A HISTORY OF INTERNATIONALISM IN HAWAII

BETWEEN 1900 AND 1940

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE DIVISION OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

IN AMERICAN STUDIES

SEPTEMBER 1972

By

Paul F. Hooper

Dissertation Committee:

Stuart Gerry Brown, Chairman
Harlan Cleveland
A. Gavan Daws
Reuel N. Denney
Seymour E. Lutzky
James M. McCutcheon

ABSTRACT

This study is the history of a movement concerning international developments in the Pacific Basin which originated in Hawaii during the early years of this century and grew to involve individuals and organizations from all Pacific Rim nations before it collapsed in the chaos preceding World War II. The principal elements in this movement were the Pan-Pacific Union and the Institute of Pacific Relations--organizations which were formed in Hawaii during and shortly after World War I--and this study is largely devoted to an examination of their respective goals, structures, and programs.

As these organizations were products rather than causes of this movement, this study begins with a review of the mainstream characteristics of Hawaiian history during the Territorial period and explores the origins of the movement prior to discussing either the Union or the Institute. Of particular interest during these formative years is the similarity of earlier efforts to promote tourism and initial ventures into the international arena. Emerging from a single source, the two activities defied a number of subsequent attempts to render them separate and independent. As a consequence, they remained connected in some manner throughout the entire period up to World War II.

The formation of the Union and the Institute signaled the beginning of a concerted and more sophisticated effort to initiate an authentic international movement directed both at promoting a higher level of cooperation and understanding among the nations and peoples of the Pacific and at capturing some special role for Hawaii in the international affairs of the Pacific Basin. A thorough examination of the specific objectives, institutional structures, and general programs which the Union and the Institute developed in pursuit of these broad ends is basic to any explanation of this movement. Although both organizations sought the same general ends, they approached their objectives in fundamentally different ways and developed markedly different institutional and procedural characteristics. Hence, the main portion of this study is devoted to an historical accounting of the growth and development of the two organizations. The final chapter, more interpretative than the others, seeks to evaluate the effectiveness of the approach adopted by each organization while suggesting some areas where further research may be in order.

It should be noted that this study does not devote equal attention to the Union and the Institute. The former organization maintained its primary base in Hawaii, but the latter moved its center of operations to the American mainland within a decade of the time it was formed. As this

study concerns only the local international movement, the Union rather than the Institute is its central focus. It should also be noted that this study is not restricted solely to the activities of these two organizations. It concerns all aspects of the movement during the pre-war period and there are occasional comments upon activities bearing little or no direct relationship to either the Union or the Institute.

Finally, it should be noted that this study is primarily a chronicle of events which occurred within the local international movement during the pre-war period. As the first attempt of any nature to examine this phenomenon, it is written simply as a record of the movement based upon all available primary and secondary materials. Hence, while the study does offer some preliminary conclusions, its primary purpose is to provide a reasonably full and complete accounting of the movement's origins, development, accomplishments, and failings. With such a chronicle available, other researchers may be encouraged to examine some of its more interesting features in greater detail.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Internationalism in Hawaiian History

One of the more interesting chapters in modern Hawaiiana concerns the role of the Islands in the politico-cultural relations of the Pacific Basin. Although little has been written about this involvement, it is in fact one of the more striking features of the modern Hawaiian experience. Dating from the early years of the Monarchy up to the present and ranging in form from imperialist forays into the South Pacific to regional associations dedicated to improving intercultural relations in the Pacific Basin, it manifests a need long felt in Hawaii for some unique role in Pacific affairs. Indeed, this involvement--an activity best described by the term "internationalism"--may well be the most persistent, if not dominant, theme in modern Hawaiian history.[1] It deserves more attention than it has so far received.

---

[1]Variations on the term "internationalism," as opposed to "international relations" or another more conventional term, are used throughout this study to describe Hawaii's early twentieth century international movement. Such usage is an attempt to emphasize the difference between the unique manner of undertakings discussed in this study and the more ordinary diplomatic activities associated with traditional internation relations. Although usage of the term does represent an effort to create specialized descriptive terminology, the movement it describes did, of course, undergo many changes over the years. Hence, the term remains more a general than a precise description.

There are three major periods in the history of internationalism in Hawaii. The first, which concerns a number of different ventures spaced throughout the nineteenth century, was essentially an effort "to play the role of a big Pacific Island power to annex or obtain spheres of influence over various islands and island groups. . . ."[2] Varying in form and purpose from a visionary plan for a "Polynesian Confederation" guided and protected by Hawaii to a "Primacy in the Pacific" scheme designed to provide Hawaii with some of the trappings of an imperialist power, all the various undertakings of this period demonstrated a preoccupation with the possibility of extending Hawaii's sphere of political influence. Events of this period, more entertaining if not more important than those of later eras, are well documented.[3]

Hawaii's second venture into the internationalist arena occurred during the first four decades of the Territorial era. It revolves about the efforts of the Pan-Pacific Union and the Institute of Pacific Relations--organizations which were created in Hawaii during this

---

[2]Jason Horn, "Primacy in the Pacific Under the Hawaiian Kingdom" (M.A. thesis, University of Hawaii, 1951), p. 1. Hereafter cited as Horn, "Primacy in the Pacific."

[3]Standard historical reference works usually devote some attention to this subject. For example, see R.S. Kuykendall, The Hawaiian Kingdom, Volume III, 1874-1893, The Kalakaua Dynasty (Honolulu, 1967), pp. 305-39 and Gavan Daws, Shoal of Time: A History of the Hawaiian Islands (New York, 1968), pp. 235-39. Hereafter cited as Daws, Shoal of Time. In addition, Horn, "Primacy in

period--to promote greater international and intercultural understanding among the nations and peoples of the Pacific. It also involves an important secondary effort directed simultaneously at improving inter-ethnic relations in Hawaii while promoting Island society as an exemplary model of intercultural harmony.

Specific activities during this period were numerous and varied. Through myriad regional conferences sponsored by both the Union and the Institute, thousands of leading citizens representing the vast majority of the Pacific Basin countries were given an unprecedented opportunity to explore the range of issues affecting relationships among the nations and peoples of the Pacific. These meetings served to demonstrate that Pacific nations did share certain interests and that other conflicting interests could at least be rationally discussed. Given the nature of previous relations among the Pacific Basin powers and the fact that no similar effort had ever been attempted in the Pacific, even so limited an accomplishment as this must be seen as a step of some magnitude. In addition, the Institute developed a research program which in time produced a contribution of major proportions to the West's intellectual understanding of Asia and the

---

the Pacific" is a detailed examination of the entire subject based upon primary source materials.

Pacific. Ironically, this same program also became an important factor in the hysteria of the McCarthy period which in turn poisoned Chinese-American relations throughout the middle years of the twentieth century.[4] Further, and of special importance within the local historical context, some of the fundamental characteristics of Hawaii's current societal self-image--in particular, the notion that Island society is a unique, East-West version of the American "melting pot" and, hence, an exemplary model for other similarly composed societies--were developed and given initial publicity by the Union and the Institute during this period. In short, activities initiated during the second phase of the local internationalist movement were destined to affect the course of history--both as actually lived and as imagined--in the Pacific Basin and on the American mainland as well as in Hawaii.

Important as this period obviously is, it has gone virtually unnoticed in subsequent studies. What references do exist are both brief and inadequate.[5] Although a lack of original source materials can be cited as a contributing factor, the almost total absence of commentary is nonetheless

---

[4]It should be emphasized, however, that this activity did not become significant until after the Institute moved its center of operations from Honolulu to New York.

[5]For example, see Helen Gay Pratt, Hawaii: Off-Shore Territory (New York, 1944), pp. 322-23. Hereafter cited as Pratt, Hawaii.

difficult to understand.[6] Activities of the period quite simply warrant additional attention. In an attempt to correct this oversight, the present study is concerned almost exclusively with an examination of this phase of the internationalist movement in Hawaii.

The third and final period in Hawaii's internationalist experience dates from the end of World War II to the present and involves a host of government-sponsored activities aimed once again at defining a special role for Hawaii within Pacific Basin affairs. Education, commerce, urban planning, communications, research, training, and socio-cultural models are all subjects which have come under discussion during the current search for such a role. While any thorough analysis of the present effort must remain a subject for future research, it is worth noting that many of the tactics now under consideration were first developed and, in some instances, employed during the preceding period. Certain mistakes might be avoided and existing perspectives broadened if those directing the current effort were more knowledgeable of the record of the previous era. Perhaps this study can also serve a useful purpose here.

---

[6]This is a problem affecting all varieties of historical research concerning the Territorial era. See David Kittleson, "A Bibliographical Essay on the Territory of Hawaii, 1900-1959," The Journal of Pacific History, VI (1971), 195-96. However, while the papers of the Union and the Institute have only recently been recovered and are still in uncataloged form, the full array of Union and Institute

Major Socio-Economic Features of the Territorial Period

Although the pre-war internationalist movement is a factor of considerable importance in the history of modern Hawaii, it was in no manner the dominant feature of the early twentieth century period. Rather, it was but one development which occurred alongside numerous other developments, many of which were of far greater importance to both leaders and residents during these years. Hence, a perspective upon the movement itself cannot be achieved without first summarizing the major historical and societal features of the period.

Most apparent among these features was the decidedly rural, agrarian, and provincial character of Hawaii throughout the entire era in question. The vast majority of Island residents were directly concerned with one or another aspect of agricultural production regardless of where they lived or worked. Only in Honolulu was there a significant group with the time and inclination to become involved in such activities as the internationalist movement. As a consequence, it was conceived and directed by this group, in the main members of a small but dominant white establishment.

Even Honolulu itself was more a rural, agricultural town than a sophisticated urban center throughout most of

---

publications--for all practical purposes primary sources--have long been readily available.

this period. Its population was but 39,306 in 1900 and grew only to 179,358 by 1940.[7] Located on the earth's most geographically isolated landfall, shipping was its only link with the outside world until a mainland telegraph cable was laid in 1902. Even thereafter, high rates and use restrictions limited the extent to which cables and, still later, radios were able to reduce the isolation. In addition, there were no institutions of higher learning or cultural centers of note anywhere in Hawaii until much later. Informal and non-commercial festivals, horse racing at Kapiolani Park, informal sessions of song and dance, and vacations at nearby mountain resort centers--not the more sophisticated entertainments found in the great cities of the world--occupied Honoluluans of the era. While Honolulu could boast of dramatic societies, periodic and very good opera concerts, a small college, one of the earliest automated local telephone systems, a powerful business community, and increasing numbers of automobiles upon the few miles of improved roads, life was, as one writer put it, "friendly, sociable, informal and leisurely but rather heedless . . . a life that kamaainas [long-time residents] took for granted, and to which malihinis [recent arrivals] easily accommodated themselves."[8] The life style

---

[7]Department of Planning & Economic Development, State of Hawaii Data Book: A Statistical Abstract (Honolulu, 1971), p. 8.

[8]Pratt, Hawaii, p. 199.

was, in other words, more casual than sophisticated, more agrarian than urban, more provincial than cosmopolitan.

Life in Hawaii was not, however, always "friendly, sociable, informal and leisurely." Indeed, it was seldom so for the rapidly increasing number of non-whites (in the main Oriental immigrant agricultural laborers) who resided in the Territory during the 1900-40 period and only occasionally so for the whites who dominated Hawaiian society during the same period.[9] There were other more pressing matters to occupy their attention. Of these, none was more persistent than the question of race relations. One or another aspect of this issue either festered in the background or raged in full view throughout the entire period. While it was an issue affecting all the various racial groups present in Hawaii, the larger groups--Hawaiians, whites, Japanese, Chinese, and Filipinos--were most frequently in conflict.

The first major racial confrontation of the twentieth century involved Hawaiians and whites. The former group,

---

[9]Non-white population increased from 125,182 to 311,243 during the 1900-40 period while white (Spanish, Portuguese, Puerto Rican and others of European extraction) population grew from 28,819 to 112,087. See Robert C. Schmitt, Demographic Statistics of Hawaii: 1778-1965 (Honolulu, 1968), 120.

embittered over the destruction of the Monarchy and then annexation, resolved to recoup some of their lost power through the electoral process. With a decided edge in numbers of eligible voters (most Orientals were not citizens at this point), their strategy made sense. Eschewing the newly organized but white-dominated Republican and Democratic Parties, they organized a third party--the Home Rule Party--as their vehicle. This party's advice to the Hawaiian voter was simple: "nana i ka ili" (look at the skin). It was also effective. In the first Territorial elections of 1900, the Home Rule Party elected a majority in the local House of Representatives and Senate in addition to electing its chief spokesman, Robert Wilcox, as Hawaii's first Delegate to Congress.

After one chaotic legislative session, the white, Republican establishment which dominated all other aspects of Island life laid plans to break the Hawaiian's electoral power and to establish its own authority within the Legislature. The strategy was blunt and direct. Establishment leaders persuaded Jonah Kuhio Kalanianaole (Prince Kuhio) to join the Republican Party and run against his fellow Hawaiian, Wilcox, in hopes that such a contest would split the Hawaiian vote, cripple the Home Rule Party, and breathe life into the Republican Party. It did. In the 1902 elections Kuhio defeated Wilcox, the Republicans captured

the Legislature (and held it until the 1950s), and the Home Rule Party entered upon a decline into oblivion.

The question at this point, as one historian puts it, was whether Kuhio would act as "chief or retainer" and, depending upon the answer, what would the Hawaiians gain from his bargain with the Republicans?[10] Kuhio, it appears, was some of each. He requested and received the major share of patronage jobs for the Hawaiians, and he was eventually able to obtain Congressional approval of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, a measure intended to revive the rapidly declining Hawaiian race by setting aside certain local farming and grazing lands for use solely by those of Hawaiian and part-Hawaiian blood. Both undertakings were of considerable importance to Hawaiians. At the same time, however, he devoted at least equal amounts of energy to the support of measures designed primarily to assist Hawaii's established commercial and agricultural interests.

Kuhio's intentions were honorable enough, but, at least from a race relations perspective, the end result of his activities was less than satisfactory. To be certain, both the Hawaiians and the whites did gain privileged positions from their bargain and Kuhio's subsequent work. However, where the whites gained a position of virtually unqualified power and authority, most Hawaiians

---

[10]Daws, Shoal of Time, p. 295.

found that their special position was effective only so long as they were willing to submit to the establishment's wishes. In short, they could expect special treatment only so long as they were willing to accept second-class citizenship. The disadvantages of such an arrangement became acutely evident later when the Republicans were swept from power and the majority of Hawaiians were left with little but second-class status.[11]

A more detailed examination of Hawaiian-white relations illustrates other facets of the association which suggest that any discrimination was in fact more the product of social viewpoints than of racist philosophies. Beginning with the arrival of the first whites in Hawaii, for example, there developed a remarkable degree of social intercourse (most noticeable in the realm of intermarriage) between whites and the Hawaiian elite--an intercourse which indicates that neither group embraced racist social philosophies at least so far as their own relations were concerned. However correct this interpretation may be, the point remains that such a distinction held little meaning for the majority of Hawaiians who enjoyed no privileged class status. For whatever the reason, the obvious reality of their lives was that they were made second-class citizens by a white-dominated government

---

[11] Ibid., pp. 295 ff.

which had recently overthrown the earlier native (although similarly elitist) political system.

Where tension and ambiguity marked the Hawaiian-white relationship during the 1900-40 period, distrust and outright hostility characterized the relationship between Orientals and whites. Greater in number than any other ethnic group in Hawaii but generally barred from citizenship by a complexity of factors involving Hawaii's Organic Act of 1900, various Federal laws, and differing national definitions of citizenship, Orientals (particularly Japanese) were ranked lowest on Hawaii's social scale. Emphasizing the low ranking, pay rates in the sugar industry--the predominant source of employment for Orientals during this time--were set according to racial categories and Orientals were placed in the lowest step. Similarly, those Orientals who sought employment elsewhere found that only menial jobs with little opportunity for advancement were available in the commercial sector of the economy.

Constantly underscoring and, in a perverse manner, justifying the local establishment's treatment of Orientals was a host of racial exclusion treaties, laws, and court decisions emanating from Federal actions during the 1880 to 1930 period. Of particular importance here are the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882, which was applied to Hawaii in 1902; the Second Chinese Exclusion Act of 1904;

the Japanese-American Gentlemen's Agreement of 1907, which put a halt to the immigration of Japanese laborers; the ruling of the Supreme Court in 1922 (Ozawa v. United States) that Oriental laborers were not eligible for citizenship by naturalization; and the Immigration Act of 1924, which set immigration quotas unfavorable to all but those of Northern European extraction and which prohibited the immigration of anyone ineligible for citizenship (i.e., Oriental laborers.

Although the white establishment could with some justification point to a lack of education, a decided tendency toward ethnocentrism, and an ignorance of American traditions as reasons for such treatment, it was, for those who tried, a difficult task to convince most Orientals that anything other than simple racism was the root problem. Various ingredients in the establishment's contemporary viewpoint--in particular, a strong residue of Social Darwinism and a lingering acceptance of the "White Man's Burden" rationale--tended to support Oriental skepticism. While the white community never considered itself racist and described inter-ethnic relationships in other more paternalistic terms, the Oriental community generally failed to grasp the essential difference.

Oriental-white tensions were also founded upon still more specific factors. The burning of Chinatown and the subsequent quarantine of virtually all Oriental residents

of the area during the bubonic plague of 1899-1900 were seen, perhaps wrongly, as overt examples of racial discrimination. When Japanese sugar laborers struck in 1909 against the aforementioned unequal pay policy and non-Japanese strike breakers were brought in at near double the regular workers' wages, similar sentiments were aroused. Another strike by Japanese workers in 1920 elicited an openly racial response on the part of the white establishment. First the plantation management and then the media took the position that the strike represented the opening blow in a conspiracy to "Japanize" the Islands. It was, in establishment minds at least, a simple question of the Americans versus the Japanese.[12] The hostility generated during this event was intense. Media stories fairly crackled with emotion as the establishment press exposed the evil intentions of the Japanese and the local Japanese press (discussed below) denounced the discriminatory policies of the sugar planters. Once the strike failed, the planters opened the breach even wider by immediately initiating a Filipino labor import program in an obvious effort to reduce their dependence upon Japanese labor.

The establishment's charge regarding the failure of the local Japanese to switch their allegiance to the United

---

[12]For a fuller discussion of these events, see Lawrence H. Fuchs, Hawaii Pono: A Social History of Hawaii (New York, 1961), pp. 213-25. Hereafter cited as Fuchs, Hawaii Pono.

States was not entirely misplaced. Although they conveniently overlooked numerous reasons why the Japanese might be inclined to maintain strong sympathies for their homeland (i.e., discriminatory laws, practices, and attitudes in addition to the question of citizenship), they were correct in charging that many local Japanese did not want to be Americanized and that they did manifest a considerable degree of devout, even fanatic, support for both Japan's national aspirations and the Japanese Emperor. This issue, opened to full view for the first time during the 1920 strike, came to a head in the form of a controversy over the Japanese language schools and the Japanese language press.

The first Japanese language school in Hawaii was opened in 1902 at the Hongwanji Buddhist Mission in Honolulu. It was founded to provide local-born Japanese children with an opportunity to properly learn the language and customs of their parents. All classes were conducted in the afternoons following regular public school hours. Thereafter similar schools were opened with incresing frequency and, by 1919, a total of 163 were in existence throughout the Territory.[13] The language press began

---

[13]Louise Harris Hunter, Buddhism in Hawaii: Its Impact On a Yankee Community (Honolulu, 1971), p. 108. Hereafter cited as Hunter, Buddhism in Hawaii.

operations before the turn of the century to serve the needs of the Japanese community which then spoke little English and read even less. By 1920, it consisted of two major newspapers--the Nippu Jiji and the Hawaii Hochi--and a number of less important publications. Both the schools and the press served at once to preserve a cultural and nationalistic identity among the local Japanese and simply to look after some of the needs of a large and generally unassimilated ethnic group.

In the process, both institutions occasionally undertook activities which the white community, understandably if not always correctly, interpreted as anti-American and anti-Christian. Buddhist and Shinto priests, brought from Japan as instructors in the schools, were not reluctant to teach their young charges about loyalty to Japan and the Emperor, and many of them openly supported the Japanese workers during the 1920 sugar strike. They also conducted missionary work among the Japanese in an attempt to counteract ongoing Christian activities. Much to the chagrin of Japanese as well as white Christians, they were successful in this undertaking. The major Japanese papers made their presence known by providing outspoken editorial support for the Japanese point of view throughout the period.

White sentiment against the schools and the press first developed as part of the wave of intense, xenophobic patriotism which swept Hawaii and the mainland during and

immediately after World War I. Citing Japan's decidedly imperialistic aspirations (i.e., the colonization of Korea, the Twenty-One Demands, and the assumption of Germany's Pacific and Asian holdings), the local media and The Friend, a stridently pro-Christian, anti-Buddhist local publication, initiated a call for restraints upon the Japanese schools and press. While the latter institution avoided much direct attention, the schools became the focus of an intense controversy which persisted throughout most of the decade.

In 1921 the Territorial Legislature adopted a law requiring that all language schools be licensed by the Department of Public Instruction and that licenses be granted upon the basis of the individual instructor's ability to understand the English language and American democratic principles. Subsequently, additional restrictive policies were promulgated and even more restrictive laws passed. The Japanese community was originally split over the controversy as there were those who felt some measure of regulation was necessary and appropriate. However, any fissure was healed when the latter restrictions were adopted and it became apparent that the establishment was seeking not so much to regulate the schools as to place a stranglehold upon them and, if possible, upon the entire institution of Buddhism. A number of the schools challenged the regulations in court, and, after years of litigation

carried as far as the United States Supreme Court, obtained a decision voiding the restrictive laws.[14] Although the ultimate resolution of this controversy may have been on the side of justice, it came too late to resolve the antagonistic racial atmosphere which produced it.

Racial prejudice--benign in comparison with racist practices elsewhere, but still racial prejudice--was but one of the mainstream characteristics of Hawaii during the first part of the century. Another was the all-powerful position of the business community. Virtually synonymous with the white, Republican establishment, this group--popularly known as the "Big Five"--was near perfect witness of President Coolidge's observation on the inexorable relationship between Americanism and business. Founded upon a control over the sugar and pineapple industries (by the 1930s, for example, various companies of the "Big Five" had come to control 96 percent of all sugar production plus Dole's Hawaiian Pineapple Company which in turn dominated the pineapple industry),[15] this group enjoyed a monopoly upon all profitable aspects of Hawaiian agriculture. In the pre-World War II era, that amounted to a monopoly upon the economy of the entire Territory.

---

[14]For an excellent discussion of these events, see Ibid., pp. 93-149.

[15]Daws, Shoal of Time, p. 312.

Using the financial power generated by its control over local agriculture, the "Big Five" was able to dominate virtually all categories of commercial activity in Hawaii. In addition to agriculturally-oriented businesses, this group controlled banking, insurance, public utilities, wholesale and retail merchandising, railroad transportation, interisland shipping, and a goodly portion of mainland-Hawaii shipping. Such power, needless to say, enabled the "Big Five" to extend its authority beyond the commercial realm and into the area of government and politics. Indeed, it was generally able to work its will even upon the overall course of Hawaiian society. With the possible exception of Delaware, nowhere else in the nation did a single group enjoy such complete and firmly rooted authority.

It would be a mistake, however, to assume that this group used its power solely on behalf of its own narrow and immediate interests. On the contrary, it exercised control in what it considered to be an enlightened, progressive manner. The men who set policy for the "Big Five" were, in the main, descendants of earlier missionaries and were concerned about justice and decency, no matter how antiquated their interpretation of the concepts may have been. They were also practical men who found "common sense" solutions to their problems, and "common sense" told them that Hawaii--agrarian, semi-literate, and racially mixed--was no place to experiment

with either political or social democracy. The general welfare would best be served, they believed, if the Islands were governed by a paternalistic code designed and applied in accordance with local realities. They spent a good portion of the first half of the century devising and implementing such a code.

As practical men, Hawaii's establishment leaders were aware that the masses--the agricultural workers--had to be able to anticipate some measure of economic and social, if not political, gain from their labors. As a consequence, agricultural wages in Hawaii, unsatisfactory as some may have found them, generally exceeded those elsewhere in the world. Communities of a respectable nature, not simple labor camps, were provided for workers and their families. Charities, churches, schools, and a broad variety of causes (including the internationalist movement) were generously supported. Urban as well as rural Hawaii profited from these acts. In short, if one were but willing to accept the restraints and obligations of a paternal system, life in pre-World War II Hawaii could be reasonably pleasant. The problem, of course, was that paternalism and twentieth century concepts of American democracy are not compatible, and Hawaii, once annexed, never really had any option but to embrace modern notions of democracy along with the rest of the nation. In time, "common sense" had to yield to political principle.

In fact, the effort to apply a paternalistic code to Hawaii never went smoothly. The well springs of popular distrust--one-sided political bargains, unsatisfactory labor relations, racial confrontations, and the realization, inspired largely by social activists from the mainland, that the American dream is based upon democracy rather than paternalism--grew ever deeper as immigrants and their children came to understand more of their new country. However, it was not so much these impediments as it was a round of new and unanticipated events which finally forced the establishment to forsake its paternalistic policies and set out in pursuit of an entirely different set of goals.

The first of these events was the Massie rape-murder case of 1931-32. Thalia Massie, the socially prominent wife of Navy Lieutenant Thomas Massie, charged that she had been raped by a gang of local men. Suspects were arrested and tried, but the case ended in a hung jury. At that point, Massie and his wife's mother took the law into their own hands by kidnapping Joseph Kahahawai, one of the accused, and killing him. For this crime they were tried and convicted of manslaughter, only to be pardoned by Governor Judd after serving a one-hour sentence in the custody of Honolulu's High Sheriff. Throughout the case, mainland newspapers issued thundering denunciations of Hawaii's racially mixed society and wondered aloud about

the safety of all white residents. More than a few members of the local white establishment shared their sentiments and doubts. At the same time, local non-white residents were given adequate reason to question whether or not American justice was in fact blindfolded. Hence, what began as a specific criminal incident involving but a few people ballooned into a most unfortunate racial controversy involving virtually everyone in Hawaii and many more on the mainland.

There was another aspect of the case which, to the few who were then aware of it, was even more unsettling than the ugliness generated by the case itself, and which offers some explanation of what would otherwise appear to be a simple and blatant miscarriage of justice. This was the stunning probability, then known by only a few members of the local establishment, that any move by the Territory to punish Massie and his mother-in-law in accordance with the court's findings would likely trigger a Congressional reaction resulting in the dissolution of the Territorial government and the creation in its place of a government controlled by the military establishment. Congress, the local leaders discovered, had such authority over the Territory and was apparently prepared to use it. In short, these leaders knew that any move to punish a white Naval officer for the killing of a local non-white citizen would likely mean the end of local self-government in Hawaii.

Facing these circumstances, they decided to permit injustice to prevail in the Massie case in an effort to avoid what they considered an even greater injustice. To say the least, such a tragic irony cast a shadow of doubt over the previously unquestioned benefits of Territorial status.[16]

Two years later there occured another incident which turned doubts about the benefits of the Territory's political standing into outright rejection of the arrangement. This incident involved the sugar industry. Between 1876 and 1900, sugar had enjoyed privileged status under the terms of a reciprocity treaty with the United States, and, thereafter, under America's tariff laws. The planters had no reason throughout this period to believe that the favorable treatment would cease. But suddenly and with little warning it did. In 1934 Congress passed the Jones-Costigan Sugar Control Act which established market quotas for all American sugar producers and imposed import restrictions on all foreign producers. Hawaii was classified as a foreign producer and forced to reduce the amount of sugar sold on the mainland by some 8 percent per annum. This was a blow of considerable significance to the local economy. Even more alarming, however, was the realization that the Territory was totally at the mercy of

---

[16]Although there are numerous sources on the Massie case, Ibid., pp. 319-31 is an excellent summary of the matter based in part upon information previously unavailable.

Congress. Congress discriminated against Hawaii (in relation to treatment of the states) in the Jones-Costigan Act and, as subsequent court action affirmed, had the right to do so under terms of the Organic Act of 1900, the basic legal document establishing the relationship between Hawaii and the United States.[17] Hawaii as a territory may have been considered an integral part of the United States but was definitely not considered an equal partner with the other states.

The aftermath of these two incidents is well known. Hawaii's leaders decided that the interests of the Territory (and their own private interests if they saw any difference) could not be protected by anything short of statehood. As a consequence, a statehood movement which had existed with only insignificant support from the time of annexation was revitalized. Although success was a quarter of a century, millions of words of testimony, and countless turns of strategy away, it was a goal the establishment accepted during the mid-1930s and pursued until realized.

Significant as this decision obviously was, it would come only after the establishment had reached another and even more basic decision--a decision to abandon the long-time effort to impose a paternalistic system upon twentieth

---

[17]For further detail, see Gerrit P. Judd, IV, Hawaii: An Informal History (New York, 1961), pp. 131-32, 187-88.

century Hawaiian society. The existence of such a system would, of course, constitute a virtually impassible barrier across the course toward statehood, and Hawaii's leaders quite simply decided the latter was more important than the former. Once it became evident that such a decision had indeed been reached, the democratization of Hawaii began. That, however, is another story from another era.

Opportunities for Success of the Internationalist Movement

Brief and general as it is, the foregoing summary notes the mainstream characteristics of Hawaiian history during the 1900-40 period. As such, it also describes the general socio-economic setting for Hawaii's second venture into the internationalist arena.

There is little in this summary suggesting that such a venture might succeed. Although Hawaii was ever quick throughout this period to express interest in a broad variety of international undertakings, the interest was usually of a general nature and ill-equipped to break down the numerous, more specific impediments which promised to block the growth of any actual movement. Interest alone, for example, could not change the fact that Hawaii was an agrarian, provincial society without a substantial urban community to lend support to internationalist projects. Nor could it change the fact that Hawaii, at least during the earlier years of the period, had no

academic resources to draw upon for inspiration and leadership in such an undertaking. Finally, interest alone could not change the fact that local inter-racial relations --far from being a model capable of inspiring other societies--were in a state of almost constant, although relatively low-level, conflict throughout most of this period.

In short, there is a strong element of incongruity in the very suggestion that Hawaii might have been able to support an internationalist movement during the first half of this century. The most prominent features of local society during this time promised to create an unfavorable if not openly hostile setting for such an undertaking, and the few factors which might have offered encouragement --particularly Hawaii's location midway between East and West--were, upon closer examination, fraught with as many disadvantages as benefits.

Yet, such a movement was initiated and it enjoyed a success far beyond the wildest expectations.

CHAPTER II

ORIGINS OF A NEW INTERNATIONALIST MOVEMENT: 1903-1911

Commercial Origins of Internationalism

The architects of Hawaii's nineteenth century internationalist venture were preoccupied with the possibility of controlling other lands and other peoples. In contrast, those who revived the internationalist movement during the first decade of the twentieth century were preoccupied with the hope of expanding trade and tourism in Hawaii and throughout the Pacific Basin. Like their predecessors, they sought a broader role for Hawaii in the affairs of the Pacific, but they saw this role in terms of dollars rather than diplomacy.

While this may appear a strange beginning for a venture which would in time become known principally for its efforts on behalf of peace and transcultural understanding in the Pacific Basin, the fact remains that it was launched with such goals in mind. Alexander Hume Ford, perhaps the key figure in the entire undertaking, later reminisced that one of his earliest goals was "to enter into a Pan-Pacific campaign to attract travel to the Pacific area, inviting writers, investors, educators, and scientists to study the Pacific lands and make their potential possibilities for new enterprises known to the

world."[1] An early issue of Mid-Pacific Magazine, a publication founded by Ford in 1910 and the principal voice of Hawaii's early twentieth century internationalist movement, editorialized that the main point of "Pan-Pacific work" was "to turn the tide and trade, travel and immigration toward the Pacific."[2]

Although the early promoters were concerned about the entire Pacific Basin, they also made certain Hawaii received adequate attention. The January 1916 issue of Mid-Pacific Magazine, which was published as the first "Pan-Pacific Guide Book Issue," opens with a preface centering upon the following passage:

> In Hawaii, sugar is king, although thousands of small stockholders here and on the mainland draw their dividends from Hawaiian sugar, a product that almost alone today, keeps the American flag still flying on the Pacific Ocean.
>
> Second to sugar in Hawaii is the pineapple industry. Although a new one, its output is now worth between six and seven millions of dollars annually, and this industry has brought to Hawaii the largest canning factories in the world, equipped with machinery made in the United States.
>
> Hawaiian Coffee is used by the United States Navy, and its flavor is unexcelled. Coffee, with a moderate protection, might easily become an industry in Hawaii as great as that of sugar.
>
> In the Hawaiian Islands there are fifty-three varieties of banana indigenous to the soil, and

---

[1]Alexander Hume Ford, "The Genesis of the Pan-Pacific Union: Part IV," Mid-Pacific Magazine, XXX (Dec., 1925), 569. Periodical hereafter cited as MPM.

[2]"Pan-Pacific Work," MPM, I (May, 1911), 596.

> with a little encouragement, American Hawaii should supply all of the Western States with this fruit, and incidentally build up another line of Pacific Ocean steamers flying the American flag, for Hawaii is inevitably destined to become the conservatory of tropical fruits.[3]

In addition to offering businessmen an opportunity to turn a profit while performing a patriotic act, Hawaii's early promoters also promised tourists unrivaled comforts and pleasures:

> Hawaii is described as the "first turning to the left" after you leave America. It is the crossroads of the Pacific where neither Summer nor Winter is known here where it is always smiling Spring, the air and the surf remain about 76 degrees the year round.
>
> See the Pacific, but see Hawaii first, and you will see it last for it is the center, the beginning and the end of things Pacific . . . .
>
> The building of the Panama Canal was regarded as a valuable adjunct in travel development, and the foresight of the Island government and the people in building palatial hotels, miles of paved streets, a rapid transit system, modern wharves, coaling plants, fuel oil depots, was unerring, for the Panama Canal has already indicated that . . . Hawaii will become absolutely the mistress of the Pacific, the real center of tourist activity, for the Hawaiian Islands, which, as Mark Twain said, "are the loveliest fleet of islands that lies anchored in any ocean," present the "Playground of the World."[4]

Such was the rhetoric of those who launched Hawaii into a second round of internationalist activities during the first half of the present century. Although Ford would

---

[3]"A Card of Thanks," MPM, XI (Jan., 1916), inside cover.

[4]"A Description of the Pound-A-Day Cruise Around the Pacific," MPM, XI (Jan., 1916), 77-79.

later state that the movement, even in its earliest years, "was not one that was particularly interested in bringing the tourist to Hawaii and the Pacific," the foregoing passages--representative of virtually all published sentiment within this movement during the first decade and a half of the century and a substantial amount of feeling thereafter--indicate otherwise.[5]

Formation of the Early Organizations

If the roots of the revived internationalist movement are to be found in the promotion of Hawaii as a commercial and tourist center, some overview of early promotional activity is necessary. Persistent, formal activity within this arena dates from January 13, 1903, when the Honolulu Chamber of Commerce and the Honolulu Merchants' Association (organizations which merged in 1913 into the Chamber of Commerce of Honolulu) created the Joint Tourist Committee in an effort to "supply tourists with full and correct information on hotels, points of interest, [and] means of

---

[5]Alexander Hume Ford, "The Genesis of the Pan-Pacific Union: Part X," MPM, XXXI (June, 1926), 571-72. Ford makes the statement cited and goes on to quote from a lengthy letter he wrote in 1912 concerning the positive affect commercial development and immigration would have upon interracial relations in Hawaii. The point of his 1912 letter, at least as he sees it from 1926 perspectives, was that commerce and tourism were simply means of achieving broader social ends. This may be so. However, if he did see the issue in such terms during the earlier period, he failed to make it generally known. As discussed elsewhere, those concerned with a broader role for Hawaii during this period

transportation . . ."[6] This organization, to be funded from the voluntary public health charge of ten cents per ton on all incoming freight which was instituted by shippers during the 1899-1900 bubonic plague as a means of sanitizing the wharves and later used to promote local industry and business, was to have been headquartered in the Alexander Young Hotel. However, before it commenced operations, the 1902-03 Territorial Legislature, at the prodding of the Chamber and Governor Sanford B. Dole, reluctantly appropriated $15,000 for tourist promotional work, and a new organization--the Hawaii Promotion Committee--was created to expend the funds. Guided by a board of directors composed of representatives from both

---

were concerned with commerce per se and Ford reflected this point of view in the earlier issues of Mid Pacific Magazine.

[6]Clarence L. Hodge and Peggy Ferris, Building Honolulu: A Century of Community Service (Honolulu, 1960), 60. Hereafter cited as Hodge and Ferris, Building Honolulu. These events, documented in full by the earlier Chamber of Commerce of Honolulu papers now in the Archives of Hawaii, are well summarized by Hodge and Ferris. As they note, there were periodic efforts prior to 1903 to initiate similar promotional activities, but, with the exception of the publication of Paradise of the Pacific starting in the late 1880s, nothing of a sustained nature resulted. Whatever promotional publicity Hawaii received was largely the result of chance. For an example of such publicity see the article on Hawaii from the Washington Star as reprinted by the Pacific Commercial Advertiser, Feb. 7, 1900, p. 1. Hereafter cited as PCA.

the Chamber and the Merchant's Association, the Hawaii Promotion Committee hired Edward M. Boyd as its Secretary, opened offices in the Alexander Young Hotel building on August 1, 1903 (one day after the building's grand opening), and immediately launched a diverse, nationwide advertising campaign.[7] With continuing Legislative support plus contributions from the business community, this committee functioned consistently over the years and exists still today as the Hawaii Vistors Bureau.[8]

Early activities of the Hawaii Promotion Committee are of interest both as a demonstration of the commercial aspirations of the early promoters and as a series of events which led to the rise of an authentic internationalist movement. In the first instance, activities during the initial decade of the Committee's existence included sponsorship of exhibits at the 1904 St. Louis Exposition, the 1909 Alaska-Yukon Exposition in Seattle, and the 1911 Boston Missionary Exposition. A permanent display about Hawaii was constructed in Atlantic City, then a major tourist

---

[7]Hodge and Ferris, Building Honolulu, 60-61.

[8]Ibid., 63-64. When the Merchants' Association and the Chamber of Commerce merged in 1913, the Hawaii Promotion Committee was made one of the new Chamber's standing committees. This arrangement persisted through three name changes for the committee (Hawaii Tourist Bureau, 1919; Hawaii Travel Bureau, January, 1945, and Hawaii Visitors Bureau, October, 1945) until 1959 when it was taken out from under Chamber auspices and reconstituted as a separate corporation.

destination area, and information offices were opened in Los Angeles and San Francisco. A mainland advertising agent was retained and advertisements were placed in leading American periodicals. Mainland lecturers were engaged for speaking tours about Hawaii, speeches which were usually enlivened through the use of motion pictures or lantern slides. A variety of pamphlets directed at tourists were prepared over the years and mailed to great numbers of prospective travelers and travel agencies.[9] Still other pamphlets on local agricultural opportunities and local residential developments (Kaimuki, a residential area in eastern Honolulu then under development, was promoted in much the same fashion residential lots on the island of Hawaii are presently being promoted) were prepared and mailed to potential immigrants.[10] In 1913, as a measure of such activity, some 500,000 pieces were sent

---

[9]For a sampling of mainland responses to this advertising, see PCA, Jan. 27, 1908, p. 1. For a response to a particular brochure, see PCA, Mar. 27, 1908, p. 7.

[10]The establishment at this time was concerned about increasing the white middle class population of Hawaii as well as the white laboring population. There was some feeling that the Hawaii Promotion Committee should place more emphasis upon appeals to potential immigrants of this category and less upon those directed at tourists. See PCA, Jan. 9, 1908, p. 4 and Jan. 12, 1908, p. 4.

through the mails and the Committee was the largest single user of the Honolulu Post Office.[11]

The Hawaii Promotion Committee was also active in local community affairs. It played a key role in initiating trans-Pacific yacht racing, lent its support to civic beautification projects, and in 1906 initiated the Floral Parade which became an annual event during the month of February and, in a very indirect sense, is the predecessor of current Aloha Week festivities.[12] Attempts were made by the Committee to interest the Transmississippi Commercial Congress and the American Society for the Advancement of Science in holding their 1910 conferences in Honolulu.[13] While these organizations ultimately decided to meet elsewhere, the idea of establishing Honolulu as a conference center--a concept which would prove important in later years--was generated.[14] In addition, the Committee lobbied vigorously if unsuccessfully

---

[11]George F. Henshall, "Promotion in Hawaii," MPM, VII (Jan., 1914), 42-43. Hereafter cited as Henshall, "Promotion in Hawaii."

[12]Ibid.

[13]PCA, Oct. 5, 1908, p. 1 and Oct. 16, 1908, pp. 9-10.

[14]Just as Hawaii sought to attract organizations to the Islands for their meetings, other organizations attempted to interest Hawaii in participating in their meetings. During this time, for example, both the North Carolina Peace Congress and the First Universal Races Conference invited Hawaii to send official delegates to their scheduled gatherings. See Foust to Frear, Oct., 1, 1908, and Weardale to Frear, Mar. 8, 1911, Archives of Hawaii, Frear Papers, Miscellaneous: Conferences, Congresses, Etc.

to have a battleship commissioned the U.S.S. Hawaii.[15]

There is little doubt, then, that the Hawaii Promotion Committee saw its primary role in terms of promoting local economic development through the expansion of tourism. Those connected with the venture were quick to cite southern California's success in demonstrating that "climate and scenery have a cash value."[16] As if to underscore this observation, the Committee soon replaced its original secretary with H. P. Wood, a man who had previously been employed as a tourist and real estate promoter in southern California.[17] As might be expected of a group which saw its role in commercial terms, the Committee measured its accomplishments in the same terms. The following passages, taken from an article reviewing the Committee's first decade of activity, emphasize the point:

> The result of all this work? They [sic] are shown in the new Honolulu, the rise of prosperity in the smaller cities of the islands, and the great passenger steamers calling at Honolulu in place of the little coasters that handled the traffic not more than a decade ago. New suburbs have sprung into existence all around Honolulu, covering once barren wastes with homes surrounded with a wealth of lawns and flowers and trees . . . . [All of this is] testimony to Honolulu's acquisition of

---

[15]PCA, May 8, 1908, p. 1.

[16]Henshall, "Promotion in Hawaii," p. 41.

[17]Ibid., pp. 44-45. It should be noted that Wood served concurrently in this position and as secretary of the Chamber.

> the most desirable of all classes of visitors--those who stay to build their homes.

The article concludes:

> Hawaii is selling her perfect climate, and throwing in the scenery and geological wonders of her coral-volcano built islands, and she is offering it, in scientific method, wherever steamers, trains or carriers take mails.[18]

As suggested earlier, however, commercial expansion was not the only product of the Hawaii Promotion Committee's work. There were other activities which, in time, evolved into a broad array of internationally-oriented undertakings founded more upon internationalist than commercial premises. One of the earliest and possibly more significant occurrences of this nature took place in late 1907 and early 1908. At that time, Alexander Hume Ford, then only recently arrived in Honolulu, requested and obtained the blessings (a "sort of a commission" as he later put it)[19] of Governor Walter F. Frear to represent Hawaii while on a trip he was planning through Australia and New Zealand and to negotiate an arrangement whereby Hawaii would join with the Australasian governments in establishing a

---

[18] Ibid., pp. 43-44. For a more complete review of early promotional activities, see Anson Chong, "Economic Development of Hawaii and the Growth of Tourism" (M.A. thesis, Columbia University, 1963). Hereafter cited as Chong, "Economic Development of Hawaii."

[19] PCA, Mar. 19, 1908, p. 5.

"Pan Pacific Tourist and Information Bureau" with offices in New York and other large American cities.[20] The mission itself was a failure in terms of its stated goals. It ranks as an important event, however, in that it marks Ford's debut upon the Hawaiian scene and appears to be the source of his ideas on regional cooperation in the Pacific Basin.[21] Had the mission not taken place, it is conceivable that there would be no chapter on internationalism in the history of twentieth century Hawaii.

---

[20]One of the Workers, "Pan-Pacific Work, MPM, I (April, 1911), 421.

[21]It is impossible to determine precisely what Ford meant by "commission." Frear's papers contain no reference to any such commission, the newspapers of that time do not speak of it, nor does Joseph Stickney, Ford's long-time friend, recall any discussion of the matter. (Statement made to the author by Joseph Stickney.) Utilizing a number of other documented happenings, it is possible, however, to conjecture a likely explanation. While on the trip, he wrote a series of reports which were sent back to Hawaii for publication in the newspapers. One report, written in Fiji and dated simply August, 1907, mentions the fact that he was on the return leg of his trip. (See PCA, Sept. 29, 1907, p. 1.) While this timing appears to be at odds with the well-documented fact that he did not return to Honolulu until March of the following year, it probably is an accurate statement. Passenger ships on the Australasian-American run at that time did not stop in Hawaii when going east, so the Hawaii-bound traveler had to go to the mainland and then return to the Islands on another ship. As Ford notes elsewhere that he was on the mainland at the end of 1907 to sever his journalistic connections prior to returning to Hawaii (Alexander Hume Ford, "The Genesis of the Pan-Pacific Union: Part III," MPM, XXX (Nov., 1925), 471.), it can reasonably be assumed that he was in fact away from Hawaii between the late spring or early summer of 1907 and the spring of 1908. If this assumption is correct, one has to reach the rather astonishing conclusion that Ford never received an official commission of any sort from Frear for the simple reason that Frear did not become

While the audacity and self-promotional tactics which characterized Ford's initial undertaking in Hawaii are of interest in themselves, the more important aspect of the venture lies in the ideas regarding tourism and regionalism which he developed while abroad. Upon returning early in March 1908, he spoke at length before various community organizations and wrote extensive articles for the local press on his experiences and impressions. His initial remarks were directed toward thepossibility of expanding tourism.[22] He argued with some passion that Pacific tourism could become an industry and that Hawaii could become the center of that industry if the local community would but undertake the necessary promotional activities.[23] Although he did not speak of it upon his return, the Australasian trip also provided Ford with some insights regarding the need for greater mutual understanding among Pacific peoples. Writing about the experience a number of years later he said:

Governor until August 15, 1907. Ford, no doubt aware as were most residents at the time that Frear would likely succeed George R. Carter, may have discussed his idea with Frear earlier in 1907 and obtained some encouragement which he later labeled a "commission," but he could not have carried a formal commission. Whether or not this conjecture is correct, it fits Ford's character. He was, as Joseph Stickney recalls, "quite an operator." (Statement made to the author by Joseph Stickney.)

[22] PCA, Mar. 4, 1908, p. 5.

[23] PCA, Mar. 19, 1908, p. 5.

> In every way the year 1908 was momentous in the Annals of the Genesis of the Pan-Pacific Union.
>
> Returning to Hawaii by the way of Fiji, I found the Hindus had been brought to replace native labor, and that Fiji was becoming a diminutive Ceylon . . . . It was the eternal question of the Pacific all over again, the problem of the white man. Shall the land be exploited for the benefit of the intellectual and forceful few, or left to the backward heritors of the ages?
>
> I had spent two months in the New Hebrides and the white man had brought his problem there . . . . The French sold gin to the natives, and the English tried to prevent it. I saw whole villages of naked savages drunk and dangerous . . . .
>
> . . . I learned much of the effects of contacts between greatly divergent races and civilizations.[24]

While subsequent developments may have embellished Ford's recollection of the trip, it is fair to conclude that his travels in 1907-08 provided him with a vision of the role Hawaii might assume in both the promotion of Pacific tourism and the development of some mechanism capable of increasing international understanding throughout the Pacific.

Although Hawaii was poised on the threshold of an increasingly active engagement in Pacific Basin affairs at this point, no events of major immediate importance were to occur for approximately another three years. During the intervening period, however, two events did occur--both involving Ford--which later proved to be of importance in the growth of internationally oriented

---

[24]Alexander Hume Ford, "The Genesis of the Pan-Pacific Union: Part III," MPM, XXX (Nov., 1925), 477-79.

activities in Hawaii. The first of these events occurred on March 25, 1908, when Governor Frear announced that he was forming a Territorial Transportation Committee to act as the agent for Hawaii in establishing some form of cooperation with the various Australasian government tourist bureaus, to assist the Hawaii Promotion Committee with its work, and to seek a reduction in travel rates both locally (among the highest in the world at that time) and throughout the Pacific. Ford was one of the six members appointed to this committee and, according to news reports, the prime mover behind its formation.[25] While the new committee itself did little aside from conduct some non-consequential discussions in October 1908 with a representative of the Australian tourist bureau (a meeting, however, which Ford would later term the "Pan-Pacific Congress of Government Tourist Bureaus"),[26] it progressed through a series of transformations and became the Pan-Pacific Union in 1917.[27]

The other event of importance which occurred during this time was the formation of the Outrigger Canoe Club,

---

[25] PCA, Mar. 26, 1908, p. 5. Other members of this committee were Frear, R.H. Trent, E.A. Mott Smith, L.A. Thurston, and J.P. Cooke. Frear was the honorary chairman and Trent was the acting chairman, although Ford later claimed that he was the chairman. See Alexander Hume Ford, "The Genesis of the Pan-Pacific Union: Part II," MPM, XXX (Oct., 1925), 376.

[26] "The Pan-Pacific Congress," MPM, I (Jan., 1911), 93.

[27] PCA, Oct. 14, 1908, p. 1.

or the Outrigger Club as it was originally known. Again, Ford was a prime mover in the undertaking. As he recalls, he arrived in Honolulu in 1907 only to find that surfing--Hawaii's unique contribution to the world of sports--was in danger of disappearing. He noted that ". . . there were scarcely a half dozen white boys and a few natives who still practiced this . . ."[28] As he was interested in surfing himself and was attempting to master the sport, he decided to create an organization which would encourage young boys to learn surfing. He and a number of interested youth (apparently all white, however) created a rudimentary organization during 1907, but he left shortly thereafter on his Australia-New Zealand trip and little came of the effort. He revived the idea upon his return and sponsored a series of organizational meetings during April 1908. On May 1, 1908, the Outrigger Canoe Club was formally organized and by-laws were adopted. Ford was elected as its first president.[29]

While this event, in and of itself, is not especially significant in the history of local internationalism (this club, in fact, has barred local Orientals from membership from the time of its founding until the present), Ford

---

[28]Alexander Hume Ford, "The Genesis of the Pan-Pacific Union: Part II" MPM, XXX (Oct., 1925), 375.

[29]PCA, May 2, 1908, p. 3.

made use of the club as a meeting place for numerous international gatherings, and, in this respect, it became a factor in the internationalist movement. Warren G. Harding, for example, was entertained there in 1915 at a luau sponsored by the Hands-Around-the-Pacific Club (one of the organizations which grew out of the Territorial Transportation Committee), and Ford insisted, quite rightly no doubt, that this event was a factor in Harding's interest in the Pan-Pacific Union after he became President.[30] Hence, the formation of this club must be considered as still another component in the growth of the local internationalist movement.[31]

Biographical Sketch of Alexander Hume Ford

Activities of an internationalist nature in Hawaii during the 1903-11 period were, in the balance, of limited scope and importance. Indeed, those that did occur were viewed largely in commercial rather than internationalist terms. Nonetheless, these activities initiated certain trends which would produce an authentic internationalist movement during the following decades. In many respects, credit for initiating these trends must be given to a host

---

[30]Alexander Hume Ford, "The Genesis of the Pan-Pacific Union: Part II," MPM, XXX (Oct., 1925), 373-74.

[31]For a more complete history of the Outrigger Canoe Club and Ford's role in it, see Harold Yost, History of the Outrigger Canoe Club (Honolulu, 1971).

of external developments far beyond the control of any one man. As is evident, what interest there was in international activities at this time was closely related to the development of a tourist industry in Hawaii and the Pacific. Thus, the work of the Hawaii Promotion Committee warrants more than passing mention as a contributing development. Of even greater importance is the fact that touring became something of a fad in America following the 1907 depression, and Hawaii's promoters were rewarded for their efforts far beyond all expectations.[32] However, even against a background of such important causal factors, it is not likely that these trends would have developed without the efforts of imaginative and ambitious individuals, most especially Ford. Hence, some effort to summarize his background, early experiences, and more characteristic personality traits is in order at this point.

Ford was born April 3, 1868, in Charleston, South Carolina, the son of Frederick Winthrop and Mary Mazy Hume Ford, both descendants of old and well-known Southern families. He studied at Porter Military Academy as a youth, but did not attend college.[33] Interested in journalism and the theater, he joined the Charleston

---

[32]Chong, "Economic Development of Hawaii," p. 127.

[33]"Alexander Hume Ford" in George F.M. Nellist (ed.), Pan-Pacific Who's Who: 1940-41 (Honolulu, 1941), p. 227. Hereafter cited as Nellist, Who's Who.

News and Courier after graduation from the military school.[34] He claims to have collaborated with Mark Twain on some dramatic productions during this time.[35] Leaving Charleston sometime in the late 1880s, he went to New York as an aspiring author and playwright. He authored at least one play--The Little Confederate--which was produced on Broadway in 1889. This minor success, he stated, made him something of a celebrity, and he became friendly with peole like Jay Gould and Cyrus W. Field.[36]

Moving from New York to Chicago around 1890, Ford attempted to publish several small magazines but found it financially impossible. He then joined the news staff of the Chicago Daily News Record where he remained for nearly a decade, increasingly active in local social and political affairs, and, he recalls, increasingly distressed by the public's general lack of tolerance and marked tendency toward ethnocentrism. Using his newspaper articles to "propagandize" as he put it (then a word with fewer pejorative connotations than presently), he argued for a more cosmopolitan point of view among his Chicago readers.[37]

---

[34]Honolulu Star-Bulletin, Oct. 15, 1945, p. 5. Periodical hereafter cited as SB.

[35]Nellist, Who's Who, p. 227.

[36]SB., Oct. 15, 1945, p. 15.

[37]Alexander Hume Ford, "The Genesis of the Pan-Pacific Union: Part I," MPM, XXX (Sept., 1925), 270.

He later said that one of his fundamental beliefs was that "prejudice is stronger than principle [and that] a man will violate every principle before he will budge an inch in his prejudices."[38] It is reasonable to assume that his Chicago experiences contributed to this belief.

In any case, Ford became an activist while in Chicago. He formed a series of ethnically-based clubs (among them the Russian Club and the African Anti-Lynching League) to combat ethnic prejudice and to broaden inter-cultural understanding. He also created the Society for the Prevention of Crime which led to confrontations with certain members of the political machine then controlling Chicago. In addition, he involved himself in the formation of an activist religious organization called the Militant Church and known by its rather temporal slogan, "Deeds not creeds, act in this world, theorize in the next." The church, led by a Presbyterian minister named John Rusk, anticipated the ecumenical movement by including on its board of directors an unfrocked Catholic priest, a Greek Orthodox priest, a Baptist minister, a Methodist minister, a Unitarian, a rabbi, an Episcopalian, and an agnostic, Robert G. Ingersoll. All of this, however, is not to suggest that the church was a farce. It was deeply involved in the

---

[38] Ibid., Part VII, MPM, XXXI (March, 1926), 257.

struggle against crime, offering such services as legal aid to the poor and clinics for drug addicts long before most American churches were willing even to admit a responsibility in the area.[39]

Another aspect of Ford's Chicago experience, one which he felt was particularly influential upon his later activities, is the fact that one of his colleagues at the Daily News Record was William E. Curtiss, an early advocate of regional organizations and the first Director of the Bureau of American Republics, the Pan-American Union's predecessor agency. Ford later said that he became aware of the potential of regional cooperation through his association with Curtiss and that Curtiss must be considered an important factor in the formation of the Pan-Pacific Union.[40] This, as discussed in more detail later, understates the case. Of all the activities and causes Ford sponsored through the Union, it is quite clear that in his mind the overriding purpose of this organization was to emulate the Pan-American Union--to become, at the expense of all else if need be, a government sponsored regional agency.

It was the newspaper work which involved Ford with local activities in Chicago, and it was also newspaper

---

[39] Ibid., Part I, MPM, XXX (Sept., 1925), 273-75.

[40] Ibid., p. 269. The change in titles occurred in 1910.

work which led to his departure. Due to a chance friendship developed with a Russian businessman while covering a food show in Chicago during 1898 or 1899, Ford was offered a position in Vladivostok with the M.S. Nicde Company. This company was concerned primarily with supplying materials for the construction of the Trans-Siberian railway, and Ford, unschooled in business matters as he may have been, leaped at the opportunity. It was a chance to travel. The job itself did not last long but it did nonetheless, help shape his subsequent career. Sailing between California and Hawaii on the way to Vladivostok in 1899, he chanced to meet George, William, and James Castle of the well-known Honolulu missionary and business family. They were returning from a trip connected with a "white labor" project at the Ewa Sugar Plantation (one of many such experiments during the period, this one involved Russian Doukhobors and, like the others, was essentially a failure), and Ford was intrigued with their description of Hawaii's ethnic composition.[41] While he stopped over only briefly in Honolulu at the time, he commented later that his main reason for returning to Honolulu in 1907 was to study the Castles' labor experiment.[42]

---

[41] Ibid., pp. 278-79.

[42] Alexander Hume Ford, "Romance of the Pan-Pacific Union," MPM, XV (June, 1918), 588.

The other important aspect of Ford's employment in Russia was that it gave him a taste of travel, renewed his interest in journalism, and exposed him to an even broader range of challenging human problems than he had seen in Chicago. Although the details of this period are far from clear, it appears that he left the Nicde Company shortly after witnessing the Boxer Uprising in China in 1900 and went back to journalism.[43] Between that time and early 1907 when he returned to Hawaii, he traveled throughout much of the world writing for such publications as Century, Harper's Magazine, and McClures' Magazine.[44] At the time he returned to Honolulu, he was employed by Hampton's Magazine, writing on problems of race and immigration.[45]

Ford emerges from this brief biographical sketch as a humane, progressive, and idealistic individual. Within the context of his times, he was. This does not say, however, that he was in all ways notably superior to his contemporaries. This he was not. For example, regardless of his concern about racial tolerance, he remained a man beset by racial prejudices. As he put it:

---

[43]Alexander Hume Ford, "The Genesis of the Pan-Pacific Union: Part V," MPM, XXXI (Jan., 1926), 9.

[44]Nellist, Who's Who, p. 227.

[45]See Note #21.

> I was brought up in the South and inherited a racial prejudice. Yet, on the Pacific, I can control that prejudice toward all other races, save that one race.[46]

Whether he controlled "that prejudice toward all other races" or simply glossed it over with a rather stifling paternalism is the question. Statements such as the following abound in his writing:

> One more word of the sons of the Oriental in Hawaii. They are as a rule true Americans. Their faces are losing the placid expression of the Asiatic and assuming the animated countenance of the American.[47]

At the same time, however, these sentiments must be seen in the light of prevailing attitudes toward race which characterized both Hawaii and mainland America at this time. Ford, like most of his contemporaries, was influenced by them. One must also recognize that Ford contributed far more than most of his contemporaries--before coming to Hawaii as well as after--toward breaking down such sentiments. Still, these observations only explain his views; they do not change them.

At another level, one might be tempted to view Ford as something of a prophet, given his relatively advanced views on international organization and cooperation. In some respects, perhaps he was. It should be noted, however,

---

[46]Alexander Hume Ford, "The Genesis of the Pan-Pacific Union: Part VII," MPM, XXXI (Mar., 1926), 259.

[47]Ibid., Part VI, MPM, XXXI (Feb., 1926), 112.

that his ideas were considerably more advanced within the context of then current Hawaiian attitudes than that of world-wide thought. The turn of the century, it must be recalled, brought the various Hague conferences and the creation of the Permanent Court of Arbitration. World War I produced the League, numerous affiliated international organizations, and several decades of international conferences on any variety of topics. In addition, the United States, as an alternative to participation in the League, engaged in a rather frantic round of international activity throughout the 1920s and early 1930s involving a multitude of international conferences and resulting in almost as many international treaties. In short, while Ford's ideas may have been unique and bold within their local setting, they can hardly be called prophetic within the broader context of their times. Indeed, there is reason to question his qualifications as a prophet within even narrower contexts. For example, although he spent some time in pre-revolutionary Russia, he issued the following comment shortly after the outbreak of the 1917 Revolution:

> When the real revolution in Russia thrills the hears of all the people, it will be found that it has become a sacred cause, beyond the control of teachers of earthly reform and "isms"--the people will, as part of their religion, demand freedom, enlightenment and a lifting of the burdens of taxation. No anarchist or terrorist, bomb in hand, will lead them on, but a Holy Man

> bearing aloft the sacred Ikon--and the people will follow to sweep all before them.[48]

Another rather serious problem with Ford was his willingness to bend facts to suit his purposes. This tendency, combined with a penchant for simplistic general theories and a love of extraneous detail, makes it difficult to accept much of what he wrote unless it can be verified through other sources. As illustrated by the matter of his "commission" from Governor Frear, Ford was willing to perpetrate an outright deception when it served his purposes to do so.[49] The bulk of his more questionable statements, however, are more the product of an over-simplification of basic points and an over-elaboration on extraneous points than a calculated deception. For example, one of his favorite explanations of Pacific problems was to the effect that peace would prevail in the Pacific if living standards were more nearly uniform from country to country and all people could afford to travel, thus coming to better understand one another.[50] Then,

---

[48]Ibid., "Russia in Religious Revolution," MPM, XIV (July 1917), 79-81.

[49]Many of these examples stem from Ford's propensity to apply the Pan-Pacific label to any event bearing some aspect of internationalism, regardless of the sponsor or his intent.

[50]For example, see By The Editor [Alexander Hume Ford], "More About Patriotism of the Pacific," MPM, IX (June, 1915), 563-67.

instead of suggesting a plan for equalizing living standards, he invariably proceeded with a detailed description of possible new steamship and railway routes, proposed fares, designs for tourist accommodations, and similar matters. To illustrate further, he once called upon Honolulu merchants to reform their Chamber of Commerce. After some rather vague references to the goals he had in mind, he launched into a long discussion of the new building such an organization might erect, going so far as to suggest its location, physical specifications, likely tenants, and possible annual rents.[51]

Finally, it should be noted that Ford was vain. He demanded attention, he loved the company of highly placed people, and he especially yearned for accolades. When compliments came--as they frequently did during his years in Hawaii--he was not at all above printing them in Mid Pacific Magazine. The following passage, although extreme, illustrates the point:

> It will be Hawaii's great mission to unite the nations of the Pacific on the principle of the brotherhood of men and establish a lasting peace. It may be that Hawaii will someday lead the nations in observing Ford Day, like Balboa Day is being celebrated today by the Pan-Pacific Union.[52]

---

[51]For example, see Alexander Hume Ford, "The Pull Together Movement," MPM, V (Jan., 1913), 83-90.

[52]Takie Okumura, "Hawaii's Mission," MPM, XXIX (June, 1925), 861.

Ford's Place in Hawaiian History

None of this is intended to tarnish a man who is the key figure in the history of local internationalism and one of the more significant figures in the general history of modern Hawaii. Rather it is intended simply as an effort to portray his weaknesses as well as his strengths in order that his activities and the fruits of those activities might be more appropriately assessed. As the following chapters will show, any of Ford's failings tend to be outweighed by his positive contributions, and he deserves a more prominent niche than he has so far been accorded in the annals of Hawaiian history.

CHAPTER III

PROTO-INTERNATIONALISM: 1911-1917

Promotion of Tourism and Internationalism

International considerations were not a significant factor in the thinking of those who inaugurated the turn-of-the-century effort to promote Hawaii as a center for Pacific trade and tourism. More by chance than planning, such considerations did become a minor factor in the effort by late in the first decade. With the turn of the second decade, they emerged as a major factor.

By this time, an impressive array of governmental, business, and civic leaders--if not the community at large--had come to believe that an investment in promotional activities would yield the Territory a profitable return. Evidence of this conviction lies in the Legislature's willingness to support Hawaii Promotion Committee activities through regular appropriations and the business community's decision to continue its self-imposed freight levy, now also designated for promotional expenditures. More important, these leaders appeared to feel that the question of promotional activities had merely been broached and that additional activities were both possible and desirable. Hence, there was a continuing interest in still other means

of enticing tourists and businessmen into the Pacific and, if possible, to Hawaii, the "Crossroads of the Pacific."[1]

Within this context, two near simultaneous developments occurred which promised to add such new dimensions to the promotional effort. As a consequence, both received considerable support from community leaders. First, in terms of chronology as well as consequence, was the introduction of Ford's Mid-Pacific Magazine in mid-December, 1910. Distributed internationally, the monthly publication provided the first media voice on behalf of Pacific Basin trade and tourist interests.[2] The second development occurred two months later when a Pan-Pacific Travel Congress was convened in Honolulu. Planned and hosted by the Hawaii

---

[1]The Hawaii Promotion Committee and the media actively promoted the idea throughout this period. Their efforts were intensified after the start of World War I with the argument that Hawaii was the world's only "safe" tourist resort. See Pratt, Hawaii, pp. 214-15. It is also worth noting that tourism became enough of an economic factor during this period to warrant mention in the Governor's annual report to the Secretary of the Interior beginning in 1914. Report of the Governor of Hawaii to the Secretary of the Interior for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1914 (Washington, 1914), p. 6. Hereafter cited as Governor's Report by the respective year.

[2]There are, of course, other Pacific-oriented publications which pre-date Mid-Pacific Magazine. Friend and Paradise of the Pacific are among the most important of them. However, Ford's publication was the first to show a concern for the Pacific Basin generally and to be directed at an international audience. As discussed in more detail in a subsequent chapter, it did succeed to some extent in reaching its intended audience. Its initial distribution was some 65% local and 35% mainland and international Roughly the same figures prevailed until the magazine folded during the mid-1930s.

Promotion Committee, the gathering was described as the first in a series of meetings designed to facilitate regional consultation and planning relative to Pacific Basin trade and travel.[3] Adding the likely impact of an internationally-distributed promotional magazine and the anticipated contribution of periodic regional planning conferences to on-going activities initiated in the previous decade, those community leaders concerned with promotion sensed that all the ingredients necessary for a sophisticated, comprehensive, and sustained promotional effort were at last present. To them, it appeared that the opportunities envisioned during the previous decade were now on the verge of realization. Although the community in general evidenced little interest in such opportunities, community leaders seemed to feel Hawaii was at the beginning of a new era.[4]

Their assessment was correct in more ways than anyone at the time could have anticipated. Tourism, as hoped, did increase steadily over the years and became an industry of major importance. Moreover, in expanding it encouraged other peripheral activities such as Ford's new magazine and the regional travel conference which in turn laid the groundwork for an authentic, local internationalist

---

[3]PCA, Feb. 24, 1911, pp. 1, 4.

[4]For example, see PCA, Mar. 3, 1911, p. 4.

movement. While that movement formally dates from the founding of the Pan-Pacific Union in 1917, international considerations did play an increasingly important role in local promotional work throughout the intervening period. Indeed, it is appropriate to term these years an era of "proto-internationalism."

Mid-Pacific Magazine and the Hands-Around-the-Pacific Club

When the first issue of Mid-Pacific Magazine came off the Hawaiian Gazette Company's presses on December 14, 1910, it carried the following announcement:

> The Mid-Pacific Magazine, published at the Crossroads of the Pacific, will be a real Pan-Pacific publication, presenting monthly interesting facts, fictions, poetry and general articles concerning the lands in and bordering upon the great ocean.
>
> The Mid-Pacific Magazine will be essentially a literary publication. It will be highly illustrated with photographs and drawings of scenes in many lands and islands, from Alaska to Cape Horn and from California to China, Java and Australasia. It is published in Honolulu . . . because here it is easiest to assemble the literature of the Pacific from around the great circular ocean that borders on the Americas, Asia, and Australasia.[5]

In fact, the magazine was essentially a propaganda device for Hawaiian and Pacific commercial interests. Although it would evolve into an important voice on behalf of international cooperation and inter-racial harmony, its earlier issues were composed chiefly of brief (and usually poorly written) articles extolling various tourist

---

[5]"Announcement," MPM, I (Jan., 1911), inside cover.

attractions in Hawaii and the Pacific and numerous photographs of scenic vistas. There were also periodic articles of a more sociological nature which, on more than one occasion, conveyed a decidedly racist message.[6] Only infrequently were there attempts at anything literary.[7] A glance at the contents of the initial issue illustrates:

"Riding the Surf" by Duke Pauoa [Kahanamoku]
"Skiing in Australia" by Percy Hunter
"Halemanu" by Mary Dillingham Frear
"Napali" by [Governor] W.F. Frear
"The Most Beautiful River" by H.F. Alexander
[Alexander Hume Ford]
"The Restless Fishooks" by R. and W. Thayer
"Strange Cruises" by A. Marchmont
"Oriental Honolulu" by S. Sheba
"Coasting Down Popocatapt1" by A.H. Ford
"Chip's Uloa" by Aleka Poka
"Hawaii" by P. Maurice McMahon
"The Changing Status of the Immigrant" by
Dr. Victor S. Clark
"The Real Home of Santa Claus" by H.M. Polworth

---

[6]Throughout this period, Mid-Pacific Magazine frequently published articles concerning such subjects as "Americanizing" Hawaii's Asian Population, advantages of Australia's "white only" policy, and the inferiority of native Hawaiians. As suggested elsewhere, such viewpoints were common enough among whites at the time and the magazine was, thus, only reflecting the climate of its time. The important point is that it outgrew this perspective rather rapidly.

[7]Aside from occasional poems, the magazine's major attempt came in a serialized "tale of the South Seas" entitled "Sabacco." Authored by Ford, it ran between February and December, 1911. Ford later recalled that he felt the story was good, but that Jack London called it "the poorest novel he ever read," see Alexander Hume Ford, "The Genesis of the Pan-Pacific Union: Part IX," MPM, XXXI (May, 1926), 473.

"The Americanization of Hawaii" by [Congressman] A.L. Brick
"Around the Pacific" by H.P. Wood
"The Trail and Mountain Club" by Guy H. Tuttle.[8]

The magazine continued in this format until shortly after the Pan-Pacific Union was founded. At that time, it became the official journal of the new organization and the previously mentioned changes began to occur. During the interim, it remained an excellent example of the still predominantly commercial outlook of the proto-internationalist movement in Hawaii. Representative captions from scenic photographs and drawings reproduced by the magazine during this period make the point with greater clarity:

> Only the Riviera in Italy and the famous Amalfi Drive can compare with the wonderful ride over the Hamakua Extension Line of the Hilo Railway on the Island of Hawaii. It is nothing short of marvelous.[9]

Elsewhere:

> In Hawaii are the Twelve Scenic Wonders of the World: The largest volcano, the largest quiescent crater, the highest Island peak, the most gorgeous fish, the only expert surf-riders, the most varied and marvelous canyons, [the] most beautiful water-falls, moonlight rainbows, Pa-u riders, the most extensive pineapple fields and the richest sugar cane. Come to Hawaii![10]

---

[8]"Table of Contents," MPM, I (Jan., 1911), 1. Of interest here is the fact that Ford often wrote under a pseudonym. H.F. Alexander in this listing, for example, is Ford. (Statement made to the author by Joseph Stickney.)

[9]MPM, X (Nov., 1915), 426.

[10]MPM. XI (Jan., 1916), inside cover. This is one of a series of thirteen pictures and captions run by the magazine and sponsored by various local commercial firms.

As near as can be determined, the origin of the Mid-Pacific Magazine dates from Ford's 1907-08 Australasian tour. An editorial in one of the early issues states that the idea for such a publication was first conceived during a discussion involving Ford and several others in Sydney during 1908. Those participating in the talks agreed to publish a Pacific-oriented promotional magazine entitled The Southern Cross with offices in New York City. When the original plans (for reasons never discussed) failed to materialize, Ford obtained backing from Hawaii's business community and initiated the venture on his own.[11]

Ford, as owner, was the dominant figure in the magazine's management from the time it was first issued until the early 1930s. The rather curious phrase "conducted by Alexander Hume Ford" appeared on the cover of every issue of the magazine until shortly before it failed in 1936, and it is a good description of how Ford managed the publication. By his own admission, he was not particularly interested in the details of publishing. As a consequence, he turned these matters over to Howard Ballou, his Associate

---

[11]"Editorial Comment," MPM, III (Jan., 1912), 96. Also, shortly after publication of the initial issue, Governor Frear, L.A. Thurston, W.R. Castle and others concerned with the magazine called a special meeting and endorsed it. See PCA, Dec. 22, 1910, p. 3. In addition, the newspapers supported the magazine through highly complimentary reviews of each issue and in time, certain mainland papers also took note of it. See PCA, Feb. 14, 1911, p. 12.

Editor and a former College of Hawaii mathematics instructor known for his research on the history of printing in Hawaii. Ballou, who served in this capacity from 1911 until his death in November 1925, had the task of turning Ford's careless work as well as the contributions of others into technically correct copy. Judging by the increased number of inaccuracies in post-1925 articles, he performed this task rather well. While others contributed to the publications management--in particular a youth named Joseph Stickney who served as a general aide and then as Assistant Editor between 1911 and 1918--it was, as Ford readily admitted, Ballou who was responsible for its initial success.[12]

As suggested, the publication of Mid-Pacific Magazine was but one of two events which contributed to the development of the proto-internationalist movement in Hawaii during this period. The other, an event considered more newsworthy at the time, was the Pan-Pacific Travel Congress which convened in Honolulu during February 1911. As the first conference of an international nature sponsored by any Hawaiian organization, it attracted broad newspaper coverage and more-so than any previous undertaking, served

---

[12]Alexander Hume Ford, "The Genesis of the Pan-Pacific Union: Part IX," MPM, XXXI (May, 1926), 473-75.

to notify the community that their leaders were interested in internationally-oriented activities.[13]

The first public mention of this event came in mid-December 1910, when the Hawaii Promotion Committee announced that it had called such a gathering to coincide with the 1911 Floral Parade and that the initial response to the invitations was encouraging. The invitations had gone to mainland organizations and firms concerned with tourism (principally railway companies) and a large attendance was anticipated.[14] There were reports that one group of Northwest businessmen had even chartered a ship for their delegation to the Floral Parade and, presumably, the Congress. Unfortunately for Hawaii, their plans failed to materialize.[15]

When the Congress convened on February 20, 1911, some sixty delegates were in attendance. However, all but two--Percy Hunter, Director of the New South Wales Tourist Bureau, and Chester Arthur Davis from Ceylon--were

---

[13]As noted previously, the 1908 meeting between a representative of the Australian tourist bureau and the Territorial Transportation Committee was occasionally but erroneously termed a Pan-Pacific Conference. It should not be confused with the 1911 Pan-Pacific Travel Conference.

[14]PCA, Dec. 12, 1910, p. 12.

[15]PCA, Nov. 25, 1910, p. 2 and Jan. 27, 1911, p. 9.

local consuls representing their governments, local businessmen representing mainland firms, or members of the several local clubs invited to send delegates. A goodly portion of the local establishment attended the Congress in the latter status. Ford, as a delegate from the Hawaii Trail and Mountain Club (another organization he helped found after his arrival in Hawaii), was among them.[16]

Undeterred by such a turnout, G. Fred Bush, then Chairman of the Hawaii Promotion Committee, led the delegates through a two-day series of meetings which produced decisions to organize as a permanent body known simply as the Pan-Pacific Congress, to establish a headquarters in Honolulu, to hold annual meetings for mutual consultation purposes, and to promote Pacific trade and travel with particular emphasis upon lowering shipping fees.[17] In addition, officers and directors were elected with the following results:

> Officers and Directors: W.H. McInerny, President; Percy Hunter, First Vice President; D.P.R. Isenberg, Second Vice President; Fred C. Smith, Treasurer; and H.P. Wood, Secretary.
>
> Directors only: F.Q. Story, Dr. J.T. McCormac, John L. Camm, C. Arthur Davis, G. Fred Bush, W.R. Castle, J.L. McLean, James F. Morgan, L.A. Thurston, B. von Damm, and A.H. Ford.[18]

---

[16] PCA, Feb. 21, 1911, p. 1. Ford, it should be noted, was instrumental in founding the Hawaii Trail and Mountain Club.

[17] Ibid.

[18] PCA, Feb. 24, 1911, pp. 1, 4.

The local establishment, if not the broader community, was well represented.

Viewing this organization and its stated goals alongside other, on-going promotional activities, it is evident why those concerned with commercial promotion were enthusiastic. Yet, for reasons which may never be fully clear, the Pan-Pacific Congress simply dissolved following its initial meeting. The Hawaii Promotion Committee's annual report for 1911 notes only that the meeting was held and its 1912 report makes no mention of the subject at all.[19] Governor Frear's papers are equally unenlightening. There is one letter from H.P. Wood, who was Secretary of the Congress by virtue of his position as Secretary of the Promotion Committee, explaining plans for future activities and then nothing more.[20] The only subsequent evidence that the Congress ever existed was its stationery which the Promotion Committee used for a few years until the supply was exhausted. Part of the reason for the failure of the Congress is no doubt related to the fact that few if any of the delegates had authority to commit their nations or organizations to its goals or to pledge financial support. As a consequence, the meeting adjourned

---

[19]Hawaii Promotion Committee Annual Report, 1911 and 1912, Archives of Hawaii, Chamber of Commerce of Honolulu Papers, General Meetings.

[20]Wood to Frear, Sept. 15, 1911, Archives of Hawaii, Frear Papers, Miscellaneous, Conferences, Congresses, etc.

with nothing more than the understanding that the officers would attempt to raise funds.[21] International organizations do not succeed under such haphazard financial arrangements.

Another factor which apparently played an even greater role in the failure of the Congress was the emergence of a competing organization--Ford's Hands-Around-the-Pacific Club--which captured the support of most of the local establishment. Ford's reasons for choosing this moment to found an obviously competitive organization (discussed in more detail below) remain a mystery. Perhaps there was a personal rivalry between him and Wood, although there is no evidence suggesting it. The Chamber documents and the documents in the various other collections relevant to Ford's activities are silent on the point. However, considering how Ford would profit from having a clear field for his own operations, the possibility of some form of intrigue cannot be entirely ruled out.

Somehow symbolic of the Pan Pacific Travel Congress's failure is the fact that the 1911 Floral Parade proved to be more important in the growth of internationalism than the Congress itself, regardless of the fact that the latter was Hawaii's first international gathering. As noted previously, the Floral Parade, held annually on

---

[21] PCA, Feb. 24, 1911, pp. 1, 4.

Washington's birthday since its inception in 1906, began simply as a parade of locally-prepared floats with prizes awarded to the outstanding entries. It was inspired by neither commercialism nor internationalism.[22] The format of this event was changed in 1911 when, under the direction of Mrs. W.F. Dillingham, it was expanded to include an international evening--a Mid-Pacific Kirmess as it was called--featuring displays on numerous foreign countries.[23] This addition proved so popular that the local press called for an expansion of the Floral Parade into an international carnival.[24] The request was honored, and by 1917 the Floral Parade had evolved into the Mid-Pacific Carnival--a carnival, incidentally, which featured Pan-Pacific Day as one of its high points.[25]

For whatever the underlying reasons, the relationship between commercialism and internationalism which grew up during the first decade of the century received what would prove to be a serious blow when the formation of the Hands-Around-the-Pacific Club was announced in 1911. Although the local internationalist movement long retained a

---

[22]Pratt, Hawaii, p. 191. In the same passage she states that this event evolved into a carnival by 1914. 1911 is the correct date.

[23]PCA, Feb. 19, 1911, p. 1.

[24]PCA, Mar. 19, 1911, p. 3.

[25]"Pan-Pacific Day, February 19th, 1917, in Honolulu: The Pacific World Center," MPM, XIII (Jan., 1917), 17-31.

decidedly commercial undertone, the notion that commercialism and internationalism could be one and the same --a characteristic of the previous era--began to disintegrate at this point. Those concerned primarily with one or the other side of the matter began the slow process of searching out new activities and new procedures suited to their special concerns. Those primarily concerned with commerce concentrated on the promotion of tourism while those more interested in international affairs devoted their attention to political and social issues in Hawaii and the Pacific. Although the bonds between commercialism and internationalism were never fully severed, activists in each arena generally worked apart from this time onward. Hence, the establishment of the Hands-Around-the Pacific Club--at least in retrospect--was a significant occasion.

With regard to the actual founding of the club, on March 14, 1911, an article appeared in the Pacific Commercial Advertiser announcing that the Territorial Transportation Committee was to be dissolved and reconstituted as a "real Pan Pacific Tourist Bureau." The article went on to note that the new agency would direct its efforts toward increasing both pan-Pacific and pan-Hawaiian travel and that it would be guided by an advisory committee known as the Hands-Around-the Pacific Club.[26] As mentioned,

---

[26]PCA, Mar. 14, 1911, p. 1. However, the title "Hands-Around-the-Pacific Club" does not appear in an article for another three days.

the new organization was supported by the same men who had agreed but a few weeks previously to support the Pan-Pacific Congress and then mysteriously deserted it. The Pan-Pacific Tourist Bureau went through a brief metamorphosis as the Public Service Association (late in the same year) and then faded into obscurity. Not so the Hands-Around-the-Pacific Club. It persisted, evolving in time into the Pan-Pacific Union and one of Hawaii's most important contributions to the world of international and intercultural relations.

The Hands-Around-the Pacific Club met formally for the first time on March 17, 1911. The purpose of the meeting was to define the club's objectives. Professor W.A. Bryan of the College of Hawaii, the group's first coordinator, was the principal speaker and he discussed various aspects of promotional work. However, according to newspaper reports it was an informal speaker, T.F. Sedgwick, who provided the most provocative remarks. Speaking on desirable goals for the new organization, he said:

> There is one great thing that all this must lead to, and that is universal peace. If all of us get together and talk matters over, we learn a great deal about each other's country. When the movement spreads and grows large enough for each of the countries we will come in contact with to come to know more of each other, then our work must lead toward universal peace. A better knowledge of each other's manners and customs will lead towards the breaking down of old traditions, and once these are severed and we find out that, with the exception of a few minor details, we are

> only the same as the other fellow after all, then there will be an end to all talk of war, and we will live together side by side and in peace.[27]

Thereafter, one or another version of Sedgwick's simplistic but nonetheless noble sentiment appeared regularly in speeches given by club members and in articles published by Mid-Pacific Magazine. Percy Hunter of Australia, one of the club's officers, wrote:

> We desire that the various great nations bordering this, the World's Greatest Ocean, should live together in true amity, that they should come to know each other better, that they should trade and travel and join in industrial and commercial activity and know no cause of quarrel or bitterness. The basis of peace is knowledge and the best way to encourage the amity of nations is to ensure a knowledge, one of the other, among the nationals of each country.[28]

An anonymous article which appeared a few years later in Mid-Pacific Magazine underscored the same point:

> Hawaii, at the crossroads of the Pacific, is seeking to bring together in a friendly commercial fellowship all of the peoples of the great ocean that, after they become better acquainted with each other's aims and ambitions, each may select those objects that are common to all on which to base united work for the welfare of all who inhabit the shores and countries of the Pacific.[29]

These articles sum up what appears to be the Hands-Around-the-Pacific Club's fundamental objective--to strengthen commercial relations in the Pacific not as an

---

[27] PCA, Mar. 18, 1911, p. 4.

[28] Percy Hunter, "The Hands-Around-the-Pacific Club Movement," MPM, III (May, 1912), 405.

[29] "A Pan-Pacific Congress in Honolulu," MPM, XI (April, 1916), 382.

end in itself but as a means of preserving peace in the Pacific. Not surprisingly then, such an objective was embodied in the statement of goals adopted at the Club's second meeting on March 23, 1911:

> To promote in Hawaii a feeling of fellowship among those residents . . . who are from the various Pacific lands and islands, or who have visited them.
>
> To spread abroad around the Pacific a knowledge of Hawaii and to secure from each other and from around the Pacific a better knowledge of the lands . . . and the objects, aims, and ambitions of their respective peoples.
>
> To aid in securing cooperation on the part of the many Pacific governments in worthy objects looking toward the attraction from Europe and America of tourists, immigrants, businessmen and all whose presence in Pacific lands will be a distinct gain to the common interests of all who live about the Pacific.
>
> To take active part in any movement directed toward the betterment of Hawaii as a place of residence or a land to visit.
>
> To keep alive a pride in the land we live in as well as the land from whence we came, and to do all that we can to make both more worthy of that pride.[30]

Stated otherwise, the proto-internationalism of the Hands-Around-the-Pacific Club was not so much a rejection of the commercial side of internationalism as it was an attempt to emphasize the internationalist potential of commercialism.

In addition to adopting a set of objectives, members of the Hands-Around-the-Pacific Club also developed a

---

[30] PCA, Mar. 24, 1911, p. 4.

leadership formula during their earlier meetings. It was simple. Major public officials from the various Pacific nations were invited to serve as honorary officers (and they usually complied) while a working secretariat was maintained in Honolulu to direct the actual operations. As a consequence, the club's officer list always contained the names of presidents, prime ministers, kings, premiers, and governors.

Governor Frear initiated this tradition in 1911 by accepting an honorary presidency in the club. Before the year was out, a full slate of honorary officers had been arranged. It was as follows:

> Honorary Presidents: Walter F. Frear, Governor of Hawaii; William C. Forbes, Governor General of the Philippines; Andrew Fisher, Prime Minister of Australia; and Sir Joseph Ward, Prime Minister of New Zealand.
> Honorary Vice President: James T. McGowen, Premier of New South Wales; Francis Wilson, Premier of West Australia; David Starr Jordan, President of Stanford University; Percy Hunter; and A.H. Ford.[31]

Changing to the extent that only high governmental officials were invited to fill the honorary positions, this leadership formula prevailed through the transformation of the Hands-Around-the-Pacific Club into the Pan-Pacific Union and thereafter until the Union began to collapse during the mid-1930s. (See Appendices A and B.)

---

[31]"Announcement: The Hands-Around-the-Pacific Club," MPM, III (May, 1912), inside cover.

Considering the evolution of new goals occurring within the local internationalist movement at this time, one might anticipate corresponding changes in the movement's style of activities. Led by the Hands-Around-the-Pacific Club, such changes did occur. They came slowly, however, as the Club, apparently uncertain about translating its new goals into action, experimented with a variety of programs and tactics over the next six years before reaching any firm conclusions. When this period of experimentation came to an end late in 1917, one of the more ironic conclusions reached was that the Hands-Around-the-Pacific Club itself would have to be dissolved and the Pan-Pacific Union created in its place.

So it was that the Hands-Around-the-Pacific Club embarked upon a number of different ventures between 1911 and 1917. Among the first of these was an attempt to establish similar organizations in various cities around the Pacific. Under the slogan "Pacific Patriotism," Ford, aided on occasion by Percy Hunter, prevailed upon old contacts and established new ones in an effort to build a Pacific-wide network of clubs. This campaign, which was pursued with varying degrees of intensity throughout the entire period, produced mixed results. Largely as the result of a trip Ford took through the Pacific region in late 1913 and early 1914 to explain the Hands-Around-the-Pacific concept, a fair number of clubs sprang into

existence by mid-decade.[32] Although many of them employed different titles, Ford claimed they represented the movement. In this regard, he cited the Million Club of West Australia (Perth),[33] the Millions Club of New South Wales (Sydney), the City Club of Manila, the Saturday Club of Shanghai, the Progress Club of Peking, and a variety of "cooperating" ad clubs and Chambers of Commerce in Northern California and the Pacific Northwest.[34] Some of these organizations folded over the years, new organizations arose, old organizations changed their titles, and defunct organizations were revived. As a consequence, it is

---

[32]This trip was a story in itself. According to Joseph Stickney who accompanied Ford, the December, 1912, issue of Mid-Pacific Magazine produced a net profit of some $2500. With this fund, they embarked upon the trip only to run out of funds while still in Asia. To Stickney's amazement, Ford was able to arrange enough free passes on ships and trains for them to complete the journey via the Trans-Siberian Railway, Europe, and the American mainland. At the same time, he also found time to obtain articles for the magazine from various officials and work upon expanding the Hands-Around-the-Pacific movement. It was, Stickney noted in something of an understatement, "quite an education for him." (Statement made to the author by Joseph Stickney.)

[33]The "million club" idea was a local boaster device apparently originated by the Spokane, Washington Chamber of Commerce in 1900. See August Wolf, "Spokane An Example," MPM, I (June, 1911), 681-83.

[34]"Preaching Pacific Patriotism," MPM, VIII (Dec., 1914), 517-19.

difficult if not impossible to determine how many of the clubs Ford considered to be part of the movement were active at any given time. In any case, Ford did believe that these clubs constituted a Hands-Around-the-Pacific movement and he made Mid-Pacific Magazine its "official organ."[35]

The main problem here--a predictable one given the split personality of the proto-internationalist movement at this time--was the diversity of goals held by these various organizations. The Perth Club, for example, sought to "secure a million white population for the state" while the Manila group wished to assist "all races of people in the Philippines to work together for the advancement of the Philippines." At the same time, the commercial organizations on the American mainland were "pledged to give the local annual Hands-Around-the-Pacific banquet."[36] Ford felt that the slogan "Pacific Patriotism" was a common denominator unifying the otherwise diverse groups, but there is some question as to whether these groups shared his feelings or were, in fact, primarily concerned with their own commercial interests. The fact that the Hands-Around-the-Pacific Club was later dissolved and replaced by the more highly organized Pan-Pacific Union

---

[35] Ibid., p. 519.

[36] Ibid.

suggests that Ford over-estimated the commitment of this loose combine of otherwise independent groups.

Another effort undertaken by the Hands-Around-the-Pacific Club and Mid-Pacific Magazine during this period involved the development and promotion of the aforementioned notion that Hawaiian society constitutes a model for other multi-racial societies. Citing Hawaiian society as an example of inter-racial harmony, the argument was made that inter-racial problems in other nations could be solved through a study and emulation of the manner in which different races and cultures lived together in Hawaii. The following passage from an early Mid-Pacific Magazine editorial captures the essence of the argument as it was made at that time:

> Hawaii is the experimental melting pot where all peoples of the Pacific gather and are tried out. It seems wonderful to many that there is no race prejudice in Hawaii. Each nationality lives, voluntarily, by itself, yet all work together in unison for the good and welfare of the islands . . . . In Hawaii it is demonstrated that the nations of the Pacific may be friendly and brotherly without any desire to mix their bloods, save that the Polynesian inter-marries with all.[37]

This statement embodies a theme which the internationalist movement sounded throughout the remainder of the era. Repeated again and again, the message that Hawaii is a model became--and remains--a standard description of Hawaiian society. Considering the subsequent importance

---

[37]"The Pacific," MPM, V (Mar., 1913), 296.

of this notion, it is of more than passing interest to note that it grew out of a rather firmly stated acceptance of the "separate but equal" doctrine.[38] It is also worth noting that this description is one created by a white-dominated organization in which there was little more than token participation by non-whites. Such considerations, however, apparently did not occur to the formulators as they proceeded to spread their doctrine without giving serious thought to either its veracity or its applicability in any given specific circumstance.

Ford and the Hands-Around-the-Pacific Club were also active in the area of local race relations. Beginning in 1908, Ford hosted occasional dinners at the Outrigger Canoe Club for the express purpose of discussing points of racial tension in Hawaii. In time, these dinners, usually attended by twelve representatives from each of two or more ethnic groups and quickly tagged the "12-12-12" gatherings, became rather well structured "sensitivity sessions" and attracted a certain amount of attention.[39] At the previously-mentioned dinner for Harding at the

---

[38]As a further aside, it is worth noting that at approximately this same time Honolulu citizens were protesting President Taft's decision to appoint C.A. Cottrill, a Black, as head of the local internal revenue office. Their protest was carried even to the White House by former Governor Carter. Cottrill was, however, appointed.

[39]Alexander Hume Ford, "The Genesis of the Pan-Pacific Union: Part II," MPM, XXX (Oct., 1925), 376.

Outrigger Canoe Club in 1915, for example, Jack London, Ford's friend and one of the guests, spoke of these dinners in a speech later published as "The Language of the Tribe." His argument was that there is a higher language--a silent language--of intercultural understanding and that Ford's "12-12-12" dinners were a way of learning it.[40] These gatherings were continued periodically until the 1920s when they were replaced in form and purpose by a series of Good Relations Clubs, still another Ford venture which is discussed in more detail in a subsequent chapter.

The Hands-Around-the-Pacific Club also sponsored a number of festivals, general meetings, and expositions. As noted, the Floral Parade was reconstituted as the Mid-Pacific Carnival after 1911 and by 1917 a Pan-Pacific Day had become one of its main features. Ford's organization was, of course, the sponsor of this part of the festivities. At a similar level, ex-Queen Liliuokalani initiated an event called "Pacific Day" (soon renamed "Balboa Day") in September 1915, which featured ceremonies involving the flags of all the Pacific lands represented by the various ethnic groups in Hawaii. Ford, through Mid-Pacific Magazine, gave the festival broad publicity and launched a campaign to make Balboa Day, or "Pan-Pacific Day" as he sometimes

---

[40]Jack London, "The Language of the Tribe," Pan-Pacific, II (July-Sept., 1938), 10. Periodical hereafter cited as PP.

termed it, an annual event. The theme as he interpreted it was a recognition of interests common to all peoples of the Pacific Basin.[41] Advocating the idea through his magazine and his contacts, he was able to persuade numerous cities around the Pacific to hold ceremonies marking the occasion.[42] The high point of this event, at least from Hawaiian perspectives, occurred in 1917 when Liliuokalani returned to the Iolani Palace throne room for the first time since the Revolution to preside over the activities.

The oft-mentioned 1915 Outrigger Canoe Club dinner for Harding (actually for a number of Congressional figures on a Pacific junket) served still another purpose for the local internationalist movement. It proved to be an evening of such inspiring fellowship and frank discussion on international topics that someone suggested the idea of forming a Pan-Pacific Club where such events might be held on a regular basis.[43] In mid-1916, Castle and Cooke, one of the "Big Five" firms, donated an upper floor in their building at Fort and Merchant Streets and the club

---

[41]"Pan-Pacific Day at the Crossroads of the Great Ocean," MPM, XII (Dec., 1916), 517-31.

[42]"Pan-Pacific News," Bulletin of the Pan-Pacific Union, I (Oct., 1919), 393-94. Periodical hereafter cited as BPPU.

[43]Will Sabin, "Pan-Pacific Gathering," MPM, X (July, 1915), 73-95.

was formed.[44] Although its location was changed on several occasions, this club served as a site for international dinners, displays, and gatherings for the next two decades. More important, it gave Ford the idea of establishing similar clubs throughout the Pacific as a means of carrying out the work of the Hands-Around-the-Pacific movement.[45] Although little came of this idea at the time, it was attempted with some success during the following decade.

In 1915 San Francisco hosted the Panama-Pacific International Exposition and immediately thereafter San Diego was host to the Panama-California Exposition. The Hands-Around-the-Pacific Club and the Hawaii Promotion Committee sponsored an exhibit at the latter event, and, as might be expected, there were suggestions that Honolulu plan a similar event. Ford broached the idea in Mid-Pacific Magazine for the first time in February 1916, and by mid-1916 the discussion was down to detail. A site was selected (the present Liliuokalani Gardens) and a steering committee was appointed.[46] Ford reached new levels of internationalist rhetoric in praising the idea:

---

[44]"The Pan-Pacific Industrial and Commercial Museum," MPM, XII (Nov., 1916), 419.

[45]"Hawaii's Pan-Pacific Club," MPM, X (Aug., 1915), 181-83.

[46]"The Pan-Pacific Exposition, Honolulu, 1919," MPM, XII (Aug., 1916), 117-31.

> From a Pan-Pacific beginning in Hawaii we may yet teach the whole world the lesson that the fruits of cooperation are sweeter than those that grow in the garden of competition. It is for us to forward a movement that will tend to lift all to higher things, to strive together to attain a loftier standard in the material life for all the peoples of the Pacific, so that each and all will benefit, no matter what their race, nationality or country . . . . Let us begin to study each other's attractions and advantages. Let us begin scientifically and earnestly at a Pan-Pacific Exposition and convention of Pacific peoples to help each other, rather than crush one another's efforts. Let us aid each other to become efficient that all may benefit. Let us study the art of working together, and to this end Hawaii invites her sisters of the Pacific to a cooperative Pan-Pacific Exposition and Congress of Pacific People . . .[47]

The need for additional planning time, the escalation of World War I, and the lack of financial backing forced one postponement after another (the original proposal had suggested 1916 and the last mention concerned a "peace" congress in 1920) until finally the entire project was set aside for the duration of the war. In the process, however, the notion that Hawaii might become a major conference center was firmly implanted. This idea would prove of major importance during the remainder of the period prior to World War II as well as during the post-war era.

---

[47]"Editorial," MPM, XII (July, 1916), 96. In fact, the planners went so far as to retain an architect--Louis Christian Mullgardt--who designed an entire set of structures in what he called "Hawaiian Renaissance," a style not unlike that of the recently demolished Theo. H. Davies Building on Bishop Street in Honolulu.

Results of Trial and Error

Such were the major undertakings of Hawaii's proto-internationalist movement during the 1911-17 period. It was, as suggested, a period of experimentation--a time devoted to a search for appropriate goals and appropriate activities. In the balance, it was a fruitful period. It produced the ideas which in turn produced the Pan-Pacific Union, and it pre-tested many of the ideas which the Pan-Pacific Union would later successfully employ. In short, it produced data which allowed the Pan-Pacific Union to undertake numerous successful ventures while avoiding certain pitfalls. Thus, the apex of internationalism in Hawaii--the era of the Pan-Pacific Union and Institute of Pacific Relations during the 1920s--was really built upon a foundation laid down through trial and error prior to World War I.

CHAPTER IV

THE INTERNATIONAL ERA COMMENCES: 1917-20

Evolution of Organizational Philosophies

An organization created to promote tourism and commerce operates from different premises from one seeking to promote better international and intercultural relations. No matter how idealistically the former organization may view the end result of commercial activity, or, conversely, how interested in commerce the latter organization may be, the operational scope and style of the two organizations cannot be the same. Such was the problem facing the Hands-Around-the-Pacific Club from the time of its founding. Ford's continuing efforts to develop a satisfactory mode of operation for the organization produced a rather constant stream of new activities which, in numerous instances, were more international than commercial in nature. As a consequence, these undertakings often proved to be incompatible--conceptually and administratively--with the basically commercial inclinations which led to the club's formation and persisted thereafter as an influential factor in its programming.

For practical purposes, only two options capable of resolving this contradiction were open to Ford. He could reorient the activities or restructure the organization. As he had enjoyed increasing success in building a momentum

within the movement based upon community acceptance of internationally-oriented activities, it seems inevitable that he would select the latter option. The only questions were when and in what manner. The answer came during May 1917, when it was announced that Ford and his fellow activists had transformed the Hands-Around-the-Pacific Club into the Pan-Pacific Union.

During the following two decades the Pan-Pacific Union would transform Hawaii's earlier, commercially inspired proto-internationalist movement into an authentic internationalist movement concerned primarily with political and cultural relations throughout the Pacific. In the process, it would capture the imagination of Hawaii's leadership to the extent that legislatures would fund its projects and governors would work upon them. At a national level, it would bring Hawaii to the attention of Presidents, Congressional leaders, and the press. In the international realm, it would sponsor an impressive array of international activities, some of which persist yet today. In the process, it would also create at least some notion of common cause among the peoples of the Pacific Basin. Hence, Ford's effort to resolve the inner contradictions of the Hands-Around-the-Pacific Club were to have farther reaching implications than even he might have anticipated.

Formation of the Pan-Pacific Union

Reviewing the period prior to the Pan-Pacific Union's formation, it appears almost inevitable that such an organization would sooner or later arise. In addition to whatever changes might have been anticipated upon the basis of the Hands-Around-the-Pacific Club's increasing social activism, it is clear that Ford had long been intrigued with the possibility of using the Pan-American Union's organizational format as a model for a Pacific regional organization. Early in 1913, Franklin P. Adams, an official of the latter organization, passed through Honolulu and spent some time with Ford. Ford commented upon their discussions in an editorial in Mid-Pacific Magazine later that year, implying even then that the Pan-American Union offered some operational guidelines for the Pacific movement.[1] From that time onward, he published frequent complimentary articles on the Pan-American Union in his magazine and, in time, came to view its key organizational characteristic--government sponsorship--as the ultimate goal for the local movement.[2]

---

[1]"Editorial Comment," MPM, VI (Aug., 1913), 196.

[2]Unlike most of the major goals underlying the creation of the Pan-Pacific Union, this hope does not appear in the organization's articles of incorporation. Ford mentions it on numerous subsequent occasions but apparently felt it was too remote a possibility to include in the original listing of goals.

Although it is never stated in so many words, it becomes apparent after a fashion that government sponsorship was indeed Ford's principal hope for the Union. More important to him (and he was the dominant personality in the organization) than any other issue or cause the Union would pursue in subsequent years was the possibility that it might be restructured as a Pacific Basin version of the Pan-American Union. Much like Woodrow Wilson and the League of Nations, he seemed to feel that all the Union stood for--international peace, improved international and intercultural understanding, better communications among Pacific peoples to mention but the main points--were of secondary importance compared to the institutional question. Serious and sustained attention to these matters, he appeared to believe, could come only after the Union had emerged as an officially recognized regional organization. In short, Ford defined the Union's form and substance--its institutional structure and its ideology--as one and the same, and he used the Pan-American Union as his model in reaching this definition.

While the preconditions for the founding of the Pan-Pacific Union may have existed for some time, the actual creation of the organization occurred without prior warning. On May 28, 1917, Ford, W.F. Frear, C.K. Ai, William R. Castle, F.E. Blake, J.M. Camara, and A.K. Ozawa filed the

following statement of incorporation with Henry C. Hapai, Acting Treasurer of the Territory of Hawaii:

1. To call in conference delegates from and representatives of all Pacific peoples for the purpose of discussing and furthering the interests common to Pacific nations.

2. To maintain in Honolulu a bureau of information and education concerning matters of interest to the people of the Pacific, and to disseminate to the world information of every kind of progress and opportunities in Pacific lands, and to promote the comfort and interests of all visitors to the Hawaiian islands.

3. To aid and assist those in Hawaii from other Pacific communities to better understand each other and to work together for the furtherance of the best interests of the land of their adoption, and, through them, to spread abroad about the Pacific the friendly spirit of inter-racial cooperation.

4. To assist and to aid the different Pacific races in Hawaii to cooperate in local fairs, to raise produce, and to create home manufactured goods.

5. To own real estate or erect buildings needed for housing exhibits, dioramas, art galleries, or in taking care of visitors.

6. To maintain a Pan-Pacific Commercial Museum and Art Gallery of Hawaiian and Pacific paintings.

7. To create dioramas, gather exhibits, books and other material of educational or instructive value.

8. To promote and conduct in Honolulu, which is also called the "Cross-Roads of the Pacific," a Pan-Pacific Exposition of the handicrafts of the people about the Great Ocean, and especially of their works of art and scenic dioramas of the most beautiful bits of Pacific lands, as well as illustrating the important industries of the different countries of the Pacific.

9. To establish and maintain at the said "Cross-Roads of the Pacific" a permanent college and clearing-house of information (printed and otherwise) concerning the lands, commerce, people, and trade opportunities in

countries of the Pacific, and training young men in commercial knowledge of Pacific lands.

10. To secure in furtherance of those objects, the cooperation and support of Federal and State Governments, Chambers of Commerce, City Governments, and of individuals.

11. To enlist for this work of publicity in behalf of Alaska, the Territory of Hawaii, the Philippines, and other American possessions in the Pacific, Federal aid and financial support, as well as similar cooperation and support from all Pacific governments, in establishing at the said "Crossroads" of the Greatest of Oceans, to wit, the Pacific, a PAN-PACIFIC UNION, to act as Bureau of Information to the world at large and for Pacific lands and interests.

12. To bring all nations and peoples about the Pacific Ocean into closer friendly commercial contact and relationship.[3]

A slightly abbreviated, better written version of the same document remained as the Pan-Pacific Union's statement of goals for nearly a decade.

The act of incorporation gave the new organization title to all the properties of the Hands-Around-the-Pacific Club and the Hawaii Trail and Mountain Club. This amounted to one temporary building known as the Pan-Pacific Pavilion located on Bishop Square directly across Bishop Street from the present Alexander Young Hotel. It had been built to display some "dioramas" (large paintings of local scenic vistas previously commissioned by Ford) during the 1917 Mid-Pacific Carnival and was to be demolished the following

---

[3]Charter of Incorporation of the Pan-Pacific Union, May 28, 1917, Archives of Hawaii, Dissolved Corporation File #1131.

year. The dioramas themselves plus a few trail cabins constituted the remainder of the property.[4]

More impressive was the initial list of officers and trustees selected to guide the Union. It was as follows:

> Officers: Walter F. Frear, President; F.C. Atherton, First Vice President; C.K. Ai, Second Vice President; F.E. Blake, Treasurer; J.M. Camara, Recording Secretary; and A.H. Ford, Corresponding Secretary. Trustees: J.A. Balch, Frank F. Baldwin, George A. Brown, William R. Castle, J.P. Cooke, Richard Cooke, George P. Dennison, John C. Lane, A.K. Ozawa, C.C. Ramirez, Dr. Syngman Rhee, George Rodiek, George H. Vicars, and George N. Wilcox.[5]

In short, Ford managed to put together a racially and geographically balanced slate which also included key names from the local establishment. While he would soon add the previously mentioned category of honorary officers (see Appendix B), the immediate task at the time of incorporation was to gain at least the nominal support of the local power structure. This he did with considerable adeptness. Unfortunately, he was more successful in gaining establishment support than in obtaining a meaningful multi-ethnic participation. As before, non-white participation remained in the token category.

An article in the Pacific Commercial Advertiser concerning this event carried some of Ford's thoughts on how

---

[4]"The Pan-Pacific Union and Its Activities," MPM, XIV (Sept., 1917), 232.

[5]Ibid., pp. 218-19.

the Union's set of goals might be translated into action. Most concerned at the time about the proposed commercial college, Ford stated that each Pacific nation would be requested to send one salaried person to Hawaii to serve both as an instructor at the college and as that nation's representative to the Pan-Pacific Union. He also indicated that students for the school would be selected through much the same process. It was his hope that it would be possible to reach some agreement with the Mid-Pacific Institute regarding a site. Difficult as the undertaking may have appeared, Ford felt it was necessary to create an institution where, as he put it, "those of all nations about the Great Ocean may work together for years before returning to their own lands with a better knowledge of the business methods of each of the other Pacific peoples, and ready to carry on the propaganda of commercial co-operation and mutual understanding."[6] Disregarding the emphasis upon commercial subject matter, this proposal is not significantly different from that which led to the creation of the East-West Center in Honolulu some forty years later.[7] Unfortunately, nothing of substance was to come of this proposal.

---

[6]PCA, May 23, 1917, p. 7.

[7]Ford and others within the internationalist movement viewed this proposal with great seriousness. For further details, see "The Need for a Pan-Pacific Commercial College," MPM, XVI (Aug., 1918), 181-83.

In addition, Ford expressed hope that the buildings necessary to house the art galleries and museums might also form the nucleus of a Pan-Pacific exposition site. (Planning for such an event, as discussed previously, was underway at this point.) The construction of additional trail cabins was mentioned as still another task the Union was especially anxious to accomplish. Finally and most intriguing, Ford mentioned that Hawaii, being a "natural racial experiment station," would be the site for an experiment designed to encourage all local citizens to "pull together" on a particular, although unspecified, project. If the results of this experiment in inter-racial cooperation proved successful, they would be forwarded to all lands of the Pacific in order that the same techniques might be more generally applied.[8] Unfortunately, no further word of this plan appears either in the newspapers or in Mid-Pacific Magazine. In any case, it indicates that the Union, like its predecessor, intended to promote the notion that Hawaiian society represents a model for other similarly constituted societies.

The Pan-Pacific Union was, thus, founded in an impressive manner and might have been expected to launch its program in a similarly noteworthy fashion. That was not, however, to be the case. The people of Hawaii, for reasons

---

[8] PCA, May 23, 1917, p. 7.

unclear, simply did not respond to its initial appeals for acceptance and support. Even the newspapers failed to give it any significant coverage. The Pacific Commercial Advertiser, then generally more interested in the internationalist movement than the other local papers, wrote the previously cited story and went on to comment, without overwhelming enthusiasm, that the Pan-Pacific Union was "the culmination of nearly ten years of propaganda and preliminary effort on the part of the races and nations around the Pacific."[9] With even less enthusiasm, the Star-Bulletin noted only that it was a development which might lend additional support to the then current food preservation campaign inspired by American participation in World War I.[10] With these comments, the local press dropped virtually all mention of the organization for nearly a year.

Tempting as it may be to cite this reception as a remarkable misjudgment of an event, there is a better explanation. It is simply that Ford chose an incredibly bad moment to bring the Union into being. The United States had formally entered World War I less than two months previously, and the entire country including Hawaii was in the initial stages of an hysterical, anti-German

---

[9] Ibid.

[10] SB, May 24, 1917, p. 10.

"hate" campaign. A daily barrage of news items on German atrocities, food and goods shortages, internal subversion, and other similar developments was creating an atmosphere wherein proposals for bettering international relations were looked upon askance if not with outright hostility.[11] "America First" patriotism--not visionary internationalism--was the order of the day. Hence, it should come as no surprise that the only recorded event sponsored by the Pan-Pacific Union during its first year of existence involved the preparation of a "service flag" containing the names of all Outrigger Canoe Club charter members who had entered military service.[12]

In addition, tourism, still a consideration if no longer the sole inspiration in the Pan Pacific Union's

---

[11]The full meaning of this point can be gathered only against the background of the nationwide campaign. Its intensity was overwhelming, apparently exceeding even that of similar campaigns during World War II and the Cold War period.

[12]PCA, Mar. 7, 1918, p. 1. This raises some interesting questions regarding Ford's own views on war. While he put no direct statements on record, one can conjecture upon the basis of other of his actions. For example, in an earlier issue of Mid-Pacific Magazine, he published a letter from an American soldier in Europe who denounced the war in very strong terms: "Bloody Awful Murder reduced to the n^{th} degree of scientific accuracy by a mechanical minded . . . Devil . . . ." See A Soldier at the Front, "War's Peace Sermon to the Pacific," MPM, XIII (Feb., 1917), 129-31. From that time onward, however, no such articles appeared in the magazine. Then on Balboa Day of the following year, Ford participated in a program which amounted to little more than pro-war oratory, see PCA, Sept. 16, 1918, p. 1. It is possible, upon the basis of these activities, to speculate that Ford may well have harbored pacifist sentiments but found it expedient to submerge them.

raison dêtre, came to a complete halt in Hawaii during this period. After March 1918, in fact, it was necessary to have a passport to enter or leave Hawaii regardless of one's citizenship or place of residency.[13] Needless to say, factors such as these doomed the Union to a slow start.

A turnabout in the Pan-Pacific Union's fortunes, although one which would prove to be of brief duration, occurred approximately a year after its founding. With the end of the war in sight and talk of a League of Nations current, the climate for internationalist ventures turned more favorable. The first local indication of this came in early March 1918, when the Pacific Commercial Advertiser published a long article on the Union, detailing its various activities and goals. While the article's emphasis was upon local activities--particularly the organization's plan to remodel its newly leased headquarters building (the University Club building on the John H. Coney property at Hotel and Richards Streets) into a combination art gallery and office building--it also suggested that the Union was well organized and ready to undertake more ambitious projects.[14] The reader could not help but feel a certain enthusiasm for the movement.

---

[13]PCA, Mar. 9, 1918, p. 1.

[14]PCA, Mar. 10, 1918, p. 2. The art gallery was for the previously mentioned dioramas, large landscape paintings executed and displayed in a manner emphasizing depth

Following this article, the Union was constantly in the local news. An editorial in the same newspaper during early May praised the organization and endorsed its plan for an international commercial college.[15] The long-pending plans for convening a "peace exposition" in Honolulu were revived by the newspapers and, in turn, endorsed by the Prime Ministers of both Australia and New Zealand--William M. Hughes and W.F. Massey respectively.[16] Mainland news writers, in particular John H. Gerrie, Financial Editor of the San Francisco Call, took notice of the Union and began to write about it.[17] Hawaii's establishment shared this enthusiasm if attendance at the

---

perception. The Union owned seven such paintings: "Kilauea" by D. Howard Hitchcock and Lionel Walden; "Haleakala at Sunrise" and "Waimea Canyon" by Hitchcock; and "Hilo Bay," "The Pali," and "Waimea Beach Oahu" by Waldon.

[15] PCA, May 4, 1918, p. 1.

[16] PCA, May 13, 1918, p. 6. It is interesting to note that these two individuals, much like Lodge and his followers, supported the Union more for reasons of their interpretation of national interest than any commitment to internationalist ideals. Both, for example, were leaders in the realpolitik group which battled Wilson at Versailles and both were leaders in the defeat of the racial equality amendment to the League Covenant.

[17] PCA, April 1, 1918, p. 6.

Union's weekly meetings is any indication. At the May 22, 1918, meeting, for example, approximately 450 persons representing some seventy local organizations attended. The meeting place had to be moved from the organization's headquarters to the Alexander Young Hotel rooftop restaurant, among those in attendance were such establishment leaders as Lorrin Andrews, W.F. Frear, W.R. Castle, W.F. Dillingham, F.C. Atherton, and Prince Kuhio. The meeting was devoted to a review of the Union's operational concepts and goals--in particular those relating to the promotion of Hawaii as the Pacific crossroads, a model of inter-racial harmony, and a Pacific conference center--and all present registered their approval of such a course of action.[18] It appeared that Ford's original vision of the Union was at last gaining acceptance.

An even more significant series of developments occurred the following month. Franklin K. Lane, President Wilson's Secretary of the Interior, journeyed to Hawaii to study conditions in the Territory (which was under the jurisdiction of his department) and to preside at the inauguration of Governor C.J. McCarthy. Apparently sensing an opportunity to further promote his cause, Ford made Lane's acquaintance and shortly thereafter hosted his

---

[18] PCA, May 23, 1918, p. 1. For further examples of praise and endorsement from the local community, see "Pan Pacific Progress," MPM, XVI (Aug., 1918), 190-96 and "Some Mid-Pacific Speeches," MPM, XVI (Sept., 1918), 225-32.

party at the Outrigger Canoe Club. In the process, Ford came near drowning the man when they swamped a canoe during a ride in the Waikiki surf and it was discovered Lane could not swim. Fortunately, they were able to bail the craft and refloat it without serious consequences.[19]

As a result of the friendship he developed with Lane, Ford was able to prevail upon him to preside at a specially scheduled Pan-Pacific celebration held at the Mid-Pacific Institute late in June. The event was attended by Governor McCarthy, all of Hawaii's former governors (save Lucius E. Pinkham, who had just been replaced by McCarthy), and a large crowd of observers. Speeches in praise of Hawaii and the Pan-Pacific Union's ideals were delivered by representatives of Hawaii's various ethnic groups. They then delivered the flags of their native countries to Lane, who, in turn, carried them back to Washington for presentation to the President on the following Balboa Day.[20] Lane was visibly impressed by the ceremony and responded with his own endorsement of the local internationalist movement. He said:

> It is right that there should be a "Crossroads of the Pacific" in Hawaii, a Pan-Pacific Union, a union of America, Australasia, and Asia because

---

[19] PCA, May 11, 1918, p. 5.

[20] PCA, May 23, 1918, p. 2.

> Hawaii is a place created by the Pacific Lands that surround the group of islands.[21]

Before Lane departed, the Union met and elected him honorary president of the Pan-Pacific Association, a newly created organization designed to complement the work of the Union proper and the Pan-Pacific Clubs (formerly Hands-Around-the-Pacific Clubs) located in the various cities around the Pacific.[22] They also elected Prime Ministers Hughes and Massey and President Wilson as honorary presidents of the Union itself.[23] When Lane left Hawaii, he did so as Ford's friend and the Union's supporter. Thus, for the first time, Hawaii's internationalist movement had an advocate within the national administration. This would prove to be of marked importance on a number of subsequent occasions.

---

[21]"Announcement," MPM, XVI (Aug., 1918) inside cover. This incidentally, is one more example of the tendency of this movement to pay tribute to every group in Hawaii save the native Hawaiians.

[22]At this time the Union redrafted its overall organizational structure as follows:

- The Hands-Around-the-Pacific Movement (the general movement)
- The Pan-Pacific Union (an organization sponsored by Pacific governments)
- The Pan-Pacific Association (a supportive organization for individuals)
- Pan-Pacific Clubs (local units of the Pan-Pacific Association)

For further details see ibid.

[23]See Appendix B for a listing of Union officers.

Still another event occurred during mid-1918 which created considerable publicity for the Pan-Pacific Union. This was the week long "Inter-Island Pan-Pacific Conference" of September 15-20, 1918. Called by the Union to coincide with Balboa Day, it was attended mainly by representatives of commercial interests from Kauai, Maui, Oahu, and Hawaii. Its theme was "service to Hawaii and the world."[24] With the exception of numerous anti-German, patriotic speeches delivered during the opening day ceremonies, the conference was largely devoted to discussions on local economic matters. Shipping problems, Oriental labor problems, and the question of opening Honolulu as a free port were the main topics. Only on the final day was there significant discussion of the Union and its objectives.[25] However, the general discussion was still visionary enough to inspire the Maui delegation to observe that it had come to Honolulu to discuss sugar, not such gradiose schemes as free ports, and that the delegates best take care to avoid any action which might jeopardize the status of sugar.[26] Although such sentiments were seldom expressed in public during this period, one senses that the establishment harbored a fair degree of similar feeling. Internationalism was fine so long as it did not threaten the status quo.

---

[24] PCA, Sept. 2, 1918, p. 1.

[25] See daily newspaper articles during the week of Sept. 15-20, 1918.

[26] PCA, Sept. 18, 1918, p. 1.

Nonetheless, the Union was able to generate considerable publicity and public enthusiasm during the mid-1918 period. A Pacific Commercial Advertiser editorial from that period expressed some of it:

> . . . The ambition of the Pan-Pacific Union . . . is to become entirely a government organization, with each land about the Pacific appointing a resident director and in Hawaii, establishing for the Pacific, a counterpart of what the Hague represents in the Atlantic . . . .
> . . . The Pan-Pacific Union is part of the ideal to which the whole world is struggling, a world union. An amalgamation of the Pan-American and Pan-Pacific Unions is not inconceivable. The men behind the younger organization, as well as those behind its older brother, the Pan-American, dream wonderful dreams, and some of their dreams are coming true.
>
> Honolulu ought to be vitally interested in the work and the aims of the Pan-Pacific Union. It is bringing the races here together; and for this, if for no other reason, it should have the support of every man in Hawaii, that it may deserve and secure the further support of every government about this great ocean, of which we are the logical service station.[27]

By autumn of 1918, it appeared that the Pan-Pacific Union had at last gained the acceptance and support of the community. Once again, however, Ford and his co-workers were to be disappointed. At this time, still another wave of hysteria, similar in intensity to the war-fever phenomenon of 1917, swept over the community and forced the Union into a second period of stalemate. The target

---

[27] PCA, Sept. 17, 1919, p. 4.

on this occasion was radicals and Orientals. The mainland campaign against Bolshevism was underway by this time and Hawaii was caught up in it, interpreting it largely as a call to eliminate un-American sentiments within the Oriental sector of the community. Exacerbated by racial labor strikes, the language school problem, the language press issue, and the citizenship question, the composite result, as noted earlier, was a period of bitter racial antagonism in Hawaii. Hence, just as the Pan-Pacific Union's ideas regarding international cooperation doomed it to inactivity during the early part of the war, its emphasis upon inter-racial cooperation forced it into retreat during this period. The Union was seldom mentioned in Honolulu during late 1918 and early 1919.

Ford, however, did not slacken his efforts. He worked to retain his original support and to enlist new backing. Under the circumstances, he did remarkably well. He was able to keep the Union alive, breaking it into special functional groups which met weekly for lunch.[28] He devised still another category of projects for the organization, among them the development of a Waikiki improvement plan and the design of a low-cost pre-fabricated

---

[28]The order was as follows: Monday - business and finance, Tuesday - art, Wednesday - conference planning, Thursday - education, and Friday - tourism. See "The Pan-Pacific Tourist Bureau Idea," MPM, XVII (June, 1919), 520-21.

house within the financial reach of Hawaii's working class.[29] Planning was continued on the long-anticipated Pan-Pacific Congress with considerable attention devoted to the possibility of turning it into a series of smaller, more topical gatherings. At one time or another, there was talk of convening Pan-Pacific conferences for bankers, chambers of commerce, foreign trade associations, YMCA directors, and the Rotarians.[30] While the reasons for interest in the latter group (aside from the fact it is an international organization) remain something of a mystery, Ford did make a strenuous effort to bring the organization to Honolulu along with the other groups.[31] In October 1919, Ford initiated a new publication--the Bulletin of the Pan-Pacific Union--which was issued along with Mid-Pacific Magazine as a monthly newsletter on Union-related activities.[32] Finally, Ford himself maintained good relations with the establishment, as demonstrated

---

[29]"Pan-Pacific Progress," MPM, XVII (April 1919), 327-32.

[30]"A Congress of Pacific Banks: 1920," MPM, XVII (Mar., 1919, 227-28.

[31]L. Tenny Peck, "Rotarians and the Pan-Pacific Conference," MPM XVII (Feb., 1919), 124-27. This article concerns Rotarians but not a Pan-Pacific conference. It is another example of Ford's penchant for labeling other activities as a part of his movement given the slightest excuse.

[32]This publication was issued monthly as part of the Mid-Pacific Magazine until the end of 1935. It was discontinued at that time and the parent publication itself folded during the following year.

by his appointment to the Hawaii Promotion Committee in 1918.[33] In short, Ford kept the internationalist movement alive during this awkward period by keeping it busy.

Ford's efforts paid a handsome return. He obtained the Department of Public Instruction's endorsement of the movement along with a pledge to inject some degree of internationalist subject matter into the public school curriculum.[34] He also obtained the endorsement of one of the leading local Japanese newspapers, the Nippu Jiji, which felt that his activities represented the best hope for relaxing Hawaii's then strained racial relations.[35] Even more important, he was able to obtain $10,000 from the 1919 Legislature as a subsidy for a "Pan-Pacific Congress in 1920."[36]

Then an event occurred which provided the final impetus necessary to establish the Pan-Pacific Union as a viable, functioning international organization. Invited

---

[33]Governor's Report 1918, p.9.

[34]Vaughn MacCaughey, "Hawaii's Public Schools and the Pan-Pacific Idea," MPM, XVII (June, 1919), 569.

[35]"The Paramount Issue," BPPU, 3 (Jan., 1920), 2-3.

[36]PCA, April 6, 1919, p. 7. This gathering did occur during the summer of 1920. However, it took the form of a science conference rather than a general congress. For further details, see Act 187 in Laws of the Territory of Hawaii Passed by the Legislature at its Tenth Regular Session, 1919 (Honolulu, 1919), pp. 254-55. Hereafter cited as Act 187, 1919.

to address the Third World's Christian Citizenship Conference in Pittsburgh during November 1919 (where he shared the platform with Charles Evans Hughes[37]), Ford utilized the trip as an opportunity to further develop his Washington contacts.[38] Assisted by Governor McCarthy (who was also in Washington at the time) and Delegate Kuhio, he managed to get a group of Senators and Congressmen together at a meeting where he showed promotional movies on Hawaii and the Union.[39] He then did the same thing for a group of Pacific Basin ambassadors and officials, obtaining from them a pledge to support the recently funded 1920 conference in Hawaii.[40] He even arranged for President Wilson, sick and isolated as he was, to view his materials.[41]

---

[37]Hughes entitled his talk "The Cure for Bolshevism" and Ford spoke on "Hawaii: The Radiating Center of Pan-Pacific Civilization." See "Pan-Pacific Ideals," BPPU, 5 (Mar., 1920), 3-14. That Ford could logically expect to make his hoped-for contacts is shown by the following quotation from a man who had recently discussed the Union with Lane: "In connection with Pan-Pacific Union work, he [Lane] said anything Mr. Ford wanted of him, he could probably get if he simply asked for it." See H.B. Campbell, "Hands Across the Sea," MPM, XVIII (Sept., 1919), 217-20.

[38]"Pan-Pacific Ideals," BPPU, 5 (Mar., 1920), 3-14.

[39]PCA, Jan. 31, 1920, p. 3.

[40]PCA, Feb. 15, 1920, p. 5.

[41]PCA, Jan. 31, 1920, p. 3.

In addition, he joined the Cosmos Club and generally succeeded in making an impression upon Capitol Hill society during the several months he spent in Washington.

While in Washington, Ford created something of a sensation by publicly offering the presidency and the executive directorship of the Union to Wilson and Lane respectively once they left federal office. The boldness of this act offended some, including Gerrie of the San Francisco Call who wrote an unpleasant criticism of Ford's "publicity stunt."[42] The Pacific Commercial Advertiser responded with an editorial attacking Gerrie and defending Ford. The end result was more publicity, if not a new slate of officers, for the Union and, not incidentally, Ford.

Ford then undertook a venture which should rank as one of the more notable Capitol Hill episodes. Desiring a federal appropriation for the proposed 1920 conference to supplement that already granted by the Territorial Legislature, he prevailed upon Lane to draft the necessary bill. As the measure (an amendment to the Diplomatic and Consular Bill of 1919) fell into the foreign affairs category, it had to have the approval of Senator Henry Cabot Lodge who headed the Committee on Foreign Relations. Undeterred by the facts that he did not know Lodge and that Lodge was in

---

[42]PCA, Feb. 5, 1920, p. 4.

the midst of the struggle with Wilson over the League and could have been expected to look with disfavor upon the proposal, he persuaded McCarthy and Kuhio to go with him to Lodge's office. The discussion was brief and to the point. Lodge was not interested. As they were leaving the Senator's office, Ford decided to try again. As he recalls it:

> I left my colleagues and walked up to the Senator. "Mr. Lodge," I said, as I brought my fist down on his desk, "you may not be interested in helping to bring together the leaders in Pacific lands for better understanding, but up there in the White House lies a man crucified to a bed of suffering, and even in his agony he is at this moment gazing on moving pictures of a pageant of all Pacific peoples who have brought the flags of their countries to Hawaii to be sent to the martyr at the White House in token of their fealty to the ideals of better understanding among the peoples about our great ocean." I got no further. Senator Lodge sprung to his feet and exclaimed, "Yes! That man at the White House has time to look at your Pan-Pacific films, but he hasn't a moment to receive us Senators."
>
> I beamed on the Senator. "Now, Mr. Lodge," I said, "that your interest is aroused, will you listen to our plan for a Pan-Pacific League of Nations?" Senator Lodge, for once not only smiled, but he gave vent to a hearty laugh and put out his hand. "Sit down," he said, "let's talk it over," And we did. In five minutes Senator Lodge was an enthusiastic supporter of the Union. "I don't believe we can ever have a League of Nations composed of the countries around the Atlantic," he said, "for the traditions there have always been traditions of envy and hatred. A world league of nations is a mad dream for the present, but out there in the Pacific, where you have never had a serious quarrel, your traditions are predominantly traditions of peace; there is the place to begin the work of a real League of Nations. You may do it there, and I am for such a League. How much do you want?" "Only nine thousand dollars." Again the Senator smiled. "Very well, my committee meets

> in five minutes, I will take this on as an amendment. Come back in an hour."[43]

The appropriation was obtained and the Pacific Commercial Advertiser spoke for the local community when it editorialized that Ford " . . . is succeeding in doing what everybody here considered the impossible."[44]

Ford suggested one more venture before he left Washington during the spring of 1920. He proposed a Congressional junket to Hawaii and on to the Orient following the Democratic Party convention in San Francisco during June.[45] Whether or not it was Ford's doing, such a trip was announced in early April.[46] Ford immediately hosted a luncheon for the participants at the Cosmos Club in an effort, as he said, to help them plan their activities in Hawaii.[47] It is of more than passing interest to note

---

[43]Alexander Hume Ford, "The Genesis of the Pan-Pacific Union: Part I," MPM, XXX (Sept., 1925), 267-69. This account may well be embellished as was Ford's tendency. However, the money was forthcoming, and Lodge sent an autographed photograph to Mid-Pacific Magazine which was reproduced in this issue. This is not so surprising as it may appear. Lodge, Theodore Roosevelt and many of the others who opposed Wilson on the League were activists when it came to American policy in Asia. For further details, see A. Whitney Griswold, The Far Eastern Policy of the United States (New Haven, 1938), pp. 87 ff.

[44]PCA, Feb. 11, 1920, p. 4. Lodge pushed the amendment through the Senate and assisted Ford in lobbying it through the House. See PCA, Feb. 24, 1920, p. 6.

[45]PCA, Feb. 16, 1920, p. 5.

[46]PCA, April 5, 1920, p. 4.

[47]PCA, April 24, 1920, p. 2. It is interesting to note that most of the newspaper coverage of Ford during

that when the junket departed Hawaii for Asia in July, Ford sailed with them.[48]

Public Acceptance of the Internationalist Movement

Financed by Territorial and Federal appropriations, the Pan-Pacific Union was able to sponsor the long-awaited Pan-Pacific Congress during the summer of 1920. Just as this event signaled the beginning of a new era in the history of internationalism in Hawaii, it also served to bring the long and frustrating era of the Union's emergence to an end. Credit for the ultimate accomplishments of this period belongs largely to Ford. The recursive pattern of fate during this period (abetted, to be certain, by such misjudgements on Ford's part as forming the Union at the very time the country was entering the war) would surely have frustrated and defeated some men. Not Ford. He persisted, seldom losing sight of his goal and seldom missing an opportunity to turn events in his favor. Perhaps more so than any other period in the history of Hawaii's internationalist venture, these several years demonstrate just how much that history is a biography of one individual.

---

this period was the result of letter-like releases which he himself prepared much as he did during his 1907-08 Australasian trip.

[48][Alexander Hume Ford], "With the Pan-Pacific Congressional Party in the Orient," MPM, XX (Dec., 1920), 517-20.

CHAPTER V

ERA OF PACIFIC CONFERENCES: 1920-1925

Enthusiasm Within the Internationalist Movement

The frustration and discouragement which marked the Pan-Pacific Union's first years gave way to a period of unbounded optimism and enthusiasm during the early 1920s. As noted, this sudden and dramatic change in circumstances followed decisions by the Territorial and then the Federal governments to fund the Union's long-planned 1920 conference. The immediate importance of these decisions is the fact that they gave the Union, for the first time in its history, a means of translating its goals into action. At another level, they allowed the Union to claim official sanction for at least a portion of its activities and, hence, gave it reason to believe that it was indeed progressing toward its ultimate goal of government sponsorship and a new status similar to that of the Pan-American Union.[1] In short, the availability of governmental funding created a new momentum within the internationalist movement which in turn created additional publicity and support. It was a breakthrough of no mean proportions.

Success bred success. With one international conference underway, a long list of subsequent gatherings plus a host

---

[1]"More Pan-Pacific News," BPPU, 15 (Jan., 1921), p. 16.

of other internationally-oriented projects were proposed to an increasingly interested audience of government officials, businessmen, educators, and scientists from both within the United States and around the Pacific. As public receptivity to these proposals mounted, various government leaders and newspapers came forth with statements of support and encouragement. For example, Congressman Stephen G. Porter, then Chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, wrote Ford:

> I am firmly convinced that the Pan-Pacific Union . . . will be productive of beneficial results as great as those now following from the Pan-American Union.[2]

His colleague, Congressman Louis B. Goodall of Maine, entered an even stronger endorsement:

> Perhaps the Pan-Pacific Union is the beginning of something that may grow into a real practical world League of Nations. I hope so.[3]

Even the White House lent its support. In accepting an honorary presidency of the Union, President Harding expressed a sentiment which both Coolidge and Hoover would later echo. He said:

> [I] hope that your organization may become an instrumentality of progress and development, and an inspiration to peace and cooperation, such as the Pan-American Union has been in the relations among the states of the Western continent.[4]

---

[2]"What Congress Thinks of the Pan-Pacific Union," BPPU, 15 (Jan., 1921), p. 14.

[3]Ibid.

[4]Harding to Ford, March 19, 1921, as reprinted in BPPU, 20 (June, 1921), p. 5.

Nor was support restricted to the United States. Prime Minister W.L. Mackenzie-King of Canada congratulated the movement on the occasion of the Pan-Pacific Commercial Congress in 1922, saying in part:

> . . . may I be permitted to express, on behalf of the Government of Canada, the appreciation felt by the people of Canada of the worthy aims and aspirations of the Pan-Pacific Union. There can be no effort more patriotic, or of greater international value, than that which has for its object the promotion of peace and progress. This is increasingly true when it relates to lands peopled by different races, whose views on many matters are, of necessity, of widely varying character.[5]

The press, too, recorded its interest in the Union.[6] Following are reasonably representative excerpts from the period:

> There is a fine tranquility not only in the name but also in the intentions of the Pan-Pacific Union . . . . Of course, guarantees that the Pan-Pacific Union will continue its deliberations . . . successfully are to be derived only from the continued amicable diplomatic relations of the countries' delegates which compose it. But it is good to know that the movement is preceeding . . . while perplexity still hangs heavy over the diplomats of the old world.[7]

---

[5]"Canada Appreciation," BPPU, 39 (Jan., 1923), p. 6.

[6]At one time or another during the first half of the decade, the BPPU reprinted or referenced laudatory editorials or articles from the following newspapers: La Prenza (New York), Sydney Evening Sun, Christian Science Monitor, Sydney Times, Advocate of Peace (Washington, D.C.), Japan Advertiser, Chicago Daily News, Trans-Pacific (Tokyo), Vancouver Sun, Washington Herald, San Francisco Call and Portland Oregonian.

[7]Washington Herald, as quoted in "Thriving Internationalism," BPPU, 30 (April, 1922), p. 8.

Elsewhere:

> Canada should jump with both feet and complete interest into the activities of the Pan-Pacific Union . . . . Peace and prosperity will reign on the Pacific so long as complete understanding exists among Pacific nations. The Pan-Pacific Union works toward that end.[8]

The leaders of the Pan-Pacific Union responded to this relative onslaught of praise and publicity with understandable enthusiasm. Ford, ever restating his basic hopes for the Union, wrote Governor McCarthy shortly after Congress appropriated funds for the 1920 conference to the effect that the Pacific governments could be expected to take over the organization within a year to a year and a half.[9] A year later, the Union raised its aims even higher and discussed the possibility that it might evolve into a Pacific League of Nations superior even to the Geneva-based organization.[10] Ford put this idea into his own terminology in a paper he submitted to the National Council for the Limitation of Armament early in 1922:

> The idea of a world league of nations was born in a manger in Bethlehem . . . a dream that is now coming true at last . . . for in the Pacific will be born a league of nations that will lighten and illuminate the whole world. To

---

[8]Vancouver Sun, as quoted in "Canada and the Pan-Pacific Union," BPPU, 47 (Sept., 1923), p. 12.

[9]Ford to McCarthy, Mar. 18, 1920, Archives of Hawaii, McCarthy Papers, Miscellaneous, Pan-Pacific Union.

[10]"The Pan-Pacific League of Nations," BPPU, 21 (July, 1921), p. 7.

> the carrying forward of the ideals expressed at this Pacific conference in Washington [the National Council meeting] the Pan-Pacific Union will bend its energies, guided we hope by its trusted leaders who are the actual heads of the governments of Pacific lands.[11]

Ford and the members of the Union were not alone in their argument that the local internationalist movement should undertake a more vigorous role. In early 1925, the Star-Bulletin offered this opinion:

> Hawaii is destined to become "The Hague of the Pacific"--but with a name and fame not borrowed but all its own--a center where representatives of all nations bordering the western ocean may meet in conference to discuss and solve their individual and joint problems, and lay plans upon which will depend the progress and the maintenance of the amicable relations of the future . . . . To some this may seem a chimerical dream, but who knows but that some day an area of ground on one of the Hawaiian islands may be set aside with its independence guaranteed by all nations, as the Hague of the Pacific, perhaps the Hague of the World?[12]

The Territorial government, also caught up in the enthusiasm, responded by adding a complimentary section on the Union in its annual report to the Secretary of the Interior beginning in 1921.[13] As discussed later, it also continued to appropriate funds for the Union.

In some instances, the Union's excitement over its new-found acceptance went beyond the bounds of reasonable

---

[11]"A Pan-Pacific League of Nations," BPPU, 31 (May, 1922), p. 16.

[12]SB, Jan. 1, 1925, p. 6.

[13]Governor's Report 1921, p. 14.

enthusiasm and into what, at least in the light of historical perspective, must be called giddiness. There are two particularly interesting examples of this. The first occurred in 1921 when Ford suggested to President Harding that Honolulu be made the "summer capital" of the United States. His argument was that "Honolulu is the central city of the United States . . . half way between Maine and Manila, and Alaska and Samoa."[14] He went on to argue that if the President were to spend his summers in Honolulu, leaders of other Pacific nations would be more likely to visit him, thus facilitating the negotiations preliminary to creating a "Pan-Pacific League of Nations."[15]

An even more peculiar flight of imagination occurred when the World Conscience Society, an organization devoted to the creation of international cities free from the control of any government, proposed that Honolulu be reconstituted as such a free city. As this organization saw it, Honolulu could be:

---

[14]"Pan-Pacific News," BPPU, 21 (July, 1921), p. 3.

[15]Ibid. The proposal may have been unrealistic but there is nothing strange about the fact that Ford felt free to offer it to Harding. The two men apparently remained on close terms after Harding visited Hawaii in 1915, and Ford frequently wrote Harding in very informal, even intimate terms. The following example, concerning Harding's appointment of Farrington as Governor, illustrates: "I know it will please you to learn that your appointee as governor, The Honorable Wallace R. Farrington, has received an ovation such as no governor of Hawaii has ever had tendered him in the past and, as I assured you, the real big Democrats here who are on our local board of trustees of the Pan-Pacific

> . . . the spiritual capital of the world, the site of an international city to cost $500,000,000, a forum of the nations, a focus of religious, learning, science, art, hygiene, athletics and general information and an assembly point for the dissemination of news . . . .[16]

Apparently Ford was interested in this proposal as he discussed it at length in a Mid-Pacific Magazine article.[17] As in the previous case, on no occasion did he question the feasibility of the suggestion itself or the practicality of using Honolulu--then little more than a small port city removed from most of the world's capitals by the better part of a month's journey--as the site for such ventures.

Unrealistic as much of the talk emanating from Hawaii during this period may have been, it was still the talk of the period and it describes the mood of the internationalist movement at the time. If it was boundlessly optimistic and even giddy talk, it was so because the speakers believed that all the ingredients--the ideas, the interests, and the support--necessary to usher in a "Pacific Era" were finally

---

Union have approved my pledge to you that they would help support Mr. Farrington's administration and that they would do all in their power to make it a success. The factional fight in the Republican Party here I think has been swept out by the splendid demonstration of all classes of people in receiving Mr. Farrington on his return from Washington." Ford to Harding, July 28, 1921, Archives of Hawaii, Farrington Papers, Miscellaneous, Pan-Pacific Union.

[16]"A Spiritual Capital for the World," MPM XXIII (March, 1922), 251.

[17]Ibid.

in juxtaposition. If those on the mainland and elsewhere who inspired such talk through their own rhetoric were merely expressing their interest in this movement rather than a hard, lasting commitment to it, Ford and his co-workers did not recognize the distinction. They felt Seward's Pacific prophecy was on the brink of realization.[18]

A more dispassionate evaluation indicates that much of the internationalist movement's enthusiasm during the early 1920s was in fact unjustified. Sifting the rhetoric and general expressions of encouragement--talk accepted by the movement at face value--from actual commitments of support, it is clear that meaningful support for the movement was directed at certain of its specific projects rather than its overall aims. In most instances, this meant support for various international conferences. The 1920 conference is a case in point. Regardless of how the Pan-Pacific Union may have interpreted the availability of government funding for this event, it is evident that the Territorial Legislature and Congress appropriated the funds with the simple intention of assisting a particular undertaking which might or might not produce meaningful results.[19] The investment was sufficiently small that any risk involved could be ignored.

---

[18]For example, see Charles S. Lobinger, "The Pacific in Prophecy," BPPU, 18 (April, 1921), p. 13.

[19]See Act 187, 1919. In addition, the wording of the Federal appropriation measure, clearly demonstrates

Such an approach--a willingness on the part of governments and private groups to provide the Union with limited support but a refusal to offer carte blanche endorsement--would in time prove fatal to the organization's ultimate aspirations. While it provided the support necessary to mount and sustain an impressive array of conferences and other activities, it fell far short of the support required to transform the Union into any sort of a Pacific League. It sanctioned, in other words, an "Era of Pacific Conferences" but not a "Pacific Era."[20]

Initial Pan-Pacific Union Conferences

For reasons noted, those who directed the course of the Pan-Pacific Union interpreted turn-of-the-decade developments more positively. They believed that it was but a matter of time until their organization would evolve into a union of Pacific nations. Feeling that the sponsorship of international conferences was the most effective method of pursuing their larger goal, they planned and

---

Congressional intent. It reads in full: "To meet the actual necessary expenses of delegates of the United States to the first Pan-Pacific Science Congress, to be held in the city of Honolulu in August, 1920, and the necessary clerical work and assistants in preparing for, during, and after the Congress and in calling a second congress to be expended through the Pan-Pacific Union at the discretion of the Secretary of State, and made available for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, $9,000. As quoted in "Pan-Pacific News," BPPU, 7 (May, 1920), p. 3.

[20]For the sake of proper perspective, it should again be noted that the use of international conferences was common the world over during the 1920s and early 1930s.

hosted numerous such gatherings over the course of the following two decades. Between the time of the 1920 conference and the Third Pan-Pacific Surgical Association Conference in 1939 (the last Union-related conference prior to the organization's collapse), they sponsored some twelve major conferences in Honolulu and were responsible for at least four held elsewhere. In addition, organizations which grew out of certain of these gatherings continued to meet long after the collapse of the Union. Finally, other groups, inspired by the Union's example, sponsored still another series of international meetings both in Honolulu and around the Pacific. It was indeed an "Era of Pacific Conferences."[21]

This era divides into two major parts. The first concerns the years between 1920 and 1925 when the Union enjoyed an almost complete monopoly upon all varieties of internationalist activity in Hawaii, and the second involves the subsequent years when other groups--in particular the Institute of Pacific Relations--arose and participated in the movement. During the first period, the Union proposed,

---

[21]A local conference on education held under Territorial Board of Education auspices in 1919 is sometimes cited in early Union publications as the first international conference of this era. It does not deserve the title. For further details, see "The Why of the Educational Conference in Honolulu," BPPU, 4 (Feb., 1920), p. 2.

planned, and, to a lesser extent, sponsored a remarkable array of events and activities. The bulk of them, as suggested, involved international conferences. At one time or another during these years, conferences were proposed concerning at least the following topics or organizations: science, education, journalism, foreign trade, conservation, sports, art, music, banking, labor, travel, agriculture, fishing, over-population, monetary systems, Polynesian development, Pacific leadership, history, roads and parks, law, transportation, medicine, the National Education Association, the Y.M.C.A., the Salvation Army, the Boy Scouts, the Red Cross, and the League of Nations Society. During the 1920-25 period, the Union succeeded in initiating and hosting conferences on five of these subjects, officially participated in two others held elsewhere, and served as the catalyst for still another.

Throughout this period, the Union saw itself as the innovator, publicist, sponsor, and host for any conference which might strengthen regional unity within the Pacific Basin. Its tactic was to stage an initial gathering and establish a secretariat charged with planning subsequent meetings which would, however, still occur under the general auspices of the Union. This tactic proved reasonably successful. For example, delegates at the 1920 conference (which had evolved into a science conference by the time it actually convened), formed such a secretariat which in turn arranged

a number of subsequent gatherings. In time, this group became the Pacific Science Association which is active still today.[22] The same is true of other conferences held in the post-1925 period. Still other gatherings created working committees charged with carrying out conference resolutions, although this procedure usually resulted in failure unless the committees were integrated directly into the Union's own organizational structure.

The First Pan-Pacific Science Congress--as it came to be known--met in Honolulu between August 2 and 20, 1920. It was the indirect outgrowth of the Hands-Around-the-Pacific Club's ambition to stage an exposition in Honolulu following the expositions in San Francisco and San Diego during 1915 and 1916. As discussed previously, that goal was frustrated by World War I, although it did persist throughout the war years, evolving from one form into another.

In early 1919, this proposal was revived in the form of a plan for a "Pan-Pacific Commercial and Educational Congress" to be held in Honolulu during 1920 or 1921. It was this proposal that the Territorial Legislature funded in 1919, making the $10,000 grant available upon the conditions that at least three other Pacific nations also

---

[22]Following the 1920 meeting, this organization has met eleven times at various locations around the Pacific. The most recent meeting was at Canberra during 1971.

contribute funds and that the funds be used for more than one gathering. As an aside, the latter condition meant that all conferences called under the terms of the 1919 appropriation had to utilize the "Pan-Pacific Commercial and Educational Congress" title. Conferences on more specific topics might be sponsored, but they were to be considered as part of a more general undertaking. Hence, the First Pan-Pacific Science Congress was originally known as the "First Pan-Pacific Scientific Conference of the Pan-Pacific Commercial and Educational Congress." This confusing requirement was dropped after 1922 when the 1919 appropriation was exhausted.

Following the action of the Legislature, Governor McCarthy appointed a committee under the chairmanship of G.P. Denison, a Pan-Pacific Union activist, to plan the actual conference. Denison's group decided to direct the focus of the gathering toward science and made arrangements for Dr. H.E. Gregory, the new director of the Bishop Museum, to serve as the meeting's director.[23] Working with the Committee on Pacific Exploration of the National Research Council, Gregory put together a proposed agenda.[24] Apparently impressed by the preparations, Australia and New Zealand contributed a total of $3,000 for conference

---

[23]A.P. Elkin, Pacific Science Association: Its History and Role in International Cooperation (Honolulu, 1961), 14. Hereafter cited as Elkin, Pacific Science Association.

[24]"The First Pan-Pacific Science Conference," BPPU. 10 (Aug., 1920), p. 12.

expenses in January 1920.[25] When China later contributed $1,000, the Legislature's funding conditions were met and the planners were free to call the conference. This occurred in April when official invitations were issued under the Union's name by the United States Department of State.[26] Throughout the planning period, Ford left most of the details to Gregory, involving himself only with fund-raising activities in Washington. In fact, he was in Asia with the 1920 Congressional junket when the conference finally convened in August.

The conference was attended by 103 accredited delegates, forty from Hawaii (invited as individuals) and the remainder as official delegates from the United States, Australia, New Zealand, the Philippines, Japan, Canada, the United Kingdom, and China. Organized into seven sub-sections (anthropology, biology, botany, entomology, geography, geology, and seismology), they listened to a total of 138 scientific papers and passed forty resolutions concerning Pacific scientific research and instructional needs.[27] The

---

[25]"Pan-Pacific News," BBPU, 8 (June, 1920), pp. 5-6.

[26]Elkin, Pacific Science Association, p. 15. Federal funding lent the conference quasi-official status and for this reason the Union was able to have invitations sent through government channels. This arrangement persisted for a number of years and was a factor in the Union's belief that it would eventually evolve into a governmental agency.

[27]Proceedings of the First Pan-Pacific Scientific Conference (Honolulu, 1921).

end result was essentially two-fold. Compiled into book form, the proceedings constituted a major contribution toward the clarification of Pacific Basin scientific research priorities. Equally important, the delegates established a working committee to plan for a second conference in the future.[28] This took place two years later in Australia. Thus concluded the Pan-Pacific Union's first truly international endeavor.[29]

The Union's next international conference took place the following year when the First Pan-Pacific Educational Conference met in Honolulu from August 11 to 24. The original inspiration and part of the funding for this gathering was provided by the Territorial Legislature when it authorized the Pan-Pacific Commercial and Educational Congress in 1919. The more immediate impetus, however, came when the Federal government indicated its interest in an educational conference dealing with comparative educational conditions in Pacific Basin countries. The government promised that the Bureau of Education in the Department of

---

[28]Elkin, Pacific Science Association, pp. 18-19.

[29]In 1925 Gregory and Ford conducted a brief but bitter debate over where the credit should go for organizing this conference. For further details, see Institute of Pacific Relations: Honolulu Session, June 30-July 15, 1925 (Honolulu, 1925), p. 143 and [Alexander Hume Ford], "A Personal Correction," BPPU, 70 (Nov., 1925), p. 16. Former publication hereafter cited as Honolulu Session.

the Interior would be assigned to assist in preparing for a conference and that formal invitations to delegates would be issued by the Secretary of State, should the Union wish to undertake the project.[30] Needless to say, the Union accepted these conditions and planning was initiated under the direction of F.F. Bunker from the Bureau of Education who, at the conclusion of the meeting, was hired by the Union as its Executive Secretary.[31] David Starr Jordan, former President of Stanford University and a long-time Union supporter, accepted an invitation to serve as Honorary Chairman of the gathering.

Eighty-six delegates representing seventeen Pacific Basin nations and a variety of private organizations attended the conference. Greeted by a letter from President Harding, the delegates attended numerous sessions on various educational topics and enjoyed a lively entertainment and sight-seeing schedule. The most interesting aspect of this gathering concerns the resolutions it passed. Few in number, they largely skipped over educational matters and focused upon peace, disarmament, and inter-racial harmony. Also of interest is the large number of local

---

[30]"The First Pan-Pacific Conference of Education," BPPU, 10 (Aug., 1920), p. 13.

[31]"The First Pan-Pacific Educational Conference," BPPU, 19 (May, 1921), pp. 5-6. Bunker left after a few years as Ford was unwilling to relinquish any decision-making authority, and the continuation of his salary was in doubt.

people (mostly whites, however) who assisted in support activities related to the conference.[32] Their willingness to participate suggests that community support for the Union and its program was increasing.

Unlike the previous scientific gathering, this conference inspired little in the way of subsequent activities. One resolution did mandate the Union to develop a "visual education" program--a collection of films and other visual aids depicting different life styles throughout the Pacific Basin--which might have made a significant contribution to transcultural understanding had it been carried to completion. However, it never progressed beyond the rudimentary stage.

Next in the series of international gatherings held under Union auspices was the Pan-Pacific Press Conference which met for one day only on October 21, 1921. Unlike previous international meetings in Hawaii, this conference was an appendage to a larger gathering, the World's Press Congress which met in Honolulu between October 17 and November 2, 1921. The World's Press Congress, a journalism association then headed by Dr. Walter Williams of the University of Missouri School of Journalism, had earlier been enticed to meet in Honolulu, and Ford, always alert

---

[32]The First Pan-Pacific Educational Conference: Program Proceedings (Honolulu, 1921).

for opportunities to promote the cause of the Union, saw that the meeting offered a chance to host a special gathering for Pacific Basin journalists.[33] He prepared a proposal for a special one-day press meeting devoted to the problems of coordination and communication among Pacific journalists, obtained William's approval, and issued invitations early in 1921.[34] By August, he had completed arrangements for the meeting and was speculating upon the possibilities of creating a separate Pacific press organization with national branches and a permanent secretariat.[35]

On paper at least, all of this came to pass when the special session convened. In addition to witnessing a

---

[33]The story of the World's Press Congress's decision to meet in Honolulu is interesting. When its plans to meet in Sydney during 1921 failed to materialize, local editors (W.R. Farrington and L.A. Thurston in particular) began lobbying for Honolulu as an alternative site. They succeeded in obtaining an appropriation of $25,000 from the 1921 Territorial Legislature (Act 161) to pay conference expenses but it required the community to raise matching funds. Farrington and Thurston each pledged $5000 and persuaded Ford and the Union to also pledge $5000. Hence, they were able to offer the journalists $30,000 for conference expenses and, aided by Governor McCarthy's urging, the journalists accepted. For further details, see "The Worlds' Press Conference," BPPU, 16 (Feb., 1921), pp. 9-10, and Ford to the Directors of the Pan-Pacific Union, Jan. 28, 1921, Archives of Hawaii, McCarthy Papers, Miscellaneous, Pan-Pacific Union.

[34]"The Pan-Pacific Press Conference," BPPU, 17 (Mar., 1921), p. 6.

[35]"Permanent Pan-Pacific Press Conference to Meet in Honolulu," BPPU, 22 (Aug., 1921), p. 11.

Balboa Day-like festival which Ford arranged, the fifty-seven Pacific journalists in attendance passed resolutions establishing a permanent Pan-Pacific Press Conference to be affiliated with the World's Press Congress, mandating an effort to improve channels of communication among Pacific journalists, commending all efforts to reduce naval armaments in the Pacific, and requesting lower Pacific radio transmission rates.[36] Unfortunately, only the radio rate issue was pursued after the conference.

A year later still another international meeting--The First Pan-Pacific Commercial Conference of October 25 - November 8--convened in Honolulu under Union auspices. Like the earlier scientific and educational gatherings, this conference also had its roots in the Territory's initial appropriation for a Pan-Pacific Commercial and Educational Congress. Perhaps due to its focus upon practical commercial problems in the Pacific, it attracted greater attention and aroused more interest than any other gathering sponsored by the Union during the 1920-25 period. Initial planning for the event started in 1920 when Secretary of the Interior Lane was invited to chair such a gathering should it materialize.[37] When Lane died in May 1921, President Harding was invited to be present (as

---

[36]"Sketch of Program and Procedure," BPPU, 26 (Dec., 1921), pp. 7-14.

[37]"The Pan-Pacific Commercial Conference," BPPU 8 (June, 1920), p. 7.

part of the previously mentioned "summer capital" proposal) at the meeting.[38] Harding responded in a hopeful fashion, indicating a desire to attend, should it be at all possible.[39] As it turned out, he did not attend although he did send a pleasant letter of greetings to the delegates.

As with previous conferences, Washington sent official invitations to Pacific Basin countries to form delegations while still other delegates were invited as individuals. However, when the 112 delegates arrived and the meeting commenced, it quickly proved to be uninspiring. Despite the immense publicity and strenuous planning, almost a third of the delegates were from Hawaii (largely business leaders), and few important governmental or commercial leaders attended. Like Harding, Viscount Shibusawa (a leading Japanese industrial spokesman who had indicated an interest in attending), Captain Robert Dollar (the shipping line magnate who had also expressed interest in the gathering), and other leading commercial figures simply sent notes of greeting.[40] Numerous papers on various subjects

---

[38]Ford to Harding, June 14, 1921 as quoted in BPPU, 23 (Sept., 1921), pp. 5-6.

[39]Harding to Ford, June 16, 1921 as quoted in BPPU, 23 (Sept., 1921), p. 7. Ford was in Washington when he sent the invitation thus accounting for the quick response.

[40]See BPPU, 37-38 (Nov.-Dec., 1922).

were presented, but they tended to be more promotional than profound.[41] Much the same can be said of the resolutions passed. Aside from an unsurprising effort to establish a Pan-Pacific Chamber of Commerce, little of consequence was suggested which had not been discussed previously in the Union's various publications.[42] The one important exception here was a resolution calling for a study on the conservation of Pacific Basin resources, a suggestion which led to an international conference on the subject in 1924.[43]

1923 saw the Pan-Pacific Union involved in two more international gatherings. In the first instance and in much the same manner as it had earlier participated in the World's Press Congress, the Union participated in the National Education Association's World Conference on Education held in San Francisco between June 28 and July 6. A year previous, the Union had proposed to the Hawaii Chapter of the National Education Association that the parent body

---

[41]Papers were reprinted in MPM, XXIV-XXVI (Dec., 1922-July, 1923) in lieu of a formal set of proceedings.

[42]The matter of radio rates, the desirability of establishing a Pan-Pacific Commercial Museum, and the question of shipping rates, all long-time Union issues, are examples. See "Resolutions Unanimously Recommended to the Pan-Pacific Commercial Conference by Its Resolutions Committee and Adopted." BPPU, 38 (Dec., 1922), pp. 7-11.

[43]Ibid.

be persuaded to hold its 1923 convention in Honolulu in order to broaden its international perspectives.[44] The invitation was rejected, but the Union did receive a counter-invitation to conduct a "sub-conference" on Pacific educational issues at the San Francisco meeting.[45]

This offer was accepted and the Union designed a one and one-half day program consisting of forty papers on education as a means for promoting international understanding. John Dewey, among others, reviewed it and found it appropriate.[46] Again, however, little of significance came in the way of follow-up work. The Union initiated a correspondence among Pacific educators on the subject, but there is no record that it was continued for any length of time.[47]

The other conference held during 1923 was the Second Pan-Pacific Science Congress which met during August and September in Melbourne and then Sydney. As this conference

---

[44]"Pan-Pacific Union Invites National Education Association to Honolulu," BPPU, 34 (Aug., 1922), p. 7.

[45]"The World Conference on Education and the Pan-Pacific Sub-Conference," BPPU, 42 (April, 1923), pp. 3-5.

[46]"Tentative Program: Pan-Pacific Sub-Conference on Education," BPPU, 46 (Aug., 1923), pp. 3-4.

[47]F.F. Bunker, "The World Conference on Education," BPPU, 54 (April, 1924), pp. 5-7.

was planned and called by the secretariat created at the 1920 scientific conference in Honolulu, the Union was not directly involved. However, Ford, who was traveling in Asia at the time, did attend.[48] The significant point about this meeting, at least from the Union's perspectives, was that it occurred as the result of the prior delegates' own initiative. It evidenced the willingness and ability of others to carry on projects initiated by the Union, something Ford believed had to occur if his organization was to succeed.

The Pan-Pacific Union's last conference of this period came during the first two weeks of August 1924, when the First Pan-Pacific Food Conservation Congress met in Honolulu. Inspired by the previously noted resolution on conservation adopted at the 1922 commercial conference, it was originally planned as a discussion on fossil fuel preservation. However, it was later broadened to include topics ranging from international law through animal quarantine procedures to land topography.

Planning for the gathering (which, unlike the Union's previous full-scale conferences, was privately funded[49]) started in mid-1923 under the direction of H.P. Agee, Director of the Hawaii Sugar Planter's Association Experiment

---

[48]"Director Ford to Attend Scientific Conference," BPPU, 48 (Oct., 1923), p. 12.

[49]"The General Proceedings of the Conference," MPM, XXIX (Jan., 1925), 3.

Station, and Dr. L.O. Howard of Washington, D.C., a well-known entomologist.[50] When the meeting convened the following year, it was more impressive in terms of both delegates and program than any prior Union-sponsored gathering. One hundred twenty-seven delegates from fifteen countries and Hawaii had indicated intentions of attending. One hundred forty-seven were actually present on the opening day to hear President Coolidge's letter of welcome.[51] No previous conference had attracted such numbers or such diversity. The some 160 papers presented in twelve topical workshops were equally diverse. They were also notably substantial in content, perhaps because they dealt with specific and precisely defined problems.[52] The same can be said of the thirty-three resolutions passed, a number of them remarkably prescient given their concern with such topics as water pollution, sea mammal preservation, parasites

---

[50]"The Pan-Pacific Conservation Congress," BPPU, 44 (June, 1923), p. 3.

[51]Delegates came representing the United States, Australia, New Zealand, Canada, China, Japan, Samoa, Fiji, Dutch East India, Indo-China, Malaya, the Philippines, Russian-Siberia, Siam, and "assorted" Latin American countries plus Hawaii. See "Delegates to the Pan-Pacific Food Conservation Conference," BPPU, 58 (Aug., 1924), pp. 3-6.

[52]"Index to the Proceedings of the First Pan-Pacific Food Conservation Conference," BPPU, 63 (April, 1925), pp. 9-16. The papers were published in MPM, XXIX (Jan.-April, 1925) in lieu of a formal set of proceedings.

as substitutes for insecticides, and crop planning.[53] In sum, it was a well planned conference dealing with specific, relevant subjects and it was a success.

With this event, the first period of the conference era came to an end. The next development within the local internationalist movement was the founding of the Institute of Pacific Relations, an event which proved to be one of the major landmarks in the local internationalist movement. During the five years of this period some 500 delegates were brought together at five international gatherings in Hawaii and still others came together in San Francisco and Australia as the direct result of activities initiated in Hawaii. Ideas were exchanged, friendships developed, and a certain number of important tasks accomplished. In all, it was an impressive start toward the goal of establishing Hawaii as the conference center of the Pacific, and, at least from contemporary perspectives, toward the even more desirable goal of bringing the nations of the Pacific together in some form of regional unity.[54]

Expansion of the Union's Program

Active as the Pan-Pacific Union was in planning and staging conferences during this period, it was also involved

---

[53]"Resolutions," MPM, XXIX (Jan., 1925), 179-87.

[54]Such a goal was discussed on numerous occasions. For example, see "Pan-Pacific News," BPPU, 35 (Sept., 1922), p. 5.

in numerous other undertakings, most of them concerning either the development of its own internal philosophy and organization or the promotion of an array of special projects. In the former category, the Union expended considerable time and energy in an effort to produce a more satisfactory statement of its aims. The original statement of goals and objectives adopted in 1917 was modified during 1920 to include a new preamble explaining that the general internationalist movement would be known as the Hands-Around-the-Pacific movement and that the Union itself should be considered

> . . . an organization representing Governments of Pacific lands, and with which are affiliated Chambers of Commerce, and kindred bodies, working for the advancement of Pacific States and Communities, and a greater cooperation among and between the people of all races in Pacific lands.[55]

The Union, of course, did not represent governments in any formal manner. Ford only wished that it did. Hence, he was forced to modify this statement to include the disclaimer that the Union was not a government agency and that it only cooperated with governments on occasion. This change occurred in 1923.[56] Such a disclaimer, needless to say, was not satisfactory to the Union and the organization completely revised its statement of aims in 1925. Compared

---

[55]"The Hands-Around-the-Pacific Movement," BPPU, 9 (July, 1920), p. 2.

[56]"The Pan-Pacific Union," BPPU, 42 (April, 1923), p. 16.

to the original document, the new statement provides an excellent example of the Union's changing self-concept:

> From year to year the scope of the work before the Pan-Pacific Union has broadened, until today it assumes some of the aspects of a friendly unofficial Pan-Pacific League of Nations, a destiny that both the late Franklin K. Lane and Henry Cabot Lodge predicted for it.
>
> The Pan-Pacific Union has conducted a number of successful conferences; scientific, educational, journalistic, commercial, and lastly and most vital of all, that on the conservation of food and food products in the Pacific area, for the Pacific regions from now on must insure the world against the horrors of food shortage and its inevitable conclusion.
>
> The real serious human action of the Pan-Pacific Union begins. It is following up the work of the Pan-Pacific Food Conservation Conference by the establishment of a Pan-Pacific Research Institution where primarily the study and work will be along the lines necessary in solving the problems of food production and conservation in the Pacific Area, land and sea. Added to this, will be the study of race and population problems that so vitally affect our vast area of the Pacific, the home of more than half of the peoples who inhabit this planet. The thoughts and actions of these peoples and races toward each other as they are today, and as they should be, for the welfare of all, will be the most important problem before the Union, as well as the problem of feeding in the future those teeming swarms of races, that must be well fed to preserve a peaceful attitude toward each other.
>
> The Pan-Pacific Union is an organization in no way the agency of any Pacific Government, yet having the goodwill of all, with the Presidents and Premiers of Pacific lands as its honorary heads. Affiliated and working with the Pan-Pacific Union are Chambers of Commerce, educational, scientific and other bodies. It is supported in part by government and private appropriations and subscriptions. Its central office is in Honolulu, because of its location at the ocean's crossroads. Its management is under an international board.
>
> The following are the chief aims and objects of the Pan-Pacific Union:
>
> 1. To bring together from time to time, in friendly conference, leaders in all lines of thought and action in the Pacific area, that

they may become better acquainted; to assist in pointing them toward cooperative effort for the advancement of those interests that are common to all the peoples.
2. To bring together ethical leaders from every Pacific land who will meet for the study of problems of fair dealings and ways to advance international justice in the Pacific area, that misunderstanding may be cleared.
3. To bring together from time to time scientific and other leaders from Pacific lands who will present the great vital Pan-Pacific scientific problems including those of race and population, that must be confronted, and if possible, solved by the present generation of Pacific peoples and those to follow.
4. To follow out the recommendations of the scientific and other leaders in the encouragement of all scientific research of value to Pacific peoples; in the establishment of a Research Institution where such need seems to exist, or in aiding in the establishment of such institutions.
5. To secure and collate accurate information concerning the material resources of Pacific lands; to study the ideas and opinions that mold public opinion among the peoples of the several Pacific races, and to bring men together who can understandingly discuss these in a spirit of fairness that they may point out a true course of justice in dealing with them internationally.
6. To bring together in round table discussion in every Pacific land those of all races resident therein who desire to bring about better understanding and cooperative effort among the peoples and races of the Pacific for their common advancement, material and spiritual.
7. To bring all nations and peoples about the Pacific Ocean into closer friendly commercial contact and relationship. To aid and assist those in all Pacific communities to better understand each other, and through them, spread abroad about the Pacific the friendly spirit of interracial cooperation.[57]

One of the more interesting features of this document is its suggestion that the Union had moved toward a more

---

[57]"Aims of the Pan-Pacific Union," MPM, XXIX (Jan., 1925), inside cover.

direct involvement with the problems of international relations, and, in the process, had cast aside most of its earlier notions to the effect that international goodwill is a function of commercial goodwill and that international understanding is a function of international travel. This suggestion is supported by other contemporary actions of the Union. Mid-Pacific Magazine, for example, began printing a number of articles on the problems of peace whereas earlier it had remained largely silent on the issue.[58] The Bulletin of the Pan-Pacific Union raised the issue even more frequently. A "Minister of Friendship" project was initiated to honor men who had contributed to peace and international understanding by conferring the foregoing title upon them. In 1922, the retiring Japanese Consul General in Hawaii, Chonosuke Yada, was made the first recipient of this title. It was presented to him amidst considerable ceremony by no less a person than Governor Wallace R. Farrington.[59] By mid-1925, the award had been conferred upon Keiichi Yamasaki, another Japanese Consul General; Prince Chandaburi of Siam; and David Starr

---

[58]For example, see George A. Taylor, "Invention and the Peace of the World," MPM, XXVIII (July, 1924), 77-79. Charles W. Baldwin, "The Perpertuation of Peace," MPM, XXVIII (Oct., 1924), 369-77, and [David Starr Jordan], "Pan-Pacific Peace," MPM, XXXI (Jan., 1926), 21-23.

[59]"The First Minister of Friendship," BPPU, 31 (May, 1922), pp. 7-8.

Jordan.[60] Still others of note received the award in later years. However, none of these activities appears to have been part of a general, systematic program designed to lead the Pacific nations into a more peaceful era. Rather, they were largely of casual, unplanned origin.

One aspect of the Union's philosophy which did not change during these years was its belief that Hawaiian society represented a model which other countries of the Pacific, if not the world, would do well to emulate. The Union leaders very simply believed that Hawaii--at least Hawaii as they perceived it--was a model for mankind in the Pacific, and they spent considerable time and effort purveying this belief. The following passage illustrates:

> Hawaii has been for nearly a century the center from which radiates the newer civilization of the Pacific. Sun Yat Sen, the first President of China, was born and educated in Honolulu. General Armstrong, the founder of Hampton Institute for the negroes and Indians, was born and brought up in Hawaii. Leaders in Japan today owe their democracy to early education in Hawaii . . . Honolulu is today the most cosmopolitan city in the world. Men of all Pacific races are perfectly at home there.[61]

Factually incorrect as the passage obviously is, it describes the beliefs and the hopes of at least the Union's

---

[60]"Ministers of Friendship," BPPU, 67 (Aug., 1925), p. 16.

[61]"Hawaii and the Pan-Pacific Union," MPM, XXII (Sept., 1921), 5-7. The most blatant error is the comment on Sun's birthplace. He was in fact born near Maccao, but the Union for years insisted he was born in Hawaii.

leadership. They were unhappy with prevailing standards of international and interpersonal relations in the Pacific, and they felt that the Hawaiian model offered a formula for reform, regardless of the fact that they had not as yet bothered to explain precisely how the formula was to be employed nor, for that matter, to seriously examine its basic assumptions in the light of local social realities. However, as noted previously, the long-term significance of this belief lies not so much in its actual usefulness or correctness as in its emotional appeal to local residents who found it a convenient and satisfying description of Hawaiian society.

The organizational structure of the Union was also changed during this period. The structural theory developed at the time the Union was formed--a general international movement composed of a governmentally oriented Pan-Pacific Union, a Pan-Pacific Association based upon individual memberships, and a variety of Pan-Pacific Clubs responsible for the movement's day to day programs--had not proved workable. In recognition of this fact, Union leaders quietly and informally relegated the less functional organizations (especially the Association) into the background and placed a greater burden of responsibility upon the Union proper.[62] The Union's central office in Honolulu

---

[62]"Some Activities of the Pan-Pacific Union," BPPU, 28 (Feb., 1922), p. 3, and "Some Functions of the Pan-Pacific Union," BPPU, 28 (Feb., 1922), pp. 7-15.

was, for all practical purposes, the only functional component in the entire operation and these changes simply acknowledged what had already become a matter of practice. The various changes, did not, however, affect the earlier policy of having heads of state as honorary officers and, more important, the Territorial Governor as actual head of the Union (see Appendix B). This practice persisted well into the 1930s with Governors McCarthy and Farrington particularly active in Union affairs.[63]

This is not to say, however, that the other organizations were simply written off. As during the days of the Hands-Around-the-Pacific Club, Ford wanted a network of organizations in the various Pacific countries and never ceased attempting to create branch units, regardless of how ineffectual they usually proved to be. At one time or another

---

[63]The Archives of Hawaii abound with letters and documents pertaining to the role of these men in the Union. While it is clear they genuinely cared about the Union, it is also clear that Ford, with his penchant for haphazard tactics, drove them slightly frantic. They often despaired at his style and went to some trouble to humor him onto more acceptable courses of action. The following letter from Farrington chastising Ford for his unorthodox diplomatic procedures illustrates: "These governments must be approached in a definite, formal way and the only method of doing that properly is through an organized committee with a definitely worded, clear cut plan . . . [and] unless something of this character is done your value as a man capable of enthusing and interesting national and international leaders will amount to very little . . . . So keep your shirt on and use your thirty pounds additional weight [recovered after an illness] and your improved clarity of brain and steadiness of nerve to the best advantage," Farrington to Ford, May 29, 1922, Archives of Hawaii, Farrington Papers, Miscellaneous, Pan-Pacific Union.

during this period, he succeeded in creating or revitalizing branches (usually Pan-Pacific Clubs) in Peking, Seoul, Shanghai, Wellington, Sydney, Kobe, Manila, Vladivostok, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Washington, Tokyo, Melbourne, Perth, and Portland. However, many of these organizations were shortlived, and still others were afflicted by the same problems which hampered the predecessor Hands-Around-the-Pacific Clubs--they were considered Pan-Pacific Clubs by Ford but in reality were local promotional organizations which had merely indicated an interest in the Union. Aside from the Honolulu Club, only the Tokyo Pan-Pacific Club was active over any significant period of time, and even it was little more than a luncheon-discussion group.[64]

As mentioned, the Union also conducted a number of special projects during this period. Some had their origins in the pre-1920 era and others were initiated later. In the former category, the Balboa Day celebration was most consistently successful. It rated as a relatively important event in Honolulu throughout this period and was, on occasion, celebrated in other cities around the Pacific. Interest in a Pan-Pacific Olympiad persisted through this era as did the effort to establish a Pan-Pacific Commercial College, or Pan-Pacific University as

---

[64] MPM printed article after article on the Tokyo Club's activities in an apparent effort to demonstrate that there was more to the Union's activities than simply those originating in Hawaii.

Ford came to view it. Although neither goal was fulfilled, work on the latter project did reach the point where incorporation papers were prepared in 1921.[65] The Union also continued its arguments on behalf of developing Honolulu into a free port.

After 1920, the Union sponsored an array of new projects, many of them the result of ideas generated at the various conferences. A Pan-Pacific Publicity Council, composed of representatives of the Honolulu press (English and foreign language) and the Chamber of Commerce, was formed in 1920 to disseminate news of the internationalist movement throughout the Pacific.[66] A related venture was attempted after the 1921 educational conference when the Pan-Pacific Information Bureau was formed to assist educators in the Pacific.[67] The previously mentioned "visual education" program, known first as the Pan-Pacific Bureau

---

[65]Apparently the papers were never filed as the State of Hawaii Department of Regulatory Agencies has no record of any corporation of even similar name or purpose. It should be noted, however, that even this was not Hawaii's first venture into the field of international education. Limited in scope as it may have been, the Mid-Pacific Institute which was formed in 1907 deserves the credit here. For further details, see Helen Gay Pratt, The Story of Mid-Pacific Institute (Honolulu, 1957), pp. 43-51.

[66]"Pan-Pacific News," BPPU, 16 (Feb., 1921), p. 3.

[67]"Pan-Pacific Information Bureau," BPPU, 50 (Dec., 1923), p. 13.

of Visual Education and later as the Visual Education Committee, was still another of the Union's projects during these years.[68] Much time and energy was invested in these projects but none of them proved viable over the long term.

The Union was also interested in another form of communication--radio--during the early 1920s. As noted, the question of radio transmission rates was a matter of some concern at this time. The press in particular wished to utilize radio to speed communications but was hampered by the fact that naval facilities, the best at the time, were of limited value due to time and subject matter restrictions as well as high use rates. The Union employed considerable energy agitating for changes in these conditions and was to some degree successful. Rates were reduced and time available to civilian users was increased.[69] In a related venture, the Union, in an effort to spread its message more effectively, initiated its own regular program over KGU, a local radio station, in 1924.[70]

Many of the Union's other projects during this period met with less success. An attempt was made to establish a Junior Pan-Pacific Union in 1922, and a group of Georgetown

---

[68]"The Pan-Pacific Bureau of Visual Education," BPPU, 12 (Oct., 1920), pp. 5-16.

[69]See entire issue of BPPU, 30 (April, 1922).

[70]"The Pan-Pacific Radio Service," BPPU, 53 (Mar., 1924), p. 10.

University students started a Pan-Pacific Students' Association in 1923. Both efforts were shortlived. The idea of a Pan-Pacific Chamber of Commerce was discussed as early as 1918 and a concerted effort was made to establish such a group following the 1922 commercial conference. This proved fruitless, as did a similar attempt to create a Pan-Pacific Bar Association in 1924. In the area of education proper, there was an effort to develop a new series of school textbooks written from a more international perspective. It also failed. Less ambitious but more successful was a student essay contest on Pacific history which the Union sponsored in cooperation with the Department of Public Instruction. The contest ran throughout this period and attracted numerous entries. Finally, in 1923, Ford transformed the previously mentioned 12-12-12 discussion group into a series of Good Relations Clubs organized along ethnic lines and designed to promote interracial understanding through propaganda within the various local ethnic communities. Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Filipino, and Caucasian clubs were founded.[71] These clubs received considerable attention and praise (including that of Governor Farrington[72]), but they never reached the level of visible accomplishment achieved by

---

[71]"Good Relations Clubs Adopt Charter," BPPU, 44 (June, 1923), p. 2.

[72]Honolulu Advertiser, April 2, 1924, p. 3. Periodical hereafter cited as Ad.

their predecessor organization during the racial crisis at the turn of the decade.

While most of the Union's special projects during this period met with limited success, one project initiated in 1924 was destined to rival the impact and importance of the Union's most successful conferences. This was the Pan-Pacific Research Institution, a scientific research and training center created under Union auspices. Science-related activity had long been a matter of special concern in Hawaii. The dominant sugar and pineapple industries--restricted to a relatively small amount of arable land and unable to maintain a constant supply of cheap labor--were increasingly dependent upon technology as a means of increasing production and maintaining profit margins. Hence, over the years a variety of agricultural research activities were sponsored and which demonstrated the vital relationship between operational scientific research and economic well-being in Hawaii. As a consequence, there had long been an inclination within the local community to support scientifically-oriented activities, an inclination the Union was well aware of through the relatively greater degree of local enthusiasm aroused by its earlier scientific conference.

In an effort to capitalize upon this inclination, Ford organized a Pan-Pacific Research Council following the 1920 scientific conference as a means of encouraging further

communication among Pacific Basin scientists.[73] While this body failed to function, the idea of a special, Pacific-oriented scientific research group in Hawaii did persist. Shortly thereafter, Ford was approached by representatives of the local scientific community with another proposal for such an organization and the suggestion that he obtain funding for it in Washington.[74] His subsequent attempt failed but, once again, the idea behind it did not. In July 1924, when the Mary Castle Trust offered use of the old Castle estate on the west side of Manoa valley in central Honolulu to the Union, Ford immediately decided to transform it into a scientific research center. Utilizing the large house and assorted out-buildings--plus an auditorium/cafeteria constructed several years later[75]--as a headquarters, laboratory, and dormitory, the Union established the Pan-Pacific Research Institution as a resident research and training center for both recognized scientists and aspiring students. It would become, Ford anticipated, the nucleus of the long-planned Pan-Pacific University.[76] The newspapers and the community shared his enthusiasm for the project.[77]

---

[73]"The Pan-Pacific Scientific Research Council," BPPU, 17 (Mar., 1921), pp. 9-11.

[74]"The Pan-Pacific Research Institution and Some Coming Pan-Pacific Conferences," BPPU, 63 (April, 1925), p. 6.

[75]Ad, Jan. 13, 1929, editorial page.

[76]"Castle Home to be Nucleus of University," BPPU, 59 (Sept., 1924), pp. 7-8.

[77]Ad, July 24, 1924, editorial page and SB,

By the end of 1924, initial organizational arrangements for the Institution were completed. A board of directors known as the Pan-Pacific Science Council had been formed, and, at their invitation, David Starr Jordan was preparing to come to Hawaii as the Institution's first director.[78] Institutional goals focusing upon food production and over-population problems and their relationship to international peace were adopted. As the Bulletin of the Pan-Pacific Union put it, "a well-fed world will not care to fight, and the Pacific can feed the world."[79] There was also talk that the Institution would concentrate its attack upon these problems within the context of oceanography.[80] Finally, it was stated that all of the new organization's activities would be conducted in the spirit of its egalitarian motto, "science without snobbery."[81]

The Institution was reasonably successful in meeting these objectives over the course of the following years until it, like its parent organization, collapsed with the advent of World War II. In August 1925, it sponsored a conference on Pacific fishery problems--the Pan-Pacific

---

July 22, 1924, p. 6.

[78]"The Pan-Pacific Research Institution and Some Coming Pan-Pacific Conferences," BPPU, 63 (April, 1925), pp. 3-7.

[79]Ibid., p. 6.

[80]For example, see Frank R. Lillie, "Woods Hole of the Pacific," MPM, XXXIV (July, 1927), 3-8.

[81]"Announcement," MPM, XXXIV (Aug., 1927), back cover.

Fisheries Conference--which initiated a Pacific fish classification project destined to last until the late 1930s. Pioneering work in this field resulted. In January 1926, the Journal of the Pan-Pacific Research Institution appeared for the first time and was issued quarterly thereafter until 1936. The work of the Institution was discussed in this journal along with news of other scientific activities in the Pacific. It was both a scholarly journal and a newsletter. A public lecture series, a system of student scholarships, and work on a massive botanic garden project were also started in the same year.[82] The following year saw the emphasis upon student programs increased through the creation of the Junior Pan-Pacific Science Council, an event which in turn led to the development of a rather complete research program for students associated with the Institution. By 1929 these students had obtained oceanographic research facilities for their own use at Kewalo Basin near Honolulu Harbor, developed a new strain of the okra plant, and constructed a sophisticated photographic laboratory at the Manoa headquarters.[83] Finally, in 1926 an affiliated research

---

[82]For further details, see "Student Scholarships at the Pan-Pacific Institution," BPPU, 81 (Oct., 1926), p. 8, "The Pan-Pacific Garden," BPPU, 80 (Sept., 1926), p. 3 and "Niniko, 'Garden at Rest,'" MPM, XXXVII (May, 1929), 433-40.

[83]"Great International Center is Being Established at Pan-Pacific Institution," BPPU, 114 (Aug., 1929), pp. 5-7.

center was established in Tokyo and in the following year a similar center was opened in Manchuria. However, both centers apparently failed to survive as there are no subsequent references to them.[84]

These activities and others persisted into the next decade, in some instances up to the time the Institution and the Union collapsed. The Depression and the consequent lack of funds, however, prevented any significant expansion of the activities during the 1930s. The Mary Castle Trust donation consisted of the site (on loan rather than as an outright grant) but no operating funds. Ford attempted to raise funds in other Pacific nations rather than in Hawaii as he felt Hawaii had made more than its fair contribution to the Union.[85] Such a scheme might have worked during the more prosperous 1920s, but it failed during the Depression and the Institution was never sufficiently funded. As a consequence, it slowly fell apart during the decade before the war. Publication of the journal ceased in 1936, and the Castle home itself was taken back in mid-1940.[86] There was a brief attempt to relocate the Institution at

---

[84]Alexander Hume Ford, "The Pan-Pacific Research Institution in Japan," BPPU, 85 (Mar., 1927), pp. 13-14 and "The Pan-Pacific Research Institution in Manchuria," MPM, XXXIV (Oct., 1927), 363-64.

[85]"The Pan-Pacific Research Institution and Some Coming Pan-Pacific Conferences," BPPU, 63 (April, 1925), p. 5.

[86]Ad, June 20, 1940, p. 2, and June 22, 1940, p. 3.

a new site in Manoa, but it too failed with the coming of the war.

The grand scientific and educational visions of Ford and his colleagues thus came to an undramatic end. They could, however, have taken solace in the knowledge that a number of truly significant achievements did result from the Institution's various undertakings. The fisheries survey, the student scholarships, and above all, the mutual consultation and cooperation which occurred were contributions of no small note. Whether or not the disheartened sponsors chose to view the matter in this light remains unknown.

Evaluation of the 1920-25 Period

No one, however, was anticipating the collapse of the Institution or any other component of the internationalist movement in Hawaii during the 1920s. Throughout this entire decade, purpose, momentum and, above all, optimism characterized the movement. Its achievement record over the first half of the decade was seen as proof that a millennium in the relationship among races, nations, and men was underway. The key to a new era in human relations was being discovered. Progress toward these ends was irreversible. Such was the mood within the internationalist movement in mid-1925 when it gained still another dimension with the formation of the Institute of Pacific Relations.

CHAPTER VI

ERA OF PACIFIC CONFERENCES: 1925-1930

Continuation of Prior Trends

The founding of the Institute of Pacific Relations (see Chapter VII) brought an end to the Pan-Pacific Union's dominance over local internationalist activity, but it did not produce a significant alteration in either the cause or the course of the local movement. It simply provided a new dimension. Activities which the Union had initiated prior to the Institute's formation, in particular the series of international conferences, continued upon their previous course without interruption. Indeed, few indications of significant change within the movement were immediately evident at any time during the entire decade of the 1920s.

Union activities during the latter half of the 1920s were, thus, essentially a continuation of those initiated during the earlier part of the decade. Previously adopted goals were maintained, additional conferences were sponsored, assorted projects were continued, and still other projects were initiated. This pattern of activity persisted until the end of the decade when the Depression struck and the Territorial government was forced to cease its consistent if limited annual subsidy to the Union, a move which plunged the organization into a crippling financial crisis.

Later Union-Sponsored Conferences

Although fewer in number, conferences were again the focal point of Union activities during this period. With the exception of the special fisheries conference sponsored by the Pan-Pacific Research Institution, the Union had not hosted a major international gathering since the First Pan-Pacific Food Conservation Congress of 1924. This hiatus was not, however, due to any lack of effort on the part of the Union. Throughout the middle of the decade, there were proposals for international gatherings in Hawaii concerning law, medicine, youth, entomology, Polynesian development, women, ethics, the Red Cross, and the League of Nations Societies.[1] With reference to both the first and last proposals, Ford developed a friendship with former Supreme Court Associate Justice John H. Clarke when the jurist visited Hawaii in 1926 and obtained his assistance in planning and promoting appropriate gatherings. Their plans, however, failed to materialize. In addition, proposals for follow-up conferences on journalism, education, and Pacific commerce were voiced during the period.[2]

This interruption in the schedule of conferences came to an end in the summer of 1926 when the Federal Government,

---

[1]"Pan-Pacific Conferences to Come," BPPU, 77 (June, 1926), p. 9.

[2]Ibid.

on its own initiative, announced that it was calling a Pan-Pacific Educational, Recreation, and Rehabilitation and Reclamation Conference to convene in Honolulu during April 1927. Also referred to as the Pan-Pacific Educational, Recreation, and Rehabilitation Conference and simply the Pan-Pacific Educational Conference, the gathering was authorized by a joint Congressional resolution and was called by President Coolidge through Secretary of the Interior Hubert Work. The purpose of the meeting was to stimulate Pacific-wide discussion on educational exchange, outdoor recreation programs and facilities, standards of child care, and homesteading programs.[3] Governor Farrington, speaking prior to the conference as the greatest booster of the local internationalist movement ever to reside at Washington Place (the official residence of Hawaii's governors), predicted that it would be "the greatest ever held in the Pacific."[4] He later added that the delegates would be "meeting together under conditions that are as nearly ideal as is possible for us to expect in this world."[5] The other Union leaders, however, were more non-committal. They had neither initiated nor planned the

---

[3]"The Pan-Pacific Educational Conference in April," BPPU, 83 (Dec., 1926), p. 3.

[4]"The Pan-Pacific Conference," BPPU, 82 (Nov., 1926), p. 3.

[5]"A Pan-Pacific Conference Called by the President of the United States," BPPU, 84 (Feb., 1927), p. 3.

gathering, and, perhaps in keeping with their long-expressed desire to serve more as catalysts than actual sponsors, they were content to simply issue progress reports through their various publications.

When the conference convened between April 11 and 16, fifty-four delegates officially representing thirteen Pacific countries (twenty-seven from the United States and twenty-seven from the twelve other areas) were present. In addition, 171 delegates representing some fifty-six colleges and related institutions were also present. It is worth noting, however, that the overwhelming bulk of delegates in the second category were local residents serving as representatives for their former colleges. All but thirty (four from outside the United States and twenty-six from the American mainland) of the delegates in this category were from Hawaii.[6] Again, all but a very few of the local delegates were from the white establishment. In other words, the gathering was not nearly so international or intercultural in character as it appeared.

Although the delegate list was disappointing, the conference staff was impressive. Secretary of the Interior Work attended both as a delegate and as the honorary chairman. The three sub-sections of the conference--concerning

---

[6]First Pan-Pacific Conference on Education, Rehabilitation, Reclamation, and Recreation: Report of Proceedings (Washington, 1927), pp. xvii-xxvii.

education, recreation, and reclamation--were chaired by Federal Commissioner of Education John J. Tigert, Director of the National Park Service Stephen T. Mather, and Federal Commissioner of Reclamation Elwood Mead, respectively.[7] Coolidge sent a pleasant if bland welcoming message which Work read to the delegates. They were then divided into topical working groups where a total of sixty-four different addresses and papers were presented.[8] The conference adjourned after adopting resolutions praising the Federal Government for calling the conference and the Territory of Hawaii for hosting it plus others affirming the importance of educational exchange, vocational education, standards for child care, government aid to settlers of new lands, conservation of natural resources, and outdoor recreation.[9] As the delegates failed to mandate decisive follow-up action in any of the areas discussed, the conference produced no lasting results. Indeed, it was seldom mentioned following its adjournment. Governor Farrington's prediction was somewhat wide of the mark.

If this conference was one of Honolulu's less consequential international gatherings, the next--the First Pan-Pacific Women's Conference of August 1928--was among

---

[7] Ibid., p. xvii.

[8] Ibid., pp. 21-470.

[9] Ibid., pp. 473-75. One possible exception to this observation was a resolution calling upon Pacific governments to sponsor similar meetings in the future. However, no machinery was created to pursue the matter and no subsequent meetings were held.

the most impressive. Of foremost importance, this conference, like the original scientific meeting, formed its own secretariat which in time led to the creation of an independent organization active still today. It also served as the occasion for a meaningful exchange of ideas and the instigation of a number of important projects pertaining to the status of women. As such, it anticipated one of the more important issues of the century and demonstrated once again the Union's ability--or luck--in defining future issues and proposing solutions which, even by current standards, must be considered modern.

The idea of sponsoring a meeting dealing with the status of women in the Pacific was first broached during the 1924 food conservation conference by Mark Cohen, a delegate to the gathering and a member of the New Zealand parliament.[10] Planning for the event started in 1924 and by the end of that year it had been decided that a meeting would be called during 1928 covering " . . . all matters of interest to women . . . ."[11] During the following year regular planning meetings were organized under the direction of Mrs. A.L. Andrews of Honolulu. When the conference actually convened in 1928, it was the most thoroughly planned and

---

[10]"Mark Cohen's Last Letter to the Pan-Pacific Union," BPPU, 102 (July, 1928), pp. 15-16.

[11]"The Pan-Pacific Women's Conference, 1928," BPPU, 62 (Dec., 1924), p. 15.

most widely publicized of all the various gatherings that had or would occur under the Union's auspices.

By 1925, three years in advance of the conference, detailed agendas had been developed and one of the local organizers, Margaret Bergen, had traveled to Chicago to invite Jane Addams of Hull House fame to attend as honorary chairman.[12] She agreed and was in Honolulu for the meeting. In addition, the organizers met with Ford and negotiated an agreement whereby the Union would provide funding for the conference but would not otherwise interfere with the planning.[13]

During the following three years, the character of the conference was changed on numerous occasions, particularly with regard to the composition of the agenda (whether or not to include controversial topics such as "peace") and the manner of selecting delegates (whether to select them outright or to allow each country to make its own selection). After considerable debate and frequent consultation with Miss Addams (who favored the more conservative agenda as it promised to be less divisive), the proponents of the conservative position prevailed. The agenda was fixed to cover only health, education, women in industry, women in government, and social services. It

---

[12]"The Pan-Pacific Women's Conference," BPPU, 64 (May, 1925), p. 11.

[13]"The Pan-Pacific Women's Conference," BPPU, 68 (Sept., 1925), p. 12.

was also decided that women in various Pacific countries would be allowed to compose their own delegations.[14] Governor Farrington prevailed upon Secretary of the Interior Work to have the Department of State forward conference invitations to the various Pacific nations.[15] This took place early in 1928, thus formalizing four years of strenuous preparation.

A large turnout of delegates attended the conference which met at Punahou School in central Honolulu between August 9 and 19. Sixty-four honorary delegates, mostly prominent local women, were present. They were joined by some 135 voting delegates and forty-eight alternates from eleven Pacific nations. Hawaii, once again represented by a local delegation rather than the mainland group, sent ninety-one more voting and alternate delegates.[16] Such an

---

[14]"Joint Committee Work on Pan-Pacific Women's Conference," BPPU, 88 (May, 1927), pp. 13-15. Also see "Pan-Pacific Women's Conference, July, 1928, Honolulu," BPPU, 92 (Sept., 1927), pp. 3-4.

[15]"Invitations to the Pan-Pacific Women's Conference Transmitted Through the State Department," BPPU, 98 (Mar., 1928), pp. 3-4. Also see "Delegates to the Pan-Pacific Women's Conference," BPPU, 100 (May, 1928), p. 12. The Department of State "forwarded" the invitations but did not "issue" them, as the conference was not officially sponsored by the Federal Government. Johnson to Satterthwaite, Feb. 2, 1928, Archives of Hawaii, Farrington Papers, Miscellaneous, Pan-Pacific Union.

[16]These figures may be slightly in error as the list of delegates by committees does not cross-check precisely with the country listing. See "List of Delegates to the Pan-Pacific Women's Conference, Honolulu, August 9-19, 1928," BPPU, 105 (Oct., 1928), pp. 7-16.

attendance is more impressive than it appears at first glance. In the first instance, although the conference was aided by the Department of State, it was not an official conference. Hence, the various governments represented did not subsidize travel costs and the delegates had to travel at their own expense.[17] Secondly, the Hawaii delegation was, in contrast to previous local delegations at such gatherings, somewhat representative of the Territory's various ethnic groups.[18] For reasons unexplained, the planners of this conference invited a far broader participation from the local community than had been the case during previous international gatherings.

Besides the usual papers and addresses, meaningful activities were mandated by a series of resolutions. In the main, these activities involved the collection of data on the condition of women throughout the Pacific within the five topical areas discussed at the conference.[19] Various

---

[17]Alexander Hume Ford, "Annual Report of the Director, Pan-Pacific Union," MPM, XXXVI (Dec., 1928), 433.

[18]Ibid.

[19]Of interest if no particular consequence are several other resolutions urging various national motion picture industries to cease international distribution on films which "bring the moral standards of the nation into question." See "Resolutions and Recommendations of the First Pan-Pacific Women's Conference," MPM, XXXVI (Dec., 1928), 411-13.

national working committees were established within these areas, and a considerable amount of information was collected.[20] Perhaps more important than the actual collection of data, however, is the fact that some form of meaningful post-conference organization was established. This led directly to a second conference in 1930 which in turn produced the aforementioned permanent women's organization.

The Union sponsored one other international gathering in Honolulu before the women's group re-convened in 1930. This was the Pan-Pacific Surgical Conference of August 14-24, 1929. Since the early years of the decade, there had been talk within the internationalist movement of sponsoring a conference on Pacific medicine. In 1925, the Hawaiian Medical Society assumed the task of organizing such a gathering and proposed that it be held in conjunction with the planned women's conference.[21] Their proposal received some attention but apparently failed to spark sufficient enthusiasm. In 1926, Nils P. Larsen, Medical Director of Queens Hospital (Hawaii's principal medical institution) and a member of the Pan-Pacific Research Institution, renewed the call and joined it to another proposal concerning the creation of a Pacific-wide medical organization.[22] The main features of his dual proposal

---

[20]"Plans for the Promotion of Research Projects," MPM, XXXVI (Dec., 1928), 429.

[21]"The Pan-Pacific Medical Conference in 1928," BPPU, 65 (June, 1925), p. 13.

[22]"Pan-Pacific Conferences to Come," BPPU, 77 (June, 1926), p. 10.

prevailed. A medical conference (concerning only surgery rather than general medicine, however) was called by the Union, and a Pacific Basin medical association was created during the meeting.

One hundred fifteen doctors from thirteen Pacific countries and the doctor from Italian Tripoli attended one gathering.[23] As during previous conferences, technical workshops were conducted. In this case they dealt with subjects ranging from cancer to plastic surgery to hospital standardization.[24] Valuable as the workshops undoubtedly were, the special significance of this conference in the history of local internationalism is the fact that it led to the creation of still another independent association. Known initially as the Pan-Pacific Surgical Congress and later as the Pan-Pacific Surgical Association, this group sponsored numerous meetings after 1929 and is presently one of the major medical organizations in the Pacific Basin.[25]

First mention of a second women's conference came early in 1929 when the Bulletin of the Pan-Pacific Union

---

[23]"Surgeons Attending the Pan-Pacific Surgical Conference, Honolulu, August 14 to 24, 1929," Journal of the Pan-Pacific Research Institution, IV (July-Sept., 1929), 16. Periodical hereafter cited as JPPRI.

[24]"The Pan-Pacific Surgical Conference," JPPRI, V (Mar.-May, 1930), 3-10.

[25]This group has met a total of twelve times, most recently in 1972. All meetings have been in Honolulu.

carried an announcement that preparations were under way for another meeting in 1930.[26] The May 1929 issue of the same publication carried a proposed agenda similar to that of the previous meeting. Aside from the still unsettled question of delegate selection procedures, planning went smoothly.[27] Inspired by high praise from the International Alliance of Women for Suffrage and Equal Citizenship, the planning group finalized its agenda during the fall of 1929 and, more important, reached a decision to form an independent organization representing the women of the Pacific.[28] This decision was important for several reasons. First, it was in accordance with the Union's hope that all the conferences it sponsored would evolve along such lines. Secondly, it resulted in the formation of an international organization composed of national chapters and thus solved the troublesome matter of selecting delegates. Finally and most important, it provided a separate and more appropriate vehicle for what was rapidly becoming an activist women's movement. As one of the delegates to the initial conference put it:

---

[26]"The Next Pan-Pacific Women's Conference," BPPU, 107 (Jan., 1929), p. 5.

[27]"The Second Pan-Pacific Women's Conference," BPPU, 111 (May, 1929), pp. 3-6.

[28]"The Pan-Pacific Women's Conference," BPPU, 116 (Oct., 1929), pp. 5-14, and "The Pan Pacific Women's Conference Honolulu, 1930," ibid., p. 15.

> . . . during two years those national delegations have been busy in their own countries trying against lethargy, lack of vision, and all the wealth of indifference to social progress, which exists everywhere, to stimulate interest, evolve national organizations, and accumulate information for the projects [sanctioned by the previous conference] . . .[29]

The conference met once again at Punahou School between August 9 and 23. Approximately the same number of delegates from most of the same countries attended. Present at the gathering were 131 regular and forty-one alternate delegates from ten Pacific countries plus the Hawaiian delegation (totaling eighty-seven) and one representative from the League of Nations.[30] The papers, discussions, and resolutions were similar to those of 1928. As suggested, the significant business of the conference was the formation of an independent organization--the Pan-Pacific Women's Association under the leadership of Dr. Georgina Sweet of Australia. Quoting from the original constitution, its objectives were

> To strengthen the bonds of peace among Pacific people by promoting a better understanding and friendship among the women of all Pacific countries. To initiate and promote cooperation among the women of the Pacific region for the study and betterment of existing social conditions.[31]

---

[29]"The Second Pan-Pacific Women's Conference," BPPU, 125 (July, 1930), p. 10. The article is a reprint of a KGU radio broadcast of May 10, 1930, featuring Dr. Ethel Osborne.

[30]"Delegates to the Second Pan-Pacific Women's Conference," BPPU, 127 (Sept., 1930), pp. 14-19.

[31]Ann Y. Satterthwaite, "Pan-Pacific Women's Conference," BPPU, 128 (Oct., 1930), p. 7.

With initial secretarial assistance from the Union, the Pan-Pacific Women's Association set out upon a course of action which it has pursued to the present time. A total of nine conferences at various Pacific locations have been held since 1930, most recently in Honolulu during 1968. In 1955, the organization changed its title to Pan-Pacific and Southeast Asia Women's Association.

Like the scientific and surgical gatherings, the evolution of the second women's conference into a separate, independent organization constitutes one of the lasting monuments to the Pan-Pacific Union. Ironically, it was also to be the Union's last conference. The Depression and the coming war would soon bring an end to the era of Union conferences and, finally, the Union itself.

Other Aspects of the Union's Program

As before, conferences were but part of the internationalist movement's activities during the 1925-30 period. The Union maintained the goals adopted during the earlier period, although it did interpret them in an increasingly activist fashion. Similarly, it retained the organizational formula previously adopted. In addition, while continuing many of the more specific projects originated during the earlier part of the decade, it initiated a number of new ventures. Finally, a certain number of internationalist projects were sponsored by other

individuals and institutions independent of both the Union and the Institute.

Although there were no formal changes in the goals and direction of the Union after 1925, there was an increasingly activist interpretation of how the organization should conduct itself. Most of the changes were directed at the task of promoting peace and international understanding. A passage from one of Ford's frequent epistles to Union members, characterized as usual by a mix of good intention and over-simplification, illustrates:

> The Pan-Pacific Union might well advocate education in the schools in all Pacific lands as to the terrible uses to which chemistry may be put, culminating in the smothering of races, to the demoralization and destruction of civilization, while if employed in a similar manner for the destruction of insects that destroy food crops, it might banish famine forever from the world, and create the greatest aid to peace that has ever been known, a world without fear of hunger.[32]

Increasing social activism led the Union away from its earlier interest in tourism and commerce and toward a newly intensified concern for international organizational activities.[33] The idea, for example, that Honolulu might be

---

[32][Alexander Hume Ford], "A World Educational Conference at the Pacific Cross Roads," BPPU, 73 (Feb., 1926), p. 15.

[33]In an undated copy of a letter to Frank C. Atherton, ca. 1930, Ford went so far as to say that he did not like tourists and felt the effort to establish tourism as an industry was a most unfortunate mistake. Ford to Atherton, undated, University of Hawaii, Hawaiian and Pacific Collection, uncatalogued Pan-Pacific Union documents.

transformed into the Geneva of the Pacific evolved from a vague and general hope into an article of faith. As Ford put it:

> I have a message from this, our Hawaii, at the ocean's crossroads, the tentative Switzerland of the Pacific. Already Honolulu has become our new Geneva. No longer will we have to nurse and cuddle our conferences held here; they now wish to take care of themselves.[34]

Expanding upon the theme, the Union proposed that territory somewhere in the Pacific be designated as a Union conference center and internationalized so that the gatherings might take place in the freest possible atmosphere. In this regard, it is reported that the owners of Palmyra Island once offered the territory to the Union for such a purpose but that the Department of State refused to consider the proposal.[35] The Union itself later suggested a similar plan involving Kilauea National Park on the island of Hawaii which, as Federal property, could easily be internationalized.[36] This proposal also failed to elicit a response from Washington.

As might be expected, related proposals first voiced during earlier years were kept alive during the latter part

---

[34][Alexander Hume Ford], "Report of the Director of the Pan-Pacific Union on Conferences Called," BPPU, 125 (July, 1930), p. 3.

[35]"An International Congress Ground in Hawaii," MPM, XL (Oct., 1930), 355.

[36]Ibid., pp. 355-56.

of the decade. Chief among these was the hope of creating a Pacific League of Nations. First discussed after Ford's meeting with Henry Cabot Lodge in 1919, the idea persisted throughout the 1920s and into the early years of the 1930s. At times there was talk of creating an entirely new organization and, on other occasions, the oft-expressed hope that Pacific governments would assume control over the Union and remold it along Pan-American Union lines was reiterated.[37] The Union's long-standing hopes pertaining to the creation of a Pan-Pacific University and a Pan-Pacific Chamber of Commerce also received attention during this period. Finally, the various arguments on behalf of the concept of Hawaii as a model society were repeated as in prior years.

The important point about all these proposals, unrealistic as they may appear in current perspective, is that the Union truly felt that they would come to pass. It had, after all, progressed from a paper organization to an important and influential entity within the period of a few years and, at least in the minds of Ford and his colleagues, there was no reason to suspect that even greater developments would not occur. However, as suggested elsewhere, these issues (save the campaign to transform the

---

[37]For example, see "A League of Nations for the Pacific," BPPU, 134 (April, 1931), pp. 3-4. The article is a reprint of a Japan Times and Mail article.

Union into a government sponsored, regional organization) were neither based upon nor joined by any systematic ideology directed at well specified ends, and, as a consequence, they were pursued in a much more casual fashion than might otherwise have been the case.

Organizationally, the Pan-Pacific Union remained basically unchanged throughout the entire conference era. The institutional formula adopted earlier was maintained--lip service to the concept of a Union surrounded and supported by the Pan-Pacific Association and various Pan-Pacific Clubs coupled with silent recognition of the fact that the Union's Honolulu office was the only viable organization in the entire scheme. As before, however, the Honolulu and Tokyo Pan-Pacific Clubs did continue to meet.

These clubs were active in an interesting if not particularly consequential manner. The local organization, still meeting in the old University Club building, continued the weekly round of luncheon gatherings started during the early 1920s.[38] Frequent appearances by visiting dignitaries constituted the high points of its program. The Tokyo Club, which met weekly at the Imperial Hotel until shortly before the war, followed a similar format. Among

---

[38]"The New Pan-Pacific Clubhouse," BPPU, 75 (April, 1926), p. 3. The Union never succeeded in its ambition to build its own administrative-conference complex.

the more notable of their numerous guest speakers during this period were Madame Chiang Kai-shek, Hu Shih (the Chinese philosopher-diplomat), and Alexandré Tolstoy (daughter of the author). However, the fact that there was more talk than action at these meetings did not pass entirely unnoticed. As one speaker before the Tokyo group put it:

> I have often wondered . . . why this club does not practice what it preaches. Week after week . . . you have talked about and discussed the necessity for a better understanding between this nation and the American nation . . . you have sent delegates . . . abroad . . . you have fathered resolutions . . . and yet when something really practical comes up . . . you have done nothing to boost it along.[39]

With the change of a few words, he could have delivered the same talk to the Honolulu Club.

The Union's leadership also remained in its previous mold during the remainder of the decade. The honorary officers were drawn from the ranks of Pacific Basin political leaders while Hawaii continued to supply the working officers. Some interesting names, however, did cross the Union's letterhead during this period. Among them were Presidents Coolidge, Hoover, Franklin Roosevelt, and Chiang Kai-shek, who served as honorary presidents of the Union, and Sanford B. Dole, who led the Honolulu Pan-Pacific Club in 1924.[40]

---

[39]Roderick O. Matheson, "Trans Pacific Press Rates," MPM, XXXII (Nov., 1926), 429.

[40]"First Meeting of Pan-Pacific Club of Honolulu in its New Headquarters," BPPU, 52 (Feb., 1924), p. 16, and "The

One of the more confusing aspects of the Union's history throughout this entire period concerns its finances. Documents presently available provide only a fragmentary record of the organization's financial status, and given the fact that it was a non-profit corporation and not, therefore, obligated to submit annual financial reports to the Territory, it is possible that no record was ever made of some of its transactions.[41] Certain other documents indicate that this was indeed the case. For example, F.F. Bunker drafted a long (twenty-three page) memorandum to the Union's Board of Trustees in 1921 while he was serving as Executive Secretary which was concerned almost solely with the necessity of putting the organization's operational and budgetary procedures upon a more business-like basis. Calling upon the Board of Trustees to take a more active role (which it eventually did) in the determination of policy, he characterized the Union's existing administrative procedure as one where

> . . . Mr. Ford has been given a free hand; . . . [where] he has committed the Union on more than one occasion to projects that most Boards would have considered impossible; and . . . [where] the Board has been content to back him up loyally

---

President of China Becomes a Trustee of the Pan-Pacific Union," BPPU, 107 (Jan., 1929), p. 13.

[41]Formal reports from non-profit, eleemosynary organizations (the Union's categorization under the Territory's corporate laws) were not required until 1940.

> when he got into trouble and to help pull him out of difficulties when they have arisen . . .[42]

Although Bunker acknowledged that Ford's audacious style of leadership frequently paid the Union high dividends, it is clear that he felt the need for a more orderly process. Farrington expressed Bunker's concerns even more succinctly. Writing to ex-Governor and fellow Union-supporter Frear in 1923, he said:

> I have no confidence in the budget system of giving Mr. Ford $10,000 [i.e., a lump sum legislative appropriation] and asking him to run the office. This is getting back to the old days. It is not a budget system. It is merely giving Ford $10,000 so he will not trouble the Directors [Board of Trustees] until he comes home with some new ideas.[43]

Nonetheless, it is important that some effort be made to recreate at least an outline of the Union's financial record as finances would prove to be the immediate cause of its collapse during the next decade.

It is clear that the Union derived virtually all its support from public donations and governmental appropriations. Subscriptions to Mid-Pacific Magazine, the other likely source of support, contributed very little. In fact, throughout the 1920s and 1930s, the magazine did

---

[42]"Report of the Executive-Secretary [F.F. Bunker] to the Trustees of the Pan-Pacific Union," Dec. 26, 1921, University of Hawaii, Hawaiian and Pacific Collection, uncatalogued Pan-Pacific Union documents, p. 5. Hereafter cited as "Report."

[43]Farrington to Frear, Jan. 31, 1923, Archives of Hawaii, Farrington Papers, Miscellaneous, Pan-Pacific Union.

not meet publication expenses and by 1935 was far enough in debt to the Star Bulletin Publishing Co. (its long-time printer) that the company assumed a controlling interest in the magazine in an effort to boost its circulation and recover some of the debt.[44] Unfortunately, the effort failed and publication folded at the end of 1936.[45] This problem is discussed in more detail in a subsequent chapter.

Of the other sources of income mentioned, governmental appropriations were the most important and, of course, the best documented. In the period between 1919 when the first such appropriation was granted and 1935 when the last grant was made, the Union received a total of $9,000 from the Federal government and $86,250 from the Territorial legislature.[46] In addition, the President of China gave $1,000

---

[44]Details of the arrangement are strange. Ford was and remained the legal owner of the magazine but, as he was in Asia and Europe throughout this period, he was not a party in the negotiations. Negotiating with Ann Y. Satterthwaite, the Union's long-time secretary who in turn obtained approval from the Union's Board of Trustees, the Star Bulletin Publishing Company agreed to cancel all of the magazine's pre-1935 debts in return for Ford's life insurance (of unspecified amount), de-facto editorial control of the magazine, 75% of all advertising revenue, and 50% of all Union membership dues. The Union accepted these arrangements for a two-year period beginning in 1935. As discussed in more detail later, this arrangement produced some drastic changes in the magazine's format but did not solve the financial crisis. For further details, see "Minutes of the Board of Trustees of the Pan-Pacific Union Special Meeting," Dec. 7, 1936, Archives of Hawaii, Poindexter Papers, Miscellaneous, Pan Pacific Union.

[45]Farrington to Castro, Aug. 3, 1936, University of Hawaii, Hawaiian and Pacific Collection, uncataloged Pan-Pacific Union documents.

[46]The 1919 Congressional appropriation was the only

in 1920 while New Zealand gave $1500 in the same year. In the following year the King of Siam gave $1,000 and New South Wales appropriated another $1500.[47] As near as can be determined, these were the only direct contributions the Union ever received from foreign governments. All of the Federal funds, the New Zealand and New South Wales appropriations, and $25,000 of the Territory's total grant were, however, tied to specific conferences and could not be expended for general purposes. The Territory's general purpose appropriations to the Union over this period thus totaled $61,250 while general purpose grants from other governments totaled only $2,000.

Private contributions are much more difficult to tabulate as there is no obvious source of documentation other than Union records--records which are available only for the 1918-21, 1931-34, and 1938 periods. These do, however, provide some view of the Union's financial status. During the 1918-21 period, expenses totalled $49,388.62 while income amounted to $47,955.15. Of this total, $20,175 came from various governmental sources and the remainder was raised through donations, dues, and

---

Federal grant which might be considered a direct grant to the Union. Although it was for certain, specified purposes, the Union was allowed to expend it under conditions set forth by the Secretary of State. All subsequent Federal appropriations were expended directly by the government.

[47]"Report," pp. 8-9.

fund-raising events. Conferences, salaries, rents, and Ford's travel expenses (so far as can be determined he never accepted a salary[48]) constituted the primary expenses.[49] For a new organization, financial circumstances during these years were not so gloomy as they might have been.

The problem was that the Union estimated that it needed an annual budget of at least $30,000 to carry on a conference program such as the one it had initiated in 1920 and 1921 and, over the years, it was simply not able to raise that amount of money. Even with consistent aid from the Territory throughout the 1920s, annual budgets seldom exceeded $20,000.[50] As the Union was not able to raise the balance it felt it needed from private sources, it remained vulnerable to the slightest change in government

---

[48]Ford was voted an annual salary on numerous occasions but apparently never accepted it. For example, see his informal annual reports in the Feb. 1926, Oct. 1927, and Dec. 1928 issues of the BPPU. Bunker, however, apparently did receive a substantial salary, although there is no available reference to the precise figure. An indication of his salary came in 1923 when the Territorial Legislature refused to grant the Union a subsidy (HB 266 for $15,000) because certain Union officers--the implication is Bunker--were receiving a higher salary than the Territory's department heads. See Senate Journal, Twelfth Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, Regular Session, 1923, (Honolulu, 1923), pp. 927, 972.

[49]"Report," pp. 15-17.

[50]See Ford's previously-cited informal annual reports.

funding policies. This, of course, became the case during the Depression when all Federal aid ceased and local aid dropped to $11,250 for the 1931-33 biennium, $5,000 for the 1933-35 biennium and nothing thereafter.

This change is reflected in the 1931-34 and 1938 budgetary statements. In the former period, receipts fell from $17,865.69 in 1931 to $4,672.83 in 1934 while expenditures fell from $18,796.80 to $4,894.85.[51] Although prior reserves created a positive balance for the period, the gross amounts were simply too small to support any meaningful program. Circumstances did not improve by 1938. In that year, the Union took in $5,032.58 and expended $4,581.06.[52] On top of this, Mid-Pacific Magazine had, as mentioned, failed financially and the Union was also responsible for that debt. In short, it lost the economic ability to conduct a meaningful schedule of activities.

No one in the Union foresaw economic disaster during the 1920s, however, as ongoing projects were continued and new undertakings initiated. In the former category, the Good Relations Clubs continued to meet, although without the more notable results of the earlier 12-12-12 club.[53]

---

[51]"Receipts and Expenditures for 4 years from January 1, 1931 to December 31, 1934," undated, University of Hawaii, Hawaiian and Pacific Collection, uncataloged Pan-Pacific Union documents.

[52]"Pan-Pacific Union Treasurer's Report: 1938," Jan. 20, 1939, University of Hawaii, Hawaiian and Pacific Collection, uncataloged Pan-Pacific Union documents.

[53]For example, see Alexander Hume Ford, "Closer Pan-Pacific Organization," BPPU, 108 (Feb., 1929), pp. 5-6.

In 1926 the local Japanese branch of the organization sent a five-man goodwill delegation to Japan to extend the Union's appreciation for the work of former Consul General Yada and thereafter the group is not mentioned again.[54] Later in the same year, Ford, who was in Japan on one of his frequent Asian trips, organized a Good Relations Club in Tokyo, but it too failed to make any visible impact.[55] Another carry over project of some importance which the Union pursued during this period was formation of a women's auxiliary. An initial attempt had been made in September 1924, but little came of it.[56] The project was revived and in September 1926 the Womens Auxiliary of the Pan-Pacific Union was formed.[57] It remained active during the remainder of the decade, primarily concerned with matters relating to the two women's conferences. Finally, such established projects as Balboa Day and the research institution in Manoa were continued throughout the period.

---

[54]"The Mission of the Five Young Men from Hawaii," BPPU, 75 (April, 1926), p. 7.

[55]"The Pan-Pacific Good Relations Club of Tokyo," BPPU, 86 (April, 1927), pp. 14-16.

[56]"Pan-Pacific Week in Hawaii, at the Ocean's Cross-road," BPPU, 62 (Dec., 1924), p. 13.

[57]"Pan-Pacific Women's Club Organizes," BPPU, 84 (Feb., 1927), pp. 9-10.

Certain new projects were initiated by the Union after 1925. Of these, only one--a youth program--was of any major significance. This undertaking commenced early in 1926 when Colbert N. Kurokawa, a highly respected Y.M.C.A. staff worker, joined the Union staff as an Associate Director with a special responsibility for youth programs.[58] His influence was soon felt. Writing in the May 1926 issue of the Bulletin of the Pan-Pacific Union, he proposed the creation of a Junion Pan-Pacific Union built around the Good Relations Club format, an international student exchange program, a Pan-Pacific Student Federation, an exchange program for professionals, and a Pacific Basin youth news bulletin.[59]

The latter proposal was the first to be acted upon. In December 1926, the Union began publication of such a bulletin. Called Pan-Pacific Youth, it was essentially a series of student essays concerning world peace, the student movement, and student ideals. Also included were news items on Hawaii and the local internationalist movement.[60] This format was maintained for the duration of the publication's existence.

---

[58]"The New Assistant to the Director of the Pan-Pacific Union," BPPU, 73 (Feb., 1926), pp. 4-5.

[59]Colbert N. Kurokawa, "The Junior Pan-Pacific Union," BPPU, 76 (May, 1926), pp. 3-4.

[60]See entire issue of Pan-Pacific Youth, I (Dec., 1926). Periodical hereafter cited as PPY.

At approximately the same time, the Union convinced the Department of Public Instruction to cooperate in sponsoring a "peace essay" contest in the public schools similar to the earlier history essay contest. Although cash prizes were offered, there is no record of anyone having entered and won.[61] The Union was also active in promoting shipboard study at this time. Starting in 1926 after the University World Cruise stopped in Honolulu, both Ford and Kurokawa expressed considerable interest in the concept.[62] Articles appeared in the Union's various publications, at first praising the idea and later proposing that the Union join in sponsoring such a tour.[63] Due perhaps to cost, the proposal was not pursued.

More important was the Union's establishment of the Cosmopolitan Club at the University of Hawaii in November 1926.[64] Created as a device to foster inter-racial amity within the student community, it functioned on the Manoa

---

[61]"Pan-Pacific Peace Essays," BPPU, 76 (May, 1926), pp. 9-10.

[62]"A Round-the-Pacific University Cruise," BPPU, 84 (Feb., 1927), p. 4.

[63]"A Pan-Pacific Floating University," PPY, II (Feb., 1929), p. 3.

[64]"The Pan-Pacific Cosmopolitan Club of the University of Hawaii," PPY, I (Dec., 1927), pp. 3-4. One of the more interesting aspects of this club was the requirement that each member take the Athenean oath of citizenship as adapted to the University of Hawaii and Honolulu.

campus until the early 1960s. In 1927 there was an effort to found similar clubs in universities throughout the Pacific and join them with existing Good Relations Clubs or Junior Pan-Pacific Union chapters.[65] So far as can be determined, the only club actually formed abroad was at Aoyama Gakuin College in Tokyo.[66] Finally, as discussed earlier, the Pan-Pacific Research Institution sponsored its own series of youth activities through the Junior Pan-Pacific Science Council.

For all the Union's investment in youth programs, the effort failed. With the exception of the young scientist's organization and a lingering interest in the Cosmopolitan Club, none of the ventures survived the decade. Even Pan-Pacific Youth folded in November 1929 (although occasional youth-oriented issues of the Bulletin of the Pan-Pacific Union were published thereafter) and Kurokawa himself left the Union at this time. Like most organizations, the Union was not inclined toward a public discussion of its failures and it is difficult to ascertain what went amiss in this venture. For whatever the reasons--affluence, isolationism, distractions of the flapper age, or lack of a clearly defined purpose--the program failed to attract any significant degree of interest among the youth of Hawaii and the Pacific.

---

[65]"The Pan-Pacific Cosmopolitan Clubs," PPY, I (Mar., 1928), p. 3.

[66]"A Pan-Pacific Cosmopolitan Club in Japan," PPY, I (Sept., 1928), pp. 3-4.

As noted, the Union was also involved in an assortment of other new activities during these years. While none of them proved to be of special importance, they are of some interest. Ford, through Mid-Pacific Magazine, made an attempt to arouse public interest in preserving native Hawaiian music and, more generally, traditional Hawaiian life styles.[67] While this effort sparked little enthusiasm, it did, like so many of his other ventures, anticipate later movements directed at similar ends. Another project which was likewise ahead of its time was an effort to develop a "commercial esperanto" for Pacific Basin businessmen.[68] Finally, the Union expended some effort in an attempt to create a combination conference center-tourist attraction-historical site in the form of a reconstructed Polynesian village.[69] This project also failed, but it did suggest an idea which would prove successful for others after World War II. However, with the exception of the youth program, these various undertakings were minor in nature and do not

---

[67]Lorrin A. Thurston, "Hawaii as a Center of Music - A Vision," MPM, XXXIII (April, 1927), 311-13, and Alexander Hume Ford, "Our Passing Hawaii," MPM, XXXVIII (Sept., 1929), 203-64.

[68]For example, see Henry W. Hetzel, "A Language for Pan-Pacific," MPM, XXXIV (Aug., 1927), 121-26.

[69][Alexander Hume Ford], "A Polynesian Village at the Ocean's Crossroads," MPM, XXXIII (May, 1927), 477-80.

significantly detract from the overall success of the Union during this period.

Finally, certain internationalist activities were undertaken in Hawaii during the late 1920s by organizations unassociated with either the Union or the Institute. Perhaps the most notable event in this regard was the founding of an inter-racial Lion's Club in 1926. Inspired by the Union and assisted by Ford but still acting independently, the founders of the new group obtained special dispensation from the national Lion's Club association and proceeded to establish one of the first major non-racial clubs in Honolulu.[70] It is still active as the Lion's Club of Honolulu. In addition, local religious leaders and local foundations expressed a certain interest in internationalist activities during this period. The Reverend Theodore Richards' creation of the Friend Peace Scholarship Fund for Asian-American exchange students and his efforts, aided by local foundations, to finance the Friend Peace House at Dōshisha University in Kyoto are the most visible examples.[71]

On a broader scale, commercial interests in the Pacific and the Federal government, apparently impressed

---

[70]For further details, see Ray Jerome Baker, A Brief History of the Lion's Club of Honolulu: 1926-1946 (Honolulu, 1946).

[71]The earlier records of the principal local foundations --the Mary Castle Trust and its successor, the Samuel N. and Mary Castle Foundation, the F.C. Atherton Trust, and the Juliette Atherton Foundation--are apparently missing. However, it is generally known that they were involved in

by the earlier Pan-Pacific Commercial Congress held in Honolulu, took the initiative in calling a second conference in Los Angeles during 1928. However, nothing of lasting consequence occurred during this meeting and it had little impact upon Pacific commerce.[72] Finally, in July 1930, the local Hongwanji Mission sponsored a Pan-Pacific Young Men's Buddhist Association Conference. The first such gathering of its kind to be held anywhere in the world, it attracted 170 delegates from Hawaii and eight other Western and Asian nations. Its discussions focused upon the problems of propagating Buddhism among the world's youth and healing sectarian cleavages within the Buddhist movement.[73] Although it was, in the words of one scholar, "one of the most significant events in the annals of Buddhism," the local internationalist movement took little note of it.[74] The Union's publications, for example, do not even mention that it occurred.

Impact of Union Programs Upon Hawaii

In sum, the Pan-Pacific Union was at its apex during the 1920s. It was, to be certain, unsuccessful in many of its ventures but the failures were more than offset by such

---

[72]"The Second Pan-Pacific Commercial Congress," BPPU, 100 (May, 1928), pp. 3-5.

[73]Hunter, Buddhism in Hawaii, p. 166.

[74]Ibid.

permanent monuments to its labors as the Pacific Science Association, the Pan-Pacific Surgical Association, and the Pan-Pacific and Southeast Asia Women's Association. And there are other monuments. Among them, the new self-image which the Union fashioned for the people of Hawaii is most evident and most important. It became a factor of no mean proportions in the domestic history of the Islands and, as indicated by the following Los Angeles Times editorial, even in the relationship between Hawaii and people elsewhere:

> Radiating from Honolulu, the Pan-Pacific Union, with Gov. Farrington of Hawaii as its president and the rulers of nearly all the nations bordering on the greatest of oceans as its backers, has come to be a recognized power for the spreading of the friendly spirit of cooperation among Pacific countries near and remote.
>
> "To bring all nations and peoples about the Pacific Ocean into closer contact and relationship," says Alexander Hume Ford, founder and director-general of the organization, "has been the object of the union - to aid those in all Pacific communities to understand one another better - to bring together in round-table discussion those of all races resident in Pacific lands for their common advancement, material and spiritual."
>
> In an interview with a Tokyo correspondent of the Times, Mr. Ford summed up the points of vantage gained by the union during its seven years' existence after he had set forth its objects in the fore-going language. He said that it had assumed some of the aspects of an unofficial Pan-Pacific League of Nations. The union has not contented itself with the exchange of pretty sentiment. It has conducted a number of successful conferences, scientific, educational, commercial and, most important of all, a conference on the conservation of food and food products in the great Pacific area.
>
> While the League of Nations makes treaties to avoid war, the Pan-Pacific Union makes economic pacts that are expected to insure the world against food shortage and its inevitable results which are almost

> as horrible as the shedding of human blood on the field of battle.
>
> The Pan-Pacific Union during the seven years it has been in operation has made a close study of race problems. This study has been carried on in a broad, sympathetic manner. It is the hope of its founder as well as of its many members that this will result in bringing the nations bordering the broad Pacific so close that nothing but an unforeseen calamity or sheer insanity could cause discord of a belligerent nature . . .
>
> Los Angeles has much to gain in commercial and other ways from Pan-Pacific unity, and it can be relied upon to do its share in support of the friendly spirit of inter-racial co-operation throughout the entire Pacific area.[75]

Simply stated, much of the image of contemporary Hawaii is founded upon Pan-Pacific Union endeavors. More spectacular monuments than this are indeed rare.

---

[75]As quoted in "Pan-Pacific Unity," BPPU, 86 (April, 1927), p. 12.

CHAPTER VII

THE INSTITUTE OF PACIFIC RELATIONS

Expansion of the Internationalist Movement

The Institute of Pacific Relations was created in 1925 when Hawaii's internationalist movement was at its zenith and the Pan-Pacific Union--then synonymous with internationalism in Hawaii--was rapidly gaining a reputation as the architect of a new and better order in the Pacific. It was not, in other words, a particularly propitious moment for the formation of another internationally-oriented organization which would have to compete with the Union.

Regardless of the circumstances, the Institute was formed and its founders set it upon a course which would carry it to a far more influential and important position than the Union ever occupied. Compared with the Union, it was destined to be better organized and financed, more firmly rooted upon ideological grounds, more influential upon the course of American and Pacific politics, more representative of the Pacific Basin nations, and more successful in the task of encouraging mutual understanding among culturally divergent peoples.

Although most of the Institute's prominence came long after it moved its center of operations from Hawaii to New York and after the local internationalist movement

had largely collapsed, the fact remains that the organization was formed and its course of action determined during the years it was part of the local movement. This was one of the most crucial if not the most spectacular periods in the Institute's development, and it constitutes one of the principal chapters in the history of local internationalism.

Formation of the Institute of Pacific Relations

A certain amount of confusion surrounds the formation of the Institute of Pacific Relations. In Gwenfread C. Allen's history of the local Y.M.C.A., the only secondary source which devotes more than passing mention to the event, it is stated that Alexander Hume Ford

> . . . persuaded the Y.M.C.A. to plan a Pan-Pacific Y.M.C.A. secretaries' conference in Honolulu in 1923 . . . [and in planning the event] . . . the idea grew to consideration of the moral, economic, and political backgrounds in which men and boys [of the Pacific] lived, and the Institute of Pacific Relations was born.[1]

This summary is correct only in the most general sense. The local Y.M.C.A., long concerned with finding ways to improve inter-racial relations in Hawaii and the Pacific, did plan a conference on the problems of the Pacific area, and the idea of creating the Institute did arise during the planning process. In addition, Ford was to an extent involved in this effort. However, the actual chain of events

---

[1]Gwenfread C. Allen, The Y.M.C.A. in Hawaii: 1869-1969 (Honolulu, 1969), p. 99.

leading to the creation of the Institute was considerably more complex than Allen indicates, and Ford's contribution to the process was not nearly so important as she implies.

In 1913 Ford proposed that a Pacific-wide Y.M.C.A. meeting be convened in Hawaii. However, he never pursued the idea and it existed in limbo until 1919 when it was revived by certain Y.M.C.A. officials on the mainland. At that time, they suggested there was need for a Pacific Y.M.C.A. secretaries' training conference focused upon the question of " . . . what is fundamental and universal in Christianity and . . . how this might be made a common basis of understanding and motivation for Pacific peoples."[2] This suggestion was approved by the organization's national leadership. They chose Honolulu as the site for the gathering and selected 1923 as the date. To make the necessary arrangements, a planning committee was created composed of local Y.M.C.A. leaders and chaired by Frank C. Atherton, Chairman of the Territorial Executive Committee of the Y.M.C.A. of Hawaii and patriarch of a family intimately associated with the local Y.M.C.A. in Hawaii from the time it was founded in 1869.[3]

In the course of planning the event, Atherton's committee concluded that the purpose of the conference should be

---

[2]Honolulu Session, p. 8.

[3]Ibid., pp. 7-8.

broadened to include the full range of Pacific problems rather than simply those of immediate concern to the Y.M.C.A. and that attendance should not be restricted solely to Y.M.C.A. officials.[4] The 1923 conference was postponed, and the committee's suggestions were discussed and approved by national Y.M.C.A. officials at a meeting in Atlantic City on September 21, 1924. February 1925 was selected as the new meeting date.[5] In addition, these officials adopted four major operational guidelines for the conference which both determined the shape of the actual conference and influenced the character of the soon-to-emerge Institute. They were as summarized below:

I. The objective of the conference would be to produce greater mutual understanding through informed discussion based upon prior research.

II. The actual discussions at the conference would be frank and informal roundtable conversations rather than a formal presentation of the background research papers.

III. Action programs keyed to major problem areas illuminated during the discussions would be initiated following the conclusion of the conference.

---

[4] Ibid., p. 11.

[5] Tentative Statement Concerning a Proposed Pan-Pacific Conference on a Christian Program for the Pacific Area, undated, University of Hawaii, Hawaiian and Pacific Collection, uncataloged Institute of Pacific Relations documents. Hereafter cited as "Tentative Statement."

IV. Delegates from various Pacific countries would be selected by the Y.M.C.A. organizations in those countries solely upon the basis of the individual's local prominence and willingness to employ a Christian approach to problems. In other words, potential delegates did not have to be Christians or Y.M.C.A. members.[6]

Following the Atlantic City meeting, J. Merle Davis of the New York Y.M.C.A. and Charles F. Loomis, Executive Secretary of the local Y.M.C.A. Metropolitan Board of Directors, were hired to direct the conference. In the course of their work, the idea of using the conference as an occasion to create a separate, permanent institution based upon the foregoing objectives and procedures was broached. Atherton's committee favored the notion and raised it again at a previously scheduled conference fund-raising meeting held in New York during February 1925. Those in attendance, mostly men of national prominence in business and educational circles, reacted with enthusiasm. A Committee on Permanent Organization under the chairmanship of Stanford President (and later Secretary of the Interior under President Hoover) Ray Lyman Wilbur was formed to refine and promote the concept prior to the convention,

---

[6]Honolulu Session, p. 12. Although the scope of the conference was broadened, the principal theme remained a Christian approach to inter-racial problems in the Pacific. See "Tentative Statement" for examples.

now scheduled for the summer of 1925.[7] With the willing cooperation of the Y.M.C.A., similar committees were formed in China, Japan, Australia, and Canada.[8] In early summer, Wilbur's group came forth with a proposal calling for the creation of an Institute of Pacific Relations based upon the following statement of purpose and scope:

> The Institute of Pacific Relations is a body of men and women deeply interested in the Pacific area, who meet and work, not as representatives of their Governments, or of any other organizations, but as individuals in order to promote the well-being of the peoples concerned.
>
> The scope of the work of the Institute and the means to be employed in that work will be determined largely by its form of organization and the extent of its financial support.
>
> Its main efforts will be devoted to collecting and elucidating the facts of international significance, which, by their influence in guiding public opinion, may assist constructively the development of the countries concerned; to urging the improvement of legal and administrative procedure where present methods tend to hinder international harmony and good feeling; and directly to promoting international friendship by personal association and by the study of economic, educational, social, political, moral and religious conditions with a view to their improvement.
>
> The Institute aims to keep its work practical, so that it may be of direct service in the removal of difficulties in international relations and in the promotion of constructive measures of assistance.
>
> Scientific investigations of questions that may be purely academic for the present, although ultimately of vital importance, as for example, the biological and social effects of race intermixture or the best means of financing countries in need, are to be undertaken so far as financial resources permit.
>
> In all of its work, the Institute will cooperate with other organizations of similar purpose, so as to achieve the best and most far-reaching results.[9]

---

[7] Honolulu Session, pp. 20-22.

[8] Ibid., pp. 22-23.

[9] Ibid., pp. 26-27.

This statement (which also included suggestions pertaining to possible administrative and financial arrangements) was founded upon the assumption that the proposed organization would in time sever all direct relationship with the Y.M.C.A. and become an independent, self-governing entity. Such a development, in fact, came to pass shortly after the statement was circulated. The Y.M.C.A., apparently convinced that the organization would be viable, willingly relinquished all control during the spring of 1925.[10] For all practical purposes, then, the Institute of Pacific Relations came into existence as an independent body even before its first formal meeting was convened.[11]

With reference to Allen's previously cited comment, it should be noted that the Pan-Pacific Union played no major role in these deliberations. Ford, as mentioned, did propose a Pacific-wide Y.M.C.A. gathering long before the organization itself became interested in the idea. However, he did not follow through on the matter. It was the Y.M.C.A., not Ford or the Union, which revived the proposal. As noted previously, when the possibility of such a gathering was revived, Ford added it to the list of anticipated Pan-Pacific conferences but did not, at least so far as any records indicate, assume an active part in

---

[10] Ibid., pp. 23-24.

[11] "The Origin of the Institute of Pacific Relations," MPM, XXX (Oct., 1925), 302. Hereafter cited as "Origin."

promoting or planning it.[12] In fact, the March 1924 issue of the Bulletin of the Pan-Pacific Union carried a brief article to the effect that the Union would not be involved with the anticipated Y.M.C.A. conference.[13]

All of this is not, however, to suggest that this conference was the source of antagonism in the relationship between the Union and the Y.M.C.A. or, later, the Institute. On the contrary, at least according to all available documentation, the relationship was both warm and close. When the conference met, Ford addressed it in a highly complimentary fashion. His opening remarks were as follow:

> The Pan-Pacific Union realizes that a large part of its mission is being fulfilled in the formation of the Institute of Pacific Relations. It rejoices in the wonderful success that has attended the first sessions of the Institute and earnestly hopes that these may increase in strength and force through many such interracial gatherings in the future of the brilliant intellects from Pacific lands.
>
> While the Pan-Pacific Union has no part in the deliberations of the Institute, it sincerely welcomes this new sister organization that promises to play a prominent and distinguished part in the bringing about of better understanding among the peoples of the Pacific. Such an organization is the need of the era--an organization of academic men who can calmly sit about the round table and discuss the

---

[12]This is so according to his own recollection. See "At a Pan-Pacific Luncheon in Honolulu," MPM, XXX (Aug., 1925), 151.

[13]"The Pan-Pacific Conferences," BPPU, 53 (Mar., 1924), p. 11.

> trying, fretting problems of immigration, race equality or supremacy, white Australia and yellow Asia, and point out, perhaps, peaceful solutions.[14]

In a letter from Atherton to Ford the Institute returned the compliments. It reads in part:

> When some five or six years ago you proposed that the Young Men's Christian Association call a conference of Association leaders and secretaries about the Pacific ocean to confer on matters of interest to the association movement, and also concerning the welfare and human relations of the peoples of these countries, many did not take the suggestion very seriously. I am glad, however, to advise you that the suggestion made at that time and urged on several occasions since has produced tangible results . . . .
>
> We wish to express to the Pan-Pacific Union, and to yourself personally, our appreciation for the suggestion which originally came from you regarding the holding of such a conference and the cooperation you have rendered from time to time. We trust that we can still have the assistance of the Pan-Pacific Union when necessary, and the publicity which you can give us through your monthly bulletin.[15]

Subsequently, the Union issued a statement explaining the relationship between the Institute and itself which, in explaining the difference in their respective approaches, went to some length to emphasize that mutual respect and cooperation characterized the relationship between the two organizations. (See Appendix C.)[16] Finally, the Union's

---

[14]Alexander Hume Ford, "The Pan-Pacific Union's Welcome," BPPU, 67 (Aug., 1925), p. 7.

[15]"Origin," p. 302.

[16]"A Statement of the Relationship Between the Pan-Pacific Union and the Institute of Pacific Relations," MPM, XXXIV (Aug., 1927), inside cover.

various publications devoted considerable space to the Institute's activities over the years and, to a lesser degree, the Institute reciprocated through its publications.

When the long-awaited organizational conference finally convened at Punahou School during the first two weeks in July 1925, it was immediately apparent that the several preparation committees had performed well. One hundred eight delegates from nine Pacific lands (Australia, New Zealand, the Philippines, China, Japan, Korea, Hawaii, the United States, and Canada) plus three at-large delegates were present. They were joined by thirty-one observers.[17] A series of round-table discussions directed at such specific points of tension as racial exclusion policies (the United States had just adopted the discriminatory Immigration Act of 1924), arms reduction, and industrial development were conducted as planned.[18] Press coverage was both extensive (the Chicago Daily News sent a special reporter to cover the event directly[19]) and complimentary as indicated by the following extracts from a Star Bulletin editorial:

> The Institute of Pacific Relations is underway--an "adventure in friendship," it has been called . . . .
>
> More than a hundred men and women are working together for two weeks to find common bases of

---

[17] Honolulu Session, pp. 35-40.

[18] Ibid., pp. 27-34.

[19] Institute of Pacific Relations (Honolulu, 1925), p. 10.

> understanding and cooperation in the Pacific area. This two weeks has been preceded by years of preparation. In fact, most of the events of Pacific history have been a preparation for the day when a concerted effort should be made to settle problems in a spirit of mutual tolerance and mutual aid . . . .
>
> [As a coral reef grows by particles, so] does man progress from the primitive to the really civilized. This Institute of Pacific Relations is adding a particle--it may be no more or it may be a great deal more--to the structure of human security, tranquility and happiness.
>
> And one particle added to that steadily growing structure is worth the effort of assembling and carrying on this "adventure in friendship."
>
> But we hope and believe that more than a minute stone will be added to the edifice. The groups here from various countries . . . can develop out of this first Institute a real step toward international harmony and cooperation in the Pacific.[20]

More important, the delegates gave their approval to the work of Wilbur's committee and the Institute was formally established. Officers were elected (Wilbur, Chairman; Atherton, Vice Chairman; and L. Tenny Peck, Treasurer), a Secretariat was established in Honolulu (headed by Davis and Loomis[21]), and the various national

---

[20] SB, July 1, 1925, p. 6.

[21] The "Hawaii as a model" theme developed by the Union was employed as the rationale for establishing the Secretariat in Honolulu. See "Handbook of the Institute of Public Relations," Bruno Lasker, ed., Problems of the Pacific, 1931: Proceedings of the Fourth Conference of the Institute of Pacific Relations, Hangchow and Shanghai, China, October 21-November 2 (Chicago, 1932), p. 521. Hereafter cited as Problems of the Pacific, 1931. However, as the Institute grew to depend less upon the Hawaii group following its formation, this theme was less frequently mentioned. The Union, not the Institute, is responsible for making it a part of the local self-image.

delegations agreed to organize units within their own countries.[22] Finally and of more than passing interest with regard to future activities, the estimated costs of the conference totalled $75,000 (although the actual cost was only some $50,000) and Atherton's committee raised approximately $71,000 even before the meeting convened.[23] The conference adjourned on an optimistic note with a decision to hold a second gathering in Honolulu during 1927. As Atherton put it shortly afterwards:

> The Institute passed off very well indeed, and we feel more than repaid for the effort put forth and the results accomplished. There was a splendid spirit throughout the conference and we all feel that we had laid the foundation for something worthwhile.[24]

Between 1925 and 1927, most of the organizational details were finalized. Davis, as General Secretary, and

---

[22] Institute of Pacific Relations, pp. 3-4. In fact, all of the administrative and organizational details mentioned here were, for all practical purposes, decided on June 30, 1925 before the conference really got underway. On that day Wilbur called an executive committee meeting which produced all the foregoing decisions on officers and administrators. The delegates may, thus, have served in more of a "rubber stamp" capacity than is immediately apparent. "Minutes of Executive Meeting, Institute of Pacific Relations," June 30, 1925, University of Hawaii, Hawaiian and Pacific Collection, uncataloged Institute of Pacific Relations documents.

[23] Honolulu Session, p. 25. $25,000 was raised on the mainland (with John D. Rockefeller Jr. contributing $10,000), a like amount raised through smaller contributions in Hawaii, and the remainder was raised within the various participating countries.

[24] Atherton to Carter, July 23, 1925, University of Hawaii, Hawaiian and Pacific Collection, uncataloged Institute of Pacific Relations documents.

Loomis, as Assistant General Secretary, traveled throughout Asia and North America promoting the organization of national units. By 1927, six such units--in Japan, China, New Zealand, Australia, Canada, and the United States--were organized and functioning. In addition, local units were created in Seoul, Manila, and Honolulu. In later years, the number of local units increased to upwards of a hundred. Finally, a Pacific Council comprised of the Institute's elected officers plus a representative from each national unit was created to provide overall leadership for the organization and the Secretariat was placed under its direction (see Appendix D).

The Institute, as noted, spent some $50,000 during 1925 and another $32,000 was expended on organizational and administrative matters in 1926. Fund raising activities, however, produced income sufficient to cover all expenses. Substantial grants by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace ($15,000) and the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial ($10,000) were helpful in this regard. A second grant from the latter institution (a sum of $15,000 annually for a three-year period beginning in 1927) enabled the Secretariat to retain Dr. J.B. Condliffe of New Zealand as Research Secretary. He established a liaison with the Social Science Research Council and, drawing at least in part upon their advice, initiated the Institute's first

research project.[25] In addition, a newsletter--the Institute News Bulletin--was started in May 1926. It was the beginning of a long and impressive list of periodicals issued under Institute auspices.[26]

With the major organizational arrangement accomplished, the Institute's second conference during the summer of 1927 was devoted almost exclusively to round-table discussions of contemporary social and political issues in the Pacific. Twelve delegations (totalling 137 individuals), representing the nine countries present at the 1925 meeting plus Great Britain, the League of Nations, and the International Labor Office, met once again at Punahou School.[27] Their discussions centered upon certain aspects of trade tariffs, extra-territoriality, immigration/emigration policies, international education, and the League's mandate system.[28] All discussions were based upon background research papers

---

[25]J.B. Condliffe, ed., Problems of the Pacific: Proceedings of the Second Conference of the Institute of Pacific Relations, Honolulu, Hawaii, July 15 to 29, 1927 (Chicago 1928), pp. 591-93. Hereafter cited as Problems of the Pacific, 1927.

[26]Institute of Pacific Relations Publications on the Pacific: 1925-1952 (New York, 1953), pp. 98-100. Hereafter cited as Publications on the Pacific.

[27]Problems of the Pacific, 1927, pp. 597-602.

[28]Ibid., pp. 65-217. See these pages for a summary transcript of the discussions.

as before, but the papers in this instance were far more comprehensive and complete.[29] Finally, the various organizational arrangements worked out over the 1925-27 period were formalized in a constitution adopted on the final day of the gathering.[30] As before, the delegates elected to convene again in two years before they adjourned the conference.

In many respects then, the 1927 conference signaled the end of the Institute's formative period and the beginning of a new era where the previously developed operational formula would be tested. Initial testing occurred during the 1927-29 period and the results were encouraging. In the area of research--destined to become the Institute's most important area of endeavor--Condliffe and his associates established the Institute as an agency from which its own members, universities, and other individual researchers might obtain research grants. There was no attempt to create a research staff in the Honolulu headquarters capable of undertaking all projects of concern to the Institute. During this period, some $34,000 was granted to fund eighteen different projects ranging from a study of Malayan emigration to an examination of industrialism in Tientsin, China. In addition, another five projects

---

[29] Ibid., pp. 221-593. See these pages for a reproduction of the papers.

[30] Ibid., pp. 607-10.

were funded through a special $40,600 grant from the Social Science Research Council.[31] One of these projects was George B. Cressey's study of Chinese geography which later became the principal English-language reference on the subject.

Closely related to the research program during these years was the Institute's publication program. The proceedings of the various conferences were published, and several brief informational pamphlets on the Institute and the Pacific Basin were also prepared. However, none of the major research projects underway reached the publication stage until later. More important at this time was the initiation of Pacific Affairs in May 1928 as a combination monthly news bulletin and scholarly journal replacing the aforementioned Institute News Bulletin. Beginning as a magazine of some forty pages with an approximate circulation of 1200, it grew to an average of eighty pages per issue and a circulation of some 2000 by 1929.[32] Under Owen Lattimore's editorship during the 1930s, the magazine became a respected scholarly journal, and it continued as the Institute's main publication until December 1960 when the Institute itself

---

[31] J.B. Condliffe, ed., Problems of the Pacific: Proceedings of the Third Conference of the Institute of Pacific Relations, Nara and Kyoto, Japan, October 28 to November 9, 1929 (Chicago, 1930), pp. 666-68. Hereafter cited as Problems of the Pacific, 1929.

[32] Ibid., pp. 670-71.

folded. At that time, the University of British Columbia assumed publication of the journal and it is still in existence. As some measure of its impact, its circulation reached a high of 4,500 in 1948 and again in 1969. However, it dropped to 3,000 in 1970.[33]

At the organizational level, Davis and Loomis continued as the principal secretariat officers, but were joined by Dr. Hawkling Yen and Keichi Yamasaki as Associate General Secretaries during the late 1920s. A librarian was retained to supervise a growing collection of books and documents (some 2,000 items in 1929) which was housed in the University of Hawaii's library. In addition, as a measure of the Secretariat's activity, the services of an office manager and eight assistants were required to handle the assorted correspondence and records. The costs of such an operation were high. In 1929, for example, expenditures (including grants) exceeded $100,000. However, the Institute was consistently successful in its fund raising efforts and avoided running a deficit.[34]

Throughout this period, the four secretaries traveled extensively in Europe, the Soviet Union, North America,

---

[33] Ayer Directory of Publications, 1937-1970 (Philadelphia, 1937-1970). Hereafter cited as Ayer Directory by the year. Pacific Affairs is not listed in the pre-1937 editions.

[34] Problems of the Pacific, 1929, p. 677.

Asia, and Australasia. As a consequence, new branches were established in Great Britain and France while the Netherlands, Mexico, and the Soviet Union expressed an interest in joining.[35] During the next decade, both the Soviet Union and the Netherlands joined the Institute as, still later, did India and Pakistan. The Netherlands, the Soviet Union, and China, however, did not maintain their membership, thus leaving Japan, the Philippines, Australia, New Zealand, India, Pakistan, Great Britain, France, Canada, and the United States as members in 1960 when the Institute collapsed.[36] In addition to laying the groundwork for an expanded membership, the secretaries' travels during the late 1920s also produced stronger ties between the Institute and both the League and the International Labor Office.[37]

In sum, when the Institute gathered for its third conference at Nara and Kyoto during the fall of 1929, its essential operational features were rather well established. The procedures and practices developed prior to the 1927 conference and put into operation thereafter had, in the main, proved satisfactory. Many conferences would follow (including several in the midst of war[38]), new people would

---

[35] Ibid., pp. 674-76.

[36] Korea, present at the first several conferences, never actually joined the organization.

[37] Problems of the Pacific, 1929, p. 676.

[38] Hangchow/Shanghai (1931), Banff (1933), Yosemite National Park (1936), Virginia Beach, Virginia (1939),

move into positions of leadership, and additional research projects would be initiated, but the basic modus operandi developed during the 1925-29 period would prevail into the 1950s when the Institute ran afoul of the McCarthy anti-Communist campaign and was destroyed.

The Institute's drive toward institutional development during its early years was not restricted solely to operational procedures. Unlike the Union, it devoted considerable energy to an effort aimed at formulating a philosophic rationale for its operational activities. This effort centered upon the Institute's acceptance of "peaceful change" as its ultimate goal and, more precisely, the particular interpretation which the organization applied to the term. Although the Institute never adopted an official stance on war as an instrument of policy, one of its basic assumptions held war as an evil to be avoided and that avoidance is possible only through an adjustment of conflicting national interests--national interests which are invariably conceived as national rights by the nations in question. This being the case, the Institute felt (but again did not take a formal position) that any long-term and reasonably permanent adjustment of conflicting national interests had to be built around an international standardization of national

---

Mt. Tremblant, Quebec (1942), Hot Springs, Virginia (1945), Stratford-upon-Avon, England (1947), Lucknow, India (1950), Kyoto (1954) and Lahore, Pakistan (1958).

rights. The organization was aware that such a change would require a prior modification in prevailing attitudes toward national sovereignty and felt that such a modification might result either from the establishment of a functional supra-national organization or from the acceptance of a new eithical standard in traditional international relations. While the Institute realized it could never hope to impose either of these conditions upon the world or even the Pacific, it did feel that it could contribute to the necessary preconditions by sponsoring activities designed to produce a more precise definition of national rights and responsibilities--a more reasonable balance between force and justice--and thus enhance the opportunities for peaceful change while decreasing the likelihood of violent change.[39]

Such reasoning explains the Institute's operational emphasis--research on points of international contention as background data for discussions on the same points both within and, hopefully, without the organization's structure. The Institute's research was not, thus, research for its own sake. It was operational research directed at specific issues and founded upon decidedly utilitarian hopes. The abstract was deliberately avoided. In short, the Institute

---

[39]For further discussion, see Henry F. Angus, The Problems of Peaceful Change in the Pacific Area (London, 1937), pp. 3-12.

believed peaceful change to be the cumulative end product of a continuing effort to reach specific understandings on specific disagreements, and unlike many internationally-oriented groups including the Pan-Pacific Union, saw value in organizations of an international character only to the extent that they were equipped to deal with the resolution of specific grievances. International activity without so precise an end in mind was of little interest to the Institute.

Local Activities of the Institute

By the early 1930s it was clear that the Institute had outgrown any earlier dependence upon the local internationalist movement. Atherton was the only person from Hawaii still occupying an elected leadership position within the Institute, and the Secretariat, although located in Honolulu, was likewise dominated by individuals from elsewhere. The Institute had, in other words, outgrown Hawaii and ceased, for all practical purposes, to be a part of the local internationalist movement. Still, as the Institute maintained its headquarters in Honolulu and local internationalists maintained an active if no longer dominant role in its activities, some effort to at least outline these activities is in order.

These activities occurred at two levels--those undertaken by the international Secretariat and those initiated by the local unit of the Institute. With the exception of

personnel changes, the Secretariat functioned as previously described during the early years of the decade.[40] These functions are explained in more detail in an article published by the Institute in 1932:

> The Central Secretariat at Honolulu acts as a clearing house or connecting link between the various groups. Its functions consist mainly in the interchange of information between the groups, the organization of the conference arrangements and program, coordination of research activities, and publication of a monthly journal, Pacific Affairs. As far as possible the organization is decentralized, the ultimate power and initiative residing in the constituent national groups. Conference programs are built out of an interchange of suggestions between the groups, and research activities are decentralized in the same way.
>
> The journal of the Institute, Pacific Affairs, has a steadily expanding circulation and is recognized widely as of increasing value to all students of Pacific problems. In addition to authoritative articles, it contains each month summaries of important Pacific happenings, extracts from editorial opinion, book reviews, and an extensive review of magazine and pamphlet literature relating to the Pacific.
>
> The Institute has also accumulated at Honolulu a specialized library on Pacific problems which is particularly rich in such materials as pamphlets, magazine articles, government reports, and newsclippings. As this collection is built up with the cooperation of the national groups, it is increasingly valuable for research students.[41]

---

[40]Two important personnel changes occurred during this period. Davis resigned as General Secretary in 1930 and was replaced by Loomis who served in an acting capacity until Edward C. Carter assumed the position in 1933. Condliffe resigned as Research Secretary in 1931 and was replaced by W.L. Holland who is active still today as a faculty member of the University of British Columbia and editor of Pacific Affairs.

[41]Problems of the Pacific, 1931, p. 525. For a more detailed monthly review of these activities during the 1928-33 period, see the "Institute Notes" section of Pacific Affairs. Periodical hereafter cited as IN .

The Hawaii branch was active in a different fashion. Prior to 1931, little activity occurred aside from the annual election of officers and an occasional meeting called to hear a particular speaker (see Appendix E). In 1931, however, the group was reorganized in an effort to expand its research and educational programming potential, and it subsequently initiated a number of new activities and programs.[42] In mid-1931, a special radio program was initiated on local station KGMB featuring Atherton, ex-Governor Farrington, and University of Hawaii President David L. Crawford discussing the role and importance of the Institute.[43] Similar programs were sponsored periodically thereafter. In the following year, a research project involving the compilation of various data on the Pacific Basin was initiated in cooperation with the Department of Public Instruction.[44] This project evolved into an on-going program concerning the production of new school textbooks on Asia.

Perhaps the most significant project this group initiated during these years was the Student Institute of Pacific Relations Conference. First convened in December 1931, this event brought local high school and college

---

[42] IN, IV (May, 1931), 466.

[43] IN, IV (Oct., 1931), 953-54.

[44] IN, V (Aug., 1932), 765.

students together for discussions on Pacific affairs in much the same manner the parent organization met at its periodic gatherings.[45] Sponsored annually throughout the 1930s, this event evolved into the current Pacific and Asian Affairs Council discussion program.

Beginning in 1933, a series of changes occurred within the international Secretariat which in time further altered the already weakened relationship between the Institute and the internationalist movement in Hawaii. In that year, Lattimore assumed the editorship of Pacific Affairs and moved the magazine's offices to New York where they were relocated in the Institute's American Council headquarters. In addition, he changed its format from a monthly journal of news items and brief articles to a quarterly publication concerned almost solely with matters of scholarly interest. In the process, the magazine's "Institute Notes" section was dropped and a new publication entitled Institute of Pacific Relations Notes was started in October 1934. It was published until December 1938.

This change was instrumental in initiating a debate over the purpose and tactics of the Institute which in turn resulted in the closing of the Secretariat's Honolulu office in 1936 and its eventual removal to New York. As

---

[45] IN, V (Jan., 1932), 109.

indicated by the change in Pacific Affairs format, Lattimore and Edward C. Carter, a former Y.M.C.A. official who became General Secretary in 1933, believed that the Institute should move away from its earlier low-key operational approach and adopt a more academic but also more vocal posture which would allow the Institute to be primarily concerned with the illumination of controversial issues in the Pacific. Above all, such a proposal suggested that Japan was destined to receive increasingly harsh criticism from the Institute, and many who opposed the proposed changes did so because they feared Japan would leave the organization (although it did not) and thereby contribute to its breakup.

The Hawaii group, in particular, reacted against this proposal. Led by Atherton and Loomis (who resigned from the Secretariat to become Secretary of the local branch after Carter became General Secretary), a debate ensued. Atherton, in a lengthy letter to the Chairman of the Pacific Council, Wilson's former Secretary of War Newton D. Baker, summarized the issues at point with fair clarity. It is worth reproducing in near full form:

> We believe it is well to remind ourselves that the Institute of Pacific Relations, not being endowed and having no governmental backing, is entirely dependent upon voluntary gifts of time and money, In as much also as it has no authority, other than moral, its effectiveness in accomplishing its purpose depends upon its influence on the free will of men which is determined largely by their receptivity.
>
> We must not forget that the I.P.R. when founded ten years ago rode upon the crest of a practically

world wide wave of internationalism which affected the leaders of public opinion and also the masses of the peoples living around the Pacific. These people were potentially friendly and ready to receive our influence and accept our leadership. Now, the pendulum has swung to the other extreme and leaders and masses alike are gripped by the spirit of nationalism. For the present we are attempting to swim upstream against a strong current . . .

We believe, however, that the original primary purpose of the Institute needs more emphasis in the future than it has received in recent years. The founders of the I.P.R. desired that there should be developed in the various peoples of the Pacific area the will to good relations and an intelligent basis therefor.

The will to good relations has in part an ethical basis: in part it is based on the belief that harmonious contacts are advantageous. At no time has the Institute emphasized the emotional appeal. We have doubted the wisdom of such appeals and recognized the ease with which they get out of hand. Our emphasis has been rational. Nevertheless the great bulk of human actions are not rational, they arise from our desires and antipathies. It would be a mistake wholly to ignore the promotion of good will as an essential feature of ethical, altruistic and religious conduct.

We have proceeded on the assumption that our chief task was to overcome ignorance. In part this means general illimination; in part it means throwing light on specific problems, situations and issues. This has led us into fact-finding enterprises.

Many of our research projects are concerned with tendencies and trends which look to the future rather than the immediate present. Undoubtedly they are of value, but on the other hand we feel not enough attention has been given to matters and problems that are causing friction now and ill will among the peoples of some of the Pacific countries. We also feel that little attention has been given to popular opinion and motivation. They are of the greatest importance. It is not enough to know the facts of a given situation, but we must know what the parties thereto think of the facts and how they feel about them.

If the I.P.R. is to have influence in the direction of good relations between Pacific peoples, it must reach a much larger and more diverse group. Following the first two conferences held in Honolulu there was considerable interest in widespread educational effort. This has not been sufficiently developed. As it now stands the membership of the I.P.R. embraces but a small number of persons. No matter how much they know

or how well disposed they may be, little can be accomplished unless substantial numbers can be reached.

It is time to decide just what we are driving at. If we are not trying merely to enlighten the small group comprised in our membership, but to accomplish something of broad inter-racial and international scope we would do well to shape our program accordingly. Most of us shy off from propaganda and publicity, so let us call it education. It is well to get knowledge, but there comes a time when something needs to be done with it.

The present trend seems to be to transform the I.P.R. to too much of a pure research organization without due regard for the practical application of the results . . . . To prevent the Institute from becoming "too academic" we must secure more active participation on the part of business and industrial leaders in all countries.

Commercial rivalries are unquestionably at the bottom of much of the friction that is apparent in the Pacific area. Up to the present time we have not secured the active interest of any large group of outstanding business men in the various countries. Following the first two conferences a certain number of business leaders in various Pacific countries gave time and financial support but their numbers have decreased in recent years. This is not entirely due to the psychology of the times for in America, Japan and other countries, groups of business men have substantially increased their contributions to organizations concerned with international relations. This is one of the weaknesses of the I.P.R. and unless we can arouse the interest of this group and have them participate actively in the work we are doing, it is apparent that we will not accomplish the results we are looking for . . . .

Every effort should be made to secure a representative group of business leaders from the various countries at the next conference. It might be well to set apart a special time for this group to get together and consider the problems which these countries are facing from a commercial standpoint, and secure, if possible, ideas and suggestions from them as to how we could get a more active participation by business leaders in the Institute's program.

There is another group which we tried to interest originally, but which has not been particularly active for some time past, and that is the large group represented by organized labor. While many may question the wisdom of trying to enlist the active participation of this group we must recognize that standards of living

wages and hours of employment of the workers in industry and agriculture have a very direct bearing on international relationships and present real problems which must be faced. How to secure more active participation and interest of this group is another phase of our work that must receive careful thought. Some definite plans and policies should be considered and discussed.

While a few of the leading newspapers of the different countries publish extracts from time to time from material gathered by the Institute, few of them are devoting much space in their papers--particularly in the editorial columns--to the Institute and its program. We should therefore devise ways and means of getting the owners and editors of newspapers informed as to the Institute and actively interested in what we are seeking to do. We think the only way this can be accomplished is by seeking to enlist the interest of two or three outstanding men in the various countries to interview personally the owners and editors of some of the leading newspapers and magazines of their countries to acquaint them fully with the Institute and to try to secure their cooperation.

Another field which is not receiving much attention is that of the young people in high schools and colleges. Here a great deal of valuable work can be done. Discussion groups should be started or conferences should be inaugurated among groups of students--not only to inform them in regard to problems in other countries, but also to enlist their active interest in the program and policies of the Institute.

If short condensed statements of some of the research material could be gotten into the hands of business and professional men and educators throughout the various countries, their interest might be secured. With the great mass of material that comes to the attention of men and women prominent in public life today, they have little time to read articles that are long or present involved problems. Consequently, if we are to secure their interest, material must be presented to them in brief form, but very clearly and forcefully; and at the present time the Institute does not seem to be doing this . . . .

At the present time the number of people interested in the Institute is very limited and it would seem that the various groups in participating countries have been too exclusive in their membership and their appeal to people. Unless the number of those interested can be greatly increased, the Institute's influence will not grow.

> Furthermore, we believe that there has been a tendency for the Institute to be too much of an Occidental institution rather than an international organization of and for the Pacific Region.[46]

This debate was carried on throughout the period in a number of polite but firm letters and memoranda expressing the various participant's points of view.[47] Resolution came at the Institute's gathering at Yosemite National Park in the fall of 1936 where it was decided to close the Hawaii headquarters. Secretariat officials, it was also decided, would center their operations on the mainland and concentrate more fully upon activities pertaining to academic research. The Institute's library was left at the University of Hawaii (where it was later absorbed into the University's collection), but all other operations were, like Pacific Affairs, moved to the American Council's headquarters in New York.[48] In short, the position of the Hawaii group was rejected and the Institute, now virtually unassociated with the local internationalist movement, entered upon a new, more cerebral period.[49]

---

[46]Atherton to Baker, Jan. 14, 1936, University of Hawaii, Hawaiian and Pacific Collection, uncataloged Institute of Pacific Relations Documents.

[47]Unfortunately, the document collection in Hawaii contains, at least so far as can be determined, only those papers originated in Hawaii. The position of Carter, Lattimore and other mainland Institute leaders is referenced in the available materials but no actual documents are available.

[48]Statements made to the author by Miss Janet Bell and Mrs. George Kaufman.

[49]W.L. Holland and Kate L. Mitchell, eds., Problems of

The principal effect of this decision upon the Institute's activities in Hawaii was simply to loosen still further the ties between the central office and the local branch. It did not appear to affect any on-going local projects. Text book research, the student conferences, and periodic public meetings continued. A new lecture series was initiated and a number of well known speakers--including scholar-diplomat Hu Shih and Karl Wittfogel, a prominent China scholar--were presented to the public.[50] Nor was there obvious bitterness between the local and parent organizations. Relations were maintained and various Secretariat officials visited on numerous occasions. Lattimore, in fact, was one of the speakers in the afore-mentioned lecture series.[51] Indeed, the only visible change was the closure of the original headquarters at 1641 South Beretania Street and the opening of a new, smaller office in the Dillingham Building in downtown Honolulu.[52]

Activities in Honolulu continued in this fashion until the outbreak of World War II when most of the local activists

---

the Pacific, 1936: Aims and Results of Social and Economic Policies in Pacific Countries (Chicago, 1937), p. 459.

[50] Institute of Pacific Relations Notes, 9 (Feb., 1938), p. 27. Periodical hereafter cited as IPRN.

[51] Ibid. However, Atherton did criticize Lattimore for being too "anti-Japanese" in the speech. See Atherton to Lattimore, Feb. 10, 1938, University of Hawaii, Hawaiian and Pacific Collection, uncataloged Institute of Pacific Relations Documents.

[52] IPRN, 8 (June, 1937), pp. 16-17.

became involved in the war effort. Loomis, for example, put aside his duties as Secretary to head the Morale Section of the military government (responsible for overseeing local inter-racial relations[53]) while others served in various capacities both locally and abroad. At the conclusion of the war, Loomis returned to his old position and the pre-war programs were resumed. The youth forums were given particular emphasis and came to constitute the bulk of the local programming effort.[54] By 1952 they had evolved into a complete program fully occupying Loomis and his staff. As a consequence of this shift in emphasis, the Dillingham Building office was given up and a house near the University of Hawaii--in closer proximity to the Institute's principal source of participation--was purchased as a new headquarters. Named the "Pacific House," this building was utilized first by the Institute and later by the Pacific and Asian Affairs Council (its successor organization) until it was demolished in the late 1960s. At that time an adjoining residence was obtained and is still in use as the latter organization's offices.

---

[53] I.P.R. in Wartime: Annual Report of the American Council of the Institute of Pacific Relations, Incorporated: 1941-43 (New York, 1944), pp. 34-35.

[54] See the annual reports of the American Council of the Institute of Pacific Relations, Incorporated for this period.

The formation of the Pacific and Asian Affairs Council is the major episode remaining in the history of the Institute's local branch, and it is an episode constituting one of the many chapters in the record of the McCarthy era. When the Institute's central organization came under the scrutiny of the anti-communist movement during the early 1950s and suffered what proved to be a fatal attack upon its integrity, the local unit's initial response was one of outrage and indignation. Statements defending the parent organization were issued, and it was even suggested that the central headquarters be returned to Honolulu where harassment might be less intense. Local leaders categorically rejected all suggestions that they change either the organization's name or its principles in an attempt to avoid the rising tide of hysteria.[55] Such a posture was maintained for approximately a year.[56] Then, apparently in response to pressures applied by the local anti-communist movement, their will collapsed. A meeting was called in December 1953 to dissolve the local branch of the Institute and create in its place the Pacific and Asian Affairs Council.[57]

---

[55]"Minutes of the Institute of Pacific Relations of Hawaii Meeting," August 12, 1952, Pacific and Asian Affairs Council, Institute of Pacific Relations Papers.

[56]For example, see Conant to Membership, May 22, 1953, Pacific and Asian Affairs Council, Institute of Pacific Relations Papers.

[57]"Notice of Special Meeting of the Members of the Institute of Pacific Relations of Hawaii to be Held on December 15, 1953," Dec. 8, 1953, Pacific and Asian Affairs Council, Institute of Pacific Relations Papers.

J. Ballard Atherton, then president of the local branch, explained in a letter to the membership that the purpose of the change was simply to emphasize the long-time independence of the organization.[58] That it had long been independent is true enough, but the unmentioned fact was that it could no longer maintain the "Institute of Pacific Relations" title if it hoped to obtain continued support from the local community. McCarthy, McCarran, and their ilk thus claimed another victim.

Contributions of the Local Branch

Although the Pacific and Asian Affairs Council did continue the youth program developed by the Institute and, in that sense, does represent a continuation of the earlier organization, the fact remains that the Institute as conceived and developed by the local internationalist movement long ago collapsed. It did, however, survive in its original form long enough to compile an enviable record both in terms of its own stated objectives and in contrast with the record of the Pan-Pacific Union, its chief "competition" within the context of the local internationalist movement.

---

[58]Atherton to Membership, Dec. 11, 1953, Pacific and Asian Affairs Council, Institute of Pacific Relations Papers.

CHAPTER VIII

COLLAPSE OF THE MOVEMENT: 1930-1940

Factors Underlying the Collapse

The eventual collapse of the Pan-Pacific Union and, for all intents and purposes, the entire internationalist movement in Hawaii was forecast by the spread of the Depression and the growth of Japanese militarism after 1930.[1] The Depression eliminated most of the Union's financial support as both governments and individuals experienced increasing difficulty in meeting their own immediate needs. In the process, interest in the Union's activities virtually disappeared. By the end of the decade, the Union, unable to generate either funds or interest, was no longer viable.

The growth of Japanese militarism, symptomatic of the rise of nationalism throughout the Pacific and around the world prior to World War II, dealt an even more deadly blow to the aspirations of the Union. Standing for international harmony and cooperation when most nations were girding for

---

[1]The Institute of Pacific Relations, directed as it was toward academic techniques and less dependent upon government and popular support, was able to survive this period. However, as previously noted, its central headquarters had been removed to the mainland where its primary support lay, and it had been transformed into a national rather than local organization. Still, it did maintain a branch operation in Honolulu and, to that limited extent, the local internationalist movement survived the collapse of the Union.

war, the Union became irrelevant. It could neither forsake its own purposes nor change those of the nations. Against such a background, its collapse became inevitable.

The Union, however, was slow to recognize its gloomy fate. Caught up in the enthusiasm of the 1920s, it continued upon the course established during that decade. Some five years passed before it appeared to realize that the 1930 women's conference was to be its last significant undertaking. The Union's lack of foresight is, at the same time, understandable. Few persons realized that the Depression would assume such gigantic proportions, and, on the other hand, Hawaii was never so severely affected as the rest of the nation even after the disaster reached its full scale. The Union, hence, was never forced to directly confront the worst ravages of the Depression and never realized until it was too late that a drastic reordering of its programs and procedures was necessary.

The Union's failure to foresee dire consequences in the Japanese invasion of Manchuria--especially when it occurred against a background of nearly three decades of increasingly militant and expansionist Japanese activity in northeast Asia--is less understandable. Although the Japanese move promised to bring political order and economic development to Manchuria and thereby remedy two problems which the Union had long considered basic to the future well-being of the area, the methods employed were quite

simply incompatible with all that the Union stood for. Yet, instead of questioning Japan's actions, the Union--in stark contrast to the Institute--offered what amounted to tacit approval. For example, shortly after the takeover occurred, the Bulletin of the Pan-Pacific Union chose to publish the following observation by an American teacher in Japan:

> . . . I glory in the fact that today that same spirit [which led Japan to prevail over Russia in 1904-05], still at great cost and sacrifice, at heavy expenditure of money and time and effort, is striving [in Manchuria], not to carry on war, but to attain World Peace and to improve the economic conditions of the whole world.[2]

As late as 1939, the Union dedicated the entire October-December issue of Pan-Pacific, the short-lived successor to Mid-Pacific Magazine, to "Manchukuo" without raising a single question about its legitimacy or the broader and clearly evident problem of Japanese military expansion.[3] The Union, perhaps because of its relative success in Japan, simply refused to see the growth of Japanese militarism and xenophobic nationalism as an evil development. At the same time, however, it should be noted that

---

[2]Margaret Cook, "At the Osaka Pan-Pacific Club," BPPU 140 (Oct., 1931), p. 5.

[3]The local community, however, did raise such questions once the issue was published. A public protest arose and a number of the Union's own officers, including Oren E. Long who was then President, resigned and disassociated themselves from the Union. See SB, Dec. 21, 1939, p. 1; SB, Dec. 22, 1939, p. 3; and Ad, Dec. 23, 1939, p. 7.

the Union was not entirely alone in its interpretation of Japan's move into Manchuria. President Hoover, for example, tended to prefer Japanese order to Chinese nationalism, a viewpoint which eventually led to his split with Secretary of State Stimson.[4]

Union Activities During the 1930s

Failing to foresee the ultimate consequences of the Depression and war in Asia, the Union entered the 1930s with the same enthusiasm and methods which charactierized its activities during the previous decade. The nature of the Union's first major venture following the 1930 women's conference underlines the point. In February 1931, Ford left Hawaii for Asia with no less a purpose in mind than reinvigorating the Union's Asian affiliates as the final prelude to a transformation of the organization into an official association of Pacific Basin governments.[5] As he put it in an address to the Tokyo Pan-Pacific Club soon after his arrival:

> An official Pan-Pacific Union, rather than being a rival in our ocean of the League of Nations, would, with a Pan-American and a Pan-European Union became, with the aid of the League

---

[4]William Appleton Williams, The Shaping of American Diplomacy (Chicago, 1956), p. 657.

[5]Ford's trip came as something of a surprise to Honolulu. When he sailed aboard the Tatsuta Maru bound for Yokohama on February 5, the local media noted the suddenness of his departure and went on to speculate that he would likely be working upon a "new, enlarged augmented

> of Nations, a real United States of the World, a consummation dreamed of with its beginning in the Atlantic, by Woodrow Wilson, by Henry Cabot Lodge with its roots in the Pacific. Will you in Japan think of these things.[6]

Employing somewhat better syntax, he made the same point in his report back to Hawaii:

> With Hawaii leading, I think the other Pacific governments will now fall in line and make the Pan-Pacific Union an official sister of the Pan-American Union with probably Honolulu, on account of its central position, the real capital of the Pacific, which it should be. The dream of a great Pan-Pacific building in Honolulu is doming down to earth and I think with a little more effort on the part of Hawaii, it will all come true. My work is now in the countries about our ocean, meeting the men who can bring all this about and securing their cooperation--and this I am doing.[7]

While others may have perceived the world with growing pessimism, Ford obviously did not.

Ford's trip--which would keep him in Asia until late 1934 and away from Hawaii until the end of 1937--was, initially at least, a veritable tour de force. Making the Imperial Hotel in Tokyo his headquarters, he received Union officials, Cosmopolitan Club members and other young Union activists, student movement leaders, and government leaders. During the same time, he delivered numerous lectures to

---

and glorified Pan-Pacific Union." They were correct. See Ad, Feb. 6, 1931, p. 1.

[6][Alexander Hume Ford], "The Future of the Pan-Pacific Union," BPPU, 134 (April, 1931), p. 8.

[7][Alexander Hume Ford] "The Director of the Pan-Pacific Union Visits Tokyo," MPM, XLI (May, 1931), 428.

various groups and addressed the Tokyo Pan-Pacific Club on still other occasions. He then embarked upon a series of organizing tours to Korea, Manchuria, China, the Philippines, Siam, and Indo-China as well as to various cities in Japan.

These tours are of some importance for it was here that Ford's mission would either succeed or fail. The first tour took him into the Osaka area late in April 1931. Accompanied by a long-time Union ally, Prince Tokugawa, he addressed the previously established Pan-Pacific Club at Osaka, approved the formation of a similar group at Nara, established a Pan-Pacific Library in Kyoto, and worked to form a Pan-Pacific Trail and Travel Club in the same area.[8] Returning to Tokyo, he then conducted similar journeys into the Kobe and Nagoya regions.

In addition to these activities, Ford spent considerable time in Tokyo attempting to organize a Pan-Pacific Clubhouse. Inspired by the creation of such an institution in Honolulu earlier in the same year when the Union converted its University Club headquarters into a central meeting place open to all inter-racial and internationalist organizations in Honolulu, Ford hoped to accomplish the same thing in Tokyo.[9] Moreover, he even speculated on the

---

[8]"Pan-Pacific Union Officials Visity Kyoto," BPPU, 136 (June, 1931), p. 16.

[9]"Prince Tokugawa Dedicates the Pan-Pacific Clubhouse, at Honolulu," BPPU, 131 (Jan., 1931), p. 7. The Union had not given up plans to build a permanent office/convention facility. The Clubhouse was simply another venture.

possibility of bringing all the organizations using these facilities--both in Honolulu and in Tokyo--together in a loose association dedicated to inter-racial cooperation, good citizenship and, ultimately, the Pan-Pacific Union.[10] However, he did not succeed in Tokyo. Although a temporary facility was obtained and preliminary planning was initiated on a permanent facility of some six or seven stories near the Imperial Hotel, the project collapsed after several months' effort.[11]

After a brief and apparently unproductive trip through Korea and Manchuria during the summer of 1931, Ford returned to Japan and worked there in unaccustomed silence for almost a year. During that time a number of Pan-Pacific student organizations were formed (Keio University, Waseda University, and Rikkyo University are mentioned[12]) in anticipation of a student congress scheduled for the summer of 1932 in Tokyo. Ford may have participated in this effort, although it is not clear. The frequency of his reports back to Hawaii diminished, and when they did arrive they were usually concerned with local problems rather than

---

[10]"At the Pan-Pacific Clubhouse, Honolulu," BPPU, 132 (Feb., 1931), p. 3.

[11]"United Club Plan Presented by A.H. Ford," and "A Pan-Pacific Clubhouse in Central Tokyo," BPPU, 135 (May, 1931), pp. 3-7.

[12]"Pan-Pacific Student Organization in Tokyo," BPPU, 143 (Jan., 1932), pp. 12-13.

his activities in Asia.[13] In June 1932, vaguely discouraged and alarmed over Japan's less than enthusiastic acceptance of his doctrines on international cooperation, Ford traveled to China.[14]

Ford's purpose in China, as has been the case in Japan, was to reinvigorate Union-affiliated organizations, in particular a previously established Chinese Pan-Pacific Association. He also hoped to create new Pan-Pacific Clubs in various major cities. For reasons unexplained, Ford couched his arguments to the Chinese on behalf of the Union in terms reminiscent of the early days of the movement in Hawaii. Although he had long before rejected commercialism as a basic justification for the Union, he revived the argument while in China.[15] Specifically, he sought to build the Chinese organization into a force on behalf of roadbuilding which, he reasoned, would encourage the creation of a sophisticated and unifying commercial

---

[13]For example, see his reports published in August, 1932, concerning the need for diversification in local agriculture. [Alexander Hume Ford] "A Message to the Pan-Pacific Club of Honolulu from the Director of the Pan-Pacific Union, Alexander Hume Ford," BPPU, 150 (Aug., 1932), pp. 4-6.

[14]"Alexander Hume Ford Advises Japanese and Foreigners to Cooperate in Promotion of the Commercial Era of the Pacific," BPPU, 151 (Sept., 1932), pp. 3-6.

[15]Alexander Hume Ford, "Returned Sons Bring Commerce to China," BPPU, 153 (Nov., 1932), pp. 3-5.

system.[16] Although a new Chinese Pan-Pacific Association was formed in early 1933 under the direction of a group of American-educated Chinese businessmen, Ford was able to accomplish little of a substantial nature during the year he remained in China.[17] A Pan-Pacific Goodwill Day (Balboa Day) banquet was held in Shanghai during September 1932, and Ford, as a featured guest, gave a radio speech (in English) to mark the occasion. He met Chiang and his wife for tea later that fall while he was touring the flooding Yangtze River.[18] In addition, he wrote a number of impassioned articles on China's effort to confront flood, famine, and Communism which were published both in China and in the Bulletin of the Pan-Pacific Union. None of this, however, contributed much toward the more general goals of his mission, and even what progress he did make was soon lost in the chaos of pre-war China. Nonetheless, he was able to rally his old enthusiasm upon leaving and conclude:

---

[16] Ibid., p. 4.

[17] "A Newly Organized Pan-Pacific Association of China," BPPU, 158 (April, 1933), p. 3. In addition, see Kuangson Young, "Pan-Pacific Movement in China," BPPU, 174 (April-June, 1935), p. 184, for a listing of officers and other technical information concerning the Chinese Pan-Pacific Association.

[18] Alexander Hume Ford, "Story of Dr. Wu Lien Teh," BPPU, 156 (Feb., 1933), p. 3.

> From Peking to Canton the work is progressing. The Good Roads Movement begun by our first Pan-Pacific Association in China some thirty years ago, is now really binding the Republic together. A powerful National Pan-Pacific Association of China has been organized by the leaders of the Republic with chapters springing up in all the large cities.[19]

After a brief return to Japan in mid-1933, Ford journeyed to Manila and embarked upon still another round of organizational activity. Using the same genre of argument employed in China, he pointed out that the Union could assist the Philippines in expanding their trade with China and Japan.[20] He never explained precisely what kind of assistance might be expected, however. In any case, he aroused at least initial interest, and a Pan-Pacific Association was formed at a special meeting held aboard the S.S. General Sherman in Manila Harbor early in August.[21] Following this, a Pan-Pacific Science Council was formed to administer a popular science lecture series and other science-related public services.[22] Much like Prince Tokugawa in Japan, Manuel Quezon, the Philippine Senate

---

[19][Alexander Hume Ford], "Director Ford Addresses the Pan-Pacific Club of Tokyo," BPPU, 161 (July, 1933), p. 5.

[20][Alexander Hume Ford], "Director of the Pan-Pacific Union Addresses Manila Rotarians," BPPU, 163 (Sept., 1933), pp. 8-10.

[21]"Pan-Pacific Day in Manila," BPPU, 166 (Dec., 1933), pp. 3-4.

[22]"The Pan-Pacific Science Council in Manila," BPPU, 166 (Dec., 1933), pp. 9-12.

President and first President of the Philippines under the Commonwealth status granted by the Tydings-McDuffie Act of 1934, took an interest in the Union and assisted Ford during his stay in the Philippines. He even offered to present Ford's proposal for a Pacific leaders' summit meeting to President Roosevelt during a meeting scheduled for early 1934.[23]

In 1934 Ford left the Philippines for Siam where he had been invited by friends to organize still another Pan-Pacific Club in Bangkok. Apparently meeting with no success (there is no subsequent reference to the venture), he returned to Japan via Indo-China and Shanghai.[24] On November 9, while in Tokyo, he startled all by announcing his retirement as Director of the Pan-Pacific Union. After twenty-seven years of work within the Union and its predecessor organizations, he wanted time to organize his papers and write his memoirs before dying.[25] The Advertiser expressed the reaction of many to his announcement when it editorialized:

> Alexander Hume Ford, wishing to retire as director of the Pan-Pacific Union, seeks a successor. One will not be easy to find, one

---

[23]"Quezon to See Roosevelt about Pan-Pacific Idea," BPPU, 167 (Jan., 1934), p. 4.

[24]Alexander Hume Ford, "Motoring Through Cambodia," MPM, XLVII (Oct.-Dec., 1934), 529-31. He discusses the trip but not the Union.

[25]SB, Nov., 17, 1934, p. 1.

> able to continue Mr. Ford's work in Mr. Ford's inimitable way, one able and willing to dedicate himself to a Cause. That word, used in connection with Mr. Ford, must be capitalized, because the Ford sincerity and zeal made his gospel little less than a religion. He sought international good will, and to the search he devoted the best years of his life. And there is better will among the peoples of the Pacific as a consequence, notwithstanding the imminent Japanese denunciation of the Washington naval treaty. Mr. Ford has been an unofficial American ambassador to the Orient and Australasia, less spectacular, but more indefatigable, than the present unofficial ambassador to Japan, Mr. Babe Ruth.
>
> Such unselfishness as that of Mr. Ford is seen seldom. A resident of Hawaii, in a burst of admiration and cynicism, once described Mr. Ford as the only unselfish man in the Islands. Cynical, because there are other unselfish men, but hardly one to vie with him. For himself he sought nothing, except the gratification of achievement. Therein lay his secret, his power to command assistance. One story, which may not be literally true, is true enough: that Mr. Ford interrupted an important conference at Alexander and Baldwin's with his announcement to the late J.P. Cooke: "Joe, I need so many thousands dollars." And got it.
>
> This editorial finds itself writing of Mr. Ford in the past tense. That should not be. He is 66 years old, having been born in South Carolina on April 3, 1868; still he is young enough to climb to the summit of Fujiyama, a mere 12,440 feet, and no gently-sloping Mauna Loa, but a steep cone. That feat encourages his many friends to hope that he will have many years in which to do the writing on which his heart is now set.[26]

Although there was no mention of it at the time, the possibility looms that disillusionment was as much a factor in Ford's decision to retire as was desire for free time. For all the effort he expended during nearly four years in

---

[26] *Ad*, Nov., 21, 1934, editorial page.

Asia, he failed--and surely he recognized the failure--to accomplish what he had set out to do. For all the organizations he created or reestablished, for all his participation in other activities, he must have realized that the likelihood of transforming the Union into a formal association of Pacific Basin nations was no greater--probably even less--than it had been when he left upon his mission in 1931.

Whether or not Ford was disillusioned with the Union when he retired in 1934, he certainly was in 1937 when he returned to Hawaii after traveling for three years in Europe and on the American mainland. In an interview with the Star-Bulletin, he voiced not only disillusionment but also what appeared to be a rejection of virtually all that the Union represented:

> Too much understanding is cause of world friction as people understand one another too well, he says. "I'm never again going to try to understand other people or other nations. Efforts directed toward international friendship hereafter should by all means avoid any approach through intellectual channels. The moment you understand what someone is attempting to do or what he believes, you immediately want to change him. It won't work."[27]

There was good reason for his despondency. In addition to the essential failure of his Asian mission, the local movement was upon the verge of collapse. Where in 1931 it had been vigorous enough to spare him, it had declined

---

[27] SB, Dec. 29, 1930, p. 1.

almost to the point of non-existence by 1937. Funding, programming, and public interest were at all time lows, and there was no indication that any reversal in the trend was likely. The Union had at last been caught by the unpleasant history of the 1930s.

All aspects of the Union's program were affected by this downward spiral. Mid-Pacific Magazine, for example, experienced a circulation decline from a high of 4,000 in 1922 to a low of 330 in 1933.[28] Advertisers ceased using the magazine in 1932, thus forcing a reduction in both size and quality. By the end of 1933, issues were averaging thirty-five to forty pages where some 100 pages had been standard in previous years. The magazine's two long-time supplements, the Bulletin of the Pan-Pacific Union and the Journal of the Pan-Pacific Research Institution, were continued, but they appeared in typewritten rather than typeset format on numerous occasions. Articles in Mid-Pacific Magazine continued to be typeset but content, formerly a mixture of travel, science and Union-oriented articles, drifted into a bland collection of travelogues. In April 1934, no longer able to maintain a monthly publishing schedule, the magazine was changed into a quarterly of some eighty pages. The Bulletin and the

---

[28]See Ayer Directory for the respective years. This source does not list MPM during most of the 1920s so it is possible that maximum circulation was even higher than the figure cited.

Journal were continued, now also as quarterlies.[29] Ann Satterthwaite, the Union's long-time chief secretary and later (1937) Executive Director, was responsible for the magazine between the time of Ford's departure and mid-1935 when it collapsed.[30] There is no evidence, however, that its decline was in any way a function of her management. The publication was simply a victim of the times.

Money, or the lack of it, was the central problem for both the Union and Mid-Pacific Magazine. As discussed previously, the Territorial Legislature ceased its support of the Union in 1935 and operating revenues thereafter dropped below the level necessary to support any meaningful program. As noted previously, Mid-Pacific's debts mounted to the point that the Star Bulletin Publishing Company assumed defacto control over the periodical in 1935 in an attempt to rebuild the magazine and recover some of their losses. Although the publishing company installed a new editor, George Mellon, who enlivened the magazine's format, the effort failed when the Union, angered by the publisher's conditions, severed all connections with Mid-Pacific and launched its own new publication, Pan-Pacific, in January 1937.[31] Mid-Pacific was discontinued at this point and

---

[29]See MPM, XLIV-XLVII (July, 1932-Oct.-Dec., 1934).

[30]"The Director of the Pan-Pacific Union," BPPU, 141 (Nov., 1931), p. 6.

[31]Satterthwaite to Frear, Aug. 26, 1936 and Satterthwaite to Farrington, Nov. 11, 1936, University of Hawaii, Hawaiian and Pacific Collection, uncataloged Pan-Pacific documents.

Pan-Pacific, never adequately financed and hurt by the aforementioned "Manchukuo" issue controversy, degenerated in quality until it ceased publication during the summer of 1941. The Pan-Pacific Clubhouse, too, was a victim of financial hardship. The concept of providing a special meeting place for a variety of similarly-minded but unaffiliated clubs never elicited a meaningful response. Only the local Pan-Pacific Club and the Pan-Pacific Women's Association met there on a regular basis.[32] As a consequence, there were no other organizations to call upon when the monthly rental charges of some $500 became too high for the Union alone to pay. Lacking any option, the Union gave up the building late in 1934 (it was then converted into a non-commissioned officers club) and moved to a small office at 1111 Union Street in downtown Honolulu.[33] This office was soon given up for even less pretentious quarters at 1067 Alakea Street.

Even the press largely deserted the Union during this time. There was little coverage of either Ford's Asian venture or local activities. Local government officials

---

[32]See BPPU, 131-72 (Jan., 1931-Oct.-Dec., 1934).

[33]Mackintosh to Pan-Pacific Union, Sept. 9, 1934, University of Hawaii, Hawaiian and Pacific Collection, uncataloged Pan-Pacific Union documents. The University Club and the Pacific Club merged in July, 1930, hence it was the Pacific Club which actually forced the Union to move.

did likewise. Governors Lawrence Judd and J.B. Poindexter broke the long-standing relationship between the Territorial Government and the Union by refusing to serve as the Union's President, and even former Governor Frear, who took the position when Poindexter refused it, ceased his participation at the end of 1936. He was succeeded by Dr. Frederick G. Krauss of the University of Hawaii, and thereafter no high government official ever again held the position. In short, the Union's supporters, faced with other more pressing concerns, simply lost interest in the organization.

Depressing as these circumstances must have been, Miss Satterthwaite and a hard core of Union supporters continued the organization's program. They attempted to keep the old issues alive--peace, Honolulu as Geneva, Hawaii as an inter-racial experiment station, and harmony through understanding--and they continued such long-standing programs as the work of the Manoa research institute and the celebration of Balboa Day. In addition, they launched a number of new (or at least refurbished) projects.

Among the most interesting of the new projects was one promoting agricultural diversity for Hawaii. Apparently growing from the Union's earlier interest in botany and botanical gardens, the project was first discussed in April 1931, when the Star-Bulletin published a paper by Ford proposing the development of a cultured pearl industry

in Hawaii.[34] The idea was apparently inspired by a visit to the Mikimoto culturing facilities during Ford's stay in Japan.[35] Subsequently, he wrote on the possibilities for an ornamental horticultural industry and the general necessity of agricultural diversification.[36] Still other articles appeared in the Bulletin of the Pan-Pacific Union, and the entire April-June 1933 issue of the Journal of the Pan-Pacific Research Institution was devoted to the subject. However, the issue sparked no discernible enthusiasm within the local agricultural community. Like so many of the Union's proposals, it was ahead of its time.

An oft-expressed interest in a Polynesian Olympiad was revived in conjunction with the 1932 Los Angeles Olympic Games. A plan was put forward calling for games in Honolulu immediately following the event in California and the Union heartily promoted it.[37] However, it too failed to arouse significant interest and was dropped. Still other

---

[34]SB. April 6, 1931, p. 2.

[35]"Pearl Culture in Hawaii," JPPRI, VI (July-Sept., 1931), 14-16.

[36]"Floating Flower Shows," BPPU, 140 (October, 1931), pp. 15-16. Also see [Alexander Hume Ford], "A Message to the Pan-Pacific Club of Honolulu from the Director of the Pan-Pacific Union, Alexander Hume Ford," BPPU, 150 (Aug., 1932), pp. 4-6.

[37]"Preparing for the First Pan-Pacific Games," BPPU, 140 (Oct., 1931), pp. 15-16.

projects were undertaken but without notably more positive results. There was a brief effort to promote an Australian proposal for a "Pacific Islands Association" vaguely similar in purpose to that of the Union.[38] Nothing came of it. The first "Hawaii Calls" broadcast (July 19, 1932) was praised as an excellent example of Pacific Basin internationalism, but the program, of course, developed into something quite different.[39] An effort was made to establish "Stateside Clubs" for mainland residents living in Hawaii. The hope was expressed that they would promote "social fellowship and friendly understanding" in Hawaii.[40] There is no record that any were ever actually organized. Finally, other conferences scheduled to meet in Hawaii--in particular the National-Pacific Foreign Trade Conference of May 3-6, 1932, and the Regional World Federation of Education Associations Conference of July 25-30, 1932--were promoted as if they were Union projects. In addition to frequent articles in the Union's various publications, one entire issue of Mid-Pacific was devoted to the trade conference.[41]

---

[38]"Pacific Islands Association," BPPU, 143 (Jan., 1932), pp. 14-16.

[39]"KGU in Aloha Program to New Zealand," BPPU, 151 (Sept., 1932), pp. 11-12.

[40]"State Clubs of Hawaii," BPPU, 162 (Aug., 1933), p. 16.

[41]MPM, XLIII (June, 1932).

Perhaps this publicity was merely the Union's way of continuing its promotion of Hawaii as a conference center, but one detects in it a considerable--and pathetic--measure of self-promotion.

As might be expected, these efforts accomplished naught. Public interest and concern were gone. Where the national press once saw Hawaii in terms of Ford's chats with Presidents and Congressional support for Union projects, the Massie case now held their attention.[42] Where local officials once participated in all the affairs of the Union, they now refused to accept even honorary positions. Where the local press once covered Union undertakings as major events, there now was silence. Perhaps this turn of events could have been avoided had the observations of a Filipino Union official, reacting to Ford's retirement announcement, been heeded:

> Who is next to "shoulder the burden," to enable him [Ford] to put his papers in order during the "closing years" of his life, is rather pathetic and a most difficult question to answer.
>
> His enthusiasm and devotion to the Cause are simply peerless. It would require a great man to shoulder and a great country to sponsor, plus adequate funds behind.
>
> This, on the one hand.
>
> On the other, it would be a pity to allow it to dwindle. And I am afraid it might without a man like Mr. Ford.[43]

---

[42]The New York Herald Tribune brought this point into sharp focus in an editorial observing that the 1932 trade conference was more important than the Massie case regardless of what people may gather from the headlines. The editorial is reprinted in "The Other Hawaii," BPPU, 148 (June, 1932), p. 3.

[43]Gregoria Nieva, "Popular in the Philippines: Pan-Pacific Union and the Work of Alexander Hume Ford Praised,"

More likely, however, Ford's absence merely spared him the agony of witnessing the collapse first hand. The goals the Union sought and the means it employed in pursuing them were hopelessly in conflict with the economic and political realities of the 1930s.

Ford's Last Years

Many individuals and institutions contributed to the success of the internationalist movement in pre-war Hawaii. No individual or institution, however, contributed more than Ford himself. Although he outlived the movement and his last years--devoted to a futile and rather pathetic attempt to re-establish the position of prominence he once enjoyed in Hawaii--are not particularly relevant to the movement's history, it would somehow be inappropriate to conclude the record without at least mentioning these years.

As noted earlier, following his retirement while in Asia during 1934, Ford traveled in Europe and on the American mainland before returning to Hawaii late in 1937. There are few available records of his activities during this period. From subsequent comments it is apparent that he traveled throughout most of Europe, but it is not clear how he financed the trip (he had no savings) nor is it clear what he expected to accomplish. There are only two documents available from this period. One is a letter he sent to the

---

MPM, XLVIII (Jan.-Mar., 1935), 91.

Advertiser from Paris proposing that Hawaii develop a display featuring the Union's dioramas for use at the 1939 New York and San Francisco expositions and at the proposed 1940 Paris exposition.[44] The other is a request to the Union for either a pension or an annuity.[45] Neither suggestion elicited a positive response.

When he returned to Hawaii in December 1937, he was welcomed by a warm editorial in the Star-Bulletin.[46] He responded with a letter to the editor which expressed more of the previously noted pessimism and went on to propose that grape culture would be a profitable industry for Hawaii. The letter also indicated that he had yet to begin the writing he mentioned at the time of his resignation.[47] Ford stayed in Honolulu for over a year after returning, but there again is little record of his activities. His name appears only on one occasion--in 1938 when an issue of Pan-Pacific was dedicated to him and he was the guest of honor at a Balboa Day ball held at the Alexander Young Hotel on September 24.[48] Earlier that year, he did ask

---

[44]Ad, April 11, 1937, p. 6.

[45]"Minutes of the Executive Committee of the Pan-Pacific Union," Aug. 5, 1936, University of Hawaii, Hawaiian and Pacific Collection, uncataloged Pan-Pacific Union documents.

[46]SB, Dec. 30, 1937, p. 8.

[47]SB, Jan. 6, 1938, p. 8.

[48]See entire issue of PP, II (July-Sept., 1938).

the Union to re-hire him as a Publicity Manager at $175 per month, but there were no funds to pay the salary.[49]

In 1939 he became ill and retired to the Baldwin Home near Paia on the island of Maui.[50] He remained there for some four years in increasing obscurity, issuing one more plea to the community to establish a display for the dioramas and writing a series of nineteen brief articles on famous men he had known.[51] At the urging of one Philip Elliot whom he met on Maui, he returned to Honolulu in late 1943 and embarked upon a final round of activities. Apparently he spent the entire time on Maui in recuperation. At least, there is no indication that he worked upon any projects other than the one newspaper series.

His first activity upon returning to Oahu was to obtain a lot on Kapiolani Boulevard midway between downtown Honolulu and Waikiki and begin work upon a diorama display.[52] When this project failed to materialize, he undertook another series of newspaper articles entitled "'Pop' Ford's

---

[49]Ford to Pan-Pacific Union Executive Committee, Feb. 8, 1938, University of Hawaii, Hawaiian and Pacific Collection, uncatalogued Pan-Pacific Union documents.

[50]SB, April 3, 1943, p. 6.

[51]Ad, Jan. 1, 1940, p. 3, and SB, Jan. 6-Feb. 19, 1941, various pages. The later series, ranging from William Jennings Bryan to Robert G. Ingersoll and from Benjamin Harrison to Sun Yat Sen, sheds little light upon historic developments except to demonstrate once again Ford's need to be identified with important personages.

[52]Ad, Oct. 31, 1943, p. 7.

Reminiscences." Running in the Star-Bulletin between February 15 and March 13, 1944, the series could have been a vehicle for Ford to publish, at least in abbreviated form, his memoirs. Unfortunately, that was not the case. The articles were brief and often pointless ramblings. Aside from a few comments on the founding of the Outrigger Canoe Club and the places he had visited in Europe, the series contained nothing of a substantial nature.[53] It did, interestingly enough, go into some detail on the deviousness of the "Japs" and how the Japanese secret service continually harassed him during his long stay in Japan.[54] As he reported nothing of this nature earlier, there is the possibility that he used the series in an attempt to refurbish the Union's reputation following its misjudgements of Japanese ambitions during the 1930s. Another possibility, one suggested by some of the comments at the time of his death, is that he was losing his mental faculties during this period. Joseph Stickney feels this is the more likely explanation.[55] In any case, the series is of little value in reconstructing the history of the local internationalist movement or Ford's role in it.

Ford lived another year and a half, spending most of this time at the Outrigger Canoe Club, and died in the

---

[53] SB, Feb. 15-Mar. 13, 1944.

[54] SB, Feb. 23, 1944, p. 4.

[55] Statement made to the author by Joseph Stickney.

Territorial Hospital near Kaneohe on October 14, 1945. He was seventy-seven at the time. Funeral services were held at the Outrigger Canoe Club where Riley H. Allen, a long-time friend and local newspaper man, delivered an eulogy praising his contribution to better inter-racial relations. His ashes were then taken to his family home in South Carolina.[56] After a half-century as one of the Pacific's more important figures, his estate consisted of the seven dioramas and $299 in cash.[57]

Local Response to Ford's Death

Like the movement he founded, Ford's last years were sad and discouraging. By the time he died, the world which had once been so quick to praise him had forgotten his very existence. While praise from another generation can redress the record, it obviously can do nothing to alter the unhappiness Ford knew in the decade prior to his death. Had he known, however, that at least some of his contemporaries remembered him throughout this period and were prepared to eulogize him for what he contributed to Hawaii and the Pacific, perhaps his passage would have been easier:

> Alexander Hume Ford, dead at 77 and forgotten by the present generation, did more than any other one man to acquaint the whole wide world with the importance of Hawaii in the Pacific theater . . . .

---

[56] Ad, Oct. 15, 1945, p. 1, and SB, Oct. 17, 1945, p. 3.

[57] SB, Jan. 24, 1946, p. 16, and Mar. 18, 1946, p. 2.

> Ford was the "livest" live wire of all the Pacific Commonwealth--the tragedy of it being that age sapped his mentality during these latter years. For what he did in promoting good sportsmanship and clean living among the boys of the 1900's and 1910's who are men today; and the real foundations which he helped to lay on which to build international understanding and friendship among Pacific nations, Alexander Hume Ford has been ill rewarded.[58]

Elsewhere:

> He has left behind not only such tangible achievements as the Outrigger Club, the Pan-Pacific Science Congress and the Trail and Mountain Club, but other fine projects of which he was not directly a part but which were suggested and inspired by things he was doing or trying to do.
>
> We of Hawaii of today owe more than most of us realize to the man often smiled at and sometimes derided as "that crazy Alexander Hume Ford."[59]

---

[58] Ad, Oct. 18, 1945, editorial page.

[59] SB, Oct. 16, 1945, p. 6.

CHAPTER IX

CONCLUSIONS

Problems of Evaluating the Internationalist Movement

The record of Hawaii's internationalist movement between 1900 and 1940 contains both some rather obvious conclusions and some questions which cannot be answered until further research is conducted and further evidence is available. The subsequent comments are directed at both aspects of that record.

On one hand, the various institutional features of the movement--goals, programs, strategies, and administrative arrangements--lend themselves to some reasonably firm conclusions. Just as Horn was able to offer an acceptable evaluation of the outward features of this movement during the nineteenth century, the same features of the movement during the earlier part of the twentieth century can be evaluated in a meaningful fashion.[1]

At the same time, where Horn was unable to explain the basic urges which drove the Monarchy to launch its several ventures into the Pacific, it is likewise impossible to offer any firm explanation of the reasons underlying activities which occurred during the first half of the

---

[1]Horn, "Primacy in the Pacific," see Chapter XIV in particular.

twentieth century. Nonetheless the matter is basic enough to warrant some comment, no matter how speculative it may be. As a consequence, several hypothetical explanations of the wellsprings of twentieth century internationalism are suggested. It must be emphasized, however, that these explanations are to be considered merely as suggestions which may prove useful as guides for further research. At this point in time, there is insufficient evidence to suggest any final, definitive explanation.

Institutional Aspects of the Movement

With regard to institutional questions, no commentary on the early twentieth century phase of the internationalist movement can avoid drawing some comparison between the Pan-Pacific Union and the Institute of Pacific Relations. Although both organizations insisted--and there is no reason to doubt their claims--that they were complementary rather than competitive, the basic fact that both emerged from the same environment, drew (at least initially) from common sources of support, and pursued generally similar ends creates a strong case for some measure of contrastive analysis. The equally basic fact that their subsequent paths differed so greatly makes the case irresistible.

Organizationally, the Institute succeeded in establishing national branch units in a total of fourteen different nations around or with interests in the Pacific. When the Institute itself collapsed during the early 1950s,

ten of these national units were still active. This period of activity covered approximately one quarter of a century. During this time, the Institute raised annual budgets averaging $100,000 from private sources.[2] Its program never suffered for lack of funds, and it was able to build an excellent administrative, research, and publications staff. In contrast, the Union was never able to found a viable national branch operation, was successful with metropolitan operations only in Tokyo and Honolulu, and never outgrew its dependency upon the Territorial Legislature's biennial subsidy. Its period of effectiveness barely exceeded a decade, and even during that time it was never able to staff its headquarters adequately or to pursue new projects unless it was able to arrange special, additional funding.

At another level, the Institute grew in stature to the point where governments called upon it for assistance and advice during World War II and the post-war settlement period. Following the war, its influence was great enough that one of the leaders of McCarthy's anti-Communist crusade was moved to charge on the floor of the United States Senate that " . . . but for the machinations of the small group that controlled and activated that organization

---

[2] Understanding Asia: The Aims and Work of the I.P.R. (New York, 1951), p. 9. Hereafter cited as Understanding Asia.

[the Institute], China today would be free and a bulwark against the further advance of the Red hordes into the Far East."[3] Overstated and hysterical as the statement is, it does provide some perspective on the Institute's prominence within governmental decision-making circles following the war. On the other hand, the Union, a collapsed and long-forgotten entity by this time, was never able to obtain much more than nominal support (messages of praise, a willingness to serve as honorary officers, and limited financial contributions) from Pacific Basin governments and their leaders even during the period of its apex.

More significant, where the Union was never able to generate sustained, on-going programs (with the possible exception of the Pan-Pacific Research Institution) capable of producing any substantial rise in the level of mutual understanding between East and West, the Institute, through research it either conducted or sponsored, was responsible for what is probably the greatest contribution ever made by a private institution to a clarification of the basic issues in the clash between Eastern and Western cultures.[4] Between 1925 and 1952 (the date of the most recent compilation), the Institute produced or sponsored some 1,500

---

[3]Speech of Senator McCarran on July 2, 1952 as quoted from Congressional Record, 82 Cong., 2 sess., pt. 7, p. 8859.

[4]The Institute itself made such a claim. See Understanding Asia, p. 15.

academic studies, periodical series, and popular pamphlets on one or another aspect of this subject. Such emminent scholars as Hugh Borton, George B. Cressey, Vera Micheles Dean, John King Fairbank, Hu Shih, Owen Lattimore, Walter Lippmann, Edwin O. Reischauer, and Arnold Toynbee participated in the effort, as did many other highly competent if less well known authorities.[5] The end result of this research program was no less than the core of modern English-language scholarship on Asia.

A goodly portion of the blame for the Union's failure to produce results on a level comparable with the Institute can be charged to the administrative--especially decision-making--process it employed. As suggested on numerous previous occasions, Ford completely dominated the organization and other officials had no effective check upon his decisions. Its Board of Trustees and various honorary officers demonstrated little interest in forging an effective collective leadership formula (at least until after Ford resigned in 1934 and it was too late to salvage the organization), and the one executive secretary who did serve during the time the Union was a viable entity and who might have developed a more effective staff system did not remain in the position long enough to accomplish any significant

---

[5]See Publications on the Pacific in its entirety.

procedural changes. As a consequence, the Union was guided almost solely by decisions which Ford personally reached after casual consultation with whoever happened to be available at the time. Throughout the entire period of its effectiveness, there were no checks or balances in the Union's decision-making process, save the availability of funds. In contrast, the Institute's decisions came through a well-developed system of collective leadership which relied upon a competent, professional secretariat. In other words, the Union was administered in an extremely personal fashion while the Institute's administration was professional.

Perhaps the most crucial of all the points of comparison between these organizations lies in the extent to which each developed (or failed to do so) a philosophic rationale or ideology to justify, guide, and sustain its activities. As noted, the Institute produced a reasonably sophisticated explanation of its raison d'être based upon a desire for international amity and an interpretation of the nature of peaceful change. This in turn provided it with a standard for selecting projects and determining positions, and it was thus able to pursue a remarkably consistent course for some twenty-five years. The Union never made a similar effort. It adopted several statements of goals which contained noble passages on such vital issues as peace, international understanding, and

intercultural empathy, but it never developed a philosophic justification in support of these sentiments. Failing this, neither did it develop any meaningful operational strategy capable of translating its goals into a consistent program. As a consequence, there was no long-term consistency within the Union's programs, and, predictably, it failed to achieve most of its stated goals. What accomplishments there were must be credited as much to chance as to planning.

As noted earlier, the Union's failure to develop an ideology was not due solely to oversight. Rather, it was more the result of a conscious choice on Ford's part. He believed that the Union had the best chance of accomplishing its objectives if it could but be transformed into a Pacific version of the Pan-American Union. In his mind, the institutional form of the Union was simply more important than its ideological substance, and he spent far more time attempting to persuade the Pacific governments to assume sponsorship of the organization than he did in developing a philosophic and operational rationale for it. Events proved how unfortunate his choice was.

Although there is little doubt that the Institute was far more sophisticated than the Union from the standpoint of institutional development, a comparison of the two organization's contributions to the local internationalist movement and their impact upon the local community shows that

the Union, for all its institutional problems, was still a vital and important organization. It was the Union, not the Institute, which initiated the local movement and generated most of the broad purpose, momentum, and enthusiasm which characterized it during the 1920s and early 1930s. Also, it was the Union rather than the Institute which created the enduring local monuments to the movement. The Pacific Science Association, the Pan-Pacific Surgical Association, and the Pan-Pacific and South-east Asia Women's Association--locally-based organizations which are still active contributors to the cause of international understanding in the Pacific Basin--all owe their origins to the Union. By way of contrast, the only similar monument to the Institute is the increasingly impotent Pacific and Asian Affairs Council.

Another less tangible but nonetheless important monument which the Union left behind is the degree to which it succeeded in calling Hawaii to the attention of civic leaders, government officials, and media representatives on the American mainland and throughout the Pacific Basin. Limited as the Union's contribution in this area may have been in comparison to later developments, its drive to create a greater awareness of Hawaii during the 1920s and 1930s was probably more effective than any other previous effort. There simply was no other activity within the Hawaiian experience up to that time which so consistently

brought civic leaders from around the Pacific to Hawaii and sent them back to their communities full of praise for the Islands, which kept presidents and prime ministers from all the Pacific Rim nations so constantly aware of Hawaii, and which caused the editors of Pacific Basin newspapers to so enthusiastically inform their readers about Hawaii. It is safe to conclude that only the Massie incident produced a more pronounced public interest in Hawaii than did the Union during the years preceding World War II. While the Institute also sponsored activities which contributed to the expanding awareness of Hawaii, it moved its center of operations to the mainland before it was able to generate any great amount of publicity for the Islands.

Still another and probably even more significant monument to the Union's presence is the lasting impact of the notion that Hawaiian society represents a model for all multi-racial societies. Prior to the time the Union developed and purveyed the idea, there was nothing particularly unique about Hawaii's self-concept. Following the Union era, this idea gained acceptance to the point where it became a fundamental feature in virtually all official and most private descriptions of Island society. An entire category of current governmental programming--cross-cultural educational, training, and exchange activities--is based upon it, as is a goodly portion of the tourist industry's promotional effort. While there is

reason to question some of the basic assumptions underlying this concept, there is no reason to doubt the impact that it has had upon local society over the past half-century. The fact that the Union and not the Institute was responsible for it is one more reason to suggest that the Union, for all its institutional shortcomings, still ranks as one of the more important factors in twentieth century Hawaiian history. Indeed, from local perspectives it appears to be a considerably more important organization than the Institute.

A number of issues--questions, problems, and perhaps even lessons--emerge from the foregoing comparison of the Union and the Institute. In some instances at least, these issues are operationally relevant to the current phase of the local internationalist movement and are thus of interest from a functional as well as historical perspective.

One of the most obvious features in the history of each organization is the paramount importance of a dominant personality during its formative years. It is quite evident that neither organization could have been founded had it not been for the presence of a strong and imaginative leader willing to undertake unconventional actions on behalf of the ends he sought. At the same time, however, it is equally evident that collective leadership proved superior to individual domination once the organization was successfully launched. Ford's reluctance to share in the direction of

the Union is clearly one of the causes of its collapse, just as Atherton's willingness to accept a collective leadership surely strengthened the Institute.

Financially the two organizations pursued different paths with markedly different results. The Institute raised virtually all of its budget through various private contributions--primarily foundation grants--while the Union relied almost exclusively upon government subsidies. The end result of these differing approaches was that the Institute was able to finance its program largely independent of the political and economic realities of the times while the Union was forced to reduce its budget during times of public financial crisis. Dependent as it was upon governmental financing, the Union's fate was practically sealed by the Depression.

An even more pronounced disadvantage of governmental financing and one which the Union experienced lies in the false sense of security which regular public subsidies seemingly induce. The initial availability of adequate public funds appears to discourage efforts to develop other more permanent financial arrangements which in turn renders the recipient ill-equipped to seek new sources of funds once a financial crisis strikes, thereby compounding the negative effect of a suddenly reduced or eliminated subsidy. This, at least, was the case with the Union. When the Depression struck and the Territorial Legislature's regular appropriation was withdrawn, Union officials were simply unprepared

and unable to find other financing. Hence, they had no alternative but to stand by and watch their organization wither and fade into oblivion. Further affirmation of this suggestion lies in the case of the Pacific and Asian Affairs Council. Faced with a financial crisis during the 1960s, it elected to forego its long-time tradition of independent financing and accept a legislative subsidy only to find that subsidy withdrawn when the government itself entered a period of fiscal retrenchment during the early 1970s. As a consequence, it is presently without sufficient funds from any source.

The Union, as noted, deliberately nurtured its close ties with governmental bodies in the hope that it would eventually be absorbed by one or more governments and be restructured as a Pacific version of the Pan-American Union. This goal, on reflection, appears to have been a mistake for political as well as economic reasons. In attempting to play a direct role in the international relations of the Pacific Basin, the Union was out of its league. Those relations were too complex--they involved too many world-wide as well as regional considerations which Union officials had no way of knowing--to accommodate the noble but simplistic approach of the Union. It had neither the talent nor the means to operate on the same level as governments, and its attempt to do so accomplished little aside from wasting its resources and destroying its

hopes. The Institute's decision to remain largely outside the political and diplomatic vortex was wise, particularly in view of the unhappy consequences of its later involvement at the political center.

In addition and as should be clearly evident, organizations with internationalist goals rarely persist over any significant period of time without a well-conceived ideology and an appropriately structured operational procedure. The simple statement of slogans and ideals--no matter how noble they may be--is inadequate. The hard realities of obtaining popular support, raising funds, and establishing effective administrative procedures were met with a good measure of success by the Institute largely because its leaders were able to explain rather precisely what they sought to accomplish through their organization, why they felt their goals were justified, and how they proposed to proceed in pursuing them. The Union, on the other hand, was never able to back its proposals with more than vague generalities and, as a consequence, was ill-prepared to demonstrate either how its proposals fit together in a general scheme aimed at certain definite ends or that it was procedurally equipped to carry its proposals to fruition. Forced for the first time to offer a strenuous defense of its purposes and operations in order to obtain operating funds during the financial crisis of the 1930s, it was unable to do so in a convincing manner and was rejected. Too late, the

Union discovered that good intentions alone are not an adequate substitute for ideological and administrative sophistication.

Conjecture on the Sources of Internationalism

While reasonably firm conclusions can be drawn about the major institutional features of Hawaii's early twentieth century venture into the internationalist arena, any conclusions concerning the more basic question of what led Hawaii into such a venture--why a small group of isolated and relatively unimportant islands felt such an overwhelming urge to assume some major role in Pacific Basin affairs--must remain in the hypothetical category. As noted previously, however, the question is important enough to warrant at least some speculative commentary.

Of all the issues raised in this category, none is more interesting or important than the idea that Hawaii's mid-Pacific, multi-cultural, island environment has prepared and destined it to lead the Pacific nations in a quest for some new and finer method of conducting international and intercultural relations. This notion--the belief that Hawaiian society presents a model for other multi-cultural societies in the Pacific and even elsewhere--has been cited for over half a century as the explanation and justification for Hawaii's extraordinary interest in the affairs of other Pacific nations.

Throughout these years, this notion has neither been seriously examined nor openly challenged. This is unfortunate, for there is little evidence that it is valid. As a consequence, numerous activities have been justified on questionable premises and conducted in accordance with equally questionable assumptions. While it is evident enough that Hawaii, like other Pacific island groups, lies in the middle of the Pacific and is home to a culturally diverse population which lives in a relatively harmonious fashion, there simply is no evidence that these attributes have prepared Hawaii for a special role in the Pacific. Likewise, neither is there evidence that these factors have had a direct bearing upon the success of any venture launched by the internationalist movement in Hawaii.

In fact, a considerably stronger case can be made to the effect that many of these features of Hawaiian society have actually worked against the success of the internationalist movement. The local populace, in the main more provincial than cosmopolitan, has never lent any meaningful assistance to the movement. For whatever the reasons, it has always been certain members of the local establishment who have provided the essential support. Further, only those activities which found support on the Asian and American mainlands have proved to have any staying power. Activities related solely to Hawaii and other Pacific island groups have never persisted. As the Institute

recognized shortly after its founding, Hawaii's location and socio-cultural makeup, while useful from a public relations viewpoint, often prove detrimental from an operational viewpoint. Problems of fund-raising, transportation, and communications are simply compounded. While technology has largely eliminated many of these problems, it has also eliminated much of the validity in the remaining portion of the argument which holds that Hawaii serves as a necessary mid-way station--literally as well as figuratively--in the journey between East and West.

In short, the notion that Hawaii, as a mid-Pacific island group, possesses unique physical and socio-cultural characteristics which dictate that it must play a special role in the affairs of the Pacific Basin is largely non-sense. Like any other Pacific-oriented area, Hawaii can play such a role if it is committed to doing so, but there is nothing in its makeup which destines it to do so.

Although a belief in destiny regardless of facts to the contrary may well be the best explanation of Hawaii's internationalist urge, there are still other possibilities which should be explored. One of these centers upon the notion that this drive is propelled by a combination of neo-colonialist or neo-imperialist motives. Citing Hawaii's past efforts to establish political hegemony over portions of the Pacific, more recent efforts to create politico-cultural unity in the Pacific through regional organizations

based in Hawaii, and present talk of establishing Hawaiian leadership in the technological and educational development of other Pacific island groups, some commentators have suggested that Hawaii's desire for a greater role in the Pacific can be explained in precisely such terms.[6]

Ridiculous as such a claim may appear on first reading, it possesses enough merit to warrant further investigation. Indeed, an interesting file of circumstantial evidence can be compiled in its support. For nearly one and one-half centuries, Hawaii has sponsored activities which, if successful, would have resulted in the aggrandizement of Hawaii's role in the Pacific and, in most instances at least, a reduction in the measure of independence enjoyed by certain other Pacific people. Ranging from the Monarchy's openly imperialist ventures to the Union's promotion of a Hawaii-based regional organization, such activities have always been founded upon the basic assumption that past experiences have placed Hawaii in a position to lead and that others in the Pacific would do well to follow. Conferences and discussions concerning Hawaii's contemporary role in the Pacific indicate that the assumption is still alive.[7] In short, it is possible to argue that the urge

---

[6]The fullest published development of this argument is in Francine duPlessix Gray, Hawaii: The Sugar Coated Fortress (New York, 1972), pp. 97-104.

[7]For example, see State of Hawaii, Governor's Conference on the Year 2000: Preliminary Task Force Reports (Honolulu, 1970), sec. VI, VIII, and X.

behind Hawaii's drive into the Pacific is founded upon hopes and assumptions not unlike those which drove the colonialists and imperialists of an earlier era.

While there is a certain plausibility to this argument, the fact remains that it is based almost exclusively upon selected circumstantial evidence. Except for the several blatantly imperialist forays launched during the Monarchy, there is no direct evidence suggesting that the leaders of the internationalist movement ever harbored such motives. Indeed, as suggested in the preceding chapters, these leaders appear to have operated from very different premises.

In other words, although the activities of the internationalist movement may have had a certain colonalist or imperialist ring to them, there is no proof that this is what the leaders intended. The bulk of the information presently available suggests that the earlier internationalists--and quite probably those involved with the current phase of the movement as well--operated from essentially idealistic premises and simply did not fully evaluate all possible interpretations of their programs. Nonetheless, such an explanation of the local internationalist movement deserves further examination.

Another and equally hypothetical explanation of Hawaii's quest for a more influential Pacific role lies in the notion that it originated in a twentieth century effort by the local establishment to assuage a sense of guilt this group

felt regarding its exploitation of Hawaii during the nineteenth century. This interpretation suggests that these leaders recognized the bad as well as the good which occurred during the modernization of Hawaii, and that they sought to make amends through the initiation of noble ventures such as the internationalist movement.

Again, a persuasive circumstantial case can be compiled in favor of the suggestion. The leaders of the movement have consistently been members of the ruling establishment and, hence, directly responsible for virtually all the major developments in Hawaiian society. Men of conscience if not always foresight, it can be assumed that they were aware of the many cases where their policies had damaged the societal fabric and that they were concerned with providing some manner of compensation if possible. Certain features of the manner in which they conducted the internationalist movement suggest that it may indeed have been, in their minds at least, just such a compensatory device.

In the first instance, non-white participation in the movement never exceeded token levels. This obvious shortcoming could surely have been remedied by the leaders if they were truly committed to internationalism for its own sake. Their failure to do so suggests a concern simply with the facade of internationalism and implies that their primary commitment lay in other directions such as, perhaps, a desire to compensate for actions past.

The manufacture of the notion of a model Hawaiian society by these same individuals can be interpreted in a similar fashion. Given its highly questionable original premises--a fact they had to be aware of--there is the possibility that this notion, too, was intended basically as a device to assauge long-standing guilt feelings. If so, the manufacturers could take pride in their creation for it has metamorphosized from the defensive slogan it once was into an affirmative article of faith used to describe Hawaii to all the world.

An even more convincing case in point in this general regard concerns the gap between rhetoric and action which has characterized the internationalist movement since its inception. From the earliest years of this movement, great ideals and goals have been enunciated but the resultant activities have consistently produced far less than promised. This gap has proved so consistent over the years that one finds it difficult to escape the conclusion that rhetoric alone was sufficient to serve the real desires of the movement's leadership. The history of the University of Hawaii illustrates this problem. Had the internationalists taken their own rhetoric seriously, they surely would have recognized the school's potential as a site for a major intercultural studies center and proceeded to mold it along such lines. Rather, they steadfastly refused to expand the institution into more than a

training center for public school teachers and agricultural technicians until well after World War II.[8]

These and still other examples make a plausible case for the notion that Hawaii's twentieth century venture into internationalism was simply a device to compensate the establishment for some deeply felt sense of guilt. However, like the previous effort to explain the phenomenon in terms of colonalist or imperialist aspirations, this argument is also based almost exclusively upon circumstantial evidence and, once again, what direct evidence does exist appears to support a contrary conclusion. In this case, there simply is no direct evidence suggesting that the establishment in fact felt any guilt for its past activities. On the contrary, what recorded statements there are on the subject tend toward a certain smugness. Hence, while further research may produce new evidence, this interpretation of Hawaii's internationalist urge, like the one preceding it, must remain in the hypothetical category.

While the matter of origins is clearly the most intriguing question raised so far by research on the internationalist movement in Hawaii, there are still other questions which do warrant some attention. Of these, the

---

[8]For further details, see David Kittleson, "The History of the College of Hawaii" (M.A. thesis, University of Hawaii, 1966).

most interesting and perhaps the most important concerns the motivations underlying the actions of the movement's individual leaders. While it is conceivable that research in the areas previously discussed will provide sufficient answers in the case of men like Atherton, it seems clear that others, such as Ford, Satterthwaite, and Loomis, who were not bona fide members of the local establishment, must have been driven by still different concerns. Until these concerns are determined, it will be impossible to complete a general interpretation of the movement itself.

For obvious reasons, Ford is of particular interest in this regard. From what is presently known of his life, there are several aspects of his personality which suggest a need for further investigation. There is, for example, the possibility that his entire effort on behalf of the Union and the movement generally was inspired more by a desire for stature in the community than a concern for international or intercultural harmony. If so, there is also the possibility that his earlier years in a "well born but impoverished" Southern household are of more than passing relevance.

If anything of this nature should prove to be true, Ford would have made an ideal "front man" for the establishment (providing the establishment did in fact hold ulterior motives which made a "front man" valuable), performing a task this group felt necessary in return for the attention

he apparently felt was so important. On the other hand, it is also possible that Ford became an international activist simply because he was a very modern man for his times and foresaw the desirability of a more international approach to the problems of the Pacific. All of this, however, is merely speculative. The only valid conclusion which can be drawn at this point about Ford's motives is that further research--preferably psychobiographical research--is in order.

Internationalism and the Future

A similar conclusion is all that can now be drawn regarding most of the questions underlying the rise of the internationalist movement in Hawaii. Rather firm conclusions about its institutional features do appear to be warranted, but the more fundamental questions must be subjected to further research. While some possible interpretations of these more fundamental questions have been suggested, they should, as noted, be viewed solely as suggestions for further research and not as conclusions.

At the same time, the rather negative tone of the various interpretations of the movement discussed above should not be interpreted as implying that the promotion of internationalist activity, in and of itself, is somehow ignoble. In the first place, simply because the various interpretations discussed above tend toward the negative, it

does not follow that further research will produce negative conclusions. There remains the distinct possibility that the movement arose for essentially the same, positive reasons its leaders claimed. Certainly this possibility deserves as much attention as any other. On the other hand, even if subsequent research should bear out a more negative interpretation of the movement, it will not mean that internationalism is an evil to be avoided. On the contrary, it is and will remain a noble undertaking so long as it proceeds from accurate premises and toward desirable ends. Even if it should become apparent that the architects of Hawaii's earlier internationalist ventures did indeed promote their programs for sometimes dubious reasons, the architects of the current effort need not be dissuaded from their work. They need only to learn from their predecessor's mistakes.

APPENDIX A

An Annual Listing of Officers and Officials of the Hands-Around-the-Pacific Club and its Predecessor Organizations as Compiled from Various Documents and Publications[1]

Territorial Transportation Committee

As of March 1908:

Honorary Chairman, Walter F. Frear (Governor of Hawaii); Active Chairman, Richard H. Trent; Members, J.P. Cooke, Alexander Hume Ford, E.A. Mott-Smith, Lorrin A. Thurston.

As of January 1909:

No changes indicated.

As of January 1910:

No changes indicated.

As of January 1911:

No changes indicated.

Pan-Pacific Tourist Bureau

As of March 1911:

Chairman, Frear; Active Chairman, Trent; Corresponding Secretary, Ford; Directors, Cooke, George Fairchild, Mott-Smith and Thurston; Advisory Board,[2] L. Ables (Mexico), J.W. Bains (West Australia), F.S. Bancroft (Alaska), A.S. Butts (Fiji), Edwin D. Casterline (Southern California), R.W. Cathcart (Tahiti), P.B. Danky (Philippines), Chu Gem (Southern China), John A. Giles (New South Wales), J.W. Gilmore (Northern China), R.A. Jordan (Queensland), R.A.

---

[1]This listing is drawn from a variety of sources as none of these organizations regularly published a list of their officers and officials.

[2]These individuals, the nucleus of the Hands-Around-the-Pacific Club, were local citizens selected on the basis of a familiarity with particular geographical regions within the Pacific Basin.

Kearns (New Hebrides and the South Seas), A.C.O. Lennemann (Samoa), C.F. Maxwell (New Zealand), C.H. Medcalf (Washington), T.F. Sedgqick (Peru and South America), S. Sheba (Japan), C.A. Stanton (Oregon), V.L. Stevenson (Victoria), and G.H. Tuttle (Northern California).

Hands-Around-the-Pacific Club

As of January 1912:

Honorary Presidents, Frear and Sir Joseph Ward (Prime Minister of New Zealand); Honorary Vice Presidents, Percy Hunter (Tourist Bureau of New South Wales), David Starr Jordan (President of Stanford University), and James S. McGowan (Premier of New South Wales); Corresponding Secretary, W.A. Bryan (University of Hawaii).

As of January 1913:

Honorary Presidents, Andrew Fisher (Prime Minister of Australia), W. Cameron Forbes (Governor-General of the Philippines), Frear, and Ward; Honorary Vice Presidents, Ford, Hunter, Jordan, McGowan, and Francis Wilson (Premier of West Australia).

As of January 1914:

No changes indicated.

As of January 1915:

No changes indicated.

As of January 1916:

Honorary Presidents, Fisher, Frear, Burton Harrison (Governor-General of the Philippines), and Ward; Honorary Vice Presidents, John Barrett (Director-General of the Pan-American Union), Ford, W.A. Holman (Premier of New South Wales), Hunter, Jordan, and John Scaddon (Premier of West Australia).

As of January 1917:

No changes indicated.

APPENDIX B

An Annual Listing of Officers and Officials of the Pan-Pacific Union as Compiled from Various Documents and Publications[1]

Pan-Pacific Union

As of March 1917:

President, Walter F. Frear; First Vice President, Frank C. Atherton; Second Vice President, C.K. Ai; Treasurer, F.E. Blake; Recording Secretary, J.M. Camara; Corresponding Secretary, Alexander Hume Ford; Trustees, J.A. Balsh, Frank F. Baldwin, George A. Brown, William R. Castle, J.P. Cooke, Richard Cooke, George P. Denison, John C. Lane, A.K. Ozawa, C.C. Ramirez, Syngman Rhee, George Rodick, George H. Vicars, and George N. Wilcox.

As of January 1918:

No changes indicated.

As of January 1919:

Honorary Presidents, W.H. Hughes (Prime Minister of Australia), W.T. Massey (Prime Minister of New Zealand), and Woodrow Wilson (President of the UnitedStates); President, Charles J. McCarthy (Governor of Hawaii); First Vice President, Atherton; Second Vice President, Ai; Treasurer, Blake; Recording Secretary, Camara; Corresponding Secretary, Ford; Trustees, Balsh, Baldwin, Brown, Castle, J.P. Cooke, R. Cooke, Denison, Lane, Ozawa, Ramirez, Rhee, Rodick, Vicars, and Wilcox.

As of January 1920:

Honorary Presidents, Sir Robert Borden (Prime Minister of Canada), Hsu Shih-chang (President of China), Hughes, Massey, and Wilson; Honorary Vice Presidents, John Barrett

---

[1]This listing is drawn from a variety of sources as the organization did not regularly publish a full list of its officers and officials.

(Director-General of the Pan-American Union), Jonah Kuhio Kalanianaole (Delegate to Congress from Hawaii), Franklin K. Lane (Secretary of the Interior of the United States), plus the Governor of Alaska, the Governor-General of Java, the Governor-General of the Philippines, the Premiers of the Australian States, and the Premier of British Columbia[2]; President, McCarthy; Vice Presidents, Ai, Atherton, Castle, and Frear; Treasurer, Blake; Secretary, Ford; Directors, Baldwin, Balsh, Brown, Camara, R. Cooke, M.L. Copeland, Denison, N.C. Dizon, John Guild, Lane, Iga Mori, Rhee, and Wilcox.

As of January 1921:

Honorary Presidents, Takashi Hora (Prime Minister of Japan), Hsu, Hughes, Massey, Arthur Meighen (Prime Minister of Canada), and Wilson; Honorary Vice Presidents, Kuhio, Lane, L.S. Rowe (Director-General of the Pan-American Union), Prince Tokugawa (President of the House of Peers of Japan), and Yeh Chung-cho (Minister of Communications of China); President, McCarthy; Vice Presidents, Ai, Atherton, Castle, and Frear; Treasurer, Blake; Secretary, Ford; Directors, Baldwin, Balsh, Brown, Camara, R. Cooke, Copeland, Denison, Dizon, Guild, Lane, Mori, Rhee, and Wilcox.

As of January 1922:

Honorary Presidents, Hora, Warren G. Harding (President of the United States), Hsu, Hughes, Massey, Meighen, and Rama VI (King of Siam); Honorary Vice Presidents, Kuhio, Rowe, Woodrow Wilson, and Yeh; President, Wallace R. Farrington (Governor of Hawaii); Vice Presidents, Ai, Atherton, Castle, and Frear; Treasurer, Blake; Director, Ford; Directors, Baldwin, W.T. Brigham, J. Cooke, Denison, Guild, D.H. Hitchcock, Lane, F.J. Lowery, Vaughan MacCaughey, C.J. McCarthy, Mori, R.H. Trent, Wilcox, C. Yada, K. Yamamoto, J.M. Young, plus all local consuls.[3]

As of January 1923:

Honorary Presidents, Harding, Hughes, Li Yuan-Lung (President of China), W.L. Mackenzie-King (Prime Minister

---

[2]The Union began listing certain Honorary Vice Presidencies in this fashion at this time and continued to do so in subsequent references. The proper names were seldom used. Hereafter this listing cites the positions only when proper names were used.

[3]Like the previously-mentioned Honorary Vice Presidencies, these Directors were listed by position rather

of Canada), Massey, Rama VI, and Prince Tokugawa; Honorary Vice Presidents, Charles Evans Hughes (Secretary of State of the United States) and Rowe; President, Farrington; Vice Presidents, Ai, Castle, and Frear; Director, Ford; Directors, Riley Allen, Baldwin, Brigham, J. Cooke, Denison, James D. Dole, Sanford B. Dole, Hitchcock, H. Stuart Johnson, Lloyd R. Kellam, Lane, Lowery, MacCaughey, McCarthy, Stanley McKenzie, Mori, Trent, Wilcox, Yamamoto, and Young.

As of January 1924:

Honorary Presidents, S.M. Bruce (Prime Minister of Australia), Calvin Coolidge (President of the United States), Massey, Mackenzie-King, Rama VI, Tokugawa, and Tsao Kun (President of China); Honorary Vice Presidents, Hughes, Rowe, and Viscount Shibusawa (Japan); President, Farrington; Director, Ford; Directors, Ai, Allen, Brigham, A.D. Castro, Denison, Walter Dillingham, J. Dole, S. Dole, Frear, Tasuku Harada, Arthur A. Hauck, Kellam, Lane, S.C. Lee, C. Ligot, Lowery, B.M. Matsuzawa, McKenzie, Mori, Frederick Muir, L. Tenny Peck, Shia Hsu Tan, Trent, J.H. Wilson, Yamamoto, and Young.

As of January 1925:

Honorary Presidents, Bruce, Coolidge, Massey, Mackenzie-King, Rama VI, Tokugawa, Tsao; President, Farrington; Director, Ford.[4]

As of January 1926:

Honorary Presidents, Bruce, J.G. Coates (Prime Minister of New Zealand), Coolidge, Mackenzie-King, Rama VI, Tokugawa, and Tsao; President, Farrington; Director, Ford.

As of January 1927:

Honorory Presidents, Bruce, P. Elias Calles (President of Mexico), Coates, Coolidge, Mackenzie-King, Prachatipok (Siam), Tokugawa, and W.W. Yen (Chief Executive of China); President, Farrington; Director, Ford.

As of January 1928:

No changes indicated.

---

than name. Hereafter, this listing cites the positions only when proper names were used.

[4]In 1924 the working officers list was simplified. Thereafter it is not mentioned again until 1935 except for the positions of President and Director. Also, all mention of Honorary Vice Presidents was dropped between 1925 and 1928.

As of January 1929:

Honorary Presidents, Bruce, Calles, Chiang Kai-shek (President of China), Coates, Coolidge, D. Fock (Governor-General of the Netherlands East Indies), Don Augusto B. Leguia (President of Peru), Mackenzie-King, Prachatipok, and Tokugawa; Honorary Vice President, H.L. Stimson (Governor-General of the Philippines); President, Farrington; Director, Ford.

As of January 1930:

Honorary Presidents, Bruce, Chiang, A.C.D. de Graeff (Governor-General of the Netherlands East Indies), Emilio Portes Gil (President of Mexico), Herbert Hoover (President of the United States), Don Carlos Ibanez (President of Chile), Leguia, Mackenzie-King, M. Pasquier (Governor-General of French Indo-China), Prachatipok, Tokugawa, Sir Joseph Ward (Prime Minister of New Zealand); Honorary Vice President, Stimson; President, Farrington; Director, Ford.

As of January 1931:

Honorary Presidents, Bruce, Chiang, de Graeff, Hoover, Ibanez, Leguia, Mackenzie-King, Pasquier, Prachatipok, P. Artis Rubio (President of Mexico), and Tokugawa; Honorary Vice President, Dwight F. Davis (Governor-General of the Philippines); President, Farrington; Director, Ford.

As of January 1932:

Honorary Presidents, Bruce, Chiang, de Graeff, Hoover, Ibanez, Leguia, Pasquier, Prachatipok, Rubio, and Tokugawa; Honorary Vice President, Davis; President, Farrington; Director, Ford.

As of January 1933:

Honorary Presidents, Bruce, Chiang, de Graeff, Hoover, Ibanez, Pasquier, Prachatipok, Rubio, and Tokugawa; Honorary Vice Presidents, Theodore Roosevelt (Governor-General of the Philippines); President, Farrington; Director, Ford.

As of January 1934:

Honorary Presidents, Chiang, de Graeff, Ibanez, J.A. Lyons (Prime Minister of Australia), Pasquier, Prachatipok, A.L. Rodriguez (President of Mexico), Franklin D. Roosevelt (President of the United States), and Tokugawa; Honorary Vice Presidents, Frank W. Murphy (Governor-General of the

Philippines) and John W. Troy (Governor of Alaska); Director, Ford.

As of January 1935:

Honorary Trustees, Ananda (King of Siam), Harry A. Baldwin (Hawaii Territorial Senator), Lazaro Cordenas (President of Mexico), Alfred W. Carter (Parker Ranch of Hawaii), Chiang, George P. Cooke (Hawaii Territorial Senator), B.C. de Jange (Governor-General of the Netherland East Indies), Sir Murchison Fletcher (Governor of Fiji), W. Forgan-Smith (Premier of Queensland), Herbert Hoover, Charles Evans Hughes, David Kawananakoa (Hawaii), Lyons, Murphy, T.D. Pattullo (Premier of British Columbia), Manuel Quezon (Pan-Pacific Association of the Philippines), H.E. Renē Robin (Governor-General of French Indo-China), Roosevelt, L.S. Rowe, Francis M. Swanzy (Pan-Pacific Women's Association of Oahu), T.E. Taylor (Pan-Pacific Women's Association of New Zealand), Tokugawa, Troy, Elsie Wilcox (Hawaii Territorial Senator), and Helen Wilson (Postmistress of Pago Pago); President, Frear; Vice Presidents, C.K. Ai and Iga Mori; Secretary, Ann Y. Satterthwaite; Treasurer, Howard K. Burgess; Finance Chairman; W.F. Dillingham; Pan-Pacific Research Institution Chairman, Frederich G. Krauss; Executive Director, Ford; Resident Trustees, Ai, Mrs. Arthur Andrews, Mrs. George P. Castle, A.D. Castro, David L. Crawford, George P. Denison, Dillingham, J.R. Farrington, Ford, Walter F. Frear, Krauss, John C. Lane, S.C. Lee, T.S. Lee, C. Legot, Oren E. Long, Mori, J.B. Poindexter, Satterthwaite, Yasutaro Soga, H.C. Lennent, Wilfred Tsukiyama, John H. Wilson, and Fred Wright.[5]

As of January 1936:

President, Frear; Vice Presidents, Farrington and Mori; Secretary, Satterthwaite; Finance Chairman, Dillingham; Pan Pacific Research Institution Chairman, Krauss; Editorial Director, George Mellon.

As of January 1937:

Honorary Trustees, Baldwin, Cordenas, Carter, Chiang, Cooke, de Jange, George W. Forbes (Prime Minister of New Zealand), Forgan-Smith, Hoover, Hughes, Kawananakoa,

---

[5]Changes in officers and officials beginning in 1935 reflect Ford's resignation from the Union and the Star Bulletin Publishing Company's assumption of control over Mid-Pacific Magazine.

H.H. Kung (Pan-Pacific Association of China), Lyons, W.L. Mackenzie-King, Kalidas Nag (Calcutta), Pattullo, Poindexter, Quezon, Sir Arthur Richards (Governor of Fiji), Robin, Roosevelt, Rowe, Swanzy, Taylor, Tokugawa, Troy, Wilcox, and Wilson; President, Krauss, Vice Presidents, Frear, Lee, and Mori; Treasurer, Castro; Executive Secretary, Satterthwaite; Resident Trustees, Andrews, Castle, Castro, Dillingham, Mrs. John P. Erdman, Frear, William H. Heen, Curtiss Iaukea, Krauss, K.T. Lee, S.C. Lee, T.S. Lee, Ligot, Lang, Benjamin L. Marx, Mori, Soga, Tsukiyama, Sam Wallace, Wilson, Y.C. Yang, and J.M. Young.

As of January 1938:

Honorary Trustees, Baldwin, Cordenas, Carter, Chiang, Cooke, de Jange, Forbes, Forgan-Smith, Hoover, Hughes, Kawananakoa, King, Lyons, Mackenzie-King, Poindexter, Quezon, Richards, Robin, Nag, Roosevelt, Rowe, Swanzy, Tattullo, Taylor, Tokugawa, Troy, Wilcox, and Wilson; President, Lang; Vice Presidents, Frear, S.C. Lee, Mori, and James Tico Phillips; Treasurer, Castro; Executive Secretary, Satterthwaite; Resident Trustees, Andrews, Castle, Castro, Dillingham, Erdman, Frear, Heen, Iaukea, Krauss, K.T. Lee, S.C. Lee, T.S. Lee, Ligot, Long, Marx, Mori, Soga, Tsukiyama, Wallace, Wilson, Yang, and Young.

As of January 1939:

Honorary Trustees, Baldwin, Mary L. Ballert (Pan-Pacific Women's Association of British Columbia), H.E. Jules Brevie (Governor-General of French Indo-China), Cardenas, Carter, Mrs. George P. Castle, Chiang, Cooke, Charles S. Crane (Mayor of Honolulu), de Jange, Ford, Forgan-Smith, Hoover, Hughes, Curtiss Iaukea, Kawananakoa, Kung, Lyons, Mackenzie-King, Nag, Pattullo, Poindexter, Quezon, Richards, Roosevelt, Rowe, Swanzy, Georgina Sweet (President of the Pan-Pacific Women's Association), Taylor, Tokugawa, Troy, Wilcox, and Wilson; President, Long; Vice Presidents, Frear, S.C. Lee, Mori, and Phillips; Treasurer, Castro; Executive Secretary, Satterthwaite; Resident Trustees, Andrews, Castro, Dillingham, Erdman, A.V. Fortye, Frear, Herbert E. Gregory, Heen, Krauss, K.T. Lee, S.C. Lee, Ligot, S. Harrington Littell, Long, Marx, More, James Lee Phillips, Soga, Tsukiyama, Wallace, Wilson, Yang, and Young.

As of January 1940:

Honorary Trustees, Baldwin, Ballert, Brevie, Cordenas, Carter, Castle, Cooke, Crane, de Jange, Ford, Forgan-Smith, Frear, Ernest Gruening (Governor of Alaska), Hoover, Hughes,

Kawananokoa, Kung, Sir Harry Luke (Governor of Fiji), Mackenzie-King, Robert Menzies (Prime Minister of Australia), Nag, Pattullo, Poindexter, Quezon, Roosevelt, Rowe, Swanzy, Sweet, Taylor, Tokugawa, Wilcox, and Wilson; President, Castro; Vice Presidents, Erdman, Littell, Mori, and Yang; Treasurer, C.A. Mackintosh; Executive Secretary, Satterthwaite; Resident Trustees, David K. Akana, Andrews, Castro, Edward L. Clissold, Dillingham, Erdman, Fortye, Gregory, Heen, Krauss, Gregorio Labrador, K.T. Lee, Ligot, Littell, Frances P. McCann, Mori, Saga, Arthur M. Trask, Tsukiyama, G.J. Watumall, Wilson, Yang, and Young.

APPENDIX C

A STATEMENT OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE PAN-PACIFIC UNION AND THE INSTITUTE OF PACIFIC RELATIONS[1]

In view of some popular confusion as to the purpose, scope, and methods of the Pan-Pacific Union and the Institute of Pacific Relations and their relationship, the following statement issued by the two organizations is of interest:

The Pan-Pacific Union and the Institute of Pacific Relations are friendly but separate organizations.

The organizations are supplementary and are not duplicating activities.

Their ultimate objectives are similar; to bring about a better understanding and closer cooperation between the peoples of the Pacific.

The Pan-Pacific Union

The Pan-Pacific Union calls conferences of official and unofficial delegates from all the lands of the Pacific to discover and discuss common interests and to create in this way a network of interests which will promote a true patriotism of the Pacific.

The Pan-Pacific Union encourages the organization of local Pan-Pacific Clubs in the larger cities of Pacific countries to promote mutual understanding and cooperative effort between the citizen and the foreigner within the gates.

The Pan-Pacific Union seeks to emphasize those matters of common agreement in the Pacific and by simple methods and

---

[1]"A Statement of the Relationship Between the Pan-Pacific Union and the Institute of Pacific Relations," MPM, XXXIV (Aug., 1927), inside cover.

language to popularize international thought.

The Pan-Pacific Research Institution is an organization of research scientists entirely independent from the Pan-Pacific Union, though cooperating with its work, which is promoting the study of race and population problems especially as they are affected by the food supply. It maintains a guest house in Honolulu, where frequent small conferences of scientists are held, and distinguished guests and students from Pacific lands are entertained.

The Institute of Pacific Relations

The Institute of Pacific Relations encourages an exchange of opinions and a discussion of questions in which racial and national interests are in conflict and it tries to throw light upon these questions. It seeks out the danger zones in the relations of the Pacific peoples. It believes that the factors which underlie the immediate signs of race friction must be studied. It tries to discover and isolate the germs of Pacific troubles, but allows others to prescribe remedies.

1. It aims to interpret the culture and history of East to West and West to East, so that each may profit by sharing with the other and may develop a mutual respect and appreciation.

2. It calls biennial conferences, gathers data, promotes research and seeks to acquaint the public of the various countries with its findings.

3. The Institute of Pacific Relations is entirely unofficial in organization and seeks no government recognition or support.

4. It is not a Pan-Pacific activity, in that all races in the Pacific are not represented in the Institute, nor is it pledged to a Pan-Pacific interpretation of its work.

5. The Institute is following an independent development, has a separate field, technique, and to an extent a separate constituency.

It is therefore agreed:

1. That both organizations will in the course of correspondence, visitation and publication acquaint their

branches and the general public with the fact of their separate identity.

2. That reports of the activities, addresses and findings of the conferences of either organization will be published by the other only with the consent of the calling body.

3. That reports be exchanged between the two organizations to promote mutual understanding and an intelligent coordination of effort.

4. That wherever the two organizations exist in the same community, they cooperate with each other in the attainment of their ends.

APPENDIX D

An Annual Listing of Officers and Officials of the Institute of Pacific Relations Between 1925 and 1936 as Compiled from Various Documents and Publications[1]

Institute of Pacific Relations

As of July 1925:

Chairman, Ray Lyman Wilbur; Vice Chairman, Frank C. Atherton; Treasurer, L. Tenny Peck, General Secretary, J. Merle Davis; Assistant General Secretary, Charles F. Loomis.

As of January 1926:

No changes indicated.

As of January 1927:

No changes indicated.

As of January 1928:

Pacific Council: Chairman, Wilbur; Treasurer, Atherton; Members, Sir James Allen (New Zealand), Sir Robert T. Borden (Canada), F.W. Eggleston (Australia), Junnosuke Inouye (Japan), Sir Frederick Whyte (Great Britain), and David Z.T. Yui (China).

Secretariat: General Secretary, Davis; Associate General Secretary, Loomis; Research Secretary, J.B. Condliffe; Editor, Elizabeth Green.

As of January 1929:

Pacific Council: Chairman, Wilbur (United States); Treasurer, Atherton (Hawaii); Members, Allen (New Zealand), Borden (Canada), Lionel Curtis (Great Britain), Eggleston (Australia), Inouye (Japan), and Yui (China).

---

[1]This listing covers only the period when the Institute was headquartered in Hawaii and lists only the leaders of the central organization. See Appendix E for a listing of local branch officials. This listing is drawn primarily from the various issues of Pacific Affairs, 1928-36.

Secretariat: General Secretary, Davis; Associate Secretaries, Condliffe, Green, Loomis, and Hawkling Yen; Librarian, Isabel Clark; Office Manager, Marguerite C. Miller.

As of January 1930:

Pacific Council: Chairman, Jerome D. Greene (United States); Treasurer, Atherton (Hawaii); Members, Allen (New Zealand), Borden (Canada), Curtis (Great Britain), Eggleston (Australia), Inazo Nitobe (Japan), and Yui (China).

Secretariat: General Secretary, Davis; Associate Secretaries, Condliffe, Green, Loomis, Miller, Keichi Yamasaki, and Yen.

As of January 1931:

Pacific Council: Chairman, Greene (United States); Treasurer, Atherton (Hawaii); Members, Allen (New Zealand), Curtis (Great Britain), Eggleston (Australia), Nitobe (Japan), Newton W. Rowell (Canada), and Yui (China).

Secretariat: Acting General Secretary, Loomis; Research Secretary, Condliffe; Editorial Secretary, Green; Office Manager, Miller.

As of January 1932:

Pacific Council: Chairman, Greene (United States); Treasurer, Atherton (Hawaii); Members, Allen (New Zealand), Eggleston (Australia), Hsu Sing-loh (China), Nitobe (Japan), Rafael Palma (Philippines), F.N. Petroff (Soviet Union), Archibald Rose (Great Britain), and Rowell (Canada).

Secretariat: Acting General Secretary, Loomis; Acting Research Secretary, W.L. Holland; Editorial Secretary, Green; Office Manager, Miller.

As of January 1933:

Pacific Council: Chairman, Greene (United States); Treasurer, Atherton (Hawaii); Members, Allen (New Zealand), Eggleston (Australia), Hu Shih (China), Nitobe (Japan), Palma (Philippines), Petroff (Soviet Union), Rose (Great Britain), and Rowell (Canada).

Secretariat: Acting General Secretary, Loomis; Research Secretary, Holland (on leave); Acting Research Secretary, Frederick W. Field; Editorial Secretary, Green.

As of January 1934:

Pacific Council: Chairman and Treasurer, Atherton (Hawaii); Members, Allen (New Zealand), Newton D. Baker

(United States), Manuel Comus (Philippines), L.P. de Bassy (Netherlands), Eggleston (Australia), Hu Shih (China), Vincent Massey (Canada), V.E. Motylev (Soviet Union), and Rose (Great Britain).

Secretariat: General Secretary, Edward C. Carter; Conference Secretary, Loomis; Research Secretary, Holland; Editor, Owen Lattimore.

As of January 1935:

No changes indicated.

As of January 1936:

Pacific Council: Chairman, Newton D. Baker (United States); Treasurer, Atherton (Hawaii); Members, Allen (New Zealand), Carl L. Alsberg (United States), Camus (Philippines), J.W. Dafoe (Canada), deBussy (Netherlands), Eggleston (Australia), Hu Shih (China), Viscount K. Ishii (Japan), Motylev (Soviet Union), and Rose (Great Britain).

Secretariat: General Secretary, Carter; Secretary of the Honolulu Office, Loomis; Research Secretary, Holland; Editor, Lattimore; Assistant Secretaries, Elsie Fairfax-Cholmeley, Pardee Lowe, Kate Mitchell, and Richard L. Pyke; Research Assistants, Chen Han-seng, Charlotte Taytor, and Karl A. Wittfogel.

APPENDIX E

An Annual Listing of Officers and Officials of the Hawaii Branch of the Institute of Pacific Relations as Compiled from Various Documents and Publications.[1]

Hawaii Branch of Institute of Pacific Relations

Prior to January 1935:

No record of officers or officials.

As of January 1935:

Officers: Chairman, Royal N. Chapman; Vice Chairman, Shao Chang Lee; Secretary-Treasurer, Charles F. Loomis; Research Committee Chairman, Philip S. Platt; Education Committee Chairman, Oscar F. Shepherd; Executive Committee, Robbins B. Anderson and Shigeo Soga.

Advisory Committee: Frank C. Atherton, Romanzo Adams, Anderson, Chapman, David L. Crawford, A.L. Dean, Herbert E. Gregory, S.C. Lee, Iga Mori, Yasatori Soga, Hugh C. Tennent, and Charles A. Wong.

As of January 1936:

No changes indicated.

As of January 1937:

Officers: Chairman, Peter H. Buck; Vice Chairman, Frank E. Midkiff; Secretary, Loomis; Treasurer, Atherton, Advisory Committee: Riley H. Allen, Anderson, Paul S. Bachman, Chapman, Crawford, Dean, W.F. Dillingham, Lee, Mori, Platt, Shepherd, Soga, Tennent, and Heaton L. Wrenn.

As of January 1938:

Officers: Chairman, Midkiff; Vice Chairman, Dean; Secretary, Loomis; Treasurer, Atherton.

---

[1]This listing is drawn from a variety of sources as the organization did not regularly publish a full list of its officers and officials.

Advisory Committee: Allen, Anderson, Bachman, Buck, Chapman, Crawford, Dillingham, Gerald W. Fisher, Lee, Mori, Platt, Shepherd, Soga, Tennent, and Wrenn.

As of January 1939:

No changes indicated.

As of January 1940:

Officers: Chairman, Allen; Vice Chairman, Dean; Secretary, Loomis; Treasurer, Atherton.
Advisory Committee: Anderson, Bachman, Buck, Crawford, Dillingham, Fisher, Peyton Harrison, Lee, Midkiff, Mori, Platt, Shepherd, Soga, Tennent, and Wrenn.

As of January 1941:

No changes indicated.

As of January 1942:

Officers: Chairman, Shepherd, Vice Chairman, Fisher; Secretary, Loomis; Treasurer, Atherton.
Advisory Committee: Allen, Anderson, Bachman, Buck, Dean, Dillingham, Harrison, Fred K. Lam, Midkiff, Tennent, Wrenn, and Shigeo Yoshida.

As of January 1943:

No changes indicated.

As of January 1944:

Officers: Chairman, Fisher; Vice Chairman, Bachman; Secretary and Acting Treasurer, Loomis.
Advisory Committee: No record.

As of January 1945:

No record.

As of January 1946:

No record.

As of January 1947:

No record.

As of January 1948:

Officers: Chairman, Wrenn; Vice Chairman, Fisher; Secretary, Loomis; Treasurer, Midkiff.
Advisory Committee: No record.

As of January 1949:

No record.

As of January 1950:

Officers: Chairman, Wrenn; Vice Chairman, J. Ballard Atherton; Secretary, Loomis; Treasurer, Midkiff.
Advisory Committee: Allen, E.C. Auchter, Bachman, Dean, Dillingham, Fisher, Lam, James H. Shoemaker, Gregg D. Sinclair, and Tennent.

As of January 1951:

No changes indicated.

As of January 1952:

Officers: Chairman, J. Ballard Atherton; no further records.

As of January 1953:

No changes indicated.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books and Articles

"Alexander Hume Ford." Pan-Pacific Who's Who: 1940-41. Edited by George F.M. Neilist. 227. Honolulu, 1941.

Allen, Gwenfread C. The Y.M.C.A. in Hawaii: 1869-1969. Honolulu, 1969.

Angus, Henry F. The Problems of Peaceful Change in the Pacific Area. London, 1937.

Baker, Ray Jerome. A Brief History of the Lion's Club of Honolulu: 1926-1946. Honolulu, 1946.

Daws, Gavan. Shoal of Time: A History of the Hawaiian Islands. New York, 1968.

Elkin, A.P. Pacific Science Association: Its History and Role in International Cooperation. Honolulu, 1961.

Feher, Joseph. Hawaii: A Pictural History. Honolulu, 1968.

Fuchs, Lawrence H. Hawaii Pono: A Social History of Hawaii. New York, 1961.

Gray, Francine duPlessix. Hawaii: The Sugar Coated Fortress. New York, 1972.

Green, Elizabeth. "Race and Politics in Hawaii." Asia, XXXV (June, 1935), 370-74.

Griswold, A. Whitney. The Far Eastern Policy of the United States. New Haven, 1938.

"Hawaii: Sugar Coated Fortress." Fortune, XXII (Aug., 1940), 30-37.

Hodge, Clarence L. and Peggy Ferris. Building Honolulu: A Century of Community Service. Honolulu, 1960.

Hunter, Charles. "Hawaii." Colliers Encyclopedia, 1960 Yearbook. New York, 1960, pp. 303-308.

Hunter, Louise Harris. Buddhism in Hawaii: Its Impact On A Yankee Community. Honolulu, 1971.

Institute of Pacific Relations Publications on the Pacific: 1925-1952. New York, 1953.

Johnson, Donald D. The United States in the Pacific. Honolulu, 1964.

Judd, Jerrit P., IV. Hawaii: An Informal History. New York, 1961.

Kittleson, David. "A Bibliographical Essay on the Territory of Hawaii, 1900-1959." The Journal of Pacific History, VI (1971), 195-218.

Kuykendall, Ralph S. The Hawaiian Kingdom, Volume III, 1874-1893, The Kalakaua Dynasty. Honolulu, 1967.

_____ and A. Grove Day. Hawaii: A History From Polynesian Kingdom to American State. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1961.

Lind, Andrew. "Hawaii at the Polls." Asia, XXXVI (Oct., 1936), 643-45.

_____. An Island Community. Chicago, 1938.

_____. Hawaii's People. Honolulu, 1967.

Littler, Robert. The Governance of Hawaii. Stanford, 1927.

Meller, Norman. "Centralization in Hawaii." American Political Science Review, 52 (Mar., 1958), pp. 98-107.

Miyamoto, Kazuo. Hawaii: End of the Rainbow. Rutland, Vermont, 1964.

Mulholland, John. Hawaii's Religions. Rutland, Vermont, 1970.

Packer, Peter and Bob Thomas. The Massie Case. New York, 1961.

Pratt, Helen Gay. Hawaii: Off-Shore Territory. New York, 1944.

_____. The Story of Mid-Pacific Institute. Honolulu, 1957.

Schmitt, Robert C. Demographic Statistics of Hawaii: 1778-1965. Honolulu, 1968.

Symes, Lillian. "Other Side of Paradise: Americanization vs. Sugar in Hawaii." Harper's Magazine, 166 (Dec., 1932), pp. 38-47.

_____. "What About Hawaii?" Harper's Magazine, 165 (Oct., 1932), pp. 529-39.

Understanding Asia: The Aims and Work of the I.P.R. New York, 1951.

Vandercook, John. King Cane: The Story of Sugar in Hawaii. New York, 1939.

Williams, William Appleton. The Shaping of American Diplomacy. Chicago, 1956.

Wittermans, Elizabeth. Inter-Ethnic Relations in a Plural Society. Groningen, 1964.

Yost, Harold. History of the Outrigger Canoe Club. Honolulu, 1971.

Serials

Ayer Directory of Publications. Philadelphia, 1922-1970.

Bulletin of the Pan-Pacific Union, 1919-1935. Honolulu.

Honolulu Advertiser, 1919-1945. Honolulu.

Honolulu Star-Bulletin, 1912-1945. Honolulu.

Institute of Pacific Relations Notes, 1934-1938. New York.

Journal of the Pan-Pacific Research Institution, 1926-1935. Honolulu.

Mid-Pacific Magazine, 1911-1936. Honolulu.

Pacific Affairs, 1928-1970. Honolulu, New York, and Vancouver.

Pacific Commercial Advertiser, 1900-1919. Honolulu.

Pan-Pacific, 1937-1941. Honolulu.

Pan-Pacific Youth, 1926-1929. Honolulu.

Government Publications

Congressional Record. 82 Cong., 2 sess., Washington, 1952.

Department of Planning and Economic Development. State of Hawaii Data Book: A Statistical Abstract. Honolulu, 1971.

Hawaii Promotion Committee Annual Report, 1911. Honolulu, 1911.

_____, 1912. Honolulu, 1912.

Laws of the Territory of Hawaii Passed by the Legislature at its Tenth Regular Session, 1919. Honolulu, 1919.

Report of the Governor of Hawaii to the Secretary of the Interior for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1914. Washington, 1914.

_____, June 30, 1918. Washington, 1918.

_____, June 30, 1921. Washington, 1921.

Senate Journal, Twelfth Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, Regular Session, 1923. Honolulu, 1923.

State of Hawaii. Governor's Conference on the Year 2000: Preliminary Task Force Reports. Honolulu, 1970.

Documentary Collections

Chamber of Commerce of Honolulu Papers. Archives of Hawaii. Honolulu, Hawaii.

Dissolved Corporation Files. Archives of Hawaii. Honolulu, Hawaii.

Farrington Papers. Archives of Hawaii. Honolulu, Hawaii.

Frear Papers. Archives of Hawaii. Honolulu, Hawaii.

McCarthy Papers. Archives of Hawaii. Honolulu, Hawaii.

Poindexter Papers. Archives of Hawaii. Honolulu, Hawaii.

Uncataloged and unpublished Institute of Pacific Relations documents in Sinclair Library, University of Hawaii.

Uncataloged and unpublished Pan-Pacific Union documents in Sinclair Library, University of Hawaii.

Unpublished Institute of Pacific Relations documents in Pacific and Asian Affairs Council headquarters, Honolulu.

Reports

Condliffe, J.B., ed. Problems of the Pacific: Proceedings of the Second Conference of the Institute of Pacific Relations, Honolulu, Hawaii, July 15 to 29, 1927. Chicago, 1928.

_____, ed. Problems of the Pacific: Proceedings of the Third Conference of the Institute of Pacific Relations, Nara and Kyoto, Japan, October 23 to November 9, 1929. Chicago, 1930.

First Pan-Pacific Conference on Education, Rehabilitation, Reclamation, and Recreation: Report of Proceedings. Washington, 1927.

Holland, W.L. and Kate L. Mitchell, eds. Problems of the Pacific, 1936: Aims and Results of Social and Economic Policies in Pacific Countries. Chicago, 1937.

Institute of Pacific Relations. Honolulu, 1925.

Institute of Pacific Relations: Honolulu Session, June 30-July 15, 1925. Honolulu, 1925.

I.P.R. in Wartime: Annual Report of the American Council of the Institute of Pacific Relations, Incorporated: 1941-43. New York, 1944.

Lasker, Bruno, ed. Problems of the Pacific, 1931: Proceedings of the Fourth Conference of the Institute of Pacific Relations, Hangchow and Shanghai, China, October 21-November 2. Chicago, 1932.

Proceedings of the First Pan-Pacific Scientific Conference. Honolulu, 1921.

The First Pan-Pacific Educational Conference: Program Proceedings. Honolulu, 1921.

Miscellaneous

Dissertations:

Chong, Anson. "Economic Development of Hawaii and the Growth of Tourism." Unpublished master's thesis. Columbia University, 1963.

Horn, Jason. "Primacy in the Pacific Under the Hawaiian Kingdom." Unpublished master's thesis. University of Hawaii, 1951.

Kittleson, David. "The History of the College of Hawaii." Unpublished master's thesis. University of Hawaii, 1966.

Pratte, Alf. "A History of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin." Unpublished master's thesis. Brigham Young University, 1967.

Interviews

Honolulu, Hawaii. Personal interview with Alexander Castro. December 9, 1971.

Honolulu, Hawaii. Personal interview with Charles Gregory. December 9, 1971.

Honolulu, Hawaii. Personal interview with Donald C. Mair. January 20, 1972.

Honolulu, Hawaii. Personal interview with Janet Bell. December 10, 1971.

Honolulu, Hawaii. Personal interview with Joseph Stickney. December 11, 1971.

Honolulu, Hawaii. Personal interview with Mrs. George Kaufman. December 10, 1971.