article is, that a people must be very degraded indeed if they are not able to vote intelligently on the question whether they shall remain independent or be transferred to a distant and foreign Power. This is not a question of ability to read and write, or to understand a chapter of the Constitution or a verse of the Bible. It is much simpler, as well as more vital to the people concerned. A third answer is that the question of annexation is not submitted to the inhabitants of Hawaii is that they would vote against it by an enormous majority. We are not now speaking of contract laborers from Asiatic countries, but of the native population and those of European and American descent who may be classed as intelligent and responsible inhabitants. An immense majority of these are known to be opposed to this transfer of their allegiance, and that is the reason why they are not consulted.

Another reason why we ought not to coerce these people in this way is, that it was by our act that they were put in a position where they could not help themselves. It was our Minister Stevens and our man-of-war and our guns that overthrew the Queen and put the present Government in power. The Queen has figured largely in our discussions of the question, and many well-meaning people have been deceived with the idea that we are delivering a people from monarchical tyranny and substituting republican government instead thereof, whereas we are doing the very opposite thing, if the first words of our Declaration of Independence are a true definition of republican institutions. But at the present time there is no question of restoring the Queen. If we were disposed to do equal and exact justice, we should allow the Hawaiians to vote on the question of having a Queen, if they want one, but that, we acknowledge, is now impracticable. It is by universal suffrage upon the question of annexation to France, and it was decided in the affirmative. A vote was not taken in the case of the annexation of Alsace and Lorraine to Germany in 1871, because that territory was conquered by war. If it had been a peaceful transaction, it is quite inconceivable that the will of the inhabitants should not have been consulted. It may be answered that all these are cases where the inhabitants are civilized and in some sense enlightened, and that the parallel does not hold good as to Hawaii. There are several answers to this kind of special pleading. One is, that these islands have been under the civilization influences of the very limited class not striving to overthrow their government without their consent, for mere than half a century. Therefore they cannot be put in the category of barbarians. We know, in fact, that they are not such. Another answer is, that a people must be very degraded indeed if they are not able to vote intelligently on the question whether they shall remain independent or be transferred to a distant and foreign Power. This is not a question of ability to read and write, or to understand a chapter of the Constitution or a verse of the Bible. It is much simpler, as well as more vital to the people concerned. A third answer is that the question of annexation is not submitted to the inhabitants of Hawaii is that they would vote against it by an enormous majority. We are not now speaking of contract laborers from Asiatic countries, but of the native population and those of European and American descent who may be classed as intelligent and responsible inhabitants. An immense majority of these are known to be opposed to this transfer of their allegiance, and that is the reason why they are not consulted.
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