eign representatives, so that a rapid review of ancient history will serve to shed a true light on the present situation.

The unjustifiable seizure of the islands by Lord Paulet (1843), some features of which are not very different from our present situation, was brought about by the high-handed enforcement of trumped-up charges and claims by the English consul Charlton, and the French incident in 1849 was caused by Consul Dillon's arrogance. As Alexander's history states it, "for years the Honolulu community was kept in a state of turmoil by consular grievances," and in 1846 a table of such grievances, prepared by order of the Legislature, "formed a roll 120 feet long." Every consul, and more prominently at one time the United States Commissioner Brown, insisted on "the right of diplomatic interference with the internal affairs of the Kingdom," and of "ready access to the person of the Sovereign." (Alex., 261.) It would now seem that in those early times the various powers represented here were vying with each other to seize any pretext which might give them a shadow of right for taking possession of these desirable and coveted islands, so that the late policy of Minister Stevens and Capt. Wiltse, of lying in ambush and waiting for the most trivial pretext to jump on the native Government, has not even the merit of being original with them.

Fortunately, in the past, the various great powers have been generous, disinterested, and honorable enough to disown the political cupidity of their agents, and this is one of the reasons why the natives to-day are so patient and peaceful; they know that the great American Republic is the most honorable and generous of all nations, and takes the lead in all just and liberal ideas, moreover they have such an inborn faith in and respect for the United States Government, whom they have been taught by their early teachers to regard as their best friend and natural protector, that they can not be otherwise than confident that history will only repeat itself and that their precious independence will not be less respected by America than it has been by England and France.

This confidence is all the more justifiable, as this is not the first time that the country has been disturbed by some annexation craze. In 1853 things here reached such a crisis that the foreigners then living in Honolulu, and "especially men recently arrived from California thought that 'the times were ripe,' and organized with the view of forcing on King Kamehameha III, annexation to the United States; 'petitions in favor of it were circulated and signed and strong commercial interests used for its furtherance;'" and stranger yet to say the King got to be "so tired of demands made on him by foreign powers, and of threats by filibusters from abroad, and by conspirators at home to overturn the national government" that he himself declared in favor of annexation "as a refuge from impending dangers." (Alexander.) But fortunately, at that time, the last remaining faithful missionaries of the old stock strongly opposed the project, believing "that its effects would be disastrous to the native race" (Alex., 277), and the honest American diplomats of the period indorsed that opinion. And here, let it be said to their honor, the early American missionaries have ever been found on the side of the rightful native authorities, advising them and helping them to resist foreign aggressions, and being allowed in consequence full political control. Even to-day, faithful to their original mission, the Roman Catholic and Anglican clergies are still found on the side of the native independent government.*

---

*The fact of these two religious denominations not being favorable to annexation may make it interesting to add here a statistical note about the approximate distri-