

Cleveland's Message on the
Venezuela Dispute.

SALISBURY'S SOPHISMS

Advised by Irresistible Logical Argument.

THE PRESIDENT'S PROPOSITION.

Let the United States Assessors, the
Boundary Line and Revisors
Further Agree.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 17.—Following
the message of President Cleveland
on the Venezuela dispute:

To Congress:
In my annual message addressed to Congress on the first instant, I called attention to the pending boundary controversy between Great Britain and the Republic of Venezuela and recited the substance of the representations made by this government to set forth the reasons why such disputes should be submitted to arbitration for settlement, and inviting whether it would be submitted.

The answer of the British government which was then awaited has been received and together with the dispatch to which it is a reply, is herewith appended. Such reply is embodied in two communications addressed by the British prime minister to Sir Julian Pauncefote, the British ambassador at this capital. It will be seen that one of these communications is devoted exclusively to observations upon the Monroe doctrine and the rights that in the present instance a new and strange extension and development of this doctrine is insisted upon by the United States, and that the reasons of justifying an appeal to the arbiters enumerated by President Hayes are generally inapplicable to the state of things in which we live at the present day, and especially to the controversy involving the boundary line between Great Britain and Venezuela.

Without attempting extending arguments to reply to those questions, it may be sufficient to observe that the Monroe doctrine, which we stand in firm and decided, because its enforcement is important to our peace and safety as a nation and is essential to the integrity of our free institutions and the tranquillity maintenance of our institutions of government, was the cornerstone of our national life and cannot become obsolete while our Republic endures. If the balance of power in the hemisphere, which is the true criterion of our independence, is lost, because its enforcement is important to our peace and safety as a nation and is essential to the integrity of our free institutions and the tranquillity maintenance of our institutions of government, it will be lost.

Assuming, therefore, that we may properly insist upon the maintenance of the Monroe doctrine in the "state of things in which we live," or any changed conditions here or elsewhere, it is not apparent why its application may not be invoked in the present controversy. If a European power, by extension of its dominions, should threaten the tranquillity of one of our neighboring republics against its will, and in dereliction of its rights, it is difficult to say why, to that extent, such European power does not thereby become a threat to the system of government of the United States. The question is, however, whether non-interference once the law is observed by the observance of the Monroe doctrine of non-intervention to our people and their government.

Assuming, therefore, that we may properly insist upon the maintenance of the Monroe doctrine in the "state of things in which we live," or any changed conditions here or elsewhere, it is not apparent why its application may not be invoked in the present controversy.

If a European power, by extension of its dominions, should threaten the tranquillity of one of our neighboring republics against its will, and in dereliction of its rights, it is difficult to say why, to that extent, such European power does not thereby become a threat to the system of government of the United States. The question is, however, whether non-interference once the law is observed by the observance of the Monroe doctrine of non-intervention to our people and their government.

It is also suggested in the British reply that we should not seek to apply the Monroe doctrine in the pending dispute, because it does not embody any principle of international law which applies to the case. This is the position which President Hayes assumed to be "manifest to our peace and safety," and it can make no difference whether the American system is upheld by an independent or other power.

Practically, the principle for which we contend has a peculiar but noteworthy relation to the United States, in that it is the only nation in the world which has many rights in the code of international law, but since in international contests every nation is entitled to the right of self-defense, it is necessary to insert into the code of international law a broad principle which was never recognized before, and which has not been recognized by the government of any other country.

Practically, the principle for which we contend has a peculiar but noteworthy relation to the United States, in that it is the only nation in the world which has many rights in the code of international law, but since in international contests every nation is entitled to the right of self-defense, it is necessary to insert into the code of international law a broad principle which was never recognized before, and which has not been recognized by the government of any other country.

The Monroe doctrine fails to recognize in these principles of international law, which are based on the theory that every nation that has its rights invaded will be just claims justice. Of course, this government is entirely convinced that under the same conditions we have clear rights and inviolable claims. Not to be compelled to the British reply,

the Monroe doctrine fails to recognize in these principles of international law, which are based on the theory that every nation that has its rights invaded will be just claims justice.

On the other hand, this government is

entirely convinced that under the same

conditions we have clear rights and inviolable claims. Not to be compelled to the British reply,

the Monroe doctrine fails to recognize in these principles of international law, which are based on the theory that every nation that has its rights invaded will be just claims justice.

On the other hand, this government is

entirely convinced that under the same

conditions we have clear rights and inviolable claims. Not to be compelled to the British reply,

the Monroe doctrine fails to recognize in these principles of international law, which are based on the theory that every nation that has its rights invaded will be just claims justice.

On the other hand, this government is

entirely convinced that under the same

conditions we have clear rights and inviolable claims. Not to be compelled to the British reply,

the Monroe doctrine fails to recognize in these principles of international law, which are based on the theory that every nation that has its rights invaded will be just claims justice.

On the other hand, this government is

entirely convinced that under the same

conditions we have clear rights and inviolable claims. Not to be compelled to the British reply,

the Monroe doctrine fails to recognize in these principles of international law, which are based on the theory that every nation that has its rights invaded will be just claims justice.

On the other hand, this government is

entirely convinced that under the same

conditions we have clear rights and inviolable claims. Not to be compelled to the British reply,

the Monroe doctrine fails to recognize in these principles of international law, which are based on the theory that every nation that has its rights invaded will be just claims justice.

On the other hand, this government is

entirely convinced that under the same

conditions we have clear rights and inviolable claims. Not to be compelled to the British reply,

the Monroe doctrine fails to recognize in these principles of international law, which are based on the theory that every nation that has its rights invaded will be just claims justice.

On the other hand, this government is

entirely convinced that under the same

conditions we have clear rights and inviolable claims. Not to be compelled to the British reply,

the Monroe doctrine fails to recognize in these principles of international law, which are based on the theory that every nation that has its rights invaded will be just claims justice.

On the other hand, this government is

entirely convinced that under the same

conditions we have clear rights and inviolable claims. Not to be compelled to the British reply,

the Monroe doctrine fails to recognize in these principles of international law, which are based on the theory that every nation that has its rights invaded will be just claims justice.

On the other hand, this government is

entirely convinced that under the same

conditions we have clear rights and inviolable claims. Not to be compelled to the British reply,

the Monroe doctrine fails to recognize in these principles of international law, which are based on the theory that every nation that has its rights invaded will be just claims justice.

On the other hand, this government is

entirely convinced that under the same

conditions we have clear rights and inviolable claims. Not to be compelled to the British reply,

the Monroe doctrine fails to recognize in these principles of international law, which are based on the theory that every nation that has its rights invaded will be just claims justice.

On the other hand, this government is

entirely convinced that under the same

conditions we have clear rights and inviolable claims. Not to be compelled to the British reply,

the Monroe doctrine fails to recognize in these principles of international law, which are based on the theory that every nation that has its rights invaded will be just claims justice.

On the other hand, this government is

entirely convinced that under the same

conditions we have clear rights and inviolable claims. Not to be compelled to the British reply,

the Monroe doctrine fails to recognize in these principles of international law, which are based on the theory that every nation that has its rights invaded will be just claims justice.

On the other hand, this government is

entirely convinced that under the same

conditions we have clear rights and inviolable claims. Not to be compelled to the British reply,

the Monroe doctrine fails to recognize in these principles of international law, which are based on the theory that every nation that has its rights invaded will be just claims justice.

On the other hand, this government is

entirely convinced that under the same

conditions we have clear rights and inviolable claims. Not to be compelled to the British reply,

the Monroe doctrine fails to recognize in these principles of international law, which are based on the theory that every nation that has its rights invaded will be just claims justice.

On the other hand, this government is

entirely convinced that under the same

conditions we have clear rights and inviolable claims. Not to be compelled to the British reply,

the Monroe doctrine fails to recognize in these principles of international law, which are based on the theory that every nation that has its rights invaded will be just claims justice.

On the other hand, this government is

entirely convinced that under the same

conditions we have clear rights and inviolable claims. Not to be compelled to the British reply,

the Monroe doctrine fails to recognize in these principles of international law, which are based on the theory that every nation that has its rights invaded will be just claims justice.

On the other hand, this government is

entirely convinced that under the same

conditions we have clear rights and inviolable claims. Not to be compelled to the British reply,

the Monroe doctrine fails to recognize in these principles of international law, which are based on the theory that every nation that has its rights invaded will be just claims justice.

On the other hand, this government is

entirely convinced that under the same

conditions we have clear rights and inviolable claims. Not to be compelled to the British reply,

the Monroe doctrine fails to recognize in these principles of international law, which are based on the theory that every nation that has its rights invaded will be just claims justice.

On the other hand, this government is

entirely convinced that under the same

conditions we have clear rights and inviolable claims. Not to be compelled to the British reply,

the Monroe doctrine fails to recognize in these principles of international law, which are based on the theory that every nation that has its rights invaded will be just claims justice.

On the other hand, this government is

entirely convinced that under the same

conditions we have clear rights and inviolable claims. Not to be compelled to the British reply,

the Monroe doctrine fails to recognize in these principles of international law, which are based on the theory that every nation that has its rights invaded will be just claims justice.

On the other hand, this government is

entirely convinced that under the same

conditions we have clear rights and inviolable claims. Not to be compelled to the British reply,

the Monroe doctrine fails to recognize in these principles of international law, which are based on the theory that every nation that has its rights invaded will be just claims justice.

On the other hand, this government is

entirely convinced that under the same

conditions we have clear rights and inviolable claims. Not to be compelled to the British reply,

the Monroe doctrine fails to recognize in these principles of international law, which are based on the theory that every nation that has its rights invaded will be just claims justice.

On the other hand, this government is

entirely convinced that under the same

conditions we have clear rights and inviolable claims. Not to be compelled to the British reply,

the Monroe doctrine fails to recognize in these principles of international law, which are based on the theory that every nation that has its rights invaded will be just claims justice.

On the other hand, this government is

entirely convinced that under the same

conditions we have clear rights and inviolable claims. Not to be compelled to the British reply,

the Monroe doctrine fails to recognize in these principles of international law, which are based on the theory that every nation that has its rights invaded will be just claims justice.

On the other hand, this government is

entirely convinced that under the same

conditions we have clear rights and inviolable claims. Not to be compelled to the British reply,

the Monroe doctrine fails to recognize in these principles of international law, which are based on the theory that every nation that has its rights invaded will be just claims justice.

On the other hand, this government is

entirely convinced that under the same

conditions we have clear rights and inviolable claims. Not to be compelled to the British reply,

the Monroe doctrine fails to recognize in these principles of international law, which are based on the theory that every nation that has its rights invaded will be just claims justice.

On the other hand, this government is

entirely convinced that under the same

conditions we have clear rights and inviolable claims. Not to be compelled to the British reply,

the Monroe doctrine fails to recognize in these principles of international law, which are based on the theory that every nation that has its rights invaded will be just claims justice.

On the other hand, this government is

entirely convinced that under the same

conditions we have clear rights and inviolable claims. Not to be compelled to the British reply,

the Monroe doctrine fails to recognize in these principles of international law, which are based on the theory that every nation that has its rights invaded will be just claims justice.

On the other hand, this government is

entirely convinced that under the same

conditions we have clear rights and inviolable claims. Not to be compelled to the British reply,

the Monroe doctrine fails to recognize in these principles of international law, which are based on the theory that every nation that has its rights invaded will be just claims justice.

On the other hand, this government is

entirely convinced that under the same

conditions we have clear rights and inviolable claims. Not to be compelled to the British reply,

the Monroe doctrine fails to recognize in these principles of international law, which are based on the theory that every nation that has its rights invaded will be just claims justice.

On the other hand, this government is

entirely convinced that under the same

conditions we have clear rights and inviolable claims. Not to be compelled to the British reply,

the Monroe doctrine fails to recognize in these principles of international law, which are based on the theory that every nation that has its rights invaded will be just claims justice.

On the other hand, this government is

entirely convinced that under the same

conditions we have clear rights and inviolable claims. Not to be compelled to the British reply,

the Monroe doctrine fails to recognize in these principles of international law, which are based on the theory that every nation that has its rights invaded will be just claims justice.

On the other hand, this government is

entirely convinced that under the same

conditions we have clear rights and inviolable claims. Not to be compelled to the British reply,

the Monroe doctrine fails to recognize in these principles of international law, which are based on the theory that every nation that has its rights invaded will be just claims justice.

On the other hand, this government is

entirely convinced that under the same

conditions we have clear rights and inviolable claims. Not to be compelled to the British reply,

the Monroe doctrine fails to recognize in these principles of international law, which are based on the theory that every nation that has its rights invaded will be just claims justice.

On the other hand, this government is

entirely convinced that under the same

conditions we have clear rights and inviolable claims. Not to be compelled to the British reply,

the Monroe doctrine fails to recognize in these principles of international law, which are based on the theory that every nation that has its rights invaded will be just claims justice.

On the other hand, this government is

entirely convinced that under the same

conditions we have clear rights and inviolable claims. Not to be compelled to the British reply,

the Monroe doctrine fails to recognize in these principles of international law, which are based on the theory that every nation that has its rights invaded will be just claims justice.

On the other hand, this government is

entirely convinced that under the same

conditions we have clear rights and inviolable claims. Not to be compelled to the British reply,

the Monroe doctrine fails to recognize in these principles of international law, which are based on the theory that every nation that has its rights invaded will be just claims justice.

On the other hand, this government is

entirely convinced that under the same

conditions we have clear rights and inviolable claims. Not to be compelled to the British reply,

the Monroe doctrine fails to recognize in these principles of international law, which are based on the theory that every nation that has its rights invaded will be just claims justice.

On the other hand, this government is

entirely convinced that under the same

conditions we have clear rights and inviolable claims. Not to be compelled to the British reply,

the Monroe doctrine fails to recognize in these principles of international law, which are based on the theory that every nation that has its rights invaded will be just claims justice.

On the other hand, this government is

entirely convinced that under the same