INFORMATION TO USERS

This material was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or “target” for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is “Missing Page(s)”. If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.

2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.

3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in “sectioning” the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.

4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from ”photographs” if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of ”photographs” may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.

5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

University Microfilms International
300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106 USA
St. John's Road, Tyler's Green
High Wycombe, Bucks, England HP10 8HR
PRATTE, Paul Alfred, 1938-
KE ALAKA'I: THE ROLE OF THE HONOLULU STAR-BULLETIN IN THE HAWAIIAN STATEHOOD MOVEMENT.

University of Hawaii, Ph.D., 1976
American Studies

Xerox University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

1977

PAUL ALFRED PRATTE

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED
KE ALAKA'I

THE ROLE OF THE HONOLULU STAR-BULLETIN

IN THE HAWAIIAN STATEHOOD MOVEMENT

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

DECEMBER 1976

By

Paul Alfred Pratte

Dissertation Committee:

Stuart Gerry Brown, Chairman
Floyd Matson
Reuel Denney
Serrell Hillman
Donald F. Johnson
ABSTRACT

The study describes the role of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin as a leader in the Hawaii statehood movement and examines the lives and work of four major decision makers involved in the Star-Bulletin statehood crusade: Wallace Farrington, Joseph Farrington, Elizabeth Farrington, and Riley H. Allen.

The Star-Bulletin helped to promote statehood with its editorial position, stood for equal rights for Hawaii's citizens of all races, universal and integrated education, and advocated the repeal of racial restrictions in American immigration laws.

The author concludes that the Star-Bulletin and its owners and editors were able to achieve and maintain a position of leadership in the Hawaii statehood movement for the following reasons: (1) The foundations of American institutions were already established in the Hawaiian Islands when Wallace Farrington arrived in 1894; (2) Hawaii's free and vigorous press; (3) The early start of Wallace Farrington's crusade for statehood; (4) Star-Bulletin support of ideas which were historically sound; (5) Consistency in editorial policy; (6) The small size of the community served by the Star-Bulletin; (7) The growth in Star-Bulletin circulation compared to Hawaii's population; (8) Community reliance on the Star-Bulletin and the printed word; (9) Star-Bulletin leadership among opinion leaders; (10) The paper's "liberalizing" effect on Hawaii; (11) Education and skill of its leaders; (12) Friendship with other journalists; (13) Influence in the Office of Territorial Governor, Territorial Legislature and Congress; (14) Dedication to the cause; and (15) Testimony of witnesses.
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CHAPTER I

STATEHOOD! AN INTRODUCTION

March 12, 1959

Tracing the development of American journalism against the social, political and economic background which shaped it will emphasize this overriding fact. It should do much more; it should demonstrate that journalism develops with a society--now leading by a bit, now following slightly, now in step--never very far from the march of national culture.

The Mass Media and Modern Society

It was exactly 9:57 a.m., Hawaii time, March 12, 1959, when Representative John P. Saylor, a Pennsylvania Republican, cast the 218th and deciding "aye" vote in the United States House of Representatives in Washington, D.C. Within moments after Saylor's vote William F. Quinn, Governor of the Territory of Hawaii, placed a call to Honolulu from a booth adjoining the House chambers.

Nearly 5,000 miles away in the seat of Hawaii's government at Iolani Palace, Acting Governor Edward E. Johnston picked up the telephone to receive formally the message. "It's over Ed, they did it," Quinn told his acting governor.¹ The United States Congress had finally approved statehood for the Hawaiian Islands. Hawaii's 620,000 residents had been given the right to govern themselves within the federal system. They were no longer "second class" citizens as they had been since annexation to the United States in 1898.

The people of Hawaii would now have all the rights and privileges spelled out specifically in the U.S. Constitution for citizens of all
States: full voting representation in Congress, the right to vote for the President, the right to elect their own state officials, latitude in law making by their own legislators, elimination of overlapping of federal-local authority, an equal share in Federal grants, and a voice in amending the constitution. They had enjoyed none of these rights as a territory under the Organic Act passed in 1900.

A. A. (Bud) Smyser, who was city editor of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin when the statehood bill was passed in the House of Representatives summarized the situation this way in the lead story he wrote for his newspaper:

Congress ended decades of procrastination today and sent to the White House a bill to give Hawaii the Statehood it has long deserved.

In 1968 he explained:

"If the lead was heavily editorial, it was also heartfelt and a lot of pent-up emotion rode on every word of it. It was my lead, and it reflected a lot of how I felt after 13 years of covering the Statehood battle and other beats."

"Bill Ewing, now managing editor, had been in the fight for twice that long, and editor Riley Allen more than three times that long.

"It was a day when everybody agreed with Star-Bulletin treasurer A. K. Wong who said 'We're all haoles now!' It meant that regardless of race or anything else, the residents of Hawaii were all equal now in the eyes of the U.S.

"This was what Statehood was really all about--the sense of equality, the sense of pride it brought--or perhaps the reverse, the battle to end the sense of inferiority that somehow we weren't allowed to be equal despite measuring up to every test of Statehood ever before imposed on any state admitted to the Union.

"Since there was at the root the feeling that the long delay was because we had a predominantly Oriental population and were thus feared in some quarters as a state that would be liberal on civil rights, the phrase 'we're all haoles now' had particular meaning and poignancy."
"It was equally significant that our victory, when it was engineered, was in a large part thanks to two Texans—the Senate majority leader, Lyndon Johnson, and the House Speaker, Sam Rayburn.

"Johnson's active support and Rayburn's acquiescence were a sign of the new liberalism developing in the country.

"The Alaska and Hawaii Statehood Bills were in this sense forerunners of the heavy flow of civil rights legislation to follow.

"Victory in Hawaii's long term battle for equal rights was a sign that the Congress was moving toward approval of more equality in other areas too."4

Donald Dedmon, in his analysis of the debate in Congress on the admission of Hawaii as a state also emphasized the influence of Senate Majority leader Lyndon Johnson and House Speaker Sam Rayburn. When Johnson moved that the Senate proceed to consider the Hawaii statehood bill on March 11, the day before it passed in the House, Johnson's motion was promptly approved.5

Many others have been cited for their special role in the achievement of statehood for Hawaii. Dedmon refers to a dozen specific groupings of individuals and institutions, including the Hawaii Statehood Commission, Hawaii's Congressmen, private citizens, territorial officials, administrative officials, elected representatives, United States officials, and special interest groups.6 Of particular note, because of their involvement with specific statehood bills in Congress, have been Hawaii's non-voting delegates Samuel W. King (later to serve as Governor of the territory), Joseph Farrington, Elizabeth Farrington, and John Burns, three term Governor and delegate to Congress when the statehood bill was finally passed in 1959.
Although deserving of a great deal of recognition for his role in helping to achieve statehood, Burns himself said "it is impossible to name the many outstanding people in Congress, in the 49 states and in Hawaii, who have played special and notable parts in preparing and helping to secure passage of the statehood bill." Burns believed that statehood was "a movement of the people," and that "no one man or group of men is responsible." 7 In an article written for a national municipal magazine shortly after passage of the statehood bill, Burns elaborated on this belief:

Fundamentally, no one man or group of men is responsible. Statehood is, as I have said, a victory of and for Hawaii's people, and it is they who are responsible. It is they who have made for Hawaii the distinguished record by which it so patently deserved statehood. Anything that any man from Hawaii did to help secure statehood was successful only insofar as he genuinely represented Hawaii's people and embodied their deeds and achievements. 8

One of the functions of this study is to demonstrate that the Hawaii statehood movement was more than a "movement of the people." The dissertation will show that statehood was led, directed, and to some extent influenced, by specific individuals and institutions from before the time of annexation until 1959. Even before annexation there were efforts to influence Hawaii's people to accept a closer economic and political relationship with the United States. These efforts started in 1820 when the first American missionaries arrived in the Islands with a printing press.

John Burns, and Hawaii's other non-voting delegates to Congress, were in a position to be influential because of their presence in Congress. As Dedmon noted, Hawaii's Congressional delegates managed the debate,
introduced enabling legislation, provided witnesses, practiced personal diplomacy, and kept the statehood issue alive in the Congress for 24 years. 9

Even before the question of statehood began to be formally debated in Congress, however, the people of Hawaii and the U.S. mainland had to be persuaded that statehood for Hawaii was desirable. Unlike the other states, Hawaii and Alaska too were non-contiguous. Further, Hawaii an island and located more than 2,000 miles from California. Unlike the predominately Caucasian population of the other states, Hawaii's population was racially mixed with a population of between 30 and 40 percent Japanese. It had a tightly knit economy, controlled locally by the "Big Five" companies and dependent on major sugar interests. After the war, charges of communist domination were made. Later there was political concern over what Hawaii's representation to Congress would be if the territory was allowed to become a state.

From 1854--when statehood was first proposed to the President of the United States by the ruler of Hawaii--until 1959, the press on the mainland and in the Hawaiian Islands played a significant role in keeping the statehood issue alive and in helping to lead the movement. This was true of the early missionary press, the independent press, and the newspapers which supported annexation in Hawaii. As early as 1849 one newspaper in New York supported statehood. The issue was debated in the American press in 1893 and again in 1898. Over the years some newspapers have opposed statehood; others have supported it and provided leadership in the movement.
The purpose of this dissertation is to describe the role of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin as a leader in the Hawaii statehood movement from the time of its founding in 1912 until 1959. Even before 1912 the Star-Bulletin's vice president and general manager, Wallace Farrington, was a leader in the statehood movement as the editor of the Pacific Commercial Advertiser and the Evening Bulletin. After the death of Wallace Farrington, his son, Joseph, took a leadership role in the movement and used the Star-Bulletin to promote the statehood cause in Hawaii and in Washington where he served in the U.S. House of Representatives from 1942-1954. Upon the death of Joseph Farrington, his wife Elizabeth Farrington became president of the Star-Bulletin and a delegate to Congress until she was defeated by John Burns in 1956.

This study will outline specific methods that the Farrington family and their editor, Riley Allen, used to promote their statehood goal. The dissertation is not a history. It is not a political study. It is not content analysis. It is not a psychobiography, although the study contains elements of all of these. Rather it is an effort to outline the procedures utilized by one family and its newspaper in providing news, interpretation, editorial opinion and otherwise educating its readers and other key decision makers to the advantages of statehood and other democratic ideals. It is a study of newspaper leadership and its effects on a developing Pacific community. It is an effort to describe a newspaper which has taken up "a great notion" and which serves as a beacon for wandering minds. In the words of Alexis DeTocqueville:

The effect of a newspaper is not only to suggest the same purpose to a great number of persons, but to furnish means for executing in common the designs which they may have singly conceived. The principal citizens who inhabit an aristocratic
country discern each other from afar; and if they wish to unite their forces, they move towards each other, drawing a multitude of men after them. It frequently happens, on the contrary, in democratic countries, that a great number of men who wish or who want to combine cannot accomplish it, because, as they are very insignificant and lost amidst the crowd, they cannot see, and know not where to find, one another. A newspaper then takes up the notion or the feeling which had occurred simultaneously, but singly, to each of them. All are then immediately guided towards this beacon; and these wandering minds, which had long sought each other in darkness, at length meet and unite. The newspaper brought them together and the newspaper is still necessary to keep them united.\(^{10}\)

In order to show how the Star-Bulletin provided leadership and exerted influence on Hawaii's population and decision makers, the dissertation will present the background and philosophy of the paper's owners and editors who controlled the quality of ideas and facts being transmitted. It will stress how the quality of facts and ideas conveyed to the community by the newspaper can be found in the continuity of certain family influences. It will describe the process by which certain information and facts were gathered and presented and other ideas suppressed. Most significantly, the dissertation describes the efforts whereby Star-Bulletin owners and editors worked to provide leadership and influence in legislative and executive bodies to which they were appointed or elected in Hawaii and in Washington, where the ultimate decision for statehood was made.

The theme for this study comes in part from the following quote concerning journalism and the development of a society from *The Mass Media and Modern Society*.

Tracing the development of American journalism against the social, political and economic background which shaped it will emphasize this overriding fact. It should do much more; it should demonstrate that journalism develops with
a society—now leading by a bit, now following slightly, now in step—never very far from the march of national culture. 11

The dissertation will show that the Star-Bulletin was ahead of the Hawaiian culture in leading the statehood movement for nearly 60 years. In the language of the Hawaiians, the Star-Bulletin served as "Ke'alaka'i," the leader.

In order to understand how an institution such as a newspaper is able to provide leadership and influence during a lengthy period of human history, it is first necessary to understand these basic terms. It is also essential to understand the means by which a newspaper is able to influence its audience.

Frank Luther Mott, in a discussion on the editorial influence of the famous American newspaper editor, Horace Greely, explained the difference between the terms "leadership" and "influence."

Let it be remembered that leadership and influence are not synonymous; so far as opinion is concerned, leadership crystallizes and organizes, while influence forms and controls. 12

While influence or control may seem apparent to some, it cannot be demonstrated with any degree of scientific conclusiveness. Leadership, or the crystallization and organization of opinion, is less difficult.

In addition to this working definition, it is important to enumerate from the first the specific means by which a newspaper may influence its readers.

In his book of readings on "Mass Communications," Wilbur Schramm suggests that there are two extreme theories of the effects of mass media. One, similar to the stimulus-response theory developed by Pavlov is described as the "1984" theory. It assumes that the media is extremely
potent, and, in the hands of advertisers, political propagandists and
mass educators, is manipulating man against his will.

At the other end of the spectrum is the theory described by Paul K.
Lazarfeld and Robert K. Merton, who argue that the media tends to be
conservative, to oppose change and stay close to the status quo. 13

In reality, Schramm claims that the truth lies somewhere in between
the two theories and probably a little closer to the latter. In
"Responsibility and the Mass Media," Schramm suggests that instead of
being like a "hypodermic needle" or "atomic bomb" in influence, the
media is more like a creek.

It feeds the ground it touches, following the lines of
existing contours, but preparing the way for change over a
long period of time. Sometimes it finds a spot where the
ground is soft and ready, and there it cuts a new channel.
Sometimes it carries floating material (an unpleasant thought
for a status figure!) which helps to change the appearance
of the banks of the stream. Occasionally, under most favorable
conditions and during times of flood, it washes away a
piece of ground and gives the channel a new look. This like
all other metaphors, has its inadequacies, but it is better
than the other ones. 14

In a discussion with this writer in August, 1975, Dr. Schramm
stated that his metaphor of the creek is still valid, but added that his
analogy might be expanded to that of a river. 15 This was the figure of
speech used by Abraham Lincoln in an interview with a reporter from the
London Times shortly before the start of the Civil War. At that time
Lincoln said that he was interested in the support of the great British
publication because it was the greatest power in the world that he knew
"... next to the Mississippi River." 16 Although all figures of speech
have their weaknesses, this writer has chosen Schramm's description of
the media in the discussion of the leadership of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin
in the statehood movement.
In the Spring, 1974, issue of the Public Interest, Paul Weaver reminds us that the press is still the co-equal of the major political institutions as the fourth estate. It is a political institution in its own right, intimately bound up with all institutions of government.

It affects them and is affected by them in turn, and together they determine the nature of the regime and the quality of public life. Governmental institutions have political effects through their exercise of legislative, executive, or judicial powers; the press achieves its impact through the way it influences the entry of ideas and information into the "public space" in which political life takes place. So the basic question to be asked about the press is: What is its relation to other political institutions, and how does it consequently manage the public space.17

Much study in this area is needed. "It is clear," as Walter Lippman wrote, "that in a society where public opinion has become decisive, nothing that counts in the formation of it can really be a matter of indifference."

Any newspaper assumes the role, described by Peterson, Jensen and Rivers, as an "informer and interpreter."18 The reporter carries out the important function of interpreting, or making meaning out of, a complex urban society--particularly when a concentration of power is involved. As noted by Ray Eldon Hiebert:

Journalists, as opposed to the literati, are concerned with power rather than beauty, with information and persuasion rather than belles lettres. It is not surprising that reporters congregate in the power centers of society, while the poets are off in the lake country or the ghettos.19

The expansion of the reporter's responsibilities and his talent in translating the mysteries of a complex urban society into easily-read columns, has contributed to the evolution of more sophisticated journalists. Leo Rosten, Dan Nimmo, Douglass Carter and William L. Rivers have all discussed Washington correspondents and their role as
"The Opinionmakers," and "The Fourth Estate." Best-known examples are Walter Lippman, Arthur Krock, James Reston, David Brinkley, Drew Pearson, Jack Anderson, and *Time* magazine. Little has been said, however, about similar opinionmakers associated with local and regional newspapers throughout the country. Another purpose of this dissertation is to show both the role of the reporter and the opinionmaker in providing facts, information, and interpretation to Hawaii's multi-racial population over the years.

The Honolulu Star-Bulletin provided leadership for its readers over a long period of time through its editorial pages, or in the persuader's role. In contrast to the first function carried out on the news pages, where the reporter provides a daily agenda of news, issues, heroes and villains, the editorial writer attempts to precipitate opinion into action. He does this through intentional advocacy--editorials, editorial cartoons, columns and interpretative columns--intended to lead the reader to a conclusion.

Because American newspapers have changed over the years from partisan publications to common carriers of the news however, the role of persuasion is now subordinate to that of reporting. In the words of Jensen, Peterson and Rivers:

> The informational content of the media is probably more influential on public opinion than the avowedly persuasive. That is, news stories may be a greater force in shaping public attitudes than editorials and political columns. They record events, and the events a paper reports probably change more minds than what it advocates.\(^{20}\)

Attempts by newspapers to influence public attitudes must meet any combination or all of the following criteria as summarized by Schramm:
1. To accomplish attitude change, a suggestion for change must first be received and accepted.

2. The suggestion will be more likely to be accepted if it meets existing personality needs and drives.

3. The suggestion will be more likely to be accepted if it is in harmony with valued group norms and loyalties.

4. The suggestion is more likely to be accepted if the source is perceived as trustworthy or expert.

5. The suggestion is more likely to be accepted if the message follows certain rules of "rhetoric" for attitude changing communication. E.g., . . . There is often an advantage in stating a desired conclusion specifically and positively. . . . Sometimes it is better to state both sides of an issue; other times, to state only one side. . . . repeat with variation. . . . use simplifying labels and slogans where appropriate. . . . make use, where possible, of audience participation. . . . fit the strength of the emotional appeal to the desired result. . . . organize the message to the advantage of primacy and recency.

6. A suggestion carried by mass media plus face-to-face reinforcement is more likely to be accepted than a suggestion carried by either alone, other things being equal.21

A means used by professional journalists at all levels to increase their sphere of influence is a process described as "social journalism." This can take place whenever newsmen or their publishers congregate in bars, restaurants, at cocktail parties or country clubs or at conventions and annual meetings. An article in Newsweek magazine describes this important form of journalism.

... the dinner party is Washington's agora, a focus of commerce between reporters and their sources. In a town that consists largely of those who govern and those who watch them govern, it's often more important--and sometimes more enticing--for the two sides to chew the fat over Stroganoff than to match wits at a press conference. A lot gets accomplished. ... Most of the press corps would agree ... As a way of gaining access, social journalism is a media methodology uniquely Washington's own. "I
don't think there's any other capital in the world where newspapermen come in the front door rather than the side door to the degree they do here" says columnist Clayton Fritchey, whose wife, Polly, is one of the circuit's "A" list hostesses. "I think any bureau chief or columnist is making a mistake if he doesn't go to these parties. It's immensely useful, especially to test a line of thinking about a situation with those close to it." More than that, the parties are a way of making a reporter visible on the Capital's competitive media front--"so that when you call a public official, you're a face, not just a voice," as one bureau man puts it.22

The Farrington family and Star-Bulletin editors used social journalism to make important inroads and converts to their statehood cause, both in government and the newspaper world. This paper will provide some illustrations.

Finally, a means for newsmen to move into an arena of greater leadership and influence is through the elective process. There is a strong journalistic tradition in America for the decision of newsmen to move into elective office as a means of carrying out strongly held goals. Horace Greeley, Henry Raymond, Joseph Pulitzer, William Randolph Hearst, Warren Harding and William Knowland were all newspapermen before seeking elective positions in American government.

The primary source material for this dissertation has come from interviews over the past twelve years with more than forty men and women in journalism and/or politics who were associated with the Hawaii statehood movement. Some of the interviews were conducted in connection with a general history of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin written by this author for his Master's degree from Brigham Young University in 1967; but most of the interviews were conducted in Hawaii during the past two years. In some cases, individuals were interviewed as part of an oral history being
conducted by the Department of American Studies at the University of Hawaii. A few individuals were interviewed as many as a dozen times, and some were invited to review chapters where their contributions were discussed. Ten persons responded to questions by letter when they could not be interviewed in Hawaii.

Another primary source of material was the public and personal files of Wallace, Joseph and Elizabeth Farrington in the Hawaii State Archives. The information there covering a period of more than sixty years provided a wealth of information and personal insights of the principals involved, as well as information on the statehood movement. Of particular value were the letters of Riley H. Allen to Congressional Delegates Joseph and Betty Farrington. The copies of Allen's letters in the Archives are the only ones remaining, as Allen ordered that all of his correspondence be destroyed following his death in 1966.

Another valuable source of information on the Farrington family and on the Honolulu Star-Bulletin was the unpublished manuscript on Wallace Farrington written by Boyden Sparks. The manuscript was intended to be published as the biography of the Star-Bulletin founder and former Governor, but Sparks died before it could be completed. Although the Farrington family had commissioned Sparks to write the manuscript, it was inadvertently turned over to the Archives and is now the property of the State of Hawaii. Copies of interviews with members of the Farrington family as well as with other Star-Bulletin personnel and political leaders provided invaluable information. A personal biography of his father, written by Joseph Farrington, served as a major source for Chapters III and IV.
In addition to the original manuscripts, letters and interviews, the author received great assistance from unpublished memoranda and from doctoral dissertations. Among the most helpful were two detailed memorandums on the "Evolution of the Star-Bulletin Editorial Policy," and an outline of the statehood movement written by A. A. Smyser, editorial page editor of the Star-Bulletin. An academic study which provided much help and inspiration was "An Analysis of the Arguments in the Debate in Congress on the Admission of Hawaii to the Union," by Donald Dedmon of the University of Iowa.

The author also relied on copies of the Congressional Record, verbatim accounts of Statehood hearings, and on subcommittee and committee reports on statehood.

As might be expected in a dissertation relating to newspaper leadership, original copies of representative newspapers and magazines in Hawaii were examined in the period under study. Of special value were original copies of the Pacific Commercial Advertiser, Evening Bulletin and Hawaiian Star. Microfilm copies of the Honolulu Advertiser and Star-Bulletin were also studied.

One of the best short accounts of the history of the Hawaii statehood movement was written by Dr. Charles Hunter of the University of Hawaii. It was published in World Affairs Quarterly in 1959.

For background information on Hawaii, the author has relied on Ralph S. Kuykendall, Gavan Daws, Andrew Lind and Lawrence Fuchs. The best information on Hawaii's press under martial law is provided by J. Garner Anthony and by Dr. Jim Richstad.

Much of the information on Hawaii's early journalism pioneers came from a paper delivered to the Hawaiian Historical Society by Riley Allen.

Miscellaneous information came from almanacs, fact books, brochures, and from newspaper clippings at the Hawaii Newspaper Agency library. A more complete account of journalistic activity after the attack on Pearl Harbor was written by the author for Quill magazine in December, 1966.

The method used in this dissertation is that of general historical research. As defined by one writer, historical research is "the study of a period, person, or phenomena in human development, in order to record discovered facts in an accurate, coherent, and critical narrative that posits causations and probabilities." The study is a history of newspaper leadership in the statehood movement. The primary question the study seeks to answer is, "What leadership did the Star-Bulletin and its key owners give to the Hawaii Statehood movement?"

In his analysis of the debate in Congress on the admission of Hawaii to the Union, Donald N. Dedmon divides the Statehood movement (1903-1959) into six major periods. In general, this author agrees with categories Dedmon utilizes as they relate to the debate that was taking place both in Hawaii and in Washington. Because this history concentrates on the members of one family and the newspaper, or newspapers, utilized by the family to promote Statehood, however, the author has added information on the newspaper and/or the lives and careers of those persons involved. The dissertation will be presented in the following manner:

Chapter II will provide a brief history of journalism in the Hawaiian Islands from the time of the arrival of the first American
missionaries in 1820 until the arrival of Wallace Rider Farrington in November, 1894.

Chapter III describes the background, education and early newspaper career of Wallace Farrington on the mainland, leading to his arrival in Hawaii.

Chapter IV relates to the early influences of Hawaii on Wallace Farrington and his notion that the world can be reformed through the medium of the newspaper.

Chapter V is a short chapter relating Farrington's brief departure from Hawaii (August 5, 1897 to June 12, 1898) and of the climate of public opinion concerning Hawaiian annexation during that period.

Chapter VI covers a fourteen year period (1898-1912) when Wallace Farrington was preoccupied with building a small newspaper; Riley Allen began his involvement also in the Statehood movement.

Chapter VII describes the creation of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin and its early efforts to "nudge" the economic and political establishment of the Hawaiian Islands and to introduce more progressive ideas to the Islands.

Chapter VIII discusses criticism of the Star-Bulletin which resulted from a change in policy during Riley Allen's absence for several years after World War II.

Chapter IX discusses Wallace Farrington's term as Governor of the Hawaiian Islands (1921-1929). Chapter X describes the influences on Joseph Farrington as a student and journalist at the University of Wisconsin and as a Washington correspondent.
Chapter XI covers the period from 1931-1941 and Joseph Farrington's departure from active newspaper work for a full-time career in government to better serve the statehood movement.

Chapter XII is a brief account of Star-Bulletin coverage of the attack on Pearl Harbor, December 7, 1941.

Chapter XIII describes Star-Bulletin leadership in opposing military rule in Hawaii from 1942 to 1945.

From 1945-1948 the study follows the outline provided by Dedmon when the Statehood fight focused on Hawaii's multi-racial population and the time for admitting Hawaii to the union. Chapter XIV covers this period during which the Islands came close to achieving statehood.

Chapter XV concentrates on Joseph Farrington's Congressional efforts to fight the communist issue, used after World War II to prevent statehood for Hawaii (1948-1953). Chapter XVI discusses the events leading up to Farrington's death in Washington in 1954.

Chapter XVII relates Betty Farrington's activities in Congress and as the new publisher of the Star Bulletin.

Chapter XVIII refers to the role John A. Burns played at the successful conclusion of the statehood movement.

Chapter XIX is a summary of the dissertation.
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CHAPTER II

THE FOUNDATIONS OF THE PRESS IN HAWAII

January 7, 1822 to November 22, 1894

The press of any country, as a general thing, is a sure indicator of its advancement, in more respects than one. The press of Hawaii—or rather of Honolulu, which amounts to the same thing—is no exception.

Reminisces of the Press by "One of the Press Gang."
Thrumms' annual for 1877, p. 24

Although the primary purpose of this dissertation is to document the leadership role of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin in regard to Hawaiian statehood, one important factor should be recognized from the start. An ongoing newspaper "crusade" would have been impossible without a foundation of free and vigorous English language newspapers as well as Hawaiian and Oriental language publications which developed in the Hawaiian Islands before Wallace Farrington arrived. Much of this foundation was laid before Farrington's time by a small group of men and women who embraced lofty Christian principles and had a desire to spread American principles of government and commerce to the Hawaiian natives. Many of these same principles were part of the life and thought of Hawaii's pioneer newspaper editors who started as missionaries, or as descendants of these "Pilgrims of the Pacific." In the words of Riley Allen they contributed to well-written journals "far above the average country weekly in the states of those days."¹

Such a portrait of Hawaii's pioneering printers and editors stands in contrast to the one painted by the French observer Alexis DeTocqueville
in the Jacksonian America of the 1830s. According to DeTocqueville, "The journalists of the United States are generally in a very humble position, with a scanty education and a vulgar turn of mind." DeTocqueville also said the characteristics of the American journalist consisted

... in an open and coarse appeal to the passions of the readers; he abandons principles to assail the characters of individuals, to track them into private life, and disclose all their weaknesses and vices.²

Despite some editors who did resort to the techniques described by DeTocqueville and who indeed were of "scanty education" and a "vulgar turn of mind," most of the other influential editors in early Hawaii such as James Jackson Jarves, Abraham Fornander, Henry Sheldon and Henry M. Whitney were, in the words of Riley Allen, "of excellent education and trained writing talent." In addition they were aware of it and attempted to promulgate the libertarian traditions of the American press in Hawaii with the same fervor with which the missionaries spread their Calvinism. Were it not for these editors, and for this vital tradition of American journalism, which had matured in less than one hundred years after the discovery of the Hawaiian Islands by Great Britain's Captain James Cook in 1778, the drive for complete self government as part of the United States could not have been carried out as effectively as it was by the Star-Bulletin or anyone else.

The journalistic environment preceding the merger of the Honolulu Evening Bulletin and the Hawaiian Star in 1912 had some differences but many similarities to the freewheeling libertarian press which had evolved in the United States. In contrast to the mainland American
colonies, the Hawaiian press did not undergo a licensing system nor wait for nearly four decades before the publication of the first newspaper. Early Hawaiian newspapers were not modelled after the English newspapers, nor did their editors suffer interference from a foreign king or his representatives. The Hawaiian newspapers did lack the growth and tradition of a free press that resulted from the opposition of the early American press to England before, during, and after the American Revolution. But this tradition was quickly adopted by the local editors and used in their struggle for freedom and self-government.

INFLUENCE OF PALAPALA PRESS

Both the colonial and Hawaiian newspapers were introduced by religious leaders. In New England it was the second group following the Pilgrims (or Protestant religious exiles) who established the press as part of their educational process at Cambridge (Harvard) College in 1638. In Hawaii it was the Protestant Congregationalists who also saw the need for promulgating the principles of Calvinism, and later of commerce, in their new found mission. Among the first members of the history-making group on board the brig Thadeus, when it arrived in Hawaii in 1820, was a twenty-year-old New York printer named Elisha Loomis and his bride. Below decks was a small secondhand Ramage press not unlike the one used by Benjamin Franklin and his brother in publishing the first newspaper in Boston. Two years after their arrival, on January 7, 1822, the first printing in Hawaii, and probably the first on the shores of the North Pacific Ocean, was struck off in a shack near the present site of Kawaiahaoo Church in Honolulu.
Albertine Loomis, a descendant of the first printer to the Islands, authored *Grapes of Canaan*, a historical novel reprinted to counteract the alleged caricatures of the first Protestant missionaries painted by James Michener in his book *Hawaii*. Loomis wrote that: "The pioneer printing equipment was to serve faithfully in the conversion of the Pacific pagans to the Christian faith, as well as the education of a generation of inhabitants of the future Fiftieth State."3

Writing from old missionary journals and letters, historian Harold Whitman Bradley tells of the close association of this Palapala press (printing of any kind, but especially the scriptures) and the missionary education program. It helped prepare the Hawaiian natives and others for their first newspapers, and for the partisan political journals which were to exist in Hawaii as they did on the mainland from the period following the Revolutionary War to the start of the Civil War. In Bradley's words:

... the mission press in 1825 printed more than 70,000 copies of pamphlets and books, with an aggregate of more than one and one quarter million pages, but this was insufficient to supply the ever increasing demand. By 1829 the annual output of the press had increased to 114,000 copies of books and tracts, with a total of nearly four and one-half million pages. During the eight years from January, 1822 to March, 1830 nearly 400,000 copies of 28 different books and tracts were issued by the missions.4

By 1834 another writer observed that "school books and religious publications ... were so numerous and well diffused as to be seen in almost every peasant's hut." Bradley concluded that:

Every book in the Hawaiian language had been translated or prepared by members of the mission and had been published by the mission press; through the monopoly of the printed page the missionaries possessed a powerful agency for moulding the thoughts and lives of the Hawaiian people.5
The first "newspaper" in Hawaii was also a product of the prolific mission press. It was Ka Lama Hawaii (Hawaiian Luminary or Torch) first issued February 14, 1834 at the missionary's Lahainaluna High School on the island of Maui. It was at that site in upper Lahaina, in a high gabled white frame and plaster rectangular structure which still stands as the first newspaper building west of the Rockies, that the pages of the publication were first issued. The object of this paper as explained by an instructor at the high school was to:

give the scholars of the high school the idea of a newspaper, to show them how information of various kinds was circulated through a periodical, secondly to communicate to them ideas on many subjects, directly and indirectly such as we could not put into sermons, nor into books written formally for which the scholars might communicate their own opinions freely on any subject they choose. 6

Regardless of these noble objectives, Ka Lama Hawaii did not meet all the qualifications generally considered to categorize it as a true newspaper. In addition to the infrequent periods of publication, Allen points out that the Ka Lama Hawaii was not a journal of general reading.

It was more a record of missionary work, aspirations and plans. It was controlled and directed by the missionaries conducting the Lahainaluna seminary, but it may be said to have paved the way for the newspaper which followed a little more than two years later. 7

Later in the same year, another small paper, Ke Kuma Hawaii (Hawaiian Teacher) was printed at Honolulu as a general newspaper contributed to by missionaries from various stations on the Islands, which at that time had an estimated population of 120,000 with some 6,000 persons in Honolulu.
Ka Lama Hawaii and Ke Kuma Hawaii were also the first of a long series of non-religious newspapers which would be published in the Hawaiian language for the next century. In her monograph Esther K. Mookini states that the Hawaiian newspapers "formed a pioneering chapter in the history of American and Pacific journalism." Mookini notes that "the Hawaiian newspapers attracted the best thinkers and writers of their time.

Church groups founded newspapers for missionizing and controversy. Politicians and parties used them to publicize their platforms and parties. Scholars published their histories and studies in them. Through such newspapers, poets and prose stylists perpetuated and extended Hawaiian literature.

FIRST ENGLISH NEWSPAPERS

The first secular newspaper in the Hawaiian Islands was not written in the Hawaiian language. The Sandwich Island Gazette and Journal of Commerce, a four page weekly, issued at Honolulu for the first time on July 10, 1836, was written in English. It was printed on the premises of the Catholic mission, and according to another printer, "was coarsely and violently offensive to the government of the day and abused the American missionaries without stint." The Sandwich Island Gazette was followed by the Sandwich Island Mirror and Commercial Gazette which ran from August 15, 1839 to July 15, 1840. The Mirror was a monthly, but in all other respects (publisher, form, content and policies) was merely a continuation of the Gazette. Although both of the "Gazettes" failed due to lack of support, they demonstrated that the press in Hawaii—like the newspapers of the colonial period—would not allow themselves to be dominated by government
or any singular form of religion. From the very beginning Hawaii's press showed that it had the same independent and pugilistic spirit which had characterized the early colonial press. Most significant of all, the early editors showed that they were willing to publish a newspaper with opposing points of view even if it was a losing financial proposition.

JAMES JACKSON JARVES AND THE "POLYNESIANS"

Francis Steegmuller recorded that by 1840 the missionary and pro-missionary elements felt that the time had come to issue a regular publication that would give expression to their ideas--ideas which included that of persuading the governments of the great powers, especially the United States, Great Britain, and France, to guarantee the independence of the native government of Hawaii. Actually, in being pro-Hawaiian, this policy was pro-American; for even as early as this the two predominant influences working on the native government from within the islands--the missionaries and the "Protestant-traders"--were American. 10

This pro-Hawaiian policy was to bring about on June 6, 1840 the establishment of one of the most famous of Hawaiian publications--the Polynesian. It was edited by James Jackson Jarves, described by one writer as a combination of "artist, dreamer, adventurer and trader--with a strong sense of religious mysticism deep within him." Jarves was later to go on to become what Russell Lynes describes as one of the major "tastemakers" in American history. 11 Before he left the Hawaiian Islands in 1849, Jarves was to direct the Polynesian in "leading
gradually, but in quite a straight line, to the extension by the United States of a kind of Monroe doctrine over the islands several years later, and to eventual American annexation.\textsuperscript{12}

Jarves also directed the Polynesian's New York correspondent to keep him informed of other mainland newspaper reaction to a proposal made by the Northern Journal of Lowville, New York. On May 1, 1849 the editor of the publication "suggested that a commission be appointed to open correspondence with the Hawaiian government in relation to their admission into the North American Unions as an independent state."\textsuperscript{13} The Polynesian's New York reporter recorded that "several papers of influence [had] seconded the motion."\textsuperscript{14}

\textbf{ORIGIN OF GOVERNMENT PRESS}

Despite the talented editor and a population which was becoming more educated and more concerned with public affairs under the administration of King Kamehameha III, the first Polynesian fell from lack of financial support after only eighteen months. Undaunted, after two and one-half years of suspended publication, the Polynesian returned in 1844 as the official organ of the pro-American Hawaiian government, with Jarves this time as "director of government printing."

Former Star-Bulletin editor Riley Allen, stated that in the capacity of a government organ, the Polynesian served to counterbalance the opinions of S. C. Damon's Temperance Advocate and Seaman's Friend. Established in 1843, the Friend is credited with being the oldest periodical west of the Rocky Mountains and was known for its early opposition to royal policies.\textsuperscript{15} The Polynesian continued as the
official government organ until 1848 when Jarves again departed from the islands after writing a "History of the Sandwich or Hawaiian Islands and Scenes and Scenery of the Hawaiian Islands." He was later famous as a vice-consul to Italy and collector of early Italian paintings.

After Jarves left Hawaii, a series of respectable editors, C. E. Hitchcock, Charles Gordon Hopkins, Edwin O. Hall, Abraham Fornander, and a young printer and business manager named Henry Whitney, all held editorial positions on the pro-government Polynesian until it was finally discontinued in 1864 during the reign of Kamehameha V who was not as pro-American as his predecessors.

Prior to the reign of Kamehameha V, the press had recorded the kingdom's adoption of its first constitution in 1840 and again in 1852. In 1854, following renewed political pressures from France, a disastrous epidemic of small pox, and new internal disturbances, King Kamehameha III directed his foreign minister "to take immediate steps to ascertain the views of the United States in relation to annexation thereto of the Islands. A treaty was then negotiated which provided that "The Kingdom of the Hawaiian Islands shall be incorporated into the American union as a State . . . on a perfect equality with all other states of the Union." The treaty was opposed by Britain and France and reaction in Hawaii as reflected in the government and missionary press was divided.

RISE OF THE INDEPENDENT PRESS IN HAWAII

It is to Henry M. Whitney, son of a missionary, native of Hawaii and a printer by trade, that credit must go for the establishment of the first major, independent newspaper. This was the Pacific Commercial Advertiser
which made its first appearance on July 2, 1856. Its establishment, according to Allen, was directly related to the death of the Polynesian, whose demise is traceable to its failure to hold the confidence of its readers. 17

As a former printer with the New York Commercial Advertiser, Whitney had been exposed to the competitive penny press and other political newspapers of the Eastern states. But Whitney had also developed a respect for an independent publication in the spirit of Horace Greeley and Henry J. Raymond. This is reflected in part in the prospectus of the first issue of the Advertiser stressing:

The necessity for a reliable domestic newspaper, devoted to inter-island commerce, agriculture, and the whaling interests in the Pacific, and independent of government control and patronage, has long existed; and the wants of our business-community having at length demanded the establishment of such a paper, the undersigned proposes to publish a Weekly Journal to be called 'The Pacific Commercial Advertiser', the first number of which will be issued on Wednesday, July 2, 1856. This paper will be devoted to commerce, the whale fishery, agriculture, manufactures, literature, and politics.

Along with his task of publishing the weekly Advertiser in English, Whitney started the first independent Hawaiian newspaper, Ka Nupepa Kuoka (The Independent) in October, 1861. Before that time, Esther Mookini notes, the Hawaiian language newspapers were all issued and editorially directed by the American Protestants, French Catholics and the Government of the Hawaiian Kingdom. Following the publication of Ka Nupepa Kuoka, the Friend of January, 1862, said: "The Hawaiians are as much attached to newspapers as any newsmonger of old Athens was to the gossip of Areopagus," and lists a considerable number of publications in Hawaiian. This was one of many attempts to give to Hawaii a permanent newspaper in
the language of the islands—an effort inevitably thwarted by the steady
and natural process of developing a single language—and that the English
language—for all the inhabitants of Hawaii.

More than anything else, an editorial written by Whitney on June 30,
1859 serves as a symbol of Hawaiian independent journalism. The reader
will also note Whitney's reference to what Riley Allen described as his
"true Anglo Saxon instinct for democratic government."

The history of journalism in Honolulu illustrates one
fact, that the foreign population will have an independent
journal in contra-distinction to any official or govern­
mental publication. The first journal established, the
(Sandwich Island) Gazette, was started mainly to exhibit
the faults of the government and its advisers. So too,
with the News, one of the most sarcastic and powerfully
edited papers ever published in any country. Both these
journals when private enterprise failed to sustain them,
were taken in hand and supported by the mercantile public.
The Times, the Era and Argus, as well as the Commercial,
were all called into being to oppose and contend with the
real or imagined tyranny of officials and with government
restraints on freedom of thought, and to maintain a fair
and open expression of public opinion. It is a trait
inherent to the Anglo-Saxon mind, that it will not sub­
mit to mental despotism. It calls for, and will have
the same freedom for thought as for limb. The despot
who attempts to chain—else than for crime—or restrain
in any manner the bones and sinews of the Anglo-Saxon race,
does it at his peril. Wherever such personal oppression
has been attempted on that race, it rises with the power
of a giant, and breaks the fetters. To attempt to chain
the mental faculties, meets with the same resistance.
Wherever the English language becomes established, news­
papers, devoted to freedom of thought, are as necessary to
the existence of the community as the light of day. With­
out a paper through which to utter its grievances, the
public mind, always changing and restless, lies pent up,
like a boil, that racks with anguish the whole frame of its
victim, and aches for some vent to discharge its stinging
poison.
ROLE OF HAWAIIAN PRESS IN BAYONET CONSTITUTION

Notwithstanding this streak of independence which Whitney showed in both his English and Hawaiian publications, the Pacific Commercial Advertiser went through a number of vicissitudes as a weekly from 1856 to 1882. In the late sixties Whitney opposed the planters on the issue of importation of Oriental labor for the sugar plantations, which had replaced whaling and sandalwood as the major sources of revenue in Hawaii. As a result, Whitney found his position politically and financially untenable and the Advertiser was sold September 1, 1870 to Black and Auld, which owned and operated the publication for ten years.

During this decade the Advertiser and other Hawaiian newspapers took sides supporting or opposing new ties with the United States prompted by the Island's expanding sugar industry. The press was also concerned with alleged corruption in the Hawaiian monarchy. In 1875 following the appearance of King Kalakaua before both houses of Congress, Hawaii and the United States signed a reciprocity treaty, made effective the next year, after stiff objection by both sides and much debate by the press in Hawaii and on the mainland. The treaty provided for duty free admission of specified goods both ways and made U.S. interests supreme by providing that Hawaii would not sign a similar treaty with any other nation.

In September, 1880, brokers acting for Claus Spreckels, the famous old "sugar king," bought the Advertiser and used it actively and energetically—if not adroitly—in furthering Spreckel's many political and industrial enterprises.
Thus, Allen concludes, the purchase by Spreckels reversed the
Advertiser's policies.

Heretofore the Advertiser had been an independent newspaper; under Spreckels it was an organ of the crown and its editor-in-chief was Walter Murray Gibson, regarded as one of the most able and most dexterous, if not the most unscrupulous, officials the Kingdom of Hawaii had ever had. Gibson, a man of high education, later became Prime Minister of Hawaii under King Kalakaua. Both Gibson and Gibsonianism passed in Hawaii in July 1887, when the so-called "Bayonet" Constitution was obtained from Kalakaua.20

In his historical analysis of the end of the Gibson regime, Ralph S. Kuykendall gives special attention to the role of the press which opposed Gibson in the reform movement which resulted in the Bayonet Constitution of 1887. In particular, Kuykendall rates the roles of the Hawaiian Gazette, the Daily Bulletin, and the Daily Herald. The obvious purpose of the anti-Gibson propaganda was to convince the public that administration of the kingdom was "not only corrupt and unworthy of trust, but ridiculous," Kuykendall says.21

ORIGIN OF THE DAILY AND EVENING BULLETINS

In addition to his role in founding Hawaii's first independent "haole" and Hawaiian newspapers, Whitney took a part in starting one of the direct ancestors of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin. The first publication to bear this name was a one-page, hand-written bulletin posted on one of the doors at the post office where, according to Allen, much of Hawaiian and American business life centered. The power of local news items in attracting public attention was never better shown than in the subsequent development of this bulletin. Whitney enlarged and changed the form of his sheet; added a printed title with headings for
several departments, and expanded the scope of the news. So successful was the daily sheet in attracting public notice, and thus advertising Whitney's stationery business, that a rival stationery firm put out the Daily Commercial Bulletin in distinct competition to Whitney's daily marine bulletin.

Later James W. Robertson—well-known as a shipping man with C. Brewer & Company—with several associates formed the firm of J. W. Robertson & Company and bought out Whitney's stationery and news business. It was this firm, J. W. Robertson & Company, that put out the first printed issue of the Daily Bulletin. This appeared February 1, 1882—Honolulu's first daily printed news sheet. It was distributed free among the business houses of the city.


CHINESE AND JAPANESE LANGUAGE NEWSPAPERS

It was during this period, when large numbers of immigrants were starting their own newspapers on the mainland, that Hawaii's Oriental language newspapers first came into existence. They not only helped fill a vital need for the Island's Oriental population of 100,000 but they contributed to the tradition of a free press in the Islands.

Lawrence Fuchs wrote that between 1886 and 1901 five Chinese language newspapers sprang into existence, with one of them, the New China Daily Press, surviving until today.

Fuchs also noted how the publishing of such newspapers and the formation of benevolent and social organizations produced group leaders
for the Chinese; editors and organization officials gained prestige and power within the Chinese community.  

The Japanese, who accounted for nearly one-fifth of Hawaii's population by 1896, did not have as many publications. The first Japanese language newspaper was started in 1892 by an ex-immigration inspector for the purpose of exposing the ineptness, highhandedness and corruption of the Japanese section of the Immigration Bureau. It was followed by a steady procession of weeklies and dailies, characterized by frequent changes in management, due mostly to operational and financial difficulties. By 1901, four Japanese publications remained.

Along with other language newspapers, the Japanese press has remained an important one. Dr. James H. Okahata, commenting in 1973 on the Japanese language press, said:

It took part in almost every community issue—major and minor. It was the medium of education; it carried instructions and information necessary to the immigrants; it brought them news of home; it took part in campaigns such as reform and Americanization movements; it sponsored relief activities; it roused public opinion and also served to enrich and elevate the cultural interests of the Japanese. And most important of all, it was a means of communication for the Japanese who were scattered throughout the numerous plantations on the four major islands.  

FROM PERSONAL EDITORIAL LEADERSHIP TO BUSINESS OFFICE LEADERSHIP

Another similarity between mainland and Hawaiian newspapers was the gradual change during the last decades of the nineteenth century from strong editorial leadership to business office influence. Professor Raymond Nixon has selected 1883—the year after the Honolulu Daily Bulletin was started—as the beginning of this era partially because it was the year that Joseph Pulitzer purchased the New York
World and led the transition to modern journalism. Newspapers in the United States and Hawaii were growing into a more complex business with the need for far greater capital investment than previously. Publishers like Adolph Ochs of the New York Times began to overshadow their editors. Business ability as well as editorial genius became necessary for survival.

ROLE OF THE PRESS IN THE HAWAIIAN REVOLUTION

In Hawaii, as on the mainland, there were a series of newspaper deaths, mergers, and births as the "haole" and language press became more involved in the events leading up to the overthrow of the Hawaiian monarchy in January, 1893. The revolution had been building up for many years, particularly since the renewal of the reciprocity treaty in 1887 when U.S. ships were granted exclusive use of Pearl Harbor. The commercial press such as the Advertiser attacked the corruption of the "Merry Monarch's" court while the Royalist press defended the Hawaiian life style. The Hawaiian press itself was split on the issues surrounding the revolution and in chorus with part of the mainland press, proposed annexation of the Hawaiian Islands.

Historian Gerritt P. Judd has summarized the debate of the major newspapers on the mainland during America's first great debate on imperialism.

Much of the press which was expansionist and in favor of a big navy, urged Hawaii's annexation. The New York Press stated, "We must plant the stars and stripes in Honolulu." The New York Independent declared, "The ripe apple falls into our hands, and we would be very foolish if we should throw it away." The Washington Star, in reference to a rumor that Queen Liliuokalani had sought British assistance, asked dramatically,
"Shall we take Hawaii and thereby prosper and magnify ourselves, or shall we let England take it, and thereby enfeeble and humiliate us?" On February 5 the New York Tribune asserted, "The popular verdict is clear, unequivocal and practically unanimous. Hawaii is welcome." Many specific annexationist arguments appeared— that it was the duty of the white race to colonize Hawaii, a typical imperialist theme, and that Hawaii's annexation was essential to America's national defense and expanding economy. A somewhat misleading annexationist jingle in questionable taste became popular, "Liliuokalani, give us your little brown hannie." 25

Some of the press outspokenly opposed annexation. The New York Evening Post criticized the haste with which the annexation treaty had been drawn in the last weeks of President Benjamin Harrison's administration and suggested that this "snap-annexation" gave "a sort of sunset glow" to the short remaining time of his presidential term. The Chicago Herald charged that annexation was "a plot on the part of Hawaii's sugar interests" and added that, because America was already predominant in Hawaii, "political union was unnecessary." The Nation reprinted a patronizing statement of the New York Evening Post, which advised the planters of Hawaii to continue "sending us your sugar and other tropical products, and sitting under your own fig-trees, in the full assurance that none will dare make you afraid." 26

In sum, both the mainland press and the newspapers of Hawaii were using the issue of the overthrow and proposed annexation of the Hawaiian Islands as the major source of material for an orgy of yellow journalism which was to last until shortly after the founding of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin a decade later.

This era of yellow journalism on the mainland and in Hawaii was also the period which saw the birth of the Hawaiian Star, the second parent of the Star-Bulletin. The Pacific Commercial Advertiser of May 1, 1894 gives the following account.
The Hawaiian Star, although the baby of Honolulu's newspaper family, is a lusty child, and one that its parents may feel proud of. It was started March 28, 1893, and is consequently, only a little over a year old. But in that year it has pushed itself to the front and is a strong factor in the forces allied on the side of the Provisional Government.

Walter G. Smith, the Star's editor, came here shortly after the revolution of 1893 as a special correspondent of the San Francisco Chronicle. He wrote a number of letters to his paper, the tone of which showed that he was a staunch upholder of the annexation cause. When it was decided to start the Star, Mr. Smith was at once chosen as its editor, and has served in the capacity ever since. About the time that he took the editorship of this paper, the Chronicle sent him word that his services here would be needed no longer, as matters had quieted down, and they did not care to keep a man here. Naturally, Mr. Smith was expected to return to San Francisco and resume his old position on the Chronicle, but rumor has it that, instead of going to San Francisco himself, he simply mailed a copy of the Star to his former paper, with his name, as editor, marked with a heavy blue border.

The Star has, ever since its inception, been the organ of the radical wing of the Annexation party. It has made a strong fight against the keeping of royalists in office, has advocated the banishment of the ex-queen, has demanded the control of the Government by the loyal annexationists alone, and has advanced several other radical views.

To some it might appear that since the Hawaiian Star had just recently started as an annexationist newspaper, and since the Advertiser was controlled by the major American mercantile interests, that there would be a unified approach to annexation in the press. Such was not the case, however. According to William Adams Russ, just at the time there should have been "unity of opinion" among annexationists, a journalistic revolution took place in the fall of 1894 among the Honolulu newspapers.

The Advertiser was affected first with the withdrawal of Henry N. Castle from the editorial chair and the appointment of W. N. Armstrong to take his place. Under Armstrong's control the course of the Advertiser became distinctly disappointing to Annexationists. Suddenly this, the oldest Annexationist paper in Hawaii, was charged with altering its
stand to that of favoring a permanent Republic and being for
annexation only with reservations. The Star referred to Arm­
strong as that "journalistic old lady" who edited the "'Tiser"
... Armstrong, however, declaring he was still an Annexationist,
maintained he had been working toward that end for the past ten
years, long before the Star had ever been heard of ... 

The result was a journalistic free-for-all in which the
Royalist Bulletin was charged with becoming republican (a
charge which was true) in which the dignified Advertiser was
accused of being a renegade to its old faith, and in which
Holomua, using the newspaper tempest for its own advantage,
waded into all the others.27

It was into such a political, economic and journalistic environment
that Wallace Rider Farrington arrived in Honolulu, November 22, 1894.
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CHAPTER III

THE EDUCATION OF A PROGRESSIVE JOURNALIST

May 3, 1871 to November 24, 1894

It is hardly an exaggeration to say that the Progressive mind was characteristically a journalistic mind, and that its characteristic contribution was that of the socially responsible reporter-reformer. ... Before there could be action, there must be information and exhortation.

Richard Hofstadter
_The Age of Reform_

The man who was to have an influence on Hawaii through his family, three newspapers, and as Governor of the Territory, was in turn greatly influenced by a number of factors inherent in his New England roots, his journalistic profession and the Hawaiian Islands he adopted. Also significant was Hawaii's mixed and poor population which, from his earliest years, helped remind Farrington of "the disparity between the rulers and the ruled" in regard to equality and self-government.

Biographer Thornton Sherburne Hardy wrote that throughout Farrington's life he felt the deep division between life as it is and the equal opportunity that ought to be.

He had inherited a sense of inequities from a social order saturated with the British past, where names like Harvard, Yale, Dartmouth and Amherst, with all their implications, made their immense weight felt. Every backwoods boy born in New England had the same struggle between what he was taught and the actuality that is.
NEW ENGLAND INFLUENCE ON FARRINGTON

Such empathy for those not part of the established power structure was not unusual for a New Englander such as Farrington. Notwithstanding the caricatures of the Congregational missionaries and others who came to Hawaii "to do good and did well," social historians such as Perry Miller remind us that historical New England was filled with "passions and conflicts," and the stable elite society of Boston and Beacon Hill did not represent the entire region. Instead, Max Lerner states that:

New Englanders risked their lives for Abolitionism and in strike riots, they spread themselves all over America in the "Yankee Exodus," they dared to fight the land grabbers and monopolists, they became the conscience of every community they settled.3

In further discussion of "the fusion of people and place," Lerner states that the willingness of the New Englanders to wear themselves to the bone for the glory of God and ten percent on their investment gives point to Van Wyck Brooks' remark that the New Englander was an amalgam of the Puritan and the freebooter.

The freebooter was indeed strong in him, yet in the process he built much and felt intensely, and no other region can so securely claim to have been the matrix of the American mind.4

FAMILY AND EDUCATION

The matrix of Wallace Rider Farrington's mind was his Maine background. Indeed, his son states that Farrington's years in the Penobscot country around Bangor is the key to his life and work in Hawaii.5

The youngest of six children, Wallace Farrington was born May 3, 1871 in Orono, Maine where his father was superintendent of a state farm and instructor of agriculture at the State College, later to
become the University of Maine. Grandparents on both sides of his family had been among the early settlers of the area where a great grandfather had migrated following service in the Revolutionary War. Grandparents on his mother's side had been among the first colonists on the Mayflower. Another relative on his mother's side was married to a former head of Punahou Academy in Honolulu. Joseph Farrington, in an unpublished manuscript, suggests that letters from this aunt to the Farrington family were an important factor in Wallace's interest in Hawaii. A characteristic of the Farrington family, according to Hardy, was that money never much interested them. Money was one means to influence and, as such, to be respected; but the power always sought was the power of ideas. A high school notebook used by Farrington and now in the Hawaii State Archives states, "The pen is mightier than the sword."

In spite of a long family tradition stressing higher education, Wallace Farrington did not join four other members of his family who taught at the college level. He concentrated on agriculture and military sciences while attending the state college, but his son notes: "Although father was the most adventurous, he was the least scholarly in the family."  

In a letter to the editor of the Country Gentleman in 1924, Farrington said:  

Although I came from a race of farmers, personally I have never had the knack of making things grow. Therefore it is not surprising that I should take to the newspaper business immediately after leaving college.
EARLY JOURNALISM CAREER

In 1890 Farrington was listed as the business manager of the State College Cadet. Following his graduation he went to work for the Bangor News where he covered the waterfront before being promoted to night editor. After that he worked for both the Lewiston Sun and the Kennebec Journal. The latter paper in the State Capitol of Augusta had been started by James G. Blaine who later became the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, candidate for President of the United States in 1884, and Secretary of State under William Henry Harrison. Another alumnus of the Journal before Farrington's time was John L. Stevens, the U.S. Minister to Hawaii when the revolution of 1893 deposed Queen Liliuokalani.

After working as a reporter for the Lewiston Sun, Farrington was employed for two years as an editor by the Phelps Publishing Company in Springfield, Massachusetts. Then came a setback. In early 1894, he is recorded as a founder and editor of the Rockland (Maine) Daily Star which died after a few issues. Farrington then traveled to New York's Park Row, the center of American journalism in the 1890s and for many years to follow.

Little information has been provided on Farrington's brief sojourn in New York City. Indeed there is some discrepancy as to whether he worked in New York before or after he first went to Hawaii. Both his biographer and other family records indicate he spent a brief time in New York before coming to the Islands. However, a private manuscript written by his son indicates Farrington worked for the New York
Commercial after leaving the Islands. This latter version was disputed by Farrington's daughter-in-law in an interview, December 20, 1975.

The exact time of Farrington's sojourn in New York is not relevant here. What is important is that New York journalism during the 1890s had an impact on journalism all over America. It was a decade since Joseph Pulitzer's wife Kate had persuaded him to purchase the dying New York World from Jay Gould for $346,000, and Pulitzer had developed it into one of the great newspapers in America. It was the period when William Randolph Hearst left San Francisco to begin his competition with Pulitzer, resulting in a new style of journalism and empire building which would have the greatest impact on the newspaper world and its readers since the era of the penny press had been ushered in on New York streets by Benjamin Day in 1833.

THE AGE OF REFORM

Equally as important as the new and yellowing journalism on the East Coast was the transition of the United States from an agrarian to an urban society. Also being given shape by the newspapers and muckraking magazines were the first stages of what Richard Hofstadter has described as "The Age of Reform" which was to set the tone of American journalism and politics from about 1890 to the start of World War II. The general theme of this progressive movement Hofstadter says was:

the effort to restore a type of economic individualism and political democracy that was widely believed to have existed earlier in America and to have been destroyed by the great corporation and the corrupt political machine; and with that restoration to bring back a kind of morality and civic purity that was also believed to have been lost.
To help carry out this progressive function in American society, a premium was set on the good reporter. The importance of the editorial page and the editorial writer was reduced. As early as 1871, a writer in *Lippincott's* Magazine observed: "For the majority of readers it is the reporter, not the editor, who is the ruling genius of the newspapers."\(^{11}\)

Editors of the Civil War era had put a great deal of stock in themselves as makers of opinion through the editorial columns. Now their successors began to realize that the influence on the public mind, such as it was, came from their treatment of the news, not from editorial writing. Before there could be action there must be information and exhortation.

Bold reportorial initiative, good reportorial writing and other skills which Farrington developed were now very much in demand. Better educated men were more attracted to the profession and were more acceptable in it.

Hofstadter noted:

As the reporter's job rose in status, even in glamor, more and more young men with serious literary aspirations were attracted to it as a provisional way of earning a living. These men brought to the journalistic life some of the ideals, the larger interests, and the sense of public responsibility of men of culture.\(^{12}\)

Finally, the occupational situation of the reporter was "uniquely illuminating." It was not merely that reporters saw and heard things, got the inside story; "they sat at the crossroads between the coarse realities of their reportorial beats and the high abstractions and elevated moral tone of the editorial page."\(^{13}\)
In brief, this was the progressive environment Wallace Farrington had to complement his education and training on the Eastern seaboard. In the fall of 1894 he accepted the advice of a former editor in Maine to meet with a Hawaii businessman interested in hiring an editor for a Honolulu daily. The outgoing editor was Henry Northrup Castle who was on his way to Europe with a young daughter.

Before leaving New York, Castle met with Farrington and discussed in some detail an offer which appealed to Farrington after his itinerant career with six publications in four years. He was to become editor of the Pacific Commercial Advertiser, the leading "haole" or Caucasian newspaper in the Islands. In addition, Farrington was offered 45 shares of stock in the company at $100 per share--less one third for a total of $3,000. The shares were to be sold by Henry Whitney, a former editor. 14

An agreement was reached on September 5, 1894, and the following week Farrington left for a visit with his family in Maine before leaving the continental U.S. In November he traveled overland to San Francisco and sailed to Honolulu aboard the S. S. Alameda.

Castle and his daughter, meanwhile, sailed for Europe on a voyage from which they would never return. In February of the following year Wallace Farrington wrote the news of the drowning of Castle and his daughter in the sinking of their passenger ship in the North Sea.
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CHAPTER IV

EARLY HAWAIIAN INFLUENCES AND EDITORIALS

January 3, 1895 to August 4, 1897

About once in so often people become possessed of the idea that the world can be reformed through the medium of the newspaper.

Editorial,
Pacific Commercial Advertiser
April 30, 1895

In addition to his New England background and experience on newspapers and magazines, Wallace R. Farrington was profoundly influenced by the complex social and economic forces of the island chain. Contrary to the usual impression acquired by some "malahinis" (newcomers) to Hawaii, the geographical, social, economic, and political patterns of Hawaii are far from simple. Each has played an important part in shaping the culture of the Islands.

Even as he made his five day journey to the Islands, Farrington was impressed by Hawaii's extreme isolation--more than two thousand miles from its nearest continental neighbor. Indeed in the light of its size--a chain of more than twenty small islands stretching some 1,600 miles from the Islands of Hawaii in the southeast to Kure Island in the northwest--it is remarkable that it was ever sighted at all by Captain James Cook in 1778. Because of its mid-Pacific isolation, communication with the United States played an even more significant role in the daily life and destiny of the inhabitants of Hawaii than it had in other American territories.
A factor which Farrington himself felt contributed to the Americanization of the Islands was the so-called "Aloha Spirit," a lack of hostility toward foreigners.

Harold Whitman Bradley, in The American Frontier in Hawaii said the development of a Polynesian kingdom with western institutions was in part,

the result of the location of the Hawaiian Islands astride the principal trade routes of the northern and central Pacific. It had been possible only because of the ready amiability with which all Hawaiian chiefs had welcomed all classes of foreigners to the Islands.¹

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL INFLUENCES ON HAWAII

University of Hawaii sociologist Andrew W. Lind provided another summary of the complex factor of influence on the Hawaiian frontier in his book Hawaii's People. Lind described Hawaii's isolated location as an outpost for trade rather than for colonial exploitation. The missionary movement under the Portestants, Catholics and Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (Mormons), the plantation which laid the foundation for Hawaii's racial melange, and the military establishment, were the other major factors influencing Hawaii's people up to the time that Farrington arrived in the Islands.² The influence of each such agency is never unitary or exclusive, Lind stated. Each affects the others and is in turn influenced by them.³

In addition to the major factors he outlined, Lind also described a number of important variables serving to increase the complexity of the Island scene. These included the unique combination of Occidental and Oriental peoples; the further consequences of insularity; the
atmosphere of freer experimentation in human relations; and the severe limits on the economic and occupational prospects for its residents. Lind concluded that Hawaii's economic and social history during the past 150 years can be told largely in terms of the persistent search for more effective means of supporting human life and capitalizing upon its limited material resources of land and sea within the context of a rapidly changing world community.4

Historian Gerrit P. Judd IV, a descendant of one of the key advisors to Kamehameha III, who ruled the Islands from 1825 to 1854, wrote that during the first ninety-eight years of the united Hawaiian monarchy the two main economic factors were "the decline of the native population and the rise of sugar as Hawaii's biggest source of wealth."5

The first led to the recruiting of foreign laborers, which at the time of Farrington's arrival amounted to almost 60 percent of Hawaii's population.6 The second, according to Judd, led to close economic ties with the United States and the eventual annexation by the United States. Despite both opposition and misrepresentation, the missionaries and their descendants had a major part in developing the economic resources of the Islands and in setting the social tone of community life there.7 Stanley Porteus said that it is hard to realize that the great changes that took place in Hawaii "fell on the heads of fewer than 5,000 whites."8 The 1890 census says that this totaled in round numbers 2,000 Americans, 1,300 British and 1,000 Germans. In other words, less than 6 percent of the population had to assume leadership or direction for the rest. This was indeed a tremendous responsibility.9 Porteus adds that the men who provided both the material and spiritual components of a stable island community "may not have
been inherently great, but certainly had greatness thrust upon
them.\textsuperscript{10}

According to Lawrence Fuchs, the social structure of Hawaii when
Farrington arrived was "a curious amalgam of a tropical European colony
and a New England settlement."

In Hawaii, as in the European colonies, there was virtually
no middle class. Oriental immigrants comprised almost 75
percent of the population . . . There was no middle class in
the American sense of small independent landholders or small
businessmen. Prestige, power and status were firmly in the
possession of a small haole elite.\textsuperscript{11}

Fuchs also notes that contradictions abounded in Hawaii prior to
annexation.

A handful of haoles, intolerant of opposition, ran the Islands,
but discontent was openly expressed in uncensored native news­
papers. The oligarchy, self-consciously Caucasian, made few
open appeals to racial prejudice. The small group, sharply
limiting the suffrage to maintain political control, neverthe­
less helped foster education. The small aristocracy, reaping
the benefits of the plantation system, with its ruthlessness,
was constantly torn between the desire for power and profit
and the evangelism of both the Congregational Church and the
American dream of freedom and opportunity for all. Even before
annexation, the seeds of conflict had been sown in the very
nature of the Island oligarchy . . .

For the next four decades, the oligarchy lived and managed
its contradictions with success. Hawaii was a plantation society
with no significant middle class, only one effective political
party, and sharp limitations on opportunity.\textsuperscript{12}

Another influence on Farrington's understanding of the Island's
political and economic life was his training as editor-to-be of the
Advertiser by outgoing editor W. N. Armstrong. An editorial written by
Farrington on his first day as the new editor praised Armstrong as "a
leader of progressive thought in Hawaii." Private papers in the Hawaii
State Archives discuss this relationship even further by noting Armstrong
as a former cabinet minister and intimate of King Kalakaua, whose reign
from 1872-1891 was notable for attempts to revive the ancient culture of the Hawaiian people. As a successor to Armstrong, Farrington was briefed on the events leading up to the overthrow of Kalakaua's sister, Liliuokalani, by the professional men and businessmen of the city in January, 1893.

Any compassionate feelings Farrington may have held toward the Hawaiian monarchy were weakened, however, three days after he assumed the editor's chair on January 3, 1896. On January 6 a large number of native royalists gathered under the command of Robert Wilcox and Samuel Nowlein, entered Honolulu at midnight, and attacked the government buildings while their allies planned to seize the electric plant, the telephone offices and the station house.

"It was the biggest story of his life," Farrington's son was to write later about the incident that would dominate much of the early chapters of a projected book on Farrington's life. Although a resident of the Islands for only two months, Farrington had to serve "as both a war correspondent and an editor" during the short-lived insurrection which led to the abdication of Queen Liliuokalani. 13

The insurrection, which ended when Wilcox and Nowlein and many insurgents were captured, also provided Farrington with additional fuel for his crusade for annexation and eventual Hawaiian statehood. One of the men mortally wounded in the exchange of gunshots was Charles Lunt Carter, a brother of the man who was to become the second governor of Hawaii. "Charles L. Carter," wrote Farrington, "was a martyr to the cause of good government and annexation. His untimely death can be regarded in no other light."14
EARLY EDITORIALS OF WALLACE FARRINGTON

A study of Farrington's early editorials reflects his concerns and his attempt to influence others as editor of the Advertiser. Although it was stated in a joking manner, part of an editorial written April 30, 1895 voices Farrington's belief that the world (or the Hawaiian Islands at least) could be reformed "through the medium of the newspaper."15

Farrington's first topic, Hardy says, was the natural beauty of the country and its heterogeneous population.16 As a newcomer, Farrington found it "a miniature world of nations, ... living in peace and quiet." On February 13, 1895 he put on record what would be a lifelong conviction that it was "all important that political or social differences should not be drawn on the color line."17

There never has been, and never will be, social lines so sharply drawn as in the Puritanical State of Massachusetts, where provided a man can show a family tree with one ancestor that was a member of the Plymouth colony, landed from the Mayflower, he has unquestioned passport unto the holy of holies of the exclusive "Four Hundred." Hawaii has absorbed more of the Western spirit, where merit wins irrespective of race, nation or previous condition of servitude ... From the business point of view alone, the country ... must, from the nature of its cosmopolitan population, raise itself above the petty level that sees in a family coat of arms a blaze of glory before which ability, push, tact, and principle should bow and offer humble obeisance.18

In addition to editorially opposing a social class system such as the one he had grown up under in Maine, Farrington from the first strenuously opposed contract labor. "No thinking man could plan in terms of contract labor and annexation to the United States at the same time," he wrote July 23, 1895.19
In a July 27 editorial,\(^2\) he also upheld the long-standing tradition of the press in opposing legislative executive sessions. He envisioned as in the best interests of Hawaii, expansion of the public school system;\(^1\) education and the new woman;\(^2\) and liberal allowances for, and "a certain amount of deference due the heads of fallen royalty."\(^3\)

Throughout many of his early editorials was a theme of protecting the underdog and fighting the large corporations in the Islands. On March 12, 1896 he wrote that "a general impression is abroad in the land that the corporations are reaping all the gold from the soil and are not bearing their proportional share of the financial burdens of the government." "In Hawaii," Farrington wrote, "the Minister of Finance, in his annual report, has given the totals which tend decidedly to support this position."\(^4\)

During his first year Farrington also became involved in an editorial dispute over the appointment of a successor to Lorrin A. Thurston, who had been recalled as the Republic's official delegate to Washington. The Star and the Advertiser had come to blows in the past over the question of patronage, and in June 1895 developed a bitter feud over Thurston's successor. The Star valiantly supported the appointment of F. P. Gastong while the Advertiser supported William R. Castle, one of the treaty commissioners, and one of the owners of the Advertiser.

Castle eventually won the appointment, but his techniques with the mainland press and in Washington were not successful. According to William Adam Russ, Jr., Castle "progressed across the continent from
one reporter's debacle to another."  

Farrington did his best to defend Castle with editorials suggesting that Castle was "too openminded and had not learned the European trait of being diplomatically close-mouthed." But the Advertiser owner was later replaced.  

Notwithstanding his efforts to make good as editor of the Advertiser, Wallace Farrington took the opportunity for some extra curricular activities. Although little is said about his hobbies and interests, he met and courted a young woman from California. She was the former Catherine McAlpine Crane, who was born in New York City but raised in California. While studying at Stanford University she was a classmate to Lou Henry, who was later to marry a young engineer by the name of Herbert Hoover.  

During her second year at Stanford, Catherine Crane went to Honolulu with her mother to visit a cousin, the daughter of Dr. John S. McGrew, one of the financial backers of the Hawaiian Star. A native of Ohio and son of the founder of the Cincinnati Enquirer, McGrew was a well-known figure in Hawaii where he was generally referred to as the "father of annexation" because of his role in championing the cause. King Kalakaua is said to have referred to him as "Annexation McGrew." When the Provisional Government was established in 1893, he was named honorary editor of the Hawaiian Star. The active editor of the Star was Walter G. Smith, long an opponent of Farrington.  

Even though Farrington was the editor of the rival newspaper and the two publications engaged in daily disputes, Dr. McGrew apparently held no grudges against the young suitor. According to family legend, the twenty-five year old Farrington courted and wooed Miss Crane in
her uncle's home. Boyden Sparkes wrote that Farrington's editorials advocating union between Hawaii and the United States became "ardent loveletters." Shortly thereafter, Farrington proposed to Miss Crane and on October 2, 1896, they were married.

The courtship and marriage of Wallace Farrington also took place in the heat of what Farrington's son later described as "one of the most important presidential races relating to Hawaii." William Jennings Bryan, the Democratic candidate, opposed the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands. His Republican opponent, William McKinley, supported it and annexation had been included in the Republican platform that year.

The importance of covering this issue for Hawaii residents prompted owners of the Advertiser to discourage the young editor from leaving the paper during the campaign for a brief visit with his fiancee's family in San Francisco. But Farrington left anyway and returned to his post with some enterprising ideas which helped him to put the Advertiser in a leading competitive position in regard to coverage of the 1896 election.

Farrington got two major "scoops" concerning the election by writing letters to mainland friends. On September 12, the Advertiser published a facsimile of a letter from a personal friend in Augusta, Maine, written in response to a letter from Farrington:

Have just returned from Joe Manley's office [Joseph Manley of Augusta]. He informs me emphatically and without equivocation that the Hawaiian plank was [President] Harrison's, just what he advocated while President and just what the Republican party believes in--annexation pure and simple. It was Harrison's idea and they mean it. If McKinley is elected, that's what will result. Joe was very earnest about it.
In the issue of the same date, Farrington's editorial page said:

If Joseph Manley, chairman of the executive committee of the Republican party, knows what his party intends to do, the Hawaiian plank of the Republican party means business. The information which this paper places before its readers on this point leaves no room to question the significance of the Hawaiian declaration made at the St. Louis convention . . .

The statement of Manley, showing that Harrison was the originator of the plank and that the party intends to advocate "annexation pure and simple" . . . shows that Harrison's influence within his party is quite as strong as when he occupied the President's chair . . . It also demonstrates that, although the question of annexation has apparently remained dormant for a number of months now, the forces of the annexation party, both here and in the United States, have not been asleep.32

Following the 1896 election, Hawaii residents had no immediate way of knowing who the winner was and what the future held for annexation. It wasn't until nearly two weeks after the election that word was received by means of a ship coming from Australia. News of the American election had been cabled half way around the world from London.

Despite the late date, Farrington's Advertiser was the first to get the word of the results out. On November 28, he exulted editorially about annexation in these words:

It should be written in letters of gold upon the banners of annexation, and that banner should be nailed to the masthead . . .

It means one thing and only one; Hawaii asks for admission to the American Union without quibbling over labor laws, immigration laws, sugar laws or any other laws. The laws of the United States are good enough for Hawaii; the people of this country say to Uncle Sam: "Open your doors and let us in; place us on a footing with your own citizens and we are satisfied."

Hawaii has in its political history sought to establish and strengthen American institutions and now seeks to put on the whole armor of Americanism. What more can American statesmen or American citizens want . . . The people of Hawaii ask for nothing better or worse.33
During 1897 a very awkward situation was developing for Farrington. The Castle family had sold more of its interests to Lorrin A. Thurston, who returned to Hawaii and the Advertiser after being replaced as the Island's minister to Washington.

Less than one year after his marriage and the McKinley election, Farrington returned home early from the Advertiser one day in late July. He told his wife to begin to make arrangements to leave the Islands. On August 4, 1897, the Farringtons left Honolulu for the mainland. She was five months pregnant at the time.
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... the Spanish-American War would not have occurred had not the appearance of Hearst in New York journalism precipitated a bitter battle for newspaper circulation.

Joseph E. Wisan

The alternative explanation has been the equally simple idea that the war was a newspaper's war ... (but) the press itself, whatever it can do with opinion, does not have the power to precipitate opinion into action.

Richard Hofstadter

Wallace Farrington's reasons for leaving Honolulu after he had served as editor of the Honolulu Advertiser for less than three years have never been made entirely clear. In his biography of Farrington, Thornton S. Hardy pays little attention to his sudden departure from the Islands. As might be expected, the Hawaiian Star made no mention of Farrington's departure. Neither did the Advertiser, except for a scant three lines of type at the head of the editorial page on August 4, 1897 noting that W. N. Armstrong was taking charge of the editorial department of the newspaper.¹

In an interview in September, 1975, Mrs. Elizabeth Farrington, daughter-in-law of Wallace Farrington, shed some light on this unanswered question and also provided an illustration of the independence of the young editor. According to her account, Wallace Farrington left Hawaii because he could not agree with all the policies of Lorrin A. Thurston.²
Even though Thurston and Farrington were in agreement on the question of annexation, Mrs. Farrington reported that there were too many other policies on which they were not compatible. As a result, Farrington felt he must leave the *Advertiser*.

More than anything else, Mrs. Farrington felt the incident reflected the strong determination of Wallace Farrington to separate the interests of the men who edited and wrote a newspaper from the men who owned it and used it to make money. This is a principle, Mrs. Farrington said that both Wallace and Joseph Farrington tried to maintain throughout their lives.

After leaving the Islands, Wallace Farrington and his wife travelled across country to visit his relatives in Maine for a brief time. They travelled to Washington where one of Farrington's brothers was employed by the Department of Agriculture. It was in Washington that their son, Joseph, the first of three children, was born October 15, 1897. It was during this same period that Congress and the press had resumed the debate on the future of Hawaii and the question of imperialism.

On July 1, 1897, the month before Farrington and his wife left the Islands, President William McKinley had sent a message to the U.S. Senate proposing that it ratify a treaty of annexation between the Republic of Hawaii and the U.S. Government. McKinley's message represented a feeling that had been growing in the United States during the previous decade. The feeling was expressed by John Fiske, the Reverend Josiah Strong, and Alfred Thayer Mahan, who encouraged manifest destiny as inevitable and a greater seapower at home and abroad. Despite the efforts of the New York newspapers and other publications fanning a
strong imperialist sentiment the concept of outward expansion did not
gain great popularity in the Senate. When the Farringtons arrived in
Washington, the persons with national reputation supporting imperialism
were Vice President Theodore Roosevelt and Massachusetts Senator Henry
Cabot Lodge. Other voices such as those of Congressman Carl Shurz,
a former journalist, opposed imperialism on the grounds that a nation
which had thrown off a foreign yoke could hardly impose one on another
nation or group of islands such as Hawaii. \(^5\) McKinley’s treaty was
rejected and the movement for annexation of Hawaii once again seemed
halted as it had been in 1893.

A number of events happened quickly, however, to help change the
attitude of America toward expansion and helped influence Wallace
Farrington to return to Hawaii. The first was the publication in
the sensational New York newspapers of the DeLome letter, a private
letter written by the Spanish Minister in the United States to a friend
in Cuba. In the letter the minister described President McKinley as
"weak and a bidder for the admiration of the crowd." Six days later
a mysterious explosion sank the battleship Maine in the harbor of
Havana killing 260 officers and men. Historians generally agree that
these two incidents precipitated the Congressional resolution which
brought the United States into the war with Spain. \(^6\)

Although there is strong consensus on the above, historians have
not agreed on the influence of the press on the Spanish-American War.
On one hand is the view expressed by Joseph E. Wisan that "the Spanish­
American War would not have occurred had not the appearance of Hearst in
New York journalism precipitated a bitter battle for newspaper
circulation." \(^7\)
Richard Hofstadter, however, is not so certain that the war was "a newspaper's war." Said Hofstadter,

the press itself, whatever it can do with opinion, does not have the power to precipitate opinion into action . . . We must, then, supplement our story about the role of newspapers with at least two other factors: the state of the public temper upon which the newspapers worked, and the manner in which party rivalries deflected domestic clashes into foreign aggression. 8

One way or the other, Wallace Farrington was exposed to the excesses of yellow journalism debating the issue of imperialism in early 1898.

In the middle of this outburst of pyrotechnical journalism and the crucial debate, Wallace Rider Farrington and his wife made a decision which was to alter their lives, and to a great extent the lives of many in Hawaii. It happened when Farrington was working in Fitchburg, Massachusetts where he had traveled to work after visiting in Washington. In much the same way that the wife of young Joseph Pulitzer had encouraged her husband to purchase the newspaper owned by Jay Gould in New York some fifteen years before, young Catherine Farrington persuaded her husband to return to Hawaii. Farrington had been invited to return by A. V. Grear, owner of the Evening Bulletin. It was an appealing idea to Farrington who had grown to love Hawaii. Catherine backed up her suggestion to her husband with the offer of a $1,500 loan. 9 Farrington thus had the financial resources to buy into the failing Evening Bulletin, founded in 1870. 10

In June, 1898, with the Spanish American War being waged in Cuba and in the Philippines, and with Commodore Dewey's ships using the Hawaiian Islands as a refueling stop, the Farringtons returned to Hawaii, carrying their seven-month-old son in a laundry basket. 11
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CHAPTER VI

PLANNING FOR THE DISTANT STATEHOOD GOAL

June 13, 1898 to June 30, 1912

One of the subjects that most engaged his instinctive interest, almost from its inception, was statehood for Hawaii, seen as a goal perhaps distant but toward which Hawaii must plan and build. "The State will be a natural development of local self-government," he wrote on February 16, 1903, while editor of the Evening Bulletin.

T. S. Hardy
Wallace Rider Farrington

For fourteen years after leaving the Honolulu Star Bulletin in 1912, Wallace Farrington was not altogether happy. Although he had returned to the Islands in 1898 to edit the Evening Bulletin, he apparently was unable to concentrate on the reporting and editorial writing tasks to the extent he wished. Instead, Farrington was forced to spend much of his time and energy in the "rough and tumble" of its business management and making the weekly payroll for himself and his small staff. Somehow he always made it, but the necessary process did not always leave him wholly satisfied with himself. In the larger sense, he realized he was not getting anywhere.

In a speech to the World Press Congress when it visited Honolulu, Farrington spoke of the frustration of journalism without motivating causes other than commercialism:

I am glad to have somebody come along once in a while and dignify my profession a little more than I do myself; because, in my activities from reporter to business manager, no sooner has one day's work been finished than I wonder what we are going to do next. It is either a story or the program for the paper, or an endeavor to find the necessary dollar whereby we might be fed and clothed for another day.
A TRADITION OF PRINCIPLES OF POPULAR GOVERNMENT

Riley Allen, a young reporter who later edited the Star-Bulletin, recalled Farrington and the early days of the Honolulu Evening Bulletin from his arrival in Honolulu in 1905.

I arrived in Honolulu with one suitcase and $4.65. But I had a job, in the goal of my life, newspaper work . . .

The Evening Bulletin and the Hawaiian Star were the two afternoon papers. Both were small. Circulation was about 2,000 each. The 1900 census gave the Territory 154,001 and Honolulu County (Oahu) 58,504. Advertising rates were low. In the morning and on Sunday there was the Pacific Commercial Advertiser, now the Honolulu Advertiser. Competition for news, circulation and advertising was keen. Most of the news stories were "local." World and U.S. Mainland news was limited by the cost—25 cents a word, as I recall. The dispatches came to us by cable "skeletonized"—we filled in the "and's" and "the's."

I worked for the Evening Bulletin for seven months, doing everything from waterfront to police to politics and business reporting. There were, as I remember, three others on the news staff, including the city editor. Wallace Farrington wrote the editorials. His style was brief, concise, incisive. He never hesitated to take a positive stand on controversial issues.

He had come to Hawaii from his home state, Maine, with a university education and some brief newspaper experience. He brought with him a tradition of, and a belief in, the principles of popular government—democracy with a small "d". He was a lifelong Republican but neither then nor thereafter did he hesitate to support Democratic candidates for public office for whose principles and personal stature he had respect.³

The principles Allen referred to as part of Bulletin policy were not only the result of Farrington's background, education and early newspaper training on the mainland. They were also a reflection of the progressive changes taking place throughout the mainland and in other parts of the world because of the Industrial Revolution. A Honolulu author suggests that "political differences" had also influenced the growth and change of Hawaii's newspapers, more so perhaps than legitimate business enterprise.⁴
On the mainland, the United States was attempting to cope with what Lord James Bryce described as "The Menace of the Great Cities."

The nation had changed from the country celebrated by Jefferson to the tenements described by journalist Jacob Riis. The balance of political power was no longer in the hands of the agrarian voters but controlled by political bosses and monied interests. This conflict was symbolized in the presidential campaigns of 1896 and 1900 when "the Boy Orator of the Platte," William Jennings Bryan, and his populist supporters, attempted to oust the conservative economic forces of William McKinley.

The period embracing the McKinley administration to the election of Woodrow Wilson also included a portion of the Progressive movement. A part of this period, described by Richard Hofstadter as the Age of Reform, included both Bryan's populism and Teddy Roosevelt's progressive movement, which sought to eliminate abuses and injustices from American life.

Playing no small part in this spirit of reform which swept the mainland United States was the American journalist, symbolized in the form of the muckraker. In the words of Richard Hofstadter:

> It is hardly an exaggeration to say that the Progressive mind was characteristically a journalistic mind, and that its characteristic contribution was that of the socially responsible reporter-reformer.5

In his Age of Reform, Hofstadter stated that the muckraker was a central figure in the new America that was emerging. Before there could be action, there must be information and exhortation. Hofstadter also noted that newspaper owners and editors began to assume a new role in the American society which superseded the partisan political role they had maintained for many years.
Experienced in the traditional function of reporting the news, they found themselves undertaking the more ambitious task of creating a mental world for the uprooted farmers and villagers who were coming to live in the city. The newspapers became not only the interpreter of the environment, but a means of surmounting in some measure its vast human distances, of supplying a sense of intimacy all too rare in the ordinary course of its life.⁶

Closely related to this spirit of the reform of American institutions was a growing sense of moral responsibility to improve the moral and spiritual conditions of the so-called downtrodden inhabitants in other parts of the world. Scholars such as J. A. Hobson of England have been prone to find "taproots" for the widespread surge of imperialism in the desire of financiers and industrialists to secure profitable investments and markets for a rapidly accelerating accumulation of capital and consolidation of industry. Obviously there were other motives for America's expansion into the Pacific and elsewhere.

Historian Charles A. Beard, writing about the acquisition of Hawaii and the Philippines, commented:

there can be no doubt that a sense of moral responsibility was an active factor in bringing about the annexation of new territorial possessions and the efforts to improve the material and spiritual conditions of the inhabitants . . . it was a potent force throughout the country.⁷

Ernest R. May claimed that practically every American scholar who has studied the record has come to the conclusion that the taking of these new territories was a result of "a temporary emotional upswell among the public."⁸ In his Diplomatic History of the United States, Samuel F. Bemis saw the war with Spain and the movement of the U.S. into the Pacific as "years of adolescent irresponsibility" and as "a great national aberration."⁹
Richard W. Leopold made substantially the same appraisal. Describing the roots of imperialism as strategic, economic, religious and emotional, he concluded:

In retrospect, the emotional root appears to be the most significant. Indeed, it may be argued that the American people quickly turned away from overseas dependencies because once their emotional needs were satisfied, the other pressures were too weak to uphold a policy that did not hold with their traditional ideas or principles upon which their institutions rested.10

In short, political isolation was the normal condition of the United States. When Wallace Farrington returned to the mainland in 1897 there had been a departure from the norm. For the next fourteen years his newspaper reported on, and editorialized on, the return to isolationism on the mainland and the indifference of the people and Congress to the fate of Hawaii. In Hawaii, too, Farrington struggled against an indifference of the residents toward a closer relationship with the United States and periodic efforts to become once again an independent territory.

FORMAL ANNEXATION OF HAWAIIAN ISLANDS

Before statehood could be achieved the Islands had to go through a number of stages to prove themselves worthy for admission into the union on an equal footing with the states. The first step was the formal annexation of the Hawaiian Islands at Iolani Palace August 12, 1898, one month after Farrington returned to Honolulu.

The Newlands Resolution, as the annexation act was called, deserves attention from the point of view of the United States. It marked the second annexation by joint resolution in American history. The first
had been that of Texas, and the reason was then, as in 1898, that the necessary two-thirds vote of the Senate was unobtainable. A short document, the first sentence of the resolution extended the sovereignty of the United States over Hawaii.

Provisions to protect the extensive government lands in the possession of the Hawaiian Republic, which had been the subject of considerable negotiation, constituted the second paragraph of the act. Further, existing laws regarding public lands in the United States were not to apply to Hawaii, but Congress was to enact special legislation. Proceeds from the sale of all public lands—except those set aside for naval, military, or local government purposes—were to be used for the benefit of the people of Hawaii.

The entire government of the Islands was vested in the President of the United States. McKinley kept in power those then in control of the Republic. Its president, Sanford B. Dole, he made first governor of Hawaii. Existing treaties of the Republic of Hawaii were to cease and be supplanted by treaties of the United States. "The municipal legislation of the Hawaiian Islands, not enacted for the fulfillment of treaties so extinguished and not inconsistent with this joint resolution nor contrary to the Constitution of the United States nor to any existing treaty of the United States, shall remain in force until the Congress of the United States shall otherwise determine."

Existing customs duties were to remain in force temporarily. The lawful debt of the Republic, not to exceed four million dollars, was assumed by Congress. Further immigration of Chinese to the Islands was prohibited, and those in Hawaii were not to be allowed to enter the United States. The Resolution concluded by providing for a commission of five, to be appointed by the President with the consent of the Senate, to recommend appropriate legislation for the Islands.

Even though the haole merchant and professional class which led the overthrow of the Hawaiian monarchy supported annexation, they were not pleased when the Organic Act went into effect June 14, 1900. The major reason for dissatisfaction was its stipulation for universal male suffrage. Although it would take many years for the Japanese, who comprised 40 percent of the territory's population, to take advantage of this privilege, the native Hawaiians who had been ousted from power now
had a clear majority of the votes.\textsuperscript{12} Even before passage of the Organic Act, a defender of the elite view wrote in the Boston \textit{Herald} that
\begin{quote}
... the responsible leaders of Hawaii were agreed that no one should be allowed to vote for the men who are to pass the laws governing the Islands unless they possess a small property qualification, say of $100 dollars. The Americans in Hawaii do not want to be swamped by Asiatics. "It will not do to have the men who built up the country... at the mercy of a herd of Orientals, who have no interest in it except to make the most they can out of it in the easiest possible way.\textsuperscript{13} But the Orientals had no votes in Hawaii. The Hawaiians did, but they could not be trusted with the franchise," wrote the Boston reporter. "Kanakas are children... they vote whichever way, not their best... A kanaka's word on any transaction is good for nothing."\textsuperscript{14}
\end{quote}
This point of view was supported by the \textit{Pacific Commercial Advertiser} and the haole semi-weekly, the \textit{Hawaiian Gazette}, which complained that Congress, by striking out property qualifications in the name of Americanism, was showing a preference for the native and a hatred of things American. In another editorial, the Gazette warned that "the aborigines and their natural allies will restore the throne of Hawaii."\textsuperscript{15}

Fuchs later observed that
\begin{quote}
The editor of the Hawaiian Gazette warned the natives not to stand apart from the haoles and form their own party. "If color is to rule any subdivision of American territory," he wrote, "the color will be white." The Pacific Commercial Advertiser, violently opposed to a Hawaiian block vote, accused the kanaka papers and Farrington's Evening Bulletin of inciting the Hawaiians to throw out the haoles.\textsuperscript{16}
\end{quote}

Newspapers run for and by former loyalists and by Wallace Farrington praised the suffrage provision of the Organic Act. In an April 25, 1900 editorial, Farrington lauded the bill for its protection of the rights of American citizens as against oligarchical rules laid down by the present ruling faction.
Along with his support for annexation and the liberal suffrage of the Organic Act, Farrington saw the need for local self government as a key step to statehood. "The state will be a natural development of local self government," he wrote February 16, 1903, during the heat of the second Territorial Legislature, whose members had ousted the Home Rule Party from control. In a number of editorials Farrington took his own Republican political party to task for its efforts to weaken or kill measures which would provide local government at the county level. 17 He was particularly disturbed about measures to centralize government at the county and territorial levels. The yes or no issue was centralized or decentralized government, a subject on which he had definite opinions.

The Legislature met in February, 1903, with county government the open question to decide. If one could judge party performance by what had been promised before election, the voters thought they had already decided it. "If the Republicans should allow the county bill to be killed," wrote Farrington on February 11th, "it would kill the Republican party and leave the way open for Congress to pass a compelling act." This was the nearest he came to threatening in print what he had been free to speak more strongly in private. 18

In another editorial written March 18, Farrington said:

The spirit of the County Bill as offered to the Senate by the Special Committee shows the purpose of the measure to be the erection of centralized counties with a centralized Territory. This paper cannot agree . . . that the situation is such that county governments, as interpreted by American custom, should be counties merely in name and not in fact. The county bill discussion is young yet but it has advanced far enough to show that in framing the bill the irresistible conflict between centralization and decentralization is to be the chief issue. 19

As the legislative session advanced and the situation grew more confused and uncertain, Farrington protested:
The County Bill won't pass. This is the gossip of the lobby and the street corner. What foundation there is for such statements it is difficult to imagine . . . Why won't the County Bill pass? . . . There is one condition and one alone to secure defeat; that is, admission by the Republican majority in the Senate and the Republican majority in the House that they are a lot of chuckle-headed chumps, incapable of compromising, lacking in ability to fulfill promises, devoid of essential elements that go to make up a competent, aggressive party whole. We know of no members of the House or Senate prepared to accept this horn of the dilemma . . . The county and municipal bills must pass. Failure will dig a grave for the Republican party deeper than the bowels of Kilauea and equally destructive.20

Prodded perhaps by such fiery editorials, both houses passed the County Bill. It was signed in April, 1903. County government was ushered in by the Board of Supervisors on January 4, 1904, with Captain Henri Berger's band playing the Doxology--"Praise God From Whom All Blessings Flow." Farrington said editorially that it was the "object for which every honest American annexationist had earnestly worked since the campaign was opened . . . leading up to the present occasion when centralized power gives way to the administration by the citizens of this Territory of their own affairs."21

Municipal and county government in Hawaii was also a major goal of the territory's second governor, George Robert Carter, who served from 1903-1907. A former director of C. Brewer and Company and friend of Farrington, Carter was appointed governor by President Roosevelt on November 23, 1903 to succeed Sanford Ballard Dole, the first territorial governor and president of both the provisional government and the Republic of Hawaii. Later Dole was appointed a U.S. District Judge.22

Both Dole and Carter had the ill luck to be in office during the first two legislatures elected under the liberal provisions of the Organic Act. The first of these legislatures, in 1900, was controlled
by the Home Rule Party; and the second, in 1903, by the Republicans. According to historians Nancy and Jean Webb, the first session was a "fiasco." It was harmful in that it hurt the cause of statehood. The legislators were quarrelsome and a disgrace to Hawaii. Also, former royalist rebel Robert Wilcos, who was elected to serve as Hawaii's non-voting delegate to Congress from 1900-1902, did nothing to promote statehood.

To replace Delegate Robert Wilcox, Wallace Farrington editorially urged the voters of Hawaii to elect Prince Jonah Kuhio Kalanianaole, a Hawaiian and the adopted son of Queen Kapiolani. Kuhio was elected and re-elected nine times before his death in 1922 and served the territory well under great handicaps as a non-voting delegate. Kuhio also became a strong supporter of statehood and in 1919 introduced the first admission bill since annexation. The admission bill had been preceded by petitions from the Hawaii Territorial Legislature asking Congress to convene a state constitutional convention in 1903, a congressional investigation for statehood in 1907, and another investigation in 1911. All three requests were ignored by Congress as was Kuhio's 1919 admissions bill. The latter died in committee as did subsequent bills which were not seriously supported by the major economic interests in Hawaii. Strong editorial support was also lacking on the mainland. A sample of the negative reaction to Prince Kuhio's 1911 admission bill is noted by Helen Gay Pratt:

The comment in the Mainland press was interesting. One editor noted the request in these flippant words: "Hawaii wants the next battleship named for her. Hawaii wants to be a state. Man wants but little here below, and that is what he most usually receives."
An Indiana editor had this to say: "Hawaii is three things. First, it is a group of islands 2,100 miles from the Mainland, in which aliens overwhelmingly predominate. Second, it must be a naval station--a Gibraltar--and statehood would complicate national control. Third, it is a queer melting pot that is puttering considerably, and whose product is uncertain. For all these reasons--aside from our national hesitancy to create a state in the mid-Pacific--it is better to wait and see the pot sputter, and also, incidentally, to develop a small land­holding class which will make the Islands less dependent on the whims of the Sugar Trust."26

Along with Wallace Farrington, "Prince Cupid" as Kuhio was called, opposed the efforts of the haoles to dominate the State legislature, the office of the Governor and the Delegate's office in Washington. The situation grew especially sensitive in 1912 when Walter Frear sought reappointment as the third governor. Both Kuhio and Farrington argued that Frear had been more sensitive to the needs of the sugar interests than to those of the Hawaiian people. Kuhio was also concerned as he was continually bypassed both in Washington and in the Islands by the Republican leaders.27 As a result of this situation, Kuhio sought to block the reappointment of Frear or win the appointment as governor for himself.

Frear's campaign for reappointment was strongly supported by the sugar agencies, although it was opposed by a newer Republican element, led by Wallace Farrington, which hoped for more liberal policies.28 Fuchs wrote that, as editor of the **Evening Bulletin**, Hawaii's second most important newspaper, Farrington frequently took issue with the **Advertiser**, which consistently attacked Kuhio and the Hawaiians as irresponsible. The **Advertiser** backed Frear, but Farrington supported Kuhio when he pushed unsuccessfully for a new governor.29

Farrington also opposed the ruling oligarchy on the issue of education in Hawaii. From the time of his arrival in the Islands, he
was a supporter of a stronger system of public education. As the offspring of a family of college teachers, Farrington also saw the value of higher education in the islands. David Kittelson, Hawaiian curator of the University of Hawaii Library, indicated that in spite of a lack of popular opinion favoring a college, "a small progressive-minded group, including Wallace Farrington, editor of the Evening Bulletin, paved the way for the College of Agriculture." Hardy elaborated on the start of the University by Farrington, who had been born in the seat of a land grant college in Maine, and who had transmitted that heritage to the Islands. Hardy and others, including Mrs. Elizabeth Farrington, claim that the initial impetus for the University developed after Farrington wrote a resolution to be introduced in the legislature by Representative William Coelho of Maui.

Farrington later said that such resolutions were "a necessary part of the political scenery," and that he had been in the habit of writing for various representatives from the days when political parties were first active in Hawaii. This resolution was one that took root and grew and these were Farrington's words which embodied it:

WHEREAS, the industries of this Territory are almost exclusively agricultural and our future development must depend for its best progress upon the thorough education of our youth, and

WHEREAS, the Federal Government has provided a means for the establishment and maintenance of Colleges of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii in Special Session assembled, that the Commissioners of Public Instruction are hereby authorized and directed to thoroughly investigate the requirements under the Federal Law, the probable expense to the Territory, a possible practicable site for such a college, the suitableness of Lahainaluna for such a purpose and other details that will enable prompt and intelligent action should it be desirable, and report to the next regular session of the legislature.
The resolution resulted in the establishment of the Land Grant College of Agriculture and Mechanical Arts in 1907-1908. In turn the college became the College of Hawaii in 1911 and eventually the University of Hawaii in 1920. From 1914 until 1920, Farrington served on the Board of Regents of the College. This experience, along with his other work in journalism, business, and in the Ad Club, helped to prepare him for later more demanding responsibilities and in his crusade for statehood. It was preparing for the merger of the Evening Bulletin with the Hawaiian Star on July 1, 1912.
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CHAPTER VII

A NEWSPAPER TO "NUDGE" THE ESTABLISHMENT

July 1, 1912 to November 14, 1918

When I hear criticisms of the Star-Bulletin's early policies, I think of the man asked how his wife was who replied, "Compared to what?"

By today's lights the Star-Bulletin of the past might be called super conservative, but it was a voice within the conservative establishment that helped move Hawaii in directions that were sound historically.

A. A. Smyser
"Evolution of Star-Bulletin Editorial Policy"

The period beginning July 1, 1912, with the merger of the Evening Bulletin and the Hawaiian Star, was "a definite turning point for Wallace Farrington and, to some extent for the Territory of Hawaii.

After the newspapers, owned by Farrington and the Atherton families, consolidated, Farrington began "to expand along his natural lines, constructively." Among his intimate friends, the one who knew him best and watched him with the most insight said after his death that Farrington was "always a builder and an organizer."¹

With a larger and more influential newspaper, Farrington was able to exert greater control over the entry of ideas into the "public space" where political life takes place and lead public opinion in the growing territory. Also he was less preoccupied with the mechanical and business details of a small daily newspaper. Instead, the financial burden was more dispersed, and he was able to delegate the reporting and editorial responsibilities to a trusted aide who had been with him at the Bulletin since 1910. Both of them felt strongly about the
statehood movement, as well as other causes. This was evidenced in the evolution of a strong editorial policy that tried to prod Hawaii in directions that have proven sound historically. Indeed, the influence of Farrington and his editor, Riley Allen, were responsible for the new Star-Bulletin being nicknamed the "Bulletin" rather than the "Star." One editor has suggested that the Star-Bulletin was more the heir of the Bulletin than the Star.² As it developed with Wallace Farrington and Riley Allen as operating heads, the Farrington family gradually increased its ownership role until it dominated.

The opportunity to organize and build a greater newspaper and provide further community leadership, did not come easily to Wallace Farrington, however. During the years before the merger there was a great deal of conflict between the controlling oligarchy and Farrington because of his progressive Republican views, as well as between Farrington and competing newspaper editors. It is only one of the many examples of his personal leadership that Farrington was later to work closely in business and politics to advance the statehood cause with various political and economic competitors of the past.

Farrington's wife recalled one incident that took place before the merger of the Evening Bulletin and the Hawaiian Star when the morning Advertiser hinted of the failing financial condition of her husband's newspaper.

Wallace and I were eating breakfast. He was drinking coffee and reading the morning paper when suddenly he stopped and gasped: "By God, this has got to stop." He then rushed out of the house clutching the Advertiser as if it was somebody's neck. It was the only time in my life that I ever saw him lose his temper completely. I was horrified because he was not given to displays of temper . . . He used to say goodbye to me. But that morning he didn't even speak. He just got his hat and went out to the street car.³
Mrs. Farrington went on to relate that she was so frightened at her husband's actions that she ran to the bedroom to a chiffonier where a revolver was hidden to see if her husband had taken it with him.

"But it was still there," she stated. "I thought that he might have done something to Thurston (editor of the Advertiser) for writing that the Bulletin was going bankrupt."

"Wallace later took the matter up with his lawyer, but Thurston was a brilliant man and nothing ever came of the incident outside of Wallace's outburst."

One other reference to the temperament of the Star-Bulletin's first owner is contained in another interview from the Farrington file in the Hawaii State Archives. According to an unnamed employee, Farrington did have a hot temper, which reportedly cooled shortly before the 1912 merger when Farrington had an appendectomy.

"I always thought there was a transformation in Farrington from that time on--it kind of changed his whole nature," the employee told Boyden Sparkes. "He was much more personable, much more affable and everything else."

A news story on the first page of the new paper, July 1, 1912, indicated that the first overtures for a combination of the two competing afternoon dailies came as early as 1895 at the initiative of the financially failing Bulletin. The Hawaiian Star rejected the offer and continued for the next two years under the editorship of A. T. Atkinson.

Atkinson held the editor's job until 1904 when he resigned to become superintendent of public education. Frank L. Hoogs succeeded Atkinson and served until his death in 1908. The Star was then sold to Charles H. Atherton, a member of one of the leading kamaaina families whose influence crisscrossed with many others in Hawaii's power elite.
The Atherton family was one of the haole families which controlled much of the island's labor and wealth as well as influencing politics. In the words of Fuchs:

The Athertons, powerful in the Castle & Cooke combine, worked closely with the Cookes in the development of the Bank of Hawaii, the Mutual Telephone Company, and the Hawaiian Electric Company. But these divisions were not always clear. The Waterhouses, especially through John, who was related by marriage to the Alexanders and the Baldwins, were also influential in the development of Atherton and Cooke interests. At the same time that John Waterhouse was president of the Bishop National Bank, he was also a co-director of the Hawaiian Trust Company and vice-president of the Mutual Telephone Company. United by school ties, marriage, and by their enemies, Hawaii's financial aid and industrial leaders rarely allowed personal differences to interfere with their co-operative management and control of the wealth of the Islands.6

Of equal importance were the basic principles which governed the lives of the missionary families and which were reflected in the editorial policies of their newspapers.

According to an account in the Golden Years Edition of the Star-Bulletin,

The Athertons were devoted Christian leaders who applied Christian principles to their work. They were also said to be careful to be self-effacing in their innumerable charitable works and contributions but bold in proposing changes and improvements in commerce, government and social action.7

Stanley Porteus, in his analysis of social thinking in Hawaii, noted that members of the Atherton family also belonged to the Honolulu Social Science Association founded in 1882. According to Porteus, it was S.S.A. members, consisting of businessmen, clergymen, engineers, biologists, artists, physicians, planters, judges, teachers and ethnologists, who filled the leadership vacuum left by the missionaries. Various S.S.A. members "carefully plotted" the course followed by
Hawaii's kings until the overthrow of the monarchy. When the time came that this course was proving dangerously uncertain, it was S.S.A. members who set up the provisional government to provide a step toward annexation by the United States. Though the association never exerted power, it had great influence in determining Hawaii's destiny.  

Four years after the purchase of the Star, representatives of the Atherton family made overtures to buy the Advertiser. "The Big Five were very much displeased with the Advertiser and its editor," Charles Frazier stated in an interview with Boyden Sparkes. With the rejection by the Advertiser, the Atherton family approached the Bulletin through a mutual friend who helped bring about the merger.  

In 1912 the controlling owners—Charles H. Atherton, his sister, Mrs. Mary Atherton Richards, and the Joseph Ballard Atherton Estate—bought the majority of stock of the Evening Bulletin Publishing Company from Farrington and announced amalgamation of the two newspapers and printing companies. The papers became the Honolulu Star-Bulletin.  

Charles H. Atherton, Frank C. Atherton, and the Joseph Ballard Atherton Estate were named as controlling owners. Wallace Rider Farrington of the Evening Bulletin was named vice-president and general business manager, and Riley H. Allen became editor. Frank Atherton, who had been Hawaiian Star treasurer, became president of the Star-Bulletin.  

What the final arrangements behind the merger were is not stated in the first Star-Bulletin account. The editorial page box on page four of the fledgling publication noted the addresses of both offices
of the papers, with the **Bulletin** office on Alakea Street serving as the main office and the **Star** office on Merchant Street serving as a branch of the newspaper. The introductory news story also announced that the combined printing equipment, including seven linotype machines and the only web printing press in Hawaii, "is the best in the territory."\(^9\) The subscription price for the paper was listed as 75 cents per month, $8 per year, or $12 for foreign subscriptions. It was the Territory's largest newspaper.

The key individual on the young newspaper, who by virtue of his long tenure would exert the greatest influence in shaping both the **Star-Bulletin** and its statehood movement, was Riley Harris Allen.

Allen was born April 30, 1884 in Colorado City, Texas. After his father died, his mother moved to Seattle, Washington. Allen got his early education at the Seattle Female Academy.\(^10\) He began college at the University of Washington. He never graduated there, but went on to the University of Chicago where he did his first newspaper work as campus reporter for the Chicago **Daily Mirror**.\(^11\)

While in Chicago, Allen was able to view first-hand and assimilate much of the aggressive reporting, writing and ruthless competition which at that time characterized Chicago journalism and which could later be portrayed in the play "Front Page." But Allen had no desire to remain in the Midwest.

In a later interview, Allen said he was greatly influenced by the life and style of William Allen White who, as editor of the Emporia Kansas **Gazette** from 1896 to 1944, became the spokesman for small towns in America.\(^12\) Like White, Allen never wanted for money or for the
necessities of life, but he also never lost his empathy with groups that were out of his social class. A close associate of the Star-Bulletin editor says that this description of White by Alan Nevins describes Allen as well.

White developed a burly, genial, neighborly personality which endeared him to a wide audience. Loving his profession of country editor, to him Emporia was a microcosm of the world. He liked the opportunity his editorial chair gave him of surveying human weaknesses and virtues, of being teacher and helper to the whole community, of expressing his own audacious opinion today upon some problem which affected a single family or block, and tomorrow upon some issue of world importance. His informality, the trait of a really great and transparently sincere personality, was captivating, and in combination with his spontaneous literary talent, enabled him to touch chords of humor and pathos, and to rise to occasional levels of literary beauty, which would have been quite impossible under the restraints of ordinary urban journalism. In his outlook upon national affairs, he began as a conservative, but rapidly worked around to a vigorous political and social insurgency, which in turn gave way to a philosophic tolerance of liberal stamp.13

Following the 1912 merger, Allen laid down the rules by which he would attempt to guide the Star-Bulletin. In his first editorial Allen wrote:

The ideals of the newspaper are aggressive, accurate, thorough newsgathering and news publishing, service to the readers of the broadest possible scope and fidelity to the welfare of the territory. It aims to give the news, to give it first, to give it accurately and impartially and to use its best and sincere endeavors to promote the progress of Progressive Hawaii.14

The references in the first issue were prompted by Farrington whose fundamental newspaper philosophy was the importance of the news to a newspaper. Writing about the stress on news in 1937, Allen said:

That may seem an entirely obvious thing to the average newspaper reader. The newspaperman or newspaperwoman knows what I mean. The interest and the importance of "features" has in the past quarter century tended to thrust the place of news into the background.
Mr. Farrington always insisted that the backbone of a newspaper is news. And while his paper published the first comic strip and the first comic section in Hawaii, and pioneered many another newspaper feature, he never wavered in his conviction that the first duty of a newspaper is to publish the news, and all the news.

In following this conviction he steadily and willingly, as general manager and later as publisher of The Star-Bulletin, spent more for news than did any other publisher in Hawaii. He did this not only for "spot news" such as earthquakes, wars, disasters, championship fights or world championship baseball games, but for the day-by-day news. He was quick to realize the opportunity to get cable news—when the Commercial Pacific Cable company opened operations here 34 years ago. (Typical of his enterprise, too, was the fact that the first message that came by the new-laid cable was to the Evening Bulletin. For many years that message, framed, hung on the wall of his office.)

Today's News Today," which he early adopted for The Evening Bulletin, was more than a catchy and effective newspaper slogan. It was an expression of newspaper philosophy. It was his gospel of newspaper production.15

The Star-Bulletin under Farrington and Allen was not only extremely enterprising in gathering and printing the news, it was determined to print all the news possible within the bounds of decency.

When World War I broke out two years after the Star-Bulletin was formed, the paper immediately set out to print all possible news from both sides.

Particularly, the Star-Bulletin was able to get and print the official communiques or press releases from the German side. These were being sent by cable to the German consul in Honolulu. But soon the Allied nations and the Allied sympathizers took exception to the Star-Bulletin practice. In defense of his action, Allen wrote:

As a matter of fact, we learned by careful checking that the German communiques were usually fairly correct. They were presented, of course, from the German standpoint, but they contained many items of news and battles and of German policy which we could not get otherwise.16
During this period Allen said he was backed completely by Farrington whose attitude was that so long as the dispatches were credited to German sources, the newspaper should publish them for what they were worth. Because of this there was a time when the Star-Bulletin was bitterly assailed as pro-German. This criticism, of course, vanished when American went into the war and the Star-Bulletin loyally supported the cause in which the nation was engaged. Even before that the Star-Bulletin pointed out editorially that the course which Germany was taking toward the United States must inevitably alienate this country and cause a declaration of war. 

Although Honolulu and Hawaii were not touched directly by the world conflict in 1914 and 1915, the Star-Bulletin and Farrington were major leaders in demonstrating Hawaii's loyalty and Americanism.

Farrington was Territorial chairman of the "Victory Boys and Girls" and Territorial head of the "Boys' Working Reserve," both of which received much support from his paper. The former did some necessary work, but its main project was the saving or earning of thousands of dollars for welfare work in the Army and Navy. The 5,000 members of the Boys' Working Reserve (plus some girls) worked in pineapple canneries, sugar plantations, the iron works, coffee companies and at the naval station. A more detailed account of Star-Bulletin activities in World War I has been provided by the Star-Bulletin.

A territorial food commission was probably the first such body appointed in the United States after the start of the war. It had an ambitious program of food production and conservation, but it was scarcely underway before criticism began to appear. The criticism grew, and even Governor Lucius E. Pinkham joined in denouncing actions of his appointees. At this point both the Advertiser and the Star-Bulletin came to the support of the commission. They agreed that while it
Rice, fish and poi presented special problems which received the attention of authorities and the press. These were wheatless days and meatless days. The papers duly reported experiments on the preparation of flour from edible canna, Irish and sweet potatoes, bananas, taro and cassava. The newspapers joined the campaign for greater use of bananas, normally shipped in large quantities to the mainland but then held in Hawaii because of divergence of shipping to the Atlantic. The Banana Consuming Propaganda Committee received newspaper help in spreading its slogan, "Buy Bananas By the Bunch and Beat the Boches Back to Berlin." Liberty Loan drives resulted in subscriptions of more than $30 million in the Islands. The first announcement came in the form of a joint newspaper advertisement by banks and trust companies in Honolulu two weeks after the entry of the United States into the war, calling attention to the fact that the Government was expected shortly to offer a large issue of bonds for public subscription. During the drives, business houses, including newspapers themselves, donated much advertising space for announcements.18

During the Third Liberty Loan, the campaign committee drew the wrath of some civic organizations upon itself by using billboards on a large scale. The Star-Bulletin editorially urged its readers to keep an eye on the larger issues and not "go off on a billboard tangent."

During the Fourth Liberty Loan shortly before the end of the war, the Star-Bulletin published a large "Swat the Hun!" issue. The push for sale of bonds continued between drives. The papers also did much to encourage the purchase of Thrift Stamps, sold for a few cents each and pasted in stamp books which were exchangeable, when full, for a real bond. Newspapers gave thrift stamps to children for obtaining subscriptions, and in other ways offered to let boys and girls earn the "baby bonds."19

Ralph S. Kuykendall, now recognized as the Island's foremost historian, was brought to Honolulu by the Hawaii Historical Commission to
write a history of "Hawaii in the World War." In his book, published by the commission in 1928, he described the role of the Star-Bulletin and other local newspapers.

Foremost among the agencies promoting American patriotism and combating enemy propaganda and German influences were the newspapers. The work which they did was of the most vital importance. In the first place, they kept the people informed of what was going on, so far as it was possible to find that out; and the way in which they presented the news, the headlines which they employed, and the emphasis which they placed on this or that, went far to interpret the news to their readers. In the second place, their editorial columns were dedicated to the service of the nation; in the most earnest and effective way they expounded the duty of patriotism in war time. In the third place, they energetically supported every war activity, by printing news stories and pictures, by donating advertising space, by editorial comment, and in other ways. And finally, they showed the rest of the world where Hawaii stood. It would be difficult to overestimate the importance of the newspapers as molders of public opinion in this war period. In Hawaii, they were all--heart and soul--loyal to their country's cause.

On minor points of procedure they sometimes differed sharply with each other; if on rare occasions their zeal outran their discretion that probably will not be counted a very heinous offense.²⁰

Notwithstanding Kuykendall's statements about the unity of the English and foreign language newspapers in promoting unity and patriotism during World War I, the Star-Bulletin and the Advertiser were starting to develop divergent editorial policies in a number of areas. In a memorandum written to executives of the Gannett chain in 1975, editorial page editor A. A. Smyser contrasts the progressive and consistent Star-Bulletin policies with those of the Advertiser, which he says reflected "a measure of racism" and "self-interest" that alienated a large portion of the population before leapfrogging to a later liberal stance.²¹ Smyser said the Star-Bulletin editorial policy was not something that has been set frivolously "from day to day." Rather there are strong connecting threads
that trace from the establishment of the paper in 1912 up to today. Smyser also claimed that the underlying Star-Bulletin policies proved "sound and wise" in terms of the broader interest of Hawaii . . . though they sometimes were very costly to the paper.22

In contrast to the "racist" and "self-interest" policies of the Advertiser, Smyser said the Star-Bulletin under Farrington and Allen was able to build up over the years a "reservoir of goodwill" that contributed to its overwhelming circulation lead. He said the Star-Bulletin lived within Hawaii's highly controlled society of the early twentieth century so that even if it was part of the establishment, it was a part of the establishment that kept "nudging for change," and did so fairly effectively and wisely.23

"By today's lights, the Star-Bulletin of the past might be called super-conservative, but it was a voice within the conservative establishment that helped move Hawaii in directions that were sound historically."24

In no other area is this claim for nudging within the establishment more true than in the Star-Bulletin promotion of the statehood movement and causes which complemented statehood. In the same memorandum Smyser stated that the Star-Bulletin was far and away the "most vigorous and ardent advocate" of Hawaiian statehood. In another interview, Smyser stated that the paper was an "unashamed promoter" of the statehood cause and all members of the staff were aware of it.

Some of the principles such as statehood which Allen listed were already part of the editorial objectives of the Farringtons' before the Star-Bulletin merger in 1912. Others would evolve over the years as the Farringtons and Allen carried out their "nudging" of the establishment.
In addition to the editorials supporting statehood and other causes relating to equal rights and the Allied War cause, the Star-Bulletin printed articles and editorials about various volunteer movements in Hawaii. Of particular interest to Allen were Red Cross Relief movements which were aiding soldiers and children throughout the world. After discussing the various opportunities for service with associates in the Red Cross, Allen suddenly decided to take a leave of absence to work with the Red Cross.

On November 14, 1918, the following news story appeared on page one of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin.

Riley H. Allen, editor of the Star-Bulletin since the consolidation of the Hawaiian Star and the Evening Bulletin July 1, 1912, relinquishes his editorship with today's issue. He is sailing tomorrow for Siberia to enter American Red Cross work to which duty he was called a few days ago. The new managing editor is Raymond McNalley, who for the past year and one half has been the city editor, in which position he has made an enviable record.
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CHAPTER VIII
STRAYING FROM THE STATEHOOD PATH

November 15, 1918 to July 23, 1921

The leading Honolulu newspapers were opposed to it [statehood]. They were greatly concerned over the Japanese problem in the territory . . . and the Star-Bulletin referred to the statehood bill as a "ridiculous proposal."

Ralph Kuykendall and A. Grove Day

The editorials are a complete surprise to me and I am sure I never heard your father refer to statehood in any such terms. I can only conjecture that your father did not wish to interfere with McNalley's freedom of expression.

Letter to Joseph Farrington from Riley Allen
January 12, 1949

Raymond McNally's name appeared in the editorial page masthead as Star-Bulletin editor from November 15, 1918 until November 27, 1920. On that date George Nellist was named editor, holding the position until Allen returned to Hawaii in June the following year. They were the only persons besides Allen to serve from 1912 to 1960. Unlike Allen, neither supported the statehood cause.

Allen's absence from the Star-Bulletin and Hawaii coincided with the final years of the administration of Woodrow Wilson as the United States recovered from the trauma of World War I and moved toward a "return to normalcy." In the words of Daniel Moynihan, "American institutions also reached their apogee in 1919, following World War I, with the extraordinary international position of Wilson, who had an eminence no American leader
achieved before, and none since, an eminence it is difficult to imagine any American will ever achieve again under our present arrangements."

Allen no doubt was able to benefit from some of this international respect for America and its liberal democracy as he and a total of thirty other Hawaii residents took part in an extraordinary adventure to rescue some 800 children from Siberia. They took the children three-quarters of the way around the world to be reunited in Russia with their parents, from whom they had been taken during the revolution.

In Hawaii, meanwhile, the years of Allen's absence coincided with the administration of its fifth governor, Charles J. McCarthy. A former supporter of Queen Liliuokalani, McCarthy had the task of getting the territory back to a peacetime basis after being appointed by Wilson to serve from 1918 until July 5, 1921. He was also "the first governor to give strong support for the statehood cause."

Despite support for statehood from McCarthy, the Star-Bulletin took little opportunity to concentrate on this effort, or on other egalitarian crusades, during this period. An analysis of news stories and editorials written by McNalley and Nellist reveals that the two interim editors were not as progressive in their thinking as Allen had been, particularly in regard to the growing Japanese "race" problems. Indeed it was during this period, when Allen was absent from Hawaii, and during the following decade, that the Star-Bulletin received its most severe criticism from historians and observers such as Lawrence Fuchs for policies said to be unfriendly to the Japanese and other minority groups.
One of the most quoted references relating to the antagonism of the Star-Bulletin toward statehood is contained in the 1948 edition of Hawaii, A History used for many years as a basic history text in the Islands.

In the chapter entitled "The Fight for Statehood" Kuykendall and Day refer to the period following the introduction of the first statehood bill by Delegate Kuhio on February 21, 1919, when local support for the statehood idea was still rather weak. According to the text:

"The leading Honolulu newspapers were opposed to it. They were greatly concerned over the Japanese problem in the territory, as exemplified by plantation labor strikes and by foreign language schools, and the Star-Bulletin referred to the statehood bills as a "ridiculous proposal.""

This quote from the Star-Bulletin, referring to Kuhio's first bill as a "ridiculous proposal," has been used by those looking for an example of opposition to statehood. It was even used by Delegate John A. Burns in a number of speeches and in State Government magazine in an article attempting to summarize the statehood movement.

Use of this particular quote from a 1948 history book is not entirely fair or accurate, however. In later editions of the book, the quote has been removed entirely although reference to the Star-Bulletin is still contained in the index.

In an interview, A. Grove Day, one of the authors, explained that Star-Bulletin opposition to statehood in 1919 is "a historical fact," but that the earliest reference had been dropped "in the light of later conditions and the exigencies of space in rewriting the issue for publishers."

Day said that he was aware that the Star-Bulletin had consistently and courageously promoted the statehood cause through its pages even though there was a period when it opposed the issue.
Charles Hunter, another Hawaii historian, also noted the Star-Bulletin opposition to statehood for a brief period. In a detailed letter to Riley Allen, January 10, 1949, Hunter said there were actually "eight or ten editorials during the period 1919-1920 that leave no doubt as to the Star-Bulletin opposition to statehood." As examples, Hunter asked Allen to consider the following:

January 22, 1920 "... there is in this community no sentiment favoring such a change in our political status."

February 6, 1920 "Statehood is out of the question. We don't want it."

March 30, 1920 Statehood "at least as far in the future as our vision can penetrate, is out of the question." Then "for reasons which we consider good and sufficient and which have been stated and re-stated in these columns so often that their repetition now would be quite superfluous, the Star-Bulletin has been opposed to statehood for Hawaii."

Allen's reply to Hunter's charge that "neither you nor the delegate will admit that the Star-Bulletin was ever opposed to statehood," is contained in a letter to Joseph Farrington in Washington, dated January 12, 1949.

I was in Siberia at the time the three editorials from which he quoted appeared. They are a complete surprise to me and I am sure I never heard your father refer to statehood in any such terms. I can only conjecture that he did not wish to interfere with McNally's freedom of expression.9

Farrington's response to Hunter's letter is similar to Allen's answer. In a January 17 letter to Allen, he wrote:

I am sure you correctly appraised the series of editorials appearing in the Star-Bulletin in 1920 as a manifestation of McNally's point of view. I know they did not reflect my father's attitude as I never heard him express himself in this way.10

Aside from these much quoted and discussed editorials—which certainly were not typical of hundreds of others written to support
statehood from 1912-1960, little is known of McNally's work or influence. The paper is noticeable for its lack of information on the man who served as its editor for a little more than two years. The Hawaii Newspaper Agency library, which serves as a "morgue" for both the Star-Bulletin and Advertiser, and which has millions of newspaper clippings, has only one clipping on McNally--a six-line Associated Press story of his death in San Francisco in August, 1939, and a nine-line "drop-in" of his work in Honolulu. The brief A.P. obituary noted that McNally was with the Star-Bulletin for eight years and head of the (San Francisco) Call-Bulletin copy desk for fifteen years. He was fifty-two years old at the time of his death. The local story added only that McNally was "a former city editor of the Star-Bulletin." He held the position for five years and left the islands twenty years ago. He served as "acting editor of the Star-Bulletin for a time," the news-story stated.11

An announcement on the November 27, 1920 editorial page told of McNally's resignation as editor because of ill health. However, the announcement added that McNally would continue with the paper in an executive capacity "as head of the news department." A check of Honolulu city directories after his resignation showed McNally listed as city editor of the Star-Bulletin in 1921 and 1922, but not thereafter.

Although he served as editor for a shorter period than McNally, much more information is available about Nellist. Before joining the Star-Bulletin as an editorial writer in September, 1919, Nellist worked with both the San Francisco Illustrated Daily Herald and the San Francisco Chronicle. On July 7, 1918, Nellist, who had been day manager of the
Western Division of the Associated Press, arrived in Honolulu to establish a Hawaii A.P. bureau. Nellist became managing editor of the Star-Bulletin upon Allen's return. He left for San Francisco in January, 1924, and returned to Hawaii in October of the same year.

In an interview at Queen's Hospital in 1966, Nellist claimed that he had been treated unfairly by the Star-Bulletin when Allen returned and resumed his job as editor. He also spoke of the problems created by the Japanese immigrants in the 1920s, a problem he said he was editorially required to discuss.12

Two editorials written during the McNally period, heralding Christmas, 1918 and the year 1919, reflected the mood of Hawaii and of the Star-Bulletin: "Tomorrow should be one of the happiest Christmases the present generation has ever enjoyed. For not within half a century, perhaps, have there been so many reasons for a truly joyous Yuletide season."

The roseate outlook in Hawaii during this period, of course, was due to the tremendous increase in demand for raw sugar, which soared to 23.5 cents per pound in 1920 after the price-setting Equalization Board, established during the war, was discontinued. Accompanying the sugar boom were efforts of plantation workers to organize, and subsequent attempts by the predominantly Japanese and Filipino laborers to gain higher wages.

The attempts at unionization and collective bargaining (for which the Star-Bulletin editorially argued the Orientals were not yet prepared) came to a head in October, 1919, when the Higher Wage Association—the first formal labor organization among plantation workers—made proposals
for higher pay. A strike, which began in January, 1920, was the longest ever conducted in the territory. McNally denounced the strike bitterly on the editorial pages. None of the Star-Bulletin denunciations of the strike, however, were as bitter as those printed in the Advertiser denouncing not only the Japanese strikers but the Japanese press as well.

On February 6, 1920, the Advertiser printed the names of fifty Japanese businessmen and white-collar workers who were supporting the strike, urging that these men be punished for their activities. On February 8, it called for the destruction of the Japanese press, asserting that it was "dangerous to the peace and prosperity of Hawaii." The foreign-language press "will always be dangerous. The only thing to do is to scotch it. Putting a muzzle on it isn't enough. That would be like muzzling a mad dog. It should be exterminated." The foreign language school system, it said, should be eliminated too: "... there is little reason to believe that it can be sufficiently controlled to render it safe."13

According to Fuchs, in a chapter entitled "No Concessions Whatsoever," the Star-Bulletin and the Advertiser kept up their anti-Oriental attacks:

Buddhism was a sinister influence behind the plantation strike, the Star-Bulletin said. Agreeing with the Advertiser, it complained about the priests of Asiatic paganism, who were in an unholy alliance with foreign-language schoolteachers and Japanese editors to control the industrialism of Hawaii... Hawaii must remain "in the hands of Anglo-Saxons whose brains and means have made the Territory what it is." The Advertiser reported that confirmation of the racial character of the crisis had appeared in an editorial in the Nippu Jiji, which admitted that the strike had "taken on a color of internationalism." It committed the Nippu's refutation of the allegation. The Advertiser also quoted strike leader Takashi Tsutsumi as saying that the Japanese government was back of the strikers and that a Japanese cruiser would come to take them home, but it did not print his denial of the story. Tsutsumi had written: "I am not
an advocate of narrow Japanese imperial principles. But I am a staunch believer in democracy... under stars and stripes, Hawaii is a free country. It is because laborers are held fast by out-of-date Japanese principles, we have started this labor movement in order to enable them to display American spirit..." Tsutsumi promised that the union movement in Hawaii would not adopt the violent policies of the Industrial Workers of the World.14

Actually, Fuchs wrote, the Japanese strike leaders in 1920 were much more American in their outlook than their predecessors in a 1909 strike. There had been no male immigration to Hawaii for thirteen years, and it was the younger Japanese, educated in American schools, who largely provided leadership for the strike on the plantation level. The Consul General again took the conservative view. Like a predecessor in 1909, he tried to persuade the strikers to go back to work and settle disputes amicably.15

Because of their anti-Oriental attacks, the Advertiser and the Star-Bulletin were criticized quite severely by the Oriental population and by acting Governor Curtis Iaukea, a Hawaiian who complained that "the American press is the voice of the planters." "I am convinced that the racial issue has been deliberately emphasized to cloud the economic issue," Iaukea wrote to Governor McCarthy. McCarthy was in Washington at the time lobbying to try to change the Organic Act to once again allow the importation of Oriental laborers. The Nippu Jiji, a Japanese newspaper, also stated that the haole newspapers, including the Star-Bulletin, were distorting the issue. "The strike was neither racial nor political; it was economic," the Japanese publication said.16

In addition to the fact that the strike was the longest ever conducted in the territory, there were other reasons for its extensive coverage and
editorial comment by the Star-Bulletin. According to historians Potter and Kasdon, the strike was the first economic action taken by more than one national group of laborers. Secondly, during the negotiations before the strike, economic data regarding Honolulu's increasing prices and living costs were gathered and analyzed and used to support the demands for an increase in wages.  

After the strike, said Fuchs, restrictive bills were sped through the legislature to punish the Japanese for their affronts. The Honolulu Star-Bulletin of March 27, 1920, said:

In our opinion this [hostile] feeling toward the Japanese has been engendered almost entirely by their temperamental characteristics, their insincerity . . . as evidenced by their conduct of the present strike on this Island . . . Studying deeper into the cause of the feeling entertained against the Japanese we have their insularity, their failure to enter into community life and become a part of it, their herding together and aloofness from their occidental neighbors.

There can be little question that the Star-Bulletin (as well as the Advertiser) reached its lowest point as a leader in the statehood movement during the three year period when Riley Allen was absent. Wallace Farrington, though he was in a position to carry out the responsible policies of the newspaper, permitted the Star-Bulletin's two interim editors to join with other major publications in unfair and inflammatory writing on the movement by immigrants to improve their lot. In addition, as noted by historians Kuykendall and Day, as well as Charles Hunter, the Star-Bulletin, did oppose statehood during this period, particularly as it related to the first admission bill introduced in Congress by Prince Kuhio in 1919. But this period should be viewed as the exception rather than the rule. In addition, as Fuchs has pointed out, this was the period when many haoles believed in racial superiority.
Criticism of the Orientals which appeared from time to time in the haole newspapers of Honolulu, was mild compared to the virulent attacks in editorials and articles in the San Francisco Chronicle. Racism was thus kept mainly a private affair even in the era when it was justified openly on Mainland college campuses.19

Equally serious as its departure from its founding principles in the area of racism was the Star-Bulletin's efforts to support legislation to muzzle the foreign language press with an anti-press statute in 1921. Although never as vicious in its criticism of the Japanese press as the Advertiser, the Star-Bulletin did not provide the leadership that it might have in trying to defend the journalistic rights of those that it did not agree with.

As Vice President and General Manager of the Star-Bulletin, Wallace Farrington could have used his influence to persuade his interim editors to support the rights of minority groups as he had done in the past. He did not, however, and for a brief period allowed the Star-Bulletin to abdicate its leadership role concerning freedom of the press as well as statehood. A major reason for this no doubt was due to his policy of not interfering with the editorial freedom of the interim editors. Other factors may have been the increasing fear of Japan as a military power in the Pacific and the growth of the Japanese population which by 1920 totalled 43 percent of Hawaii's 110,000 residents.

Fortunately for the immigrants of Hawaii, as well as the other residents, many of the smaller Japanese language newspapers served as a check and balance on the haole newspapers, as well as on the less responsible foreign language newspapers in the Territory. Dr. James Okahata in describing the role of the Japanese press in Hawaii states:
The role of the Japanese press during the decades was an all important one. It took part in almost every community issue—major or minor. It was the medium of education; it carried instructions and information necessary to the immigrants; it brought them news of home; it took part in campaigns such as reform and Americanization movements; it sponsored relief activities; it roused public opinion and also served to enrich and elevate the cultural interests of the Japanese. And most important of all, it was a means of communication for the Japanese who were scattered throughout the numerous plantations on the four major islands.20

In an article in the January, 1922 issue of Mid-Pacific Magazine, Y. Soga, editor of the Nippu Jiji wrote that despite what was being said against the Japanese press, "it is a valuable factor in the Americanization work of the Japanese population of the Islands which totalled more than any other single race."21 Because the majority of Japanese of the Territory's population did not speak or read English, they had to rely on the Japanese press. As examples of the important role of the language papers, Soga referred to the crusades by the Japanese press urging enlistment in the U.S. Army during World War I, the liberty bond and war savings stamp drives, and American Red Cross Relief movements.

The influence of the Japanese press, whether in the good direction or the bad direction, virtually effects Hawaii's interests, and upon its attributes, depend interracial harmony in this integral part of the United States.22

Thus, for a brief period we see that the Japanese language press stepped into the leadership vacuum vacated by the Star-Bulletin. Both media would continue to educate, instruct and arouse public opinion for the next four decades. But it would be the Star-Bulletin which provided the major thrust in the statehood movement when Riley Allen returned to the Islands in August, 1921.

Exactly one month after Allen's name was replaced on the masthead as editor on July 23, 1921, Star-Bulletin editorials began to agitate for
Statehood once again. Lead editorials of August 23 and 24 and again on September 24, 1921 have provided the first indication that the *Star-Bulletin* had resumed the endorsement for statehood it started in 1912. Hunter has observed that it is not a direct approval of Statehood, but "preparation for eventual statehood."\(^{23}\)

The transition from the period of Allen's absence to a more specific endorsement for statehood becomes clear in the lead editorial of January 12, 1923: "A declaration of Faith" referring to Governor Wallace Farrington's speech to visiting Rotarians. In the Governor's private papers dated August 2, 1923, Farrington makes the following commitment: "Every move I make will be with the idea of rendering service to the people in hastening the day when Hawaii shall be considered ready for full statehood."\(^{24}\)
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CHAPTER IX

HASTENING THE DAY

STATEHOOD CONTRIBUTIONS BY GOVERNOR WALLACE FARRINGTON

July 5, 1921 to July 5, 1929

Every move I make will be with the idea of rendering service to the people in hastening the day when Hawaii will be considered ready for full statehood.

Governor Wallace R. Farrington
August 2, 1923

The Star-Bulletin's leadership role in the statehood movement improved during the decade described as "the Roaring Twenties." A major reason for the more responsible role of the Star Bulletin was the appointment of its vice president and general business manager, Wallace R. Farrington, as governor of the territory for two terms, from 1921 to 1929. During this period Farrington's accomplishments prompted one admirer to state that, with the exception of Hawaii's first governor, Sanford Dole, "no governor did as much for the territory and for the nation."^1

Farrington's efforts in Hawaii were enhanced by the Star-Bulletin, through friends in the U. S. Congress including Republican Presidents Warren Harding, Calvin Coolidge and Herbert Hoover. None of the presidents, however, joined Farrington by endorsing statehood for Hawaii at this early date.

Several factors explain the appointment of Wallace Farrington as governor of Hawaii. Robert M. C. Littler says there is always "a great deal of politics afoot when a governor is to be chosen. Writing in 1929, Littler said:
A successful candidate must have people pushing him in Honolulu and others pulling for him in Washington. But the essential thing is influence with the President. Governor Farrington was a personal friend of President Harding's. The appointment is always from the party of the President. Formal recommendation by the party central committee in Hawaii is usually influential, if not decisive, in most appointments, but not so with that of governor. When the Republicans are in power the sugar interests in Honolulu are expected to have considerable say as to the governor, because they are always substantial contributors to the national party fund.  

Another reason for Farrington's appointment was a strong letter-writing campaign by Star-Bulletin executive Charles Merill to prominent Farrington friends such as Cyrus H. K. Curtis and Senator Frederick Hale.  

But the primary factor was evidently at a luncheon sponsored by the Ad Club of Hawaii on February 3, 1915. Club President Wallace Farrington introduced a newly-elected Republican Senator from Ohio as the luncheon speaker by casually remarking that the Senator might some-day be elected "President of the United States." When Senator Warren Harding got up to speak to the Honolulu business executives, he put his hand on Farrington's shoulder and remarked that if he ever did become president, Farrington would surely become vice president of the Senate.

Hardy claims that the two men took a strong liking to each other. They had much experience and background in common. As one of Farrington's intimates said years later: they were both small town newspapermen. They talked the same language... 

During his stay in Honolulu, Harding early formed the habit of dropping in almost daily to read the press dispatches in advance of their appearance in the Star-Bulletin; and to talk of everything they might suggest in connection with the ominous appearance of the war news, its possible effect on national policies and politics, searching questions about this unfamiliar, interesting place where he happened to be, Honolulu personalities that he had met and their influence on local affairs. From these many conversations, he gathered
the impression that Farrington was unusually well informed, had
definite convictions of his own, and could be trusted. There
sank into his consciousness a realization that Hawaii was an
American territory, not merely an agreeable place in which to
pass a pleasant vacation.6

Wallace Farrington cultivated his friendship with Senator Harding,
as well as with other Congressmen and newspaper publishers over the
years. Whenever he was called East on private business, Farrington
made it a point to see Senator Harding. He also instructed the Star-
Bulletin's political correspondent in Washington to keep in touch with
Harding and keep both men posted on items of mutual interest. On
June 2, 1921, Harding sent Farrington's nomination to the Senate for
confirmation. Confirmation followed "after the last dog had been hung"
on July 5.7

Two Hawaii historians, Ralph S. Kuykendall and A. Grove Day,
reviewed Governor Wallace R. Farrington's administration in these two
paragraphs in their book, Hawaii, A History, published by Prentice-Hall:

A few months before Governor Wallace R. Farrington (1911-
1929) stepped out of office, he summed up one phase of his
administration in these words: "The conspicuous advance step
of recent years has been to bring the machinery of public
administration up to a more modern standard."

This had been done by a reorganization of the accounting
systems of the Territory and the Counties, establishment of a
retirement system for public employees, and a scientific
classification of personnel employed by the Government. He
advocated an equalization of taxes and a careful study of the
whole tax system. Farrington's two terms coincided almost
exactly with the 'normalcy' era of Harding and Coolidge.
Hawaii shared in the prosperity of that period, and the
Territorial and County Governments were able to spend large
sums for public improvements. One notable result was that
Honolulu had its 'face lifted' by a phenomenal program of public
and private building, so that the Island metropolis came to
look like a modern American city. Farrington was intensely
devoted to American ideas and sought to promote them by
strengthening the school system and by other appropriate
measures.8
A more critical assessment is provided by newspaper columnist Samuel Amalu in his book on former Governor John Burns who was twelve years old when Farrington was inaugurated Hawaii's sixth governor.

Wallace Rider Farrington fully enjoyed his role as Governor of Hawaii, and played his role to the hilt. He even dressed for the part, wearing a cutaway and formal morning dress even at his office. As a newspaperman, he was not especially brilliant. As a Governor, he was perhaps even less brilliant. But he was an excellent organizer, a bureaucrat's bureaucrat. As such, he reorganized the entire machinery for public administration in the territorial government. And he improved it and made it much more efficient than formerly. He was even instrumental in establishing a retirement system for government employees and introduced a systematic classification of all government personnel. Nor was he remiss in providing for the public. Many public improvements were effected during his administration, and he did much to strengthen the public school system.  

Farrington's administration also contributed significantly to legislation which aided the statehood movement. Two of the most important were Hawaii's Bill of Rights, adopted by Congress March 10, 1924, and its companion measure, the Declaration of Rights, which became law April 29, 1925. Together, Hardy says, they built for Farrington the most solid legislative monument of his administration. They also helped to focus national attention on Hawaii's claims. Promulgation of the laws, and subsequent pressure on Congress and Federal agencies, resulted in millions of dollars being obtained for Hawaii.

Prior to the passage of the two bills, the Hawaiian Islands had been classified as an insular possession and thereby deprived of substantial sums of money to which they were rightfully entitled. Particularly, the misunderstanding dating back to the time of annexation led to the exclusion of Hawaii from participation in certain appropriations made to all of the states for education, good roads, farm loans and for
other purposes, although the exclusion was in express violation of the declaration of Congress itself.12

Ironically, one of the two men who assisted Governor Farrington in the refining of the bill passed by the State Legislature was his old journalistic foe Lorrin A. Thurston. The other was Walter Frear whom Farrington had opposed for reappointment as governor a few years earlier. Farrington, clearly, was not a vindictive man when it came to issues relating to statehood.

After thoughtful consideration talked over at home, Farrington had chosen Thurston to draft such a bill as he wanted, because of his intimate acquaintance with events that led up to annexation—he had been one of the prime movers in them—his personal knowledge and his special abilities. Frear strengthened and smoothed the finished bill, but the main outlines were Thurston's. Both men were lawyers, though it was long since Thurston had been active in practice and failing sight hampered him more with every year that passed. Frear had been Chief Justice of the Supreme Court and Governor of Hawaii. Farrington supplied the generative idea. The work he left to others.13

Next to his work promoting the Bill of Rights and the Declaration of Rights in his administration, and on the pages of the Star-Bulletin, Farrington's major contribution to statehood was helping to develop a strong public school system to educate the territory's diverse population. As a member of a family of educators and as a journalist, Farrington had promoted a better public school system since his arrival in the Islands in 1894. In 1911, while serving as editor of the Evening Bulletin, Farrington had served on a special committee which reported that, compared with progressive states on the mainland, there were too few teachers for pupils in the Islands, salaries were distressingly low, buildings were overcrowded, and the per capita cost of education was meager. The committee asked for a greater priority in public schools.
In 1920 the Star-Bulletin had published serially the results of a survey conducted by a Federal Commission, acting under the United States Commissioner of Education. The major premise behind the investigation was that education should enlarge individuality and provide a wider range of thought and action for Hawaii's people. The paper editorially supported the Federal survey, which had a tremendous impact on the schools of Hawaii. Many of the major recommendations endorsed by the Star-Bulletin were adopted. Two of the more controversial recommendations contained in the survey were a proposal to do away with the foreign language schools and group students according to their ability. By the time Farrington took office the following year, there were three distinct attitudes toward Hawaii public schools:

the first, whose foremost spokesman was Governor Farrington, was that expanded educational opportunities were compatible with development of Hawaii's basic industries. Non-haoles should go to school, even the University, to become better citizens and to contribute more to Hawaii's peculiar economy, Farrington believed.

A second view, growing in popularity within Hawaii's oligarchy, held that education in Hawaii had to be curtailed, despite criticisms of the 1920 federal survey, for education would destroy an economy based on the utilization of masses of ignorant laborers.

A third position, whose principal advocate was McKinley High School principal Miles Cary, urged education to liberate talent and creativity, with the hope of someday transforming the social structure of Hawaii.

Governor Farrington's position concerning education was simple. He told his superintendent of instruction, Vaughan MacCaughey, that he would work for the expansion of high schools, but that the superintendent and his department should be friendly to industry and should instruct the children in the dignity of manual labor.

In keeping with his vocational school background and work on the farms of Maine, Farrington used his new office, as well as the
Star-Bulletin, to promote and publicize Territory-wide contests encouraging the agricultural and gardening abilities of Hawaii's children. He even wrote letters and sent pictures of Hawaii's young gardeners to the White House. President Calvin Coolidge replied to one in October, 1924:

I feel that a large part of this success is due to your own unfailing interest and enthusiasm, and I trust that the work will be continued.17

In a 1927 address to the Hawaiian Education Association, Farrington proudly asserted that in the previous year more than 10,000 public school students from the Islands' total population of 360,000 had found vacation employment on Hawaii's sugar plantations and in pineapple canneries. A social worker told a session of the New Americans Conference, "You cannot force the Oriental youth with a high school education to go back to the plantation--he will not do it." Farrington replied the next day that no one was trying to drive the Orientals back to the plantations, but in Hawaii there should be opportunities available so they would want to remain in agriculture.18

Farrington did his best to implement the recommendations of the federal survey. He agreed that it was deplorable that Hawaii had a smaller public high school enrollment in proportion to its total public school enrollment than any state or territory, including Puerto Rico and the Canal Zone. Fuchs wrote that:

... during his administration, five new high schools were added, many intermediate or junior high schools were started throughout the Territory, and the most progressive educational methods employed anywhere in the United States were permitted to enter Hawaii's classrooms.19

Wallace Farrington found himself in an unusual predicament because of his strong promotion of public education. He came in for severe
criticism from some of the most powerful men in Hawaii, including Frank Atherton who was a co-owner of the Star-Bulletin.

During the 1920s, the schools and teachers, whom Fuchs described as the "godparents of modern Hawaii," were occasionally defended by the Democratic party's perennial candidate for Congress, Lincoln McCandless. McCandless made education in Hawaii a major campaign issue in 1922, stating his views in the Democratic party organ, the New Freedom, and in the Japanese newspapers Hawaii Hochi and Nippu Jiji. But Fuchs says:

... it was Farrington's determination to implement the recommendation of a 1920 federal survey and his support of three excellent superintendents of public instruction combined with the still active pro-education missionary tradition of Hawaii and the ability and determination of an unusual group of teachers, that enabled the public schools to prosper. 20

Samuel Amalu expresses a similar point of view in regard to Governor Farrington's strong independent stand on public education in opposition to the so-called "establishment" of that period.

The entrenched plutocracy of Hawaii wanted to do away with the public system or at least to decimate it so that it would have ended up almost wholly ineffective. What happened was that the immigrant laborers in the plantations were sending their children to the public schools. And those children were getting an excellent education from teachers and administrators who were devoted to their work. As a result of such an education, the second generation of the imported labouring class were no more content to return to the plantations and to do the same work that their parents were doing. They were leaving the plantation and getting jobs in the cities and towns.

Immediately, the plutocracy became alarmed. Their cheap labour was quickly becoming less and less available. So the big wheels in the controlling companies devised a plan whereby public education in Hawaii and especially in the public schools would be limited to the elementary classes, with no one going beyond the 7th grade. This would have provided the basic elements of reading and writing—with just enough arithmetic to be able to figure out the monthly bills at the plantation stores. It would not have made the children educated enough to leave the plantations.
Despite his own close association with the ruling plutocratic elite of Hawaii's governing families, Wallace Rider Farrington fought tooth and nail to prevent the passage of such a notorious piece of legislation. And it was his contribution to the fields of public education in Hawaii that later made it possible for so many of Hawaii's present leaders to attain their positions in life.20

Farrington's concern and zeal for the education and Americanization of Hawaii's multi-racial population as a major step to statehood brought him into conflict with the U.S. Supreme Court. In a series of hopeless cases he defended the Territory's right to regulate and discourage foreign language schools. The U.S. Supreme Court acknowledged the burdensome nature of the language problem in Hawaii, but said that such laws, if passed on the mainland, would "shock the conscience of mankind."21 In 1927 the high court threw out the laws as unconstitutional and an infringement upon the basic rights of the foreign parents of Hawaii to educate their children as they deemed best.22

The two Acts which attempted to restrict (but not prohibit) foreign language schools were not passed during the Farrington administration. The laws came about as a result of a blast of nationalist sentiment after World War I and were signed into law by Wilson appointee Charles James McCarthy, a Democrat. Farrington, nevertheless, said he intended to resolutely follow his determination that the legislature and the governor of Hawaii should be obeyed whether his steps took him to the legislature again, to Congress, or to the highest court in the land—to accomplish the main objective sought.23

Farrington's major objective continued to be statehood. Hardy wrote that statehood seemed a preoccupation totally eclipsed in Farrington's mind by the language school problem. But, like other
eclipses, it passed. How persistent was his interest in the deeper problem, how truly the two were fused in his personality until they became different aspects of the same thought, is seen so clearly that it cannot be misunderstood, Hardy claimed. It was explicit in an address Farrington delivered to the Summer School of public school teachers. He said in part.

Our confidence in the future of our great Republic is based on our confidence in the integrity of our public schools. Support of the public school is a fundamental part of the United States of America. Our confidence in the steady onward march of Hawaii to a realization of its high ambition to secure full statehood in our American Union is based on our faith in the public schools . . . in the children who are our citizens of tomorrow.

The alien language schools of Hawaii, the alien spirit evidenced in the agitation to maintain those schools in a manner contrary to the expressed wish of the people of this Territory, is the greatest stumbling-block in our pathway toward statehood. Hawaii with its large alien population is now frequently characterized as a horrible example of an attempt to assimilate an overwhelming number of aliens, who indicate by their actions that they have not desire to be assimilated. The agitation intensifies this opinion, and observers are quick to remark that the effort to parallel the public school with uncontrolled alien schools springs from the same source as that which was responsible in recent years for strikes, violations of law and reckless attempts to arouse racial antagonisms and cement national prejudices . . .

Cross currents and deliberate misrepresentation befog the issue, but Hawaii's population--citizen and alien--is working out an answer to two very vital questions: Can the American public school develop sterling Americanism in the child of the Orient, as has been done to the child of Europe? And is the alien from the Orient as willing and as capable of accepting Americanism as the alien of Europe has proved to be?24

Notwithstanding his efforts to inhibit the foreign language schools and build the English speaking schools, Farrington's empathy for the various racial groups in Hawaii did not change from the time he first arrived. Despite fears by many Hawaii and mainland residents that the Orientals were "taking over the Islands," Farrington continued to preach
tolerance through his newspaper and from the governor's seat. He also
strongly opposed federal immigration restrictions to aliens from the Far
East. This did not prevent him, however, from working closely with the
major business and community leaders of the Islands or from being closely
related to conservative Republican philosophy, which prevailed through-
out the mainland and which dominated Island business. His association
with business contributed in part to the image that historians hold of
the ninth governor. According to Fuchs:

The new Governor, Wallace R. Farrington, despite his early
aberrations, was an orthodox conservative Republican except on
educational matters. He frequently made liberal statements on
racial tolerance and education and, indeed, encouraged many
nonhaoles in advancing their education; on land and labor
questions, however, he consistently acted in the oligarchy's
interest. Like his predecessors, he sincerely believed that the
business of government in the Islands was business, and that to
serve sugar and pineapple was, in large measure, to serve
Hawaii.25

While a number of historians and writers, such as Amalu and Fuchs,
have categorized Farrington as an "orthodox Republican," the record
shows clearly that Farrington was also a progressive and visionary leader
who did much to condition private as well as public opinion. This is
particularly true in regard to the question of statehood, which was
opposed by the controlling oligarchy in the Islands during Farrington's
administration.

Robert Littler, in his analysis of the administration of Hawaiian
government in 1929, noted that within and without the territory public
men seemed to be agreed that for Hawaii, statehood was very far distant.
Two reasons were advanced at that time, according to Littler.

There is fear of Oriental domination if the territory
were to have complete state autonomy, and there is general
satisfaction with the present arrangement.
Littler then described two distinct views concerning the opposition to statehood on racial grounds.

The first proceeds from the optimists. To their manner of thought there is no such thing as racial distinctions within Hawaii. These people believe that the tropical sunlight of the Islands stops the eye from noting the subtle distinctions of color between yellow and brown and white. The other view proceeds from the pessimists. They fear for the very existence of the territory. They view with alarm the fact that eighty percent of the population is of other than American stock, that two-thirds of the population are of Oriental ancestry, that one-third of the population is of the Japanese race and that this portion of the population is increasing more rapidly than any other. The Japanese, we are told, are merely biding their time, and are preparing to oust the whites and seize Hawaii for the Mikado. Like the date for the end of the world, the definite time for this catastrophe seems to be in some doubt but a few have ventured to suggest 1945 or thereabouts. 26

It is into the latter group that the sugar interests and major backers of the Republican party are placed. But it is into the former group of "optimists" that Littler places Farrington and Star-Bulletin editor Riley Allen. 27 Granted, Farrington did not push the unpopular idea as it was promoted by his son during the decades to come. But Farrington did encourage news articles and editorials on the subject in his newspaper. He also advanced statehood publicly and privately with influential decision makers in Hawaii and on the mainland. Throughout his tenure as governor, Farrington continued to provide leadership on the issue even though he was only a short step ahead of the group he was leading.

In an interview with Boyden Sparks, Joseph Farrington recalled that:

In the early phases we couldn't get too much action on statehood. We didn't get it until the 30s and incidentally I used to talk to my father about statehood but he never got as agitated and aggressive about it as I did. Probably for good reasons.
But Wallace Farrington did keep the subject alive while searching for new ways to bring Hawaii into the union. He quietly chastized those who did not hold the same point of view that he did, particularly the sugar interests. One of them recalled.

I can't remember hearing much about statehood, until after Farrington became Governor. I dare say he learned at first hand some of the practical difficulties of dealing with the Federal Government and its departments at arm's length. No doubt the subject came up lightly at dinner table discussions long before that. I presume as much, because there always were plenty of intelligent people here and it must have come up in table talk at a very early date; but I mean it didn't come to be even distantly regarded as a serious subject by men of affairs until Farrington's time. 28

At times during the twenties Farrington's defense of the statehood movement and concern over the lack of progress toward the goal prompted some rather acid comments. In an address before the Honolulu Social Science Association shortly before leaving office, Farrington delivered "Some Thoughts About Statehood." He noted:
	hat Hawaii had undergone thirty years of probation and that some of its erstwhile leaders had become either timid or conservative, and that these included men who had helped to pioneer annexation. He implied that people were so satisfied and comfortable with present prosperity that they wished to let well alone. They were also held back by the realization that Hawaii would lose $150,000 a year from federal resources as payment of official salaries and the expenses of the legislature, a rather trivial consideration. He had studied the mechanics of statehood and noted that New Mexico also had its racial problems. Farrington had high praise for the framers of the Organic Act, of whom Judge Frear was one, in that it left the control and administration of public lands in the hands of territorial officers although title in them was vested in the federal government. Statehood was "our eventual destination though we cannot foresee when we will arrive." Farrington had been a newspaperman and was possibly more sensitive to popular opinion than some of the pioneers of annexation. 29

Farrington promoted the statehood cause through the cultivation of friends in the White House, the U.S. Congress, and in newspaper offices
across the country. Correspondence in Farrington's private files at the State Archives reveals the time and effort Farrington and his wife took to entertain VIP's in Honolulu and throughout the Hawaiian Islands. In particular, Farrington was successful in maintaining a lengthy friendship with Louis C. Crampton, chairman of the Department of the Interior sub-committee on appropriations after a pleasant visit to the Islands in 1921. Crampton was later to write to Interior Secretary Herbert Work describing Farrington as "one of the ablest, most conscientious, efficient public officials I have ever met."30

Farrington also discussed statehood with Presidents Harding, Coolidge and Hoover, and Arizona Senator Carl Hayden among others.

Farrington was particularly pleased to meet with Hayden during a 1928 visit because of Hayden's intimate knowledge of the statehood process in Arizona.

In a letter to Hayden, Farrington said he
did not anticipate that Hawaii would realize its ambition to become a state in the very near future. But I do believe it is highly desirable for us to study the experiences of other territories so that we shall be informed on what steps to take in case the movement toward statehood assumes a definite aggressive form.31

In reply to Farrington's letter, Hayden warned Farrington that he believed the race issue affected the admission of New Mexico, as it would also affect Hawaii if a move were made to admit the territory into the union as a state.32

Even though Farrington was serving in one of the most influential positions in the territory he never forgot the importance of his colleagues in the newspaper world—or as one journalist was to describe them, those who "govern the governed."33 Along with Allen, Farrington kept up a
steady correspondence with various executives and reporters he had met at conventions he traveled to on the mainland each year. Farrington also had the privilege of hosting the Press Congress of the World in Honolulu in 1921 thus introducing the Islands to hundreds of influential newsmen. Again Farrington was indebted to his old newspaper foe, Lorrin Thurston, for the idea on which they collaborated for the welfare of the territory. Farrington explained how this happened in a speech to the Congress.

As I was sitting in my office at the Star-Bulletin one day, Mr. Thurston came in with a clipping in his hand. "This clipping, he said, "is from the Editor and Publisher, and it says that the people of Sydney have given up the Press Congress of the World. I don't know Dean Williams [Walter Williams, Dean of the School of Journalism at the University of Missouri and President of the Congress] and I understand that you do. I wish you would join me and see if we cannot work out some scheme, whereby we can extend an invitation to the Press Congress of the World so that they shall come here."

So we got up a telegram and sent it out to Dr. Williams, inviting him to bring his Press Congress to Honolulu. In the course of shaping up that telegram, we enlisted the name of Alexander Hume Ford. Mr. Ford enlisted the Governor of the Territory, Governor McCarthy, and we sent the telegram. Mr. Williams responded very favorably and here you now are.34

Hardy says that both Farrington and Thurston were heartily in accord on the community benefit bound to flow back to Honolulu from a world gathering of editors and publishers; but, in Farrington's words, the power of the press could also harm the statehood cause, the same as it could harm chances for world peace, if not used properly.

We talk about the dangers of armies and navies--that possession is a temptation to use them. No more dangerous weapon exists than a well-equipped circulating medium, reaching hundreds of thousands of readers. The frightfulness of this weapon is when it falls into the hands of foolish ones who don't know it is loaded. One of the matches regularly thrown into international powder magazines is the falsifying press.

World Peace will be absolutely guaranteed only when the press of the world can say to governments and diplomats: "Give us all the facts and we will tell the truth about them."35
The pages of the *Star-Bulletin* were also used to promote and editorially comment on two conferences of the Institute of Public Relations held at Punahou School in 1925 and 1927. Although the subject of statehood was never a formal part of the agenda, one scholar suggests that the possibilities of statehood most certainly were discussed in evening parties and on verandas throughout the meetings attended by prominent citizens from throughout the Pacific basin.  

The *Star-Bulletin* was so enthusiastic about the exposure of the Islands to the world through the prestigious organization that it even donated editor Allen to the Institute as its press officer during its second conference. More and more, the Hawaiian Islands were receiving national and international exposure during the Farrington administration. A highlight of Farrington's wooing of the media on behalf of Hawaiian statehood occurred when Farrington was interviewed by reporters for the fledgling *Time* magazine, started in March, 1923, by Briton Hadden and Henry R. Luce.  

The July 25, 1927 magazine featured Wallace Farrington as the cover personality, while the issue discussed the possibilities of Hawaiian statehood.

After eight years as one of the territory's most successful administrators, Farrington was anxious to return to newspaper work where he might do more to speed along the statehood process. Letters from the top officials, including Secretary of the Interior Work, encouraged Governor Farrington to accept another term as governor. But Farrington politely turned down these offers even though he did play a role in selecting his successor, Lawrence McCully Judd, who also supported statehood.  

In July, 1929, Farrington left office, a changed man,
according to one commentator, "looking tired and worn." The best non-
medical opinion among those who saw most of him is that the rigid
repression under which he held himself for years wore out his heart. 39

In an interview with the press associations, Senator Bingham had
proposed him for Governor General of the Philippines.

In October, 1929, the New York stock market fell over the precipice.
The United States and Hawaii were both sucked into a deep depression.
The following year Farrington was stricken with repercussions of a siege
of the "Shanghai cold" he had suffered while traveling to China and
Japan for the third annual Institute of Pacific Relations. 40 He never
fully recovered and spent the last year of his life in bed. One of his
last acts was to write a hard-hitting editorial against the administration
of Franklin Delano Roosevelt entitled "Roosevelt the Wrecker."

Shortly after his death in 1933 at the age of 62, the Board of
Regents named a building in honor of Wallace Farrington at the University
of Hawaii. Although Farrington had not funded the University of Hawaii
he had written the bill enacted by the Legislature for its establishment
as a land grant college which preceded the University. In a very real
sense, Hardy said, the University of Hawaii is Farrington's monument. 41
So is the cause of education which he promoted so effectively as a
newsman and as governor. 42

Sometimes overlooked is the role Wallace Farrington played in
rendering service to the people in hastening the day when Hawaii shall
be considered for full statehood in the face of opposition from
Hawaii's other community leaders.

During the twenties, the major architects of Hawaii's economic and
political structure were unwilling to wade any deeper into the sea of
local and national politics to force the statehood issue. The Advertiser continued to oppose statehood, and much of the local population was either unaware or afraid of what statehood might mean. In the words of L. A. Thurston, statehood was much like heaven—a state devoutly to be wished, but to be earnestly avoided for as long as possible. The time was not yet ripe. For many years after annexation, the policy for nearly all the community leaders except Wallace Farrington and the Star-Bulletin had been "wait and see." Although not as agitated and aggressive as his son over the issue, Wallace Farrington had indeed helped hasten the day toward the eventual goal of statehood.
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CHAPTER X

EDUCATION AND EARLY TRAINING OF JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON

October 15, 1897 to September 12, 1931

No doubt it was at Wisconsin that he acquired the social, political, and economic ideals that left their indelible mark on his character and his future . . . His political philosophy was, to use a shorthand expression, a liberalism in the finest tradition of his party.

J. Garner Anthony

Joseph Farrington, only son of Wallace Farrington, left Hawaii in 1915 after graduating with honors from the prestigious haole-missionary private school--Punahou Academy. Despite his father's wishes that Joseph attend a more conservative school on the East Coast, the younger Farrington selected the University of Wisconsin at Madison, ostensibly because an uncle was teaching agriculture there, but in reality to study in a more progressive climate than he felt he would find in Maine.¹

Even before his enrollment at the University of Wisconsin, Joseph Farrington had developed a more liberal philosophy than his father's about the economic and social structure of the Hawaiian Islands. It was at Wisconsin, Garner Anthony later said, that Farrington "acquired the social, political and economic ideals that left their indelible mark on his character and charted his future . . . his political philosophy was, to use a shorthand expression, a liberalism in the finest tradition of his party."²

A primary factor in Joseph's liberalism and in his sense of urgency concerning statehood, was his exposure to the leading political family of the progressive movement--the LaFollettes. For three years Joseph
Farrington was the college roommate of Phillip LaFollette, who later became governor of Wisconsin. Both young men spent hours discussing the democratic reforms being carried out in Wisconsin, and being promoted in Washington by "fighting Bob" LaFollette, the family patriarch, Senator, and presidential candidate. It was also Phillip's ambition to be president someday, and he promised that if ever elected to that office he would name his roommate governor of the territory of Hawaii. 3

In addition to their time together at the University, Farrington and LaFollette also spent many houses in the LaFollette home where Joseph met the aging Senator and his son, "young Bob," who was elected to succeed his father in 1925. It was in the LaFollette living room that Farrington had dates with another journalism student--Mary Elizabeth Pruett.

Elizabeth Farrington was born May 30, 1898 in Tokyo, Japan, the daughter of Robert Lee and Josie Baugh Pruett, American missionaries. She was graduated from Hollywood High School in California and Ward-Belmont Junior College in Nashville, Tennessee, before enrolling in journalism classes at the University of Wisconsin. 4 In 1920, Farrington proposed to her in a manner she described in a newspaper article and interview:

"Think about it a long time, Betty," he told her. "I want you to know now, not afterwards, that your life will be one of sack cloth and ashes." She wondered what Joe meant by sack cloth and ashes. Joe continued:

I'm dedicating my life to the cause of statehood for Hawaii. Great causes, such as this one, for freedom and liberty and justice take years and years to achieve--100 to 150 years sometimes. The French and American revolutions, remember how long they took.
We may never see Hawaiian statehood in our lifetime but someone has to start the fight all over again and keep it up. We almost got statehood in 1900 but no one kept at it.

I'm going to keep at it as long as I live. If you marry me, there'll be many times that I'll have to sacrifice you and the children we hope to have for the cause. I want you to understand beforehand what it will mean; what you are getting into.

"What does a young woman in love do? She says, 'Yes,' of course," Mrs. Farrington recalled. "From the day we were married in Washington, D.C., until Joe's death on June 19, 1954--34 beautiful years--I cannot remember a day that his first words on getting up in the morning were not what to do about statehood today, and his last words at night were what had or had not happened about statehood during the day.

"When I look back over the years there were many more frustrating goodnights and dubious goodmornings than happy, cheerful ones. But that never dampened Joe's ardor. He kept doggedly at it." 5

Before Joseph Farrington could become actively involved in the statehood movement, however, he had a military obligation to fulfill. Even though serious reservations were raised about the war by his room-mate and other members of the LaFollette family, Farrington decided to follow his own conscience. This decision did not cause him to lose faith in the LaFollette family who had broken with Wilson over the question of American entry into World War I.

European troubles were none of America's, Senator LaFollette said. The war was the work of international bankers and profiteers. 6 After that, terrible abuse was his lot. Even the faculty at the University of Wisconsin turned against the Senator and his family. Efforts were even made to expel him from the Senate.
Farrington remembered this injustice against his friends throughout his life. In an interview he told how it prepared him for future racial prejudice in the Hawaiian Islands.

I was rooming with Phil LaFollette for three years. He was so absolutely convinced that his father was right that he just had a kind of zeal that would carry any martyr through a crisis. They were performing a great and lasting service to the country and they were being ruthlessly and cruelly persecuted.\(^7\)

Farrington later used the hatred against Germans during World War I as a point of reference when public opinion was turned against Japanese Americans during World War II.

Everybody that was German was suspect. That was a great and valuable experience for me because I knew a great many German American boys. I still believe LaFollette was completely loyal to this country. There is no doubt in my mind about it. There is one thing that came from that experience. It enabled me to stand my ground when the Japanese Americans of Hawaii came under exactly the same kind of attack and suspicion. I was so close to the LaFollettes that I realized how they operated. How unjust it was. So I never had any doubts in my own mind about the Japanese. I was seasoned to it.\(^8\)

At the close of his junior year in June, 1918, Farrington enlisted in the United States Army where he was later commissioned a second lieutenant of Field Artillery. He was discharged in December, 1918 and returned to the University of Wisconsin where he graduated in 1919.

Following graduation, Joseph Farrington worked on the *Public Ledger* in Philadelphia for three months before being assigned to the paper's bureau in Washington, D.C. from 1920 to 1923.

The *Ledger* at that time was owned by Cyrus H. K. Curtis, one of Wallace Farrington's long-time friends from Maine. Like Farrington, Curtis also began writing for a small newspaper. Later he became the head of Curtis Publishing Company, publisher of the *Saturday Evening Post*, *Country Gentleman*, and *Ladies Home Journal* magazines. He also published
the Philadelphia Inquirer, Public Ledger, Evening Bulletin Ledger, and New York Evening Post. It was said that "a thousand intellectuals turned up their noses at the Curtis papers; a million worthwhile citizens read and enjoyed them."9 There can be little doubt of the influence of Farrington's friend Curtis, who had amassed millions and was one of the nation's wealthiest men. He was also a powerful, if not quiet, force in the fortunes of the national Republican party and considered an influence in the Coolidge and Hoover administrations.10

Elizabeth Farrington later recalled a ten day visit at the Curtis Estate with the elder Mrs. Farrington. (Her husband could not come as he was working as a reporter in Washington, where the couple was married in 1920 in a ceremony attended by such notables as Senator LaFollette and Justice Brandeis.)

Never had I seen an estate like this one. One hundred sixty seven acres of front yard at Wyncotte, in Germantown, with an 18-hole golf course beginning at the dining room lanai, a private yacht, horses to ride--just everything.

But no matter what my host and hostess suggested, I had to decline. I didn't know how to play bridge, I didn't ride. I didn't play golf. Just a plain kuuaina from California that married Joe Farrington. Finally I told Mr. Curtis I was tongue-tied. The only thing I recognized in his mansion was one fly and a bar of Ivory soap.

Mr. Curtis then loosened up and couldn't have been more sympathetic. He took me into his private music room where he had just installed a pipe organ for his own use. We sat down while he played simple Christian hymns like "Jesus Savior, Pilot Me" and "Will there be any stars in my Crown."

I told him he and I had something in common. He played the organ like I used the typewriter--the hunt and peck system.

Then he told me his life story, how he grew up a poor boy on a farm in Maine and used to ride in the same wagon to Sunday School with young Wallace Farrington, Joe's father. He said he couldn't play bridge or golf either when he was my age and whoever heard of a yacht?

Then he wanted to know what I was interested in. When I told him about my love of newspaper work as a young cub reporter--how proud I always was of my scoops--we talked the same language.
For the rest of the ten days, Mr. Curtis and I talked statehood. He was concerned about Hawaii's non-contiguity more than anything else but in the end we had the Saturday Evening Post, Ledger and Ladies Home Journal on our side. During his three years in Washington, Joseph Farrington made many important friends and developed newspaper contacts which were to help him in his statehood movement for the next three decades. In addition, Mrs. Farrington continued to work as a journalist, serving as a correspondent and columnist for a number of newspapers. Among the close friends of the Farringtons then and later were former classmates Irving Maeir, publisher of the Milwaukee Journal; Owen Scott of U.S. News and World Report magazine; Doris Fleeson, Ruth Montgomery, May Craig, and Paul Miller, Associated Press; Frank Bartholomew of United Press and Jenkins Lloyd Jones. In short, Mrs. Farrington said, "We tried to make friends with the entire Washington press corps." In addition to the press corps, the young newspaper couple were able to meet a number of other dignitaries and officials through Governor Farrington when he came to Washington on official business. Mrs. Farrington recalled one visit when the entire family met many of the cabinet and other high ranking officials. George Christian, secretary to President Harding, was "worked on" by the Farringtons constantly as "a pipeline to the President," Mrs. Farrington said.

One time Mr. Christian invited us to a formal dinner at the Willard Hotel, the center of Washington politics in those days. Joe was very excited over the possibility of the contacts he would make for statehood. Charlie Forbes, a member of the Cabinet, would be there—Dr. Saunders, the President's personal physician, Senator Jim Watson of Indiana, and quite a number of very important people. Joe told me over and over how to initiate the conversation and "turn the table," as it were.
He stressed the importance of the occasion, and impressed upon me all the wonderful things about Hawaii.

Upon arrival, we were seated at a table in a private dining room. Cocktails were served, although prohibition was the law of the land. I never so much as tasted sherry, so I declined. That made me uncomfortable but I noticed that Joe also declined. I felt better.

Then the waiter passed around one of those tiered silver plates with rows and rows of canapes on each layer. Should I only take one, or one of each? I couldn't get Joe's eye and panicked. George Christian saw me take one little canape and he called over to me to take plenty. Then I panicked again and took one of each. Never will I forget the look of mortification on Joe's face.

I feared to go home after one of those affairs. Many a time Joe told me I had ruined all chances for statehood. I just had to overcome that burden and eventually I think I did.

Meanwhile, we were constantly getting stories and editorials on statehood into all kinds of newspapers and periodicals.

There was also much entertaining to do for business reasons, for official reasons when we helped Joe's father, the governor, and for our own personal friends.

But I never had a party or guest in my life that Joe didn't check every name on the list—whether two or two hundred. He would brief me on whether our guests were for statehood and my conversation was to be guided accordingly. As a hostess, I considered myself a total failure unless everyone present had been converted to our cause before departing.13

It was only after a great deal of persuasion by his father and by Frank C. Atherton, chairman of the board of directors, that Joseph Farrington returned to Hawaii in November, 1923. Mrs. Farrington recalled that both she and her husband were enjoying the excitement and challenge of reporting in Washington. But her husband felt a responsibility to his father, to the family newspaper, and to the statehood cause which he said could best be carried out at that time in Hawaii through the pages of the Star-Bulletin while his father served as governor.14 On January 1, 1924, Joseph Farrington was named managing editor of the Star-Bulletin, replacing George Nellist. The younger Farrington also became vice president and director of the corporation publishing the newspaper, the
Honolulu Star-Bulletin, Ltd., which had purchased another Hawaii newspaper the previous year.

Along with the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, which in 1924 had a circulation of 14,419 for the territory's 290,000 residents, the Farrington family was able to begin influencing public opinion through the circulation of the Hilo-Tribune-Herald which was purchased by Farrington interests in 1923. Although owned by the Star-Bulletin, the Hilo-Tribune-Herald was competitive for news and circulation on the Big Island. It also had an independent editorial policy, and from time to time took positions opposite to those of the Star-Bulletin. But on statehood the Hilo paper never departed far from its cousin in Honolulu. It also adhered to many of the same liberal policies advocated by the Star-Bulletin in regard to race relations, reform and local government.
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CHAPTER XI
GETTING "AGITATED AND AGGRESSIVE" OVER STATEHOOD

September 14, 1931 to December 6, 1941

In the early phases you did not get much direct action on statehood. You didn't get the action until the thirties and incidentally, I used to talk to my father about statehood but he never got agitated and aggressive about it as I have been. Probably for good reasons.

Joseph Farrington

There can be little question that the period described by Frederick Lewis Allen as "the Terrible Thirties" is among the most important decade in history—not only for the United States and Hawaii, but for the rest of the world as well. It was an era of lurid gangsterism, economic depression and far-reaching political upheaval which Allen suggests started September 3, 1929 with the stock market crash, and ended exactly ten years later when Hitler's storm troopers marched into Poland.\(^1\) During the years in between, Japan invaded Manchuria, the Lindbergh baby was kidnapped, Franklin Delano Roosevelt was elected and the New Deal was inaugurated. In addition, the medium of radio started to make inroads into newspaper advertising, a new picture-oriented publication named Life was created, and the American Newspaper Guild was started. In Hawaii, newspaper attention was turning to Japan as that expansion-minded nation sought new territory throughout the Pacific before finally attacking Pearl Harbor.

Before December 7, 1941, nation-wide attention was focused on the Islands for several reasons. The first was an alleged rape and murder
trial that received some of the best and worst newspaper coverage in an era of gangster killings, kidnappings and trials. Without a doubt, Peter Van Slingerland reported, the furor caused by the case acted as a catalyst, hastening the end of the paternalistic, autocratic governmental and economic control while, at the same time, drawing the attention of the mainland to a Pacific possession previously by-passed by history.²

The second cause for national attention, in which the Star-Bulletin was involved, was the winning of key public opinion leaders in the battle for statehood with the passing of the discriminatory Jones-Costigan Act in 1934. Two Congressional committees visited in 1935 and 1937 to study the question of self rule.

It is an interesting historical coincidence that two events of the early 1930s leading to Hawaii's place in the national spotlight took place within a week of each other at opposite ends of the Pacific. One event, which attracted less notice from the Star-Bulletin and mainland newspapers, was the invasion of Manchuria at Mukden the night of September 18, 1931, and the subsequent establishment of the puppet state Manchukuo by Japan. Even though world public opinion generally opposed Japan's war-like overtures in the Pacific, nothing was done to protect the weaker countries or to stop intercourse with the aggressor nation. It was an era when nations such as the United States, and regions such as Hawaii, were more interested in pulling themselves out of the depression. Isolationism was still the mood in Washington and in Honolulu. But the Japanese invasion of Manchuria, as one historian has noted, served as "the first volleys of World War II."³
Less significant, but much more newsworthy as far as national newspapers were concerned, was the famous Massie (or Ala Moana) rape and murder case. The story began September 12, 1931 and trials lasted through May of 1932. Repercussions from the case were felt as much as five years later when two Congressional Committees first came to the Islands to study the Territory's worthiness for Statehood.

According to news stories which first appeared in the Monday, September 14, 1931 issue of the *Star-Bulletin*, Mrs. Thalia Massie, the twenty-year old wife of a young Navy lieutenant, was assaulted by a group of young men who picked her up as she walked by herself through Ala Moana park after leaving a party at 11:30 p.m. She said she was thrust into an automobile and taken to a lonely spot where she said they beat and raped her. The police arrested five suspects the next day: Horace Ida and David Takai, of Japanese descent; Benny Ahakuelo and Joseph Kahahawai, Hawaiians; and Henry Chang, Chinese. Mrs. Massie identified them as her assailants.

The much-publicized trial began on November 16, and after three weeks ended in a mistrial when, after nearly one-hundred hours of deliberation, the racially mixed jury failed to agree on a verdict. Later one of the defendants, Ida, was seized in the street by about twenty men, driven into the country, and severely beaten for the purpose of forcing a confession.

On January 8, 1932, the *Star-Bulletin* reporter at the judiciary building phoned to say that Kahahawai had been forced into a car in the shadow of the Kamehameha statue as he walked to report to the court. He was found later to have been murdered. The police arrested Mrs. Massie's husband, her mother Grace Fortescue and two enlisted men, Edward J. Lord
and Albert O. Jones. They were charged with the slaying and a trial followed which attracted national attention.

Clarence Darrow, one of the greatest criminal attorneys in American history, hastened to the defense of Lieutenant Massie and his co-defendants. The trial attracted long lines who waited for hours for admittance. No trial has done so in Hawaii before or since that time. The Star-Bulletin made arrangements for each of its reporters to attend at least one session in order to see the great Chicago attorney in action.

The jury in Judge Charles S. Davis's court deliberated for two days. The verdict was manslaughter, with a recommendation for leniency. Sentencing was set for May 5. But, early on the morning of May 4, Public Prosecutor John C. Kelley advised newspapermen to keep close to him for a possible important news break. Governor Lawrence M. Judd set a press conference for 11 a.m. It was learned that he had had a long phone conversation with Dr. Ray Lyman Wilbur, Secretary of the Interior.

Ninety Congressmen cabled Judd asking him to grant a pardon to the defendants; another such petition had 1,781 signatures. Prosecutor Kelley went to the Judiciary Building; and in a previously unannounced session, with only the four defendants, their attorneys, newspapermen and court officials present, the defendants--Mrs. Fortescue, Lieutenant Massie, and Seamen Lord and Jones--were sentenced to ten years in prison.

The defendants crossed the street to Iolani Palace where the Governor commuted the sentence to one hour, which they served on the spot. Shortly after that they left the Islands.
During the tempestuous months of the Massie trials, numerous mainland newspapers and magazines sent writers to Hawaii to cover the case, which received sensational treatment throughout the country.

The Associated Press later listed the Massie case number 9 on its ten most important news stories of the year. The kidnapping and murder of the Lindbergh baby was number 1. According to Lawrence H. Fuchs, public opinion on the mainland, stirred by the Hearst newspapers, turned against Hawaii and its racial aloha. As an example, page one of the January 12, 1932 Star-Bulletin carried one story from its Washington bureau telling of attacks being made against Hawaii and requests for investigations from Washington. In an adjacent story, the Hearst press papers asked for martial law in Hawaii. But the Star-Bulletin replied with figures showing there were more rape cases in mainland cities than in Honolulu. Also, on the editorial page, Allen answered critics of the Territory in one of his shortest and most succinct editorials entitled: "The Situation." Wrote Allen tersely, "The further people are from Hawaii, the more they know about how Hawaii should be governed."

W. F. Sabin, writing in retrospect for the year 1932 in Thrum's Annual pointed out that ignorance of Hawaii (geographical, historical, social, inter-racial, cultural, educational, and all other conditions, in fact) made many mainland newspaper reports of the Hawaii situation absurd, and that some articles were inspired by racial prejudice. Sabin added, however, that much was written for mainland consumption by "the penmen of Honolulu, and the rest of the Territory, by way of denial, correction, explanation and illuminating information."
While opinions are divided some people on the scene felt the Star-Bulletin provided leadership in defensive journalism during the Massie trials. Mrs. Loujo Hollingsworth, the Star-Bulletin court reporter who covered the case, and editor Riley Allen, both told this writer that the Star-Bulletin played the cases for what they actually thought the crimes were worth as compared to the opposition newspapers in Hawaii which were more sensational in coverage. A study of placement of the stories, headlines and reporting of the cases by this writer, however, shows the handling of the Massie trials to be technically the same. Mrs. Hollingsworth believed that the more sensational treatment of the stories by the Honolulu Advertiser resulted in many areas of the mainland receiving a more distorted picture of the crime through the United Press, which picked up the Advertiser stories. On the other hand, Mrs. Hollingsworth believes the story told by the Associated Press to mainland clients was better balanced because its information was supplied by the Star-Bulletin.

William Ewing, Associated Press correspondent in Hawaii, was perhaps in a position to be more objective. Ewing arrived in Hawaii in January, 1932, after Associated Press executives in New York City found that they had been scooped on the murder of Kahahawai by the rival Advertiser and United Press. As a consequence, Ewing was diverted from Rio de Janeiro to Hawaii.

According to Ewing, both Mrs. Hollingsworth and Jack Peck were assigned to cover the trial, but all copy was being handled personally by Joseph Farrington. "Joe was very sensitive to the color issue being raised by the mainland reporters and felt that it was his responsibility to edit
out any comments that might give the wrong impression of the Islands to mainland readers,"\(^{15}\) Ewing said.

As an example, Ewing related how he had written one account of the testimony of the 11-year-old nephew of the murdered man in court. According to Ewing, his account dramatically told of the child looking to the accused Massie and pointing at him with his "brown" fingers.

Farrington was furious when he saw the story and shouted at me, "Is this your idea of color?" Ewing recalled.\(^{16}\) He also remembered sending out another story, shortly before the verdict of the Massie defendants, about police with riot guns patrolling the streets. Ewing's Associated Press story was picked up and given front page play in the New York Times.

"When Farrington saw the story, he angrily told me that this time you have 'Out-Hearsted Hearst'," Ewing said.

In reply, Ewing wrote a note to Farrington saying that he had received the information on the riot-gun squad from Farrington's own editor, Allen. Following that exchange, Ewing received a note from Allen saying he would no longer provide Ewing with help.

Ewing also recalled that Farrington was sensitive about the use of the word "kanaka," which Ewing was quoting from actual testimony in the trial.

Despite Farrington's efforts to edit out what he believed were inflammatory terms, Ewing described the new publisher as "completely honest"\(^{17}\) in his covering of the case.

Ewing believed that the other major correspondents he knew were honest and fair in their coverage of the Massie trial. Those known to Ewing were reporters from the New York Times, Chicago Tribune and United Press. Ewing says he did not know the Hearst reporters but does not
deny that in keeping with their style over the years they probably presented "a sensational approach to the trial."\textsuperscript{18}

The \textbf{Star-Bulletin} also demonstrated journalistic integrity on the editorial page. Basically, the paper's voice of comment avoided the case during the early days when facts were few and often contradictory. This contrasts with an \textit{Advertiser} editorial demanding "prompt and vigorous action" from the harassed and inadequate police department the day after the crime was committed. Allen's first major editorial on the case was written December 14, after the kidnapping of Ida, asking for a "Line up for Law and Order." The other editorials worthy of note concerning the Massie cases were written on May 3, 1932, praising the handling of the second trial, and on May 5. The latter editorial, written after Judge Davis had released the convicted murderers with a one-hour sentence, stated that "Only the passage of time will determine the ultimate wisdom of the Massie case. For the immediate present, it is infinitely better in view of the situation locally and in Washington to reserve final judgement until everyone is more disposed to look at all of the facts of the situation calmly."\textsuperscript{19}

As a result of the Massie case, Joseph Farrington departed from active newspaper work. For seven years he served as managing editor and then as general manager of the \textbf{Star-Bulletin} until his father returned to the newspaper. Although Farrington repeated the statement made to him by newsman Roy Howard that a journalist should never go into politics, in his own words, he was "shoved" into politics because of the events of the Massie case. In a taped conversation with Boyden Sparkes in September, 1952, Farrington told how he dropped his work with the \textbf{Star-Bulletin} to do
"public relations work for the Territory" at the request of Governor Lawrence Judd and his father. Wallace Farrington had been appointed to a special Commission, consisting of distinguished local citizens, named to combat unfavorable publicity arising out of the rape case. "That was the first time I had ever left the newspaper profession," Farrington told Sparkes, "and I fully intended to return to it as a working newspaperman, as that is what I liked to do. I was happy in it." 20

In spite of Joseph Farrington's sincere intention to stay with the paper, he gradually loosened his day-to-day control of the Star-Bulletin. One reason was the death of his father. The senior Farrington managed to carry out many of his duties as publisher until shortly before his death. As one writer stated in Thrum's Annual:

During his illness and until the last few days before his death, [Farrington] continued to write the forceful, fearless and pungent editorials for which he was noted as an editor, and was a frequent contributor to the editorial columns. 21

Among the last of his news stories were a series of articles on Korea, Manchuria, Northern China, and Japan, which particularly impressed him not only for its efficiency but for its power as well. Another of Wallace Farrington's last editorials, published May 23, 1923, was also one of the Star-Bulletin's most controversial. Entitled simply "Roosevelt-Wrecker," the editorial attacked the F.D.R. Congress for its attempts to take away Hawaiian home rule and thus "wreck" the Territory. It was reproduced in its entirety in the Honolulu Advertiser on October 5, 1934, by opponents of Joseph Farrington who was running for office in the Territorial Senate. Elizabeth Farrington was to later state that her father-in-law had written the controversial editorial but that her husband took the blame for it. 22
Joseph Farrington's main reason for backing out of active newspaper work in 1934 was his growing conviction that he could accomplish more in the battle for Statehood in a political office than as an active newspaper publisher. The fact is that Joseph Farrington never relinquished his hold on Star-Bulletin as far as the family financial interests were concerned. His role in the day-to-day decision making process was greatly decreased, however, in spite of letters, memoranda, and personal conversation with Riley Allen. The major, notable shift in policy from the guidelines first laid out by Wallace Rider Farrington two decades before was that emphasis on Statehood was accelerated.

The issue which dominated the news and editorial pages of the Star-Bulletin after the Massie cases was the Rankin Bill, an attempt to amend the Organic Act permitting mainlanders to be appointed to Territorial offices. This "carpetbagger" bill, as it was referred to by some, was to Hawaii as a red flag is to a bull. Helen Gay Pratt wrote: "The Rankin Bill came into the news many times and achieved a notoriety far beyond its importance." Nevertheless, it is interesting to note in unpublished interviews in the Farrington file at the Hawaii State Archives that Joseph Farrington used his personal influence with his friends in Washington to make certain that no anti-home rule bills got through Congress.

One of the first actions taken by Joseph Farrington as a State Legislator in 1934 was to introduce legislation in the state senate establishing the Hawaii Equal Rights Commission. The bill was passed and signed into law by Governor Poindexter. It established a full-time commission whose purpose was to promote Statehood both in the Islands and
in Washington. Another purpose was to correct, prevent or refute such misinformation or statements regarding the territory and its inhabitants as may be "disseminated, broadcast or published." The end result of this action, according to Jan Jabulka, was to "speed up" the Statehood fight which gained impetus as a result of the Massie case and the passage of the Jones-Costigan measures. The bill, which went into effect June 8, 1934, attempted to prevent overproduction, but mainland sugar interests managed to get fixed quotas, while Hawaii was put with United States possessions and foreign countries. Gerrit P. Judd IV said the act provided that if the quotas were further reduced, the reductions would take place in the foreign and overseas area. Other provisions of the act were equally discriminatory.

Joseph Farrington told Boyden Sparkes that it was the negative effect of the Massie cases, the Rankin Bill and the Jones-Costigan legislation declaring residents of the Territory as second class citizens that finally prompted him to run for the State Legislature in 1934.

Jan Jabulka recalled that when Farrington's friend and Statehood supporter, Sam King, ran for the U.S. Congress at the same time, editor Riley Allen detached Jabulka from all other reporting duties and instructed him to cover King's campaign territory-wide.

King's opposition at that time was Democratic Delegate Lincoln McCandless whom the Star-Bulletin considered ineffectual in promoting statehood. McCandless was defeated. According to Jan Jabulka, this serves as another example of the Star-Bulletin leadership in the statehood struggle—the paper supported only those candidates for office who were statehood adherents.
While Farrington provided leadership for the movement in Hawaii, Delegate King was successful in bringing to Hawaii the first congressional committee for an on-the-spot investigation into the Island's fitness for statehood. According to Dedmon, the hearings chaired by Representative Eugene B. Crowe of Indiana mark the beginning of active congressional debate on Hawaiian statehood.29

During the first Congressional hearings, and dozens of others that followed, Farrington testified and formally introduced arguments in favor of statehood. He refuted arguments opposing statehood as the Star-Bulletin had been doing for a number of years. The question of Farrington's consistency in believing statehood to be the ultimate destiny of the Islands was also brought out during the first statehood hearings in a question and answer session between Farrington and Chairman Crowe:

The Chairman: . . . Then, I take it, you are for statehood now?
Mr. Farrington: Yes.
The Chairman: That you were for statehood two years ago?
Mr. Farrington: Yes.
The Chairman: Four years ago?
Mr. Farrington: Yes.
The Chairman: And that you have been consistently for statehood?
Mr. Farrington: Yes, I have.
The Chairman: You have always been consistently for statehood?
Mr. Farrington: Yes. If you asked me when I wasn't for statehood, it would be difficult for me to answer that question.
The Chairman: Then your interest isn't commercial; it is patriotic, because you believe it is the proper thing and the best thing for the Territory?
Mr. Farrington: Draw your own conclusions.
The Chairman: I will say I have a great deal of faith in a person who has been consistent in his belief.30

In 1936, as general manager of the Star-Bulletin, Senator Farrington left for both the Democratic and Republican conventions on the mainland
and wrote a series of interpretive articles on "political developments of the conventions and their national and territorial significance."

On his way to the political conventions in the East, Farrington himself became a newsmaker as he was interviewed by the Associated Press in Los Angeles. In a front-page interview which later appeared in the Star-Bulletin, Farrington told California reporters that there was no conflict between Hawaiian statehood and national defense. Farrington also criticized the F.D.R. New Deal in subsequent interviews and news articles.

During this period the Star-Bulletin reflected in its pages the fact that Hawaii was coming out of the Depression, and that it was also going through a transportation and communications revolution. In 1930 the first radio telephone conversation occurred and regular trans-Pacific telephone service was inaugurated in Iolani Palace. Four years later the carrying of air mail between the islands was inaugurated. In 1935, Star-Bulletin headlines announced the air journey of Amelia Earhart from Honolulu to Oakland in 18 hours, 17 minutes, and the first regular flight by Pan-American of air mail from San Francisco to Manila took place.

The latter news story, which occupied almost all of the front page of the November 15 Star-Bulletin, was written by reporter William Norwood, who also wrote sports and politics for the paper. Norwood, known for his "political liberalism, friendship with nonhaoles and Democratic affiliations," later moved into public relations work for Castle and Cook and still later became the number two man in the Cabinet of Governor John Burns as Burns's administrative assistant. Norwood was only the first of a number of Star-Bulletin reporters and editors known for their political liberalism and progressivism.
To a lesser extent, another new era was begun in August, 1936 with the return of William Ewing to the Islands from New York City where he had been recalled by the Associated Press.

Ewing was born in Vaughn, Mississippi October 5, 1903, the same year that the Territorial Legislature had introduced the first of dozens of joint resolutions endorsing statehood. Raised in a rural farm background, Ewing received exceptional stimulation from a mother interested in arts and music. His father was elected to a number of offices, including a seat in the Mississippi State House of Representatives.32

After leaving Mississippi College for a period because he felt he was "too immature at age 16," Ewing drifted into newspaper work in Yazoo City, Jackson, and New Orleans where he worked for the Times-Picayune.

Another Southerner soon spotted the talented student and invited him to work for the Associated Press in Richmond, one of the major bureaus under its new president, Kent Cooper. Ewing advanced quickly with the wire service to New York City before being assigned to Panama as the bureau chief. Among his major stories in the Central American country were the Managua earthquake and the visit of the Duke of Windsor. Next he was called to Washington where he served as a wire editor filing news of the Depression. As has been mentioned, Ewing was assigned to New York City, where he was being groomed for the job of chief of the bureau in Rio de Janerio, when he was asked if he would like to take over the Honolulu bureau because "all hell had just broken loose in the Massie case after the murder of one of the suspects."
According to Ewing, news in Honolulu was pretty routine after the Massie case and very little of it was filed on the wires which went to San Francisco, and from there across the nation. In addition, Ewing believes that the Star-Bulletin was an inferior newspaper to the Advertiser which was under the editorial direction of Ray Coll at that time. Ewing also claims that the Star-Bulletin was serving as the mouthpiece of the sugar interests of Hawaii during the last years of Wallace Rider Farrington. "There is no question about it," Ewing said in an interview September 20, 1975. "The paper was very conservative and Farrington worked closely with Frank Atherton."33

Notwithstanding the increased efforts of Joseph Farrington in Hawaii and Sam King in Washington, the two Congressional committees of the 1930s did not make any strong recommendations for statehood before World War II. The 1935 subcommittee headed by Rep. Crowe recommended to the full committee that considerable further study is necessary before a favorable report can be made. The vote for deferment was three to one. The recommendation of the subcommittee was accepted.

The joint committee in 1937 also recommended further study and went on to suggest a plebiscite of the electorate of the territory to determine its actual sentiment on statehood.34

In 1938 Farrington was re-elected on a 100 percent statehood plank. In 1939 he successfully sponsored legislation which put a plebiscite on the 1940 ballot. The Star-Bulletin went all out in promoting a "yes" vote on the issue. Hawaii's voters endorsed statehood in the plebiscite by a 2 to 1 margin.35 It was enough for Congress, Jabulka said, and the movement picked up momentum.36
By the end of the era preceding the attack on Pearl Harbor, the Honolulu Star-Bulletin had become an accepted, respected and influential institution in the economic, political and social life of the Hawaiian Islands. In the three decades since its founding in 1912, the paper's circulation had increased more than ten times from 4,262 to 45,414 in 1941, with a circulation of nearly 54,000 on weekends. This increase in circulation compares with the near doubling in the Territory's population from 192,000 in 1910 to 422,000 in 1940.37

Roughly speaking, if the Star-Bulletin circulation had a readership estimated at three persons per newspaper then it would have been reaching nearly 80 percent of Honolulu's population of 180,000 in 1940. Using this same estimate its territorial influence would have been about one-third of the population of the entire Islands. On the "Big Island" of Hawaii, Star-Bulletin influence would have complemented the Hilo Tribune Herald, which was also owned by the Farrington family.

In chorus with the increasing circulation and influence of the Star-Bulletin, the gap between the lead of the evening paper and the Honolulu Advertiser was growing. Whereas, the Star-Bulletin lead over the Advertiser had only been about 1,000 papers in 1912, the gap had increased to 16,000 in 1941 when Advertiser circulation was only 29,000 on weekdays and 42,000 on Sundays.38 It was a trend which would continue as the Star-Bulletin continued to aggressively report the news and promote statehood and other progressive causes for its multi-racial population.

The aggressive policy of gathering and writing news for Hawaii's residents stressed by Riley Allen in a story he told about Wallace
Farrington and a crew which worked for nearly 24 hours to repair a broken press. After the Saturday paper had been run off and delivered on Sunday, Farrington told his employees that the newspaper is a contract.

... It's a contract with your subscribers and your advertisers. You've undertaken to get it out ... so you get it out ... That philosophy he sometimes expressed in another way:

When you start a thing, see it through. If you don't expect to see it through when trouble comes, don't start it!39

In no better way can the Star-Bulletin's professionalism in providing the people of Hawaii with news be demonstrated than in the account of how the Star-Bulletin attempted to provide its readers with the news in World War II.
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4. The first story of the alleged rape appeared in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin under a one column headline on the front page, "Woman Names Three Men as her Attackers." This compares with the initial story in the morning Honolulu Advertiser which was placed under an eight column banner headline stating "Gang Assaul ts Young Wife." The following day the Star-Bulletin used a four column headline in early editions, but returned to a less conspicuous one column headline over the front page story for later editions.

5. In keeping with Star-Bulletin policy of not using the names of rape victims, the name of Thalia Massie was never used in the first reports or during the trial. She was generally referred to as "victim" or "young woman," "matron" and "a woman of refinement." It was only after her mother was arrested in the Kahawahai murder that Mrs. Massie's name was used by the Star-Bulletin.
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Honolulu needed newspapers that morning as desperately as famished people needed food.

Joseph Farrington

Over the years, much as been said and written about the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor shortly before 8 a.m., December 7, 1941. There have been historical and journalistic accounts written describing the process with which Riley Allen organized the Star-Bulletin staff and published an edition even before the last enemy planes returned to the waiting carriers. When Star-Bulletin owner Joseph Farrington phoned from his Alewa Heights home at 8:15 a.m. to see what was happening at the Star-Bulletin, Allen informed him: "Everything is under control." Publication of an issue during an enemy attack earned the Star-Bulletin added respect in the community. Joseph Farrington claimed that some persons who had actually witnessed the rising sun ensignia on the Japanese airplanes flying overhead did not believe Oahu was being attacked until they read it in the Star-Bulletin. Walter Lord told the story of Japanese Consul General Kita not believing the report of the attack related by Star-Bulletin reporter Larry Nakatsuka. Nakatsuka then left and returned with a copy of the Star-Bulletin which had large headlines screaming WAR! If the newspaper wasn't adequate evidence, at least it might serve as a conversation piece.
"Honolulu needed newspapers that morning as desperately as a famished people need food," Farrington said later.

It is clear the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor hastened Hawaii's ultimate acceptance as a state in 1959. But the attack also brought a temporary halt to the statehood movement both in Hawaii and in Washington. For the next four years the Star-Bulletin and its leaders were preoccupied with a struggle to retrieve basic rights from the United States military.


3. One account in the files of Joseph Farrington at the Hawaii State Archives tells of Marine Officers phoning the *Star-Bulletin* to complain about young newsboys trying to make sales at the gates of Pearl Harbor just as the Japanese planes made their last attack.

4. Pratte, *op. cit.*

5. Boyden Sparkes manuscript. Also see Pearl Harbor file.


CHAPTER XIII

THE STAR-BULLETIN ROLE IN OPPOSING MILITARY RULE

December 8, 1941 to December, 1945

One interesting aspect of the regime of martial law in Hawaii was the attitude of the press both in Hawaii and on the continental United States. In Hawaii the two leading newspapers took opposite stands on the issue. The Honolulu Star-Bulletin at an early date recognized the threat to Hawaii inherent in the continuance of the military government. This position was in accord with the position of Joseph R. Farrington, the publisher of the paper who was elected delegate to Congress from Hawaii in November, 1942.

The Honolulu Advertiser, on the other hand, for the most part stoutly defended the military regime, which course was dictated both by editorial preference as well as by the rivalry existing between the two newspapers.

J. Garner Anthony
Hawaii Under Army Rule, p. 109

At 12:10 p.m. on December 7, while Riley Allen and his staff were still frantically gathering and publishing information in their "War" editions, two U.S. Army officers were ushered into the executive chambers of Governor Joseph B. Poindexter.

There was no question as to the seriousness of the situation which existed in the Islands. Approximately 3,000 American soldiers lay dead or dying; many of the Navy's best ships were in flames, imprisoned in mud, or at the bottom of Pearl Harbor; smoldering airfields were strewn with riddled planes. There was no guarantee that the Japanese attackers would not return.

It was under such conditions that the 72-year-old governor, who was recovering from a serious illness, agreed to the military request for
martial law; with it came the temporary suspension of the privilege of the writ of habeus corpus. Poindexter was later to claim that he had been told that the martial law would only last for a "reasonably short time." The document he signed authorized the military to maintain control "during the present emergency, and until the danger of invasion is removed, to exercise the powers normally carried out by judicial officers." It also contained an illegal paragraph.

Samuel Weaver suggests that the army may have been acting in spite against the predominately Japanese-American population after being humiliated by the Japanese attack. The military moved not only into Iolani Palace, it moved gradually into virtually every aspect of civilian life. It imposed complete military rule, a dictatorship in which the commanding general of the Army in Hawaii assumed the title of military governor and took control of all three branches of government—executive, legislative and judicial.

The territorial courts were closed, the press was licensed and censored, labor was rigidly controlled, travel was sharply restricted, and regulations for daily civilian activity during the early days of military government were issued and severely enforced. Penalties often harsh by civilian standards were assessed by military courts for common and minor offenses as defined. As the war progressed, the military danger to the islands lessened; protests were made against military rule, and some distasteful and extreme practices were modified, sometimes under pressure from Washington, D.C.

Surprisingly, only a handful of individuals and institutions stood up to this unprecedented violation of civilian authority by the military, which lasted for more than three years. With the exception of J. Garner Anthony, a young state attorney general, the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, and Federal Judges Delbert Metzger and Frank McLaughlin, the majority of the people in Hawaii acquiesced to the military rule. As the Honolulu Advertiser was later to say, "we liked it."
University of Hawaii psychology professor Stanley Porteus wrote in 1962 that the only explanation that he could offer for the obscuring of the light of judgment during World War II was that the people of Hawaii suffered under "a condition of delayed shock," or the "befogging of judgement under the stress of peril."

In other words, it was not that democracy was any less dear to us, but what we had lost was the understanding that it was being taken and withheld from us. Anthony, who later documented the experiences of this period for the Star-Bulletin and in a book, published in 1954, suggested several reasons why the people of Hawaii did not rise up to seek restoration of their basic rights as citizens of an American territory.

... I believe that there are several reasons. The first is fear. To the average citizen the present regime is anathema. However, he is never sure of his ground and is fearful of punishment and hence remains inarticulate. He is also afraid lest his criticism of existing conditions will stamp him unpatriotic. The second reason is censorship. I feel safe in saying that no place in America, and probably few elsewhere have been subjected to the rigid censorship which exists here. By the censorship of the press and all means of communication, there is a virtual blackout of information available to the public concerning civil affairs in Hawaii. Some information trickles back via visitors returning to the Mainland. The third reason is the fact that a large number of employees of these services include the civilians working for the military governor. The last, but not the least important, reason is the existence of a small number of fascist-minded business men. They are influential with the 'office of the military governor.' This group, I regret to say, favored the military regime with all its stringent controls of labor, severe and arbitrary penalties for infractions of orders. To be sure, they want to win the war, but they are also interested in profits and find it extremely convenient to obtain whatsoever they desire in the form of an order from the military authorities. They are not hampered either by democratic processes, such as legislation, or by territorial civil servants who, as a rule, are far more able to deal with the shrewd man of business than the average Army officer.

A surprising aspect of martial law in Hawaii was the attitude of part of the press in Hawaii.
By and large the press on the mainland was true to its journalistic traditions, which have generally opposed any government suppression of the media and of civil rights. The New York Times, for example, quoted extensively from legal articles written by Anthony for publication in the Stanford Law Review. In Hawaii, however, the two major newspapers took opposite stands on the issue of a free press. In Anthony's words:

The Honolulu Star-Bulletin at an early date recognized the threat to Hawaii inherent in the continuance of the military government. The position was in accord with the position of Joseph R. Farrington, the publisher of the paper, who was elected delegate to Congress from Hawaii in November, 1942.

The Honolulu Advertiser, on the other hand, for the most part stoutly defended the military regime, which course was dictated both by editorial preference as well as by the rivalry existing between the two newspapers. 5

As an example, in 1942, Lorrin P. Thurston, president and general manager of the Honolulu Advertiser accepted the position of "public relations advisor to the military governor." Thurston not only went out of his way to make things difficult for the Star-Bulletin crusade to remove the military rule, but encouraged news stories and editorial comment against the Star-Bulletin. It was unfortunate that this newspaper thus foreclosed itself from being of any public service in criticizing the existing regime. 6

According to Gwenfread Allen in her official history of World War II, Army and Navy censors were on the job at the telephone, radio, and cable companies within two hours after the attack. Radio announcers were instructed "All eyewitness stories are out . . . all details of places are out . . . don't mention or speculate on size of attack." Then they moved into newspaper offices, and they were soon reading the mail at the post office. 7
Beginning on December 8, 1941, and until February, 1942, the Army and Navy supervised civilian censorship. Then censorship came under the Federal Office of Censorship until April, 1945. The close liaison of the office with the military governor's office, and the presence of Army and Navy personnel among the censors, led many people to believe it was still under the military. The Federal Office of Censorship retained former Star-Bulletin reporter William Norwood to assist in the regulation of censorship of the papers until April, 1945, when the Army took over again through the Office of Internal Security. 8

Anthony was later to write:

In the year 1942, there existed no free press in Hawaii. The press operated under a military censorship--not the self-imposed censorship about which the mainland press complained, i.e., insufficient information about the conduct of the war, but censorship which prohibited publication of news items of general interest not related to the conduct of the war but related to the regime of military government. The military governor controlled the press through a licensing system which permitted it to publish 'under such conditions and regulations which shall be prescribed from time to time by the military governor.' (General Orders No. 14). 9

A memorandum written by Riley Allen, June 5, 1944, provides the most thorough outline of the newspaper censorship issue in Hawaii for the three year period after the Pearl Harbor attack.

1. In addition to the normal censorship exercised by the post office department on newspapers passing through the mails, newspapers in Hawaii are under the voluntary press censorship common to newspapers all over the United States. Hawaii newspapers are thus under the Office of Censorship, Washington, D.C. and the civilian censorship in the Federal building, Honolulu.

2. Additionally, newspapers in Hawaii are under a form of censorship by the Army and Navy, inasmuch as many matters of news interest are either withheld from publication completely or given to the newspapers in incomplete form.

3. Immediately after war broke out December 7, 1941, Hawaii newspapers were placed under an actual military censorship, through the issuance of general orders by the Office of the
Military Government, which first suspended all newspapers in Hawaii and then, in the case of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin and the Honolulu Advertiser, immediately authorized them to continue publication. There was no interruption in publication for either the Star-Bulletin or the Advertiser.

4. For some weeks the Star-Bulletin and the Advertiser operated with censors in the newspaper offices, appointed by the division of military intelligence of the Hawaiian Department and in cooperation with the Office of the Military Government.

Later, in the case of the Star-Bulletin itself, Army censors (civilians temporarily called into the Army service, though not enlisted or commissioned) were withdrawn for other work, and Vern Hinkley, managing editor of the Star-Bulletin was verbally designated as the G-2 censor for the Star-Bulletin.

5. This military censorship (operated in conjunction with a sort of naval censorship which withheld or announced news) continued until the "restoration" of civil rights on March 10, 1943.

6. The new set of general orders of the military government issued on that date summarized all of the military orders which were continued in force after the transfer of a large number of functions to the governor of Hawaii (civil government). Inasmuch as the new general orders, which aimed to cover the then existing entire field of the Office of the Military Governor's control over civil affairs, did not contain any provision for military censorship or supervision of the press, it is assumed that no such censorship was thereafter or is now operative.

7. However, the newspapers of Hawaii are under definite and extensive restrictions as to publications of certain classes and items of news, this through direct requests which in some cases amount to directives of the Army and Navy commands, usually through the public relations offices of the two general branches of the armed services.

8. At present the general restrictions on newspapers in Hawaii are as follows:

(a) We are in an advanced base, if not actual combat area, hence the restrictions here are applied much more stringently, apparently, than on the mainland.
(b) We are not permitted to mention weather conditions until at least a week after those conditions have disappeared, and then only with the OK of Army G-2.
(c) We are not permitted to publish any address containing an APO number.
(d) We are not permitted to publish any military unit number unless that number has been announced officially in a war theater communique or from Washington. There is one exception to this—the 7th Air Force—and recently we have been asked not to use anything regarding the fighter command of that Air Force.
(e) Mention of any high civilian officials traveling here is taboo. This includes those from other Allied countries. A case in point is the story of Walter Nash of New Zealand, whom the Navy brought through here on his way to Washington. We published it and were taken to task, mildly.

(f) We are not permitted to reveal the name of any soldier killed in an accident here, such as a traffic smashup, until the Army has notified the next of kin. Navy is not so particular on this point.

(g) "Pen Pals" [a correspondence column] was eliminated on the ground that it might provide the enemy with information of value.

(h) No mention can be made of division numbers of troops stationed in Hawaii or of regimental numbers.

(i) No mention can be made of the arrival or departure of planes or ships.

(j) No mention can be made of any kind of military material in Hawaii.

(k) No mention can be made of any captured enemy equipment brought here, unless by permission of G-2. A case in point is the Japanese tank taken on Betio. This story was finally released. We understand a Japanese Zero was brought here but the Army has never admitted it and has not allowed us to say such a plane is here.

(l) We are not permitted to publish news of the eruption of Mauna Loa until some time after that eruption has subsided, this on the grounds that the enemy might profit from the knowledge of the volcanic glare at night, or from the knowledge that the flowing lava might cut military roads and other communications.

(m) We are usually not permitted to make mention of airplane accidents but if a crash occurs where it has been seen by many people, the Army will permit us to publish the bare facts, but without the names of any of those injured or killed.

(n) We are not permitted to say anything regarding the construction of warehouses, barracks, air fields, pipe lines, etc., all of which fall in the category of military installations.

(o) We are not permitted to say anything regarding military figures, here from Washington for inspections or on other business, until they have returned to the mainland and usually not until they have reached Washington.

(p) Recently we were denied permission to publish a story on the opening of the new naval air station at Keehi lagoon although there was an official ceremony at which a good many persons were present and a special plane was flown from California to make the first landing.

(q) Recently we were asked to remove from the Star-Bulletin a picture and caption which told of the arrival of a large number of mainland women [wives of men already here] to take jobs. This was done despite the fact that the same article had been published in the Pearl Harbor Banner and the Advertiser. (We removed the picture after three editions had run off.)
Although censorship is described as voluntary it actually is very rigid in the Hawaiian Islands, with a very tight grip being kept by Navy PRO and Army G-2 on all sorts of matters. Mr. Hinkley has been designated, by word of mouth only, as the censor in The Star-Bulletin office and as such is expected to exercise careful control over the everyday matters which come up. Staff members frequently refer to Navy or Army censors just the same.

Not infrequently the Star-Bulletin is asked to omit news items which, while not classified as "detrimental to military security," would be disliked by some officer in the services. One instance of this was that the Navy cable censor's office objected to an item being reported a court trial, in which the operation of the censorship was referred to in court. (On January 20 the Star-Bulletin published a brief item concerning one Harry H. Gusky being fined $300 in provost court for cabling an order for one dozen red roses to a woman in Detroit. The roses were a signal, prearranged via mail, that Gusky, a USED construction inspector general, had received expected orders transferring him to Texas.) Censorship officials noticed the mail message and later the cable. MP Sergeant Ludwig arrested Gusky. After this story appeared the editor of the Star-Bulletin was visited by Lt. Ralph Fitkin, USNR, of the cable censor's office. He objected to the revelation of the fact that the cable and mail censors collaborate on such matters. This matter was referred to Byron Price, who, on February 25, wrote Riley H. Allen that he felt Lt. Fitkin was merely carrying out his [Price's] policy in such matters. He said, however, that the Honolulu Cable Station would be instructed in this matter.

Riley H. Allen, Editor
Honolulu Star-Bulletin

Anthony illustrated his legal treatise against military rule with the example of an editorial by Riley Allen mildly criticizing the dictatorial government. "He was promptly given to understand that such conduct would not be tolerated." Murders and rapes occurred in Honolulu, but the newspapers were forbidden to publish the incidents. They were also denied access to police files since the police operated directly under the control of the military governor.
Another illustration of the newspaper censorship is the story of the handling of prostitution by the Army in 1942. Before Pearl Harbor, the practice had been controlled privately by Honolulu police who segregated the unfortunates in certain areas of the city, mainly Iwilei, the downtown industrial district. After the war started, a substantial number of prostitutes were imported from the mainland under military priorities and allowed to set up shop in residential districts throughout the island. Although this was common knowledge at the Star-Bulletin and throughout the community, where homeowners objected vigorously, nothing was done by the military until prostitution reached such proportions that "jurisdiction" was returned to the local police. When the women were ordered to return to their former segregated regulations, the city was treated to the spectacle of a three weeks' strike by the prostitutes who picketed the police station and the office of the military governor with placards announcing their grievances.11

The resulting stiflying of thought from all such censorship, as well as the interference of the military itself, caused the Star-Bulletin to object during the war. Riley Allen recalled that at one time during the early weeks of the war he had been asked to censor his own copy. Allen objected to this procedure however, saying that it placed too much responsibility on the shoulders of the newspaper. He insisted that if there was to be censorship at all, the military would have to do it. As William Norwood later stated: "Riley didn't want anyone to censor his newspaper, including himself."12

After Norwood's week as censor, a former Seattle newsman took over the job in the Star-Bulletin office while Norwood censored the two Japanese language papers, the Hawaii Hochi and Nippu Jiji.
In an interview, Norwood explained that in addition to watching for outright security breaches by the Honolulu papers, he was also instructed to make certain there was no criticism of the national administration's war policy and to help persuade newspaper editors to psychologically condition their readers. "In effect, the censors were also the arm of a propaganda agent," Norwood said. He recalled the "go-round" he had with Riley Allen over the publication of a Drew Pearson column critical of the lack of military preparation before Pearl Harbor. Allen eventually killed the column although other newspapers across the mainland were allowed to print it.

Norwood also recalled the consistent championing of Japanese-American loyalty to the United States by Allen and the Star-Bulletin. In contrast to the Advertiser, the Star-Bulletin had a strict editorial policy against using the word "Jap" in print throughout the war, notwithstanding the convention of such a short term in the creation of headlines. Farrington later said:

I made the word "Jap" kapu (forbidden) as a matter of policy, and in announcing that policy that we were not going to fight a race war in the Star-Bulletin. It would have been dastardly in view of the fact that one-third of our population is Japanese.13

Joseph Farrington in a letter to Allen dated December 3, 1943, also objected strenuously to the use of the term "military governor" in Star-Bulletin news stories and editorials.

By this policy, a title which has no authority in law, is not necessary to the war effort, and has been assumed and is used arbitrarily, is woven into the thinking of the people of Hawaii and in the process can very readily become the background for efforts to ultimately convert the devotion of the government of the islands to a governor general such as was used in the Philippines.14
Norwood later told how he had admired the Star-Bulletin for its "journalistic independence" during the war, and Allen as the most courageous and independent newspaper editor within the framework of the military society.

Even as the Star-Bulletin continued to fight censorship another discussion of the issue attracted national attention. This was a legal brief written by Garner Anthony and mailed out of the Territory to the University of California Law Review. The article was quoted from extensively by the Star-Bulletin on May 16, 1942 and by the New York Times the following day. In early December, conferences on the termination of martial law in Hawaii were begun in Washington. On December 21, Delegate Farrington made a public announcement giving his unqualified support to the Territorial governor and attorney general in their efforts to restore constitutional government under a reign of law in the Territory of Hawaii and to reestablish civil authority and responsibility consistent with the defense of the Islands. . . . Continuance of military rule and complete dominance over civilian affairs not only is contrary to every tradition of America since the earliest days of this nation, but is in fact a positive detriment to the total war effort. 15

Despite serious health problems, Farrington had decided to leave the Islands after being approached by Republican party leaders and close friends to take the place of Representative Sam King who had resigned his seat in Congress to go on active duty in the Navy. Mrs. Farrington provides this account of her husband's decision:

Joe had suffered a severe thrombosis in November, 1940, and had just begun to go back to his office for a few hours daily when he was called upon to take Sam King's place. No one thought Joe could survive the hard task ahead.

A group of party officials came to see me one day. Jim Winne, Republican national committeeman; Bina Mossman, Republican
national committeewoman; and Fred Lowrey. I think he was state chairman then. They asked me how I felt. I, too, thought it would take Joe's life. He was out just a few hours a day after two years in bed.

"Knowing Joe, there is no other answer," I replied. Who am I to say 'no' when other women are losing their husbands and sons on the field of battle. Joe can't carry a gun but if this is the way he can serve his country in war time, I cannot say 'no' even if it takes his life.

That is the way we went to Washington. I didn't believe Joe could stand either the physical or emotional strain of that journey.

We sailed on a small 10,000 ton Dutch freighter, escorted by two destroyers, zig-zagging eleven days all the way to San Francisco.

For 14 long years Joe survived and fought his battle, first for removal of the military rule and next for statehood.

No one knew what the physical struggle was.

He could not and never did carry as much as a book again because it brought on angina pains.

Night after night he had to be pulled out of what I called strangling fits. He would literally start to strangle after he went to sleep from no provocation at all. It was living with the Sword of Damocles hanging over us.16

Shortly after his arrival in Washington, Farrington began writing the first of more than 2,000 letters that he and Allen exchanged between Honolulu and Washington from 1943 until the day before his death in 1954.17 These letters, which have served as the basis for the last half of this dissertation, contain an abundance of information relating to politics, government and journalism in Hawaii as well as the personal life and thought of Farrington and Allen. They are the only Allen-correspondence left, as Allen ordered that all his personal mail be destroyed after his death in 1966.
The letters are revealing in that they show how Farrington attempted to provide direction for the Star-Bulletin from more than 5,000 miles away. Many of them contain basic instructions on possible editorials and reprimands. The letters reveal a sensitive man; when chastizing, as he occasionally did, Farrington did not mention any names. The letters also show concern over Hawaii, statehood, and the principles of American journalism.

Joseph and Elizabeth Farrington made a concentrated effort to interest the working press in the statehood cause. As a former newsman, Farrington knew the influence of journalists on their readers as well as on Congressmen. Farrington once encouraged the use in the Star-Bulletin of more columns by Walter Lippman because of the "enormous influence he has on congressmen." Farrington reasoned that Lippman could have a similar influence locally. Jan Jabulka, a former Advertiser advertising executive who became head of the Hawaii Statehood Commission, wrote that the Star-Bulletin subscribed to a number of syndicated columns that the Advertiser did not. Jabulka said the Bulletin undoubtedly brought these influential writers "into camp." Drew Pearson, for example, whose column appeared in the Bulletin for decades, was a personal friend of the Farringtons. His column frequently boosted Hawaii's admission into the union. The Farringtons also influenced the press and officials in Washington through conversations at social events. According to Mrs. Farrington:

In Washington we started in earnest cultivating all the friends we could. We did give fabulous parties. The first I remember we gave for our friends of the press, many of whom we had known when we lived in Washington in the 1920's. Now these same men were leading members of the powerful Gridiron Club and it was a great help to have them on our side.
We also entertained the women of the press—time and again, flying up dozens of leis to make the parties as Hawaiian as possible.

We constantly entertained members of the Congress and the cabinet officials, at small dinners, at large dinners, at cocktails and buffet suppers, and at more formal receptions. 20

After his arrival in Washington, Farrington immediately acted to strengthen the Washington reporting staff. Apparently Star-Bulletin coverage in Washington did not always please Farrington. In October, 1943, he wrote Allen to complain of a number of errors in articles which had appeared in several September issues. He also discussed the possibilities of getting copies of the Star-Bulletin to him at an earlier date so he could correct errors.

I hope it is going to be possible from this service to clarify what appears to me to be some serious inadequacies in the manner in which my activities have been represented. I am more than ever convinced of this since my visit to the Islands in August.

The coverage of my activities seems to me far below the standards which I like to associate with the Star-Bulletin method of presenting the news.

I have given the whole situation a great deal of thought because of its importance—not so much to me but to the Star-Bulletin. My isolation and consequent inability to communicate directly with people at home as has been my custom when holding public office makes it particularly important that some means be found to overcome the serious weaknesses in the representation I am now receiving in the news columns.

This is important from the Star-Bulletin's viewpoint because I am at all times fighting to advance the principles and policies for which the Star-Bulletin has always stood, and my record is likely to reflect both to the credit and discredit of the Star-Bulletin because of my important identification with the company and in addition, because I am still head of the firm. 21

In another letter from Washington, Farrington wrote to complain about articles in a column about Senator Robert Taft and the Republican organization.
The comments are not only grossly inaccurate but prejudiced and extremely unfortunate under present circumstances.

The fact of the matter is that Senator Taft is a man of unusual ability and integrity and regarded as such by most people here.

I cannot see any good purposes served by the publication of such material in the Star-Bulletin.22

Later in the letter Farrington wrote that Washington Bureau chief Raymond Mobley has said the reporter responsible for the article had made a written apology to Taft.

I think this ought to serve as something of a guide in handling the column in the future as the authors are not showing their stability or sense of responsibility that we should be able to expect of them.23

With the support of Farrington and other Territorial officials in Washington, Governor Stainback was able to issue a proclamation restoring civil authority in Hawaii on February 8, 1943. General Delos C. Emmons issued a similar proclamation restoring civil authority that became official the following month. This first major step toward the restoration of civil government, according to Anthony, was greeted with wide publicity as well as editorial comment in the newspapers.

The Advertiser greeted the restoration negatively, with the editor voicing the possibility that military necessity might require a return to the military regime.

Now that conditions are such that certain civil responsibilities safely can be relinquished they have been returned to the civil authorities to handle until such time, if any, as military necessity may dictate otherwise.24

The Star-Bulletin of February 9, 1943, met the return of civil government with great acclaim in its editorial, "Restoration and Its Meaning."
The dominant principle observed throughout the formula announced Monday is the principle that on American soil not invaded or occupied by foreign troops or forces not set aside as military or naval reservations for specific military or naval occupancy and use, civil authority shall be prevalent and paramount.

For the people of Hawaii generally, we have every right to be deeply proud that the White House, the Justice Department, the Navy Department—all participating in this plan of restoration—have said in effect, "you have proved your right to direct the affairs of local government in our American outpost territory."

The attitude of the Advertiser against the restoration of civil rights was best typified in an April 23, 1944 editorial. It stated that 95 percent of the public was behind the military and opposed to Secretary Ickes and Governor Poindexter, and his chief clerk, whose unwillingness to "subordinate their personal desire for power and control, to the honestly expressed serious needs of the Army and Navy, in the midst of the most difficult war the nation has ever faced, has created an intolerable position."

In contrast to the Advertiser position, the Star-Bulletin Company owned Hilo Tribune Herald also opposed military rule and supported the Star-Bulletin stand. It was competitive and highly considered in the community. Because of talk of the possible sale to Big Island business interests in 1943 and 1944, Farrington received a number of letters from residents throughout the state expressing concern about the paper falling into outside hands. The ILWU, a major labor union on the Big Island, wrote the following letter.

Hilo, Hawaii, February 10, 1944

Honorable Joseph R. Farrington
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.
Dear Mr. Farrington:

We have delayed writing to you because of a natural hesitancy in not wanting to interfere with your private affairs. However, recent reports in the press and from other sources that the Hilo Tribune Herald might be sold, or that Mr. Urban Allen might be removed as its editor, make us feel that this is a matter for public concern.

As citizens of an American community it is our duty to beware of any attempt that might lead to the suppression of news that is in the public interest.

The influence of the policies of the Tribune Herald has been universally felt on this island and widely appreciated. Those policies under Mr. Allen's editorship have contributed to the progress and welfare of the Big Island and have made an important contribution toward more decency and efficiency in our local government.

We are aware of the fact that under existing conditions on this island the Tribune Herald has been handicapped in promoting the welfare of the community against a few special interests who seem to have no regard for the community other than their own financial gain. This handicap has made the good work of the paper even more appreciated.

We can interpret the attempt to purchase the Tribune Herald or the removal of Mr. Allen in no other way than as a move to suppress the mildly liberal expression of public opinion and news presentation that has been given.

The continued growth and present large circulation of the Tribune Herald is conclusive evidence of the esteem in which the Tribune Herald is held by the people of this island and their appreciation of its policies.

We want to take this opportunity to assure you of our continued support of the Tribune Herald and Mr. Allen if it is continued as at present. We feel that the issues involved are greater than any personal issue and that the continuation of the present policies of the Tribune Herald are of vital concern and interest to the people of the community.

In order to conserve paper and time, we are writing this to you collectively. But we want to assure you that each of us individually subscribes to the opinions expressed and the pledge to give our continued support to the present policies of the Tribune Herald.

ILWU, Local I-36, Hilo

The Hilo Tribune-Herald and the Star-Bulletin had earned support and respect from the unions and other working people of Hawaii because of their coverage of the Japanese and other Hawaii natives in military units in World War II. The Star-Bulletin, from the beginning, expressed
great faith in the Americans of Japanese ancestry, and in the Japanese nationals who had made their home in Hawaii for decades but who were prevented by law from becoming American citizens. Correspondence in Farrington's congressional files show the dozens of requests he received from Americans of Japanese ancestry who were discriminated against because of their racial background. In a taped interview with Boyden Sparks, Farrington described the many discussions he and his wife had in Washington, in small groups and with individuals, attempting to enlist the Japanese in the U.S. Armed Forces.

The feeling about putting the boys of American-Japanese into the U.S. Army uniform was bitter. A congressman severely criticized us for doing this; he never retracted his statement later. These sharp criticisms during the early part of the war were replaced by only praise for these boys when they heard of the gallantry and good showing made by these boys. ... Most of the boys who volunteered were from here. Very few were from the mainland.

You see, it was our form of government that made Americans of these boys. Would they have fought and made this their country if not given citizenship and equality? They were being trained from a long time ago for such an emergency. If this war has proven anything, it was our system of government that made these people Americans. It was just as natural for these boys to fight for this country as you or I. It was the civilians here who saved Hawaii.29

June, 1942, saw the first group of AJA soldiers leave from Hawaii for training on the mainland. According to former Star-Bulletin reporter Larry Nakatsuka, the mainland newspapers found the Nisei (Those American GI's with Japanese Faces) good copy for curious readers. Whole pages of pictures and articles praised the tough, brown-skinned "Jap Yanks" from Hawaii.30 Because almost every Japanese family in Hawaii had one or more relatives, friends or acquaintances among the soldiers, the battalion made excellent news for the Star-Bulletin. The group became the 100th battalion.
Early in 1943, headlines announced that the War Department was asking for volunteers for another all-Nisei combat team to include 1,500 men. By the end of the month-long campaign, more than 20,000 volunteers had swamped the draft boards, and 2,600 had been selected for duty. The second group trained with some of the earlier members of the 100th battalion. The 100th, which later became part of the 442nd Regimental Combat Team, was the most decorated unit in the entire history of the United States Army. Ten times the 442nd was cited by the War Department for outstanding accomplishments. Their slogan, "Go For Broke," reflected the fighting determination of men anxious to vindicate themselves and their families.

From September 22, 1943, when the 442nd first landed at Salerno in Italy, until it officially returned home in 1946, the pages of the Star-Bulletin were filled with accounts of the AJA soldiers. War Department press releases gave frequent commendation. Thomas D. Murphy wrote in his book, Ambassadors in Arms:

> These notices were intended to stimulate morale within the battalion itself and among the AJA trainees at Shelby. They were also ammunition for the psychological warfare against Japan and Germany, as well as means of mitigating homefront prejudice against Americans of Japanese ancestry.31

In response to all the publicity flowing from Army public relations offices, and in particular to an Associated Press story that had appeared in the Star-Bulletin two days before, the Advertiser published an editorial on October 18, 1943, entitled "Less Limelight Please." The Advertiser felt the stories not only gave mainlanders the impression that the only fighting men from the territory were those of Japanese blood, but also that they gave the local people a distorted view of their own role in the national war effort.
It was true that too much praise had on occasion proved embarrassing to the Japanese soldiers, had fostered exaggerated and untrue stories, and had caused concern that it would not help the Japanese-Americans if other soldiers became annoyed. However, in reply to the *Advertiser*, the *Star-Bulletin* wrote a blistering editorial, noting that such complaints probably stemmed from ignorance of the fact that the War Department had deliberately and carefully embarked on a policy of proving to the enemy—particularly to the enemy Japanese—that under the American democratic system this country can produce and is producing young men of Japanese blood who willingly and effectively fight other men of their own race—the enemy.32

Farrington offered his own advice from Washington. In a letter written to Allen October 29, 1943, Farrington observed "one of the best solutions for the resentment that seems to be developing over the large amount of attention being given to the 100th battalion and 442nd regiment is to develop news about other sons of Hawaii who are active in the Army."

Farrington recognized that such coverage would present some difficulties but could be arranged through the War Department. To provide greater coverage of non-Nisei soldiers, Farrington hired John B. Terry, a former *Star-Bulletin* reporter, to assist Radford Mobley in the *Star-Bulletin* bureau in Washington.

The slowing of the statehood movement during the war did not prevent Farrington from preparing for a more fortuitous time by cultivating friends in Congress and in the press in Washington. Correspondence indicates that a number of correspondents, including H. V. Kaltenborn, were won over to Hawaii's cause after visiting the Islands.

One reason the statehood cause nearly halted appears to have been the attitude of Hawaii's governor. In one letter to Allen June 1, 1945,
Farrington sarcastically refers to the governor and his wife as "His Excellency and Lady Stainback." In a transcript of a telephone conversation between Farrington and Allen over a proposed visit of a congressional committee to the Islands, Allen suggested there were possibly three indications that the governor was not enthusiastic about statehood:

One is that he is not moving very fast on a number of things. One is that he is very slow to move on anything dealing with statehood. Another is that as far as the Interior Department is concerned, he is not quite sure of Ickes' position. 33

Allen advised Farrington to permit Stainback to issue the invitation to the congressional committee because of "the governor's vanity," or his position.

He has a feeling that you may get some of the credit and the glory. I think if it is entirely agreeable to you he will probably prefer to make the request directly and inform you of it. 34

Notwithstanding such an attitude in the executive office in Hawaii, Farrington continued to make points in the nation's capitol. In particular, Farrington was successful in his wooing of vice-president Harry S. Truman in one of the socials held at the Farrington home. Mrs. Farrington recalled:

I like to remember one party we had. It was in honor of the new Belgian ambassador, Robert Silvercruys, who had taught me French as a student at the University of Wisconsin. There were many distinguished guests present.

There were many other distinguished guests present including Lord and Lady Halifax (he was the British ambassador) and Vice President and Mrs. Truman. Every one seemed to have a wonderful time.

All the dignitaries wore vanda orchid maunaloa weave leis. We brought Hawaiian musicians down from the Lexington Hotel in New York. Pualani Mossman, who lived in Washington then, danced. Harry Truman played the Missouri Waltz on the piano I still have. Everyone was for Hawaiian statehood that night. And the fact was indelibly impressed upon the vice president.
The next day President Roosevelt died and Harry Truman became the President of the United States. Every time we saw the President and Mrs. Truman after that, they mentioned that evening and always referred to it as "our last night of freedom." And Harry Truman never forgot we meant what we said. He was the first President to come out unequivocally for statehood. 35
NOTES TO CHAPTER XII


5. Ibid., p. 109.

6. Ibid., p. 38.


9. Ibid.


13. Joseph Farrington files, Pearl Harbor Folder, Hawaii State Archives. In an interview with Trinidad Pelletier May 11, 1976, Mrs. Pelletier recalled that a group of staff members--particularly those on the copy desk and including one Japanese-American writer who petitioned Allen to permit them to use the word "Jap" in news copy and headlines. Allen refused.


17. As one example, Farrington wrote Allen on October 3, 1944 to say he had received a total of ten letters from Allen, five from Porter Dickinson and five from a secretary. "It certainly shows I am not being neglected by my associates at the Star-Bulletin," he said.

19. Ibid.

20. Interview, Elizabeth Farrington, September 15, 1975.


22. Letter to Riley Allen from Joseph Farrington, April 5, 1944.

23. Letter to Riley Allen from Joseph Farrington, April 26, 1944.


27. Golden Years Edition, Honolulu Star-Bulletin, Tuesday, August 14, 1962, Section 1, p. 22. The article notes that the publication has the largest circulation area of any small town daily in the country, for it serves the entire Big Island--more than 4,000 square miles. See also Honolulu Star Bulletin, Ltd. Report of the President and General Manager, 1944, p. 4.


29. Boyden Sparks, Farrington file, November, 1942.


31. Thomas D. Murphy, Ambassadors in Arms (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1954), p. 296. In an interview May 13, 1976, Murphy confirmed even though he made little use of the newspapers in his research, he was aware that the Star-Bulletin played up the Japanese angle more than the Advertiser. He attributed this to the difference in philosophy of the two editors.


33. Letter to Riley Allen, June 1, 1945.

34. Ibid.

35. Interview, Mrs. Elizabeth Farrington, September 15, 1976.
CHAPTER XIV

THE STATEHOOD DEBATE RESUMES IN HAWAII AND IN THE U.S. CONGRESS

August 15, 1945 to April, 1948

Mr. Farrington. . . . and so you find that same tolerance in considering the views of other people, and there is an intense and lively interest in politics, civil affairs, and we are everlastingly engaging in the liveliest debates on issues of public importance. That is the tradition.

Senator Dworshak. How many newspapers and how many radio stations do you have in the islands?

Mr. Farrington. There are two newspapers and five radio stations in Honolulu. There is one daily newspaper on the Island of Hawaii and two radio stations, and there are several bilingual newspapers, two, I believe, and county papers.

Senator Dworshak. You have adequate means of disseminating information?

Mr. Farrington. There is no question about that.

Senator Dworshak. Stimulating interest on the part of the public on controversial issues?

Mr. Farrington. Oh, yes, the air is full of controversy and a lot of people are listening in on the States at the same time, of course.

Senator Dworshak. That is a healthy condition.

Hearings Before the Senate Committee on Lands

In the three years after V-J Day, the Star-Bulletin resumed its efforts to promote statehood both in Hawaii and in Washington where publisher Joseph Farrington was serving his second term as a member of the House of Representatives. Despite his handicap as a non-voting Republican representative from a small island territory, Farrington was successful in persuading the Democrat-controlled Congress to hold statehood hearings in Honolulu in January, 1946. Following the November elections when the Republicans gained control of the Congress, Hawaiian
hearings were held in Washington, D.C. in 1947 when a statehood bill passed the House of Representatives.

Even before the passage of the first statehood bill, the Star-Bulletin heralded a December 20, 1945 announcement by Interior Secretary Harold Ickes approving statehood in the immediate future. In a press statement the following day, Farrington described the announcement as

the most significant contribution to the movement for statehood for Hawaii since the people of the Islands, in a plebiscite in 1940 requested by the Congressional Committee to determine their wishes, voted two to one in favor of statehood.

The secretary's statement extends to the people of the Islands in recognition of their achievements and inspirations far beyond that ever voiced before by a Federal official of the high rank of the Secretary of the Interior.

In the 1946 hearings Farrington served as one of the members of the subcommittee on territories chaired by Rep. Henry D. Larcade of Louisiana. As a member of the committee Farrington was thus in a position to develop testimony of friendly witnesses and attempt to encourage, embarrass or confound witnesses hostile to the statehood resolution which he had introduced. In his own formal testimony, Farrington said that the most serious objection to statehood after the Second World War was the question of how the Japanese would use their political powers their numerical position would offer them under statehood.

Dedmon recorded that the lines of questioning and the testimony presented in the hearings in Hawaii consistently harked back to the issue of the diverse population of Hawaii as being the real motivating issue of the period.

One of the methods that Farrington and the Star-Bulletin used to dispel fears of Hawaii's Japanese-American population was by citing
statistics of Hawaii's war record. In formal testimony before the congressional committees, Farrington noted:

The "distinguished record it (Hawaii) established in World War II," . . . is written in the American battle history in Europe and Asia. In World War II, for example, the 100th Infantry Battalion and the 442nd Combat Team from Hawaii composed of so-called Japanese Americans, formed what has been described by Gen. Mark Clark as "the most decorated unit in the entire military history of the United States."

In January 1943, the War Department had ended the restriction on enlistment by Nisei and called for volunteers to form an all-Nisei combat team. The response was instantaneous and overwhelming. During a month's call, 10,000 men, or 40 percent of the eligible number in the population, volunteered. Of these, 2,600 were finally chosen. The quota had been 1,500.

The 2,600, together with mainland Japanese Americans formed the 442nd Combat Team, which eventually joined its fellows of the 100th Battalion to help write into the annals of American military history one of the greatest records of heroism.

These 3,600 men amassed 10 unit awards, including 7 Presidential citations. They received over 5,000 individual awards, including 3,600 Purple Heart Medals with 500 oakleaf clusters, 810 Bronze Star Medals with 38 clusters, 15 Soldiers' Medals, 17 Legion of Merit Medals, 342 Silver Star Medals with 12 clusters, 1 Distinguished Service Medal, 47 Distinguished Service Crosses, and 1 Congressional Medal of Honor.4

In the 1946 hearings Farrington disagreed with state senator Kamokila Campbell who opposed statehood for reasons related to race.

"I have always felt, and still feel, that the determining factor in our life is not racial ancestry, and I believe that nothing proves that more definitely than the record of the war," Farrington said.

In his summary statement, Farrington pointed out that the Hawaiian Islands had been a Territory for forty-five years and during that period the Federal government had controlled the executive and judicial branches of the government, where all the authority of law enforcement is vested, and has controlled the right to veto any of the acts of our legislature.

"I feel, therefore, that the answer to that point is that it is not to say certain conditions don't exist, but that the best solution will be found by our own people rather than people abroad."6
In his testimony in 1946, as in 1935 and again later, Farrington stressed the importance of "immediate statehood." Dedmon commented on this feeling of urgency when he noted that "proponents of statehood for Hawaii were always confronted with the primary task of convincing enough congressmen that the time to admit Hawaii was then and not later." Opponents often found reasons for delaying; the latter group were called "eventualists" by editor Allen.

"In the face of pleas to wait a while in order to do something else first, proponents maintained always that the time was then, that there was nothing more to be done before admission that could not be done just as effectively after admission." The cry of Farrington and the Star-Bulletin always was that "Hawaii had waited too long already."

Encouraged by the testimony of Farrington as well as by that of dozens of other Island residents, the subcommittee recommended that the full Committee on Territories "... give immediate consideration to legislation to admit Hawaii to statehood." This was followed shortly after by the action of President Harry Truman in his State of the Union Address endorsing statehood for the Hawaiian Islands.

In March, 1947, the House Committee on Public Lands considered Hawaiian statehood at hearings in Washington. At the conclusion of the hearings, for the second time within two years, a committee of Congress unanimously recommended statehood for Hawaii. Efforts were made to bottle up the bill in the rules committee. But Farrington appeared before the committee on April 17 to urge prompt consideration of H.R. 49.

In his statement Farrington noted:
With plans for the future of the Pacific rapidly taking shape, the establishment of Hawaii as a state would strengthen the position of this country by demonstrating its determination to maintain a predominant position in the Pacific.9

One of the last remaining objections to the admission of Hawaii as a state was eliminated when Admiral Chester W. Nimitz told the Committee on Public Lands that it offered no obstacle whatsoever from the military or naval standpoint. The testimony of Admiral Nimitz followed a conference by three members of the Public Lands Committee in Tokyo with General MacArthur in which he expressed the opinion that to extend statehood to Hawaii would strengthen the movement for democracy in the Pacific.10

In June, 1947, a Hawaiian Statehood bill passed the House by a vote of 196 to 133. It was the first time that either branch of the Congress had acted on the floor on a Hawaiian statehood issue.11

Farrington's optimism over the passage of a statehood bill in 1947, however, was muffled in the U.S. Senate which held the bill for nine months before holding hearings in Washington in April, 1948.

In testimony before the Committee on Public Lands chaired by Senator Hugh Butler, Farrington expressed his concerns.

Time is running out on us. We feel the country has spoken, the House has spoken, the President is for us, and we are up against the last barrier here in this committee.

This, to us, is an hour of great decision, and we do not want to lose. If we lose, we will have lost something that has been in the making for many years. I cannot believe that you gentlemen will not recognize the merit of our case and at least carry the issue to the floor of the Senate.

Talk to the men who went into battle with the boys from Hawaii. They will tell you that they not only fought for this country but they fought also to prove that they were as good American citizens as the boys that came from your States.12

As part of his testimony, Farrington also introduced evidence to show that in a sample of 282 American newspapers with a combined
circulation of 25 million, 94 percent of the comment was in favor of statehood for Hawaii.

"I think the record shows conclusively that the press of this country is almost overwhelmingly in favor of statehood."13

In reply to questions from Senator Henry Dworshak of Idaho, Farrington referred to the lively debates carried on over Hawaii's newspapers and radio station.

Mr. Farrington. There are two newspapers and five radio stations in Honolulu. There is one daily newspaper on the Island of Hawaii and two radio stations, and there are several bilingual newspapers, two, I believe, and county papers.

Senator Dworshak. You have adequate means of disseminating information?

Mr. Farrington. There is no question about that.

Senator Dworshak. Stimulating interest on the part of the public on controversial issues?

Mr. Farrington. Oh, yes, the air is full of controversy and a lot of the people are listening in on the States at the same time, of course.

Senator Dworshak. That is a healthy condition.14

In Honolulu, the Star-Bulletin continued to serve as the leader disseminating information and stimulating interest in statehood for the Island's population which was nearing 500,000. Before the end of World War II, the Star-Bulletin had been the only major newspaper supporting statehood. The Advertiser had continued to oppose statehood until after the war when its publisher Thurston was named a member of the Statehood Commission by Governor Ingram Stainback.

After the war, the Star Bulletin also served as the home for a number of outstanding journalists who reported on the changes in the Islands economic and political structure. According to Time magazine which did a feature story on Joseph Farrington and Hawaii's chances for statehood:
In the decade since the Jap attack on Pearl Harbor, Hawaiians have faced a half century's accumulated problems of transition: the breakdown of economic monopoly, the rise of aggressive labor unionism, the threat of Communist control, the restlessness of homecoming veterans, and the rights, problems and adjustments of linguistic and racial minorities. For each problem they have found, if not the answer, at least a piece of the answer. Out of the pieces, Hawaii has created a bright new mosaic of American life.15

One of the well-known reporters who started work with the Honolulu Star-Bulletin in the postwar years was Keyes Beech who was later to gain recognition as Pulitzer Prize winning correspondent for the Chicago Daily News Foreign Service. Beech had worked for the Akron (Ohio) Beacon-Journal before enlisting in the Marine Corps in 1942. After seeing action as a combat correspondent at Tarawa and Iwo Jima, Beech came to Hawaii where Allen hired him as the paper's military reporter.

Farrington recognized in Beech the qualities that would gain him national and international recognition for his coverage of the Pacific and Far East and had Beech assigned to Washington to report the statehood battle.

In a letter to the author dated April 26, 1976, Beech said that when he returned to Honolulu by freighter after a stormy voyage from San Francisco, Allen met him on the dock with a handful of statehood clippings.

"Read these. You start covering the statehood hearings tomorrow," Allen said. No visitor to Hawaii was allowed to escape without committing himself, favorably, of course, on statehood, Beech recalled.16

Beech also covered the atomic bomb tests at Bikini atoll and other areas in the Pacific before joining the Chicago Daily News staff in 1947. Five years later Beech became the third Star-Bulletin alumnus to be awarded a Nieman Fellowship to study at Harvard University.
The first winner was former Star-Bulletin reporter John B. Terry. The second was Larry Nakatsuka who went on to become a government official both in Hawaii and in Washington. A graduate of St. Louis College, Nakatsuka joined the Star-Bulletin in 1939 as a special articles writer and shortly thereafter became a staff writer. Nakatsuka was asked to cover the labor beat which was being started because of the rapid organization of labor unions. Within a few months, Nakatsuka was covering some of the major strikes in the history of the state, in 1946 and 1949.

On the basis of his work, Nakatsuka was invited by the national Nieman Foundation to Harvard where he studied labor economics. Two of his journalistically prominent classmates were John Steele, later chief of Time magazine's Washington bureau and Robert P. Martin, Far East regional editor of U.S. News and World Report.

In a letter to the author, Nakatsuka recalls that Allen particularly encouraged him to cover the news of the Japanese community. It was a natural follow-up to the abundant coverage the paper had given to the Japanese-American soldiers in World War II.

By printing articles on the Americanization and the coming of age of the Japanese Americans in Hawaii, Nakatsuka said, the Star-Bulletin contributed to "a better understanding and appreciation of the role of the Japanese residents and thereby fostered a better acceptance of Hawaii's people, including the Japanese, on the part of Americans on the Mainland United States."

Nakatsuka said that during the period he worked for the newspaper, the Star-Bulletin published "countless articles, strong pro-statehood
editorials, special statehood issues and sections to advance the cause of statehood."

Statehood news was front paged more than any other page I knew of," Nakatsuka said.

"In my opinion, it is very doubtful if Hawaii could have achieved statehood without the long, arduous leadership of the Farrington family and the paper's editors. The Star-Bulletin played a major, if not indispensable role," Nakatsuka said.

Much of the postwar labor reporting was also handled by Nakatsuka who covered the first industry-wide pineapple strike in 1947, the telephone strike in 1948, the bitter longshore strike in 1949, the bus strike in 1950 and the pineapple strike on Lanai in 1951. Nakatsuka recalls those years as difficult times, as he tried to report the news fairly despite pressures from both sides. He got to know people closely associated with the labor movement as well as management officials and Federal mediators assigned to the labor disputes.

One observer noted that as a labor reporter Nakatsuka "sized up controversial situations well and wrote about them competently and without playing favorites." 18

The compliment paid to Nakatsuka was only one of many tributes which have been paid to the Star-Bulletin for its coverage of Hawaii's labor movement. According to one report:

The reporting of news in the field of labor unions, labor management activities and industrial strikes, strife and struggle has been one of the most difficult, most unrewarding, most criticized and most misunderstood endeavors of the Star-Bulletin over the past 50 years. 19

As one means of summarizing labor's view of Star-Bulletin coverage in this important area which paralleled the statehood drive, six of
Hawaii's labor leaders were interviewed by Star-Bulletin reporter Kay Kund for an article in the Golden Years edition of the Star Bulletin, August 14, 1962. Some were highly critical. Some had great praise for the newspaper. All held strong and deeply felt opinions.

Arthur Rutledge, president of the Hawaii Teamsters Union said:
"The Star-Bulletin's reporting of local labor news was reasonably full and objective . . ."but editorially he had seldom seen the newspaper say a good word about unions."20

Jack W. Hall, head of the International Longshoreman's and Warehousemen's Union said that "Prior to labor establishing itself in Honolulu by pulling itself up by its boot straps, the Star-Bulletin and its morning adversary were viciously anti-union." But under the presidency of Farrington, Hall said the paper became fair to both management and labor.21

Representing the Typographical Union, Frank Almond, secretary-treasurer, praised the policy of the Star-Bulletin for its treatment of labor organizations after Joseph R. Farrington took office as publisher.

It has not always been sympathetic with the tactics of some unions, nor has it been slow to condemn racketeering in any shape, whether in a union or in any other organization.
But generally speaking, the newspaper has been a friend of labor, its reporting has been fair and straightforward, and its editorial policy has strongly endorsed the function of labor in the Island economy.22

Almond pointed to the year 1937 when the Wagner Act made it easier for unions to organize. The Star-Bulletin was the first company in the Islands to sign an agreement with the Typographical Union, he said.

The Star-Bulletin later signed contracts with the pressmen, the bindery workers, the engravers, the Hawaii Newspaper Guild...
Relations of the Typographical Union with the Star-Bulletin have been pleasant and straightforward. Former managing editor and later editor William Ewing recalled nothing unusual about a newspaper such as the Star-Bulletin trying to do a journalistic job by being fair and reporting events relating to labor and the revolution of 1954 as they happened.

"To my knowledge, there was no pressure on the reporters or editors to slant the news," Ewing said.

Correspondence from Allen to Farrington in Washington however, reveals that some criticism was directed at Allen by various members of the board of directors over its labor coverage. At a 1943 board meeting, one director criticized the handling of a news story saying that a report of CIO representatives' demands for an upward revision in plantation wages played into the hands of labor unions. And Alan Davis, who was then the president of C. Brewer in 1948, accused Farrington and Allen of not actively taking the side of management in its struggle against labor.

Perhaps one of the best summaries of the relations between the Star-Bulletin and organized labor as well as the Island's mixed population has been provided by Lawrence Fuchs. In a chapter entitled "Politics of Democracy" Fuchs describes Farrington as one of the three major Republican leaders during the war years, the other two being Samuel W. King and Lawyer Roy Vitousek.

A capable legislative leader, Vitousek usually spoke for the more conservative faction of the G.O.P. while Farrington sought to encourage friendlier relations with labor and identify the Republican party with the campaign for statehood.
Fuchs also states that Farrington and his Star-Bulletin editor Riley Allen realized that political success in Hawaii would depend upon organized labor and the Island's non-haole groups who comprised the backbone of the "Revolution of 1954."

As delegate, Farrington kept in close touch with Japanese boys at the war front, expediting furloughs and obtaining other favors. He called for the repeal of all Chinese exclusion acts, although there was no demand for Chinese immigration from the sugar planters, and he favored legislation extending naturalization rights to Oriental aliens. The columns of his newspaper were friendly to the labor movement, and Farrington consistently received the support of Jack Hall in his campaigns for the delegateship. But his policies met opposition within the Republican party and from the Star-Bulletin's board of directors. 27

Farrington's friendly relations with labor and the other ethnic groups of Hawaii also brought him endorsement from Hall and the ILWU against a Democratic candidate, William Borthwick, who opposed statehood. Support for the Republican was justified on the grounds that the Honolulu Star-Bulletin had been and would continue to be fair to the ILWU.

Not everyone was pleased with the ILWU endorsement of the Republican candidate. According to Mrs. Farrington, after the endorsement was announced, her husband was attacked by the Honolulu Advertiser and others.

Suddenly Joe Farrington became the evil one. He was accused of everything under the sun--big banner headlines in the morning paper welcomed us at breakfast each morning for two months of the campaign. I couldn't eat.

Two headlines I remember in particular: "Joe Stalin--Joe Farrington." and "Ignominious Son of an Illustrious Father." Finally, I just didn't look at the papers at all.

Friends would say, "You shouldn't be like that. Everyone in politics gets a tough hide." But that just isn't so.

I believe that most people in public office are sensitive to news stories about themselves. Most public officials, whether or not you agree with them, are making a sincere effort, doing what they believe to be best for their nation, state, and their constituency.
No matter how much Joe protested that he never had and never would have any deal with the ILWU, the bombarding kept up.

Our friends deserted us. There were only five haole women among my close friends that would step into the house. So how was I to entertain Miss Marlan Martin, vice chairman of the Republican National Committee, the highest official in the party to have visited the Islands at that time, came to Hawaii during her vacation to visit us . . .

Mrs. Farrington went on to say that she conceived the idea of having an interracial luncheon to which she would invite five or more from each group--haoles, Japanese, Chinese, Filipinas, Hawaiians, Koreans, Puerto Ricans.

At that time there were not enough Negroes in the territory to think of them as a racial group, but I did invite two friends I knew.

I went to great lengths to make this luncheon interesting to Miss Martin. I wanted her to go back and tell her friends on the continental United States what a wonderful community we had with all races living in equilibrium and harmony.

That, Joe and I agreed, would be a wonderful way to start spreading the cause of statehood among the women of the nation. Miss Martin had just founded the National Federation of Republican Women of which I was president later. We had 500,000 members and I spent 12 years, while Joe was in Congress, going into all states, organizing the clubs and speaking everywhere on statehood.

Unfortunately, despite his friends in ILWU, neither Farrington nor his paper were able to prevent the first of three major strikes in Hawaii that accompanied the unionization process. In October, 1947, Hawaii's sugar workers went on the most costly and destructive strike in Hawaii's history to that date. Edward Johannessen said the strike cost the people of the territory an estimated $20 million in loss of trade alone.

This was a small amount compared to the strike two years later that lasted for 178 days. Although there were only 2,000 longshoremen involved, its effects touched the lives of every resident of the Islands
and many on the mainland. The strike also had a significant effect on
the advertising revenue and the reputation of the Star-Bulletin for its
courage.

In the following months and years, the Star-Bulletin would receive
other mixed reactions for its coverage and editorializing on the labor
scene.

Notwithstanding the generally favorable comments concerning coverage
of the labor movement there is at least one area where the paper had been
criticized for its lack of reporting and support in the postwar era.

John A. Burns in a taped interview for the Department of American Studies
at the University of Hawaii said that Hawaii's major newspapers were
always voices of the hegemony from 1900 until 1954. Burns also charged
that the two newspapers never supported the Revolution of 1954 which
helped to change the economic, social and political paths of Hawaii. He
also charged that the two newspapers never gave Burns any personal
coverage until he came to power as a delegate to Congress and later as
a three term governor.

Although there are elements of truth in Burns's charges, the
accusations do not fully take into account the differences between the
establishment oriented Advertiser and the more progressive Star-Bulletin.
Nor does Burns fully acknowledge the efforts or leadership of the Star-
Bulletin in helping prepare the way for the Revolution which Burns was
leading through the newspaper's long crusade for statehood and related
concerns in education, labor and social change. Burns is correct,
however, in his contention that neither he nor his movement received the
attention it deserved.
A. A. Smyser suggests that one reason for the lack of Star-Bulletin emphasis on the grass roots revolution taking place after the war was because the Star-Bulletin underestimated its broad appeal and dedication and commitment of Burns and his small group of leaders to the cause. Another reason was because of the Star-Bulletin's preoccupation with leading the statehood movement in Hawaii and in Washington. After a brief period of nearly seeing the statehood goal accomplished, matters were to change suddenly in January 1948.
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CHAPTER XV

DEFLECTING THE CHARGES OF COMMUNISM IN HAWAII AND WASHINGTON

April 1948 to February 1953

... but more important than that, Joe Farrington had not done badly as a delegate to Congress, and his popularity among levels of Island society was tremendous. And more than anything else, he had the appearance of being always friendly and easy to approach. Needless to say, Jack Burns was soundly beaten.

Sam Amalu

Some of the most serious and damaging delays to statehood began in January, 1948, with the start in Honolulu of the fifth series of Congressional hearings.

Joseph Farrington began cultivating a friendship with Senator Guy Cordon of Oregon, who served as chairman of the subcommittee on territories and insular affairs. Writing to Allen shortly after the hearings in Honolulu, Farrington described the "extraordinary opportunity" he had to get acquainted with Cordon on the return air trip to Washington.

I am confident that if he [Cordon] comes to the conclusion that action should be taken now to admit Hawaii to the union as a state--and I am very very hopeful it will--he will be a most effective advocate on the floor.

I hope my expectations as to the result of his deliberations prove to be correct--for if they are not, I do not see much hope for victory.¹

Despite assistance from Cordon who recommended passage of a statehood bill, Farrington's hopes were not realized that year or during his lifetime. Although Cordon's subcommittee recommended passage of the bill, it did not get past the full committee headed by Hugh Butler
of Nebraska, who served as the biggest obstacle to Hawaii's statehood chances for the following five years.

Even before the 1948 hearings, Butler had let it be known that he would not let the bill passed by the House pass the Senate until, "[accused communist] Harry Bridges stops running the government of Hawaii and Alaska." Unfortunately for Hawaii, ILWU leader Bridges was under indictment for having lied about his earliest communist affiliations; and Butler used this and other related charges about communism as a means to halt the statehood drive. According to Charles Hunter, Butler "professed to see a communist under every pineapple." 

Correspondence between Farrington and Allen reveals that at least some of the information used by Butler was provided him by sources in the Hawaiian Islands. In a May 24, 1947 letter to Allen, Farrington refers to "information from Col. McClellan to Butler."

"I was also informed confidentially that Kamokila Campbell has sent a radiogram to Senator Butler 'confidentially' asking him to use his influence to delay consideration of statehood in Hawaii," he wrote Allen.

The letter indicates that Farrington also misjudged the strength of statehood opposition both in Hawaii and on the Mainland.

"I do not think any of these influences will operate to prevent the Republican leadership from carrying out assurances they have given me that the measure will be brought to the floor." 

Among those testifying at the 1948 Butler-Guy Cordon hearings were Riley Allen and Urban Allen, an associate editor of the Star-Bulletin.

In his testimony, Urban Allen described his efforts, and those of other
Star-Bulletin reporters and staff members, who had encouraged statehood through resolutions with national organizations. Allen testified how he had been instrumental in getting a statehood plank in the national Junior Chamber of Commerce convention in Milwaukee in 1946. Another journalist and admirer of Joseph Farrington, Eileen O'Brien, testified that she had carried out a similar role with the Zonta international woman's organization.

In a later interview Mrs. O'Brien explained how she and her husband--both Democrats--had supported Farrington primarily "because of his leadership in the fight for statehood." Another Democrat who testified on behalf of statehood at the 1948 hearings was Spark M. Matsunaga, a former member of the 100th battalion and later a member of the House of Representatives (1963-1976). At the request of Farrington, Matsunaga testified before the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee in Washington in May, 1951.

In a letter to the author describing the role of the Star-Bulletin in formulating public opinion favorable to Hawaiian statehood, Matsunaga referred to a front page banner headline story entitled "Tears in the Senate Chamber," telling how he (Matsunaga) moved the committee members to tears with his appealing testimony.

Matsunaga also told how, after being summoned by Farrington to Washington from his law classes at Harvard, he had been instrumental in preventing State Minority Leader Lodge from circulating a "Dear Colleague letter" in opposition to statehood. The Star-Bulletin, Matsunaga said, played "a major role" in the statehood movement.
Some of the best testimony on the statehood issue, however, was delivered by editor Riley Allen. In a semi-humorous vein, Allen described those who opposed statehood and in so doing pointed again to the view that communism, though real enough, was "a front for other arguments."

My observation is that opponents of statehood are chiefly in the following categories:

1. Those who are getting along comfortably under the Territorial form of government; are apathetic about civic duties and have no ardent desire and determination to support the democratic processes of government. They are the beneficiaries of the status quo.

2. Those who apprehend that more power will be given to the people and who fear that some of their own influence and standing may be impaired. Some of them honestly feel that the people need the guidance of an enlightened and supposedly altruistic group of leaders, and that the people as a whole are not to be trusted with the direction of government. They are the apostles of plutocracy and paternalism.

3. Those who are moved by race prejudice and who do not wholeheartedly subscribe to the American Constitution and the Bill of Rights. They are the reservationists.

4. Those who sincerely and uneasily apprehend that somehow communism will be more sinister, more powerful, gain a stronger hold on government, under statehood than under the Territory. They are the victims of ideological nightmares, for it has never yet been explained why a State is more vulnerable to communism than is a Territory.

5. Those who are using one alleged reason after another (as, for instance, first the distrust of Americans of Japanese ancestry; next, the infiltration of communism) as an excuse for postponing statehood indefinitely. They say, "Yes, I am for statehood--eventually." These are the eventualists.

All of them together, in my opinion, constitute only a small minority of the citizens and voters of Hawaii.9

Dedmon concluded that Allen, in this passage, put his finger on the opposition's technique of using the best argument at the time to avoid expressing a far less palatable one.10

In addition to carrying out the statehood fight in Washington and in Hawaii, Joseph Farrington, like all other elected officials, had to concentrate on keeping his congressional seat. Although he had had little difficulty in getting re-elected in the past, the return of the thousands
of nisei veterans, and the growth and vitality of the Democratic Party in Hawaii, caused concern for him and his supporters. In 1948 John A. Burns, the head of the Democratic Party in Hawaii, decided to challenge Farrington for the top post.

According to Samuel Amalu:

There was absolutely no way that Jack Burns could have beaten Joe Farrington, and it is public knowledge that Jack did not expect to win or even to come close to winning. Joe came from one of Hawaii's most prominent families. His father had been the Territorial Governor of Hawaii under the administrations of both Harding and Coolidge. A somewhat pompous and dandified person, he was, nevertheless, an extremely popular governor—if not with the people, then at least with the powers that be. He had been, moreover, one of the founders of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, the largest newspaper in the Islands. Joe himself was in control of that newspaper. But more important than that, Joe had not done badly as Delegate to Congress, and his popularity among levels of Island society was tremendous. And more than anything else, he had the appearance of being always friendly and easy to approach. Needless to say, Jack Burns was soundly beaten.11

Notwithstanding Farrington's immense popularity at the polls and in Washington, neither he nor the Star-Bulletin had a friendly relationship with the Territory's Democratic Governor Ingram M. Stainback. A former attorney and U.S. Judge, Stainback had been appointed Hawaii's ninth governor by Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1942 and reappointed by Truman in 1946. In contrast to his courageous opposition to military rule during World War II, during his second term Stainback became preoccupied with a crusade against communism. Fuchs described the post-war Democrat as "against military law, for land reform and mildly sympathetic to labor. Otherwise he was generally conservative."12

Stainback's administration, which Fuchs says was "top heavy with elite business representatives," brought him in constant conflict with Allen's editorial stands, with the statehood strategy of Farrington,
and with Star-Bulletin reporters on the beat. One memorandum from political writer Bud Smyser in 1949 complained about the number of press releases from the Governor's office being released on opposition time. Another time, Smyser jokingly commented to Allen: "I must be doing something wrong. Stainback complimented me for a story today."

In Washington, where Bill Ewing had been assigned to cover the statehood beat in 1948, controversy developed over a story that an Interior Department official had stated that Stainback would not be reappointed. A heated exchange of letters passed between Allen and Ewing before Farrington finally stepped into the dispute. Correspondence shows that Allen requested Ewing to obtain an affidavit of remarks published in the Star-Bulletin "in case" of any possible libel suit from the angry governor. Ewing refused in a curt letter, arguing that the editor's request was "uncalled for and unreasonable" as well as an insult to his professional integrity.13

In a March 12 letter, Farrington stepped into the middle of the dispute. His feeling was that not only Allen's request, but Ewing's reply were "quite unnecessary."

I see nothing in this incident nor the current attacks of the Advertiser to cause the Star-Bulletin to desist from pursuing a course that will inform the people of Hawaii of the attitudes and activities of the governor that are so patently calculated to encourage the deferment of favorable action to statehood.14

In a later letter, Farrington wrote

I believe it inadvisable for the present to undertake editorially to oppose the reappointment of Governor Stainback as suggested by Bud Smyser, despite the current attempts of the Advertiser to misrepresent the Star-Bulletin's position."

The plain truth of the matter is that the Advertiser's support of Governor Stainback does not exist as much from the desire to see him continue in office as it does from opposition to
the Star-Bulletin. And, of course, it finds it convenient to express the latter in criticism of myself.

Farrington also suggested that the Star-Bulletin had been instrumental in thwarting Stainback's attempts for reappointment made after Stainback made a trip to Washington in 1950.

I think our procedure thus far has been completely successful as the Governor is returning to Honolulu without any commitment whatsoever from the Interior Department. I can tell you confidentially that he was unsuccessful in his efforts to see the President, and his attempts to enlist the support of other members of the cabinet in his campaign only fortified Secretary Chapman's determination not to depart from his original decision on the Governor's reappointment.15

Farrington concluded by asking Allen to compile a record of the Advertiser's past critical comments on Stainback, and particularly a statement made by Lorrin Thurston at the time of Stainback's original appointment. "I don't suggest that it be used at this time," Farrington warned.

It might be used later, however, to show that they only reversed their attitude on Stainback when the Star-Bulletin ceased to support him. I believe that the Star-Bulletin should continue to adhere to the policy of reporting accurately the development in this situation as it has in the past. This will show that the principal source of opposition continues to come from the Democrats themselves.16

One amusing anecdote of the Star-Bulletin's feud with Stainback is contained in a letter from Farrington dated July 5, 1949, containing a clipping headlined "Farrington and Stainback Support Settlement Plan Proposed by Strike Board."

For a long time now the news staff has made a policy of giving my name priority in almost every story in which it appears with that of some other official.

I realize this is done in relationship to the Governor because of the news staff's dislike of him.

I think this is very wrong from the standpoint of news policy; that is, it is neither correct or objective. I request that it be discontinued.
Of course, the limit was reached when headlines reported "Farrington and Truman confer."17

From his office in Washington, Farrington expressed special concern to his Honolulu editor that candidates elected to the constitutional convention should be in favor of statehood.

I think that before the time for filing nomination papers for the Constitutional Convention primary election comes on the night of January 21, 1950, a careful survey be made of the candidates in the field by way of making sure that we have strong friends and supporters of our point of view as candidates in every district.

This is particularly important in those districts where some individuals are standing for election who may prove to be hostile. I think in these areas it be particularly important that we have candidates who can win.

Certainly we don't want to let people who are unfriendly walk in without any contest. And the best basis upon which to have this contest is to have someone else in the field who can do a real job.

I think the strategy to follow in this election is to see that we have people in every district who will protect the following that we normally command.

I think this without any special editorial support will do the job.18

The people of Hawaii approved a new state constitution by a vote of 83,154 to 27,260 in the general election on November 7, 1950. This plus the heavy losses suffered by Hawaiian soldiers in the Korean action were cited by Farrington as compelling reasons for statehood. In a statement released to the Star-Bulletin November 27, 1950, Farrington contended that the admission of Hawaii as a state at this time would greatly enhance the position of the U.S. in the Pacific and in its war on communism.

In a statement urging the Senate to take favorable action on H.R. 49, the Hawaii statehood bill, in the final weeks of the Congress,
Farrington noted casualties of Hawaii's sons had at that time reached 425—or about five times the ratio of casualties of the country as a whole. "If the losses for the entire country were at the same rate as those for Hawaii, they would be close to 150,000 instead of 29,996," he said.\(^{19}\)

Farrington also emphasized Hawaii's war record in both World War II and the Korean conflict in hearings held before Rep. John Saylor's subcommittee on territories and insular possessions in Washington February, 1953. It was one of the most comprehensive of any testimonies ever presented to the Congress on statehood. Dedmond noted that Farrington had "summarized the summaries."\(^{20}\) In his testimony Farrington presented a statistical record of congressional investigations on the subject, a summary of their conclusions, excerpts from national party planks on statehood, a collection of Supreme Court rulings, a compilation of statistics in Hawaii's economy, figures on the area of the territory, a breakdown of extraterritorial and county elections, a brief history on the evolution of Hawaii's constitutional monarchy, a record of polls, and press excerpts.\(^{21}\)

Mrs. Elizabeth Farrington was later to state that such extensive work in attempting to remove the spectre of communism from the Hawaiian Islands was a contributing factor to her husband's death.\(^{22}\)
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CHAPTER XVI
FRUSTRATION AND DEATH IN THE STATEHOOD MOVEMENT
February 1953 to June 19, 1954

How much more time do we Americans think we have?

Rep. Joseph Farrington
conversation with Rep. Walter H. Judd
United States House of Representatives
June, 1954

The last months of Joseph Farrington's life were among the most disappointing and frustrating in his career. In the opinion of his wife¹ and other close associates in Hawaii² and Washington³ the growing complexities and discouragement of additional defeats in the statehood struggle, along with the concern for his expanding newspaper business, undoubtedly contributed to the stress of an already weakened heart.

In Honolulu, the Star-Bulletin continued to grow in circulation, advertising lineage and influence throughout the Hawaiian Islands. Audit Bureau of Circulation figures show that between 1950 and 1958 the Star-Bulletin gained advertising lineage at four times the rate of the Advertiser. By 1958 the Advertiser was down to only 37 percent of the total advertising appearing in the two newspapers and to only 32 percent of the total circulation.⁴ The Star-Bulletin circulation, which grew from 75,000 to 97,000, nearly doubled the Advertiser circulation which had grown from 44,000 to 47,000. By 1961 the Star-Bulletin was at the top in all categories. In only one other market in America where two independent newspapers then existed, was the second so far behind the first.⁵
But in Washington, matters were not so bright for Farrington, who was now witnessing the debate on Hawaii statehood drift from orderly discussion of issues to complicated wordy, repetitious arguments on issues only indirectly connected to the primary question. In a study of 75 different debates in Congress, Donald N. Dedmon concludes that in contrast to the rational statehood debate in the previous years, the prime motivating issue of the period from 1953-58 was political.

In addition to the continual strain of the statehood fight in Washington, Farrington found himself involved in two election campaigns: his own for a fifth term in Congress, and a futile effort to help his political ally, Robert A. Taft, win the presidential nomination. Once elected to office, Farrington found himself being second-guessed both in Washington and in Hawaii concerning statehood strategy and seriously challenged for his Congressional spot. To add to his emotional concerns, two of his close associates died shortly before his own death. They were Taft and Boyden Sparks, who was writing a biography of Wallace Farrington. Thus it was that the story of the Farringtons' drive for statehood would never be told as planned.

A puzzle to students is Joseph Farrington's support of the so-called "conservative" faction of the Republican party over the "liberal" Eisenhower group before and after the 1952 presidential primary. To some this appears to be inconsistent in light of Farrington's long progressive or liberal stance, which at times alienated him from the controlling oligarchy in Hawaii and won him endorsement from the left-leaning ILWU. Nevertheless Farrington enthusiastically supported Robert A. Taft, both in local and national politics and through the pages of his
newspaper, despite the fact that the Eisenhower bandwagon had enough votes to capture the Republican nomination on the first ballot at the Chicago convention in July, 1952.

Samuel P. King, son of the Territory's eleventh governor, explained why both his father and Joseph Farrington had supported Taft in the face of the Eisenhower movement of the early 1950s.

It was simple. Even if Eisenhower got elected President, Senator Taft would still be in Congress and Taft controlled the U.S. Senate. Both Farrington and my father knew that if statehood was to become a reality, it would have to go through Congress. Eisenhower had already endorsed statehood. He would go along with whatever the Congress wanted. But statehood still had to get through the Senate and Taft was the key man there. King says that the approach was the same that Farrington and his father had used in supporting U.S. House Speaker Joseph Martin in some of Martin's losing political causes.

Judge King's assessment is not his view alone. James MacGregor Burns, in The Deadlock of Democracy: Four Party Politics in America, describes in detail the division of Congress into Presidential (strong) and Congressional (consensus) coalition parties. This contributes to a lack of popular control over politics. The splintered wings, according to Burns, have actually set up barriers because the people and their national government, instead of simplifying the alternatives, clarifying competing party doctrines, and allowing the victorious majority to govern. They have also permitted powerful factions to reign in Congress.

In a chapter detailing the Eisenhower-Taft dispute, Burns noted that Taft was "clearly and indisputably the boss of Congress" by the time of the new President's inauguration January 20, 1953.
While Eisenhower was busy constructing his administration during the pre-Inauguration weeks, Taft had been busy constructing his. The Senator's group, indeed, seemed more unified over policy than the President's. Eisenhower, trying to placate independents and regulars, Dewey men and Taft men, liberals and conservatives, had come up with a cabinet that cut across the party spectrum. The General had no influence over Taft's arrangements in Congress, but the Senator was an unseen presence in Eisenhower's Cabinet Building.\textsuperscript{11}

Farrington's influence on the new Eisenhower administration, through Robert Taft, are evidence in the events which led to the dumping of Randolph Crossley in his try for appointment as eleventh governor of the territory. A. A. Smyser, who was city editor of the \textit{Star-Bulletin} in 1953, said that Eisenhower had informed Crossley that he would be named as the territory's governor. Eisenhower had even planned to make the announcement of Crossley's replacement of Oren Long when Eisenhower stopped over in Hawaii on his way back to Washington from Korea, where he had fulfilled an election promise.\textsuperscript{12} Crossley asked, however, that the announcement be made from Washington, preferably by Farrington, in the hope of helping to patch up the political feud which had been festering in the islands since before the 1952 primary.

Before the announcement could be made, however, the Taft forces engaged in a furious barrage of letters and other propaganda in support of part-Hawaiian Samuel Wilder King.\textsuperscript{13} Even though King had written to Taft as early as January 2 stating that he did not think he could win the nomination, Eisenhower changed his mind in favor of King.

In a letter to the author June 20, 1976 the following account of the role of Joseph Farrington in the appointment of Samuel King as governor is related by Mrs. Elizabeth Farrington:

\begin{quote}
First of all, everyone knew [Eisenhower] could be nominated, either on the Republican or Democratic ticket. King was a
sophisticated politician. Furthermore, Eisenhower did not correspond about his possible nomination beforehand. Instead Henry Cabot Lodge represented him in all decisions and correspondence because Eisenhower was still in the military, head of what is now NATO in Europe, and could not participate.

Taft did not turn the nomination to King for "his good friend, Farrington." Instead, Joe and the five leading Republicans of the Senate went up to see Eisenhower in his offices at the Commodore Hotel in New York. Eisenhower had been elected but not yet inaugurated. It was the week between Christmas 1952 and New Year's 1953.

The senators were incensed to learn that Eisenhower had not told anyone (including Randolph Crossley) that he would appoint him to anything. When an appointment needed Senate confirmation it is always customary for the President to consult the Senate Republican leadership before submitting a name. Eisenhower was very ignorant about politics and the protocol of the Senate. When he was told, he realized his mistake and apologized to the Senators and to Joe Farrington, whose patronage the governorship was. The President also learned that the President consults the Republicans in the Congress about all appointments in their districts. This he had not done.

Then Joe and the Senators gave Eisenhower their reasons why they preferred King. The senators had served with him in Congress for eight years and had faith in his ability and recognized the value of that experience. Furthermore, he was part-Hawaiian which they thought an advantage.

Joe told Eisenhower he had no objection to Randolph Crossley as a fine young man but felt he had time and could be governor later. Now we wanted and needed King who was much Crossley's senior. So Eisenhower changed. He had to to get the confirmation. The Senators would not have accepted an appointment if Eisenhower had gone over their heads, as it were, because if he did it in one case, he would do it in other more important appointments.14

A letter to the newly appointed governor's secretary on May 8, 1953, from Hawaii's Secretary of State, also demonstrated the influence of the Star-Bulletin publisher in that appointment. "Without Joe's and your help, I would probably still be sweating it out at Lewers and Cooke," wrote Farrant L. Turner.15

With his own re-election16 and the controversial appointment of Sam King out of the way, Farrington was able to more fully concentrate on the hearings and complex political strategy which resulted in the
passage of the third statehood bill in the U.S. House of Representatives on March 10, 1953.

A March 11 radiophone summary from Farrington to Governor King in Honolulu tells the strategy that Farrington used in the battle to obtain passage of the bill in the House of Representatives. The strategy involved calling upon Republican members who were actually opposed to vote against a bill to recommit but permit them to vote against the bill on final passage.

"By this strategy," Farrington said, "the Republican leadership was able to enlist additional support against the motion to recommit and to defeat the political strategy of the Democrat leadership." 17

Farrington received support from Democratic southern representatives, particularly those from Louisiana and Texas. In reply to a letter Farrington wrote to him thanking him for assistance in the Hawaii statehood fight, Rep. Henry Larcade of Louisiana noted his pride that all of the delegation from Louisiana voted for Hawaiian statehood except one member. "This is all the more pleasing in view of the fact that there is no other state in the union which voted 7 to 1 for the bill," 18 Larcade wrote. Despite the death of Robert Taft, Rep. Larcade said that his appraisal of the Senate led him to believe that Farrington had the necessary votes to pass the bill there. Larcade continued:

"When Senator Long of Louisiana was first elected to the Senate he promised me faithfully that he would vote for statehood for Hawaii; and since I was one of those in the Louisiana Senate who took a leading fight and voted against, and saved his father from impeachment as Governor of Louisiana, I feel certain that he will keep his promise."
As for statehood foe Allan Ellender, Larcade described the Louisiana Democrat as "hopeless." However, Larcade also advised Farrington to have his friendly senators keep telling Ellender that "there is a great majority of votes for the bill, and knowing him as I do, it is my opinion that he will not be so vociferous and active." 19

One Southern Senator who continued to fight statehood through the seniority system and on the floor of the Senate was Democratic Senator James O. Eastland of Mississippi. During hearings in Washington in April, 1953, Eastland once again brought up the old charges that Hawaii was "communistic" and if granted statehood "would send two representatives from Moscow to Washington."

Indignant and outraged after fighting such charges since the end of World War II in editorials and letters throughout the country, the Star-Bulletin replied April 17, 1953 with one of the most famous answers to a political accusation in American journalistic history.

All issues of the Star-Bulletin that day carried an eight column headline three columns deep stating: "Eastland calls Hawaii a Communist Community; These died (348) or were wounded (902) fighting communism."

The entire front page of the issue and nearly two inside pages were devoted entirely to listing the names of the dead and the wounded. In the Korean War, as in the Second World War, the Hawaiian Islands had the highest percentage of any state of men killed, wounded and serving in the armed forces. The list of names was forceful testimony to the false charges of disloyalty made by Eastland and others.

Senator Eastland had no reply to the Star-Bulletin feature, which was picked up by the wire services and other newspapers across the country.
The name of a Louisiana Senator helpful to the Hawaii statehood cause—Russell Long—was to come up again in connection with an issue which caused Farrington great disappointment and resulted in a sharp strain on his friendship with Governor King. In the spring of 1953, following passage by the House of the Statehood bill, King took it upon himself to organize a lobbying effort of the entire state legislature in Washington. Farrington advised against it and did all he could to prevent what he described as "a monstrous junket."

Farrington's efforts were unsuccessful, however, and the large Hawaii delegation traveled to Washington, where its members proceeded to try to corner all the legislators they could in spite of the concern and embarrassment of Farrington.

Both the Honolulu Advertiser and the Honolulu Record viewed the situation with some amusement, and ILWU public relations commentator, Robert McElrath, used the incident as an example of Farrington's loss of influence both at home and in the nation's capitol. The Honolulu Record in a front page news story, described the details of the incident in Washington in biting words. An exchange of letters between Farrington and Star-Bulletin publisher Porter Dickinson June 6 also discussed the incident; Dickinson referred to a conversation with "young" Sam King and concern over the "rift between his father and you."

A June 12 letter from Farrington stated in no uncertain terms his feelings about the governor's efforts to attempt to provide statehood leadership in Washington from a vantage point in the Hawaiian Islands. Said Farrington:

I certainly intend to cooperate with the governor as a public official so long as I feel it is sound, but certainly am not
going to support him in the kind of performance that brought about that recent junket to Washington.20

The incident was an embarrassing one for the State. Were it not for the office of Senator Long, the Hawaii delegation would not have received any assistance, according to the Honolulu Record, because Farrington was not helping in Washington.

Shortly before his death, Farrington expressed his feelings in a letter to Riley Allen following the April 1 passage of a combined Hawaii-Alaska statehood bill by a 57-28 vote in the Senate. The ongoing feud with the Advertiser, as well as a number of business and political problems, were discussed. Farrington reiterated his feelings of frustration and responsibility in the statehood movement.

I disagree entirely with the Advertiser when it states that the entire problem lies in the laps of the state legislators.

The responsibility is the office of the delegate to Congress, and I accept the responsibility.21

Farrington also predicted the length of the statehood struggle and referred indirectly to his rift with King and others who wanted to call the shots from back home.

It would be nice to have this issue settled promptly, but I am afraid it will not. There may be another period of considerable delay. In this event, I certainly hope that those at home who are more concerned with the influence that these developments may have on their own political future rather than on the outcome of the fight itself will not be permitted to confuse the situation and thus add to the difficulties we already face.22

Farrington's continued commitment but increasing discouragement are evident in a number of other letters exchanged with Allen during the last six months of his life. Of particular sadness to him was the death on May 18 of well-known magazine and book writer Boyden Sparks, who had been researching and writing a book on Wallace Farrington and the statehood movement for more than two years,
The 221-page manuscript was to have told Hawaii's story to the world and served as another major public relations effort for statehood. Riley Allen was sent to South Carolina to recover the manuscript, and to New York where he talked to the publishing company about completing it. But the effort was futile, and the unpublished manuscript remains today in the Hawaii State Archives.

In mid June of 1954, the combined Hawaii-Alaska statehood bill was referred to the House of Representatives as a new measure, entirely different from the Hawaii statehood bill passed by the house in April. Before it could be returned to the House for a vote it required a special rule to allow it to be reported out of committee. The task of getting his fellow House members to vote for the rule was not an easy one, and Farrington expressed his concern to his close friend, Rep. Walter Judd of Minnesota, one week before his death. "How much more time do we Americans think we have?" Farrington asked. Judd later recalled some of Farrington's last comments.

That is as near as I ever recall hearing him say a word of frustration at the many and long delays. It was not a personal frustration. He trembled for his country as he saw it fiddling while Rome burned. Which way are the two thirds of the people of the world who are not Caucasians to go?

He knew that Hawaii is one of the focal spots where that question will be answered. He knew that his duty was far more than to get statehood for this one group of Islands.

That effort was only a part of his loyal, thoroughgoing Americanism; his duty to his country; his concern for the survival of the civilization of which he and you and I are trustees. He was motivated by his vision of the total struggle, not just his proper concern to get a change of status for the people who had elected him to serve their interests.23

Mrs. Farrington remembers both the frustration and happiness of her husband's last days.
I do remember the frustration of his last days. He was happy when he said goodbye and I went to Kansas because of the expected birth of a new grandchild. But Joe had also received word from President Eisenhower that if he could line up two more votes in the Senate that Eisenhower would see that the statehood bill was reported out of the House Rules Committee when it next came up on June 21, 1954. When I left Washington for Kansas, Joe had gotten seven votes, five more than required, in the Senate and had so informed the President.

While in Leavenworth, Kansas, Joe telephoned me every day. On Friday, June 18, he was discouraged because he told me he had asked Joseph Martin, the Speaker of the House, to check the Republican members of the Rules Committee (there were eight of them and four Democrats). If Joe Martin had called the members it would have been tantamount to an order. But instead Joe Martin told Joe to call the members himself. Then Joe said he knew he was licked.

Saturday I spent the whole day in heat of 105 degrees shopping for the new baby. When I returned to my room I started to call Joe but thought I had better wait.

That was on Saturday, June 19, 1954. That morning, Margaret Turner told me, Joe had come in to the office happier than usual. In saying good morning he had said to all the girls, 'Oh, what a beautiful morning, just like a day in Hawaii. At noon you girls take the day off--it's too beautiful to stay inside--but I'll stay, you can't help me. I have to contact each member of the Rules Committee because of the meeting on Monday.'

So at noon the girls took off. Joe had spent the morning walking those blocks and blocks of marble corridors from one distant office to another to make sure of those votes.

Finally, about 2:30 p.m., he had tracked down every man but one--Clarence Brown of Ohio. He decided to walk back to his own office and call him from there.

On the way he passed the House restaurant, which was closing.

'I guess it's too late for me?' he asked Mrs. Ridgeway, the manager. 'Never for you, Mr. Farrington,' she said. So he had a light lunch of fruit salad and tea, went back to his office, called Clarence Brown, then decided to rest on the couch in his office instead of going home.

He had to go later to a party being given for people from Hawaii. There he would meet Harold and Ann Kay and a few others and take them to dinner.
But Joe never got from his desk to the couch. So nothing happened at the Rules Committee Monday because the Congress and the nation were in official mourning for Joe Farrington.24
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CHAPTER XVII

STATEHOOD CONTRIBUTIONS BY DELEGATE ELIZABETH FARRINGTON

June 19, 1954 to November, 1956

So, whatever happens, whether Statehood comes to Hawaii now in these next 60 days, or whether it takes a little longer, statehood for Hawaii will be the enduring monument of the Farringtons—and I put them both together for this final crown of their lives and of their country's ambitions.

Memorial Address to Joseph R. Farrington
U.S. House of Representatives
June 21, 1954

The Star-Bulletin was unable to report the death of its popular publisher for two days. Farrington's body was not discovered until late Saturday afternoon, after the Star-Bulletin had gone to press, and the paper did not publish again until the following Monday. Ironically the opposition Advertiser published the first news of the death of the well-loved publisher.

In the meantime, however, the press of the nation, and Farrington's colleagues in Washington and the Hawaiian Islands, joined together in expressions of shock and praise for the fight he had been waging for so many years. Although tributes to the dead are not the best historical evidence, they nevertheless provide some clue to Joseph Farrington's wide popularity and influence across the nation as well as the American mood which contributed to the blocking of Hawaii statehood bills.

Farrington's death, which coincided to the day with the suicide of Senator Lester C. Hunt of Wyoming, brought tributes from the nation's two largest wire service executives, Hugh Baillie of the United Press
and Frank Starzel of the Associated Press, as well as A. H. Sulzburger, publisher of the New York Times. Doris Fleeson, a nationally-syndicated columnist writing about the deaths of "two of the loveliest and best leaders," said that Joe Farrington had died of a heart attack while still struggling "to pierce the cynical inertia which thwarted his devoted efforts to win statehood for his people." 1

In the same column, Mrs. Fleeson also made reference to the "McCarthy atmosphere" in American politics and the nation's capitol at the time of Farrington's death and which contributed to that of Senator Hunt. It was an "Indian Charlie" Congress, Mrs. Fleeson stated, using a reference made by Wisconsin Senator Joseph McCarthy to Assistant Secretary of Defense Struve Hensen. According to Mrs. Fleeson the McCarthy maxim was that "if one was ever approached by another person in not a completely friendly fashion, one should start kicking at the other person as fast as possible below the belt until the other person was rendered helpless."

Mrs. Fleeson said Hunt had feared such tactics would be used against him and his family and withdrew from the forthcoming election. The Friday before Hunt died in the Senate office building, McCarthy had threatened an "unnamed Democrat." He said he had no proof but was looking for something.

Mrs. Fleeson also took to task the apathetic Congress which she said had "given lip service to Farrington's ideals and wallowed in his wonderful hospitality" while frustrating his valiant efforts for statehood. "There are, of course, always reasons why the often-made pledges of statehood made by both parties and recent presidents are not said to be attainable," she charged. "The politicians select reasons
according to their party. But somehow in the end, nobody gets through on the issue.

It was a cruel disappointment to Joe Farrington that, in two sessions of the Republican congress, which have not exactly been crowded with achievement, nobody was willing to fight the statehood issue through to a conclusion.\textsuperscript{2}

In a front page story, \textit{Star-Bulletin} Washington correspondent Frank Hewlet wrote that doctors had advised Farrington he was "living on borrowed time" after a serious heart attack fourteen years before, Farrington had already decided not to run for Congress again and wished to return to Honolulu to put his personal affairs in order. The \textit{Star-Bulletin} itself described its former publisher as "a soldier who died at his post, literally dedicating his life to Hawaii, the Pacific and to the advancement of his country along the path of peace and democracy and service to all people."\textsuperscript{3}

The opposition \textit{Advertiser}, which had reluctantly come to endorse statehood after years of opposition, asked for "a strong push toward statehood as a tribute."

According to Mrs. Elizabeth Farrington it was not until after the death of her husband that the \textit{Advertiser} became enthusiastic about the statehood cause. "To everyone's surprise, \textit{Advertiser} publisher Lorrin Thurston became chairman of the Statehood commission after he had done absolutely nothing but talk and fight against it."

In a letter to the author June 19, 1976 Mrs. Farrington said the earlier opposition to statehood had been inspired by Walter Dillingham, a major financial backer of the \textit{Advertiser}.

I don't know if Walter Dillingham's name ever appeared as holding the majority stock. He was too clever for that, but he bailed the \textit{Advertiser} out with hundreds of thousands of dollars--saved their building for them once when the depression caught them and many other times.\textsuperscript{4}
Because of Dillingham's help, Mrs. Farrington says, all news stories and editorials were slanted against statehood, particularly after the real statehood drive started in 1934 when her husband first ran for the State Legislature.

A. A. Smyser recalled one editorial appearing in the Advertiser before World War II as saying that Hawaii needed statehood like a cat needs two tails. After World War II the Advertiser entered the stage of active foot dragging in the statehood movement, Smyser said. Publisher Lorrin Thurston was appointed a member of the statehood commission by Governor Ingram Stainback who was equally unenthusiastic over statehood.

Remarks presented in eulogy of Farrington in both the House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate June 21 were full of praise. There were forty-nine eulogies from representatives and senators of both political parties. With few exceptions, all the speakers noted Farrington's background and "persistent" and "effective" work during his twelve years in Congress. According to Speaker of the House Joseph Martin, "When victory comes, and it will come quickly, the name of Joe Farrington will lead all the others as the one chiefly responsible for victory."

Rep. Hoeven of Iowa said that many a vote was cast in the House of Representatives for Hawaiian statehood" because Joe Farrington was the author of the bill." Rep. Jenkins of Ohio stated that a number of the members of Congress were going to vote for statehood "just because of Farrington's popularity." Rep. Dague of Pennsylvania, who had voted against statehood in the past, said he had told Farrington shortly before his death that he was "determined to cast his vote for statehood should the question come up again."
One of the most succinct tributes to the life and work of Joseph Farrington was delivered by J. Garner Anthony, the Star-Bulletin attorney and former attorney general who had fought with the Star-Bulletin for the lifting of press censorship in World War II. In his brief eulogy at Central Union Church the following Saturday, Anthony outlined the life of the "keiki o ka aina" (child of the soil) by summarizing the natural evolution Farrington made from newspaper reporter, to publisher, to political life.

One characteristic of Joe Farrington which finds its counterpart among great Americans of the past was his faith in the good sense of the common people on any public issue. He insisted that if the facts were made clear, the ordinary man would usually reach the right answer.

He recognized the validity of change as a necessary and vital process in our democracy. For this, he was at times criticized by some of his friends, which complaints he received with an outward calm and credited to them a lack of understanding of the problem or the immaturity of his critics.

Anthony concluded with the following:

When a great tree falls, the landscape seems strange. So when a noble man dies, life for us who remain seems strangely vacant but the race must go on to the end. There is no surcease in the struggle for the ideal for any of us until we are gathered to our father's home at the grave of our beloved friends ... 8

As if in response to Anthony's observation that the landscape seems strange after the fall of a great tree, the Star-Bulletin began to undergo major changes which proved to be the most eventful in the history of the publication. The changes coincided with rapid growth and development in the Islands.

According to economic accounts, the five years preceding statehood recorded the most remarkable construction growth in the history of the Islands with values increasing from $97 million to $216 million. Hotels
were built, houses, office buildings for new business firms, and shopping centers to serve growing suburban communities also were built. Much of this building boom was stimulated by military personnel, which from 1950 to 1959 helped skyrocket defense expenditures in the Islands from $147 million to $338 million. Whereas military spending in 1935 amounted to only about 9 percent of Hawaii's earnings from its sugar and pineapple exports, such expenditures at the time of statehood exceeded the total value of all exports from the Islands. Even more startling was the fact that by 1959, roughly one-sixth of Hawaii's population was made up of military personnel and their dependents; nearly one-fourth of Hawaii's people depended directly on defense spending for a living.

Almost as fantastic was the jump in tourism, which boomed beyond the most visionary Star-Bulletin editorials. The number of visitors to Hawaii rose from a little more than 50,000 tourists in 1951 to 300,000 visitors in 1960. During those years the revenues from the tourist trade increased from about $25 million to $110 million, or more than four times. During the nine years before statehood, tourism was the fourth largest source of mainland dollars in Hawaii, exceeded only by the military, sugar, and pineapple, perhaps bringing as much as $350 million to the Islands annually.9

Closely related to the growth in population and in the economy of the Islands was the continuing increase in the circulation of the Star-Bulletin while the number of Advertiser readers remained under 50,000. Recognition must be given to long-time circulation manager Joseph Gomes who helped boost circulation from 12,000 when he first started with the Star-Bulletin to nearly 100,000 before he was replaced by former Hearst
circulation manager, Al Fink. The circulation figure of near 100,000 compares with an Island-wide population of about 500,000. When one notes that an average newspaper may have a readership of about three, this means the Star-Bulletin was reaching approximately three out of every five readers. Additional credit must go to the network of more than a dozen bureau chiefs and correspondents scattered across the Island state and Oahu, who reported on a variety of stories including tidal waves, volcano eruptions and labor strikes, as well as the statehood battle.

Edwin Edwards, a Maine resident who started as a copy editor before being named the territorial and state editor on the same day, recalls that all statehood stories were major news. "There were absolutely no instructions about how to handle the stories," Edwards recalled in an interview, "but everybody just knew."10

Other long-time staffers with the Star-Bulletin included back shop workers Charles Frazier, Arthur Henrickson and Gus Gomes, photographer Amos Chun, the only Chinese-American war correspondent in Hawaii during the war years, and sports editor, Louis Leong Hop. Former city editor Smyser recalls that writers such as Louis, representing the ethnic background of the Islands, were regularly sent to journalism conventions on the mainland whenever possible simply to try and sell the merits of statehood to other American journalists.11

The Star-Bulletin journalist who managed to attract the most attention on the mainland was not from the news staff, however, but from the management ranks.
Elizabeth (Betty) Pruett Farrington replaced her husband in Congress and assumed the leadership role in *Star-Bulletin* management for several years. In an interview in September, 1965, Mrs. Farrington recalled that within hours after receiving word of her husband's death she was approached by a group of Republican officials who politely enquired if she would be willing to run in a special election to succeed her husband in Congress.

Despite her background in Washington as a reporter, national correspondent, wife of a Congressman and a nationally recognized leader of the GOB, Mrs. Farrington turned down the offer at first. "I thought that Hebden Porteus, a state senator, should replace Joe and I told them so." Porteus was not interested, however, and the GOP officials, noting the growth of the Democratic party throughout the territory, felt that the background and name of Betty Farrington would assure them continued control of the seat in Washington. Mrs. Farrington was also anxious to continue the work of her husband, with which she had become intimately familiar through many discussions and visits to her husband's office.12

Mrs. Farrington agreed to run in a special election held July 31, 1954. A close associate of John Burns said Burns had tried to prevent any Democratic opposition to Mrs. Farrington out of sympathy to the widow. For the second straight time within two years, the Democrats nominated federal judge Delbert E. Metzger. He was defeated handily by Mrs. Farrington 43,195 to 19,591.

The background, philosophy, attitudes, professional training and methods Mrs. Farrington used to influence decision makers both in Hawaii and in Washington were somewhat similar to those utilized by her husband
in the statehood movement. An article on the Farrington family in the 1962 Golden Years Edition of the Star-Bulletin states that:

As a political leader in her own right, Mrs. Farrington brought to her new duties the experience gained in her husband's efforts for statehood, and as leader of national Republican women's groups.

After her marriage to Joseph R. Farrington in May 17, 1920, she continued her interest in national and world affairs, particularly in Pan-Pacific relations.

She held a number of important posts in Republican Party circles, including the presidency of the Washington League of Republican Women from 1946 to 1948. She became president of the National Federation of Women's Republican Clubs in 1949.

She held positions in social and civic organizations while in Honolulu, and continued these interests in Washington during her husband's 12 years as Delegate to Congress.

She was selected by McCall's magazine as one of the 10 most influential women in national politics, and by Washington's General Federation of Women's Clubs as one of the 12 leading career women in the nation.13

As a former working journalist and wife of one of the more active and popular Congressmen, Mrs. Farrington recognized the value of social activities and parties as well as the power and prestige of the family newspaper in providing attention for those in the best position to help the statehood cause in Washington and Hawaii. Correspondence between Mrs. Farrington and Riley Allen flowed back and forth on a near daily basis. Allen was kept busy greeting, hosting, and accommodating dozens of newsmen and elected officials along with their relatives and friends around the Islands. In addition, traveling officials received more than ample coverage in the Star-Bulletin as Mrs. Farrington followed up with letters or phone calls to see what play the visitors had been given.

As an example of the follow-up Mrs. Farrington made on her suggestions, she sent a telegram to Allen requesting that Allen or Managing Editor Bill Ewing inform by telephone "what treatment Senator (Wallace)
Bennett of Utah received in the editorial columns of the Saturday, Sunday, Monday and Tuesday Honolulu newspapers.\textsuperscript{14}

Within a few days after the special election victory over Delbert Metzger, Mrs. Farrington met with President Eisenhower to discuss strategy to move the Hawaii statehood bill, which had been merged with the Alaska bill. President Eisenhower had been, and was still, opposed to statehood for Alaska, and it was generally conceded that his stand would be decisive. In an August 8, 1954 letter to Eisenhower summarizing a meeting she had with the President the previous day, Mrs. Farrington pleaded for immediate consideration by the President and action on his part to request leadership in the House of Representatives to appoint a conference committee to reconcile the dispute between the House, which had passed a Hawaii statehood bill in 1953, and the Senate which had merged both Alaska and Hawaii in 1954.\textsuperscript{15}

Unless conferees are named by the House on Monday (August 9), and they meet promptly with the Senate conferees, there will be no possibility of action this session . . . unless action is completed on H.R. 35 before the House adjourns, statehood will have to wait and start anew in the next Congress. In that event it is unlikely that Hawaii will have representatives in the next Congress.\textsuperscript{16}

According to Charles Hunter, while Mrs. Farrington "pleaded" with Eisenhower in person, to support statehood for both territories as the only way to get Hawaii admitted, "the President tended to place the blame on the congressional leaders, who blamed the Democrats, who in turn held the Republicans responsible. But Speaker Joseph W. Martin blamed Sam Rayburn who said he was not leading Congress." Hunter added that while statehood advocates in Congress insisted that they had done all they could, it seemed that the only people really pleased about the statehood bill was a little group of "wily, die-hard senators who contrived its defeat." They numbered hardly more than a dozen, and when
they could not defeat the bill in Congress they had to make it unpalatable to the administration. This they did by attaching Alaska. The pro-Hawaii Democrats, in Hunter's words, "foolishly thought" the President would be forced to accept Alaska to get Hawaii. But the house leaders shielded the President from the unpleasant duty of swallowing Alaska or vetoing a major article of his legislative program. Most observers agreed that the house would have accepted both territories on a free vote. The theme of the nation's press seemed to be that this was "politics in the raw." And the New York Times of October 9, 1954 quoted the President as saying, when listing the major items of his program that remained to be passed, "We must drive through partisan obstructions to achieve statehood for Hawaii..."17

The results of the 1954 elections also did not do much to help the Hawaii statehood cause. In Hawaii, Mrs. Farrington was barely able to defeat John Burns by a vote of 69,466 to 68,576 to return to a Congress where the Democrats now controlled both Houses, as compared to previous GOP control of both houses under President Eisenhower.

In the house, Hunter says, Sam Rayburn, "mortal enemy of statehood," was speaker while H. W. Smith (D-Virginia) headed the all-important Committee on Rules. In the Senate, statehood supporter Guy Cordon had not been reelected; Hugh Butler had died; and in the Democratic Congress, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs would be headed by Senator James E. Murray (D-Montana) who made it evident that Hawaii would not even pass his committee unless accompanied by Alaska. With Hawaii electing a Democratic legislature for the first time in history, it looked to many as if the islands had committed political suicide. A number of the
successful candidates had been endorsed by the ILWU, still purportedly communist-led. A considerable number of the newcomers were Nisei, who were not expected to be too palatable to the Southern element in Congress, now more than ever in possession of the balance of power with a Democratic victory at the polls.

As Congress opened in January, 1955, the same kind of impasse as in the previous Congress was obviously in the making.

Twenty-six senators promptly sponsored a bipartisan Alaska-Hawaii statehood bill and the President's message said Alaska could expect statehood as its complex problems were resolved and that, meanwhile, there was no justification to deny statehood to Hawaii. Committee hearings were started in the house but no witnesses were called from Hawaii. Attention was given to cabinet and other administrative officials, where obviously divided opinions did not help the cause. Secretary of Defense Wilson's letter to Senator Jackson was termed evasive and unsatisfactory by the press in Washington.18

It was during this period that the Hawaii-communist scare was raised again by Rep. John R. Pillion, a Republican of New York. Pillion saw the election of 1954 as a victory for the ILWU and the communists, and said that statehood for Hawaii would be an invitation to two Soviet agents to take seats in the United States Senate. One answer to Pillion was furnished by the San Francisco Chronicle which said, "You hear lots of idiotic things from congressmen."

But Pillion did raise doubts, and while the combined statehood bills were reported out of committee on March 3 by a vote of 19-6, the Committee on Rules was known to be in opposition and Speaker Rayburn was reported as showing "little enthusiasm."

Another answer to Pillion was drafted in part by Riley Allen and used both in the Star-Bulletin and in a newsletter mailed by Mrs. Farnington to all of her colleagues in the House and Senate in May 9, 1955.
One of the most significant contributions made by Mrs. Farrington was her exposure of discrepancies in and legal objections to, a last ditch attempt by opponents of statehood to grant commonwealth status to each of the eligible territories. In short, the advocates of the commonwealth idea claimed that Puerto Rico had been reorganized in such a manner and was enjoying the status of countries much like Canada and Australia in the British Commonwealth.

While Canada and Australia were indeed independent, and entitled as sovereign governments to seats in the United Nations, Puerto Rico's foreign affairs (and many internal matters as well) were still entirely controlled from Washington. It was unthinkable that Hawaii could be regarded internationally as a separate government. In the sense here applied, the word "commonwealth" had little of its British meaning. Moreover, Canada and Australia had wrested freedom from a mother government unable to hold them as subservient colonies. Hawaii and Alaska had no desire to pull away from close bonds with the forty-eight states. They were already classified as "organized incorporated" territories. What they desired was first-class citizenship.

"The Act of Congress incorporating Hawaii as a Territory of the United States," argued Mrs. Farrington, "is irrevocable. Congress, having once extended the Constitution of the U.S. to Hawaii, may not 'de-extend' it." According to the Webbs, Mrs. Farrington's argument was based on a Supreme Court decision which declared:

Congress cannot suspend the operation of the Constitution in any territory after it has come under the sovereign authority of the United States, nor . . . can Congress prevent the Constitution from being the supreme law for any peoples subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.
Mrs. Farrington also took an active part in efforts to obtain a request for immediate statehood for Alaska in the Republican platform. "This is strictly confidential," she wrote Allen July 19, 1956, "but I was told that the Interior Department is preparing the statehood plank, and I asked Fred Seaton to see that it contained a request for immediate statehood for Alaska. I cannot speak for the Interior Department, of course, but Fred told me that it had been cleared with the President."\(^{22}\)

Along with these accomplishments, handled through the Legislative process, Mrs. Farrington worked hard to influence the President of the United States in his appointments—particularly Republican appointments to the Judiciary. Letters between Mrs. Farrington and Governor Sam King describe the efforts exerted by GOP officials in Hawaii to secure the appointment of a Republican friend. In an April 5, 1956 reply to Governor King, Delegate Farrington indicated that his request would probably not be granted. Nevertheless, Mrs. Farrington explained that out of 11 Hawaii appointments made by President Eisenhower, only two were Democrats. In addition, six of the total of eleven were made in a Congress with a Democratic senate, she said.

"I do not think the Republican party of Hawaii is doing too badly. Nor do I think the Democratic senate has been too prejudiced in behalf of their own party."\(^{23}\)

In addition to those accomplishments, Mrs. Farrington had a respectable record of service in other fields. According to the Star-Bulletin, her record of bills was "exceptionally good." The 84th Congress, of which she was a non-voting member, may have passed more legislation affecting Hawaii than any of its predecessors.\(^{24}\)
Most of the Island-related legislation came in bills sponsored by Mrs. Farrington. Her most successful Congressional actions included:

1. Reapportionment of the Territorial Legislature for the first time. It reduced the political power of Neighbor Island residents by increasing the power of Oahu residents through more equitable representation based on population.

2. Confirmation of the nomination of Masaji Marumoto as an associate justice of the Hawaii Supreme Court. He was one of the first Americans of Oriental ancestry to achieve such a judicial rank. The first was Benjamin Tashiro who was named by Eisenhower to a judicial seat on Kauai.

3. The establishment of a new position of post auditor, and of longer terms and higher salaries for Hawaii's judges.

4. Putting the Territory of Hawaii on the same basis as the States for various Federal benefits, including fish and wildlife aid, water pollution and watershed protection benefits.

5. Repeal of the 10 percent Mainland-Hawaii travel tax.

Administrative actions indorsed and pushed by Mrs. Farrington resulted in the expenditure of millions of dollars in Hawaii under Federal programs. These included military housing projects, school construction, special military appropriations, a $1.7 million harbor at Kawaihae, $570,000 in Nawiliwili Harbor improvements, and other works.

The return of Fort Armstrong to the Territory by Federal Government, establishment of the City of Refuge as a National Historical Park, establishment of a Small Business Administration office in the Islands, funding by Congress of a $1 million Geophysics Institute in Hawaii, and passage of a number of land bills, were among Mrs. Farrington's Washington accomplishments.
She was also able to assist a number of Japanese language schools in securing restoration of properties taken during World War II.

Northwest and Aloha Airlines were saved years of litigation by her efforts in obtaining passage of a bill to give them a permanent operating certificate. Joseph Farrington had earlier obtained temporary certification for the two airlines.

Congress approved millions in bond issues while Mrs. Farrington was delegate, and eased restrictions so the Territory could float future bond issues without Congressional permission.²⁵

Note of Mrs. Farrington's record in the statehood movement has been made by Donald Dedmon.

Like her late husband, she was a fluent speaker and an excellent debater. In ability to refute opposing arguments she had few equals in the debate.²⁶

Notwithstanding the large amount of correspondence that flowed back and forth between Washington and the Star-Bulletin apprising Mrs. Farrington of the political changes taking place in Hawaii, Mrs. Farrington appears to have been preoccupied with her official duties rather than with the political races of 1954 and 1956 and the increasing strength of the Democratic party and its challengers. The Star-Bulletin too appears to have failed to fully recognize the depth and breadth of the grass roots movement of Democrats organized under the leadership of John Burns. But the paper did report on other newsworthy events.

Less than two months after her victory over John Burns in the 1954 election, Allen sent clippings and a letter to Mrs. Farrington concerning the appointment of former Territorial governor Oren Long as an associate editor of the Honolulu Advertiser. In his letter Allen warned:
My interpretation of this is that the Advertiser is trying to build up Oren as a competitor for you in 1956. The Advertiser's news and editorial policies have become increasingly pro-democratic since your election last fall, and the Advertiser is obviously trying to gain favor with the Democratic party.

Though his association with the Advertiser may not be a positive factor in his favor, the formidableness of Oren as a candidate should not be underestimated.27

A few weeks later Allen wrote to say "Long is doing more public speaking and public appearances than writing for the Honolulu Advertiser."

Later in July, Allen's concern over possible opponents for Mrs. Farrington changed from Long to the popular Democratic Territorial chairman John A. Burns. A July 25 letter included a number of news clippings concerning the activities of John Burns on Maui and the Big Island. Concern about Burns as a possible political threat was not halting Star-Bulletin coverage.

Jack is doing a lot of traveling around the territory and speaking as territorial chairman. It is quite obvious that he is trying to build up a strong following for the Democrat party since its dismal performance in the 1955 legislature.28

Another letter was sent to Mrs. Farrington by Millard Purdy, a Star-Bulletin political reporter, on May 29, 1956. In it Purdy noted stories he said were being spread by the Democratic party on the Neighbor Islands claiming Mrs. Farrington would not run again for office, and attacking the record of Mrs. Farrington in Washington and of Governor King in Hawaii.29 Democratic territorial chairman John Burns was at least partially responsible for the latter. Loyalist Burns publicly advocated that Democratic candidate Adlai Stevenson could help achieve statehood. Governor King disputed Burns's remarks in a memo to Mrs. Farrington:

The news story of Burns talk to the Kiwanis Club yesterday quoted him as saying he had a confirmed commitment from Adlai Stevenson to support statehood for Hawaii.
When Stevenson passed through Honolulu some two years ago he refused to express any support of statehood for Hawaii. I doubt whether he has any interest in statehood whatsoever.\textsuperscript{30}

Notwithstanding her more than respectable record in Congress, Mrs. Farrington was not able to defeat John Burns in 1956. Burns soundly thrashed Mrs. Farrington 82,067 votes to 66,732.

For the first time since 1932, Hawaii had elected a Democrat to Congress. And for the first time since 1942 there was no longer a Farrington leading the statehood movement in Washington.

The final push for statehood was made by John Burns, but the \textit{Star-Bulletin} continued the fight at home with Betty Farrington on the job as publisher.
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CHAPTER XVIII

JOHN A. BURNS LEADS THE STATEHOOD MOVEMENT

November, 1956 to March 12, 1959

... So let's just settle for Joe Farrington taking the Children of Israel [the Hawaiians] through the wilderness and Jack Burns taking them into the promised land.

Frank Hewlett
Honolulu Star-Bulletin Washington correspondent
June 6, 1975

John Anthony Burns is credited with obtaining statehood for Hawaii in March, 1959. Burns—former Honolulu Star-Bulletin switchboard operator, police officer, real estate man, professional politician and leader of the Democratic Revolution in Hawaii—accepted and helped execute a strategy which eventually persuaded a reluctant Congress, controlled by his own Democratic party, to accept the Hawaiian Islands as an equal member of the Union. Acceptance came after more than one half century as an incorporated territory.

Republican president Dwight Eisenhower, in one of the last of hundreds of petty partisan moves that frustrated the movement, declined to invite Delegate Burns to the White House ceremony formally announcing Hawaii as a state. But Eisenhower's snub apparently did not minimize Burns's efforts in the Congress and in the Islands. Later he would serve three terms as Governor of Hawaii. Nor did the snub detract from the credit for statehood which Burns received both from his admirers and detractors. 


1
Burns may have secretly savored the credit and acclaim he attained by virtue of his office in Congress when the Statehood bill passed, realizing perhaps that his presence there would serve as an important symbol of the Democratic grass roots movement he led from post-World War II in Hawaii until the time of his death in 1974. But in public, Burns sidestepped assigning credit for statehood to any one individual or group. He maintained that

Statehood is, as I have said, a victory of and for Hawaii's people, and it is they who are responsible.\(^2\)

Notwithstanding Burns's comment that "Hawaii's people" were responsible for statehood, not all of Hawaii's people at the time of annexation wanted to be a part of the United States. Nor did Congress believe the Islands were prepared for such status for more than half a century. Even after the citizens of the territory voted 2-1 in favor of statehood in 1940, the people of the United States and their elected representatives had to be convinced that it would be economically, strategically and politically helpful to the nation to adopt the offshore Islands and give the inhabitants voting representation in the United States Congress.

The difficulties relating to the Hawaiian Islands and to the economic, racial and political complexities of life in Hawaii, the mainland, and in the Congress could not be solved by Hawaii's people. Needed were a specific thought, a political philosophy, goals, institutions and leadership to give direction. Converts to the cause were required. Opponents to statehood had to be persuaded to think otherwise.

John A. Burns was one of a very small and select group of men and women who helped lead Hawaii to statehood. More specifically, Burns was
instrumental in working with influential members of his own political party to steer a statehood bill through a balky Congress. But before Burns could arrive at such a time and place, fifty-nine years of spade-work were necessary in Hawaii and in Washington.

The multiracial population of Hawaii had to be educated. The people of Hawaii had to be convinced that the democratic institutions they were being schooled under, as a territory, were desirable. Basic freedoms had to be fought for during two World Wars, as well as the Korean conflict. Ongoing challenges and slurs at the loyalty of Hawaii's people had to be disproved; antagonists in Congress and in the press had to be converted; and it seemed that another territory (Alaska) had to receive statehood before Hawaii's time was right.

Burns's efforts, though crucial, were part of a movement which had been going on for more than 100 years. Although Burns must be given credit for the final victory, he would never have been in such a position if it were not for the efforts of others who prepared the way through consistent and persistent education of the people of Hawaii and of the mainland, and through forceful debate in the U.S. Congress.

To win passage of a bill in Congress which is in any sense controversial, requires a long campaign of persistent explanation and development of a case in support of the recommended change. If the public and the representatives who speak for them in Washington are not informed on the subject, the process is even slower. Extensive hearings and repeated debates may be required. Those in support of the bill need to appeal to the public for support. Once strong support is evident, this support must be brought to the attention of the members of Congress. Supporters must demonstrate that the proposal is what the public demands. Thus, proponents talk over the heads of Congress to the people, and they urge the people through their representative spokesmen and organizational leaders to appeal also to Congress in support of the cause. The process is a time-consuming one even with a strong piece of legislation. It is, in effect, a long-term educational process which requires
extensive evidence and able spokesmen supported by a cohesive group of leaders. Those who propose the change must overcome the conservatism of those who oppose the change. The task is compounded by the fact that Congress is a complex machine. As a bill is threaded through our legislative bodies chances of its being blocked or temporarily delayed by the forces operating the machinery of government are everpresent. The machinery of government is heavily in the hands of the conservative element who may oppose the recommended change. In the case of Hawaiian statehood, the position of the affirmative was strong for many years. Nevertheless, favorable action was obtained only after twenty-five years of congressional debate.3

As we have seen so far, the major issues and arguments preventing Hawaii statehood from the period 1953-58 concerned the old questions of Hawaii's diverse races, non-contiguous territory, representation in the U.S. Senate, and whether Alaska or Hawaii should be admitted first or both at the same time.

For five years President Eisenhower had indirectly delayed passage of the Hawaii statehood bill by refusing to endorse statehood for Alaska. Congressmen who sought to keep one or the other of the territories from statehood attached both bills together as Siamese twins. Thus opponents were assured of getting the accumulated "no" votes of either or both sides against the bill.

In 1956, at the same time Eisenhower was re-elected, John Burns defeated Elizabeth Farrington. The positions taken on Alaska statehood by Eisenhower and Delegate Burns changed the course of the debate.4 Eisenhower in his budget message of 1957, endorsed statehood for Alaska—with a few reservations—just as he had endorsed statehood for Hawaii. Burns, together with Leo O'Brien of New York and Senator Henry Jackson of Washington, agreed to push the Alaska statehood bill first, and keep Hawaii statehood bottled up in committee, until the former was passed by both Houses and signed by the President.
One of Burns's close associates--Ed Rohrbough--recalls that Burns, shortly after his election, met with Senate Majority Leader Lyndon Johnson to discuss a plan to let Alaska move first for statehood.

Johnson agreed that such a strategy would be best because of Alaska's non-contiguity. But suppose the Alaska bill was brought to the floor of the House? Johnson wondered. What was to prevent an opponent from moving to bring the Hawaii bill to the floor and joining the bills in dual defeat?5

Burns's answer to Johnson was simple, according to Rohrbough. He told the Majority Leader that if anyone made such a move, Burns himself would move to return the Hawaii bill to committee. If he were to do this, Burns asked, "Don't you think my motion will carry?"

According to Rohrbough, Burns was told that such a move would be political suicide. But it also demonstrated to Johnson and other southern representatives the sincerity of Burns concerning statehood.6

Rohrbough, long-time Burns worker and former writer for the Honolulu Record (1948-58) said he did not believe Joseph or Elizabeth Farrington were sincere in the statehood movement.

"Sure, they were outwardly enthusiastic," Rohrbough said in a 1976 interview. "But in private they did not want statehood. They did not work hard for statehood in Washington. When they returned to Hawaii they blamed constant defeats on the southern senators and criticized them in public. If you know anything about the legislative process, this is not the way to win friends and influence people."

Rohrbough said that Burns learned first hand of Farrington's duplicity in the statehood cause when he met with southern senators after his election. They were surprised at Burns's sincerity. Because of
Farrington they had always thought that support for the statehood cause was simply a political act.

Despite the alleged Farrington public and private dichotomy, Rohrbough admits that the Star-Bulletin played an important role in the statehood movement.

Whether they wanted to or not, the Farringtons were educating the people of Hawaii to the benefits of statehood through the Star-Bulletin," he said.

A somewhat similar view of the Farringtons' failure to achieve statehood in Washington is contained in a recent book published by the John Burns Mamalahoa Foundation. Author Sam Amalu claims that while it may have been true that Republican candidates to Congress did indeed work hard in an effort to achieve statehood for Hawaii, "the seeds for their failure were planted in their own attitudes.

"This is not meant as a rebuke, nor is it meant to disparage the honest efforts that these delegates to Congress put forth. It is meant only to show how great a part personal attitudes play in the game of politics." Amalu goes on further to quote an unnamed Hawaii Republican lobbying for statehood in Congress who noted that Jack Burns walked over to the opposite side to argue an issue.

"That is the difference between Joe Farrington and Jack Burns. Joe would have never crossed the aisle.

"And we probably would not have gotten statehood," Amalu claims.

Another long-time Burns aide, Dan Aoki, agreed with the comments of Rohrbough and Amalu concerning the Farringtons' duplicity in the Statehood movement.
"Publicly the Farringtons were for statehood. It was their major political issue. But privately they were always against it," Aoki said in an interview June 23, 1976.

Aoki said the primary means Farrington used to make sure that statehood would not be passed was to introduce enabling legislation which would have to pass through the powerful Rules Committee--and thus be killed."

In contrast to Farrington's strategy, Aoki said that Burns had studied "Cannon's" Congressional rules and believed that statehood measures were privileged information and would not have to go through the Rules Committee. "Straight statehood measures could go directly to the floor for a vote after being reported out of committee," Aoki said.

When Burns informed Farrington of this when the entire state legislature and clerks went back to Washington in 1947, Farrington cursed at Burns and told him to mind his own business. "Farrington was a masterful politician," Aoki said.

Aoki also said that Samuel Wilder King had employed the same strategy--being publicly for statehood but privately against it--when King served in the U.S. Congress. He said that Burns had been informed of the duplicity of King as well as of the Farringtons by Rep. Cooley of North Carolina when Burns was first elected to Congress.

In a second interview, June 25, after reviewing this chapter, Aoki said that the remarks concerning Farrington's duplicity had never been made by Burns or his associates. Rather, Burns was only repeating what he had been told by partisan members of Congress--a number of whom were opposed to statehood for varied reasons. In addition, Aoki stated
that Burns held no bitterness against the Farrington family despite differences in how statehood should be obtained.

As might be expected, Burns's so-called "two-step" strategy brought him strong opposition in Hawaii and in Washington. In Honolulu, the Star-Bulletin editorially criticized the delegate for his tactics and predicted serious repercussions in the 1958 elections. In Washington, President Eisenhower publicly stated that Hawaii was more deserving of statehood than Alaska and that Hawaii should go first.

But like Farrington before him, the politically-wise Burns knew that even if the President had something to do with running the country he did not run the Congress. Lyndon Johnson and Sam Rayburn ran it. And with their support the Alaska bill finally reached the floor of the House by bypassing the Rules Committee which had held the bill up for more than a year. On May 28, 1958, the Alaska bill passed the House. The following month, with Johnson executing the strategy, the bill passed the Senate by a 64-20 vote.

With the passage of the Alaska statehood bill, a number of Republicans expressed the hope that Congress would also vote on Hawaii before the 1958 session ended. With this in mind, Secretary of the Interior Seaton called Governor Quinn to Washington to help lobby for the bill. Like Governor Sam King before him, Quinn also brought a delegation to lobby with him. This delegation consisted of all Republicans and a representative of the Hawaii statehood commission. Burns was seriously disappointed that he had not been consulted because he believed the delegation should come to him. In a national radio hookup, Burns charged political partisanship. He also called a number of people in Hawaii to tell them that the completely politically partisan
delegation might do Hawaii a great deal of harm in the next session and, "anything you can do to get them home will be greatly appreciated."\(^\text{10}\)

In spite of the political pressure play by the GOP, Burns stood his ground. He was adamant that statehood would not be considered that session because there was no time. If the Star-Bulletin disagreed with him from its vantage point in Honolulu, Burns was confident that he had the key decision makers in Congress coming over to his way of thinking.

The voters of Hawaii also overwhelmingly agreed with their new Democratic Delegate in the 1958 election campaign against Farrant Turner. Charles Hunter says that at first Burns was "less than frank" when direct questions were put to him about chances for statehood in the next Congress. After considerable pressure, Burns said flatly that statehood was "a sure thing in the 86th Congress."\(^\text{11}\)

Hunter himself was not so optimistic. In an historical outline of the statehood movement in the January, 1959, World Affairs Quarterly, he noted that long years of promises made but never kept, and of cheerful assurances each year that statehood had never been so near, had worn Hawaii's people into "a state of frustration, hurt pride, indifference and lethargy."

Even when the national leaders call Hawaii a showplace of democracy and a way of life we advocate on a global basis, the cynic knows that only an unexpected fortuitous set of political circumstances will overcome a hard core of resistance to statehood in the Congress of the United States.\(^\text{12}\)

Notwithstanding Hunter's bleak assessment, the opposition had finally been worn down. Dedmon says, the unified forces which had fought the battle for so many years repeated in 1959 a number of the original
defenses: the inevitability of statehood for Hawaii, the importance of
the Islands for defense, and the promise of Hawaii's leadership in the
Pacific.

In his concluding chapters, Dedmon notes that in Farrington's
statements in the Congressional hearings in 1935 can be found the
point of view maintained throughout the debate that Hawaii statehood
had been promised since 1900. An argument against statehood that
remained to be answered in 1959 was the claim that the people of Hawaii
were not American. The pro-statehood view was the same as it had been
throughout the debate—Hawaii was American. Delegate Farrington had
expressed this in the first debate in the House of Representatives when
he called the territory a completely American commonwealth. In fact,
Farrington asserted, as had the Star-Bulletin for many years, the
standards of government in Hawaii were considerably higher than the
national average.13

Dedmon also notes that in Farrington's catch phrases may be found
the main arguments of those supporting statehood for Hawaii for defense
reasons. This group of spokesmen held that Hawaii was inestimably
important to the United States because of her strategic location in the
Pacific and that her value would be enhanced by giving the territory
statehood.14

Another argument first used in Congress by Farrington, and repeated
by Burns during the final months of debate, was that the United States
must admit Hawaii as a state because of the leadership role of the
country. According to Dedmon, however, this argument was not a strong
one. The relationship of Hawaii statehood to the leadership position of
the United States could not be established, even though the view was a plausible one. But the contention was bolstered by the opinion of such recognized authorities on Pacific affairs as President Sinclair of the University of Hawaii and Representative Judd of Minnesota.\textsuperscript{15}

During the final months, the discussion of Hawaii statehood in the \textit{Star-Bulletin} and in other newspapers was characterized by an assumption on the part of all that statehood for Hawaii would pass. Rather than debating specific issues, many statehood opponents were almost willing to "take a waiver" on the entire issue. With Burns and his allies working behind the scenes, the opposition was crumbling by the time the debate moved to the floor of the Senate and the House. Although some of the opposition still argued that "two wrongs did not make a right" and that admitting Hawaii would be a grave mistake, a favorable vote was inevitable. Only 15 Senators and 89 Representatives opposed the statehood measure on the final vote in March, 1959.\textsuperscript{16}

Even after the final Congressional votes in Washington March 12, the bill required the President's signature. On March 18—\textmd{with Rep. Burns noticeably absent from the ceremony—President Eisenhower signed the statehood bill with "great satisfaction."}\textsuperscript{17}

In June the citizens of the Territory formally voted 17 to 1 in favor of statehood with pro-statehood victories in every representative district.\textsuperscript{18} In post statehood elections, the people of Hawaii voted to send the following back to Washington as their United States Senators: Oren Long, a Caucasian Democrat, and Republican Hiram L. Fong, an American of Chinese ancestry. Daniel K. Inouye, an American of Japanese ancestry was elected to succeed Burns as the first elected and voting representative
to the U.S. House. Burns, who chose to run for the powerful office of
governor, created by the state's constitutional convention, was defeated
by William F. Quinn who was endorsed by the Star-Bulletin. Other
progressive Republican liberals were also elected, proving that the
revolution of 1954 had not yet destroyed the Republican party of
Hawaii. That would come later during Burns's three terms as
governor.

As for Elizabeth Farrington, she was named president of the Star-
Bulletin shortly after her defeat at the hands of John Burns in 1956.
In 1961, after a bitter court fight over Farrington family stock, the
Star-Bulletin was sold to nonfamily interests. In 1971, five years after
a solemn declaration by Alexander Atherton that the locally owned paper
would never be sold to interests outside of Hawaii, the Star-Bulletin
was sold to the Gannett chain of New York.

The idea of selling the family-owned newspaper to outside interests
in Hawaii or on the mainland, and even the offer to merge production
facilities of the Star-Bulletin and Advertiser under a joint operating
agency, were opposed by both Riley Allen and Mrs. Farrington. Correspon-
dence between the two in April, 1956 shows they were both in disagreement
with a proposal by J. B. Atherton to conduct "a feasibility study" on
joint operating arrangements with the Advertiser. On April 5, 1956
Allen wrote:

I view with misgiving anything which reduces newspaper
competition in Honolulu or any other American city, and
I better believe we will serve not only the public but our
stockholders if we preserve this competition.

On April 9, Mrs. Farrington wrote to say she concurred "wholeheartedly"
with everything Allen had said concerning the proposal presented by
Atherton.
Riley Allen, the major link between the three members of the Farrington family and "driving force" in the statehood cause, retired in July, 1960--48 years after the Star-Bulletin was founded. With the exception of two years, he had personally supervised the reporting and editorial writing of the biggest continuing story in the history of the Islands and one of the major news events in the history of the United States--the attack on Pearl Harbor and Hawaii statehood. He died in October, 1965.

For Allen statehood was more than just a historical movement. From a topic of news and editorial interest, statehood had evolved into something like an obsession, dominating his entire life and out of the Star-Bulletin office. Mrs. Trinidad Peltier, Allen's secretary for ten years, believes statehood served as a substitute for his childless marriage. She illustrated this by describing his reaction the morning of the statehood announcement when she went into his office and found him sobbing.

I had never seen Mr. Allen cry before. But there he was behind his typewriter with tears streaming down his face. I was embarrassed. He didn't say anything. Neither did I. So I left quietly and closed the door for him. I felt he wanted to be alone. Statehood had finally come. It was Riley's baby.23

Mrs. Peltier's story is not without precedent in American journalism history. Joseph Pulitzer, the great New York City editor, who served as a champion for the downtrodden with many crusades in his newspapers, is also said to have felt the same way toward his editorial pages. One of his secretaries records: "It is no exaggeration to say that the editorial page of the World was to Joseph Pulitzer what a child is to a parent."24
In much the same way, the statehood movement and related causes became a part of the life of Riley Allen and the Star-Bulletin. In an article celebrating the Star-Bulletin's 50th anniversary, Allen summarized these editorial causes in his own words:


At a time when establishment of County government was viewed with skepticism and often opposition by a good many people, first the Evening Bulletin and then the Star-Bulletin, strongly backed it,

2. Statehood. The Star-Bulletin has never wavered in support of this and was no Johnny-come-lately in the long Statehood fight. The late Joseph R. Farrington, president of the Star-Bulletin, literally gave his life for this. He died in his office (as Delegate to Congress) at Washington, D.C., of a heart attack which was one of many he had largely as the result of his unremitting, exhausting, yet often frustrating but never-ending Statehood fight.

3. Public parks and playgrounds: Advocacy of these has been consistent for 50 years, including the preservation of Hawaii's natural beauties and landmarks.

4. Co-operative relations with newspaper unions. The Star-Bulletin was the first Hawaii newspaper to sign a contract with the International Typographical Union—an event which faced some bitter criticism here—and has for many years enjoyed good relations with newspaper and printing unions, even when negotiations of new contracts were at times in controversy.

5. Public education. To develop Hawaii's public school facilities steadily and in conformity with the need of a growing population.

6. Active participation of all citizens in politics. (Hawaii has the largest turn-out vote, in proportion to registration, in the nation.)

7. Strong representation in the national Congress—whether by Democrats or Republicans. Hawaii needs, at Washington, the finest Senators and Congressmen we can elect—the most dedicated and most able.

8. Inter-racial development: Hawaii is the nation's truest, most deeply-founded example of such friendly development—based on
the traditions of American citizenship. There are occasional incidents and situations yet where some racial irritation occurs, but they are few.

9. Emphasis on Hawaii's citizens as true and loyal Americans. This issue came up sharply and spectacularly at the outbreak of World War II, when Hawaii's people of Japanese ancestry, including Island-born men and women and youths, were under suspicion. That suspicion was natural, in view of Japan's dawn attack December 7, 1941. But it was ill-founded, as events soon proved.25

Shortly before Allen's retirement in 1960, he received the following letter from Fred A. Seaton, Secretary of the Interior:

Dear Riley:
If some future historian were to postulate the theory: But for one man, the achievement of Hawaiian statehood would have only been a dream, your name would necessarily be included in a very small and select list for final consideration and choice.26

The purpose of this dissertation has been to show that Seaton's assessment was a good one. Statehood was not simply a people's movement. Were it not for the leadership and influence of certain men and women, statehood for Hawaii might have remained a dream and would certainly have been prolonged. Major contributors on a select list must include Riley Allen; John Burns; Wallace, Joseph, and Elizabeth Farrington; and the Honolulu Star-Bulletin.
1. "He helped Hawaii get Statehood" is a slogan used by Burns supporters in his election campaigns. In a column critical of so-called Communists working for Burns in Human Events magazine of December, 1962, Fulton Lewis, Jr. also claims that it was John Burns more than any other man who was responsible for Hawaiian statehood in 1959.


4. Ibid., p. 398.


6. Interview Ed Rohrbough, May 7, 1976. The comments of Rohrbough and Sam Amalu are typical of a number of very close partisan followers of John A. Burns. They also reflect the feelings that Governor Burns had toward the Farringtons and the Star-Bulletin in informal conversations the author had with Burns as a newspaper reporter from 1964-69.

   Partisan comments on the other side have also been provided by Mrs. Farrington and Dr. Walter Judd, who in a telephone interview October 10, 1975 described Burns's role in the statehood movement as minimal. "Statehood was in the bag before Burns came to town," Judd stated. Farrington and the Republicans had it all wrapped up."

   Nadao Yoshinaga, another Burns follower and long-time legislative leader in Hawaii in a May 7, 1976 interview said the Star-Bulletin had a major role in bringing statehood to Hawaii. Yoshinaga said the Star-Bulletin had a "mania" for statehood by running stories on the subject over and over again. "Any time you have people with a newspaper who for profit, or for personal or journalistic reasons want to do something to influence others, they certainly can if they wish to," Yoshinaga said.


9. Ibid., p. 52.

11. Ibid.


15. Ibid., p. 417.


17. Officials of the Eisenhower administration claim that Burns was not at the Statehood signing ceremony because someone inadvertently failed to invite him.


19. Ibid., p. 416.

20. At a banquet celebrating the 55th anniversary of the Star-Bulletin July 4, 1967, Alexander Atherton pledged to keep the paper in local hands. "Maybe the Star-Bulletin will be sold someday," Atherton said to the shock and gasps of about 200 employees of the editorial department of the Star-Bulletin Printing Company and their wives . . . "but it will be over my dead body."

After similar declarations by James Couey who once commissioned a book on the Star-Bulletin stressing local control of the newspaper, the publication was sold to Gannett Company for $15 million. The transaction did not take place "over Atherton's dead body." Atherton is still very much alive.

21. Letter from Riley Allen to Elizabeth Farrington, April 5, 1956 indicates that both were highly opposed to a proposal by J. B. Atherton of the Star-Bulletin executive committee to conduct a study on the feasibility of joint operating arrangements with the Honolulu Advertiser.


CHAPTER XIX
". . . AN IRRESISTIBLE INFLUENCE"

Summary and Conclusions

The purpose of this dissertation has been to describe the role of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin as a leader in the Hawaii statehood movement. Included is the life of the paper's first owner, Wallace R. Farrington, and his early role promoting annexation and eventual statehood as editor of the Pacific Commercial Advertiser (1894-97) and of the Honolulu Evening Bulletin (1898-1912) and as Territorial Governor (1921-29). The dissertation also examines the contributions to statehood made by Joseph and Elizabeth Farrington as Star-Bulletin decision makers and as delegates to the U.S. Congress (1942-56). This study examines the leadership role of Riley H. Allen, who—with the exception of a three-year period—served as the Star-Bulletin editor from 1912-1960. The basic question answered is: "What leadership did the Star-Bulletin and its owners and editors give to the statehood movement from before annexation in 1898 until 1959?"

In order to answer the question, the author conducted interviews with principals involved in the statehood movement. He studied and analyzed public and private correspondence between members of the Farrington family and Riley Allen in the Hawaii State Archives. He also examined official Congressional documents relating to statehood, as well as newspapers, magazines, periodicals and other secondary sources.

From his study the author has concluded that the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, members of the Farrington family, and Riley Allen, were
principal leaders in the Hawaii statehood movement from 1894 until 1959.

In coming to this conclusion, the author noted that the ultimate decision for statehood was reached in the United States Congress which debated the question from 1935 to 1959. For fourteen of these twenty-four years Joseph or Elizabeth Farrington served as Hawaii's delegates to the U.S. House of Representatives. But it was not until after Democrat John Burns was elected to the Democratic controlled Congress in 1956 that statehood was realized. Obviously, Burns and other individuals and institutions also provided significant leadership for the statehood movement.

Further, the Honolulu Star-Bulletin did not always support statehood and other causes related to the drive for equal status with the American states. During the period from 1918-1921, the Star-Bulletin opposed a statehood measure introduced in the U.S. House by Delegate Prince Kuhio. During those years, when editor Riley Allen took a leave of absence, Star-Bulletin owner Wallace Farrington permitted the newspaper's interim editors, Raymond McNally and George Nellist, to exercise their editorial discretion. Wallace Farrington also abdicated his leadership in progressive causes in Hawaii when McNally and Nellist editorially attacked the Japanese immigrant labor movement, the Japanese language press and Japanese language schools. In the post-World War II period, the Star-Bulletin failed to fully report and interpret the meaning of the broad "grass roots" movement being led by John Burns. The movement eventually culminated in the "Revolution of 1954," and in a drastic change in Hawaii's economic, social and political structure.
Such examples, however, are exceptions to the rule and represent the only significant deviations from the Star-Bulletin's long and consistent cumulative record in support of statehood for Hawaii, and of related causes. The dissertation has shown that to win passage of a controversial measure requires a lengthy campaign of "persistent explanation" and development of a case in support of the recommended change. The statehood movement was a long-term educational process which required extensive evidence and able spokesmen both in Hawaii and in Washington. By virtue of its position as an institution disseminating information and opinion in support of statehood, the Star-Bulletin assumed the role of a leader. Over a 60-year period the newspaper and its owners became the primary leaders who organized, unified, encouraged and persuaded Hawaii residents, as well as opinion makers and decision makers on the mainland, that the Hawaiian Islands should be an integral part of the United States. Granted, the Farringtons did not achieve the actual victory in the United States Congress. And direct political influence is not the role of a private institution such as the Star-Bulletin. But the Star-Bulletin did assume the role of a leader--Ke Alaka'i. In the words of a Washington correspondent who covered the statehood movement for the Star-Bulletin for nine years: "... Let's just settle for Joe Farrington leading the Children of Israel [Hawaii's citizens] through the wilderness and Jack Burns taking them into the promised land."

The Honolulu Star-Bulletin was able to achieve and maintain its position as a principal leader in the Hawaii statehood movement for the following reasons, as illustrated in the dissertation.
1. The foundations of American institutions were already established in the Hawaiian Islands before Wallace Farrington arrived in 1894.

Wallace Farrington was able to promote annexation, and eventually statehood, from a position of strength because the native Hawaiian monarchy had been overthrown in 1893 and a provisional government—and later a Republic patterned after the American form of government—had been established. The Islands also had a constitution and a representative legislature. Even before the ousting of Queen Liliuokalani, the Hawaiian Islands had developed strong religious and cultural ties with the United States through the persistent efforts of the Congregational missionaries and other Christian denominations. As early as 1854, King Kamehameha negotiated a treaty with U.S. President Pierce that would have incorporated the Islands into the American union, not as a territory, but as "a state with perfect equality with the other states."

Statehood for Hawaii was in no way a matter of "political predestination" for the Hawaiian Islands. Throughout its history there was always the chance that the people of Hawaii might select a different political status ranging from independent nation to commonwealth. The opportunities for closer ties with other nations were reduced, however, by varied American private and public interests, including the press, which combined to draw the Hawaiian Islands into a closer relationship with the United States.

2. A free and vigorous press had been established in Hawaii. Among the civilizing and "Americanizing" tools that the missionaries brought to Hawaii with them in 1820 was a small printing press. The
early "Palapala," or missionary, press was used primarily to educate the illiterate natives. In 1834 the missionaries also issued the first "newspapers" to disseminate accounts of Christian activities in the Islands. The first missionary press was followed by anti-missionary publications and other independent and government subsidized publications, in English, Hawaiian, and various foreign languages. Many of the newspapers were edited by men of excellent education and trained writing ability. They provided information and helped to form public opinion. The newspapers also took an active part in discussing the question of statehood for Hawaii. Thus when Wallace Farrington arrived in the Hawaiian Islands, he found a free and vigorous press. There were no government efforts to censor his news or editorial opinions on annexation and statehood. The major problem facing Farrington was to make his newspapers economically profitable.

3. Wallace Farrington had an early start in his crusade for statehood. Farrington began to advocate statehood shortly after arriving in Hawaii. He saw statehood as the extension of annexation and home rule. When Farrington started his crusade many Hawaiians and part-Hawaiians—who comprised about one-quarter of the population—were divided on the question. The Japanese community, or 40 percent of the population, had not yet reached a decision. The "haoles," or Caucasians who comprised about 15 percent of the population were divided on the issue. Some, such as those who started the Hawaiian Star in 1893, sought annexation and statehood. Others preferred the status quo for fear that closer ties with the United States would harm their economic control over the Islands. Opinion on the mainland was also divided when Farrington
began to agitate for statehood. But in 1940, the residents of Hawaii voted two to one in favor of statehood in a plebiscite. A nation-wide Gallup Survey in 1941 showed 48 percent in favor of Hawaii's admission as a state. In 1946 60 percent favored statehood.

4. The Star-Bulletin supported ideas which proved historically sound.

In addition to its leadership in the statehood movement, the Star-Bulletin advocated other ideas which promoted equal status for the Islands. These ideas, which always had statehood as the ultimate goal, included equal rights for Hawaii's citizens of all races; universal and integrated education (at a time when this was less than popular with the more extreme elements in Hawaii's society); repeal of racial restrictions in American immigration laws which discriminated against people of Oriental ancestry; and respect for the law.

During World War II the Star-Bulletin opposed the continuance of military government.

In contrast to such positions, which have stood the test of time, Hawaii's other daily newspaper, the Honolulu Advertiser, stoutly defended the military regime during World War II. The Advertiser served as public relations advisor to the "military governor." Farrington objected to use of the word "military governor" in the pages of the Star-Bulletin out of concern that the term would become accepted and woven into the thinking of Island residents. Farrington refused to allow the word "Jap" to be used in the pages of the Star-Bulletin despite its convenience in composing headlines.

The prewar Advertiser also distrusted Hawaii's citizens of Japanese ancestry and continually opposed statehood. In 1927 the Advertiser
declared that "Hawaii needs statehood as much as a cat needs two tails."
It was not until 1947 that the Advertiser began to support statehood.

5. Consistency in editorial policy.

In contrast to the changing positions of the Advertiser, Star-Bulletin editorial policy was for the most part consistent. This consistency was due primarily to continuity of Farrington ownership which traced from the merger in 1912 of the Hawaiian Star and the Evening Bulletin, edited by Farrington. Still another reason was the 45 year tenure of Riley Allen as editor from 1912 to 1918 and from 1921 to 1961.

The only departure from the Star-Bulletin's statehood crusade occurred from 1918-1921 when Allen was in Siberia doing volunteer work for the American Red Cross. Riley's absence did not justify Farrington's failure to provide direction for the interim editors, or for the statehood cause, which resumed when Allen returned to Hawaii. But it does indicate the continuity the paper maintained when Allen was editor.

6. The small size of the community served by the Star-Bulletin helped determine the paper's leadership. Wilbur Schramm has explained that "The smaller the city or the communication unit, the more likely it is to reflect the policy of one man or a few men." Honolulu was not a metropolis. In 1896 Honolulu's population was 30,000, or 27 percent of the Territory; in 1920 it was 83,000, or one third of the Islands population; and in the decade before statehood, 250,000, or half the population of the Territory. Thus the Star-Bulletin, because of the relatively small size of Honolulu and the paper's territory-wide circulation, was in a position of potential influence.

7. Star-Bulletin circulation increased steadily relative to Hawaii's population.
In 1900, shortly before Wallace Farrington began advocating statehood, Hawaii's population was 154,000. Honolulu's population was about one fifth of that. Bulletin circulation was 2,000.

In 1910, Hawaii's population was 192,000 and Honolulu had 52,183 residents. Star-Bulletin circulation was 4,262 at the end of its first year of operation in 1912.

In 1920, Hawaii's population was 256,000; Honolulu, 83,000; Star-Bulletin's circulation, 8,500.

By the time of statehood the Territory's population was 620,000; Honolulu, 290,000. Star-Bulletin circulation was approximately 100,000.

Thus, Star-Bulletin circulation increased in proportion to the territorial population increase. If each copy of the Star-Bulletin had a readership of three persons, the Star-Bulletin was reaching nearly one half of the residents of Hawaii in the decade before statehood. In addition, the Farrington family controlled the Hilo Tribune-Herald, a progressive newspaper which also supported statehood.

By contrast, the Honolulu Advertiser showed a continuous decline in advertising and circulation from 1929 until the Star-Bulletin and Advertiser formed a joint operating arrangement in 1962. Before the joint operating arrangement, the Advertiser was at the bottom in all categories. In only one other market in America where two independent newspapers existed did the second lag so far behind the first.


Although the previous figures cannot be interpreted to show direct influence, or a cause and effect relationship on Star-Bulletin readers,
they are evidence that the Star-Bulletin was a respected and popular community opinion leader. Part of this was due to the Islands' isolated geography. Part was due to the lack of alternative newspapers, which dwindled because of economics in the twentieth century. The people of Hawaii did not have radio until the mid-1920s. Television did not come until the fifties. Thus the people of Hawaii relied on the press for information and similarly on the Star-Bulletin. Further, the Star-Bulletin had the advantage of the printed word, which permits the audience to set its own pace, allow for repeated exposure, and allow for treatment at any length. This was particularly valuable to the statehood cause because of Hawaii's multi-racial and multi-lingual population using the newspaper as an aid to learn English.

9. The Star-Bulletin was a leader of the opinion makers.

In addition to serving as the major instrument providing news and opinion to the general population, the Star-Bulletin served as an important leader for opinion makers. Research shows that newspapers feed group leaders more than followers, for leaders are keenly alert to mass communications, particularly in the area of leadership. A newspaper's direct political influence is greatest upon those who are closest to the news itself. Despite the press's poor record in backing winners, Curtis MacDougall noted that politicians generally prize newspaper endorsements and cringe from editorial attack. Even many of Hawaii's population who did not speak English were affected indirectly by the Star-Bulletin by others who read the paper and passed on its views.

10. A "liberalizing effect" on Hawaii.

By today's standards the Star-Bulletin is considered a part of the "hegemony," a term often used by John Burns. But the dissertation has
shown that if the Star-Bulletin was part of the hegemony, or "establishment," it was a part that, in the words of A. A. Smyser, "kept nudging for a change." And it did so effectively. If the Star-Bulletin was anti organized labor for a period, and tolerated a high degree of social exclusiveness, "it was nevertheless encouraging the corrective trends of education, universal franchise, and an open society."

One of the mistakes that critics of the hegemony make is the failure to differentiate between the Advertiser, which did serve as "the voice of the establishment" and the Star-Bulletin, which worked within the establishment for gradual change. Granted the Star-Bulletin did not succeed in all the areas that it might have as a progressive leader. One notable example was the Star-Bulletin's failure to recognize and report on the grass roots movement of John Burns preceding the "Revolution of 1954." Over a sixty year period, however, the Star-Bulletin contributed to the social progress of the Hawaiian Islands in somewhat the same manner that Vernon Parrington noted the press on the mainland contributed to American life and thought. Although the Star-Bulletin was not liberal, it had "a liberalizing effect" on the Hawaiian Islands.

11. The education and skill of the Star-Bulletin leaders.

All of the major decision makers promoting statehood through the Star-Bulletin were well educated and skilled journalists. Wallace Farrington graduated from the State College of Maine and worked for newspapers in New England and New York during the start of the Progressive period. His son, Joseph, was educated at the University of Wisconsin and was said to stand for "a liberalism in the finest tradition of the
Republican party. While at Wisconsin he was a roommate of Phillip LaFollette, and had the chance to become close friends with the leading "progressive" families. Both Joseph Farrington and his wife Elizabeth, worked as members of the Washington, D.C. Press Corps, one of the most responsible and prestigious positions in American journalism. Star-Bulletin editor, Riley Allen, was educated at the University of Chicago and worked for newspapers in Chicago and Seattle before coming to Hawaii in 1905. He said he was influenced by the well-known American editor William Allen White.

12. Friendship with other journalists.

Because of their education and newspaper backgrounds, the Farringtons and Riley Allen were able to utilize personal diplomacy in winning and maintaining friends for the statehood cause among journalists. Among Wallace Farrington's friends who rose to positions of influence were publisher Cyrus Curtis and Warren Harding. Farrington solidified the friendships at Editors and Publishers Conventions each year. As a leader, Farrington refused to allow past differences to interfere with his statehood pursuits. As Governor he called upon his former journalistic foe, Lorrin Thurston, to help draft Hawaii's Bill of Rights. Farrington also worked with Thurston to invite the World Press Congress to Hawaii in 1921--thus exposing the Islands to hundreds of national and international reporters.

Joseph and Elizabeth Farrington also had influential friends in journalism across the country. Many of these were former colleagues the Farringtons had worked with as members of the Washington Press Corps from 1920-1924. Wallace and Joseph Farrington were also newsmakers. In 1927
and again in 1947 they were both featured on the covers of *Time* magazine as major proponents of statehood.

Riley Allen kept two secretaries busy writing dozens of letters each week on the statehood cause. He complimented journalists who wrote favorable articles or editorials. He reprimanded or provided additional facts and information for those who did not support statehood. The *Star-Bulletin* also had some control over the content of news leaving the Islands as it was the major source of news for the Associated Press. Dozens of journalists who travelled to the islands were interviewed and hosted by the *Star-Bulletin*, which was used as the base for gathering news and sending it out.

13. Influence in the Office of Territorial Governor, Territorial Legislature and the U.S. Congress.

As the Governor of a highly centralized American territory for eight years, Wallace Farrington had opportunities for great influence. Like the chief executive of the United States, Farrington had "power" to persuade others to be cordial to the idea of statehood through his professional reputation and prestige. In addition, Farrington furthered the statehood cause by strengthening the public school system and through the passage of Hawaii's Bill of Rights and Declaration of Rights.

Joseph Farrington advanced the statehood cause as a state senator by introducing legislation which started the Hawaii Equal Rights Commission. He also introduced the bill which placed a statehood referendum on the ballot following recommendation by a Congressional committee. As a member of the U.S. House from 1942-54, Joseph Farrington introduced statehood measures, served as the principal debate manager,
provided friendly witnesses and practiced personal diplomacy to advance the statehood cause. As Hawaii's elected delegate and as owner of the Territory's largest newspaper he was in an unequalled position to keep the statehood issue alive before the public and the decision makers. There was never doubt in the minds of the public that Hawaii's delegate to Congress and the Territory's largest newspaper were speaking with the same voice.

Elizabeth Farrington also provided leadership in the statehood movement by building interest, creating support, and by developing a strong case to advance arguments. While a member of the House of Representatives from 1954-1956 she was described as an excellent debater and did much to discredit arguments of those opposed to statehood.

14. The dedication of the Star-Bulletin leaders to the statehood cause.

Because of the frustrating length of the statehood movement, commitment and motivation were essential characteristics of its leaders. Wallace Farrington did not yield to early pressure from owners of the Pacific Commercial Advertiser to take a more moderate approach seeking annexation. He left Hawaii when he could not longer agree with its owner. After allowing his newspaper to be used to oppose statehood and other progressive causes for a brief period during the World War I Japanese scare, in 1923 Farrington recommitted "every move I make to rendering service to the people in hastening the day when Hawaii shall be considered ready for full statehood." As Governor he used the prestige of his office to try to convince the local leaders that statehood was in the best interest of the Territory, if not in their best personal interests.
In a speech before the Honolulu Social Science Association in 1929, he chastized community leaders for becoming timid or conservative in supporting statehood after helping to pioneer annexation.

Joseph Farrington was much more "agitaded" and "aggressive" over statehood than his father and the crusade colored all of his waking hours. At the time of their engagement, Farrington's wife related that she was told she would have to take second place to the statehood movement as he had dedicated his life to the cause. Members of Congress as well as his associates in the press, attributed Farrington's heart attack in 1954 to overexertion in the statehood cause in Congress.

Similarly, Riley Allen dedicated much of his life to advancing statehood and other progressive causes in Hawaii. In addition to writing hundreds of news articles and editorials, Allen appeared before Congressional committees or prepared statements for other witnesses, and for the Farringtons. One secretary said she wrote about 100 letters per week for Allen relating to statehood. She also claimed that Allen used the statehood crusade as a compensation for a childless marriage.

Although such illustrations verge on the overdramatic, they also serve as examples of sincerity and dedication. Allen's case also has a historical precedent in the life of Joseph Pulitzer, the famous New York editor, who is said to have considered his editorial page as a child. The examples of Star-Bulletin dedication to the statehood cause raise serious questions about reports that the Farringtons were "insincere" in seeking statehood in Washington. Some sources indicate that the Farringtons only used statehood as a political issue to gain popularity, but that in reality they were "ineffective" or unable to work with
Congressional leaders in and out of their party to achieve the goal in Congress.

Interviews with various sources, however, indicate that the charges of insincerity against the Farringtons were more "whispers" arising from the murky depths of Congressional politics after the death of Joseph Farrington in 1954 and the defeat of his wife in 1956. In some cases the reports appear to have originated with sources opposed to statehood, who may have been using the charges against the Farringtons for political reasons rather than basing them on fact. The public record, and private papers, show that the Farringtons were sincere, dedicated to the statehood cause, and as effective as they could be in a Congress with shifting political coalitions.

Such reported dedication to the cause of statehood does not mean that the Farringtons were without fault, or that they always responded rationally to the choices that faced them. They made mistakes, and they made enemies, as the dissertation has indicated. Neither the Farringtons nor Riley Allen spent their entire lives arriving at statehood, but they did view statehood as a great historical crusade. To borrow a phrase from Stanley Porteus: "They may not have been great, but they had greatness thrust upon them."

15. Testimony of witnesses

A final point needs to be made about the leadership role of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin in the statehood movement. It concerns the testimony of forty persons who observed the Star-Bulletin or who took part in the statehood movement themselves—who have been quoted in this study. These observers included U.S. Congressmen, Washington correspondents, a U.S. District Judge, Executive and Legislative aides, politicians,
and ordinary men and women who remember how the Star-Bulletin influenced them over the years. Granted, some of the observers were too close to the movement to be considered objective. With the exception of three individuals, however, all observers agreed that the Star-Bulletin played a major, if not indispensable, role in the statehood movement. The word repeated again and again was "major" role. Other adjectives included "dominant," "very important," "extremely influential." Even those who felt the Star-Bulletin was a minor influence credited the newspaper with playing a significant role in educating the people of Hawaii to statehood.

Words are slippery and elusive. They cannot be pinned down with any degree of surety. No specific mathematical formula has been or can be developed to specify exactly what the weight of Star-Bulletin leadership was on the statehood movement.

Was Statehood achieved because of Star-Bulletin leadership, or did Statehood come in spite of what the Star-Bulletin did?

Other efforts toward statehood were indeed being made, but other leaders lacked the power and prestige of the people connected with the Star-Bulletin in combination with the newspaper itself. While their efforts would ultimately have proven successful, it is not likely that they could have matched the same timetable.

To answer the question of Star-Bulletin influence one might reverse history and consider what might have happened had the Star-Bulletin as the largest newspaper in Hawaii, joined the Advertiser in opposing Statehood.
Alexis DeTocqueville suggested that the power of the periodical press was "second only to that of the people," and that "when many organs of the press adopt the same line of conduct, their influence in the long run becomes irresistible."

Had the Star-Bulletin and the Advertiser "adopted the same line of conduct" in opposition to Statehood, the efforts toward Statehood as outlined in this study would not have occurred. The combined efforts of the largest newspapers against Statehood, in light of their impact on the community, might have been "irresistible." It would likely have meant that with the influence of at least one Territorial governor, Congressional delegates, and the two newspapers moving against statehood in chorus with local economic interests, an effective brake could have been put on any statehood movement, especially in Congress.

Even after the plebiscite in Hawaii in 1940, and polls throughout the Mainland, showed the majority of the people in favor of Statehood, Congress still resisted. It required years of groundwork, as outlined in this study, to prepare the people of Hawaii for the movement and to gain their support. The "voice of the people" and the "joining up" of the Advertiser to the cause and the work of men like John Burns, then carried the statehood movement to its final, "irresistible" conclusion.
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