaty for the lease of Samana and other purposes, imparts this important

nformation:—
"In this negotiation the President has guaranteed to the Dominican Republic protection from all for-eign interposition during the time specified in the treaties for submitting the same to the people of the

Of the absolute futility and nullity of this guarantee until after the ratification of the treaties, shall speak hereafter. Meanwhile we behold the

plenipotentiary:—
"For this purpose the honorable Secretary of the Navy was directed to place three armed vessels in this harbor, subject to my instruction."
Why three armed vessel? For what purpose? How unlike old Spain! What follows reveals the menace of war:"I shall raise the United States flag on shore and

shall leave a small guard with it." Here is nothing less than military occupation. Be-sides war ships in the waters, the flag is to be raised on shore and soldiers of the United States are to be eft with it. Again the contrast with Old Spain, who possted not only that there was not a single Spanish "bottom" on the coast, but not a single Spanish soldier on the land. Then follows an order to make

"Should you find any foreign intervention in-tended, you will use all your force to carry out to the letter the guarantees given in the treaties," Nothing could be stronger. Here is war. Then comes a direct menace by the young plenipoten-tiary, launched at the neighboring black republic.:—
"The Dominican Republic, fearing trouble from the Haytien border, about Jasmel, you will please inform the people, in case you are satisfied there is an intended intervention, that such intervention, direct or indirect, will be regarded as an unfriendly act towards the United States, and take such steps as you think necessary." (Senate Ex. Doc., No. 34, p. 9, Forty-first Congress, Third Session.)

The Dominican Republic fears trouble, or in other was the usurper Bacz trembles for his power, and therefore the guns of our navy are to be pointed at Hayti. Again, how little like Old Spain! And this was the way in which our negotiation began. We have heard of an "armed neutrality," and of an "armed neutrality," and of an "armed near "but here is an armed negotiation." The force employed in the negotiation naturally

fractified in other force. Violence follows violence in new forms. Armed negotiation was changed to armed intervention, being an act of war, all of s placed beyond question. There is repetition and reduplication of testimony. The switness of war appears in the telegram dated at the Navy Department January 29, 1870, addressed to Rear-Admiral Poor, at Key West. Here

is this painful despatch Proceed at once with the Severn and Dictator to Port-au-Prince: communicate with our Consultnere, and inform the present Haytien authorities that this Government is determined to protect the present Dominican Government with all its power. You will then proceed to Dominica, and use your force to give the most ample protection to the Dominican Government against any power attempting to interfere with it. Visit Samana Bay and the cap tal, and see the United States power and authority secure there. There must be no fallure in this natter. If the Haytiens attack the Dominicans with

their ships, destroy or capture them. See that there

is a proper force at both San Domingo City and "If Admiral Poor is not at Key West, this despatch must be forwarded to him without delay. (Ibid., p. 11.) "Proceed at once!" Mark the warlike energy. What then? Inform the Haytien Government that "this Government is determined to protect the present Dominican Government (the usurper Ba-2) with all its power" Strong words, and vast in scope. Not only whole navy of the United States. out all the power of our country, is promised to the usurper. As Dominica, where the admiral is to go next, he is directed to use his force "to give the most

ample protection to the Dominican Govera-ment (the usurper Bacz) against any power attempting to later ere with it." Then comes a new At Samana and the city of St. Domingo "see the United States power and anthority secure there." Here is nothing less than military occupa-tion. Pray, by what title? Mark again the warlike energy. And, then giving to the war a new charac-ter, the Admiral is told: "If the Haytiens attack ter, the Admiral is told: "If the Haytiens attack the Dominicans with their ship, destroy or capture them." Buch is this many-shotted despatch, which is like a mitrailiense in death-dealing missives.

This beligerent intervention in the affairs of another country, with a declaration of war sgainst the Black Republic, all without any authority from Congress or any sanction under the Constitution, was followed by a despatch dated January 81, 1979.

was followed by a despatch dated January 31, 1870. to Lieutenant Commander Aden, of the Swatata, with an armament of six 32-pounders, 4500 pounds, and one 11-inch gun where is the breath of war. After harrying the ship off to the city of St Do-

mingo, the despatch says:_
"If you find when you get there that the Domi-"If you find when you get there that the Dominican Government requires any assistance against the enemies of that republic, you will not healtate to give it to them." (Senate Ex. Doc. No 34, p. 15, Forty-first Congress, third session.)

What is this but war, at the call of the usurper Bacz. against the enemies of his Government, whether domestic or foreign? Let the usurper cry

out, and our flag is engaged. Our cannon must fire it may be upon Dominicans, rising against th usurper, or, it may be upon Haytlens warring on the usurper for their rights; or it may be upon some other foreign power claiming rights. The order is

and assistance to the Dominican people against their enemies now in the island and in revolution their enemies now in the island and in revolution against the lawfully constituted Government, and you will use the force at your command to resist any attempts by the enemies of the Dominican Republic, by land or sea, so far as your power can reach them." (Ibid, p. 12.)

Here again is belligerent intervention in Dominica, with a declaration of war against the Brack Republic, included under the head "Enemies of the Dominican Republic," or, perhaps, it is a case of "Tunning a muck," according to Malay example, for the sake of the usurper Baez.

Thus much for the orders putting in motion the powers of war. I have set them forth in their precise words. Soon I shall show wherein they offend international law and the Constitution. Mean while the case is not complete without showing what was

the case is not complete without showing what was done under these orders. Already the State Depart ment has testified. The Navy Department testifies in harmony with the State Department. And here the record may be seen under two heads, first, belli perent intervention in Dominica, and, secondly, beiligerent intervention in Hayti.

BELLIGERENT INTERVENTION IN DOMINICA. In Dominica there was a constant promise of pro

In Dominica there was a constant promise of protection and a constant appeal for it with recurring incidents, showing the dependence of the usurper upon our naval force. And here I proceed according to the order of dates.

Rear-Admiral Poor, of the flag ship Severa, reports from the city of St. Domingo, under date of March 12, 1870, that the President, meaning the usurper Bazz, in formed him that he was obliged to keep a considerable force against Cabral and L. nekeep a considerable force against Cabral and Lape ron, and then added, "If annexation was delayed it would be absolutely necessary for him to call upon the United States Government for pecuniary aid."
(Ibid., p. 17.) Not content with our guns, the usurper wanted our dollars, Next Commander Bunce, under date of March 21, 1870, reports from Puerto Plata that "the authorities think that from Puerto Plata that "the authorities think that the excitement has not yet passed, and that the presence of a man-of-war here for a time will have a good moral effect" (p. 19). The man of war becomes a preacher. The same officer, under date of March 24, 1870, reports a speech of his own at Puerto Piata, that Rear-Admiral Poor "had a heavy squadron about the island and would drive him (Luperon) out—probably in doing so destroying the town and all the property in it" (p. 19). And this was followed, March 26, 1870, by formal notice from Commander Bunce to the British Vice-Consul at Puerto Plata, in these terms:—

these terms:—
"As to my objects here, one of them certainly is, and I desire to accomplish it as plainly as possible to inform the foreign residents here that if any such league or party is formed among them, and with or without their aid Luperon, Cabral, or any others hos tile to the Dominican Government should get pos session of this port, the naval forces of the States would retake it, and in so doing the foreign residents, as the largest property-holders, as well as the most interested in the business of the port, would be the greatest sufferers." (*Ibid.*, p. 20.)

Here is the menace of war. Meanwhile the work of protection proceeds. Rear Admiral Poor reports under date of May 7, 1870, that upon arrival at San Domingo City:—
"I found it necessary, properly to protect the Dominican Government, to despatch one of the sloops I found there to the northwest portion of the Island and the other to Puerto Plata, intending, as soon as able to do so, to despatch one to Samana bay and able to do so, to despatch one to Samana bay and to station the other off St. Domingo City." (Ibid.,

22.) Here is protection at four different points. Meanwhile the treaty for aunexation and also the reaty for the lease of Samana had both expired by he lapse of time, March 29, 1870, while the treaty for annexation was rejected by solemn vote Jun 30, 1870, so that no treaty remained even as apo logy for the illegitimate protection which had been continued at such cost to the country. But this made no difference in the aid supplied by our navy; nor was the administration here unadvised with regard to the dependence of the usurper. Commodore Greer reports from off St. Domingo City, under date

of July 21, 1870:—
"I am inclined to the opinion that a withdrawal of the protection of the United States, and of some future time, would instantly lead to a revolution, headed by Cabral, who would be supported by the enemies

of the present Government and assisted by the liaytiens." (*Ibid.*, p. 23)

This is followed by a report from Commander Allen at Samana Bay, under date of August 28, 1870, announcing that he has received a communication from "his Excellency President Baez requesting the presence of a vessel on the north side of the island on account of an intended invasion by Cabral."

(Ibia., p. 24.) In the communication, which is inclosed, the usurper says that he "deems the presence of a ship-of-war in the Bay of Manzaniio of immediate importance." (Ibid.) Cabral, it appears, was near this place. Other points are mentioned to be visited. Then follows another report from Commandate Original and Carraphor 1, 1870. der Greer, under date of September 3, 1870, where the dependence of the usurper is confessed:—

The President was anxious to add to the force at his disposal in the city of San Domingo, as he feared an ontbreak, and asked me if I could not bring some of his men that were at Azua. I acceded to his request, and on the 2d instant landed sixty-five officers and men that we had brought from Caba. Here is a confession, showing again the part

played by our navy.

Still the cry of the usurper was for help. By a letter from the Executive Mansion at San Domingo, under date of August 30, 1870, he desires Commander Irwin of the Yantic to proceed "to Tortuguero de Azua for a few hours, for the purpose of transmitting to this city the rest of the Dominical bettelling Restauration and it is thought convenient. battallon Restauracion, as it is thought convenient by the Government." (Ibid., p. 61.) Then, again, under date of October, S, 1870, the usurper declares "the necessity at present of a man-of-war in this port, and that none would be more convenient than the Yantic for the facility of entering the river Ozama, owing to her size." (Ibid., p. 31.) Thus not merely on the coasts but in a riot was our navy invoked, but this was not enough. Under date of October 8, 1870, the usurper writes from the Execu-October S. 1879, the usurper writes from the Executive Residence, "to relterate the necessity of the vessels now in that hay (Samana) coming to the southern coast," (Ibid., p. 32.) And as late as January 8,1871, Rear-Admiral Lee reports from off San Domingo City, that delay in accomplishing annexation has among other things "risk of insurrection;" thus attesting the dependence of the usurper upon our power. Such is the uniform story, where the cry of the usurper is like the refrain of a ballad.

BELLIGERENT INTERVENTION IN HAYTI. The constant intervention in Dominica was supplemented by that other intervention in Hayii, when an American admiral threatened war to the Black Republic. Sname and indignation rise as we read the record. Already we know it from the State Department. Rear-admiral Poor, under date of Feb. 12, 1870, reports to the Navy Department his achievement. After announcing that the Severa, with an armament of fourteen 9-inch guns and one 60-pounder rifle, and the Dictator, with an armament of two 15 inch guns, arrived at Port-au-Prince February, 1870, he narrates his call on the Provi-sional President of Hayti, and how, after communi-cating the pendency of negotiations and the deter-mination of the Government of the United States "with its whole power" to prevent any interference on the part of the Haytian or any other Government with that of the Dominicans (meaning the usurper Baez), he launched this declaration:— "I herefore, if any attack should be made upon the Dominicans (meaning the usurper Bacz) during the said negotiations, under the Haytlen, or any other flag, it would be regarded as an act of hostility to the United States flag, and would provoke hostility in

return. Such was his language in the Executive Mansion of the President. The Rear-Admiral reports the dignified reply of the President and Secretary of state, who said:—
'That while they were aware of their weakness,

they knew their rights, and would maintain them and their dignity as far as they were able, and that they must be allowed to be the ludges of their own policy, or words to that effect." (bid., p. 14.)
Such words ought to have been to the Rear-Admirai more than a broadside. How poor were his great guns again t this simple reproof! The black republic spoke well. The near-Admiral adds that he heard afterward, unofficially, "that the authorities were displeased with what they considered a menace on the part of the United States, accompa-nied with force." And was it not natural that they

should be dispicased?

All this is bad enough from the official record, but I am enabled from another source, semi-official in character, to show yet more precisely what oc-curred. I have a minute account drawn up by the gentleman who acted as interpreter on the occasion The Rear-Ada iral could not speak French; the Fre sident could not speak English. Instead of walting upon the Secretary of State and making his comnumication to this functionary, he went at same to the Executive Mansion, with the officers of his ves-serand other persons, when after announcing to the

President that he same to p.y a friendly visit, he said that, "as a safor, he would take the same opportunity to communicate instructions received from his Government,"

The President, justly surprised, said that he was not aware that the Rear-Admiral had any official communication to make, otherwise the Succetary of State for Foreign Affairs would be present, being the proper party to receive it. The Sucretary of State proper party to receive it. The Secretary of State and other members of the Provisional Government were sent for, when the Rear Admiral proceeded to make the communication already reported, and at

peremptory, leaving no discretion. The assistance must be rendered. "You will not hestate to give it to them;" so says the order. On which I observe, this is war.

This was not enough. The Navy Department, by still another order, dated February 9, 1870, addressed to Commodore Greer, of the ship Congress, with an armament of fourteen 9-inch guns and two 60-pounder rifies, enforces this same conduct. After mestioning the treaty, the order says:—

"While that treaty is pending, the Government of the United States has agreed to afford countenance and assistance to the Dominican people sgainst their enemies now in the island and in revolution forces under his command, and he proceeded

reply:— That Hayti, having the knowledge of her feeble ness at d of her dignity, had taken note of the com-munication, made in the name of the United States, that, under present circumstances, the Government of Hayti would not interfere in the internal affairs of Santo Domingo, but the Government could not prevent the sympathies of the Haytien people to be with the Dominican patriots, fighting against au-

Who will not say that in this transaction the Black Republic appears better than the Rear-

TWO PROPOSITIONS ESTABLISHED. Such is the testimony establishing beyond ques-tion the two propositions, first, that the usurper Bacz was maintained in power by our navy, to ena-ble him to carry out the sale of his country, and, secondly, the further to assure this sale the neighbor republic of Hayti was violently menaced, all this being in breach of public law, international and constitutional. In considering how far this conduct is a violation

of international law and of the Constitution of the United States, I begin with the former.

GREAT PRINCIPLE OF "EQUALITY OF NATIONS" VIO-

LATED. International law is to nations what the National Constitution is to our coequal States; it is the rule by which they are governed. As among us every State, and also every citizen, has an interest in up-holding the National Constitution, so has every na-tion and also every citizen an interest in upholding international law. As well disobey the former as the latter. You cannot do so in either case without dis-turbing the foundations of peace and tranquility. To insist upon the recognition of international law is to uphold civilization in one of its essential safe guards. To vindicate international law is a constant duty which is most eminent according to the rights

Foremost among admitted principles of international law is the axiom, that all nations are equal, without distinction of population, size, or color. As a natural consequence, whatever is the rule for one is the rule for all; nor can we do to a small, weak, or black nation what we would not do to a large or black hatton what we would not do to a large, strong, or white nation; nor what that nation might not do to us. Do unto others as you would have them do unto you, is the plain law for all nations, as for all men. The equality of nations is the first orinciple of international law, as the equality of men is the first principle in our Declaration of Independence, and you may as well assail the one as the As all men are equal before the law, so are

This simple statement is enough; but since this commanding principle has been practically set aside in the operations of our navy, I proceed to show how

t is il ustrated by the authorities.
The equality of nations, like the equality of men, The equality of nations, like the equality of men, was recognized tardily, under the growing influence of civilization. Not to the earlier writers, not even to the wonderful Grotius, whose instinct for truth was so divine, do we repair for the elucidation of this undoubted rule. Our Swiss teacher, Vattel, prompted, perhaps, by the experience of his own country, surrounded by more powerful neighbors, was the first to make it stand forth in its present character. His words, which are as remarkable for their picturesque force as for their juridical accuracy. their picturesque force as for their juridical accuracy, state the whole case: | 'Nations composed of men and considered as so

many free persons living together in a state of na-ture, are naturally equal, and inherit from nature the same obligations and rights. Power or weakncss does not in this respect produce any difference A dwarf is as much a man as a giant; a small republic is no less a sovereign State than the most powerful kingdom. By a necessary consequence of that equality, whatever is lawful for one nation is equally lawful for any other; and whatever is unjustifiable in the one is equally so in the other." (Vaitel, The Law of Nations, Preliminaries, secs. is, 19).'
Later authorities have followed this statement,

with some slight variety of expression, but with no diminution of its force. One of the earliest to re-produce it was Sir William Scott, in one of his maserly judgments, lending to it the vivid beauty of his 'A fundamental principle of public law is the perfect equality and entire independence of all distinct States. Relative magnitude creates no distinction casual, gives no additional right to the more power-

casual, gives ho additional right to the more powerful neighbors; and any advantage selzed upon that ground is mere usurpation. This is the great foundation of public law, which it mainly concerns the peace of mankind, both in their pointic and private capacities, to preserve inviolate." (The Le Louis, 2 Dodson kep., 243.)

The German Heffer states the rule more simply, but with equal force:—
"Nations being sovereign or independent of each other treat together on a footing of complete equality. The most feeble State has the same political rights as the strongest. In other terms, each State exercises in their picuitude the rights which result from its political existence and from its participation n international association." (Heifter, Le Droit In-

ternational, Liv. I, sec. 27.)
The latest English writers testify likewise. Here The latest English writers testify likewise. Here are the words of Phillimore:—

"The natural equality of States is the necessary companion of their independence—that primitive cardinal right upon which the soluce of international law is mainly built."

""" "They are entitled in their intercourse with other States to all the rights incident to a natural equality. No other State is entitled to encroach upon this equality by arrogating to itself peculiar privileges or prerogatives as to the manner of their mutual intercourse." Phillimore, International Law, vol. 11, p. 33.) Twiss follows Phillimore, but gives to the rule a

fresh statement;—
'The independence of a nation is absolute and not subject to qualification, so that nations in respect of their intercourse under the common law are peers and equals." "Power and weakness do not in this respect give rise to any distinction "It results from this equality, that whatever is lawful for one nation is equally lawful for another, and whatever is unjustifiable in the one is equally unjustifiable in the other." (Twis, The Law of Na-

lin our own country Chancellor Kent, a great authority, gives the rule with perfect clearness and simplicity:—
"Nations are equal in respect to each other, and

entitled to claim equal consideration for their rights, whatever may be their relative dimensions or strength, or however greatly they may differ in Gov-ernment, religion, or manners. This perfect equality and entire independence of all distinct States is a fundamental principle of public law." (Kent, Commentaries, Vol. I, p. 21.) General Halleck, whose work is not surpassed by any other in practical value, while quoting espe-cially Vattel and Sir William Scott, says with much

sententiousness:- "All sovereign States, without respect to their relative power, are, in the eye of international law, equal, being endowed with the same natural rights. ound by the same duties, and subject to the same

obligations." (Halleck, International Law, chap. v, Thus does each authority reflect the other, while the whole together present the equality of nations as a guiding principle not to be neglected or dishon

The record aiready considered shows how this The record aready considered shows how this principle has been openly defled by our Government in the treatment of the Black Republic of Hayti, first, in the menace of war by Admiral Poor, and secondly, in the manner of the menace, being in substance and in form. In both respects the Admiral did what he would not have done to a powerful nation, and what we should never allow any nation nation, and what we should never allow any nation

Hayti was weak, and the gallant Admiral, rowing ashore, pushed to the Executive Mansion, where, after what he called a friendly visit, he struck at the independence of the Black Republic, pointing from the windows of the Executive Mansion to his powerful navy, and threatening to employ it against the Haytien capital or in sinking Haytien ships. For the present I consider this unprecedented insolence only so far as it was an offense against the equality of nations, and here it may be tried easily. Think you that we should have done this thing to Think you that we should have done this thing to England, France, or Spain? Think you that any foreign power could have done it to u+? But if right in us towards Hayti, it would be right in us towards England, France, or Spain; and it would be right in any foreign power toward us. If it were right in us toward Hayti, then might England, France, Spain, or Hayti herself do the same to us. Imagine a foreign fleet authorsel off Alexandria, while the adurate politing chored off Alexandria, while the admiral, pulling ashore in his boat, hurries to the Executive Mansion and then, after announcing a friendly visit, points to his war ships visible from the windows and men-aces their thunder. Or, to be more precise, suppose the Haytian navy to return the compliment here in the Potomac. But just in proportion as we con-demn any foreign feet, including a Haytien fleet, doing this thing, do we condemn oursely ss. The case is clear. We did not treat Hayti as our peer. The great principle of the equality of nations we have openly set at naught.

To extenuate this plain outrage I have heard it said that, in relations with Hayd, we are not bound by the same rules of conduct applicable to other nations. So I have heard, and this, indeed, is the only possible defease for the outrage. As in other days it was proclaimed that a black had no rights which a white man was bound to respect, so this de-

fense assumes the same thing of the Black Republic. But at last the black has obtained equal rights and so, I think, has the Black Republic. As well deny the one as the other. By an act of Cougress, drawaby myself and approved by Abraham Lincolu in the session of 1862, diplomatic relations were established between the United States and Hayti, and the President was expressly anthorized to appoint diplomatic representatives there. At first we were represented by a commissioner and consul-general; now it is by a minister resident and consul-general; now it is by a minister resident and consul-general. Thus, by act of Congress and the appointment of a minister, have we recognized the equal rights of Hayti in the family of nations, and placed the Black Republic under the safeguard of that great axiom of international law which makes it impossible for us to do unto her what we would not allow her to do unto us. In harmony with the United States, the Almanach de Gotha, where is the authente if not official list of attents and the same of the same and rights constants the manner. de Gotha, where is the authentic if not official list of nations entitled to equal rights, contains the name or Hayti. Thus is the Black Republic enrolled as an equal; and yet have we struck at this equality. How often have I pleaded that all men are equal before the law, and now I plead that all nations are equal before the law without distinction of color. BELLIGERRAT INTERVENTION CONTRARY TO INTERNA

TIONAL LAW. From one vielation of international law I pass to another. The proceedings as already detailed show belligerent intervention, contrary to international law. Here my statement will be brief.

According to all the best authorities, in harmony with reason, no ration has a right to interfere by belligerent intervention in the internal affairs of another, and especially to take part in a civil feud, excent updat conditions which the conditions which the conditions with the conditions which the conditions with the conditions with the conditions which the conditions with the co another, and especially to take part in a civil redo, except under conditions which are wanting here; nor has it a right to interfere by belilgerent interventian between two independent nations. The general rule imposed by modern civilization has been non-intervention; but this rule is little more than a scientific expression of that saying of Philip de Comines, the famous minister of Louis XI, "Our Lord God does not wish that one nation should play the devil with another." Not to occupy time with the devil with another." Not to occupy time wi authorities, I content myself with some of our own country, which are clear and explicit, and I begin

with George Washington, who wrote to Lafayette under date of December 25, 1798:—
"No Government ought to interfere with the internal concerns of another, except for the security of what is due to themselves." (Sparks' Writings of Washington, Vol XI, p. 382.)
Wheaten lays down the same rule substantially,

when he says:—
"Non-interference is the general rule, to which cases of justifiable interference form exceptions, limited by the necessity of each particular case." (Wheaton's Elements of International Law, p. 182,

Part II, Chap I, sec. 12.)
Thus does Wheaton, like Washington, found intervention in the necessity of the case. Evidently neither thought of founding it on a scheme for the

acquisition of fereign te ritory.

In harmony with Washington and Wheaton, I cite General Halleck in his excellent work:

"Wars of intervention are to be justified or condemned accordingly as they are or are not undertaken strictly as the means of self-defense, and selfprotection against the aggrandizements of others, and without reference to treaty obligations, for, if wrong in themselves, the stipulations of a treaty cannot make them right," (Halleck, International Law, Chap. XIV, sec. 19.)

Then, again, Halleck says in words applicable to the present case:

the present case:—
"The invitation of one party to a civil war can afford no right of foreign interference as against the other party. The same reasoning holds good with respect to armed intervention, whether between belligerent States or between belligerent parties in the Armed intervention, or, as I would say, bellige

rent intervention, is thus defined by Halleck:—
"Armed intervention consists in threatened or actual force, employed or to be employed by one State in regulating or determining the conduct or affairs of another. Such an employment of force is virtually a war, and must be justified or condemned upon the same general principles as other wars,

(Poid., sec. 12.)
Applying these principles to existing facts already set forth, it is easy to see that the belligerent intervention of the United States in the internal affairs of Dominica, maintaining the usurper Baez in power, especially against Cabral, was contrary to acknow-ledged principles of international law, and that the beligerent intervention between Dominica and Hayti was of the same character. Imagine our navy playing the same fantastic tricks on the coast of France which it played on the coasts of San Do-mingo, and then still further, imagine it entering the perts of France as it entered the ports of Haysi, and you will see how utterly indefensible was its conduct. In the capital of Hayti it committed an act of war, hardly less flagrant than that of Eng-land at the bombardment of Copenhagen. Happily blood was not shed, but there was an act of war. Here I refer to the authorities a'ready cited and challenge contradiction.

To vindicate these thipgs, whether in Dominica or in Hayti, you must discard all acknowledged principles of international law, and join those who, regardless of rights, rely upon arms. Grotius reminds us of Achilles, as described by Horace:—

As things not made for him, claims all by arms; and he quotes Lucan also, who shows a soldier ex-

"Now, Peace and Law, I bid you both farswell." The old Antigonus, who, when besieging a city, laughed at a man who brought him a dissertation on justice, and Pompey, who exclaimed, "Am I who am in arms to think of the laws?"—these seem to be the models of our Government on the coasts of St. Do-

USURPATION OF WAR POWERS CONTRARY TO THE CONSTITUTION. The same spirit which set at defiance great prin opies of international law, installing force insteads equally manifest in disregard of the Constitu tion of the United States, and here one of its mos distinctive principles is struck down. By the Consti-tution it is solemnly announced that to Congress in given the power to "declare war." This allotment of power was made only after much consideration an the American Revolution. In England, and in all other monarchies at the time, this power was the exclusive prerogative of the crown, so that war was justly called the last reason of kings. The framers of our Constitution naturally refused to vest this kingly prerogative in the President. Kings were re jected in substance as in name. The one-man power was set aside, and this prerogative was placed under the safeguard of the people, as repre-sented in that highest form of national life, an act of Congress. No other provision in the Constitu tion is mere distinctive or more worthy of venera

tion. I do not go too far when I call it an essentia

element of republican institutions, happily disco-

vered by our fathers.
Our authoritative commentator, Judge Story, has explained the origin of this provision, and his testi-mony confirms the statement I have made. After remarking that the power to declare war is "not only the highest sovereign prerogative, but that it is in its own nature and effects so critical and calamitous, that it requires the utmost deliberation and the successive review of all the councils of the nation, the learned author declares, with singular point, that "it should be difficult in a Republic to declare war," and that, the co-operation of all the branches of the legislative power ought upon principle to be required in this, the highest act of legislation;" and he even goes so far as to suggest still greater re-strictions, "as by requiring a concurrence of two-thirds of both houses" (Story, Commentaries on the Constitution, sec 1171. See also sec. 1518.) There is no such conservative requirement; but war can be declared only by a majority of both houses with the approbation of the President. There must be the embodied will of the Legislative and the Executive, in other words of Congress and the President. Not Congress alone without the President can declare war; nor can the President alone without Congress. Both must coneur, and here is the triumph of re-

But this distinctive principle of our Constitution and new-found safeguard of popular rights has been set aside by the President, or rather, in rushing to the goal of his desires, he has overleaped it, as if it

the goal of his desires, he has overleaped it, as if it were stubble.

In harmomy with the whole transaction is the apolegy, which insists that the President may do indirectly what he cannot do directly; that he may, according to old "Polonius," "by indirections find directions out;" in snort, that the gh he cannot declare war directly, he may indirectly. We are reminded of the unratified treaty with its fattle promise "against foreign interposition" that is, with the promise of the war powers of our Government set in metion by the President alone, wi hout an act of Congress. Here are the precise terms of this promise:—

The people of the Dom'nican Republic shall, in the shortest possible time, express, in a manner conformable to their laws, their will concerning the consider herein provided for; and the United States shall, until such expression shall be had, protect the Dominican Republic against foreign interposition, in order that the national expression may be free." (Senate Ex. Doc. No. 17, p. 99, Forty-first Congress, Now, nothing can be clearer than that this pro-

visios, introduced on the authority of the President alone was beyond his powers, and, therefore, brutum fulmen, a mere wooden gun, tutti after the ratifac-tion of the trenty. Otherwise the President alone might deciare war without an act of Congress, doing might deciare war without an act of Congress, doing inetrectly what he cannot do directly, and thus over-turping that special safeguard, placing what Story jestly calls "this highest sovereign prerogative" under the guardianship of Congress.

Here we must another distinctive principle of our Constitution. As the power to declare war is lodged in Congress with the concurrence of the President, so is the power to make a treaty lodged in the President, with the concurrence of two-thirds of the

sident with the concurrence of two-thirds of the Senate. War is declared only by Congress and the President; a treaty is made only by the President

and two-thirds of the Senate. As the former safe-guard was new, so was the latter. In England and all other monarchies at the time, the treaty-making power was a kingly preregative, like the power to declare war The provision in our Constitution re-quiring the participation of the Senate was another limitation of the one-man power, and a new contrioutlon to republican institutions. The Federalist, in an article written by Alexander Hamilton, thus describes the kingly preroga-

"The king of Great Britain is the sole and absolute representative of the nation in all foreign transac-tions. He can of his own accord make treaties of peace, commerce, alliance, and of every other de-scription. It is an established fact that the prero-gative of making treaties exists in the Grown in its utmost plenitude; and that the compacts entered into by royal authority have the most complete legal sanction." (Federalist, No. LXIX.)

Such was the well-known kingly prerogative which our Constitution rejected. Here let the

Federalist speak again :-"There is no comparison between the intended power of the President and the actual power of the British sovereign. The one can perform alone what

the other can only do with the concurrence of a branch of the legislature." (Ibid.)

Then again, after showing that a treaty is a contract with a foreign nation, having the force of law, he Federalist proceeds .-"The history of human conduct does not warrant that exaltee opinion of human virtue which would make it wise in a nation to commis interests of so delicate and momentous a kind as those which con-cern its intereourse with the rest of the world, to the sole disposal of a magistrate created and cir-comstanced as would be a President of the United

States, ' (Ibid, LXXV.)
Thus does this contemporary authority testify egainst handing over to the "sole disposal" of the President the delicate and momentous question in the unratified St. Domingo treaty.

the unratified St. Domingo treaty.

Following the *Pederalist* is the famous commentator already cited, who insists that "it is too much to expect that a free people would confide to a single magistrate, however respectable, the sole authority to act concinsively, as well as exclusively, upon the subject of treaties (story, Commentaries sec. 1512); and that, however proper it may be in monarchy, there is no American statesman but must feel that such a prerogative in an American Presi-dent would be inexpedient and dangerous; that it would be inconsistent with that wholesome jealousy which all republics ought to cherish of all depositaties of power, and then he adds that-

"The check which acts upen the mind, from the consideration that what is done is but preliminary, and requires the assent of other independent minds to give it legal conclusiveness, is a restraint which awakens caution and compels to deliberation.

The learned author then dwells with pride on the requirement of the Constitution which, while it confides the power to the executive department, confides the power to the executive department, guards it from serious abuse by placing it under the ultimate superintendence of a select body of high character and high responsibility" (ibid.); and then, after remarking that the President is "immediate author and finisher of all treaties," he concludes in decisive words that "no treaty so formed becomes binding upon the country, unless it receives the deliberate assent of two-tairds of the Senate." (Ibid., sec. 151s.) Nothing can be more positive. Therefore, even at the expense of repetition, I insist that, as the power to declare war is under the safeguard of Congress with the concurrence of the President, so is the power the concurrence of the President, so is the power to make a treaty in the President with the concurrence of two-thirds of the Senate; but the act of neither becomes binding without this concurrence. Thus, on grounds of authority, as well as of reason, is it clear that the promise of the President to em-ploy the war powers without the authority of con-gress was void, and every employment of these war powers in pursuance of this assumption was a usur

If the President, were a king with the kingly prerogative either to declare war or to make treaties he might do what he has done, but being only Presi dent, with the limited powers established by the Constitution, he cannot do it. The assumption in the St. Domingo treaty is exceptional and abnormal, being absolutely without precedent. The treaty with France in 1803 for the cession of Louisians coutsined no such assumption; nor did the treaty with Spain, in 1819, for the cession of Florida; nor did the treaty with Mexico, in 1848, by which the title to Texas and California was assured; nor did the treaty with Mexico, in 1858, by which new territory was obtained; nor did the treaty with Russia, in 1867, for the cession of her possessions in North America. In none of these treaties was there any such assumption of power. The Louisiana treaty stipu lated that possession should be taken by the United States "Immediately after the ratification of the pre-sent treaty by the President of the United States, sent treaty by the President of the United States, and in case that of the First Consul shall have been previously obtained "(Statutes at Large, Vol. VIII, p. 202). The Florida treaty stipulated "six months after the exchange of the ratiocation of the treaty, or sconer if possible." (Ibid., p. 255.) But these stipulations, by which possession on our part with corresponding responsibilities was adjourned till after the exchange of ratifications, were simply according to the dictate of reason, in harmony with cording to the dictate of reason, in harmony with

the requirement of our Constitution. The case of Texas had two stages, first under an upratified treaty, and secondly, under a joint resolution of Congress. What was done under the latter had the concurrence of Congress and the President, so that the inchaste title of the United States was created by act of Congress, in plain contradic-tion to the present case, where the title, whatever it may be, is under an unratified treaty, and is created by the President alone. Here is a manifest differ-

ence, not to be forgotten.

But it is not to be disguised that during the pendency of the treaty, and before his ratification by the Senate, there was an attempt by John Tyler, aided by his Secretary of State, John C. Calhoun, to com-mit the United States to the military support of Texas. Suffice it to say, that there was no collision or telligerent intervention, but only what denton calls an "assumpsit" by Calnoun. On this "assumpsit"the veteran Senator, in the memoirs of his "Thirty Years in the Senate," breaks forth in these indig-

"As to secretly lending the army and navy of the United States to Texas to fight Mexico while we were at peace with her, it would be a crime against God and man and our own Constitution, for which heads might be brought to the block, if Presidents and their Secretaries, like constitutional kings and minister, should be held capitally responsible capital crimes." (Benton, Thirty Years' View, Vol. 11, p. 642)
The indignant statesman, after exposing the un-

constitutional chariantry of the attempt, proceeds :-"And that no circumstance of contradiction or folly should by wanting to crown this plot of crimand imbecility, it so happened that on the same day that our new Secretary here was giving his written assumpsit to lead the army and navy to fight Mexico while we were at peace with her, the agent Murphy was communicating to the Texan Government, in Texas, the refusal of Mr. Tyler, through Mr. Nelson, to do so, because of its unconstitutionality." (Ibid.,

Again he says:—
'The engagement to fight Mexico for Texas,
while we were at peace with Mexico, was to make
war with Mexico! a piece of business which belonged to Congress and should have been referred to them, and which, on the contrary, was concealed from them, though in session and present." (Ibid., p. 643.)

In the face of this indignant judgment, written more than a decade after the attempt, and being already the undying voice of history, the "assumpsi of John C. Celhoun will not be accepted as a proper example for an Executive. But there is not a word of that powerful utterance by which this act is forever blasted that is not strictly applicable to the "sesumpeit" in the case of Dominica. As in the first there was an engagement to fight Mexico for Texas, while we were at peace with Mexico, which was nothing ess than war with Mexico, so the present engagement to fight Hayti for Dominica, while we are at peace with Hayt; is nothing less than war with Hayti Nor is it any the less "a crime against God and man and our own Constitution" in the case of Hayti than in the case of Mexico.

President Polk, in his annual message of December, 1846, paid homage to the true principle when he announced that "the moment the terms of annexa-tion offered by the United States were accepted by Texas, the latter became so far a part of our counrexas, the latter became so far a part of our country as to made it our duty to afford protection and defense." (Exec. Doc. House of Rep., No. 4, p. 15, Twentieth Congress, second session.) And accordingly he directed those military and naval movements which ended in war with Mexico. But it will be observed here that these movements were condi-tioned on the acceptance by Texas of the terms of annexation definitively proposed by the United tates, while our title had been created by act of Congress, and not by the President alone.

Therefore, according to the precedents of our history, reinforced by reason and authority, does the "assumpsit" of the treaty fail. I forbear from characterizing it. My duty is performed if I exhibit

it to the Senate. But this story of a violated Constitution is not yet complete. Even admitting some remote infinite-imal semblance of excuse or apology during the pendency of the treaty, all of which I insist is absurd beyond question, though not entirely impossible in a quarter unused to constitutional questions, and needquarter unused to constitutional questions, and heeding them little—conceding that the "assumpsis," inserted in the treaty by the Secretary of State had deceived the President into the idea that he possessed the kingly prerogative of declaring war at his own mere motion—and wishing to deal gently even with an undoubted usurpation of the kingly prorogative so long as the Secretary of State, aworn counsellor of the President, supplied the formula for the usurpation land you will bear witness that I have done nothing but state the case), it is hard to hold back when the same usurpation is openly pro-

longed after the Senate had rejected the treaty on which the exercise of the kingly prerogative was founded, and when the "assumpsit" devised by the Secretary of State had passed into the limbo of things lost on earth. Here there is no remose loninitesimal semblance of excuse or apology—nothing—absolutely nothing. The naurpation pivols on nonentity, always excepting the kingly will of the President, which constitutionally is a nonentity. The great artist of Bologna, in a much-admired statue, sculptured Mercury as standing on a pull of air. The President has not even a pull of air to stand on.

stand on.

Nor is there any question with regard to the facts.
Saying nothing of the lapse of the treaty on the
29th of March, 1876, being the expiration of the
period for the exchange of ratifications, 1 refer to
its formed rejection by the Senate June 39, 1870,
which was not unknown to the President. In the order of business the rejection was communicated to him, while it became at once a matter of universal notoriety. Then, by way of further fixing the President with this notice, I refer to his own admission it the annual measage of December last, when he answers that "during the last session of Congress a treaty for the annexation of the Republic of St. Domingo failed to receive the requisite two-thirds of the Senate, "and then, after denounding the rejection as "folly," he proceeds as follows:—
"My suggestion is that by joint resolution of the order of business the rejection was communicated

"My suggestion is that by joint resolution of the wo houses of Congress the Executive be authorexed to appoint a commission to negotiate a treaty with the authorities of San Domingo for the acqui-sition of that island, and that an appropriation be made to defray the expenses of such commission. The question may then be determined, either by the action of the Senate upon the treaty or the joint ac tion of the two houses of Congress upon a resolu-tion of annexation, as in the case of the acquisition

of Texas."
Thus by the openideclaration of the President was the treaty rejected, while six months after the rejection he asks for a commission to negotiate a new treaty, and an appropriation to defray the expenses of the commission; and not perceiving the happilica-bility of the Texas precedent, he proposes to do the deed by joint resolution of Congress. And yet, during this intermediate period, when there was no unralified treaty extent, the same beiligerent intervention has been proceeding, the same war-ships have been girdling the island with their guns, and the same naval support has been continued to the usurper Baez; all at great cost to the country and by the diversion of our naval forces from other places of duty, while the Constitution has been dismissed out of sight like a discharged soldier.

missed out of sight like a discharged soidier.

Already you have seen how this bedilgerent intervention proceeded; how on the 21st of July, 1870, Commodore Green reported that "a withdrawal of the protection of the United States and of the prospect of annexation at some future time would instantly lead to a revolution headed by Cabral;" how on the 28th of August, 1870, Commander Allen reported Baez as "requesting the presence of a vessel on the north side of the island on account of an intended invasion by Cabral;" how at the same time the usurper says that he "deems the presence of a ship-of-war in the Bay of Manzanillo of immediate importance;" how on the 3d of September, 1870, Commodore Green reported that Baez "feared an outbreak," and appealed to the Commodore "to bring some of his men Baez "feared an outbreak," and appealed to the commedore "to bring some of his men which were st Azua," which the obliging Commodere did; how, under date of October 8, 1870, the usurper, after declaring the necessity of a man-of-war at the port of St. Domingo, says that "none would be more convenient than the Yantic for the facility of entering the river Ozama, owing to her size;" and how again, on the same day, the usurper writes spill acother letter "to reiterate the necessity writes soil acother letter "to reiterate the necessity of the vessels now in that hay (Samana) coming to the southern coast." All these things you have seen, attesting constantly our belligerent intervention and the maintenance of Baez in power by our navy. which became his body guard and omnipresent upholder. I leave them to your judgment without one word of comment, reminding you only that no President is entitled to set aside the Constitution of our

SUMMARY.

Mr. President, as I draw to a close, allow me to repeat the very deep regret with which I make this exposure. Most gladly would I avoid it. Controversy, especially at my time of life, has no attraction for me; but I have been reared in the school of duty, and now, as of old, I cannot see wrong without trying to arrest it. I plead now, as I have often pleaded before for inside and page.

for justice and peace.
In the evidence adduced I have confined myself carefully to public documents, not travelling out of the record. Despatches, naval orders, naval reports -these are the unimpeachable authorities. And all these have been officially communic ted to the Senate, are now printed by its order, accessible to ail. On this unanswerable and cumulative testi-mony, where each part confirms the rest and the whole has the harmony of truth, I present this trans-gression. And here it is not I who speak, but the

Thus stands the case. International law has been violated in two of its commanding rules, one securing the equality of nations, and the other providing against beligerent intervention, while a districtive fundamental principle of the Constitution, by which the President is deprived of a kingly prerogative, is asserted by the President. This is the simplest asserted by the President. This is the simplest statement. Looking still further at the facts, we see that all this great disobedience has for its object the acquisition of an outlying tropical Island, with large promise of wealth, and that in carrying out this scheme, our republic has fereibly maintained a usurper in power that he might sell his country, and has dealt above at the independence of the European Country. a blow at the indeper dence of the Black Republic of Hayti, which besides being a wrong to that republic was an insuit to the African race. And all this has been cone by prerogative alone, without the authority of an act of Congress. It such a transaction, many-headed in wrong, can escape judgment, it is deficult to see what recurities remain. What other sacred rule of international law may not be violated? What other foreign nation may not be st uck at? What other belligerent menace may not be hurled? What other kingly prerogative may not

be seized?
On another occasion I showed how these wrongful proceedings had been sustained by the President beyond all example, but in a corresponding spirit. Never before has there been such Presidential instrained to witness. Presidential visits to the Casttol, with appeals to Senators, have been followed by assemblies at the Executive Mansion, also with by assemblies at the Executive Manslon, also with appeals to Senators; and who can measure the pressure of all kinds by himself or agents, especially through the appointing power, all to secure the consumeration of this scheme? In harmony with this effort was the Presidential measage, where, while taxing the Senate with 'folly' in rejecting the treaty, we are gravely assured that by the proposed acquisition "our large debt abroad is to be ultimately extinguished," thus making St. Doming of the packhorse of our vast load, or perhaps, copying Don Quixote when he imposed upon the shoulders of Sancho Panza the penitential stripes which belonged to himself.

iorged to himself.
Then, responding to the belligerent menace of his Admirs!, the President makes a kindred menace by Admirs!, the President makes a kindred menace by proposing nothing less than the acquisition of the "Island of St. Domingo," thus adding the Black Republic to his scheme. The innocent population there were startled. Their Minister here protested. Nor is it unnatural that it should be so. Suppose the Queen of England, in her speech at the opening of Parliament, had proposed in formal terms the acquisition of the United States, or suppose Louis Napoleon, in his speech at the opening of the Chambers during the Mexican war, while the French forces were in Mexico, had coolly proposed the acquisition were in Mexico, had coolly proposed the acquisition of that portion of the United *tates adjoining Mexico and stretching to the Atlantic, and in support of his proposition, had set forth the productiveness of the soil, the natural wealth that abounded there, of the soil, the natural wealth that abounded there, and wound up by aunouncing that out of this might be paid the French debt abroad, which was to be saddled upon the coveted territory. Suppose such a preposition by Louis Napoleon ov by the English Queen, made in formal speech to Chambers or Parliament, what would have been the feeling in our country? Nor would that feeling have been dimincountry? Nor would that feeling have been dimin-ished by the excuse that the offensive proposition crept into the speech by accident. Whether by accident or design, it would attest small considera-tion for our national existence. But the Haytiens love their country as we love ours—especially are they resolute for national independence. All this is shown by the reports which reach us now, even if

is shown by the reports which reach us now, even if their whoic history did not attest it.

The language of the President in charging the Senate with "folly" was not according to approved precedents. Clearly this is not a proper term to be employed by one branch of the Government with regard to another, least of all by the President with regard to the Senate. Folly, sir! Was it folly when the Senate refused to sanction proceedings by which the equal rights of the brack Republic were assailed? Was it folly not to sanction hostilities against the black Republic without the authority of Congress? Was it folly not to sanction belligerent intervention in a foreign country without the authority of Congress? Was it folly not to sanction a usurpation of the war powers under the Constitution? According to the President all this was folly in the Senate. Let

to the President all this was fully in the Senate. Let the country judge.

Thus do we discerp, whether on the coasts of St. Denings or here at Washington, the same determi-nation with the same disregard of great principles, as also the same recklessness towards the people of flayti, who have never injured us.

PRESENT DUTY.

In view of these things, the first subject of inquiry is not soil, climate, productiveness, and possibilities of wealth, but the exceptional and abnormal proceedings of our own Government. This inquiry is essentially preliminary in character. Before considering the treaty or any question of acquisition, we must at least put ourselves right as a nation; nor do I see how this can be done without estracing or do I see how this can be done without retracing our Continued on the Third Place,