ment, had produced the unfortunate state of affairs that was brought to your attention as a reason why such information should not be longer withheld.

The first part of Minister Thurston’s interview with Secretary Gresham, quoted by you on pages 8 and 9 of your letter, standing alone, permits the construction which you have given to it. But taken with the rest of the interview, as reported in my letter of specifications, must, I submit, be considered as having been rendered somewhat problematical in meaning by the Secretary’s refusal in the latter part of the interview to answer Mr. Thurston’s direct question whether or not the United States intended to use force.

In your reference to paragraph 12 of the letter of specifications you say “you expressed your satisfaction and approval of what occurred.” Permit me to say in fuller explanation of the interview in question that I expressed my satisfaction with your assurances that you did not mean to give the impression that you had any “intention of exercising authority inconsistent with that of” the Hawaiian Government.

This assurance referred solely to your reported remarks published in the Hawaiian Star, November 16, as follows: “Until the time comes for me to carry out my instructions, the peace and good order of this community will be kept undisturbed in the interest of humanity,” etc. My satisfaction was with the temporary relief afforded by your assurance that until the time should come for you to carry out your instructions you had “no intention of exercising authority inconsistent with that of” the Hawaiian Government. I was still in the dark as to your instructions and as to your plans for carrying them out when the time should arrive, and my anxiety was not lessened by the natural implication of your words, that your interest in the peace and good order of the community was limited to the period before the time for carrying out your instructions should arrive.

A somewhat similar explanation may be made of my satisfaction with your assurance that my reply to the demands of your Government would be forwarded to Washington, and that nothing would be done by you until you were further instructed (p. 37 of your letter). It was simply a relief to me to learn that the unknown action of the United States toward my Government was to be delayed.

Whether your address to a delegation of the American League, referred to by you on page 15 and reported in the Hawaiian Star, November 17, taken in its “entirety,” admits of a friendly construction, in view of the contemporaneous circumstances of the following language which is a part of the address, I am content to leave where you have left it, to a reasonable construction of the whole address. The words referred to are as follows: “I have my instructions, which I cannot divulge. * * * But this much I can say, that the policy of the United States is already formulated regarding these islands, and that nothing which can be said or done either here or there can avail anything now. I do not come here as did Mr. Blount. I come to act. When the proper time comes I shall act.”

You say on pages 16 and 17 of your letter, referring to my inquiries on November 24 and 29 as to the intentions of your Government and the correctness of the published reports of Mr. Gresham’s letter: “My duty, as I understood it, did not permit me to discuss with you the letter of Mr. Gresham to the President, nor could I, under the state of facts, be questioned as to the existence or nature of the intentions of my Government. As a matter of fact, it was at that time doubtful whether my Government had any ‘intentions,’ hostile or otherwise, toward your Government.”

I confess my inability to satisfactorily weigh the last sentence of this quotation in view of the circumstances and especially of your remark to the delegation of the American League, reported in the Hawaiian Star November 17, and in my letter of specifications, “that the policy of the United States is already formulated regarding these islands.”

Your letter on pages 21 and 25 imply that my reference to warlike preparations on the American ships-of-war in the harbor of Honolulu was limited to Friday, December 15. I had no intention of limiting my statement to that or any one day. As a matter of fact, my information was based upon observations made upon a Tuesday, which I understand to have been the Tuesday following the arrival of the Corwin. The fact, as stated by you on pages 29 and 30 of your letter, that Mr. J. O. Carter based his statement to his nephew that “restoration was certain, that force would be used by the United States for that purpose,” entirely upon Secretary Gresham’s published letter and current newspaper comments, may explain how the same sources of information may have tended to lead the rest of the community to a similar conclusion.

You stated in speaking of the general apprehension of the use of force by the United States, “furthermore, as frankly admitted by you in this correspondence, your Government did not itself entertain this apprehension.” What I did say was this: “I am not prepared to state that the Government entertains this opinion, although the want of information to the contrary has compelled us to act as if it was correct.”