

any other interference with peaceful freedom of belief by the executive authority is a high-handed offense against American right, American law, American conscience, American order and American freedom.

EDWARD M. SHEPARD.
Brooklyn, Dec. 3, 1903.

JUDGE DUNNE ON THE PANAMA TREATY.

On Sunday afternoon, December 7, Judge Edward F. Dunne spoke before the Henry George Association of Chicago on the recent Panama affair. The Chicago Examiner reports that "Handel hall was crowded and Judge Dunne was enthusiastically received." The Examiner's report of the speech is as follows:

In the year 1846 the United States of America concluded a treaty with the republic of New Granada, now known as the republic of Colombia, in which, in return for certain valuable concessions to American citizens, among which were the same privileges of commerce and navigation enjoyed by the citizens of Granada in crossing the Isthmus of Panama, the United States of America "guaranteed positively to the republic of New Granada the neutrality of the isthmus and the rights of sovereignty and property which New Granada has and possesses over the said territory."

This treaty has been faithfully observed by the republic of New Granada and its successor, the republic of Colombia, down to the present day, and until the month of November, 1903, was respected and adhered to by the United States of America.

During the month of November just past the United States government, without any pretense of this treaty being violated, hurriedly equipped in its navy yards a number of gunboats, loaded up a number of its war vessels with ammunition and marines, and hurriedly dispatched them to Colon and Panama in a time of profound peace.

Immediately upon their arrival, as by a preconcerted signal, a few hundred men in the cities of Colon and Panama, cities located at either end of the isthmus railroad, seize a few hundred rifles and a splendid supply of ammunition and small arms opportunely placed at their disposal by some disinterested philanthropists, occupy the railroad termini and declare themselves to be the republic of Panama in revolt against the republic of Colombia.

At once, by orders from Washington given several days before, United States marines are landed from the United States gunboats, the railway stations seized by United States troops and all transportation of Colombian troops

over the railroad prohibited. The United States gunboats blockade the harbors and Colombian vessels are warned off and prohibited from landing at their own ports, Panama and Colon.

Within 100 hours after this preconcerted and prearranged emeute, before any election is held, before even any semblance of a convention or convocation is called, before a shadow of a congress is gotten together, before the rudiments of a provisional government is gotten under way; before, so far as the press dispatches disclose, a provisional president or even a dictator is appointed, the president of the United States gives official recognition to an agent of the French canal syndicate in Washington, who declares himself minister plenipotentiary of the undelivered foetus of a government, and within a few hours afterward concludes an alleged treaty with this worthy which violates the solemn pledges made by this government with the southern republic 57 years ago.

The foregoing is the shameful story of American history for the month of November, 1903.

A more scandalous and disgraceful exhibition of Punic faith and breach of national honor is not recorded in the pages of history.

In 1846, when the treaty between these countries was negotiated, the young republic of Granada was weak in population and financial strength, but she possessed then and she possesses now one of the most important strategic possessions in the world—a narrow isthmus, about 30 miles in width, separating great oceans, capable of being cut across by modern engineering skill, and thus reducing by thousands of miles and weeks of time navigation around the world. Even in 1846 the envious eyes of the great nations of the world rested upon this isthmus, and enlightened, broad-minded and fairly disposed American statesmen at that date, recognizing the tremendous importance of the position and fearing lest the great land-grabbing nations of Europe might despoil the young republic of its most valuable possession, inspired and brought about this treaty of 1846, which was fair to both republics and mutually advantageous.

The American statesmen of that day were incapable of fomenting rebellions within the territory of sister republics and grabbing off what they could lay their hands on during the disturbances that followed.

In making the treaty of 1846 they were inspired by the spirit of the Monroe doctrine, and guaranteed to the

young republic of South America, then but recently sprung into being, that no European nation should despoil her of her territory or sovereignty.

That our government at Washington connived at the outbreak at Panama is established beyond all question:

1. Walter Wellman, a very reliable and well-informed correspondent, stationed at Washington before the outbreak, wrote to his paper that the United States authorities were hastily dispatching gunboats, marines and munitions of war to Panama, and that something "was in the wind" at Panama.

I remember reading the letter several days before the outbreak.

2. On November 17 a New York paper printed the following: "Mr. Dugue (publisher of the Star and Herald at Panama) is said to have informed Mr. Hay that the revolution was scheduled to take place on September 23," to which Mr. Hay replied: "September 23 is much too early."

Mr. Dugue went back to New York. The revolution was postponed to November 3.

3. American war vessels had, by orders of the government at Washington, been collected within striking distance, and on the day before the revolution began Admiral Glass was notified to go to the isthmus.

4. The planting of the agent of the French canal syndicate, the soon-to-be minister plenipotentiary of the unborn republic, at Washington before the outbreak, so as to be ready to sign the previously drafted and arranged treaty.

5. The scandalously indecent violation of international law and customs in recognizing a representative of a government not even provisionally organized, within a few hours after the outbreak.

6. The signing of a cut and dried treaty with a man notoriously interested as the agent of companies which would acquire \$40,000,000 thereunder at a time when the alleged republic he claimed to represent had neither a president, a senate, a congress or a flag, so far as the press dispatches disclose to the world.

7. The insolent, outrageous and high-handed conduct of the United States marines and sailors, acting under orders from Washington, in refusing to allow Colombian troops to travel upon the Panama railway to suppress the rebellion, and in refusing to allow the soldiers of the republic to be landed in Panama and Colon, when sent there by their government to put down the disturbance.

The conduct of our government at Washington in this regard shows that not only was the outbreak organized with the full approval, if not active assistance, of the United States authorities, but that our government openly succored and assisted the rebels by preventing the Colombian government from suppressing the revolt. That the Colombian government could have suppressed the revolt within a few days, or weeks at most, cannot be doubted in view of the fact that even if every citizen of the state of Panama was in revolt, which is far from the fact, they would be outnumbered as 13 to 1 by the citizens of Colombia.

The population of Colombia is 3,878,600. The population of Panama is 235,000. As well might the county of La Salle revolt against the great State of Illinois.

There is no possible doubt but that our government at Washington connived at, if it did not actually organize, the revolt at Panama, and that it actively and openly assisted the insurgents after the outbreak and prevented the constituted authorities of Columbia from suppressing the revolt.

It is a record so unprincipled, so indecent and so vile as to cause every American citizen who has country's honor and glory at heart to hang his head in shame.

We take the young Republic of Columbia in 1846 under our protection, and pledge ourselves to protect her from the designs of the great robber nations of the earth. She has around her a girdle of surprising value.

In 1903 we despoil her and steal her girdle.

No wonder that in the agony of her disgrace and misplaced confidence the young republic has appealed from our government to our people, and pointed out to them in words that burn and brand the infamy of our conduct.

I utter these words, not so much in criticism of the powers that be in executive station at Washington, but in protest at the confirmation of a treaty which, if it is consummated, will forever degrade my country and disgrace the American name, character and flag. This soiled, be-greased, foul, ill-scented and bedraggled document bearing the names of John Hay and "what's-his-name," minister plenipotentiary of the alleged Panama republic, must be presented, even if it is presented with a tongs, to the United States senate for confirmation. In that senate there are men professing allegiance to two or more parties. The dominant party does not control the senate by a two-thirds

vote. In the dominant party there are men who love their country and have its honor at heart. In the minority there are men of like caliber. Is there not in the senate of the United States at least a minority of one-third among all parties who have intelligence and virtue enough to prevent by their votes of "Nay" on a motion to confirm this scandalous iniquity and disgrace to the American nation? For the honor of America it is to be hoped there is. If there is not I see only a degeneracy of the great American republic like to that which submerged the old republic of Rome into the degradation and final dismemberment of the Roman empire.

It remains to consider the explanation offered by the state department and its apologists.

First—It is asserted by them that in guaranteeing the sovereignty of the republic of Colombia over the isthmus, we only pledged the faith of the United States to protect the republic from the aggressions of foreign countries, and that we did not guarantee it from revolt within its borders.

The words of the treaty do not bear this construction. No reference to foreign countries is made in the words of the guarantee. It is absolute and unconditional, and given for most valuable considerations. The guaranty runs not to the state of Panama or its citizens, but to the republic of New Granada. But even if it did not cover insurrection from within, it certainly does prevent the government of the United States, in honor and in conscience, from taking sides in case of insurrection with the insurrectionists, or giving them aid or comfort. Yet this is just what our government has done, and has done so flagrantly, openly and indecently, that even the most shameless apologist of the administration has not the temerity to indorse it.

The press dispatches, without contradiction, all show that we prevented the Colombian government from landing Colombian troops to suppress the outbreak, and prevented the Colombian troops on the ground at the time of the outbreak from using the railroad for a like purpose. The admiral commanding the United States squadron, which had been collected at the isthmus in anticipation of the outbreak, even refused to allow an envoy from Bogota to land at Panama for the purpose of discussing the situation with the rebels—a most scandalous proceeding for an alleged neutral nation.

Secondly—It is alleged by the apologists of this national crime that in recognizing this spawn of greed and corrup-

tion, yecept the republic of Panama, we were following international precedents. I know of no such precipitous recognition of a national weakling in history.

In 1861 great States of the United States, having a population of probably 8,000,000 souls, formally seceded from the United States, established a new government and carried on a great war with varying success for four years, and yet no civilized government deemed it proper to accord the new government recognition. The Cuban insurrectionists carried on a successful war for many months against Spain, and had absolute control over large tracts of country in Cuba, and yet neither the United States nor any other government accorded them recognition.

Aguinaldo and the Philippine insurgents against Spain carried on successful war against Spain, and held undisputed sovereignty over a great part of Luzon for many months, and yet neither the United States nor any other civilized government recognized them as a defacto government. Numberless other cases of like character will be found in history, but not a case can be found where an insurrection which springs into being between two days has ever been dignified with recognition as a government within five days after its origin, by any civilized government on earth.

The whole scaly, slimy, miserable plot is so transparently fraudulent and corrupt that an attempted defense of it exposes its defenders to the charge of dishonesty or moral obliquity.

Be bad, and others can talk about you;
Be good, and you can talk about others.
—Chicago Tribune.

What Russia wants in China is an open door that only Russia can get through.—N. Y. Press.

Mr. Morgan's "undigested securities" are coming to be viewed by the public more in the light of "digested insecurities."—Life.

"You say your daughter is fond of music?"

"I should say so," answered Cumrox. "When Gwendolyn makes up her mind to play the piano nothing can stop her. And she seems to like it, no matter how bad it sounds."—Washington Star.

BOOKS

"THE FAILURE OF JESUS AND HIS TRIUMPH..."

Under the pseudonym of "Frater Occidentalis," some brilliant writer has