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Hawai‘i holds a somewhat nebulous place in American History. While it easily fits in the dominant narrative surrounding the Spanish American War of 1898 and World War II, Hawai‘i rarely factors into other major historical fields, often making a brief cameo appearance when it does. Because the state is geographically placed at the western extreme of America, one supposes that western historians would gladly accept the task of chronicling Hawaiian history; yet, even academics in this field hesitate to embrace the region. In fact, some scholars who study the American West completely dismiss the notion of including the Hawaiian Islands. General American history textbooks reflect academics’ uncertainty towards including the islands in the greater American narrative as they rarely mention Hawaiian events. Comparing Hawai‘i with the continental territories, Native American policy, American insular colonies, and U.S. imperialism, however, quickly dispels the notion that Hawai‘i lies outside the American West. In fact, it holds a very important role in American history as the transitional zone between the older expansionist American imperialism and a newer form of American colonialism.

Moreover, incorporating Hawaiian history into western regional studies forces scholars in the field to rethink existing paradigms. At the present, western historians
view the West as a place lying roughly between the Mississippi River and the Pacific coast. Including the Hawaiian Islands, however, forces them to refine their rigid political definition of the West to allow for more fluid boundaries. This dissertation argues that including Hawai‘i forces scholars to redefine the region as those incorporated territories throughout western North America and the Pacific Ocean which the United States conquered, subdued, annexed, and admitted into the Union. Moreover, it is a place in which American imperialism reshaped, and continues to shape, all facets of human life and the environment.
In memory of Emily Kahaleihinano Smith (May 7, 1927-May 10, 2005)
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A NOTE ON TERMINOLOGY

Before delving into the history, it is necessary to clarify certain terminology. There is a growing trend among Western historians to use indigenous names when referring to indigenous political, social, and economic institutions. Thus, we refer to the Diné as opposed to the Navajo and the Lakota and Dakota instead of the Sioux. Western historians do this not only for accuracy, but also as recognition of the fact that indigenous societies in the Americas developed their own institutions and cultures. In other words, the use of indigenous terminology prevents repeating past mistakes of denigrating or incorrectly representing indigenous institutions by referring to elements of Native American society using European language, i.e., calling social leaders “chiefs” and their military leaders “braves.”

In keeping with this trend, this dissertation uses Native Hawaiian terms to refer to their people and land. The terms “Kānaka” and “Kānaka Maoli” refer to Native Hawaiians. “Kānaka” is the plural form of Kanaka, which indicates Native Hawaiians. When speaking of Native Hawaiians as a group, or when using the adjective form of the word, the author uses the term “Kānaka.” The term “foreigners” indicates immigrants and non-Native Hawaiian residents in the islands prior to annexation. After annexation, the author uses “Hawaiian” to refer to all citizens of the Territory of Hawai‘i and State of Hawai‘i, including Native Hawaiians, while still using “Kānaka” and “Kānaka Maoli” for Native Hawaiians. It is recognized that islanders and Native Hawaiians refer to immigrants and new arrivals as “haole” or “malihini”; however, it was not deemed necessary to utilize Native Hawaiian terminology to refer social groups in the post-1893 overthrow period. When necessary, the text refers to ethnic groups as
European/European American, Japanese/Japanese American, Filipino/Filipino American, and so forth. Only in very few cases are “malihini” and “haole” used. When discussing the masses of Native Hawaiian society prior to the overthrow of 1893, the term “maka ʻāinana” is used.

Native Hawaiian terminology is also employed when discussing political institutions prior to 1893. “Aliʻi” refers to political leaders. Although there is the temptation to refer to these individuals as “lords” or “chiefs,” the author considers these as poor translations. The former connotes a feudal or aristocratic society found in European nations such as Medieval England or the Austria-Hungarian Empire. While the status of aliʻi was hereditary, there was also a spiritual element to this term in older Native Hawaiian society in which an aliʻi’s mana gave instilled in him the right and ability to lead that was lacking in modern European political systems. On the other hand, “chief” has a very derogatory connotation in Western history as older narratives used this term in a pejorative manner when referring to indigenous political leaders. Finally, the term “mōʻī” is used interchangeably with for king and queen. Since this term appears later in the Hawaiian monarchy, the author generally uses the term “aliʻi nui” to indicate earlier sovereigns like Kamehameha I. After 1893, the terminology uses basic American names to refer to political and social institutions and titles.

Finally, the author recognizes that there exists some debate over the proper usage of Native Hawaiian terms. For sources on Native Hawaiian language, the author referred to leading scholars on Native Hawaiian history who use indigenous terms in their manuscripts. Jonathan Kay Kamakawiwoʻole Osorio’s Dismembering Lāhui: A History of the Hawaiian Nation to 1887 was helpful in this aspect.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

At six o’clock in the evening, on the day of Tuesday, January 17, 1893, Queen Lili‘uokalani signed and dispatched a communication to Sanford B. Dole, chief executive of the provisional government of Hawai‘i. It was a relatively brief letter, but one that would greatly affect the islands and their inhabitants over a century. It read:

I, Liliuokalani, by the Grace of God and under the Constitution of the Kingdom, Queen, do hereby solemnly protest against any and all acts done against myself and the constitutional Government of the Hawaiian Kingdom by certain persons claiming to have established a provisional government of and for this Kingdom.

That I yield to the superior force of the United States of America, whose minister plenipotentiary, His Excellency John L. Stevens, has caused United States troops to be landed at Honolulu and declared that he would support the said provisional government.

Now, to avoid any collision of armed forces and perhaps the loss of life, I do under this protest, and impelled by said force, yield my authority until such time as the Government of the United States shall, upon the facts being presented to it, undo the action of its representatives and reinstate me in the authority which I claim as the constitutional sovereign of the Hawaiian islands.¹

Clear and concise, the letter relayed the reluctant capitulation of Lili‘uokalani, the last mō‘ī of the Hawaiian Islands. For Dole, Stevens, and members of the Committee of Safety,² a pro-American annexation organization, the queen’s abdication signified the


success of their *coup d'état* and the ascendancy of the American settlers. For decades, descendants of American missionaries in Hawai‘i pursued political, legal, and other means to develop trade and foster a close relationship with the United States of America. Often, they attempted to achieve these ends through diplomacy, as in the case with the Reciprocity Treaty of 1876. The number of treaties between the Kingdom of Hawai‘i and the U.S.A. had increased throughout the latter half of the nineteenth century in order to strengthen the economic and diplomatic bonds between the two nations; however, plantation owners and businessmen quickly realized that diplomacy was not an effective tool to secure an open market for their agricultural products within the republic. Always in their minds lay the idea of annexation as the only guarantee to gain access to the markets within the country that their ancestors called home.

The European settlers’ approach ran contrary to the foreign affairs policies developed and pursued by Hawaiian monarchs. Although Hawaiian monarchs approved of developing an intimate relationship with the United States of America, protecting their sovereignty remained at the heart of Hawaiian diplomacy. Hawaiians understood that they needed to balance the various European powers to preserve their kingdom, and they achieved a large measure of success throughout the eighteenth century. Granted, the threat of European conquest often loomed over the islands. Twice, the Kingdom of Hawai‘i faced the guns of European military vessels. Angered by Hawaiian anti-Catholic measures and a tax aimed at stopping the sale of liquor within the kingdom, in 1839

Committee members were not Native Hawaiian. Europeans, Americans, or naturalized westerners filled the ranks of this committee ostensibly established to protect American property in the islands. These men, however, had ulterior motives. They held deep pro-annexation convictions. Though some of these men were Hawaiian citizens by birth or naturalization, and therefore owing allegiance to the queen, they maintained their loyalty to the United States of America. Needless to say, this was not an organization on par with the Sons of Liberty or Committees of Correspondence from the Revolutionary War Era. They were more akin to the filibustering enterprises of the mid 1800s. For more information, see Kuykendall, *The Kalakaua Dynasty*, 582-605.
French Captain C. P. T. Laplace, commanding *L’Artémise*, threatened Hawaiian monarch Kamehameha III with bombardment and invasion if the tax and religious codes were not revoked. Only four years later, British commander Lord George Paulet invaded Hawa‘i, forcing the monarch to abdicate. Fortunately for the Kānaka, Lord Paulet’s superior, Rear Admiral Richard Thomas, considered his actions as contrary to British policy and restored Kamehameha III to his throne, albeit with changes in Hawaiian policies regarding British subjects.³ In an era dominated by European nation-states and their lust for colonial territories, using diplomatic channels to balance the imperial powers one against the other was the most effective tool for smaller states. Hawaiians had successfully navigated the waters of imperial conquest since the advent of Kamehameha I in 1810. With the capitulation letter of Queen Lili‘uokalani, the non-Native Hawaiian planters, businessmen, merchants, and a rogue U.S. diplomat succeeded where France, Russia, Britain, and the United States had failed. They toppled the Hawaiian monarch, and in the process, won their ultimate goal: a clear road to American annexation and unlimited possibilities for their own business interests.

The settlers’ victory over Native Hawaiian forces supplanted the legitimate ruling family with the Committee of Safety, thus ending the first phase of the path towards annexation. Their victory, however, was only a partial one, at best. The sugar planters supporting the *coup d’état* needed immediate annexation by the United States of America. Such a union would provide plantation owners with a degree of protection against the protective tariffs that were so popular with mainland American businessmen and politicians. Yet, they did not consider the possibility of a prolonged debate

concerning the nature of the relationship between Hawai‘i and the United States federal government. Moreover, they could not foresee the developments of 1898. The conclusion of the Spanish-American War initiated a period of overseas, territorial expansion. In the American mind, the idea of annexing the Hawaiian Islands was troubling since they were populated by Native Hawaiians, Chinese, and Europeans. The Treaty of Paris of 1898 further complicated the issue. Now there existed the possibility of a political union with islands populated by Puerto Ricans, Guamanians, and a myriad of Filipino ethnicities in addition to Hawaiian citizens. Given the preponderance of eugenic theories and nativist sentiments, the question of empire became more complex. While expanding from sea to shining sea, Americans simply removed unwanted Native American and Latino communities from valuable lands, replacing them with settlers of European decent. But this was a new colonial age, and the genocidal policies of the past no longer sufficed. Whereas Americans relished the possibility of resettling old Cherokee lands in Georgia, Lakota prairies in the Dakotas, or Tejano ranges in south Texas, it was unlikely that masses of city dwelling Americans would leave their homes for the expensive trip to Luzon for the purpose of working on plantations. Americans were lured to the West by the possibility of wealth and land in the past. Forcibly removing Native Americans was acceptable throughout the 1800s. But these factors were gone by 1898. Now, statesmen needed new techniques to govern their insular acquisitions, as well as a new reason for holding them in the first place.

In terms of Hawai‘i, the questions regarding its relationship to the United States of America were legion. Should it be a commonwealth relationship? Did control over these islands strengthen the American position in the Pacific Ocean at the cost of
American anti-colonial and republican ideology? Was this indicative of the formation of an imperial foreign policy in Washington, D.C.? Or would Hawai’i follow the historical precedent set by continental territories by eventually gaining statehood? While many questions concerning this political bond arose, only one received scant attention within the walls of Congress and on the streets of American cities: would Native Hawaiians ever regain their sovereignty? For Cubans, the Teller Amendment to the declaration of war against Spain answered this question by promising independence after the war. Their people were guaranteed self-determination before the Spanish even capitulated. Native Hawaiians were not so fortunate. The issue of Kānaka rights to their ancestral lands and sovereignty would remain suppressed in the public’s mind until Kānaka activists began demanding recognition of their indigenous rights in the decades following statehood. After realizing the failure of statehood to solve the economic, cultural, and political damages caused to the Kānaka by the American conquest of Hawai’i, Native Hawaiians recommenced the fight for self-determination after the early 1900s.

The absorption of the Hawaiian Islands into the American political system was novel to policy makers. No national plan existed for gaining overseas territory prior to the 1890s. While Americans believed it was their manifest destiny to conquer a continent, they never developed a master plan for creating an overseas empire. The war against the Spanish Empire radically changed American foreign policy. In the past, the nation interfered in South and Central American countries but never established colonial outposts there. Businessmen made inroads into the Chinese market prior to 1898, yet the U.S. Navy lacked sufficient naval stations in the Pacific Ocean for a permanent American
presence. The Spanish-American War sparked a sudden move by American
e xpansionists to extend the scope of Manifest Destiny to overseas lands.

The move towards overseas, territorial colonialism sprang from the atmosphere of
the Gilded Age. The closing of the frontier, so passionately advertised by Frederick
Jackson Turner, in conjunction with the views of imperialists like Theodore Roosevelt,
Admiral Alfred Thayer Mahan, and others, spurred the nation into an amateurish attempt
at establishing European-style colonies in the Pacific Ocean and Caribbean Sea.
Expansionists and nationalists considered aggressive occupations necessary to the
survival of American capitalism. Successful expansion relied on establishing outposts in
the Pacific, and Hawai‘i fit the criteria for such a naval station. Annexationists used the
Spanish-American War as a new tactic in their fight for Hawaiian annexation, even
though politicians in the halls of Congress had remained reluctant to develop a close
relationship with the Hawaiian Islands until the very late 1800s.4

The events of July of 1898 changed the urgency with which congressmen
approached the national relationship with Hawai‘i. The House of Representatives passed
a joint resolution, known as the Newlands Resolution, to annex the Republic of Hawai‘i
on July 15, 1898, which the Senate had endorsed on July 6. The next day, President
William McKinley signed the document, thus laying claim to the Hawaiian Islands as an
insular territory of the United States of America and ending the debate over annexation.
In the historical context, this process of acquisition was different from the Louisiana
Purchase, the Adams-Onis Treaty, or the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. Americans did

4 Howard Zinn, A People’s History of the United States: 1492-Present (New York: Harper Perennial
Modern Classics, 2005), 297-320; Walter LaFeber, The American Age: U.S. Foreign Policy at Home and
Abroad, vol. 1, To 1920, 2nd ed. (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1994), 178-239; and Stephen Kinzer,
Overthrow: America’s Century of Regime Change from Hawaii to Iraq (New York: Times Books, 2006),
31-34, 78-94.
not purchase this land, nor wrench it from another imperial power as the spoils of war. Instead, their citizens emigrated to the kingdom and integrated themselves into the politics and economy of the Hawaiian people. After a period of approximately seventy-three years they overthrew the government with the aid of the United States and established a hastily-constructed, temporary government with an eye toward immediate annexation. In comparing it to other historical processes then, the annexation of the Republic of Hawai‘i was not dissimilar to that creating the Republic of Texas. Yet unlike Texas, Americans could not agree on the exact nature of the political bond between the United States of America and the Hawaiian Islands.

It did not take long for academicians, journalists, private citizens, and even foreigners to voice their views on the Hawaiian question. Shortly after news of the coup d’état reached the continental newspapers, articles appeared containing advice on how to proceed. For example, in three months after the overthrow of the queen, *The Social Economist* published an article entitled, “Philosophy of Immigration and Annexation.” In this piece, the author traced the development of the global economy, finally concluding that the American capitalist economy was the pinnacle of economic evolution. Although the author claimed that the southern states continually retarded economic progress, he considered the United States of America as the heir to a movement towards economic liberalism that began in Europe. Since certain factors prevented this progress from becoming fulfilled there, the goal of creating and spreading a purely capitalist economy fell to the United States. The republic had the political and economic framework necessary to complete its mission, but certain elements and developments could halt any progress towards economic liberalism. Within the southern states of the United States,
which he termed the “block of barbarism,” the institution of slavery and the treatment of African-Americans following Reconstruction had already slowed this progress.\(^5\) To admit Hawai’i to the United States would further block the process, since the Republic of Hawai’i would need to enter into the Union as either a state or a foreign dependency. In either case, the author claimed that the addition of the islands filled with “coolies and kanakas” and “a few American capitalists . . . similar to the former slave-holders of the South” would add yet another economic and social burden to the American republic.\(^6\)

Academic circles even took notice of the economic aspects of the Committee of Safety’s *coup d’état* and subsequent appeal for annexation. In March of 1893, scholar Frederick R. Clow wrote an article, entitled “Our Commercial Relations,” in which he described at length the economic ties between the Republic (previously the Kingdom) of Hawai’i and the United States of America. He observed that the reciprocity agreement formalized in 1876 stemmed from a desire of the American federal government to prevent Hawaiian markets from moving into the British economic sphere. Moreover, the treaty brought much needed growth and wealth to Hawaiian plantation owners. Yet, the loss of this agreement in 1891 gravely affected the Hawaiian economy, leading to plantation closures and increased unemployment. To stall this downward economic spiral, the author concluded that Hawaiian political leaders sought annexation as a permanent form of reciprocity. While Clow acknowledged the possibility of converting Pearl River into a naval base, his figures suggested to his readers that annexation would cost at least $5,000,000 per annum. Instead of annexation he suggested a quick


\(^6\) Ibid.
expenditure of $25,000,000 on new armaments and battleships to save American taxpayers’ money while still increasing the naval presence in the Pacific Ocean.\textsuperscript{7}

The academic question regarding annexation was not limited to the continental United States. In an article in \textit{Forum}, dated December of 1897, the Rt. Hon. James Bryce, M.P., presented his case against annexation. In analyzing the situation, Bryce focused on two main topics: military power and democratic institutions. First, the author argued that annexing the Hawaiian Islands would have an adverse effect on American security within the Pacific Ocean. Although the islands provided a superb location for a coaling station, their location 2,300 miles from the North American continent placed extra demands on the U.S. Navy. Whereas Bryce considered the size of the United States as preventing any serious threat of invasion from another power, the annexation of Cuba, Hawaiʻi, and other insular possessions would require vast expenditures to construct a fleet. In other words, American insular territories, like European colonies, would become “territories which lie at the mercy of a stronger hostile fleet.”\textsuperscript{8}

Bryce continued his argument by claiming the annexation of Hawaiʻi and the islands gained from Spain after the Spanish-American War would inevitably force America to adopt a European, colonial system. His article was one of many written between 1893 and 1898 as part of a debate on whether or not the United States could successfully incorporate large populations of “non-white” citizens into the republic. In Bryce’s opinion, the American democratic system required a well-educated European

\textsuperscript{7} Frederick R. Clow, “Our Commercial Relations,” \textit{Journal of Political Economy} 1, no. 2 (March 1893): 280-284 [database online]; available from JSTOR.
\textsuperscript{8} James Bryce, “The Policy of Annexation for America,” \textit{Forum} (December 1897): 385 [database online]; available from JSTOR.
stock “capable of working self-governing democratic institutions” to operate effectively.\(^9\) His analysis of the population of the Hawaiian Islands led him to believe that such a population did not exist in Hawai‘i. Therefore the United States Congress would need to establish a colonial office, similar to the Colonial Office in London.

Here, Bryce saw two problems. First, the United States government lacked experience in colonial administration. His historical description of the British system was one that developed over a long period of time, complete with a trained staff knowledgeable of the subtleties need to oversee colonial possessions. Developing this system would require significant time and resources on the part of the Americans. Second, Bryce, as well as other scholars, politicians, and journalists, viewed such a colonial institution as incompatible with the American constitutional and legal system. His proof for this argument lay in American territorial history. He wrote, “It is moreover to be noted that the status of a Territory has heretofore been deemed a transitory and provisional one, intended to lead up in due time, when the region becomes more densely populated by competent citizens, to the higher status of statehood.”\(^10\) Bryce correctly observed that this was the general rule regarding the treatment of territories throughout American history. But was his assumption correct?

American historians have written numerous works on territorial history, many of which uphold Bryce’s position. The Northwest Ordinance of 1787 established the procedure by which territories became states. Once established, a territory moved through three processes on the path to statehood. On the one hand, this document provided settlers in the region with the promise that they would not live permanently

\(^9\) Ibid.
\(^10\) Ibid., 385.
under a colonial system of government. This was a form of colonization that eventually led to full equality. Historians traditionally see this as the separating factor between American and European imperialism. According to this view, Europeans never intended to grant equality to their subjected states. They held territories for wealth, not to expand freedom or lofty goals of republicanism. Americans, on the other hand, used a colonial framework to subjugate foreign lands so they could recreate their democratic institutions. This was to be expected. After all, the United States of America emerged from their revolution against an imperial power only four years earlier. To subject American citizens to colonial rule would thus run counter to their revolutionary ideals. On the other hand, congressmen desired an orderly system of occupation in the territories. While Congress clearly desired the occupation of these lands for economic development, to expand their republic, provide land for citizens, and replenish a depleted treasury, they did not want to risk disunion and chaos within the territories. As a preventative measure, Congress retained the right to intervene and closely observe political, legal, criminal, and economic developments during the statehood process.

Insofar as continental expansion and general territorial history was concerned, territorial status usually led to statehood. Yet, in the overall historical context, the issue

---

11 On April 20, 1786, James Monroe wrote to the Secretary for Foreign Affairs, John Jay, regarding the Northwest Ordinance of 1787. In the letter, Monroe solicits advice from Jay concerning the governance of the territories. He wrote, “The first question which arises with respect to the government is, Shall it be upon Colonial principles, under a governor, council, and judges of the U.S., removeable at a certain period of time and they admitted to a vote in Congress with the common rights of other States, or shall they be left to themselves until that event?” Examining this document suggests that their recent experience as colonial subjects was fresh in the minds of the legislators responsible for this document. Moreover, the language within Monroe’s letter clearly indicates that he, as well as others, realized that the territorial process threatened to introduce the spirit of imperialism into their republic of freedom. James Monroe to John Jay, Secretary for Foreign Affairs, New York, 20 April 1786, in Edmund C. Burnett, ed., Letters of Members of the Continental Congress, vol. 8, January 1, 1785, to July, 25, 1789 with supplement (Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Institution of Washington, 1936), 342.

contained more intricacies than acknowledged. Historically, territorial status may have led to statehood, but it did not guarantee statehood. While the Northwest Ordinance of 1787 established a pattern for American expansion, it never became a constitutional element within the American legal system. As Peter Onuf notes, Chief Justice Roger B. Taney declared the ordinance null and void in Strader et al. v. Graham (1850). 13 Prior to this ruling, the Northwest Ordinance “filled a constitutional void” surrounding congressional powers to admit new states to the Union. 14 Onuf’s observation regarding this “void” is rather poignant. When crafting the Constitution of the United States of America, the framers included a section giving Congress the authority to admit new states, provided the territory lay outside preexisting states. Furthermore, to Congress went the “Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States.” 15 When confronted with a surplus of lands following the American Revolutionary War and a deficit in the United States Treasury, congressional leader devised the Northwest Ordinance of 1787.

The warnings against the dangers of annexing a predominately Asian population, the unpreparedness of the American political system to administer non-continental colonial possessions, and the distance of the islands from the mainland deterred Congress. After all, national response toward an expanded role in global affairs was greatly divided. Americans opposing an imperial foreign policy managed to overcome their differences long enough to form the Anti-Imperialist League in 1898. According to

13 Onuf, Statehood and Union: A History of the Northwest Ordinance, xxi. Onuf goes into much detail regarding the lasting effects of the Northwest Ordinance on the American statehood process. He covers the relationship between the Northwest Ordinance and the Constitution, and how this played into relations between the various territories, as well as between territorial governments and congress.

14 Ibid.

Howard Zinn, this was an “odd group” representing different—and sometimes opposing—segments of society, “united in a common moral outrage at what was being done to the Filipinos in the name of freedom.” Yet, their efforts were insufficient to counteract the move by industrial leaders, politicians, and political theorists to introduce a new kind of American imperialism. Stephen Kinzer attributed this failure to a lack of radical action on the part of the Anti-Imperialist League. This “outspoken band of idealists,” as he termed them, could not counter the growing desire among the populace to expand trade and missionary policies across the Pacific and the globe. Moreover, the increase in American productivity and transportation, as well as the perceived fulfillment of Manifest Destiny within their own borders forced Americans to look overseas for new frontiers of commerce and expansion.

Drafting her letter of surrender to the United States government, Queen Lili’uokalani placed her trust in the honor of America’s elected representatives, hoping that they would uphold the anti-colonial and republican rhetoric inherited from the Revolutionary War generation. During the reign of her ancestor, King Kamehameha III (1824-1854), the United States honored Hawaiian sovereignty, but significantly less so than did the British Empire. She probably worried about the worst consequences. And they came true. The Kingdom of Hawai’i, the jewel of the Pacific Ocean, had been presented by the Committee of Safety as a gift to the American Empire, and the Americans intended to keep it.

Yet, Congress did not immediately accept Hawai’i. American opinion divided over the issue of annexation. Primarily anti-imperialist sentiment rejected the

---

16 Howard Zinn, 314-315.
17 Stephen Kinzer, 80-85.
transformation of the nation into a colonial power. This group simply opposed the idea of holding colonial possessions in the manner of late-nineteenth and early-twentieth century European nations. While this position on annexation served as a solidifying agent, anti-imperialist opinion split over other issues. Southern anti-imperialists feared the integration of foreign, non-western races into the body politic, while others were wary of the impact the Hawaiian sugar industry and the administration of a new colonial government would have on the economy.

For those in favor of annexation, the place of Hawai’i in national politics caused a degree of discord over how to incorporate the region into the imperial republic. Politicians, intellectuals, and businessmen proposed plans that covered a broad spectrum. Some suggested turning the island into colonies administered in a fashion similar to British and French holdings in Africa, Southwest Asia, and India. The Northwest Ordinance of 1787 served as another possible solution. Congress could authorize a territorial government that allowed for a large degree of self-government. Unfortunately, this stoked anxiety among congressmen and Americans who, like their southern anti-imperialist opponents, dreaded including Asians and Polynesians in the American political system. Worse yet, establishing a territorial government historically served as the first step towards statehood, i.e., incorporation into the Union on an equal footing with the older states. Throughout the course of the next 62 years, Americans continued this debate.

On August 21, 1959, President Dwight D. Eisenhower ended the debate over Hawai’i’s status in the United States of America by signing PL 86-3, An Act to Provide
for the Admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union.\footnote{U.S. Congress, An Act to Provide for the Admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, Public Law 86-3, \textit{U.S. Statutes at Large} 73 (1959): 4-13.} With the State of Hawai‘i adding the fiftieth star to the American flag, citizens, statesmen, and scholars, alike, could finally stop debating on whether or not it was just, proper, economical, or advantageous to incorporate the Pacific atoll into the Union. Hawaiians’ wartime sacrifices and relentless campaign for statehood had won them an official place in Congress and among the fellowship of the continental states.

Ironically, PL 86-3 initiated a new debate among historians. After the tumult had subsided in the national press, U.S. Congress, and general public, historians were left the task of making sense of sixty-two years worth of discussion, law, colonialism, and social developments occurring throughout the continental states, as well as the island chain located 2,300 miles west of them. Instead of the question, should the Territory of Hawai‘i be given commonwealth status, historians ask how did Hawaiians avoid commonwealth status and win statehood? Rather than asking, whether or not control over the islands would strengthen the American position in the Pacific Ocean at the cost of American anti-colonial and republican ideology, scholars consider the effect statehood had on American image in the Pacific Rim. Sixty-nine years later, historians know the answer to the question: would the Kānaka ever regain their sovereignty?

In other words, since 1959, historians have produced a significant body of literature on the role of Hawai‘i in American history. Historians focusing on issues in the Pacific Rim, indigenous history, and Hawaiian history have produced most of the written work, which is quite logical. Yet, one discipline has largely ignored Hawaiian history, especially twentieth-century Hawaiian history. Academics involved in the field of the
North American West have many reasons to engage in research topics covering these islands. The West was the region in which over two hundred years of American colonial history occurred. Laws passed regarding race relations, territorial government, land use, and homesteading set the precedent for the rest of the nation. Cow towns and boomtowns set the scene for violence and lawlessness. From this milieu of ruggedness emerged lawmen and pistoleers, represented by Billy the Kid, Wyatt Earp, and Wild Bill Hickok, who would blaze their way into American myth with their six-shooters. More than this, the American West was the scene for campaigns of conquest and colonialism. Here was the birthplace of American attitudes towards indigenous peoples that would later appear in the Philippines and Vietnam. The coastlines of California, Alaska, Oregon, Hawai’i, and Washington served as points of departure for troops sailing to Guadalcanal, Saigon, and Inchon; manufactured goods reaching China and Japan; and atomic bombs delivering death and destruction to Hiroshima, Nagasaki, and to a lesser extent, Eniwetok. Just as the West was the setting for figures and events of the legendary Old West, it was also a theatre in the neo-colonialism of post-World War II America. Yet, the field remained silent about Hawai’i and its role in the New West.

Pacific history is not new to western historians. In 1951, as American troops fought against communist forces on the Korean peninsula, a preeminent western historian, Earl Pomeroy, introduced the field to the possibilities of incorporating Pacific territorial history with his history of Micronesia. He first encountered Micronesian history before the Japanese bombs fell on Pearl Harbor. His experience during World War II as an instructor of naval and diplomatic history rekindled his interest in the subject
by introducing him to military and world affairs in the region. Unfortunately, his book, *Pacific Outpost: American Strategy in Guam and Micronesia*, failed to capture western historians’ interest in the relationship between colonialism in the American West and national interests in the Pacific Rim. Turnerianism, the bane of most modern western historians, still reigned in the field. Historians spent their energies producing work on cowboys and Indians. Women, minorities, colonialism, sexuality, and town-building were ancillary to legitimate scholarship. Moreover, the Pacific Ocean was irrelevant to their field. Aside from being a place from which Chinese and Japanese immigrants magically appeared, it meant little to the West.

The advent of New Western History signaled an end to Turnerianism. With the publication of books like “It’s Your Misfortune and None of My Own,” by Richard White, and *Legacy of Conquest*, by Patricia Nelson Limerick, western historians began to consider groups, persons, and themes that Turnerians marginalized. Today, world-systems theory, postmodernism, and environmental theories offer new approaches to the discipline. And still, Hawai’i remains absent.

This dissertation seeks to rectify this oversight. By building on recent scholarship from the fields of the American West, European colonial studies, and American foreign affairs, this narrative will prove that the history of the Territory of Hawai’i is integral to the study of imperialism in the Twentieth-Century American West and the Pacific Ocean. Examining modern Hawaiian history in the context of the Twentieth-Century American West, decolonization, colonialism, and the Cold War not only refines the definition of the
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region west of the Mississippi River, but it also connects western studies to the wider field of American and European colonial history.

Accomplishing this rather large goal is no easy task. To do so, the dissertation must move from events occurring at the global level to the regional level. Chapter two begins by providing an overview of American colonialism in the context of global colonialism in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, thus connecting events in the American West to global colonial history. This step is necessary to providing a new perspective on American Western History. Traditionally, the American West has been depicted as a region separate from European imperialism and colonialism. Europeans conquered Africans, Indians, and Asians; Americans defeated Native Americans. European adventurers, industrialists, and colonial administrators extended the British Empire as representatives of the Colonial Office by establishing colonial governments based on the principle of indirect rule. Meanwhile, Americans expanded their republic of freedom and liberty by establishing new states in the West where Chinese, European, and Japanese immigrants lived next to Native Americans, African Americans, Mexican Americans, and European Americans. In other words, European colonialism had nothing to do with American expansion.

But scholars must consider an alternative depiction of this narrative. What if western historians viewed American expansion west of the Mississippi as part of a larger trend in world history? Historians in the American West have already begun this process by writing comparative histories between Canada and Australia and the American West. Yet, what was Canada? Colonial historians classify it as a Dominion, a settler society that displaced Native American populations and established a colony intrinsically linked
to the British Empire throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Canadians were not alone. New Zealand, Australia, and South Africa were also classified under this term.

Chapter two seeks to connect the settlement of the American West to this event in world history, the expansion of white settler societies that recreated neo-Europes and neo-Americas throughout North America and the Pacific Ocean. For the British Empire, the Dominion occupied territories in British North America, New Zealand, Australia, and South Africa. For the United States, the creation of the “American Dominions,” i.e., settler societies, began with the opening of the Louisiana Purchase and extended across the continent into the Pacific Ocean to Hawaiʻi. Like members of the British Commonwealth, these American settler societies developed advanced economies powered by European, Asian, and African laborers in lands depopulated of the native inhabitants and financed by money from metropolitan centers located on or near the North Atlantic Rim.

In addition to securing the American West to global colonial history, chapter two addresses the exclusion Hawaiʻi from histories of the American West. Building on the work of John Whitehead and William Robbins, this chapter establishes the islands as part of the capitalist world-system developing in the American West, as well as other trends in the Twentieth-Century American West.

Having established Hawaiʻi as part of the American West, and the American West within global colonial studies, the present study turns to events tying Hawaiʻi into regional trends west of the Mississippi. Chapter three begins this process by incorporating Hawaiian territorial government into western territorial history. By studying the structures of colonial government in the islands and comparing it to
territorial governments in western continental territories, the study reveals that Hawaiian government from 1900 to 1959 was a direct continuation of the colonial government model as established by the Northwest Ordinance and modified by the Wisconsin Organic Act.

Moreover, this chapter makes a direct distinction between incorporated American colonialism and unincorporated American colonialism. Although historians can compare American imperial history to that of European empires—more specifically the British Empire—one must account for the differences in the two systems. European empires primarily conquered territories in Africa and Asia, though Britain had Dominions in the Pacific Ocean and southern Africa. While American colonialism developed from its experiences as a possession of the seventeenth-century and eighteenth-century British Empire, as well as its “sub-imperial” actions prior to the Revolutionary War, it was never an exact replica of the British system.

The U.S. had two forms of colonialism. Incorporated colonialism was characterized by white settler societies replicating their former communities and political organizations in conquered trans-Mississippi regions (as described above). To ensure their continued allegiance to the eastern states, the federal government offered the possibility of full political association from the first territorial stages. On the other hand, unincorporated colonialism occurred in U.S. territories in which the indigenous population remained the majority. The federal government never extended them the offer of full association, and colonial administration mirrored the indirect rule British agents exercised over African and Asian possessions.
Next, chapter four addresses issues arising from the noncontiguous geographical location of the Hawaiian Islands. Noncontiguity caused administrative and policy problems for American administrators. To Americans living in the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century, Hawaiian noncontiguity seemed unique. Although the blue water thesis and Cold War threatened American control over the region, Hawaiian noncontiguity was not unique. American armed forces, pioneers, and wagon trains experienced geographical separation as early as the first Oregon-bound wagon train. This chapter not only analyzes American concerns towards the perceived Hawaiian geographical isolation, but it also examines the federal impulse to grant Hawai‘i statehood as a means of seemingly observing international demands for decolonization.

Having examined issues pertaining to territorial government and noncontiguity, we next turn our attention to indigenous policy in Hawai‘i, the Pacific possessions, and the continental territories. For settler societies in Australia, New Zealand, Canada, South Africa, and the U.S., indigenous issues played a larger role in colonial affairs. This chapter seeks to examine the relationship between Native Hawaiians’ loss of sovereignty and conquest to overall American indigenous policy. It reveals the similarities in the conquest of continental and insular indigenous peoples, as well as the federal government’s neglect of Native Hawaiians. In essence, the federal government approached Native Hawaiians with a policy similar to that found forty years later on the mainland, called the Termination Program. Finally, it connects experiences of Native Hawaiians, Native Americans, and South Pacific Islanders towards tourism and the Cold War arms race.
Finally, white settler societies throughout the world eventually demanded equality with their larger political community. For British Dominions, the Statute of Westminster (1931) began the political process of making British Dominions equal to the metropole. In Hawai‘i, statehood granted Hawaiian equality with the mainland states. Chapter six traces the techniques used in Hawai‘i since 1903 to overcome opposition to their full inclusion into the Union. By combining the political methods used in continental statehood movements with the boosterist techniques of the American West, Hawaiians successfully overcame the opposition, winning statehood in 1959.

Combining these topics with current literature on Hawai‘i in the American West proves that it is not only part of the American West, but also a part of larger colonial events in world history. Furthermore, it reveals the importance of including Hawai‘i in the American West by placing American colonialism within the trends of colonial settler societies throughout western controlled territories. This contributes to the growing body of knowledge in American Western History by further ridding the narrative of exceptionalism and revealing similarities between American and European colonial systems.
CHAPTER 2
THE TERRITORY OF HAWAI’I AND AMERICAN IMPERIALISM IN A GLOBAL CONTEXT

Mirroring its geographical distance from the interior of the United States, Hawaiian history has always been on the periphery. Located far from the immediate attention of American historians, its role in United States history often seems obscure, ambiguous, and difficult to place. Native Hawaiians, after all, are not historically Native Americans, even though recent U.S. Congresses and Supreme Courts view them as legally compatible. Native Hawaiians once lived under a constitutional monarchy that funded a budding school system. Each mō‘ī worked to forge closer ties with Eurasian nations, and Hawaiian art, religion, and language differs substantially from indigenous cultures on the North American continent. Do they belong to the realm of indigenous history, or should historians treat them similar to the conquered communities that once belonged to the Republic of Mexico? Urbanization, community development, and state development in the insular state did not follow the east-to-west orientation of the continental states, nor did its population have ties primarily to western Europe. With its predominately Asian population, distance from the mainland, and Polynesian roots, can cultural historians link the island chain to the dominant American culture, or are Hawaiian culture and society unique? Most importantly for this study, the islands lay west of the Mississippi river, yet Hawaiian history lacks a Wyatt Earp, transcontinental cattle drives, Little Big Horn, Wild Bill Hickok, transcontinental railroads, and gushing oil geysers. If it is west of Western America, to what region does it belong?
Already split over the precise regional boundaries of the American West, the Hawaiian Islands complicate the issue of what comprises the Old and New West when placing their history in contexts of economic, colonial, cultural, geographical, and political events and trends in the region. According to John Whitehead, Hawai‘i not only belongs in the region: he claimed that it is “America’s first and last Far West.”

Contrary to his characterization, historians Michael P. Malone and Richard W. Etulain defined the West in such terms as to exclude the island chain absolutely, because it lacks the characteristics of aridity, resource-extractive industry, and a common history. Malone and Etulain’s definition reflected older theories regarding the American West, such as Walter Prescott Webb’s environmental determinism found in the Great Plains and the Turnarian notion of a frontier. With a healthy portion—though now a minority—of Turnarian-grounded western historians in the field, one cannot summarily dismiss the definition offered by Malone and Etulain, especially given their contributions. Finally, other historians claim that Hawai‘i’s role in Western historiography lies somewhere between the positions assumed by Whitehead, Malone, and Etulain. For example, Walter Nugent stated that “by nineteenth-century criteria Hawaii might not qualify, but by twentieth-century ones it certainly does.”

If one simply accepts the older definitions of the American West as a place populated by Euro-American pioneers, Native Americans, Chinese Americans, and South and Central Americans, all working to mine gold, grow crops, drive cattle, or pump oil in an arid or semi-arid region, then no, Hawai‘i is not part of the western saga. It becomes
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1 John Whitehead, “Hawai‘i: The First and Last Far West?” *Western Historical Quarterly* 23 (May 1992): 156; Available on JSTOR.
an anomaly, a state simply suspended in the Pacific Ocean. If, on the other hand, one steps back from the geographically strict definition of the West as a place between the Pacific Ocean and the Mississippi River and instead places American continental expansion within the context of a larger, global trend of colonialism and imperialism, then Hawai’i not only belongs within the imperial tradition of the American West, but it also broadens the field of Western history by revealing that the process of expansion as outlined in the Northwest Ordinance did not stop at the West Coast. Instead, it continued to Hawai’i while simultaneously mutating into a form of territorial acquisition more akin to European colonialism. Given this transformation, territorial history, which is a crucial component of Western history, must now account for the appearance of unincorporated, i.e., colonial, territories in addition to the old narrative of incorporated, i.e., imperial, territories. To accomplish this task Hawai’i must be placed in the framework of twentieth century American imperialism, American colonialism, and European colonialism.

With the increased historical interest in colonialism, imperialism, the Cold War, and twentieth century history in Western studies, the inclusion or exclusion of Hawai’i in the West has produced some degree of debate. The debate began in the early 1990s when John Whitehead responded to Michael Malone and Richard Etulain’s argument for excluding Hawai’i in their work *The American West: A Twentieth-Century History*, in which they dismissed the notion of including Hawai’i based on its supposed lack of aridity, a shared history, and extractive industry. They asserted that the frontier heritage set the West apart from the rest of the nation. Though west of other lands, the State of Hawai’i did not experience this phase lasting from 1803 to 1890 in which the federal
government retained control over all regional lands and eastern business interests dominated society in the region. Moreover, the West shared a common literary history that popularized the image of the West as a rough-hewn place populated by individualistic men, representative of Frederick Jackson Turner’s imagined West.4

John Whitehead countered their definition in two essays, “Hawai’i: The First and Last Far West?” (1992) and “Noncontiguous Wests: Alaska and Hawai’i” (1997). In his first attempt to establish Hawai’i firmly within regional studies of the American West, Whitehead examined Malone and Etulain’s claims that Hawai’i had neither an arid climate nor a shared history by noting that the Hawaiian climate shares common traits with the American West. It, too, has pockets of aridity scattered throughout the islands. For an example, he noted that the region surrounding Kawaihae, Hawai’i, which is located on the island of Hawai’i, receives a scant 5.7 inches of precipitation per annum. When sugar planters sought to cultivate the lands surrounding Kawaihae in the late 1800s, plantation owners compensated for arid conditions by constructing an irrigation system. With an examination of one locale located on the biggest island, Whitehead demonstrated that the Hawaiian climate is as diverse as the American West and that extreme climatic patterns required collective action to engage in extractive activities.5

Whitehead next turned his attention to highlighting historical commonalities between Western states and the islands. By reviewing Hawaiian history from the migration of the first Polynesians to the islands to the late 1900s, he pointed out similarities between Hawaiian events and Western events. For example, he suggested that the sandalwood trade from 1818-1821 created a valuable market for Americans

4 Malone and Etulain, The American West, 9-10.
comparable to the trade network established by the Santa Fe Trail following the Mexican Revolution of 1820. He cited a landmark event in the Hawaiian cattle industry when King Kauikeaouli (Kamehameha III) brought Mexican cowboys to the islands to instruct Kānakas in the art of raising cattle. He even linked Hawaiian missionary activities to the Oregon Country through Marcus and Narcissa Whitman, who began their missionary activities in what became Washington State in the 1830s which correlated with the arrival of New England missionaries in the Hawaiian monarchy in 1820.6 These are only a few examples of the various historic events that Whitehead used to show parallel developments in Hawai‘i and the American West.

In terms of addressing Malone and Etulain’s charges of Hawai‘i lacking historical and climatic characteristics with the West, Whitehead hit on some of the basic issues in his article without providing an in depth comparative analysis. Later, in “Noncontiguous Wests: Alaska and Hawai‘i,” Whitehead built upon his previous effort to ground the islands firmly with regional studies, and this time he focused on Hawai‘i and Alaska’s regional relationships with the American West. He began by reexamining the exclusionist argument of aridity, and then he offered a regional analysis of Hawai‘i and Alaska during which he placed them within the Maritime West of New England, the Gold Rush West of California, and the “Untransformed West.”7 Economic connections between Hawai‘i and the West were forged initially by New England trading vessels originating with the arrival of the U.S.S. Columbia, Captain Robert Gray commanding, and continuing until roughly 1846 when events in California, the Oregon Country, and
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6 Whitehead, “Hawai‘i: The First and Last Far West?” 159-160, 163.
northwest Mexico overshadowed this trade network. He defined the “Maritime West of New England” as a “triangle from the Northwest Coast up to Russian America and over to Hawai’i,” a trade network through which missionaries, American settlers, and manufactured goods reached and changed Hawaiian society.\(^8\) The California Gold Rush of 1849 inaugurated the Gold Rush West as the Californian market opened to Hawaiian agricultural products. With a new market for sugar and other goods, as well as a potential threat from Californian filibusters, this West further integrated Hawai’i into the American economic sphere.\(^9\)

Whitehead ended his discussion by posing the possibility of an “Untransformed West,” created when the industrialization of major Western cities in the twentieth century and the popularization of the West in the media affected perceptions of Hawai’i. The noncontiguous states became part of the “Untransformed West” as they lagged behind major Californian cities in industrial capacity and rates of urbanization. Increased immigration to the newest states, the continuation of agricultural industries in the islands, and attempts to establish a rudimentary maritime industry in Alaska, however, lessened the gap caused by the rapid industrialization of the west coast during World War II. Oddly enough, his depiction of the tourist industry suggests that the industry prevented the islands from evolving beyond the “Untransformed West.”\(^{10}\) In this instance, his analysis suggests that Whitehead did not consider the tourist industry as a major form of modern business as depicted by Hal Rothman in \textit{Devil’s Bargains}. Granted, Rothman considered tourism as an industry capable of making massive profits at the cost of local

communities and the environment, but he never denigrated its major role in the modern American economy.\(^\text{11}\)

Whitehead, however, did offer a caution about regional inclusion. He observed that Alaskans and Hawaiians do not readily regard themselves as Westerners. Instead, they consider themselves apart from the region as “Alaskans frequently refer to themselves as ‘Northerners’ (circumpolar rather than Yankee), and the peoples of Hawai‘i seem happiest with the appellation of ‘islanders.’ ‘Western’ or ‘Westerner’ are not designations that are widely voiced in either state.”\(^\text{12}\) These debates over Hawai‘i and the American West occurred throughout the 1990s. Recent events in Hawai‘i and the insular territories, however, have renewed the importance of this debate. On April 30, 2008, the Hawaiian Kingdom Government—a Native Hawaiian sovereignty organization—occupied Iolani Palace and closed its doors to the public. The occupation only lasted a few hours, but Mahealani Kahau, leader of Hawaiian Kingdom Government, vowed that members would continue returning to the palace every weekday in protest of the 1893 coup by the Committee of Safety.\(^\text{13}\) Only two days earlier, a letter signed by Ikaika Hussey of the Movement for Aloha No ka Aina (MANA), Terrilee Keko‘olani of Ohana Koa/Nuclear-Free and Independent Pacific, Noelani Goodyear-Kaopua of the University of Hawai‘i—Manoa, Jon Osorio of the Center for Hawaiian


\(^\text{12}\) Whitehead, “Noncontiguous Wests: Alaska and Hawai‘i,” 316. Unfortunately, Whitehead does not include evidence in the way of polls, studies, documents, oral interviews, or other material that historians could use to corroborate his assertion. His claim, however, is quite believable. Considering Texans’ identity as something unique in American society—belonging to the West and South, possessing a unique culture, etc.—one could assume that Whitehead expressed a basic characteristic of Hawaiian identity in his article. For the present, more research is needed on this topic. For more information on Texas identity, one can review Arnoldo De León’s article “Regional and Ethnicity: Topographical Identities in Texas” also located in Wroble and Steiner, *Many Wests*, 259-274.

Studies at the University of Hawai‘i—Manoa, Kekuni Blaisdell of Ka Pakaukau, Kai’opua Fyfe of the Koani Foundation, and Andre Perez and Kelii “Skippy” Ioane of Hui Pu appeared in The Nation asking Americans to support Kānaka efforts to regain their sovereignty and end the military presence in Hawai‘i. In their letter, they included a brief history of the military occupation of the islands since the 1893 coup d’état. Their statistics show that the U.S. Navy and Army controlled over 150,000 acres of land for military bases and training sites. From these areas, military men and women, munitions, armaments, and materiel are dispatched throughout the Pacific Ocean. Since assuming hegemony over the lands starting in 1898, the federal government has subjected the islands and Native Hawaiians to environmental, political, and cultural degradation through tourism, militarism, and colonialism, they argued.14

Modern protests such as these are continuations of Native Hawaiian resistance to American control. Sometimes, protest movements have been labeled or portrayed as terrorism. For example, from 1977 to 1987, Hui ‘O He’e Nalu—a Native Hawaiian surfing club—protested surfing tournaments held by International Professional Surfing (IPS) that took up the entire surf along the North Shore. The IPS and its founder, Fred Hemmings, secured permits from the Hawaiian state government that gave them exclusive rights to the surf during these tournaments. For Hui ‘O He’e Nalu members, these restrictions were another means for haole colonization of Native Hawaiian culture. Surfing, after all, was a Native Hawaiian sport with deep cultural and historical meaning. Prohibiting Hui members from North Shore waters during surfing competitions was absolutely unacceptable to the club. From 1977 to 1987, Hui ‘O He’e Nalu fought against this new, perceived form of colonialism, eventually winning concessions from the

IPS. For example, IPS hired only Hui members to work as security guards and lifeguards until 1987. The money earned from this concession allowed the Hui to promote community projects, hold surfing competitions, and expand the club. By the 1990s, Hui members had survived the accusations of domestic terrorism, poor press from local newspapers, and negative imagery in mass media to continue their struggle against other American controls over the islands.\textsuperscript{15}

Native Hawaiian resistance is only part of the reason why Western historians should take notice of American insular regions. Increasingly, the Territory of Guam and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico grow in importance to the United States politically and militarily. In terms of the military, over 200,000 Puerto Ricans served in the armed forces since the Spanish American War.\textsuperscript{16} During the tight campaign for the Democratic National Party presidential candidacy in 2008, the Guam caucus and Puerto Rico primary made national headlines as Americans waited to see if they would have their first African American or female presidential candidate in the election of 2008. With fifty-five voting delegates, Puerto Rico had a sizeable impact on the campaign. Guam, on the other hand, only had four delegates; however, in such a close race every delegate had significant importance.\textsuperscript{17}

Native protest movements, Democratic caucuses, North Korean nuclear weapons, growing Chinese economic power, and other international events serve only to remind

Western historians of the need to continue placing Western historical events and trends, especially those of the twentieth century, in a global context. As Richard White noted at the Western History Association’s Twenty-Ninth Annual Conference in Tacoma, Washington, in 1989, “[t]he current recognition of the strategic importance of the Pacific Rim . . . has placed the West at the physical center of events in the larger realm of national affairs.”18 With Hawai’i serving as a transitional zone between the older forms of American imperialism and the new American colonialism and post-World War II hegemony, the islands link imperial events in the North American continent with the Pacific Ocean and the rest of the world.

There are various means by which Western historians can incorporate the islands into the region. One requires historians to repudiate all exclusionist arguments that Hawai’i lies outside the purview of Western history. This task is quite possible. For example, in Magic Lands: Western Cityscapes and American Culture after 1940, John M. Findlay offered a definition of the West based on the U.S. Census and urbanization. Since federal workers within the U.S. Census Bureau placed Hawai’i outside of the “eleven Mountain and Pacific states,” he did not consider Hawai’i as geographically connected to the region. Also, he excluded Hawai’i because it lacks a regional experience of “moving to and living in its cities and suburbs.”19 To illustrate his point, Findlay provided statistics revealing that the greatest rate of urbanization for the American West excluding Hawai’i was in the twentieth century as the U.S. population experienced another east-to-west migration reminiscent of nineteenth-century overland

trails. As proof, he noted that “In 1900 the region had barely 5 percent of the nation’s population; by 1970 it had almost 17 percent. . . . By the time of the 1970 census the West had become the most highly urbanized of the four American sections, with 83 percent of its population dwelling in urban places. Ten years later, when the figure reached 84 percent, its closest competitor, the Northeast, was at only 74 percent.”

A swift counter to Findlay’s basis for exclusion requires little more than referencing census records (See Table 1).

**Table 1: Population of the West 1990**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Western States</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>550,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>3,665,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>29,760,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>3,294,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawai‘i</td>
<td>1,108,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>1,007,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>2,478,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>799,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>1,202,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>1,515,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>639,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>3,146,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>2,842,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>696,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>16,987,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>1,723,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>4,867,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>454,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In 1900, Hawai‘i only had 368,336 residents. Following post-World War II, more Americans migrated to the islands, as veterans returned to the mainland with descriptions of paradise. Once statehood tied the islands firmly to the United States, Americans were even less reluctant to relocate to the islands. Between 1930 and 1960, the population nearly doubled to 632,772. Moreover, the population in the twentieth century was

20 Findlay, 1.
largely urban-based. By 1990, Hawai‘i was the forty-first largest state in the United States with a population of 1,108,000, which was larger than that of such Western states as Alaska, Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, North Dakota, and South Dakota. More importantly, out of 1,108,000 people, 836,000 (75.4% of the population) lived in the city of Honolulu making the Hawaiian Islands a very urban place. Considering the scarcity of available land in Hawai‘i and the post-World War II industry dominated by tourism, Hawaiians required large urban centers to provide jobs, homes, education, and entertainment.

Historians who include Hawai‘i in the West have countered such exclusionist definitions, but so far it has been a piecemeal approach that is at times cumbersome, clumsy, inaccurate, and inefficient. Postmodern theory fragmented the older metanarratives and paradigms that attempted to simplify historians’ understanding of the West. Instead of a homogenous region as depicted by Turner, western historians today envision the West as a region comprised of multiple cultures, borders, themes, processes, and images, sometimes leaving them with multiple Wests instead a singular American West. In such a fragmented area, historians could quibble ceaselessly over the authenticity of one region in comparison to another based on class, race, gender, urbanization, climate, geography, imagery, art, and literature. To avoid the fragmentation of the field into a chaotic cluster of multiple Wests, historians attempt to provide paradigms with which they understand and analyze the region as a whole, and it is at this level that historians must examine the relationship of Hawai‘i to the West.

For this reason, Whitehead’s idea of adding new Maritime, Gold Rush, and Untransformed Wests as a means of understanding the relationship and effect of Hawai‘i on the West may not be entirely feasible. Reviewing his work in this area, it becomes readily apparent that these are not inclusive models for Hawai‘i in the West. For example, the Maritime West emphasizes the connectivity between Hawai‘i and the Northeast through “the continual flow of people and products” across the Pacific Ocean.25 The Maritime West faded when the Gold Rush West redirected Hawaiian markets to the West Coast. From 1846 to 1893, the constant threat of conquest shaped Hawaiian politics as the monarchs navigated through the complex atmosphere of foreign affairs. American settlers in the kingdom and the close proximity of a large Californian population drew the Hawaiian monarchy, economy, and culture closer to the United States resulting in the 1898 overthrow.26 While these are important connections between the Hawaiian Islands and other territories, they do not necessitate the creation of yet another American West.

When Whitehead used significant events in America to anchor Hawai‘i to the West, his model was also flawed. For example, gold strikes near Sutter’s fort in 1848 and the Yukon River in 1886 were part of a larger mining industry throughout the American West. While mining drew settlers and industries to such regions as California, Colorado, Nevada, British Columbia, Alaska, and the Black Hills, Western historians now perceive nineteenth-century extractive industries as part of a larger imperial effort to control and settle Western lands. Whitehead correctly noted that the California Gold Rush drew settlement to the West Coast; however, his analysis ignored other major

factors, such as agriculture and transportation. Throughout the West, mining settlements were temporary, fluid affairs. The get-rich-quick mentality prevalent in the camps eclipsed any thought of town building and community development. Instead, middle class entrepreneurs, farmers, and ranchers were the core of urbanization in the West. Immigrating to the West with their families, these groups required schools, churches, banks, and other infrastructure. Granted, miners required legal institutions, stores, and entertainment, but mining camp demographics revealed that transitory, single males dominated their numbers.27

Instead of adopting John Whitehead’s idea of adding new Wests based on Hawaiian history, Western historians may want to consider adding a new sub-region to existing paradigms. By considering Hawai‘i and Alaska within existing sub-regions of the American West or creating a new sub-region for the Pacific Ocean, historians can include noncontiguous territories within current models of the American West. The problem is to what sub-region should Alaska and Hawai‘i belong? As chapters three, four, and six reveal, Hawai‘i continued the traditions of the Northwest Ordinance in the settlement, conquest, and administration of the islands; however, their noncontiguous nature and changes in national attitudes and federal policy regarding colonialism and imperialism were altered with the Spanish American War. In his article “The American View of Decolonization, 1776-1920: an Ironic Legacy,” Walter LaFeber analyzed American expansionist and foreign policy from the Early Republic to the Cold War. He correctly argued that the young republic inherited the colonial policies of the British Empire. Although professing equality, liberty, freedom, and anti-colonialism, American
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statesmen formulated foreign policy that appeared adverse to imperial ideology, yet was imperialist in practice. For example, the Monroe Doctrine denounced colonialism in the Americas and vowed to prevent the acquisition of more territory by European empires in 1823, yet U.S. officials later used it to ensure economic and political hegemony throughout South and Central America.28 Whereas congresses and presidents accepted foreign policy designed to guarantee American merchants access to foreign markets, they never approved of colonization as practiced by European empires. American policy following 1898, on the other hand, permitted the accumulation of overseas territories. It is within this milieu that the Hawaiian Islands were annexed by the United States. This divergence from the standard pattern of settlement in the American West complicates the process of placing Hawai‘i within existing sub-regions.

In the end, two factors prevent Western historians from accepting the role of Hawai‘i in Western developments. First, rigid adherence to regionalism prevents Western historians from placing the West within the larger context of global colonialism and imperialism. If historians approached the American West as an area of American imperialism within larger events occurring simultaneously in world history, then the borders at the Pacific Ocean and Mississippi shrink in importance. In other words, regionalism is important, however, overemphasis on regionalism at the expense of the American West in world history becomes counterproductive.

Second, Western historians have erred in their emphasis on a contiguous American West. Cartographers, historians, geographers, and other academics once relied on continents for an easy compartmentalization of international boundaries, world

cultures, religion, and trade networks. Placing cultures and nations within the tidy framework of continents sufficed for the modern era. Postmodernism, however, revolutionized the study of geography. Michel Foucault’s theories challenged the academic habit of writing metanarratives. According to Martin W. Lewis and Kären E. Wigen, “postmodernism in geography emphasizes fluidity, contingency, movement, and multiplicity, questioning the rigid spatial frameworks that have limited and constrained our geographical imagination.”

Western historians must consider geography’s use of postmodern theory. Instead of clear, contiguous borders based on political and economic systems, postmodern geographers have moved toward viewing a world composed of superregions characterized by similarities in culture, religion, economics, and other social forces. Superregions are then broken into subregions that serve as borderlands between the two in which social elements from the two sides intermix in a manner reminiscent of Richard White’s middle ground. Furthermore, these new borders are not always impermeable or contiguous. Instead, they are characterized by fluidity. Including Hawai’i and other insular territories in the West forces Western historians to consider these issues.

Thus, the present definition of the American West as a place, or superregion, bounded by the Mississippi River, Canada, Mexico, and the Pacific Ocean must be modified before continuing on to Hawai’i as part of a subregion. Geography is an important characteristic of the West that helped determine the types of industry settlers
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30 Lewis and Wigen, 151. Here, the authors refer to Richard White’s depiction of the cultural exchanges between the French, the English, and Native Americans. Within the middle ground, acculturation occurred as all sides adopted parts of each other’s cultural practices as they engaged in trade and diplomacy. Moreover, the middle ground was not a geographical place.

31 Lewis and Wigen, 14-16, 31-33, 146-156.
could develop in the region. After all, one would not expect to see a field of banana trees in the middle of Death Valley. Political boundaries were also important. State governments forged out of Kansas and Nebraska territories experienced much different processes of evolution and forms of government control than did those of the Northwest Territory and Missouri Territory (see chapter three); yet, culture, politics, religion, ethnicity, and economics played an equally important role. Instead of arbitrarily selecting geographical boundaries or state borders as the leading characteristics in the definition of the American West, historians should rely on the one constant that included geography, politics, culture, gender, indigenous policy, economics, and ethnicity . . . imperialism. Perhaps the American West is not so much a legacy of conquest as it is the continuing effects of American imperialism that began in the nineteenth century and continued into the twentieth.

Prior to engaging in this topic, however, it is necessary to clarify key terminology. Imperialism, colonialism, empire, informal empire, and economic imperialism are words used to describe subtle variations in a global phenomenon that began in the 1500s, accelerated in the late 1800s, and declined during the 1900s. Prior to the scramble for Africa in the 1880s and 1890s, European nations had extended their power, economy, environment, and cultures to regions in Asia, Africa, the Americas, and the Pacific; however, from approximately 1876 to 1915, European expansion greatly accelerated. As noted by Eric Hobsbawm, western empires conquered and colonized one-quarter of the world’s surface in order to tie peripheral economies, markets, and resources to the growing European industrial machine.32 As empires expanded across the far reaches of time, their policies of control transformed to accommodate different subjugated

populations, white settler populations, technological innovations, and international
cerns. Needless to say, the British and French empires of the seventeenth and
eighteenth centuries differed greatly from those in the twentieth century administered by
Winston Churchill and Charles de Gaulle.

Since the advent of European imperialism, scholars have worked to gain an
intimate knowledge of this phenomenon. Their studies contain an entire lexicon of
terminology specifically applicable to this field. Of the various terms developed,
colonialism and imperialism create a good deal of confusion as they are often used
interchangeably and, thus, incorrectly. Colonialism and imperialism describe two
different processes that often occur simultaneously. In cases such as the British Empire
and the United States, a western power could engage in both processes simultaneously in
different regions in order to more efficiently administer or exploit conquered territories.
In *Europe Overseas: Phases of Imperialism*, Raymond F. Betts offered very basic, yet
accurate, definitions of colonialism and imperialism, both of which provide a good
starting point on which to develop a dialogue over the subtleties of empire. He defined
imperialism as a “consciously undertaken state activity in which force, intrigue, or even
egotiation is employed to secure the long-range political or economic domination by the
state of foreign territory or foreign peoples it wishes for some reason to control.”
Furthermore, imperialism may be transoceanic or transcontinental, thus allowing for
ations such as Russia and the U.S to embrace it. The key element in the definition of
imperialism is longevity and integration. Empires accumulated colonies without the
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intent to integrate them into the political system of the metropole, whereas imperial
nations conquered territory with the full intention of future incorporation at some level.  

Scholars can further narrow the definition of imperialism to account for the 

hegemony of a nation in a subjugated territory solely for economic purposes.

Economic imperialism may be defined as the use of power to determine 
relations between actors who are bound together mainly by political or economic 
institutions that have been imposed from outside, and who lack a common, 
internally generated sense of moral or cultural solidarity. The result may be to 
divert the economic choice of local people away from their perceived self-interest 
in a process of informal imperialism. Alternatively, by the exercise of formal 
control it may determine the economic institutions and policy of a colony, 
securing the interests of the metropolis, or providing favourable access to public 
goods for particular groups within local society who have an affinity with the 
Imperial power, such as settlers, expatriate businessmen and colonial officials, 
and their indigenous allies. The effect of such actions within the subordinate or 
colonized economy makes it easier to extract resources without providing 
payment for them in the form of social investment. The opportunity to do this is 
often given to favoured groups of nationals and outsiders, selected on the basis of 
their ethnic composition or political significance rather than their social need or 
economic potential.

The United States also exhibited patterns of economic imperialism throughout the West 
and Hawai‘i in the nineteenth century and twentieth century. Although the federal 
government never exercised a form of control equivalent to that of King Leopold II of 
Belgium in the Congo, policymakers insisted on retaining the right to legislate for the 
territories while the executive branch guaranteed compliance with congressional will. At 
times, power struggles erupted between settler societies in the West and Washington, 
D.C., as in the case of the Mormon War.

34 For more on the “politics of difference” in empires, see Frederick Cooper, Colonialism in Question: 
The Oxford History of the British Empire, ed. William Roger Louis (New York: Oxford University Press, 
1999), 71. 
36 Peter S. Onuf, Jack Ericson Eblen, and Howard Lamar are leading experts on this subject. For a 
description of early federal control of American territories and the creation of the Northwest Ordinance, see 
Peter S. Onuf, Statehood and Union, Midwestern History and Culture, eds. James H. Madison and Thomas
Colonialism, on the other hand, was very different from imperialism. Historians may place colonialism historically within the bounds of imperial expansion; however, colonialism refers to a specific form of overseas conquest in which “a dominating society, basing its rule on superior force, exploits the indigenous population and the land now under its control.”\textsuperscript{37} The governing structures within the colonies relied on the “politics of difference” in which the colonizer excludes the colonized masses from politics and society in order to exercise more control over the territory. In other words, politics of difference created a binary hierarchy in which the colonizers assumed positions of superiority over the indigenous masses. They justified this system through public ceremonial displays, claiming superior morality, and imagined racial hierarchies.\textsuperscript{38} In an empire there existed a “distinction between subject and citizen, the former involuntarily incorporated but [having] no rights and no voice, the latter a participating member of a polity.”\textsuperscript{39} According to these criteria, Britain, Belgium, France, Italy, Portugal, and Spain clearly fit into the category of a colonial nation, because their colonial governments in areas such as Africa relied on the subjugation of indigenous peoples by a handful of colonial administrators. Political institutions formed by the colonial power sought to rule, not incorporate. Prior to granting citizenship to Native Americans, the United States may have fit this definition, but Frederick Cooper argued

\textsuperscript{37} Betts, \textit{Europe Overseas}, 7.


\textsuperscript{39} Cooper, \textit{Colonialism in Question}, 174.
that the nation evolved out of this stage by the twentieth century.⁴⁰ Raymond F. Betts concurred with the exclusion of the U.S. from the category of a colonial power by citing the American motto of *E Pluribus Unum* as indicative of the political and cultural absorption of new territories into the nation, an event that did not occur in other colonial empires.⁴¹ While they present interesting and well-conceived cases, Betts and Cooper did not consider American policy in the Pacific Ocean during the Cold War. Later, chapters three, four, and five will provide an in depth discussion on this issue.

The United States of America participated in both colonialism and imperialism in modified forms. With the passage of the Northwest Ordinance, historical events in the trans-Mississippi settlements, the Supreme Court ruling in the *Insular Cases*, and territorial expansion in the Pacific Ocean, policymakers developed a system of imperialism and colonialism that separated holdings into two forms of administration and control. The federal government engaged in imperialism, more specifically in a form of economic imperialism, in its incorporated territories. Incorporated territories had the possibility of full incorporation into the American political system, and American settlers living within them retained their basic constitutional rights. Unlike in incorporated territories, colonial ideology determined political, economic, and social policies for the unincorporated territories. There, the politics of difference governed and admission to the American Union was not a viable possibility. A comparison of nineteenth-century and twentieth century American, British, and French imperial and colonial policies and administration in the Pacific Ocean will further place American imperialism and
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⁴⁰ Cooper, *Colonialism in Question*, 168-197.
colonialism within the larger framework of the expansion of European cultures and nations throughout the world.

Britain, America, and France expanded into foreign territories throughout the 1800s and 1900s to acquire raw materials and new markets. Expanding into the Americas, Africa, Asia, and Pacific Ocean, imperial powers transformed the land and indigenous cultures to meet their needs. In the early 1900s, the British Empire focused its energies in India and British North America following the loss of its most valuable colonies to American revolutionaries. Unlike Spain and France, the British Empire was decentralized. The Crown and Parliament divided administrative functions among the Foreign Office, the India Office, the Admiralty, and the War Office, each holding responsibility over select aspects of colonial security, policy, and international relations.42

During the Edwardian Era, the British government made efforts to reform its colonial apparatus. The Colonial Office reined in embarrassing administrators in the colonies. Administrators redrew borders throughout Africa to control populations and rationalize government. Colonies received funds from London for the improvement of transportation and infrastructure in order to facilitate the flow of raw materials to the metropole. Finally, the Colonial Office took steps to professionalize colonial staff. In the process, they passed measures designed to monitor sexual relations between overseas citizens and colonial populations. Ronald Hyam borrowed the term Leviathan from Thomas Hobbes to describe the new colonial apparatus that emerged under the reign of

Edward VII, in which the reformed Colonial Office, British administrators, bureaucrats, and employees assumed more direct control over colonial life. They monitored and controlled most aspects of indigenous labor, farm production, and resource development. Science and professionalism governed the new Leviathan as technological innovations in transportation and communication linked the periphery to the metropole. Unlike the scattered colonial apparatus of the nineteenth century, railroads, transoceanic cables, and wireless radio facilitated the delivery of goods, people, and communication throughout global empires.43

Given the long distances between the metropole and the periphery, local administrators, missionaries, and settlers greatly influenced colonial policy through their actions. As noted by Peter Burroughs, the decentralized British Empire was not the monolithic entity consisting of an all-powerful Colonial Office and professional field administrators as often depicted in the movies. “At the core of Imperial administration, therefore, lay a continuous interplay between mother country and colonial communities, between centre and periphery, a series of essentially bilateral relationships which entailed constant negotiation rather than the imposition of rule and the acceptance of subjection.”44 In the case of the Pacific Ocean, statesmen in London may have approved the acquisition of Australia and New Zealand; however, British expansion into surrounding islands such as Fiji was the result of sub-imperialism. By the late nineteenth
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century, Australians’ trade with surrounding islands made Fiji, British New Guinea (Papua), the Solomon Islands, and other small islands essential to business and light industry in the Dominion.\textsuperscript{45} Once the Dominion settlers forced the British to assume control over smaller Pacific Islands, London dispatched an administrator to oversee the islands, their resources, and indigenous residents. By the twentieth century, the Colonial Office administered non-Dominion territories in the Pacific Ocean following the policy of indirect rule as local ministers and bureaucrats worked with select indigenous leaders. Eventually, the Colonial Office consolidated the Gilbert and Ellice Islands, the Solomon Islands, New Hebrides, Tonga, and other British-controlled islands under the Seat of the High Commissioner of the Western Pacific.\textsuperscript{46} After the close of World War II, these islands became trust territories of Great Britain, New Zealand, and Australia, most of which received independence.

France began colonizing islands in the early 1800s in an attempt to prevent British hegemony in the Pacific Ocean. The French conquered their first cluster of insular territories in 1842 when they took the Society Islands (including Tahiti), Tuamotus, the Marquesas, and the Austral Islands. By 1853, they added the Loyalty Islands and New Caledonia. In the 1880s, French expansion in the Pacific Ocean ended after they established a protectorate over Wallis and Futuna. For the nineteenth century, French Pacific holdings were peripheral to imperial policy. While New Caledonia and Tahiti held promise as potential sites for future colonization, Paris did not make any serious


effort at establishing settlements in the South Pacific. The *Etablissements Français d'Océanie* (EFO) produced modest amounts of copra, gold, pearls, and phosphates during the 1800s and 1900s, but the colonies primarily served as transportation hubs for French commerce in the Pacific.\(^\text{47}\)

Following World War II, French interest in the EFO revived. The EFO was part of the massive colonial reorganization under the Fourth Republic (1946-1952). French colonial administrators placed the EFO under the *territories d’outre-mer* (TOMs), while Guadeloupe, Guyane, Réunion, and Martinique fell under the *departments d’outre mer* (DOMs), together referred to as the DOM-TOMs. Yet, the government did little else with its Pacific colonies since it faced greater problems in Africa, Algeria, Indochina, and at home. Instead of using the islands as refueling stations, French politicians and private investors considered other possibilities for insular economic, political, and social developments. In Tahiti and New Caledonia, administrators encouraged immigration and tourism. French sailors and soldiers returning from World War II spoke of the beauty of the islands and their women. Early tourists prized the islands as exotic places of rest where one could enjoy all of the pleasures the South Pacific offered. The tourist industry in the French islands changed insular economies and environments. Under the older form of French colonialism, islanders produced goods for export. By the 1960s, local hotels generated a market for copra, fish, pandanus leaves, and other staples.\(^\text{48}\)

Finally, Cold War concerns affected French insular colonies. Decolonization weakened France’s place as a dominant, global power as nationalist movements denied


the empire access to cheap materials and indigenous labor. Recognizing the need to revise military strategy to meet Cold War threats, Charles de Gaulle shifted French military policy away from conventional forces to nuclear weaponry. In late 1958, he authorized research on the production of nuclear weapons, and in 1960, the French Republic produced its first weapon of mass destruction. Of course, producing nuclear weapons required nuclear tests. Starting in 1960, the French military used the Algerian desert for its experiments; however, the loss of the colony in 1962 forced France to look elsewhere. From 1966 to 1972, France joined the United States in the polluting the South Pacific maritime environment with nuclear fallout and island-erasing explosions. 49

The United States was a colonial power, but colonialism was not an emphasis of American expansion nor was it an extreme form of control exercised in Hawai‘i. Prior to the Cold War, Americans’ interests in their four “colonies” of Guam, Puerto Rico, the Philippines, and American Samoa rested primarily on raw materials and transportation. Having secured the strategic locations occupied by the colonies, the federal government ceased its bid for colonial possessions after 1899. One could say that the Spanish American War was an anomaly in U.S. history. Congresses and presidents historically sought access to foreign markets. They also denounced attempts by European powers to prohibit or obstruct American commerce, but they did not condemn colonial policies that transformed indigenous societies into participants in the capitalist world-system. Although often mislabeled as colonial, the Open Door policy, dollar diplomacy, and the Roosevelt Corollary were displays of American power. Colonialism required the

49 Aldrich, 302-309.
colonizing power to control and reshape the colonized territory and population.\textsuperscript{50} Still, the U.S. never assumed direct control over China, South America, or Central America (outside of the Panama Canal Zone), and its interventions in the Caribbean were not permanent affairs.

Ironically, American commitment to containment strategy in Asia fostered an atmosphere in Washington, D.C., more receptive to a military strategy in the Pacific Ocean that embraced colonialism. As Chapters three and four reveal, the United States opposed granting self-government and full democratic participation to residents of Guam, Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (TTPI). The American government accepted the U.N. mandate to administer the TTPI in 1946 with special conditions. President Harry S Truman and other policy makers wanted the TTPI classified as a \textit{strategic} trusteeship allowing the U.S. military to plant permanent naval and air bases in the islands. Moreover, the strategic trusteeship answered to the U.N. Security Council in which the U.S. had a veto as opposed to the General Assembly. In the atmosphere of decolonization, the American government did not want islanders to harbor future ideas of independence.\textsuperscript{51}

Although the Security Council handled issues regarding the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, the U.N. Charter and Trusteeship Council still required the administering authority to help the indigenous people of the islands move toward self-government. Shortly after assuming control, the Secretary of the Interior Harold Ickes and Commissioner of Indian Affairs John Collier initiated a campaign to replace naval control


over the islands with the Department of the Interior. They argued that the US Navy would not educate the South Pacific Islanders properly in the principles of democracy. In the end, the Department of the Interior won the battle. On July 1, 1951, the US Navy relinquished control over all TTPI islands, except for Saipan and Tinian where it allegedly constructed CIA bases to train Chinese, and later Vietnamese, nationals.

Regardless of which department administered the islands, federal policy outlined a plan to educate the islanders and develop the islands’ economy in such a way that they would remain associated with the United States in the unlikely event that they gain independence. In its decolonization of Pacific colonies, U.S. policy followed the same technique as the French in Indo-China and elsewhere. From 1946 to 1952, France restructured its empire into the Fourth Republic, a convoluted system in which associated states and associated territories became part of a federation. While the associated states sent delegates to the National Assembly and the associated territories had representation on the High Council of the French Union, France continued to make policy decisions and dictate foreign policy. By 1954, the failures in this system became apparent. In order to prevent further nationalist outbreaks in its colonies, France reorganized yet again into the Fifth Republic which assumed the form of a commonwealth. Algeria, Vietnam, and West African nations successfully severed their ties to France during these two periods; however, its Pacific colonies remained territories of France.

Likewise, the United States accepted decolonization of its insular colonies on paper but not in fact. The Philippine Islands received independence in 1946, an event often flaunted as evidence of American anti-colonialism. Yet the price for their political
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independence was high. They had to accept the Bell Act which established free trade for eight years between the U.S. and the islands with Congress reserving the right to increase tariffs on imported Filipino goods over the course of twenty years. This act tied the Filipino economy to the U.S. with favorable conditions set for American producers. Moreover, the Bell Act and independence were conditional on the Filipino acceptance of a continued American military presence in their islands, which remained for nearly half a century until the closing of Subic Bay Naval Base and Clark Air Base in 1992.54

Whereas the Philippines became self-governing in 1946, Guam, American Samoa, the TTPI, and Puerto Rico remained within American control. From 1976 to 1986, the Micronesian islands separated into the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas, the Federated States of Micronesia, the Republic of the Marshalls, and the Republic of Palau. The Republic of the Marshalls and the Republic of Palau became self-governing, yet they exercised their sovereignty under a free association compact with its previous administering authority.55 The two colonies won from Spain in the Spanish American War have remained under U.S. control for over one hundred years after their conquest, with Guam remaining an unincorporated territory and Puerto Rico gaining commonwealth status. However, Puerto Rico may not remain the Estado Libre Asociado de Puerto Rico for much longer. In 1967, 60% of Puerto Ricans accepted commonwealth status. By 1993, only 48.7% desired association with the U.S., while 46.2% yearned for statehood. During the plebiscite of 1998, the majority of voting Puerto Ricans rejected the options of remaining a commonwealth or becoming a state preferring independence,
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while large groups of eligible voters boycotted the election altogether.\textsuperscript{56} This resurgence in Puerto Rican independence makes one wonder whether Puerto Rico will remain with the U.S. into the twenty first century.

When placed in the context of on-going American colonialism, the Territory of Hawai‘i did not fit the colonial definition. The president appointed a governor, secretary, and three justices to enforce federal will in the islands, but Hawaiians chose their territorial legislature and sent delegates to Congress. From 1898 to 1959, Hawai‘i remained a territory of the United States, but it was an incorporated territory, a status indicating the possibility of statehood. Moreover, the governor, secretary, and justices administered a settler society composed of a population predominately European American and Japanese American with a small group of Native Hawaiians. Colonial populations, on the other hand, had a small group of European bureaucrats governing a larger body of indigenous peoples. For example, Indian Civil Service (ICS) consisted of only 1,250 men. To them, the British government entrusted control over an Indian population of millions.\textsuperscript{57} Finally, racism may have permeated Hawaiian society as European Americans excluded other ethnicities from high society and white-collar professions, but these were not rigid, legally enforced structures of difference. Under American administration, there never existed a \textit{code de l’indigénuant} that restricted the movement and job possibilities of the population. While racial barriers were daunting, non-European American immigrants and Native Hawaiians could negotiate them. While the first generation of Chinese in Hawai‘i had limited economic opportunities and no


political voice, small portions of the community successfully negotiated Hawaiian society and established a niche for themselves by the 1920s and 1930s. By assimilating American culture, learning English, accepting Christianity, and forming community organizations, they established themselves as loyal Chinese-Americans. As Lawrence Fuchs noted, the election of Republican Hiram L. Fong to the U.S. Senate in 1959 was indicative of their ability to negotiate American racial barriers.58

The above example of the ability of the Chinese community to negotiate American social structures was also evident in the continental American West. Throughout western states and territories, first generation immigrants established a community base upon which the second and third generations built. Whereas language and cultural barriers excluded the first generation from grasping the opportunities offered by the American economy, the second and third generations assimilated parts of American culture, thus allowing them to function within the capitalist economy.59 As Judy Yung’s study on Chinese women in San Francisco revealed, the second generation of Chinese women broke from their parents’ loyalty to Chinese culture. They, too, discarded older fashions of dress for American styles, challenged the notion of obedience to one’s parents, and, in some cases, adopted the social behavior of the flapper.60 While their social advances were small, they reveal the permeability of American politics of

difference, which, according to Frederick Cooper, set the U.S. apart from other colonial powers.61

Although American settler societies in the trans-Mississippi region, Alaska, and Hawai‘i had little in common with European and American colonies in the South Pacific Ocean, they shared many similarities with Dominions of the English Empire. In New Zealand, Canada, and Australia, historians detect similar patterns of settlement to territories in the American West. The English Parliament legislated for their settler societies until the local population developed the necessary legal infrastructure. In the case of Australia and New Zealand, London gave the settlers self-government in 1850 and 1846, respectively. As dominions of the English government, New Zealand, Australia, South Africa, and Canada had jurisdiction over all domestic matters.

Following World War I, English Dominions agitated for control over foreign affairs, as well. Having suffered severe losses in campaigns such as Gallipoli and experienced the hardship of war for the interests of the metropole, settlers desired a more equal voice in the Commonwealth and greater control over trade agreements with other states. Also, Wilsonian ideology of national self-determination affected the Dominions. When fighting between Greece, Turkey, and Britain erupted in 1922 over Turkish refusals to abide by its post-World War I treaty responsibilities, Dominion states reluctantly dispatched reinforcements. The Chanak Crisis revealed the need for a restructuring of the Commonwealth. In 1931, Parliament passed the Statute of Westminster recognizing the right of the Dominions to determine their own domestic and foreign policy. And throughout the course of World War II and the ensuing Cold War, the Dominions would determine their own course in world affairs. Cultural ties to the
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metropole, however, remained strong enough to prevent a complete break with the Commonwealth.\textsuperscript{62}

Although not exactly alike, American incorporated territories had similar experiences in settling new lands. Like English Dominions, incorporated territories exercised control over local affairs. White settlers developed economic, political, educational, and religious institutions that mirrored those in the metropole. Since the 1990s, comparative historical studies between the Canadian West, American West, and Australia have revealed these similarities in European and American imperialism.

Indigenous studies produce interesting links between these regions of imperial expansion. Throughout the twentieth century, indigenous peoples of New Zealand, Australia, Canada, and the United States struggled to reclaim their right to their homelands and natural resources. John Wunder’s study on the recent inclusion of indigenous peoples in the Australian Northern Territory and American Northwest revealed “two different approaches to incorporating Native peoples into national park ownership and management.”\textsuperscript{63} Australians relinquished their claim to the Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park and returned the ancient landmarks to the Pitjantjatjara in 1985 as part of an effort to establish a cooperative relationship between the aboriginal population


and Parliament. In the 1990s, the American federal government tried a similar cooperative management plan with the Nez Perce; yet, their aversion to returning land to indigenous peoples precluded a fully cooperative relationship. Instead, the National Park Service simply included the Nez Perce into the decision-making process over the Nez Perce National Historical Park. While the solution differed, the struggle over control of national parks in Australia and the United States originated from historical events in which a settler society displaced an indigenous population, claimed historical and spiritual landmarks, and invented its own settler historical connection between the land and their national history. In other words, the settler populations redefined indigenous landmarks to celebrate the non-indigenous imperial past.64

Other studies have proven similarly successful in examining similarities and differences between these imperial regions. Margaret D. Jacobs study on the removal of indigenous children from their homes as a means of forced assimilation in Australia and America uncovered the use of race and gender in assimilation policies.65 Kurk Dorsey revealed a trans-national effort by American and Canadian conservationists to secure a bilateral agreement between the Canadian Parliament and American Congress protecting seals, birds, and fish.66 Finally, Andrew Graybill has produced a remarkable study on the use of the Texas Rangers and Canadian Mounties to prevent labor stoppages in American and Canadian coal mines. Needless to say, historians today recognize the connections between American and European imperialism.67

64 Wunder, “‘Looking after the Country Properly,’” 10-36.
Historians using world-systems theory to analyze the American West reveal that the American West was also a place of economic imperialism. While local entrepreneurs made some investments into the western economy, eastern business interests and European financers funded the commercial development of the region, which in turn gave them control over westerners’ lives. Their wealth and power gave them influence over the media and legislatures which they used to further their own interests and quash threats to their hegemony. In the twentieth century, the federal government supplanted private investors as the chief patron of enterprise as western states became dependent on military and federal contracts. In the case of Hawai‘i, Pearl Harbor and Hickam AFB drew money and immigrants to the islands. Of course, one cannot forget modern tourism which generated money for Western states. While the service industry relied on private enterprise, federal projects such as national parks added to the lure of exotic travel destinations.

If the present definition of the American West limits Western historians when accounting for American imperial policy in the Pacific Ocean and Hawai‘i, how can they modify existing paradigms to account for twentieth century developments in all American territories west of the Mississippi? In 1987, Patricia Nelson Limerick published her ground-breaking book, *The Legacy of Conquest: The Unbroken Past of the American West*. At the time of its publication, a group of Western historians were working to end the hegemony of Turnerianism in the discipline. As cultural studies
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uncovered the histories of previously marginalized groups, they brought into question Turner’s idea of a simple process of frontier settlement that slowly progressed westward. Discounting Turnerianism as flawed and outdated, Limerick suggested a new model for understanding the American West. She argued that historians needed to approach Western history as “the study of a place undergoing conquest and never fully escaping its consequences.” Since the publication of *The Legacy of Conquest*, the West as place has permeated every facet of scholarship in the field. Breaking from the limited frontier thesis, Western historians have engaged in decades of scholarship that documents the history of marginalized groups.

Debates over including Hawai‘i into the American West have shown that western historians’ current definition of the American West has become too rigidly place-centered, a development that Limerick may not have intended with *The Legacy of Conquest*. She wrote, “In choosing to stress place more than process, we cannot fix exact boundaries of the region, any more than we can draw precise lines around ‘the South,’ ‘the Midwest,’ or that most elusive of regions, ‘the East.’” This study suggests refining the definition of the West. Instead of Western history being “the study of a place undergoing conquest and never fully escaping its consequences,” Western historians should consider the American West as those incorporated territories throughout western North America and the Pacific Ocean which the United States conquered, subdued, annexed, and admitted into the Union. Moreover, it is a place in
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which American imperialism reshaped, and continues to shape, all facets of human life and the environment.

By stressing imperialism as opposed to continental conquest, the definition of the American West no longer requires territorial or state contiguity with the continental territories and states. Since empires are transoceanic and transcontinental, boundaries become more fluid. Moreover, examining American imperialism in incorporated territories would automatically include cultural, economic, political, indigenous, and environmental topics. Furthermore, redefining the American West as a place of American imperialism situates the discipline within the larger, global context of colonial studies. Western historians have already begun this process using comparative studies. Now it is time to adjust the present models of the American West to account for the paradigmatic shift.

Finally, the question of Hawai‘i as a subregion has two possible solutions. First, historians could simply place Hawai‘i within the present subregion of the Pacific West. As Whitehead has already proven, Hawai‘i is intricately linked to Oregon, Washington, California, and Alaska. Since it shares so many historical continuities with these regions, they should be classified together. Indeed, when the National Endowment for the Humanities launched its regional humanities centers initiative, it divided the nation into ten regions. The Pacific included Hawai‘i, Alaska, Washington, Oregon, California, plus Guam and American Samoa. Second, historians could create a new subregion called the Pacific Borderlands that includes Hawai‘i, Alaska, and those littoral regions of California, Oregon, and Washington that connect the West to the Pacific Rim. Since
more studies of Hawai‘i and Hawaiians in the West are needed, however, Western historians may want to wait before narrowing its role to the subregional level.

Clearly, placing Hawai‘i within the American West enhances Western historians’ present understanding of the region. Since Hawai‘i has ties to American policy in the Pacific, yet was settled, conquered, governed, annexed, and admitted in a manner more akin to other western incorporated territories, the islands act as a portal to imperial and colonial studies along the Pacific Rim. In a sense, it has a role similar to Texas history. Although Texas fought in the Civil War and had southern institutions, it also lies within the American West. Thus, in historical studies it has a dual role. Likewise, Hawai‘i belongs to both Pacific Rim studies and Western history. Accepting its proper role as a part of U.S. imperialism in the West requires historians to reconsider their definition of the West as place to the West as a place of American imperialism connected to American colonial activities in unincorporated territories. In doing so, the refined definition of the American West enhances the process initiated by Patricia Nelson Limerick and other Western historians by welding the field to colonial and imperial studies beyond the North American mid-continent.
CHAPTER 3
MODELS FOR HAWAIIAN COLONIALISM

Developing a policy to administer new kinds of territories was not easily devised by Americans. Countless pro- and anti-imperialists realized at the turn of the century that the legacy of the Northwest Ordinance of 1787 provided few answers for the new problems of empire facing the United States of America. These problems posed questions of lasting importance. How should their republic, born of anti-colonial ideologies and forged in the fires of expansion, proceed when presented with a new path demanding an aggressive, imperial foreign policy? Moreover, what role would recent territorial acquisitions have within the American political system? Did conquest and limited incorporation of overseas colonies equal a promise of statehood? Or had this young republic finally abandoned its anti-colonial ideologies and fully embraced a future constructed on a past dominated by conquest, racism, and a desire for power? Regardless of their uncertainties, the colonialist leaders of America pushed onward in their quest to absorb Hawai‘i. By basing their policies on past experiences of conquering and incorporating western American lands, yet adjusting them to exigencies encountered in the Hawaiian Islands, the relationship between the islands and the U.S. from 1898-1959 would be quite unique. Treated as neither an insular colony like Puerto Rico nor a continental territory like Nebraska, Hawai‘i occupied a unique position in the American federal framework between the old colonial system and the new.

Scholars have already explored the relationship between Hawai‘i and the American West. Either they conclude that the islands were a part of the West, or their history, geology, environment, and cultures precluded them from the region. Two
scholars, Lanny Thompson and John Whitehead, have provided well-conceived ideas that advance the proposition that the Hawaiian Islands had a direct correlation with the American West. For Thompson, the way in which “Congress adopted for Hawai‘i the standard territorial government” made its territorial phase more akin to the other continental territories than to Puerto Rico and the Philippines.¹ His essay, “The Imperial Republic: A Comparison of the Insular Territories under U.S. Dominion after 1898,” compared the political and cultural forms of American imperialism in U.S. insular possessions following the Spanish-American War. In his analysis, he suggested that “Hawai‘i was . . . one of the final frontiers of European American settlement,” whereas the Philippines, Guam, and Puerto Rico provided Americans with their first European-style colonies in the Pacific Ocean and Caribbean.²

Likewise, Whitehead considered the islands as a part of the American West, sharing more similarities than dissimilarities with continental territories. In his article, this expert on Alaska dismisses the arguments that Hawai‘i failed to meet the necessary criteria for admittance into the field of Western History. While some authors cling to the belief that aridity is one criterion, Whitehead notes that portions of Hawai‘i receive scant rainfall. Other authors consider Hawai‘i outside of the American West because it lacks a common history with the other contiguous states. Again, the author claims the opposite. He refers to literature written by eminent Hawaiian historians Ralph Kuykendall, Gavan Daws, and Edward Joesting to prove otherwise. In essence, Whitehead not only argues that the islands are part of the American West, but he also goes so far as to suggest that

² Ibid.
they were “America’s first and last Far West.” To prove his point, Whitehead revisits the historical narrative tracing the development of Hawaiian society, politics, and economics during the nineteenth century. At times, he notes the contribution of Hawaiians in the western continental territories to solidify further the link between the islands and the American West.

Are Whitehead and Thompson correct in lumping Hawaiʻi in with territories like New Mexico, Colorado, Nebraska, and Oregon? Yes, there are some irrefutable similarities in the histories, economies, and cultures present in the regions. There are, however, some differences, as well. After all, the political process towards Hawaiian statehood and the debates surrounding the issue would have novel elements.

In understanding the role of Hawaiʻi in American History, one must consider it as a transitional area between the older, expansionistic form of American imperialism, and the neo-colonialism that sprang out of post-World War II politics. In his work, *The First and Second United States Empires: Governors and Territorial Government, 1784-1912*, Jack Ericson Eblen places this period in the Third American Empire, a period in which the United States of America expanded into Alaska, the Pacific Ocean, and the Caribbean. This empire was followed by the Fourth Empire, which consisted of post-1920s America. This study disagrees with Eblen’s categorization of phases in American Empire, but agrees that there were changes in the form of imperialism. The Hawaiian Islands were part of a transitional period between the older form of continental expansion and the neo-imperialism of post-World War II history. To fully understand its place, one must begin with the relationship between the Hawaiian Islands and the federal

---

3 John Whitehead, “Hawaiʻi: The First and Last Far West?” *Western Historical Quarterly* 23, no. 2 (May 1992): 156; Available from JSTOR.
government in comparison with those of the continental territories and insular possessions.4

To begin with the comparison of territorial governments, one must first answer the basic question, what is the American West? Since the rejection of Turnerianism by modern scholars, this terminology has come under increasing scrutiny. In popular mythology, the American West is a place where gunslingers saunter calmly down the dusty lane at high noon, stoically facing their unknown fate. It is a region in which noble Native Americans live at one with nature, all the while facing the onslaught of settlers. It is a place of lawlessness, yet it remains noble. The dregs of society live there next to men of honor and character. For Hollywood, these images, these means of depicting the Euro-American settler society, located somewhere west of everywhere else, works. But for many, a more precise definition is needed.

One concise definition of the American West is postulated by Richard White in his text, “It’s Your Misfortune and None of My Own”: A New History of the American West. According to White, the American West is first and foremost a political entity. It is a region comprised of the lands gained by the Louisiana Purchase, Texas Revolution, settlement of Oregon Country, the Bear Flag Revolt, and the U.S.-Mexican War of 1846. In other words, it is a region west of the Mississippi River that American settlers, armies, and diplomats conquered during the nineteenth century. Its borders were the product of political choice and historical development. Finally, while certain geographical characteristics dominate the region—aridity, flat surface elevation, and sparse vegetation—they do not necessarily act as requisites for inclusion into the region.

4Note that insular possession indicates not only Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Philippines, but also American Samoa and the Pacific Island Trust Territories.
Throughout his book, White examines the specific cultural, economic, political, and environmental characteristics and developments of this region.\(^5\)

From day-to-day operations to the fundamental framework of government, Hawaiian politics shared similarities with western continental territories. To suggest that Hawai‘i was somehow different or inferior to continental territories insulted some Hawaiians. For example, on January 23, 1939, John Snell, Executive Secretary of the Hawaii Equal Rights Commission, sent a letter to Rand McNally & Company protesting the labeling of Hawai‘i as an American *possession* in the *Rand McNally International Edition World Atlas*—1937. To add further insult, the editors of the volume placed a map of the Territory of Alaska directly after the State of Washington, yet the Territory of Hawai‘i fell after the Dominion of Canada along with various South Pacific Islands. According to Snell, Hawaiians were “inclined to resent” the inclusion of Hawai‘i with “a lot of miscellaneous South Sea Islands.”\(^6\) Of course, one must wonder whether or not Native Hawaiians would have agreed with him!

This letter provides a solid example of the perceptions many Hawaiians had of their homeland. The average Hawaiian felt a strong degree of pride. In order to combat the growing image of the Hawaiian Islands as just another group of underdeveloped, unincorporated atolls in the Pacific Ocean, the Hawaiian Territorial Legislature created the Hawaii Statehood Commission in 1947.\(^7\) The territorial legislature charged this body

---


\(^6\) John Snell, Executive Secretary of the Hawaii Equal Rights Commission, to Rand McNally & Company, January 23, 1939, in Samuel Wilder King Papers, M-472, Box 20, Folder 886 “1936-1942,” Hawai‘i State Archives. In his letter, Snell directly compares the Territory of Hawai‘i to the State of Texas. Although Texas never experienced the territorial phase, it was a republic prior to joining the Union. For Snell, this is the common experience that links Texas to Hawai‘i.

\(^7\) The Citizens’ Statehood Committee and the Hawaii Equal Rights Commission preceded the Hawaii Statehood Commission. All three organizations worked for the same goal, Hawaiian statehood.
with the responsibility of promoting Hawaiian statehood, working with congressional members in Washington, D.C., and disabusing Americans of the idea that granting the territory statehood would harm national interests. To accomplish this task, the Hawaii Statehood Commission would publish reports, books, and leaflets, write newspaper articles and editorials, and even attend congressional hearings.

In his study of the Dakota Territory, Howard Lamar offers an overview of territorial history. As most texts show, the Northwest Ordinance of 1787 initiated the territorial process. During the settlement of lands west of the Appalachians and east of the Mississippi River in the early nineteenth century, congressmen and territorial officials adhered to the administrative structure of the Northwest Ordinance. Although Tennessee and New Orleans deviated slightly from the letter of the law, a three-stage territorial process was the pattern for settlement. Beginning with the incorporation of trans-Mississippian lands, the Northwest Ordinance served as a historical template; however, the territorial process had to be adjusted. Whereas ensuring the loyalty of settlers to the national government was a primary concern in the trans-Appalachian region, slavery and political patronage dominated the question of American expansion in the trans-Mississippi region once the threat of England, France, and Spain lessened. Finally, the Civil War inaugurated a final phase of territorial politics, according to Lamar. From 1861 onward, congressmen and presidents used the territories to reward their allies, and the needs of settlers remained low on any lists of territorial priorities.8

The Northwest Ordinance of 1787 provided the nation with a template for territorial governments as well as a process leading toward statehood. Congress

organized territorial boundaries for a given region and then established a nascent
territorial government. The President appointed a governor, a secretary, and three judges.
These propertied gentlemen had the responsibility of ensuring good government in the
region. Evidence suggests that the territorial phase was intended to guarantee the
replication of American politics, culture, commerce, and industry in the region; then
these men were responsible for the transmission of American society into the lands
recently wrested from Native Americans and imperial Europeans. In essence, these men
performed the tasks of colonial agents. Once the population reached 5,000, territorial
citizens could elect representatives to a legislative assembly. At this point, the area began
moving from a colony toward statehood. Territorial inhabitants now assisted the
 governor in establishing laws and managing public funds. Furthermore, the population
elected a territorial delegate to Congress. Because this delegate had no official vote, the
territory remained on the periphery of the American political system. This individual
could influence representatives and senators to enact or alter legislation in a way
favorable to the territory. Finally, the territorial legislature could apply for admission
once its population reached 60,000. This step indicated the close of colonial status.
From this point on, the territory became a part of the metropole.

By the time the Organic Act for the state of Hawai‘i came before the U.S. Senate
for final approval in 1900, Congress had passed organic acts for many other territories,
each slightly modified to meet the needs of local populations. Congress abandoned its
initial stage of territorial government—the district—with the Wisconsin Organic Act of
1836. Howard R. Lamar’s work on territorial government revealed four adjustments to
the process initiated under the Northwest Ordinance. These evolutions in congressional
territorial policy directly correlated with problems arising from the variety of colonial regions. For example, the collapse of Native American resistance in the Trans-Appalachian West created conditions favorable for the passage of the Wisconsin Organic Act that increased the likelihood of incorporation of these lands. While this development clearly benefitted regional inhabitants, changes in congressional governance following the Civil War did not. With the collapse of Democratic opposition and the ascension of the Republican Party, congressional leaders viewed territorial governmental offices as perfect pawns in the spoils system. Instead of seeking men of ability, they sought men of loyalty. According to Lamar, the final evolutions in territorial policy occurred from 1861 to 1912. Within this period, controversial issues such as polygamy in Utah, corruption in Santa Fe, gold in Denver, and non-arable deserts, Apaches, and Mexican-Americans in Arizona caused the final alterations to territorial policy. In his assessment, Lamar briefly mentions the results of the Spanish American War, the Hawaiian coup, and their effect on the territorial process.⁹

The traditional form of territorial government sufficed for places like the territories of Colorado, Arkansas, Washington, and Wyoming. Congress established a government and permitted the residents to elect delegates to a territorial legislature. Popular perception led people to believe that presidential gubernatorial appointees were always outsiders with little ties to the region. Richard White, however, pointed out that while most governors were not native to the region, neither were the settlers. During

their tenure, territorial governors often established connections to the people and region and often chose to remain there after their term ended.10

Sometimes the process of installing a territorial government lagged behind settlement. As Elliott West illustrated in *The Contested Plains: Indians, Goldseekers, and the Rush to Colorado*, H.P.A. Smith, Edward “Ned” Wynkoop, Hickory Rogers, Joe McCubbin, and William Larimer swiftly moved to establish a township near Cherry Creek, the location where William Green Russell discovered gold. By early 1859, the group had Denver City secured from their competitors and ready to receive a stream of emigrant Americans yearning for their chance of gold. For the Arapahoes and Cheyennes, a great transformation began during the years following 1858. As migrants rushed to Colorado, their wagons crushed the vegetation next to the Arkansas, Smoky Hill, Republican, and Platte Rivers. They left detritus strewn about the Plains, and their beasts of burden devoured the grasses needed for Native American herds. Meanwhile, congressmen worked to establish some form of colonial government. Although the gold rush was well under way, it took the federal government three years to establish Colorado Territory, permitting President Abraham Lincoln to send its first governor, William Gilpin, to his new seat of government. As this example illustrates, settlements in the American West sometimes went years before establishing a direct relationship with the federal government.11

For all practical purposes, politics in the Territory of Hawai’i were not so remarkably different from politics in other western territories. Granted, slavery never plagued Hawaiians in their territorial phase, although some congressmen accused white

---

10 White, 172.
settlers of using imported contract laborers as a form of slave labor. At the time of annexation, political patronage still existed in the United States of America, but the progressive reforms of the late 1800s and early 1900s curbed the rampant corruption inherent in this system. Starting with the Pendleton Act of 1883, civil service reform slowly removed government jobs from control of the dominant party to a more rationalized system. This process inevitably affected the governorship of Hawai‘i.

Following annexation, Hawaiian governors relied on presidential appointment for their jobs, but the element of patronage had changed from that experienced in the Dakota, Kansas, Nebraska, and Colorado Territories. Before, presidents nominated partisan allies, regardless of their qualifications or state citizenship. The Hawaiian Organic Act protected the populace from the rule of strangers by stipulating that territorial governors hold citizenship in the territory. This provided islanders a degree of security, since they possessed a modicum of familiarity with the nominee. Moreover, political groups in Hawai‘i exerted some influence over the selection of the governor. When searching for a new governor during Eisenhower’s election campaign in 1953, Senator Hugh Alfred Butler of Nebraska, Chairman of the Committee of Interior and Insular Affairs, received letters from various Hawaiian residents in favor of Samuel Wilder King. These recommendations justified the nomination of King because of party affiliation, family ties, or personal integrity. William H. Soper claimed ancestry from John H. Soper, Marshal of the Kingdom under King Kalakaua. His letter traced both his and King’s ancestry back to pre-annexation figures as a way to enhance the nominee’s pedigree further.12 Another recommendation came from Arthur K. Trask, a leading Native

---

Hawaiian Democrat. In a letter to President-elect Dwight D. Eisenhower, Trask clearly broke party ranks to support King. He praised the nominee not only for his performance at the 1950 Constitutional Convention, but also for representing “the best historical tradition of the Polynesian and American cultures.” This presidential election was particularly significant in Hawaiian history. For members of the Republican Party, the division between supporters of Dwight D. Eisenhower and Robert Taft extended into Hawaiian politics. Here, Republicans split between Randolf Crossley and Samuel W. King. In the end, King’s political career and Hawaiian ancestry gave him the decisive edge over Crossley, thus securing him the governorship.

The King nomination is anecdotal evidence of the nature of Hawaiian politics during statehood. On the one hand, twentieth-century progressive reforms and the long history of representative government in Hawai‘i saved the residents from the rampant patronage present in continental territories. Long before annexation, Hawaiian politicians had formed political parties and traditions. Leading settlers, moreover, knew how to maneuver in through the American political system, while mustering support at home. In other words, they were hybrid politicians, having been raised to operate in the Hawaiian Legislature while venerating the American Congress. When nominating federal office holders, presidents would inevitably select men from their party, but the list of potential candidates came from the Republican and Democratic Parties of Hawai‘i.

On the other hand, Hawaiian democracy, like western democracy, existed only so far as the leading businessmen and territorial politicians allowed. In the islands, five

---

13 Arthur K. Trask to Dwight D. Eisenhower, President-elect, 8 January 1953, Folder 61 “Hawaii Governor—Sam King,” Box 51, Hugh Alfred Butler Papers, MS2331, Nebraska State Historical Society, Library/Archives Division.
14 For more on this issue, see Roger Bell, Last Among Equals: Hawaiian Statehood and American Politics (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1984), 201-202.
major businesses ruled Hawai‘i throughout the territorial period. They were American Factors, Theo. H. Davies, Alexander & Baldwin, Castle & Cooke, and C. Brewer. The Big Five were agencies that had slowly amassed power throughout the nineteenth century. As the demand for Hawaiian sugar grew, agencies aided plantation owners by managing their affairs, procuring labor from Asia and the Philippines, supplying equipment, and tracking developments in American and European markets. Their control and profits grew with the sugar industry, eventually allowing them to invest in individual plantations. By the early 1900s, these investments had given American Factors, Theo. H. Davies, Alexander & Baldwin, Castle & Cooke, and C. Brewer absolute control over sugar production in the islands. To further extend their power, these companies invested in the Matson Navigation Company, the only major maritime transportation company. Island railroads fell under their control as well. Finally, they exercised a large degree of influence on Bishop & Company and the Bank of Hawai‘i, Ltd., the only banks in the islands.\textsuperscript{15} In addition to controlling the Hawaiian economy, they were also the leading supporters of the Republican Party. Throughout the territorial phase, this party dominated Hawaiian politics. If Richard White is correct in his contention that “party loyalty in the West was markedly weaker than in the South, Northeast, and Midwest,“\textsuperscript{16} then territorial politics in Hawai‘i is clearly different from the American West. The reliance of the Big Five on the American market ensured their allegiance to the Republican Party, which was the party of industry and commerce during the Progressive Era and Great Depression. The Democratic Party, on the other hand, was based on a


\textsuperscript{16} White, 353.
constituency tied to the South, a region dominated by agriculture and the major source of
domestic sugar for the nation. More importantly, the Big Five control over the political
machinery of Hawai‘i, including law enforcement, retarded the growth of opposition
groups in the islands. In the early 1900s, unions discovered the extent of plantation
owners’ control of Hawaiian politics. As their representatives tried to approach
plantation workers, management would remove them from their property.17

However, the domination of the Republican Party in Hawai‘i would not survive
the first half of the twentieth century. First, there clearly existed dissatisfaction with the
status quo. Native Hawaiians, like Duke Paoa Kahanamoku and Prince Jonah Kuhio
Kalanianaole, thought that they could have the best effect on Hawaiian politics by
working within the Republican Party. As is commonly known, Prince Kuhio served as
the territorial delegate from 1903-1922. In his efforts, he continuously pushed for
statehood as a means to secure Native Hawaiian rights under the protection of the U.S.
Constitution. He also labored to secure the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1920, a
piece of legislation designed to provide Native Hawaiians with homesteads.18 Other
politicians like Johnny Wilson and John A. Burns chose a different path to voice their
discontent with Hawaiian politics. Wilson aided in the formation of the Democratic Party
in 1900, serving as the mayor of Honolulu and an influential party member during the
tumultuous days of the Wilson Administration. Unfortunately, the Democratic Party did
not capitalize on Wilson’s presidential victory. Discord within the party, in conjunction

18 The Hawai‘i State Archives houses the Jonah Kuhio Kalanianaole Papers. Collection M-80 contains his
personal correspondence outlining his political views. In Box 1 of collection M-474, one finds copies of
every piece of legislation that he introduced in Congress. Although he was a dedicated Republican Party
member, it is clear from his correspondences that his first devotion was to the Native Hawaiian people. His
association with the Republicans was primarily a vehicle to secure these goals.
with a “return to normalcy” and the Republican Party under President Warren Harding, led to the downfall of the Democrats. Following World War II, the John A. Burns, Dan Aoki, Daniel Inouye, and others worked to revive the flagging Democratic Party.¹⁹

Second, the hegemony of the Republican Party was not a product of the electorate’s loyalty. Returning to the Big Five, the Republican Party received support from the five most powerful corporations and those that ran them. As the principal employers throughout the island chain, these institutions influenced and directed every facet of daily life for the majority of Hawaiian residents. The owners were the major landholders, as well as the wealthiest individuals. In comparing their role in territorial politics, one could say that the principle players in the Big Five were the secular version of the religious leaders of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints in nineteenth-century Utah Territory. In the State of Deseret, Church authorities directed everything from water irrigation to public ordinances. They guided the settlement of families around the Great Salt Lake, as well as throughout the Mormon Corridor. In essence, the church was the state. While the Territory of Hawai‘i and the Territory of Utah both had histories of oligarchic control, it would be unfair to claim that they were exactly the same. The Big Five amassed wealth and power throughout the years by purchasing land from the crown, influencing the monarchy, and replacing Native Hawaiian labor with underpaid Asian contract labor. The story of the creation of the Big Five is an old story, told and retold in almost every Hawaiian history book. Another rendition is not necessary. Suffice it to say, their accumulation of power differed remarkably from the church

leadership in the Territory of Utah. The elders of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints derived their authority from the church body. Mormons followed Brigham Young to the Great Salt Lake region through their own free will. During the settlement of the region, Young and the church leaders may have exercised unlimited authority, but they did not do so for personal glorification. As Ray Allen Billington and Martin Ridge noted in *Westward Expansion: A History of the American Frontier*, “unity was needed” in the irrigation and settlement of the arid lands in Deseret. In other words, the Saints may have lost political rights and powers, but this was a willing sacrifice for economic development.

In addition to the relationships of power in Utah and Hawaiʻi, one can see other similarities between these two territories. The history of the relationship between the Mormons in Utah and the federal government can be presented in two different manners. First, there is the classic presentation. In the fall of 1847, Brigham Young led the first group of Mormons to the Great Salt Lake in order to build a New Zion. Over the next five years, battalions of overland Mormon migrants increased the population of Saints residing in the desert. Separated from the rest of the world, the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints built their utopian society in which both secular and ecclesiastical authority were vested in the church leadership. Through community planning, the Mormons constructed irrigation canals and laws to govern their usage. This development occurred at roughly the same time as other regions. Again, the Saints distinguished themselves. California and Colorado altered English Common Law governing riparian rights. Their innovations would help shape water laws throughout the American West in

---

which ownership or first rights generally took precedents over other claims to water. 21
Mormons, however, ignored riparian rights and ownership. Instead, each community had
claim to an equal share of water. And so the story goes. Mormons constructed a
religious community that varied from the American norm. Hostilities erupted in 1857
between the State of Deseret and the U.S. Army, but the two sides reached a dénouement
after the construction of the Transcontinental Railroad, finally placing Utah on the path to
statehood, granted in 1896. 22

There is a second way of perceiving Mormon history and the relationship between
the Territory of Utah and the federal government. In *Something in the Soil: Legacies
and Reckonings in the New West*, Patricia Nelson Limerick revisited Leonard Arrington’s
earlier studies on Mormon ethnicity. Limerick argued that the Church of Jesus Christ of
Latter-day Saints constituted an ethnicity separate from the white, Anglo-Saxon ethnicity
of nineteenth-century America. Joseph Smith’s teachings established the religious
foundations of this ethnic group. The practice of polygamy and the centrality of the
church in Mormon life made this faith different from the Protestant and Catholic strains
of Christianity. These practices made them so strange in the eyes of American Christians
that they viewed Mormons within their communities as dangerous. According to
Limerick, separation was the next step in the evolution of this uniquely American
ethnicity. With their cultural focus on the communities of the Great Salt Lake and their
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21 For more information, see Walter Prescott Webb, *The Great Plains* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1959), 431-452.
isolation from mainstream American society, the Saints of Utah developed a society, language, and political system novel to the Western Hemisphere.23

Approaching Utah Territory from this perspective provides an interesting comparison with the Territory of Hawai‘i. When congressmen tried to frame a territorial government for Utah, the presence of a population considered different and outside the American norm troubled them. The issue of polygamy itself caused great tumult in the national capitol. Analyzing the language and laws used towards the Mormon population, one sees traces of overseas colonial rhetoric. Congressional leaders were concerned about the “unchristian” practice of polygamy in the deserts of Deseret, just as the history of polygamy within Polynesian society caused concern. The domination of society by the leadership of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, and territorial governor Brigham Young in particular, was something that had to be eradicated and replaced by a territorial government based on American principles. Thus, the Mormon population became as separate and “savage” as the population of the Hawaiian Islands. In the eyes of influential Americans, the Saints’ leaders were as autocratic and dictatorial as the monarchs of the Kingdom of Hawai‘i. In short, the Mormons were the white heathens of the continent. They, like the Kānaka, would fall under the politics of difference in the American empire.

Comparing and contrasting the basic operations of political power in the territories provides ample evidence that the Territory of Hawai‘i shared characteristics with trans-Mississippi territories, but the real links between these regions exist in the

basic structure of territorial government. By examining the basic structure of territorial
governments, one sees a direct connection between Hawai‘i and the mainland. Extending
this comparison to the other Pacific territories and Puerto Rico also produces interesting
results. They clearly prove that Hawai‘i shares more characteristics with the older form
of American expansion and less so with post-1898 colonial developments.

Reviewing the process of statehood, territories organized during the Early
Republic followed a three-stage pattern as outlined in the Northwest Ordinance of 1787.
First, Congress organized an area into a district with a governor, secretary, and three
judges. The Northwest Ordinance extended the basic guarantees of personal liberty as
delineated in the Bill of Rights and outlawed slavery. Next, after the population reached
5,000 free male inhabitants, the district became a territory and could indirectly elect a
house of the legislature. The legislature consisted of a council and an assembly.
Territorial residents qualified to vote popularly elected ten legislative council nominees,
of which Congress selected five to serve. Before a legislature was created, laws were
passed by majority rule of the governor, secretary, and three presidentially-appointed
justices of the supreme court. The assembly was chosen from territory residents by the
President. Anyone familiar with American colonial history quickly recognizes this
structure. When devising a system of governance for the territories, policymakers used
the British imperial system as a model. Adhering to their revolutionary ideals, they
devised stages to prevent the creation of an American empire that reproduced the
inequalities inherent in the British system. Once the population reached 60,000, a
popularly-elected constitutional convention drafted a state constitution. Finally, they
petitioned Congress for full admittance into the Union on an equal footing with the older
states. This was the prevailing system used in the old Northwest and Southwest territories.²⁴

As American settlers poured into the lands obtained from France and Mexico, the basic principles of the Northwest Ordinance continued influencing territorial development, but congressional experience in governing the territories brought changes to territorial governments. The most significant change occurred on April 20, 1836. Congress authorized *An Act establishing the Territorial Government of Wisconsin*. On the surface, this piece of legislation seems unremarkable. It provided the territory with a governor with veto powers, the authority to appoint lower officials, and other basic duties. He was appointed by the president and had to reside in his appointed territory. A bicameral legislature comprised of thirteen council members and twenty-six representatives of the assembly or house oversaw all legislative functions. Law passed by this body were subject to gubernatorial and congressional approval, but assemblymen still had significant powers. Also, the Wisconsin Organic Act provided the territory with a supreme court composed of one chief justice and two associate justices. Territorial residents elected a delegate to the United States Congress, though he was not a voting member of that body. Finally, residents were “entitled to, and enjoy[ed], all and singular the rights, privileges, and advantages, granted and secured to the people of the Territory of the United States northwest of the river Ohio, by the articles of the compact contained in the ordinance for the government of the said Territory, passed on the thirteenth day of

July, one thousand seven hundred and eighty-seven.”25 In simpler terms, residents were guaranteed rights contained in the First, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, and Eighth Amendments to the Constitution.

This was the basic structure that the United States Congress deliberately created for the Territory of Wisconsin and made for every territory to follow, save Hawai‘i and Oklahoma. The territorial acts of Iowa, Utah, New Mexico, Washington, Idaho, Montana, Arizona, Oregon, Dakota, and Colorado that followed “An Act establishing the Territorial Government of Wisconsin” were basically copies. Every territory in this group had a governor, nominated by the president, with the power to veto legislation from the legislature and appoint lesser territorial officials. These territories each had a legislature with a council composed of thirteen members nominated by the people and appointed by Congress.26 The territorial house generally consisted of twenty-six elected officials, except in the territories of Colorado and Oregon. Coloradans initially elected eighteen members, a number later raised to twenty-six. Oregon, however, only elected eighteen. The make-up of the territorial supreme court and judicial systems did not vary throughout the territories. In this one aspect, Congress never deviated from the basic principles outlined in the Northwest Ordinance. Finally, each territory had a territorial delegate to Congress. This individual attended congressional sessions and committees, but he was not a voting member. Nonetheless, a canny delegate could have a beneficial influence in Congress for his territory. By developing close connections, he could sway

26 Oregon had only nine council members.
voting members of Congress to introduce and support legislation needed for the benefit of the region.  

Congress also included provisions protecting the basic rights of American citizens living in the territories. The Wisconsin Organic Act guaranteed settlers the protection of the Bill of Rights by extending the provisions in the Northwest Ordinance of 1787 that safeguarded civil liberties. When organizing the territories of Iowa and Oregon, lawmakers referred to the Wisconsin Organic Act and Northwest Ordinance as a means of extending the Bill of Rights to pioneers in these regions. The territories of Wisconsin, Iowa, and Oregon were organized in 1836, 1838, and 1848, respectively. Following the Compromise of 1850, Americans were ready for another round of territorial organization. When addressing the issue of personal liberties, Congress adjusted its approach in a way that was fundamentally important for the insular territories. Starting with the Utah Organic Act in 1850, Congress altered their legislative template. In the Wisconsin Organic act, settlers enjoyed the protections of the Bill of Rights through the following phrase:

And be it further enacted, That the inhabitants of the said Territory shall be entitled to, and enjoy, all and singular the rights, privileges, and advantages, granted and secured to the people of the Territory of the United States northwest of the river Ohio, by the articles of the compact contained in the ordinance for the government of the said Territory, passed on the thirteenth day of July, one thousand seven hundred and eighty-seven; and shall be subject to all the

---


28 Wisconsin Organic Act, 15; Iowa Organic Act, 239; and Oregon Organic Act, 329.
conditions and restrictions and prohibitions in said articles of compact imposed upon the people of the said Territory. 29

Starting with “An act to establish a Territorial Government for Utah,” lawmakers ensured civil rights by simply inserting the words, “the Constitution and laws of the United States are hereby extended over and declared to be in force in said Territory of Utah, so far as the same, or any provision thereof, may be applicable.” 30 The wording of this phrase would later appear in the famous—or infamous—Insular Cases.

Examining “An Act To provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii,” a.k.a. the Hawaiian Organic Act, one immediately recognizes the form and wording of the statute with some minor modifications. The organic act provided for a governor to execute the laws of Hawai‘i, appoint minor officials, and approve legislation. Unlike the other territories, the Hawaiian Organic Act required gubernatorial nominees to hold citizenship in the islands. This provision aroused a degree of debate within the Senate. Senator Eugene Hale, a Republican from Maine, introduced the amendment responsible for this requirement. He wrote this amendment to provide more self-government for Hawaiian citizens and limit the involvement of the federal government in the administration of the islands. Senator Benjamin Ryan Tillman (Democrat-South Carolina) rejected this motion. In his mind, such a qualification would reinforce the oligarchic control that the landowners already exercised. Ironically, it was Senator Clarence Don Clark of Wyoming (Republican) who presented the greatest opposition to the amendment. In his speech, he recognized the dangers of appointing governors from outside the territory. Political patronage often landed unscrupulous and unqualified men in these positions. He agreed with recruiting from within the bounds of the territory. His

29 Wisconsin Organic Act, 15.
30 Utah Organic Act, 458.
concern, however, was limiting the ability of the president to search in other American communities for qualified candidates. After all, citizenship in the territory did not guarantee competence.\textsuperscript{31}

The Hawaiian Organic Act had other differences from the continental organic acts. For instance, the Territory of Hawai’i had its territorial assembly. It was bicameral in nature, but the upper chamber was termed a senate as opposed to a council and its members were elected without the approval of the United States Congress. Also, the Hawaiian Organic Act explicitly extended legislation excluding the immigration of Chinese laborers to the islands.\textsuperscript{32} The racial composition of the Hawaiian Islands deeply troubled some congressmen. In order to allay fears that Hawai’i would serve as an unguarded Ellis Island of the West for Asians, they made sure to include this prohibition and later the means to enforce it. It would serve as a source of contention between the business community of the Territory of Hawai’i and the federal government. The Gentlemen’s Agreement of 1907 also restricted immigration from Japan, by 1923 an acute labor shortage affected Hawai’i, leading to Hawaiian leadership petitioning Congress to permit the temporary immigration of Asian laborers.\textsuperscript{33}

Otherwise, the governmental structure of the Territory of Hawai’i remained comparable to the other American territories in the American West. The federal and

\textsuperscript{32} The exact legislation referred to in the Hawaiian Organic Act is U.S., “An Act to prohibit the coming of Chinese persons into the United States” passed in 1892. However, most historians of Hawaiian history acknowledge that the U.S. Congress was essentially extending the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882 to the Hawaiian Islands (The first statute only lasted ten years, requiring an extension of its life in 1892). In books covering this issues, readers may either find references to the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882 or passages simply stating that the Hawaiian Organic Act prohibited the importation of Chinese laborers. See Fuchs, 87, 206-207; and U.S., An Act to Execute Certain Treaty Stipulations Relating to Chinese, chap. 126, \textit{U.S. Statutes at Large} 22 (1882): 58-61.
terритори government encouraged the formation of republican institutions within the spirit of the Constitution. American culture and society flourished, as did the myriad of other cultures within the islands.\(^\text{34}\) And by the time of Pearl Harbor, the political culture of Hawai‘i had strong ties to that of the mainland. The wartime sacrifices of Hawaiians further strengthened these bonds between the states and the territory, making it difficult to deny them statehood by 1959.

There is one final, crucial link between Hawai‘i and the American West. Only four states existed as sovereign nations prior to admittance into the Union: Hawai‘i, Texas, Oregon, and California.\(^\text{35}\) The story of Texas is an old one. Empresario Stephen F. Austin received permission from the Mexican government to establish a colony of three hundred families in 1821. By 1824, a colony of American immigrants thrived in the Mexican province of \textit{Tejas}. In exchange for large tracts of land—the smallest grant was 177 acres—the American immigrants were required to swear loyalty to the Republic of Mexico and convert to Catholicism. Just as the United States of America relied on immigrants to settle and farm the vast expanses of federal lands, the Republic of Mexico also required imported labor. Yet, American immigrants resisted assimilating into

\(^{34}\) For a thorough examination of the cultural composition of Hawai‘i, see Fuchs (1961).
\(^{35}\) Oregon existed under a provisional government from 1843 to 1848. As settlers arrived from the United States along the Oregon Trail, Oregonians recognized the need to create some form of government to oversee land sales, livestock, Native American relations, and other local matters. In fact, the decision to hold a legislative assembly for the formation of a provisional government came on May 2, 1843, at the “Second Wolf Meeting.” Participants arrived to discuss a way to combat the wolves preying on livestock. In the midst of the meeting, it was decided that Oregon Country needed a government that did not rely on Dr. John McLoughlin and the Hudson Bay Company. Although some mountain men and Canadians supported the motion, American settlers were the primary proponents of the provisional government, which adopted the code of law for Iowa. For more information, see Dorothy O. Johansen, \textit{Empire of the Columbia: A History of the Pacific Northwest} (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1957), 225-245. Although the Oregon Provisional Government is important in the study of territorial government in the United States, it receives less attention here than Texas and California. In Oregon, two foreign populations vied for control of the lands inhabited by Native Americans in the Pacific Northwest. The Kingdom of Hawai‘i also had multiple foreign populations residing in its borders, yet only the American population provided any significant threat to Kānaka sovereignty. The overthrow of Hawai‘i was the product of one nationality as opposed to a joint assault on Hawaiian sovereignty by two foreign populations.
Mexican society. From the outset, Austin worked to placate the demands of government authorities to import a docile and law-abiding population, while trying to incorporate some form of American democracy as demanded by his fellow settlers.  

For a time, the immigrant population of Tejas y Coahuila adjusted to the demands of their new nation. The issue of slavery in Tejas, as well as demands for some degree of autonomy strained relations between Texians and their new government. By the early 1830s, the Mexican government revived the question of slavery in their provinces. They permitted importing slaves into the province as a means of attracting new immigrants from the United States of America, but as more immigrants arrived with their slaves, the policy came under question. Of course, this upset the American Mexicans living in Tejas. Finally, on October 2, 1835, the issues of slavery and self-government for Texians entered a new field of debate, one of armed rebellion. For, on this date, the opening shots of the Texas Revolution rang out in the small town of Gonzales. As the history books show, the Texians fought and won their rebellion after finally defeating Santa Anna near the San Jacinto River.  

For the next nine years, Texians and Americans danced a convoluted minuet of admission. The Americans in Mexico residing inside the borders of Tejas may have pledged allegiance to the Republic of Mexico; but in their minds the oath never included rebuking their dedication to American culture, ideals, government, prejudices, or industry. Considering this, it was only natural that they would seek reunification with the nation they had left after wresting independence from the Mexican government. The

---


37 For information regarding the Texas Revolution, see Marquis James, *The Raven*, intr. Henry Steele Commager (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1994); James L. Haley, *Sam Houston* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2002); Hine and Faragher, 161-174; or Billington and Ridge, 125-150.
political climate, however, had drastically changed from 1820 to 1836. Having
successfully preserved the peace and political balance of Congress with the Missouri
Compromise, northerners were hesitant to incorporate a slaveholding Republic of Texas
into the nation. Unable to bully anti-slavery northern politicians, southerners and Texians
alike had to wait patiently for the next nine years.

For Texians, the time did not pass quickly. Every year they faced the possibility
of war rekindling between their nascent nation and the Republic of Mexico. With
northern opposition to annexation of another slave state, there was no guarantee that the
United States of America would incorporate the Republic of Texas, thereby extending the
protection of the United States Army to the lands bordering the Rio Grande. Finally,
President Sam Houston devised the perfect scheme for incorporation. Feigning
indifference towards annexation and fostering closer relations with Great Britain, the
Texians spurred annexationist democrats in the United States Senate to push harder on a
bill adding the Lone Star Republic to the Union. Finally, on March 1, 1845, President
Tyler signed the resolution adding Texas to the United States of America.

Americans repeated the process of Texas ten years later in the province of
California. Following their independence from Spain, political leaders of the Republic of
Mexico passed legislation permitting trade with foreign countries. New England
merchant vessels began making regular stops to trade for hide, tallow, and other
Californian products. Aboard these trade ships were men like Richard Henry Dana who
sought adventure in other lands. Dana later recorded his Californian experiences in Two
Years Before the Mast. This work was one of many that portrayed the area as an
agricultural paradise. The imagery was enough to draw American settlers off of the
Oregon Trail and onto the California Trail. At the end of their journey, they emerged in California, most likely next to Sutter’s Fort.\textsuperscript{38} John Augustus Sutter was a Swiss immigrant who was wanted for bankruptcy in his native land, yet prospered in California, a common theme for early European immigrants. When hostilities between the United States and the Republic of Mexico erupted in 1846, John C. Frémont and prominent Californians orchestrated the Bear Flag Revolt that severed California from Mexico. Since it was clear to both the American and Mexican governments that the leaders of the Bear Flag Republic favored annexation to the United States of America, the region was incorporated into the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. Unlike Texas, California did not have to wait nine years before Congress annexed the territory. Instead, they became self-governed in 1848 and a state in 1850.\textsuperscript{39}

In comparison, Hawaiians had lived under the rule of various alii before Kamehameha I unified the islands under his crown. Like the Lipan Apache, Kiowa, Comanche, Wichita, and Spanish residents of Tejas y Coahuila, Kānakas had their ancestral homelands stripped from them by European-American settlers living in the region. Finally, the Republic of Hawai‘i, as in the case of Texas, experienced a brief existence as a republic dominated by the rebellious settler society.

Yet the similarities stop there. Hawaiians experienced two years of political limbo before their territorial bill passed Congress. Afterwards, they lived through another 59 years of territorial status. Texas, on the other hand, experienced only nine months and twenty-eight agonizing days after annexation and prior to statehood. What

\textsuperscript{38} It is interesting to note for the purpose of this study that New Helvetia, a.k.a. Sutter’s Fort, was constructed with the help of kanaka laborers.

was the reason for the delay? President John Tyler may have signed the joint resolution annexing the Republic of Texas on March 1, 1845, but the Texans still needed time to produce a constitution establishing a “republican form of government” within its borders.40 Once done, statehood was granted.

Hawai’i clearly has close connections with the tradition of territorial government begun with the Northwest Ordinance of 1787, but how did it compare with other insular possessions? Matching the history of Hawaiian government with the other insular territories shows a sharp break from the traditions established in 1787 and continued throughout the American West. Regarding the extension of American government to areas in the Pacific Ocean and Caribbean Sea, Hawai’i became the last remnant of the older American colonial system.

One noteworthy comparison between Hawai’i and the other insular territories is the legislative methods used to construct their governments. In Hawai’i and Puerto Rico, the United States Congress actively participated in governing. For Hawai’i, congressmen drafted the Hawaiian Organic Act. This statute remained in effect until President Dwight D. Eisenhower in 1959 signed PL 86-3 admitting Hawai’i as a state. Puerto Rico also had a formal territorial government organized by Congress. The Foraker Act of 1900 ended the military government in place since the conclusion of the Spanish-American War of 1898. It created the office of the governor to be filled by a presidential nominee. The individual was an American and had significant powers over the Puerto Rican people. Also it established a Legislative Assembly comprised of an Executive Council and House of Representatives. Representatives were popularly elected by Puerto Ricans.

40 U.S., “Joint Resolution for annexing Texas to the United States,” Joint Resolution No. 8, United States Public Statutes at Large 5 (1845), 797-798; and U.S., “Joint Resolution for the Admission of the State of Texas into the Union,” Joint Resolution No. 1, Statutes at Large 9 (1845), 108.
thus providing for some democratic rule under the colonial government. The Council, however, was not so democratic. The president appointed eleven members, only five of which had to be from Puerto Rico.\textsuperscript{41}

The framework established by the Northwest Ordinance and passed on to western territories was present in Puerto Rico, but its democratic nature was lessened. Other territorial governments had limitations on the degree of self-government they exercised. The governor was appointed by federal authorities. Legislative council members required congressional approval at first. And any laws passed by the assembly were subject to gubernatorial or congressional veto. Congressmen considered these controls necessary to the orderly settlement of colonies. They wanted to direct the conquest of new lands without reducing fellow citizens to absolute colonial subjects. The Foraker Act, on the other hand, created a colonial framework of government intended to control a foreign population.

Here, American expansionist policy diverted from its earlier stages. Before, American settlers and federal agents removed the indigenous presence from the land prior to settlement. The reservation system aided in this process by concentrating first peoples in restricted areas. Also, historians like Jared Diamond and Alfred Crosby have provided studies revealing the dramatic effect western diseases had on Native Americans. By the time migrating families and individuals arrived, an illusion of “empty space” or “empty land” had been created. For the first time in their expansionist history, Americans found

themselves confronted with a colonial dilemma. They had to create a system with which they could govern a large foreign, non-
English speaking population. Moreover, they entered the Spanish-American War to expand liberty and democracy to the Spanish colonies of Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines. To deny Puerto Ricans a role in the governance of their home would betray American claims as protectors of liberty. The result in Puerto Rico was a colonial system with a veneer of democratic participation. As the years passed, Congress extended the political rights of Puerto Ricans with the Jones Act of 1917 and the Elective Governor Bill of 1947.42

The territories of Hawai‘i and Puerto Rico were lucky in comparison to Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands as they at least had some elements of democracy incorporated into the territorial government. When Guam and American Samoa came under the control of the United States government in 1898 and 1899, respectively, Congress was not responsible for establishing a working government. Instead, President William McKinley passed Executive Order 180-A for Guam and Executive Order 1900 for American Samoa. In these islands, the ranking naval officer of the base assumed absolute authority over the islands and its inhabitants. Under the naval government fell every office and department responsible for maintaining military discipline, as well as the civilian community. The Department of Public Health,

---

Department of Public Works, Department of Agriculture, and other government organizations were organized by him and run by his appointees.\textsuperscript{43} Records indicate that the naval governors of Guam and American Samoa conducted affairs honestly and efficiently. Nonetheless, the continuous military rule in the islands at time affected the civil rights of the inhabitants. For example, the military governor acted as the high court for the island. Whereas Hawaiians and Puerto Ricans had recourse to the Supreme Court of the United States of America, Samoan justice stopped with the ranking naval officer. \textsuperscript{44} In 1946 and 1947, the Law Offices of Peter and Dalton of Omaha, Nebraska, became involved in a case involving the seizure of an ocean vessel named \textit{Captain Steffany}. During World War II, the Governor of Samoa seized the vessel. A board of appraisers valued the vessel at $23,035.00, after which the governor offered some compensation to the family of Joseph Steffany.\textsuperscript{45} The Steffany family, however, refused to accept the validity of the seizure. Ownership of the \textit{Captain Steffany} allowed them to conduct a transport business. According to documents, the naval government transferred the vessel to the Samoan Navigation Company. This was a transport business operated by the American Naval Administration in Guam. Throughout 1946 and 1947, the law firm of Peter & Dalton engaged in a prolonged legal battle to reclaim the vessel as well as business profits lost from the seizure. What is important


\textsuperscript{45} Steffany died shortly before construction was finished.
here is the avenue the Steffany family chose in order to reclaim their property. While the statute creating the territorial government of Hawai‘i gave islanders a large degree of protections for their civil liberties, no such guarantees existed for Samoans or Guamanians.46

In addition to the structure and legislative roots of the insular territories, historians have often cited the Insular Cases47 as a defining legal difference between American island and continental colonies. The Insular Cases were a set of Supreme Court rulings delivered at the beginning of the twentieth century. They concerned the issue of whether or not the “constitution follows the flag.” The opinions of the court were often contentious. Perusing them, scholars can read the views of the Supreme Court justices, which, at times, were bitterly divided. In the end, the Supreme Court made two important rulings. First, the constitution does not follow the flag. Second, the American territories were not designed with the same purposes in mind. The continental territories, in addition to Hawai‘i, were incorporated territories, and therefore, destined for statehood. The insular territories, excluding Hawai‘i, were unincorporated territories and not guaranteed future statehood. The following sections will examine these rulings in more depth with regard to their effect on the insular territories, but its main focus will

46 For more information on the Steffany case, see Hugh Alfred Butler Papers, MS2331, Box 217, “4a General Samoa,” Nebraska State Historical Society; and Hugh Alfred Butler Papers, MS2331, Box 119, “4a—Samoa,” Nebraska State Historical Society.

center on the historical reasons given by the Supreme Court. Viewing the Insular Cases from this particular perspective shows them to have firm, historical roots in the American territorial system starting with the Louisiana Purchase.

The cases of *De Lima v. Bidwell* (1901) and *Downes v. Bidwell* (1901) unquestionably reveal the connection between the Insular Cases and the American West. Beginning with *De Lima v. Bidwell*, Justice Henry Billings Brown noted that ports in New Orleans, Florida, and Texas were treated as foreign ports, regardless of the fact that they were within American boundaries. Since the daily lives and activities of the communities had existed under foreign rule, the federal government needed time to develop and implement a policy for governing these new territories. Secretary of the Treasury Albert Gallatin established the historical precedent starting in 1803. He ordered his department to treat the port of New Orleans as a foreign territory from December 20, 1803, to February 24, 1804. Until Congress admitted New Orleans into the U.S. Customs, Spanish laws governing commerce remained in effect. This treatment of newly acquired ports lasted until the acquisition of California. At this point, Secretary of State James Buchanan issued orders to treat ports along the California coast as domestic ports. From these examples, Justice Brown dismissed the notion that Puerto Rico and the insular territories could exist under American sovereignty, yet remain foreign ports. As in the case of New Orleans, Texas, and Florida, the federal government may have assumed control over new territories and retained existing laws and import duties, but it did so only as long as was needed to devise a political framework for the region.\(^{48}\)

Questions over the validity of having different laws governing imports in Puerto Rico and the Pacific and Caribbean insular territories continued beyond *De Lima v.*

Bidwell. In *Downes v. Bidwell*, the Supreme Court ruled on whether or not goods from Puerto Rico could be taxed upon entering the port of New York City. Once again, Justice Brown delivered the opinion of the court in which he built upon his analysis of territorial history and law. The Supreme Court ruled that the contiguous territories provided the colonial framework and basis for the way Congress legislated for the insular possessions. Brown stated that the U.S. Constitution was formed by states and their inhabitants and that the constitutional prohibition against discriminatory import duties as outlined in Article 1, Section 9, of the Constitution applied only to states and not to territories.49

As a basis for the ruling, Justice Brown relied on a literal reading of the Constitution and territorial history. First, he cited the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Amendments as examples of how congressmen recognized and differentiated between states and territories. In both amendments, lawmakers carefully included references to the states. He noted that the Thirteenth Amendment prohibited slavery in the states *and* the territories, whereas the Fourteenth Amendment provided citizenship to residents of the *states only*. This reading of the amendments corresponds with the wording of the organic acts of Wisconsin, Iowa, and other Trans-Mississippi territories. As noted earlier in this chapter, congressmen included sections extending the U.S. Constitution and Bill of Rights to the continental colonies.50

For the purpose of this study, Justice Brown’s treatment of territorial history is important. Although the views of lawmakers towards the extension of the Constitution over the territories may have fluctuated over the years, Brown believed “Congress has been consistent in recognizing the difference between the States and the territories under

50 Ibid. at 250-251.
the Constitution.” For instance, Justice Brown showed that the first territory to have revenue laws different from the states was Orleans Territory. Until 1804, Orleans Territory was treated differently from the states. Starting with this region and continuing with the Philippines, Congress had always extended constitutional protections and other relevant legislation to new regions. Territorial association with the United States of America, however, did not entail the automatic extension of rights reserved specifically for the states.

Towards the end of the opinion of the court, Justice Brown went beyond mere import duties by commenting on the governance of an American empire. He stated that “there may be territories subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, which are not of the United States.” This does not make them foreign to the U.S. After all, the Court ruled in De Lima v. Bidwell that a territory could not be both domestic and foreign. Instead, the territories are not states, and therefore, do not automatically enjoy the protection of the Constitution, which is a compact between the states and the federal government. As happened in “Louisiana, Florida, the Northwest Territory . . . and still more recently in the case of Alaska,” the territorial governments resembled the British

51 Ibid. at 258.
52 According to Jack Ericson Eblen, The First and Second United States Empires, 147, Orleans Territory consisted of the area encompassing modern day Louisiana. After Louisiana entered the Union in 1812, the name of the territory was changed to Missouri Territory. In reading Eblen’s study of the American territorial system, it is not surprising that Orleans Territory did not enjoy the same trade and taxation protections as the states. Congress still used the district stage to govern this region. In the district stage, the governor, secretary, and judges legislated. Furthermore, the governor held near unlimited power over the legislative process, save that new statutes must have come from the law books of the older states (a point which caused some confusion). Otherwise, he held the power to prorogue or dissolve the legislature during the second stage, oversee Native American affairs, apportion the territory, choose the seat of government, and influence local politics. As Ericson illustrates, governors could overuse these powers to their detriment, as was the case with Winthrop Sargent in Mississippi territory. An astute governor, like Arthur St. Clair (Northwest Territory), employed his gubernatorial powers with moderation. With the abandonment of the district stage in the trans-Mississippi West, unlimited gubernatorial powers faded from the colonial process on the mainland, though they later reemerged in certain insular territories.
53 Ibid., 251-258.
54 Ibid., 278.
colonial system as existed in the colonies prior to the Revolutionary War. It is Congress who must extend the protection of the Constitution. The confusion over the relationship between the Constitution and the territories emanated from historical congressional actions in which select constitutional provisions were extended shortly after the federal government assumed sovereignty over a new region. This gave the illusion that the U.S. Constitution followed the flag. Furthermore, no time limitations have ever been stipulated on territorial status. Hawai‘i, for instance, became an incorporated territory in 1898. If Congress desired, Hawai‘i could have remained an incorporated territory indefinitely. Though the federal government obtains sovereignty and responsibility over annexed or conquered areas, it retains the right to define the relationship between the national government and territorial inhabitants. Thus Downes v. Bidwell recognized the politics of difference important in creating and administering an imperial framework.

The Supreme Court, however, did recognize certain natural rights possessed by indigenous and territorial peoples that the federal government had to protect regardless of whether or not Congress extended constitutional protections to them. These rights included the

rights to one’s own religious opinions and to a public expression of them, or as sometimes said, to worship God according to the dictates of one’s own conscience; the right to personal liberty and individual property; to freedom of speech and of the press; to free access to courts of justice, to due process of law and to an equal protection of the law; to immunities from unreasonable searches and seizures, as well as cruel and unusual punishments; and to such other immunities as are indispensable to a free government.

---

55 Ibid., 279.
56 Frederick Cooper, Colonialism in Question: Theory, Knowledge, History (Berkley: University of California Press, 2005), 22-25. See the section on the question of spatiality in the American Empire and its effect on the territories.
57 Downes v. Bidwell at 283.
These were the same civil rights protected in the Northwest Ordinance of 1787 and extended to the Trans-Mississippi territories through the Wisconsin Organic Act.\textsuperscript{58}

The dawn of the twentieth century brought a vitally important shift in American expansionist policy. Had the Supreme Court delivered a similar ruling prior to 1890, American settlement may have proceeded quite differently. The forced removal and assimilation of Native Americans, as well as the actions conducted during armed conflict with them, relied on the absence of these natural rights, and many white settlers encouraged the genocidal policies of the American government. Had the Supreme Court and federal government recognized and adhered to a ruling similar to Justice Brown’s, white settlement may not have penetrated the lands of the Kiowa, Cheyenne, Arapaho, Sauk, Fox, Nez Perce, and other first peoples. In \textit{Downes v. Bidwell (1901)}, a shift in the aggressive, expansionist policies that allowed for the development of settler societies occurred throughout the continent to a system more akin to British and French colonies as exercised in their empires.

Since the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands with the Newlands Resolution, Hawaiian territorial government had a structure based on the Northwest Ordinance. The Newlands Resolution ended the Republic of Hawai’i and authorized President William McKinley to appoint government officers to direct the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of government until Congress provided a new territorial government. All treaties between Hawai’i and foreign nations ceased to function; the U.S. federal government assumed Hawaiian national debts; and the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882 was extended to include Hawai’i. On the surface, it seemed that American policymakers

\textsuperscript{58} For more on the protection of these rights, see pages Downes v. Bidwell at 276-287.
desired the full incorporation of Hawai‘i into the American political system. There existed, however, a provision preserving existing customs laws between the islands and the continental states and territories. These duties, of course, were prejudicial to Hawaiian agricultural products, intending to limit the importation of Hawaiian sugar into the United States. The McKinley Tariff of 1890 established these taxes and are commonly known as some of the highest duties ever levied in American History.\textsuperscript{59} This aspect of the concurrent resolution suggests that American politicians had not completely decided on the nature of the relationship between the United States and Hawai‘i. The preservation of import duties raises the possibility that some in Congress wanted Hawai‘i to be a colony without its potential addition to the formal, political American Union.\textsuperscript{60}

Laying claim to Hawai‘i, the Philippines, Guam, and Puerto Rico, however, was easier than constructing a federal-territorial relationship between them. This may seem odd considering the experiences congresses and presidents had amassed since the foundation of the republic. When reviewing the debates over territorial formation prior to 1860, slavery dominated the debate. In 1857 with the \textit{Dred Scott v. Sanford} decision, Chief Justice Roger B. Taney attempted to end any contentions over slavery in American territories. Ultimately he failed as his ruling increased northern opposition to the spread of the “peculiar institution.” Chief Justice Taney’s tolerance of slavery could not be maintained after the vicious fighting from 1861 to 1865. Radical Republican control in Congress and adoption of the 13\textsuperscript{th} Amendment brought the end to slavery, and therefore an end to the territorial questions on the permissibility of slavery. Even so, other issues

\textsuperscript{59} Kuykendall, 1874-1893 \textit{The Kalakaua Dynasty}, 561. Kuykendall and other Hawaiian scholars have analyzed the McKinley Tariff of 1890 as a source of unrest among American settlers in Hawai‘i. It is often cited as a direct cause of the 1893 overthrow of Lili‘uokalani.

\textsuperscript{60} U.S., \textit{Newlands Resolution}, Resolution No. 55, \textit{U.S. Statutes at Large} 30 (1898): 750-751.
such as polygamy and race hampered the inclusion of southwestern territories into the Union. Americans solved these contentions without resorting to extensive violence, as Mormons eventually rejected polygamous marriages and the lure of gold and valuable minerals increased the flow of settlers descended from Western European states into Arizona and Mexico. The Hawaiian Islands lacked the institutions of slavery and polygamy when Congress annexed them in 1898, but other problems slowed the statehood process for half of a century. American phobias about admitting a region dominated by a large population of Japanese Hawaiians, Chinese Hawaiians, Korean Hawaiians, Filipino Hawaiians, and Native Hawaiians lasted for fifty years.

Throughout the early 1900s, it was common to consider the United States of America as the mainland and its states, the metropole of the American Empire. Hawai‘i, Puerto Rico, Guam, and Samoa were territories or colonies held by the nation. While the former kingdom entered American history as a region wrested from autocratic Kānaka control by revolutionary American settlers and guided by the federal government following annexation, few Americans readily admitted or even realized the close relationship that Hawai‘i had with the rest of the country.

The process begun by the Northwest Ordinance did not stop at the Mississippi River or even the coast of the Pacific Ocean. Just as the three-stage territorial process mutated to accommodate the needs of settlers in the American West, congressmen returned to the Northwest Ordinance to govern the Territory of Hawai‘i. Unlike Puerto Rico, Guam, Samoa, the Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands, or even Orleans Territory, Hawaiians never experienced the more traditional form of colonialism. The
Organic Act modified the existing democratic institutions to conform to stage two of the Northwest Ordinance.

Nonetheless, Hawai‘i would remain a stage-two colony until 1959, regardless of its large population, contributions to the federal treasury, extensive education system, predominant American culture, or republican institutions. Hawaiians had achieved everything expected of a territory to win acceptance into the union, but American concerns about non-contiguity, race, communism, and labor prevented statehood for over sixty years. Overcoming these obstacles would present a challenge to Hawaiians until after World War II.
CHAPTER 4

HAWAI’I TERRITORY AND COMPLICATIONS OF GOVERNANCE

While drafting the Northwest Ordinance, American statesmen confronted the perplexing issue of establishing settlements in Native American territory, isolated by the Appalachian Mountains, and separated by dense forests. Their task was a difficult one, yet they succeeded in drafting a landmark piece of legislation. In accomplishing this feat, they relied on imperfect maps and eyewitness accounts to familiarize themselves with the territory. Also, the creators of the ordinance knew that settlers would rely on rudimentary transportation, poor roads, and rivers to maintain contact with states, the federal government, and American markets. Daunting though the task was, they never considered abandoning expansion into their neighbors’ lands.

Having experienced two centuries of colonization, conquest, and settlement, organized by legislation over one hundred years old, and armed with modernized railroads and ships, controlling and developing the Territory of Hawai’i should have been an easy task for Americans living in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, especially when compared with the difficulties faced by settlers living in the Territory of Indiana in 1812 or Dakota Territory in the 1860s and 1870s. Yet for all of the advancements in technology and communications, Americans found themselves challenged at the thought of colonizing or incorporating atolls. While their ancestors poured across seas of grass en route to Oregon or California, the Pacific Ocean suddenly appeared as a menacing obstacle to controlling the Philippines and Hawai’i. To overcome these ostensibly formidable obstacles, Americans slightly altered their approach to colonizing Hawai’i and completely abandoned the Northwest Ordinance in
their efforts to occupy Puerto Rico, Guam, Samoa, and the Philippines. Abandoning the anti-imperialist rhetoric of the Revolutionary War and wary of incorporating non-contiguous territories into the United States of America, the nation had to reconsider the role of colonization and the place of conquered peoples within its political framework. In the process, concerns over distance, race, and national security caused the extension of Hawaii’s territorialism into the mid-twentieth century, while injecting the concept of a different and new colonial system into the American dialogue.

For America’s insular possessions, a new subject appeared in congressional debates over the governing of islands—distance. The Hawaiian Islands lay over 2,300 miles southwest of California. To reach the island of Guam, one had to travel an additional 3,000 miles west. From there, almost 2,000 more miles separated the weary sojourner from the Philippine Islands. Puerto Rico, on the other hand, was somewhat easier to reach, since the island lay less than 1,500 miles from the coast of Florida. In 1903, journalist John Marvin Dean made the journey from the West Coast to the Philippines after a brief stay in Honolulu. According to his memoirs, the trip cost less than one thousand dollars. Going directly to Manila from Seattle or San Francisco took twenty-eight days. Should an early nineteenth-century tourist seek this trip, he or she could have reveled in the sights and sounds on Hawai’i at the minimal cost of a few days.\(^1\) In contrast, it could take months for settlers to make the journey from the eastern United States to destinations in the American West prior to the completion of the transcontinental railroad. For example, Sarah Raymond Herndon and her family began their trip from Missouri to Montana on May 1, 1865. During their trek west, their wagon

train met no armed resistance from Native Americans nor suffered a contagious outbreak nor faced blizzards or other natural obstacles. In comparison to other westward migrations, their trip was relatively uneventful. Nonetheless, it took them four months to travel a distance equal to half of that Dean crossed on his way to Honolulu. Comparing these two “voyages,” one can easily see how dramatic changes in transportation between 1865 and 1900 affected travel. Still, by the late 1940s and early 1950s, the distance between Hawai’i, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines had dwindled further still. To get from Washington, D.C., to Honolulu, Territory of Hawai’i, one needed only 20 hours of flight time. But regardless of the decrease in transit time, lawmakers and citizens had difficulty setting aside the issue of distance in their views of governing insular possessions.

Why is distance significant in a comparative history of Hawai’i, the American West, and the unincorporated insular possessions? According to Frederick Cooper, a colonial empire is “a political unit that is large, expansionist (or with memories of an expansionist past), and which reproduces differentiation among people it incorporates.” This is not to say that the policies of differentiation remain static. He notes that some empires eventually allow subjugated minorities access to their political framework. Also, space places a pivotal role in empire. Imperial Rome, for instance, used the borders of their territory as a line demarcating the end of civilization and the beginning of barbarism. For Romans, all persons residing outside of their borders were distinct and
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2 Sarah Raymond Herndon, Days on the Road: Crossing the Plains in 1865, the Diary of Sarah Raymond Herndon, foreword by Mary Barmeyer O’Brien (Helena, Montana: TwoDot, 2003).
3 Statehood for Hawaii, fo. 534, Box 11, Joseph Rider Farrington Papers, M473, Hawai’i State Archives 40.
different, and therefore naturally subordinate to them. Likewise, European empires of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries had similar views of peoples residing on the periphery.

It should come then as no surprise that a republic that borrowed so heavily from Roman and Enlightenment political theories and practices should also develop similar views on conquered cultures residing outside national boundaries. Americans initially subjected Native Americans to their virulent form of imperial differentiation. At first, Americans believed that genocide was justified in their quest to fulfill their manifest destiny. With the so-called Peace Policy of the 1870s and the Dawes Severalty Act of 1887, previous policies of forced removal and warfare changed into programs intended to eradicate all vestiges of indigenous culture, thereby allowing for the incorporation of the remaining Native Americans namelessly into the American political system. In this phase of American expansion, physical space was not so much a factor in the politics of differentiation as was culture. The West, after all, was a place to be colonized and incorporated into the body politic. To achieve these ends, settlers used brutal tactics to clear the lands of their original inhabitants and, in the process, to create the stereotypes and prejudices for cultural others that they would also apply to Africans, South and Central Americans, Polynesians, and Asians as the United States began global economic and military expansion in the late nineteenth century.

While Americans showed an aptitude for formulating policies to facilitate continental conquest and thereby statehood, the move from governing contiguous

---

5 Ibid., 158-159.
6 Richard Drinnon, Facing West: The Metaphysics of Indian-Hating and Empire Building (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1997): 220-221, 240-241. The pages listed contain direct references to the application of Indian-hating in the Pacific Ocean; however, the entire work contains detailed information on the evolution of American prejudices towards the indigenous peoples of other countries.
territories to non-contiguous seemed a bit much for many Americans. In the period from 1898 to the early 1900s, anti-imperialists argued that incorporating non-contiguous territories would inevitably lead to the embrace of a colonial system. They considered the insular territories unfit for settlement, since whites were incapable of living comfortably in tropical regions. Unable to promote white resettlement similar to that of Oregon Country, Texas, California, and other continental regions, the populations of the islands would remain predominately foreign and non-white. Without a significant presence of white Americans living in the islands, proper assimilation to American culture was impracticable, they reasoned. During the debate over Hawaiian statehood, critics extended this argument. By admitting a non-contiguous territory inhabited by large populations of Asian immigrants, Americans risked the possibility of having to admit the Philippines, Puerto Rico, Guam, Samoa, and the Pacific Territories to statehood. Such a development threatened to provide equal representation of majority non-white populations in Congress.⁷

Commentary on American control of Puerto Rico extended anti and pro-imperial arguments. In direct opposition to those who opposed annexation for purposes of non-contiguity was the notion that possessing distant territories, or outposts, in the Pacific Ocean and Caribbean would enhance American security and trade. By 1900 critics of American colonialism exposed the failings of the colonial government in Puerto Rico. For example, Ramón B. Lopez, editor of La Correspondencia de Puerto Rico, accused

the American government of failing to meet the educational, political, and economic needs of the Puerto Rican people. Americans had promised to inaugurate policies that would fix the problems of the Spanish administration and enhance the infrastructure of the island, but the ineptitude of American administrators made things even worse. Unable to speak the language, ignorant of the culture, and unaware of Puerto Rican needs, colonial agents failed to run the mail service, maintain the roads, improve the education system, and unite the divided political climate on the island properly.  
Ironically, nine months earlier, Dr. George G. Groff praised the same American administration in Puerto Rico. Groff served as Secretary and Treasurer of the Superior Board of Health of Puerto Rico. In his eyes, colonial policies successfully established an infrastructure capable of alleviating tropical diseases, educating the masses, protecting private property, and setting Puerto Ricans on the path to learning good governance. Moreover, Puerto Rico, Groff noted approvingly, was the beginning of an American presence throughout Latin America. “Anglo-Saxon” Americans now could set out in search of “unoccupied lands,” which they would find and settle throughout South America.

Likewise, there existed in the U.S. the opinion that the Philippines and Hawai’i were crucial in controlling the Pacific Ocean and opening trade routes to China. During times of peace, the national attention given to the strategic benefits waxed and waned. War, however, seemed to revive Americans’ interest in the value of American insular possessions. For example, during the Boxer Rebellion in China, articles abounded in
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10 Ibid., 105.
American publications on the necessity of possessing Hawai‘i, the Philippines, Guam, and Samoa. These islands offered fueling stations necessary for oceanic transportation. Reviewing the articles published in *Harper’s Weekly* throughout the year 1900, the Boxer Rebellion and the Boer War in South Africa dominate the stories read by subscribers to this popular, national publication. Riddled throughout the issues are articles on the Philippines, Hawai‘i, and, at times, Puerto Rico. Articles about the Philippine Islands emphasized the strategic importance of these islands to the American nation predominated. Looming over the argument is a map centered on the archipelago. Extending outward are mile markers in a 360-degree radius. They are marked at 1000-, 2000-, and 3000-mile intervals illustrating the spatial importance of this American outpost in the Pacific Ocean. This illustrated the projection of American economic and military power deep into Australia, China, Japan, and India. By controlling the Philippines, the nation could exercise a “moral influence” and “anti-imperialistic” policies in China, while counteracting the extension of Dutch, British, and Japanese power in the region.¹¹

Similar concerns appeared in the debates in Congress over the Hawaiian Organic Act. While some congressmen loathed the possibility of providing a territorial government for the islands on the grounds that it could lead to statehood, Senator John Tyler Morgan of Alabama, Representative William Shadrach Knox of Massachusetts, and Representative Edward Hamilton of Michigan made cases in favor of Hawaiian incorporation based on its strategic importance. Each congressman noted that the Hawaiian Islands lay 2,000 miles from the western coast of the United States of America.

and by controlling Hawai‘i the United States gained the only viable coaling station in the middle of the Pacific Ocean. This not only provided a military advantage to the United States Navy, but it also gave the U.S. control of the primary shipping routes in this sensitive region of the world.  

The military importance of Hawai‘i continued beyond World War II. In fact, World War II, the Cold War, and decolonization movements reminded Americans of the strategic importance of Hawai‘i. Gavan Daws, John Whitehead, Victoria Wyatt, Tom Coffman, Lawrence Fuchs, and a myriad of others have published books or articles that delve into the effect World War II had on Hawaiian efforts to obtain statehood. While World War II played a vital role in the history of Hawai‘i, the Cold War Era and decolonization had an equally important impact. Recent work in this area has produced intriguing results. In his book, *Completing the Union: Alaska, Hawai‘i, and the Battle for Statehood*, John Whitehead remarked that Hawai‘i became a physical and ideological “outpost to combat Communism” after 1950.  

In an article entitled, “‘A Symbol of the New Frontier’: Hawaiian Statehood, Anti-Colonialism, and Winning the Cold War,” Gretchen Heefner continued the foray into this new approach to the history of Hawaiian statehood. Her essay “explores the ways statehood advocates used the dual discourses of race and internationalism to present a Hawai‘i that was both integral to U.S. interests and key in projecting a positive American image to the rest of the world.” Heefner’s scholarship reveals the ways in which Hawaiians and mainlanders recognized the

---


international implications that previous arguments against statehood on the account of a heterogeneous Hawaiian population had on the perceptions of America as an anti-colonial power. By annexing Hawai‘i and embracing its myriad of races, American leaders might project an image of America that would counter a growing image of the Soviet Union as the only sincere anti-imperialist, global power.

The attack on Pearl Harbor alerted Americans, many for the first time, to the patriotism of Hawaiians and Hawaii’s strategic value. It actually aided in strengthening the relationship between the territory and the federal government after World War II. In 1947, the Committee on Public Lands submitted a report on an enabling act pending in Congress. For 49 years, pro-statehood Hawaiians had struggled to overcome the argument that non-contiguity made the territory unsuitable for statehood. With this report, evidence now existed suggesting that this argument against Hawaiian statehood was weakening. Throughout the first half of the 1900s, the status of “incorporated territory” was sufficient in tying the archipelago to the United States, thereby securing this vital outpost for the republic. But according to the authors of the report, individuals interviewed on Hawaiian statehood claimed that “Hawaii’s value to the Nation as a defense outpost in the Pacific would be greater as a State than as a Territory.”

15 Granted, opposition to a closer bond with the Territory of Hawai‘i also existed. Hawaiians found themselves battling charges of communism, questions over the racial makeup of the islands, and a myriad of other issues for their right to statehood from 1945 until 1959. Nonetheless, this report does reveal a shift in congressional attitudes towards non-contiguous territories and political inclusion.

15 U.S., Committee on Public Lands, Enabling the People of Hawaii to form a Constitution and State Government and to Be Admitted into the Union on an Equal Footing with the Original States, 80th Cong., 1st sess., 1947, H. Rep. 194, 14.
Expanding beyond continental borders introduced Americans to the dangers and complexities involved in maintaining isolated strategic posts. The very first Americans from the thirteen original states who moved into the lands of Kentucky and the Ohio River Valley learned the necessity of constructing well-designed forts and defenses. Creeks, Shawnees, Miamis, Sauks and Foxes refused to relinquish their lands without a fight. Yet, Americans were never very far from the main population centers of the new U.S.A. during this time period.Explorers and traders successfully entered the lands prior to the American Revolution, discovering the swiftest routes to potential frontier settlements.

Once American settlers began pushing past the Mississippi River, the situation changed. Distance became more pronounced as overland wagon trains snaked their way across the arid and semiarid stretches of the Great Plains. As Elliott West illustrated in *The Contested Plains: Indians, Goldseekers, and the Rush to Colorado*, Cheyennes and Arapahoes relied on the lush grasslands astride the Platte and Republicans Rivers.16 Further south, Kiowas and Comanches had long since laid claim to the Arkansas and Red Rivers. And in the north, Lakotas, Dakotas, and Crows guarded precious sources of water for their families and herds. After caravans crossed this stretch of land, Americans stood before the Rocky Mountains, a seemingly impenetrable obstacle to westward movement.

The pattern of settlement across Trans-Mississippi lands did not follow a smooth westerly progression. As the old story goes, Americans skipped the Great American Desert altogether, opting to conquer and colonize the lands of Utah, California, and
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Oregon Country first. In these regions, farming and industry was more akin to the more traditional forms practiced on the eastern seaboard. Although southern Californian agriculture would later rely heavily on massive, federally-funded irrigation projects, early settlers found ranching and farming well suited to the region. With the influx of settlement following the Gold Rush of 1848 and the conclusion of the Mexican-American War, it suddenly became highly profitable, too. That California and Oregon’s statehood was isolated and not contiguous to America’s settled regions was not lost on Hawaiians.

Still, a primary concern among many Americans about the incorporation of Hawai‘i was its perceived isolation from the States. Initially, Hawai‘i was separated from the United States. Without airplanes, computers, telephones, and other modern amenities, distance caused delays in relaying orders and information from the islands to the mainland not unlike pre-railroad days for Californians. World War II, the advent of radio communication, telephones, airplanes, and other technology lessened the effect distance had on the administration and defense of the islands.

Ironically, in their appeals against incorporation and statehood, Americans must have forgotten a celebrated part of their past . . . the Great American West. Hollywood glamorized the American West as a place of masculine virility in which bold settlers built a new American. The reality, however, was much different. In order to wrest the land from indigenous peoples, American policymakers had relied on two principle tools: the treaty and the United States Army. Treaties often served short-term purposes. By offering incentives to Native Americans, diplomats received assurances that indigenous peoples would relinquish certain lands. For example, Kiowas and Comanches agreed in the Treaty of Medicine Lodge Creek in 1867 to limit their hunting to the Texas
Panhandle and southwestern Oklahoma. In exchange, Americans promised to provide food, supplies, education, and medical care until the Kiowa and Comanche peoples adjusted to their new lives on a reservation. Inevitably, as with Kiowas and Comanches, indigenous groups quickly realized that the deal was one-sided and often not honored by the Americans. This realization, in turn, led to war.

In order to conduct military operations in the West, the United States Army relied on forts manned by cavalry detachments. Here, one sees parallels to the vulnerability of strategic points in the Pacific Ocean with the western lands. Camp Supply, Fort Belknap, Fort Larned, and Fort Apache were some of the principle forts used in the Southwest and Great Plains. Like Hawai‘i, Guam, Puerto Rico, and American Samoa, they were isolated from the primary areas of settlement. While oceans may have separated the islands from the Californian or Floridian coast, the Great Plains, Rocky Mountains, and the rivers in between served as natural obstacles to reinforcements and supply trains. When the presence of Native Americans determined to preserve their homelands was added, it could be argued that western continental outposts were just as isolated as the insular possessions.

Historians have previously made interesting points regarding this phase in Hawaiian history. After World War II, decolonization movements erupted throughout Africa, the Middle East, and Asia. Indigenous demands for independence, coupled with the United Nations Charter denouncing colonialism, made American control over its insular territories uncertain. By 1947, the Philippine Islands were nominally independent from the United States of America. As H.W. Brands noted in Bound to Empire: The United States and the Philippines, America insisted on maintaining economic controls
over the Philippines. The fall of China, advent of the Eisenhower Administration, and beginnings of the Korean War revived a lagging American interest in the islands, and with communism gaining momentum in Asia, the Philippines again became an outpost for American might in the Pacific Ocean.\footnote{17}

The Philippines, however, were independent of the United States. How did the Cold War and decolonization enter into the equation of spatiality and the territorial-federal relationship of the island regions still under American control? In the case of Puerto Rico, these global movements prompted two significant developments. First, the militarization of Puerto Rican society increased. The United States military enhanced its use of the island as a staging point in the Caribbean and Central America. As the Cold War continued and the U.S. increased interventions in Latin America, Puerto Rican strategic value increased. Efrén Rivera Ramos noted in\textit{American Colonialism in Puerto Rico: The Judicial and Social Legacy} that by 1999 Puerto Rico housed the Roosevelt Roads Naval Station and the U.S. Army Southern Command among other vital installations. Moreover, American military operations in the War on Drugs relied on Puerto Rico. Second, Puerto Rico was not insulated from the wave of independence movements occurring globally. The 1950s and 1960s witnessed increased demands for independence. By 1967, the Puerto Rican Congress held a plebiscite on continued political association with the United States or self-government as a result of public demand.\footnote{18}

\footnote{17}H.W. Brands,\textit{ Bound to Empire: The United States and the Philippines} (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), 227-250.  
The ideological conflict between capitalism and communism had a significant impact on post-World War II treatment of the insular possessions, but this struggle alone did not dictate a policy shift. The creation of the United Nations greatly affected the political ties between America and its colonies. Americans’ rhetoric and actions regarding imperialism have always been rather duplicitous. Since the founding of the republic, lawmakers espoused anti-colonial rhetoric. The Monroe Doctrine and Declaration of Independence exemplify national positions on colonialism. Combined, these historic documents rejected control of the New World and its peoples by the Old World. Supposedly, every human being had a natural right to live free of colonial control in a democratic government that provided its citizens with the liberty to progress as far as their abilities would allow. England and other European nations represented the antithesis of these liberties as they expanded across the globe, subjugating smaller nations in the process. In 1823, the United States of America began its long career as the professed defender of the rights of international sovereignty. By 1919, President Woodrow Wilson added to this image with his views on self-determination. Humans had the right to form nations and identities based on the national, historical developments of their cultures. No foreign power had the right to intervene in this process. Throughout the twentieth century, Americans pressed to transform this policy into international law.

While the U.S.A. projected this foreign policy throughout the world, it never applied it within its own borders. Looking back on four centuries of history, one sees the European-American settlers pushing Native Americans from their lands, using education and law to assail indigenous cultures, and sanctioning the civil and legal discrimination of ethnic minorities. In their insular colonies, the American Navy replaced civilian
government in Guam, Samoa, and the Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands. Hawai‘i, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines enjoyed some degree of autonomy, but the inhabitants of these islands could only exercise their democratic rights under the aegis of Congress.

The formation of the United Nations forced the United States to face its colonial past. Chapter XI, Article 73 of the U.N. Charter initiated a move towards ending colonialism and reducing its legitimacy among western populations. Following World War II, colonial powers were obligated to aid their territories in developing healthy governments, economies, educational systems, and infrastructures. Basically, member states refused to recognize the right of the colonizer above the colonized. Indigenous peoples possessed the natural right to live under a popularly supported government, and the colonial powers had to ensure the stability of countries emerging from their colonial territories before they withdrew. Granted, this was a policy on paper. Algeria, Angola, Vietnam, and Kenya often represented the violent process indigenous peoples had to endure to achieve their freedom.

To facilitate the process of decolonization and ensure that colonial powers fulfilled their obligations, U.N. member states authorized the creation of the trusteeship system. Like the mandate system under the League of Nations, the colonies and territorial possessions of the Axis Powers went to Allied nations in trust. England, France, America, and other colonial powers also had to place their territories on a list of non-self governing and trust territories. The United States received a U.N. trusteeship of the “Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands.” Since the Philippines gained their independence in 1946, they were not listed. Hawai‘i, Alaska, American Samoa, and Puerto Rico did make the list, however. This international classification of the insular
territories gave them a status equal to that of European colonies in Africa, Asia, and South America. This threatened an American cultivated anti-colonial image as independence movements ripped through Africa and Southeast Asia. In The Cold War and the Color Line: American Race Relations in the Global Arena, Tim Borstelmann revealed the ways domestic racism complicated Cold War foreign policy. With African Americans’ political freedoms denied by segregation codes, America could not claim a moral authority over the Soviet Union. Moreover, it made competing with the communist state rather difficult in Africa. The American system of freedom and democracy was hypocritical in the eyes of the colonized.\(^\text{19}\)

In addition to affecting America’s image as an anti-colonial power, the trusteeship system threatened congressional control over its colonies. The major powers debated over what cultures U.N. Charter, Chapter XI, Article 73, affected. Nations like the Soviet Union and the U.S.A. supported the “salt water” theory. This defined colonies as “being separated from the colonial power by a substantial body of water, preferably an ocean.”\(^\text{20}\) These two nations recognized the threat decolonization posed to their national boundaries. Within these large empires existed communities of indigenous peoples that maintained their separate, traditional cultures. Should the U.N. Charter apply to these groups, they would have pockets of sovereign nations within their borders. For the United States of America, imperium in imperio was pure blasphemy. Britain, Belgium, and other colonial powers also recognized this. Enforcing the salt water theory would


result in the loss of their empires while the U.S. and U.S.S.R. remained intact. Finally, Belgium proposed an extended view of decolonization, essentially expanding the right of self-determination to all indigenous peoples. Luckily for the United States and Russia, the Belgian thesis was never adopted as official U.N. policy.  

While the United Nations did not immediately affect Native Americans in their fight for self-determination, the relationship between the federal government and the insular territories, both incorporated and unincorporated, quickly came under the scrutiny of the United Nations Trusteeship Council. Starting in 1946, the Trusteeship Council required that the United States, Britain, France, and other colonial powers submit reports on political, economic, health, educational, and cultural developments in their colonies and trust territories. In addition to reports from the actual trustees, annual inspection tours comprised of U.N. representatives submitted information to the Security Council, Trusteeship Council, and General Assembly. 

The United States of America faithfully provided detailed reports on its noncontiguous territories. Included were economic, cultural, educational, and political goals and achievements for each island. Describing each territory, the federal government made sure to inform the reader that the U.S.A. took its duties seriously. Guam, Puerto Rico, Alaska, Hawai‘i, the Virgin Islands, and Samoa all had protections in place to safeguard the civil rights of the indigenous inhabitants. In terms of education, every territory had a system in place that not only provided sound, vocational instruction to the populace, but was also relayed to the masses through indigenous instructors. The education the children received may not have prepared them for university life in the
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contiguous states; however, it gave them vital information on producing the goods and services necessary to their homelands. Furthermore, the authors of the American reports constantly highlighted the national commitment to establish a proper infrastructure that would eventually lead to self-government. For example, Guam and American Samoa were listed as unorganized territories. In 1946, the U.S. Naval Military Government devised five objectives necessary for the reconstruction of Guam and Samoa after the Japanese occupation. These efforts centered on physical reconstruction, improved health care, fostering “self-governing communities,” an economic program, and an education program designed to help islanders meet these objectives. The stated purpose of this policy was the eventual granting of U.S. citizenship to all Guamanians and Samoans, thus including them within the political framework of the empire.22

While meeting the requirements established by the U.N. Charter for the improvement of trust and non-self-governing territories, the report on Guam and Samoa did not necessarily provide a time frame for complete independence from the United State of America. Reports concerning Hawai’i, however, always included references towards the possibility of statehood. The 1946 report to the Secretary-General provided information on various facets of human life, but it began with a statement contained in the Hawaiian territorial governor’s report to the Secretary of the Interior:

Hawaii, where the first blow of the Pacific War was struck, has devoted every resource at its command to the production of that war. The cost to Hawaii in terms of expended resources, natural and human, recurring and non-recurring is incalculable. Its civilian population, swollen during three and one-half years of war to a figure in excess of half a million, cheerfully shared with uncounted thousands of service men and women accommodations and facilities for human

subsistence which in other times would have been considered intolerably inadequate. 23

This report continued noting Hawaiians’ patience with military rule. Although they experienced restricted civil liberties under military rule, they regained those liberties afterwards, and, one gathers from the short quote, they bore these restrictions with a sense of nationalism.

In the following year, the U.S. provided a report even more upbeat than the first. It details the territorial government of Hawai‘i. Anyone reading the document could quickly discern the colonial nature of the government. Yet, the authors of the report countered this colonial image with a section suggesting the possibility of statehood. They noted that a congressional delegation to the islands declared in a report dated February 15, 1938, that the Hawaiians met every qualification necessary for statehood, but the federal government needed a clear statement from the islanders that they desired inclusion into the Union. This came in 1940 when 46,174 people voted in favor of statehood, 22,428 against. By 1951, these reports clearly marked Hawai‘i as on the verge of gaining statehood. The islanders had called a constitutional convention, like citizens in the mainland territories did throughout the nineteenth century, which drafted the framework for the first American state government in the islands. Finally, the United States issued its last U.N. report concerning Hawai‘i on December 12, 1959. 24

Examining the reports concerning Hawai‘i, Guam, Puerto Rico, Alaska, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands, one notices a constant trend in each document. The national government wanted to prove that they truly had the best interests of the islands at heart. After the end of World War II, the United States vocally supported an end to colonialism, even though it funded French attempts to rebuild their colonial empire in Southeast Asia. Also, it was not a secret that the U.S. Navy valued these islands as strategic bases within the Pacific Ocean. This aspect of their non-contiguous nature never lost its appeal to the military. Just as Hawai‘i and other islands projected American dominance during the early 1900s, it would do so again at mid-century as the nation confronted their communist rivalries in Asia and Russia. Still, these reports clearly set the Americans apart from their European allies. They did not have vast tracks of land colonized. The Guamanians and Samoans may have lived under U.S. Navy rule, but the Puerto Ricans, Alaskans, and Hawaiians had a larger degree of autonomy. The colonial administrators carefully monitored health, sanitation, and education. So why would the trusteeship pose a threat to Americans during the Cold War?

Every year, a delegation of U.N. representatives visited the trust and non-self-governing territories. After their review tour, the representatives submitted reports to the Secretary-General. These documents, in addition to the reports voluntarily submitted by the administering nations, listed the conditions in the territories and were made available to the Security Council, Trusteeship Council, and General Assembly. Any curious person could access them to reference the actions of the nation responsible for these
developing areas. Moreover, the reports were analyzed by the Security Council, the members of which submitted commentaries on the behavior of the administering authority. This is where the U.S.S.R. and other communist or nonaligned nations unsympathetic to the United States had an opportunity to link Americans with their imperial allies. This provided a vulnerable spot in the Americans’ anti-colonial armor.25

For example, the American 1949 report on conditions in the Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands contained its standard information on educational, economic, cultural, and political developments. Examining commentary on the contents reveals that the Soviet Union used the United States territorial system against the Americans. The Soviet representative argued that Guam’s primary administrative center lay outside of the territory. This made it very difficult for indigenous Guamanians to participate in governmental affairs. Also, the Commander-in-Chief of the Pacific Ocean was the primary person responsible for governing the island. After all, the U.S. Navy had jurisdiction over these islands. In essence, this was not an effective means of promoting self-government within the islands. The language used by the U.S.S.R. representative was not bellicose, yet it suggested that Americans were asserting a form of colonial control over the islands instead of preparing them for self-government. Other representatives on the council, such as one from Iraq, suggested that this was simply a government that was left over from World War II. Once Americans finished

25 Senator James E. Murray published a letter from Senator Frank Church in the Congressional Record. Senator Church’s letter made a poignant observation that American holdings in the Pacific Islands resembled the Soviet satellites of Eastern Europe and British, French, Portuguese, and Belgian colonies in Africa. See Frank Church to James E. Murray, 28 January 1958, in Congressional Record 104 (February 26, 1958-March 12, 1958), 3201.
reconstructing the islands infrastructure, they would no doubt initiate policies aimed at providing self-government.\textsuperscript{26}

The nuclear testing during the late 1940s and early 1950s provided rival nations an additional opportunity to question American motives towards their insular possessions. Since the United States of America was the administering authority responsible for preparing an island and its people for self-government, it appeared hypocritical that they would make the land inhospitable from nuclear fallout, especially when the Department of Defense conducted these experiments without the consent of the indigenous people.

By August of 1956, U.N. member states and local leaders had already voiced opposition to further nuclear tests in American controlled Pacific Islands. Prior to nuclear tests conducted in the spring of 1956, the Marshallese had petitioned the United States to stop any further testing in the area. They were well informed of the problems suffered by the people residing on Bikini and Eniwetok after naval experiments. The American administering authority, however, refused to respect the Marshallese request. According to a report submitted by visiting U.N. representatives, President Dwight D. Eisenhower had full knowledge that the islanders desired the cessation of nuclear testing. In his response, Eisenhower placed more value on national defense. Without a treaty between the U.S.S.R. and U.S.A. guaranteeing nuclear disarmament, the federal government argued it had no other choice than continuing the tests. Eisenhower did not view this line of thought as selfish. According to him, “the [United States] had a

responsibility not only to its people but to all the peoples of the free world to maintain at a maximum its capacity to deter aggression and preserve peace.”

Comparing the Hawaiian experience with that of the Marshallese, non-contiguity was disadvantageous to the residents of the islands. Both Hawai’i and the Marshall Islands were declared strategically necessary to the defense of the United States of America during the Cold War. The U.S. Navy could use them for training ground, operations, and other purposes. Also, both territories experienced a period of naval dominance over their civilian affairs. The Hawaiians experienced this during World War II. Marshall Islanders lived under military rule from World War II until the late 1970s. However, Hawai’i’s population, its popularity as a haven for tourists and its status as an incorporated territory spared it the pains of nuclear testing. Granted, the testing of conventional weapons in the islands proved problematic for all Hawaiians. The U.S. Navy used Kaho’olawe during their bombardment exercises. For Kānakas, Kaho’olawe held deep spiritual and historical importance. When Native Hawaiian activism reemerged after statehood, ending naval training exercises was a top priority among the people. In viewing the environmental inequalities suffered by these cultures, one sees a shared experience. While the Department of Defense never subjected Kānakas to radiation or nuclear testing, it threatened their cultural inheritance with conventional weaponry. One can attribute this to the noncontiguous nature of the islands. Separated from the continent by thousands of miles, Americans were less likely to raise a fuss over “necessary” weapons testing than they were if it occurred in the borders of their own

states. Moreover, the islands and their people resided beyond their borders, far from public awareness.

The United States of America also discovered the disadvantages of controlling non-contiguous territories following World War II. As decolonization movements swept throughout Africa and Southeast Asia, and the nonalignment movement roused people in undeveloped nations against economic and military domination by foreign powers, reports to the United Nations Trusteeship Council threatened Americans’ anti-colonial image. Americans had tried to present itself as a bastion of democracy, but descriptions of naval rule in Guam, Samoa, and the Trust Territories of the Pacific Ocean prevented them from successfully doing so. The Security Council gave the Russians a perfect podium from which to highlight the colonial nature of American insular possessions as an example of their colonial nature. Moreover, the inclusion of their possessions on the list of non-self-governing territories would eventually force Americans to one day redefine their status. Either they would need to provide full independence, or they would have to find an alternate solution.

In the end, Americans followed both paths. For Hawai‘i, they granted statehood. There existed a significant white settler population in the archipelago. Other inhabitants descended from Pacific Rim countries had proven their loyalty during World War II and thereby had sacrificed much for the right to be American citizens. Also, the islands had a history of constitutional government. They formed their earlier political and legal systems from the English and the Americans. Economically, they had much to offer the nation. In the end, the historical relationship between Hawai‘i and the United States made Hawai‘i too valuable to lose.
The other insular possessions, on the other hand, were not so lucky. Non-contiguity, in conjunction with racial and economic matters, prevented their full inclusion into the American political system. While their inhabitants received citizenship, their territorial status prevented them from sending a representative to sit in the Senate. Some of the territories gained independence by the 1970s, but others, like Puerto Rico, remained attached to the United States under the label of “Commonwealth.”

Reviewing the role of contiguity in Hawai‘i and the insular possession, one sees the way in which territorial non-contiguity affected the federal-territorial relationship. First, the distance separating the continental states and insular possessions gave them a sense of “otherness” to Americans. They were the lands outside of the national boundaries bordered by the Pacific and Atlantic Oceans to the west and east, as well as Canada and Mexico to the north and south. If anything, some Americans disdained national policy that marked these places as American property. This aspect of non-contiguity remained with Hawaiians throughout the statehood process, acting as one of the primary obstacles the islanders faced. Second, their global positions made these possessions valuable. The Philippines, Guam, Samoa, and Hawai‘i provided the United States Navy with bases from which they could project American power into Asia, Australia, and the far eastern edges of Russia. American corporations also found these commerce lanes useful when opening new markets in the Pacific Rim.

Finally, the United Nations Charter, Trusteeship Council policies, and independence movements forced American policymakers to reconsider the association of the federal government with these territories. In 1947, Senator Hugh Alfred Butler, Chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, received a preliminary report
on the status of American Pacific possessions. In the opening pages of the report, the
author described the transfer of sovereignty from the Navy Department to civil authorities
under Executive Order No. 10077. According to this document, the Secretaries of Army,
State, Navy, and Interior recommended this move to President Truman. The increasing
international interest in the administration of U.N. trust territories and non-self-governing
territories was paramount in this decision.28 With the era of European colonialism and
American expansion gone, the U.S. was left with the option of statehood or self-
government.

28 Mills Astin, Chief Clerk of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to Hugh Alfred Butler, U.S.
Senator, 24 January 1950, Hugh Alfred Butler Papers, MS-235, Box 217, “Interior and Insular Affairs,
1950-1951,” Nebraska State Historical Society. The report is attached to this letter in Butler’s files.
CHAPTER 5

PACIFIC ISLANDERS, NATIVE AMERICANS, AND AMERICAN COLONIALISM

Three areas are crucial in comparing the history of Native Hawaiians with indigenous peoples in the American West and insular territories. Most important is the loss of indigenous sovereignty. From here, all other concerns originate. The loss of Native sovereignty is unique to each area in what becomes the United States. Richard Drinnon argued in *Facing West: The Metaphysics of Indian-Hating and Empire-Building* that American policy towards indigenous peoples originated with the first English settlements and evolved with the westward march of American civilization. ¹ But subsequent incorporations of lands deflect this British-centric view. Other European colonial powers—Spain, France, the Netherlands, Sweden, and Russia—opted in various ways to restrain and attack Native sovereignty, and they influenced American actions. The construction of the American empire also relied on the creation of an “Indian Policy,” ultimately geared toward the destruction of indigenous ways of life. While the federal policies towards First Peoples of North America, the Hawaiian Islands, and the insular territories shared a common origin, indigenous peoples experienced the process of conquest differently. On the continent, Native Americans lost sovereignty through war and dishonored treaties. The white settler society in Hawai’i gradually brought the islands and Native Hawaiians under the dominion of the American empire through

¹ Richard Drinnon, *Facing West: The Metaphysics of Indian-Hating and Empire-Building* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1990), xi-xix, xxi-xxx. Although the preface and introduction lay out the structure and basic argument of the work, the entire point that American racism in the construction of the American Empire is tied to the racial conflicts with Native Americans is quite convincing. Needless to say, this study is crucial for students examining American imperialism, as well as the origins of American genocide in the West.
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political maneuvering, while South Pacific Islanders came under American rule through diplomatic negotiations among various colonial powers.

After conquest the subjected populations experienced different manifestations of a common policy towards indigenous cultures. Until the 1860s to 1880s, politicians followed the Jeffersonian policy of keeping Native Americans isolated from the capitalist system. With the advent of President Ulysses S. Grant’s Peace Policy, reformers and humanitarians reformulated American Indian policy to incorporate indigenous peoples into the economy once they assimilated the American ethos towards private property and individual acquisitiveness. To achieve these ends, American agents took Native children to live in boarding schools so that they would forget their parents’ culture. Taken east to Carlisle Indian School, Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute, or other assimilation facilities, children were prohibited from contacting their relatives, parents, and friends on the reservation in hopes that they would forever lose any knowledge of their childhood cultures. Back on the reservations, Native Americans suffered because of a corrupt, inefficient, and deadly Indian policy. The adult population lacked any serious economic opportunities. To compensate for the lack of purchasing power among adults and inadequate food sources available on the reservations, federal agents doled out annuities and rations, sometimes withholding them to enforce the will of the federal government. The Dawes Act ended the reservation policy by forcing residents onto individual plots in hopes of transforming them into farmers and workers.

Losing sovereignty over their homelands seriously affected indigenous economies well into the twentieth century. American Indian policy caused incalculable hardship and suffering among urban and reservation communities. After World War II, the federal
government attempted to shirk its responsibilities towards the First Peoples during the Termination Program, an inconsistent policy that left indigenous peoples destitute by the mid-1960s. With the expansion of the American economy in the post-World War II era came a desire to open natural resources on indigenous lands to corporate development. This goal was achieved in one of two ways. First, agreements between the private business and tribal governments provided industry with valuable resources while providing limited employment on destitute reservations. Second, terminated tribal governments usually had to sell their landholdings. As in the case of the Menominees and Klamaths, larger firms benitted from the opportunity to purchase indigenous lands rich with natural resources at bargain prices. Although First Peoples experienced short-term benefits from these transactions, they oftentimes suffered in the long-term.

On the surface, American policy towards the Pacific Islanders appeared different from Native American policy, and yet all Native peoples experienced land loss. After conquest, the inhabitants of Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands retained most of their traditional homelands, and the Naval Department established vocational schools and prevented the encroachment of private enterprise into the islands. In comparison with the Native Americans, it would appear that South Pacific Islanders fared better. However, naval base construction and nuclear experiments on South Pacific atolls rendered entire island chains uninhabitable. Clearly, the drive to displace indigenous populations from economically viable or strategic lands and incorporating them into the global economy remained a mainstay in overseas colonial policy. One could say that the US government recreated a reservation system in the
South Pacific Ocean, since many islands themselves were transformed into floating reservations isolated from the public eye.

In contrast to Native Americans, the Kānaka experienced the policy of termination over forty years prior to its implementation in the mainland. Beginning with the Great Mahele of 1848, the monarchy and their American “advisors” slowly transformed the Native Hawaiian economy into a capitalist system based on the American model. Scholars often perceive the Great Mahele of 1848 largely as a failure. Kamehameha III wanted to care for the economic needs of his subjects, but large portions of royal land went to settlers and foreign businesses. They, in turn, used this land to amass political and financial power at the expense of the Kānaka. Like Native Americans, Kānaka were pushed into an alien economic system in which they lacked the financial resources to compete. The Hawaiian Homes Commission made another attempt at reestablishing a Native Hawaiian agricultural economy in 1920 by placing Native Hawaiians back on the land; however, the valuable land once again fell into the hands of sugar plantations, pineapple companies, wealthy landowners, or hotel owners. Needless to say, when annexation occurred in 1898, lawmakers saw no need to institute a reservation system or Hawaiian boarding schools or official recognition since Native Hawaiians were already acquainted with American capitalism. Instead, Kānaka were immediately thrust into the economy. Native Hawaiian communities became marginalized in the expanding tourist industry and agribusiness.

Control over their ancestral homes became crucial to the survival of Native Americans, Kānaka, and South Pacific Islanders in the twentieth century. The Pacific territories of Guam, the Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands (TTPI), and American
Samoa escaped the great land grab of American settlers. United States policy regarding these islands preserved the indigenous rights to the land. Instead of opening the islands to extensive economic competition, the Naval Department prohibited white settlement in the islands during the early 1900s. This did not come without a price. In addition to the continued military presence in the region and the absence of democratic institutions, the Administering Authority used the land to benefit American interests. For example, the victory of communist forces in China changed American policy in Asia. Without Chiang Kai-shek acting as a bulwark against the U.S.S.R., the Truman Administration had to turn to Japan as its primary ally in the region. In 1949 U.S. military authorities in Tokyo authorized the mining of phosphates in the islands, transforming the South Pacific into a storehouse of natural resources for Japanese industry. That year alone the Supreme Commander of the Allied Forces in Japan, Douglas MacArthur, authorized the shipment of 148,000 tons of phosphate to Japan to aid in the rebuilding of its industrial base. Although the shipment was worth at least $1,480,000, the islanders only received twenty-five cents per ton ($37,000) in royalties.²

Here, one sees the colonial nature of America in the Pacific Ocean. World War II may have destroyed the military power of the Japanese Empire, but it retained its economic and strategic importance in Asia as one of the few nations with viable industries. Suddenly, American policymakers found themselves faced with the dilemma of securing natural resources for the rejuvenated Japanese economy, a problem that originally had lead the Japanese Empire to its aggressive policy of military expansion in the first place. The TTPI once again became a source of exploitation for the Japanese

economy, only this time regional resources were exploited under the direction of its liberator.³

In Hawai‘i, tourism became the next greatest business venture following World War II. With more Americans aware of the islands’ scenic attractions and the growth of commercial aviation, tourists came in increasing numbers. Here a comparison of Native American casinos and Hawaiian tourism provides interesting results. While Native Americans found new economic opportunities in catering to Americans’ desire for games of chance starting in the late 1970s, Native Hawaiians did not benefit from the growing tourism industry. Instead of becoming investors in the new industry or shaping its development, the Kānaka Maoli became another the commodity for the tourist industry.

As Haunani-Kay Trask, a leading Native Hawaiian activist and scholar, writes:

In Hawai‘i, the destruction of our land and the prostitution of our culture is planned and executed by multinational corporations (both foreign-based and Hawai‘i-based), by huge landowners (such as the missionary-descended Castle & Cook of Dole Pineapple fame), and by collaborationist state and county governments. The ideological gloss that claims tourism to be our economic savior and the “natural” result of Hawaiian culture is manufactured by ad agencies (such as the state-supported Hawai‘i Visitors Bureau) and tour companies (many of which are owned by the airlines) and spewed out to the public through complicitous cultural engines such as film, television and radio, and the daily newspaper.⁴

Within the tourist industry, promoters twisted Native Hawaiian culture into an alluring package intended to attract tourists. Marketing Kānaka traditions has had a long lasting impact as Native Hawaiian culture in addition to Hawaiian landscapes remain at the core of the tourist industry. Just as Native Americans fight to regain their cultural property

³ See Thomas J. McCormack, America’s Half-Century: United States Foreign Policy in the Cold War and After, 2nd ed. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995), 57, for more information on the role of Japan in post-World War II Asia.
⁴ Haunani-Kay Trask, From a Native Daughter: Colonialism and Sovereignty in Hawai‘i, rev. ed. (Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 1999), 137.
and identities, the Kanaka Maoli fight for control over their cultural identity from an
industry that has become the mainstay of a predominately non-indigenous Hawaiian
economy.

Finally, Native Hawaiians and Pacific Islanders alike suffered environmental
inequalities generated by post-World War II military policy. The story starts in the
southwestern United States. From Native American lands, the military mined the
uranium necessary for atomic bombs. First Peoples suffered from the mining detritus and
nuclear fallout as a result of nuclear production and testing. In Hawai‘i, the US Navy and
Army confiscated Kānaka lands for bases. Kahoʻolawe, a place of great cultural
importance for Native Hawaiians, became a stationary target for vessels of war. Lastly, it
was a staging point for military drills and operations in the Pacific Ocean. From Hawaiʻi,
the Navy shipped atomic bombs and scientists vital to the nuclear tests conducted in the
southern Pacific Islands.

Born of a formidable imperial parent, Great Britain, America has fostered
imperial ambitions since its formation. The framers of the U.S. Constitution, early
presidents and statesmen, economists and preachers, and the average citizens of the
eighteenth and nineteenth centuries often embraced the notion of a republican empire. As
supporters of this vision, they accepted the fact that an empire requires the “forcible
subjugation of formerly independent peoples by a wholly external power.”

Throughout
North America and the Hawaiian Islands, indigenous peoples fought to preserve their
sovereignty and cultures while halting the United States’ slow progression to the Pacific
Ocean. By 1890, the last formal resistance of North American First Peoples fell in a

---

5 William Appleman Williams, *Empire as a Way of Life*, introduction by Andrew Bacevich (New York: Ig
cloud of smoke at Wounded Knee Creek, and although Native Americans would rise again to assert their right to self-government at Alcatraz Island in 1965 and the takeover of Wounded Knee village in 1973, many historians consider the Massacre at Wounded Knee to be the symbolic end of indigenous geo-political sovereignty in the United States. In Hawai‘i, the overthrow of Queen Lili‘uokalani in 1893 by the so-called Committee of Safety marked the end of Kānaka sovereignty in the Hawaiian Islands.

Throughout the twentieth century, sovereignty, land, and culture played major roles in the histories of Kānaka, Native Americans, and South Pacific Islanders. By the post-World War II era, their struggles against an aggressive, imperialist power of the nineteenth century, changed into a movement to reclaim them from one of the two major superpowers locked in the middle of a Cold War. While this chapter will address some of the attempts by Native Hawaiians, North American indigenous peoples, and South Pacific Islanders to retain their traditions and values, it will mainly focus on an examination of the struggles by indigenous peoples in the United States for their sovereignty and land, as well as the environmental consequences of American imperialism in the Twentieth Century.

For Native Americans, sovereignty was lost to the American nation in sheets of paper and clouds of lead. American policy toward First Peoples was never uniform. In fact, the only thing consistent about federal Indian policy is its inconsistency. American Indian policy began as negotiations between equals. Emerging from the Revolutionary War, the nation suffered from debt, instability, and division. Congress under the Articles of Confederation was a weak institution. Fearing the creation of a strong, centralized

---

6 We recognize the continuing struggles of indigenous peoples to regain their sovereignty. However, Wounded Knee is seen as the final blow dealt by the federal government to subjugate the First Peoples of the nation.
government, the states intentionally limited powers of the federal government. At the same time, they delegated to Congress the responsibility for treating with Native Americans and maintaining peace between indigenous and settler communities. After demarcating the borders between American and Native settlements, the federal government sometimes tried to preserve the peace by preventing white settlement on indigenous lands. This was a difficult task considering settlers’ rampant desire in the future states for indigenous lands. Recognizing their vulnerability during and following the war, Congress and some individual states entered into treaty negotiations in an attempt to solidify the boundaries between American regions of settlement and Native lands. This is not to suggest that Americans were always vindictive in the negotiations. Having supported the revolution, Tuscaroras and Oneidas received decent terms following the American Revolution. The remaining tribes of the Iroquois Confederation, however, did not.7

Congressional restraint towards First Peoples was fleeting. The United States, after all, had imperial ambitions. Expansion and settlement was the *modus vivendi* of Americans. As Colin G. Calloway notes in *One Vast Winter Count*, the Northwest Ordinance presaged things to come in national Indian policy. Although the blueprint for the Ohio River Valley promised to respect Native American rights to their lands, the development of new settler communities was the thrust of the Northwest Ordinance.8 From 1790 to 1834, Congress passed a series of bills that served as the foundation for the legislative assault on Native sovereignty in all American territories. The next major

8 Calloway, *One Vast Winter Count*, 373.
evolution occurred in the 1850s when congressmen and bureaucrats created a reservation system to facilitate national expansion into the American West.

Beginning with the first trade and intercourse law in 1790, Congress tried to limit the occasions for conflict between whites and Natives by monitoring interaction between the two groups and by requiring all persons engaged in commerce with indigenous peoples to apply for a license. By doing so, Congress ensured that only authorized, respectable traders could come in contact with indigenous communities. American statesmen hoped that this would end, or at least curb, the abuse of First Peoples by unscrupulous traders and in the process reduce the possibility of conflict. The act also prohibited private American citizens from purchasing land from Native Americans. By controlling all land transactions, Congress could pace expansion in such a way that Native Americans would not feel threatened by white advancement into the interior and prevent fraudulent land deals from reigniting warfare along the borders.9

From 1790 to 1834, congressmen periodically renewed, updated, and amended these trade laws as frontier conditions dictated. In 1793, the new Trade and Intercourse Act further delineated the boundaries between white-indigenous settlements. An 1802 statute attempted to stop traders from selling whiskey to Native Americans. This congressional action received popular support given the deleterious effects liquor had on Native communities, economies, and cultures. Finally, Congress passed an 1834 version during an overhaul of the entire Indian Department in an attempt to formalize and rationalize Indian policy. In addition to transferring Indian affairs to the new Department of the Interior, congressional action formed the post of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to oversee and execute congressional policy. The Trade and Intercourse Act of

---

9 Prucha, The Great Father, 90.
1834 added to this process by: 1) recognizing formally the boundaries of lands under Native American sovereignty as defined by the multitude of treaties between indigenous nations and the federal government, 2) continuing the licensing system and placing it under the supervision of federal field agents, and 3) expanding U.S. national interests in Native American affairs by acting as a mediator in inter-Native American conflicts.

There was also an attempt to create an “Indian state,” but opposition in Congress quickly defeated this idea.10

The trade and intercourse laws were instrumental in eroding Native American sovereignty. According to Francis Paul Prucha, the “laws were not primarily ‘Indian’ laws, for they touched the Indians only indirectly. The legislation, rather, was directed against lawless whites and sought to restrain them from violating the sacred treaties.”11 This analysis is correct in that the letter of the law was aimed at American citizens. Other historians offer alternative analyses that have linked the trade and intercourse acts to the overall process of destroying Native American sovereignty. As part of a larger process aimed at assimilating indigenous culture with Anglo-American education, trade, and culture, the trade and intercourse acts directly affected Native rights by limiting their trade with Americans and other nations.12

Indian Removal was the next major onslaught on Native American sovereignty. The notoriety of the Indian Removal Act of 1830 is legendary and requires little additional analysis. Needless to say, it was passed under the aegis of Andrew Jackson, a president with no compunction against forcibly taking lands from indigenous nations.

---

10 Prucha, The Great Father, 293-309.
11 Prucha, The Great Father, 92.
Prior to this presidency, the federal government had experience in seizing indigenous land either through force or the threat of force. In the years following the American Revolutionary War, white settlers quickly seized Native American territory. Some lands were conquered by militiamen; others were left vacant when Native American refugees fled the fighting. After the smoke of war cleared, settlers, speculators, and squatters claimed these areas as vacant land open for settlement.\textsuperscript{13}

Why was Indian Removal important in terms of federal policy towards Native peoples? Indian Removal broke from the previous policy of obtaining lands as need dictated. The Indian Removal Act initiated a national program in which federal agents actively sought the total removal of indigenous nations from within state borders or in close proximity to future settlement. Whereas post-Revolutionary War treaties were more akin to national purchases of smaller segments of land to accommodate settlement, Indian Removal was the process of emptying national lands of indigenous peoples, often under the threat of force. In short, Indian Removal introduced a new vein of genocide into American Indian policy.

Finally, the reservation system was unquestionably directed at undermining Native American sovereignty. The origins of this system did not begin on a specific date. The reservation system, like other elements of American Indian policy, developed over time. Some of the earliest proposals to relocate indigenous populations emerged during the presidencies of George Washington and Thomas Jefferson. Placed on their new lands, the federal government would assist in the education and “civilization” of

\textsuperscript{13} See Calloway, \textit{One Vast Winter Count}, 371-372, for information regarding the seizure of indigenous lands during and immediately after the Revolutionary War. This process was not unlike that seen during the Arab-Israeli War of 1848 and the Six Day War of 1967 in which Palestinians fled their homes during the fighting, only to find them occupied after the conflict ended.
relocated tribes. Although this was never fully developed during the Early Republic, its basic tenets appeared in legislation such as the trade and intercourse acts.\(^{14}\)

The reservation system was fully developed by the decades following Indian Removal. Relocating Native nations to the Trans-Mississippi West sufficed until settlers developed an interest in lands located in Texas, Oregon, Nebraska, Utah, and California. As American expansion took the nation into lands supporting transplanted indigenous peoples, leaders in the Office in Indian Affairs had to reevaluate their approach to assimilation. Under commissioners Luke Lea and George W. Manypenny, with the assistance of Charles E. Mix, policy shifted from forcefully removing indigenous nations to lands outside the limits of white settlement to placing them on “small parcels of land ‘reserved’ out of the original holding of the tribes or bands” where American agents would assist in the transformation of indigenous culture to a capitalistic, agrarian society modeled after the United States.\(^{15}\)

Although the trade and intercourse acts and reservation system implemented American policy towards Native Americans, they were not enough to conquer indigenous homelands. Americans relied on violence, or the threat of violence, to force First Peoples to submit to the law. As Robert M. Utley once wrote, Native Americans “posed a practical problem that had to be dealt with. About [the Native American’s] ultimate fate none disagreed: progress demanded his destruction along with the wilderness. About the means of his destruction, however, there was disagreement. He could either be destroyed

\(^{14}\) Prucha, *The Great Father*, 90-93.  
\(^{15}\) Prucha, *The Great Father*, 317. For information regarding the events of this transformation, see pages 323-328.
outright by killing or, consistent with the tenets of progress, elevated from savagery to
civilization.”16

From the 1850s to the 1890s, the federal government used a combination of
treaties and wars to secure access to the West. Treaties promised Native Americans
annuities, land, education, and security to relinquish claims to prime agricultural,
pastoral, and mineral resources. War ensured that the Native nations would accept a
treaty.

Of course, treaties lasted only so long as Americans remained uninterested in
Native American lands. For example, the Treaty of Ft. Laramie (1868) ended hostilities
between Lakotas led by Red Cloud and the U.S. Army over the Bozeman Trail. News of
Lt. Col. George A. Custer’s discovery of gold in the Black Hills of South Dakota
shattered the tenuous peace six years later as Americans rushed to the spiritual center of
Northern Plains indigenous nations. There, they established illegal mining operations
and towns. Instead of forcefully closing these squatter settlements, the American
government authorized the use of force to wrest these lands from the Sioux. In other
cases, Native Americans grew disillusioned with the reservation system. In 1874,
Kiowas and Comanches residing on the Ft. Sill Reservation in Indian Territory grew
weary of reservation life after 5 years. That year, some of their warriors left Ft. Sill and
joined the Quahadi Comanches in the last act of armed resistance by the Comanches and
Kiowas on the Southern Plains.

The regulation of trade between indigenous and white populations, removal to
inferior lands outside of white settlement, and confinement to reservations to undergo

16 Robert M. Utley, The Indian Frontier of the American West, 1846-1890 (Albuquerque: University of
New Mexico Press, 1984), 35.
forced assimilation assumed primary concern for Native Americans until national legislators passed the General Allotment Act of 1887.\textsuperscript{17} Under this law, Congress authorized the President to divide up the reservation lands among the inhabitants. Married occupants received one hundred sixty acres of land, and unmarried persons over eighteen and orphans received eighty acres. Lands remaining after the division were opened to non-Indian settlement. The statute also granted American citizenship to Native Americans who received lands under this act.\textsuperscript{18} Politicians and humanitarians hoped that by dividing the reservations and granting Native Americans citizenship the process of assimilation would accelerate by disrupting the communal nature of tribal society.

Sentiment among politicians and humanitarians moved away from the existing allotment approach to U.S.-Native American relations by the late 1800s. Perceiving the reservation system as a flawed tool for assimilating Native peoples, they believed the General Allotment Act would force Native Americans into the capitalist marketplace, a good development. Although it succeeded in fracturing tribal lands, opening territory to white settlement, and severely disrupting indigenous society, the legislation did not produce the desired reform results. By the Great Depression, allotment was judged a failure, and new reformers led by John Collier reconstructed Native nations with the Indian Reorganization Act. Passed in 1934, this law allowed indigenous peoples to reconstruct tribal governments with greater degrees of self-government. Instead of assaulting Native cultures, John Collier wanted to preserve indigenous lifestyles and reinstitute dialogue between Congress and tribal governments. Although Collier did not

\textsuperscript{17} Also referred to as the Dawes Severalty Act.
\textsuperscript{18} An act to provide for the allotment of lands in severalty to Indians on the various reservations, and to extend the protection of the laws of the United States and the Territories over the Indians, and for other purposes, chap. 119, \textit{U.S. Statutes at Large} (1887) 388-391.
achieve everything that he wanted, the Howard-Wheeler Act included provisions allowing for the reconstruction of tribal governments, ending allotment, and granting funds under the Secretary of the Interior for tribal economic development.

The final assault on Native American sovereignty and culture, however, was a product of the post-World War II era. From 1947 to 1949, former President Herbert Hoover chaired the U.S. Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, with Secretary of State Dean Acheson as vice chairman. Dubbed the “Hoover Commission,” Hoover and his associates examined ways to reduce operating costs in the executive branch. After two years of extensive investigation, the committee produced The Hoover Commission Report on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government. Within this publication, committee members made recommendations aimed at rationalizing the executive bureaucracy and reducing expenditures in the process.

The report included recommendations on streamlining each executive department, including the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The Commission estimated that the executive department spent roughly $40,000,000 on Native Americans every year. Taken out of a federal budget of $40,000,000,000, appropriations for indigenous programs accounted for 1/1000 of total annual federal expenditures. This averaged out to almost $100 per Native American. Moreover, the Commission concluded that programs aimed at alleviating

---

19 Note that this was a unilateral effort undertaken by John Collier and the Bureau of Indian Affairs. As John Wunder notes in “Retained by The People,” this unilateral decision making process was very much a continuation of past approaches to Indian policy.

problems in indigenous communities were ineffective. Poverty, malnutrition, illness, and unemployment still plagued Native populations. Committee members attributed this to the cessation of allotment. Transforming Native Americans into independent citizens who did not rely on federal largesse presented the best option to rehabilitate tribal members. The commission viewed the Indian Reorganization Act (IRA) as only propping up antiquated tribal governments that lacked the ability to care for their people.\(^{21}\) Since the Hoover Commission was charged with finding financially burdensome or nonviable government programs and recommending action to either streamline, reform, or end them, an inefficient and unsuccessful Bureau of Indian Affairs became the perfect target.

To resolve the growing social problems and rationalize the administration of Native American affairs, the Commission made a number of recommendations. The first outlined the basic approach the federal government took in fulfilling its obligations to Native inhabitants of the United States. “Our task force on Indian Affairs, supported by a considerable body of thought both inside and outside the Government, advocates progressive measures to integrate the Indians into the rest of the population as the best solution of ‘the Indian Problem.’ In the opinion of the Commission this policy should be the keystone of the organization and of the activities of the Federal Government in the field of Indian Affairs.”\(^{22}\) The IRA of 1934 reversed the assault on tribal governments. Now, the Hoover Commission advocated a return to pre-IRA policies. After making this recommendation, the Hoover Commission outlined a plan of action. In devising future


\(^{22}\)The Hoover Commission Report, 465.
Native American policies, the federal government needed to insure that every American Indian receive adequate educational and medical services, as well as a standard of living equal to that enjoyed by the rest of the nation. Instead of tribal governments directing affairs over tribal lands and their occupants, Native American resources and property should be transferred to “Indian-owned corporations.” Collier’s plan for Indian reorganization already included provisions for such economic entities, so what made this idea unique? The cornerstone of the Hoover Commission Report was the transfer of all Native Americans to state jurisdiction after the consolidation of tribal assets into corporations. In other words, Hoover’s team recommended the end of federal stewardship over Indian affairs and the incorporation of reservation inhabitants to state control, thus blending America’s First Peoples into the mass of society.

Within the pages of the Hoover Commission Report, the committee members wrote the cold, hard ideology that served as the core of the Termination Program. It meshed with the Cold War logic of conformity, efficiency, and Americanism permeating the Eisenhower and Truman administrations. In an era where the treatment of First Peoples served as an embarrassing blemish in a history that Americans used to justify their worldwide claims to moral superiority, the existence of impoverished, malnourished, racial, and national minorities within the borders of the United States worked against the nation in foreign affairs. Coming out of the Second World War, Americans, and some Native Americans, believed that all citizens should enjoy in the post-wartime prosperity. In the eyes of men like Dillon S. Myer, Commissioner of the Bureau of Indian Affairs under President Dwight D. Eisenhower, and Senator Arthur V.

---

23 The Hoover Commission Report, 467.
24 The Hoover Commission Report, 466-467.
Watkins of Utah (Republican), the Indian Reorganization Act and its tribal governments prevented indigenous communities from partaking in the national prosperity of the 1950s which, in turn, affected American society as a whole.²⁵

Although the House and Senate passed a number of bills implementing the Termination Program, two pieces of legislation were crucial. First, House Concurrent Resolution 108, passed in July of 1953, terminated the federal-tribal relationship for “the Flathead Tribe of Montana, the Klamaths of Oregon, the Menominees of Wisconsin, the Potawatomis of Kansas . . . and the Chippewas located on the Turtle Mountain Reservation in North Dakota.”²⁶ This resolution marked the beginning of the renewed assault on indigenous governments, economies, and homelands. Throughout the 1950s, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, congressmen, and other federal agents persuaded or coerced indigenous nations into relinquishing their right to self-government, consolidating tribal property into corporations, and selling valuable natural resources. As in the case of the Menominee and Klamath Nations, the revenue received from land sales cost the people long-term economic security. House Concurrent Resolution 108 worked in concert with Public Law 280, signed by President Eisenhower on August 15, 1953, which placed Native Americans living in California, Nebraska, Minnesota, Oregon, and Wisconsin under state jurisdiction of the law. By severing their legal relationship with the federal government, indigenous people became citizens of their respective states. To advance this process further, the federal government also initiated the Relocation policy to move young Native Americans from the reservation to urban centers, thus scattering their communities and social networks. In places like Chicago, Native Americans were left to

²⁶ Fixico, Termination and Relocation, 97.
scratch a living in menial jobs in an effort to realize the American dream, an illusion unattainable to minorities in pre-Civil Rights America.\footnote{Fixico, \textit{Termination and Relocation}, 97-98, 111-113, 134-157. While Donald Fixico’s work serves as the authoritative source on the Termination Era, Vine Deloria, Jr., and Clifford Lytle briefly delve into this subject in \textit{The Nations Within}, 192-196. Prucha’s \textit{The Great Father} also has material on this subject. Finally, John Wunder provides interesting material on Termination. His analysis links the program to past legislation like the trade and intercourse acts and also places it in the context of events leading to the Indian Bill of Rights. See Wunder, “\textit{Retained by The People}”, 98-111.}

Returning to the Hoover Commission Report, the text included a section on “The Indian Population,” which defined the “term ‘Indian’ as . . . all persons of Indian descent who are members of any recognized Indian tribe now under Federal jurisdiction, and all persons who are descendants of such members who were on June 1, 1934, residing within the present boundaries of any Indian reservation, and shall further include all other persons of one-half or more Indian blood.”\footnote{The Hoover Commission Report, 464.} This phrasing reveals the perceptions of Americans toward indigenous persons under their control. The nation had a responsibility toward Native Americans living within the continental U.S. and Alaska. Indigeneity was characterized by blood and location as opposed to culture, tribal recognition, or history. More important for this study, American policies toward indigenous peoples excluded Native peoples outside of the continental United States.

The origin of the Kānaka is one reason for this. Historical texts and government documents often list Polynesians as a group distinct from Native Americans. If one accepts the Bering Strait Theory, the First Peoples of the Americas migrated across the great northern glaciers from Asia. Once the “low bridge” formed, flora, fauna, and humans all rushed over and south, hoping to seize prime real estate—at least, this is the
rather witty description offered by Vine Deloria, Jr.\textsuperscript{29} Satirical descriptions aside, proponents of this theory point to Siberia and the Eurasian landmass as the origin of Native Americans. Some indigenous people claim otherwise. According to their spiritual beliefs, they emerged in North America, and thus they are a people distinct from Africans, Europeans, and Asians. Historical records, on the other hand, trace a clear migration route across the southern Pacific Ocean for the Kānaka. They share an ancestry with other Polynesians (Tahitians, Samoans, etc.). Sometime around 750 A.D., they crossed the vast expanse of the Pacific Ocean and discovered the Hawaiian Islands after having migrated through various island chains in Oceania. Their legends speak of another people already living in the atoll, the Menehune, which suggests that there were multiple migrations to the islands. According to Ralph S. Kuykendall, Native Hawaiians most likely absorbed these people into their communities.\textsuperscript{30}

By examining their legends, art, and religion, scholars will notice that Native Hawaiians absorbed everything about the islands into their social consciousness. The ‘aina (land) became a part of their very essence. Regardless of their ancestral migrations, they are an indigenous people. As of 1898, they became a colonized, indigenous people to whom the United States government owed certain obligations as outlined in the United Nations Charter.

As noted, the Hoover Commission had numerous recommendations for Native Americans, yet it did not specifically mention Native Hawaiians. This is a common

\begin{footnotes}
\end{footnotes}
pattern in American history. Unless the territorial delegate or Hawaiian residents raised the issue, the federal government largely neglected this indigenous group. Instead of focusing their attention on making the executive branch more responsive to Native Hawaiian needs, the Commission addressed the issue of colonial administration for the territory as a whole. In other words, the colonizer considered the colonized secondary to the needs of maintaining an imperial infrastructure. The committee members noted that administrative responsibilities were spread throughout the various branches of government. Within the Executive Branch alone, offices of the administration of Organized Territories, Trust Territories, the Philippine War Damage Commission, Non-self-governing Territories, Philippine Alien Property Administration, and a legion of other administrations and departments fell under the jurisdictions of the president’s office, the Interior Department, the Navy Department, or the State Department. The lack of a rational organizational structure was already problematic. Its weaknesses were compounded by the absence of a trained cadre of colonial administrators. The commission recommended the consolidation of all overseas administrations, departments, and territories under an Administration of Overseas Affairs. This would essentially create a colonial office for the first time in American history.31

This is a common theme in Hawaiian history. Americans’ interest in the islands had always centered on the possible benefits the region had for the continental nation. Little consideration was given to the original occupants and rulers of the region once they were conquered and the island chain annexed. Like Native Americans, Native Hawaiian culture and sovereignty faced assaults from white settlers and missionaries bent on transforming them into participants in the western capitalist economy. But unlike Native

Americans, the Kānaka were not a tangible element in American society. The settler-Kānaka relationship did not permeate the dime novels of the late 1800s. No Buffalo Bill emerged to produce Wild West shows that captured the attention of mass audiences in Europe and America. In short, Native Hawaiians and Polynesian cultures did not enter popular culture and memory in the same manner as Plains Indians did until the post-World War II Era.

In examining the manner in which the Americans conquered the Hawaiian Islands, one not only learns why the federal government has treated the Kānaka different from Native Americans, but also the reason why Americans have always faced a tougher task in justifying the overthrow of the indigenous kingdom. Aside from popular culture and memory, the fundamental difference between the conquest of Hawai‘i and the American West is the absence of any treaty or agreement with which Americans could mask their blatant betrayal of the Hawaiian people and absolute disregard of international law in subjugating the Kānaka homeland. In the West, Americans bought the Louisiana Purchase and Gadsen Purchase. They took the Southwest from the Republic of Mexico in the course of a “just war.” Texans delivered their republic to the Union after a revolution aimed at protecting their natural rights. In the exchange of lands, Native Americans were shuffled from one benign caretaker to another. According to American and European perceptions of human relations and international law, trading land and wardship over indigenous peoples through treaties and war were legitimate acts. Or so the old narratives say.

For Hawai‘i, no such justification of conquest exists. Native Hawaiians never lived under the protection or dominion of a foreign nation. In 1810, Kaumualii, the ali‘i
of Kauai, formally yielded to Kamehameha, ending the days of a fragmented Hawai‘i.

From 1810 to 1893, the direct descendents of Kamehameha, or those related to his house, ruled the Kānaka under the title of mō‘ī, or ruler.\(^{32}\) The ali‘i continued to govern the land as agents of the monarch, something akin to the nobility of western monarchies. Generally, they held positions as governors, royal councilors, or members of the ‘Aha Ali‘i (House of Nobles). A traditional western political system would evolve over the years and Hawaiian leaders confronted serious threats to their sovereignty by foreign nations, but the Hawaiian Kingdom always remained a nation completely independent of other powers.\(^{33}\)

Since other nations identified with or recognized the constitutional monarchy developing on the islands, Native Hawaiians’ adaptation of western political models helped them in terms of foreign affairs; however, these new ideas and institutions also facilitated the downfall of the monarchy. American textbooks generally hail the adoption of western representative government and writing by the Cherokee Nation as a unique case in Native American history; yet, they were not the only indigenous peoples living in what became the United States to do so. After appraising the tensions between foreign powers and the position of the Hawaiian Islands in Pacific maritime transportation and trade, Kamehameha began the process of adopting western technologies and ideas in

\(^{32}\) According to Kuykendall, the office of kuhina-nui was instituted after Kamehameha’s death when his son, Liholiho, accepted the suggestion of Ka‘ahumanu, wife of Kamehameha, to elevate her status. Osorio notes that this office was an extension of the mō‘ī. Kuykendall writes that historical documents generally compared this office to that of a prime minister; however, the uniqueness of this position makes it difficult to translate it directly into a position in a western constitutional monarchy or republic. See Kuykendall, *The Hawaiian Kingdom*, vol. 1, *Foundation and Transformation*, 64, or Jonathan Kay Kamakawiwo‘ole Osorio, *Dismembering Lāhui: A History of the Hawaiian Nation to 1887* (Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 2002), 290.

\(^{33}\) For information of the Hawaiian monarchy, Ralph S. Kuykendall’s three volume series, *The Hawaiian Kingdom*, provides ample information on issues ranging from economics to politics to social issues. Osorio’s *Dismembering Lāhui* offers a history of these years from the Native Hawaiian perspective, something quite muted in *The Hawaiian Kingdom*. Finally, Gavan Daws’s *Shoal of Time: A History of the Hawaiian Islands* gives the reader an abridged account of the Hawaiian monarchy.
order to strengthen the Hawaiian nation. In 1839, Mōʻi Kauikeouli, a.k.a. Kamehameha III, officially adopted a western political theory of constitutional government when he issued the Declaration of Rights and Laws. It read:

God hath made of one blood all nations of men, to dwell on the face of the earth in unity and blessedness. God has also bestowed certain rights alike on all men, and all chiefs, and all people of all lands.”

These are some of the rights which he has given alike to every man and every chief, life, limb, liberty, the labor of his hands, and productions of his mind. God has also established governments and rule for the purposes of peace, but in making laws for a nation it is by no means proper to enact laws for the protection of rulers only, without also providing protection for their subjects; neither is it proper to enact laws to enrich the chiefs only, without regard to the enriching of their subjects also; and hereafter, there shall by no means be any law enacted with is inconsistent with what is above expressed, neither shall any tax be assessed, nor any service or labor required of any man in a manner at variance with the above sentiments.

These sentiments are hereby proclaimed for the purpose of protecting alike, both the people and the chiefs of all these islands, that no chief may be able to oppress any subject, but that chiefs and people may enjoy the same protection under one and the same law.

Protection is hereby secured to the persons of all the people, together with their lands, their building lots and all their property, and nothing whatever shall be taken from any individual, except by express provision of the laws. Whatever chief shall perseveringly act in violation of this constitution, shall no longer remain a chief of the Sandwich Islands, and the same shall be true of the governors, officers, and all land agents.34

The Declaration of Rights and Laws moved the Kingdom of Hawaiʻi away from their traditional form of government in which the aliʻi nui ruled absolutely. With this publication, the king voluntarily limited his powers and defined the rights of the people. Also, the decree placed the nobility and the people under the law, essentially recognizing that subjects possess certain fundamental rights, which their leaders must respect. In this process, one can see the influence of westerners on Hawaiian political thought.35

This document was followed by the Constitution of 1840, the first of three constitutions willingly accepted by the Kānaka. Under the constitutions of 1840 and 1852, the government consisted of the mōʻi, kuhina nui, the ‘Aha Aliʻi (House of Nobles), the House of Representatives, and a judicial system. When Dr. Gerritt P. Judd, Judge John Iʻi, and Judge William L. Lee drafted the 1852 version, they incorporated a system of checks and balances. Also, the new constitution permitted universal male suffrage. In 1864, Mōʻi Lota Kapuāiwa oversaw the passage of the last constitution that was willingly accepted by the Hawaiian people and their rightful leaders. This version merged the ‘Aha Aliʻi with the House of Representatives and increased the powers of the executive branch. New property and education qualifications, however, curtailed the political powers of the makaʻāinana\(^36\) by eliminating universal suffrage.\(^37\)

Native Hawaiians successfully incorporated western political ideas into their government with the help of European and American advisors. After Captain James Cook’s discovery of the islands, ships increasingly stopped at Hawaiian ports to resupply during their cross-Pacific voyages. At times, sailors would desert and take shelter among the population, providing a source of European and American immigration. The most significant source, however, came from New England seminaries. The American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions (ABCFM)—an organization established in 1810 by Andover Theological Seminary alumni—sent its first group of missionaries to the

\(^{36}\) Makaʻāinana was used to refer to the native inhabitants of the islands.

islands aboard the *U.S.S. Thaddeus* on October 25, 1819. They arrived in the islands in 1820, the first of many groups to make the journey.  

The missionaries became a major source of change and colonization over the years. Dedicated to teaching Protestant Christianity, these men and women established churches and built schools. Over the years, they turned the *ali`i* and *maka`ainana* away from traditional Native Hawaiian cultural and political practices. Missionaries like Dr. Judd also endeared themselves to the rulers of the Kingdom of Hawai`i and received appointments as royal advisors. The missionaries, their descendants, and foreign businessmen later capitalized on their growing political influence and economic power to change gradually the Hawaiian government to serve their purposes. Within twenty years of their arrival, more members of their ranks served as advisors to the mō`ī, assisted in drafting the 1840, 1852, and 1864 constitutions, and served as elected representatives.  

The apex of foreigners' influence on the Kānaka was felt in the Constitution of 1887, a.k.a. the Bayonet Constitution. Forced on the mō`ī, David La`amea Kalākaua, by the Hawaiian League, this constitution weakened the monarchy and consolidated power in the cabinet, which by then had become dominated by foreigners. Although the 1893

---

40 In this study, foreigners refers to naturalized and non-naturalized aliens living in the Kingdom of Hawai`i. Although naturalized foreigners swore allegiance to the Hawaiian monarch, they rarely held these oaths as sacred or inviolate. To simplify, I refer to all non-indigenous persons living in the islands prior to 1898 as foreigners. After 1898, however, Hawaiians refers to both native and non-native citizens of the Territory of Hawai`i, while Native Hawaiian indicates only those who with Native Hawaiian ancestry.  
coup d’état toppled Lili‘uokalani, the Bayonet Constitution was a pivotal moment in which the foreign element greatly curtailed the ability of Hawaiian monarchs to block growing American control, thereby creating the favorable conditions for 1893.

Comparing these two processes wherein sovereignty was taken from Kānaka and American Indians reveals a distinct difference in the way Native Hawaiians and Native Americans lost their sovereignty. Native Americans faced pressures from external forces. After the rulings of Cherokee Nation v. Georgia and Worcester v. Georgia, Native Americans became the wards of the federal government in the American legal system. Legally perceived as domestic dependent nations, they held certain rights to their lands, yet the cases denied them their status as sovereign foreign nations. Because of their status as domestic dependent nations, Congress could not dictate treaty terms to First Peoples, at least not until after 1871 when it unilaterally abrogated the treaty process. The rulings and the desire to maintain a positive public image contributed to the United States’ reliance on a process of isolating indigenous peoples from major American settlements—in accordance with the trade and intercourse laws, Indian Removal, and the reservation system—and then used bribes, violence, or the threat of violence to wrest concessions from First Peoples.

Hawaiians, on the other hand, were colonized from within their political system. As foreigners increased in numbers, they also increased their political and economic power. From 1820 to 1893, they slowly came to dominate the islands by influencing the structures of government and production. They primarily desired conquest through an annexation agreement between the monarchy and the United States Congress. It was not until Queen Lili‘uokalani threatened to reconsolidate monarchical and Native Hawaiian
power through a new constitution that the foreign population used outright violence to topple the government.

Just as Native Hawaiians’ experiences differed from those of Native Americans, they were not the same as those of other insular territories. Guam, Puerto Rico, and the trust territories\footnote{American Samoa is an exception. It was the result of peaceful negotiations between Germany and the United States.} came under American control as the result of negotiations between European nations and America. Once the fighting ceased, the belligerent sides negotiated peace. In the process, these islands became pieces of colonial property to be traded at whim. Only two insular territories deviated from this pattern. First, America secured an interest in Samoa after peaceful negotiations with Germany. The second exception was the Philippines. After the Treaty of Paris (1898), the U.S. gained control over the Philippines. When it refused to relinquish control of the archipelago to the Filipinos, organized, armed resistance led by Emilio Aguinaldo erupted, preventing the Americans from simply laying claim to the territory. From February 1899 to May 1902, Filipino independence fighters struggled to overthrow the new colonial government. The resulting war was brutal. Civilians were victims of the fighting. Passing armies scorched the countryside. The war also assumed racial dimensions as American troops often linked the killing of revolutionaries with the Native American guerilla fighters in the American West.\footnote{Richard Drinnon, \textit{Facing West}, 313-315; and H.W. Brands, \textit{Bound to Empire: The United States and the Philippines} (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), 53-59. See also Leon Wolff, \textit{Little Brown Brother: How the United States Purchased and Pacified the Philippine Islands at the Century’s Turn}, Francis Parkman Prize Edition (New York: History Book Club, 2006) as a good source on the Philippine campaign of the Spanish-American War and for the subsequent revolution.} At the cost of human lives, money, and materiel, the U.S. Army finally subdued the revolutionaries after three years of intense combat.
There was never a Hawaiian version of Wounded Knee, Sand Creek, or the Philippine-American War. Lili’uokalani chose diplomacy instead of leading her nation to war. As her letter in Chapter One clearly stated, she surrendered her powers peacefully and under duress, because Hawaiians did not have a military comparable to the United States nor did she desire the death of her subjects. In doing so, she fulfilled her primary role as mō‘ī by preserving the lives of her subjects. Afterwards, she continued adhering to this role by speaking publicly against annexation and pleading her case to the American public and Congress.

In the end, the queen and her people relied on words, ideas, and democratic processes rather than force to preserve their sovereignty. From 1893 through the early 1900s, Kānaka voiced opposition to annexation to the United States of America. As Tom Coffman notes in *The Island Edge of America: A Political History of Hawai‘i*, groups loyal to the monarchy and a Hawai‘i for Hawaiians coalesced in the Home Rule Party during the 1900 Territorial elections in order to counteract the efforts of Sanford Dole, W. O. Smith, Lorrin Thurston, and other pro-annexationists of American descent. In addition to partisan politics within the American system, they would also rely on public protest.45

This opposition has often been overlooked by previous historians throughout the twentieth century. Ralph S. Kuykendall, a leading historian of Hawaiian history, wrote his monumental work, *The Hawaiian Kingdom*, composed of over one-thousand pages of text in three massive volumes; and although he painstakingly presented a political, economic, and cultural history of the islands, the author ceased his study with the year

---

1893. His three-volume text includes information pertaining to early debates within the United States regarding the morality and legality of annexing the islands, but it focuses primarily on the plantation owners of Hawai‘i and American politicians.\footnote{Kuykendall, \textit{The Hawaiian Kingdom}, vol. 3, 1874-1893. \textit{The Kalakaua Dynasty}, 605-650.}

Conversely, the scope of Gavan Daws’ \textit{Shoal of Time} extends beyond the year 1893. He presented a more detailed account on Kānaka resistance to the American conquest of their homeland. Daws included information concerning the reports submitted by James H. Blount and John T. Morgan, detailing the overthrow of Lili‘uokalani. He described the changes in policy toward Hawai‘i between the Cleveland and McKinley administrations, as well as the short-lived counterrevolution of 1894 by Lili‘uokalani’s supporters. Finally, he also provided a two-page summary of the Home Rule Party, without delving into any specific policies or platforms that they promoted. His consideration of Kānaka reactions to the revolution and annexation, however, did not go into great detail. His only analysis consists of one paragraph, leaving one with the impression that the Kānaka had accepted defeat long before the revolution occurred.\footnote{Daws, \textit{Shoal of Time: A History of the Hawaiian Islands}, 270-295.}

His final conclusion can be summed up in his own words. “Their resistance to all this was feeble. It was almost as if they believed what the white man said about them, that they had only half learned the lessons of civilization.”\footnote{Daws, \textit{Shoal of Time: A History of the Hawaiian Islands}, 291.}

One must give these two men—Kuykendall and Daws—a modicum of credit. Compared to other works of the early to mid-twentieth century, their histories contain a good deal of information regarding Native Hawaiian perspectives. For example of the opposite, \textit{Hawaii: An Informal History}, by Gerrit P. Judd IV, a descendant of Dr. Gerrit
P. Judd, failed to provide any significant information on this subject, leaving the reader to believe that the revolution was warmly greeted throughout the islands.  

There is one notable Native Hawaiian figure who constantly appeared in twentieth century narratives of the conquest of Hawai`i—Lili`uokalani, the last mō`ī of Hawai`i. Her memoirs, *Hawaii`s Story by Hawaii`s Queen*, made it rather difficult for historians to overlook her opposition to annexation. Her book first appeared in 1898. Written as “a plea for justice,” the worked traced Lili`uokalani’s life from childhood to the end of her reign as queen. While determining the extent of the impact that the book had on the American people or even the number of readers exposed to it is difficult, evidence exists proving that the public was aware of *Hawaii`s Story by Hawaii`s Queen*. On February 15, 1898, the *Chicago Daily Tribune* carried a review of her book. Overall, the reviewer considered it “dignified, both in appearance and in contents.” Regarding Lili`uokalani’s “case” of the overthrow of her country, the writer claimed that “no scholar or lawyer could have state[d] it more effectively.” While her book received positive criticism, the article also considered some of her narrative as evidence “sufficient to condemn her at the bar of the Christian world.”

---

49 Gerrit P. Judd, IV, *Hawaii: An Informal History* (New York: Collier Books, 1966), 116-122. There are a number of other early histories and travel books that provide no account of Native Hawaiian reactions to the conquest of their monarchy. Two good examples of books that contain a glossy account of these events aimed at informing people of the basic history and culture of the Hawaiian islands are Stanley D. Porteus, *Calabashes and Kings: An Introduction to Hawaii* (Palo Alto: Pacific Books, 1945), and Clifford Gessler, *Hawaii: Isles of Enchantment* (New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1942). Both of these works treat the 1893 Revolution as one step in the inevitable path to annexation. Although neither give ear to Native Hawaiian sources, they offer the readers detailed accounts of the nightlife on Waikiki.

50 Lili`uokalani, *Hawaii’s Story by Hawaii’s Queen*, introduction by Glen Grant (Honolulu: Mutual Publishing, 1990), xii.

51 *Chicago Daily Tribune*, “Liliuokalani Tells ‘Hawaii’s Story’ and Her own,” February 15, 1898 385 [database online]; available from ProQuest Databases.

52 *Chicago Daily Tribune*, “Liliuokalani Tells ‘Hawaii’s Story’ and Her own,” February 15, 1898 385 [database online]; available from ProQuest Databases.

53 *Chicago Daily Tribune*, “Liliuokalani Tells ‘Hawaii’s Story’ and Her own,” February 15, 1898 385 [database online]; available from ProQuest Databases.
book, and subsequently her life, that the reviewer found offensive to his or her Christian morals were Lili’uokalani’s refusal to use the last name of her husband John Owen Dominis, her attempt to enact a new constitution, her licensing of the sale of opium, and permitting a lottery, as well as her refusal to pardon Lorrin Thurston and his associates for their rebellion. While this review cannot be taken as the primary example of how Americans received *Hawaii’s Story by Hawaii’s Queen*, it is indicative of the fact that Lili’uokalani and her protestations against the 1893 rebellion reached the American public.

Finally, in 2004, Noenoe K. Silva wrote *Aloha Betrayed: Native Hawaiian Resistance to American Colonialism*, which traced the extent of anti-annexation sentiment among the Kānaka. Essentially, Silva built on the growing interest in Native Hawaiian resistance to their incorporation into the growing American empire. She noted that scholars Davianna McGregor-Alegado, Albertine Loomis, Nancy Morris, and Merze Tate made some efforts at uncovering the activities by Kānaka political and social groups to prevent the annexation of the islands to the United States of America. Yet, she possessed the one element necessary to cover this movement in its entirety, a grasp of the Native Hawaiian language. Overall, her book seeks to refute “the myth of passivity through documentation and study of the many forms of resistance by the Kanaka Maoli to political, economic, linguistic and cultural oppression, beginning with the arrival of Captain Cook until the struggle over ‘annexation,’ that is, the military occupation of Hawai’i by the United States in 1898.”

While her historical study certainly

---

accomplished this monumental task, Silva’s treatment of the anti-annexation movement among Native Hawaiians from 1893-1898 is most relevant.

Examining the fourth chapter of *Aloha Betrayed: Native Hawaiian Resistance to American Colonialism*, entitled “The Antiannexation Struggle,” one discerns two primary means of resistance employed by Kānakas. The first was overt, armed struggle against the colonial government established by the Committee of Safety and headed by Sanford Dole. In 1893, a revolution against the provisional government erupted on Oahu. It lasted for a very short duration before fighters loyal to the new government suppressed the Royalists, as Queen Lili‘uokalani called them in her book. Afterwards, the provisional government used the incident as a means of completely erasing Honolulu and Iolani Palace of any vestiges of the indigenous, sovereign monarchy. They arrested supporters of Lili‘uokalani, including Robert Wilcox, as well as the queen herself. It was during this time that Queen Lili‘uokalani received a demand from the provisional government to sign the statement of capitulation.55

In addition to armed rebellion, Native Hawaiians formed political groups to oppose annexation and reclaim their sovereignty. Just as the Cherokee Nation attempted in the mid-1830s, Kānaka men and women used democratic and political means to sway the votes of congressmen in a republic supposedly bound to democratic and anti-colonial ideology. Unfortunately, just as the Cherokee Nation learned in 1838 as they marched along their Trail of Tears, Native Hawaiians came to realize that the American commitment to democracy, anti-colonialism, and the “inherent rights of man” only applied to those of white, Northern European descent. Three principal parties served as

---

the leading organs for anti-annexationist sentiment, the Hui Aloha 'Āina for Women, Hui Aloha 'Āina for Men, and the Hui Kālai'āina. As Noenoe K. Silva stated, “The Kanaka Maoli strategy was to challenge the U.S. government to behave in accordance with its stated principles of justice and of government of the people, by the people, and for the people. They hoped that once the U.S. president and members of Congress saw that the great majority of Kanaka Maoli opposed the annexation, the principles of fairness would prevail and Lili’uokalani’s government would be restored.”

They generated public opposition to the Morgan Committee’s attempts to draw public support for annexation, wrote numerous articles and editorials against annexation, dispatched Native Hawaiian representatives to aid in the fight against annexation within the walls of the American Congress, and wrote a petition against annexation in 1897 that was endorsed by a significant majority of Kānaka citizens.

Unfortunately, the time during which the Kānaka worked feverishly to save their ancestral islands was very different from the modern, post-World War II world of permanent borders and an internationally-recognized right of all nations and peoples to self-determination. As American settlers overthrew the Hawaiian monarchy, European nations intensified their efforts to expand their empires. From 1880-1900, Africans witnessed the downfall of their kingdoms and tribal lands to European nations scrambling to gain access to new markets and exploitable, raw materials. By 1885, the Berlin West Africa Conference had begun the process of a rationalized system among European nations to colonize the great continent with minimized conflict among the superpowers of the time. Asian nations were also under increasing pressure from Europe and the United

56 Silva, *Aloha Betrayed*, 146.
States to open their borders to trade. Americans, long believing themselves the great inheritors of the anti-colonial ideology and enlightened ideals of the Revolutionary War, fell under the sway of imperial ambition. As men like Theodore Roosevelt and Alfred Thayer Mahan rose to political prominence, the concept of an overseas American empire and increased military might grew in intensity. With the publication and growing popularity of Frederick Jackson Turner’s “The Significance of the Frontier in American History,” the idea of a closing frontier and a decreasing area for expansion and development caused concern among Americans. Increasingly, politicians looked overseas for new areas in which to expand, including Hawai‘i.

The Newlands Resolution (1898) concluded the debate over Hawaiian sovereignty. Just as Puerto Ricans, Filipinos, Guamanians, Samoans, Native Americans, and South Pacific islanders had learned, Americans never relinquish a territory once they gained it. Even if the United States returned some limited political control over an area, post-World War II American neocolonialism economically bound developing former colonies to American will. This is precisely the fate of the Philippine Islands following its independence in 1946. The Newlands Resolution formally bound the Hawaiian Islands to the United States, but it said very little about the relationship between the Kānaka and the federal government. Throughout the territorial history of Hawai‘i, federal policies directed at Native Hawaiians sought to incorporate them into capitalistic, American society, yet federal officials also assumed a form different from indigenous programs on the continent.

Had the U.S. followed historical precedents as established in the continental territories, Native Hawaiians would have received compensation for lost lands and the
Bureau of Indian Affairs would have started monitoring their progress. But the Kānaka community remained absent from B.I.A. reports. Also, the prominent institution of American Indian Policy—the reservation—never existed in the islands, regardless of the presence of an indigenous population. Comparing the population of Native Hawaiians with Native Americans, one notices that though Native Hawaiians suffered devastating population losses after Cook’s arrival, they never were the smallest indigenous group in the United States. In 1900, there were 39,656 Native Hawaiians, including Part-Hawaiians.58 Two years earlier, 262,965 Native Americans lived in the continental U.S., excluding Alaska. However, populations among separate nations varied dramatically. For example, while the Department of the Interior listed 32,161 Cherokees and 20,500 Navajos, it also counted only 1,658 Nez Percés, 1,202 Omahas, and 1,553 Comanches.59 In 1940, the combined population of Native Hawaiians and Part-Hawaiians grew to 64,310. Unfortunately, the Kānaka community experienced a significant loss of 15,424 as their population dropped from 29,799 to 14,375.60 Though their numbers declined significantly, they remained one of the larger indigenous groups when compared to the populations of other indigenous nations and reservations in the Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs for 1940.61 Providing these figures is not a simple exercise in statistics. It reveals the significant presence of the Kānaka in the United States of America. Regardless, the federal government ignored legitimate Native Hawaiian authorities in the annexation process and did not recognize indigenous claims

to land, property, funds, and sovereignty as provided for in *Cherokee Nation v. Georgia* (1831) and *Worcester v. Georgia* (1832). One could even make the point that a distinguishing difference between Native Hawaiians and Native Americans was the inapplicability of these monumental court cases to the Hawaiian nation.

Native Hawaiians found themselves at the epicenter of a new American colonialism. First, the islands themselves became floating reservations. With limited economic opportunities at home and abroad, Kānaka had few sources of income. As Table 1 illustrates, out of a population of 39,260,627,791 taxpaying Native Hawaiians owned $15,605,117 worth of real and personal property. This compared to 1,806 corporations holding $185,624,595 in assets and 6,811 Anglo-Saxons controlling $31,379,464. As in other colonized territories located in Africa, Asia, and the Middle East, the settler society held most of the wealth in the territory, while the Native population had the least. In the case of the Territory of Hawai‘i, prior to annexation foreigners accumulated significant wealth at the expense of the indigenous population. This wealth gave them effective control over the islands. Throughout the territorial period, Native Hawaiians were left with few options in terms of work. They could find work as laborers on plantations, in the shipping industry, or as dock hands, but white-collar professions remained dominated by white employees. As the figures show, two decades after the conquest of the region, the Native Hawaiian population still only managed to control 6.23 percent of the wealth in terms of property, whereas industries and American settlers possessed a combined total of 86.62 percent.63

---


63 Of course, the use of the term “Hawaiians” in the House Report complicates this matter. Who exactly qualified as Hawaiian? Moreover, of the total indigenous persons owning property, how many were part of
These figures show that the Kānaka population already showed a familiarity with private enterprise and property. Their political history under the monarchy and during the anti-annexation struggle proved that they already possessed experience with republican institutions and democratic processes. With schools already established on the islands under the supervision of the missionaries and the monarchs, as well as the inability of most Kānaka to relocate to urban places with other employment opportunities, the Hawaiian Islands provided an isolated, compact territory in which colonial authorities could assert significant control.

Table 2. Property held by territorial citizens according tax returns filed in 1919.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taxpayers</th>
<th>Number of taxpayers</th>
<th>Valuation of real property</th>
<th>Number of tax payers</th>
<th>Valuation of personal property</th>
<th>Total valuation</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corporations, firms, etc.</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>$88,909,410</td>
<td>1,023</td>
<td>$96,715,185</td>
<td>$185,624,595</td>
<td>74.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo-Saxons</td>
<td>3,312</td>
<td>26,656,188</td>
<td>3,499</td>
<td>4,723,276</td>
<td>31,379,464</td>
<td>12.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiians</td>
<td>5,878</td>
<td>13,670,508</td>
<td>1,913</td>
<td>1,934,609</td>
<td>15,605,117</td>
<td>6.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese and Spanish</td>
<td>2,665</td>
<td>5,619,076</td>
<td>1,622</td>
<td>917,411</td>
<td>6,536,487</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>1,631</td>
<td>3,140,305</td>
<td>1,367</td>
<td>1,656,250</td>
<td>4,796,555</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>1,183</td>
<td>1,897,764</td>
<td>3,461</td>
<td>4,684,364</td>
<td>6,582,128</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15,452</td>
<td>139,893,251</td>
<td>12,885</td>
<td>110,631,095</td>
<td>250,524,346</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table taken from House Committee on the Territories, Rehabilitation of Native Hawaiians, 66th Cong., 2nd sess., 1920, H. Rep. 839, 6.

Though this is an intriguing way of viewing the archipelago, it has flaws. The reservation system in the continental territories relied heavily on annuities and rations to supplement Native American incomes, ensure order, provide supplemental nourishment, promote assimilation, and provide compensation. Although Native Hawaiians faced hardship and lost their homelands, colonial status offered them no annuities or compensation. In many ways, the reservation system was designed to familiarize Native Americans with the capitalist economy. That was not necessary in Hawai‘i. The the ali‘i or came from native families that managed to benefit from the growth of the agricultural industry prior to 1898?
Hawaiian monarchy had promoted trade and commerce with other nations. Industry was strongly encouraged in the islands, and until the influx of Asian immigration in the late 1800s, Kānaka served as the primary workforce. In addition, the missionaries successfully established an education system in the kingdom. The schools and churches had already infused American culture into Native Hawaiian society by 1898. Kānaka familiarity with American politics, economics, knowledge, and culture thus rendered the reservation system useless as a form of social control and assimilation.

Second, the lack of a Hawaiian reservation system or laws targeting them suggests that the federal government inadvertently followed a policy of termination fifty-five years before the passage of House Concurrent Resolution 108 in Congress. Instead of the federal government assuming control over Kānaka affairs as it had done on the continent, the Newlands Resolution folded the Hawaiian indigenous community into the general population. By neglecting to provide reparations for the illegal overthrow of the monarchy, seizing of public lands, and confiscating treasury funds, the U.S. never officially developed or recognized a federal-ward relationship with Native Hawaiians as it had done with Native Americans. One could retort that the development of Kānaka culture, politics, and economics set them apart from Native Americans in that they had already assimilated to the American culture prior to 1898. Yet this line of reasoning does not withstand scrutiny. During the congressional debates over the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1920, an act designed to place Kānaka on homesteads, images of Native Hawaiians as part of a “dying race,” a “noble race,” or a people in need of
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64 On January 25, 2005, Senator Daniel Kahikina Akaka of Hawai‘i introduced S. 147, dubbed the Akaka Bill, authorizing a change in Native Hawaiians’ status to that of one on par with Native Americans.
rehabilitation appear.65 These debates are indicative of the image Americans held of Native Hawaiians. Regardless of their incorporation of western technology and learning, American perceptions of the Kānaka remained similar to that of other indigenous peoples.66

Although the federal government never subjected Native Hawaiians to the reservation, congressmen attempted to implement an indigenous homesteading act similar to the General Allotment Act of 1887 (also referred to as the Dawes Act).67 During his tenure as territorial delegate, Jonah Kuhio Kalaniana’ole raised the issue of providing Native Hawaiians with land in order to give them some form of economic stability. Kuhio, or Prince Kuhio as congressmen referred to him, succeeded Robert William Wilcox as the second territorial delegate to Congress. A Native Hawaiian and relative of Queen Lili’uokalani, he used his affiliation with the Republican Party to gain concessions for his countrymen. He considered the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1920 as vital to securing Native Hawaiians a stake in the future agricultural industry of the Hawaiian Islands.

This legislation was very basic in its form. Any person of “not less than one-half part of the blood of the races inhabiting the Hawaiian Islands previous to 1778” could apply for a land allotment in the islands.68 Applicants could then receive a ninety-nine

65U.S., Congressional Record, 66th Cong., 2nd sess., 191920, 33, pt. 7: 7448.
66 There is an interesting document in the Jonah Kuhio Kalaniana’ole Collection, M-40, Box 4, Folder 8, Hawai’i State Archives, entitled Hawai’i Territory, Statement by the Legislative Commission of Hawaii in Support of a Bill Providing for the setting Apart of Portions of the Public Lands for the Use by Hawaiian Citizens of Hawaiian Blood, dated January 1, 1920. This document offers the support of the Hawaiian territorial legislature. Its description of Native Hawaiians, however, is of importance here and depict Native Hawaiians as a non acquisitive people who need the guidance of the government in claiming a homestead in the islands. The stereotypical picture of Native peoples as inept at functioning within a capitalist economy was not limited to the federal government or continental Americans.
67 Also referred to as the Dawes Act, the Dawes Allotment Act, or the Dawes Severalty Act.
68 Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1920, Public Law 34, U.S. Statutes at Large 42 (1921), 108.
year lease on twenty to eighty acres of farmland, one hundred to five hundred acres of pasturage, or two hundred fifty to one-thousand acres of second class grazing land, a deal similar to the one Native Americans under the General Allotment Act. Land in Hawai‘i, however, was scarcer than on the continent. Whereas the heads of continental indigenous families received a minimum of one-hundred sixty acres of land with the possibility of more for grazing purposes, insular allotments were significantly smaller. Also, Native American allotments were held in trust by the federal government for twenty-five years, after which they received the title to the land in fee simple, whereas neither the federal government nor the Territory of Hawai‘i—under whose care Congress entrusted the lands and their distribution—awarded lands to Native Hawaiians. Instead, Kānaka homesteaders paid one dollar per year on a ninety-nine year lease. While the lessee had the right to will the lease to his or her heirs, he or she never received full title.69

Both pieces of legislation also provided for the opening of lands not allocated to non-indigenous persons. In the case of the Dawes Act, the federal government allotted lands from existing reservation to end the communal nature of indigenous cultures and force tribal members to become private, landowning citizens wedded to the American economy. Everyone received an allotment regardless of whether or not they wanted one or supported the policy. Once the land was distributed to all qualifying persons, the Department of the Interior purchased the remainder and opened them up to settlement.70 In Hawai‘i, Delegate Kuhio designed the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act to provide public lands to Native Hawaiians thereby creating a Hawaiian land base. Unlike the Dawes Act, the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act did not specify that all Native Hawaiians were entitled to a land allotment.69

69 General Allotment Act of 1887, Chapter 119, U.S. Statutes at Large 24 (1887), 388; and Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1920, 110-111.
70 General Allotment Act of 1887, 389-390.
Hawaiians had to receive an allotment automatically. It did, however, authorize the Commissioner of Public Lands to offer non-leased lands to non-indigenous persons or corporations. The funds from these leases went to the Hawaiian Home Loan Fund established for the act to assist indigenous lessees in starting their farms. Also, an amendment to the legislation removed restrictions on corporate land holdings. During the drafting of the Hawaiian Territory Organic Act, congressmen were concerned over the massive landholdings of the various agribusinesses. To stimulate homesteading and prevent a land monopoly, Congress restricted corporate landholdings to less than 100,000 acres. No doubt, the existence of this amendment received support from the Big Five and other political powerhouses in the islands.71

Representatives and senators on Capitol Hill responded favorably to Kuhio’s initiative, as did the territorial legislature. Territorial legislators considered the Hawaiian Homes Commission a viable plan to move the indigenous residents of Honolulu tenement houses out of the “fatal conditions” in which they lived.72 Once transplanted to the “clean, healthful, and decent” environment of the Hawaiian countryside, Native Hawaiians would enter a new, economically viable life as “independent and contented tillers of the soil.”73 It is quite understandable that Congress readily accepted the bill, since their predecessors designed the Dawes Act thirty-three years earlier with similar goals in mind. Yet, programs designed to return Native Hawaiians to the land have failed to meet expectations. By 1956, Native Hawaiians leased only 68,000 acres.74 The

72 Statement by the Legislative Commission of Hawaii in Support of a Bill Providing for the setting Apart of Portions of the Public Lands for the Use by Hawaiian Citizens of Hawaiian Blood, 2.
73 Statement by the Legislative Commission of Hawaii in Support of a Bill Providing for the setting Apart of Portions of the Public Lands for the Use by Hawaiian Citizens of Hawaiian Blood, 3.
pattern continued into the late twentieth century as corporations, public entities, and non-indigenous residents occupied 130,000 acres of reserved land, leaving just over 29,000 acres for Native use.\textsuperscript{75}

Land and economic independence are two crucial elements of indigenous sovereignty. Land categorically represents Native sovereignty by providing a base for economic solvency, retaining ancestral territory, and possessing cultural importance.\textsuperscript{76}

For example, Canyon de Chelly is located deep in the heart of Dinétah, the homeland of the Diné (or Navajo) Nation. Nestled within its steep walls is Spider Rock, a tall, beautiful landmark that dominates the valley floor. It was the home of the mythical figure Spider Woman who taught the Diné the art of weaving. Today, Dinés retain control over Canyon de Chelly. With the promotion of tourism during the 1940s to 1960s, the site became a popular stopping point for visitors to the Southwest. Since then it has become a source of revenue for the Diné Nation while maintaining its spiritual significance. This influx of visitors also opened a market for Navajo rugs and other weavings. As Americans became more familiar with these high quality products, the price for Navajo-crafted rugs climbed as well.\textsuperscript{77}

Not all indigenous peoples, however, retained their original homelands or their spiritual centers. As Americans assaulted Native sovereignty during their expansion into the American West and Pacific Ocean, settler communities, industries, and the U.S.

\textsuperscript{75} Haunani-Kay Trask, \textit{From a Native Daughter}, 68-69.
\textsuperscript{76} Franz Fanon listed land as a crucial element in decolonization movements. Land provided “bread . . . and dignity.” Moreover, the struggle of the colonized included the fight to posses the homes and livelihoods of the colonizers. Tired of the medina and craving the life of the whites’ cities, decolonization required the absolute removal of the settler society. See Franz Fanon, \textit{The Wretched of the Earth}, translated by Richard Philcox (New York: Grove Press, 2004), 1-9.
\textsuperscript{77} Peter Iverson, \textit{Diné: A History of the Navajos}, featuring photographs by Monty Roessel (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2003), 141, 223-225. See this work for information on the new importance of tourism and weaving in the Diné economy.
military gained access to Native territory. White miners secured the right to dig for gold in the Black Hills just as they had done in Cherokee lands in Georgia during the 1830s. Starting in 1830 with the Indian Removal Act, the United States removed First Peoples from lands containing rich ore deposits or quality top soil. As white settler communities poured into the lands, the U.S. Army forced the previous inhabitants onto sub-marginal lands.

Returning to the Black Hills of South Dakota as an example, this region retains great importance to Siouan peoples of the northern Great Plains. Unlike Spider Rock, this region lies outside of existing reservation borders of the Lakotas, but it remains not only a place where they conduct ceremonies, but also a place for personal spiritual journeys. In 1920, Lakotas filed their first court case in an effort to have the land returned to their control. After eighty-eight years and multiple lawsuits, the judicial system still refuses to return the land, though it recognizes that the United States illegally laid claim to the territory in the late 1800s. In 1987, Senator Bill Bradley of New Jersey and Senator Daniel Inouye of Hawai‘i introduced S.R. 705 which authorized the return of the Black Hills to the Lakotas. Needless to say, the bill failed and mining and tourism still continues in the region. Regaining control of the Black Hills remains an important goal for the Lakota Nation, which continues to reject a monetary settlement for the loss of the sacred place. Of course, this is but one example among many of the cultural and material losses that accompanied forced relocation and the ongoing struggles of Native Americans to reclaim lost territory.78

For Native Hawaiians, land served as the catalyst for an eruption of vocal Kānaka activism. It began in 1970 with two events. First, Bishop Estate evicted residents of the Kalama Valley to allow construction of upper income housing by Kaiser-Aetna. This protest movement initially included people that represented multiple ethnicities in the Hawaiian Islands. The activism of “Kokua Kalama” took a twist as it merged with the cultural reawakening of Native Hawaiians that began in the 1960s to form “Kokua Hawai‘i” (Save Hawai‘i). According to Haunani-Kay Trask, Norman Meller, and Anne Feder Lee, the Kalama Valley protest movement marked the beginning of Native Hawaiian activism of the twentieth century.79

Another major land battle of the 1970s had roots dating back to the territorial period. In 1952, President Dwight D. Eisenhower authorized the use of a seemingly barren island for naval bombardment practice. To the president, this land held no intrinsic value. It was simply another island in the Pacific Ocean. But Native Hawaiians knew otherwise. Kaho‘olawe had deep cultural roots for the Kānaka. The island once contained an ecosystem capable of sustaining life. Western agricultural and pastoral practices, however, rendered the small island barren. Regardless, it remained a part of Native Hawaiians’ cultural heritage and would serve as a major battleground in Kānaka attempts to reassert their right to Native Hawaiian culture and land. Spurred on by the tactics used by Native Americans on Alcatraz Island, the cultural revitalization of the era, and a deep sense of aloha ‘aina (love for the land and desire to preserve it from western

2008), 106-107, the Lakota have consistently rejected monetary compensation which totaled $571 million in 2001. The authors note that their rejection of this money in the face of Lakota poverty is suggestive of the determination of the Lakota people to retain their lands.

exploitation), Walter Ritte, Jr., Charley Maxwell, and other Native Hawaiians began their campaign to force the State of Hawai‘i and federal government to relinquish the land. On January 3, 1976, Walter Ritte, Jr., and eight other illegally landed on the island in an attempt to force the cessation of bombardment exercises and get the attention of policymakers. Their fight for the land continued throughout the late 1970s, sometimes landing activists in prison for trespassing of federal lands. Finally, in 1990, Congress suspended all naval exercises on the island and the beginning of extensive efforts to clean up the ecological damage caused by the U.S. Navy.

In Hawai‘i, the military provides employment for Natives and non-Natives, alike. Thousands of young marines, army soldiers, and naval personnel passed through the Hawaiian Islands on their way to the Pacific Theatre during World War II. No doubt, these young men enjoyed the lovely vistas and relaxing beaches of the atoll. Following the conclusion of the war, promoters, Hollywood, and writers increased the public perception of Hawai‘i as a prime vacation site. Needless to say, the Hawaiian tourist industry owes much to the military for its quick growth in the mid-twentieth century. But as activists like Haunani-Kay Trask and Walter Ritte, Jr., the military came with a price for Native Hawaiians. The bases, both army and navy, occupy land that could be used for Native Hawaiian homelands. And there is the issue of artillery practice and Kaho‘olawe.

Native Hawaiians were not the only indigenous group whose struggle for sovereignty was complicated by the increased importance placed on the military in post-
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80 For a more thorough description of aloha ‘aina, see Trask, *From a Native Daughter*, 37-38.
World War II America. The war greatly cost Americans, Europeans, Asians, and Africans. As the world emerged from the ruins of such a catastrophic armed contest, one would have thought that mankind had tasted enough blood and horror to last a century. The year 1948 proved otherwise. After World War II, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America briefly tried to preserve their wartime camaraderie; however, Joseph Stalin and Harry S Truman both knew that the *modus vivendi* could not last. In 1948, the western world witnessed three critical events that dramatically affected life in Dinétah and the Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands. First, in May 1948, Stalin ordered all land routes to Berlin from Western Germany closed, bringing the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. to the brink of war. The possibility of armed conflict coincided with an ongoing reevaluation of American air power by General Curtis LeMay, USAF. When he assumed command of the Strategic Air Command (SAC) on October 19, 1948, the general found it unorganized and incapable of executing an accurate attack on its targets. The Berlin Blockade stressed the need for LeMay to restructure and retrain SAC, as well as redefine its role in future conflicts. By November 1948, he had devised a new purpose for SAC. Since future wars would be quick, brutal affairs, United States armed forces would need to inflict massive casualties in the opening phases to emerge victorious. With this in mind, LeMay devised a plan in which SAC would drop large amounts of nuclear ordnance on the Soviet Union during an air blitzkrieg, thus dramatically reducing the enemy’s ability to wage war early in the conflict. This plan set the United States in a new direction regarding its strategy as nuclear weapons, and not conventional forces, would decide future conflicts. With the adoption of National Security Council Report 68 in 1950 and the election of President Dwight D. Eisenhower
in 1952, the preeminence of SAC in American defense strategy became a reality. Finally, a less publicized event took place deep in the heart of Soviet territory. After years of research and work, Soviet scientists finally discovered a means to increase the payload of a nuclear weapon without increasing its size. The process of layering heavy and light nuclear elements, called “sugarization,” became the principle design of the first nuclear bomb produced by the Soviet Union, which it successfully detonated during their test, dubbed First Lightening, on August 28, 1949.82

The heightened tensions of the late 1940s and increased reliance on nuclear weapons and power suddenly transformed Dinétah from a reservation on marginal land to a valuable source of uranium. Had uranium held value for Americans in the nineteenth century, they would have pressured the Diné to leave the Four Corners region and resettle in another part of the Southwest. Afterwards, mining companies and speculative settlers would flood into the region in search of instant wealth. But it was the mid-1900s and such behavior was no longer accepted. The pogroms throughout Eastern Europe in the early 1900s and German concentration camps of World War II caused the leading western nations to reconsider their stance on human and indigenous rights. For the first time, an international body, the United Nations, took a stand against genocide, forced removal, and inhumane governmental policies.

Nonetheless, there was radioactive gold in those mountains, and Uncle Sam thoroughly intended to dust off his mining equipment and strike out for pay dirt. Instead
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82 Richard Rhodes, *Dark Sun: The Making of the Hydrogen Bomb* (New York: Touchstone, 1995), 324-368. This brilliant work covers the history of the early Cold War and the development of the hydrogen bomb. Those desiring information on everything from the formation of nuclear policy to the creation of SAC to the principles behind nuclear weaponry should reference this book. It was preceded by another brilliant piece of scholarship that is also important for understanding nuclear weaponry. See also Richard Rhodes, *The Making of the Atomic Bomb* (New York: Touchstone, 1986).
of relying on removal or warfare to gain access to this wealth, the federal government
relied on private enterprise. The Vanadium Corporation of America and the Kerr-McGee
Corporation offered the Diné royalties for mining operations in Dinétah that eclipsed
other revenue resources. Uranium royalties alone could reach as high as $6.5 million.
There were additional inducements for the Diné. Aside from tourism and coal mining,
few other economic opportunities existed in Dinétah. Vanadium and Kerr-McGee were a
solution to reservation unemployment, since their mining operations offered Diné men
the chance to earn a paycheck. Moreover, mining jobs were long-lasting, stable
employment, since Vanadium and Kerr-McGee had long-term plans for the stores of
uranium in the Navajo reservation.83

Unfortunately, uranium mining came with a steep price. The corporations never
warned Dinés of the hazards involved in working around uranium. Diné miners were
ignorant of its radioactive properties and their baleful effect on the human body.
According to Peter Iverson, a thirsty miner “might scoop water from a dust-covered
puddle on the mine floor. He came home wearing clothing covered with material that
endangered other family members. Children played in and around the mines, coming
into contact with the tailings.”84 To make matters worse, the companies failed to
ventilate the shafts properly and left the detritus from uranium mining exposed to the
wind or resting near water sources. The effect on Navajo health was devastating. “Of the
150-odd Diné miners who worked underground at the Shiprock facility during the
eighteen years of its operation, eighteen had died of radiation-induced lung cancer by

83 Iverson, Diné, 219; and Ward Churchill and Winona LaDuke, “Native North America: The Political
Economy of Radioactive Colonialism,” in The State of Native America: Genocide, Colonization, and
84 Iverson, Diné, 219.
1975 (not the “oat cell” variety associated with cigarette smoking) and another twenty-one were feared dying. By 1980, twenty of these twenty-one were dead, and another ninety-five had contracted similar respiratory ailments and cancers.”85 As the United States benefitted militarily from the uranium of the Dinétah, Diné people faced growing physical and environmental problems.

In the large picture, nuclear warfare and the Cold War linked Dinétah, Hawai’i, and the South Pacific. Uranium used to create nuclear weapons came from Dinétah, and Diné miners suffered potentially lethal exposure to radiation while extracting it. From there, the weapons were transferred to the Hawaiian Islands, still the “Crossroads of the Pacific.” In addition to serving as the naval command center for the entire Pacific Ocean, the islands also acted as a transportation hub and training center for the region. But nuclear weapons did not stop there. There were transferred to other areas of the Pacific. Throughout the late 1940s and 1950s, many nuclear bombs found their way to the Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands where the U.S. Navy and U.S. Air Force conducted at least eight series of nuclear tests between 1946 and 1958.

Operation Crossroads was the first nuclear test conducted in the Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands. In 1946, the U.S. military detonated two nuclear devices. The USAF dropped the first weapon into a fleet of outdated Japanese, German, and American ships to examine the effectiveness of nuclear weapons on naval forces. They followed the air test by detonating a submerged warhead. The result was both devastating and awe-inspiring, not to mention environmentally catastrophic for the ecosystem as tons of contaminated sea water evaporated into a towering inferno of radioactive steam reaching

over 100,000 feet. The nuclear fallout not only harmed the marine life, it also flooded the land and the islanders with radiation.\textsuperscript{86} Crossroads rendered the Bikini atoll utterly uninhabitable. With the indigenous population showing the signs of radiation sickness, the federal government had no other choice than to remove them to other atolls in the Pacific Island.\textsuperscript{87} The two explosions in Operation Crossroads initiated an assault on South Pacific Islanders’ homes that lasted over a decade and resembled the exploitation of indigenous lands in other American regions. One could even argue that they suffered a similar process of removal as experienced by the Cherokees, Choctaws, Chickasaws, Seminoles, Sauks, Fox, Creeks, and countless other First Peoples.

Although Operations Crossroads (1946), Sandstone (1948), Greenhouse (1951), Ivy (1952), Castle (1954), Wigwam (1955), Redwing (1956), and Hardtack I (1958) all spread radiation and laid waste to islands in the South Pacific—primarily in the Bikini and Eniwetok atolls—Operation Ivy served as a turning point in the destructiveness of these experiments. On November 1, 1952, the military detonated the first thermonuclear weapon during Operation Ivy Mike. While this test is best remembered for enhancing tensions between the Soviets and the Americans, it had serious repercussions at the local level as well. Over one thousand military and civilian spectators attested to the massive explosion caused by the hydrogen bomb. It was said that the fireball resembled the sun. Its mushroom cloud climbed over 100,000 feet. For the previous inhabitants of the

\textsuperscript{86} Rhodes, \textit{Dark Sun}, 228-229, 260-262.

islands, Operation *Ivy* rearranged their landscape. The resulting explosion was so intense that it erased Elugelab, the northern most island of the Eniwetok atoll, from existence.\(^{88}\)

Residents of the TTPI refused to accept the destruction of their homes passively. Throughout the late 1940s and into the 1960s, they submitted resolutions, petitions, letters, and protests to the United Nations Security Council and the United Nations Trusteeship Council. Even non-indigenous citizens and organizations implored the Trusteeship Council to end nuclear tests by the United States in the Pacific Ocean.\(^{89}\)

Petitions from TTPI citizens focused on two primary issues. First, they protested the continuation of nuclear tests and the inadequate protection of the inhabitants from radiation. Representatives constantly reiterated the demand that “all nuclear experiments with lethal weapons in this area be immediately ceased”\(^{90}\) in their many petitions to the Trusteeship Council. Yet, they tended to moderate this demand by describing the American tenure as the administering authority of the TTPI as benevolent and beneficial. Also, petitions sometimes moderated their demand for the cessation of nuclear tests by accepting those deemed essential for the protection of the free world. Given the Cold War attitude of the United States towards weapons of mass destruction and their role as

\(^{88}\) Rhodes, *Dark Sun*, 500-509.

\(^{89}\) See A. Elliott Castello, Sacramento, California, to United Nations Trusteeship Council, January 8, 1956, located in United Nations Trusteeship Council, *Petitions*, T/PET.10/L.1, and Committee of Soviet Women, Moscow, to the U.N. Secretary General, 19 June 1958, located in United Nations Trusteeship Council Petitions, T/PET.10/L.2. These two documents are rather small petitions located in a sea of petitions from Pacific Islanders to the council. Browsing through the many documents, the vast majority of anti-nuclear test petitions to the United Nations Trusteeship Council came from regional governments in the TTPI. Although these two petitions do not suggest wide-spread activism among non-indigenous populations, they do reveal knowledge of the tests in American and Soviet communities. The letter from the Committee of Soviet Women, however, is interesting. The text presents a case against the continuation of these tests based on the health and rights of women and children living in the region. The author(s) also states that the tests threaten to block diplomatic efforts between the U.S. and U.S.S.R. to calm Cold War tensions. It would be interesting to see further studies on environmental movements in the U.S.S.R. in the context of the Cold War and nuclear warfare.

the protectors of democracy, the administering authority could have read such phrases within the petitions as a blank check to continue lethal experiments. In addition to demands to end nuclear detonations, these petitions pleaded for the administering authority to teach residents how to deal with radioactive fallout. In 1954, the Marshallese people informed the Trusteeship Council that Rongelab were ignorant of the lethal nature of the radioactive dust that coated their island and contaminated their drinking waters. Their continued consumption of polluted waters aggravated already deteriorating health conditions on the island. Worse still, another petition citing the same demands and concerns of the 1954 petition appeared in front of the Trusteeship Council two years later. The reappearance of these demands and concerns in the midst of the multiple other documents and voiced protests by other council members revealed the disregard of the American military and territorial administrative bodies towards the welfare of the Marshallese and other islanders during these environmentally unsound experiments.91

Second, inhabitants of the Bikini, Eniwetok, and Kwajalein atolls engaged in negotiations with the federal government over compensation for the loss of land to nuclear tests and military bases. The United States continuously attempted to secure agreements offering annuities to individuals displaced by radioactive fallout or the construction of military bases. The method of payment resembled the old annuity system on American Indian reservations. The federal government paid a set amount at the
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91 Petition from the Marshallese People Concerning the Pacific Islands, T/PET.10/28, 6 May 1954, in United Nations Trusteeship Council, Petitions, T/PET.10/1-T/PET.10/150, June, 1950-June, 1979; and Petition from the Marshallese Congress Hold-Over Committee Concerning the Pacific Islands, T/PET.10/29, 20 March 1956, in United Nations Trusteeship Council, Petitions, T/PET.10/1-T/PET.10/150, June, 1950-June, 1979. Petition from Representative Amata Kabua Concerning the Pacific Islands, T/PET.10/30/Add.1, 3 November 1959, reported that Americans conducted blood tests of the inhabitants of the region. Taken together with other reports to the Trusteeship Council and Security Council regarding the status of the healthcare system in the TTPI, the United States clearly understood that the nuclear tests had a negative impact on the physical well being of the inhabitants. Regardless, the tests continued into the late 1950s.
signing of the agreement. The remaining balance went into a trust account for the previous occupants to provide annual payments. The islanders, however, preferred to remain on their land. They knew better than anyone else the agricultural value of their homelands. Unlike the American West, there were no deserts to irrigate in the Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands. They could not engineer marginal acres for agriculture or grazing. Losing land in the South Pacific meant the loss of one’s livelihood and independence. Unable to produce their own food, the former residents would become dependent on the marketplace and the pitiful annuity system for their sustenance.92

Previously the continuity of the territorial system throughout the American West and into the Hawaiian Islands was discussed. It did not, however, extend into the insular territories. Although the Supreme Court grounded its decision that the constitution does not follow the flag93 in the history American continental expansion, the colonial governments erected in Puerto Rico, Guam, the Philippines, Samoa, and the Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands differed dramatically from the territorial governments.

---


Whereas the governance of the insular possessions differed from Hawai‘i and the American West, the treatment of indigenous inhabitants did not. American perceptions of “the other” originated in its relations with the Native nations of the North American continent. American Indian policy emerged from the fires of the American Revolution with the clear purpose of subduing indigenous resistance while facilitating white expansion. As the nation grew in size, wealth, and population, its treatment of First Peoples experienced a reciprocal process of degradation.

To conquer the Native peoples of North America, the United States relied on warfare and treaties, or to put it more candidly, Americans relied on violence or the threat of violence. The loss of sovereignty developed somewhat differently in the Pacific Ocean. The United States of America gained control over its insular possessions, except the Hawaiian Islands, through treaty negotiations and wars with other European powers. American Samoa was the product of negotiations with Germany. Spain relinquished control over the Philippines, Guam, and Puerto Rico after the Spanish-American War of 1898. Finally, the Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands fell into American hands after World War II. Hawai‘i, on the other hand, came under American dominion as a result of intrigue from within, a process similar to that of Texas.

Within every American territory, incorporated or unincorporated, indigenous people struggled to retain their sovereignty. Land always served as the principle object, the primary goal, of indigenous efforts to regain control over their own destinies. Land is everything in decolonization movements.94 For Native Americans, their struggle lay in retaining control over the little territory left to them, and in some cases, retaining the right

---

94 Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth*, 1-9.
to govern themselves. Hawaiians fought throughout the early 1900s to reverse the *coup d'état* of 1893. Unsuccessful in that endeavor, they began and continue to resist the incursion into their Native lands of tourist facilities, military bases, and immigrants (albeit American or foreigners). Finally, Filipinos were the only Pacific Islanders to succeed in overthrowing American colonial rule. Granted, the economic ties of neo-colonialism keep the republic within the American orbit, but they remain the only successful decolonization movement in American History. South Pacific Islanders, however, will continue to suffer the effects of American colonization so long as the radioactive fallout remains in their environment. As the crater of Elugelab, the tailings of Dinétah, and the wasteland of Kaho‘olawe can attest, the violence and destructiveness of American colonization has completely reshaped the world of the indigenous peoples of the American West and Pacific Ocean.
CHAPTER 6
HAWAIIAN BOOSTERISM AND STATEHOOD

On March 3, 1953, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs submitted House Report No. 109, *Enabling the People of Hawaii to Form a Constitution and State Government and to be Admitted into the Union on an Equal Footing with the Original States*, to the House. It recommended acceptance of House Resolution 3575, yet another bill that attempted to set in motion the admittance of the Territory of Hawai‘i as a state. Hawaiians had long since dreamed of this day. Conquered by American settlers in 1893 and annexed by the United States in 1898, Hawai‘i and Alaska remained the last two incorporated territories in 1953. Both territories contained sizeable white settlements culturally linked to the “lower 48 states” as well as diverse cultures, and both were eager to join the Union. In the document, the committee members considered Hawaiian citizens fine products of American society who were ready and qualified to join the American Union as a state. Although it reported favorably, territorial inhabitants would wait another six years before President Dwight D. Eisenhower would sign PL 86-3, formally accepting the atoll as an equal to the other American states.¹

The report in and of itself was not remarkable. It neither generated enough congressional support to pass H.R. 3575 nor was it the first of its kind. Throughout the early to mid-twentieth century, congressmen had debated the merits of adding Hawai‘i to the Union. Congressmen and senators periodically visited the islands on fact-finding tours and had conducted congressional investigations throughout the 1930s, 1940s, and 1950s, usually returning with favorable impressions of life in the atolls. Territorial

¹ U.S., Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Enabling the People of Hawaii to form a Constitution and State Government and to be Admitted into the Union on an Equal Footing with the Original States, 83rd Cong., 1st sess., 1953, H. Rep. 109.
legislatures joined in the push to grant Hawaiians full participation in American society
by presenting memorials to Congress requesting the passage of an enabling act at least
fourteen times prior to 1959. Needless to say, reports on the Territory of Hawai’i were
commonplace by 1953. So what was remarkable or noteworthy about this particular
report? The importance of H. Rep. 109 lies in the source of the information contained in
its pages. Reading through the document, the language and content resembled earlier
reports, like House Report 194, passed March 27, 1947, in which members of the
Committee on Public Lands provided reprints of historical documents, facts, figures,
tables, and interviews, in addition to recommending favorable action on an enabling act
for the territory.2 Starting on page fifty-five in the appendix of the latest in a series of
reports, however, the authors included a summary of every congressional investigation of
the atoll since 1935. Following this section were tables, charts, lists, and other
information on the territory, all credited to a nondescript organization, called the Hawaii
Statehood Commission, located in Washington, D.C.3 From the text alone, congressional
leaders or modern readers could simply assume that this was yet another non-profit
organization or lobbyist group supplying Capitol Hill with information. Such institutions
were not uncommon to Washington, D.C. Yet, this institution was novel to the territorial
process. It was an organization sponsored and funded by a territorial legislature for the
sole purpose of advancing statehood through research, entertainment, advertisement, and
mass communication.

2 U.S., Committee on Public Lands, Enabling the People of Hawaii to form a Constitution and State
Government and to be Admitted into the Union on an Equal Footing with the Original States, 80th Cong., 1st
3 Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, H. Rep. 109, 55-73.
Commissioned in 1947, the Hawaii Statehood Commission was the predecessor to the Hawaii Equal Rights Commission. These two organizations served as the principle vehicles for the statehood movement in the mid 1900s. Chartered in 1935 and revised in 1937 and 1939, the Hawaiian Territorial Legislature charged the Hawaii Equal Rights Commission with the broad task of compiling information that supported the rights of the territory and its inhabitants from facing discriminatory legislation; compiling information that assisted territorial legislative goals; preventing, combating, and correcting misinformation about the islands and their inhabitants; assisting the territorial delegate, territorial legislature, and federal statesmen when drafting congressional legislation; and, finally, preparing biennial reports. To aid the Commission with this monumental task, the Hawaiian Territorial Legislature authorized the opening of an office in Washington, D.C., and the appropriation of funds for a support staff. The duties attributed to the Hawaii Equal Rights Commission may have primarily emphasized ensuring equal treatment of the islands with the states, yet they also promoted the incorporated, insular territory as an American region capable of self-government and deserving of full

---

4 In 1946, Governor Ingram M. Stainback also authorized the formation of the Citizens’ Statehood Committee. Although this entity had territorial approval, it was not the principal organ for the statehood drive. Honolulu Star-Bulletin, “Hawaii’s Campaign for Statehood . . . How It Developed over the Years,” April 14, 1959, A 4-5.


6 Roger Bell, Last Among Equals: Hawaiian Statehood and American Politics (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1984), 63. Bell is correct in his analysis that the Hawaii Equal Rights Commission primarily sought equality with the other states, yet such a goal automatically indicated statehood. Within the American political system, territorial status automatically indicated inequality. Lacking congressional representation and subject to presidential nominees for high political office, the democratic process within the territorial and between the territory and the federal government is compromised. Through its efforts to obtain equality, they also promoted statehood and a positive image of the Territory of Hawai’i, thus making them an promotional organization.
inclusion into the American political system. When they created the Hawaii Statehood Commission to replace the Hawaii Equal Rights Commission in 1947, Hawaiian legislators dropped or subordinated the responsibility of ensuring equality. Now, the primary focus of the Commission was gaining statehood.7

For twenty-five years, the Hawaii Equal Rights Commission, Hawaii Statehood Commission, territorial delegates, Hawaiian businesses, and private citizens waged an unrelenting campaign for Hawaiian statehood. During this time, they utilized every legitimate means to achieve their goals. Whether it was entertaining congressional dignitaries, or publishing material on Hawaiian culture and politics, pro-statehood forces blended modern advertising with political lobbying to sway public and congressional opinion.

Congress already had experience with territorial populations pressing for statehood. After all, New Mexico and Arizona entered the union in 1912 after a protracted campaign that ran from the late 1890s into the early 1910s. In 1896, Utah finally entered the Union as a state after overcoming numerous obstacles. Their territorial duration also lasted a significant period of time, as they began moving towards statehood as early as 1849. So how exactly does the Hawaiian campaign fit into the present paradigm for Western American History? From roughly 1898 to 1959, Hawaiian citizens continuously pushed for statehood. To aid their campaign for full political incorporation into the American Union, Hawaiians combined the tested tools used by politicians to advance statehood for the continental territories with advertising methods championed by boosters and railroads to draw settlers and tourists west. Between 1935

and 1959, Hawaiians perfected their techniques which ultimately won them the public support in continental states needed to sway congressional votes in favor of statehood.

To understand fully the advertising innovations made during the Hawaiian statehood campaign, it is necessary to analyze the differences between more traditional statehood movements and western boosterism. Although most major cities throughout the nation engaged in some form of place promotion in their history, this phenomenon occurred most extensively in the American West. In the region west of the Mississippi River, the federal government possessed large tracts of land conquered from Native Americans and the Mexican Republic. Selling these lands relied on drawing settlers from the eastern seaboard or Europe. The federal government assisted in this process by passing legislation like the Homestead Act of 1862, which offered potential settlers 160 acres of land in the West. The offer applied to men, women, American citizens, and even foreigners. To claim the land, the individual simply had to pay a filing fee and improve and live on the land for five years. Later legislation added to the attractiveness of western lands by increasing the size of the land offered or extra benefits for planting trees.8 The federal government could pass any number of bills to entice settlers into leaving their homes, but such measures did not always prove effective in combating the negative imagery associated with the West.

Second, westerners faced the challenge of dispelling popular, negative images about the region. Americans have long associated three characteristics with the American West: treeless, flat, and arid. Portions of California, Oregon, and Washington escaped this misleading imagery, but the Great Plains and the Southwest did not. After

---

all, American primers adopted Major Stephen Long’s description of the Great Plains as the Great American Desert until the late nineteenth century. Although Americans may not have associated California and Oregon Country with these three images, they did associate most western regions as places void of or deficient in the modern amenities of urban life. Potential migrants desired a fresh start, yet they also wanted access to schools, theatres, stores, and other institutions.9

Luring settlers and combating negative imagery challenged western statesmen, businessmen, and private citizens who wanted to see their territories and cities increase in agricultural production and population, respectively. Accomplishing this goal required both individual and joint efforts. Generally speaking, railroads were the principal agent of place promotion in the West. Territorial governments also engaged in boosterism, yet budget restrictions limited their overall participation in the process. Private individuals also joined in efforts to promote their homelands to other Americans. Their motives ranged from possessing a deep passion for the land or recognizing the economic and social benefits of an increased population. And though territorial governments and residents wrote and published literature favorable to the region, their ability to disseminate this information on a large scale over extended periods of time was limited.10

10 Emmons, Garden in the Grasslands, 47-56; David M. Wrobel, Promised Lands: Promotion, Memory, and the Creation of the American West (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2002), 72-73; and Earl Pomeroy, The Territories and the United States, 1861-1890: Studies in Colonial Administration (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1947; Reprint, 1969), 22. Pomeroy observed that territorial legislatures used their annual reports to the Department of the Interior to relay information to individuals curious about the territory. This was one way territories could provide information to prospective settlers at a very low cost to their budgets.
Railroads, on the other hand, had the means, the determination, and the financial incentive to sink significant funds into promotional schemes. Constructing a transnational railroad linking the west coast to the east coast was a dream dreamt by the federal government prior to the American Civil War. Following the defeat of the southern states in 1865 and the ascendancy of the Republican Party, little dissent stood in the way of realizing this lofty ambition. To foster the spread of railroads throughout the western territories, congressmen turned to the railroad industry. By offering significant tracts of land at discounted prices and giving railroads huge amounts of free real estate, Congress initiated a period of massive expansion of the national transit system throughout the region. The mere presence of a transcontinental rail network automatically benefitted the nation.

While the railroad industry led commercial ventures in profit and wealth, their business was completely reliant on the presence of a populated countryside and thriving cities. Owning trains and rail systems was not enough; railroads needed passengers and cargo to generate revenue which would not come without sufficient settlement in the territories and western states. Boosterism provided an answer to this dilemma. Railroad companies hired promoters to write tracts, gazettes, and other literature for distribution in the eastern states, as well as European nations. They also created or used immigration bureaus as “disinterested” third parties to conduct transactions and sell their land. Since these efforts brought settlers, and therefore taxpayers, to the territories and states, western legislatures sometimes assisted the railroads in their efforts.11

Promoters used a standard set of tactics to lure settlers to the land. Often, they portrayed western lands as Edenic. Instead of a flat, treeless, arid region, the Great Plains became a place in which the land was fertile, rain would follow the plow, and building supplies were easily found on the land or in local stores. If an area had a sparse population, promoters twisted the truth to suggest a region in which the frontier stood to close soon, thus increasing the value of the land. They described sparsely populated regions as areas quickly filling with industrious farmers and businessmen intent on developing schools, city infrastructure, and other creature comforts. As David Wrobel notes, western promotion campaigns “were imaginative efforts to bring places into existence.”

By glossing over the unattractive parts of the region and overemphasizing the pleasant or perceived, boosters sought to erase misperceptions or negative imagery to promote settlement, tourism, or investment.

Historians of the American West usually separate boosterism from statehood efforts and for good reason. Promotional literature targeted Europeans and eastern Americans for potential relocation to the region, or to increase the number of tourists visiting the region. Boosterism, in other words, was a form of advertisement employed by railroads, businesses, territorial governments, and private citizens for very specific commercial purposes. Territorial statehood drives, on the other hand, were political affairs that relied on networks forged between territorial residents and delegates with congressional representatives and senators. Once a region met the minimum population quota as established by the precedent set by the Northwest Ordinance and developed the necessary social infrastructure—schools, churches, banks, businesses, state capitol, basic
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industry, railroads—the territorial legislature composed a memorial to Congress
requesting statehood. The territorial delegate then delivered this and used his political
contacts to move it through the House of Representatives and the Senate. Granted, this
was the basic plan of attack. Each territory had its own unique experience with this
process. This is not to say that statehood drives lacked a measure of advertisement or
place promotion. Territorial legislatures and delegates sometimes had to contend with
congressmen’s preconceived notions of the fitness of a territory to enter the union. The
degree and tools used to overcome congressional opposition, however, were different
than the tactics utilized by boosters.

For example, on February 2, 1848, the United States of America formally ratified
the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo, which transferred lands claimed by the Republic of
Mexico in the present-day Southwest to the American nation. One year later, a religious
group—the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints—living in the Great Basin region
applied for admission into the Union. Possessing a stable government, extensive public
infrastructure, and a viable economy, the Mormons met the basic criteria for statehood
according to their calculations. Congress thought otherwise. The Mormons practiced
polygamy, which most Americans considered distasteful. Also, Brigham Young and the
church elders held absolute control over political, social, religious, and economic affairs
in Deseret, a feature contradictory to the requirement established by the Northwest
Ordinance for a republican government. Throughout the mid-1800s, the inhabitants of
Deseret continued to push their claims for statehood. Unfortunately for them, the brief
Mormon War of 1857-1858, the dominance of church leadership, and the presence of
polygamy clashed with and complicated the issue. Following the Civil War and the
ascension of the Republican Party, polygamy became the newest target for national reform. In 1882, the Edmunds Bill attempted to end this practice by declaring polygamy illegal, punishable by $500 and up to 5 years in jail.¹⁴

Overcoming opposition to statehood was a product of political developments as opposed to an act of promotion. In 1872, residents officially abandoned the Deseret constitution—and thereby the dream of a Mormon state—and drafted a new constitution for Utah Territory, which occurred towards the end of the one-party system within the region. From 1865-1878, non-Mormon Utahans successfully organized a second party, the Liberty Party, to challenge the church leaders’ political hegemony. With the opening of the Mormon economy to the Southwest and the growth of the “gentile” population, religious leaders realized that the territorial political system had to accommodate an increasing non-Mormon population. Greater support for the Liberty Party was indicative of this development. The next important political obstacle to fall was the Nauvoo Legion. Established during their residence in Nauvoo, Illinois, in the 1840s, the militia protected the community from possible anti-Mormon violence. Although the militia was a defensive unit, their Illinoisan neighbors perceived the paramilitary unit as a move by the Mormons to establish a military presence in their state. Joseph Smith intensified their fears of the Nauvoo Legion when he used it to destroy an anti-Mormon newspaper press, the *Nauvoo Expositor*, in 1844. These perceptions of the Nauvoo Legion followed the unit to Utah. Through most of their territorial history, the Mormons kept the

controversial militia; however, in 1884, Utah leaders finally relented to external pressures and dismantled it.\textsuperscript{15} The final step in resolving the political barricades to statehood occurred on September 28, 1890, when the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints officially abandoned polygamy. Afterwards, the move to statehood occurred with relative speed. In November 1892, Congress passed an enabling act, and statehood followed two months later on January 4, 1896, when President Grover Cleveland signed the bill incorporating Utah into the United States.\textsuperscript{16}

Opposition to Utah emphasized religious and political differences, while Colorado, New Mexico, and Arizona faced political obstacles muddled by American racism. All three potential states contained significant Latino populations. Since they represented the earliest settlements in the territories, community infrastructure reflected their Spanish heritage. In these three territories, parochial schools represented a large segment of the education system. Given the prevalence of anti-Catholicism and xenophobia in the United States during the late 1800s and early 1900s, American statesmen were reluctant to admit territories with educational facilities dominated by a non-Protestant denomination. In Colorado, statesmen overcame the racial and political obstacles by 1874. The territories of New Mexico and Arizona, on the other hand, remained territories into the post-Spanish American War period, an era marked by increased American imperialism overseas. As Howard Lamar noted in his study of southwestern territorial history, many of the concerns over granting these territories statehood


\textsuperscript{16} Lamar, \textit{The Far Southwest}, 330-351.
grew out of the Spanish-American War: whether America should be an imperial nation with colonies or should accept the new possessions of Puerto Rico and the Philippines as an eventual part of the American Union. . . . More important for the Southwest was the fact that the war had been with Spain. Thus the backward and underdeveloped colonies that the United States had acquired possessed a Spanish colonial culture, possessed also by the Arizona and New Mexico in varying proportions.¹⁷

While territorial proximity to the other states and the source of potential white immigration helped these regions deny race-based anti-statehood arguments, political forces played a dominant role throughout the battle to achieve statehood. Granted, there was a degree of pandering to leading political leaders. The citizens of Central City, Colorado Territory, for example, gave President Ulysses S. Grant a royal treatment when he visited them, including the use of a silver-bricked walkway from his carriage to the hotel. But these incidents were tangential to the political effort.¹⁸ Hawaiian politicians, on the other hand, found it necessary to combine political maneuvering with mass promotion to overcome anti-statehood forces. New Mexico, Arizona, Colorado, Utah, and other western territories had to show proof that they had successfully completed the requirements established by the Northwest Ordinance. Hawai‘i, on the other hand, first had to persuade the American public that they had the right to be considered for complete political union years after they met all requirements established for potential states.

Hawai‘i also had to confront public misperceptions about race, geography, and republicanism in the territory before achieving statehood. As previously noted in chapter four, statehood opponents throughout the nation focused on the noncontiguous geographical location of the atoll. Separated by 2,300 miles of open water, the Hawaiian Islands appeared to be the most isolated of territories. Politicians noted this fact about

Hawaiian geography during Congressional debates over annexation as well as statehood. After the conclusion of World War II, the issue continued to reappear. As European colonies erupted in decolonization movements, Hawaii’s status as a non-self-governing territory separated by miles of ocean enhanced the arguments against statehood by compromising the image of America as a bastion of freedom, as well as raising questions regarding Americans’ legal and moral right to hold dominion over the former monarchy. During the Cold War, statehood proponents also countered noncontiguous arguments by illustrating that Hawaiian statehood would extend American borders deep into the Pacific Ocean, thereby projecting its military power into Asia.19

While Hawaiian statesmen and citizens reminded Americans of the equal isolation of California and the Oregon Country prior to 1869 as a quick counter to this issue, statehood proponents experienced more difficulty countering anti-statehood attacks on issues of race, geography, and communism in the Hawaiian Islands.20 For these three topics, islanders relied heavily on a new method of statehood promotion that combined both boosterism and past territorial politics from the continental American West. In this process, the territorial legislature worked intimately with private citizens, federal organizations, state commissions and committees, and private citizens to advance the cause of statehood. Although the statehood movement began as early as 1903—perhaps

---

19 For more information on this subject, see Chapter 4. Roger Bell also covers this issue briefly in Last Among Equals: Hawaiian Statehood and American Politics (Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 1984), 89.

even earlier if one includes the annexation debate of 1854—proponents perfected their new tactics of overcoming challenges to the Hawaiian right of entry into the American Union between 1935 and 1959.

Beginning with racial issues, eastern American migrants transplanted their attitudes towards ethnicity in the Hawaiian Islands, just as they had done in the American West. Although some visitors and settlers considered race relations between Euro-Americans, Japanese Americans, Native Hawaiians, Part-Hawaiians, Chinese Americans, and Filipino Americans as positive, negative stereotypes concerning the ethnic makeup of the island or news stories concerning conflict between Euro-Americans and non-Euro-Americans had a more significant impact on the issue of statehood. In fact, their influence affected the movement so significantly that the Hawaii Equal Rights Commission, Citizens’ Statehood Committee, Hawaii Statehood Commission, territorial representatives, and private statehood supporters continuously addressed the issue throughout the statehood process.

As shown in Table 3: Population of Hawai‘i, 1900-1960, the descendants of immigrants from Asian countries accounted for the majority of the population living in the Territory of Hawai‘i, a population pattern that began under the Kamehameha dynasty. With European diseases devastating the Native Hawaiian population, Hawaiian monarchs looked abroad for a new labor source. In 1850, Kauikeaouli passed the Act for the Government of Masters and Servants establishing the rules for immigrant labor to the

---

islands. As the Native Hawaiian population continued to diminish and sugar
production increased in economic importance, plantation owners continued to press for
more laborers.

Table 3: Population of Hawai‘i, 1900-1960

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Groups</th>
<th>1900</th>
<th>1910</th>
<th>1920</th>
<th>1930</th>
<th>1940</th>
<th>1945</th>
<th>1950</th>
<th>1960</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian</td>
<td>154,001</td>
<td>191,909</td>
<td>255,912</td>
<td>368,336</td>
<td>423,330</td>
<td>499,769</td>
<td>632,772</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part Hawai‘ian</td>
<td>9,857</td>
<td>12,506</td>
<td>18,027</td>
<td>28,224</td>
<td>49,935</td>
<td>61,422</td>
<td>73,845</td>
<td>91,109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>26,819</td>
<td>44,048</td>
<td>54,742</td>
<td>80,373</td>
<td>112,087</td>
<td>172,583</td>
<td>124,344</td>
<td>202,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>18,272</td>
<td>22,301</td>
<td>27,002</td>
<td>27,588</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rican</td>
<td>4,890</td>
<td>5,602</td>
<td>6,671</td>
<td>8,296</td>
<td>9,090</td>
<td>9,551</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>1,990</td>
<td>2,430</td>
<td>1,219</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Caucasian</td>
<td>8,547</td>
<td>14,867</td>
<td>19,708</td>
<td>44,895</td>
<td>103,791</td>
<td>114,793</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>25,767</td>
<td>21,674</td>
<td>23,507</td>
<td>27,179</td>
<td>28,774</td>
<td>30,005</td>
<td>32,376</td>
<td>38,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>2,361</td>
<td>21,031</td>
<td>63,052</td>
<td>52,569</td>
<td>46,464</td>
<td>61,062</td>
<td>69,070</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>61,111</td>
<td>79,675</td>
<td>109,274</td>
<td>139,631</td>
<td>157,905</td>
<td>163,300</td>
<td>184,598</td>
<td>203,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>4,533</td>
<td>4,950</td>
<td>6,461</td>
<td>6,851</td>
<td>7,042</td>
<td>7,030</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>2,651</td>
<td>4,943</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>472</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Others</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>1,618</td>
<td>12,002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900-1910</td>
<td>154,001</td>
<td>191,909</td>
<td>255,912</td>
<td>368,336</td>
<td>423,330</td>
<td>499,769</td>
<td>632,772</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian</td>
<td>29,799</td>
<td>26,041</td>
<td>23,723</td>
<td>22,636</td>
<td>14,375</td>
<td>10,988</td>
<td>12,245</td>
<td>11,294</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The Reciprocity Treaty of 1876 further stimulated planters’ desire for Asian
laborers. Though they repeatedly tried luring white agricultural laborers to the islands,
this ethnic group showed great reluctance to travel to the Hawaiian Islands to serve as
manual laborers in a tropical climate. Asian laborers, however, readily accepted the
opportunity to earn money for their families. As Ralph Kuykendall noted in *The
Kalakaua Dynasty*, in 1876 only 55,000 people lived in the atoll, out of which only 2,500
were Chinese. The Reciprocity Treaty and the subsequent increase in immigration
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forever changed this as more immigrant laborers from China, Korea, Japan, and the Philippine Islands arrived each year.²³

Throughout the territorial period, Japanese Americans represented the largest ethnicity in Hawai‘i. In 1900, out of 154,001 residents in the islands, 61,111, or 39.6%, were of Japanese descent. One year after statehood, their numbers increased to 184,598 out of 499,769, although this group declined in total proportion of island ethnicities to 36.9%. The Gentlemen’s Agreement of 1907 and Immigration Act of 1924 contributed significantly to the stabilization of the Japanese American population. When the United States annexed the islands, congressmen applied the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882 to the islands in response to western anti-Chinese agitation.²⁴ When restrictions to Chinese immigration were extended to the islands, plantation owners showed a degree of reluctance to accept these measures. They anticipated unrest and labor shortages. Strikes by Japanese American plantation laborers and the increased economic success of this ethnic group soured the opinions held by businessmen towards this group. Then in 1920 Japanese Americans and Filipino Americans engaged in two strikes, separated by ethnicity, for increased wages and better working conditions. These strikes were among the earliest significant labor movements in Hawai‘i that threatened to upset plantation-owner hegemony. By resisting poor labor conditions in the islands and showing a desire for self-improvement, Japanese Americans cast off the racial stereotype of docile workers in the islands.²⁵

²⁴ Moon-Kie Jung, “No Whites, No Asians: Race, Marxism, and Hawai‘i’s Preemergent Working Class,” *Social Science History* 23 (Autumn 1999): 368; Available on JSTOR.
Japanese Americans were not the only non-European immigrant group in the islands. Critics of Hawai‘i pointed to the general “imbalance” between Euro-American settlers and “the other.” Here was a classic instance in which a colonizing group, dependent on the economic and political benefits derived from its position as the colonizer, attempted to maintain its power by demonizing the subaltern ethnicities. In their own view, white settlers of the Hawaiian Islands were the civilizing, industrious force in the region, but their status as the minority group threatened the advancements made in colonial infrastructure and prevented any possibility of inclusion into the American political union, at least until 1958. As seen in the chart, white settlers represented 26,819, or 17.4%, of the population in 1900. By 1960, their numbers increased to 202,230, or 31.9%, of the population; however, as a group, they were still a minority, whereas the white population in the continental territories overshadowed non-European American, South American, Central American, African American, and Native American groups.

Conflicts between European Americans, Asian Americans, and Native Americans further enhanced the negative image of the Hawaiian Islands ethnic makeup. The Massie case is exemplary of the effect conflicts between these ethnicities could have on continental Americans’ perceptions of the Hawaiian Islands. On September 12, 1931, Thalia Massie, the young bride of Lieutenant Thomas H. Massie, US Navy, left a party early after growing bored. She departed from the Ala Wai Inn, Waikiki district, Honolulu, at 11:30 p.m. Three young men, whom Thalia Massie later identified as Joseph Kahahawai, Chang, and Ahakuelo, purportedly abducted, robbed, and raped the young woman on her return to the hotel. After hearing testimony from Mrs. Massie, the
Honolulu Police Department detained Kahahawai, Chang, and Ahakuelo. The case went to court with the first legal battle ending in a mistrial. The prosecutors and defense attorneys were preparing for a second trial, when on January 8, 1932, Lt. Massie and two enlisted men, E.J. Lord and A.G. Jones, drove to the courthouse and lured Joseph Kahahawai into their vehicle. They then took Kahahawai to the home of Mrs. Granville Fortescue, Thalia Massie’s mother. There, Lt. Massie shot the unarmed Kahahawai in an act of vigilante murder. Events that were less than three months in the making would fixate the attention of the continental United States for the next five months as the US Navy, Territory of Hawai’i, and American population debated over the nature of the murder, the effectiveness of the Hawaiian legal system, and race relations on the islands.26

Following the arrest of Mrs. Granville Fortescue, Massie, Lord, and Jones, major national newspapers erupted in a chorus of controversy. The popularity of the young Massie couple, Lt. Massie’s prominent Kentucky roots, and the alleged assault of a white female by Native Hawaiian “thugs” further exacerbated an already intense situation. Rumors circulated on military bases located in Hawai’i of potential racial conflict. Rear-Admiral Yates Stirling, Jr., commanding officer of forces stationed in Hawai’i, publicly denounced the situation, saying crime in Honolulu was “intolerable.”27 Rallying around their comrades, the US Navy issued a statement announcing its intentions to boycott Honolulu by visiting other Hawaiian harbors. The furor also spilled over to the mainland.

27 “Navy Chief Stands Behind Officer in Hawaii Case,” *Los Angeles Times*, January 10, 1932, 1, 2; Available on ProQuest.
Americans read of the Massie murders in major newspaper publications. The U.S. Attorney-General even visited the islands to investigate rumors of rampant crime and an incompetent judicial system in the region.28

After five months, the Massie case ended with the four suspects’ conviction of second-degree murder. Hawai‘i Territory Governor Lawrence M. Judd, however, commuted their sentences after one hour. In the end, public pressures and tensions among Hawaiian Islanders, the federal government, and the U.S. populace won out over justice. Rather than run the risk of alienating the mainland, Gov. Judd decided to release the prisoners and return them to the states.29 It appears that even Hawai‘i, Paradise of the Pacific, melting pot of all races, was not immune to vigilante justice.

Governor Judd’s decision to commute Massie, Fortescue, Lord, and Jones’s sentences may have preserved the peace, but sixteen years later feelings of injustice planted by the Massie case would return to the islands in the Major-Palakiko case. In March 1948, authorities discovered the body of a wealthy haole woman murdered in her home. After an investigation, they charged two Kānaka escapees from the Oahu prison with the crime. Found guilty, they were sentenced to die by hanging. Unlike the guilty parties in the Massie trial, appealing to the governor failed to keep the men from their appointed execution dates. In a study of the Major-Palakiko case five years later, Bernhard L Hormann discovered that the case became “a symbol to various component

population elements in Hawaii.”30 Reflecting on past trials and experiences of the Hawaiian judicial system, persons of Japanese, Hawaiian, Chinese, and “other non-Haole groups” perceived injustice in the way the legal system gave white residents special treatment. Hawaiian law, it seemed to them, was two-sided. Swift, hard justice descended on non-white suspects and criminals, while whites received lighter sentences, or in the case of Massie and his accomplices, no punishment at all.31

Massie’s vigilantism and the skewed justice system of the Major-Palakiko case were symptomatic of American racial views at the time. Throughout the southern states, justice for white Americans was not the same “justice” experienced by African Americans. Regional violence and community vigilantism were present in the American West. Western communities resorted to vigilante justice when social trends diverted from the accepted norm or when local law enforcement proved ineffectual. Granted, Hawaiian history does not reveal any large social vigilante movements.32 Yet, the slanted judicial system was symptomatic of the West as a whole. Throughout the region, law enforcement agents or vigilante groups often terrorized Mexican, Chinese, and Japanese immigrants. In many western courtrooms, judges permitted the exclusion of testimonies by Chinese Americans, Native Americans, South Americans, and Central Americans on the grounds that they could not understand the oath required to testify, or even in instances of religious or cultural differences. White violence toward these groups generally originated from cultural differences or cyclical downturns in the economy; however, historical developments generated mob and law violence, as well. In the case

31 Hormann, “The Significance of the Wilder or Major-Palakiko Case, A Study in Public Opinion,” 2-8.
32 Richard White, “It’s Your Misfortune and None of My Own,” 332-333.
of the Texas Rangers, border conflicts begun during the Texas Revolution and U.S.-Mexico War continued throughout the late 1800s and into the early 1900s.\textsuperscript{33} One could say that western legal culture embraced the racial prejudices of society.

During the rising tensions of the 1930s between the United States and the Japanese, as well as the horrors and turmoil of World War II, Americans considered the Japanese American population on the mainland and the Hawaiian Islands as a threat, a subversive element in society that threatened to sabotage the war effort. The Roosevelt Administration responded to this perceived threat with Executive Order 9066 in February 1942 authorizing the removal of the Nisei and Issei to concentration camps situated in the interior of the nation. This was not the first instance where the nation overreacted to a perceived threat within its borders. During the Red Scare of 1919, federal policies targeted socialists, communists, and leftists in an attempt to silence subversive political ideologies. Throughout the nineteenth century, Americans considered Native Americans as the largest internal threat. Their response ranged from the Indian Removal Act of 1830 and the reservation system to genocidal campaigns like that of Sand Creek in 1864. Hawaiian minorities and labor leaders suffered civil oppression as well during the 1940s and 1950s. Whereas the Japanese American population was the source of fear throughout World War II, labor leaders and suspected communists became the hidden enemy during the post-World War II statehood movement. The result was the same as their political rights were sacrificed in the name of a greater good.

By the 1940s, labor unions evolved into the major source of opposition to the entrenched powers in the Hawaiian Islands. But this did not happen overnight. The

Hawaiian labor movement developed with each new generation of workers. Labor unions and strikes of the 1920s and 1930s were different in composition than those of the post-World War II era. As Moon-Kie Jung noted in “No Whites, No Asians: Race, Marxism, and Hawai‘i’s Preemergent Working Class,” pre-World War II labor was ethnically fragmented. Plantation owners knowingly divided their workforce according to race to prevent unionization and strikes. It was not uncommon to see a Japanese or Kānaka *luna*\(^{34}\) overseeing a work gang of Chinese or Filipino laborers. By providing low-level supervisory and managerial positions to certain ethnicities while closing them to others, plantation owners successfully fomented animosity among their laborers. The different ethnic groups also added to this process through their own action and preconceived racial views. The living arrangements mirrored the views of ethnic minorities towards each other with plantation housing segregated throughout the early 1900s. When the Immigration Act of 1924 completely barred the importation of Japanese and Chinese laborers into the Territory of Hawai‘i, business owners turned to the Philippine Islands as a source of imported labor. To the more established ethnicities, the word Filipino became associated with cheap labor. The division was not confined only to racial and class perceptions. Ethnic blocks conducted the strikes of the 1920s and 1930s. To illustrate this point, Jung highlights the plantation strikes of 1920 in which Filipino laborers and Japanese laborers conducted separate, simultaneous labor stoppages for roughly the same terms.\(^{35}\)

---

\(^{34}\) The Hawaiian word *luna* refers to a foreman, manager, or field boss.

Ethnic separation slowly deteriorated during the late 1930s and throughout the 1940s. By the conclusion of World War II, the International Longshoremen and Warehousemen’s Union emerged as the preeminent union in the islands uniting workers of all racial groups present in the territory. While this new form of collective bargaining successfully bridged cultural gaps, its radicalism antagonized conservative elements in the Hawaiian Islands. After the conclusion of World War II, a battle erupted between labor and business. With the advent of McCarthyism, wealthy Hawaiians delivered a major blow to the working class by successfully branding the union as a communist organization. Ironically, their actions hampered the statehood cause for almost fifteen years.

The ILWU had its roots in the 1934 strike located on the West Coast. That year, the International Longshoremen Association (ILA) began a strike in California that quickly spread to other parts of the shipping industry, resulting in the absolute shutdown of transportation along the docks. After a compromise between the ILA and business leaders, Harry Bridges and other non-compromising union members bolted the organization and established the ILWU. Bridges established the union on the principle that he would never compromise or back down during a strike.36 Hawaiian laborers needed a union headed by leaders adamant about securing recognition of the workers’ voices to break the stranglehold businessmen had on society. The only thing left to find was an energetic leader capable of organizing the masses.

Manning the picket lines during the California strikes was a young man named Jack Hall. Introduced early into union life, the young man displayed the qualities

36 Tom Coffman, The Island Edge of America: A Political History of Hawai‘i (Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 2003), 39.
necessary to lead the fight in the islands. His dedication to the union and the cause of the laborer later helped him become a driving force in the Hawaiian ILWU chapters. Unfortunately, his association with radical labor ideas and the U.S. Communist Party during the 1930s would plague Hall and the Hawaiian ILWU during the 1940s and 1950s. Hall had joined the party in 1935.37

Radical ideas among the working class were not unheard of during the Great Depression. Even the Great Plains, heartland of America and modern home of conservatism, witnessed a surge in leftist movements and radical agrarianism. In northeast Montana, Charles E. Taylor established a communist newspaper, *Producers News*, in which he published leftist articles covering the farmers’ plight during the Great Depression. Throughout the Northern Great Plains, non-socialist farmers engaged in farm strikes, vigilante action, penny auctions, and protest movements to vent their frustration and force politicians to listen to their demands.38

Although the federal government recognized the existence of Great Plains radicalism, opposition to such movements tended to occur primarily at the local level. This radicalism is understandable given the upheaval caused by the financial crisis, dust storms, and international events of the 1930s. America after 1945 was a different story. In a world characterized as a battleground between the opposing ideologies of capitalism and communism, Americans were less apt to excuse leftist movements or challenges to the status quo as the venting of frustration over a broken system. For laborers in the

38 Charles Vindex, “Radical Rule in Montana” in *Americans View Their Dust Bowl Experience*, eds. John R. Wunder, Frances W. Kaye, and Vernon Carstensen (Boulder: University Press of Colorado, 1999), 281-302. This volume also examines other forms of agrarian radicalism during the Dust Bowl. Although socialist movements and newspapers were limited to very specific regions, the Depression era Great Plains as a whole was a region rampant with various forms of farmer protest.
Territory of Hawaiʻi, the revival and expansion of organized labor was the rational result of the economic stranglehold by the Big Five, Republican Party, and wealthy citizens over the islands. Hawaiian employers argued that they compensated their workers with decent paychecks and ample employment opportunities. From the perspective of the laborer, it was exactly the opposite. Wages were low, and employment was sporadic. Moreover, education and advancement opportunities were limited, at best. Unionization presented the only viable solution to economic slavery.

Naturally, Hawaiian industrial and agribusiness leaders abhorred collective bargaining and unionization in any form or fashion. Having reigned over the economic life of the atolls for almost a century, they were loath to relinquish any power to the worker. To combat the growing power of the ILWU, they collectively worked to portray labor as a communist-infested segment of Hawaiian society. In an interview with Michaelyn Chou in 1978 ex-territorial delegate Elizabeth Pruitt Farrington dismissed the charges of communism. She said, “But [my husband] Joe did say this: that the trouble with the Big Five—then, (there’s no such thing as the real Big Five, but what we refer to as the big business interests)—he said, ‘The trouble was that whenever it was an economic issue, when the unions wanted the new contract with more money, then the Big

39 Islanders and mainlanders referred to American Factors, Theo. H. Davies, Alexander & Baldwin, Castle & Cooke, and C. Brewer—the dominant industrial, agricultural, and commercial business interest in the islands—as the Big Five. Their wealth, landholdings, and political connections gave hegemony over all aspects of island life.


41 Joseph Rider Farrington was Elizabeth Pruitt Farrington’s husband. He served as the territorial delegate prior to Mrs. Farrington following his career as a territorial senator and owner of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin.
Five yelled “communism” to them when it wasn’t at all. Then if it was really communism, they stayed quiet because the contract was going all right.’ See what I mean?”\(^{42}\) Compared to the average laborer, the Farringtons were members of the established class. Joseph Rider Farrington came from a distinguished family, and he was part owner of the principle newspaper, the *Honolulu Star-Bulletin*. When he passed away in 1954, Republican Party leaders in the islands offered Elizabeth Farrington the position of territorial delegate. Regardless, reality did not prevent business leaders from charging the ILWU and union members as having an association with the Communist Party, thereby effectively undermining the ability of labor to wrest political and economic power from the Hawaiian old guard.

Ironically, the plan devised by businessmen, conservative politicians, and affluent citizens to undermine the labor movement provided the anti-Hawai’i statehood opposition on the continent and in the isles with ammunition. Hawaiian statehood posed a threat to Southern Democrats in Congress. The incorporation of a state with a predominately Asian population boded ill for their campaign to preserve segregation throughout the southern states. Hoping to preserve the relative balance in Congress, they did not want another Republican state with pro-civil rights sympathies to take a seat on Capitol Hill. Such a development could tip the balance in favor of social reform. Since President Harry Truman tied Hawaiian statehood to his civil rights program, they continuously raised the issue of the presence of a white minority in congressional debates over statehood. While this gained them some support among the American population, it was

not enough to guarantee the continued exclusion of the islands from full participation in the American democratic process. The possibility of communism, however, gave them the opportunity to ally their cause with other senators and congressmen dedicated to winning the Cold War. From 1946 onward, pro-statehood forces found themselves fighting a two-front battle for incorporation. They not only needed to soothe American fears over including an atoll with a population that was 75% non-white, but they had to confront serious charges of being a home for communists.

Although Southern Democrats eagerly exploited accusations of Hawaiian communism to oppose the passage of an enabling act, they were not the only senators to block pro-Hawaiian legislation in Congress for this reason. Throughout the early 1950s, Senator Hugh Alfred Butler of Nebraska (Republican) acted as a leading critic of Hawai‘i statehood because of the alleged presence of communism. He diligently gathered information regarding the supposed communist conspiracy in Hawai‘i. Republicans fearing Hawaiian communism found themselves allied with Southern Democrats to prevent the incorporation of a traditionally Republican territory into the Union.

Groups within Hawai‘i further complicated the task of winning statehood for the territory. First, in late 1951 and early 1952, a famous court case against Jack W. Hall, Koji Ariyoshi, Jack Denichi Kimoto, Charles Kazuyuki Fujimoto, Eileen Toshko

---


Fujimoto, Dwight James Freeman, and John E. Reinecke ended in a guilty verdict. The famous “Trial of Seven” received national press as leading leftists and union organizers were tried before a federal judge for violating the Smith Act. Arrested at the end of 1951, the trial took over one year before a jury found all seven defendants guilty in June 1953. The male defendants all received a sentence of five years in prison and a $5,000 fine, while the only female defendant, Eileen Fujimoto, received a lighter sentence of 3 years and $2,000.

The Trial of Seven received national press coverage since it included prominent labor and leftist leaders in the islands. Moreover, in 1947, Ichiro Izuka named all seven defendants as communist leaders, even listing their roles in propagating communism throughout the islands, in his pamphlet, *The Truth about Communism in Hawaii*. Written by a self-professed Whitaker Chambers-like communist who assisted with HUAC investigations after admitting his involvement with communist members, this publication was a sensation as it provided statehood critics and curious Americans with a purportedly accurate narrative of the workings of the Communist Party in Hawai‘i.

To add to the negative publicity, the Equal Rights Commission, Hawaii Statehood Commission, and Citizens’ Statehood Committee faced a determined foe in the form of IMUA. The Hawaii Residents’ Association, Inc., also known as IMUA, was created in

---

45 “Hawaii’s Docks Boss Convicted with 6 Others,” *Chicago Daily Tribune*, June 20, 1953, 3; Available on ProQuest.
46 “6 Hawaii Reds Each Sentenced to 5 Years: Fined $5,000,” *Chicago Daily Tribune*, July 4, 1953, 1; Available on ProQuest. For more information on the trial written by historians, see Roger Bell, *Last Among Equals*, 209; and Daws, *The Shoal of Time*, 373-374. Senator Hugh Alfred Butler also kept close tabs on the progress of the trial. The Hugh Alfred Butler Collection at the Nebraska State Historical Society contains numerous newspaper clippings and other documents on the court case that Butler collected. Apparently, this court case vindicated his beliefs about the extent to which communism penetrated Hawaiian society and unions. See Box 224, Hugh Alfred Butler, MS2331, Nebraska State Historical Society, Library/Archives Division.
1949. Its stated purpose was threefold: “1) Combat Communism and all Un-American subversive activities. 2) Live and work together in racial harmony. 3) Demonstrate and maintain the American Way of Life.” In order to fulfill these goals, the Hawaii Residents’ Association recruited prominent, established members of Hawaiian society. Former Governor Lawrence M. Judd served as its president in 1955. Its membership also included T.G. Singlehurst of the Bishop Trust Co., Mrs. Walter F. Dillingham, retired Brigadier General K. J. Fielder, and a number of physicians.

The Hawaii Residents’ Association was very active in its struggle to eliminate communism in Hawai‘i. Unfortunately for territorial residents in favor of statehood, their relentless crusade damaged the image of Hawai‘i throughout the nation. Its publications, speeches, fundraisers, and activities not only proclaimed that a great conspiracy existed in the islands to overthrow republicanism and replace it with a Marxist state, but they also reached the mainland. They tracked alleged communists and communist organizations in the islands with a fervor reminiscent of the Spanish Inquisition.

Labor unions were their primary target. Reviewing their literature, IMUA focused their attacks on the ILWU and the United Public Workers’ Union (UPW). Reminiscent of the McCarthy hearings before the House Un-American Activities Commission (HUAC), IMUA publicly denounced and proclaimed that members of

---

48 “1955 Public Policy Statement by “IMUA” Hawaii Residents’ Association, Inc.,” Box 9, fo. 358, John Burns Papers, M-481, Hawai‘i State Archives.
49 Walter F. Dillingham hailed from a family that arrived in Hawai‘i prior to annexation. His business, Hawaiian Dredging Company, was responsible for large-scale projects like dredging Honolulu harbor and developing Ala Moana Park. Not only was he a significant businessman in the territory, but he was also an ardent critic of statehood. See Frank J. Taylor, “Hawaii’s Indefatigable Land Maker,” Reader’s Digest (November 1951), Box 224, Hugh Alfred Butler, MS2331, Nebraska State Historical Society, Library/Archives Division, Lincoln, Nebraska.
50 Dr. Lyle G. Phillips, “Anti-Statehood . . . or Anti-Communist? Decide for Yourself,” Speech delivered at the All American Conference of National Organizations to Combat Communism, Pittsburgh, Ohio, November 16, 1957, Box 9, fo. 358, John Burns Papers, M-481, Hawai‘i State Archives.
ILWA and UPW, as well as individuals associated with the University of Hawai’i, Honolulu schools, and liberal organizations, actively sought to undermine American society in the islands. Americans brought before HUAC risked losing their jobs and community standing. Likewise, members of organizations targeted by IMUA faced the possibility of public embarrassment and worse. Radio programs broadcast throughout the islands were a favorite tool of IMUA, and their shows often included segments in which the narrator would name suspected communists on the air. Worse still, they included their place of employment and their supposed connection to other communists and the ILWU. In addition to denouncing these organizations and their members, they also targeted members of the Democratic Party. After the conclusion of World War II, working class veterans like Daniel Inouye and Daniel Aoki returned to the islands intent on breaking the grip that the Republican Party held on Hawaiian politics. Allying themselves with John Burns, they worked to transform the Democratic Party into a viable political organization. By championing workers’ rights, education, and social programs, they quickly captured the attention of working class Hawaiians, as well as the unions. This combination, between the unions and the Democrats, placed the party as a threat to the American society championed by members of IMUA.

---

52 For the rise of the Democratic Party, see Roger Bell, Last Among Equals, 144-145. Tom Coffman, Gavan Daws, and John Whitehead also discuss the revival of the Hawaiian Democratic Party in their major publications. For the best source on John Burns’ role in this, reference Dan Boylan and T. Michael Holmes, John A. Burns: The Man and His Times (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2000). Finally, the targeting of unions, Democrats, and liberals is found in almost every speech and publication delivered by IMUA. A good source for documents illustrating this bias is the John Burns Papers at the Hawai’i State Archives. As territorial delegate, Burns kept track of the activities of IMUA, since they often targeted him and his associates. For a quick reference, I recommend examining box 9, fo. 359 and 358, John A. Burns, M-481, Hawai’i State Archives.
IMUA inflated the numbers and danger of Hawaiian communists. There never was a large presence of Marxists in the islands. HUAC teams dispatched to Honolulu never uncovered more than 130 members. Most of these were active in the Communist Party throughout the 1930s and 1940s. J. Edgar Hoover’s FBI operatives reported only small groups of communists, not the overarching network of subversives as portrayed by IMUA. This followed a time of radicalism in the United States of America. American workers lived with an enormous amount of stress throughout the Great Depression. Given the uncertainties of the market, the dearth of job opportunities, and the apparent failure of capitalism, Americans experimented with leftist ideologies and radical programs to fix the system; however, American society in the 1950s wanted an end to viable leftist groups. This allowed them to tolerate such groups as IMUA whose tactics would most likely land them in a modern courthouse for slander and libel.

Regardless, news of the anti-communist campaign conducted by IMUA and other conservatives reached the mainland where it provided Southern Democrats and statehood critics with more ammunition. The task of combating this negative publicity even penetrated popular culture as images of a viable, strong, threatening communist presence in the islands appeared in movie theatres throughout the states. In 1952, John Wayne starred as HUAC investigator dispatched to the Territory of Hawai`i to find red commies in Big Jim McLain. Assisting McLain in his search for subversives is Mal Baxter, a Marine Corps veteran who served in Korea and lost a brother in the Japanese bombardment of the U.S.S. Arizona. In Hawai`i, McLain uncovers a horrendous communist plot. Apparently, Moscow dispatched a shady operative, called Sturak, to organize operatives who are members of the local unions. Although the movie script

53 Roger Bell, Last Among Equals, 174.
never directly states the names of the unions, it is easy to identify them as the ILWU and UPW. With the local labor unions and a bacteriologist at his disposal, Sturak plans to create a work stoppage at piers throughout Hawai‘i to prevent supplies from reaching cities. Simultaneously, the bacteriologist will unleash a deadly disease into the population. With communications cut off, shipping halted, and an infected populace, the Hawaiian people will easily fall to the communist cells planted throughout the atoll. To make matters worse, Sturak has no intentions of rewarding his commie stooges. They, too, will fall since they are expendable pawns in the great Cold War chess game. Luckily for America, Big Jim, enraged at the murder of his partner Mal, discovers a secret meeting of the last cell in time to arrive, pummels them silly with his manly fists, and then lectures them on how Americans “don’t hit the little guy” since they “believe in fair play and all that sort of thing.”

For territories in the continental American West, gaining full political membership was primarily a political process. Entertaining visiting federal representatives could prove helpful. At other times, territorial legislatures pressured Congress into acting swiftly by drafting and adopting a state constitution prior to the passage of an enabling act. Regardless of the tactic, scholars in the American West have highlighted the federal-territorial relationship as the main avenue to statehood.

The issue of Hawai‘i, on the other hand, was more complex. When contemplating full incorporation of the territory, Americans’ attention turned immediately to the issues of non-contiguity, race, and communism. New Mexico, Arizona, and Colorado also confronted congressional opposition because of the presence of a significant Mexican-

---

American community within their borders, but they also expected the white population to increase rapidly with settlement. Hawaiian attempts to lure European and American settlers to the islands always met with failure. Regardless of their efforts, the racial composition in the islands promised to remain mixed.

Hawaiians confronted a novel challenge overcoming the negative publicity generated by charges of communism during their fight for statehood. Radical ideologies and labor movements were an established fact in the West. The Knights of Labor successfully made inroads in Kansas City politics during the 1880s, even allying themselves with the Republicans.  

In 1877, Lampasas County, Texas, residents banded together to form the Knights of Reliance, which later became known as the Farmers’ Alliance. Initially a non-political organizations that stressed cooperatives and education, the Farmers’ Alliance served as the core for the Populist Movement, a national organization of American farmers that peaked after backing William Jennings Bryan during the election of 1896. Of all the unions and agrarian organizations in the West, none matched the Industrial Workers of the World (IWW). While the IWW provided members with social activities, its greatest impacts on the region came in the form of strikes. By mobilizing all workers, including migrant laborers, the Wobblies were capable of disrupting commerce across large areas. Their radicalism even went so far as to condone sabotaging industrial machinery. While western communities learned to accommodate the Populists, Knights of Labor, and other movements, they never accepted the radicalism of the IWW. During the Red Scare that followed World War I, western

---

cities and states utilized public opinion, law enforcement, and state government to crush the union.57

As shown, labor radicalism was not a new development in the West by the time Hawai‘i earnestly began its statehood campaign; yet, the charges of communism leveled at the territory assumed a new significance during the Cold War. Following the development of nuclear weapons in Russia, the victory of the communist forces in the Chinese Civil War, and the advent of McCarthyism in the United States, the rise of the ILWU, UPW, and anti-Republican groups suddenly appeared as a significant threat to Hawaiian conservatives and mainlanders, creating negative publicity that was vastly different from the images of aridity and barrenness plaguing boosters and statehood proponents in western territories. To overcome effectively the challenges posed by race, non-contiguity, and communism, Hawaiian statehood promoters had to blend the tactics of older western statehood movements with the advertising skills and techniques employed by western boosters.

Just as place promotion and statehood required the cooperation of state, business, and private entities and the use of multiple media, promoting Hawaiian incorporation was a massive undertaking. Private citizens, the territorial legislature, business interests, and nonprofit organizations engaged in collective and individual campaign efforts to highlight the most attractive features of Hawaiian politics, economics, and culture. Since their opponents successfully associated the Territory of Hawai‘i with “un-American” characteristics by exaggerating the threats posed by race and communism, statehood promoters could not rely on simply presenting Hawai‘i in real terms. To accomplish their goal, they, too, would need to exaggerate the beauties of the islands by promoting

57 White, “It's Your Misfortune and None of My Own,” 293-296.
tourism, monitoring the national press, hosting congressional dignitaries, writing articles and editorials, advertising the islands, lobbying Congress, and ensuring a positive portrayal of Hawai‘i in the national media.

On May 3, 1957, Honolulu resident Ray Jerome Baker wrote to his friends, Dr. and Mrs. Richard Blum, regarding events occurring around the city. A renowned local photographer, Baker maintained a rather significant correspondence network with friends scattered across the nation. While most of his letters covered topics ranging from his trip across Soviet Russia to his views on the foreign policy of “Mr. Dull-ass” (he was an ardent critic of Secretary of State John Foster Dulles), his attention through much of 1956 and 1957 returned to hotel construction along Waikiki by Henry Kaiser, a major industrialist who had been visiting the islands since the 1930s. Recognizing the potential profits of Hawaiian tourism, he began constructing hotels after World War II. By May 3, Kaiser had completed another project, a large convention center that Baker called “a huge bowl turned upside down; built in such a way that there are no struts, braces or supports inside.”

This building was designed to serve as a convention center for the growing number of business tourists arriving in the islands. Since the conclusion of World War II, Baker and other Honolulu residents recognized a growing trend in Honolulu. Each year, more tourists arrived to attend hula dances and luaus, surf the waves at Waikiki, and even haunt the dim bars near the hotels. Prior to World War II, annual tourism hovered around 25,000 people per annum. Since the end of the war, these numbers grew swiftly. In 1958 alone, 183,610 visitors arrived in Honolulu, bringing with them $88 million dollars in

58 Ray Jerome Baker, Honolulu, Hawai‘i, to Dr. and Mrs. Richard Brun, Hill Valley, California, May 3, 1957, Box 10.2, Ray Jerome Baker Collection, MS Grp 16, Bishop Museum and Archives.
revenue. As Baker well observed, the trend was here to stay and forward-thinking investors like Henry Kaiser and Conrad Hilton wanted in on the business early.\textsuperscript{59}

The tourist industry was important to western continental territories and states, as well as Hawai‘i, as it generated revenue, encouraged settlement, and dispelled misperceptions of the region. As a promotional tool, it was perfect. It offered familiarity through fun. Railroad owners and operators recognized that they could earn money selling extra land faster if the territory had a sizeable population and strong infrastructure. In trying to promote western territories, their interests intersected with those of local communities, as well as territorial and state legislatures. Local western communities were expanding and diversifying their economies as the nineteenth century concluded and the twentieth century began. They needed investors, middle class professionals, and wealthy entrepreneurs to supplement the largely agrarian population. They hoped that some of their bourgeois visitors would fall in love with the states and decide to establish roots there, or at least invest in new business ventures.\textsuperscript{60}

Likewise, the interests of the nascent tourist industry coincided with those of the territory. Although the conclusion of the Second World War brought with it record numbers of visitors from the mainland (see Table 3), experts predicted that statehood would greatly increase these numbers. It would make people more willing to visit the


islands and also increase investment in hotels and other recreational companies.\textsuperscript{61}

Tourism, in turn, helped statehood proponents counter the negative publicity caused by their antagonists by giving the territory a chance to show visitors the better side of island life and culture and increasing the industrial base of the Hawaiian economy. Hawaiian businessmen recognized the potential of the tourist industry to make generous profits as early as 1902. In that year civic and economic leaders created the Hawaii Promotion Committee, which became the Hawaii Tourist Bureau in 1917. Funded by the territorial legislature and private enterprise, this institution oversaw promotional activities to increase the flow of visitors to the islands. The Hawaii Tourist Bureau focused its efforts on disseminating information and creating a tourist infrastructure throughout the islands.\textsuperscript{62} It published \textit{Tourfax}, a pocket guidebook started in 1920, in addition to maps, brochures, posters, and other literature. \textit{Tourfax} contained a virtual cornucopia of information for island visitors. It described the geography of the islands, local events, and Hawaiian culture. The publishers also included a hotel guide in the pocket encyclopedia with complete information on the amenities provided at establishments. Finally, the Hawaii Tourist Bureau remembered to acquaint visitors with territorial and local laws governing marriage, customs, immigration, health, and other important issues.\textsuperscript{63}

\textsuperscript{61} “Statehood Seen Bringing Record Flow of Tourists,” \textit{Honolulu Star-Bulletin}, April 14, 1959, C-9. In their study on tourism during World War II, David Farber and Beth Bailey noted the importance of the US serviceman on national perceptions of Hawai‘i. They wrote, “One strategy was to shape the opinions of the men from the mainland who had spent time in Hawaii during the war. As Hawaii moved toward statehood, their opinions about the place would matter. It was important to the business elite that Hawaii not appear as primitive or unstable.” (657)


\textsuperscript{63} \textit{Tourfax} no. 127 (Fall 1940), Handbook on Hawaii, COM 16-1, Hawaii Equal Rights Commission, Hawaii State Archives.
Table 4: Tourists visiting the Territory of Hawai‘i from 1922 to 1958, selected years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Through passengers</th>
<th>Tourist arrivals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td>18,202</td>
<td>9,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>19,492</td>
<td>12,021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>19,103</td>
<td>12,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>19,201</td>
<td>15,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926</td>
<td>19,478</td>
<td>16,762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927</td>
<td>19,657</td>
<td>17,451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928</td>
<td>20,793</td>
<td>19,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td>22,262</td>
<td>22,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>21,585</td>
<td>18,651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>19,268</td>
<td>15,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932</td>
<td>16,662</td>
<td>10,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>17,173</td>
<td>10,111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>25,110</td>
<td>16,161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>25,992</td>
<td>19,933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>27,942</td>
<td>22,199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>31,951</td>
<td>21,987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>27,132</td>
<td>23,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>41,156</td>
<td>24,381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1939-June 1940</td>
<td>32,215</td>
<td>25,007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>183,610</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Businesses throughout the island added to the advertising campaign of the Hawaii Tourist Bureau by running their own colorful ads in magazines, newspapers, and tourist bureaus throughout the nation. Castle and Cooke, Matson Navigation Company, Inter-Island Airways, the Royal Hawaiian Hotel, the Association of Hawaiian Pineapple Canners, Coca-Cola, and other companies utilized Hawaiian imagery to sell their products or lure potential customers to the Pacific retreat. Their advertisements provided picturesque scenes of island attractions. In these pictures, outrigger canoes manned by Kānaka oarsmen broke the still, deep blue waters lining the beaches where happy tourists sunbathed. Well-dressed diners danced to the music of jazz bands under a canopy of
palm trees and stars. Every picture and every image relayed to the observer a paradise available to travelers.\textsuperscript{64}

In his work on visual Hawaiian promotion material, DeSoto Brown traced the career of four artists responsible for the imagery viewed by Americans. Don Blanding, Ruth Taylor White, Frank McIntosh, and Eugene Savage were pioneers of Hawaiian iconography associated with mid-1900s advertising. White’s work featured the Native Hawaiian hula dancer image most often identified with the islands. Frank McIntosh and Eugene Savage both drew menu designs for the Matson Navigation Company. Since oceanic travel served as the primary form of transit to the islands before the commercialization of air travel, most tourists arrived aboard a Matson ocean liner. Imagery found on Matson menus became so popular that the company began selling them as a souvenir item. More important to this study is the accuracy of the imagery.

According to Brown, these men used an exaggerated style to portray the islands. Reminiscent of the promotional images used by railroads, boosters, and territorial legislatures in the nineteenth-century West, the designs drawn by Blanding, White, McIntosh, and Savage portrayed an almost Edenic land to lure people west.\textsuperscript{65}

Pictures, menus, postcards, and magazine pages were a great platform to promote the territory, but the arrival of moving pictures and radio vastly increased the potentials of advertising, and the pro-statehood faction quickly recognized this. The Hawaii Tourist Bureau staged motion pictures throughout the islands at the peak of tourist season.

Utilizing the latest cinematographic innovations in color and sound, the movies captured


the most attractive aspects of the islands to show in movie theatres throughout the United States. With the growing popularity of motion pictures, the bureau realized that it could reach mass audiences with an advertising medium that captured the imagination with doctored images. Moreover, the Hawaii Tourist Bureau was adept in producing these films. In 1939, their movie, *Hawaii, U.S.A.*, proved rather popular as it drew in large audiences at the Golden Gate International Exposition.66

Filmed in 1938, *Hawaii, U.S.A.* was a masterpiece of promotional material. Throughout the film, the audience was treated to picturesque panoramas of the landscape. The film celebrated Hawaiian diversity by flashing images of beautiful beaches, majestic mountains, clean Honolulu streets, happy residents, and lei-bearing Kānaka before the audience. *Hawaii, U.S.A.* captured more than scenes of popular tourist sites. The director made sure to include the economic and military importance of the territory. The dialogue described the Hawaiian sugar industry as “American agriculture at its best.” Workers appeared in the movie. The narration covered how they received rent-free homes, gymnasiums, hospitals, and clean recreation areas. The Honolulu business center, “typically American,” was an economic hub where over $100,000,000 in manufactured goods were bought and sold. As for non-contiguity, wireless radio, telephones, and modern transportation linked Hawaiian cities together and kept the islands in close contact with the mainland. Finally, American viewers enjoyed scenes depicting the presence of the powerful U.S. Army and Navy throughout the islands. Pearl Harbor Naval Base, the “most important offshore base” of any nation in the world, not only protected Americans living in the Territory of Hawai‘i, it also projected American

---

democracy and freedom throughout the Pacific Ocean.67 This film would have made the promoters of nineteenth-century Omaha, Denver, and Sacramento Valley proud as it carried on their tradition of selling Edenic dreams and vistas to the American public.

The Hawaii Tourist Bureau and territorial businesses performed remarkably in their efforts to promote Hawaiian tourism. By the 1960s, the islands had been transformed from a sugar- and pineapple-producing colony into a major tourist destination in the United States. Clear proof of this came in the form of a film celebrating the tourist scene of Waikiki. Released in 1962, *Blue Hawaii* starred Elvis Presley as young Chadwick “Chad” Gates. As a young soldier returning from peacetime duty in the armed forces, Chad must decide on a career path and marriage partner. His parents want him to follow his father’s example. Mr. Gates works as the vice-president at the Great Southern Hawai‘i Fruit Company. As a leading Honolulu businessman, Gates can afford to house his southern belle wife in a comfortable home, complete with an Asian-American butler named Ping Pong. As a spouse and mother, Sarah Lee Gates wants Chad to marry well. Unfortunately for her, Chad is in love with Maile, played by Joan Blackman, a young lady with a Native Hawaiian grandmother, who is “below his class.” Worse still, Chad has no intention of having his career handed to him. According to Chad, the G.I. Bill promised him that he could do anything he wanted in life. In Chad’s case, he wants to live in a beach shack where he can surf, swim, practice Judo, and play music with his Native Hawaiian friends.68

Throughout the mainland, such a youth would be considered lazy and a drain on society, but in Hawai‘i, Chad can turn his dream into a reality. The rest of the film

---

67 *Hawaii, U.S.A.*, (1938; Drumming Process, Co., 1938), Bishop Museum and Archives.
follows Presley’s character as he enters the tourist industry. After experiencing a few setbacks, young Mr. Gates successfully lands a client in his new tourist business. In addition, he teams up with Maile, who finally accepts his marriage proposal. Of course, the dialogue must reconcile Chad and his parents. This occurs when Chad makes an agreement with his father’s friend and business partner to act as a liaison for conferences attended by *malihinis* (mainlanders, strangers).69

*Blue Hawaii* portrayed a Hawai’i completely different from that of *Big Jim McLain*. Instead of a territory rife with communism, the island society as depicted was youthful, racially tolerant, and completely Americanized. Chad’s parents reflected the old society. They were well-off, white Hawaiians with ties to the mainland. Chad and Maile, on the other hand, were rooted in the land. They used Hawaiian terminology, like *aloha, mahalo, and wikiwiki*, and they attended *hukilaus* with their Native Hawaiian friends.

The film also suggested that the younger generation was contributing to the erosion of racial barriers. The marriage between Maile and Chad shows a blending of the white settler and indigenous population, but director Hal Kanter limited the mingling of the races. Although Chad can mingle socially with Kānaka, they are never his complete equal. The film cast included Native Hawaiians, but they never appeared in major roles. From the film, one would assume that Kānaka lived to serve in Hawai’i. Throughout the movie, they performed hula dances, served beverages, tended bar, played music, gave beachside massages, paddled outrigger canoes, and conducted *hukilaus*. There was no shortage of the sensual, exotic *wahine* (woman) either. Numerous times attractive Native Hawaiian women appeared in the stereotypical grass skirt that revealed a toned body. In

one particular scene, a tourist from Oklahoma made bawdy remarks to a hula dancer. Instead of offering resistance or showing displeasure, she simply smiled and excused herself. Five minutes later, however, Chad ended the scene in a fist fight with the same tourist for making a pass at one of the underage teens for whom Chad was serving as a tour guide.

Finally, the importance of tourism was not lost on the federal government. Congressional reports often highlighted the profitability of the industry. Visiting the islands in 1939 for the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, James H. Shoemaker discovered that 24,381 tourists arrived in 1939, an increase of over one thousand persons from 1938. This increase reflected a trend in Hawaiian tourism. With each passing year, more mainlanders arrived (see Table 3). Foreign tourists were also visiting the territory with growing frequency. More important still, in 1939 tourists spent approximately $11-12 million. With pineapple and sugar exports to the U.S. accounting for only $3-4 million in revenue, it was clear that the tourist industry was one of the most lucrative sources of business on the islands. Tourism also offered diverse employment opportunities as hotels, restaurants, taxis, buses, curios, clothing stores, and other businesses expanded.70

For the federal government, Hawaiian tourism only added to the profitability of keeping the islands. In the American system, territorial legislatures could rely on the federal government for a few things, taxation being one of them. Unfortunately, the colonial apparatus guaranteed little else. When congressmen voted to appropriate funds, for instance, they did not always include the territories as recipients, especially during times of need. During their fight for statehood, islanders constantly reminded congressional dignitaries, newspaper editors, and the American public that funds

generated by sugar, pineapples, and tourism fed the national coffers. From 1942-1952, Hawaiian residents paid $1,200,000,000 in federal taxes, which, they happily noted, was more money than ten states contributed.\footnote{Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, H. Rep. 109, 60.} By 1957, tax revenue further increased to over $267 million.\footnote{A. Gram Robinson, ed., \textit{Congressional Digest}, 8.} If nothing else, Hawaiian commerce greatly benefited Americans economically; and with the annual increases in tourism, the islands’ value would only increase.

Congressional visits were another means of promoting statehood and overcoming negative publicity. Hosting and entertaining congressional delegations offered islanders a way to dazzle Washington officials with island life. Throughout the early 1900s, multiple parties of senators and representatives, not to mention lesser bureaucrats, traveled across 2,300 miles of open sea on fact-finding tours. From 1907 to 1940, at least six official teams of congressmen came to the Hawaiian Islands. To ensure that their visitors enjoyed their stay and left with a favorable impression, the territorial legislature appropriated funds for entertainment. The amount of money varied with each year. In 1907, legislators set aside $15,000 for such purposes, while reserving $5,000 for 1940.\footnote{Hawaii Equal Rights Commission, “Act 1 (1907)” and “Act 234 (1939)”, in Legislative Action Relating to Statehood and Equal Rights for Hawaii Sessions 1903-1937, fo. “Legislative Action,” Hawaii Equal Rights Commission, COM 16-1, Hawai’i State Archives, 4, 123.}

Congressional visits also afforded elected leaders with opportunities to promote internal improvements in addition to statehood. In spring of 1915, a delegation of representatives and senators arrived in Hawai‘i. Initially, the legislature allocated $15,000 for their visits; however, territorial delegate Prince Jonah Kuhio Kalaniana’ole urged them to increase the amount to $30,000. Kalaniana’ole was an active delegate who generally enjoyed success in prompting Congress to include Hawai‘i in appropriations,
yet 1915 was a tough year as a number of bills favorable to the atoll had stalled. These included acts allocating money for harbor improvements, a national park at Kilauea, transit programs, roads, a fish hatchery, coffee industry subsidies, and education funds. He hoped that the 1915 delegation to Hawai‘i would report on these bills favorably if they saw firsthand the benefits they would offer to the islands. The legislature concurred with Delegate Kalaniana‘ole and voted immediately for the extra funds.74

The creation of the Hawaii Equal Rights Commission and Hawaii Statehood Commission allowed the legislature to extend their promotion-through-entertainment efforts to Washington, D.C. To do so, the legislature authorized staff members to use funds for social gatherings. Territorial delegates added to the Commissions’ efforts by using their dinner parties and other events to press the case for statehood. According to his widow Elizabeth Pruitt Farrington, Delegate Joseph Rider Farrington accrued $200,000 in debts from entertainment bills amassed during his time in the capitol.75

Although a very effective tool, the promotion-through-entertainment tactic briefly made the statehood effort vulnerable to attacks by its critics. Alice Kamokila Campbell was an outspoken critic of statehood. A part-Hawaiian descendant of ali‘i blood whose family had close ties with Queen Lili‘uokalani, Campbell represented a portion of Native Hawaiian society that absolutely opposed statehood. Although the majority of Native Hawaiians supported statehood, twenty-seven percent maintained a desire for independence. While a portion of this group based their position on the events of 1893,

Campbell’s main reason for opposing statehood was race. She distrusted the Japanese-American population and urged the national government to delay statehood so long as this ethnicity represented the majority of all islanders.\textsuperscript{76}

Most of Alice Campbell’s anti-statehood activity involved writing editorials, testifying before congressional hearings, and speaking against the movement as a territorial senator. In 1948, she attempted to cripple the statehood movement through the judicial system. At 9:19 a.m., January 17, 1948, Campbell filed a suit against Governor Ingram M. Stainback, Territorial Senator Walter D. Ackerman, Jr., Territorial Treasurer William B. Brown, Auditor Joseph Dickson, and several members of the Hawaii Statehood Commission. Initially, the lawsuit charged the illegal use of territorial funds for “liquor, luaus, dinners, entertainment, and other purposes.”\textsuperscript{77} Realizing that these were not sufficient grounds for a court case, she later expanded her suit to include using the $200,000 appropriated by the territorial legislature “for the purpose of propagandizing, subsidizing and otherwise advancing the cause of statehood for Hawaii.”\textsuperscript{78}

Campbell did not win the case, but she succeeded in hampering the promotional activities of the territory. By 1948, the Hawaii Equal Rights Commission and Hawaii Statehood Commission became the primary vehicles for statehood promotional activity. In \textit{Alice Kamokila Campbell v. Ingram M. Stainback, et al.} (1948), the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii invalidated the section of Act 115 that authorized the Hawaii

\textsuperscript{77} Opinion of the Court by J. Peters, \textit{Alice Kamokila Campbell v. Ingram M. Stainback, et al.}, Circuit Court, First Judicial Circuit, Territory of Hawaii, Box 2, fo. 84, Samuel Wilder King Papers, M-472, Hawaii State Archives, 1.
\textsuperscript{78} Petition by Alice Kamokila Campbell, \textit{Alice Kamokila Campbell v. Ingram M. Stainback, et al.}, Circuit Court, First Judicial Circuit, Territory of Hawaii, Box 2, fo. 84, Samuel Wilder King Papers, M-472, Hawaii State Archives, 2.
Statehood Commission to promote statehood throughout the nation. Although the court recognized the right of a territory to petition Congress, the presiding justices ruled that such petitions must be for the general welfare of the people. In the case of Act 115, the territorial legislature created the Hawaii Statehood Commission for the express purpose of advocating a specific political position not held by everyone in the territory. While the Commission could legally entertain congressmen, collect information, disseminate data, protect Hawaiians’ rights, and petition Congress, the Hawaiian Statehood Commission could no longer actively promote and advertise statehood following *Alice Kamokila Campbell v. Ingram M. Stainback, et al.*

Members of the Hawaii Statehood Commission, however, refused to allow this setback to interfere with their work. Following the decision, Executive Secretary George H. McLane contacted the law office of Edward R. Burke. After reviewing all materials pertaining to the court case, Burke wrote McLane with an interpretation of Peters’ opinion. According to his letter, *Alice Kamokila Campbell v. Ingram M. Stainback, et al.* invalidated the ability of the Hawaii Statehood Commission to conduct “national and sectional advertising and publicity” to sway congressional members to vote in favor of Hawaiian statehood, but it recognized the right of the Commission to maintain an office in Washington, to prepare “documentary material for study and use by members of Congress,” to comply with “specific requests by members of Congress that information on statehood be sent to designated constituents,” and to fulfill “requests direct to the statehood office from individual citizens or organizations requesting information on

---

statehood.” In other words, Burke told McLane that it was absolutely necessary for the Commission to “comply meticulously with the decision,” but the language was broad, thereby allowing the Hawaii Statehood Commission to continue its work under the guise of providing information.

Newspapers and printed material remained a critical tool in promoting the territory to the nation. Delegates, territorial commissions, and private citizens involved in the statehood movement meticulously tracked articles and editorials on Hawaiian statehood. For example, in July 1958, Riley H. Allen, editor of the *Honolulu Star-Bulletin*, tracked at least fifty-eight editorials and articles in papers scattered throughout the nation. The locales varied. He found articles in major urban centers—Salt Lake, Washington D.C., Philadelphia—as well as smaller, less known towns—Havre, Montana; Alpena, Michigan; Tyler, Texas. Even local newspapers were monitored for content. From summer of 1939 to July 1940, the Hawaii Equal Rights Commission collected political cartoons printed in *Hawaii Hochi*, an Honolulu-based newspaper catering to Japanese Americans. Tracking this information provided statehood advocates with a way to gauge the perspectives Americans held toward Hawai’i, in addition to views and opinions expressed in mainland communities. Tracking popular opinions on Hawaiian

---

80 Edward R. Burke to George H. McLane, April 19, 1949, *Alice Kamokila Campbell v. Ingram M. Stainback, et al.*, Circuit Court, First Judicial Circuit, Territory of Hawai‘i, Box 2, fo. 84, Samuel Wilder King Papers, M-472, Hawai‘i State Archives.
81 Edward R. Burke to George H. McLane, April 19, 1949, *Alice Kamokila Campbell v. Ingram M. Stainback, et al.*, Circuit Court, First Judicial Circuit, Territory of Hawai‘i, Box 2, fo. 84, Samuel Wilder King Papers, M-472, Hawai‘i State Archives.
82 “Editorials Urging Action in Congress on Hawaii Statehood Bill,” Box 9.4, Riley H. Allen Papers, MS Grp 18, Bishop Museum and Archives. Allen was not the only Hawaiian to follow closely the treatment of Hawai‘i in mainland newspapers. Farrington, King, the Hawaii Statehood Commission, Hawaii Equal Rights Commission, and numerous others did likewise. Perusing through their collections at the Hawai‘i State Archives reveals files loaded with clippings from newspapers around the country.
society aided their development of advertising campaigns. Also, the commissions and
delegates sometimes responded to outrageous articles or publications.

The Hawaii Statehood Commission, Citizens’ Statehood Commission, Hawaii Equal Rights Commission, territorial delegates, and others also wrote numerous speeches, articles, and other material countering the charges pertaining to race and non-contiguity; however, answering critics’ charges of communism proved more difficult. First, little could be done to silence or counter southerners’ charges that Hawaiian congressmen would ally themselves to liberals on issues of race. Very rarely did they even attempt to address negative comments about the ratio of Japanese Americans to European Americans. Instead, they highlighted the Americanism of the Hawaiian population. As proof of their loyalty to the nation, statehood proponents often used the heroics of the 100th Infantry—a World War II unit composed completely of Japanese Americans from Hawai’i—and the patient endurance of Hawaiians under four years of martial law to illustrate this.84

Second, modern transportation provided a ready counterargument to complaints of non-contiguity. When challenged by the statement that the Territory sat 2,300 miles from the California coast, statehood defenders quickly dismissed this as immaterial. Perhaps it may have mattered in the nineteenth century, when the nation relied on wind-powered ships for transoceanic trips, but air travel and petroleum driven naval vessels dramatically reduced travel time between the islands and Washington, D.C. Comparing

---

84 For examples of this literature, see the Statehood for Hawaii booklet, Statehood for Hawaii newsletters in fo. 534, Box 11 Joseph Rider Farrington Papers, M-473, Hawai’i State Archives; Joseph Rider Farrington, “Statehood for Hawai’i”; fo. 105, box 4, Elizabeth Pruitt Farrington Papers, M-475, Hawai’i State Archives; and Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, H. Rep. 109, 62-63, 66. Editorials on statehood run in Hawaiian newspapers also used Americanism to counter these charges. See Honolulu Star-Bulletin, September 26, 1940, 8; Honolulu Star-Bulletin, March 15, 1946, 6; and Honolulu Star-Bulletin, July 9, 1952, 8.
modern travel times with the California trail often served as a favorite tactic used to dismiss charges of non-contiguity.  As noted, the overland distance was roughly the same as the space separating Honolulu from California. A wagon train crossing that distance required months worth of traveling before the transcontinental railroad. Taking a boat to California meant covering more miles, over 13,000 nautical miles to be precise. In the 1950s, air travel had reduced the time to one day. Finally, they illustrated the strategic importance of the islands. Because they lay some distance from the coastline, the nation would benefit from the ability to project its military might even farther. No doubt, this was a weighty argument during the early stages of the Cold War.  

While proponents readily addressed doubts about the wisdom of incorporating the Hawaiian territory based on its geography and ethnic population, they had more difficulty confronting their antagonists’ accusations that the islands were home to a large communist faction. Newspapers both inside of Honolulu and on the mainland tracked the progress of investigations into a possible communist presence in the islands by HUAC and the FBI. The International Longshoremen and Warehousemen’s Union bore the brunt of these investigations. Since the ILWU sought to break the economic, political, and social power of Hawaiian business, conservative islanders considered them a threat to the stability of society. Only one newspaper unquestionably supported the ILWU, UPW, and workers. The Honolulu Record ran articles depicting Hawaiian businessmen as willing to use any force—economic, political, or physical—to break the workers’ will to resist. Their opposition was so strident that they even targeted the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, the principle newspaper of the islands run by Riley Allen and partially owned by
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85 A. Gram Robinson, ed., Congressional Digest, 7, 20; Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, H. Rep. 109, 68-69; and Statehood for Hawaii booklet, Statehood for Hawaii newsletters in fo. 534, Box 11 Joseph Rider Farrington Papers, M-473, Hawai’i State Archives.
Joseph Rider Farrington, as a mouthpiece for conservative, established interests on the islands. Of course, it did not help that its editor, Koji Ariyoshi, a major supporter the ILWU, was one of the defendants in the infamous Trial of Seven, a sensational court case in which all were found guilty of violating the Smith Act.

For statehood advocates, time and cooperation conquered accusations of rampant communism. Through the full participation of its citizens, law enforcement, and territorial officials, the Territory of Hawai‘i appeared as eager asHUAC and FBI to rid the islands of communism. The arrest and sentencing of Jack Hall and other communist leaders appeared in newspapers as the dismantling of the communist leadership in Hawai‘i. Although IMUA, Senator Butler, and southern senators resorted to this issue when debating the incorporation of the territory, this issue subsided with the rest of the McCarthy hysteria by the late 1950s.

In their struggle for statehood, Hawaiians faced some opposition that earlier territories had to confront. The most notable example of this is in the matter of race. New Mexico, Arizona, Colorado, and even Texas, all brought sizeable South and Central American populations into the Union with them. For California, Oregon, and Washington prior to 1869, geography complicated territoriality and statehood as
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86 The majority of the articles run by the Honolulu Record were ardently pro-labor, pro-civil rights, and anti-Big Five. For examples of their content, see “‘Radical As Any Union,’ Star-Bull Bosses Tell Newsmen about Guild,” Honolulu Record 9, no. 3, August 16, 1956, 1, 7; “‘Bloody Monday’ Observed by Hilo Dockers after 18 Years,” Honolulu Record 9, no. 5, August 30, 1956, 31; “Candidates Flock to Greet, Meet with ILSU; Old Fears Forgotten,” Honolulu Record 9, no. 7, 1. The Honolulu Record was first published in August 1948 and ran until July 1958. It was one of many alternate news sources, few of which showed the resilience of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin. The Hawaiian Collections at the University of Hawai‘i—Mānoa has records of these periodicals that include their dates of publication, language, and political/social position, i.e. pro-labor, Filipino paper, plantation newsletter, military newspaper, etc.

communication and travel proved burdensome. Yet, their proximity to the United States helped them overcome these obstacles. Since it was expected that their populations would eventually have a white majority and that railroads would connect their cities with the rest of the country, these territories successfully conducted statehood campaigns through the established political channels.

Hawaiian statehood advocates also used the old political tools to their fullest extent. Their territorial delegates and legislatures constantly pressed Congress to pass an enabling act. Hawaiians even tried the old technique of sending a petition to Washington, D.C., complete with a revised draft of an enabling act. By 1953, a new plan developed that would tie the Alaskan and Hawaiian statehood movements together. Since Alaska was a Democratic region and Hawai‘i was traditionally Republican, proponents of this plan believed it would overcome southern opposition by maintaining the Democrat-Republican balance in the Senate. Finally, Alaskans and Hawaiians even dusted off old techniques, like the Tennessee Plan in which a “Territory of Tennessee” drafted a state constitution as a way of prodding Congress into action.

Unfortunately for the residents of the islands, the United States changed dramatically since the annexation of Hawai‘i in 1898, making the older techniques used by continental territories outdated. Assuming more international concerns following the Spanish-American War and World War I, Americans had to consider issues other than

---


89 John S. Whitehead, Competing the Union: Alaska, Hawai‘i, and the Battle for Statehood, Histories of the American Frontier, ed. Howard Lamar (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2004), 232, 253. Although Roger Bell’s Last Among Equals is perhaps the most detailed account of the Hawaiian statehood movement, Whitehead’s work is an excellent reference for the political techniques used by Alaska and Hawai‘i to gain admittance to the Union.
their national desires when annexing or incorporating territories. Hawaiian society and geography were also different from those found in previous territories. In the Old West, the federal government used war, removal, and assimilation to empty the territories of Native Americans and other ethnicities. But this was the New West. The national image would not withstand the international and domestic reaction should policies used to conquer the Old West reappear in overseas American territories.

Recognizing that the path to statehood had changed, territorial authorities merged and transformed the techniques utilized by the continental territories in their quest for statehood. Instead of focusing their energy on Congress, the legislature, Hawaii Statehood Commission, Hawaii Equal Rights Commission, and private citizens conducted a long-term, national advertising campaign to sway public opinion in favor of statehood. By combining the political tools used by earlier state legislatures with the spirit and techniques of western boosters, Hawaiians changed the nature of the territorial statehood drive, winning them full participation with the states in 1959.
CHAPTER 7

CONCLUSION

On May 20, 1959, Evangeline Keale Kamakawiwo’ole and Henry “Tiny” Kaleialoha Naniwa Kamakawiwo’ole welcomed their third child into the world. Named Israel Ka’ano’i Kamakawiwo’ole, he would grow up amidst the sights and sounds of Honolulu life in Kaimuki and Pālolo Valley. As a child and teenager, his mind rested on eating sweet breads, learning the ‘ukulele, and playing with friends. At age 14, Israel’s family moved to Māhaka, an impoverished village populated by Kānaka Maoli. Although he resisted the move from Honolulu, his experiences there would radically alter the course of Israel’s life as the people, family, landscape, and social life of Māhaka introduced the young man to the traditional cultural practices of Kānaka that the settler society of the Hawaiian Islands had labored hard to suppress since 1820.

From Mākaha, events took Israel Kamakawiwo’ole from a young man who found himself in trouble on a number of occasions to the musical voice embodying the independence movement of the Kānaka Maoli. Initially, Native Hawaiian sovereignty meant little to him; however, his brother, Henry “Skippy” Kaleialoha Naniwa Kamakawiwo’ole, was passionate about the subject. As their band, Mākaha Sons of Ni’ihau, matured in popularity and musical style, Skippy Kamakawiwo’ole began writing songs celebrating Kānaka culture and sovereignty, including the famous “Hawaii ‘78” which Israel Kamakawiwo’ole biographer Rick Carroll dubbed, “the signature anthem for

---

2 Carroll, 11-15.
3 Carroll, 26-29.
the Mākaha Sons, Israel, and a whole generation of Hawaiian activists.”4 After Skippy’s death in 1982, Israel emerged as the lead man of the Mākaha Sons of Ni’ihau. Having learned the value of Kānaka Maoli culture from his older brother, Israel slowly transformed into a leading voice for Native Hawaiian culture and sovereignty through the 1980s and 1990s. Unfortunately, his morbid obesity destroyed his health, finally killing him on June 26, 1997 at the age of 38.5

Born shortly before the passage of PL 86-3, Israel Kamakawiwo’ole witnessed the rebirth of the Kānaka Maoli sovereignty movement which paralleled indigenous movements in the continental states. The 1960s and 1970s witnessed an explosion in civil rights movements throughout the United States. As African Americans engaged in nonviolent demonstrations and formed militant black power groups, teenagers of South and Central American descent demanded access to equal education opportunities in California schools. Likewise, Native Americans banded together in opposition to the legacy of imperialism in the U.S. Abandoning negotiation with the federal government as useless, Native American youth embraced activism in the name of indigenous sovereignty. In 1968, the American Indian Movement formed. In 1969, a group of young Native Americans seized Alcatraz Island outside of San Francisco capturing public attention.

Events 2,300 miles across the Pacific Ocean took a similar turn almost ten years later as Native Hawaiian activists briefly seized Kaho’olawe. From the perspective of an outsider observer, Israel’s music may not have carried great significance. In the eyes of Native Hawaiians, however, he was the embodiment of Kānaka culture and a voice of the

4 Carroll, 61.
5 Carroll, 44, 48-65, 74, 82-85105108, 123, 135.
movement. Just as the Kānaka Maoli witnessed a cultural revitalization during the post-statehood period, Israel himself began a long journey towards self-discovery. His voice and political ideals matured with the Native Hawaiian sovereignty movement. With the signing of the famous Apology Resolution in 1993 by President William Clinton, in which the United States formally recognized the illegality of the 1893 overthrow, Kamakawiwo’ole emerged as a symbol for continued Hawaiian resistance to U.S. imperialism.

The movement for indigenous rights was not limited to the United States. As Linda Tuhiwai Smith noted in *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*, the Maoris of New Zealand experienced European imperialism over their economy, land, culture, and knowledge. As Europeans expanded throughout the globe following Christopher Columbus’s voyage to the Americas, they reshaped indigenous politics, economies, lives, religion, and land. The 1960s not only fostered indigenous protest movements in the United States, Canada, New Zealand, and Australia, it nurtured the development of a transnational indigenous sovereignty movement. As indigenous peoples labored to revitalize their cultures, they moved away from domestic activism to international activism.6

These recent happenings signify the connection between events in American imperial history, i.e. the history of the American West, and developments in European colonies and dominions throughout the world. As the field of the American West continues to mature and develop from the Turnerian days in which scholars believed that there existed an orderly process of frontier development by Americans of European

---

descent, Western historians continue looking beyond the traditional borders of the American West. Recognizing similar developments in Australia, New Zealand, Canada, and trans-Mississippi America, the idea of a neatly compartmentalized and unique West no longer withstands scrutiny.

Hawai’i is inextricably connected to the American West, just as the American West is intimately connected to global issues in imperialism and colonialism. If historians continue accepting the archaic frontier thesis that has been used indirectly to exclude Hawai’i from the American West, then the American West as a region becomes static and not a region with a rich history with the passing of the frontier. On the other hand, embracing a refined definition of the American West as all of western North America and the Pacific Ocean incorporated territories conquered, subdued, annexed, and admitted into the Union in which American imperialism reshaped all facets of human life and the environment expands scholars’ understanding of the West. In this context, Western historians cannot separate Hawai’i from the region as American imperialism completely transformed the culture, economy, political system, and environment of the islands, while integrating them into the capitalist economy. Moreover, the inclusion of the Hawaiian Islands forces Western historians to take into consideration all territorial history and not just continental territorial history since the study of territorial governments is at the core of the history of the American West. Given the commonalities between Hawai’i with other insular territories, scholars in the field must also acknowledge the role these U.S. possessions played in the continuing legacy of the Northwest Ordinance and other expansionist policies as the nation transformed itself from a purely imperial state to a colonial power.
Hawaiians and Kānaka Maoli witnessed American imperialism in their islands since 1820. Although the first missionaries fervently believed that they were only fulfilling their religious duties, their activities in the islands placed new pressures on traditional Kānaka culture and prepared indigenous society, economy, and government for succeeding waves of colonists. In fact, missionaries served as the first agents of imperialism through their education programs and involvement in the economic and political life of the islands. From 1820 to 1893, the incorporation of American and European political ideas and culture slowly eroded Native Hawaiian sovereignty. Representative government seemingly refined monarchy and gave Europeans something to which they could relate; however, it also separated the ali`i and mō`ī from the people and reoriented the political power to American and European settlers. As the nineteenth century progressed, the American settler society expanded their political and economic hold using their roles as advisors to the king, representatives in government, and positions in Hawaiian schools, finally culminating in the 1893 overthrow.

In 1898 the United States annexed the Hawaiian Islands inaugurating a new era in Hawaiian history. Prior to the passage of the Newlands Resolution, the Hawaiian Kingdom existed as a small, sovereign state trying to preserve its independence during an era in which European nations slowly accumulated territories and colonies throughout the world. As Polynesian peoples throughout the Pacific Ocean tried to ward off conquest and colonization, the American empire-nation steadily incorporated new continental territories through wars, treaties, purchase, and settlement. In 1898, the U.S. succeeded where England and France failed when they made the islands an incorporated territory of the United States. For the next sixty-two years, Hawaiians experienced American
imperialism first-hand as they lived under a territorial government that had roots extending back to 1787.

Under territorial government, American settlers experienced the politics of exclusion characteristic of an imperial or colonial power. They produced raw materials for the metropole, lived under American sovereignty, were subject to its laws, adhered to the cultural values of the dominant power, and they held little to no political power. Territorial residents elected representatives to the territorial legislature, yet Congress had plenary power over the region. They elected congressional delegates who had no voting rights on Capitol Hill. Furthermore, the president nominated the governor, secretary, and justices. Viewing territorial history from this perspective, statehood movements were not symbolic rites of passage. Instead, they were battles fought by territorial residents for full inclusion into the empire-state, a process that made American imperialism unique.

Whereas the British Empire recognized self-government in the Dominions of Australia, Canada, and New Zealand with the Statute of Westminster, they were never fully incorporated into Great Britain. They remained apart. Emerging from the Revolutionary War, the framers of the Northwest Ordinance intentionally devised a system whereby American incorporated colonies had the guarantee of complete political inclusion into the empire-state, a process that gives the United States empire its paradoxical nature.

The acquisition of insular territories in 1898 threw this system into disarray. Conflicted over the colonial path that the war between Spain and the U.S. propelled the nation into, diplomats, intellectuals, and citizens debated federal policy towards Puerto Rico, the Philippine Islands, Hawai`i, and Guam. Could the United States govern colonies in the Caribbean and Pacific Ocean? Did the Constitution permit colonialism?
More importantly, should they have the right to request full participation in American politics? The *Insular Cases* decided by the U.S. Supreme Court largely helped answer this question. By relying on precedents established in the development of continental territories, the justices determined that unincorporated territories did not hold the same position in the American system as incorporated territories. While the Northwest Ordinance and other policies gave incorporated possessions the right of inclusion into the Union, unincorporated territories were guaranteed little else than the protection of their basic rights. In essence, Congress held plenary power over them. Without directly referring to colonialism, the Supreme Court helped legitimize American colonialism with its rulings on incorporated versus unincorporated territories. Since Hawai‘i was both an insular possession and an incorporated territory, residents there would experience a slightly modified form of the territorial process though it remained a region of American imperialism with characteristics similar to U.S. colonies.

The material presented in this dissertation illustrates the connectivity of Hawai‘i to Western continental incorporated territories during this process. Just as territorial governmental structures and settler responses to the federal-territorial relationship originated on the mainland and continued into the Pacific, policies toward Native Hawaiian sovereignty began with the interaction between the federal government and Native Americans. Although Congress did not include Kānaka Maoli in Native American policy during the post-annexation, historians can see commonalities in the policies. For example, with the Hawaiian Organic Act and Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1920, Congress relinquished its responsibility toward Native Hawaiians to the state. Following World War II and the Hoover Commission Report,
federal lawmakers attempted a similar policy throughout the continental states. Also, the links in American usage of Native lands is clearly visible in the post-World War II era. As the example of the links between nuclear tests in the South Pacific and uranium mining in Dinétah illustrates, indigenous peoples often suffered from the Cold War military mentality as they lacked the basic protections enjoyed by citizens living in the metropole.

Moreover, these linkages between Hawai’i and the West demand the inclusion of the islands in scholars’ work on the American West. Accepting postmodern geographical ideas of fluid borders determined by economic, cultural, religious, and other social factors as opposed to arbitrary political lines permits Western historians to accept place without rigidity. Under the older views of the American West, the region had to lie in the continent, exist within certain political boundaries, contain specific environmental and geological characteristics, and rely on extractive industries. New Western Historians challenged these views. Rejecting the frontier thesis and the 1890 census as marking the end of the frontier, these scholars extended the American West into the twentieth century, adopted postcolonial and postmodern theories, engaged in comparative historical studies, and largely advanced the body of cultural studies. Unfortunately, the definition and the models for understanding the West remained somewhat static. Although they accepted conquest as a defining feature of the West, political borders and geographical borders remained wedded to the paradigm. By expanding the definition of the American West to include imperialism as a primary characteristic, Western historians will liberate the field, shatter the rigid borders, and have the mobility to account for all American territorial imperialism, even in regions lying outside the continental United States.
Israel Kamakawiwo’ole did not start his career as an activist for Native Hawaiians. Instead, his understanding of the culture and history of his people slowly changed as his exposure to the struggle increased. The people and communities around him broadened his views. Accepting the challenge to fight for Kānaka sovereignty, he was transformed from one of many Native Hawaiian singers to a leading voice for his time. Likewise, Western historians must remain open to new ideas surrounding the American West. Incorporating new theories, refining old definitions, and abandoning the notion of a contiguous West will not only make scholars more aware of the region’s role in global imperial and colonial history, but it will also provide them with a new model capable of including all insular territories in the discourse on the American West.
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