HAIL, COLUMBUS!

The filibustering message and treaty submitted to the Senate on Thursday by the President in the Hawaiian matter deserve to be framed and exhibited at the World's Fair. They will find a place beside the Silver-Purchase Act, the swindling pension legislation, Porter's bogus Census, the Geary Chinese Registration Act, and the broken Treasury, as our national centennial display for the admiration of mankind, and by way of comparison with the past. But in 1876, when Baldwin Babcock and the Whiskey ring, Blaine and the Mulligan letters, Schenck and the Emma Mine, Belknap's impeachment, Butler's readoption by the Republican party, and the perversion of the Alabama award for the benefit of claimants ruled out at Geneva. It was in 1876, too, that the Executive and Senate fastened upon a reluctant country the indefensible treaty with Hawaii, which, in the matter of reciprocity, gave a munificent bounty to a handful of sugar planters, that, in the name of bunishment, the first move was made by Senator Jones for a bounty on silver mining, and that Congress began its endeavors to rival the unconstitutional and abominable laws of California directed against the Chinese, both resident and immigrant.

On what theory of democracy, self-government, or home rule has the tender of the Hawaiian Islands been made to this country and entertained and recommended by the Executive? Notoriously, the 'plebiscitarians' represent the merest fraction of the inhabitants, whose wishes have not been manifested by a plebiscite or even consulted. The natives, whose hereditary dynasty has just been overthrown, gave the greatest mass of the laboring population, Chinese and Japanese, the large Portuguese contingent, and the rest of the European colony, are to be taken over without an opportunity to be heard in their own behalf, and without one word in the treaty to guarantee them (it they wanted it) 'the enjoyment of all the rights, advantages, and immunities of citizens of the United States,' and 'the free enjoyment of their liberty, property, and religion,' as was done in the case of Russia's subjects in Alaska, 'the uncivilized tribes' excepted. Was there anything in the partition of Poland, or the successive annexations of Alsace Lorraine to France and to G-marry, more un-American than this? We all know that the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution contemplated white men alone in their glittering generalities, and that it cost us a civil war to incorporate black Americans among 'the people.' But that was a hundred years ago, and are we now to shut our eyes on all but a little group of self-exiled Americans who have effected a coup d'etat, and to see no other 'people' in the archipelago?

Are we to do more, and worse, by stigmatizing, in the very terms of the treaty, one large and indispensable part of the Hawaiian population—the Chinese, namely—and, through no act of theirs, upon no consultation, subjecting them to an oppressive statute which cannot be maintained in our courts, and which is in flagrant disregard of our treaty stipulations with China? It is actually true that the United States has been committed by its Executive, with the approval of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Senate, to the forcible seizure of a kingdom, with the expressed intention to make more intolerable the condition of one specific class of the inhabitants, and that a tolling class introduced by the planters. This is one of the tender mercies of the wicked, and if it is to be carried out in the spirit of our Christian attitude towards the Chinese on this continent, the cooies of Hawaii must be marched up before the camera, as if for the Rogers' Gallery, to be docketed or, failing that, or on loss of the 'passports,' be liable to be locked up and deported to China.

Yet the Chinese are not an 'uncivilized tribe,' like the Aleuts, and they are superior, in hereditary civilization and in all that goes to make the stuff of empires, to the Hawaiian aborigines, whom evangelizing has but helped on to extinction. Nevertheless, they will not be allowed to become Americans, and in the mostliberal measure of self-government accorded to the islands by any Congress we are likely soon to have, they will be denied the suffrage—the badge and defense of freemen. Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness will, for them, be wholly at the mercy of despots seated either at Washington or at Honolulu. They have merited all this by their extraordinary pains to settle at 2,000 land docked, or, failing that, or on loss of the 'passports,' be liable to be locked up and deported to China.

The President's precipitancy here, as in the case of Chili, has its spring in that spirit of caste which ought to find no refuge in the bosom of a Presbyterian elder, much less of the head of the Grand Old Party which enslaved the degraded products of American slavery. Contempt for Spanish Americans as 'dages' led us to play the bully to a small South American State just after a half-fearful struggle, of a tyrant and usurper, contempt for Orientals reprieved every natural scruple in him against making an exception of the Chinese Hawaiians in the treatment to be accorded to the population generally, or bringing it under the protection of the American flag. Add to this a personal dislike not only in the judicial spirit, but in common justice, which now for the second time, to our national disgrace, hurries him into decisive action before the other side has had a chance to be heard. Such experiences can but induce devout thankfulness that the days of this President are numbered, and that ineptitude, half-truth, bad faith, and pseudo-Americanism will be wanting in the conduct of foreign relations by his successor.

"AMERICANISM"

The extraordinary manner in which it is proposed to carry out the annexation of Hawaii was fully foreshadowed by the boisterous acclaim with which the New York Tribune, as the custodian of the Baine tradition, received the news of the revolution in that country. The reason why the Republican organ was excited over the matter was, it said, that the annexation in hot haste, and with a good deal of fagging, would be a striking manifestation of a state of mind, or rather of feeling, known as "Americanism," for which Mr. Blaine in his lifetime was very remarkable, and which all Americans should cultivate, and, so to speak, keep an eye on for emergencies. No exact definition of "Americanism," so far as we know, has ever been attempted by a great statesman. It is, as we have said, evidently a state of feeling, but its nature is ascertainable only by observing the things which are done or proposed by persons who declare themselves animated by it, and seek to communicate it to others within reach of their influence. That is to say, "Americanism," or "intense Americanism," has to be diagnosed, like any abnormal bodily condition, by special observation. Examination by experiment is impossible. All the inquirer can do is to sit down before the subject and watch and listen and make notes. For the purposes of such diagnosis nothing could be better than the Hawaiian annexation scheme. Much assistance was, it is true, afforded by Mr. Blaine's proposed quarrel with Chili about Peru, and subsequently by the Barrandra affair, and the second Cuban row about Balmaceda, and the Valparaiso outrage. But the Hawaiian incident is the most complete exemplification of "Americanistic" methods which has ever been furnished to the world.

We say "Americanistic," and not "American," because the American mode of dealing with foreign nations, whether weak or strong, and the American view of national dignity, national greatness, national rights and duties, are almost as luminously recorded and as well known as the Decalogue and the Golden Rule. The literature of American international morality is large enough to fill a library. The American attitude towards the non-American world, both in peace and in war, is set out in the Farewell Address, in the Federalist, in the voluminous writings of the founders of...