that annexation would make them American citizens, as such is the case in say Texas or Arizona, they would forever abandon the thought of royalty and hail annexation with delight as the ultimate destiny of Hawaii.

Will the people of the United States, as represented in Congress or either branch thereof, permit the vast majority of the Hawaiian people to be driven by armed force into a distasteful political condition by a handful of political jackals of the missionary party, simply because the Hawaiians are poor and the other own the property? And this is practically the reason advanced by the commissioners. Does the action of the United States Government on the Samoan question indicate that America will use her armed forces to permit a minority of foreigners to coerce a majority of the native people; and would such a course be creditable to the American people? Would it be an exponent of the American principle of justice to the weak? But the entire question could be settled by forming a treaty which would remove the objections referred to, by interfering with no vested rights, and by giving political privileges to the rich and the poor alike. And while this might not altogether please the monopolists, an accommodation which would give equal civil rights to the Hawaiians in the management of local Hawaiian affairs is the one only which is just, beneficial, or practical from the standpoint of the future, from either the American or Hawaiian point of view.

It is not necessary to refute the arguments of that portion of the American press which opposes annexation on sentimental or economical grounds. That issue I assume to be already settled. It will be a sorry day for both America and Hawaii if annexation should now be deferred. Nevertheless, it will be a source of great grief to Hawaii and of future disgrace to the proclaimed political righteousness of the American people if the latter refuse us conditions which represent a fullness of political rights. The only hope of a condition of affairs which will make Hawaii a country in which a white man of self-respect and loving liberty can live and prosper is annexation, accompanied by an equal franchise to Hawaiians in matters of local administration.

Referring to the idea of an American protectorate, this would be bitterly repulsive to the great majority of the Hawaiian people, native and foreign, as many degrees worse, if possible, than "annexation" under the Thurston-Harrison treaty, with carpetbag government controlled by the family-compact oligarchy. It would, to our minds, mean the presence of a foreign armed force to bayonet into submission any resistance to tyranny, however great, if only perpetrated in the name of law and by the authority of the Government for the time being. It would mean the engrafting of a moneyed aristocracy into place and power, who, representing only the Missionary party, could, by their unlimited wealth, drown the cries of the people of this country from consideration of any man or body of men holding the power of review. Our appeals would not likely reach the Congress. This is the view which caused the unanimous uprising of the people against what is generally known as the "Blaine treaty" in 1889-90.

This was a treaty drafted, as was said, by Mr. Blaine, then Harrison's Secretary of State, and brought from Washington by H. A. P. Carter, then Hawaiian minister to the United States. A majority of the cabinet were in favor of it, and tried to force the King to sign it; but C. W. Ashford, who was attorney-general, resisted it on the ground that it contained a "troops" clause, permitting the United States to land forces to "preserve law and order," which, he contended,