

THE TAR HEEL.

THE OFFICIAL ORGAN OF THE UNIVERSITY ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION.

Vol. 6.

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA, CHAPEL HILL, N. C., March 8th. 1898.

NO. 19.

CAROLINA DEBATERS WIN.

The 2nd, Inter-collegiate Contest Between the University of Georgia and the University of North Carolina.

On Friday night, March 4th, was held in Gerrard Hall the 2nd. annual inter-collegiate debate between the University of Georgia and the University of North Carolina.

The morning train brought the Georgia boys. They were Messrs. W. F. Upshaw and J. S. Roberts. They were met at the train by a committee composed of Messrs. Grimes, Broadhurst, Sams and Cox, F. J. Judge Connor, one of the judges, came over on this train also. The other judges, Congressman Woodard and Judge Montgomery, came in on the evening train. Mr. London, President of the debate, came by private conveyance from Pittsboro.

By half past seven the students and town's people had begun to assemble in Gerrard Hall. The rostrum was elegantly decorated with the colors of the two Universities. Interwoven above, they separated on either side and fell in folds of white and blue behind the seats of the North Carolina boys, of red and black behind those of the Georgians. Streamers radiated out from the chandelier in the centre of the hall to the galleries on the sides.

When eight o'clock came the hall was crowded below and above. The marshals escorted the speakers and officers to the rostrum amid enthusiastic applause.

Mr. London called the meeting to order a few minutes after eight. In a short speech he made a few remarks concerning the great good done by these debates in encouraging and stimulating the art of speaking.

He then announced the query: Resolved, that the United States annex Hawaii.—Affirmative Messrs. W. F. Upshaw and J. S. Roberts of the University of Georgia. Negative, Messrs. W. J. Brogden and E. K. Graham of the University of North Carolina.

SYNOPSIS OF THE DEBATE.

Mr. J. S. Roberts, class 1900, U. Ga., made the first speech on the affirmative. The ground taken by him was that the United States should annex Hawaii because it would be the consummation of the policy of the United States toward Hawaii for the past sixty years.

He spoke of the geographical position of the islands, pointing out their strategic importance. He also showed their value in view of the expanding trade in the Pacific Ocean.

He dwelt at length on the naval and commercial advantages which the possession of the islands would add to the United States; also the disadvantages which would accrue were the islands to fall into the hands of some other

strong power. Annexation means the industrial expansion of the islands and consequently an increased trade with the United States. The permanent possession of the islands is necessary that our navy in the Pacific may be ef-



J. S. ROBERTS, U. GA.

fective. The islands are needed as a base of supplies. Being the only base within a radius of 2,100 miles, their possession will be a heavy advantage in case of war.

In conclusion he contended that a protectorate is undesirable as it would involve responsibility without possession and would be the surest way of entangling us with outside nations.

MR. BROGDEN.

Mr. W. J. Brogden, of Goldsboro, '98, U. N. C. was the next speaker. His argument of the negative was enthusiastic and pointed.

He said that the annexation of Hawaii would set a dangerous precedent which would embark our government upon a policy of colonization similar to those adopted by the great empires of the past. The variety of non-assimilative elements thus introduced into our political system would soon destroy the unity and permanence of our Union.

The Monroe Doctrine would receive a fatal blow. European powers have respected this doctrine of non-interference only because the United States has respected it. When the United States becomes the aggressive nation and inaugurates a policy of annexation, then the hostility and rivalry of foreign nations are cordially invited. The South American Republics are contemplating forming a combination against us in order to protect their liberties. Can we annex Hawaii at the cost of the friendship of South America?

The annexation of Hawaii would also incorporate into our Union people wholly incapable of self government. There are only 1600 voters out of a population of 100,000. Omitting the Portuguese, 4-5 of the total population are Asiatics and Polynesians who are obviously unfitted for Democratic institutions.

Such a population, if erected into a State, would neither be a useful mem-

ber of the Union, nor qualified to conduct the business of legislation within its own borders, much less qualified, therefore, to send Representatives and Senators to Washington to formulate policies for the American people. The annexationists argue that Hawaii could come in as a territory, but this argument is merely a subterfuge.

Our Constitution has no provision whatever for the governing Machinery of a petrified territory. If Hawaii cannot be governed as a State or as a territory it is evident that some partisan government must be invented by Congress, and such a scheme would offer a field for political jobbery and bribery. Not only are the Hawaiians incapable of citizenship but they are actively opposed to becoming citizens of this Commonwealth. One of the vital principles of our republic is that the government derives its power from the consent of the governed. In pursuance of this principle it becomes necessary to consult the wishes of the Hawaiian people. If they are favorable to annexation, then why has not some supporter of the scheme presented some petition proving this to be a fact, and thus obviate a vital objection?

Even granting that the Hawaiians are willing to become American citizens, still annexation would be unwise, inexpedient, and suicidal. Our political system is already heavily strained. Our family of states is already large enough to create embarrassment in the Senate.

Ring rule, bribery and complicated race problems have already "polluted the temple of our liberties". With these momentous questions awaiting



W. J. BROGDEN, U. N. C.

solution, it is the most consummate inconsistency to introduce another problem into our political system.

In the future the energies of our statesmen must be directed toward the perfection of American institutions, and not dissipated in fruitless efforts to assimilate a foreign people.

MR. UPSHAW.

Mr. W. F. Upshaw was the other speaker for Georgia. In the outset he declared that the Republican government of Hawaii is a recognized Republican government, having full power to treat as she wishes. She offers her sovereignty. Shall we accept?

The assertion of our authority in the Pacific has been used time and again to prevent annexation to England or France. Blaine is quoted as to the relation of Hawaii to the United States to the effect that the islands should remain neutral so long as Hawaii finds this practicable. When Hawaii finds this im-

practicable, annexation must come to the United States.

The "parting of the ways" has come. The question is not, Shall Hawaii be annexed, but shall Hawaii be annexed to the United States, Great Britain or Japan?

Next, he contended that the government of the islands under the United States will involve no difficulty and that the annexation is thoroughly in accord both with letter and spirit of the Constitution.

Then the ethical side of the question was taken up and he argued that it was our duty to annex for two reasons; the first, to save them from Asiatic despotism; the second, an economic reason, to afford a free market for her cane sugar so that



W. F. UPSHAW, U. GA.

the productivity of the islands may develop. Permanent admission of this sugar free of duty into the United States will be a great advantage to the consuming classes of the people.

Under changing conditions, which are rapidly going on in the Pacific, Honolulu is sure to become a center of industrial activity. This will render its possession important.

Finally the permanent possession of the islands is essential for the security of our commerce in times of war or peace on the Pacific.

MR. GRAHAM.

The second speaker on the negative was Mr. E. K. Graham, of Charlotte, '98, U. N. C. He con-



E. K. GRAHAM, U. N. C.

finied himself to the strategic point of view. He denied that the possession of Hawaii would in any sense prevent a hostile attack on our Pacific coast. In Vancouver's Island the English have a far more effective base of supplies; the naval stations in the South Sea Islands are within easy radius of our coast while even China and Japan are in

[Continued on 2nd page.]