

ZRV
D-176 Ch
C.R.

*Estados Unidos.
Monroe Doctrine
Charles T. Daly, L.L.D.
Is the Monroe Doctrine Involved
In the Controversy Between
Venezuela & Great Britain
Reprinted from the N.Y. Herald
of January 19, 1896.*

341.42
D153

341.42
D/153



IS THE MONROE DOCTRINE INVOLVED IN THE CON-
TROVERSY BETWEEN VENEZUELA AND
GREAT BRITAIN?

BY CHAS. P. DALY, LL.D.

(Reprinted from the N. Y. Herald of Jan. 19, 1896.)

The impression which appears to have been produced on the minds of our people by the President's recent message was that England, under cover of a disputed boundary, had taken, or was about to take possession by force, in disregard of the Monroe doctrine, of a large part of the territory of Venezuela; which appeared the more obvious from her refusal to allow the question in dispute to be settled by arbitration, and in view of the fact that among the large nations in modern times England has been one of the most aggressive in taking and holding as a permanent possession the territory of weaker nations, three examples of which will suffice: Her interference on behalf of an English commercial company in India, which was followed up by acquiring the whole of India; her taking New York by force, in a time of peace, from the Dutch, who discovered and settled it, and her recent occupation of Egypt.

Whether the Monroe doctrine is or is not involved in what is known as the Venezuelan controversy is a question now open for examination, and in what I have to say respecting it, I do not wish to be understood as questioning that doctrine, for I believe as fully as any one that it is our interest to maintain it; that as a national policy it may even be more important in the future than it is now; and one good effect at least, has resulted from President Cleveland's message: it has disclosed, in respect to that doctrine, how widespread throughout our country at the present day is the determination of our people to uphold it. In the message announcing it, in 1823, President Monroe said: "With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European Power we have not interfered, and shall not interfere." When this was said British Guiana was one of these existing colonies or dependencies, and the question obviously arises, What has Great Britain done or threatened to do that calls for our interference now? If she has simply entered upon and expressed her determination to keep possession of territory that



HUNTING

really belongs to her, it is no violation of the Monroe doctrine; it is not an attempt by a European Power, in the language of the message, "to extend its system to any portion of this hemisphere," which "is dangerous to our peace and safety," nor is it with respect to governments upon this continent, "who have achieved their independence and maintained it, an interposition for the purpose of oppressing, or controlling in any other way their destiny," which "cannot be regarded in any other light than as a manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States."

Whether it is, what President Buchanan in his message in 1860 declared to be within the Monroe doctrine, an attempt to deprive a neighboring Republic of a part of its territory, or what Mr. McMasters, in a recent article, calls an attempt by Great Britain to take from Venezuela a territory that has been estimated as embracing an area of 33,000 square miles, but which he declares is 109,000 square miles, and 40,000 square miles larger than the six New England States, and which he says "she has no just claim to whatever," a safer opinion may be formed when the facts have been more fully investigated and made known.

Whether this territory belongs to England or to Venezuela appears to me to be rather a geographical and historical than a political question, and one that involves an inquiry extending over the long period of two hundred years. What is in dispute, briefly stated, is this: England claims that the territory extending from the mouth of the River Essequibo to the Orinoco was a part of Dutch Guiana when Dutch Guiana was ceded by the Dutch to the English in 1814, while Venezuela claims that it never belonged to Dutch Guiana, but was Spanish territory, which, as such, passed to Venezuela in 1810, when her struggle with Spain commenced, which resulted in the achievement of her independence. As Señor Calcaño, a former Minister for Foreign Affairs in Venezuela, puts it, in an article on the rights of Venezuela, published on December 22, 1895, "What was Spain's possession in 1810 belongs to Venezuela, and what was Holland's in 1814 belongs to England."

This gentleman, who is said to have filled many other important public offices in Venezuela, may be accepted as one who is able to present the Venezuelan side of the question as strongly as it can be presented. He says, in the article above referred to, that "when Dutch Guiana was ceded by the Dutch to the English in 1814, the Dutch and the English knew very well, that there, at the mouth of the Essequibo, commenced the Spanish domain"; and then continues, "it was not merely the Dutch and the English who were aware of

this fact; it was a matter of universal knowledge; chorographers, historians and geographers all knew it, and stated it in their charts, in their chronicles and treatises, published in England, France and Spain."

If this is true it disposes of the whole question. But it is not true, as will subsequently appear. He refers to no chorographer, a title given to one who describes a district or particular country, or to any chart or map in support of this broad statement. He refers to two historical works only—Father Caulin's "Chorographical History of New Andalusia," for the statement that the Dutch in 1596 attempted to ascend the River Orinoco and were driven back by the Spanish, which is true, but the Dutch settlements west of the Essequibo cannot be said to have become permanent until several years afterward. He also refers to the Abbé Raynal's work on the East and West Indies, to show that in 1666 and 1740 the Dutch were driven away by the Spaniards from the vicinity of the Essequibo, which may be true, for all that I know to the contrary, but the Abbé Raynal, though an attractive writer, is not, as is well known to scholars, very reliable upon questions of fact.

Señor Calcaño also says that Holland knew that the Spanish domain commenced at the Essequibo, because by the fifth chapter of the treaty of Münster, in 1748, between her and Spain, "she recognized Spain's rights to these territories," but no such recognition is found in the fifth chapter or article of that celebrated treaty. All that it provides is that Spain or Holland shall thereafter continue in possession of such lordships, cities, countries, &c., in the East and West Indies, Brazil and upon the coast of Asia, Africa and America, as either "respectively hold and possess," and says nothing whatever respecting boundaries. And equally unfounded is Señor Calcaño's further statement that such a recognition is found in the agreement entered into between Spain and Holland at Aranjuez, June 23, 1720.

The whole of the region lying east and south of the Orinoco was originally known as Caribana, a name derived from the Caribs, who then inhabited it, and is represented by that name on the earliest atlas we have, that of Ortelius, which was published at Antwerp in 1570, in which atlas he embraces, under the name of Caribana, all that was afterward known as Dutch and French Guiana. Under the extensive views that were then entertained as to what came under and was acquired by the right of discovery it was regarded as belonging to Spain, and the first settlers in it, east and south of the Orinoco, it is said, were an order of Capuchin friars, under a

Spanish patent, and Miss Stevens, an American lady, who lived for some time in the old town of Guasapati, south of the Orinoco, says that in that town there were, during her time, the remains of an old monastery, a chapel, and botanical gardens which these Spanish friars had planted. In 1614 the Dutch, according to Dalton, the historian of British Guiana, settled at the mouth of the Essequibo, where they erected a fort, and afterwards made other settlements west of the Essequibo, within the now disputed territory. These first settlements were made under the auspices of some Dutch merchants of Zeeland, in Holland, but as the settlements and intercourse with them increased both west and east of the Essequibo River, this infant Dutch colony was recognized by Holland and brought under the control of the States General.

In 1621 it was represented to be in a flourishing condition and thirteen years afterward the settlement at the mouth of the Essequibo was visited by the Dutch navigator, De Vries, who will be familiar to those acquainted with the history of New York when it was a Dutch colony. These settlements were New Zealand and New Middelburg, on the banks of the Pumaron and the Maroco, another at the confluence of the Cuyuni and the Essequibo, which were all within the disputed territory, with settlements or posts on either side of the Essequibo, and upon them the Dutch had plantations where they cultivated tobacco, cotton and sugar. Upon some of them sugar mills and churches were erected at the joint expense of the settlers, which plantations were afterward extended beyond the east bank of the Essequibo. In 1670 a Governor of Essequibo was appointed by the States General, and in 1687 a fortification was erected on Cape Nassau, the name that the cape still bears, and which is within the disputed territory, being about half way between the mouth of the Essequibo and that of the Orinoco. This continuous course of settlements both west and east of the Essequibo warrants the statement of Dalton, that "at the close of the seventeenth century the seven united provinces of Holland succeeded in their endeavors to colonize this land by the cultivation of tobacco, cotton and probably sugar," which he contrasts with "the conduct of the Spaniard who, in his thirst for gold, sought an imaginary treasure while the Dutchman contented himself with the cultivation of the soil."

If we depended upon these facts alone to determine what would, under such circumstances, be the natural boundary of such a colony, or, to express it in the language of Mr. Olney in his letter to Lord Salisbury, its legitimate territorial expansion, it might be

regarded as embracing the whole territory west of the Essequibo to the mouth of the Orinoco, from many examples in the settlement of our own North American colonies as to territory they had taken possession of when the country was a wilderness and inhabited by savages, and which distinguish one from another; a conspicuous example of which was the settlement of the French at the mouth of the Mississippi and but little beyond it, who ceded to the United States by treaty at the beginning of this century, the Mississippi from its mouth to its head waters, and the whole region west of it to the Pacific.

When settlements are made in countries theretofore inhabited by savages, especially over a continent like ours, it has generally been on the coast, by the mouth of rivers; and where the intention was to settle permanently and develop the country, they are generally regarded as having taken possession of what may be required for that purpose, in the natural course of territorial expansion; what they have so possessed themselves of being usually indicated by the natural features of the country, such as mountain barriers, the course of rivers and their tributaries, the limitations imposed or indicated by great rivers or the proximity of other settlements in the same region, with a recognition of their equal rights to territorial expansion; and where a new region inhabited only by savages is taken possession of and a settlement made at the mouth of a river emptying, like the Essequibo, into the sea, that possession is regarded as embracing the river to its head waters and the tributaries flowing into it; the possession of a river and its tributaries being essential as a necessary means of transport through the country which is then a wilderness; and we are told by a Spanish writer, Alcedo, to be hereafter referred to, that the country through which the Essequibo flowed was covered with woods to the shores of the river, and sheltered barbarous tribes, who maintained themselves by fishing and the chase; that the Caribs inhabiting Caribana were on amicable terms with the Dutch and assisted them to navigate the Essequibo and its two large tributaries, the Cuyuni and the Mazaroni, to entrap the Indians, whom they brought to labor on their plantations. This would imply possession then by the Dutch of the whole country through which these rivers flowed, which may be said practically, from the configuration of the country, to embrace the whole of the disputed territory.

But it would seem that the Dutch did not so regard it sixty-two years after their settlement at the mouth of the Essequibo, if we may infer what the view of the Dutch then was from the Dutch

maps of that period, 1696, which are the earliest maps I have been able to find delineating Dutch Guiana. At that period the country in the vicinity of the Orinoco was called New Andalusia. What was then known as Venezuela lay to the south of it; and this Spanish province of New Andalusia is represented on these Dutch maps as extending south of the Orinoco, and including the whole of the now disputed territory. The earliest Dutch maps, or map of any kind of Dutch Guiana, that I have been able to find is one of Pieter Mortier, a Dutch geographer, compiled, as he says, from the best authorities, which is in an atlas published at Amsterdam. It is without date, but this, from some familiarity with the subject, I am able to fix approximately at 1696.

It gives the Dutch settlements west of the Essequibo before referred to, and represents the Spanish province of New Andalusia as extending beyond the Orinoco and into the now disputed territory, and the territory east of the Essequibo he distinguishes by the word "Holandais." But another Dutch map of about the same period, by Charles Allard, shows this more clearly. It is contained in an atlas published at Amsterdam by Covens & Mortier, which gives the whole boundary of the Spanish province of New Andalusia by a carefully drawn red line, showing that it extended over the Orinoco and included the whole territory from the mouth of the Orinoco to that of the Essequibo, the course of this red line clearly indicating that it was then a Spanish province, and the country east of the Essequibo is represented on this map as Guiana.

It is a material fact in this controversy that the united testimony of these Dutch cartographers shows that up to 1708 the country now in dispute was regarded by them as Spanish territory, and it is scarcely supposable that nearly a century after the Dutch began their settlements these cartographers could have had any object in diminishing the extent of a Dutch colony. But maps are by no means infallible, and at that early period cartographers did not always limit themselves to what they had ascertained, but sometimes put down what they imagined. But it is also to be said that the Dutch, who had been great navigators, were at that time in advance of other nations in geographical knowledge. The first atlas and the first work on physical geography were published in Holland, and the maps of these cartographers had then a deserved reputation for the extent of the geographical information they furnished and their comparative accuracy. Of course it cannot be declared that they represented what was then understood by the Dutch government to be the extent of the Dutch colony. They are

not in this respect entitled to the weight that would be attached to a map published by the government, or one of its departments, like our Hydrographic Office, but they are entitled, in my mind, to the consideration that I have not in my researches found anything to contradict them for a period of many years thereafter.

On the contrary, Doppelmaier's great German atlas, published in Nuremberg in 1742, shows a settlement or post called St. Thomas, with the words "sub Hispanis" on the east side of the Orinoco and near its mouth, and Guiana as east and south of the Essequibo, indicating that the region west of that river belonged to Spain, although it shows Cape Nassau, as on previous maps about half way between the mouth of the Essequibo and that of the Orinoco. Within a few years, however—that is, in 1759—the Dutch government, as Lord Salisbury has stated, claimed the basin of the Cuyuni River and its branches, which is west of the Essequibo and within the disputed territory, as belonging to the Dutch, the government of Holland having sent a remonstrance to Spain complaining of the incursion of the Spaniards into the Dutch posts and settlements on the banks of the Cuyuni, which remonstrance was followed by another in 1769, to which remonstrances, he says, Spain made no reply, and that it is evident from archives now existing in Spain that the Spanish Council of State did not consider that they had the means of rebutting these remonstrances, and that they regarded the reports sent them as to the Spanish claim by their subordinate officers as unsatisfactory and improbable; while Senator Lodge, in his recent speech in the Senate, says that before this—in 1758—when the Director-General of the Essequibo in that year sent a protest to the Spanish authorities complaining that Spanish troops had driven the Dutch from one of the posts they had on the banks of the Cuyuni, a reply was received saying that the River Cuyuni and its dependencies belonged to Spain.

It may possibly be that during the half century that intervened from the time of the publication of the Dutch maps to this period—1758—the Dutch colony had so increased in population and trade that the territory west of the Essequibo became requisite to it in the ordinary course of territorial expansion, or it may be that when the States General of Holland recognised the infant colony and took control of it, which they did by granting to the Dutch West India Company certain rights in it, and exercised other acts of dominion, they regarded the territory from the mouth of the Essequibo to that of the Orinoco as having been taken possession of by



them, as Spain had not permanently settled in it, her settlements, so far as made, being very limited and close to the Orinoco, and because her claim beyond that, if any, would have extended to the whole region originally known as Caribana, as all that it rested upon was the vague and loose ideas that then existed as to the extent of possession that was incident to the right of discovery, which claim neither the Dutch, the French nor the English paid any attention to when they settled in Caribana, England also having had a colony there for some years, which, in 1674, she exchanged with the Dutch for New York.

It may be, therefore, as I have said, that when the States General of Holland took the Dutch settlement there made under its control, it had the right to take possession, and did so, of the territory west of Essequibo, or that part of it where the Spanish had no settlements and they had, such as New Zeeland, Middelburg, Kick-overal, Cape Nassau, which they fortified, and settlements or posts on both sides of the Essequibo. However that may have been, it is certain that Holland claimed all the territory as hers more than half a century before Dutch Guiana was ceded to the English. It may be further stated that for some years before and after these Dutch remonstrances were sent to Spain European cartographers generally, as well as Alcedo, an eminent Spanish geographer, treated the now disputed territory as belonging to the Dutch.

I have not gone over all the European atlases between that time and 1814, nor would it, I suppose, be possible to do so in this country. The largest collection of atlases, from the first one, by Ortelius, in 1570, to the beginning of the present century, that I know of, and I have seen the principal collections in Europe, is the one belonging to the American Geographical Society at New York, and what I have been able to gather from this large collection has been confirmatory of what has been above stated. My space will admit only of my referring to a few of these maps. An undated map of Herman Moll's, entitled the Coasts, Countries and Islands of the South Sea Company, gives the whole region east of the Orinoco to Dutch and French Guiana. The general atlas of the world, London, 1721, has what is called a new map of the world from the latest observations. It shows Cape Nassau considerably to the west of the Essequibo and the Territory of Caribana nearly as in previous maps. In Henry Popple's atlas of the Portuguese Empire in America, with the French and Spanish Settlements Adjacent, there is a map which, from the date of other maps in the atlas, I fix at about 1750, showing the territory from the mouth of the Orinoco

to that of the Essequibo as separate from New Andalusia, with the name of Surinam, evidently given by the Dutch, and it is distinguished from New Andalusia by being colored, which, if correct, shows that at that time the now disputed territory was distinct from that of the Spanish. In another map in the same atlas of the British possessions this is shown more clearly, which represents Surinam as far as then settled by the Dutch, with the same boundary from the Essequibo around the coast to the Orinoco and then south to Lake Cayama and the island of St. Thomas, with the Dutch settlements west of the Essequibo, as in the Dutch maps I have referred to, fifty-five years before. In Thomas Jeffery's map, London, 1778, the boundary of Dutch Guiana is represented by a line from the mouth of the Orinoco and thence around the coast to the River Maroni, which is the boundary between Dutch and French Guiana.

Thomas Kitchen's General Atlas of the World, London, 1782, represents as Dutch Guiana the country to the south of the Orinoco eastward to the Maroni River, the boundary, as I have said, of French Guiana, the boundary being marked by colored lines. Within the lines represented as Dutch Guiana is the River Cuyuni, the two Dutch forts heretofore referred to, the Dutch Cape Nassau, and the Dutch settlement far to the west of the Essequibo, or, in general words, all of the territory now claimed by the English as acquired from the Dutch. This atlas was published fourteen years before the English conquest of Dutch Guiana and thirty-two years before the colony was ceded to the English by the Dutch, at a time when there could not have been any interest on the part of an English cartographer to give an erroneous representation of what was then understood as Dutch Guiana; and Arrowsmith's English Atlas, London, 1806, includes as Dutch Guiana the region west of the Essequibo and a considerable way inland.

But more important than this is what is found in the work of the Spanish geographer, Alcedo (Note A). It is in five volumes, published in Madrid, 1786-1789, the original work in Spanish being now exceedingly rare, a copy of which is in the library of the American Geographical Society. A translation by G. A. Thompson was published in London, 1812-1815. To cite passages from this voluminous work would require too much space. I shall therefore confine myself to a very brief enumeration of what he states, giving the volumes and pages where the passages I refer to can be found in the English translation. He describes Caribana as a large country which extends to the mouth of the Orinoco, and

which includes the Dutch colony of Essequibo, Surinam, Berbici, and the French colony of Cayenne (Vol. I., p. 310). He places the Rivers Cuyuni, Carmen and Cosacuro, which are all in the disputed territory, as in that part of Guiana possessed by the Dutch, who had built forts on either side of the Essequibo, and says that by means of these rivers the Dutch merchants of the province, assisted by the Caribs, go to entrap the Indians (Vol. I., pp. 318, 524, 570). That on two of the islands of the Essequibo are plantations, with some houses forming part of the colony which the Dutch had established on the shores of that river (Vol. II., pp. 82, 83). He refers to the River Maraquin, which is within the disputed territory, as in that part of Guiana possessed by the Dutch (Vol. II., pp. 445, 451), and to the River Mazaroni, which is also within the disputed territory, as one which the Dutch navigate, being protected by the Caribs (Vol. III., p. 86).

I have not, except in a very limited extent, been able to follow the French and German atlases from the time of Sanson and that of Doppelmaier in 1742, to 1814; but as far as I have seen them I have found nothing contrary to what I have stated respecting this period. The German cartographers during the present century have been noted for their care and accuracy in map making, and it may be material in the present inquiries to state that the three last German atlases, by Kiepert, Andree and Stieler, the last edition of Stieler being in 1891, works of deserved reputation, all agree in giving British Guiana a western boundary, drawn in a general southerly direction from the mouth of the Orinoco, thus giving to Great Britain all that she now claims and where she has over 40,000 inhabitants.

These facts show, so far as the representations of cartographers and geographers are entitled to weight, that the territory claimed by Venezuela was regarded as belonging to the Dutch for more than half a century before it was ceded by the Dutch to the English. It is said, however, by Miss Stevens that between the years 1780 and 1783 orders were issued by the King of Spain for peopling and governing the portion of Guiana lying between the Essequibo and the Orinoco, with directions to investigate the Dutch trading posts, and Señor Calcaño says that before this, by the royal decrees of the King of Spain, of April 13, 1779, and October 1, 1780, a Spanish naval officer was directed to storm a fort which the Dutch were erecting on the River Maroco, and to inform the Governor of Essequibo that the Spanish government would not tolerate trespasses by strangers on land of the Spanish domain; and the New

York *Sun* of December 20, 1895, has published a portion of a map said to have been authorized by the Spanish government in 1796 showing that Dutch Guiana was to the east of the Essequibo, and the country west of it, which includes the disputed territory, belonged to Spain; the weight to be given to which I am unable to determine without reading these decrees and seeing this map, in which connection I should mention that a writer of January 2, 1896, calls attention to a Venezuelan account of a Spanish royal order of 1780 establishing rules to people the province of Guiana and to occupy land, which states that this province commenced at the windward of the fall of the River Orinoco into the sea on the border of the Dutch colony of Essequibo; which this writer regards as an admission by Venezuela that leaves no doubt that in 1780 the Spanish government admitted the existence of the Dutch possession to the mouth of the Orinoco; which is not so clear to me as it seems to the writer, as I have met with other instances in which the Spaniards use the name of Guiana for the territory west of the Essequibo, which name of Guiana, Dalton says, was given by the Dutch and meant wild coast.

The facts here brought together, I think, sufficiently show how difficult, if not impossible, it will be for the Commission appointed by the President to do what the act of Congress under which they were appointed requires of them—that is, “to report upon the true divisional line” between Venezuela and British Guiana, but it is possible for a board of arbitration to say what, in view of all the circumstances, would be a fair line of separation or boundary. This Lord Salisbury will not consent to; that is, he is willing “to hold open for public negotiations and even arbitration the unsettled land between the Schomburgk line and what the English consider their rightful boundary, but not the territory within the Schomburgk line, an arbitrary one, fixed some years ago by their own officials; the reason given for the refusal being that the right of the English to that was undoubted, the claim of Venezuela to include which in the arbitration, Lord Salisbury says, is a “pretension hardly less exorbitant than would be a refusal of Great Britain to agree to an arbitration on the boundary of British Columbia and Alaska, unless the United States would consent to bring into question the one-half of the whole area of the latter territory.”

But this illustration is not analogous. The uncertainty, if I am warranted in so expressing it, as to what was Spanish and what was Dutch territory, has existed for two hundred years, as shown by Dutch maps at the beginning of that period. These show that the

whole region west of the Essequibo to the mouth of the Orinoco was Spanish territory, and in the claim made to it by Spain some thirty-five years before the English possession of the colony, no distinction was made as to any part of it, but the whole territory was claimed west of the Essequibo, and such being the fact, what ground can there be for distinguishing part of the territory that lies within an arbitrary line drawn by Sir Robert Schomburgk, a Prussian surveyor employed by Great Britain, as a particular part in respect to which England has, as Lord Salisbury says, "an undoubted right?"

Where a dispute exists between two individuals, one of them may rightfully refuse to submit the matter to arbitration, who feels assured that he has but to resort to a judicial tribunal to have his rights enforced; but when a dispute exists between two independent States upon a question of boundary, there is no such tribunal to resort to, and the only way in which it can be settled is by arbitration or the sword, and this brings up the question whether the refusal of Great Britain to have the matter in dispute between her and Venezuela settled by arbitration is a position that calls for the application by us of the Monroe doctrine—that is, if a question of this kind arises between a European colony and one of the South American States which that State is willing to have settled by arbitration, but the parent country of the colony is not, that it is our right and we will compel her to do so, to the full extent of our power, which is a view of the Monroe doctrine of extensive obligation and fraught with widespread consequences.

When the United States was invited by Colombia and Mexico to send delegates representing the United States to a Congress of Republics, to be held at Panama, for making the Monroe doctrine more effectual, which our government did not accept, it may be well to recall the language of a resolution then adopted by the House of Representatives, the close of which was in these words: "The people of the United States should be left free to act in any crisis in such a manner as their feelings of friendship toward these Republics and as their own honor and policy may at the time dictate." At the present time—that is, by the census of 1891—British Guiana had a population of 278,295, of which 2,533 were born in Europe, 99,615 were Africans, 105,465 East Indians and 3,714 Chinese, and Venezuela had a population of 2,323,529, the proportion of the white race in each being about one per cent. I have, I think, set forth the nature and full extent of the Venezuelan claim, and whether we will go to war with Great Britain to compel her to have it settled by arbitration may be safely left to what President

Van Buren said was characteristic of our people—the sober second thought—who will consider, to use the language of the resolution just referred to, whether our friendship for this Republic and our own honor and policy demand that we should carry the Monroe doctrine to that extent. A war between two great nations in such a matter with all that such a war will entail on each, appears to me to be extraordinary, unless it has its source in an instinctive desire to make war upon each other, which I do not believe. The same sober second thought may be commended to the English Government with the expectation that upon a more thorough understanding of the facts it may see its way to avoid such a conflict, as I think that if there ever was a case that should be settled by arbitration it is this.

CHARLES P. DALY.

NEW YORK,
January 17, 1896.

NOTE A.—The title of Alcedo's work, taken from the first volume, is as follows: *Diccionario Geográfico-Histórico de las Indias Occidentales o América: Es a saber: de los Reynos del Perú, Nueva España, Tierra Firme, Chile, y Nuevo Reyno de Granada, Etc., Escrito por el Coronel D. Antonio de Alcedo, Capitan de Reales Guardias Españolas.*

Tomo I.

Con Licencia.

En la Imprenta de Benito Cano. En Madrid Año de MDCCLXXXVI.

The military rank of the writer and the *imprimatur* give an official character to the work.

NOTE B.—In the article by Mr. Charles H. Lugin in the *Herald of Sunday*, January 26th, on Guiana's Boundaries a Century Ago, the writer gives a quotation from a manuscript History of Guiana, which he says is in his possession, and adds that a reference in the quotation "to the map sent by the Spanish Government to D'Anville, the French geographer, on which the lines of Dutch Guiana are laid down in accordance with a description given herein, seems to be important, and the map, if it could be found, would be almost conclusive evidence."

The quotation from the manuscript which he gives says nothing about any map. The words of the quotation are as follows:

"With respect to the Dutch line it appears by certain authentic documents transmitted by the Court of Spain to M. D'Anville, Geographer and Engineer to the King of France, in which there is a distinct and full description of the Dutch territories wherein the line extends to the westward of Lake Amacou, making a distinct curve for the Lake of Parima and then running up to the Rio Negro according to the dotted line on the general map of Guiana." (*So printed.*)

It does not follow from the statement that certain authentic documents were transmitted by the Court of Spain to D'Anville, that one of these documents was a map of Dutch Guiana, with a dotted line showing the boundaries of that colony. There may have been a map, but this is not necessarily inferrible from the statement.

It does not appear from the manuscript quoted when these documents were sent from Spain to the French geographer, but in D'Anville's atlas of 1752 there is a map of South America (dated 1748) in which the boundaries of Dutch and French Guiana are distinctly marked by coloured lines, and the boundaries of Dutch Guiana as therein laid down are in accordance with the statement made by the writer of the manuscript in Mr. Lugin's possession. This map may have been made by D'Anville from documents transmitted to him by the Spanish Court as the manuscript states. In this map Lake Amacou (or Amucu, as the map has it), lies south of the southern boundary and east of the western boundary of Dutch Guiana, as laid down, and the curved line referred to in the manuscript is drawn from the point of junction of the southern and western boundaries passing Lake Parima (a lake then believed in, but which does not exist), and then, as the writer of the manuscript states, is carried to the Rio Negro, a branch of the Amazon, and continued to the Amazon itself.

This map of D'Anville's, of 1748, has this cartographical importance that it represents the territory now in dispute as then belonging to the Dutch.

In my article on this controversy in the *Herald* of January 19, I did not refer to D'Anville's map, because my space was too limited to include all the cartographical evidence from the middle of the last century to the period of the cession of Guiana by the Dutch to the English in 1814; contenting myself with the general statement that all the cartographical evidence during this period of about forty years, so far as I had been able to ascertain, warranted the statement that the now disputed territory was then generally recognized by cartographers as belonging to the Dutch.

CHAS. P. DALY.

ZRV
D-176 *ch*

-23.919-

C.206 F.14

