received that force was not to be used nor what your further intentions were concerning this Government.

(28) During your nearly two months' residence in this city you and your family have declined the customary social courtesies usually extended to those occupying your official position, on the specified ground that it was not deemed best under existing circumstances to accept such civilities.

I do not for a moment intimate that such a course is improper or that it is a subject for criticism. It is simply referred to by me as an existing fact bearing upon your relations to this Government and germane in considering the question of your attitude thereto. It would not have been referred to by me except in response to your inquiry.

In the absence of specific definite information as to the intentions of your Government, the foregoing are some of the facts from which this Government has been obliged to infer what such intentions were, and which, considered as a whole, constitute the "attitude" toward this Government.

It may be that the proper logical deduction and inference from the foregoing facts is that the attitude of the United States and its representative toward the Provisional Government is and has been "one essentially and designately expressive of peace." It will give us the greatest pleasure to receive assurances to that effect, but I submit that under the circumstances and in the absence of such assurances, they are capable of another construction, to a sufficient extent at least, to warrant the question which I have asked you in my communication of December 27.

Your second request for information is as follows:

"You assert that at the time of my arrival in this country the forces of this Government were organized and amply sufficient to suppress any internal disorder. Will you inform me what connection this statement has or is designed to have with the Government of the United States or with the future action of its representative?"

I reply that there are two reasons for the said statement. First, that already stated in my letter of December, that "in consequence of your attitude, the enemies of the Government, believing in your intentions to restore the monarchy by force, have become emboldened," etc.; and, second, that by reason of my inability to ascertain whether your Government proposed to use force in support of its policy of restoration, I was obliged to act as though it did so intend; as a result of which this Government has been obliged to increase its forces, and has been, and now is, subjected to the necessity of increased watchfulness and large additional expense, which, but for such attitude, would have been unnecessary.

The effect which I had hoped this communication might have upon the future action of the representative of the United States was that he might give such assurances that such additional watchfulness and expense might be avoided.

Your third inquiry is as to the time, place, and subject-matter of the "language" used by yourself in public and in communication to this Government. The answer to this is covered by my reply to your first inquiry.

Your fourth inquiry is as to what particular words in the published letter from Secretary Gresham and in the President's message, and which message of the President I referred to. I reply that certain of the words of the Secretary and the President which I deem pertinent to the subject-matter have already been quoted in my reply to your first inquiry, although there are other obvious bearing on the same subject.

I have already replied to you that I referred to the President's first message in my letter dated the 27th, having actually been written on the 26th of December, and forwarded to you before I had knowledge of the contents of the second message.

Your fifth inquiry is as to the time and contents of your communications which were "ambiguous."

I have enumerated them in my reply to your first inquiry.

The ambiguity consists in the reiterated statement that you proposed to do some act and carry out certain instructions which all the surrounding circumstances indicated were inimical to this Government, without stating what that act nor what those instructions were; and, while presenting and speaking assurances of friendship and amity, without the consent of this Government negotiating with its enemies for its subversion and declining to state what your intentions were.

Such utterances and actions were so inconsistent, one with the other, with international rules of comity, and the past relations and international policy of the two governments, as to be not only ambiguous but incomprehensible to this Government.

Your sixth inquiry is as to when, where, and to whom you declared that you intended to do some act when the proper time arrived. The reply to your first inquiry covers this also.

Your seventh inquiry is as to the time and manner when the Government has sought the assurance that force would not be used. The answer is contained in my reply to your first inquiry.