

**COALITION POLITICS IN HAWAI'I - 1887-90 :  
HUI KĀLAİ'ĀINA AND THE MECHANICS AND WORKINGMEN'S POLITICAL  
PROTECTIVE UNION**

**A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE DIVISION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF HAWAI'I IN  
PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF**

**MASTER OF ARTS**

**IN**

**PACIFIC ISLANDS STUDIES**

**DECEMBER 1993**

**By**

**David William Earle**

**Thesis Committee:**

**Terence Wesley-Smith, Chairperson  
Davianna Pōmaika'i McGregor  
David Hanlon**

We certify that we have read this thesis and that, in our opinion, it is satisfactory in scope and quality as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in Pacific Islands Studies.

THESIS COMMITTEE

T. A. Wesley-Smith  
Chairperson

Naomi McGea

Daniel Hanlon

© Copyright 1993

by

David Earle

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author acknowledges the support provided by the East-West Center, Honolulu to undertake a Master's degree at the University of Hawai'i.

The author also acknowledges the assistance received from Katie Boyle, for proof-reading, Marion Kelly, for assistance with the initial research, and the Pacific History Association IX Annual Conference and the University of Hawai'i Graduate Student Organization 1993 Spring Symposium, where he was able to present parts of the research and receive invaluable feedback on it.

## ABSTRACT

In 1889, Hui Kālai'āina (The Hawaiian Political Association) and the Mechanics and Workingmens' Political Protective Union united to form the National Reform Party in order to win the 1890 election in Hawai'i. They stood against the Reform Party, which represented the interests of the American and European elite in the islands. The National Reform Party's policies were to maintain the independence of the islands and improve the situation of Native Hawaiians and the American and European lower and middle classes. Their coalition provides an interesting example of political cooperation between native people and settlers. It highlights the ambiguities and tensions of race, class and national identity in nineteenth century Hawai'i. This thesis traces the origin and development of the coalition from 1887, when the American and European elite forced the adoption of a new constitution for the kingdom, to the legislative session of 1890, when the National Reform Party held the balance of power. It concludes by assessing the success of the coalition and some of the problems that it faced.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	iv
ABSTRACT .....	v
LIST OF TABLES .....	x
PREFACE .....	xi
Approaching History in Hawai‘i from a Pākehā Perspective .....	xi
Theoretical Approach .....	xiii
The Incorporation of Hawai‘i into the World-Capitalist System .....	xxii
The Kingdom of Hawai‘i in the 1880s .....	xxxi
Sources .....	xxxiii
Usage of Hawaiian Words .....	xxxvi
The Structure of the Thesis .....	xxxvii

## PART I: NĀNĀ I KE KUMU (LOOK TO THE SOURCE)

### CHAPTER 1: FROM RUNNYMEDE TO KA HALE ALI‘I ‘O

‘IOLANI: THE ANGLO-SAXON HERITAGE .....	2
Monday, June 15, 1215 .....	2
Thursday, June 30, 1887 .....	4
Discussion: The Anglo-Saxon Heritage in Hawai‘i .....	7
The Creation of a Constitutional Monarchy .....	12

## **CHAPTER 2: "HO‘OULU LĀHUI": HAWAI‘I UNDER KING**

<b>KALĀKAUA I</b> .....	16
<b>The Election of Kings</b> .....	16
<b>Reciprocity Established with the United States</b> .....	20
<b>Claus Spreckels and Celso Caesar Moreno</b> .....	22
<b>A Trip Around the World</b> .....	25
<b>The Gibson Ministry</b> .....	25
<b>The Increase of the Nation</b> .....	29
<b>The Continuation of the Reciprocity Treaty</b> .....	33
<b>Discussion: The Maintenance of Hawaiian Independence</b> .....	34

## **PART II: KA HO‘ĀLA ‘ANA (THE AWAKENING)**

### **CHAPTER 3: REACTION AND RESISTANCE: 1887-8** .....

<b>The Provisions of the 1887 Constitution</b> .....	37
<b>The 1887 Election Campaign</b> .....	42
<b>The Reciprocity Treaty</b> .....	55
<b>Conspiracies against Kalākaua</b> .....	56
<b>The 1888 Special Election</b> .....	57
<b>Discussion: Towards a Mass Organization</b> .....	60

### **CHAPTER 4: HUI KĀLAI‘ĀINA AWAKENED** .....

<b>The Establishment of the Hui</b> .....	64
<b>"Hihi a paakiki ke hana aku"</b> .....	72
<b>Discussion: Will the True Hawaiians Please Stand Up?</b> .....	81

<b>CHAPTER 5: OTHER EVENTS OF 1889</b>	<b>84</b>
<b>The Two Hui Kālai‘āina</b>	<b>84</b>
<b>The Wilcox Rebellion</b>	<b>86</b>
<b>The Factions Struggle On</b>	<b>89</b>
<b>The Rumored Treaty of Reciprocity</b>	<b>90</b>
<b>Discussion: By the Gun or by the Ballot?</b>	<b>94</b>

<b>CHAPTER 6: THE MECHANICS’ AND WORKINGMEN’S POLITICAL PROTECTIVE UNION</b>	<b>98</b>
<b>The Situation of Mechanics and Workingmen in Hawai‘i in the 1880s</b>	<b>98</b>
<b>Early Labor Organizations in Hawai‘i</b>	<b>106</b>
<b>The Establishment of the Union</b>	<b>109</b>
<b>Discussion: Nineteenth Century Labor Politics Comes to Hawai‘i</b>	<b>111</b>

## **PART III: KA HOPENA (THE RESULT)**

<b>CHAPTER 7: THE 1890 ELECTIONS</b>	<b>117</b>
<b>The Organization of the Parties</b>	<b>117</b>
<b>Cabinet Policy Announced</b>	<b>123</b>
<b>The Coalition Debate Continues</b>	<b>126</b>
<b>The Reform Party Ward Meetings</b>	<b>127</b>
<b>National Reform Party Launched</b>	<b>130</b>
<b>The Meetings Continue</b>	<b>135</b>
<b>The Election Results</b>	<b>139</b>
<b>Discussion: The Campaign Issues and Strategies</b>	<b>140</b>



<b>CHAPTER 8: NATIONAL REFORM PARTY IN GOVERNMENT,</b>	
<b>1890</b> .....	148
<b>Events Between the Election and the 1890 Legislative Session</b> .....	148
<b>National Reform Party Versus the Cabinet</b> .....	152
<b>The Proposed Constitutional Convention</b> .....	160
<b>Other Matters Considered in the Legislature</b> .....	169
 <b>CHAPTER 9: CONCLUSION</b> .....	173
 <b>BIBLIOGRAPHY</b> .....	180

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1. Analysis of Voters for the Houses of Representatives and Nobles, 1888 . . . . .	39
Table 6.1. Distribution of Work Force by Islands and Occupation, 1878 and 1884 . . . . .	102
Table 6.2 .1890 Work Force for all Islands, by Occupation, Nationality and Gender . . . . .	104
Table 6.3. Survey of Daily Wages of Mechanics and Laborers in Honolulu, 1890. . . . .	106

## PREFACE

### **Approaching History in Hawai‘i from a Pākehā<sup>1</sup> Perspective**

I arrived in Hawai‘i from Aotearoa (New Zealand) in fall 1991 to undertake an M.A. in Pacific Islands Studies. I brought with me a commitment to the furthering of Māori<sup>2</sup> sovereignty, which by extension I found to be a commitment to supporting Native Hawaiian sovereignty. In Aotearoa, it is becoming accepted that the role of Pākehā in supporting Māori sovereignty is first to work with our own people to clear the way for and to remove obstacles to the achievement of Māori sovereignty. An important part of this task is to understand who our ancestors were and what they did, who we are now and what we can become in a future where Māori sovereignty is fully recognized.

As a Pākehā, an historian and a Māori studies graduate, I find myself in an unusual and sometimes difficult position. I do not wish to waste the gifts of understanding that I have received through Māori studies, but I also do not wish to trample on those areas of Māori history which at this time are best left for those of Māori ancestry to deal with. Therefore, my interest lies in the histories of the cultural, political and spatial borders between Māori and Pākehā and of the interactions that took place across these borders.

---

<sup>1</sup>Pākehā are New Zealanders of European ancestry.

<sup>2</sup>Māori are the indigenous people of Aotearoa.

The topic of this thesis is one that I stumbled upon while reading Kuykendall's history of the Hawaiian kingdom<sup>3</sup>. It concerns the interracial politics of the period before the overthrow of the Hawaiian monarchy in 1893, which was a pivotal event in the history of the islands and marked the beginning of the end of Hawaiian independence. The political history of this period is usually represented as a struggle between the Haole<sup>4</sup> sugar planters and the Hawaiian monarchy. It is assumed that other Haole supported the actions of the sugar planters, while the Hawaiians supported their monarchs.

My discovery was that there was in fact a significant group of Haole who sided with Native Hawaiians against the ambitions of the sugar planters. Working and middle class Haole became a group whose loyalty was sought by both sides. A significant number sided with Native Hawaiian politicians rather than with the sugar planters. In doing so they also chose to transcend their various national identities and act as citizens of Hawai'i. Their actions challenge the oppositional paradigm of Native Hawaiians versus foreigners, which has tended to dominate the historical accounts of that period. They also demonstrate the flexibility and negotiability of concepts such as race, class and national identity in the practice of culture and politics. In doing so, it opens to examination the potential for action that arises through the recognition of a variety of possible alliances. This is a topic which is as relevant today as it was then.

---

<sup>3</sup>Ralph S. Kuykendall, *The Hawaiian Kingdom, Volume III: 1874-1893, The Kalakaua dynasty* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1967).

<sup>4</sup>Haole are residents of Hawai'i of predominantly European or European-American descent.

## Theoretical Approach

This thesis utilizes an approach to history that Fernand Braudel described as *histoire-problème*, that is, to approach the study of history as an analytical exercise, rather than just the recounting of events.<sup>5</sup> The *problème* analyzed in this work is how a non-indigenous class based movement works, or doesn't work, alongside an indigenous nationalist movement.

As a framework for *histoire-problème*, Braudel identified three principal categories of social time, which he defined both in terms of their length of time-span and the object of their measurement. The first is *l'histoire événementielle*, or "episodic history", which focuses on the ordering, reporting and explaining of events within a short-term time-frame. The middle category is *l'histoire conjoncturelle*, which Immanuel Wallerstein explained as follows:

*L'histoire conjoncturelle* is often mistranslated "conjunctural history." The term "*conjoncture*" in fact does not refer to a conjuncture but rather to either phase (the rising or the declining phase) of a cyclical process, one half, so to speak, of a bell-shaped curve on a chart. I think it would be more fruitful to translate it therefore as "cyclical history," although that term too is ambiguous in English, since the cycle referred to is not that of the entirety of human history, as when we say that Toynbee has a cyclical concept of history in that each civilization repeats some basic pattern. Braudel's cycles are cycles *within* something.<sup>6</sup>

Braudel referred to the something in which these cycles occur as the *longue durée*, or *l'histoire structurelle*, which deals with the very long term. Wallerstein warned that it should not be confused with anthropological structuralism, such as that of Lévi-Strauss, which is antithetical to historical processes. Structural history deals with structures which change over time. Braudel suggested that Lévi-Strauss's

---

<sup>5</sup>Immanuel Wallerstein, *Unthinking Social Science: the limits of nineteenth-century paradigms* (Cambridge, U.K.: Polity Press, 1991), 187.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid, 136-37.

structuralism exists is a fourth time-frame, which he called the too long-term, and suggests that "if it exists, [it] can only be the time period of the sages."<sup>7</sup>

Braudel asserted that it was cyclical and structural time that gave significance and meaning to history. He dismissed events as the dust of history and considered the ongoing social, political, economic and cultural patterns as demonstrated through these longer time period to be more real.<sup>8</sup> I find Braudel to be too dismissive of the importance of historical events. I agree that it is our conceptualization of the longer time spans that provides the framework for determining the significance of events. However it is the events that link us to the individuals that were involved in them. Without this level of intimate analysis of individual actions, we are left with an impersonal and largely deterministic framework of history.

Wallerstein elaborated Braudel's temporal categories by extending them to TimeSpace categories and suggested that each period also relates to a specific space. He warned that these spaces are "every bit as controversial and constructed a phenomenon" as the categorizations of time. However, while the boundaries may be fuzzy, there is no doubt that events occur within a particular space as well as a particular time. The spacial definitions and boundaries of a historical study are as important as the temporal ones, as the choice of particular spacial definitions is intimately related to analytical questions that are being focused on.

Wallerstein connected episodic history with the immediate geopolitical space in which the events take place. Cyclical time is connected with what he termed ideological space. These are large spatial divisions that "are linked with, are explained by, and in turn explain, major economic, political, and social thrusts that are in some sense "medium-term" in time-span."<sup>9</sup> Structural time corresponds then to structural

---

<sup>7</sup>Ibid, 137.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid, 137-38.

<sup>9</sup>Ibid, 141-42.

space, that is space that is occupied a self-contained historical system such as the capitalist world-economy. As with the immediate geopolitical space, the choice of definitions for the ideological and structural spaces is also closely related to the types of analytical questions being posited. We therefore need to be aware of how we define the space, as well as the time, that we are studying.<sup>10</sup>

Wallerstein also raised the existence of another type of TimeSpace, which I believe is relevant to the present study:

It is the time of which the theologians speak, *kairos* as opposed to *chronos*, the "right time" as opposed to "formal time," which Paul Tillich argued was the distinction between "qualitative" and "quantitative" time. ... The chronosophies of mankind have such theological concepts deeply embedded within them. ... The intermeshed concepts of "crisis" and "transition" -two of the commonest words in our social scientific vocabulary - are nothing but avatars of *kairos*.<sup>11</sup>

He suggested that *kairos* is connected with structural TimeSpace, and is not related to cyclical-ideological TimeSpace, "despite our propensity to label each downturn in a cycle as a crisis and each upturn in a cycle as a transition to a new order." The real fundamental structural changes occur within the geohistorical social systems that occupy structural TimeSpace:

It is when [a system's] demise is in sight that a system is in crisis, and must therefore be in transition to something else. This is the "right time" and of course the "right place" to which the concept of *kairos* refers. The theologians are reminding us of something fundamental, of the existence of fundamental moral choice which comes rarely but, when it comes, come unavoidably.

People resist fundamental moral choice. They always have; they always will. For choice is not easy, and it is for the most part not really possible. It is in fact true that almost all that we do is determined, by which we mean constrained, even into the inner recesses of our mind, by our social biographies.<sup>12</sup>

While the ongoing geohistorical social system is very efficiently perpetuated through the determination, or constraint, of individual actions, when it reaches a point where the internal contradictions are so fully developed as to precipitate systemic crisis and therefore transition into another state, the

---

<sup>10</sup>Ibid, 139-45.

<sup>11</sup>Ibid, 146.

<sup>12</sup>Ibid, 146-47.

predictability of the outcome is diminished. This is the time when free will is most effective and moral choices most important. The outcome of the crisis will be the result of collective effort, which in turn will be the culmination of the work of antisystemic movements. Whereas before the crisis "large fluctuations resulted in small changes (hence the 'determinism', hence the disillusionment with outcomes of reformism, even when called 'revolution'), [during the crisis] small fluctuations will result in big changes (hence the opening for true 'agency', hence the responsibility we all bear.)"<sup>13</sup>

Wallerstein privileges the use of *kairos* for those times when the entire historical system is in transition, such as the transition from European feudalism to capitalism and the inevitable transition in the future from capitalism to something else. I would suggest however that *kairos* is a relative concept that is ever present and that it operates at all levels of historical reality. It is relative in terms of how widespread the effect of a moral choice is. I agree with Wallerstein that when the historical system is in transition that moral choice becomes a very critical issue for all of us, for this is the time when it will have its fullest possible impact. However, there are also instances where a more restricted version of *kairos* is present. The outcomes of the choice may still be set within the existing historical system, but nonetheless, a degree of choice exists. Also, while the short-term and medium-term consequences of this choice may be limited in terms of changing the historical system, these choices can I believe have a cumulative effect which can influence the form of the new system that will emerge once the full systemic crisis is reached. It is this more limited and relative, but pervasive form of *kairos* that I wish to invoke in this thesis.

This brings the discussion to the issue of free-will and determinism. It should be clear from the above that I am arguing for a history in which free-will plays a significant role. While the historical system places constraints on individual actions, individuals can and do make choices with regard to how best to

---

<sup>13</sup>Immanuel Wallerstein, *Geopolitics and Geoculture: essays on the changing world-system* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 14-15. For a fuller explanation of the process of crisis and transition, see Immanuel Wallerstein, "Crisis as transition," in Samir Amin and others, *Dynamics of Global Crisis* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1982), 11-54.



adapt, challenge or survive in that system. Even the system itself, I believe, is sustained through the ongoing collective agreement of those groups and individuals who are part of it. When this agreement can no longer be sustained, the system enters a crisis. In the case of Hawai'i, contact with the European world system was largely inevitable and given the nature of world capitalism, incorporation into that system was also inevitable. However, at every point along the way there were choices that Hawaiians and non-Hawaiians made which had important consequences regarding the manner of incorporation and on who's terms that incorporation took place. While many of these choices were made fairly automatically, a number of them were also quite deliberate and made with a sense that they would change the course of history, which they often did. My interest therefore in this thesis is in the choices individuals make within the framework of the current historical system, what influenced them in making these choices and what the consequences of their choices were.

The issue of determinism and free-will becomes much more blurred at the individual level. Most of the time the historical system "determines" the outcomes of individual choices through means that are barely visible and not widely understood as such at the time. Individuals tend to make a certain choice because they do not recognize the existence or possibility of other choices. They make certain other choices because they have been told that this choice will best serve their individual interests, either short-term or long-term. They make still other choices because that is what everyone else does. Situations where individuals are forced to make a specific choice are much rarer I believe than we allow ourselves to think. This is not to deny that there are differences in power between individuals and groups according to where they are placed within the historical system, but to point out that the system is so 'designed' as to persuade the majority of people to underestimate their individual and especially their collective power. In order to understand this phenomenon, we need to look at the phenomenon of culture.

Of all the concepts invoked by the social sciences and humanities, culture is probably the one that is most challenging. The problem lies with the wide range of definitions and uses to which it is put. In

this thesis, I use culture to refer to the "webs of significance" in which individuals are suspended. This is a definition based on the work of Clifford Geertz, who in turn began with the ideas of Max Weber.<sup>14</sup> My analysis of culture therefore is an interpretation of meaning. It takes culture to be a publicly acted document, created by individuals who share common understandings of the meanings of their actions with other individuals. To understand an action, or an event, it is necessary therefore to understand the meanings that are associated with it. Thus, the same action may mean quite different things to two different individuals, depending on the system of meanings that they are familiar with, that is, according to their cultural background. What makes such interpretation even more interesting, is that while these meanings are agreed upon between certain groups of individuals, they can also be manipulated, subverted and changed through the process of events. Culture in this sense is not static, it is forever changing, sometimes subtly, sometimes abruptly. The importance of maintaining certain meanings is also variable. Some are deeply embedded in the individual and collective mind and these are strongly defended, even in the face of overwhelming change. These are the shared meanings that define the very purpose and existence of the group or collectivity who share them. Other meanings are fluid and dynamic. They are more easily changed as new circumstances arise without presenting such a fundamental challenge to the group identity.

Control of the collective agreement on meaning is an important aspect of power politics. If those who hold the economic and political power, can also persuade others to maintain a certain set of meanings which reinforce their own privilege, then their power is secure. However, the very nature of meaning ensures that no one group or individual could ever have a total monopoly over it. So that even the least powerful groups can still make use of the manipulation of meaning to subvert the intentions of the powerful. Culture therefore becomes the wildcard within the historical system. It is the arena in which individuals can exercise the greatest collective choice, at the same time as being the mechanism by which those who control the system try to limit the apparent range of possible choices. Morality itself is part of this system

---

<sup>14</sup>See Clifford Geertz, *The Interpretation of Cultures* (New York: Basic Books Inc., 1973), 3-30.

of meanings. So that the moral choice of *kairos* is one that will be based on what moral meanings individuals and groups agree to share.

### *TimeSpace definitions*

The episodic history recounted in this thesis took place in the TimeSpace of the Hawaiian Islands from July 1887 to 1890. This time period is bounded by the imposition of the 1887 constitution and the 1890 legislative session. I have chosen to define the Hawaiian islands as the space for the episodic history because this is the space in which the events that I am interested in occurred. It is the space to which the constitution and laws of the Kingdom of Hawai'i applied, over which the King and the legislature had sovereign power and therefore the space in which the elections were held. It is a space which also has, for the purposes of this study, gender and racial boundaries. National politics was defined by the 1887 constitution as the activity of Hawaiian, European and American males. These groups are the central focus of the study. From the evidence I have found, with the exception of certain members of the royal family, women did not play a visible role in national politics during this period. Asian men did play a role, but their role was firmly restricted to the margins, although their presence and right to remain in the islands was an issue of major political importance.

The Hawaiian Islands in the late nineteenth century were caught up in several competing ideological spaces. A major theme in this thesis is the struggle to determine which ideological space the kingdom should be part of and under what conditions. The dominant ideological space was that of the greater United States of America. As this space was being extended westward, the Hawaiian islands were gradually being incorporated into it. At this time they were still on its periphery. However, they were also on the periphery of other spaces, most notably that of the British Empire. While never formally part of the Empire, the Kings of Hawai'i had a general preference for this ideological space and the British government was determined to maintain a presence in the islands since they provided a valuable link between Canada and Australia, New Zealand and the South Pacific. The islands were also on the periphery of the French

and German empires, although the links with these spaces were both economically and politically weaker. There was also the ideological space of Polynesia to which King Kalākaua unsuccessfully tried to establish a political reality. Within or between these spaces, the King and the people of Hawai'i were trying to hold on to their own independent ideological space.

All of these ideological spaces existed within the structural TimeSpace of world capitalism. For the purposes of this thesis, I have used Wallerstein's analysis of world capitalism as a historic world system. He identified its temporal boundaries as being from the "long sixteenth century to the present." Its spacial boundaries began with most of Europe and Iberian America and had extended to encompass the entire globe during the late nineteenth century.<sup>15</sup> In the Pacific, this involved the final allocation of colonial territories between the great powers during the 1880s. By the early 1890s Hawai'i was the last fully independent sovereign state in the Pacific, status that would not outlast the decade.

Wallerstein identified the following as the defining characteristics of the world-capitalist system:

Its mode of production is capitalist; that is, it is predicated on the endless accumulation of capital. Its structure is that of an axial social division of labor, exhibiting a core/periphery tension based on unequal exchange. The political superstructure of this system is the set of so-called sovereign states defined and constrained by their membership in an interstate network or system. The operational guidelines of this interstate system include the so-called balance of power, a mechanism designed to ensure that no single state ever has the capacity to transform this interstate system into a single world-empire whose boundaries would match that of the axial division of labor.<sup>16</sup>

The interstate system allows for one state to reach a position of hegemony for a short period of time, when it can "largely impose its rules and its wishes (at the very least by effective veto power) in the economic, political, military, diplomatic, and even cultural arenas." This involves the simultaneous domination of agro-industrial production, commerce and finance. Wallerstein identifies three such periods

---

<sup>15</sup>Immanuel Wallerstein, "The three instances of hegemony in the history of the capitalist world-economy," *International Journal of Comparative Sociology* 24 (1983) : 100.

<sup>16</sup>Ibid, 100-101.

of hegemony in the history of the capitalist world system: "the United Provinces in the mid-seventeenth century, the United Kingdom in the mid-nineteenth, and the United States in the mid-twentieth." The period of this study is located between the end of British hegemony, which Wallerstein tentatively dates at 1873, and the beginning of the struggle between the United States and Germany for succession.<sup>17</sup>

It is also the period where the crisis of the capitalist system is starting to emerge and be understood in a systematic manner. Wallerstein cites the political turmoil of the twentieth century as the central expression of this structural crisis. By this he means the turmoil between ideologies, such as the occurrence of class and nationalist revolutions of various kinds, as well as "the many vaguer but nonetheless quite real politico-cultural modes of rejection: the civilizational "renaissances", the pan-movements, the assertion of the claims of "minorities," the women's movement."<sup>18</sup> Wallerstein dates the origins of these movements to the French revolution of 1789, which "put the ideology of the *Ancien Régime* permanently on the defensive, and throughout the world-system. And it simultaneously firmly established the ideological motifs of the modern world, the rallying cries and the rationale of the movements to come. These motifs can be plainly summarized in the French Revolution's famous slogan, 'liberty, equality, fraternity.'<sup>19</sup> The 1848 revolution in France marked the first serious attempt by a proletarian-based political group to gain power and the beginning of the organization of proletariat, nationalist and women's groups throughout the world-system. Although there was considerable debate over tactics and the relationship between class, gender and nationalist based movements, the main focus of this phase was the achievement of state power. The most

---

<sup>17</sup>Ibid, 101-102.

<sup>18</sup>Wallerstein, "Crisis as transition," 34.

<sup>19</sup>Immanuel Wallerstein, "Antisystemic movements" in Samir Amin and others, *Transforming the Revolution: social movements and the world-system* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1990), 13.

striking success of these movements was the Bolshevik revolution of 1917, which inspired a further series of class and nationalist revolutions.<sup>20</sup>

### **The Incorporation of Hawai'i into the World-Capitalist System**

At the time of this study, Hawai'i was relatively recently incorporated into the world-capitalist system. In order to understand the events of 1887 to 1890, it is necessary to briefly outline the process of incorporation, as well as to outline the Hawaiian world-system that was replaced by the world-capitalist one. This is not meant to be a comprehensive account, but merely to cover the major points relevant to this thesis.

#### *The Hawaiian World-System*

The first people to arrive in the Hawaiian islands were Polynesians, who settled in the islands more than 1500 years ago. By the eve of European contact the islands were well populated and a complex and stratified society had been formed. This society constituted a self-contained world system. While they were aware of and in occasional contact with people from other islands of the Pacific, their own islands provided everything that was necessary to maintain the social, economic and political system.

The economic base of the system was subsistence agricultural production, supplemented by fishing and the gathering of natural resources. Agricultural production centered around the cultivation of *kalo* (also known as taro or *Colocasia esculenta*). The land was not individually owned, but held in trust. The

---

<sup>20</sup>See *ibid*, 16-27 for an extended discussion of this period. Wallerstein omits the women's movements in his analysis. I have included them because I believe that they were important anti-systemic movements of the time, even though their links to class based struggles were not always clear.

concept of wealth equated to an abundance of *kalo* and therefore the control of the water-supply needed to grow it. The Hawaiian word for wealth is *waiwai*, meaning plenty of water. Economic relations were based on exchanges of generosity between families and related households. Accumulation of surplus production was socially unacceptable, as was exchange for profit. An exception to this rule existed in the case of the *Ali'i* (chiefs), who could accumulate certain forms of wealth, such as feather cloaks and *kapa* (decorated bark cloth), as symbols of their power and the prosperity of their lands.<sup>21</sup>

There was a class based division of labor, between the ruling *Ali'i* and the *maka'āinana* (commoners). *Maka'āinana* literally means those who were on the land, as well as the eyes of the land. They were planters, fishermen and craftsmen and held rights to land and resources in specific areas. The *Ali'i* provided the social organization necessary to maintain the productivity of the land. In return for this the *maka'āinana* were required to give them regular donations of surplus labor and produce.<sup>22</sup>

The political superstructure of the system was composed of *moku* (districts) controlled by independent *Ali' Nui* (high chiefs) or *Mō'ī* (supreme chiefs). The control of the land was vested in the *Mō'ī* and was the basis of his sovereignty. When a new *Mō'ī* came to power, the land would be re-divided among his *Ali'i*. This act was known as *kālai'āina* (to carve the land), and formed the central performative act of Hawaiian politics. Within each *moku* there was a complex subdivision of lands over which an equally complex system of *konohiki* (land stewards) were appointed to collect tribute to the *Ali'i Nui* and organize

---

<sup>21</sup>E. S. Craighill Handy and Elizabeth Handy, *Native Planters in Old Hawaii: their life, lore, and environment*, with the collaboration of Mary Kawena Pukui, Bernice P. Bishop Museum Bulletin 233 (Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press, 1972), 18, 41, 313-15.

<sup>22</sup>*Ibid*, 323-33; Lilikalā Kame'eleihiwa, *Native Land and Foreign Desires: Pehea Lā E Pono Ai?* (Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press, 1992), 30; Marshall Sahlins, *Historical Ethnography*, vol. 1 of *Anahulu: the anthropology of history in the Kingdom of Hawai'i*, by Patrick V. Kirch and Marshall Sahlins (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), 28.

cultivation and fishing. The *konohiki* were selected from the ranks of the *kaukau ali'i* (junior lines) who could claim relationship to the ruling *Ali'i Nui*.<sup>23</sup>

The major ideological underpinning of the system was a generous concept of kinship. The *Ali'i* traced their descent back to Wākea and Papa, the sky-father and the earth-mother. Wākea and Papa also gave birth to the islands and Wākea fathered the *kalo*. Thus kinship included a recognition of the land and the *kalo* as elder siblings.<sup>24</sup> The genealogy of the *Ali'i Nui*, along with its associated *mo'olelo*, provided the structure of Hawaiian history and the models on which to pattern behavior. Lilikalā Kame'eleihiwa states:

*Ali'i Nui* are not merely individuals born into a ruling class; they are the totality of their genealogy, which is comprised of the character of their ancestors. This is the sum total of their identity.<sup>25</sup>

The *maka'āinana* also recognized a kinship relationship to the land and to the *Ali'i*. The term *kama'āina* referred to a person born in the local area and literally means child of the land. The relationship between the *Ali'i* and the *maka'āinana* was generally a personal and affectionate one, unless the *Ali'i* were particularly abusive of the relationship, which was not usually the case.<sup>26</sup>

The social and political order was further reinforced by the related concepts of *kapu* and *mana*. *Mana* refers to power which emanates from the *Akua* (gods) and is most concentrated in the *Ali'i Nui*. It is demonstrated through successful and efficacious actions, especially where spiritual powers are involved. It was the *mana* of the *Ali'i*, accumulated through descent and demonstration, that gave them the right to rule. *Kapu* provided a system of marking for the purpose of the control of society and of political and

---

<sup>23</sup>Kame'eleihiwa, *Pehea Lā?*, 29, 51-52; Handy and Handy, *Native Planters*, 41.

<sup>24</sup>Kame'eleihiwa, *Pehea Lā?*, 19-25.

<sup>25</sup>Ibid, 21.

<sup>26</sup>Handy and Handy, *Native Planters*, 42-3, 326; Kame'eleihiwa, *Pehea Lā?*, 26.



spiritual power. It defined *Ali'i* gender relations through separation of men and women while eating. It defined *Ali'i* and *maka'āinana* relations through prescribed rituals of separation and obeisance. It also regulated the use of resources.<sup>27</sup>

The emphasis on kinship did not mean that Hawaiian society was free of major conflict. There was intense rivalry among the *Ali'i*. They competed for *mana* either through sexual alliances or warfare.<sup>28</sup> The latter could increase the burdens on the *maka'āinana*. Violence was also used to maintain the social and spiritual order in the form of capital punishment and human sacrifice. However, on the whole order was maintained through mutual respect and compliance, rather than coercion.

#### *The Incorporation of Hawai'i into the World-Capitalist System*

The incorporation of Hawai'i into the world-capitalist system began in 1778 when the British explorer Captain James Cook arrived in the islands. His arrival disrupted the self-contained Hawaiian world-system and brought momentous changes. The most devastating being introduced diseases to which the Hawaiians had no natural immunity, which wiped out 90 to 95 percent of the population during the first century of contact.<sup>29</sup> The survivors of this unbidden holocaust also had to deal with the continual arrival of people in the islands whose ways were utterly strange to them. They called the newcomers *Haole* or *Hā'ole*, meaning without breath, on account of their unfamiliarity with the language and ways of the

---

<sup>27</sup>See Valerio Valeri, *Kingship and Sacrifice: ritual and society in ancient Hawaii*, translated by Paula Wissing (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985), 90-104 for a more extended discussion of these concepts.

<sup>28</sup>Kame'eleihiwa, *Pehea Lā?*, 44.

<sup>29</sup>Until recently the accepted estimate of population size at the time of Cook's arrival was around 350,000. David Stannard has revised this estimate to 800,000 or more. The census of 1878 showed the population of Hawaiians, including part-Hawaiians, to be 47,508. While the accuracy of the 1778 population estimates is still being debated, both estimate show that the decline in the Hawaiian population during the first century of contact was catastrophic. The population continued to decline to a low of 37,656 in 1900, but had recovered to 211,448 by 1986. David E. Stannard, *Before the Horror: the population of Hawai'i on the eve of Western contact* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1989). Eleanor C. Nurdyke, *The Peopling of Hawai'i*, second edition (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1989), 178.

Hawaiians.<sup>30</sup> But the Hawaiians would also have to learn to breathe with the Haole, if they were to survive into the future.

There were three major events in the process of incorporation into the world-capitalist system; state-formation, adoption of Christianity and western education; and privatization of land titles.

As mentioned above, the political superstructure of the Hawaiian world system was composed of *moku* ruled by independent *Ali'i Nui* or *Mō'i*. These *moku* generally ranged from part to all of one island. There were a few recorded instances though when *Ali'i Nui* managed to unite several islands under their control. One such instance was Ka-lau-nui-o-hua, who united the island of Hawai'i and then extended his control over Maui, Lāna'i, Moloka'i and O'ahu and was defeated when he tried to occupy Kaua'i. Military and political expansion of this kind was generally short-lived and the conquerors inevitably were overthrown by their rival *Ali'i Nui*.<sup>31</sup>

Following the arrival of Captain Cook, European fire-arms were introduced to the islands as an item of trade. These were put to use by an aspiring *Ali'i Nui* from the island of Hawai'i, Kamehameha. Utilizing the military advice of two British ship's officers, John Young and Isaac Davis, he gained control of the island of Hawai'i and by 1795 had conquered Maui and O'ahu. He attempted also to conquer Kaua'i, but his ships were destroyed by high winds and seas in the channel between O'ahu and Kaua'i. A second attempt was thwarted by the outbreak of a major epidemic.<sup>32</sup>

---

<sup>30</sup>Nordyke, *Peopling of Hawai'i*, 43.

<sup>31</sup>William Davenport, "The 'Hawaiian Cultural Revolution': some political and economic considerations," *American Anthropologist*, 71 (1969) : 2.

<sup>32</sup>*Ibid*, 11-14.

Kamehameha established a centralized kingdom, utilizing a mixture of Hawaiian and British monarchical and feudal structures. Through this structure, he was able to maintain a reasonable degree of control over relations and trade with the increasing numbers of Europeans who were visiting the islands. In 1810, the *Ali'i Nui* of Kaua'i acknowledged Kamehameha's supremacy and accepted Kamehameha's heir, Liholiho, as successor to the kingdom, including Kaua'i. Thus, all the islands were unified under a single political structure, that had the potential to be recognized within the interstate system.<sup>33</sup> However, the kingdom still had to pass the test of succession.

Kamehameha died after a brief illness in 1819. He had named his son, Liholiho, as his political successor, and his nephew, Ke-kua-o-ka-lani, as custodian of the state war *Akua*, *Kū-kā'ili-moku*, a position that was effectively commander-in-chief of the military. This was a common form of co-succession that was designed to reduce the possibilities of the kingdom being destroyed through factional rivalries. Furthermore, Kamehameha appointed his influential wife, Ka-'ahu-manu to act as *Kuhina Nui* (chief counsellor) for the young Liholiho. The *Kālainmoku* (divider of the land), Ka-lani-mōkū, and the *Kahuna Nui* (high priest), Hewahewa, remained in office following Kamehameha's death. However Ka-'ahu-manu worked to extend her influence and control over the kingdom.<sup>34</sup>

Following the death of a *Mō'i* the restrictions of the *kapu* were lifted for as part of the mourning ceremony, until the new *Mō'i* was installed. During Kamehameha's reign, the Europeans had commonly violated and derided the *kapu* without punishment, divine or secular. However, Kamehameha was quick to enforce the full penalty on Hawaiian *kapu* violators. The fact that Europeans lived without *kapu* restrictions and that they broke them with impunity, weakened the symbolic force of these laws. The period of mourning following Kamehameha's death turned into a test to determine how much of the old system

---

<sup>33</sup>Ibid, 14.

<sup>34</sup>Ibid, 14-15; Kame'eleihiwa, *Pehea Lā*, 73-74.

of *kapu* would be reinstated. Liholiho and Ke-kua-o-ka-lani went into retreat during this period. When they were requested to return to court, the two most influential women in the kingdom, Ka-'ahu-manu and Liholiho's mother, Ke-opu-o-lani, invited them to eat with them in violation of the *kapu*, which required that men and women eat separately. Liholiho agreed to do so and thus the *kapu* was broken by those whose mandate it was to enforce it. It also brought to an end the concept of divine rule and ushered in a new era of secular government. With the cooperation of Hewahewa, the temples of the state *Akua* were destroyed.<sup>35</sup>

Liholiho's co-successor, Ke-kua-o-ka-lani, did not agree with the abolition of the *kapu* and the state religion. He gathered allies together and launched a military coup against Liholiho, invoking the power of the old *Akua*. Liholiho had the greater access to firearms and after two battles defeated and killed Ke-kua-o-ka-lani and demonstrated that the powers of the old *Akua* were also finished. These actions left the kingdom without a state religion.

Various explanations have been posited to account for this sudden cultural change. The changes were part of a power play by Ka-'ahu-manu to concentrate power in the hands of Liholiho without breaking up the kingdom, by eliminating the role of Ke-kua-o-ka-lani and the state *kahuna* (priests). They were also a response to the increasing tensions that resulted from contact and trade with the Europeans. In this sense they can be seen as constitutional reforms needed to ensure that the kingdom could function more easily within the world-capitalist system. They were also an attempt to preserve the life of the kingdom. Ka-'ahu-manu justified her actions on the basis that Hawaiians would live as Europeans did. In the period since European contact, the Hawaiian population had been declining alarmingly. Europeans were not affected by the epidemics, so to live as Europeans did, meant both to acquire their superior technology and to find

---

<sup>35</sup>Davenport, "Hawaiian Cultural Revolution", 14-16.

effective ways of halting the epidemics. This in turn meant abandoning the old systems of social relationships.<sup>36</sup>

Shortly after the abolition of the *kapu*, a small band of extremely puritanical Congregational missionaries arrived in the islands from New England. They were invited to stay and the Hawaiians were interested in learning what they had to teach. The missionaries offered *Ke Ola Hou*, new life and rebirth under a new *Akua*, *Iesu Kristo*. They also introduced a new set of *kapu* based around the restrictions of evangelical Christianity and Western capitalism. They set up an education system for the Hawaiians, teaching them the culture and technology of the Europeans. The old Hawaiian skills were becoming increasingly obsolete, so it was to the missionaries that they turned to learn the skills necessary for survival in the new world system. The first to be educated were the *Ali'i*, with a view to training them for positions in government. Education was then gradually extended to a large proportion of the population, providing manual training and basic literacy. In this regard the Hawaiian mission set an example that was ahead of its time, with regard to education in other parts of the world system.<sup>37</sup>

The missionaries also took a role in advising on the constitutional development of the kingdom. In 1838, several of them severed their ties with the mission board and became advisors to the government. They promoted two major reforms; the establishment of a constitution and the privatization of land titles. Both of these reforms were in response to pressure from Americans and Europeans to bring the government of the kingdom into line with the accepted norms of state government within the world capitalist system. The constitution, which was established in 1840, was modelled on American constitutional principles. The privatization of land was meant to protect the interests of the *Ali'i* and the *maka'āinana* by securing their land titles and protecting them from the actions of unscrupulous foreigners. It was also intended to increase

---

<sup>36</sup>Ibid, 16-19; Kame'eleihiwa, *Pehea Lā?*, 81-82.

<sup>37</sup>Merze Tate, *Hawai'i: reciprocity or annexation* (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1968), 6.

the prosperity of the kingdom by allowing the development of capitalist enterprises. However, the main beneficiaries were the missionaries and other foreigners, who the advantage of understanding how the system worked and were able to accumulate major land holdings.

Throughout the nineteenth century, Hawai'i went through a number of stages of economic integration into the world-capitalist system. The first stage was the trade in provisioning of ships. This was fairly peripheral to both the Hawaiian and the capitalist world-systems and did not result in major changes to the economic system in Hawai'i. The basis of trade was reciprocal exchange, although the demand for firearms and ships by the government stimulated the role of capital accumulation. The desire for accumulation was further fuelled by the development of the sandalwood trade at the beginning of the nineteenth century. Sandalwood was in high demand by American and British traders who desperately needed a commodity to exchange for Chinese tea. The Hawaiian islands provided an ideally situated source for the wood, being strategically positioned on the route across the Pacific to China. After the sandalwood was exhausted, Hawai'i became the major provisioning port for the North Pacific whalers. This trade brought about the introduction of formalized trading companies and the development of European style commerce within the islands. Whaling declined dramatically in the 1860s as whale numbers became depleted and increased competition from petroleum was felt. It also became increasingly dangerous, as whalers had to venture further and further north into the Arctic waters. In 1871, 33 ships were lost in the Arctic and 1876 another 13 were lost, effectively ending whaling in the North Pacific.<sup>38</sup> Hawai'i then turned to agriculture and ranching for its economic prosperity. Of the various enterprises that were experimented with, sugar proved to be the most viable. It was to be the sugar trade that determined Hawai'i's role in the world capitalist system for the rest of the nineteenth century and the first half of the twentieth.

---

<sup>38</sup>Theodore Morgan, *Hawai'i: a century of economic change, 1778-1876* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1948), 140-46.

## The Kingdom of Hawai'i in the 1880s

By the 1880s, many things had changed in the Kingdom of Hawai'i compared to the time of Captain Cook's arrival and further changes were taking place. The Native Hawaiian population had declined to 47,502 by 1878 and declined further to 40,622 by 1890. In 1878, there were 3,748 Haole in Hawai'i. By 1890, this number had increased to 18,939. The other major racial group were Chinese, of whom there were 6,045 in 1878 and 16,752 in 1890. This meant that within a twelve year period, Native Hawaiians had fallen from being 82 percent of the total population to a mere 45 percent.<sup>39</sup>

The main reason behind these demographic changes was the sugar industry. Sugar exports had grown from 38 million pounds for 1878 to 242 million in 1890, with a value of \$13 million and accounting for over ninety percent of the value of total exports from the islands. By 1890, there were 64 plantations in operation covering an area of 64,149 acres, with a total capital investment \$33 million; \$25 million of which was owned by Americans, \$6 million by British and a mere \$266,000 by Native Hawaiians.<sup>40</sup> In order to obtain sufficient labor to work the plantations, the planters had imported labor China and Portugal. A substantial number of Americans and other Europeans had also arrived and settled in the island to take up jobs on or connected with the plantations and their growing service industries.

Politically the decade was a period of increasing tensions between Native Hawaiians and Haole. Native Hawaiians were learning how to regain political control under the new systems of government. Many of those educated in the mission schools were now taking up jobs in the government and the professions. At the same time, the sugar planters wanted to maintain control of the government for their

---

<sup>39</sup>Nordyke, *Peopling of Hawaii*, 178-79.

<sup>40</sup>Thomas Thrum, *Hawaiian Almanac and Annual* (Honolulu: Press Publishing Co.), 1882:13, 1891:26, 61-63.

own benefit and there was an increasingly large group of middle and working class Haole who also wanted a real political voice.

It was a period when the concepts of race, class and national identity were important categories of social organization. Native Hawaiians were still divided between *Ali'i* and *maka'āinana*, but each had taken up new roles in the economic system. The *Ali'i* formed an educated middle and upper class, who held positions in government, the public service and the profession, especially teaching and law. The *maka'āinana* were laborers and tenant farmers. Haole were also divided by class. There were a small group of plantation and major business owners who formed the upper class. There was a middle class of professionals, skilled workers and small businessmen and a lower class of laborers and semi-skilled workers, who owned little in the way of real property.

Race and nationality provided somewhat ambiguous categories of identification. In Hawaiian they are both referred to by the same word, *lāhui*, which is defined as "nation, race, people, nationality; great company of people; species, as of animal or fish, breed; national, racial."<sup>41</sup> In the late nineteenth century *lāhui* generally referred to the Hawaiian nation, which included all people of Native Hawaiian ancestry and could also include others born in the islands or who were long-term residents, depending on the context and the attitude of the speaker. As a term for race it can similarly be as narrow as just the Native Hawaiian people, or as broad as to include other Polynesian people and even the Japanese, who were seen to be racially related in terms of distant shared ancestry.<sup>42</sup>

For Haole, concepts of race were closely linked to the new science of evolution. They viewed the world as being divided into several major races based on skin color and physical features. The white race

---

<sup>41</sup>Mary Kawena Pukui and Samuel H. Elbert, *Hawaiian Dictionary: Hawaiian-English, English-Hawaiian*, revised and enlarged edition (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1986), 190.

<sup>42</sup>Kuykendall, *Hawaiian Kingdom III*, 159.



was of course considered by them to be the most superior and had supposedly proved this through its conquest of the world. The white race was further divided into sub-groups, of which the Anglo-Saxons were seen as the most successful and therefore most highly evolved. National identity was related to political allegiance. Therefore, both white Americans and British could identify themselves as Anglo-Saxons, while recognizing their separate nationalities and political ideals. To be American was to believe in the ideals of republican democracy as the highest form of political organization, while to be British was to believe in the Empire of Great Britain under the glorious reign of Queen Victoria as the greatest achievement of any nation in the history of the world. This interplay of Anglo-Saxon identities was further complicated in Hawai'i by the emergence of a Hawaiian national identity amongst Haole who had been born in the islands or chosen to settle there permanently.

On the plantations, the work and wage levels were determined according to race and nationality. Planters considered that the supposed differences in racial characteristics suited different races for different jobs. The Chinese were employed unskilled and routine labor in the field and the mill. Portuguese immigrants were brought in to take up more skilled work and work as *luna* (overseers) in the fields. American and British were employed in the skilled and technical jobs. An American or British skilled worker on average was paid twice the wage of skilled workers of other nationalities.<sup>43</sup> Similar patterns of occupation and income distribution by race were present outside of the plantation as well.

## Sources

As mentioned above, I stumbled upon this topic while reading the third volume of Ralph S. Kuykendall's history of the Hawaiian Kingdom. I have used his account of the period as a starting point

---

<sup>43</sup>Ronald T. Takaki, *Pau Hana: plantation life and labor in Hawai'i, 1835-1920* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1983), 24, 76; Thrum, *Almanac*, 1891:63.

for my research. His footnotes have provided an invaluable guide to primary materials. However, while I have much respect for the thoroughness of his scholarship, my analysis often differs from his and I include much that he had omitted.

This work inter-links with Davianna McGregor-Alegado's Master's thesis, which deals primarily with the actions of Robert Wilcox in 1889.<sup>44</sup> I have extended the material she presents on the 1887 election campaign, but left the details of Wilcox's rebellion much as she has stated them. I would recommend that her thesis be read along with mine by anyone with a strong interest in this period.

My major primary sources have been the newspapers of the period. There were two main English language papers published at the time, the *Pacific Commercial Advertiser* and the *Daily Bulletin*. Ownership, and therefore editorial politics, of these papers changed even faster than the various governments. However, for most of the period in question, the *Advertiser* was the propaganda organ of the Reform party government, while the *Bulletin* claimed to be the independent voice of the workingman.

The Hawaiian language newspapers are more numerous and varied. Unfortunately many issues of them for this period are no longer in existence, leaving large gaps in the record, often at what from my point of view were the most critical times. However, what exists is of great value. There were two Christian newspapers. The main one was *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa* (The Independent Newspaper) which was a supporter of the Reform party and provided reports on major political events from a Native Hawaiian Christian perspective. Most of the issues of this paper are still in existence. The other was *Ko Hawaii Pae Aina* (Of the Hawaiian Islands) which tended to be more extreme in its criticism of non-Protestant Native Hawaiians.

---

<sup>44</sup>Davianna McGregor-Alegado, "Hawaiian Resistance" (M.A. Thesis, University of Hawai'i, 1979).

Of the secular Hawaiian papers, the main one of interest for this topic is *Ka Elele* (The Messenger). Edited by a Haole, Daniel Lyons, it became the organ of Hui Kālai'āina. During the 1890 election campaign it was published as *Ka Ahailono o Ka Lahui - The National Herald* as the unofficial paper of the National Reform Party. There was also a paper called *Ka Makaainana* (The Commoner) of which unfortunately few issues exist from this period. In 1889, J. E. Bush established *Ka Oiaio* (The Truth) and later *Ka Leo o Ka Lahui* (The Voice of the Nation), which also provide some material of interest. The other major secular paper was *Ka Nupepa Ke Alakai o Hawaii* (The Newspaper The Leader of Hawai'i) which contained some political news and occasionally provided a more neutral assessment of events.

I have chosen to use newspapers as the source for public debate since they are the most readily available source today. However, we need to be cautious as to how representative they were of that debate. Since literacy rates were fairly high for both Native Hawaiians (around eighty percent) and Haole (around ninety percent),<sup>45</sup> it can be assumed that newspapers were widely read and discussed within both communities. But there is some question as to what parts of the papers were most read and discussed. The English language papers devoted considerable space to social news and events. It is likely that these had wider interest amongst readers than the more long winded and on-going political debates, which form the source material for this thesis. The front page of every Hawaiian language paper was devoted to *mo'olelo*, which included Hawaiian legends, folk-tales and history, biblical stories and American legendary histories. These were written in serial form and could carry on for several months. Robert Louis Stevenson, on his trip to the Kona coast of the island of Hawai'i in 1889, recorded the arrival of "a great packet of *Ka Nupepa 'Elele*" at the wharf:

---

<sup>45</sup>Kingdom of Hawai'i, Bureau of Public Instruction, *Report of the General Superintendent of the Census, 1890* (Honolulu: R. Grieve, 1891), 34.

I saw one capable middle-aged man tear [the packet] open, turn straight to the story page, read through the current number of one of the serials and then drop the paper like the rind of a sucked orange.<sup>46</sup>

There is insufficient information on which to judge whether this was the normal method of reading the paper. However, given the placement of the *mo'olelo* and the content of the political pages, it is likely that the majority of readers found the *mo'olelo* more interesting. For the purposes of this thesis, I am assuming that the papers, imperfect as they may be, provide the best source on the detail and scope of political debate in Hawai'i at that time and certainly provide us with an account of the major and most influential political viewpoints.

### Usage of Hawaiian Words

A number of Hawaiian words are used in the text. Definitions of these words can be found in the glossary. In most cases I have chosen to italicize Hawaiian words to identify them clearly as such. The exceptions are place names, personal names and the word *Haole*, which is commonly used in standard English in Hawai'i and can be regarded as an ethnic category. In Hawaiian, the pluralization of nouns is achieved through grammatical context rather than by modifying the noun, as in English. I have chosen to keep with this convention when using Hawaiian words. For that reason *Haole* is both singular and plural depending on the context.

As much as I have been able to I have included the diacritical markings in the spelling as an aid to proper pronunciation. However, I may be in error with regard to the inclusion or non-inclusion of these in the spelling of some personal names, since the sources for these names do not always include the

---

<sup>46</sup>Robert Louis Stevenson, *Travels in Hawaii*, ed. and intro. by A. Grove Day (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1991), 186.

diacriticals. I apologize to anyone that I may have inadvertently offended by this through my ignorance. Where I have directly quoted other authors I have reproduced the Hawaiian words as they spelt them.

### **The Structure of the Thesis**

The first part of this thesis, *Nānā i ke Kumu* (Look to the Source), looks at the background and wider development of the two major competing ideological spaces in Hawai'i. The first ideological space is that of that of the Anglo-Saxon Americans and their tradition of republican democracy. The second is that of an independent Hawai'i under rule of the Hawaiian Kings. In particular I will look at its operation during the reign of King Kalākaua, who was the king during the period of this study and who revived aspects of Hawaiian culture, while trying to gain international recognition for the kingdom. It is the conflict between these two ideological spaces that sets the scene for the politics of the period from 1887 to the overthrow of the kingdom in 1893.

The second part of the thesis, *Ka Ho'āla 'Ana* (The Awakening), covers the establishment of Native Hawaiian and Haole movements to resist the changes being made by sugar planters and their allies.

The third part, *Ka Hopena* (The Result), covers the election campaign of 1889-90 and the effectiveness or otherwise of the resistance movements in the legislature of 1890. In the conclusion I draw together my analysis of the events and their meanings and make some connections to present day situations in Hawai'i and Aotearoa.

**PART I**

**NĀNĀ I KE KUMU**

**(LOOK TO THE SOURCE)**

# CHAPTER 1

## FROM RUNNYMEDE TO KA HALE ALI'I 'O 'IOLANI: THE ANGLO-SAXON HERITAGE

Monday, June 15, 1215 in a meadow called Runnymede, on the south bank of the River Thames, on the island of Britain, John, King of England agrees to meet with his rebellious barons to discuss their demands for the reform of the Kingdom. A month or so before the barons had taken control of the City of London and demanded that the King meet with them to discuss their demands. These demands fell into two categories: a list of complaints which had driven the barons to rebellion and "would not outlive the passions of the present hour" and a restatement "in detail [of] the essentials of an orderly society, as it was understood at the time, which would be preserved after John's day and would in the distant future become a symbol of government under law"<sup>1</sup>.

The rebellion was against the accumulation and abuse of royal power and was fueled by the military failures of the King in his wars on the European continent. The barons sought the reinstatement of customary restrictions on the power of the crown, "limits which drew a distinction, already understood in medieval political theory, between rule according to law and rule by the imposition of arbitrary will"<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>William F. Swindler, *Magna Carta: Legend and Legacy* (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Co, Inc., 1965), 78-80.

<sup>2</sup>A.E. Dick Howard, *The Road from Runnymede: Magna Carta and Constitutionalism in America* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1968), 6-7.

While John had considerable forces still loyal to him, he was, for the moment, tactically overpowered. He therefore with some unwillingness gave his assent to their demands, with one exception. Over the next three days, the articles were redrafted into a more formal document and on Friday, June 19, the King and the barons met again to read the agreement, seal the copies and make their peace<sup>3</sup>. Thus the Magna Carta was born.

A couple of months later, on August 24, it was formally annulled by the Pope. He was indignant at the rebellion of the barons, who had violated their loyalty to their paramount lord, going against a fundamental precept of the political system of the age. Since their lord was a vassal of the Holy See, it was rebellion against the Church herself<sup>4</sup>.

With the Church on his side, John regained control of the country, with the exception of London. But the civil war had laid England open to invasion. Phillip of France took the opportunity to form an alliance with the rebels and invade the island. Within a year, support for the rebels and their French allies waned. "Too many in England recognized their bad faith and their total lack of principle. If John was no better, he was at least the lawful sovereign, and men could contrast the continued effectiveness of royal government, wherever it functioned, to the anarchy and spoilage of the rebels and the invaders"<sup>5</sup> The same year John died of dysentery, and on the accession of his nine-year old son Henry the fundamental chapters of the Magna Carta were reissued from the throne<sup>6</sup>.

---

<sup>3</sup>Swindler, *Magna Carta*, 82.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid, 100-101.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid, 102.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid, 105.



Thursday, June 30, 1887, at Ka Hale Ali'i 'o 'Iolani in Honolulu, a committee of thirteen, headed by sugar plantation owner Paul Isenberg, presents King Kalākaua of Hawai'i with a list of demands for the reform of the kingdom and gave him twenty-four hours in which to make a reply.<sup>7</sup> In January of that year, a secret organization, known as the Hawaiian League, headed by some of the leading Haole businessmen and sugar planters, had been formed to secure "Constitutional, representative Government, in fact as well as in form, in the Hawaiian Islands, by all necessary means." The league had set about acquiring firearms and had made an alliance with the Honolulu Rifles, an all Haole volunteer militia. Over the next few months the league had built up public antagonism, especially in the Haole and foreign community, against the King and his Prime Minister, Walter Murray Gibson. As verbal attacks on the King increased and rumors of an armed overthrow became more credible, Gibson and the cabinet resigned with the hope that it would ease the tension. The same day, June 29, a new shipment of rifles arrived and were placed on sale to the public. Notices appeared in the city calling a public meeting for two o'clock the next day "to take into consideration the present mal-adjustment of Public Affairs, and to consider means of redress". In response the King called out the Honolulu Rifles to protect government buildings and keep the peace. However, while the troops were nominally under the command of the government, they were in reality under the orders of the league. Whether the King was fully aware of it or not, he had allowed his capital to fall into the control of those who opposed his right to rule.

At the public meeting a set of prepared resolutions was read. The resolutions criticized the Hawaiian government for failure "through corruption and incompetence, adequately to perform the functions and afford the protection to personal and property rights for which all governments exist." They went on to state:

That while some of the evils of which we complain can not be at once adequately redressed and their recurrence prevented, and many others are incurable except by radical changes in the present constitution involving protracted delays; yet there are some evils which we feel must be remedied

---

<sup>7</sup>Unless otherwise stated, this account is based on the information given by Kuykendall in *Hawaiian Kingdom III*, 348-66.

at once, before a permanent reform movement can be inaugurated with any reasonable prospect of success.<sup>8</sup>

They then stated their specific demands. First, the present cabinet must be dismissed and that the King call either William L. Green, Henry Waterhouse, Godfrey Brown or Mark P. Robinson "to assist him in selecting a new Cabinet, which shall be committed to the policy of securing a new constitution." Second, Gibson must be dismissed from all offices. Third, the King must return a payment of \$71,000 received for an opium trading license which was not issued. Fourth, Junius Ka'ae, who arranged the payment, must be dismissed from office. And fifth:

That we request a specific pledge from the King -

- (1) That he will not in future interfere either directly or indirectly with the election of representatives.
- (2) That he will not interfere with or attempt to unduly influence legislation or legislators.
- (3) That he will not interfere with the constitutional administration of his cabinet.
- (4) That he will not use his official position or patronages for private ends.

The meeting then went on to discuss the means for obtaining a new constitution and the general opinion was that it should be done as quickly as possible, which meant circumventing the provisions of the existing constitution. The resolutions were then delivered to the King who promised a reply within the specified period. In the meantime, the Honolulu Rifles put Gibson and his son-in-law, Fred Hayselden, under arrest.

King Kalākaua's first response was to approach the British, French, Portuguese, Japanese and American diplomatic representatives with an offer to put the affairs of the Kingdom into their hands. This they declined. They recommended that he agree to the demands and appoint Green to form a new ministry. Kalākaua then sent a letter confirming his total agreement to the demands, with the exception of the matter of the opium payment, which he promised to refer to the new cabinet.

---

<sup>8</sup>Resolutions as quoted in *Daily Bulletin*, July 1, 1887.

The new cabinet consisted of Green, Brown, Lorrin A. Thurston and Clarence W. Ashford. The first task they undertook, with the assistance of several members of the Hawaiian League, was the drafting of a new constitution. The document was completed by Wednesday, July 6 and presented to the King. With obvious signs of unwillingness and after much discussion, Kalākaua agreed and signed it.

It will never be known for sure why Kalākaua agreed so readily to the new constitution. It is quite likely that he feared for his own life and the lives of his people. The city was still under the control of the Honolulu Rifles and the King probably feared that any refusal on his part to the demands of the cabinet might lead to his overthrow. He would also have been aware that the other military companies loyal to him were not in a strong position to challenge the Rifles. The military forces of the kingdom in 1887 were composed of one regular unit, the King's Guard, made up of 85 officers and enlisted men and seven volunteer companies, including the Honolulu Rifles. Major Robert Hoapili Baker, the commander-in-chief of the King's guard and volunteer forces had himself described the forces as a "useless appendage, tending only to promote aggrandizement, pomp, vain show and pretensions, ... of no advantage to the public in general." The Honolulu Rifles was the only unit that was properly trained and equipped for combat.<sup>9</sup> Any ensuing conflict following the imposition of the new constitution would have lead to widespread bloodshed and perhaps triggered the intervention of the United States, ultimately endangering Hawaiian sovereignty. However, having signed the document, the King fully supported it, even in the face of criticism from his own people.

Over the next five years, the new constitution, dubbed by many the "Bayonet Constitution", was vigorously debated. There were a number of attempts made to revise or revoke it by those who were unhappy with it, none of which ultimately succeeded. Just as a number of amendments to the most controversial sections were presented to the Legislature for passage in 1893, a similar group of Haole "barons", led by Thurston and Stanford B. Dole, overthrew the Kingdom and proclaimed Hawai'i a republic.

---

<sup>9</sup>McGregor-Alegado, "Hawaiian Resistance," 52.

In 1899, the Republic of Hawai'i succeeded in persuading the United States of America to annex Hawai'i as a territory.

#### **Discussion: The Anglo-Saxon Heritage in Hawai'i**

The 1887 Constitution represents a decisive stage in the struggle between two competing ideological spaces in Hawai'i - that of the Anglo-Saxon Americans and their tradition of republican democracy and that of an independent Hawaiian monarchy. Americans at that time saw themselves as being in the forefront of the great Anglo-Saxon destiny that was symbolized in the Magna Carta. By invoking the myth of the Magna Carta and reenacting the actions of the barons against their King, the American sugar planters were able to gain support from other Haole to force constitution reforms that would strengthen the positioning of Hawai'i within American ideological space.

#### *The Manifest Destiny of America*

The concept of "Manifest Destiny" was an important aspect of Anglo-Saxon American identity during the later part of the nineteenth century and a justification for westward expansion of empire. In the spring of 1879, John Fiske delivered the last in a series of lectures, marking the centenary of the United States, to a packed congregation at Boston's Old South Church. His topic was the future of the Anglo-Saxons and he received enthusiastic support from the audience. He later published the lecture under the title "Manifest Destiny" and over the next five years delivered it another fifty times, in London, Boston, New York and a host of other cities. In describing the lecture, Richard Drinnon notes:

In "Manifest Destiny" Fiske made ... Providence ... a Darwinian deity who spoke English with a slight Teutonic accent. To the concepts of Darwin and Spencer, Fiske added those of the Anglo-Teutonists: English historians Sir Henry Maine, William Stubbs, and the bumptious Edward Augustus Freeman (who is perhaps best remembered for an observation that came out of his visit to the United States in 1881: "This would be a great land," he wrote to a friend in New Haven, "if only every Irishman would kill a negro, and be hanged for it"). Fiske drew on Freeman to show how Teutonic tribes had carried the germ of democracy from the forests of Germany to Britain in the fifth century; there in the chosen home of freedom, away from upheavals on the

Continent, it had grown into the English Parliament; then Puritans had carried the idea across the Atlantic for its fullest expression to date, the Constitution of the Founding Fathers that came out of their New England town meeting and the written fundamental laws of settlers in the Connecticut Valley.<sup>10</sup>

Fiske went on to predict a time when "every land on the earth's surface that is not already the seat of an old civilization shall become English in its language, in its political habits and traditions, and to a predominant extent in the blood of its people ... when four-fifths of the human race will trace its pedigree to English forefathers, as four-fifths of the white people in the United States trace their pedigree to-day." The main question according to Fiske for the "barbarous races" is "by what process of modification [they] are to maintain their foothold upon the earth at all."<sup>11</sup>

While Fiske's ideas represented a rather extreme vision of Anglo-Saxon destiny, they were widely received. His ideas were further developed at the newly founded John Hopkins University in Baltimore in the form of the Teutonic theory of history. Echoing the ideas of Fiske, the theory linked the origins of democracy to the practice of self-government in the primeval German forest. While no direct record of it existed, it was indirectly evident through the subsequent triumphs of Anglo-Saxon democracy, such as the Magna Carta and the Declaration of Independence. The theory provided the mystic origins of frontier values that were being rediscovered in the westward expansion of the United States in the late nineteenth century. The theory held for several decades, although even as early as 1890 there were signs of a move to a nationally autonomous interpretation of American history.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup>Richard Drinnon, *Facing West: the metaphysics of Indian-Hating and Empire-Building* (New York: Schocken Books, 1980), 239.

<sup>11</sup>Quoted in *ibid*, 240-41.

<sup>12</sup>Alexander Saxton, *The Indispensable Enemy: labor and the anti-Chinese movement in California* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1971), 47-49.

### *The Anglo-Saxonization of Hawai'i*

An article in *The Friend*, a monthly journal published on behalf of the Christian temperance movement in Honolulu, in August 1887 espoused the Hawaiian version of "Manifest Destiny". The title, "Anglo-Saxonizing Machines", drew on Canon Wilberforce's description of America with respect to its ability to assimilate immigrants. It claimed that:

Hawaii is gradually getting into working order as a small but somewhat effective "Anglo Saxonizing machine". Probably no well informed and thinking man among us will have any other expectation for the future of the Hawaiian Islands that they will be home of a population which will be at least, English speaking. And to our mind, the universal use of the language will carry with it much of the exercise of English thought and the practice of English customs. ... The politics of the country are fast ranging themselves in Anglo-Saxon lines, that is the lines of truly Representative government "*of the people, by the people and for the people*" and that in substantial honesty and justice. For a few years past, a fatuous effort has been in progress to subvert liberal and Representative Government, and to revert to old Asiatico-Polynesian ways, heathen ways of absolute and despotic ruling. Heathen debaucheries and even heathen sorceries were largely involved to promote the end. ... Provoked by what may be considered a premature effervescence of evil elements, the honest sagacity and force of civilization came to the rescue. The resistless tide of Anglo-Saxon principles of government suddenly overtopped the frail "palace" dykes, and swept away the retrogressive rubbish. ... The Anglicized civilization is settled in this country and is inevitably to prevail.<sup>13</sup> (emphasis added)

Monsieur G. Bosseront d'Anglade, French Commissioner to Hawai'i in the late 1880s, concurred in his published work on Hawai'i with the benefits that Anglo-Saxon civilization had brought to the islands. Commenting on the transformation of Honolulu "into a populous modern city provided with all the amenities associated with civic progress", he conceded that "Anglo-Saxon civilization alone is capable of generating such a result ... the Latin peoples, whether Spanish, Portuguese, Italian or French, would be incapable of achieving comparable colonial goals, results realized by the English throughout the world and now by Americans in Hawai'i." He went on to comment on how the Americans in Hawai'i have imposed "their own customs, their religion, and a large measure of their American laws and institutions." However,

---

<sup>13</sup>*The Friend*, August 1887, 1.

unlike Fiske, he mourned the loss of cultural diversity by the imposition of one people's customs over others'.<sup>14</sup>

Prior to the events of June 30, 1887, a letter to the *Hawaiian Gazette* warned that:

Men who lived here from the time of the Kamehamehas have seen a constitutional government changed into an absolute despotism and military rule. Some of the descendants of the men who forced King John to give the English people the Magna Carta are here. The descendants of those who fought on Bunker Hill are with us, and also Germans, who love liberty and right.<sup>15</sup>

At the meeting on June 30, 1887, a number of the speakers specifically called on aspects of the Anglo-Saxon heritage. William Kinney quoted the words of William Pitt, Senior, Earl of Chatham; "It is time that the crown were addressed in the language of truth". Pitt was leader of the Whigs in the British parliament in the eighteenth century and argued against the power of the King and in favor of American independence. Sanford Dole justified their actions by quoting the existing constitution that stated that "the King conducts his government for the common good [and that] 'All people are allowed to assemble for the common good.'" This is the same rationale that can be found in the actions at Runnymede. J. A. McCandless spoke on behalf of mechanics. He reminded his people that the "movement was in the hands of the descendants of the men who one hundred years ago fought for liberty in America." Lorrin A. Thurston referred to the constitution as a contract between the King and people and argued that if both agreed to change it "there is no violation of constitutional rights and no revolution."<sup>16</sup>

It is clear that Haole of American origin identified themselves racially as Anglo-Saxons, acknowledging their shared heritage with the British. The Magna Carta was an important part of that

---

<sup>14</sup>G. Bosseront d'Anglade, *A Tree in Bud: the Hawaiian Kingdom 1889-1893*, trans. from G. Sauvin (pseud.), *Un Royaume Polynésien, Iles Hawaï*, by Alfons L. Korn (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1987), 110-11.

<sup>15</sup>Quoted in Jacob Adler and Gwynn Barrett (eds), *The Diaries of Walter Murray Gibson 1886, 1887* (Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii, 1973), 161.

<sup>16</sup>*Daily Bulletin*, July 1, 1887.

heritage, which continued with the development of constitutional government under the British monarchy and culminated in the American Declaration of Independence and the Westminster parliamentary system. The development of these political systems was inextricably tied to the development of world-capitalism in which both America and Britain had taken leading roles. It was the destiny of the Anglo-Saxon race to extend this world-system across the entire globe.

Anglo-Saxons in Hawai'i therefore believed that it was their duty to reproduce the structures of Anglo-Saxon government in Hawai'i, not only for their own benefit, but also for the benefit of the Native Hawaiians. Kamehameha I had begun the process by incorporating aspects of the British monarchy into his new system of government, while retaining many Hawaiian structures. The structures that he adopted from Britain were mainly related to the rule of the King and the old feudal order. As time went on, the Hawaiian Kings were forced to adopt more democratic modes of Anglo-Saxon government. The first constitution of Hawai'i was strongly based on the American constitution, while the constitutional monarchy of Queen Victoria was often held up as an example for the Hawaiian Kings to emulate. From the Anglo-Saxon American perspective, the maintenance of Native Hawaiian political systems was a transitional measure and the sooner they learnt to operate in a proper democratic mode of government the better it would be for all. This ultimately meant the establishment of an American style republic and therefore the ending of the monarchy. However, in 1887 they did not have sufficient support from Haole or other nationalities to go this far. Invoking the Magna Carta as a means to reform the monarchy and develop a more republican style of government under it provided a useful compromise.

In later years, Thurston justified his actions in both the 1887 constitution and the overthrow of the Monarchy in terms of his Anglo-Saxon heritage. Andrew Farrell, who edited his memoirs, summarized it thus:

These memoirs should destroy the delusion that the revolution was ferment of sugar. True enough, some sugar planters were active in the Reform Party ... Briefly put, the overthrow was compassed



by attorneys, men who knew their rights, the rights of the people, under Anglo-Saxon law, and were determined to maintain those rights against the throne.<sup>17</sup>

Rights under Anglo-Saxon law were precisely what the barons wished reinstated at Runnymede.

### **The Creation of a Constitutional Monarchy**

The 1887 constitution was the culmination of a long process to establish Anglo-Saxon government in Hawai'i and a sign that the American form would predominate. As mentioned above, Kamehameha I had incorporated aspects of the British monarchy into his new united government of the islands, while retaining important elements of the Hawaiian political structures, such as the role of the *Ali'i*. With the arrival of the American missionaries following the abolition of the *kapu*, ideas of American democracy and political economy began to be more widely disseminated within the islands. In 1838, King Kamehameha III and his *Ali'i Nui* were concerned as to how to ensure the recognition of Hawai'i as an independent nation by the imperial powers and to control the behavior of foreigners who landed on their shores. They hired William Richards, an American evangelical missionary who had arrived in Hawai'i fifteen years earlier, as their political advisor. He taught them what he considered the three paths to foreign *mana*, namely Christianity, Law and Capitalism. The first had already been successfully introduced by himself and his colleagues from the New England mission. The second involved the establishment of an organic act and written laws. The third involved the creation of private property rights.<sup>18</sup>

The first step towards constitutional government was taken in 1839, with the Declaration of Rights. This became the opening statement of the 1840 constitution and provides a good example of the American

---

<sup>17</sup>Andrew Farrell in Preface of Lorrin A. Thurston, *Memoirs of the Hawaiian Revolution*, edited by Andrew Farrell (Honolulu: Advertiser Publishing Co., Ltd., 1936), x.

<sup>18</sup>Kame'eleihiwa, *Pehea Lā?*, 174.

heritage in action. It proclaims that God had made "all nations ... to dwell on the earth in unity and blessedness [and] bestowed certain rights alike on all men and all chiefs, and all people of all lands. [These include] life, limb, liberty, freedom from oppression, the earnings of his hands and the productions of his mind, [but these are] not however [given] to those who act in violation of the laws." It goes on to say that governments are established by God for the purposes of peace and that they shall make laws which apply to and benefit all of the people, not just those who rule.<sup>19</sup> The constitution also re-established the administration of the Kingdom according to a parliamentary system, by establishing an appointed council of chiefs and an elected house of representatives as well as a supreme court.<sup>20</sup>

The constitution was further revised in 1852, giving greater power and regularity to the legislature. In the drafting of this constitution there emerged an argument between the American advisors and R.C. Wylie, the Minister of Foreign Affairs and "an ardent admirer of the British constitution, as it then existed".<sup>21</sup> The final product reflected the wishes of the Americans, but Wylie reported that the King was reluctant to sign it<sup>22</sup>. A reluctance to uphold this constitution was also evident in the actions of his successors. Kamehameha IV came to the throne in 1855 and sought changes to limit the power of the House of Representatives and impose a property qualification on voters.<sup>23</sup> The first can be interpreted as a move to limit the power of foreigners, who tended to control the legislature. The second can be interpreted as a wish to follow the British political structures. The Kamehameha Kings had generally

---

<sup>19</sup> 1840 Constitution of Hawai'i quoted in Ralph S. Kuykendall, *Constitutions of the Hawaiian Kingdom: a brief history and analysis*, Papers of the Hawaiian Historical Society, No. 21 (Honolulu: Hawaiian Historical Society, 1940), 10.

<sup>20</sup>Kuykendall, *Constitutions*, 12-14.

<sup>21</sup>Ibid, 16.

<sup>22</sup>Ibid, 17.

<sup>23</sup>Ibid, 21.

avored the British version of Anglo-Saxon government over the American, since it preserved and enhanced the *mana* of the throne. Kamehameha IV died before these changes were made.

Kamehameha V came to the throne in 1863 and refused to take the oath to support the constitution. He called a constitutional convention the following year. The convention reached a deadlock over the question of a property qualification. The King then decided he would write the constitution himself, and included greater powers for the King and a moderate property qualification. He linked the establishment of this qualification to preservation of the monarchical character of the government.<sup>24</sup> The Haole community, especially the Americans, were not impressed at this effort by the King to subvert the reproduction of American democracy in Hawai'i. The property qualification was later removed by his successor Lunalilo. Lunalilo ruled only a short time and under his successor, Kalākaua, the objections of Haole to the King's power increased.

As will be discussed in the next chapter, Kalākaua instituted a number of changes that did not please the Haole community, especially the Americans and the more puritanical Christians. The Americans were unsympathetic to his appropriation of British political symbols to support Hawaiian political goals. These were the symbols of a monarchy from under whose oppressive rule their Anglo-Saxon ancestors had fought for their independence. In particular they objected to the spending of large sums of their tax money, while the more essential infrastructure for the expansion of capitalism, such as roads, bridges and harbors, were neglected. Hence a vigorous campaign was launched against Kalākaua and his ministry, which characterized him as a regressive and authoritarian ruler. By invoking the myth of the Magna Carta, and reenacting the actions of the Anglo-Saxon barons against an ancient British king, the Haole elite were able to regain political control. However, unlike the original act, where Native barons were rebelling against

---

<sup>24</sup>Ibid, 36.

the heir of a conquering king, in Hawai'i, it was foreign land owners and their heirs that were rebelling against an indigenous king.

## CHAPTER 2

### "HO'OULU LĀHUI": HAWAI'I UNDER KING KALĀKAUA I

#### The Election of Kings

On December 11, 1872, King Kamehameha V died without naming his heir. The constitution provided that if the King died without a named successor, that it was the duty of the legislature to elect a person of *Ali'i* rank to the throne. Two possible candidates for the throne came forward, William Charles Lunalilo and David Kalākaua. Lunalilo was widely recognized as closest relative of the deceased king and therefore the rightful heir. He resisted suggestions from his supporters that he should simply proclaim himself king, saving the country the trouble of an election and issued a manifesto. In it he claimed his direct descent from Kamehameha I and promised to restore the liberal constitution of 1852 if he was elected. His opponent, Kalākaua, issued a platform promising "to preserve and increase the people, so that they shall multiply and fill the land with chiefs and commoners". He also promised to repeal personal taxes, put Native Hawaiians into government offices and amend the constitution of 1864 to produce a true agreement between the people and the throne. He warned the people to "beware of the Constitution of 1852 and the false teachings of the foreigners who are now grasping to obtain control of the government if W. C. Lunalilo ascends the throne."<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Ralph S. Kuykendall, *The Hawaiian Kingdom Volume II: 1854-1874, twenty critical years* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1966), 239-44.

The election of the new king was first put to the general voters in a plebiscite, which was then referred to the legislature for confirmation. Lunalilo had the greatest popular support from the Native Hawaiians, as well as strong support from the Haole, who opposed Kalākaua's pro-Hawaiian platform. On the day of the election, the court-house where the legislature met was surrounded by a crowd of Lunalilo's supporters. The vote was unanimously in favor of Lunalilo, which pleased the crowd, who would probably have rioted if he had not been elected.<sup>2</sup>

When Lunalilo came to the throne, Hawai'i was feeling the effects of a world depression. Sugar exports for 1872 were five million pounds less than the previous year. The sugar planters therefore raised the question of establishing a reciprocity treaty with the United States in order to secure free access to that market. Two earlier attempts had been made to secure a treaty with the U.S., in 1855 and 1867. In both cases the treaties were rejected by the U.S. Congress because they would threaten the profitability of the sugar industry in the southern states, without offering any real benefits to the U.S. When the idea of reviving treaty negotiations was raised in 1873, it was suggested that Hawai'i should offer to cede the territory around Pearl Harbor to the U. S. to be used as a naval station, in return for free access to the U.S. sugar market. It was thought by the planters that this would be the only terms under which the treaty might succeed. For a while it appeared as though both the King and the cabinet would be prepared to negotiate a treaty on these terms. Native Hawaiians were enraged by such a suggestion to compromise the sovereignty of Hawai'i and vocally opposed it. Several members of the royal family spoke out against it, including Queen Emma, the widow of Kamehameha IV, and David Kalākaua. The King was advised to act quickly if he was really supportive of the cession of the harbor. He decided that cession would not be in the best interest of his people and withdrew his support and the cabinet then withdrew the proposal.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup>Ibid, 244-45.

<sup>3</sup>Kuykendall, *Hawaiian Kingdom II*, 247-57; Merze Tate, *Reciprocity or Annexation*, 82-100.

Lunalilo's reign was brief. He died on February 3, 1874 without any appointed heir. A special meeting of the legislature immediately called for February 12, to decide who should succeed the Throne. There were two possible candidates, Queen Emma, the widow of Kamehameha IV, and Kalākaua. Both candidates launched public campaigns and had widespread support amongst the Native Hawaiians. Their campaigns for the throne had in fact started while Lunalilo was still alive as each of them had vied for appointment as his heir.

Following his previous defeat in the election of Lunalilo, Kalākaua had continued to be a vocal supporter of the rights of Native Hawaiians. He had opposed the cession of Pearl Harbor and initially appeared to be anti-American. However, in December 1873, he wrote a letter to the newspaper where he promised that if he were to become king, he would uphold the existing laws, including those prohibiting the sale of alcohol to Native Hawaiians and requiring the observance of the Sabbath, that foreigners would be welcome in Hawai'i and expressed his confidence in the good faith of the American government. The letter was an obvious ploy to gain the support of the Americans, including the descendants of the missionaries. In this regard it was successful and the American community grudgingly conceded that Kalākaua would be the better of the two candidates. Kalākaua had also recently married and thus had the potential to provide an heir to the throne, which due to her age, Queen Emma would not be able to provide. A secure line of succession would prevent another interregnum.<sup>4</sup>

In terms of genealogy, Queen Emma's claim to the throne was stronger, as she was more closely related to King Kamehameha I. She was also a descendent of John Young, British adviser to Kamehameha I and had been raised Dr. Rooke, a British doctor. She was therefore strongly pro-British and had been in part responsible for the pro-British style of her late husband's reign. She had been instrumental in the establishment of Queen's Hospital for the treatment of Native Hawaiians and in the establishment of the

---

<sup>4</sup>Kuykendall, *Hawaiian Kingdom III*, 3-9; Merze Tate, *The United States and the Hawaiian Kingdom; a political history* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1965), 34-35.

Church of England in Hawai'i, which she and her husband believed was more compatible with monarchical government than congregationalism. Following the death of her husband in 1865, she had visited England, France and the United States and met with Queen Victoria. At this time she was also given a new name, Kaleleokalani, meaning the flight of the *Ali'i* (singular), which she changed to Kaleleonālani, the flight of the *Ali'i* (plural).<sup>5</sup>

Queen Emma had been strongly outspoken against the cession of Pearl Harbor and the actions of the Americans in Hawai'i in trying to give away Hawaiian territory. Americans feared that if elected she would oppose any development of closer ties to the U. S. while promoting closer ties with Britain. While Kalākaua had gained the support of the newspapers, Queen Emma and her supporters undertook their campaign using placards and pamphlets. Native Hawaiians appear to have been more divided in their support for the two candidates than in the previous election. However, it was Queen Emma who attracted the greater demonstrations of public support. Native Hawaiians were perhaps more prepared to trust her not to sell out to the Americans, as Kalākaua seemed to be about to do.

The legislature had been elected the day before Lunalilo died. Most of the members of who were elected to the House of Representatives were Native Hawaiians. For the first time since 1851, no Haole were elected from Honolulu. The majority of the Nobles and the Representatives were supporters of Kalākaua, so when the legislature met on February 12, they voted by 33 votes to 6 in his favor. Emma's supporters, who had gathered outside the courthouse where the Legislature had met, were furious and

---

<sup>5</sup>Anne Harding Spoehr, *The Royal Lineages of Hawai'i*, Bishop Museum Press Special Publication 84 (Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press, 1989); Kuykendall, *Hawaiian Kingdom II*, 35-36, 69-72, 83, 87-97, 201-207, 281.



attacked the building and legislators. 150 U.S. Marines and 70 British naval personnel were invited to land to quell the riots and restore order.<sup>6</sup>

Kalākaua was well experienced and qualified to take on the role of King. He had been educated at the Royal School, had an interest in a wide range of subjects and had travelled to the Pacific coast of America. He had been employed in various government offices, a member of the privy council and chamberlain under Kamehameha V and a member of the House of Nobles from 1860 to 1873.<sup>7</sup> He had an active interest in Hawaiian music, and composed a numerous songs. He was also interested in Hawaiian history and traditional culture.

#### **Reciprocity Established with the United States**

In his speech on April 30, 1874, at the opening of the legislature, Kalākaua announced his two major policies; the increase of the people through the encouragement of larger families, improved infant health and the immigration of free labor and the establishment of a commercial treaty with the United States, but without cession of territory. The sugar planters were quick to petition the King to resume negotiations on the treaty. The King referred the matter to the legislature, indicating again his support for it. The legislature approved the negotiation of a treaty and a delegation to Washington were appointed and

---

<sup>6</sup>Kuykendall, *Hawaiian Kingdom II*, 262; Kuykendall, *Hawaiian Kingdom III*, 7-11, 191; Robert C. Lydecker, *Roster Legislatures of Hawaii, 1841-1918; constitutions of monarchy and republic; speeches of sovereigns and president*, Archives of Hawaii Publication No. 1 (Honolulu: Hawaiian Gazette Co., 1918), 126-27.

Kuykendall gives the figure of 39 votes to 6. However, Lydecker lists a total of 39 members for the special legislative session that elected him. Therefore, Kuykendall's figure of 39 votes for Kalākaua is probably in error. Of the 29 Representatives, 3 were Haole and of the 10 Nobles, 6 were Haole.

<sup>7</sup>Kuykendall, *Hawaiian Kingdom III*, 12.

instructed to avoid reference to any cession of territory. Kalākaua visited Washington himself during the negotiations to strengthen relations with the United States.<sup>8</sup>

The United States government was more favorable this time to the proposition of the treaty, even without the gaining of Pearl Harbor. They saw it as a way to maintain and strengthen American interests in the islands and forestall advances from other great powers, especially Britain. While the treaty was making its slow progress through the machinery of government in Washington over the following year or more, the text of the treaty was not published in the islands. This helped to fuel speculation and rumors against the Treaty, especially amongst the supporters of Queen Emma. They were concerned that the treaty would compromise Hawaiian sovereignty and worried that a secret deal was being made over Pearl Harbor. It was even suggested that the Queen should replace Kalākaua on the throne. In the election in 1876 it appeared that the majority of those elected were supporters of Queen Emma's "party" and opposed the Kalākaua. In August of that year there reports of another planned attempt to put Queen Emma on the throne, which was never actually carried out.<sup>9</sup>

By the time the 1876 legislative session opened, the treaty had been ratified by both governments and proclaimed by the President of the United States. The King and his cabinet had ratified the treaty on the basis of the act of the previous legislature authorizing its negotiation. The new legislature attempted to have the treaty submitted for their approval on constitutional grounds, but the supreme court ruled that the King and cabinet were fully authorized to ratify and proclaim it.<sup>10</sup> While Kalākaua had succeeded in ensuring the future commercial prosperity of the Kingdom, he had done so at the cost of much of the

---

<sup>8</sup>Lydecker, *Roster*, 130-31; Kuykendall, *Hawaiian Kingdom III*, 17-22.

<sup>9</sup>Kuykendall, *Hawaiian Kingdom III*, 13-16; 22-38.

<sup>10</sup>Ibid, 38-39.

support from his own people. The supporters of Queen Emma continued to provide a strong opposition to Kalākaua's government.

The reciprocity treaty opened the way for the rapid expansion of the sugar industry, much to the benefit of the Haole land owners and sugar planters. As James H. Blount, the United States Commissioner sent to Hawai'i in 1893 to investigate the overthrow of the monarchy, later said:

From it there came to the islands an intoxicating increase of wealth, a new labor system, an Asiatic population, an alienation between the Native and white races, an impoverishment of the former, an enrichment of the latter and many so-called revolutions.<sup>11</sup>

Sugar exports had been growing steadily since the 1850s. In 1860, Hawai'i had exported just over one million pounds of sugar and had earned \$480,000 from exports, of which sugar was the main component. By 1876, sugar exports had increased to 26 million pounds and total export earnings were two million dollars. The reciprocity treaty enabled this growth rate to continue, so that by 1887, Hawai'i was exporting 212 million pounds, with a value of eight million dollars. During the 1880s, exports began to far exceed imports, creating a trade surplus, which was valued at four and a half million dollars in 1887.<sup>12</sup> Most of this surplus wealth was being accumulated by the Haole sugar planters and businessmen.

#### **Claus Spreckels and Celso Caesar Moreno**

The election of 1878 was relatively quiet and free from controversy. Only four Haole were elected to the legislature, including Walter Murray Gibson, who had supported the rights of Native Hawaiians through his newspaper *Ka Nuhou*. Once the legislature met, Gibson led an attack on the existing cabinet

---

<sup>11</sup>United States Congress, House, *Affairs in Hawaii*, 53rd Cong., 3d Sess., 1894-5, House Executive Document., vol. 3, 571.

<sup>12</sup>Thrum, *Almanac*, 1881:15,17; 1889:19-20.

using the issues of financial mismanagement and a dispute that had arisen between Hawai'i and Britain over the reciprocity treaty. Britain claimed that the treaty had violated an earlier treaty between Britain and Hawai'i and British traders were suing the Hawaiian government for loss of profits. Gibson supported the British case to build disfavor against the cabinet. Shortly afterwards, Kalākaua dismissed the cabinet and appointed a new one.<sup>13</sup>

Kalākaua's sudden decision to dismiss the cabinet appears to be linked to the arrival of California sugar magnate, Claus Spreckels. Spreckels had just acquired a tract of land on Maui and was trying to get a permit for water supply, which needed Cabinet approval. The Cabinet were slow in approving the application and Spreckels was worried that it would be denied. He approached Kalākaua with the offer of a gift of \$10,000 and a loan of \$40,000 and the same night Kalākaua dismissed his cabinet. Kalākaua was virtually landless and so had little private income to supplement what he was paid from the government, which was barely adequate to support a proper royal lifestyle. An alliance with Spreckels offered both private gain and a means of breaking the control of the descendants of the missionaries over Hawaiian politics and economy.<sup>14</sup>

In 1880, Kalākaua also developed a relationship with the Italian-American adventurer Celso Caesar Moreno, who had arrived in the islands in 1879 with a ship load of Chinese laborers and was attempting to establish a Chinese shipping line to Hawai'i. He had met the King in San Francisco in 1874 and was quick to renew his friendship. He quickly became one of Kalākaua's main advisers. Moreno sought Kalākaua's support to obtain a government subsidy for his shipping line. Kalākaua was very supportive of his plans for closer connections between Hawai'i and China, including the importation of laborers. He viewed this as a way of opening up Hawai'i's relationships with Asia and balancing the influence of

---

<sup>13</sup>Kuykendall, *Hawaiian Kingdom III*, 197-200.

<sup>14</sup>*Ibid*, 200-204; Kame'eleihiwa, *Pehea Lā?*, 314-15.

America. Through Kalākaua, Moreno was not only able to get a subsidy for his shipping line, but also the passage of a bill allowing the legal importation of opium to the Kingdom for sale to Chinese only.<sup>15</sup>

Immediately after the legislative session, Kalākaua dismissed the cabinet and appointed a new one headed by Moreno, who was naturalized on the same day. There was widespread outrage from Haole and Native Hawaiians at this sudden move to put the government in the hands of a foreigner of dubious credentials and concern at the lack of ability of the other Cabinet members. Stanford B. Dole, a prominent sugar planter, organized a mass meeting opposing the King's actions. The American representative exerted his influence on the King over the next few days and Moreno handed in his resignation. Moreno then gained support from some of the Native Hawaiians, who saw his forced resignation as a result of the interference of the American representative in Hawaiian politics. Part-Hawaiian Representative Robert Wilcox convened a mass meeting in support of Moreno and against outside interference in Hawaiian politics. Moreno remained in Hawai'i another ten days, during which time the King sent letters to Washington, London and Paris demanding the recall of their representatives, who had all spoken out against Moreno's appointment. Moreno left Hawai'i for Europe on August 30, with three young Hawaiians, Wilcox, Robert Boyd and James K. Booth, who were being funded by the government to study abroad. He was also given a commission to negotiate treaties with European countries for the recognition of Hawai'i's independence, which was later canceled.

It was at this time that Gibson bought the main English language newspaper, the *Pacific Commercial Advertiser*, and established the Hawaiian language paper, *Ka Elele*. Through these two papers he was able to pursue a vigorous campaign in support of Native Hawaiian rights and against the Haole sugar planters.<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup>Kuykendall, *Hawaiian Kingdom III*, 207-211.

<sup>16</sup>Tbid, 213-21.

## **A Trip Around the World**

In 1881, Kalākaua decided to embark upon a trip around the world to investigate how other countries organized their affairs. He was the first reigning sovereign to circumnavigate the globe. He used the trip as a chance to improve Hawai'i's standing internationally and gain recognition from the major world powers. He began by visiting California, where he renewed his friendship with Claus Spreckels. He then went to Japan and was a guest of the Emperor. Together they discussed proposals for Japanese immigration to Hawai'i and the formation of Federation of Asian Nations. The latter was never acted on, but indicated a common interest between the two countries. From Japan, he travelled down the China coast, through South-East Asia and across India to Egypt. From there he went to Italy, where he met Moreno again. On account of information received about the true nature of Moreno's activities in China, Kalākaua relieved him of responsibility for the Hawaiian trainees and established alternate arrangements. He then met with the Pope in Rome and went onto England, where he was received by Queen Victoria. He concluded his trip with a tour of Europe, before heading back to Hawai'i via the United States. The trip was successful in raising Hawai'i's international profile and in doing so firmed American resolve to keep Hawai'i within its sphere of influence and out of the hands of other powers.<sup>17</sup>

## **The Gibson Ministry**

In the elections of 1882, Gibson headed a campaign in support of the rights of Native Hawaiians and received the vast majority of votes in Honolulu. Gibson then launched a vigorous campaign against the existing cabinet. Under pressure the cabinet resigned and the King appointed a new cabinet headed by Gibson, which included two Native Hawaiian members, John E. Bush and Simon Ka'ai. The previous

---

<sup>17</sup>Ibid, 227-35, 244-45.

cabinet had been all Haole. The appointment of the cabinet was taken by Native Hawaiians as an indication of the King's recommitment to their rights and aspirations.<sup>18</sup>

Walter Murray Gibson was an American who had arrived in the islands in 1861 as a missionary of the Church of Jesus Christ of the Latter-Day Saints. He established a mission on Lana'i, but was later excommunicated by the Church for fraudulent land dealing. In 1872, he moved to Honolulu and became involved in the Catholic Church and Hawaiian politics. As mentioned above, he ran for the legislature in 1878 and won with a large majority. Through his two newspapers he had championed the rights of Hawaiians, and won a fair degree of popularity among them.<sup>19</sup> This did not endear him to other Haole, who accused him of inciting racial antagonism and seeking power for his own ends. His Mormon and Catholic associations also alienated him from the protestant majority of the Haole community.

In 1882, under the Gibson ministry a number of controversial measures were passed. The purchase of crown lands by Claus Spreckels was approved, in spite of opposition from several Native Hawaiian Representatives. The laws prohibiting the sale of liquor to Native Hawaiians were abolished on the grounds that they were discriminatory. And a bill authorizing a two million dollar loan was passed to cover over expenditure by the government. This issue sparked a debate over taxation in which Haole asserted their interests as the majority of the taxpayers in the Kingdom.

Two major expenses which attracted criticism from Haole were the building of a new palace and the holding of a coronation ceremony. Work on the Palace had begun in 1879 and it was completed in 1882 at a much greater cost than was originally intended. The Palace was built to standards that rivaled the existing palaces of Britain. The coronation ceremonies were held in 1883. Money had been aside for the ceremony in 1880, but they were delayed until after the King's world trip. The coronation was held

---

<sup>18</sup>Ibid, 249-54.

<sup>19</sup>Ibid, 25-28.

to mark the establishment of a new dynasty in a style that a nineteenth century monarch of international fame, as well as to awaken a sense of national pride in the people. The ceremonies included a public revival of hula, which had been earlier banned by the missionaries. Many Haole objected to the ceremonies as a unnecessary waste of public money. The more puritan Haole were gravely offended by the hula, even though the dancers were fully clothed from wrists to ankles. The free movement of the hips was just too suggestive for their puritan minds and the printer of the program was charged with printing obscenities, on account of references to body parts and sexual conduct in the chant titles.<sup>20</sup> In general, Kalākaua's unashamed enjoyment of sensuality and sexuality, as well as his liking for alcohol and gambling, did little to improve his reputation with the Puritans.

In the 1884 elections, the Haole businessmen and planters in Honolulu organized a campaign against Gibson. They gained support from several Native Hawaiian candidates who were opposed to Kalākaua's policies. While the independents, as they were referred to, did not gain a majority of the seats, they did provide an indication of growing opposition to Gibson's policies. The opposition focussed on the financial mismanagement of the government and the growing influence of Claus Spreckels, who had been loaning the government money and was attempting to take over a significant share of Hawaiian sugar production. This opposition was carried into the 1886 elections, where Haole candidates again aligned themselves with independent Native Hawaiian candidates against the government party. Kalākaua used his personal influence to persuade Native Hawaiian voters to support the government party, especially in the districts of the popular independent candidates, Joseph Nāwahī and G. W. Pilipo. The government party won the majority of seats, but the independents gained sufficient seats to continue their opposition in the legislature.<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup>Ibid, 204, 263-65; Kristin Zambucka, *Kalakaua: Hawai'i's last king* (Honolulu: Mana Publishing, 1983), 74-75.

<sup>21</sup>Kuykendall, *Hawaiian Kingdom III*, 268-76, 279-87.



The major debate again in the 1886 legislative session centered around government expenditure, which was again much greater than their revenue. In order to meet the short-fall in expenditure, Gibson proposed a loan of up to two million dollars. A month later the King instructed the legislature to be more economical in its spending. This appears to be the result of pressure from Claus Spreckels, who was at this stage owed \$700,000 by the kingdom and had made personal loans to the King and Gibson. A few days later, the King, on the advise of Spreckels, dismissed all except for Gibson from his cabinet and appointed a new cabinet which included the newly arrived John T. Dare, who had worked as an attorney for Spreckels in California. The independent members of the legislature took this as a clear sign that Spreckels was now running the country. In an attempt to limit Spreckel's control over the kingdom's finance, an amasser was sent to London to raise at least part of the proposed loan there. Spreckels was outraged by this, as he saw his control over the kingdom slipping and tried to force an amendment to the loan bill to prevent it going to London. The amendment was defeated and the cabinet resigned. A new cabinet was appointed, with Gibson still in charge.<sup>22</sup>

One of Kalākaua's most ambitions plans was the establishment of a Polynesian confederation. In the 1880s the future of Sāmoa was uncertain. It had not been claimed by any of the imperial powers, but it was likely that it soon would be by either the United States or Germany. At the end of 1886, Kalākaua sent a mission down to the islands to establish diplomatic relations, headed by Bush. The mission was also to visit the independent kingdom of Tonga. The mission was unsuccessful due to poor organization, misunderstandings with the Samoans, and the outbreak of war between the two main rulers in Sāmoa. It was also the butt of criticism from the Haole because of the expense involved. They did not believe that Hawai'i had the right to interfere at this level of global politics, which they viewed as the exclusive preserve of the white races.<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup>Ibid, 287-98.

<sup>23</sup>Ibid, 322-39.

## The Increase of the Nation

The Native Hawaiian population was continuing to decline. By 1872 it had fallen to 51,531. Kalākaua was concerned to take measures to reverse this situation. In this regard, he established his policy of *Ho'oulu Lāhui* - to increase and preserve the (Hawaiian) nation.<sup>24</sup> The policy included improving the situation of Native Hawaiians by promoting improved health and sanitation measures, continuing free health care at Queen's Hospital, educating Hawaiian young men abroad to prepare them to take positions in government, and providing loans to Hawaiian agriculturalists, using crops rather than land as collateral. The policy also included an active program of immigration recruitment, aimed primarily at obtaining more labor for the sugar plantations.<sup>25</sup>

The first group of agricultural laborers to be imported were from China. In 1872, there were 2,038 Chinese in Hawai'i. By 1884, there were 18,254.<sup>26</sup> There was considerable opposition from many Haole to Chinese immigration. The Chinese were seen culturally as very different and were generally unwilling to convert to Christianity or adopt Anglo-Saxon ways. The immigrants were mainly male and many used opium, which the Haole did not approve of. The introduction of leprosy and smallpox from China were also used as reasons to oppose their immigration. Not all the Chinese came in as laborers and many of them stayed on having completed their contracts on the plantations. By the 1885, there was a sizeable Chinese population involved in business in Honolulu and operating their own agricultural enterprises, such as rice growing, around the islands. As businessmen, the Chinese were very efficient. They made use of clan houses to pool their resources and provide capital for business development and through cooperative enterprises were able to survive on a much lower rate of return than would be acceptable to most Haole

---

<sup>24</sup>*Ho'oulu* means "to cause to increase; to grow, sprout or propagate." It also means "to stir up, inspire, excite, taunt." Pukui and Elbert, *Dictionary*, 368-69.

<sup>25</sup>Nordyke, *Peopling of Hawai'i*, 178-9; McGregor-Alegado, "Hawaiian Resistance," 31.

<sup>26</sup>Nordyke, *Peopling of Hawai'i*, 178-79.

businessmen and workers. Opposition to Chinese immigration and business activities continued to grow, with the issue of competition and the feared "Asiatizing" of the islands now being the major issue. This opposition was mainly from the middle and working classes in Honolulu, who felt the effect of the competition the hardest.<sup>27</sup>

To offset the largely Asian plantation work force, workers were also brought in from Portugal. Between 1878 and 1887 some 12,000 Portuguese arrived in seventeen ships from the islands of Madeira and the Azores. They had escaped poverty at home caused by a blight that had crippled the wine industry at home. Eleanor Nordyke notes that "Portuguese workers who moved to Hawai'i were considered sober, thrifty, honest, industrious, and peaceable, and the presence of their wives and families gave them social stability."<sup>28</sup> They were imported as families in the hope that they would settle permanently in the islands and provide a stable lower middle class. However, the high cost of sponsoring whole families restricted the numbers that could be brought in. Many of them then went onto California, where land was cheaper and where greater opportunities were believed to exist.<sup>29</sup>

The other group of workers to be brought to the islands was from Japan. They began to arrive in the late 1880s, after concerns had been raised about the increasing numbers of Chinese. Kalākaua believed that the Japanese were culturally and racially related to the Native Hawaiians and shared a common

---

<sup>27</sup>Kuykendall, *Hawaiian Kingdom III*, 174-75; Wai Jane Char and Tin-Yuke Char, eds, *Chinese Historic Sites and Pioneer Families of Rural Oahu* (Honolulu: Hawaii Chinese History Center, 1988), 7.

<sup>28</sup>Nordyke, *Peopling of Hawaii*, 44. For similar comments on the desirability of Portuguese, see Takaki, *Pau Hana*, 35, and A. Marques, "Portuguese immigration to Hawaiian Islands," in Thrum, *Almanac*, 1887:74-78.

A number of Portuguese of African descent from the Cape Verde Islands had also arrived in the islands between 1820 and 1880 aboard whaling ships. Many of them married Hawaiians and were classified in the censuses as either Portuguese or Part-Hawaiian. Nordyke, *Peopling of Hawaii*, 71.

<sup>29</sup>Kuykendall, *Hawaiian Kingdom III*, 123, 173.

ancestry. In general, there was less opposition to their immigration, although the Haole working and middle classes were still wary of Asian immigrants. By 1890 there were 12,610 Japanese in Hawai'i.<sup>30</sup>

By 1884, the Native Hawaiian population had fallen further to 44,232. The small-pox epidemics of the early 1880s had been responsible for a significant proportion of this decline. The increased immigration meant that Native Hawaiians made up just over half of the total population, compared to over eighty percent twelve years before. While Kalākaua's policy to increase the population of the nation had succeeded, it had not helped preserve the Native Hawaiian population and was turning them into a minority within their own country.<sup>31</sup>

The fundamental problems of the poverty of Native Hawaiians had not been addressed. They continued to lack the necessary resources to maintain an adequate subsistence lifestyle. Not only had they lost access to much of their land and traditional forest and fishing resources, but the diversion of stream waters and other developments associated with sugar plantations further reduced the viability of what lands they did hold.<sup>32</sup>

Kalākaua introduced a range of policies to increase the pride of Hawaiians in their nation. These included the construction of the new palace; the coronation; the erection of a statue of King Kamehameha I at the time of the coronation; and the holding of a jubilee celebration in 1886 and annual birthday celebrations.<sup>33</sup> As all of these events were held at taxpayers' expense, the American population was not

---

<sup>30</sup>Ibid, 159, 172; Nordyke, *Peopling of Hawaii*, 61, 178-79.

<sup>31</sup>Kuykendall, *Hawaiian Kingdom III*, 178-79.

<sup>32</sup>McGregor-Alegado, "Hawaiian Resistance," 31-32.

<sup>33</sup>Ibid, 28.

particularly pleased by them. They viewed these events as anachronistic trappings of monarchy that Hawai'i was better off without.

For the Native Hawaiians these events did succeed in instilling a sense of national pride. Kalākaua publicly revived aspects of traditional Hawaiian culture. The public revival of hula was very important to the perpetuation of Hawaiian culture. Buck notes that "chant and *hula* were the ideological center [of Hawaiian culture] and the primary reservoir of social knowledge and history." She goes on to note its integral role to the reproduction of social structures.<sup>34</sup> This is a role that hula has continued to play to the present day. Many of the dancers from Kalākaua's court went on to become great teachers and composers of hula at a time when Hawaiian culture was under its greatest assault in the early twentieth century.

As well as reviving hula, Kalākaua set up a Hawaiian board of health to license the practices of Native *kahuna* (healers), whose activities had also been suppressed by the missionaries. Many Native Hawaiians found that *kahuna* were better able to treat their ailments because of their greater awareness of the spiritual and psychological aspects of disease. Kalākaua also established the Hale Nauā or Temple of Science, which combined the study of ancient Hawaiian and modern science, with the rituals of masonry and traditional Hawaiian schools of learning. The Puritans viewed this as a revival of heathenism and a perversion of the sacred rites of Masonry, which a number of them practiced.<sup>35</sup> Other measures taken by Kalākaua included the establishment of an Hawaiian board of genealogists to research the genealogies of the *Ali'i* and the publication of a volume of Hawaiian myths and legends.<sup>36</sup>

---

<sup>34</sup>Elizabeth Buck, *Paradise Remade: the politics of culture and history in Hawai'i* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1993), 102.

<sup>35</sup>For example, refer to Thurston's comments and those of his editor in Thurston, *Memoirs*, ix, 28.

<sup>36</sup>His Majesty, David Kalākaua, *The Legends and Myths of Hawai'i: the fables and folk-lore of a strange people*, ed. and intro. by Hon. Rollin Mallory Daggett (New York: C. L. Webster & Co., 1888).

## The Continuation of the Reciprocity Treaty

While the reciprocity treaty had established free trade between the United States and Hawai'i, the treaty was only guaranteed for seven years. From 1883, it was terminable by either party on one year's notice. Opposition to the treaty had continued in Hawai'i, especially with regard to privileges that it gave the U. S. and American traders over other trading partners. In the U. S. opposition also continued from the southern states and also from California, where Spreckel's control over the Hawaiian sugar market raised the concern of other refiners. Spreckels had invested heavily in the Hawaiian sugar industry and was buying a substantial proportion of the crop for his Californian refineries, as well as exerting considerable influence over the government.<sup>37</sup>

In 1883 a proposal was put to the U. S. government to extend the treaty for another seven years. The proposal received favorable attention, but the issue of ceding Pearl Harbor was raised again by the U.S. as a condition of renewal. The U. S. were becoming increasingly aware of the strategic value of the islands in terms of establishing a strong presence in the Pacific. The Hawaiian government made it clear that this condition would be unacceptable, but the U. S. government continued over the next three years to insist upon it. In early 1887, news reached the islands that the Senate had approved a treaty convention which included the cession of Pearl Harbor. This was taken as a definite indication that an extension to the treaty would not be considered by the U. S. without this condition. The Hawaiian government still refused to accept it and began to explore the possibility of a treaty with Canada.<sup>38</sup>

---

<sup>37</sup>Kuykendall, *Hawaiian Kingdom III*, 373-81; Tate, *Reciprocity or Annexation*, 137-76.

<sup>38</sup>Kuykendall, *Hawaiian Kingdom III*, 381-93; Tate, *Reciprocity or Annexation*, 183-91.

## **Discussion: The Maintenance of Hawaiian Independence**

King Kālākaua had used the support of the American community as part of his strategy to secure the throne. For a while he tried to balance the interests of the American sugar planters and his own Native Hawaiian people, but he found this to be an increasingly difficult job. He faced increasing opposition within the legislature from Native Hawaiian members. The arrival of Claus Spreckels and Celso Moreno in the islands provided an opportunity to obtain financial support and political advice from outside of the rather insular group of protestant American planters in the islands. However, as he was to find out, this was at a cost. Spreckels came very close to owning the kingdom and the King. Kālākaua had to once again find ways to spread his support.

The trip around the world expanded the King's understanding of global politics. He used the connections he established with foreign countries to help maintain Hawaiian independence through the process of obtaining treaties with various powers recognizing that independence. It was a strategy that relies on the fact that the more countries that recognized Hawai'i as a sovereign state, the less likely it would be that one of them would try and take it over and risk the moral, or even military, outrage of the others. In particular, he was trying to keep the United States in its place and prevent Hawai'i from being totally dependent upon it. In this regard, he made an alliance with Japan for the importation of labor and turned to London to provide a loan for the government. He was also contemplating a reciprocity treaty with Canada, if the United States were not prepared to renew the existing one without demanding the cession of Pearl Harbor.

At home, the reign of Kālākaua was a time of the revival of Hawaiian identity and culture. The educated Native Hawaiians, who were mainly of *Ali'i* rank, once again had the opportunity to participate in Hawaiian politics and society in a meaningful and influential manner. However, this very much displeased the Haole population, particularly the descendants of the original missionaries, who were in the

process of making their fortune out of sugar. They did not want a politically active and argumentative Native population, they objected to erosion of Christian and Anglo-Saxon values by the revival of Hawaiian culture, they objected to Kalākaua's tendency to favor foreigners and entrepreneurs who were not of their group, and they objected to what they viewed as the wasting of taxpayers' money and high levels of corruption within the government. Finally, it appeared that they might be about to lose their free trade agreement with the United States, threatening the viability of their sugar plantations. The stage was set thus by 1887 for a conflict between the sugar planters and King Kalākaua.



## **PART II**

**KA HO‘ĀLA ‘ANA**

**(THE AWAKENING)**

## CHAPTER 3

### REACTION AND RESISTANCE: 1887-8

#### The Provisions of the 1887 Constitution

WHEREAS, the Constitution of this Kingdom heretofore in force contains many provisions subversive to civil rights and incompatible with enlightened Constitutional Government; And WHEREAS, it has become imperative in order to restore order and tranquility and the confidence necessary to a further maintenance of the present Government that a new Constitution should be at once promulgated:

Now THEREFORE, I, Kalakaua, King of the Hawaiian Islands, in my capacity as Sovereign of this Kingdom, and as the representative of the people hereunto by them duly authorized and empowered, do annul and abrogate the Constitution promulgated by Kamehameha the Fifth, on the 20th day of August, A. D. 1864, and do proclaim and promulgate this Constitution.<sup>1</sup>

So reads the preamble of the 1887 constitution, stating the basic rationale and justification for its forced promulgation. In signing this document, King Kalākaua was forced to admit publicly in the opening statement that the previous government, with which he had been closely involved, was in error, thus denigrating not only his own *mana*, but also that of Kamehameha V.

Although the 1887 constitution was for the most part the same as that of 1864, there were several important changes. The power of the King was greatly reduced and executive power was placed effectively in the hands of the cabinet. The cabinet was still appointed by the King, but it could now only be dismissed by a majority vote of the legislature, whereas before the King was responsible for doing so. The members

---

<sup>1</sup>"Constitution: granted by Kalakaua, July 6, 1887" in Lydecker, *Roster*, 159-70.

of the cabinet sat and voted in the legislature, but they did not hold elected seats. Between legislative sessions, which were held every two years, the cabinet virtually ran the country.

The King was no longer supposed to have the right to veto legislation, although a later court decision interpreted the new constitution as leaving him a limited right<sup>2</sup>. However, if he returned a bill to the legislature unsigned and it was passed again by a two-thirds majority, it would become law whether or not he agreed with it. If he didn't sign or return a bill within ten days it would also become law, thus preventing him from holding a bill unsigned.

The qualifications for voters for the House of Representatives were changed. The 1864 constitution allowed all male *subjects* who had paid their taxes, were over 21 and had lived in the Kingdom for at least one year, to vote.<sup>3</sup> The 1887 constitution extended the vote to *residents* who had resided in the kingdom for at least one year, whether or not they were subjects of the kingdom. They also had to be able to read or write in Hawaiian, English or another European language. The literacy and the residence tests were not applicable to those in the Kingdom at the time of the promulgation of the constitution, provided that they registered and voted in the next election. But the constitution then restricted the right to vote on racial criteria. Voters had to be of Hawaiian, American or European birth or descent. This excluded Asian immigrants from voting and exercising political power.

Under all previous constitutions, the House of Nobles was appointed by the King. Under the new one, it was to be elected by a select group of voters. Those eligible to vote had to have been resident in the kingdom, but not necessarily subjects of it, for at least three years. They also had to have

---

<sup>2</sup>Kuykendall, *Hawaiian Kingdom III*, 414.

<sup>3</sup>Voters also had to have property of \$150 in unincumbered real estate, lease-hold property for which a rent of at least \$25 per annum was paid, or an annual income of at least \$75 per annum. These qualifications were removed in 1874. Kuykendall, *Constitutions*, 43.

unencumbered, taxable property worth at least \$3,000 or have received an annual income of \$600 in the year preceding the election. An oath to support the constitution and the laws was also required for electors of Nobles and Representatives, as well as government officials.

*The Effect of the New Voting Qualifications*

The only surviving register of voters that I have been able to locate for this period is one compiled in 1888, showing the names, birth places and occupations of those voters who had registered for the 1887

Table 3.1. Analysis of Voters for the Houses of Representatives and Nobles, 1888.

Nationality	Voters for House of Representatives	Voters for House of Nobles	Voters for House of Nobles as a percent of voters for House of Representatives
Native Hawaiian	64.0% (9,336)	35.5% (1,065)	11.4%
Hawai'i born - foreign parentage	1.3% (189)	4.5% (135)	71.4%
American	5.5% (806)	22.1% (661)	82.0%
British	4.6% (670)	18.4% (550)	82.1%
Portuguese	19.3% (2812)	4.8% (143)	5.1%
German	3.0% (443)	8.7% (259)	58.5%
Others	2.3% (342)	6.2% (185)	54.1%
Total	100.0% (14,598)	100.0% (2,998)	20.5%

Source: Lorrin A. Thurston, "'That's Different': an analysis of the vote for Representatives and Nobles," *Pacific Commercial Advertiser*, Nov 22, 1889.

election and the 1888 special election.<sup>4</sup> It also shows which individuals were eligible to vote for the House of Nobles. In 1889, Prime Minister Lorrin Thurston published an analysis of this register, showing the number of voters by nationality and location who could vote for the Houses of Representatives and Nobles. He was attempting to demonstrate that Hawaiians were not disadvantaged in the elections by stating that they were the single largest national group in each category of voter. However, the figures show that Hawaiians and Portuguese were extremely underrepresented among voters for the House of Nobles. While around 80% of American and British registered voters could vote for Nobles, only 11.4% of Hawaiians and 5.1% of Portuguese could. The percentages were higher on O'ahu than on the other islands. Also, while Hawaiians were the majority of voters for the House of Representatives (64.0%), they were in the minority for the House of Nobles (35.5%).

The changes in the qualifications for voting for the House of Representatives also affected enfranchisement. Firstly, a number of Chinese citizens of Hawai'i who were able to vote in the previous elections were now excluded from the franchise on racial grounds. Secondly, a large number of European and Americans who had not taken citizenship in Hawai'i were now able to vote. In the 1887 election they were also exempt from the residence and literacy tests, opening the possibility of candidates hiring voters *en masse* to support them. The two sources for this would have been visitors to the ports and Portuguese immigrants who worked on the sugar plantations.

Evidence regarding such actions is scant, since few of the voting records survive. However, the 1894 report of U.S. Commissioner Blount was quite clear on this point. He recorded an interview with Chief Justice Judd concerning the circumstances of the 1887 constitution, where Judd explains that there were two factions in the Hawaiian League, one that wanted just to restrain the power of the King and one

---

<sup>4</sup>"Great Register of Voters, 1887-1888," Hawai'i State Archives.

It is likely that registers for other elections were kept only as handwritten documents and never published. In any case they appear not to have survived in the archives.

that wanted to overthrow him and establish a republic. Judd states that the latter group were dissatisfied with the outcome and that "they didn't want the Hawaiians to vote at all; and the reasons that the Portuguese were allowed to vote was to balance the Native vote."<sup>5</sup> Blount goes on to point out that in 1888, only three Portuguese were naturalized and only five more became so in the period up to his visit. In addition "very few could read and write". He states:

These ignorant laborers were taken before the election from the cane fields in large numbers by the overseer before the proper officer to administer the oath and then carried to the polls and voted according to the will of the plantation manager. Why was this done? In the language of Chief Justice Judd, "to balance the Native vote with the Portuguese vote." This same purpose is admitted by all persons here. Again, large numbers of Americans, Germans, English, and other foreigners unnaturalized were permitted to vote under the forgoing form [i.e. the oath to support the Constitution and laws]. Two thirds of this number were never naturalized.<sup>6</sup>

That a large number of non-literate Portuguese were signed up to vote is confirmed by the census of 1890. It showed that in December 1890, 1518 Portuguese males of all age groups reported that they could read and write, while 2091 were registered to vote. There were 720 Portuguese males attending school and presumably under the voting age, so if 80 percent of them could read and write, this would leave 937 literate Portuguese out of school, most of whom were probably old enough to vote. Therefore, only about half of the Portuguese voting population could read and write. The figures for other nationalities are much less conclusive. In most cases it appears that the voting population was equal to or less than the literate male population of voting age.<sup>7</sup> Also, as will be discussed later in this chapter, the total votes cast in the 1887 election far exceeded those cast in the 1886 election. The number of registered non-Hawaiian voters reported in the 1890 census was significantly less than those recorded on the 1888 role, in spite of steady population growth for all nationalities.<sup>8</sup> This could reflect the fact that a number of the people signed up for the 1887 elections were only temporarily in the country and had since left. A declining interest

---

<sup>5</sup>U.S. Congress, *Affairs in Hawaii*, 576.

<sup>6</sup>*Ibid.*, 578-79.

<sup>7</sup>Kingdom of Hawai'i, *Census - 1890*, Table 7.

<sup>8</sup>*Ibid*; Thurston, "Analysis"; Nordyke, *Peopling of Hawaii*, 178-79.

in politics and errors in the census record may also have influenced the figures.<sup>9</sup> The number of Hawaiian voters appears to have increased, in spite of the fact that the Hawaiian population was still decreasing.

As intended, the 1887 constitution achieved two major and interrelated aims. Firstly, it limited the power of the King and increased the power of the cabinet. So long as the King could be persuaded to appoint ministers favorable to Haole elite this meant that they had control of the executive branch of government, with very little in the ways of checks and balances. Secondly, the balance of power in selecting the members of the legislature was transferred from the King and the Native Hawaiian population to the Haole population, and in particular those with property and income.

### **The 1887 Election Campaign**

#### *Petitions to the King*

In response to the new constitution, a two-pronged reaction was initiated by a sizable group of Native Hawaiians and Chinese. The first approach was to ask the King to repeal or amend the constitution, the second was the election of candidates who could achieve this during the next session of the legislature.

On July 19, two to three hundred people of Hawaiian and Asian descent gathered at a vacant lot on Fort Street, Honolulu, to discuss their opposition to the new constitution.<sup>10</sup> The opening address was given by Mr. K. Katsura, a Japanese lawyer, who explained to the audience the purpose of constitutions and the defects of the new one. He went on to say that the new constitution disenfranchised his countrymen,

---

<sup>9</sup>It could also reflect underreporting of registration in the Census. It is probably therefore a combination of all three factors and on the information available it is not possible to determine the relative influences of each of these factors.

<sup>10</sup>The account of this meeting is reconstructed from the following newspaper reports: *Daily Bulletin*, July 20, 1887; *Hawaiian Gazette*, July 26, 1887; *Pacific Commercial Advertiser*, July 20, 1887.

who had come to Hawai'i under a treaty between the Japanese and Hawaiian governments which promised that the rights of the Japanese in Hawai'i would be protected. He stated that a constitution is a contract between the King and the people, and since this new constitution did not have the approval of the majority, it was not valid.

His speech was followed by that of Mr. Joseph Moku'ohai Poepoe, a young Hawaiian lawyer. In his speech he explained the differences between the old and new constitutions and stated:

His Majesty had surrendered his right as an independent sovereign, and that the people were now the rulers, as in the United States where they had no nobility and every man was a good as his neighbor. Now, in Hawaii, we have had chiefs from time immemorial and it is our duty to support them.<sup>11</sup>

He then went on to criticize the exclusion of Asians from voting, stating that they were treated like animals and yet contributed \$300,000 a year towards the national income. He then read a petition to the King, asking for the removal of the objectionable features of the constitution.

In his speech Poepoe contrasted the American style democracy that had been forced upon Hawai'i in the form of the new constitution with the old system of *Ali'i* rule, as described in the Preface. He considered that the rule of the *Ali'i* was perpetuated in the power of the King, and therefore it was the duty of the people to support him.

Poepoe was himself of *Ali'i* descent. He was descended from Hewahewanui, who was the *Kahuna Nui* (High Priest) to Kings Kamehameha I and II and had sanctioned the burning of the temples and the wooden representations of the old *Akua* following the breaking of the *kapu*.<sup>12</sup> Poepoe was born in Kohala

---

<sup>11</sup>*Daily Bulletin*, July 20, 1887.

<sup>12</sup>Edith Kawelohea McKinzie, *Hawaiian Genealogies: extracted from Hawaiian language newspapers*, ed. Ishmael W. Stagner II (Lā'ie, Hawai'i: Brigham Young University, 1983), 2:108; Kame'eleihiwa, *Pehea Lā?*, 82.



in 1852 and had been educated at the Royal School in Honolulu and then at Ahuimanu, which was later St. Louis College. He was fluent in English and Hawaiian and well versed in French, Latin and Hebrew. His education at the Royal School reflects his rank as an *Ali'i*, since only the highest ranking *Ali'i* were eligible to attend, and also meant that he was a close friend of members of the royal family. He was a close friend of King Kalākaua, whose biography he compiled following his death in 1891. After graduating, he taught school at Kohala for two years before moving to Honolulu and entering the practice of law.<sup>13</sup>

Poepoe was member of the new generation of *Ali'i* who had been educated in the mission schools, but held onto the ideals of Hawaiian society. They were employed in such occupations as law, teaching, the public service and politics. Under Kalākaua's rule, the opportunities for this group of people had grown considerably. The 1887 constitution threatened their position by once again giving the Haole greater control over the political system. The changes meant that native Hawaiians were less likely to be elected to the legislature and with a Haole dominated cabinet, they were less likely to be appointed to the public service.

The final speaker at the meeting was Mr. C. Monting, a Chinese businessman. He had arrived in the islands in 1878 as a rice cultivator and had become a leader among the Hakkas. He was a director of the United Chinese Society, which was established in 1884 to unite the various Chinese ethnic groups in reaction to the growing anti-Chinese sentiment.<sup>14</sup> He spoke at the meeting on the exclusion of his people from voting rights.

---

<sup>13</sup>*Commercial Advertiser*, April 11, 1913; *Ka Moolelo o Ka Moi Kalakaua I*, preface signed by Joseph M. Poepoe (Honolulu: n.p., 1891).

<sup>14</sup>Hsiao-ping Huang, "Chinese Merchant Background and Experience in Hawai'i under the Monarchy" (Ph.D. diss., University of Hawai'i, 1989), 221-22; Clarence E. Glick, *Sojourners and Settlers: Chinese migrants in Hawaii* (Honolulu: Hawaii Chinese History Center and University Press of Hawaii, 1980), 218.

A copy of a printed petition, which is most likely the one referred to by Poepoe, still exists in the King's papers in the State Archives, although the names of the petitioners have been cut off.<sup>15</sup> The petitioners humbly requested the King of Hawai'i, David La'amea Kalākaua, to consider their concerns:

While, as a result of our careful consideration of the new Constitution that was recently proclaimed, we have noticed many things in that Constitution which we think are evils imposed upon this State, its Throne and its People, and included in these are the following:

- (1) The usurpation of the Ancient Prerogatives associated with the Throne of Hawai'i.
- (2) The establishment of the administration of this State on the principles of Republican Government.
- (3) As well as the dragging down of the authentic Monarchical Government of Hawai'i to that of a Republican Government.
- (4) Sovereign power will be established additionally apart from the King who rightfully sits on the Throne of the State; and
- (5) The great restriction of the proper civil rights of the native Hawaiian Peoples and the people of Asia.<sup>16</sup>

They requested that the constitution be corrected before the administering of the oath by the people to support the constitution. In order to achieve this, the King was requested to call an extraordinary session of the legislature according to his powers under the new constitution. They noted that while the new constitution was binding upon the King and his cabinet, by virtue of their oaths taken on July 6, it was not yet binding on the rest of the nation, who had not taken the oath to support it. Therefore, he should call the legislature as elected under the old constitution to represent the people and correct and agree to the new constitution. They further noted that the new constitution was based on Thurston's explanation that the constitution is a contract between the people and the King. But when, they asked, will the voices of your own subjects be heard on this matter?

---

<sup>15</sup>Printed petition, F.O. and Ex., 1887, Local Officials: King, Hawai'i State Archives, Honolulu.

<sup>16</sup> Ibid, own translation.

Both the King and Prime Minister Green provided written replies to the resolutions. These were presented to a mass meeting, attended by nearly 800 people, held at Kaumakapili church on August 9.<sup>17</sup> In his reply, the King stated that he thought that the people were better off under the new constitution, saying:

Under the old Constitution, the people went barefoot or wrapped their feet in ti leaves; under the new Constitution, they wore shoes; under the old Constitution, they wore the malo, now they wear clothes like other civilized people; under the old Constitution they sheltered their heads under palm leaves, now they wear hats and moreover, this was His Constitution.<sup>18</sup>

He went on to state that the people's rights had been extended, since they could now vote for the Nobles. He refused to call a special session of the Legislature and had verbally assured the committee that if the Honolulu Rifles were a threat to the people, he would have called on "his own men ... the whole nation or even a man-of-war if needed", but he did not think it was necessary. The reply from Green was along similar lines. He suggested that they should read the new constitution or "get someone to explain it" and they would find that their rights had not been restricted. The request for the old legislature to sit, he said, was "so repugnant to the spirit and text of the Constitution that His Majesty and the Cabinet have sworn to support, that I'm entrusted to say they cannot be granted."<sup>19</sup> The meeting rejected both replies, but gave their approval to the work of the committee. They discussed the selection of candidates for the next election.

The opening of Kalākaua's reply provides an insight to his thoughts on the matter. An initial reading of it gives a strong impression not only that Kalākaua supports the new constitution but that he is

---

<sup>17</sup>*Pacific Commercial Advertiser*, August 9, 1887,

<sup>18</sup>*Hawaiian Gazette*, August 9, 1887.

*Ti* or *Ki* (*Cordyline terminalis*) is a broad leafy plant of the lily family. The leaves were used for many purposes by the Hawaiians, including house thatch, food wrappers, hula skirts and sandals. The *malo* was a loincloth worn by men. Pukui and Elbert, *Dictionary*, 145, 233.

<sup>19</sup>Draft of letter, Green to Jas. Keau et. al., F.O. & Ex 1887, Local Officials: King, Hawai'i State Archives. A Hawaiian translation of the letter accompanies it.

rejecting the past. But an alternative reading would suggest that his rejection is of the clothing of the past in favor of that of "civilization", even though the latter may be neither necessary nor particularly advantageous in the Hawaiian climate. The fundamental values of Hawaiian society are not referred to. It perhaps reflects the belief that to succeed in the global community, Hawai'i and Hawaiians had to adopt the outward signs of "civilization", even if they were somewhat uncomfortable, but that this did not change the fundamental identity of the people or the nation. This is consistent with Kalākaua's adoption of European symbols of monarchy, such as the palace and the coronation, and concurrent revival of aspects of Hawaiian culture, such as hula and genealogy. Kalākaua may also have been referring to the economic development and wealth generated by the 1876 reciprocity treaty, which had expired and was due to be renewed. As will be explained later in this chapter, this was the most important item of business for the cabinet after the election. Under the Gibson ministry and the previous constitution, the cabinet would never have agreed to cede Pearl Harbor to renew the treaty. Yet the prosperity of the Hawaiian sugar industry depended on the renewal of the treaty, even if it meant the surrender of sovereignty over Pearl Harbor. Under the new cabinet and constitution, the King had no choice but to agree to the renewal of the treaty under whatever conditions the cabinet were prepared to agree to, including cession of Pearl Harbor to the United States. By this stage, Kalākaua knew that ratification of the treaty, along with the cession of Pearl Harbor, was inevitable and this may have been his way of providing his subjects with a rationale for accepting this loss.

#### *Selection of Candidates for the Independent Ticket*

The work of preparing for the election had already begun before a reply to the petitions had been received. The meeting to nominate candidates for Nobles and Representatives was held on July 25.<sup>20</sup> The speakers at that meeting encouraged the people to register and vote. Samuel Kāne pointed out that it was a perilous time and that whether or not they agreed with the constitution, they were under an obligation to

---

<sup>20</sup>*Pacific Commercial Advertiser*, July 26, 1887.

support it. He stated that they would have the majority on their side and be able to change it, although the crowd seemed to disagree on the point of whether or not they would be able to successfully elect Nobles to represent them. The next speaker, A. P. Kalaukoa, proposed himself as a candidate and spoke in support of the constitution. He was cried down with calls of "*Nui ka pilikia!*".<sup>21</sup> Kalaukoa had stood as an independent candidate in 1884 in opposition to the alleged corruption of the Gibson ministry<sup>22</sup> and after this meeting was nominated as a Reform Party candidate and was elected to the Legislature.<sup>23</sup> He was followed by Poepoe, who referred to the previous speaker as an "Angel of Death". He stated that the country was in mourning and went on to highlight the class divisions in the new constitution. He saw the new constitution as aiming to make the country into a republic.

The final selection of candidates for the House of Representatives took place on August 19, at one of the largest meetings held so far. Poepoe read out a contract between the nominees and the people "to work for each other" and the candidates were then elected by delegates from each ward. This method of selection indicates that there was a reasonable level of organization, and it was the same method as was used by the Reform Party at its convention a couple of days before. The candidates selected were Poepoe, W. C. Achi, Antone Rosa and Kāne.<sup>24</sup>

Candidates for the House of Nobles were selected at the next meeting on August 22. At the meeting, Poepoe suggested that preference should go to Native Hawaiians. Fifteen names were proposed,

---

<sup>21</sup>"There are many problems."

<sup>22</sup>Kuykendall, *Hawaiian Kingdom III*, 270-71.

<sup>23</sup>*Pacific Commercial Advertiser*, September 13, 1887.

<sup>24</sup>*Pacific Commercial Advertiser*, August 19, 20, 1887.

None of these candidates had previous legislative experience.

of which seven were Native Hawaiians. From these fifteen, nine were chosen, including all but one of the Native Hawaiians.<sup>25</sup> The candidates for Nobles addressed a campaign meeting on August 30.<sup>26</sup>

On September 5, the independent platform was presented. It called for amendments to the new constitution, the preservation of the Kingdom as a constitutional monarchy, wise and economical government, the equalization of taxes so as not to burden the mass of the people, and internal improvements to ensure the prosperity of the nation. It also called for the election of the principal officers of the government by the people, with the exception of the ministers and the judiciary, as well as demanding that any foreigner taking up an office under the government must forswear all allegiance to his own country and that further immigration of foreign laborers be suspended until the national debt was paid.<sup>27</sup>

The call to elect government officials was a reaction to the blatant nepotism of the Reform cabinet, which had dismissed officials appointed by the previous ministry and appointed people who had supported the Hawaiian League.<sup>28</sup> The point about foreign immigrants initially indicates a concern about the cost of immigration to the general taxpayers, when it was the sugar planters who benefitted most from it. For the period 1886-8, the government was facing a deficit of \$1.7 million, equivalent to 38 percent of government expenditure.<sup>29</sup> Support for immigration was one of the items of government expenditure that had raised controversy. Between 1880 and 1886, the government had spent over one million dollars in subsidizing immigration, while the planters, who benefits most from it, only paid \$930,000 towards the cost of bringing in new immigrants. It had also been one of the justifications for raising the two million dollar

---

<sup>25</sup>*Pacific Commercial Advertiser*, August 23, 1887.

<sup>26</sup>*Ka Nupepa Ke Alakai o Hawaii*, August 31, 1887.

<sup>27</sup>*Pacific Commercial Advertiser*, September 6, 1887.

<sup>28</sup>Kuykendall, *Hawaiian Kingdom III*, 402-404.

<sup>29</sup>Thrum, *Almanac*, 1887:33.

loan in 1886, although it seems most of the money was intended for improvements to infrastructure in the kingdom.<sup>30</sup> In later elections the debate over immigration shifted to the desirability of bringing more Asians into Hawai'i.

The meeting was also addressed by P. O'Sullivan, a Haole mechanic, who spoke on behalf of mechanics and laborers. He had defected from the Reform Party and was received with great applause. His attacked Chinese immigrants, who he said were "not like the Portuguese, who come here with their families to settle and promote the industries of the Kingdom."

Further meetings were held on September 9 and 11.<sup>31</sup> The speeches at these meetings followed lines similar to those given before. Clarence Ashford and William Castle, members of the Hawaiian League and the Reform Party, tried to speak at the second meeting, with the result that the meeting fell into chaos.

There is less information available about the electoral organization on the other islands. In most districts, there were independent candidates standing for the House of Representatives, but only on O'ahu were there independents standing for Nobles.<sup>32</sup> On the eve of the election there was a large meeting held at Hilo, on the island of Hawai'i, to hear the independent candidates Joseph Nāwahī and George C. Beckley. The meeting was attended by a large number of Portuguese.<sup>33</sup>

While the independent candidates drew most of their support from the Native Hawaiian community, the Native Hawaiian community was divided over the election. *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa* took the lead in

---

<sup>30</sup>Andrew W. Lind, *An Island Community: ecological succession in Hawai'i* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1938), 193; Kuykendall, *Hawaiian Kingdom III*, 290-91.

<sup>31</sup>*Pacific Commercial Advertiser*, September 10 and 12, 1887.

<sup>32</sup>*Pacific Commercial Advertiser*, September 13 and 19, 1887.

<sup>33</sup>*Pacific Commercial Advertiser*, September 13, 1887.

presenting the case in favor of the new constitution. As a strongly Christian newspaper it presented a conservative missionary viewpoint. It had strongly opposed the Gibson ministry and Kalākaua's revival of Hawaiian culture. However, its position was not an all-out support for the Reform Party. It counselled caution in choosing which candidates to vote for and provided some accurate criticism of the independent platform. In particular, it pointed out the contradiction between opposing the establishment of a republican government and calling for the election of government officials.<sup>34</sup> On August 27 it published a letter supporting the new constitution, signed by 136 people who were mainly Native Hawaiians.

There were four other Hawaiian language newspapers being published at the time: *Ke Alakai o Hawaii*, *Ko Hawaii Pae Aina*, *Ka Makaainana* and *Ka Nupepa Elele*. Of these only a few issues of *Elele* and *Ke Alakai o Hawaii* survive from this period. Both of these papers strongly supported the independent candidates. On July 30, the *Elele* was taken over from ex-Premier Gibson's son-in-law, F. H. Hayselden, by a Haole friend of Gibson, Daniel Lyons. The paper's platform was "to support for Nobles and Representatives only those who pledged themselves before the election to strike out from the new Constitution, the clause requiring a property qualification for the voting of Nobles; and also to amend the New Constitution so as to have all officers of the Government, except His Majesty's Ministers, elected by the people themselves, instead of being appointed as in the old and New Constitution."<sup>35</sup> This platform was later incorporated into the Independent Platform.

*Ke Alakai o Hawaii* ran a series of articles on the problems of the new constitution as well as printing in each issue "*Na kanawai he umi o ke aloha nui i haawi ia ma ka mauna kupu kelakela ke poo Waialeale*" (The ten commandments of the great aloha, given on the glorious mountain top of Wai'ale'ale). Wai'ale'ale is the highest peak on Kaua'i. At the top of the mountain is an altar to the *Akua* Kāne, called

---

<sup>34</sup>*Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*, August 6, 1887.

<sup>35</sup>*Ka Elele*, July 30, 1887. Unfortunately no other issues of *Elele* survive from the election campaign period.



Ka'awako. The *Ali'i Nui* of Kaua'i made a regular and difficult pilgrimage up the mountain to receive the support and blessing of Kāne.<sup>36</sup> Wai'ale'ale was used in this instance as the Hawaiian equivalent to Mount Sinai and the ten commandments listed were loosely modeled on the biblical ones. They began with "you shall have no other Monarch, but the one who sits on the Throne of Hawai'i; do not swear falsely or curse with the name of your Monarch." They went on to urge voters to choose candidates that would respect the *Ali'i*, the *Āina* (land) and the nation, to honor the King and Queen, not to overthrow the government or act outside of the law, or to promote republican government. Finally they urged those who could vote for Nobles to do so.<sup>37</sup>

Finally, a comment is required on the position of Asian residents who had been disenfranchised. The first public meeting on July 19 had shown all the signs of an alliance developing between Native Hawaiians and Asians. The printed petition launched at this meeting included the exclusion of Asians from voting as one of the concerns, although it was given a fairly minor place on the list. However, the resolutions of the August 2 meeting entirely omitted the issue of Asian franchise and over the next month an element of anti-Chinese sentiment entered into the meetings. The Chinese business community organized its own petitioning effort. Two petitions from Chinese on this issue from this period, with 35 and 17 signatures respectively, survive in the archives.<sup>38</sup> The cabinet minutes record their receipt at the meeting

---

<sup>36</sup>Edward Joesting, *Kauai: the separate kingdom* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press and Kauai Museum Association, 1984), 1-5.

The link between the sacredness of Wai'ale'ale and the *Ali'i Nui* is also illustrated in Hawaiian proverbs. The proverbial saying "*Kaulīlua i ke anu, Wai'ale'ale*," which means "Extremely cold is Wai'ale'ale," is said of someone who is high above others. It is the first line of a chant composed by Kaumealani, a female *Ali'i* of Waialua, O'ahu. The last person to inherit this chant was King Kalākaua, who was also known by the name of Kaulīlua. Mary Kawena Pukui, *Ōlelo No'eau: Hawaiian proverbs and poetical sayings*, Bernice P. Bishop Museum Special Publication No. 17 (Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press, 1983), 175.

<sup>37</sup>*Ka Nupepa Ke Alakai o Hawaii*, August 31, 1887, own translation.

<sup>38</sup>Handwritten petitions to the King, F.O. and Ex. 1887, Local Officials: King, Hawai'i State Archives, Honolulu.

of August 1, but no indication of any discussion of them.<sup>39</sup> The Chinese business community took up the matter again after the election with a petition to the Legislature signed by 387 naturalized Chinese, but to no avail.<sup>40</sup>

#### *Reform Party Platform and Candidates*

The Reform Party was well organized and held a series of nominating conventions throughout the islands. The largest one was held in Honolulu on August 18. Of the 99 voting delegates only 11 were Native Hawaiians, which reinforced the view that this was a predominantly Haole party. In an attempt to dispel that image, the Reform candidates held a meeting at Kaumakapili church on September 1, which was well attended. Judging from the support given to the independent candidates at subsequent meetings it seems that they did not succeed in persuading their audience to support them. Two of the four Reform Party candidates for Representatives for Honolulu were Native Hawaiians, namely A. P. Kalaukoa and D. L. Naone. On other islands, out of a total of 17 Reform Party candidates for Representative, six were Native Hawaiians.<sup>41</sup>

The Reform Party platform was released on August 18. Its main planks were the abolition of all unnecessary government offices and curtailment of excessive salaries; rigid financial management; liquidation of the national debt; and the reduction of taxation. In addition, it stated that the independence and autonomy of the Kingdom would be preserved.<sup>42</sup>

---

<sup>39</sup>Cabinet Council Minute Book: 1874-91, Hawai'i State Archives, Honolulu, meeting of August 1, 1887.

<sup>40</sup>Legislative Files, November 15, 1887, Hawai'i State Archives, Honolulu.

<sup>41</sup>*Pacific Commercial Advertiser*, August 19, September 2, 13, 1887.

<sup>42</sup>*Pacific Commercial Advertiser*, August 18, 1887.

### *The Election Results*

In the election, the Reform Party secured all the seats in the House of Nobles and all but two of the seats in the House of Representatives.<sup>43</sup> It was later pointed out that while the Reform Party had won by a significant margin, the total number of votes for the independent candidates on O'ahu exceeded the total number cast for the winning candidates in the 1886 election.<sup>44</sup> This raises again the issue of the extension of the franchise. This was something of a wildcard in the election. While it appears that those to whom it was extended in this election favored the Reform Party, there were clear indications that their loyalties were not fixed. The demand for extending the franchise to residents as well as subjects had come mainly from the Haole working classes. It had been raised in these terms by J. A. McCandless at the rally on June 30.<sup>45</sup> But the new constitution also excluded many of them from voting for the House of Nobles, which caused at least some, such as O'Sullivan, to support the independents. The Portuguese were also an uncertain group. Because many of them were non-literate and employed on sugar plantations, they were an easy group for the Reform Party to target. On the other hand, there were signs of independent organization. A meeting was held in Honolulu in early August to discuss the possibility of fielding Portuguese candidates, but it seems that the meeting decided not to act on it.<sup>46</sup> A large number of Portuguese also attended the final independent campaign meeting in Hilo.<sup>47</sup> In the next election, the loyalty of the Portuguese and working-class Haole would become hotly contested between the two sides.

A significant amount of Reform Party support also came from Native Hawaiians. Their support was in fact crucial to their victory. Two thirds of the registered voters for the House of Representatives

---

<sup>43</sup>*Pacific Commercial Advertiser*, September 13, 19, 1887.

<sup>44</sup>*Daily Bulletin*, September 16, 1887.

<sup>45</sup>*Daily Bulletin*, July 1, 1887.

<sup>46</sup>*Daily Bulletin*, August 15, 1887.

<sup>47</sup>*Pacific Commercial Advertiser*, September 13, 1887.

were Native Hawaiians. The Reform Party captured two thirds of the total vote. Since 95 percent of the registered voters turned out to vote, if it is assumed that every Haole voted for Reform, then the other half of the Reform Party's support must have been from the Native Hawaiians.<sup>48</sup> The figures for voting patterns for the House of Nobles are not so easy to interpret, since it was only on O'ahu that independent candidates stood. However, on each island the vote for the Reform Party candidates for the House of Nobles exceeded the number of non-Hawaiian voters. However, since non-Hawaiians were the majority of voters for the House of Nobles on each island, the Reform Party could have won these seats even without the Native Hawaiian support.

It is clear from these figures that a large proportion of Native Hawaiians did not support the independent candidates and preferred to support the Reform Party candidates instead. It is likely that the Reform Party had managed to gain some of the support of those who had opposed Kalākaua and the Gibson ministry and also of the more evangelical Hawaiians. The letter in support of the new constitution which was published in *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa* on August 27, and referred to above, would support this assumption.

### **The Reciprocity Treaty**

When the new cabinet came into office on July 1, they decided not to do anything about the treaty until after the elections. With the elections giving a clear victory to the Reform Party, they were confident to go ahead and accept the terms of the renewal of the treaty as dictated by the United States Congress. The provision for the use of Pearl Harbor did not amount to the cession of sovereign territory. It provided the U.S. with the right, if and when it wished, to establish a coaling and repair station in the harbor for the exclusive use of its ships. Although several proposals were made in the Congress over the next few years,

---

<sup>48</sup>Thurston, "Analysis"; *Hawaiian Gazette*, September 20, 1887.

no development of the harbor actually took place until after the overthrow of the Kingdom in 1893. The United States gave the cabinet its assurance that the Pearl Harbor provision would not, in the opinion of the U.S., in anyway diminish the rights of Hawai'i to act as an independent sovereign nation. It did however place Hawai'i more firmly within the U.S. sphere of influence. With the assurance from the U.S. regarding the independence of the islands, the cabinet went ahead and ratified the treaty. King Kalākaua later told the British commissioner that he had been "most unwilling" to agree to cession of Pearl Harbor, but he had capitulated to the "urgent desire" of his cabinet.<sup>49</sup>

### **Conspiracies against Kalākaua**

After the elections there were three reported attempts to force King Kalākaua to abdicate in favor of his sister and heir, Princess Lili'uokalani.<sup>50</sup> The first two attempts were made by the Reform cabinet. Kalākaua was determined to exercise the full extent of his limited powers under the new constitution. During the 1887 Legislative session, he chose to veto five bills. This led to a major argument with the cabinet over whether the constitution allowed him to do so without the advice and consent of the cabinet. The matter was settled in the supreme court in February 1888 in favor of the King. In the meantime, the cabinet put pressure on the King by twice approaching his sister during December 1887 to ask if she would take the throne in place of her brother, which she refused.

The Princess was also in contact with another group, namely C. B. Wilson, Robert Wilcox and Sam Nowlein, who planned to persuade the King to abdicate in favor of his sister for the benefit of Hawaiians. It seems that Lili'uokalani was somewhat more willingly involved in this attempt. These three men went

---

<sup>49</sup>Kuykendall, *Hawaiian Kingdom III*, 396-97.

<sup>50</sup>This section is based on McGregor-Alegado, "Hawaiian Resistance," 64-75, unless otherwise cited.

to the King with the support of about 300 men under arms. There was some dispute between them as to what their demands were supposed to be, but as it turned out Wilson asked the King to abdicate. The King refused and by this time most of the armed supporters had slipped away. This incident led the cabinet to give its support to the King on the condition that the King give his support to them. In effect the attempt only strengthened the hold of the cabinet over the King.

In January, further mass meetings were held. Poepoe, Wilcox and Edward Kekoa addressed a meeting on January 16. They sent a letter to Kalākaua inviting him to meet with them to discuss their lack of confidence in the cabinet and legislature. Kalākaua, through the office of his Prime Minister, refused to attend and suggested that this was a matter for the Legislature to attend to. Lili'uokalani also recorded in her diary that she was approached on January 24 by the Reverend J. Waiamau, who had chaired at least one of the mass meetings held before the election,<sup>51</sup> with regard to another meeting, which proposed to call on her to take the throne.

In February 1888, Robert Wilcox left Hawai'i and went to San Francisco, possibly under threat of arrest. With the failure of these attempts and perhaps fear of arrest, Native Hawaiian resistance to the government seems to have died down for a while.

### **The 1888 Special Election**

On July 28, 1888, Samuel Gardner Wilder, Noble for O'ahu, died. Since the legislature was still in session, it was decided to hold a special election to fill his seat. The election was announced for August

---

<sup>51</sup>*Pacific Commercial Advertiser*, August 20, 1887.

22.<sup>52</sup> The Reform Party held ward meetings to discuss possible candidates on August 9 and a nomination convention on August 13, where it was decided to nominate the late Noble's brother, William C. Wilder, as their candidate.<sup>53</sup>

The process for nominating an independent candidate was considerably messier and exposed the problems that were being faced by the opposition at that time. On August 8, John Lota Kaulukou announced his intention of running.<sup>54</sup> Daniel Lyons, editor of the *Elele*, proposed Thomas R. Lucas, president of the Mechanics Benefit Union, as a candidate, and believed that he would be a stronger candidate than Kaulukou. His rationale was that there were many in the Reform Party who were uncertain about the actions of the party in government and would therefore vote for Lucas. He referred to these as people who have more love for their country than for money and wealth.<sup>55</sup> Lyons claimed that he talked with Kaulukou, who indicated to him that he would be prepared to stand down in favor of Lucas. This conversation had apparently taken place in his office in front of several people and Kaulukou had clearly agreed that Lucas would get more votes than him. However, it appears that by August 18, Kaulukou had been prevailed upon by others to keep his name forward as a candidate and decided to stay in the running.<sup>56</sup>

---

<sup>52</sup>*Pacific Commercial Advertiser*, July 30, August 3, 7, 1888.

<sup>53</sup>*Pacific Commercial Advertiser*, August 10, 13, 1888.

<sup>54</sup>*Ka Nupepa Ke Alakai o Hawaii*, August 18, 1888.

Kaulukou had been a member of the House of Representatives during the sessions of 1880, 1882, 1884 and 1886 and was a member of the cabinet under Gibson in 1886. Lydecker, *Roster*, 293.

<sup>55</sup>*Ka Elele*, August 11, 1888.

<sup>56</sup>*Ka Elele*, August 11, 18, 1888.

A debate emerged between the *Elele*, which supported Lucas, and *Ka Nupepa Ke Alakai o Hawaii*, which supported Kaulukou, as to who was the best candidate.<sup>57</sup> Of the other Hawaiian language papers, *Ka Makaainana* did not officially support a candidate but preferred Kaulukou,<sup>58</sup> and *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa* supported the Reform Party, and strongly opposed Kaulukou.<sup>59</sup> The argument revolved around several issues. One was the practical desire to have an independent candidate in the House of Nobles. To this end Lucas was probably the best candidate in that he could capture a much larger proportion of the discontented Haole vote, as well as maintaining a good proportion of the Hawaiian vote. This was in part because he was a Haole worker and in part because Kaulukou's previous association with the Gibson ministry was held against him by much of the Haole and some of the Hawaiian community. However, Native Hawaiian political leaders seemed to strongly desire a Native Hawaiian candidate. In addition, there were concerns raised about Lucas's ties to the Anti-Asian Union of Hawai'i, which had been instrumental in pushing the legislature to consider amendments to the constitution restricting the rights of the Chinese. The *Elele* denied the accusations on Lucas's behalf, but the concerns still remained.

A nomination meeting was held at Kaumakapili church on August 18, which Lyons, as reporter for the *Elele*, refused to attend.<sup>60</sup> Poepoe chaired the meeting and asked for nominations to be made "without concern for the color of the skin of the person". Three names were nominated, Kaulukou, W. C. Wilder and Lucas. Before the candidate was decided on, W. C. Achi requested that a committee of 3 members should be nominated to draw up a platform to which the candidate would pledge himself. This was agreed and Achi, Antone Rosa and Lucas very quickly produced the platform. The platform included the sorting out of the administration of labor immigration, supporting the law and upholding the rights of

---

<sup>57</sup>*Ka Elele*, August 18, 15, 1888; *Ka Nupepa Ke Alakai o Hawaii*, August 18, 1888.

<sup>58</sup>*Ka Nupepa Ke Alakai o Hawaii*, August 25, 1888.

<sup>59</sup>*Nupepa Kuokoa*, August 11, 18, 1888.

<sup>60</sup>*Ka Elele*, August 18, 1888; account of the meeting from *Ka Nupepa Ke Alakai o Hawaii*, August 25, 1888.



all, rich or poor, the abolition of unnecessary government offices, and the maintenance of the monarchy and of good government. Once the platform was approved, Achi spoke on the qualities necessary in a candidate, especially his ability to draw the vote of the Hawaiian, Haole and Portuguese voters. He considered that Kaulukou was a good candidate, but could not draw the votes, so he nominated Lucas. However, Lucas spoke later and withdrew his nomination, giving his support to Kaulukou. Rosa was also nominated and declined, stating that he would wait until the next election. Kaulukou was therefore asked to be the candidate, which he agreed to do, stating that he would support the platform adopted by the meeting.

The election result was in favor of Wilder vote of 584 to 443. This compared to a vote of 1308 to 511 for his late brother in the 1887 election, against Cummins.<sup>61</sup> From these figures it is clear that Kaulukou managed to maintain, but not increase the independent vote from the last election, while Wilder lost well over half of the voters that had supported his predecessor. The argument between the *Elele* and *Ke Alakai o Hawaii* continued even after the election. *Ke Alakai o Hawaii* suggested that if the *Elele* had not opposed Kaulukou that he could have won. *Ka Elele* responded that since their opinions did not make a difference in the nomination, they were probably not that important in determining how many people voted for Kaulukou. If Lucas had run, they were sure he would have won.<sup>62</sup>

#### **Discussion: Towards a Mass Organization**

Poepoe's petition to the King regarding the new constitution echoed the voices of petitioners heard over forty years earlier. When Kamehameha III invited foreigners to take key positions in his government, many of the people were worried that the foreigners would eventually take over. In 1845, several hundred

---

<sup>61</sup>*Pacific Commercial Advertiser*, August 23, 1888.

The average votes for Nobles in 1887 had been 1263 for Reform and 372 for independents.

<sup>62</sup>*Ka Elele*, September 1, 1888.

signed petitions to their King expressing their concern at foreigners holding office or owning land.<sup>63</sup> In one such letter to the King, Samuel Mānaiakalani Kamakau, a young *Ali'i* and student of Hawaiian history, asked why it was necessary to appoint foreigners, when Kamehameha I had ruled adequately on the advice of his *Ali'i Nui*. Quoting the old men who he had talked with and who were alive in the time of Kamehameha I, he warns:

There may be men living right among us who will devastate the land like the hordes of caterpillars in the fields; they hide themselves among us until the time comes, then they will be on the side of their own land where their ancestors were born.<sup>64</sup>

The old men rejected the laws of other governments as unsuitable for them, saying: "Those laws are good for them, our laws are for us and are good laws for us, which we have made ourselves".<sup>65</sup>

The King responded that foreign advisors were necessary so that they could interpret the laws of other countries for him. He assured his people that he still looked to their welfare and would promote their place in government wherever they were qualified to take office, in particular in being able to speak in the foreign languages.<sup>66</sup>

The 1887 petition was even less successful, with Kalākaua virtually dismissing their concerns. It seems that the organizers of the petition were well aware that it was not any more likely to succeed than previous petitions to the King and the government, since they had already begun to recruit candidates for the election before the reply to the petition was even received. With the Reform Party winning the majority of the seats in the 1887 election, the need for Native Hawaiians to form a mass organization in order to win

---

<sup>63</sup>McGregor-Alegado, "Hawaiian Resistance", 23.

<sup>64</sup>Samuel M. Kamakau, *Ruling Chiefs of Hawai'i*, rev.ed. (Honolulu: Kamehameha Schools Press, 1992), 400.

<sup>65</sup>Ibid, 400-401.

<sup>66</sup>McGregor-Alegado, "Hawaiian Resistance", 23; Kamakau, *Ruling Chiefs*, 400-402.

the elections was clearly apparent. Both the 1887 and 1888 campaigns were hampered by lack of organizational backing, especially with regard to the platforms, which were publicly announced only days before the election.

Even under the new electoral rules, it was at least theoretically possible for the Native Hawaiian voters to still control the House of Representatives. As discussed above, Native Hawaiian support for Reform Party candidates in 1887 was crucial to their victory.

In light of this situation, if Native Hawaiians were to once again control the legislature, their task was two-fold. First, they had to create a broad-based organization and platform that would attract the support of the majority of Native Hawaiian voters for the House of Representatives. This would entail the reeducation of Native Hawaiian voters to abandon the old Emma versus Kalākaua division, as well as divisions based on religious denomination, in order to unite for common good of the country. Second, they had to develop a strategy to find candidates for all the seats in the House of Nobles and gain the support of non-Hawaiians to vote for those candidates. This second task had the added difficulty of finding members of the propertied and wealthy classes who would be prepared to support the concerns of the lower classes, especially with regard to abolishing or reducing the property and income qualifications, which were the very thing that maintained their political privilege.

The 1888 election showed the weakness of support for the Reform Party from the voters for Nobles. Participation in this election dropped from 95% of registered voters in 1887 to 60% in 1888, mostly at the expense of the Reform Party.<sup>67</sup> It was clear that there was the opportunity to develop an alliance with disenchanted non-Hawaiian voters but it was a question of how to do it and on whose terms.

---

<sup>67</sup>Thurston, "Analysis"; *Hawaiian Gazette*, September 20, 1887; *Pacific Commercial Advertiser*, August 23, 1888.

This issue came back to the debate between Hawaiian and Anglo-Saxon political values. If the independent Native Hawaiian candidates wanted to form a coalition with Haole they would have to make some compromises on the adoption of Anglo-Saxon principles into their policies. The option of restoring the old regime for the prime benefit of Native Hawaiians was no longer realistic. This was apparent as early as the 1887 election campaign. The initial petitions to the King were primarily aimed at restoring the old power structures. However, the electoral platform included the policy of electing government officials. This policy is clearly an incorporation of American ideals of democracy into the independent platform.

The other area on which compromise would be necessary was the question of support for the disenfranchised Asian voters, and in particular the Chinese business community. There are some indications that Hawaiians felt some degree of racial affinity with the Chinese. Chinese businessmen had intermarried with Hawaiian women and a number of Hawaiian business and professional offices had a significant Chinese clientele. It was reasonable therefore that Native Hawaiians would be concerned about the disenfranchisement of the Chinese. However, the Haole workers were strongly in favor of restricting the rights of the Chinese, who they despised and viewed as unfair competitors. Since the Chinese could not help provide votes for the Hawaiians, the Hawaiians were faced with a choice of supporting the Chinese and remaining politically marginal, or abandoning the Chinese and taking advantage of the Haole vote. In the end it was the latter choice that was made. It is significant perhaps that Poepoe, the organizer of the first meeting of Hawaiians and Asians following the 1887 constitution, opted out of politics at this stage.

## CHAPTER 4

### HUI KĀLAİ'ĀINA AWAKENED

#### The Establishment of the Hui

##### *An association is proposed*

In early August 1888, former member of the House of Representatives J. K. Kaunamano,<sup>1</sup> of Honoka'a on the island of Hawai'i, wrote a letter to Daniel Lyons, editor of the *Elele*, expressing his support and admiration for the paper. He described it as "the fearless warrior, renowned in our country in the midst of confusion." He went on to say that "the policies and politics of the *Elele* are wisdom and truth for the good of all and the continuation of the independence of the Hawaiian Government under its Sovereign of old." He concluded by encouraging the *Elele* to "continue ... the good fight for righteousness and justice in all things."<sup>2</sup>

In the same issue of the *Elele*, a similar letter from another former member of the House of Representatives, D. H. Nahinu,<sup>3</sup> of Ho'okena on the island of Hawai'i, was published. Nahinu specifically responded to suggestions that Lyons had published several times before regarding the need for Native

---

<sup>1</sup>Kaunamano was a member of the House of Representatives for the sessions of 1864, 866, 1867, 1880, 1882, 1884, 1886 and 1892. Kuykendall notes that he introduced bills for the licensing of opium in the 1886 and 1892 legislative sessions. Lydecker, *Roster*, 293. Kuykendall, *Hawaiian Kingdom III*, 302, 545.

<sup>2</sup>*Ka Elele*, August 18, 1888.

<sup>3</sup>Nahinu was a member of the House of Representatives for the sessions of 1864, 1873, 1882, 1884 and 1886. Lydecker, *Roster*, 297.

Hawaiians to establish their own political association. He suggested that the association be established first in Honolulu and then branches be set up on other islands. He suggested that Pilipo, another previous member of the House of Representatives<sup>4</sup>, who had a strong following and was a supporter of Queen Emma, could be invited to travel the land to gain support. He suggested the names of David Manaku, Kinikake Desha, W. L. Holokahiki, Sam Parker, J. L. Kaulukou and J. E. Bush as possible founding members.<sup>5</sup> He warned Lyons that he would need to be patient and that the work would be "tangled and difficult." He encouraged him to act quickly and not to delay.<sup>6</sup>

Lyons printed a reply to these letters, thanking them for their support and assuring them that their trust in him would not be misplaced. He assured them that "we are not visitors [*malihini*] ... we have become locals [*ua kama'āina mākou*] and more so than some within this Government; because of this we have within us the love of the Hawaiian race just like they have for themselves ... We have no other burden in our hearts but to foster the love of this wonderful and good Nation."<sup>7</sup>

*Daniel Lyons responds*

In the following issue, Lyons published an article announcing his intention to establish the organization, referring to it as *Ka 'Ahahui 'Elele* (The Elele Association). He announced that in response

---

<sup>4</sup>G. W. Pilipo was a member of the House of Representatives during the sessions of 1860, 1868, 1870, 1878, 1880, 1882 and 1884. He was active in criticizing the 1876 reciprocity treaty. In the 1884 election he stood with the independent candidates, who opposed the Gibson Ministry. In the 1886 election he stood with them again and Kalākaua made a special visit to his electorate in support of Pilipo's opponent, who was then elected. Lydecker, *Roster*, 298. Kuykendall, *Hawaiian Kingdom III*, 199, 270, 282.

<sup>5</sup>Samuel Parker was a member of the House of Nobles in 1886. J. L. Kaulukou was a member of the House of Representatives for the sessions of 1864, 1866, 1867, 1880, 1882, 1884, 1886 and 1892. John E. Bush was a member of the House of Nobles for the sessions of 1880, 1882, 1884 and 1886. Lydecker, *Roster*, 287, 293, 298.

<sup>6</sup>*Ka Elele*, August 18, 1888.

<sup>7</sup>*Ibid.*

to Kaunamano's and Nahinu's letters, the publishers of the *Elele* had decided that Lyons should initiate the project. Lyons went on to say:

It is perhaps a wondrous small thing, our position publishing a Hawaiian newspaper, and the thrusting onto ourselves of the initiative for the establishment of the first Hawaiian Association of this kind that has tried to be established in this land. Our attempt to become leaders for this somewhat great task is perhaps somewhat puzzling, it would be more understandable if we were a person of the land, we have only been here for five years. And furthermore - we have not become citizens of Hawai'i - and because of this lack citizenship; therefore we are denied many of the rights belonging to the Nation; therefore it cannot be said, we are guilty of the crime of desiring to control office. Nor do our friends and supporters greatly desire Government positions. We stand alone in this time in the struggles for this salvation. We are not affiliated to one party and are not pledged to support anyone in office, except for those who work righteously [*hana pono*] and are true friends of the Hawaiian people, without our being paid for this.<sup>8</sup>

He went on to recall his association with Walter Murray Gibson, whom he had worked with since his arrival in Hawai'i and from whom he had learnt much about Hawai'i and its peoples. He noted his role in guarding Gibson on the night of June 30, 1887, when he was in danger from attack by the mob.<sup>9</sup> On this basis he suggested that he could be trusted "to establish an Association for the well being of the Hawaiian people." He announced he would open a book in the *Elele* office for people interested in joining the association to write their names in. A meeting would then be held to elect an executive committee.<sup>10</sup>

In the next week's paper, Lyons elaborated further on his reasons for establishing the association. He pointed out that other nationalities in Hawai'i had associations to represent them, so why not the Hawaiians. His proposed association would therefore give Hawaiians the voice that they lacked in the operation of the government. He accused the government at that time of being controlled by Haole who

---

<sup>8</sup>*Ka Elele*, August 25, 1888.

<sup>9</sup>Gibson noted in his diary for that day: "Rumors of armed mob, purpose to lynch me. Col. Ashford informs me that I will be shot down if I attempt to leave my house. The mob around my house - an anxious night. Faithful guard of Dan Lyons." Adler and Barrett, *Diaries of Walter Murray Gibson*, 161.

<sup>10</sup>*Ka Elele*, August 25, 1888.

were hardhearted and contemptuous towards the Hawaiians, with little regard for them. Therefore such an association needed to be established.<sup>11</sup>

In the same issue, a number of letters of support for Lyons were published. Three of them, from A'arona Kimoteo, Kapitala Ali'i, and "K.", were in reaction to an article in *Ka Nupepa Ke Alakai o Hawaii*, which advised readers not to sign the book. These writers gave their support to Lyons and the *Elele* and urged the *Alakai* to do the same. Another letter from Ioane Koa of Pālama expressed similar thoughts and asked what had happened to Poepoe and Kaulukou, had they left the country?<sup>12</sup>

Over the next two months, Lyons continued to print weekly notices and articles explaining the purpose of the association, reporting progress on organization and arguing against his critics and detractors. It seems that the response to signing the book was fairly quick and the number of signatures grew steadily.<sup>13</sup> He reiterated that the executive committee would be made up only of Hawaiians and that his role was only to start up the association.<sup>14</sup> On September 29, he announced that there was enough support for Hui Kālai'āina, as he now called it, for organization to begin on O'ahu. He said that he had asked some of the supporters to draw up a constitution and rules. He suggested that an executive committee made up of president, vice-president, secretary and ten members be established, who would then decide on the constitution and rules for conducting the association. He hoped that the organization would then spread throughout the land.<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup>*Ka Elele*, September 1, 1888.

<sup>12</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>13</sup>*Ka Elele*, September 8, 22, 29, October 6, 13, November 3, 1888.

<sup>14</sup>*Ka Elele*, September 8, 1888.

<sup>15</sup>*Ka Elele*, September 29, 1888.



From the comments printed in *Elele*, the other Hawaiian language newspapers continued to be either skeptical or critical of Lyons' actions. Lyons accused the Haole of trying to divide the Hawaiians by urging Hawaiians to boycott the association.<sup>16</sup> One of the other newspapers, which was not named by the *Elele*, raised the concern that it was not proper for a Haole to establish such an association. To this, Lyons replied that he had waited a long time and given others plenty of chance to act. Since nothing had been done he had decided to go ahead himself.<sup>17</sup> There were further criticisms regarding the ability of the association to support itself financially and that it would be a financial drain on the Hawaiian people.<sup>18</sup>

By the end of October, Lyons had gained considerable support for the association and announced his intention to hold the inaugural meeting by the end of the following month. His headline for October 27 read: "*Ka Ahahui Kalai Aupuni Hawaii - Lanakila Kamahao! Lokahi ka Pilipaa o Ka Lahui Hawaii!! Huro! No Hawaii Uuku Nei!!!*" (The Hawaiian Political Association - Marvelous Triumph! The Unity of the Hawaiian People is Agreed!! Hurray! For Tiny Hawai'i!!!). In the same issue Lyons printed an article commenting on the qualified support from *Ka Makaainana*, which was still cautious, but willing to wait and see. He invited them to state any specific criticisms that they had and he would correct them.<sup>19</sup> By early November, *Ke Alakai* seems to have dropped its earlier criticism of the association and Lyons and adopted a similar position to *Ka Makaainana*.<sup>20</sup>

In the following issue of the *Elele*, Lyons announced the date of the first meeting of the association to be November 22 and that more than five hundred members had signed up. His tone was clearly

---

<sup>16</sup>*Ka Elele*, September 22, 1888.

<sup>17</sup>*Ka Elele*, September 29, 1888.

<sup>18</sup>*Ka Elele*, October 20, 1888.

<sup>19</sup>*Ka Elele*, October 27, 1888.

<sup>20</sup>*Ka Nupepa Ke Alakai o Hawaii*, November 10, 1888.

exuberant as he encouraged more readers to join.<sup>21</sup> Lyons had also received considerable support from people on the outer islands. His supporters urged him to act quickly and were apparently anxious to get the association up and running. Lyons noted that the position of Native Hawaiians who were rural laborers was more severe than that of those in Honolulu and that they were less informed of politics. One of the important jobs of the association would therefore be to increase their understanding of the political situation.<sup>22</sup>

During November, Lyons also published his thoughts on the path that the association should follow. This was the first time that he had publicly espoused a policy for the organization. In doing so, he contradicted his previous strategy of first setting up the executive committee and then instructing them to develop the constitution and policies. His proposed policy was that an amendment be made to the constitution of Hawai'i to allow the election of all government officers. He pointed out that he had pushed for this policy during the 1887 election campaign, but the candidates had been too distracted by trying to secure office for themselves to pay attention to it. He proposed it as a policy that would not just benefit Native Hawaiians, but all the people of Hawai'i. He went on to compare his proposed policy to that of the British and American governments of the time. In Britain, he said that government officials were appointed by the House of Commons and by individual members of parliament in the case of appointments within their constituency. He insisted that this system had not worked well in Hawai'i. He claimed that:

In America the power of appointment is in the hands of the people. In that country, two parties are brought together, like the association that we are awakening. These great parties choose the people to sit in each Office from the Judges of the Supreme Court to the Traffic Policemen, and their names are presented for the people to elect.

He then reviewed the history of the system of appointment within Hawai'i. Under Kamehameha III he stated that the King and the four governors appointed the government officials. However, under the new

---

<sup>21</sup>*Ka Elele*, November 3, 1888.

<sup>22</sup>*Ka Elele*, November 10, 1888.

constitution, "the King cannot veto the appointment of his political enemies in the highest offices of the government if the Reform Party so pleases".<sup>23</sup>

*The Inaugural Meeting - November 22, 1888.*

The first meeting of the 'Ahahui Kālai'āina Hawai'i went ahead as planned. The press were excluded from the meeting, but two other papers carried reports based on the written statements of the executive committee and comments made to them by those present. The *Elele* of course published a full account of the meeting.<sup>24</sup> Estimates of attendance ranged from 500 and 1500 people.<sup>25</sup> The meeting began with the election of the executive committee. John E. Bush was elected president. W. H. Cummings, James Kaulia, S. W. Lōkai and D. W. Pua were elected vice-presidents. Thomas K. Nakanaela was elected secretary and Frank Metcalf correspondence secretary.

After the elections, Daniel Lyons stood and explained the purpose of the meeting and his speech was then translated into Hawaiian by Bush. He spoke mainly on the platform he had prepared for the association, namely the election of all government officers. He denounced the fact that in a nation of 80,000 people, four people had control of the government, pointing out that in "all civilized nations of the world, the power of appointment is in the hands of the people, through their legislature". He suggested that Native Hawaiians had, for the past 50 years, sat back and watched their political power being taken away. He said that some Haole believed that Native Hawaiians could not be trusted to govern themselves, and asked how they could not be trusted if they were not allowed to participate in the government. He finished

---

<sup>23</sup>*Ka Elele*, November 10, 1888.

<sup>24</sup>*Pacific Commercial Advertiser*, 23 November, 1888; *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*, 24 November, 1888; *Ka Elele*, 24 November, 1888.

<sup>25</sup>*Ka Nupepa Kuokoa* estimated attendance to be nearly 500 people, the *Pacific Commercial Advertiser* estimated it to be nearly 1000, and *Ka Elele* estimated it to be almost 1500 in its banner headline, but in the account of the meeting given said that "more than 1000 had gathered before the meeting started". This may imply that more arrived after the meeting had begun.

by calling on Native Hawaiians to unite for the benefit of the continued independence of the nation and to put aside their conflicts.<sup>26</sup> His speech drew frequent applause from the audience. However after speaking to attendees afterwards, the *Advertiser* noted that "there were some audible murmurings against Mr. Lyons, a foreigner, taking a prominent part in a representative Hawaiian assembly."<sup>27</sup>

Following Lyons' address, Bush read the "Rules and Policy of Hui Kālai'āina Hawai'i." The rules set up an executive committee composed of a president, three vice-presidents, a secretary and a treasurer, who would then appoint a board of 12 members. They stated that there would be no membership fee but that a voluntary fund would be established. The purpose of the Hui was to support candidates for the 1890 election who would carry out its policy that all government officials be elected by the people. The rules also provided that the *Elele* newspaper be the official voice of the Hui. The rules and policy were agreed to by the meeting and the meeting was adjourned at nine o'clock.<sup>28</sup> According to the *Advertiser*, speeches were also made by Bush, Kaulukou and several others during the meeting.

The initial reactions to the Hui from the other Hawaiian language newspapers appear to have been quite skeptical. *Ke Alakai* noted that the executive committee elected at the meeting was not composed according to the rules and suggested that this was a symptom of the hasty establishment of the Hui. It criticized the monopoly role of the *Elele* as mouth piece of the Hui and suggested that there were more important issues than the policy that Lyons had forced on them.<sup>29</sup> *Kuokoa* criticized Lyons' policy as well and was concerned that if it were put into place, only those with sufficient money to campaign for office

---

<sup>26</sup>*Ka Elele*, November 24, 1888.

<sup>27</sup>*Pacific Commercial Advertiser*, November 23, 1888.

<sup>28</sup>*Ka Elele*, November 24, 1888.

<sup>29</sup>*Ka Nupepa Ke Alakai o Hawaii*, November 24, 1888.

would be elected. In their opinion this would effectively exclude Native Hawaiians.<sup>30</sup> The *Elele* apparently replied that *Kuokoa* did not understand the benefits of *Elele*'s policy which had been used in America, *Elele* claimed, for 300 years. *Kuokoa* noted that America had been independent for just over 100 years and went on to say that Hawai'i should not be compared to America. "We are a land of chiefly families [*'āina 'ōhana ali'i*] and they are a republican democracy." They again noted the cost of the presidential elections in America.<sup>31</sup>

**"Hihi a paakiki ke hana aku"**<sup>32</sup>

*Daniel Lyons: Savior of the Nation?*

The role of Daniel Lyons in Hui Kālai'āina became increasingly problematic and was criticized more widely as time went on. He appears to have used his power as the editor of the *Elele* to keep tight control over the Hui and oppose anyone who might want to criticize him. Signs of this were present in his writings before the November meeting.

Lyons was of Irish descent and appears to have spent most of his early life in America. He got his political and journalism training in Virginia City, Nevada in the early days of the Comstock silver mine. While there, he worked for several years as a journalist for the *Virginia Chronicle*. He was a member of the State Assembly in 1879, as well as being a county and city official and a fireman.<sup>33</sup>

---

<sup>30</sup>*Nupepa Kuokoa*, November 24, 1888.

<sup>31</sup>*Nupepa Kuokoa*, December 8, 1888.

<sup>32</sup>"It will be a entangled and difficult job." D. H. Nahinu to Daniel Lyons, printed in *Ka Elele*, August 18, 1888.

<sup>33</sup>John Koontz, *Political History of Nevada*, 5th ed. (Carson City: SPO, 1975), 65, 149; *The Independent*, July 15, 1895.

His experiences of politics in Nevada had a definite influence on the political ideas he later expressed in Hawai'i. The State of Nevada was established with a strongly republican constitution, modelled on that of the State of California. It allowed voters to elect the governor, the lieutenant governor, the secretary of state, the state treasurer, the state controller, the attorney general, the surveyor general, the superintendent of public instruction, the justices of the supreme court, the clerks of the supreme court, the state printer and the state mineralogist.<sup>34</sup> Local government in Virginia City followed a similar pattern, with the election of the mayor, the board of aldermen, a recorder, a treasurer, an assessor and the chief of police who was also the street inspector.<sup>35</sup> This system of politics appears to have been very successful in Nevada. It provided a system of good government, which superseded the corruption and favoritism of the earlier territorial period.

Lyons came to Hawai'i in 1882 and set up a newspaper, the *Daily Hawaiian*, which failed shortly afterwards. In 1884, he was employed as manager of the *Elele* by Gibson's son-in-law, Fred Hayselden. He became friends with Gibson and as noted earlier, guarded him on the night of June 30, 1887 when his life was in danger.<sup>36</sup> This connection with Gibson probably came about through the Catholic Church of which Gibson was an active supporter following his dismissal from the Latter Day Saints. The Catholics were a small minority in Hawai'i at that time and were often bitterly opposed by the New England protestants. This would account for Lyons extreme dislike of the "missionaries", as he often referred to them.

As a friend of Gibson and later as editor of the *Elele*, Lyons acquired a knowledge of Native Hawaiian politics and of the Hawaiian language. His use of the language was, in my opinion, functional

---

<sup>34</sup>Koontz, *Political History*, 79, 178-80.

<sup>35</sup>Russel R. Elliott, *History of Nevada* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1973), 150.

<sup>36</sup>*The Independent*, July 15, 1895.

rather than fluent. His writings are often clumsy and difficult to understand, lacking the elegance of writers who are Native speakers. The fact that he addressed the first Hui Kālai‘āina meeting in English and asked Bush to translate probably indicates a lack of confidence in the spoken language or else a difficulty in making himself understood due to his Irish accent. From his actions with regard to Hui Kālai‘āina, his understanding of Native Hawaiian politics and culture seems to have been at about the same level as his understanding of the language.

It appears that during the early part of 1889, opposition Lyons' role in controlling the policy and direction of the Hui grew steadily. Articles appeared in the two Hawaiian language Christian newspapers expressing their concerns about Lyons. *Nupepa Kuokoa* printed an article in early March under the title "*Laiana? A i ole Laiona paha?*" (Lyons? or maybe Lion?). The article was a fictional discussion between two old men about Lyons. One thought that he was a member of a missionary family of the same name and had been born in Hawai‘i, while the other corrected him and pointed out that he was from Ireland and had not been in Hawai‘i long. He suggested he should be renamed "Lion" for the way he roared. The same issue contained a letter from Kalāhikimai noting how Lyons regarded anyone who disagreed with him as an enemy of Hawai‘i. It seems clear that Lyons' rather explosive Irish temperament was not appreciated by many Hawaiians. Kalāhikimai questioned whether the members of the Hui understood its true purpose when they joined and pointed out that they did not have a say in writing the constitution. He also suggested that in a monarchical state, a policy to elect government officials would destroy the King's *mana*.<sup>37</sup>

In March and April, *Ko Hawaii Pae Aina* printed a three part column entitled "*Laiana - Ka Auhuhu o Hawaii*" (Lyons - The Poison of Hawaii).<sup>38</sup> The writer of the columns, Pūhili‘ole, accused Lyons of

---

<sup>37</sup>*Nupepa Kuokoa*, March 2, 1889.

<sup>38</sup>*Ko Hawaii Pae Aina*, March 30, April 13, 20, 1889.

The seeds of the 'Auhuhu (*Tephrosia purpurea* syn. *T. piscatoria*) were used for poisoning fish. The phrase, "*he 'apu 'auhuhu kōheoheo*" (a poisonous concoction made of 'auhuhu) is used to describe a person of poisonous nature. Pukui and Elbert, *Dictionary*, 31; Pukui, *Ōlelo No'eau*, 64.

using *Elele* to promote his own idea regarding the election of all government officials. He claimed that Lyons' "main opinion is to depose the throne, kick the buttocks of the Cabinet and the Missionary Children and the wealthy Haole of the land and the newspapers *Paeaina* and "Kuokoa"." He accused him of establishing the Hui to express his anger at the throne and the cabinet, as well as to control the 1890 elections and make sure only those who agreed with him could stand for office. In part two Pūhili'ole went on to ask what was the *kaona* (hidden meaning) of the Hui. His answer was that it was to overthrow the throne and the government and establish a government that did not love and respect the people. He went on to attack what appears to have been Lyons' self proclaimed role as the savior of the people, pointing out that Jesus is the Savior. He then went on to list the actions of the royal family in establishing schools and hospitals for their people as being a more effective means of salvation than the policy espoused by Lyons. In the final part he recalled Lyons' association with the mismanagement of the Gibson ministry and again suggested that he wanted to control the Hui and exclude candidates from the next election who did not agree with him.

At the end of March, *Ko Hawaii Pae Aina* reported on an unsuccessful attempt to set up a branch of the Hui at Lāhainā on the island of Maui. The meeting was initiated by two men, 'Ai and 'Ino'a'ole, from Kipahulu, O'ahu, who were sent by the Hui. When they stood during the meeting and read the rules of the Hui, they were interrupted by Kaiwikaōla, along with W. A. Mio and William White,<sup>39</sup> saying "We've had enough of the Elele newspaper peddled from Hawai'i to Kaua'i, therefore explain your thoughts on sections 7 and 9 regarding the election of the government officials and the elections of Representatives and Nobles". When 'Ai and 'Ino'a'ole could not explain it, they were instructed to return home and tell their people that they were mistaken in establishing and joining the Hui. Kaiwikaola referred to Lyons as

---

<sup>39</sup>William White had spoken at a meeting in Hilo in 1887 in support of the petition opposing the new constitution. He later stood against the Reform Party and was elected to the 1890 legislature.



"Ailiki" (Irish) and described him as a plump *kōlea*,<sup>40</sup> saying he had seen a letter from him to another itinerant Haole in Lāhainā, who had "no business in Lāhainā, no love of the Hawaiian race and our people", encouraging him to run for election for the House of Representatives on the Hui's ticket. When he finished this speech, everyone stood and left and only two people joined the Hui.<sup>41</sup> The report of this meeting not only illustrates the lack of support for Lyons on Maui, but also illustrates that the style of politics advocated by Hui Kālai'āina and expressed in the *Elele* was not so well received on Maui as it was in Honolulu.

*John Edwin Bush - Minister Plenipotentiary to Sāmoa and Tonga*

At the time when Bush became president of Hui Kālai'āina, he was best known for his role in Kalākaua's unsuccessful mission to Sāmoa in 1886-7. He was born in Honolulu in 1842 and was of mixed Hawaiian and Haole ancestry. I was unable to find any further information on his ancestry or his education. However, it was commented in one of his obituaries that he was a recognized authority on the Hawaiian language. He worked as a whaler-seaman in his youth. In 1880, he was appointed minister of finance and later minister of the interior, in the Gibson ministry. While in office, he had been an advocate of Portuguese and Japanese immigration. When the treaty of friendship was being negotiated with Japan, he insisted that a Native Hawaiian ambassador be sent as the Japanese Emperor would be more likely to deal seriously with him. John M. Kapena was sent, accompanied by J. L. Kaulukou as his secretary, and the treaty was agreed to, in spite of the skeptical predictions of the American consul to Hawai'i.<sup>42</sup>

---

<sup>40</sup>The *kōlea* or Pacific golden plover (*Pluvialis dominica*) is a migratory bird which spends the winter in Hawai'i. The name is used as "a scornful reference to foreigners who come to Hawaii and become prosperous, and then leave with their wealth, just as the plover arrives thin in the fall each year, fattens up and leaves; a less common figurative reference is to one who claims friendship or kinship that does not exist." Pukui and Elbert, *Dictionary*, 162.

<sup>41</sup>*Ko Hawai'i Pae Aina*, April 6, 1889.

<sup>42</sup>*Hawaiian Gazette*, June 29, 1906; *Pacific Commercial Advertiser*, June 29, 1906.

As mentioned above, his most noted role in government was as minister plenipotentiary to the King of Sāmoa and the King of Tonga and high commissioner to the other independent chiefs and people of Polynesia. Bush was sent to Sāmoa in December 1886 and successfully negotiated an alliance between Malietoa, one of the two rulers of the islands, and Kalākaua. On his return to Hawai'i, he was equipped with a steamer, the *Kaimiloa*, to visit Sāmoa and the other islands of the Pacific as Hawai'i's representative. The voyage of this ship got off to a bad start when a drunken brawl occurred on board the night before it sailed. When they arrived in Sāmoa, the more puritan Samoan chiefs were not impressed by the Hawaiians' liking for alcohol. The *Kaimiloa* was recalled to Hawai'i in June 1887, but Bush decided to stay on and returned to Honolulu in November of that year.

The mission to Sāmoa took place at a time when Germany, Britain and the United States were involved in discussions over its future. Germany was actively involved in supporting the struggle of Tamasese against Malietoa. None of the powers were happy with Hawai'i's intervention or Kalākaua's idea of a Polynesian confederation of independent states. The plan was actively discredited as an attempt at Hawaiian self-aggrandizement and to place Hawai'i in control of the other islands. The Haole population were also opposed to the plan on the basis of its cost. They opposed the appropriation of government money for a scheme which they considered Hawai'i should not be involved in and cited the drunken brawl as a reason to discredit it as a serious attempt at diplomacy.<sup>43</sup>

Bush's role in the mission and his close association with the Gibson ministry were frequently used against him by his opponents in subsequent years. He was clearly identified as a favorite of Kalākaua and therefore would not have had much support from the more ardent followers of Queen Emma. He was held responsible for much of the mismanagement of the previous government and the failure of the Samoan

---

<sup>43</sup>Kuykendall, *Hawaiian Kingdom III*, 322-39.

mission. His politics remained strongly nationalist and pro-Native Hawaiian, which did not always please his Haole allies.

### *A Split Develops*

The first sign of a split developing within Hui Kālai‘āina came on May 24, 1888, when Bush established his own newspaper. Named *Ka Oiaio* (The Truth), the paper was "produced for the well being of the Hawaiian nation, by a group of people who love their race." Its editorial policy stated that:

Because of the growth of mistaken and illegal ideas within the Hawaiian community and the grumbling that is unheeded under the leadership that greatly desires to capture the few rights that remain for the Hawaiian, this paper has been established for the benefit of the race, to build up their hopes, a gate to enter, a meeting place to rest at, a friend to discuss actions to save us.<sup>44</sup>

Bush also announced his plans to set up a Hawaiian language press. Although the content of the first issue made no direct reference to Lyons and the Hui, the wording of the policy appears to be an attack on Lyons and on the actions of Robert Wilcox who was at that time trying to organize an armed revolt.<sup>45</sup>

The front page included an article discussing who the true Hawaiians are and pointing out that one should not just look at the color of the skin, but a person's inner motivations. There was also a long article introducing the editor and inviting support from the readers. Bush mentions that he was a typesetter and newspaper publisher in his youth and when he left that for a career in politics, he never thought that he would return. He saw himself as perpetuating a long tradition of Hawaiian journalists and writers, mentioning Kamakau amongst others. The main news article in this issue was about the current difficulties being faced by Hawaiian mormons in Utah, which was also prominent in the other papers<sup>46</sup>.

---

<sup>44</sup>*Ka Oiaio*, May 24, 1888.

<sup>45</sup> His actions are discussed in the next chapter.

<sup>46</sup>Unfortunately only two issues of *Ka Oiaio* are extant, May 24 and June 21, 1889. These are insufficient to provide a full understanding of Bush's style and coverage.

An editorial in *Kuokoa* the following day, commenting on an editorial in the last issue of *Elele*, indicates the level of desperation that Lyons had reached in trying to get support for his policy. He apparently invited the "missionaries" to support the policy. Presumably, *Kuokoa* adds, he did this because his own people would not support it. Lyons invited people to ask the "missionaries" if his policy was not the same as the government under which their grandparents grew up. He then apparently went on to call the "missionaries" ignorant animals and generally abused anyone who disagreed with him.<sup>47</sup> What Lyons seems to have missed is that opposition to his policy was not just a "missionary plot" to maintain their current hold on power. There was no doubt a sizeable proportion of the Hawaiian population who were suspicious of any policy that further lessened the power of the throne. *Kuokoa* went on to once again question whether all races would be able to elect the government officials, implying that Native Hawaiians would be in danger of being outvoted if this were so. This is a point which Lyons still did not appear to understand.

From an editorial that appeared later in *Ko Hawaii Pae Aina*, it appears that Lyons had at last broadened his policy in the May 25 issue of *Elele* to include the removal of the property and income qualifications for voting for Nobles. *Pae Aina* saw this as bending to outside pressure and suggested that the issue of removing the vote from non-citizens also needed to be considered. It warned that "the true political association is to think for ourselves with equal say. This grows inside and is not a means to conquer."<sup>48</sup>

In early June, *Ko Hawaii Pae Aina* reported on a meeting of Hui Kālai'āina held at a house in Honolulu. The meeting was chaired by Bush. The meeting agreed to dismiss D. Naoho as treasurer and appoint W. H. Cummings in his place. They then proposed to establish two committees, one to look for

---

<sup>47</sup>*Nupepa Kuokoa*, May 25, 1889.

<sup>48</sup>*Ko Hawaii Pae Aina*, June 8, 1889.

a constitution for the Hui and the other for a platform. While Lyons was proposed as a member for each of these committees, the meeting voted against his inclusion. The meeting was a deliberate attempt to exclude Lyons from the organization because of the control he had been exercising over it. The paper went on to suggest that Lyons had formed a secret association with some Haole on the basis that they could use the Hui to gain support for them in the next election.<sup>49</sup>

It appears that a full meeting of the Hui was then called by Bush on June 20, which was attended by less than seventy people. At this meeting a new constitution and platform, as written by the committees, were presented. Lyons was present at the meeting and tried to prevent the changing of the constitution by pointing out that the existing one could only be amended by the board of directors. He was opposed by J. K. Nahale,<sup>50</sup> who dismissed any discussion based on the old constitution. Nahale was supported by Bush and W. C. Achi on this point. The new constitution effectively reestablished the Hui and gave more power to the vice-presidents. Bush stated that he would resign as president, so that a fresh election could be held under the new rules. The platform presented to the meeting omitted the policy of electing all government officers. The policies were as follows:

1. It shall be the purpose of this Association to preserve monarchical institutions as they exist, and to conserve the interests of all the people.
2. To reduce the expenses of government and to abolish all useless offices and expenditures.
3. To reconsider those parts of the Constitution which have an unjust bearing on certain classes of the people.
4. To encourage the industry of the kingdom.
5. To reduce the amount of property qualifications to voters for Nobles.
6. To encourage all progressive enterprises originating within or coming into the Kingdom.
7. That two-thirds of the Legislature shall have the power to elect the Cabinet.

---

<sup>49</sup>Ibid.

<sup>50</sup>Nahale had been a member of the House of Representatives in 1886. Lydecker, *Roster*, 296.

8. That the heads of Government shall have the power to appoint the minor officials.

After it was read, Lyons asked what had happened to the old platform and whether the new organization had any connection with the old. Bush expressed his opinion that the new was disconnected from the old. In reply to this Lyons proposed to continue the old organization and "repudiate the action of those who have formed this Association". He said, "I consider the offices of the old Association vacated and will call a meeting to have new officers elected." This statement was then ruled out of order.<sup>51</sup>

A few days later, the *Daily Bulletin* commented that the policies agreed to at the meeting were mild in comparison to rhetoric of Bush and Achi in the *Oiaio*. It also pointed out the unconstitutional status of the meeting and suggested it should be treated as "a very palpable farce".

#### **Discussion: Will the True Hawaiians Please Stand Up?**

One of the most critical points in the debate during this period was who were the true and trustworthy leaders of the Hawaiian people. This is highlighted in the first issue of *Ka Oiaio*, where the writer discusses who the true Hawaiians are. He suggests that to be Hawaiian is more than just a matter of the color of one's skin, but also involves love of the land, the people, the *Ali'i* and the government. He suggested that some of the whites who live with Hawaiian women and are citizens or locally born are more true than certain Native Hawaiians in the present government.

Daniel Lyons used a similar argument to claim that his love of the people and the land outweighs his lack of Hawaiian ancestry and overseas birth and that he should be considered as a true friend and savior. In this regard he plays a very similar role to that of Walter Murray Gibson, who was also an

---

<sup>51</sup>*Daily Bulletin*, June 21, 1889.

outsider who 'adopted' Hawai'i as his home. To their credit they showed far more concern for the well being of the people than many of the sugar planters, who were third or fourth generation descendants of the Protestant missionaries. However, Lyons' critics, including many Native Hawaiians, appeared wary of his role in Hui Kālai'āina because he was not a true *kama'āina*.

Thus we see already in this period that *kama'āina* status has become a political tool to be held and manipulated by those who seek power. *Kama'āina* means one who is Native born or born in a particular place. It literally means a child of the land.<sup>52</sup> Originally, its use was applied strictly according to this definition. As more and more Haole arrived and the Native Hawaiian people themselves moved around the islands more, people who were closely identified with the Hawaiian people or a particular place, but not actually born there, could be regarded as honorary *kama'āina*. This is the status which Lyons tried to secure for himself.

Not all Native Hawaiians were prepared to agree with this. Their distrust of Lyons goes back to the basis of Hawaiian leadership. Leadership was traditionally a matter first and foremost of genealogy. One was born into the role. Therefore, a Haole, born outside of the islands, could never be considered as a legitimate leader of the people, no matter how good his qualifications or intentions were. The idea of leaders being chosen on the basis of genealogy conflicted with the Haole notions of election on merit. This had been most obvious in the key role of genealogical debates in the elections of King Lunalilo and King Kalākaua. No doubt there were also elements of this in the elections for Representatives and appointment of Nobles.

Lyons' role in trying to direct the Hui to implement his single issue policy was ultimately destructive to the development of a Native Hawaiian politic at this stage. While his use of *Elele* to

---

<sup>52</sup>Pukui and Elbert, *Dictionary*, 124.

publicize the establishment of the Hui was well-timed and useful, his refusal to stand aside and let the Native Hawaiians sort out their policies for themselves robbed them of an opportunity to settle some of their differences and build a stronger mass movement. The advice of *Ka Oiaio* therefore seemed most appropriate, that Hawaiians needed to think for themselves and develop their own political ideas to follow.<sup>53</sup>

---

<sup>53</sup>*Ka Oiaio*, June 21, 1889.



## CHAPTER 5

### OTHER EVENTS OF 1889

Hui Kālai'āina continued to operate for several months as two separate organizations. There is no direct evidence available of whether or how the factions became reconciled. However, the list of candidates fielded in the 1890 election indicates that some reconciliation must have taken place. This chapter covers the events in the latter part of 1889, in particular the Wilcox rebellion and the attempts to renegotiate the reciprocity treaty. These events had important implications for reuniting Native Hawaiians and for the 1890 election campaign.

#### The Two Hui Kālai'āina

On the day following the June 20 meeting of Hui Kālai'āina, *Ka Oiaio* published a long article on "political principles".<sup>1</sup> The writer emphasized that his ideas were not those of the *Elele* and were independent of the official policies of Hui Kālai'āina. He also distanced himself from certain Hawaiians who were planning to take power by force. He opposed the *Elele*'s republican ideas and proposed the restoration of some of the rights of the King, such as the appointment of the supreme court, overseas representatives and the island governors, and the selection of his own cabinet. He also suggested that the property and income qualifications for voting for the House of Nobles be abolished. There was no name attached to the article. This means that even if Bush did not write it would have received his editorial approval.

---

<sup>1</sup>*Ka Oiaio*, June 21, 1889.

In addition to this long article, there was also a short article that appeared to have been inserted at the last minute. Entitled "The Two Hui Kālai'āina Hawai'i", it said that everyone was aware that there were two separate organizations in existence - the "Hui Kālai'āina Hawai'i of the Hawaiians" and the "Hui Kālai'āina Hawai'i of the Haole" - and suggested that they should meet together to negotiate a common set of ideas. However it is not clear whether this refers to the split of the Hui between Bush and Lyons' or to the existence of a Haole political association, possibly an informal predecessor of the Mechanics' and Workingmen's Political Protective Union. If it is the former, it shows that Bush was willing to resolve the split in the Hui.

Lyons' faction of the Hui continued to operate, as evidenced by a report in *Ko Hawaii Pae Aina* of a meeting organized at Kula, Māui on July 10.<sup>2</sup> At the meeting, Sam Kaili asked for the policies to be explained and the secretary, W. K. Kaleihuia, explained them as they had appeared in the *Elele*. Kaili replied that he did not want to join as it was not his desire to overthrow his country and he loved his King and government. This seems to have persuaded others against joining also. This particular branch had been set up in May with 17 members and, according to the writer of this report, few had joined since then, while some had left.

A few days before the Wilcox rebellion, *Elele* published a plea for support for the Hui and for change through legal and constitutional means. The article appears to be an attack on the proposed actions of Robert Wilcox and as well as a pledge of support for Kalākaua against the actions of the conspirators and the Reform cabinet.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup>*Ko Hawaii Pae Aina*, July 29, 1889.

<sup>3</sup>Translated and quoted in *Pacific Commercial Advertiser*, August 8, 1889.

## The Wilcox Rebellion<sup>4</sup>

Robert Kalanihiapo Wilcox was born in 1855 at Kahulu, Honuāla, Maui. He was once described as "a man whose blood is higher than his sharp tongue."<sup>5</sup> He was the son of Kalua Makoeokalani. Her mother was a descendant of Lonohonuakini, *Mō'ī* (supreme *Ali'i*) of Maui. Her father was a descendent of Keaweikekahiali'i-o-ka-Moku, *Mō'ī* of the island of Hawai'i.<sup>6</sup> His father was Captain William S. Wilcox, from Newport, Rhode Island. Robert went to school on Maui, attending the same school as Lorrin Thurston and his brothers. After he graduated, he became a teacher and in 1880 was elected to the Legislature as representative for Wailuku, Maui. He was then selected by Kalākaua to travel to Italy, along with Robert Boyd and James K. Booth, to study at a military academy. This was part of a program to educate young Hawaiians abroad with the aim of equipping them to take up senior government positions after their return. While in Italy, Wilcox was greatly impressed by the Italian nationalist Giuseppe Garibaldi, who was instrumental in uniting that country.

Wilcox, along with the other students abroad, was recalled to Hawai'i in 1887 following the imposition of the new constitution. He arrived in Honolulu in October with his new wife, the Countess Gina Sobero. Two attempts were made to place him in public office and both were rejected by the cabinet. He was offered jobs in the survey department and as a country school teacher, both of which he refused because they were low-paid and did not properly use his skills.

Kalākaua's sister, Lili'uokalani, invited him and his wife to stay at her residence. During his stay there, he became involved in the attempted conspiracies to place Lili'uokalani on the throne described in

---

<sup>4</sup>The following account is summarized from McGregor-Alegado, "Hawaiian Resistance," 76-107, unless otherwise cited.

<sup>5</sup>McKinzie, *Genealogies*, 2:65.

<sup>6</sup>*Ibid.*, 2:65-67.

Chapter 3. In February 1888, faced with possible arrest and continued unemployment, he and his wife left for San Francisco. He obtained a well-paid job there and his wife gave birth to a son.

In April 1889, he decided it was time to return to Hawaii to help his fellow countrymen in the coming elections. The Countess Sobero decided to return to Italy with their son and later had their marriage annulled. On his return he opened up an engineering and survey office, which had a predominantly Hawaiian and Chinese clientele.

On May 18, 1889, Wilcox called a meeting to organize a new rifle association. Around 30 men signed up and the Kamehameha Rifle Association was thereby formed. This new association strengthened the military forces loyal to Kalākaua and provided a legitimate cover for Wilcox's plans to force the reinstatement of the old constitution. In June, he started to form a secret core group known as the Liberal Patriotic Association. The group had ten members, of which Wilcox and Robert Boyd were the only Hawaiians. Apparently he did not trust other Hawaiians to maintain the secrecy of the organization. During the next month or so, he gradually expanded the core group until around seventy to eighty men were involved, including several Chinese businessmen.

Wilcox was eager to press ahead with his plan to force the King to reinstate the old constitution as soon as possible. However, the others counselled him to wait until they had more support. They finally decided to take action on July 30, believing that they had the support of Kalākaua. However, the King had left the palace the night before. While the King was probably aware of what was happening and was afraid of being deposed, there appears to have been no intention on the part of Wilcox and his men to do anything more than force him to reinstate the old constitution.

In the early hours of the morning of July 30, Wilcox and his men gained control of the palace grounds. They sent a message to the King requesting that he come to the palace. He refused and retreated

to his boat house, where he met with the cabinet. The cabinet had heard rumors of the insurrection, but were nonetheless caught off guard. They quickly assembled armed forces to retake the palace, while Kalākaua met with the American, British, French and Portuguese commissioners to seek their advice. He decided to demand Wilcox's surrender. Unfortunately, this demand was not delivered before shooting broke out between the government troops and Wilcox's men. Several of Wilcox's men were killed or seriously wounded in the fire. They were forced to surrender by nightfall and 100 armed soldiers of the U.S.S. Adams were landed to patrol the streets. Martial law was declared.

Seventy men were arrested and charged. Albert Loomens and Robert Wilcox were charged with treason. Twenty-eight were charged with conspiracy and thirty-seven with riot. Their arraignments were held in October, but only Loomens', Ho Fon's and Wilcox's cases actually came to trial. Loomens and Ho were convicted of treason and conspiracy respectively by all-Haole juries. Wilcox was acquitted of conspiracy by an all-Hawaiian jury. Loomens was sentenced to death, which was later commuted to one year in prison and banishment from Hawai'i. Ho Fon was fined \$250. Once Wilcox was acquitted, the government decided to drop the charges against the others as they no doubt guessed they would have little chance of obtaining a conviction.

Many Native Hawaiians believed that Wilcox's acquittal legitimated his actions in attempting to restore the old constitution. This made him something of a folk hero. He went on to become involved in Hui Kālai'āina and to stand in the 1890 elections.

Even though it was poorly organized and unsuccessful, the rebellion demonstrated the level of frustration felt by many Native Hawaiians against the government. With the failure of the rebellion, the only way left for Native Hawaiians to regain political control was through winning the next election. It is evident in the organization of the electoral campaign that Native Hawaiian political leaders were aware of this and were willing to put some of their differences aside for the greater benefit of their people.

## The Factions Struggle On

The Wilcox rebellion focussed attention on the role of papers such as *Elele* and *Ka Oiaio* in promoting unrest. *Kuokoa* was quick to blame them for creating anti-government sentiment, even if they were not actually involved in the planning of the rebellion. Lyons' faction of the Hui was quick to disassociate itself from the rebellion, pointing out that they had been working for change through constitutional means, rather than armed revolt. Bush was amongst those arrested for conspiracy. There is little evidence of what his actual role in the rebellion might have been beyond perhaps publishing anti-government statements.<sup>7</sup>

The August 17 issue of *Ko Hawaii Pae Aina* included a comment on a claim by *Elele* that Hui Kālai'āina had reached its thousandth member in Honolulu. It doubted that membership was anything like that and confirmed that the Bush faction had taken half the membership. It reported that they had heard that only 12 people had attended Lyons' meeting, which was chaired by H. P. Kauaeahu, who they said had been charged with rebellion.<sup>8</sup>

The next event concerning the Hui to be reported in the papers was the discovery by the police of a secret political organization in Waipi'o Valley on the island of Hawai'i. Inspired by paranoia typical of a police force following civil unrest, the meetings were raided and the membership books seized. A letter to *Ko Hawaii Pae Aina* explained that the organization was set up by J. K. Kaunamano and had 63 members. The letter went on to ask how a group of people in the remote valley of Waipi'o could possibly be plotting revolt against the government in Honolulu. The *Elele* claimed that the organization was a branch

---

<sup>7</sup>*Nupepa Kuokoa*, August 3, 1889; Daily Bulletin, August 3, 1889; McGregor-Alegado, "Hawaiian Resistance," 103.

<sup>8</sup>His name is not amongst those who were arraigned in October, implying that these charges were dropped, if they were ever made at all. McGregor-Alegado, "Hawaiian Resistance," 103-104.

of Hui Kālai'āina and was neither seditious nor treasonable. This makes sense as Kaunamano was one of the two letter writers who encouraged Lyons to establish the Hui. He also apparently tipped off Kalākaua to the plans for the rebellion shortly before it occurred.<sup>9</sup>

A meeting of the principle officers of Lyons' faction of the Hui was held on August 23 in the *Elele* office, where it was decided that nominations for Nobles and Representatives would be decided on November 26. Branches were notified of this through the newspaper. It appears that at the same meeting, an attempt had been made to elect a permanent president. Rev. J. Waiamau nominated the Rev. Timoteo, who had been present at the inaugural meeting of the Hui. Rev. Timoteo declined nomination, but his name was still put forward at the meeting. It seems that he was elected at the end of the meeting when he was not present. He later officially withdrew from the position. There is no information as to who took his place at that stage. A notice announcing the date for nominations later in September was signed by Daniel Lyons, "Organizer and President pro-tem", J. A. Kaho'onei, treasurer, and John Poe, secretary. In the same issue, Lyons refers to the Hui and its platforms in terms that indicate that he was still at this stage maintaining that the election of all government officers was either all or the main part of the platform.<sup>10</sup>

### **The Rumored Treaty of Reciprocity**

In mid-September, rumors became current that the cabinet were secretly negotiating a renewal of the treaty of reciprocity with the United States which would place significant limits on Hawai'i's independence. As mentioned in chapter 3, the existing reciprocity treaty had been ratified in November

---

<sup>9</sup>*Daily Bulletin*, August 20, 1889; *Ko Hawaii Pae Aina*, August 24, 1889; *Daily Bulletin*, August 24, 1889; McGregor-Alegado, "Hawaiian Resistance," 95.

<sup>10</sup>*Ka Elele*, September 28, 1889; *Nupepa Kuokoa*, August 31, September 14, 1889.

1887 by the Reform Party cabinet and gave the United States the exclusive right to develop and use Pearl Harbor as a repair and refueling station for their navy. A right which they had yet to exercise.

Although the treaty would last for at least another five years there were a number of issues that arose in 1889 that persuaded the Cabinet to consider pushing for its renewal. They hoped that they could secure a longer duration for the treaty, avoiding the problems that sugar planters had faced between 1883 and 1887 with respect to long term planning and investment when the treaty had been up for annual renewals and they had feared that the government would refuse to accept the Pearl Harbor provisions in order to renew it. There was some uncertainty as to what the U.S. administration in 1894 might think of the treaty and the planters wanted a more immediate assurance of long-term stability. There was also a movement developing within the United States to reduce or remove the tariffs on sugar imports and pay a bounty to domestic growers. Under the existing Treaty, this would rob Hawai'i of its favored status over the Caribbean and put them at a disadvantage relative to the United States growers. The reason behind this movement was that the federal government was experiencing an embarrassing surplus of funds. There was also a desire to broaden the range of goods that would be admitted duty free between the two countries, with the belief that this would stimulate local production. Finally, there was concern that Hawai'i was the last group of independent islands in the Pacific. By 1889, all other groups, including Sāmoa, had been claimed by one or more of the European powers. As neither Russia nor Germany had signed documents recognizing Hawai'i's independence, it was feared that they might try and take the islands. Whether or not this was a realistic fear, it provided the opportunity to suggest closer military ties to the United States, which in turn would provide an incentive to Washington to agree to the extension of the trade provisions.<sup>11</sup>

The idea for the new treaty arose in March 1889 during conversations between the Hawaiian Minister in Washington, Henry A. P. Carter, and U.S. Secretary of State James G. Blaine regarding the

---

<sup>11</sup>*Daily Bulletin*, October 4, 1889.



situation in Sāmoa and the possible introduction of sugar bounties. In April, Carter submitted to Blaine a suggested outline of a possible new treaty. In doing so he had at least the moral support of the cabinet. He then returned to Hawai'i for the summer. The issue was not formally raised again until August, when the cabinet asked Carter to prepare a draft treaty. The draft was prepared by him and discussed in a cabinet meeting on 24 September. A copy was taken to the King for his information, including two supplementary clauses which the cabinet had rejected. Kalākaua discussed the draft with the British Commissioner, who then discussed it with the French Commissioner. The cabinet met again and agreed that Carter should return to Washington with the draft as a basis for negotiation.<sup>12</sup>

The draft treaty contained several provisions. First, it confirmed that existing treaties between Hawai'i and the United States would remain in force. It then went on to extend the scope and provisions of the free trade agreement to allow Hawaiian products coming into the United States to be treated on exactly the same basis as United States domestic products, including the payment of bounties, and visa-versa. The fourth article stated that the United States would guarantee the "perfect independence and autonomy of the Hawaiian Government in all its dominions and its rights of sovereignty over such dominions", but that no treaties would be negotiated between Hawai'i and other powers without the full knowledge of the government of the United States. The proposed additions to this article, which the Cabinet had rejected, provided for United States forces to have access to Hawai'i in order to provide protection and to have freedom of action to restore Hawai'i's independence if necessary.<sup>13</sup>

Bush had suspected that something was going on for a while and appears to have seen a copy of the draft treaty on September 24. He immediately called a public meeting to discuss the matter, claiming that the cabinet was about to make Hawai'i a protectorate of the United States. The cabinet was quick to

---

<sup>12</sup>Kuykendall, *Hawaiian Kingdom III*, 436-43.

<sup>13</sup>*Daily Bulletin*, September 28, 1889.

deny this, but the meeting went ahead anyway. The meeting was held at the Chinese Theater on September 26 and was well attended. Bush, Antone Rosa, and Kaulukou addressed the meeting and indicated that they had seen copies of the draft. They were concerned that it would threaten Hawai'i's independence, as well as put skilled workers out of work as a result of competition with United States products. A resolution was passed asking the King to withhold assent from the treaty and place it before the next legislature, so that the people could let their feelings be known. A committee of fifteen people was then appointed to take the resolutions to the King.<sup>14</sup>

The composition of this committee reflects the unified front being put forth on this issue by Native Hawaiian and Haole political leaders. It included Bush, Rosa, Achi, and Kaulukou, as well as Kaho'onei, the Secretary of Lyons' Hui Kālai'āina and Kaunamano, who as discussed above, also seemed to be allied with Lyons. It is interesting that while it was Bush who initiated the meeting, he did not do so in the name of Hui Kālai'āina. It is possible that his faction of the Hui had disbanded by this time. It is also significant that Lyons appears to have taken no direct action in this event and does not even refer to it in that week's issue of the *Elele*.<sup>15</sup>

The committee presented themselves at the palace the following morning and the King assured them that he had not signed anything. He then referred them to the cabinet. On October 4, the cabinet published a lengthy reply justifying their actions. News of the opposition to the treaty reached Washington and for a while slowed down the negotiations. However, in December, Carter sought authority to continue

---

<sup>14</sup>*Daily Bulletin*, September 26, 27, 1889.

<sup>15</sup>*Daily Bulletin*, September 27, 1889; *Ka Elele*, September 28, 1889.

The other members of the committee were: J. Kekipi, J. F. Colburn, J. Kanui, A. N. Tripp, W. L. Holokahiki, G. Kualako, J. Pekelo, J. Kanoelehua and A. K. Kunuiakea.

negotiations and sign a new treaty. The King refused to sign the commission and the matter was put aside until after the elections.<sup>16</sup>

#### **Discussion: By the Gun or by the Ballot?**

As noted above, the support for Wilcox's armed attempt to allow or force Kalākaua to reinstate the old constitution was a sign of the level of frustration among many Native Hawaiians. In planning and undertaking the rebellion, Wilcox adopted exactly the same strategy as used by the Hawaiian League in 1887 to change the constitution. He assumed that since the 1887 constitution had been forced upon the King under the threat of armed revolt, then if Native Hawaiians could muster sufficient forces, they would be able to undo this act and reinstate the old constitution.

In her analysis of the rebellion, McGregor suggests a number of reasons why it did not succeed.<sup>17</sup> First, Wilcox had misjudged the King's commitment. It seems that the King was only partially informed of the actions and had not indicated clearly any support for them. As stated earlier, he may also have been scared that he would lose his throne and that Wilcox would place his sister, Lili'uokalani, on the throne in his place. Wilcox also misjudged the power and influence of the King. McGregor comments:

[The King] was the symbol of the Hawaiian people and their nation. It seems that Wilcox and his men thought that the King was powerful in and of himself and his co-operation was sufficient for winning them a new constitution.<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup>*Daily Bulletin*, September 27, October 4, 1889; *Nupepa Kuokoa*, September 28, 1889; Kuykendall, *Hawaiian Kingdom III*, 444-47.

<sup>17</sup>McGregor-Alegado, "Hawaiian Resistance," 110-27.

<sup>18</sup>*Ibid*, 114.

The King was in reality under the control of the cabinet. In 1893, when Queen Lili'uokalani attempted to abrogate the 1887 constitution, she was overthrown by a group of people who represented interests similar to the Reform Party cabinet, namely those of the sugar planters and Haole businessmen.

McGregor goes on to point out that Wilcox made errors in recruitment, underestimated the need for careful planning and made a number of serious tactical errors, including underestimating the capacity of the government troops to respond. She also points to his failure to recruit allies or build a broad support base in the Hawaiian community. Wilcox was a member of the Hawaiian middle class and had no real ties to the common masses. The people he recruited were largely of a similar position. He had apparently expected the masses to arise spontaneously to support his cause. However, the majority of the Native Hawaiians were indifferent to his call to support the Monarchy. In fact, as discussed in Chapter 3, there was a significant group who must have voted for the Reform Party and supported the new government.

However, following his acquittal, Wilcox became something of a folk hero because he had dared to fight back, even if the fight was badly planned and ill timed. As will be seen in chapters seven and eight, his status as folk hero gave him considerable power within the election campaigns, and also made him less controllable by his more sober minded colleagues.

As with the conspiracies to put Lili'uokalani on the throne in 1887 and early 1888, the failure of the Wilcox rebellion allowed the cabinet to increase its power over the King. They forced the King to sign a statement of principles stating that the government would be conducted by the cabinet and the King would sign all documents presented to him by the cabinet.<sup>19</sup>

This statement, signed in early August, may have emboldened the cabinet to go ahead with the revisions to the reciprocity treaty, believing that they could force the King to sign any agreement that they

---

<sup>19</sup>Tbid, 124.

could reach with Washington. Also, if they could do this before the election, they would be free of any objections by the legislature. Fortunately their plans were found out.

During the period from 1887 to 1889 there is a clear lack of unity amongst the Native Hawaiian leaders. This is compounded by the fact that several of them were absent from the islands during key events of this period. The initial protest was led by Joseph Poepoe, who pulled out of politics after the 1887 elections and may have travelled abroad for part of the next two years. Bush and Wilcox were both out of the country during the 1887 election campaign. Bush seems to have been more willing to fit in with the developments that had occurred during the months following the imposition of the new constitution. In particular, he was willing to take on the presidency of the Hui Kālai'āina. Wilcox, on the other hand, appeared to have no interest in working with the emerging mass movement and was determined to implement more drastic measures of his own to reinstate the old constitution. Wilcox's absence during much of 1888 means that he missed the establishment of the Hui and the debates that went on around it. In particular, he seems to have taken a while to realize that many Native Hawaiians did not want a complete return to the old system of government, but rather a revision of the new system.

The rebellion clearly illustrated that armed revolt was not feasible. At this stage, the only option for those who wished to see change was to get candidates elected to the new Legislature that could achieve such a change through constitutional means. The mass meeting held to discuss the rumored treaty was successful in stalling the treaty negotiations until the new Legislature could meet. This provided an indication that a mass, peaceful protest could succeed, and inspired the organization of a mass movement for the elections.

As discussed at the end of Chapter 3, it was clear by this stage that any candidates standing against the Reform party would need to capture wider support if they were to be elected. The Haole who were disaffected with the Reform party and about to organize a political protective union, was one group to whom

such candidates could and did appeal. However, in doing so, the Native Hawaiian candidates would to some extent miss the opportunity to broaden their support from their own people.

## CHAPTER 6

### THE MECHANICS' AND WORKINGMEN'S POLITICAL PROTECTIVE UNION

#### **The Situation of Mechanics and Workingmen in Hawai'i in the 1880s**

The rapid expansion of the sugar industry following the 1876 reciprocity treaty with the United States resulted in a similar expansion of employment in jobs which directly or indirectly serviced the industry. There was an increased demand for skilled and semi-skilled laborers to construct buildings, mills and irrigation schemes, which lasted until the mid-1880s. By 1890, however, the demand for labor in these areas had declined. Thrum's *Hawaiian Annual and Almanac* provides anecdotal evidence of the changes in labor demand from year to year, from which the following account can be constructed.<sup>1</sup>

The sugar harvest of 1880 fell below expectations due to a shortage of labor for care of the cane and of the equipment. It was noted that labor saving machinery, such as steam plowing and traction engines, was needed and was being introduced. The introduction of this kind of machinery in turn reduced the need for horse pasture and would allow the further expansion of the cane fields. It was also noted that two steam rice mills were now in operation on O'ahu and a third was being planned. These plans were later abandoned. All of these changes required the employment of additional skilled labor. Building in

---

<sup>1</sup>Thrum, *Almanac*, 1881:62-3, 1882:65-6, 1883:60-1, 1884:65-8, 1885:55, 1886:62-4, 1887:86, 1888:74, 85, 1889:88, 1890:98-9, 1891:145-6.

Honolulu continued "unabated" with the construction of the palace and the music hall, as well as shop extensions and cottages. "This has given steady employment to our mechanics throughout, for which fair rates of wages have ruled."<sup>2</sup>

The following year saw the erection of several new mills on the sugar plantations, the parts for them being produced by the Honolulu Iron Works. In addition to making and replacing the parts for the mills, the iron works also produced fittings for ships and steamers. In 1880 it employed 500 to 600 employees.<sup>3</sup> There was also further expansion of cane fields. It was noted that Honolulu was "undergoing a change ... that bids fair to eclipse any former period of her history" with regard to improvements in buildings and the expansion of the residential areas to the east of the city.<sup>4</sup> There was also activity at Kohala on the island of Hawai'i, where new wharves, storehouses, dwellings, and workshops had been built as part of a development scheme sponsored by S. G. Wilder.

The building activity continued in 1882 with the further expansion of Honolulu city, extensions of railroads at Kohala, Hawai'i and East Maui, and the expansion of the telephone system on O'ahu. The same was true in 1883, with building activity mainly taking place in the business area of Honolulu and at Waikiki. It was noted that the buildings were more lavish in style and ornamentation. Wilder's Kohala railroad, which it was noted had created considerable employment, was completed that year. It was also noted, with regard to a change in the law allowing liquor to be sold to Native Hawaiians, that "poverty, crime and sickness is growing at a ratio that portends an alarming increase in the death rate of Hawaiians."

---

<sup>2</sup>Thrum, *Almanac*, 1881:63.

<sup>3</sup>George Bowser, "An Itinerary of the Hawaiian Islands", in George Bowser (ed.), *The Hawaiian Kingdom Statistical and Commercial Directory and Tourist's Guide, 1880-1881*, (Honolulu: Press Publishing Co.), 461.

<sup>4</sup>Thrum, *Almanac*, 1882:66.



This comment indicates that the newfound wealth in the islands was certainly not trickling down to the Native Hawaiian population, who were, it would seem, increasingly marginalized.

In 1884, it was noted that there was a fall-off in trade and building activity due to low export prices resulting from a high rate of foreign exchange. This continued the following year, when it was noted that there had been a larger number of failures than usual, a substantial number of these being by Chinese businesses. It was further noted that a significant number of mechanics were leaving the islands as a result. At the same time, alterations to sugar mills were keeping the Honolulu Iron Works operating at full capacity. In 1886, building activity seemed to pick up again, partly as a result of a major fire in Honolulu, but also including a number of new buildings and residences. This continued the following year. With the settling of the reciprocity treaty that year, a number of new development plans were proposed, including a Hilo-Hamakua railroad, a railroad from Pearl Harbor to Honolulu and electric street lighting in Honolulu.

These plans did not eventuate in time to prevent another exodus of skilled workers in 1888, mainly, it seems, due to a drop in building activities. While the building industry did not pick up the following year either, there was greater call for foundry men and machinists, with the extension of plantations and the commencement of construction of the O'ahu railroad. In 1890, it was reported that a new iron works had been opened in Honolulu, new residences built and much work carried out building wharves, buildings and stations for the O'ahu railroad. As a result, the various trades in Honolulu were enjoying some prosperity.

#### *The Distribution of Employment*

The censuses of this period provide some quantitative data on the numbers of people employed in various occupations. The censuses of 1872, 1878 and 1884 used the categories of agriculturists, mechanics, contract laborers and others.<sup>5</sup> The figures show that there were 1,146 mechanics in 1872, 2,606 in 1878

---

<sup>5</sup>The data is probably not strictly comparable and is also subject to a wide margin of error. The 1872 census used the category of "laborers" without reference to contract status and "professional" in place of (continued...)

and 3,919 in 1884. The increase in "other" occupations is even more dramatic, from 512 in 1872 to 2,285 in 1878 and 12,303 in 1884. Agriculturalists increased by much smaller proportions, from 8,258 in 1872 to 8,763 in 1878 and 10,968 in 1884. The number of contract laborers also increased, from 5,025 in 1872 to 7,871 in 1878 and 12,351 in 1884.<sup>6</sup>

Table 6.1 shows the distribution of occupations by islands for 1878 and 1884. While there was a small increase in the number of mechanics on O'ahu, the main increases in employment were on Hawai'i and to a greater extent on Maui. The increases in numbers of agriculturalists were mainly on O'ahu and Maui. There were substantial increases in contract laborers on Hawai'i, Maui and Kaua'i. However, the big increase in other occupations was on O'ahu, with smaller increases on the other islands. These figures confirm the picture of employment being created by the extension of the sugar plantations, especially on Maui, and the development of Honolulu into a service center of significant size.

The 1890 census used more detailed categories for occupation. It is somewhat uncertain as to how comparable they are with the earlier broad categories. However, they can be used to indicate the trends. There were only 2,809 mechanics recorded in the 1890 census, compared to 3,919 in 1884. It is more difficult to compare the figures for agriculturalists and contract laborers, since the 1890 census combined contract and non-contract laborers into one group. However, it appears that the number of farmers and non-contract agricultural laborers in 1890 was about the same as the number of agriculturalists reported in 1884.

---

<sup>5</sup>(...continued)

"other". However I am assuming for the present analysis that these categories are roughly similar. Although the titles for the categories in the 1878 and 1884 census are identical, there may also have been some changes in which occupations were included in which category. Finally, unless careful instructions were given to the enumerators, it is also likely that there was some variance in interpretation with respect to which categories to place respondents in. However, the data is reliable enough to provide support for the points made in this section.

<sup>6</sup>Edward D. Beechert, *Working in Hawaii: a Labor History* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1985), 140; Kingdom of Hawaii, Board of Education, *Census of the Hawaiian Islands, taken December 27th 1878 under the Direction of the Board of Education*; Kingdom of Hawaii, Board of Education, *Census of the Hawaiian Islands, taken December 27th 1884 under the Direction of the Board of Education*, main table.

Table 6.1. Distribution of Work Force by Island and Occupation, 1878 and 1884

Island	Mechanics		Agriculturalists		Contract Laborers		Other Occupations	
	1878	1884	1878	1884	1878	1884	1878	1884
O'ahu	1,441	1,732	3,035	4,680	1,192	1,021	321	6737
Hawai'i	656	979	2,566	2,547	3,157	5,903	1,139	2594
Maui*	325	982	1,990	2,551	2,340	3,127	792	2330
Kaua'†	184	226	1,172	1,190	1,182	2,300	33	642
Total	2,606	2,919	8,763	10,968	7,871	12,351	2,285	12,303

\* Includes Moloka'i and Lana'i.

† Includes Ni'ihau.

Source: Kingdom of Hawai'i, *Census 1878; Census 1884*.

The number of contract laborers, on the other hand, rose from 12,351 in 1884 to nearly 20,000 in 1890.

There was a major drop in the numbers in other occupations, from 12,303 in 1884 to about 6,600 in 1890.

While some of these changes may reflect the way in which the census was carried out, the figures for the population by nationality confirm the pattern of a decrease in skilled employment and an increase in unskilled contract labor between 1884 and 1890. The skilled and semi-skilled work force was made up of Native Hawaiians, Americans, Europeans and some Chinese. The foreign workers, including Chinese who were not under contract to plantations, tended to be fairly mobile. As noted above, when work was short they could leave the islands, and this is precisely what they did between 1884 and 1890. While the Native Hawaiian population continued to decline due to high mortality and low fertility, the numbers of all foreigners, with the exception of Japanese and British, also decreased due to out-migration. The decrease in these groups was about 3,600 for Native Hawaiians and about 5,000 for the others, of which the largest

groups were the Chinese and Portuguese. The British population increased by 62. The Japanese increased by over 12,000, all of which were presumably contract laborers.<sup>7</sup>

In summary, then, the 1880s started with a boom in skilled and semi-skilled employment. The first half of the decade saw major expansions in terms of mills, some infrastructure and the development of Honolulu as a metropolitan center. This boom was largely over by the end of the decade. Most of the work being offered was in the maintenance of existing buildings and plants, although there were some new development schemes just starting up. The employment boom led to a major influx of skilled workers during the early part of the decade. This influx quickly changed to oversupply, with a decline in the number of skilled and semi-skilled jobs and a corresponding exodus of foreign workers. Those who decided to stay found their jobs gradually disappearing, while the number of jobs for unskilled contract laborers continued to increase. The American workers in particular were quick to associate their problems with the increasing number of Chinese workers who were taking jobs outside of the plantations. This led to a vigorous anti-Chinese movement, which will be discussed later in this chapter. The tightening employment conditions were probably a major reason for the formation of the Mechanics and Workingmen's Political Protective Union in 1889.

#### *Characteristics of the 1890 Work Force*

The 1890 census provides some detailed information on the composition of the work force by nationality, gender and occupation. This information is summarized in Table 6.2. These figures show that the paid work force was strongly dominated by men. The numbers for women in the work force probably omit many of the women who helped in their husbands' occupations, such as in farming, fishing or running a family business. It probably also omits women involved in part-time wage work or sale of craft items, where the husband or other male head of the household, who would have responded to the census, did not

---

<sup>7</sup>Kingdom of Hawai'i, *Census 1884*, main table; Kingdom of Hawai'i, *Census 1890*, Table 6.

Table 6.2. 1890 Work Force for all Islands, by Occupation, Nationality and Gender.

	Hawaiian	Portuguese	American and other European	Chinese	Japanese	Others
<b>Males</b>						
Laborers	2,328	2,653	213	8,763	9,565	341
Agriculture*	4,307	139	99	1,612	39	27
Transport†	608	73	220	74	6	31
Mechanics	893	165	951	564	42	75
Planters ‡	65	17	65	42		5
Traders§	161	56	198	776	27	15
Clerks ¶	136	35	339	164	20	9
Professional #	199	10	229	16	23	6
Other	1001	118	475	1,056	115	65
<b>Total</b>	<b>9,698</b>	<b>3,266</b>	<b>2,789</b>	<b>13,067</b>	<b>9,837</b>	<b>574</b>
<b>Females</b>						
Laborers	41	3	4	64	1404	87
Agriculture*	85			21		
Transport†	0					
Mechanics	103	2	7			
Planters ‡	2		1			
Traders§	3			1		1
Clerks ¶	2		11			
Professional #	37	1	114	2		1
Other	84	5	32	10	14	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>357</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>1418</b>	<b>90</b>

\* includes fishermen; † includes mariners, drivers and teamsters; ‡ includes ranchers; § includes merchants;

¶ includes salespersons; # includes teachers.

Source: Kingdom of Hawai'i, *Census 1890*, Table 6.

count this as "real work". One interesting feature of the female work force is the number of Native Hawaiian women working as mechanics. There is no data on what kind of trades they were involved in, but it does indicate a more significant involvement in wage work by Native Hawaiian women than by women of other nationalities. Also, there were a significant number of American and other European women employed as professionals and teachers.

The figures for the male work force show more clearly the correlations between race and class. Most of the Native Hawaiians were in agricultural or laboring jobs, although there were some in the skilled and professional occupations. Most of the Portuguese were laborers. While most of the Chinese were also laborers, there were a significant number of farmers, who were mostly rice farmers, as well as skilled workers and traders. The Japanese were almost entirely laborers. The majority of Americans and other Europeans were in skilled and professional jobs and businesses.

In 1890, a survey of the incomes of mechanics and laborers in Honolulu was carried out for the Minister of Finance (refer to Table 6.3). These figures further illustrate the strong correlation between race and class in Hawai'i at the time. Americans, British and Germans were nearly all skilled workers and received significantly higher wages than Hawaiian and "other" skilled workers. The "others" would have been mainly Portuguese.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup>The figures in the report only cover Hawaiians, Americans and Europeans. The compilers of the report attempted to get figures for Chinese as well, but they found that most of the Chinese were working on a cooperative basis rather than being paid wages, so it was decided not to include them in the wage figures. A comparison with the census figures shows that Portuguese would have made up the large majority therefore of the "others".

Table 6.3. Survey of Daily Wages of Mechanics and Laborers in Honolulu, 1890.

		Hawaiian	American	British	German	Others	Total
<b>Skilled*</b>	<b>Number</b>	125	68	72	14	27	306
	<b>Highest</b>	\$4.50	\$7.00	\$8.33	\$4.50	\$5.00	\$8.33
	<b>Lowest</b>	\$1.25	\$2.00	\$2.00	\$2.25	\$1.50	\$1.25
	<b>Average</b>	\$2.29	\$3.98	\$4.51	\$3.50	\$2.76	\$3.28
<b>Laborers and Apprentices</b>	<b>Number</b>	105	3	3	4	75	190
	<b>Highest</b>	\$2.00	\$2.17	\$2.50	\$2.50	\$2.25	\$2.50
	<b>Lowest</b>	\$0.25	\$1.00	\$0.66	\$0.83	\$0.50	\$0.25
	<b>Average</b>	\$1.36	\$1.56	\$1.30	\$1.58	\$1.43	\$1.40
<b>All Workers</b>	<b>Number</b>	230	71	75	18	102	496
	<b>Average</b>	\$1.86	\$3.88	\$4.38	\$3.07	\$1.78	\$2.56

\* includes blacksmiths, boiler makers, carpenters, machinists, marine engineers, molders, pattern makers, masons, plumbers, painters, ship carpenters, tin smiths and horse shoers.

Source: Kingdom of Hawai'i, Report of the Minister of Finance - 1890, Hawaii State Archives, 12-13.

### Early Labor Organizations in Hawai'i

While there was little real organization of labor in the islands under the monarchy, the Mechanics and Workingmen's Union was not the first organization representing the interests of mechanics and workingmen to be established in Hawai'i. The first official organization appears to have been the Mechanics' Benefit Union, established under royal charter in 1857.<sup>9</sup> Hsio-ping Huang, in her dissertation on Chinese merchants in Hawai'i, mentions a workingmen's union that was established in 1883. It was apparently strongly pro-American and anti-Chinese, organizing a meeting in 1887 to protest Chinese competition.<sup>10</sup> However, I have not been able to find any other reference to this union.

<sup>9</sup>Kingdom of Hawai'i, Privy Council, "Records," Hawai'i State Archives, 10:140.

<sup>10</sup>Huang, "Chinese Merchants," 239.

The first and only trade union to be chartered in Hawai'i during the monarchy period was the Honolulu Typographical Union No. 7. They received their charter from the International Typographical Union on August 9, 1884. Apart from the names of mentioned on the original charter, there are no records of their activities or membership during this period. An organization of longshoremen was also established in the 1880s, with a quasi-political agenda. While they paraded at election times, their main function appears to have been to look after the welfare of the needy. The Sailor's Union of the Pacific was organized out of San Francisco in 1885. Its members were sailors of ships which would have visited Honolulu often. It is likely that they also would have brought union ideals to Hawai'i. Kuykendall mentions the existence of a "workingmen's ticket" in 1886 elections, but it apparently drew very little support.<sup>11</sup>

There was also a growing anti-Chinese movement amongst mechanics and workingmen. As mentioned previously, the movement was fuelled by the fact that an increasing number of Chinese were establishing themselves in business and mechanical occupations after completing their contracts on the plantations, during a time when demand for skilled labor was falling. Kuykendall notes that prior to 1885, opposition to the Chinese had been based mainly on moral grounds, such as their indulgence in drinking, gambling, opium smoking and refusal to convert to Christianity. After 1885, the opposition shifted from morality to economic competition and mechanics and workingmen were at the forefront of the protest.<sup>12</sup>

In the legislative session of November and December 1887, a bill was introduced to regulate Chinese immigration. The Honolulu Chamber of Commerce protested that, if implemented, it would end all Chinese immigration, rather than just restricting it as intended. As a result, the bill was amended in such

---

<sup>11</sup>John E. Reinecke, *Labor Unions of Hawai'i: a chronological checklist* (1967), 3; Manuel G. Jardin, *History of Honolulu Typographical Union, Local No. 37* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1970), 3; Beechert, *Working in Hawai'i*, 155-56; Kuykendall, *Hawaiian Kingdom III*, 281.

<sup>12</sup>Kuykendall, *Hawaiian Kingdom III*, 174.



a way as to have little real effect and then passed. This drew a strong protest from the opponents of Chinese immigration and resulted in the establishment of the Hawaiian Anti-Asiatic Union on February 7, 1888.<sup>13</sup>

The Anti-Asiatic Union launched a petition requesting legislative measures to restrict Chinese immigration. They gathered 1,600 signatures and presented it to the Legislature in June 1888. W. A. Kinney then introduced a proposal to amend the constitution to allow for the restriction not only of immigration, but also of the activities of Chinese within the Kingdom. The amendment was debated, but then quite suddenly postponed indefinitely by a vote of the Legislature. There were allegations that some of the members had been bribed by the Chinese community, but in the end the issue was considered dead. Kinney and A. Marques, who had led the Anti-Asiatic Union, then left the islands for about a year. The Union ceased to exist in their absence.<sup>14</sup>

The anti-Chinese issue was taken up again in the latter part of 1889. On his return to Honolulu, Kinney tried once again to raise the issue of an anti-Chinese constitutional amendment, to be passed by a special session of the legislature. The cabinet rejected his proposal and he launched a vigorous campaign during September to try and reverse the decision. A series of meetings were organized by Thomas Lucas and Frank Godfrey, culminating in a large public meeting on September 23, calling for a special session of the legislature. The cabinet considered the request for a month. They then replied that they did not consider it worthwhile submitting the request to a special legislative session. They also stated their policy for the new legislative session in 1890, which was later incorporated into the cabinet's general policy statement.<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup>Ibid, 176-78.

<sup>14</sup>Ibid, 179-81.

<sup>15</sup>Ibid, 181-82.

## The Establishment of the Union

On September 7, 1889, the inaugural meeting of the Mechanics and Workingmen's Political Protective Union was held. Robert More was elected as temporary President and Frank Godfrey as temporary secretary. The *Daily Bulletin* noted that the organization was intended to represent the interests of mechanics and workingmen in political affairs and hoped to be able to influence some 1500 voters in Honolulu alone in the upcoming election. It was also noted that :

From the sentiments expressed at the first meeting it would seem that the organization is not of that rabid character, which usually is characteristic of workingmen's organizations, for the promoters recognize that capital and labor should go hand in hand to obtain the best results for this workingmen's interest.<sup>16</sup>

At a meeting the following week the officers of the Union were elected. They were as follows;

President: John Phillips; Vice-President: D. McKenzie; Secretary: Frank Godfrey [replaced by W. H. Stone a month later]<sup>17</sup>; Sergeant-at-Arms: Richard Cayford; Executive Committee: Henry C. Reid, Jack A. Mehrtens, Peter O'Sullivan, John F. Bowler and J. W. Gibbs.<sup>18</sup>

The Executive Committee was entirely Haole and all of them were born outside of Hawai'i. They held various occupations. Godfrey, Mehrtens, Bowler and Gibbs had arrived in the early to mid 1870s. Phillips arrived in 1883 and O'Sullivan was in Hawai'i in 1880. There is no information available on the arrival dates of the others. Phillips ran a plumbing and tinning business. Godfrey was a newspaper writer and editor. Stone was a bookkeeper and collector. Cayford was a horseshoer. Reid was a pattern maker at the Honolulu Iron Works. Mehrtens was an upholsterer and also served in the police. O'Sullivan was a carpenter. Bowler was also involved in construction and had worked on 'Iolani Palace. Gibbs was a

---

<sup>16</sup>*Daily Bulletin*, September 10, 1889.

<sup>17</sup>*Daily Bulletin*, November 19, 1889.

<sup>18</sup>*Daily Bulletin*, September 14, 1889.

painter.<sup>19</sup> I was unable to find any information on McKenzie. The committee members were all therefore employed in skilled occupations and a number of them ran their own businesses. While the membership of the Union presumably included workingmen and laborers, its leadership was controlled by the skilled mechanics.

Information on the activities of the Union comes entirely from reports of their regular meetings in the English language newspapers. Unfortunately there are no other records or publications produced by the Union or its members in the public archives or libraries in Hawai'i. Therefore understanding of its background, membership and purpose must be pieced together from these third hand accounts. The report in the *Daily Bulletin* of the October 18 meeting gives some insight into the main concerns of the Union shortly after it was established. A discussion took place at the meeting as to "whether it is conducive to the general good that the Government pay rates of wages as low as a dollar a day." Gibbs suggested, "in a serio-comic air", that Chinese be employed in government "from the King and the 'four other Kings' [i.e. the Cabinet] and the judges" down, in order to save ninety percent of revenue spent on salaries. "True," he admitted, "it would ramify, through the white and Native working people, but they are already told they are not wanted." Bowler spoke next, condemning the government for allowing wages to be brought "to the lowest point," and urged the audience to unite in the next election. Mr. D. M. Cowley blamed the immigration policy for the low wages. Under this policy he claimed that "while Asiatics are landed to work for \$13 a month, Native labor must follow suit." However he believed that the Government was trying to lessen the numbers of Chinese. Both he and the next speaker, Mehrtens, specifically mentioned the giving of public works contracts to Chinese as one source of grievance. These last two speakers emphasized that government rates were below what they considered adequate wages.<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup>*Honolulu Advertiser*, November 23, 1925; *The Independent*, July 21, 1900; *Pacific Commercial Advertiser*, October 11, 1899; *Star Bulletin*, September 25, 1923; Bowser, *Hawaiian Directory*; J. C. Lane, ed., *Hawaiian Directory and Handbook of the Kingdom of Hawai'i* (San Francisco: McKenny Directory Co., 1888).

<sup>20</sup>*Daily Bulletin*, October 19, 1889.

At the November meeting the platform of the Union was presented. Its two important planks were the removal of the property qualification for the election of Nobles and the election of chief officers of the Government. This second plank is very similar to the one promoted so heavily by Daniel Lyons for Hui Kālai'āina. From the debate at the meeting reported in the *Bulletin*, it would seem that it had genuine and well thought out support from the members of the Union. This is not surprising when it is remembered that election of key government officials is one of the elements of American style democracy and indicates a strongly American influence over the Union.

Union membership appears to have grown steadily in Honolulu. By October it had 325 members, a number of whom were Native Hawaiians. This had increased to about 625 by the end of November. In November, a branch was also established on Maui.<sup>21</sup>

#### **Discussion: Nineteenth Century Labor Politics Comes to Hawai'i**

##### *International movements*

The French Revolution of 1789 was a critical event in the history of movements against the world capitalist system. Immanuel Wallerstein noted that it was an event which "put the ideology of the *Ancien Régime* permanently on the defensive ... throughout the world system. And it simultaneously firmly established the ideological motifs of the modern world, the rallying cries and the rationale of the movements to come. These motifs can be plainly summarized in the French Revolution's famous slogan, 'liberty, equality, fraternity.'"<sup>22</sup> The French Revolution provided the inspiration for both social and nationalist movements. It changes the concept of "sovereignty" from that which was vested in the "sovereign" into

---

<sup>21</sup>*Daily Bulletin*, November 19, 1889; *Pacific Commercial Advertiser*, October 19, November 9, 21, 30, 1889.

<sup>22</sup>Wallerstein, "Antisystemic Movements," 13.

that which was vested in the "people". It thus provided the basis of the formation of "nations" within the interstate system.<sup>23</sup>

The 1848 Revolution in France marked the beginning of fully organized movements against the world capitalist system. Wallerstein notes that "it was the first time that a proletarian-based political group made a serious attempt to achieve political power and legitimize worker's power."<sup>24</sup> The revolution was not successful, demonstrating the difficulties that proletarian movements would face in gaining power. This was also the year in which the *Communist Manifesto* was published, which provided the major strategic document of proletarian movements. Furthermore, it was the beginning of the nationalist movements in Germany, Italy and Hungary, which were seeking to establish new sovereign states, based on constitutionalism and nationalist interests. These too were unsuccessful, illustrating the need for long term political organization in order to achieve their objectives.<sup>25</sup>

In 1862, the International Working Men's Association was formed, also known as the First International. There was considerable debate within the Association as to how best to pursue the struggle of the working classes. The consensus formed around the Marxist strategy of the organized pursuit of the acquisition of state power by the industrial proletariat. In 1870 this strategy was briefly put into action by the Paris Commune. The latter part of the nineteenth century saw the development of a dual system of organization of the working classes; trade unions and political parties. The unions functioned within the work place, using the power of the strike to improve the condition of the employees. The parties functioned within the state and aimed for control of the state through election or revolution. Within both of these types of organization, there emerged a hierarchy, where the better educated, skilled workers became the leaders

---

<sup>23</sup>Ibid, 14.

<sup>24</sup>Ibid, 16.

<sup>25</sup>Ibid, 16-17.

and tended to restrain the more revolutionary desires of the unskilled workers. They favored the achievement of power through evolutionary means, such as election and constitutional change, rather than violent revolution.<sup>26</sup>

These organizations also faced the problem of how to relate with the emerging nationalist movements. These movements were anti-imperialist rather than anticapitalist, but shared a common struggle against the expanding world system. The basis of nationalism conflicted with the internationalist nature of the proletarian movements. It was believed that capitalism would eventually homogenize the world, eliminating national differences. Therefore, there were two approaches to the problem of alliances with nationalist movements. One was to deny the legitimacy of their claims in favor of the development of an homogenous international proletariat. The second was to form interim alliances as a tactical move to further the interests of the working classes.<sup>27</sup>

#### *Labor Movements in the United States*

The period from the end of the civil war to the depression of 1894 was a period of enormous industrial expansion in the United States. The increased demand for labor resulted in a significant increase in immigration from Europe. These workers brought with them the emerging ideals of the proletarian movements. They organized themselves as trade unions and used the strike as weapon to improve their conditions of employment. They also organized themselves into more broad based political movements, such as the movement for the eight hour day. In the 1880s, economic depression resulted in increasing unrest amongst the working class. As strikes increased, unions became more organized and the American Federation of Labor was established in 1886. The violence between workers and employers also increased. The most notable incident of this period being the Haymarket affair in Chicago, where 3,000 workers had assembled in a political rally. A bomb went off in the midst of the attending police, killing seven of them.

---

<sup>26</sup>Ibid, 17-21.

<sup>27</sup>Ibid, 21-22.

The police then fired into the crowd and killed several people and wounded two hundred others. The event drew international attention and fuelled the continued activities of the working class against the oppression of their employers. The political movements however tended to join with the existing party system to pursue their goals within the state. There also existed a range of fraternal organizations that supported the welfare and aspirations of the working class.<sup>28</sup>

#### *Labor Politics in Hawai'i*

As work became harder to find on the east coast of the United States, many workers moved westward to new opportunities that were opening up on the west coast. Some of these workers then came on to Hawai'i, where the booming sugar industry offered the chance of secure employment. While many of these people were transient and merely taking advantage of the opportunity to work for a while in the islands, a significant number began to consider Hawai'i their home. As the initial demand for labor dropped off, the transient laborers left and those who remained found it more difficult to get enough work to make a steady living.

Following the pattern of the California labor movement, the Haole mechanics and workingmen were quick to blame their problems on increased competition from the Chinese. The Chinese were acceptable so long as they worked in jobs that Haole did not wish to undertake, such as cutting cane on the plantations or jobs that were traditionally carried out by women, such as laundrymen, dressmaking and domestic service. Their willingness to provide low paid labor in these areas was actually beneficial to the Haole workers in that it promoted a viable sugar industry for them to provide services to. However, when the Chinese left the plantations and competed for contracts and jobs that the Haole desired and were able

---

<sup>28</sup>Martin Shefter, "Trade Unions and Political Machines: the organization and disorganization of the American working class in the late nineteenth century," in *Working-Class Formation: nineteenth century patterns in Western Europe and the United States*, edited by Ira Katznelson and Aristide R. Zolberg (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1986), 197-278; Howard Zinn, *A People's History of the United States* (New York: Harper Collins, 1980), 264-66.

to undercut the rates of pay demanded by Haole by working cooperatively and using cooperative financing schemes, problems arose. This, combined with the Haole attitudes that regarded Chinese as inferior, made them the ideal scapegoat.<sup>29</sup>

The workers arriving from Europe and American, through California, also brought with them the ideals of Anglo-Saxon democracy as developed in the mining towns, as well as those of the international working class movement.<sup>30</sup> They held the concept of sovereignty belonging to the people and being expressed through their right to vote. They therefore opposed any restrictions on this right, such as the property and income qualifications. Although they were apparently happy for the definition of "the people" to be restricted to Hawaiian and Haole males. However, they found that the Hawaiian government was controlled by an elite group of businessmen and sugar planters who were determined to maintain their privilege. The leadership of the Union was probably aware that while they commanded a good proportion of the vote, they could not hope to gain political power on their own. Lyons' Hui Kālai'āina provided a logical ally in achieving that power. The fact that it was controlled by a Haole of like mind to them would make the alliance easier to achieve.

---

<sup>29</sup>Glick, *Sojourners and Settlers*, 74. See Saxton, *Indispensable Enemy*, 68-78, for dynamics of anti-Chinese movement in California in this regard.

<sup>30</sup>*Ibid*, 46-60.



## **PART III**

### **KA HOPENA**

#### **(THE RESULT)**

## CHAPTER 7

### THE 1890 ELECTIONS

#### **The Organization of the Parties**

The first group to start organizing for the elections was the Reform Party branch on the island of Hawai'i. At the end of November 1889, the central committee met at Hilo and asked the cabinet what their policies would be for the next legislative period. The policy issues which they requested comment on were:

The internal improvements and the development of the resources of the country, ... the question of immigration and a labor supply for the industries of the country, ... the Chinese question, ... the public debt, ... future indebtedness for internal improvements, ... political relations with the United States, ... [and] any other matter of policy importance for the country upon which there has been no public declaration.<sup>1</sup>

On November 26, the nomination process for Nobles on the island of Hawai'i began with a local meeting in Kohala, which was attended mainly by Haole. One observer at the meeting noted that "the foreign elements were not harmonious in seeking to uphold the present Government." A similar meeting was held on November 30 at Hamakua. The major issue at that meeting appears to have been the granting of licenses for the sale of wine and beer.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>*Pacific Commercial Advertiser*, November 25, 1889.

<sup>2</sup>*Pacific Commercial Advertiser*, December 5, 1889.

### *Coalition Proposed and Debated*

At a meeting of the Mechanics and Workingmen's Political Protective Union, held on November 29 in Honolulu, Daniel Lyons, as president of Hui Kālai'āina, proposed that the Union appoint a committee to meet with a similar committee from the Hui to discuss political matters. The proposal was discussed briefly and referred to the executive committee. Then the meeting went on to discuss other business.<sup>3</sup>

The *Pacific Commercial Advertiser*, which was closely aligned with the Reform Party government by that time, was quick to raise its concerns over the Union's direction. In the same issue in which it reported the November 29 meeting, it warned that:

It would seem as though the Mechanics Union was drifting fast into a channel full of rocks and quicksands. The wirepullers are apparent, and there is every prospect of another political wreck.<sup>4</sup>

The *Advertiser* does not make it clear as to who the "wirepullers" were in this instance.<sup>5</sup> But it is likely, from the *Advertiser's* editorials, that it is a reference both to those who promoted the Union platform of electing government officers and abolishing the property and income qualifications for the House of Nobles. It is also likely to be a reference to the approach from the Hui.

On the following Monday, a meeting of the Hui was called by Lyons to select the committee to represent the Hui in the meeting with the Union to select candidates for Nobles and Representatives for the upcoming elections. The committee consisted of representatives from the five Honolulu electoral wards, as follows;

Ward 1 - L. Keau, Elia Naoho, Mikasope  
Ward 2 - J. Kanui, Miekapu, Palau.  
Ward 3 - Kukalito, Maliu, Kahili.  
Ward 4 - Kukaulili'i, Mauliaoa, Kuaheku.

---

<sup>3</sup>*Pacific Commercial Advertiser*, November 30, 1889.

<sup>4</sup>*Pacific Commercial Advertiser*, November 30, 1889.

<sup>5</sup>Wirepullers are those who secretly or underhandedly try to influence an organization.

Ward 5 - Kale Kuakia, Lohelani, Kahoane.<sup>6</sup>

L. Keau is possibly J. Keau. He and J. Kanui stood unsuccessfully as an independent Noble 1887. Mikasope was the editor of *Ka Leo o ka Lahui* and had earlier worked as a compositor for the *Elele*.<sup>7</sup> I have found no information on the other committee members. The absence from this committee of anyone that was connected with the original establishment of the Hui is notable.

The *Daily Bulletin* added its voice to the concerns expressed by the *Advertiser* the day after this meeting. It noted that the platform proposed by the Union followed the "distinctive doctrines" of the Hui and was not surprised that the two organizations were considering joining forces for the elections. However, it thought that "many thoughtful citizens who admired the originally declared purposes of the Union have had their sympathies shaken by the platform adopted which appears to their minds as containing a combination of reactionary and ultra-radical elements." It hoped that the selection of candidates might make up for this and noted that changes to the constitution proposed in the platform would take two elections to be adopted.<sup>8</sup>

On December 6, Bush's newspaper, *Ka Oiaio*, published a list of the names of the people it believed would be chosen as candidates for the two organizations. The list included a number of the original members of the Hui, as well as Thomas Lucas and Robert Wilcox. The list was reprinted by the *Bulletin*, which endorsed them as "worthy gentlemen" and "fit representatives of the people, and their government." In the editorial on the same day, it called for moderate candidates "who recognize that every individual and every class of the community is as much entitled to consideration, in the regulation of public affairs, as every other individual and every other class, and that every legitimate interest, however small,

---

<sup>6</sup>*Pacific Commercial Advertiser*, December 3, 1889.

<sup>7</sup>Lane, *Hawaiian Directory*.

<sup>8</sup>*Daily Bulletin*, December 4, 1889.

has a right to existence and protection." It objected racially based politics, whether it was anti-Hawaiian politics or anti-Haole.<sup>9</sup>

On the same day, the *Advertiser* strongly warned the Union against coalition with the Hui. "To identify ... at this or any other time with ... the *Elele*, will be the greatest blunder that could be made, at a time when no necessity exists for making a blunder." Instead it urged the Union to "preserve their identity as an organization, and retain their power to use it at the polls wherever it may accomplish the most good."<sup>10</sup>

The Union met again on Friday, December 6 and the executive committee announced that they had added three new members to their number for the purposes of meeting with the Hui. The new members of the committee were Horace Gates Crabbe, A. Marques and Robert Hoapili Baker. The vice-president, D. McKenzie, then proposed that "all members of the Executive Committee who may have intentions to run as either Representatives or Nobles be requested to resign from the said committee." This created quite a debate in the meeting, which was fueled by McKenzie accusing his fellow committee members of "mostly engaging in the indulgence of beer" on their meeting days. The meeting was finally brought to order and agreed to empower the committee to nominate candidates for a Union ticket and to set a date to meet with the Hui. The *Advertiser* interpreted this resolution to indicate that the Union had taken its advice and would field its own candidates, while still giving the Hui the courtesy of a joint meeting.<sup>11</sup>

The new members for the executive committee were of higher class status than the original members. Crabbe, an American who had arrived in Honolulu with his father in 1847, ran a draying, horse

---

<sup>9</sup>*Daily Bulletin*, December 6, 1889.

<sup>10</sup>*Pacific Commercial Advertiser*, December 6, 1889.

<sup>11</sup>*Pacific Commercial Advertiser*, December 7, 1889.

restriction of Chinese immigration. It promised to restrict Chinese immigration to agricultural laborers, teachers and officials and to prohibit those not already engaged in a trade or a mechanical occupation from engaging in these activities. The second policy was the establishment of a telegraphic cable with the American continent. The third was concerning immigration and labor supply. It proposed continued government assistance for immigration of agricultural laborers. Immigrants, it suggested, "should be accompanied by a fair proportion of women, and, so far as possible, be of such a class and nationality that they will become settlers in the country, and build up a permanent middle class." The expense of immigration would be born mainly by the employers, but the government would subsidize the immigration of women, "who come largely in the interests of sound public policy." There is no indication as to where these new laborers would come from, but it can safely be assumed that it would not be China, especially if they were to form a permanent middle class.

The fourth item was a pledge to meet all government expenses, including interest on the national debt, out of current receipts. The fifth concerned loan money. Loans would be restricted to "the construction or establishment of reproductive public improvements". In addition, the government should be able to refinance its debt when appropriate and regulate large deposits in the Postal Savings Bank to avoid their sudden withdrawal.

The sixth item was the controversial issue of relations with the United States. In this regard the cabinet promised to continue present relations and secure an extension of the reciprocity treaty, extending the terms so that all trade between the countries would be free of duty. It also promised "to jealously guard the independence and autonomy of the Kingdom" by securing a treaty with the U.S. guaranteeing "such independence against the encroachment by itself or any foreign power whatsoever".

The seventh item pointed out that "the Cabinet believe in the proposition that the condition of the roads of a country is one of the surest indices of its civilization and advancement." It therefore promised

he was a palace hanger-on, who never did any work." It went on to describe him as "a wolf who does not even take the trouble to array himself in sheep's clothing" and related his presence to a general tendency of American laboring parties to be controlled by leaders "who want of intelligence or honesty, or both, made them unworthy of their cause." The *Advertiser* emphasized that the main issue was the choice between "the maintenance of real constitutional government or the return to the rotten days of old", which people such as Baker epitomized in their view. An attack such as this on a close relative of the Queen could not have endeared them to many Native Hawaiians and other supporters of the royal family.

The *Advertiser* continued in this vein for the rest of the month. On December 13, it defended the 1887 constitution in its editorial. The following day it expressed concern at what it viewed as relatively minor disagreements within the Reform Party that could lead to its division and downfall in the next elections. On December 16, it appealed to Haole voters to stand together:

For every Anglo Saxon, for every free man, among us there should be no question here. He should throw aside all personal feeling, should forget all minor difference and cast his vote where it will tell the most in this great matter [i.e. the maintenance of the existing constitution].

Meanwhile, Robert Wilcox appears to have been turning his hand to electoral politics and travelling around the other islands, holding meetings to gain support for the Hui. On December 16 he spoke at Paia, Maui, where he spoke alongside the leading contender for the Reform Party nomination.<sup>16</sup>

### **Cabinet Policy Announced**

On December 18, the reply of the Reform cabinet to the request from the Hilo committee for clarification as to its policy was published. The statement covered ten major issues. The first was the

---

<sup>16</sup>*Pacific Commercial Advertiser*, December 26, 1889.

the argument in another editorial. This time it focused on arguments to do with discrimination against Native Hawaiians and Portuguese and concluded that interests of the kingdom outweighed the interests of particular groups such as Native Hawaiians and Portuguese.<sup>14</sup>

Meanwhile, a joint meeting of the two committees was set up by the Union for Tuesday, December 10. However, while the entire Union committee attended the meeting, the only representative from the Hui was Daniel Lyons, even though he was not member of the Hui committee. The meeting was then used to discuss political issues relating to the Union. Another meeting appears to have been scheduled for Monday, December 16 at the same venue. However, there are no reports available as to the outcome of that meeting.<sup>15</sup>

In its December 11 editorial, the *Advertiser* tried again to convince mechanics that the removal or reduction of the property and income qualifications, as proposed by the Hui, would not be in their best political interests. It pointed out that not only did the qualifications ensure, in their opinion, that good government would be maintained by the election of reliable and intelligent members to the House of Nobles, but it also gave the mechanics a political advantage. They warned that being "led off by the nose by the Elele and its crowd" would only "produce discord and confusion" within their own ranks. It is clear from this that the Reform government and its supporters were concerned that it was about to lose a sizable proportion of the voters for Nobles if the coalition went ahead. Therefore it was keen to convince them that their interests lay with the Reform government, rather than with the Native Hawaiians.

The next day, the *Advertiser* was very critical of the appointment by the Union of Hoapili Baker to its executive committee, who they claimed had "confessed in open Court ... with edifying frankness that

---

<sup>14</sup>*Pacific Commercial Advertiser*, December 7, 10, 1889.

<sup>15</sup>*Pacific Commercial Advertiser*, December 11, 1890; *Ka Elele*, December 14, 1889.



and grain business. Marques, who was Portuguese, was a prominent Honolulu land owner and had also been involved in the establishment of the Hawaiian Anti-Asian Union. Baker was a cousin of Queen Kapi'olani on his father's side and a descendant of Liloa, *Mō'i* of Waipi'o on the island of Hawai'i, on his mother's side, and therefore of quite high *Ali'i* status. He was of pure Hawaiian ancestry, the name Baker being taken from his adoptive parents.<sup>12</sup>

In its editorial the following day, the *Bulletin* expressed its approval of the proposed coalition, stating that it was "about the best thing they could do". Apparently the *Elele* expressed its concerns that the *Bulletin*, while claiming to be the paper of the workingman, was opposing the main principles of the platforms of the two political organizations set up to represent them. In the same issue, the *Bulletin* replied that it reserved the right to express its own opinions, especially as the Hui and the Union would together hold the balance of power in the elections.<sup>13</sup>

The *Advertiser's* editorial column that day was a strongly worded argument against the abolition of the property and income qualification, as advocated by the Union. It stated that "no intelligent person can advocate the proposition that the qualifications for Nobles and Representatives should be the same." It went on to argue that the House of Nobles needed to be kept a separate body from the other, with a separately defined voting group. It suggested that the "restriction is placed so low as to include every industrious mechanic and laborer, and to exclude only the idle and the ignorant." To allow "the idle and the ignorant" to vote for Nobles would only bring "disaster and confusion". A few days later it continued

---

<sup>12</sup>*Pacific Commercial Advertiser*, April 6, 1900, December 6, 1903; Bowser, *Hawaiian Directory*, 94; McKinzie, *Genealogies*, 1:48, 2:137.

Adoption of children between native Hawaiian families was and still is a common occurrence. It is a way of ensuring that they grow up with a greater sense of community. The children of *Ali'i* were adopted to parents specifically chosen on the basis of what they could teach the child. The adoption of Hoapili to the Baker family follows this pattern. It was no doubt hoped that he would learn about both the Haole and Hawaiian worlds so that he could be better equipped to lead his people. This is another example of how the *Ali'i* adapted to the new realities.

<sup>13</sup>*Daily Bulletin*, December 7, 1889.

a vigorous program of public works, financed from internal borrowing. Item eight promised "liberal appropriations" for education. Item nine promised a continuation of the strict policy of segregating sufferers of leprosy and continued funding of new treatment methods. Finally, it promised "the gradual extension of local self-government."<sup>17</sup>

The *Bulletin* suggested the following day that the cabinet policy statement would "open a wide enough field for discussion [until] election day".<sup>18</sup> The statement became the basis for subsequent election debates, and was understood to be the platform of the Reform party, until the official Reform party platform was agreed to by a convention held in mid-January.

In a later editorial, the *Bulletin* suggested that the statement incorporated the Reform party platforms of 1887 and 1888, as well as aspects of the platform agreed to by the Bush faction of Hui Kālai‘āina in June of that year. It generally praised the measures proposed in the statement. It suggested however that there was "little or no public demand" for broadening the terms of the treaty with the United States and the government should proceed cautiously on this.<sup>19</sup>

On December 20, the central convention for the island of Hawai‘i met in Hilo and nominated its candidates for Nobles. The next day, the candidates pledged before the convention that they would support and uphold the policies of the present administration as published in the cabinet's reply. On the same day, a meeting was held in Makawao, Maui, which attracted both Reform Party and Hui Kālai‘āina supporters.<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup>*Daily Bulletin*, December 18, 1889.

<sup>18</sup>*Daily Bulletin*, December 19, 1889.

<sup>19</sup>*Daily Bulletin*, December 21, 1889.

<sup>20</sup>*Daily Bulletin*, December 24, 1889; *Pacific Commercial Advertiser*, December 16, 26, 1889.

## The Coalition Debate Continues

On December 20, the *Bulletin* published the names of the candidates that it was said were likely to be adopted by the Union. Most of the people named were Haole and, according to the *Bulletin*, "would pass muster as a compromise between extreme administrationists and extreme oppositionists". The names were probably from an initial list drawn up by the Executive Committee, as it seems unlikely that some of those named, such as Paul Isenberg, would agree to stand in the company of the others. This indicates that the Union was at this stage still thinking in terms of perhaps fielding its own ticket, independent of the Hui.

The next day the *Advertiser* renewed its argument against a Union and Hui coalition, accusing the *Elele* and "Mr. Bush's paper" (*Ka Oiaio*) of advocating "the breakdown of all conservative checks, the restoration of unreasonable powers to the King and in general, a system of government, wherein the rights and interests of the people will be sacrificed." It went on to warn the Mechanics Union that an alliance with the Hui "is a misalliance" and that they would be "simply playing into the hands of their enemies". It claimed that the interests of "all honest workers ... [were] to sustain the true principles of reform which gave us the constitution of 1887." As the article went on, it is clear that the writer viewed Native Hawaiians as untrustworthy and unreliable and that any Native Hawaiian politician who came to power would in his view represent a total return to all the problems of the Gibson ministry.

On December 24, the *Advertiser* editorial claimed that the Union was being captured by the Hui, who were not prepared to compromise on their preferred platform and ticket. In particular it cited the likely nomination of Robert Wilcox for representative. "Imagine men who a few months ago shouldered a musket to suppress Wilcox, now going to the polls to vote for him", it said. It went on to suggest that the Union no longer represented mechanics and had been captured by what it termed the "King's Party".

The Portuguese language newspaper, *Luso Hawaiiano*, printed a column on the election campaign, which was translated and reprinted by the *Advertiser*. The writer complained that the Mechanics' Union had "failed to maintain the view (intuito) of politics for which it was created", and that the Hui was only out to get rid of the cabinet. None of the parties, he claimed, had given the least thought to Portuguese voters, who themselves had not made an effort to get involved. He suggested that Portuguese could form a fourth party and send their own representatives to the Legislature. He went on to suggest a program that such representatives could follow. It covered the sovereign independence of the kingdom, the restriction of Asian immigration, internal improvements, education, sound finance, the division of crown lands into homestead lots for settlers, reduction of the national debt, free hospital care for the poor, irrespective of nationality, and the creation of local governments. He concluded by attacking the Reform Party ticket agreed to in Hilo on the basis that it represented the interests of planters who were not sympathetic to Portuguese.<sup>21</sup>

#### **The Reform Party Ward Meetings**

The Reform Party began a series of Ward meetings in Honolulu in late December. At the Ward Two meeting on December 27, C. L. Carter emphasized that "the establishment of constitutional cabinet government was the great issue in the coming campaign." A. S. Hartwell rejected the notion that only Anglo-Saxons were capable of self-government and suggested that Native Hawaiians were equally capable. Thurston also spoke and recalled that the 1887 election had extended the franchise to the majority of "the most intelligent people in town", namely the foreign residents who were not citizens. He then went on to comment on how those such as Bush, Rosa, Kaulukou and Lyons, who under the pre-1887 constitution had "neither proposed, advocated, nor carried out any progressive legislation," were now proposing "a system

---

<sup>21</sup>*Pacific Commercial Advertiser*, January 4, 1890.

of government which would be more democratic than a republic, [by advocating] the elect[ion] of all government officers and remov[al of] all restrictions on the elective franchise." He interpreted this as a sign of political progress and hope for the future.<sup>22</sup>

At the ward three meeting on December 30, most of the speeches focussed on the organization of the ward. Thurston also addressed this meeting and spoke on the reciprocity treaty. He rebutted allegations made by Bush through *Ka Oiaio* and *Ka Leo o ka Lahui*, that he would sell out the country and "cede independence to the United States". He stated:

The independence of this country is a tender point to me. When I speak of "home" I do not look across the water for that place. I belong here, all my interests are here. For four generations my family has lived here, and I hope that they will live here for four generations longer in a free and independent country (great applause).

He went on to say there was no foundation to the rumors that had caused Bush to call a public meeting in September concerning the proposed treaty with the United States, but that the meeting was a healthy sign of the willingness of the public to defend the independence of the country. He stated that such a treaty was now a matter for the next legislature, as outlined in the cabinet's policy. He went on to state that there was no truth to further allegations, that had recently been made by Bush, that the Cabinet was continuing with secret negotiations with Washington. He concluded by stating that he thought the opposition was "a disorganized lot who are simply trying to get back to the position where they were two years ago, but which by their own actions they had forfeited".<sup>23</sup>

The ward four meeting was held the following evening. W. A. Kinney addressed the meeting and stressed that the Reform Party represented the interests of the majority, rather than the few. He also guessed that the opposition ticket would contain both those who would wish for a return to the old politics,

---

<sup>22</sup>*Daily Bulletin*, December 29, 30, 1887.

<sup>23</sup>*Daily Bulletin*, December 31, 1889.

increasing the power of the King, and those who would wish to increase the power of the people. Invoking Anglo-Saxon and Teutonic racial identity, he commented, "It is only the common sense of the Anglo-Saxon and Germanic peoples that keep such combinations tickets from winning." W. O. Smith followed him and pointed out that during the period from 1876 to 1887, there was little done in the way of public improvements, in spite of the huge amounts of money appropriated by the Government. Objecting to the expenditure of royal pomp and overseas missions, he echoed the "roads as indices of civilization" sentiments of the cabinet policy statement. He went on to point out that the present government had made up for this quite well. He finished by explaining the importance of local government to the development of the other islands.

The last speaker was W. C. Achi, who had not only stood as an opposition member in 1887, but had been active in trying to broaden the platform of Hui Kālai'āina at the June meeting. He now declared his support for the Reform party, saying that he believed it had proven capable of achieving the best for all the people of Hawai'i. He said he was not prepared to support the opposition ticket because it included people who had had their chance at government and used the power and government money for their own private benefit. He felt confident that as time went on, more Native Hawaiians would come to understand that the Reform Party represented good government that was best for the whole nation.<sup>24</sup>

There was a meeting of candidates for the Kohala district of the island of Hawai'i on New Years day. Robert Wilcox opened the proceedings with a speech which strenuously denounced the government and justified his own actions in organizing the attempted rebellion. According to the *Advertiser*, his ideas were not that well received by the local audience. He was followed by the two local candidates, J. K. Kaho'oho'o, the Hui Kālai'āina nominee, who stated he would work for the good of Native Hawaiians, and J. W. Moanauli, the Reform Party nominee, who stated that he would work for the good of all races.

---

<sup>24</sup>*Daily Bulletin*, January 3, 4, 1890.

Wilcox also addressed a meeting at Hamakua, of which the *Advertiser* noted that there were "no signs of an uprising visible yet."<sup>25</sup>

### **National Reform Party Launched**

By early January it seems that the Union and Hui committees had managed to meet and talk out any differences they may have had. They had agreed on a joint ticket and platform to be launched under the title of the National Reform Party. These were then ratified at separate meetings of the two organizations held on January 3. The report of the Union meeting indicates that there was little or no dissent regarding either the platform or the ticket. There is no report available of the Hui meeting.

The ticket was as follows;

Nobles: Herman A. Widemann, John Adams Cummins, Edward Creamer Macfarlane, E. Muller, Horace Gates Crabbe, Charles James McCarthy, John Smith Walker, John Phillips and D. W. Pua.

Representatives: William Humphries Cummings, John E. Bush, A. Marques, Thomas Lucas and Robert Wilcox.<sup>26</sup>

The Nobles ticket was made up of two Native Hawaiians (Cummins and Pua), one local-born Haole (Macfarlane), two Germans (Widemann and Muller), two Americans (Crabbe and McCarthy) and two Scotsmen (Walker and Phillips). On the Representatives ticket, there were two Native Hawaiians (Bush and Wilcox), one local-born Haole (Cummings), one Portuguese (Marques) and one American (Lucas).

In order to get a full ticket for Nobles, the National Reform Party had had to look beyond skilled mechanics to sympathetic businessmen and landowners. Widemann was a sugar planter at Wai'anae. He

---

<sup>25</sup>*Pacific Commercial Advertiser*, January 9, 1890.

<sup>26</sup>*Daily Bulletin*, January 4, 1890.

had grown up in a military family in Germany and run away to sea because of class discrimination in the military academy. After visiting the Hawaiian islands several times on whaling vessels, he decided to settle on Kaua'i in 1846. He grew coffee and then sugar, and sold his sugar interests in 1876 as a protest against the reciprocity treaty with the United States. He believed that the differential tariff offered by the treaty was unnecessary and insulting to Hawaiians and he objected to the obligation to the U.S. that it placed upon Hawai'i. Two years later he decided that the "idle life" did not suit him and he bought the Wai'anae sugar plantation, which he ran until his death. Cummins was born on O'ahu in 1835, of *Ali'i* descent. His mother's line traced back to Liloa, *Mō'i* of Waipi'o valley on the island of Hawai'i. His father was an English settler with wide sugar, cattle and agricultural holdings. Cummins founded a lucrative sugar plantation at Waimanalo, O'ahu, where he frequently entertained members of the royal family. He was a close companion of King Kalākaua. Macfarlane was a leading Honolulu businessman and joint proprietor of the government sponsored Hawaiian Hotel. Crabbe ran a draying, horse and grain business in Honolulu. He had arrived in Hawai'i with his father, who for a while was the American representative to the Hawaiian government. He was chamberlain to King Lunalilo during his short reign and had been a part owner of the Leilehua ranch. McCarthy arrived in Honolulu in 1881 as a representative of a San Francisco wholesale fruit company and was engaged in various business enterprises. He was a captain of the Honolulu rifles and served in that capacity during the imposition of the 1887 constitution and the quelling of the Wilcox rebellion. However he was a strong supporter of the monarchy and later spoke out against the overthrow in 1893. Walker had lived in Honolulu since 1861 and ran an importing and shipping business. Phillips arrived in Honolulu in 1883 and ran a tinning and plumbing business. I have not been able to find information on the occupations or businesses of Muller and Pua.<sup>27</sup>

---

<sup>27</sup>A. Grove Day, *History Makers of Hawai'i: a biographical dictionary* (Honolulu: Mutual Publishing, 1984), 29-30; McKinzie, *Genealogies*, 1:76; George F. Nellist, *The Story of Hawaii and its Builders*, vol. 3 of *Men of Hawaii* (Honolulu: Honolulu Star Bulletin, 1925), 627; *Pacific Commercial Advertiser*, February 8, October 11, 1899, March 4, 1902, December 6, 1903, March 21, 1913; *Paradise of the Pacific*, March 1902.



The candidates for representatives were only slightly more proletarian. Cummings owned a sugar plantation at Hāna and was joint owner of a ranch that leased the island of Kaho'olawe. Bush owned and edited the newspaper *Ka Oiaio* and had an interest in the newspaper *Ka Leo o ka Lahui*. Marques was a local land owner, Lucas ran a contracting business with his brother George, and Wilcox ran a civil engineering and surveying office.<sup>28</sup>

A number of the candidates had previous experience in the Legislature. Bush, however, was the only one directly connected with the much-criticized Gibson ministry. Widemann had been a judge of the Supreme court before being appointed to the House of Nobles and Kalākaua's first cabinet in 1874. His appointment continued as a member of the House of Nobles until 1886. In 1887, he was elected to the House of Nobles on the Reform Party ticket. However, he was too much of a royalist to be able to continue with that party and decided to give his support to the National Reform Party. Cummins had held a seat in the House of Representatives in 1874. Walker had been a Noble from 1874 to 1886. He was minister of finance in the cabinets of 1874, 1880 and 1882 under William Green, and president of the legislature in 1886. Bush had been a Noble from 1880 to 1886 and was minister of finance under the Gibson ministry. Wilcox had been elected to the House of Representatives in 1880 before his trip to Italy.<sup>29</sup>

The joint platform, or Declaration of Principles as it was called, was a lengthy and verbose document. Its thirteen articles are summarized as follows:

1. To promote and defend all measures to the advantage of the working classes, while remembering that all are entitled to equal consideration and protection.
2. To maintain the absolute independence and perfect autonomy of the kingdom and not to enter into treaties that might threaten this.

---

<sup>28</sup>*Hawaiian Gazette*, July 31, 1900; Kuykendall, *Hawaiian Kingdom III*, 63; *Hawaiian Directory 1880-81*, 94; *Paradise of the Pacific*, April 1910; McGregor-Alegado, "Hawaiian Resistance," 81.

<sup>29</sup>Lydecker, *Roster*, 287-88, 300; Kuykendall, *Hawaiian Kingdom III*, 12-13, 143, 193, 223, 258, 288.

3. A healthful and progressive revision of the present constitution, which is imperfect and hastily framed.
4. A liberal modification of the property and income qualification for voting for the House of Nobles so as to include a worthy class of Natives, small landowners and mechanics who are now unjustly debarred.
5. That certain public offices might be satisfactorily filled by election of the people. This question to be considered by the legislature.
6. Rigid economy in public expenditure, including the reduction of excessive salaries, while raising the lowest salaries which are inadequate.
7. Augmenting the efficiency of the Homestead Act and promoting settlement of the land by suitable immigrants.
8. Immediate and stringent measures against the "Asiatic hordes" who threaten this country, supplanting and starving out the Natives and driving away the foreign workmen. Chinese to be kept on the plantations and shipped home as soon as their contracts expire. Asiatics not to be employed on public works. No further Asiatics to be allowed to engage in trades or mechanical occupations and present licenses to be canceled on the natural disappearance of the actual owners.
9. In the interests of the laboring classes: Government not to import finished materials that could have been made in the country; Queens Hospital to be more accessible to all nationalities; healthful recreation to be allowed on Sundays (which was prohibited at that time by laws enacted by the missionaries several years earlier); a more equitable assessment of property and a just revision of the tax laws.
10. Public improvements such as improvement of Honolulu harbor; extension of the railroad around O'ahu; development of a systematic road system; improvement of other harbor facilities.
11. Attention to education, health and sanitation.
12. A cautious study of the feasibility of local self-government.
13. A strong and rigid administration of the laws regarding delinquents, opium smugglers, illicit liquor sellers and vagrants.<sup>30</sup>

The available newspaper reports provide mere glimpses of what may have been happening behind the scenes while the coalition was being debated. The final ticket clearly indicates that the original Hui executive committee members must have had some influence over the process and decisions of the joint committee, since many of them were included on the ticket. It is also interesting that in the platform Lyons'

---

<sup>30</sup>*Pacific Commercial Advertiser*, January 6, 1890.

policy of electing government officers was reduced in scope. How much of a role Lyons took in the process is uncertain. The non-appearance of his committee at the December 10 meeting may have been due to poor communication or it may have been a protest against Lyons' efforts to control the process. We do know, however, that family tragedy limited his involvement in politics in the period from late December to mid-January. His infant daughter died of diphtheria on December 29, followed by his eldest daughter on December 31, his wife on January 1 and one of his sons on January 7. As a precaution, Lyons himself was placed under quarantine for a couple of weeks.<sup>31</sup>

Not everyone in the Union was happy with the process. One union member wrote a letter to the *Advertiser* in January, under the pseudonym "Wood B. Cant", complaining of the undemocratic nature of the decisions. He claimed that the meetings where the decisions were made were poorly attended and that the candidates had made up their own platform, independent of the Union's original one. He also claimed that the Hui had forced the Union to accept the names of Bush and Wilcox on threat of withdrawing from the process. However, in a speech at the combined Union and Hui meeting on January 8, D. M. Crowley, speaking on behalf of the Union, claimed that "out of a membership of six hundred, only one has left the Union on account of a difference of principles."<sup>32</sup>

The *Advertiser* gave qualified approval to the platform and suggested that it was not too different from what the current government was aiming to do. However, it was very critical of some of the people named on the ticket; "The gospel is good, but when the Devil is appointed to preach the gospel, one knows that the Devil, and not the gospel, will be preached." It was not critical of McCarthy, Phillips, Marques, Muller and Crabbe, who it thought to be honest and trustworthy. Its criticism was mainly aimed at Bush and Wilcox. It reminded the mechanics of Wilcox's failed rebellion and Bush's "crying for bloodshed and

---

<sup>31</sup>*The Friend*, January 1890, 6; *The Elele*, January 4, 1890; *The National Herald - Ka Ahailono o Ka Lahui*, January 10, 1890; *The Independent*, July 15, 1895.

<sup>32</sup>*Pacific Commercial Advertiser*, January 8, 9, 1890.

ruin", presumably through his paper. "Can it be possible the respectable law-abiding citizens like Macfarlane, Lucas and others consent to ally themselves with men like them!" it asked. It went on to accuse Widemann of betraying his voters. According to the *Advertiser*, he had opposed "the principles of progress" and upheld the power of the King while in Government as a Reform Party member. It also accused him of siding with those members of the legislature who had been accused of bribery in connection with an anti-Chinese constitutional amendment. It concluded by accusing Cummins of "constant subserviency to the King". The *Bulletin*, on the other hand, congratulated the two organizations on producing a platform that was "striking in its breadth and moderation" and which contained "no element of reaction."<sup>33</sup>

### **The Meetings Continue**

The Reform Party continued its series of Honolulu ward meetings on January 6, with the ward five meeting. Thurston addressed the meeting and stated that he was optimistic for the future and the continuation of the work that the Reform government had begun. He then went on to comment that the opposition, in his opinion, had paid the Reform Party the highest compliments, by not only stealing their name, but also their platform. He claimed that Hui Kālaiʻāina had abandoned their earlier platform of electing all officers and abolishing the property and income qualifications in order to achieve the coalition, and concluded "that their opposition is based on self-interest or personal feeling and not on principle." J. W. Gibbs, a member of the Union executive committee, denied that the Hui and Union had stolen either the name or platform of the Reform Party. Achi then spoke, reiterating the speech he had given at the ward four meeting in support of the improvements that had been made by the government. He stated that his

---

<sup>33</sup>*Pacific Commercial Advertiser*, January 6, 1890; *Daily Bulletin*, January 4, 1890.

purpose in leaving Hui Kālai'āina and joining the Reform Party was not in order to be nominated or obtain a government office, as some of members of the Hui apparently had suggested.<sup>34</sup>

A combined meeting of the Hui and the Union was held on January 8, which nearly 2000 people attended. Antone Rosa spoke as president pro-tem of the Hui, explaining that he was filling in for Daniel Lyons. He accused the government of discrimination against Hawaiians, both in terms of the restrictions on voting for Nobles and employment policies. He suggested that the 1887 uprising was "not a Native Hawaiian revolution and cannot be considered of the people and for the people of this soil." Therefore, Hawaiians, including those Haole who were permanently settled in the country, needed to regain their political power. Widemann then spoke and pledged his support to the platform. McCarthy followed him, stating that he represented "retail storekeepers and workingmen" and spoke on the need to abolish the restrictions on voting for Nobles, and in favor of the anti-Chinese provisions as well as amendment of the puritanical and restrictive Sunday law. Walker, Bush and Lucas spoke next, all supporting the platform. Wilcox was the final speaker. He denied that he was against the "white race" and pointed out that he had not only lived among them, but married one. He was however committed to regaining the rights of his people.<sup>35</sup>

During the election campaign the *Elele* ceased publication and a daily newspaper, called *The National Herald - Ka Ahailono o Ka Lahui*, was produced in its place on behalf of the National Reform Party. Its content consisted mainly of reports of the National Reform Party meetings and exchanges of political shots with the *Advertiser* and occasionally the *Bulletin*. On January 16, the paper reported that Lyons had returned to work as editor of the paper. Thurston and W. A. Kinney also produced a newspaper

---

<sup>34</sup>*Pacific Commercial Advertiser*, January 7, 1890.

<sup>35</sup>*Pacific Commercial Advertiser*, January 9, 1890.

on behalf of the Reform Party, called the *Honolulu Daily Times*, which carried their views on the election issues. Ten issues were produced between January 25 and February 5.<sup>36</sup>

The National Reform party started off its Honolulu ward meetings in ward four on January 11, which was attended by about 200 people. Lucas, the candidate for that ward, opened the meeting, instructing voters in the details of the electoral process. He went on to say that the "election is one of the most important ever held in the country, as it was to decide whether the Hawaiian Islands were to be an independent kingdom or a large plantation peopled by slaves." McCarthy spoke next, saying that "he was proud to stand as a representative of workingmen, as he like his father, was a workingman." He discussed the Chinese question and pointed out that they had taken over the taro and poi industry from the Native Hawaiians. He also addressed the issue of reducing the property and income qualification and repealing the Sunday law. Wilcox followed him and "spoke of the injustice of the present government towards Native Hawaiians", citing differential pay rates to teachers based on race. He also claimed that "if the King had signed the ... treaty [with the United States] pressed on him, the independence of the country would be gone." He concluded with the words, "Vote straight for the ticket and the life of the land will be saved." The final speaker was Mr. D. M. Cowley who spoke on the lack of opportunity for young Hawaiians and also raised the issue of Japanese immigration, which the Government was trying to ignore.<sup>37</sup>

The ward meetings continued through the rest of the month, and were addressed by the candidates. Wilcox spoke at a number of these meetings and his fiery style often drew criticism from the Government side. He remained unrepentantly pro-Hawaiian. In at least a couple of speeches he suggested that the power of the King should be carefully increased, although this was not a National Reform party policy.

---

<sup>36</sup>Thurston, *Memoirs*, 211.

<sup>37</sup>*Daily Bulletin*, January 13, 1890.

A couple of special meetings were also organized for Portuguese voters, which were addressed by Marques. The ward three meeting, held on January 31, turned into a mass meeting attended by nearly 1500 people.<sup>38</sup>

Meanwhile, the Reform Party held its convention in Honolulu on January 15 and adopted a platform that followed the cabinet policy statement. The platform was short and is summarized as follows:

1. The maintenance of the autonomy and independence of the kingdom, while securing, at the same time, the amplest commercial benefits in our treaty relations with the United States.
2. Restriction of asiatic immigration to agricultural necessities and prohibition of Chinese not engaged in trade or the mechanical occupations from doing so.
3. Internal improvements and development of national resources.
4. Extension of the Homestead Act to facilitate the settlement of small landholders.
5. Honest, economical and efficient administration in all departments of government.

The candidates for all islands were also confirmed. They included Achi and Kaulukou as representatives for O'ahu. It appears that Kaulukou had intended to run as an independent candidate for the Ko'olaupoko district, and that the Reform Party had then decided to endorse him by adding his name to their ticket.<sup>39</sup>

A mass meeting was held by the Reform Party on January 20, attended by about 400 people, including about 40 Native Hawaiians. The platform was read to the meeting and then a number of the candidates had the chance to speak. The Hon. W. C. Wilder was the first to speak. He defended the record of the Reform Government by comparing it to that of the previous government. He then went on to comment on the National Reform Party candidates. He suggested that Macfarlane and Muller were standing out of personal grievances against the Government. He also noted that McCarthy had been a captain in the Honolulu rifles during the time of the Wilcox Rebellion and had resigned, according to Wilder, because he

---

<sup>38</sup>*National Herald*, January 14, 16, 17, 18, 21, 25, 29, February 1, 1890; *Pacific Commercial Advertiser*, January 29, 30, 1890; *Daily Bulletin*, January 30, February 1, 1890.

<sup>39</sup>*National Herald*, January 16, 20, 1890; *Pacific Commercial Advertiser*, January 20, 1890.

disagreed with the decision to try Wilcox for conspiracy rather than treason. Now he was standing on the same ticket as Wilcox. The other speakers continued in a similar vein.<sup>40</sup>

### **The Election Results**

The election was held on February 5. On O'ahu, there was a good turnout for the election, with over ninety percent of those registered casting a vote. The National Reform Party won all of the seats for Nobles and all but one of the seats for Representatives, which Bush lost by the small margin of 13 votes. However, the Reform Party gained the majority of the seats on the other islands. On the island of Hawai'i, four of the seats for Nobles went to Reform and two to independent candidates. Four of the Representatives were Reform Party and three were National Reform. On Maui, all six Nobles elected were Reform Party. Two of the Representatives were Reform and four were National Reform. On Kaua'i, all three Nobles and three Representatives were Reform Party candidates.

This meant that National Reform held 14 seats in the House of Representatives and 9 seats in the House of Nobles, while the Reform Party held 10 and 13 seats respectively. This gave each party 23 seats each, plus two seats held by independents.<sup>41</sup>

---

<sup>40</sup>*Pacific Commercial Advertiser*, January 21, 22, 1890; *National Herald*, January 21, 1890.

<sup>41</sup>*Daily Bulletin*, February 14, 1890.



## Discussion: The Campaign Issues and Strategies

There were three main themes around which the election issues can be discussed: good government, immigration and Hawaiian independence.

### *Good Government*

Both parties had their own concepts of what was involved in good government. For the Reform Party it meant a continuation of the structure of government as set out in the 1887 constitution, including the continuance of the property and income qualifications for voting for the House of Nobles. They defended this structure in terms of their honesty and efficiency in government, as well as their ability to provide for the economic development of the nation. As the cabinet policy stated, "the condition of the roads of a country is one of the surest indices of its civilization and advancement."<sup>42</sup> The record of the Reform government was constantly compared to the supposed evils of the government under the pre-1887 constitution. An article in the *Advertiser*, describing what the Reform Party had done, compared the centralization of power around the King in the 'bad old days' to the decentralization of power to the legislature under the new constitution. It concluded by suggesting that, if elected, the National Reform Party would reinstate the old order, with all its mistakes.<sup>43</sup>

This was a difficult argument for the National Reform Party to refute, since it would appear that there was considerable public opinion, especially amongst Haole, against any return to the former system. Their main counter-argument was that the power previously held by the King was now held by the four members of the cabinet, who were acting in a similar manner to the way the King used to. However, with the exception of Wilcox, none of the candidates publicly supported the reinstatement of any of the powers

---

<sup>42</sup>*Daily Bulletin*, December 18, 1889.

<sup>43</sup>*Pacific Commercial Advertiser*, January 11, 1890.

of the King. Their solution to better government was to opt for greater democracy, by reducing the property and income qualification and making certain offices elected by the people. Even Wilcox had to be careful to spell out that he only supported the reinstatement of limited rights to the King, such as a limited right to veto legislation.<sup>44</sup> The argument for the return to a more Hawaiian system of government, based around the monarchy, seems to have been lost at this stage.

The National Reform Party platform did include the revision of the constitution. But it was qualified by the following statement;

Such revision, made in a progressive and liberal spirit, keeping in view the political and social advancement of the country, and carefully guarding the people's liberties, would be the most efficacious and satisfactory method of eradicating forever all ideas of retrogression, which at present no intelligent man, Native or foreigner, can entertain without fear for our future safety and independence.<sup>45</sup>

The major argument then focussed on the property and income qualifications. The *Advertiser* was quite quick to raise its defense of the existing system. It proposed that for well balanced government there needed to be three branches - "the sovereign, emperor, king or president, the nobles or senators, and the representatives or commons". It suggested that if the same people elected both the Nobles and the Representatives, it would remove the necessary distinction between these two Houses. It believed that the voting qualifications selected out "a class of electors who are either land-holders or who by their industry have raised themselves above their fellows, so as to derive a larger income from their labor." It also believed that the income qualification was low enough "to include every industrious mechanic and laborer, and to exclude only the idle and the ignorant." In a later editorial it referred to the qualifications as "pre-eminently an intelligence qualification."<sup>46</sup>

---

<sup>44</sup>*National Herald*, January 20, 1890.

<sup>45</sup>*Daily Bulletin*, January 4, 1890.

<sup>46</sup>*Pacific Commercial Advertiser*, December 7, 10, 1889.

These arguments in favor of the qualifications were repeated in the Reform Party campaign speeches later. They clearly show the cultural belief that property and income were signs of responsibility, intelligence and hard work. This was not a belief which extended as far as the working classes, who knew that hard work, even in a skilled profession, did not always yield a reasonable income and that the rich were not always hard working, responsible or even intelligent. They saw the qualifications as protecting the privileges of a particular group of Haole property owners.

In a reply to the *Advertiser's* editorials, A. S. Hartwell, a Reform Party supporter, suggested that the problem had more to do with the Nobles and Representatives sitting together as a single body. In his opinion a single legislature was bound to become tyrannical with no check on its power. He suggested that if the Nobles were elected on a six year term and voted separately from the Representatives, then the voting qualifications could be reduced or removed while still maintaining a conservative check on legislation.<sup>47</sup>

The original policies of both the Hui and Union had been to abolish the qualifications altogether. The National Reform Party's declaration of principles included a pledge for a "liberal modification" of the qualifications "in order to include ... a worthy class of Natives, small land-owners and mechanics who are now unjustly debarred". The declaration then went on to state that the idea of splitting the legislature into two bodies, as proposed by Hartwell, should be considered. However, it did not suggest whether this could lead to an abolition of the voting qualifications.<sup>48</sup>

There was no public discussion of a return to appointment of Nobles by the King or some other system that would specifically favor the appointment of Native Hawaiians in order to preserve the Hawaiian control of the country. It seems that it had been conceded that royal appointment of Nobles did not ensure

---

<sup>47</sup>*Pacific Commercial Advertiser*, December 12, 1889.

<sup>48</sup>*Daily Bulletin*, January 4, 1890.

that Hawaiians or people of good qualifications would necessarily be appointed. Hawaiians had for a long time been critical of the number of Haole appointed to the House of Nobles and Haole had been critical in more recent years of the number of people appointed on the basis that they would support the King. The need for the National Reform Party to maintain the support of the Haole vote also meant that they could not propose any system that was seen to favor Hawaiians over Haole.

### *Immigration*

In early 1889, it had been anticipated that the major election issue would be the continuance of Chinese immigration. However, when it came to the platforms, both parties agreed on the issue. Both conceded that Asian labor was needed for the plantations. This was work that Haole laborers were not prepared to undertake, especially at the low rates of pay necessary to keep the plantations profitable. Both included a promise to prevent the Chinese who were not already doing so from engaging in occupations outside of plantation labor. National Reform wanted to go further and exclude Asians from being able to work on public projects.

The main difference in the platforms was in scope. The Reform Party's specifically addressed Chinese immigration, while omitting reference to Japanese. The Japanese made up the majority of the newly arriving plantation laborers. By addressing Chinese immigration only, it appears that the Reform Party hoped to keep attention away from the issue of Japanese laborers. However, the National Reform Party's platform addressed all Asian immigration.

### *Hawaiian Independence*

This was an issue that both parties also seemed to agree on. It is interesting in light of future events that they both realized that the majority of the voters wished Hawai'i to remain an independent nation. However, the Reform Party wanted to seek closer ties with the United States in order to preserve the profitability of the sugar industry. The National Reform Party candidates were quick to suggest that

the Reform cabinet would sell the country to America if it was required to maintain a profitable sugar industry. This was later cited as one of the issues that may have lost the Reform Party the support of non-American Haole voters.<sup>49</sup>

For the Native Hawaiians, the value of independence was obvious. Even the pro-Reform Party Hawaiian language newspaper *Kuokoa* was a staunch defender of independence. For Haole at this time, independence was also valued. There were two probable reasons. One was the cosmopolitan nature of the Haole community. No one national group within it wanted to see Hawai'i controlled by another nation, so maintenance of a policy of independent neutrality was the best compromise. The second was a reluctance to be ruled as a colony from either London or Washington. Independence allowed much more freedom of local politics.

#### *Campaign Strategies*

In a speech following the election victory, Noble D. W. Pua referred to the Union and the Hui "as older and younger brothers."<sup>50</sup> The vocabulary of Hawaiian kinship includes separate terms for siblings of the same gender as the speaker, according to whether the sibling is older or younger. This can be seen as a reflection of family politics, where the sexes were divided and hierarchies existed within each according to birth order. Pua's metaphor therefore calls on an important relationship in Hawaiian society. Since the Hui was formed first, it can be assumed that Pua was referring to it as the older brother and the Union as the younger brother. However, this did not mean that the Hui was in control of the coalition.

The coalition was a success in terms of getting its candidates elected, especially on O'ahu. But both sides had to pay a price. The Hui was unable to develop policies that might have led to an articulation

---

<sup>49</sup>Kuykendall, *Hawaiian Kingdom III*, 451-52.

<sup>50</sup>*National Herald*, February 8, 1890.

of a more general Native Hawaiian politic. There were a number of issues that they could not address because of the coalition. For instance, to insist on a policy of restricting the vote to citizens of the Kingdom in order to reduce the impact of the non-resident Haole vote was not possible, as the Union represented the political interests of a significant proportion of that particular group. Similarly, to push for the recognition of voting and civil rights for Chinese citizens, who were often closely connected with the Native Hawaiian community through intermarriage, would have found little sympathy and probably much hostility with the Union.

For the Union, the price seems to have been less. The policies agreed to in the platform cover the range that would be expected from such an organization. The main points of compromise appear to have been on the issue of removing the qualifications for voting for the House of Nobles and electing all government officials. However, this may have been the result of a more sober analysis of the situation by both Union and Hui committee members. Their main compromise must have been one of association. Although the facade of unity was maintained throughout the election, for many of the members the association with such ardent Hawaiian nationalists such as Wilcox and Bush must have been less than comfortable. It is likely that a number of the supporters of the Union would have been involved in the campaign against the Gibson ministry and in favor of the 1887 constitution, and as Wilder pointed out in his speech, at least one of the candidates was a member of the Honolulu Rifles during the Wilcox rebellion.

It was the Union had the greater power within the coalition. It could provide the critical votes needed to get candidates into the House of Nobles. The Hui could no doubt have gotten its own representatives into the lower house without Union assistance, and in fact the ticket for the House of Representatives reflected this. The problem was that Native Hawaiians were in a distinct minority amongst voters for Nobles. Therefore the policies of the National Reform Party had to meet the concerns of middle class mechanics and businessmen ahead of all other groups.

One of the most intriguing aspects of the campaign was the extent of side switching. Widemann's move from the Reform Party to the National Reform Party is not particularly surprising. He had been a member of the early cabinets during the reign of Kalākaua, but had apparently not been a part of the Gibson ministries. It is likely therefore that he supported the Reform Party initially as a reaction to the Gibson period. However, as a royalist he was an outsider in that Party and the move to support the National Reform party was the next logical choice for him. Achi's defection to the Reform Party is a little harder to understand. He had been active in opposing the 1887 constitution and later in the attempt to reform the Hui along with Bush. It may have been this experience that pushed him over to the Reform Party. Having been disillusioned with the infighting in the Hui or because he found that he could not secure a position of power within it, he may have decided to try his luck with the Reform Party. The strangest side switch was Kaulukou's. It appears that the Reform Party chose him, rather than the other way around. We have no information as to why he chose to stand as an independent in the first place and it seems like blatant opportunism on the part of the Reform Party to add him to their slate. After all, he was closely associated with the Gibson ministry and had first been elected to the legislature while holding a government office. This was one of the pre-1887 practices that the Reform Party had been strongly critical of.

One of the key themes used by both parties was that of racial issues against the overall interests of the Hawaiian kingdom. The Reform Party emphasized that they were interested in national development to benefit all races. They actively recruited Native Hawaiian candidates in order to prove their support for them and avoid the perception of being an all-Haole party. They tried to convince the public that the National Reform Party would give greater privileges to Native Hawaiians and were stirring up racial antagonism. The National Reform Party actually took a line similar to that of the Reform Party. They were quick to point out that they were not anti-Haole, but rather against the control of the country by a particular class of Haole, namely the sugar planters.

The other voting group, whose support both parties were out to capture, were the Portuguese. Both sides had Portuguese candidates, Marques for National Reform and Gonsalves for Reform. It appears that the Portuguese gave most of their support to National Reform. National Reform held a number of meetings especially for the Portuguese. This was important given that their command of English was limited, excluding them from fully participating in many of the regular political meetings. The National Reform Party also had a more strongly worded anti-Chinese policy, an issue which was very important to the Portuguese, and finally, it did not represent the interests of the sugar planters, who were bosses to many of the Portuguese.

The National Reform Party succeeded in gaining influence within the legislature. With an evenly divided legislature, it would now be a test of how real the bonds of the coalition were. The final chapter will examine their record during the 1890 legislative session.



## CHAPTER 8

### NATIONAL REFORM PARTY IN GOVERNMENT, 1890

#### Events Between the Election and the 1890 Legislative Session

##### *Wilcox in the Cabinet?*

According to the constitution, the cabinet remained in office until voted out by the legislature. The possibility that the legislature could pass a vote of want of confidence in the cabinet and demand a new cabinet led to an immediate campaign to promote Robert Wilcox as a cabinet member or even as premier. Within a couple of days, Bush's paper, *Ka Oiaio*, ran an article claiming that Wilcox was entitled to be a member of the new cabinet, on account of the fact that he secured the largest majority.<sup>1</sup> A similar article in *Ka Leo o Ka Lahui* followed in early March. It asserted that Wilcox was the proper candidate for Premier and listed his qualities, which included his education, his recognition of "the poor and the low", his love for his people, and that he "will save his race, ... will stop the mournings of the people and will stop the shedding of tears on the highway". It also stated that he would not *ho'opilimea'ai* "behind these graspers of riches who are fond of honor."<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Quoted in *Pacific Commercial Advertiser*, February 10, 1890.

<sup>2</sup>Translated from *Ka Leo o Ka Lahui*, March 3, 1890 and reprinted in *Pacific Commercial Advertiser*, March 29, 1890.

*Ho'opilimea'ai* literally means close association for food. It describes attaching oneself for personal gain, as to an *Ali'i* and is often used disparagingly. Pukui and Elbert, *Dictionary*, 330.

This was apparently not well received by some of the Haole members of the National Reform Party. There were rumors that they wished to minimize Wilcox's role, even though they realized that he had gained them a significant proportion of the Native Hawaiian vote.<sup>3</sup>

The *Advertiser* reprinted the above articles in an attempt to discredit Wilcox and his supporters within the National Reform Party. In late March, it also reprinted a letter from Wilcox to Celso C. Moreno, an old friend and one time Premier of Hawai'i, who the missionary planters had bitterly opposed. The letter had been published in the *Washington Bee*. In the letter, Wilcox declared that the rule of the missionary planters was over. He suggested that the new legislature would impeach Chief Justice Judd for his role in allowing the 1887 constitution to be put in place, as well as impeaching Hawai'i's representative in Washington, Carter, for his role in the treaty negotiations of the previous year. He also stated that the National Reform Party would have got more seats in the legislature if it had not been for the Reform Party threatening and bribing voters to support them.<sup>4</sup> It is clear from the letter that Wilcox had unrealistic expectations of what the National Reform Party could achieve in the legislature and how its members would behave.

#### *The Election of Bush*

In early April, the election of National Reform Party Representative J. N. Paikuli for the Ko'olau district of O'ahu was declared invalid, because of incorrectly cast votes. He had been elected over Kaulukou by a vote of 130 to 128. The petitioners on behalf of Kaulukou proved that two of the votes cast were invalid, thus invalidating his election. A special election was then held. National Reform took

---

<sup>3</sup>Kuykendall, *Hawaiian Kingdom III*, 455.

<sup>4</sup>*Pacific Commercial Advertiser*, March 31, 1890.

advantage of the opportunity to get Bush elected to the legislature and nominated him. Kaulukou ran again against him. Bush was elected by a vote of 171 to 107.<sup>5</sup>

*The Treaty Negotiations with the United States*

On March 17, news from Washington indicated that the republican congress was likely to adopt the plan of removing sugar duties on imports. This was expected to flood the market with cheaper overseas sugar. In order to prevent the squeezing out of the Louisiana and Florida producers, who did not have access to cheap foreign labor, a bounty of two cents per pound was being proposed for domestic producers. These changes would seriously threaten the competitive advantage that Hawaiian producers had enjoyed over other foreign producers by virtue of the reciprocity treaty.<sup>6</sup>

The cabinet met immediately to discuss the need to revive the treaty negotiations in order to maintain Hawai'i's competitive advantage. In an attempt to avoid the problems of the previous year, the cabinet decided to invite representatives of the sugar industry and members of the National Reform Party to meet with them to discuss the treaty. The meeting was attended by eighteen of the largest sugar plantation owners and two National Reform members, namely Macfarlane and Marques. The meeting decided that the cabinet should continue with the negotiations of the draft treaty, but without the controversial Article 4, which required Hawai'i to inform the United States of any negotiations it might enter into with other powers. Some of the planters were keen that Hawai'i should be free to negotiate with Canada or other buyers in case the United States negotiated further reciprocity treaties with the sugar producing republics of Central America, which would again remove their competitive advantage. The two National Reform Party members present took no part in the discussion or the decisions.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup>*Daily Bulletin*, March 25, 26, 27, 28, April 8, 9, May 15, 1890.

<sup>6</sup>*Daily Bulletin*, March 17, 18, 1890.

<sup>7</sup>*Daily Bulletin*, April 1, 2, 1890; Kuykendall, *Hawaiian Kingdom III*, 456-57.

Public opinion was divided on the necessity of renegotiating the treaty at this stage. The *Advertiser* reprinted an excerpt from "J. E. Bush's paper" where he states that he had originally supported the reciprocity treaty, believing that it would make all Hawaiians rich. But the wealth had gone to only a few Haole, while nearly all of the Native Hawaiian planters had gone out of business. He blamed this on high interest rates from the Haole banks and other cunning means on the part of Haole to keep the Native Hawaiians out of the competition. In its own editorial, the *Advertiser* was scornful of attempts to maintain complete Hawaiian independence at the risk of losing the sugar trade and making everyone poor. The *Bulletin* had a somewhat more sober analysis, suggesting that the loss of the treaty might harm the fortune hunters but there was a wide gap between that and total ruin of the country. It also thought it very unlikely that the United States would pay the bounty to any overseas producers, so it would be better just to wait and see how it all turned out.<sup>8</sup>

The cabinet was also divided on the treaty. Attorney General Ashford had recently returned from a visit to Canada, where he had unofficially discussed the development of trade relations between Hawai'i and Canada with top officials. He opposed the immediate renewal of the treaty and advised the King that he did not have to sign the commission authorizing the negotiation of the treaty. Both Ashford and the King believed that it was a matter that should be discussed by the new legislature when it met. This meant that nothing more could be done on it until that time.<sup>9</sup>

#### *Rumored Insurrection*

During April, Marshal John H. Soper received information that an insurrection, similar to the one of the previous year, was being organized. The reports implicated Wilcox and V. V. Ashford, Colonel of the Honolulu Rifles and brother of Attorney General Clarence Ashford. Soper decided to increase the police

---

<sup>8</sup>*Pacific Commercial Advertiser*, April 1, 1890; *Daily Bulletin*, April 2, 1890.

<sup>9</sup>Kuykendall, *Hawaiian Kingdom III*, 457.

patrols as a precautionary measure. This led to an argument within the cabinet, because Soper had bypassed the Attorney General in making his decision. The Attorney General believed that the actions were not only unnecessary, but could have been counterproductive. However, the majority of the cabinet supported the Marshall's actions. The National Reform Party legislators for O'ahu held a caucus and passed a resolution condemning Soper's actions "as being not only hurtful to the well-being and good repute of the community, but also dangerous to the general peace." There was a clear suspicion that the rumors and the actions were invented as a means of casting suspicion on members of the National Reform Party. No evidence was ever produced to support them.<sup>10</sup>

### **National Reform Party Versus the Cabinet**

On May 21, the 1890 legislature was opened by His Majesty the King with all the ceremony befitting a constitutional monarchy. One of the first matters raised was which rules of order the legislature would follow. Noble Macfarlane moved that the rules of 1886 be adopted. Reform Party members quickly objected that the rules of 1888 were preferable as they were in line with the 1887 constitution. The 1888 rules were then adopted. It seems that Macfarlane's motion was mainly to score a political point. Noble Walker, of the National Reform Party was elected President over Reform Party candidate Cecil Brown by a vote of 28 to 24. The President then nominated the standing committees, most of which had National Reform Party majorities.<sup>11</sup>

It appeared then that the National Reform Party had the greater support in the legislature. In order to have full control it was necessary for the National Reform Party to demonstrate that the cabinet could

---

<sup>10</sup>Kuykendall, *Hawaiian Kingdom III*, 458; *Daily Bulletin*, April 24, 25, May 2, 1890.

<sup>11</sup>*Daily Bulletin*, May 21, 22, 1890.

not be trusted and win a vote of want of confidence in them. Two issues were used by National Reform to attack the cabinet. The first was the renewal of the reciprocity treaty with the United States, and the second was Marshall Soper's action concerning the rumored insurrection.

#### *Treaty Controversy Reviewed*

On May 27, Representative Kalua moved that because of the conflict within the cabinet concerning the proposed treaty with the United States and because of allegations made by the Attorney General that the treaty would be prejudicial to Hawaiian independence, which was confirmed by the published draft, the Minister of Foreign Affairs be required to lay down all correspondence with Washington regarding the treaty, including copies of correspondence between the State Department and the Hawaiian representative and minutes of cabinet meetings where the treaty was discussed, from January 1, 1889. There was much discussion of the motion, but it was passed without dissent.<sup>12</sup>

Minister Austin provided his reply regarding the treaty on June 2 and it was then referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, which was charged with investigating whether the proposed treaty was prejudicial to Hawaiian independence. The committee interviewed all four members of the cabinet separately and read through the material provided to them and reported three days later. Noble Baldwin of the Reform Party was on the committee but did not sign the report. Instead he produced a minority report, which was tabled on June 13.<sup>13</sup>

The majority report was signed by Marques (chair), Crabbe, Bush and J. T. Baker, all of whom were National Reform Party members. It stated that the documents furnished to them by Minister of Foreign Affairs Austin had been insufficient and so they had called on each of the cabinet ministers. All

---

<sup>12</sup>*Daily Bulletin*, May 27, 1890.

<sup>13</sup>*Daily Bulletin*, June 2, 5, 13, 1890.

the ministers were forthcoming, with the exception of Austin, who they charged with disrespect towards the House. Specifically, he had only given documents since September 24, 1889, not January 1, as requested; he had failed to give key correspondence with Hawaiian Representative Carter; he had not given any minutes of cabinet meetings; and he had claimed that most of his correspondence with Carter was by means of private and personal letters, rather than official diplomatic communications, which he claimed as private property. The report then went on to reconstruct the sequence of events regarding the treaty as best it could from the information available. The committee concluded that "our general impression is that a certain duplicity has never been absent from all the transactions of the present cabinet in respect of the treaty matter, and outside of the testimony of the Attorney General, it seems very conclusive that if everything had been straightforward, there would have been no reason for obstructing our investigations."<sup>14</sup>

Baldwin's minority report claimed that the majority report was strongly partisan and prepared in haste. He suggested that it exhibited a gross ignorance of diplomatic procedure and defended the actions of Austin with regard to the use of private correspondence for diplomatic business and his right to withhold information that might be prejudicial to Hawai'i's international relations if it were made public. Following the presentation of Baldwin's report, Austin made his reply to the House. He stated that there was no correspondence prior to September 24, nor were there any official minutes of cabinet meetings. He also defended the use of private letters to carry out correspondence of a preliminary nature. He stated that he had always been opposed to annexation or protectorate status for Hawai'i.<sup>15</sup>

#### *The Debate between Ashford, Thurston and Wilcox*

On May 27, Noble Crabbe questioned the Attorney General as to the causes of keeping a special police force in Honolulu during the last two months. He was followed by Noble Muller, who asked if an

---

<sup>14</sup>*Daily Bulletin*, June 6 - supplement, 1890.

<sup>15</sup>*Daily Bulletin*, June 13, 14, 1890.

armed force had been kept at the Station House and, if so, why? He went on to ask if there were any reasons to expect a disturbance, if so on what authority it was believed such a disturbance might occur and whether the cabinet sanctioned the actions. In the afternoon, Representative White, of the Reform Party, introduced a resolution that because of the excitement raised by "preparations of war" made by the marshal, the ministry be requested to explain what grounds existed for alarm.<sup>16</sup>

On June 2, Attorney General Ashford replied to Crabbe and Muller's questions. He stated that he did not know the cause of the marshal's preparations. The marshal had refused to give him information on the grounds of confidentiality of sources. He agreed that an unwarranted display of force had been made and had presented an order to the cabinet for the marshal's removal. However the cabinet had deferred on it and alleged that Wilcox and V. V. Ashford were organizing trouble. Prime Minister Thurston asked for the right of reply.<sup>17</sup>

Thurston gave his reply on June 6. He admitted that the Marshall had acted on the wishes of the majority of the cabinet and stated that he should be thanked for it. He claimed that V. V. Ashford and Wilcox were contemplating a disturbance and the Attorney General was involved in it. He went on to explain that Wilcox had organized a conspiracy to dethrone the King and overthrow the government in late 1887 and charged that a number of his co-conspirators were now in the House. Thurston went on to claim that he had allowed Wilcox to leave the country in 1888 out of sympathy for his wife. On his return in 1889, he had organized a rebellion and glorified in what he had done. After the elections there were rumors that he was planning to overturn the government and Thurston was tipped off to this by Antone Rosa. Thurston claimed that Wilcox had been jubilant regarding the election and had expected to be party leader, but others had expressed their opposition. He went on to claim that Wilcox had suspected his Haole

---

<sup>16</sup>*Daily Bulletin*, May 28, 1890.

<sup>17</sup>*Daily Bulletin*, June 2, 1890.



supporters of turning on him and put feelers out regarding the possibility of organizing another uprising. He had gotten mixed support. Thurston then went on to charge V. V. Ashford with complicity in the 1889 rebellion and then going on to attack the cabinet through the papers. Thurston stated that he distrusted the Attorney General because he had not informed the cabinet of what he had been doing on his recent trip to Canada had instructed the King to ignore the instructions of the Supreme Court that he must sign all documents agreed to by the cabinet, in relation to the signing of the commission for the renegotiation of the treaty. Thurston concluded that he had felt justified in supporting increased security, given V. V. Ashford's disaffection and Clarence Ashford's actions against the cabinet.<sup>18</sup>

Clarence Ashford claimed the right of reply on June 9, which was given to him after some debate. He claimed that Thurston had acted outside the law by giving orders to the marshall, which only the Attorney General could do. He had made accusations against Wilcox and V. V. Ashford on very little evidence, to which V. V. Ashford had no right of reply. He pointed out the cabinet, not just Wilcox, had also been involved in conspiracies against the King in late 1887 and that V. V. Ashford was clearly on the government side during the actions he led against the 1889 rebellion. He pointed out the hypocrisy of denouncing a revolutionist when one is in power by virtue of a revolution. He went on to defend his right to talk privately with the Canadian Prime Minister and press, when he was invited to, and stated that he had offered to give the cabinet a full briefing, but they had not found the time to listen to him. With regards to his advice to the King, he defended his actions by stating that the Supreme Court decision was not a properly constituted opinion, since there had been no chance for opposing views to be argued in court. Therefore it was the private opinion of the Judges and of no more weight than that of any other three intelligent people. He believed that he had acted correctly in his position as Attorney General in instructing the King not to be bound by it. The other cabinet Ministers were angry with him for this action and told

---

<sup>18</sup>*Daily Bulletin*, June 6, 7, 1890.

him, "That action of yours will damn you out of the country." He claimed that they then concocted the conspiracy on the part of Wilcox and V. V. Ashford to damn him through his brother.

Thurston then replied to Ashford's reply and denied certain points. He said, "If it was parliamentary I would say that the Attorney General is the most cold-blooded falsifier I have ever heard. But as it is not parliamentary, I will not say it." He went on to deny that he had been a part of the conspiracies to dethrone the King.<sup>19</sup>

The next day, Wilcox replied to Thurston's allegations. He stated that on his return from Italy in 1887, he had discovered that Native Hawaiians had little to gain from the new constitution and that few had been given government offices. He himself had failed to obtain an appropriate job and had gotten a far better one in San Francisco. He had returned in 1889 to raise up his down trodden people and started to arrange meetings to discuss action. He then went on to detail the rebellion and his role in it. He claimed that he had not had occasion to act after the elections, since his party had the majority.<sup>20</sup>

#### *A New Cabinet Appointed*

The public argument between the cabinet ministers had raised considerable public concern. On June 12, Noble Pua presented the House with a petition from 800 signatories demanding the removal of the present ministry because they had endeavored to give away the independence of the country, encouraged disturbances, were not in accord with one another, had not apprehended those who shot Wilcox's men without authority on July 30, 1889, and had not prevented a large importation of opium.<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup>*Daily Bulletin*, June 9, 10, 12, 1890.

<sup>20</sup>*Daily Bulletin*, June 10, 1890.

<sup>21</sup>*Daily Bulletin*, June 12, 1890.

On June 13, following Austin's reply to the majority report of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Widemann proposed a motion of want of confidence in the cabinet because of its irreconcilable differences. Representative Brown, of the Reform Party, amended the motion to one of no-confidence in the Attorney General on account of him advising the King not to sign the commission for the treaty, against the advice of the Supreme Court. The Attorney General's actions, he claimed, were "illegal, revolutionary, unconstitutional, and contrary to his oath of office."

There was a long debate following the resolutions in which Ashford claimed he had not acted illegally, and even if he had, that the independence of the country was more important than the letter of the constitution, quoting Abraham Lincoln in his defence. Wilcox stated that he had been elected to try all the Ministers and not just one, stating "the Minister of the Interior and the Attorney General gained their offices through revolution, and if they had their deserts they would be tried by court martial and shot." He then went on to attack the Supreme Court. Representative Nāwahī, also of the National Reform Party, stated that the people were tired of the quarrels and wanted new Ministers in office. McCarthy pointed out that the election showed the want of confidence in the Ministry.

After a long debate, Brown's amendment failed by a tied vote of 24 to 24, which was more or less voted according to party affiliation, Reform party in favor and National Reform against. Thurston then announced the cabinet's resignations.<sup>22</sup> It is likely that if they had not resigned they would have been voted out by the want of confidence motion.

The King accepted the cabinet's resignations and requested they remain in office until a new cabinet could be appointed. He then invited John A. Cummins to head the new Ministry and select his fellow Ministers. The new cabinet consisted of Cummins (Minister of Foreign Affairs), Godfrey Brown,

---

<sup>22</sup>*Daily Bulletin*, June 14, 16, 1890.

(Minister of Finance), Charles N. Spencer (Minister of the Interior) and Arthur P. Peterson (Attorney General). Cummins was the only member of the legislature in the new cabinet, and he resigned his seat as a Noble. The House was then adjourned until June 30, to give the new Ministry a chance to settle in.<sup>23</sup>

The *Bulletin* described the new cabinet as conservative and largely non-partisan. It described it as a safe choice which failed to fulfil the predictions of the more radical Reform Party members. The *Advertiser* described the new Ministry as "so much better than it was feared". Cummins was believed to be conservative. Brown was experienced and although he had fallen out with the Reform Party, he was still loyal to the principles of the 1887 constitution. Peterson was described as an able but conservative lawyer and Spencer as inexperienced but able. The *Elele* stated that the National Reform Party had fulfilled its election pledge and "given us a Ministry representative of the interests of the Kingdom as a whole and strictly without class distinctions", which would be "acceptable and satisfactory to a large majority of the voters." It went on to describe them as conservative, capable and patriotic and pointed out that the majority were identified with the National Reform Party, which was probably true. The *Nupepa Kuokoa* noted that with the exception of Brown that all were new to cabinet positions, but was generally supportive of the choice.<sup>24</sup>

The cabinet announced their policies to the legislature on July 2. Their policies were "to promote such legislation as will be conducive to the benefit of all classes," in favor of "liberal appropriations for internal improvements," especially deepening the entrance to Honolulu Harbor, "to promote efficient and economical administration of public affairs" and last but not least, "to preserve the independence and

---

<sup>23</sup>*Daily Bulletin*, June 16, 17, 1890.

<sup>24</sup>*Daily Bulletin*, June 17, 1890; *Pacific Commercial Advertiser*, June 18, 1890; *Ka Elele*, June 21, 1890; *Nupepa Kuokoa*, June 21, 1890.

autonomy of the Kingdom."<sup>25</sup> This was a fairly safe and conservative policy, aimed at pleasing both parties.

The election of Cummin's replacement in the House of Nobles was announced for July 9. The National Reform Party proposed C. O. Berger as their candidate and held a mass meeting on June 28 to ratify the nomination. Berger had stood unsuccessfully for the Party on Maui in the February election. He was married to a Native Hawaiian woman and had a family in Hawai'i. His opponent from the Reform Party was Mr. Alexander Young, who had been manager of the Honolulu Iron Works for about twenty years. His nomination was ratified at a mass meeting on July 2. The election result was overwhelmingly in favor of Berger, who got 971 votes, compared to 535 for Young.<sup>26</sup>

#### **The Proposed Constitutional Convention**

Once the new cabinet was in power, the next task for several National Reform Party members was to amend, revise or entirely rewrite the constitution. There does not seem to have been a united Party strategy on this and certainly it was not a cabinet policy. In early July there were a number of private members' bills introduced concerning the constitution. On June 30, Representative J. W. Kalua gave notice of "a bill to authorize His Majesty to call a convention for the purposes of making a Constitution". On July 1, Representative Marques gave notice of "a bill to amend and revise the Constitution". The next day, following the announcement of the cabinet policy, Representative Nāwahī moved that "whereas it is the universal wish of the people to have a constitution giving equal rights to all, the Ministers be requested to state if they intend to bring forward a new constitution this session." Minister Brown's immediate response

---

<sup>25</sup>*Daily Bulletin*, July 2, 1890.

<sup>26</sup>*Daily Bulletin*, June 18, 26, 30, July 1, 3, 10, 1890.

was that the cabinet would need time to consider a reply. But the resolution was then ruled out of order by the President of the legislature, who said that the honorable member "might as well ask the Ministers if they intended to hold a revolution." On July 10, Representative Kama'i gave notice of "a bill to amend certain articles and add certain articles to the Constitution."<sup>27</sup>

On July 19, a mass meeting was called by Bush and Wilcox to discuss the holding of a constitutional convention. Speeches were made by Bush, Wilcox, Nāwahī and Lyons and a committee of twenty-six was appointed to follow up the actions of the meeting.<sup>28</sup>

The first meeting of the Hawaiian National Committee, as it was called, was held on July 24. Meetings were then held regularly through to October. The minutes that were kept of the meetings tell nothing of the political discussions that went on, but do provide an outline of their organizational plan. The Committee was headed by J. K. Kaulia as President, with Isaac H. Sherwood, Secretary, S. K. Aki, Treasurer and C. B. Dwight, Notary Public. All the members of the Committee were sworn not to reveal the business of the meetings to anyone outside of the Committee. The first business of the Committee was to seek an audience with His Majesty the King and to send out petitions to each electoral district asking for support for the holding of a constitutional convention. Each district was asked to send a delegation to meet with the National Committee in Honolulu on August 9. At that meeting there were delegates present from O'ahu, Maui, parts of the island of Hawai'i and one district of Kaua'i. The audience with the King was arranged for August 14.<sup>29</sup>

---

<sup>27</sup>*Daily Bulletin*, June 30, July 2, 11, 1890.

<sup>28</sup>*Daily Bulletin*, July 21, 1890.

<sup>29</sup>Hawaiian National Committee Appertaining to the Matter of Approaching His Majesty the King for the Purpose of Forming a New Constitution, "Minutes," typescript translation by Bruce Cartwright (Honolulu:Archives of Hawaii, 1928).

On August 14, the Committee, consisting of 48 representatives, being the same number as in the legislature, marched to Palace, led by the Royal Hawaiian Band. The delegates marched two abreast behind the Hawaiian flag and were led by George Mackham, carrying the petitions, and Palekaluhi, carrying the resolution. They were all dressed in tall hats, full dress suits and white gloves. About 500 people had gathered to watch their arrival at the Palace. The Committee went inside and met with the King and his chamberlain and Ministers Cummins and Brown as representatives of the cabinet. The petition was presented by Judge S. K. Mahoe. The petitioners requested to "present the sentiment of the Nation ... for the benefit of the Crown, the country and the people." It stated that as the King was forced to abolish the old constitution, without being allowed proper time to consider the new one and to consult with His subjects, and that as electoral rights given in the old constitution have been taken away and as His subjects were forced to swear under the new one in order to maintain their electoral rights, and on account of many objections to the present constitution "obstructing all manner of work and promotion of peace in the land, as well as perfect personal safety, hitherto enjoyed by Your independent Government of Hawaii nei," it is resolved that "our King request the legislature to enact a Law authorizing You to call a convention for the purpose of drafting a suitable and equitable Constitution for Your Kingdom immediately after the prorogation of the Assembly in 1890."<sup>30</sup>

The King replied that he would submit the matter to the legislature and would request them to take steps to carry out the desires expressed in the petition. The delegation appeared pleased with the outcome and marched back to their headquarters, where several impromptu speeches were made. A mass meeting was planned for that night to present the report of the delegation. While all of this was going on, the legislature continued to sit and conduct its business, in spite of Bush and Wilcox's attempts to obtain a recess.<sup>31</sup>

---

<sup>30</sup>*Daily Bulletin*, August 14, 1890.

<sup>31</sup>*Ibid.*

The King took the petition to the legislature the following day, without consultation with his cabinet. On the same day, Kalua's bill for the convention was introduced. On August 18 Noble Phillips read two bills for specific amendments to the constitution, one to enable to the legislature to restrict the activities of Chinese laborers and the other to reduce the property qualification for voting for Nobles to \$1,500 and the income qualification to \$500. The bills, along with the petition, were referred to a select committee established to consider bills relating to the constitution, which consisted of Kalua, Baldwin, Marsden, Ho'okano, Widemann, Marques, Kanoa, G. N. Wilcox and Paehaole.<sup>32</sup>

The Hawaiian National Committee continued to meet until early October. They appear to have intended to establish themselves as a permanent body with a constitution and permanent office. Most of their activities after August 14 seem to have been aimed at maintaining the organization and probably at the collection of further petitions for the convention. It was reported by the Select Committee later that 4,800 people had signed these petitions.<sup>33</sup>

Many members of the Haole community were alarmed at the idea of a constitutional convention. They were afraid that it would lead to civil unrest and reinstatement of all or part of the old system of government. The American and British commissioners were approached by "the leading member of the cabinet and the most conservative of the legislature" to meet with the King and try and dissuade him from supporting the convention. They met with him on August 18 and advised him that it would be better to make changes through the provisions of the existing constitution, "to go outside that would be to get on dangerous and Revolutionary ground." Kalākaua was not happy with this intervention in domestic politics and wrote to London suggesting the British commissioner be replaced.<sup>34</sup>

---

<sup>32</sup>*Daily Bulletin*, August 16, 18, 19, 1890; Kuykendall, *Hawaiian Kingdom III*, 463.

<sup>33</sup>Hawaiian National Committee, "Minutes"; *Daily Bulletin*, September 29, 1890.

<sup>34</sup>Kuykendall, *Hawaiian Kingdom III*, 463.



On September 6, the Mechanics' Union held a well attended meeting where the matters of want of confidence in the current cabinet and the constitutional convention were raised. (The want of confidence in the cabinet had arisen from an exchange of questions between Marques and Minister Brown in the House a few days before and will be discussed later.) The meeting appointed a committee of five to organize a mass meeting to pass resolutions on these matters. The decisions were made without discussion or dissent. The *Bulletin* reported that Mr. Crowley had objected at the meeting to dealing with such important issues in "so summary a fashion".<sup>35</sup>

The mass meeting was held on September 9 in the name of the National Reform Party. Several hundred attended the meeting. The committee had abandoned the want of confidence issue and focussed exclusively on the constitutional convention. The speakers included key figures in the Hawaiian National Committee, along with their supporters from the legislature, namely Quinn, Kaneakua, Kaunamano, Kaneali'i, Bush, Nāwahī, Wilcox, William White and Kiha. Bush spoke on how the "new constitution would be one that every man, woman and child in the kingdom would have a hand in framing." He claimed that there was nothing in the present constitution to prevent the holding of the convention and that the present constitution "was illegal itself." Wilcox urged Native Hawaiians to crowd the Legislative Hall when the enabling act for the convention came up for discussion. He added "that any National Reform Party member voting against it ought to be torn limb from limb." The *Bulletin* commented that "the audience was in very good humor, giving the impression that they looked on the proceedings as a farce. They laughed at the hottest appeals and greeted fresh orators with cries for Kaulukou and others not of the party."<sup>36</sup> This may reflect a lack of popular support for Wilcox's sentiments or it may have been the result of an attempt by the Reform Party and its supporters to stack the meeting.

---

<sup>35</sup>*Daily Bulletin*, September 6, 1890.

<sup>36</sup>*Daily Bulletin*, September 10, 1890

In the legislature the same day, during a discussion on the military bill, Wilcox responded to a suggestion that Hawai'i did not need a military by saying that "there was a danger of another bloody revolution and the streets being made sticky with blood, if the wishes of the people were to be persistently thwarted as at present. It would be a worse revolution than that of 1887, and some of the finest buildings in Honolulu would be blown up. He would take a hand in it himself if the rights of the people were not granted." He then accused Noble McCarthy of working for his own Native country rather than Hawai'i.<sup>37</sup> While this was an isolated outburst of emotion by Wilcox, it alarmed some of the Haole community and the British and American representatives. The latter instructed the commanders of their national ships to be on alert in case of emergency.<sup>38</sup>

On September 23, the majority report of the select committee on constitutional amendments was presented, signed by six of the nine members. They declared that the bill providing for the convention was unconstitutional but that the legislature could pass any amendments to the constitution that it wished to. Of the other three members of the committee, Representative Ho'okano generally supported the report but had doubts on some specific points, and Representative Marques and Noble Widemann opted to present a minority report. The majority report was debated briefly and then deferred for discussion on September 29.<sup>39</sup>

The main issue addressed in the report and in the discussion was whether the existing constitution allowed for the holding of a convention. The majority report took the line that because the constitution did not provide specifically for a convention, it would be unconstitutional to hold one. They cited the case of Rhode Island, where there had been much opposition to the constitution because it contained property and

---

<sup>37</sup>Ibid.

<sup>38</sup>Kuykendall, *Hawaiian Kingdom III*, 464.

<sup>39</sup>*Daily Bulletin*, September 23, 24, 1890.

income qualifications for voting for the Senate. A constitutional convention had been held, even though there was no provision in the constitution to do so, but the outcome of the convention did not meet with wide public agreement. As a result there were riots and the United States Supreme Court was called upon to make a decision. They ruled that the convention was unconstitutional because there was no provision in the constitution for holding it. The committee was concerned that exactly the same thing could happen in Hawai'i.

The promoters of the convention believed that just because the constitution had no provisions for a convention, it did not prevent the legislature from passing a law to enable the King to call one. They also opposed the use of United States case law to justify a legal position in Hawai'i. Instead they referred to the precedent set by King Kamehameha V in calling a constitutional convention in 1864, after which he proclaimed the constitution which lasted until 1887. While not fully supporting the convention, Ho'okano suggested that the constitutionality of the convention should be decided by the Supreme Court rather than the select committee.

From the debate on the report, it is clear that the promoters of the convention saw its function as being to some degree symbolic. They were not after the total reinstatement of the old constitution so much as the removal of the existing one. They viewed the existing one as having been forced on the King and the Hawaiian people without the proper chance for them to be able to consider it. The convention therefore would do away with the constitution that had been imposed on them and allow them to write one of their own making. In all likelihood the convention would probably retain many of the provisions of the 1887 constitution. The opponents of the convention were concerned that the convention would not achieve anything. The existing constitution, which they had sworn to support as members of the legislature, would have to be abrogated and then the fate of the country would be left to 48 delegates, who might or might not be able to agree on a new constitution. Even if they did agree, the new constitution might not be

accepted by some group of the nation, leading to further civil unrest. Their preference therefore was for careful amendment of the constitution through the legislature.

After three days of debate on the reports and the bill to enable the calling of the convention, the majority report was accepted by a vote of 24 to 16. This effectively defeated the bill.<sup>40</sup>

The select committee met for the next couple of weeks to consider a number of bills that had been introduced to amend specific provisions of the constitution. On October 18, they presented their report in favor of several of these amendments. These included reducing the property qualification for voting for Nobles to \$1 000, adding a clause enabling the legislature to restrict the immigration and activities of agricultural laborers of any nationality, increasing the maximum compensation for members of the legislature from \$250 to \$500 for each biennial session, and restricting voting rights to subjects of the Kingdom rather than just residents. This last change also involved specifying that candidates for the House of Nobles must be males, a matter which appears to have been overlooked by mistake when the constitution was written.<sup>41</sup>

The amendments were debated on November 6. There were some differences of opinion regarding the voting qualification changes. There was unanimous support for specifying that Nobles must be male. Nāwahi commented that the current wording could allow a woman to stand and she might just be elected, the way things were going, but he thought that "the country was scarcely ready for female legislators." The changes in the property qualification and restriction of the vote to subjects drew a more extensive debate. Bush introduced an amendment to reduce the income qualification to \$300 and Cummings moved that it be \$400. However the motion to keep the income qualification at \$600 was passed by a vote of 26 to 16.

---

<sup>40</sup>*Daily Bulletin*, September 29, 30, October 1, 2, 1890.

<sup>41</sup>*Daily Bulletin*, October 18, 1890.

Those voting in favor of the status quo on the income qualification felt that there had to be a distinction between voters for Nobles and Representatives. They believed that lowering the property qualification by itself would meet the grievances of Native Hawaiians and mechanics who were unjustly excluded. If the income qualification was also lowered, they believed that no worthwhile distinction would be left. On the question of restricting the vote to subjects the House was almost unanimous, passing it by a vote of 40 to 2. There were some concerns raised that this would disenfranchise some existing voters, but the importance of voters being long-term residents of the Kingdom, rather than just itinerants, seemed to outweigh this concern.

The clause enabling restrictions to be placed on agricultural laborers drew some debate also. The committee had widened the scope of the clause from the original bill to include people of all nationalities brought into the islands to work on plantations and not just Chinese. This was in anticipation of the need to deal with the large numbers of Japanese immigrants who were arriving at that time. While most members agreed with the provision, Bush and Widemann spoke against it. Bush maintained that it was repugnant to the constitution and contrary to Article 13, which stated that "the Government is conducted for the common good, and not for the profit, honor, or private interest of any one man, family, or class of men," and that it contravened Article 11, which forbade involuntary servitude and slavery. Widemann was concerned that it could be applied to Chinese and others already resident in the Kingdom and wanted it only to apply to those who arrived in the future. The amendment was passed by 36 to 7. Bush and Widemann were joined by five other National Reform members in voting against it.<sup>42</sup>

The amendments were read a third time on November 10. Most were passed unanimously. Muller moved to reduce the income qualification to \$450, but the amendment was lost.<sup>43</sup>

---

<sup>42</sup>*Daily Bulletin*, November 6, 7, 1890.

<sup>43</sup>*Daily Bulletin*, November 11, 1890.

## Other Matters Considered in the Legislature

The National Reform Party managed to get a number of other matters passed by the legislature. The offices of Governor of the four main islands were reestablished. The Honolulu Rifles were disbanded and military forces were limited to the King's Royal Guard. Also, a bill was passed once again providing for the education of Hawaiian youths abroad.<sup>44</sup>

### *Anti-Chinese Measures*

A bill was enacted providing for Chinese immigrants to come into the Kingdom under a system of permits, which limited their stay to five years, prohibited them from engaging in employment other than agricultural labor, and provided that one quarter of their wages be withheld and paid to them on their departure.<sup>45</sup>

The Bill was ruled unconstitutional in 1892 in the case of *Chong Chum vs. Kohala Sugar Company*, with regard to the withholding of wages.<sup>46</sup>

### *McKinley Tariff Act*

The provisions that had been feared by Hawaiian sugar planters for some time were finally introduced by the United States Congress in the form of the McKinley Tariff Bill. The bill, which was signed into law on October 1 by the President, provided for the removal of import duties on sugar and the payment of a bounty to domestic producers of two cents a pound.

---

<sup>44</sup>Kuykendall, *Hawaiian Kingdom III*, 465-66.

<sup>45</sup>*Daily Bulletin*, November 7, 8, 10, 11, 1890.

<sup>46</sup>Kuykendall, *Hawaiian Kingdom III*, 184.

On November 13, Samuel Parker introduced a resolution into the Hawai'i legislature authorizing the renegotiation of the reciprocity treaty, which was adopted. The Hawai'i Minister to Washington met with Kalākaua in San Francisco, where they decided it would be better to wait until things settled down in Washington before pressing ahead with negotiations.<sup>47</sup>

*Dissent within the National Reform Party*

When Kalākaua appointed the new cabinet, it had the support of both Parties. However, as the session went on the National Reform Party became increasingly divided in its support for the cabinet. The first real sign of disagreement came in early September, when Marques put a number of questions to the Minister of Finance concerning "the removal from office of certain few individuals notorious for their incompetence or their offensive and active partisanship in politics," as evidenced in the report of the Minister of Finance and other reports. He claimed that the National Reform Party had persistently demanded their removal and the cabinet had promised the committee of the Mechanic's Union that they would be removed by September 1. He accused the cabinet of not keeping its pledge and going back on its word of honor and asked what they would do about the matter.<sup>48</sup>

Minister Brown replied the next day that he was unaware of the National Reform Party's demands and that the cabinet would make such changes as were found to be necessary when appropriate. The cabinet was surprised at the tone of the question and the questioning of their integrity and stated that they refused to operate a system of political appointments.<sup>49</sup> As mentioned above, this issue was raised at the Mechanic's Union meeting on September 6, where it was decided to put the issue of want of confidence

---

<sup>47</sup>Kuykendall, *Hawaiian Kingdom III*, 466-69.

<sup>48</sup>*Daily Bulletin*, September 2, 1890.

<sup>49</sup>*Daily Bulletin*, September 3, 1890.

in the cabinet to the mass meeting the following week. However, the committee organizing the mass meeting decided to drop the issue and focus on raising support for the constitutional convention.<sup>50</sup>

Both Wilcox and Bush argued during the debate on the constitutional convention that the National Reform Party had pledged itself to hold the convention in its election policy. Other members of the Party disputed this and maintained that they had only made a pledge to consider revisions of the constitution, which could be done through individual amendments. However, it appears that Wilcox viewed the defeat of the convention bill as a betrayal of National Reform Party policy, as well as of the Native Hawaiians, by his party colleagues. In a debate in early October concerning the conduct of the Post-Master General, Wilcox stated that "he was surprised to see members of the National Reform Party, who boasted loudly before the election of what they were going to do in the House, standing up to defend Reform officials. If this thing continued there would be a new Government before a year, and there would be no King , and he [Wilcox] would take a hand in the business." He later apologized for going off the subject of the debate, adding that "the session was made lengthy by the Ministry not being well liked."<sup>51</sup>

Finally, on October 23, Bush introduced a motion of want of confidence in the cabinet. He stated that the cabinet did not have a declared policy or platform of principles, and that their action since taking office had "been of a vacillating character". One of his main grievances was that the cabinet had not supported the holding of the constitutional convention and acted in such a way as to discourage the legislature from supporting it. Wilcox spoke in support of the resolution and accused Cummins of acting in support of the convention outside of the House, but against it within the cabinet. Nāwahī also spoke in support of it. The supporters of the resolution also accused the cabinet of allowing biennial appropriations to get out of hand. The supporters of the cabinet replied that the cabinet had stated its policy on taking

---

<sup>50</sup>*Daily Bulletin*, September 6, 10, 1890.

<sup>51</sup>*Daily Bulletin*, September 24, 29, October 13, 1890.



office and that the question of expenditure was the responsibility of the House. The resolution was indefinitely postponed by a vote of 26 to 18.

## CHAPTER 1

### CONCLUSION

The "Bayonet" constitution of 1887 marked the clash between two ideological spaces in Hawai'i - that of the expanding empire of the United States of America and that of an independent constitutional monarchy. The reign of King Kalākaua, for the period up until 1887, was a time of the strengthening of Hawai'i as an independent nation. Kalākaua travelled around the world, making Hawai'i a visible member of the interstate community. He publicly revived many aspects of Hawaiian culture that were in danger of being lost. He adopted internationally recognized symbols of monarchy, such as the coronation ceremony, to improve Hawai'i's international image and build national pride at home. He also promoted Native Hawaiians in government and politics and sent young Native Hawaiians to Europe for further training and experience.

During the same period, the economic ties between Hawai'i and the United States increased considerably. This was the result of the boom in sugar production, which was based on the 1876 treaty of reciprocity between the two countries. The main beneficiaries of this treaty were a small group of Haole sugar planters, the majority of whom were American. While they were gaining economic control in the Kingdom, the political control that they and their predecessors had carefully built up under the reigns of the previous kings, seemed to be slipping away from them. They became particularly alarmed when it appeared that the Hawaiian government would refuse to accept the terms dictated by the United States for the extension of the reciprocity treaty. The loss of the treaty would mean economic ruin for many of them.

In order to regain the political control of the country the Haole sugar planters and their supporters reenacted the actions of the thirteenth century English barons who forced King John to sign the Magna Carta. The Magna Carta was a powerful political symbol for Anglo-Saxon Americans in the nineteenth century. It was seen as the basis of American democracy and independence. In the case of Hawai'i, it was a symbol that could be used to attract support not only of Americans, but also the British and even the Germans, by invoking a common Anglo-Saxon heritage. The strategy was successful. Kalākaua was easily portrayed as a corrupt and authoritarian king and the Haole sugar "barons" were therefore able to portray themselves as the agents of democratic change and constitutional reform.

At this stage, the peoples of Hawai'i, Haole and Native Hawaiian were faced with a choice of whether or not to accept the new constitution. Most of the Haole at this stage were willing to accept it and support it, such was the force of the argument used by its instigators. Native Hawaiians were not so sure. They had lost much of their political power, but did not have the means to challenge the new regime. They could either refuse to accept the new constitution and in doing so waive their right to vote, or they could accept the new constitution, at least provisionally, and work for change through the legislature.

In order to make the second option work, they faced a second problem. Namely that they were not a unified political group. Kalākaua's election had been marked by a bitter division between his supporters and the supporters of his rival, Queen Emma. This division had continued in the elections for the House of Representatives. While Kalākaua's supporters maintained a majority in each election, there was a strong group of Native Hawaiian politicians opposed to them. This division had become even stronger during the period from 1882 to 1886 under the Gibson ministry. Native Hawaiians were also divided by religious affiliation, regional areas and between urban and rural areas. These divisions were such as might be expected within any nation state. However, the 1887 constitution had robbed Native Hawaiians as a group of political power and if they were to regain it, they needed to be able to establish some form of unity.

The first election under the 1887 constitution illustrated that this unity was yet to be realized. Around half of the Native Hawaiian voters chose to support the Reform Party, which was controlled by those Haole who had forced the adoption of the 1887 constitution. This shows just how effective the use of the Magna Carta to justify the new constitution was, even for Native Hawaiians. Having failed to regain power through the election, a small group of Native Hawaiians chose to try a more direct method. In organizing his insurrection, Robert Wilcox drew on his experience of nationalist politics in Italy. However, his efforts were poorly organized and unsuccessful and effectively ruled out the possibility of regaining power through armed revolt. In the meantime, Daniel Lyons used his position as editor of the *Elele* to establish Hui Kālai'āina in order to build a broad based movement for Native Hawaiian political aspirations.

The major problem faced by the Hui was the role played by Lyons. Lyons was not content to simply facilitate the formation of the Hui, he wanted to impose his own American styled political agenda upon it. He provides a good example of the role that Haole should not take in relation to indigenous politics. He clearly crossed the line between supporting and controlling the organization and could not understand why Native Hawaiians did not appreciate his help. The resulting split in the Hui robbed the Native Hawaiian members of valuable time in which to develop a more united front against the Haole sugar planters.

The members of the Hui on both sides of the split realized that in order to win the 1890 elections they would need a wider support base than could be gained from Native Hawaiian voters alone. In particular, if they were to get supportive candidates elected to the House of Nobles they would need to make some kind of alliance with Haole to provide both the candidates and the voters. By this stage there existed a significant group of middle and working class Haole who were disaffected with the pro-American and pro-planter policies of the Reform Party government. Some of these Haole had organized themselves and formed the Mechanics and Workingmen's Political Protective Union. The Union could have fought the election alone and possibly won enough seats to force the Reform Party to make an alliance with it.

However, its leadership decided instead to make an alliance with the Hui and to form the National Reform Party.

The National Reform Party fits a common pattern of the nineteenth century of an alliance between a proletarian and a nationalist movement. As explained in Chapter Six, the end of the nineteenth century was a time of the growth of proletarian movements throughout the world capitalist system. Hawai'i was no exception. The Union was not as revolutionary as some of its European and American counterparts, but it did represent the general trend amongst the working and middle classes of striving for greater control of the political process. This was also the period of the growth of nationalist movements, especially on the periphery of the system. Both types of movements were opposed in their own ways to the world capitalist system. Both wanted to restrict the power of the elite. However, there was a significant difference in motivation between them. The proletarians were anti-capitalist, while the nationalists were anti-imperialist. This also meant that the proletarians did not necessarily oppose imperialism and the nationalists did not necessarily oppose capitalism. Their common ground was that they opposed a particular group who were both imperialist and capitalist.

Wallerstein suggests that there were two responses by proletarian movements to the question of alliances with nationalist movements. One was to ignore them on the basis that world capitalism would eventually do away with national and racial differences. The issue for them was one of class and economics and nationalism was a dangerous distraction. The other response was to form an interim alliance with the nationalist movements which recognized that they were both oppressed by the elite group. This was a tactical alliance which, from the proletarian perspective, needed to be under the control of the proletariat and would be pursued only in as much as it furthered the class based goals of the proletariat. A third option of full support for nationalist movements against imperialism was not considered, reflecting the ambiguous attitudes of the proletariat, especially Europeans and white Americans, towards imperialism.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Wallerstein, "Antisystemic Movements," 22.

The alliance between the Union and the Hui fits in with the second strategy of an interim alliance against a common enemy. Together they were able to break the hold of the Haole elite over the political control of the kingdom. In doing so they gained a space for action, where the future of the country could be considered and directed by a wider group of people than just the Haole elite. They were also able to maintain for a while the independence of the kingdom. But their alliance did not go as far as providing full support for Native Hawaiian nationalism or providing unequivocal opposition to United States imperialism.

There were significant costs involved in participating in the alliance, especially for the Native Hawaiian members. It limited the ability of the Native Hawaiian members to develop a greater support base amongst their own people, by diverting their efforts into establishing and maintaining the alliance with the Union. The need for the Native Hawaiians to accommodate and compromise with the Haole members prevented the Native Hawaiians from considering policies that better fitted their own cultural and political aspirations. They had little option but to go along with more American style of politics of the Union. Native Hawaiians also had to not only abandon their support for the Chinese business community, but also give their support, directly or indirectly, to the passage of anti-Chinese legislation. Finally, those who wanted to see the 1887 constitution removed and a revised version of the old constitution reinstated through a constitutional convention found that there was insufficient support for this objective from their party colleagues.

There were a number of important issues facing Native Hawaiians at the time that I have not highlighted in this thesis, because these issues tended to be dealt with in the political background and were not specifically addressed by the National Reform Party. During the 1890 legislative session, a large number of petitions were regularly sent to the legislature from Native Hawaiians throughout the kingdom. One of the major issues that petitioners were concerned about was the treatment of leprosy. Leprosy sufferers were at that time being quarantined on a remote part of the island of Moloka'i. If someone was diagnosed as having leprosy, they could be forcefully removed from their home and sent to the quarantine

station. They would never see their family again. This raised continual complaints about misdiagnosis and concerns as to whether the government was doing all that it could to properly treat the sufferers. Another major issue, which received less attention from the government, was the impact of the development of irrigation schemes, railroads and other infrastructure needed for the plantations on the neighboring land owners. These issues were of greater day-to-day importance to many Native Hawaiians, especially those living in the rural areas, than changing the constitution.

The alliance was not without its costs to the Union. No doubt many of its members would have liked to have seen greater democratic reforms put in place and the eventual establishment of an American style republic. However, if they were to keep the support of the Native Hawaiians, they needed to limit any reforms to those that could be achieved within the framework of an independent constitutional monarchy.

There was little discussion or analysis within the coalition of the wider political issues of the day. Their aims were short-term and pragmatic. They were aware that action needed to be taken and taken quickly, with whatever support was available. Deeper issues of culture and politics were not addressed. For example, the role of *Ali'i* within the political system. This was one of the points where Haole and Native Hawaiian political diverged significantly. Native Hawaiians still recognized birth and ancestry as the more important criteria for leadership and viewed elections as a means for confirming rather than selecting leaders. Haole, on the other hand, favored merit and performance as the major criteria for leadership and were generally opposed to any ideas of inherited leadership. In pushing for greater democracy, it was the Haole values that were given the greater emphasis.

As an interim alliance, the question of the future role of Haole in the kingdom was not addressed either. This question highlights the contradiction involved in working class settlers in supporting an indigenous nationalist movement. If they give their full support to the nationalists, they have to examine

their own role as part of the imperialist system which the indigenous people are struggling against. This is perhaps the most difficult question that alliances of this kind have to face.

The National Reform Party's story provides lessons which are applicable to present day situations in Hawai'i, Aotearoa and elsewhere. It shows that when indigenous and non-indigenous people choose to work together for a common purpose that they can succeed. However, it also shows that there are costs involved in this kind of alliance and that given the unequal power distribution between the members of the coalition, these costs will probably be born mainly by the indigenous people, unless the deeper questions of imperialism and colonialism are actively addressed. The question that such coalitions face today is whether it is possible to go beyond an interim alliance based on common short term goal and develop a longer term alliance based on a shared vision of the future. The story also illustrates that coalition is not always the correct solution. In the case of Lyons' attempts to control the Hui, it would have been better for Native Hawaiians to have given the space to work out their own agenda, without interference from well meaning Haole. As Lyons was warned by Nahinu, it will always be a tangled and difficult job.



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Published Works

#### *Books*

- Adler, Jacob and Gwynn Barrett, eds. *The Diaries of Walter Murray Gibson: 1886, 1887*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1973.
- d'Anglade, G. Bosseront. *A Tree in Bud: the Hawaiian Kingdom 1889-1893*. Translated from G. Sauvin (pseud.), *Un Royaume Polynésien, Iles Hawaï*, by Alfons L. Korn. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1987.
- Beechert, Edward D. *Working in Hawai'i: a labor history*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1985.
- Bowser, George, ed. *The Hawaiian Kingdom Statistical and Commercial Directory and Tourist's Guide, 1880-1881*. Honolulu: Press Publishing Co.
- Buck, Elizabeth. *Paradise Remade: the politics of culture and history in Hawai'i*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1993.
- Char, Wai Jane and Tin-Yuke Char, eds. *Chinese Historic Sites and Pioneer Families of Rural Oahu*. Honolulu: Hawaii Chinese History Center, 1988.
- Davenport, William. "The 'Hawaiian Cultural Revolution': some political and economic considerations." *American Anthropologist*, 71 (1969) : 1-20.
- Day, A. Grove. *History Makers of Hawai'i: a biographical dictionary*. Honolulu: Mutual Publishing, 1984.
- Drinnon, Richard. *Facing West: the metaphysics of indian-hating and empire-building*. New York: Schocken Books, 1980.
- Elliott, Russel R. *History of Nevada*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1973.
- Geertz, Clifford. *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books, 1973.
- Glick, Clarence E. *Sojourners and Settlers: Chinese migrants in Hawaii*. Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii and Hawaii Chinese History Center, 1980.
- Handy, E. S. Craighill and Elizabeth Handy. *Native Planters in Old Hawaii: their life, lore, and environment*. With the collaboration of Mary Kawena Pukui. Bernice P. Bishop Museum Bulletin 233. Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press, 1972.

- Howard, A.E. Dick. *The Road from Runnymede: Magna Carta and constitutionalism in America*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1968.
- Jardin, Manuel G., *History of Honolulu Typographical Union, Local No. 37*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1970.
- Joesting, Edward. *Kauai: the separate kingdom*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press and Kauai Museum Association, 1984.
- Kalākaua, His Majesty, David. *The Legends and Myths of Hawai'i: the fables and folk-lore of a strange people*. Edited and introduced by Hon. Rollin Mallory Daggett. New York: C. L. Webster & Co., 1888.
- Kamakau, S. M. *Ruling Chiefs of Hawaii*. Revised edition. Honolulu: Kamehameha Schools Press, 1992.
- Kame'eleihiwa, Lilikalā. *Native Land and Foreign Desires: Pehea Lā E Pono Ai?*. Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press, 1992.
- Ka Moolelo o Ka Moi Kalakaua I*. Preface signed by Joseph M. Poepoe. Honolulu: n.p., 1891.
- Koontz, John. *Political History of Nevada*. 5th ed. Carson City: SPO, 1975.
- Kuykendall, Ralph S. *Constitutions of the Hawaiian Kingdom: a brief history and analysis*. Papers of the Hawaiian Historical Society, No. 21. Honolulu: Hawaiian Historical Society, 1940.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Hawaiian Kingdom Volume II: 1854-1874, twenty critical years*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1966.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Hawaiian Kingdom, Volume III, 1874-1893: the Kalakaua dynasty*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1967.
- Lane, J. C., ed. *Hawaiian Directory and Handbook of the Kingdom of Hawai'i*. San Francisco: McKenny Directory Co., 1888.
- Lind, Andrew W. *An Island Community: ecological succession in Hawai'i*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1938.
- Lydecker, R. C. *Roster of the Legislatures of Hawaii, 1841-1918: constitutions of the Monarchy and Republic, speeches of Sovereigns and President*. Board of Commissioners of Public Archives Publication No. 1, Archives of Hawai'i. Honolulu: Hawaiian Gazette Co. Ltd., 1918.
- McKinzie, Edith Kawelohea. *Hawaiian Genealogies: extracted from Hawaiian language newspapers*. 2 vols. Edited by Ishmael W. Stagner II. Lā'ie, Hawai'i: Brigham Young University, 1983.
- Morgan, Theodore. *Hawai'i: a century of economic change, 1778-1876*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1948.
- Nellist, George F. *The Story of Hawaii and its Builders*. Volume 3 of *Men of Hawaii*. Honolulu: Honolulu Star Bulletin, 1925.
- Nordyke, Eleanor C. *The Peopling of Hawai'i*. 2d ed. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1989.

- Pukui, Mary Kawena. *ʻŌlelo Noʻeau: Hawaiian proverbs and poetical sayings*. Bernice P. Bishop Museum Special Publication No. 17. Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press, 1983.
- Pukui, Mary Kawena and Samuel H. Elbert. *Hawaiian Dictionary: Hawaiian-English, English-Hawaiian*. Revised and enlarged edition. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1986.
- Reinecke, John E. *Labor Unions of Hawaiʻi: a chronological checklist*. Honolulu: n.p., 1967.
- Sahlins, Marshall. *Historical Ethnography*. Volume 1 of *Anahulu: the anthropology of history in the Kingdom of Hawaii*, by Patrick V. Kirch and Marshall Sahlins. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.
- Saxton, Alexander. *The Indispensable Enemy: labor and the anti-Chinese movement in California*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1971.
- Shefter, Martin. "Trade Unions and Political Machines: the organization and disorganization of the American working class in the late nineteenth century." In *Working-Class Formation: nineteenth century patterns in Western Europe and the United States*, edited by Ira Katznelson and Aristide R. Zolberg, 197-278. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1986.
- Spoehr, Anne Harding. *The Royal Lineages of Hawaiʻi*. Bishop Museum Press Special Publication 84. Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press, 1989.
- Stannard, David E. *Before the Horror: the population of Hawaiʻi on the eve of Western contact*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1989.
- Stevenson, Robert Louis. *Travels in Hawaii*. Edited and introduced by A. Grove Day. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1991.
- Swindler, William F. *Magna Carta: legend and legacy*. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Co, Inc., 1965.
- Takaki, Ronald. *Pau Hana: plantation life and labor in Hawaiʻi*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1983.
- Tate, Merze. *Hawaiʻi: reciprocity or annexation*. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1968.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The United States and the Hawaiian Kingdom; a political history*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1965.
- Thurston, Lorrin A. "'That's Different': an analysis of the vote for Representatives and Nobles." *Pacific Commercial Advertiser*, Nov 22, 1889.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Memoirs of the Hawaiian Revolution*. Edited by Andrew Farrell. Honolulu: Advertiser Publishing Co., Ltd., 1936.
- Valeri Valerio. *Kingship and Sacrifice: ritual and society in ancient Hawaii*. Translated by Paula Wissing. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel. "Crisis as transition." In Samir Amin, Giovanni Arrighi, Andre Gunder Frank, and Immanuel Wallerstein, *Dynamics of Global Crisis*, 11-54. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1982.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The three instances of hegemony in the history of the capitalist world-economy." *International Journal of Comparative Sociology* 24 (1983) : 100-108.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Antisystemic movements." In Samir Amin, Giovanni Arrighi, Andre Gunder Frank, and Immanuel Wallerstein, *Transforming the Revolution: social movements and the world-system*, 13-53. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1990.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Geopolitics and Geoculture: essays on the changing world-system*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Unthinking Social Science: the limits of nineteenth-century paradigms*. Cambridge, U.K.: Polity Press, 1991.

Zambucka, Kristin. *Kalakaua: Hawai'i's last king*. Honolulu: Mana Publishing, 1983.

Zinn, Howard. *A People's History of the United States*. New York: Harper Collins, 1980.

#### *Government Reports*

Kingdom of Hawaii, Board of Education. *Census of the Hawaiian Islands, taken December 27th 1878 under the direction of the Board of Education*.

\_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_. *Census of the Hawaiian Islands, taken December 27th 1884 under the direction of the Board of Education*.

\_\_\_\_\_, Bureau of Public Instruction. *Report of the General Superintendent of the Census - 1890*. Honolulu: R. Grieve, 1891.

U. S. Congress, House. *Affairs in Hawaii*. 53rd Cong., 3d Sess., 1894-5. House Executive Document., vol. 3.

#### *Newspapers and Periodicals*

*Commercial Advertiser* (Honolulu). April 11, 1913.

*Daily Bulletin* (Honolulu). July 1887 - November 90.

*Elele, Ka* (Honolulu). July 1887 - June 1890.

*Friend, The* (Honolulu). January 1890.

*Hawaiian Gazette* (Honolulu). July 1887 - November 1890, July 31, 1900.

*Honolulu Advertiser*. November 23, 1925.

*Independent, The* (Honolulu). July 15, 1895, July 21, 1900.

*Ko Hawaii Pae Aina* (Honolulu). March 1889 - November 1890.

*Leo o Ka Lahui, Ka* (Honolulu). October 1889-January 1890.

*National Herald, The - Ka Ahailono o Ka Lahui* (Honolulu). January 9 - February 11, 1890.

*Nupepa Ke Alakai o Hawaii, Ka* (Honolulu). August 1887 - November 1890 .

*Nupepa Kuokoa, Ka* (Honolulu). August 1887 - November 1890.

*Oiaio, Ka* (Honolulu). May 1888 - November 1890.

*Pacific Commercial Advertiser* (Honolulu). July 1887 - November 1890, February 8, October 11, 1899, April 6, 1900, March 4, 1902, December 6, 1903, March 12, 1913.

*Paradise of the Pacific*, March 1902, April 1910.

*Star Bulletin*, September 25, 1923.

Thrum, Thomas. *Hawaiian Almanac and Annual*. Honolulu: Press Publishing Co. 1881-91.

## **Unpublished Works**

### *Manuscripts and Archival Materials*

Hawai'i State Archives, Honolulu.

Cabinet Council Minute Book: 1874-91.

F.O. & Ex., 1887, Local Officials: King.

"Great Register of Voters, 1887-1888."

Legislative Files, 1887.

Privy Council, "Records."

Report of the Minister of Finance - 1890.

Hawaiian National Committee Appertaining to the Matter of Approaching His Majesty the King for the Purpose of Forming a New Constitution. "Minutes." Typescript translation by Bruce Cartwright. Honolulu:Archives of Hawaii, 1928.

### *Theses and Dissertations*

Huang, Hsiao-ping. "Chinese Merchant Background and Experience in Hawai'i under the Monarchy." Ph.D. diss., University of Hawai'i, 1989.

McGregor-Alegado, Davianna. "Hawaiian Resistance." MA Thesis, University of Hawai'i, 1979.