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[Honolulu Daily Bulletin, Jan. 31st, 1894.]

CRAIGSIDE, Honolulu, January 31st, 1893.

Sir:—No one can read, without a shudder, the words which the Queen is reported to have spoken to the Minister of the United States.

It is a terrible thing to have such words spoken by any one, or of any one, whom we have known in the circle of friendship. But it is an equally terrible thing, to know that there is not a civilized country in the world, except England and the United States, where the leaders of whom the Queen spoke, would not to-day be sentenced to death, without hope of reprieve.

The fact is that we have been playing with crime, and gossiping about murder, until the moral standard of Honolulu has fallen far below the requirements of civilization.

Whether it be more outrageous to threaten that the Queen shall not live on the throne, or that the leaders of the annexation movement shall not live with the Queen on the throne, I do not know; but both threats seem to have been definitely made, and both are little to the credit of those who made them. It is certain that the spectators, who have most admired the heroic patience and dignity with which the Queen has borne the cowardly brutality of the past year, will most regret, that in the moment of trial, she failed to grasp the greatness of her opportunity.

Mr. Willis asked the Queen if she realized the solemnity of the words she used, and we may well ask ourselves if we realize the solemnity of the measures we used.

If we dare face facts, what a political condition we are in to-day! and the cause is almost in a nutshell.

On the 14th of January, the Queen violated her Constitutional
oath, and thereby absolved everyone who held by the Constitution, from personal allegiance to her.

There were three possible courses: Constitutionality, treason, treachery.

The Constitutional course would have been, to declare the Queen disqualified, by reason of her attack on the Constitution; and I suppose that the power which installed Mr. Dole as President of the Provisional Government, could, at that time, have installed him as head of a Council of Regency.

The next possible course was the treasonable one, of violating the Constitution, by upsetting the Monarchy, in favor of a republic, or of some other form of independent government. This was a much more precarious course than the other, because, unless the electorate could be counted upon to support the movement, it must be a practical failure. Treason, however, is a gentlemanly crime, and sometimes it is even a creditable one.

The third course was treachery, or betrayal of the sovereignty without the nation's consent; and treachery has never anything to recommend it, either in manners or morals. The very word "treachery," like the word "beheading," has a repulsive sound. Unfortunately, there were a few—probably not over half a dozen—advocates of this course, and they carried the others blindly with them.

There is a worldly morality, which says that "success justifies treason." I never heard it said that success justifies treachery, but in this case, the mission to Washington had not even the questionable merit of success. No man, Christian or pagan, has yet given any reason that a statesman could listen to, for that expedition of envoys; and failure in such an exploit is fatal to the reputation of any community. We may like it, or we may dislike it, but the fact which can no longer be concealed is, that we rejected constitutionality, and we passed by simple treason, and we took our stand upon treachery, as our political basis. All the world knows it, although part of the
world vainly tries to conceal it, and there is now no way of escape, except backwards.

It is said that the Provisional Government will now try to hold on to something until three years hence, when they will make another attempt at annexation. But what have they to hold on to? They have destroyed the Constitution, they have antagonized the natives, they have no friendly relations abroad, and they have not even the ability to defend the envoys of foreign powers, whom elsewhere it is a matter of keenest honor to protect, from the ribald scurrility of their own organs.

A Provisional Government which has three years to run, with only a hope of annexation at the end of it, is not likely to make many friends, especially as, at the end of three years, they will have to answer those unpleasant questions about the consent of the natives, which they managed to avoid answering correctly at the first attack.

The position to-day is, that the Constitutional fulcrum has been lost, and that the Provisional Government have only a lever in their hands. If they cannot regain their fulcrum, they will have to use their lever as a crowbar, and three years of government by crowbar is not a fascinating prospect, even for the governors. This kind of life is paradise for annexationist newspapers, but government by mass meeting is not very much for business men of any sort to look forward to. Had we not better try to bring the lever and the fulcrum together again? They can work together, and they cannot work apart.

There can be no stability that does not grow out of the nation itself. The Constitution of 1887 was accepted by the nation, and the only safe plan is to get hold of that Constitution, or to get the nation that adopted it, to adopt another. There can be no freedom, and no security for law and order for this generation, unless we seek it in the solidity of constitutional authority.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

THEO. H. DAVIES.
CRAIGSIDE, Honolulu, February 1st, 1894.

Sir:—The point to which your correspondent draws my attention, is one of great interest and great importance. Moreover, it is one in which I believe I am absolutely accurate, as I have endeavored to be throughout the discussion.

The Queen, undoubtedly, did something on the 14th of January, beyond having the mere intention to attack the Constitution. She did attack the Constitution, and would have violated it, had not the Cabinet interposed. This is now historical, and two days afterwards, the Queen and Cabinet found it necessary to issue a proclamation, to the effect that no further attempts would be made to abrogate, or alter, the Constitution, except in a constitutional way.

The Queen, on her accession, took the oath to be faithful to the Constitution, and on the 14th of January that faith was not kept. The Constitution was not broken, but the oath, which bound the Queen to the Constitution, was certainly broken.

It is impossible to contend that the Constitution, which did not bind the Queen to itself, must necessarily bind the people to the Queen. The Constitution is the supreme strength of the nation, and whoever, whether sovereign or citizen, is disloyal to the Constitution, weakens—not the Constitution—but his own hold on it. Therefore, I maintain that loyalty to the Constitution absolved its adherents from personal allegiance to the Queen, who was then undoubtedly disloyal.

I think there is no doubt that, at that time, the loyal citizens of Hawaii would have been perfectly justified in asking for the Queen's abdication—but they did not.
The Queen very soon recognized her mistake, and bowed once more to the constitutional control; whilst those who had then the opportunity to compass her deposition, threw away their opportunity, and took up the character, before the world, of which some of them are said to be still proud.

I do not think that anything is to be gained by concealing the mistakes that have been made. The Queen's one mistake was the attempt to carry out an intention which, as she informed Mr. Blount, had been in her mind for many months. That mistake had been admitted by the Queen, and condoned by the people, and to-day the Queen is the embodiment of the national instinct of the Hawaiians. If the object of the revolutionists was, as they declare, to get rid of the Queen, they certainly are not to be congratulated on the use they made of their opportunities. The only creditable course now open to them, is to imitate the plan adopted by the Queen, by acknowledging their unfortunate errors, and returning to the paths of constitutional propriety and order.

THEO. H. DAVIES.
HONOLULU, February 7th, 1894.

Sir:—Will you be good enough to publish the following report of the interview which I had yesterday morning, with the Attorney-General:

Having received a note, which Mr. Smith informed me that he regarded as courteous, but which I observe that he has permitted to be publicly described as a summons, I called at the Attorney-General's office yesterday morning, at half-past nine. To my surprise I found the Marshal present, and on my inquiring the object of his presence, Mr. Smith stated that Mr. Hitchcock had been requested to come, because he had received some letters upon the subject of our interview.

Mr. Smith then politely stated that many rumors had been circulated, with regard to the enlistment of troops at Vancouver and elsewhere, and that the Hawaiian Consul at Tacoma had written officially upon the subject, and that my name had been coupled with the transaction. Mr. Smith further stated that he felt that the report was a very preposterous one, but that he believed I would be glad of an opportunity to contradict it.

I then stated to Mr. Smith, that on my arrival here I had made a point of calling upon the four ministers; that he himself had not paid me the civility of returning my call; that under these circumstances I was surprised that he should again ask me to come to his office, as though I were a messenger boy, and with the object of ascertaining if I was a conspirator. I added that gentlemen did not like that kind of treatment.

I further stated to Mr. Smith that I did not feel any anxiety to contradict newspaper rumors; that I had no idea that my
name was connected with these military reports, until I saw it in an afternoon paper; that there was not an atom of foundation for the statement; and that I knew nothing of the man who was said to be engaged in the transaction in Vancouver.

I assured Mr. Smith that he would never find my name mixed up with conspirators, treachery, or traitors.

I think I did not "squirm," but there were only two other gentlemen present, and one of them apparently says that I did. One of these gentlemen must have given publicity to our interview, which I should have thought it would have been more honorable to suppress, unless with the consent of the Attorney-General and myself.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

THEO. H. DAVIES.

XVII.

[Daily Bulletin, Feb. 12, 1894.]

HONOLULU, February 12th, 1894.

Mr. Davies will feel obliged if the editor of the Bulletin will insert in his columns, the enclosed correspondence which occurred last week between the Attorney-General and Mr. Davies.

[copy.]

ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S OFFICE,

HONOLULU, H. I., February 5th, 1894.

Mr. T. H. DAVIES, City:

Dear Sir:—There is a matter of public interest about which I desire to speak to you.

And would ask, if convenient, you would call at my office tomorrow morning at 9:30 o'clock.

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) WILLIAM O. SMITH,

Attorney-General.
HONOLULU, H. I., February 9th, 1894.

Dear Sir:—I venture to draw your attention to a statement published in the Hawaiian Star on the 7th instant with regard to an interview to which you invited me on Monday last, at your office.

You will no doubt remember that I cordially accepted your personal assurance, that the request for an interview was intended as an act of courtesy on your part.

The offensive paragraph in the Star is therefore of more importance to you than even to myself, and I have waited two days in the expectation that you would communicate to me the regret, which you no doubt feel, at the infringement of the rules of courtesy towards a visitor, who relied simply on your personal assurance.

I need not remind you that the only witness of our interview was one of your own principal officials, who saw and heard everything, although he had no other share in the proceedings. This renders it unnecessary that I should look to any one but yourself as chief of the department, to represent in such a manner as you deem right, your disapproval of the violence which appears to have been done to the ordinary rules of official procedure.

May I add that I am sincere in the belief that the publication of the paragraph in question was as distasteful to yourself as it can have been to me.

I am, faithfully yours,

(Signed) Theo. H. Davies.

Hon. W. O. Smith,
Attorney-General.
ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S OFFICE,
HONOLULU, H. I. February 9th, 1894.

MR. T. H. DAVIES, City:

Sir:—Your note of this day relative to a statement published in the Hawaiian Star of the 7th inst., with regard to our interview, is in hand.

In reply, I would state, that the reporter of the Star called upon me and asked for information upon the subject. I told him that you called at my invitation, and had denied any knowledge of, or connection with, the proposition to obtain volunteers at Vancouver for the purpose of aiding the ex-Queen.

Further than this I gave him no information, nor said anything which would justify the use of any offensive expressions.

I am no more responsible for the utterances of the Star to which you take exception, than you are responsible for the comments of the Daily Bulletin of the 8th inst., which in commenting upon the matter seeks to give the impression that I treated you as a "revolutionary desperado," and that a representation had been made to you that the interview would be "strictly confidential," and thus I committed a breach of faith.

It is useless to pursue these matters. Were I disposed to do so, I would ask by what authority you stated in your published letter that I "permitted" my note "to be publicly described as a summons."

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) WILLIAM O. SMITH,
Attorney-General.

[copy.]

HONOLULU, February 9th, 1894.

Sir:—I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of your letter of this date, in which you inform me that you yourself gave
the statement to the Star, upon which the offensive paragraph of the 7th inst. was based.

May I point out your inaccuracy in thinking that I hold you in any way responsible for the use the newspaper made of the information you gave. It appears to me that the responsibility of having given away a private conversation at all for publication without consent, is as much as it would be fair to ask any man to assume.

Your quotations from the Bulletin are, I venture to think, hardly germane to the question. I have had no communication upon the subject, with either paper. Indeed, I invariably sign my communications to the press, and thus avoid the misfortune of divided responsibility from which you have not escaped.

You thought fit, in our interview, to reproach me with seeking to impose my ideas of honor upon others. I replied that I was only conscious of one standard of honor, and that it was my desire to live as near that standard as possible.

It was in reliance upon that standard that I complied with your request for an interview, and, in doing so, I now recognize the error I made.

I assume that I have your consent for the publication of this correspondence.

I have the honor to be,

Your obedient servant,

THEO. H. DAVIES.

HON. W. O. SMITH,
Attorney-General.

XVIII.

[Daily Bulletin, Feb. 28, 1894.]

HONOLULU, Feb. 27th, 1894.

Will you be good enough to publish the enclosed copy of a letter which I addressed to-day to President Dole.
In reply I was informed by the Attorney-General that the Government had not sought to give publicity to the matter,* but that I was at liberty to use the copy of the letter which I had received.

I therefore enclose further, for the favor of publication, copy of a letter which President Dole has received from Mr. C. W. H. Sansom.

THEO. H. DAVIES.

* Vide the Attorney-General's letter on page 11.

[COPY].

HONOLULU, Feb. 27th, 1894.

Sir:—I have received from Mr. C. W. H. Sansom, of Vancouver, B. C. (a gentleman who is entirely unknown to me), a note expressing his great regret at the published report of an investigation held here on the 6th inst., in which my name was coupled with his own.

Mr. Sansom informs me that he has written you upon the subject, and he has given me copy of the letter.

I venture to hope that you will think it right to cause the publication of the letter in question, if it has come to hand.

I have the honor to be, sir,

Your obedient humble servant,

THEO. H. DAVIES.

His Excellency, PRESIDENT DOLE.

[COPY.]

VANCOUVER, B. C., February 16th, 1894.

To PRESIDENT DOLE, Honolulu.

Sir:—Recent despatches in the papers state that Mr. Theo. H. Davies' name has been coupled with mine in an investigation held on the 6th inst., in Honolulu, and, to prevent such an act of great injustice towards that gentleman, I beg to inform you that he has nothing to do whatever with myself and the subject mentioned.

I remain, yours truly,

(Signed) C. W. H. SANSOM.
CRAIGSIDE, Honolulu, February 6th, 1894.

Sir:—Some years ago, a writer in the Overland Monthly ridiculed the happy-go-lucky social ethics of this community, by saying that if a Honolulu man was charged with telling a lie, he would simply drawl out, "You cannot prove it."

The New York Nation, which certainly (whatever its politics) belongs to the highest class of papers in the language, has recently published a most scathing article, in which it says:

"Mr. Dole is the head of probably the most rascally and illegitimate little state in the world."

This quotation is actually reproduced by one of the government organs in Honolulu, without any comment, except a chuckle at the idea that the "little state" will be left alone. There is not even the defence of, "You cannot prove it."

I have no intention to protest any further in favor of our national morality, but I do humbly protest in favor of some regard being shown for the rules and principles of statesmanship.

Last Monday evening, three Hawaiian Cabinet Ministers appeared on the platform of what has hitherto been a secret political league in Honolulu. One of the ministers informed the meeting, that he had been "long wanting to see the faces of the men for whom he had been working."

Two days before this speech of the Hawaiian Minister was delivered, this said league issued a manifesto, which I understand has been sent to Congress; it begins as follows:

"The American League wishes to be heard in the Hawaiian Islands matter."
For one, I am very desirous that the league should be heard, and this is what it says:

1. “Our ranks include only citizens of the greatest Republic of the earth.”

2. “We are willing to trust the care of our sugar, rice, coffee, and other industries, in the hands of the patriotic statesmen of the United States.”

3. “To put it succinctly, Hawaii is an American colony.”

4. “We are of the mass of people who made a stand for law and order, and constitutional rights.”

5. “What we Americans desire for these islands, is a good stable government.”

6. “We do not despise Hawaii, else we would not offer her to our mother country. All of us love dearly this mid-Pacific land.”

7. “The islands are a richer prize than was Texas, California, or Alaska.”

8. “And now, as to the natives; to plot against them, to connive with their enemies, to wrong them in any way, would be infamy on our part.”

9. “We are on the ground, familiar with every feature of the case, and actuated by the highest and noblest motives.”

10. “We are not an assemblage of adventurers.”

11. “We are in every sense a community of determined progressive Americans.”

Think of the bewilderment of the Provisional Government, when the loyalty of such a band as is here autobiographically described, is placed at their disposal! In fact, this “community of determined progressive Americans,” who thus offer Hawaii to their mother country, and would on no account either plot against or wrong the natives, do not seem to leave much room for the members of the Provisional Government to either live, or move, or have their being.
My present object, however, is to quote, and not to criticize, the language of the league, beyond saying that it is either the language of men representing a nation, or it is the language of—"an illegitimate state." But, if a nation, what nation? Surely, not the American nation, or else where was Mr. Willis? Surely, not the Hawaiian nation, or else why do their "ranks include only citizens of the greatest Republic of the earth?"

The serious question for us is: In what capacity were Hawaiian Ministers present? For whether Liliuokalani be the Queen, or Mr. Dole be the President, Hawaii is still a nation, and the band of "determined progressive Americans" have sent to Congress a document which no government under the sun, which respects itself, or claims respect from others, could allow to be sent.

I suppose, at some time or other, we shall need the recognition of other nations, unless we propose to pursue a little piratical course of our own. But we may be sure that we shall never have their recognition under the revolutionary regime, unless we make a little more effort than we have hitherto made, to deprecate both the scorn and the ridicule of foreign powers.

Theo. H. Davies.
Honolulu, February 14th, 1894.

Sir:—The editor of the Friend, in the current number, once again makes valiant fight to show that I have made accusations against missionaries' sons, and he says that he desires to make his record good on the subject. I fear I cannot do much for the editor's record, but I will, once for all, make a statement which I challenge him to controvert, and then I shall leave him to quote it, and to represent it, as he may deem best.

We need not go again over the names of the actors of January, 1893. Some were good, and some were bad; some were missionaries' sons, and some were not; some fought for what they regarded as principle, and some for booty. I observed, however, that sermons "appropriate to the occasion" were preached in pulpits that, I should have thought, would be draped in black; and by men who, I should have thought, would be broken down with grief.

The Friend was much in evidence, and invoked the prayers of the nation for the blessings of Heaven on Mr. Thurston and his four colleagues. (I notice, by the way, that no reference to these prayers and blessings was made on the 17th of January of this year, nor in the number of the Friend that recorded the celebration of the anniversary.)

At an early date after the revolution, I wrote to a personal friend who was prominent in the movement:

"One of the few bright spots in this whole affair, is that an earnest Christian man like yourself is near the helm; but do you realize what it is that you are doing? Do you know that the remedy you are adopting is one that mankind abhors?"
That sentence was written last March, and I have never wavered in my opinion of the transaction. I publicly stated, in the same month, that "it was not a plot of bad men, but a blunder of good men."

Where, then, are my accusations against the missionaries, or their sons?

But in June was issued the report of the Hawaiian Evangelical Association, in which it was announced that, after resolving that politics should be excluded from their pulpits, the members had decided, by a contested vote, to call as an association upon the Provisional Government.

By this act, the missionary association formally accepted the responsibility of what the revolution was still striving to accomplish, and which was even then described as "seeking to convey a stolen kingdom."

Not satisfied with this official participation in what was at best a questionable transaction, the Friend, as late as October, declared:

"The whole body of Protestant Evangelical Christians are practically a unit for annexation."

I ask, now, who has dragged in the names of the missionaries, and why were they dragged in?

The Friend tries to make cheap capital by laying it on my shoulders, but there are many individual missionaries who are to-day as grieved as I am at the Hawaiian catastrophe, and whose names would have been to-day as free as mine is, had not the Friend and its "friends" determined that the association should be part of the revolution, and of the annexation movement.

An act is no better, and no worse, because it is done by a missionary's son, and it is mere clap-trap for Mr. Bishop to pretend that my censure against an act which I believe to have been politically immoral, is directed against the actors, because
they were missionaries' sons. I question very much whether some of them would thank Mr. Bishop for trying to shield them behind the Mission Children's Society, and whether they would not prefer to fight in the open, like ordinary people.

The time has now come, when the religious and the political parts had better be dissociated from each other. Religion in politics may be very good, but politics in religion is very bad, and the name of religion has taken nothing but harm from the alliance into which the Friend hurried it.

Even as a political move, this whole business is what I wrote, a year ago, that it would be. The President's message, Mr. Blount's report, the declarations of the New York Nation and of the London Times, are all verdicts of "guilty," and as such Christendom will accept them; and the best that any one says in defence is: "She was a wicked woman, they were good men, and now it cannot be helped."

That may satisfy politicians, but it is very poor comfort for the Christian associations which have been manoeuvred into such a conflict.

My opinion of the transaction has been pronounced emphatically from the first, and I believe the transaction is all that I ever thought it was.

My knowledge of the personality of the actors is the knowledge possessed also by others, and it leads me to believe that many of them would rejoice greatly, if they could go over again the last thirteen months of their history.

My faith in many of the members of the mission families is such, that I believe no greater joy could come to them, than to be relieved from the political alliance to which the editor of the Friend so recklessly committed them, and which has played such havoc with their hearts' work.

Henceforth I shall regard this whole annexation movement as rather bad politics, but as having nothing to do with either religion, or with what one of its most zealous missionary sup-
porters described to me recently, as “a missionary, in the truest, sweetest sense of the word.”

Thank God there are many, even in these islands, who still embody such a description; men and women whose religion sanctifies their politics, as it sanctifies their homes, and who have to mourn that that religion has received its worst wounds “in the house of its friends.”

I am, Sir,
Your obedient servant,
THEO. H. DAVIES.
Honolulu, February 17th, 1894.

Sir:—The “careful review” of my letters (by W. N. A.) which absorbs so much of your valuable space this morning, was “prepared especially for the Advertiser.” This much I gathered, not only from your announcement, but from the style of the article itself, and from the appropriate headings which were, I presume, supplied from your own stores.

I am rather puzzled to know who “W. N. A.” is. I have a very dear friend with the same initials, but I know that he is at present engaged in reviewing his own speeches, and trying to reconcile what he said, with what he wishes he had said. Moreover, my W. N. A. has several of my letters still unanswered, and as they were written entirely in his own interest, he will probably review them, before troubling himself with any others of mine.

I observe that your “W. N. A.” has little respect for a man who works or votes in a minority, and I am bound to say that this tendency rather reminds me of my friend, who never likes to stand alone. I do not know that he ever tried. His brother did, and did it well.

I think, also, that I recognize some traits of my W. N. A. in that exuberantly irrelevant jocosity of style with which your reviewer approaches anything like a serious topic; and the adjectives were especially suggestive of my friend’s habits of thought. In fact, the only serious statement that your “W. N. A.” makes, is when he gives himself and you away, by writing:

“With Mr. Davies’ arguments and propositions we will not quarrel. For the purpose of this review, we shall assume that they are correct and cannot be gainsayed.”
Did ever any such brilliant attack have such a collapse? And you had headed it so beautifully, with the words: "The literary performances of the champion exposed."

Exposed! why "W. N. A." has not even read the literary performances, or he would have known that the one object for which I entered the lists was the defeat of annexation, by the preservation of Hawaiian independence.

Annexation is defeated, Hawaiian independence is preserved; why should I fight? If your "W. N. A." and my W. N. A. were to join together and shout till they were both hoarse, they would never persuade anyone that they represented the Hawaiian nation.

I fear, however, that dark days of perplexity await your reviewer. He must be with the majority, and at present it seems doubtful whether that passion will not land him in the camp of China, where "W. N. A." will stand for Wing No something, and he be found fighting against the very men whom at present he is vainly trying to bless.

Sir, I know that I only provoke the scoffs and jeers of the annexation press, when I speak solemnly of the Hawaiian situation; but, once again I protest against the infatuation which leads men to play with a crisis, which is apparently not only beyond their control, but beyond their appreciation.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

THEO. H. DAVIES.
CRAIGSIDE, Honolulu, February 26th, 1894.

Astronomers tell us that our planet has two distinct motions—the diurnal motion, or rotation on its own axis, and the annual motion, or circuit around the sun.

The Hawaiian revolution of January, 1893, presented the same phenomena; that is, a rotation on its own axis, which we term revolution, and a circuitous motion, which we may term annexation.

In reviewing the political situation in Hawaii, it is important that a clear distinction should be made between these two movements of Revolution and Annexation.

Revolution is a simple movement; Annexation is a very complex one.

Revolution is internal, and requires no external aid; Annexation is nothing if not external, and has no self-contained power.

Many people went into the revolution, in the belief that it did not mean annexation; others held aloof, because it did mean annexation.

If revolution had not included or aimed at annexation, the revolutionists could have dictated terms to the Queen, and could probably have secured her assent to her own deposition. But the cry went forth “Annexation and nothing else,” and with that motto the envoys went to Washington.

Annexation meant the end of Hawaiian nationality, and for that reason I girded myself and also went to Washington, not in the interests of the Queen or of the Princess, but in defence of Hawaiian nationality.
It is true that we hear some disappointed murmurs, to the effect that annexation is only postponed, but for all practical purposes annexation is dead, and we are thrown back on revolution.

But how does Hawaii come out of the conflict? Wounded—cruelly wounded—in the house of her friends. No constitution, no legislature, no absolute foundation for anything!

Enough of the past, the present and the future demand all our thought and effort. The very first thing is for men of sense and conscience to study facts, and it will take all the men of sense and conscience to steer the poor craft.

Let us first enquire what is impossible, and then examine into what is possible.

I hold it to be impossible to organize any government that shall not be permanent in intention. We cannot exist without recognition, and no nation will recognize a provisional government, except as a revolutionary makeshift. When Kalakaua died, every diplomatic representative received fresh credentials to the new sovereign. How many received fresh credentials to the Provisional Government? Not one! And to-day the relation is only one of convenience, for the discharge of necessary business.

A Provisional Government cannot negotiate a treaty, and in fact, it has no recognized existence, beyond its own limits.

A ready answer to this will be: "We do not want recognition, we can do without it." Some people can and do live without friends, but it is not an ideal existence for either men or nations, and, to commercial nations, it is ruin.

There is another difficulty of an unrecognized government, which it is better to study, than to ignore. The Japan Herald pointed it out, in saying that Japan might consider it her duty to take the part of the recognized, against the unrecognized government of Hawaii. If she did so, without in any way encroaching on Hawaiian independence, it is by no means certain
that President Cleveland would go to war with Japan, in order
to defend the Provisional Government against the Queen. Although there is no likelihood, so far as I know, of any such proceeding on the part of any foreign power, it is as well that we keep in mind the perils of an unrecognized government.

A Provisional Government, attempting to establish itself, "on the three years' system," without the moral support of the Hawaiian people, is an anomaly, and, as I contend, an impossibility; and a leasehold government, such as that would be, would hardly ask for recognition even from the United States.

There is another very tangible peril. An unfriendly administration in the United States will be very liable to have an unfriendly effect on the continuance of treaty relations with Hawaii; and that is a suggestion which may make to tremble the stoutest heart that proposes to carry on for three years, in defiance of the stern counsel of the United States Government.

There must be no misconception as to how much of our prosperity depends on the goodwill of the party in power in the United States. For instance, if any duty be imposed on sugar by Congress, it will be imposed on Hawaiian sugar also, unless a special clause be enacted, excepting Hawaiian sugar. The treaty alone will not counteract the tariff, any more than it did with rice under the McKinley bill. We cannot afford to add, to our other troubles, the hostility which might inflict upon us such a penalty as a duty on our sugar.

I apprehend, then, that whatever form of government be now adopted for Hawaii, it must be permanent in intention, and must not be composed of elements which avowedly mean mischief to the government they assist to set up, and which admit their intention to upset the whole Constitution, as soon as opportunity offers.

I am disposed to think that the quickest and safest step now to be taken, is that which I believe the Executive and Advisory Councils have decided upon;—that is, a national convention, and a new Constitution.
That proposal appears to me to offer a basis of peace and order, if it be carried out in a spirit of conciliation. But there is a possibility, if not a danger, of a fundamental mistake. If the convention and constitution do not carry with them the assent of the Hawaiian nation, there will be no security, for a generation to come. I do not believe that any government that does not make a show of being supported by the Hawaiian people, will receive recognition even from a Republican Administration in the United States. They will look suspiciously upon us for a long time, and a white man's government will not be allowed to represent the Hawaiian nation, simply because he says so.

The American League recently sent to Congress the following statement: "We are of the mass of the people who made a stand for law and order, and constitutional right." "Our ranks include only citizens of the greatest republic of the earth."

That frank declaration had the apparent approbation of the Hawaiian Ministers, and it is sure to be pigeon-holed at Washington, and brought as evidence against us.

The point then is: Who compose the Hawaiian nation? I think there is but one answer: The men who have votes under the Constitution of 1887. Whether they ought to have had them is not the question. The Constitution, broken and battered as it is, is still the highest law, and they, at any rate, have not violated it. Therefore, no convention and no constitution can be solid, that has not the sanction of those men.

If you do not get this sanction, you will have to live on in unfriendliness, for as many years as you like to pay for it. The Hawaiian people are not dying out, and their friends are not dying out, and "the sympathies of mankind will be with them always."

Therefore, I repeat that the sanction of the electorate is necessary to the validity of any constitution. How are we to get that sanction? I can only think of one way.
We certainly shall not get it, if we leave the manipulation exclusively in the hands of men who have avowed their desire to subvert Hawaiian nationality. We shall not get it, unless we show the Hawaiians that we accept the defeat of annexation manfully, and mean to live loyally beside them, as neighbors should live.

I am aware that this is the crucial point, for many—perhaps most—annexionists do not intend to live loyally beside the Hawaiians.

I think those men had better leave the convention alone, and stick to the military despotism, which is the only alternative.

There is, as I said, only one way in which the national sanction can be obtained, and it implies conciliation and concession, and the question may as well be faced now, for on its settlement depends the other question, of prosperity or ruin for our commercial and agricultural life. The annexationists have made a great fight, in which they have given no quarter, and the iron has been driven into the soul of the Hawaiians. But there has been one fatal mistake: the patriotic instinct of the Hawaiian has been left out of the reckoning. No man who regards patriotism as a sentiment, which can be transferred from land to land, like a gipsy's tent, has ever experienced, or he has forever lost, the inspiration of patriotism. It is not love, nor charity, nor justice, nor is it either pride or bluster; it is just the unquenchable instinct that makes a man prefer to perish in the ashes of his home, rather than live to mourn its loss. Those of us who saw and remember what took place when Kalakaua was elected, when the women and children were silently sent away, and the indolent men became a frenzied mob, will not require to be reminded of the influence which national instinct can exercise over the Hawaiians.

The patriotism of the Hawaiians dominates the position to-day, and they have the whole world for their friends. That patriotism controls the Hawaiian vote to-day, and without that vote there can be no solid constitution, no peace, no prosperity for either foreigner or native.
There is no disguising the fact from any one but ourselves, that the movement for annexation has resulted in a serious defeat, and the only point for us to decide is, whether we will accept the verdict now, or go through a year of worse anxiety and possible riot, and then accept it. The elements of disorder are only too apparent even now, and with them we have to face internal disaffection and external unfriendliness.

The anti-Hawaiian utterances of the American League on one hand, and the unmistakable tone of the Chinese on the other hand, show that a policy of justice to all cannot be maintained by any government, that has not the loyal support of the bulk of the people.

Let me recapitulate:

1. The comparative simplicity of revolution was involved with the complexity of annexation.
2. Thereby, not only had the Queen to fight for her throne, but the nation had to fight jointly with her, for national existence.
3. Annexation has been defeated, but the Sovereign and people have been driven together by common danger.
4. The Constitution has been irretrievably broken.
5. A new Constitution must be adopted, and it must be permanent in intention.
6. A national convention, to be valid, must be based on the electorate of 1887, and representative of the Hawaiian people.

To deal effectively with the foregoing problem, is as delicate an operation as can be undertaken. I think a remedy can be found, if we have pluck enough to use it. The nation is now split into two parts: the Hawaiians and their friends, versus the foreigners and their friends.

Neither party can achieve harmony and progress alone, and it would be childish to expect such success.

It would be worse than childish, it would be wicked, to at-
tempt to throw the country into the agitation of a convention, without some security for harmonious action.

My proposal would be:

That the good offices of the United States Minister, or of some other mutually acceptable intervener, should be sought; that under his counsel, each party should nominate three members for a joint committee; that the committee should draft a new Constitution, which must conserve as far as possible the interests of both parties; that the committee must be unanimous in its work; and that both parties should loyally support the said draft Constitution, on appeal to the electorate.

Within these outlines, we may preserve peace, justice and honor.

If these three objects can be obtained in any other way, I will gladly support that plan.

But if the men who are honestly praying for peace, justice, and honor, have no better plan than mine in view, I ask them to set personal prejudice aside, and to give earnest consideration to what I have written with a faithful desire to promote only the peace and progress of Hawaii.

Theo. H. Davies.
CONCLUSION.

Upon the 9th of November, 1893, I closed a published letter, with these words:

"If any one will endeavor, either in public or in private, to show me that I am in error, I will listen earnestly and patiently, and if I can see that I am wrong, I will retract, with a thankful heart, every word of censure I have written."

That frank challenge has not been taken up, and the only reply that has been made to the calm, earnest, severe strictures which I have made, has been bitter denunciation of myself for making them.

If the principles, which I have felt bound to vindicate, could have been set aside by personal considerations, they would never have found expression by my pen.

But the question which I have, in clear tones, asserted to be one of right and wrong, is beyond the reach of either denunciation or personal considerations.

When the verdict of history shall be pronounced, personal considerations will have disappeared, and the actors of to-day will have to stand—not by their motives—but by their record.

Theo. H. Davies.

Honolulu, February 28th, 1894.