

Pro-Annexationist Propaganda in the Pacific Commercial Advertiser, 1898

Ruhiyyih Nāpualani Spock

Plan B Paper

**in partial fulfillment for the
Master of Arts in Pacific Islands Studies**

Table of Contents

I. Introduction	1-4
II. Annexation is the Incentive for Propaganda	5-17
III. Negative Portrayal of Hawaiians in the PCA	18-40
IV. Civilizing Mission	41-53
V. Conclusion	54-57
Bibliography	

I. Introduction

Colonialism, one of the most significant themes in the field of modern world history, has utilized many of the same strategies all over the world for its expansion. Because colonialism has not been categorically supported, pro-colonialists have utilized propaganda in order to promote it among the powerful forces in government. This propaganda has involved the denigration of indigenous people, along with the glorification of the purportedly positive, creative and civilizing influence of the colonizer.

In the process of colonialism, racist assumptions of superiority have been rationalizations for essentially unjust acts, with the assertion that Europeans were superior, and their influence was naturally positive and necessary for non-Europeans. Colonialism was marketed as progress, a gift to the pitiful colonized who cannot help themselves.

This strategy was utilized all over the world, including Hawai'i. When the annexation of Hawai'i by the United States was yet tenuous in early 1898, pro-annexation forces in Hawai'i resorted to colonialist propaganda in order to promote their cause. An example of the use of propaganda by a pro-annexationist is found in the editorials of the Pacific Commercial Advertiser.

What were the attitudes of the American pro-annexationist community in Hawai'i towards native Hawaiians in the late nineteenth century? Residue of these attitudes still exist in present-day Hawai'i. Attitudes perpetuated during that period have a direct affect over people living today and understanding the historical context for negative images serves to weaken their power over the psyche.

Historical Context of Annexation

After being apprised of the takeover of the Hawaiian government from Queen Lili'uokalani on January 17, 1893, United States President Benjamin Harrison submitted the Hawaiian annexation treaty to Congress in February of the same year, immediately prior to leaving office. In March, suspicious of the illegal nature of the situation, the incumbent U.S. President Grover Cleveland withdrew the annexation treaty from the United States Senate. United States Special Commissioner James Blount was sent to Hawai'i to investigate whether annexation was the will of the majority of the people. The ensuing document, called the "Blount Report" declared that annexation was not universally supported by Native Hawaiians, and recommended that America

should not legitimate such an act of outright aggression through annexation. This complex issue raised the question: “Should America expand its borders overseas?” U.S. Senator Stephen M. White of California argued: “The annexation of Hawai’i will constitute the entering wedge for an imperialistic policy” (Osborne 1981: 136).

By 1898, Hawai’i had been under the rule of the “Provisional Government” for 5 years. This government made up of Americans in Hawai’i had declared itself the official government of Hawai’i. President McKinley took office in that year, bringing an imperialist agenda back into the White House. Although a treaty was never passed, political maneuvering facilitated Hawai’i’s annexation through a joint resolution in the same year. Annexation occurred, and the prophecy of Senator White came true. Guam, the Philippines, Puerto Rico and Wake Island were absorbed into the American empire within seven months of the passage of the Annexation Act (ibid).

These events precipitated an active debate within the United States from 1893 onward. The “Anti-Imperialist League” was formed by Americans who spoke out publicly against the overseas expansion of the United States. It provided the opposition which annexationists had to reckon with in their efforts to promote their cause.

What were the thoughts, perspectives, philosophies of this community of people who called themselves “annexationists”? How did they view the native Hawaiians whose royal government was wrested away under threat of war in 1893? How did their perspective inevitably support an action such as annexation? Were they similar to other colonialists of their time in other parts of the world?

Methodology

This study was conducted using library resources in the microfiche collection at Maui Community College Library and books from the Hawaiian Collection of the University of Hawai’i Hamilton Library. Resources include the newspaper, The Pacific Commercial Advertiser as well as secondary sources in history and political science.

In order to ensure a high proportion of articles directly relating to Native Hawaiians, the study focuses on the year 1898, the year of the passing of the Annexation Act. The 1898 newspapers proved to be a gold mine of articles and editorials revealing the perceptions held by the community of pro-annexationists in Hawai’i towards native Hawaiians at this crossroads in Hawaiian history. For the sake of brevity, the evidence in this study is limited to articles taken

from January 1898 through March 1898. The themes which emerge during this period are representative of the themes found in the newspaper during the whole year. Most of the excerpts are taken from editorials, and are therefore a reflection of the viewpoint of the editorial staff.

During the period under examination, these editorials were written by William N. Armstrong, with the newspaper under the ownership of the Hawaiian Gazette Company. Armstrong was a Yale-educated lawyer, son of Christian missionary Dr. Richard Armstrong. He travelled around the world with King Kalakaua, and wrote his memoirs of that trip in his journal: Around the world with a King. W.N. Armstrong's book mirrors the tone of his editorials, reflecting a deep lack of respect for native Hawaiians.

Direct quotes which occur in this paper contain highlighted portions as an aid to the reader, allowing the full context of the quotes to be maintained while facilitating a quick reading of the most-relevant sections.

Newspaper Reporting in the Nineteenth-Century

In the process of examining the evidence in the 1898 Pacific Commercial Advertiser, it became obvious that there was a marked difference in tone in comparison to the contemporary news media, attributable at least in part to the era in which it existed. According to Discovering the News: A Social History of American Newspapers by Michael Schudson, objectivity in newspapers was not even a goal of the media until quite late in the nineteenth-century. "American newspapers were expected to present a partisan viewpoint, not a neutral one. Indeed, they were not expected to report the "news" of the day at all in the way we conceive it..." It wasn't until 1896 that The New York Times began to climb to its premier position by stressing an "information" model, rather than a "story" model, of reporting (Schudson 1978: 4-5).

In 1890s Hawai'i, the press was still considered partisan by at least one outside observer. Consider the following article from The San Francisco Chronicle, regarding the lack of objectivity of the haole press in Hawai'i:

"The government of the Sandwich Islands appears to have passed from the hands of the king into the hands of a military oligarchy that is more domineering than Kalakaua ever was. Before the recent revolt of the Europeans in Honolulu, the press of the city was very plain-spoken. It printed unadorned truths about the king, and the latter made no effort to suppress such unpleasant utterances. Now, under the new regime, the newspapers are kept in check with military thoroughness. It seems incredible, but it is an actual fact, that not one of the Honolulu journals dared to reprint the comments of the American press on the so-called revolution, although

such comments would have been very interesting reading to all Hawaiians. Even the reports of court proceedings are dry and matter-of-fact records, very different from the ordinary accounts. In a word, the freedom of the press of Honolulu is a myth under the reform party, and the man who looks for the facts in the Honolulu journals will not find them.” (The San Francisco Chronicle, Monday, Sept. 5, 1887, as quoted in Hawai'i's Story, Appendix A)

Apparently, an atmosphere of repression during the Republic period (between 1893-1898) existed in Hawai'i's newspapers which had not been present prior to the overthrow.

Purpose

The basic argument of this research paper is simple and straightforward. The editorials written in The Pacific Commercial Advertiser reflected a specific view of the world which served to rationalize the pro-annexation political agenda of its authors. European colonizers across the globe during that time employed a similar worldview which served to justify similar goals. Furthermore, America's roots as a settler-controlled country were formed in the historical legacy of a struggle between indigenous people vs. settlers and bids for political control over the land area. The struggle in America has provided a historical precedent which has been used by expansionist interest groups to justify further imperialism, via the ideology of “Manifest Destiny.”

The Pacific Commercial Advertiser, an English-language newspaper in Hawai'i was supportive of the Republic of Hawai'i government and its desire for United States annexation. Editorials directly supported annexation, providing responses to the critique by anti-annexationists in America and in Hawai'i. Editorials also promoted annexation in an indirect manner: by denigrating Native Hawaiians and celebrating the positive effects of American influence in Hawai'i, referred to as the “civilizing mission.”

Hawai'i was not the first nor the only place in which this sort of negative representation of native peoples has occurred. By the late 19th century, a worldview had evolved which explained the world in terms of Europeans vs. non-Europeans. J.M Blaut labels this worldview as “the colonizer's view of the world,” in his book by the same name. This view sums up the assumptions and perceptions of the colonizer into a tidy set of characteristics which serve to rationalize the colonial enterprise as a natural, ethically-justified endeavor. The negative representation of Hawaiians in The Pacific Commercial Advertiser constitutes a case study of this phenomenon at play in Hawai'i. Nothing original; business as usual in a colonial setting. It fits into the imperialist scheme.

II. Annexation was the incentive for propaganda

One of the most significant themes of the editorials in the Pacific Commercial Advertiser (PCA) in early 1898 was the promotion of annexation. In examining the contents of the Pacific Commercial Advertiser for the year 1898, it is clear that the newspaper's editorial staff was supportive of the overthrow and the ensuing bid of the Republic of Hawai'i for annexation. Annexation was promoted within the Pacific Commercial Advertiser primarily for commercial benefits and to ensure the safety of Hawai'i and America.

In addition to promoting annexation, Pacific Commercial Advertiser newspaper editorials severely criticized anti-annexation from many angles. Anti-annexationists within the United States were portrayed as complacent, misinformed, narrow-minded; and racist. Anti-annexationists within Hawai'i, on the other hand, were portrayed as dishonest or crazy.

Section II will discuss the annexation issues and establish the motive for propaganda, while Sections III and IV will discuss the two angles of the propaganda used to support the pro-annexation stance.

Target Audience of the Pacific Commercial Advertiser

The Pacific Commercial Advertiser (PCA) served as one of the major news sources for the foreign white (American and European) community in Hawai'i. Hawaiians, however, were not directly addressed in the articles of the Pacific Commercial Advertiser, even within the discussions of the future political status of Hawai'i. The tone and form of the discussion of annexation within the Pacific Commercial Advertiser suggest that pro-annexationists saw the annexation decision as one belonging to Americans on the continent and within Hawai'i, not Native Hawaiians themselves.

Richard Drinnon, author of Facing West: the Metaphysics of Indian Hating, cites the U.S. Congressional Record XXXI (6661-63) to show that annexationists did not take the view of Native Hawaiians into mind in the discussion on the future status of Hawai'i.

“But what if the Hawaiian natives did not want to be annexed? That mattered not at all to Hoar, no more than not consulting ‘the Indians in Texas or in California or in New Mexico or in Alaska when those territories were taken into the Union.’ As with the Indians then, so with the Hawaiians now: ‘it would be as reasonable to take the vote of children in an orphan asylum or an idiot school.’”

The lack of regard for the opinions of native people was true in other colonial communities as well. In The Myth of the Lazy Native, S.H. Alatas describes the ways in which Southeast Asians were discussed by colonialist scholars during the colonial period. In his examination of colonial texts, he observes that the audience was not the native people who were being described. The scholars, who were themselves Europeans, were describing Southeast Asians to other Europeans. Southeast Asians were the objects of discussion, not the subjects. They were not expected to participate in decision-making. Following is one of Alatas' observations about the ideology of colonialists regarding natives:

“...The exact point in time is difficult to establish but it can safely be assumed that by the middle of the 18th century the Dutch was the major power in the archipelago; it was then that the theme of laziness began to develop. This theme was not intended for the native population, **they were not asked for their opinion or told of opinions which others held about them. They were simply discussed.** Until the present moment, with the exception of a few educated natives, the overwhelming majority of Southeast Asians are not aware that they have been the subject of discussion for centuries. **The European colonial authors, administrators, priests and travelers wrote for a home audience. It was their own people they wished to convince of the laziness and backwardness of the natives.**”(Alatas 1977: 22)

Similarly, the Pacific Commercial Advertiser's audience was clearly not Hawaiians or other non-European groups in Hawai'i. By way of illustration, in the following Pacific Commercial Advertiser editorial, the use of “we” in its inclusive form clearly excluded non-whites. Note the phrases “we the Anglo-Saxons,” which indicates a white-only intended audience. Note also the reference to “the civilized races.”

“Penal Contract Laws”

Considered as an abstract proposition, the penal contract labor system is not tolerated by the civilized races. The special and pressing reasons for abolishing the system here, aside from the reasons in the abstract, are the intense opposition of the powerful laboring classes and indeed of all classes in the United States to it, and our dependence on the States for prosperity. ...

...A solution of the labor question has been thought of in a vague, general way, through the introduction of American laborers. But the planters, as a body, do not believe in it. They have not made any serious trials in it....Five years have passed since we, the Anglo-Saxons took possession, and there is not in existence a body of American laborers on the sugar plantations, nor has any serious attempt been made to secure one....

However, many men have been ‘thinking’ on the subject, nothing has been done, since **we, the Anglo-Saxons**, have had it our own way. We may therefore expect that nothing will be seriously done on that line. (PCA 3/18/1898: 4)

These articles were addressed to other white foreigners, and Hawaiians were discussed as objects, as if important decisions such as the future political status was up to the Anglo-Saxon community in Hawai'i, not a choice for Hawaiians to decide upon. Hawaiians were not deemed intelligent enough to warrant respect and to have their opinions count. Again, in the following excerpt from a March 10, 1898 editorial, note the intended (white) audience which was being addressed.

There are hardly 2,000 of us "able bodied" men who are trying to hold the fort of "white civilization here against 80,000 or more, who oppose us. We need to make our frontage solid as granite. We have put men in office, whose political sagacity may not be equal to the occasion, but we have put them there, and must stand by them, or cripple them. ...The suspicions, the insinuations, the criticisms on the admirable administration of the Government seem to indicate that the Legislature regards it as foolish, indiscreet, and not above suspicion. What we need in the presence of the forces working against us, is harmony, solidity, marching in line. (PCA 3/10/1898: 4)

Apparently, the forces working against "us" in the above excerpt, was the possibility of the white foreigners in Hawai'i being outnumbered by the Asian foreigners in Hawai'i, (referred to as "invaders" in the next excerpt). The editor suggested that more immigrants be allowed to immigrate from America, in order to reinforce the white population in Hawai'i.

The supremacy of the whites on these Islands can only be maintained by a large number of "small" white laborers, engaged in various industries. In this is our political salvation. We all know it. It is the only barrier against the 'invaders.' (PCA 3/10/1898: 4)

The above statements clearly illustrate that the supremacy of the white community over non-whites in Hawai'i was the political agenda of the paper.

Again, in a discussion on political strategy, the editor appealed to the readership to remain united, as Anglo-Saxons against non-Anglo-Saxons in the following excerpt from the editorial entitled "Too Much Suspicion."

...The wisdom of the hour would seem to be, to make the most strenuous efforts to consolidate the Anglo-Saxon element here, in face of its racial foes, rather than weaken it by 'suspicions.' We need consolidation, and not disintegration.

We need, in the interest of good government, and of annexation if it is possible, the aid of all of those who can influence the natives. It does not pay to kick such people now.

We gave the natives and their friends a Constitution which secured to them the privilege of taking things into their own hands at the ballot box. It was an invitation to trouble, in the event of delay in annexation. We did it, in spite of some strong advice to the contrary. ... we have made them a factor in our political situation... (PCA 2/16/1898: 4)

The tone of the article suggested also that Native voting rights were not considered normal in a colonial situation. In fact, the Constitutional rights were criticized by other Europeans. The editor implied that these voting rights were a “gift” of the colonial government, not a right. Hawaiians were considered an unimportant group, according to these editorials. They were not addressed in this discussion of Hawai’i’s future, nor were they feared as a force to be reckoned with. The Hawaiian population was so depleted physically, economically, and politically by 1898 that their interests were largely ignored.

The Role of the Anti-Imperialist Movement

In Anti-Racism in U.S. History, Herbert Aptheker discusses the presence of anti-racism as a response to racism throughout America’s history. He asserts that if anti-racists were not present, racist propaganda and anti-miscegenation laws would not have been necessary for the furthering of racist agendas.

Similarly, pro-imperialism rhetoric wouldn’t have been so strong if it was generally accepted that imperialism was a praiseworthy endeavor. The strong presence of anti-imperialists serves as the opposition which motivates the editors of the paper to address anti-imperialist arguments. The rhetoric which was used to justify colonial rule was further strengthened by the presence of the Anti-Imperialist League in America, as well as anti-annexationists in Hawai’i itself. Since there was a faction against annexation, annexationists had a clear target of who to compete with, in influencing the decision of whether annexation was a good thing for America.

By the late 1890s, the anti-imperialist movement was growing in America. According to Thomas J. Osborne, author of Empire Can Wait: American Opposition to Hawaiian Annexation 1893-1898, most anti-imperialism in the 1890s was primarily based on a reverence for America’s republican tradition and an anti-colonial attitude. There was a fear that the annexation of Hawai’i would provide precedent for the acquisition of more overseas territories which would further reduce mainland profit. Secondary to these ethical concerns was the fear of economic competition in labor and the sugar industry which Hawai’i would provide if it were a United States territory.

What were the arguments of anti-imperialists in America in 1898? Osborne states that pro-annexationists were responding to the criticism by their fellow Americans who opposed annexation, trying to influence Congress in their favor. Annexation wasn’t a cut and dried event; it

was under attack, and its approval in Congress was tenuous. The Pacific Commercial Advertiser's response was to address those arguments through the implication that Hawaiians did not know how to rule themselves, therefore they needed the "superior races" (European Americans) to assist them through annexation.

The initial reaction to news of the overthrow of the Hawaiian Monarchy in 1893 was favorable by Congress and the press but soon attitudes became skeptical. Annexation was campaigned against within the press for the following reasons: the belief in the illicit involvement of Minister Stevens and American marines in the overthrow of the queen; the belief that annexation was spawned by wealthy cane planters for getting sugar bounty from America; the belief that the United States did not have to annex (and outlay funds) to acquire the same commercial and military benefits (in this case, a protectorate was advocated over annexation); a fear of the dangers of embarking upon a new policy of colonialism; and the racist belief in the unsuitability of Hawaiians to be United States citizens. (Osborne 1981: 6-7)

Major ideological deterrents to annexation prompted the Pacific Commercial Advertiser to address those "moral" arguments with social Darwinism, the popular ideology of late 19th century America. Social Darwinism is based on the assumption that groups of people, inaccurately labelled as "races," evolve socially in the same way that species evolve biologically. (Osborne 1981: 34) By this logic, there is a hierarchy of societies, in order of evolutionary levels, and the highest evolutionary level of society was European/American. Many anti-annexationists rejected this ideology. For example, President Cleveland (1894-1898) was against colonial ventures and committed to "propriety" and ethics in international relations (Osborne 1981: 8)

However, not all anti-imperialists were opposed to imperialism on ethical grounds. It has been shown that during the course of the Hawaiian debate of 1893-94 the anti-imperialists subscribed to a broad range of racial views in respect to the mixed population of the islands. The only notion that the majority of the opponents of annexation held in common was the belief in the supposed superiority of Anglo-Saxon peoples, particularly Americans. (Osborne 1981: 38)

The following is an excerpt from the Introduction to American Imperialism in 1898-Problems in American Civilization, (1955) edited by Theodore P. Greene. This collection of essays focuses primarily on how to explain the forces which led the United States into expansionism and whether the decision for annexation was in the best national interest of the United States. Here, the editor outlines the basic arguments of pro-imperialist versus anti-imperialist

perspectives:

“In a world where other great powers were rapidly absorbing the undeveloped portions of the globe, was it not both the duty and the interest of the United States to annex the Philippines? Failure to do so would leave the islands open to seizure by another power which might treat the natives with far greater harshness and which might use the islands to the detriment of American trade and security. Anti-imperialists, on the other hand, asked whether a republic like the United States could afford to contradict its political and social traditions by assuming control over other peoples who were to be its subjects, not its citizens.” (Greene 1955: v)

Anti-imperialism provided the opposition for the propaganda. The “conscience” was represented by the anti-imperialists. Annexationists attempted to allay anti-imperialist fears with their own arguments and propaganda.

Pacific Commercial Advertiser articles which address a Continental American audience

Many editorials within the Pacific Commercial Advertiser addressed anti-annexation critiques by Americans on the continent. Economic gain and security were hailed as the most powerful incentives for America to annex Hawai'i .

Imperialism is clearly a value of this newspaper

The following article exemplifies the imperialist perspective of the newspaper, portraying non-European countries as objects of the economic desires of European countries. It also shows that the aim of contact with non-Europeans is the economic benefit of European countries, not to assist non-Europe along their path of development. It shows the reality behind the propaganda of “civilizing mission.” If the development of non-Europe were really for altruistic aims, the development of Asia would be described as a good thing, not critiqued as competition for European countries.

“Dividing the Chinese Empire”

...’Opening up’ savage Africa is one thing. ‘Opening up’ and encouraging industrial competition among several hundred millions of Asiatics who lay the Anglo-Saxon out flat in intelligent cheap labor is another thing.

England and the United States ‘opened up’ Japan, expecting to find there large markets for their own goods. They did open a market and at the same time opened up a country which threatens seriously to drive British and American goods of certain kinds out of the Oriental markets. The more China is brought under good and liberal administration, the quicker her

millions of people will do their own manufacturing, and take money from , instead of sending it to Europe. (PCA: 1/18/1898: 4)

Scarcity of Resources and Commercial Interests for America promoted Annexation

The argument of the scarcity of resources in relation to the growing United States population is another point which the Pacific Commercial Advertiser editorial brought up as evidence in support of annexation. According to the article, the United States' economic needs would require "foreign outlets" of import and export markets. These foreign markets, predominantly in Asia, would require a Pacific route, bringing Hawai'i into the picture. The editor of the Pacific Commercial Advertiser believed that the recognition of this need would break the complacency with which the average American viewed the rest of the world which would prompt Continental Americans to support annexation.

The average man does not care to increase his load. He does not take care of his health until he begins to lose it. He does not raise his umbrella until the rain falls.

Many of the Americans begin to realize that in the struggle for trade, Europe may, without threats of war towards America, close up the opening for her possible trade. As the American looks westward, Hawai'i lies across the line of vision.
(PCA 1/28/1898: 4)

In the next article, the editor suggested that annexation would be supported for commercial reasons before military or strategic reasons become important. The editorial cited a "breakthrough" with the New York Journal of Commerce, which finally agreed to the necessity for annexation, due to commercial interests in China. Again, the Pacific Commercial Advertiser was praising Americans for coming to their senses about the annexation issue, when the right choice, according to the Pacific Commercial Advertiser, was clearly pro-annexation.

" A Remarkable Conversion"

The Advertiser, during the last four years, has with more or less persistence, advocated the theory that annexation would be the result of the steady but slow growth of American commercial sentiment, and not of any strategic or military sentiment.

We have now the most remarkable evidence of the sudden growth of this sentiment, in the change of views on annexation, made by the New York Journal of Commerce, a conservative paper, which is read by more responsible merchants than any other paper in America: a paper whose careful editorials have unusual influence with the Eastern mercantile classes.

The Journal has always opposed annexation, on various grounds. On the 28th of last month,

its leading editorial, at great length, reviews the growing needs of American commerce in the Orient. It points out the rapid expansion of the manufacturing industry, and the absolute necessity of seeking markets in all parts of the world. It looks with alarm at the growth of European influence in China, and the sudden tendency to exclude Americans from its advantages. It says:

“These events conclusively silence the objections that have been hitherto well taken against connecting the Atlantic and Pacific oceans and annexing Hawai’i. Both achievements have now become inevitable.”

To those who have been watching, not the jingoes, but the great mercantile interests of the Atlantic states, which have, until now, refused to endorse annexation, this is news of the highest value. With these great interests actively on the side of annexation, the rest is only to record the needed votes. (PCA: 1/22/1898: 4)

Again, in the following article, the editor cited commercial development as an incentive for American support for annexation. He likened an American Hawai’i to the enviable Hong Kong possessed by the British.

Important News:

The friends of the annexation treaty propose to make the issue on commercial lines, and eliminate to a marked degree the flavor of jingoism that was so conspicuous in the original plan....

The “strategic” argument, unwisely forced to the front, has frightened conservative men in America. Those who pushed it, hardly realized that Captain Mahan’s argument for the annexation of Hawai’i, called for, and he insisted on it, a vast navy to defend it. **Now the Americans don’t like that sort of talk, because they are no longer savages, and prefer peace to war. And besides, they have no more fear of a terrible war, than the people of these Islands have a fear of being suddenly swallowed up by an earthquake.**

The one great unassailable argument in favor of annexation, from the American standpoint, is the need of possessing in the Pacific a great commercial exchange, like Hong Kong, which is the third most important port in the world, if we are correct. Great Britain holds this spot directly in front of Chinese trade.

This argument, so far as our own experience goes in conversing with very conservative men in the States, arrests their attention. It does not frighten them. It sets them to thinking....

No doubt the sudden movements of Germany in the Orient set the people in Washington to thinking. Germany wants a “Hong Kong” in the Orient. The Washington people begin to think, “if Great Britain has a Hong Kong, and Germany wants a Hong Kong, why should we not have a Hong Kong, that is, Hawai’i.” So we have excellent news. (PCA 1/17/1898: 4)

Finally, in the next excerpt, the editor suggested that New York businessmen would support annexation on commercial grounds, as long as it would be personally advantageous for them to do so.

The New York business men are gradually realizing the importance of the Pacific commerce, in the future. They are not influenced by Dr. McArthur's declaration that "Divine Providence has offered us the Hawaiian Islands." But a good outlet for the products of their city, which is the largest manufacturing center of the United States, will touch them seriously. Not until within a few years, has the question of outlet bothered them. Now they are beginning to think. Naturally enough, they will move slowly. In time, they will all become very good annexationists. It is a good sign when such an influential body of men listen to what is said in favor of expansion. Perhaps, the next step will be a movement by the Chamber of Commerce of that great city. (PCA 3/26/1898: 4)

One of the arguments against annexation which was put forth by an anti-imperialist American journalist, Mr. Watterson of the Louisville Courier-Journal is that somehow Hawai'i with a large non-white population, was not good enough to become a part of the United States, which would confer United States citizenship upon this non-white population. The Pacific Commercial Advertiser rebuked this idea, by stating that if Native Americans, "Indians" were admitted into the Union, Hawai'i's people should also be admitted, for they are better than Indians.

Mr. Watterson of the Louisville Courier-Journal ...tells his readers what he thinks about Hawai'i. In his hatred of her, he even adores the savage Indian. He says:

'There is no naming the Indian with the foul children of the archipelago (Hawai'i) who were born with the cholera, nurtured on poison and doomed in the cradles of their remotest ancestors to die of leprosy. We could meet and beat the Indian in the open field. He fought well and he fought fair. But we cannot fight the cholera with rifle cannon.' (PCA 2/10/1898: 4)

Note that the Pacific Commercial Advertiser editor labelled Indians "savage," thus revealing his own racist perceptions. He further argued that Mr. Watterson's respect for Indians was unfounded, and that they were actually much more savage than Hawaiians.

When he says the American Indian "fought fair" he knows perfectly well that he contradicts every page of history on Indian warfare,...Mr. Watterson makes a fire of a hundred volumes of Indian history in order to cast a lurid light over our "miserable condition." (PCA 2/10/1898: 4)

In future articles, however, it was apparent that the Pacific Commercial Advertiser editor did not have such a positive opinion of Hawaiians. His defense of the Hawaiian in the above case was merely for the sake of promoting annexation.

The Pacific Commercial Advertiser addressed arguments of anti-annexationists in the Continental United States

American annexationists from the Continental United States were portrayed as misled by inaccurate information; complacent; or narrow-minded.

Anti-annexationists were portrayed as misinformed

In the January 24, 1898 editorial of the Pacific Commercial Advertiser (p. 4), the editor criticized Ex-Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania's Mr. Agnew's anti-annexation stance. Judge Agnew's opinion was that the annexation of Hawai'i by the United States, although it had been in practice for over 100 years prior to 1898, was unconstitutional. The Pacific Commercial Advertiser editor argued that annexation was "vital and necessary to the integrity and growth of the United States." The editor further suggested that contrary to Justice Agnew's opinion of the overthrow that "the natives were robbed of all men hold dear, country, government and sunny homes," (PCA 1/24/1898: 4) Hawaiians were actually in support of the overthrow. The editor thus claimed that the anti-annexationists were misinformed, due to "the influence of the partisan press in America, which positively declares the 'robbery' of the natives by the whites, and leads men...astray." The editor ended by referring to the overthrow group as "revolutionists" suggesting positive, dynamic, evolutionary, necessary change, as opposed to theft.

We would like to present to the venerable jurist this state of things. Suppose that the French nation suddenly said to the United States: "We see that your great jurists hold that you really had no right to annex Louisiana. Please return that territory to us." Suppose Mexico should say to the United States: "Give us back Texas, California and the Gadsden purchase. It was unconstitutional annexation." Suppose Russia demanded the return of Alaska on the same ground. We respectfully ask the venerable jurist what decision he would render on it, if he became the arbitrator in the matter? Every lawyer knows that he would simply say what that able jurist of New York City, James C. Carter, said before the Bar Association of the United States: "Laws and constitutions are only the expressions of the present thought of the people, and lose their force, whenever they do not reflect those thoughts and opinions." He would fervently advise the keeping of the stolen goods, and at the same time, beseech them not to repeat the offense. But these offenses have been vital and necessary to the integrity and growth of the United States. (PCA 1/24/1898: 4)

Anti-annexationists were portrayed as complacent

The following editorial pointed out that the Democratic party's opposition to annexation was due in part to the strong contingency of representatives from Southern states, who acted largely on inherited ideas of Southern men "...founded during the slavery period...which fostered

provincialism in its worst form". With this indictment, the Pacific Commercial Advertiser editor condemned the anti-annexation Democratic party as provincial and narrow-minded, concerned only with local development; in a word, "backwards."

We, of course, feel sadly, that he does not take "broad views." But our views were not very "broad" until we got into a scrape and were frightened. If he would only get scared as we have been scared, he would take more interest in the matter. ...(PCA 1/7/1898: 4)

Anti-annexationists were portrayed as narrow-minded

In an editorial written two days later, anti-annexationists were again denigrated as narrow-minded. The Pacific Commercial Advertiser editor cited the Congressional debate on the Louisiana purchase some years prior, and the statement of a Senator White from Delaware, whom the editor described as one of the "limp narrow-minded men, who squatted by the road side and believed that they had gone far enough already."(PCA 2/9/1898: 4) In arguing why the Louisiana purchase should not be made, Senator White said:

"If it should ever be incorporated into this Union, which I have no idea can be done but by altering the Constitution, I believe it will be the greatest curse that could at present befall us. Louisiana must and will become settled. Thus our citizens will be removed to the immense distance of two or three thousand miles from the capital of the Union; their affections will become alienated; they will begin to view us as strangers. These, with other causes will in time effect a separation. We have already territory enough."(PCA 2/9/1898: 4)

In the rest of the article, the Pacific Commercial Advertiser editor suggested that Senator White was regretting this statement in his ghostly form, along with other people throughout history whose ideas were proven wrong. This implied that people who oppose annexation were clearly misguided and will see the "truth" in the future.

There is some reason to believe that Senators are reflecting on the narrow views of their predecessors, who invariably opposed expansion of territory, and now cease to hold places as statesmen in the histories. Let every Senator who is in doubt on this subject try to realize the sad plight of the ghost of Senator White which, through the innumerable ages, wanders about whispering to itself: "What an ass I made of myself in that Louisiana matter." (PCA 2/9/1898: 4)

The Pacific Commercial Advertiser addressed arguments of anti-annexationists in Hawai'i

The portrayal of anti-annexationists in Hawai'i was categorically worse than the portrayal of American anti-annexationists in the United States. The antagonism of the Pacific Commercial Advertiser towards them was revealed in characterizations such as "ranting anarchist" and "crazy," which aimed to discredit their claims. This was significant because anti-annexationists in Hawai'i were more threatening to the cause of annexation than anti-annexationists in America. Those from Hawai'i were assumed (by outsiders) to be privy to the true conditions in Hawai'i, whereas anti-annexationists from America were arguing on purely theoretical grounds. The opinions of anti-annexationists from Hawai'i thus had more weight than those from America, causing the attack on them within the Pacific Commercial Advertiser to be more severe. In response to a Hawai'i Legislative speech by an anti-annexationist Representative Loebenstein in which he criticized Republic of Hawai'i President Dole, the editor (Armstrong) wrote a vicious editorial in the Pacific Commercial Advertiser attacking Loebenstein and defending the Republic of Hawai'i's bid for annexation.

Mr. L. seems to view the situation as the Queen does. He and she declare that the natives 'are goaded by their wrongs,' and she as well as he feels badly about it. ...

But Mr. L. declares that the present rule is that of "a general tyranny, despotism and centralism of a hide-bound centralizing and medioco executive, arrogating to itself both judicial and legislative functions, in defiance of the Constitution."

...Whatever the defects of the Government are, it is not what Mr. L. declares it to be. (PCA 3/28/1898: 4)

Towards the end of the editorial, the Pacific Commercial Advertiser editor attacked the anti-annexationist's credibility:

Therefore, his language is only that of an irreconcilable, ranting anarchist, the ravings of a political dervish who finally gets so wrought up with anger and rage, that he tears off his clothes, and foams at the mouth. Mr. L.'s speech is an admirable specimen of "sand lot" oratory and he was very properly rebuked by Representative Atkinson. (ibid)

Denigration of the anti-annexationists continued in the following article, in which pro-annexationists were referred to as "earnest patriots," while anti-annexationists were described as "snakes."

... We shall have trouble enough of all kinds if annexation fails, but we congratulate the President that he did not go into hysterics over it,... We shall face the music. Snakes will be

lively in the Paradise of the Pacific, as they were in Eden. But the Earnest Patriots will come to the front with plenty of grit, and help to scorch them. (PCA 3/5/1898: 4)

III. Negative Portrayal of Hawaiians in the Pacific Commercial Advertiser

In addition to articles promoting annexation directly, coverage within the Pacific Commercial Advertiser also consisted of articles which indirectly supported the goal of annexation. These articles were divided into two themes: the portrayal of Native Hawaiians as inferior and corrupt; and the representation of Americans as providing a positive, “civilizing” influence on Hawaiians and Hawai’i, thus being necessary to the successful progression of Hawai’i into the modern world.

Representation of Pacific Islanders

By the time colonial administrators appropriated land and resources in the Pacific in the 19th century, Pacific islanders had already been represented to European eyes back in Europe through explorer and missionary descriptions. Portrayals ranged from noble to ignoble, reflecting a racism which was self-serving to the colonial enterprise. Polynesians were portrayed by Europeans as smarter, more civilized, more beautiful than Melanesians, who were depicted as bloodthirsty, unreasonable cannibals. However, all Islanders had something in common: they were inferior to Europeans. This was in fact a characteristic they supposedly shared with all non-Europeans, from Mexico to Malaysia; from Mongolia to Zaire. According to the European colonialist worldview, God hath shed His light on Europe alone and left the rest of humanity in darkness, to be enlightened only through contact with those chosen few. Thus colonialism was transformed into an act of altruism.

Myth of the Lazy Native

An insightful study on the images of colonized peoples propagated by colonizing powers is The Myth of the Lazy Native by S.H. Alatas, Professor of Malay Studies at the University of Singapore. This study is primarily concerned with images of Southeast Asians as indolent, which, from the colonial point of view, is an unforgivable trait, responsible for the natives’ demise and continuing low status throughout the colonial era. Alatas describes this image as an integral part of the legitimization of colonial rule over the Southeast Asians (Alatas 1977: 23), to a critical faction within Europe that was against imperialism. Alatas traces the advent of the use of this

image to the mid-18th century, the height of the Dutch colonial rule in the area, when there was a strong necessity for an explanation for their control over the indigenous population. (Alatas 1977: 22)

“... judgment on the lazy Javanese became more forceful and numerous as Dutch colonial control of the island grew. By the beginning of the 19th century, particularly after the introduction of the culture system by van den Bosch, the idea of the lazy Javanese figured more prominently in the controversy between the liberal and conservative factions in Dutch circles. ...The Dutch East India Company’s system of forced delivery...required a moral justification and the myth of the lazy Javanese furnished this. Earlier Dutch records on Java (17th-early 18th century) made very little reference to laziness. During that time the Dutch did not directly regulate the labour of the Javanese. (Alatas 1977: 61)

The Colonizer’s View of the World

According to J.M. Blaut, author of The Colonizer’s View of the World, imperialism has been supported by a political ideology which he has labeled as “diffusionism.” Diffusionism is based on the idea that humankind is inherently unequal; with Europeans as inherently superior, and non-Europeans as inherently inferior. This theory was utilized in colonial settings all over the world, as a rationalization for colonialism and a way to suppress potential indigenous opposition. The *same myths* were reproduced and applied to the representation of people from diverse cultures around the world. Indeed, the fact that they were used to describe peoples with no historical or cultural relationship to one another illustrates the fact that the assumptions say more about the colonizer’s perception than the reality of the colonized.

Along these lines, Edward Said described the ways in which “the Orient” has been defined by “Orientalist” scholars from the West, according to the varying needs of the Western powers. His analysis of the subjectivity of knowledge about the constructed category called “the Orient” has been a useful tool in looking at the relationship between power and representation in many settings.

“...for a European or American studying the Orient there can be no disclaiming the main circumstances... that he comes up against the Orient as a European or American first, as an individual second. And to be a European or an American in such a situation is by no means an inert fact. It meant and means being aware, however dimly, that one belongs to a power with definite interests in the Orient...” (Said 1979: 11)

The representation of non-Europeans were less depictions of reality than they were reflections of the colonizer’s worldview. Edward Said continues:

“... Orientalism is--and does not simply represent--a considerable dimension of modern political-intellectual culture, and as such has less to do with the Orient than it does with “our” world.” (Said 1979: 12)

Manifest Destiny in America

In America the colonizer’s view of the world was present from the very beginning of the colonization of the North American continent. This evolved into the ideology of Manifest Destiny, incorporating the concept of “civilizing mission” into American philosophy. Since Americans generally saw America as a moral, ethical country which venerated freedom, it was necessary for these rationalizing ideologies to evolve in order to make “sense” of the oppressive acts which in fact were the antithesis to the freedom America espouses.

The propaganda included at its very base, a denigrating view of Native Americans, as inferior to Anglo-Americans in every way. This cleared the path to promote the idea that actually, the American government was providing a service to the colonized by sharing its superior methods of government and its economic and social systems with the inferior colonized. It justified the political takeover of a land previously owned by independent peoples.

Propaganda Changes According to the Needs of the Colonizer

Further proof of this connection between political agenda and propaganda is found in Dr. James Evans study of stereotypes in the 19th century American Frontier, entitled Mexican Bandit, Indian Savage and the Chinese Heathen: Three Popular Stereotypes. In the years in which the indigenous land owner was seen as a threat to the interests of the colonizer, the image perpetuated by the colonizer was negative. For example, when Chinese immigrants to the United States outnumbered Japanese immigrants, the Japanese were portrayed in newspapers of the time as the “model minority”. When Chinese immigration subsided and the Japanese were the only ones left, all of a sudden the “model minority” became evil. The same people were portrayed in two lights, the only difference being the perceived threat to the political/economic agenda of the authors. (Evans 1967: 210-211)

“...When the Anglo-Americans, some of them fresh off the boat from their European homelands, had reduced the Indians, Mexicans, or Chinese in numbers and/or found a stereotype no longer to be of economic advantage, they discarded it. (ibid)

“ By the 1890’s the Indian no longer possessed much land thought to be of value. He had been deprived of his land and/or subdued. Since he had been deprived, there could be no

further thefts of his property and thus there was no reason to continue the legend that he was a savage. (Evans 1967: 211)

Rather than being arbitrary reflections of “prejudice” and ethnic pride against non-white people, they were more specifically related to the desires of the Americans for Indian or Mexican land. The fact that they changed according to the changing needs and agenda of American expansionism is evidence for the connection between the stereotypes and political utility.

Negative images of natives were used to justify oppression in Southeast Asia

Professor Alatas’ comments on the colonial ideology in Southeast Asia mirror this phenomenon in Hawai’i:

“...the colonial ideology utilized the idea of the lazy native to justify compulsion and unjust practices in the mobilization of labour in the colonies. It portrayed a negative image of the natives and their society to justify and rationalize European conquest and domination of the area. It distorted elements of social and human reality to ensure a comfortable construction of the ideology.” (Alatas 1977: 2)

The political aim of colonialism in Southeast Asian countries was facilitated by the portrayal of natives as inferior. This mirrors the experience of Native Hawaiians in Hawai’i.

The denigration of Native Hawaiians within the Pacific Commercial Advertiser

In Hawai’i, the colonizer’s view of the world was propagated by pro-annexationists. In order to address the anti-annexationists’ opposition, the colonizer’s view of the world was again employed, resulting in the negative representation of Native Hawaiians in The Pacific Commercial Advertiser. There were several ways in which Hawaiians were negatively portrayed in this newspaper. First, there was an emphasis on race as a category used to describe human behavior, in which Hawaiians and other ethnic groups were categorized and theorized about. Next, the blame for the loss of the Hawaiian Kingdom was placed upon Hawaiians themselves, for mismanagement and incompetence. Lastly, there was a personal indictment of Lili’uokalani which attacked her credibility. Each of these themes represented in the Pacific Commercial Advertiser served to indirectly support the newspaper’s agenda of annexation, by discrediting Native Hawaiians.

“Race” has been used historically in order to justify imperialism

The use of “race” as a category has been used inaccurately to describe what are actually

ethnic variations among the one human race. This occurred in order to promote certain political aims, such as slavery, colonialism, and other oppressions throughout history. This has been present in America from the beginning of the colonial era and directed towards Native Americans, African slaves, Mexicans and Asian immigrants whenever needed to justify oppression.

Indeed, this racism was brought to Hawai'i in the minds of American settlers to Hawai'i. Consider the following editorial, in which the editor attempted to denigrate an anti-annexationist Congressman (Atkinson) by associating him with the negative attributes he associated with African-Americans:

"Interpreting the Constitution"

'Whatever the wording of the Constitution is, it was not meant that the Ministers should try to lead either the House or the Senate,' etc.,etc. ...Whenever a man uses the vague phrase, 'whatever the wording may be,' etc., you may be pretty sure that he doesn't care much about words and their meaning. The Representative evidently needs as much training in a knowledge of the Constitution, as the venerable darky did, who was elected to the Georgia Legislature, after the Civil war. After the first week of the session, he rose and said: "Mr. Speaker! What am dat 'ar no'sh'un day calls de Constitushun? I hears dem talkin about hits pervishuns. Is de perwishuns wegetable or meat? Mr. Speakah! What am de Constitushun?" (PCA 2/21/1898: 4)

The racist aversion to African-Americans which prevailed in the continental United States was reproduced in the perspective of the editorials. In the following editorial about labor in Hawai'i entitled "Annexation Items" the editor announced that African-Americans were not welcome as laborers in Hawai'i, except as a last resort. American racism was alive and well among annexationists in 1898 Hawai'i.

...The Southern States will find work for many millions of industrious Negroes. But they would be only too willing to colonize Hawai'i with Negro tramps. However, Hawai'i will never receive Negro laborers of the kind that will immigrate, until she is in the very last ditch, so far as labor is concerned. One good dose of the "way down" Negroes on a plantation will be quite enough. The good darkies can always do well at home. (PCA 3/23/1898: 4)

Articles in the Pacific Commercial Advertiser which discussed "Race Habits:"

One of the themes describing the newspaper's most prevalent articles in early 1898 is the idea that there were certain characteristics associated with "race" which would affect any plebiscite put before Native Hawaiians on the question of annexation. In the Pacific Commercial Advertiser, "Race Habits" were discussed primarily in the context of "objectivity" in voting matters. The

notion that race habits could not be overcome was the crux of the argument about why Hawaiians could not maintain control of their own country or even have a say in their political future. In response to a suggestion to have the annexation question put to a vote by Native Hawaiians, the editor of the Pacific Commercial Advertiser, thereafter wrote many articles on “race instincts” present in all the races. According to him, these race habits would undoubtedly influence the Hawaiian vote, in favor of restoration of the Native Hawaiian Monarchy rather than annexation. His argument was that the vote would reflect “race instincts” rather than objectivity and intelligent choice for the best political future for Hawai’i.

“Race Habits” were assumed to exist and divide people and to determine behavior:

“Race Habits in South Africa”

It is simply foolish to ignore the race question, in these Islands. It exists and must be met wisely or unwisely. The Teutonic races have confronted it everywhere in the extension of their dominion. It will become a more troublesome question here, in the future. **After the Hawaiian race habits are dealt with, the race habits of the Portuguese, the Japanese and the Chinese must also be dealt with. The best preparation for doing so intelligently, is to get adequate ideas of the strength and nature of their racial habits. They may be dormant, as our “tempers” are dormant, but trivial accidents will instantly bring them into play.** (PCA 2/1/1898: 4)

Here the editor suggested that only education alters race prejudice:

“The Influence of the Press”

...In the first place, few men are open to conviction. Party allegiance, racial feeling, and religious sentiment determine men’s thoughts. Reason operates slowly. It may strike for generations against the mailed armor of habit or prejudice, without penetrating it....
 ...Is the case hopeless? Surely not. Only men are impatient and insist on seeing immediate results. It is by the education of the children that racial instincts and habits are modified, and good citizens are made. ‘I can’t wait for that,’ cries the restless Reformer. ‘But you have got to wait for it,’ replies Human Experience. (PCA 2/17/1898: 4)

In the next article, crime statistics listed by ethnicity were discussed. Ethnicity was dangerously related with crime, as well as reinforcing stereotyped perceptions of other groups.

“Convictions for Crime”

The biennial report of the Chief Justice contains an interesting comparison of the criminal offenses, committed by the different races on the Islands.

In the face of this statement our social conditions is not only disgraceful, but presents the inhabitants of the Republic to the world, as the wickedest little civilized nation on earth. Ten percent of the entire population have been convicted of crime. If the same proportion of convictions were made last year in the United States, over 7,000,000 of its inhabitants would have been under sentence for crime. The proportion of convictions to the number of inhabitants is far less than in Hawai’i, even in the slums of the cities.

But this dreadful aspect of our social life is changed, when it is noticed that the convictions for gambling and the possession of opium, made up the largest of the conviction.

The Chief Justice states that of 4,146 arrests for gambling, only 2,861 convictions were obtained. Twelve hundred and eighty-five were discharged. When such a great, almost suspicious proportion of discharges is made, it is pretty evident that there is either a lax or an arbitrary system of arrests. There may be, however, some adequate and just cause for it. The Marshal plainly suggests, in his report, a state of things which may account for it.

According to these statistics, the Portuguese, as a race, take the lead as law abiding citizens. The percentage of convictions of persons of this race is only 3.49. No doubt the Chinese would present as good a record, if their crimes of gambling and having opium in possession were abolished.

The Americans, British, and Germans make up about 80 percent of the 'other races' set forth in the statement. The members of these races are practically exempt from the crime of gambling. Convictions of the people of these races are chiefly for drunkenness. The high percentage of these convictions, proves clearly one fact. If the 'white man,' referring now especially to these races, cannot work in the tropics, he certainly can get drunk in the tropics. The Rev. Joseph Cook, tells us that a Republican form of government cannot exist, where the snow does not fall. His conclusion must be that the Anglo-Saxon is better able to get intoxicated, than to rule himself in the tropics.

At any rate we believe that it is generally admitted that our judicial system has been and is, excellent, even if it is below the snow line.

The high percentage of convictions of the members of the most intelligent and enlightened nations, furnishes a curious and interesting study. (PCA 3/19/1898: 4)

The Pacific Commercial Advertiser editor portrayed racial instincts as inherent and difficult to overcome, even for "the more cultivated people." And the editor wrote that only education over long periods of time would take them away. The following feature article was a report on a lecture offered by a Professor Shaler, which encapsulated the theory which the editor later extrapolated on in subsequent editorials.

Again, the editor was still trying to prove the racial instincts run people, not intelligence; "even civilized people."

"The Research Club"

If that healthy nursery plant, the Research Club, becomes firmly rooted here, Rev. Mr. Birnie must be credited with having planted one of the most valuable social and political growths that the Islands need.

It is the young men who shape the future of the nation. In the ordinary course of events the older men control and govern. They, as a class, invariably keep things as they are in all branches of human activities. The reasons for it, are many and sufficient.

In the discussion of the racial question, the young men will find that they are lacking facts which underlie our social conditions. With or without annexation, the racial instincts, habits and prejudices will be extremely active and pushing, and must determine the complexion of our social life and our political life too, if there is no annexation. All things tend towards annexation at present, and with it these racial questions are still supremely important. (PCA 3/14/1898: 4)

Below, the editor was further trying to prove the “racial instinct” theory saying that it is custom and since even law is based on custom, it should be recognized. The “race instinct” argument was continuously emphasized in this newspaper as a critical response to the proposal that the political status of Hawai’i be put to a vote by Native Hawaiians. By claiming that the “race instinct” was unavoidable and difficult to change, the editor tried to discredit Native Hawaiian objectivity. In other words, he was saying that if a plebiscite was to be held, Hawaiians would vote for the restoration of the Monarchy, but their votes would be out of “race habit” or loyalty rather than the objective use of intelligence.

“Supernatural Natives”

After reading several communications on the subject of “racial instincts” we have concluded that the large majority of “educated” men in this community have not given it much, if any attention, and therefore, know as little about it as they do about sewerage systems upon which their’s and their families’ health and even life somewhat depends. This is due, mainly, to a lack of time, and inclination to study these subjects and not to the lack of intelligence or ability. These subjects are disposed of by horse-shed opinions, or are waived off with a motion of the hand. In the end, the community suffers from such trifling.

The great mass of material on the force of habit collected by students and scholars is hardly known. The wisdom of Lord Bacon was expressed in these words: “The predominance of custom is everywhere visible, inasmuch as a man would wonder to hear men profess, protest, engage, give great words, and then do just as they have done before as if they were dead images and engines, moved only by the wheels of custom.” “Instinct,” “custom” and “habit” are convertible forms. The Latins said: “Custom is a second law;” and Carlyle said: ‘We do everything by custom, even believe by it; our very axioms, let us boast of Free thinking as we may, are oftenest such beliefs as we have never heard questioned.’

So when our good friends of the Cousin’s society say that the early missionaries did not find racial prejudices among the natives. Lord Bacon and Herbert Spencer and these scholars are foolish talkers, or the natives were simply supernatural creatures. What were the superstitions of the natives but race prejudices in favor of their own gods? And what were their ideas of virtue and right but race instincts or customs which neither the early nor late missionaries rooted out, and exist, according to Rev. Mr. Bicknell’s and Dr. Sereno Bishop’s writings with alarming force today?

Gen. Bradley T. Johnson, a noted Confederate general said 20 years ago: “We know nothing about the Negroes’ habits and mental processes, and now we are facing them in our ignorance.” At the October Indian Conference at Lake Mohonk, Dr. Ellis said,

we are no longer trying to make a Puritan of the Indian, but to make a good Indian. That is, he is taken with his prejudices and customs, and made better. His racial instincts are recognized.

The common law of the English-speaking world is founded mainly on immemorial usage, or custom, which becomes the racial instinct, and yet this powerful common law is often contrary to good abstract reasoning. It is surprising that lawyers are not the first, in this community, to realize the supreme force of race instincts in shaping institutions. Even if Lord Bacon is not considered an “authority” here, Blackstone should be.
(PCA 1/20/1898: 4)

In the following articles, the editor discussed “racial instincts” in the context of the way that people vote along ethnic lines, even in the United States. The editor was implying that the Hawaiian anti-annexation sentiment could be attributed to a similar “prejudice,” which is based on “race” sentiment rather than intellectual understanding. The editor implied that all “races” do this, (even the “stronger races,” as he so often refers to the Anglo-Saxons), so it is not surprising, therefore, according to him, that Hawaiians would not be able to dismiss their ‘racial instincts’ in order to base their political decisions on rationality.

Here the editor stated that race instincts in Hawaiians were so strong that they overcame all attempts at rationality. This editorial was a response to the proposal that a plebiscite be held and Hawaiians be given an opportunity to vote on the annexation question.

The Friend says: “The unenlightened Hawaiian will prefer even a stupid or oppressive ruler of his own kin, but educate him up enough and he will like other educated races, enjoy liberal and Republican regime.

We would like to ask the Friend what we have been doing with “him” since 1820, but educating him. When will the “enough” arrive? Why is it not here? Who is doing the educating now? As the editor of the Friend has been conclusively proving to the readers of the Independent (NY) that the native is not fitted for self-government, will he tell them when he will be? Perhaps the Friend means merely to generalize and state a proposition for instance: A bad man likes bad things. Make him good and he likes good things. A bad dog bites. “Make” him a cherub, and he won’t bite. A monkey steals. “Make” him a Quaker and he won’t. The trouble lies in the “making.” We have been in the business of making our neighbors the Hawaiians good for three-fourths of a century, and his racial, as well as our own racial instincts have not been thought of. The Friend’s idea seems to be to give the races chloroform, pull out instincts by the roots, and then declare that all races are assimilated. (PCA 2/5/1898: 4)

The following article reiterated the idea that race instincts were insurmountable. In the context of the discussion of Hawaiian self-determination, this argument had the effect of discrediting Hawaiian desires for nationalism, as an irrational desire based on ethnic loyalties rather than rational examination of the issues:

Statement by the editor in the editorial:

We have collected and published in another column, some facts and reflections on the strength of the racial instincts, because in those instincts will be found the solution of the native Hawaiians, thought and political conduct, now and hereafter. We earnestly ask the young men to seriously study the subject and so understand what appears to be foolish and even disastrous in the natives' attitude. We have drawn elsewhere largely on the valuable writings of Professor Shaler of Harvard College, who has presented the question of the racial instincts of the Negro, to the American public, and its place in politics. There can, of course, be no exhaustive discussion of this matter, in our columns. We must confine ourselves mainly to suggestions. A clearer understanding of racial instincts may help us to steer wisely through the ugly political shoals which surround us now, and will surround us for many years to come, with or without annexation. For want of space, we confine ourselves to the native race, though all that we say is equally applicable to the Portuguese, the Japanese, the Chinese, and to the Anglo-Saxon as well.

The dominant party, mainly of Anglo-Saxons is trying to establish good and stable government here. It must deal in some way with the native race, and it is under the highest obligation to deal with it justly, whether or not it asks for justice or not. The Anglo-Saxon with his own prejudices and racial instincts must sufficiently appreciate the natives' prejudices and racial instincts. He should not do so in order to yield to them, but in order to understand the native line of thought. This community has been much at sea, because it failed to appreciate the force of racial instincts. In spite of education, and experience, the dominant race here thinks and acts largely on racial instincts. The reasons for it appear in the views which we print elsewhere.

The English have manifested the most intense racial feeling towards the French for several centuries. ...The people of both of these countries unite in despising American ways. On the other hand, the American misrepresents and despises the English and French ways. he believes in the utter selfishness of the British nation. The American here as a rule, believes that Great Britain is willing to defy the laws of God and man and gobble up these Islands.

He refuses to believe in British Justice or fairness. The Britisher on the other hand, believes that the American has no sense of fair play in his dealings with these islands. The racial feelings, after all guide the thoughts of each. The racial instinct of the Englishman is for a monarchy. That of the American is for a democracy.

The English statesmen, to a large extent, refuse to accept the political theories of American statesmen. The Americans despise the House of Lords and want to know of what use the Queen is. Running through social, political and even business life, are these racial differences, creating angry feelings, constant suspicions and even a thirst for each other's blood.

These conflicting view do not arise, it is evident enough, from any studious, careful examination of the subject but come with the birth of the child, and are fostered in his education. (PCA 1/3/1898: 4)

The following article discussed the concept of "the race instinct" which the editor suggested is an allegiance to one's cultural roots. Here he stated that this lack of objectivity could be overcome, but it would be a difficult endeavor which included "education" in the form of

westernization.

“The Racial Instinct”

Judge Hartwell, we believe does not quite seize the point we have made regarding the racial tendencies of the natives, or he would not have stated that there is danger of overestimating these things, and of producing a hopeless and not only hopeless but unfounded belief in natural tendencies.

We place the native on the same plane upon which we placed the stronger races, and illustrated it by citing the racial antipathies of those remarkably civilized races, the English and the French. Professor Shaler, in no place stated that the case is “hopeless” but, on the other hand distinctly stated that **the higher men rise in intelligence, the more quickly are the race instincts modified.** Therefore the case cannot be hopeless. **No one asserts that the racial instincts are irradicable; but only education, long periods of time, and change of environment does it.**

The racial instincts of the natives, until modified by time, will influence them largely, just as they influence other races. We have had abundant experience in the Eastern cities, for 40 years of the indomitable, irrepressible and blind feeling of the Irish race, in its antipathy to “Republican” government. It is called in a rather loose way the “racial” feeling....The existence of this instinct creates divergent lines of thought between races. Here it is not necessary that it should be extreme. **We do not use the words “race instinct” in any degrading sense.** (PCA 1/15/1898: 4)

Therefore, according to the logic of the above editorials, Native Hawaiians were not capable of objectivity in voting on the annexation question, and would have voted out of loyalty to their “race” rather than objective, intellectual deliberation. This clearly aimed to discount Native Hawaiian opinion as prejudiced, particularly the overwhelming majority of anti-annexation sentiment within the Native Hawaiian community.

Non-Europeans were labelled by ethnicity rather than name:

Particular themes were prevalent in the coverage within the newspaper which supported the civilizing mission of the pro-annexationist Americans in Hawai’i. For example, Hawaiians were often mentioned in crime reports, giving the impression that most Hawaiians were criminals. Within those crime reports, Hawaiians and other non-white ethnicities were listed by their ethnicity, with their names omitted or included only incidentally, while Americans or European people were listed by their names, without reference to their ethnicity. This reflected the target audience of the newspaper, which was the American and European community of foreigners in Hawai’i, who would know the other people within their community. It also reflected a racist perspective; in which the ethnicity of the participants in crimes was being mentioned to validate an assumption that non-whites were more prone to criminal behavior. If the non-white community

could be presented as prone to criminal behavior, i.e. “uncivilized,” the civilizing mission would then have been deemed necessary, therefore justifying annexation.

Consider the following headlines which were commonplace (occurring every 2-3 days) in the Pacific Commercial Advertiser during this period.

“Chinese and Japanese have a Big Fight.” (PCA 1/29/1898: 5)

“Knocked Out: Severe Rebuke given to a Waiter by a Native.” (PCA 1/5/1898: 3)

“Limb fell. Japanese was under it and was injured.” (PCA: 1/6/1898: 4)

“Much sickness. Several members of a Portuguese family stricken.” (PCA 1/6/1898: 7)

“Pake Gamblers. Police hot on trail of gaming enterprises.” (PCA 1/7/1898: 5)

Europeans and Anglo-Americans, on the other hand, are not listed by ethnicity; they are listed by name, which imparts more respect and humanity.

“Saved a Life: Ernest Renken Injured in Rescuing a Japanese.” (PCA 1/11/1898: 8)

While out with a fishing party near Waianae recently, Ernest Renken at the peril of his own life, saved a Japanese from death by drowning. The Japanese could not swim a stroke, but under the excitement of the instant, jumped into deep water after a big fish.

“The Japanese’s” name isn’t mentioned once throughout the length of the article.

The above examples thus illustrate the generally racist manner in which people in Hawai’i were categorized and perceived by the editor of the Pacific Commercial Advertiser (and presumably at least some of the readers) during this period. Non-whites were not afforded the dignity of their names; they were simply referred to by their ethnicity; while Europeans and white Americans were mentioned by name. This reflects the intimacy of the white community in Hawai’i, small enough so that people knew each other by name. It also reflects the racial division which existed between this white minority and the population at large.

Competition of ethnic groups

The following articles reflected the idea that different races were in competition with one other. Here the editorially specifically discussed Asians. There was an element of fear reflected in the articles; fear of Asians overwhelming the population of Hawai’i and becoming powerful enough to usurp American power in Hawai’i.

Jan 12, 1898 p. 4 Editorial Page Chinese Homes:

“We are told by an excellent authority that there is a larger number of Chinese “homes” on these islands in which the ideas and habits of the Anglo-Saxons prevail than there is in any other place outside of China, in proportion to the population. It is said that they are Christian homes. It is perhaps enough if they are homes where woman is treated and honored as she should be.

Whatever may be the religious view in the future of the many Chinese children now attending our public schools it is certain that ...they will abandon the ideas prevailing in China and largely assimilate themselves to the Anglo-Saxons. Whether they will assimilate their vices or virtues first, remains to be seen.

Unless there is a decided increase in the numbers of Americans and Europeans, the Asiatics will in a generation become the most powerful social element here, in education, in wealth, and even in political power....If immigration be absolutely stopped, the increase of the Asiatic race will be rapid. The children now in the kindergartens and schools will become great factors in our social and political problems.

One of the most striking illustrations of the rapid changes here is the racial condition of the Kamehameha schools for girls. **The purely Polynesian faces make up a small minority. The story of the dying Polynesian is told at a glance.** One of the interesting studies will be the relative value, in the future, of the mixture of Polynesian with the blood of European, Chinese, and Japanese. Which breed, will possess the strongest staying powers?

Again, this reveals the perspective that race equals personality or character. It also reflects the editor's belief in the notion that Hawaiians were dying out, a common rationalization for colonialism. Finally, it raised the idea of “purity” of race, and “breeds” of people.

“Legislative Duty”

About one half of the time prescribed by the Constitution for the length of the Legislature session has passed, and yet the one supremely important, vital question which goes to the existence of the white man on these Islands has not been touched. The members of the Legislature are honest, patriotic and prudent. But they are occupying their time in matters, which however, important, are insignificant in comparison with the question regarding the political control of these islands, either with or without annexation.

Does the Legislature propose to adjourn without adopting or providing some plan, if any can be devised, for settling the question of what the back bone and sinew of the State shall be made of? While the policy of the whites here is in outward appearance a drifting one, it is in its results a most vigorous one.

The Portuguese substantially confess like the Anglo-Saxon that they cannot compete with the Asiatics. Neither Anglo-Saxon nor Portuguese can complain. The Asiatics were ‘cordially invited to attend’ by the State itself.

The census of childbirths is very significant. **The Asiatic females number 7,644 already. It is only a question of time when the 30,735 excess of Asiatic males over Asiatic females will decrease by marriage, and the childbirths will increase more rapidly than ever.** The merchants, the mechanics, the laborers of the American and European races say

that it is now only a question of time when they will be crowded out by Oriental competition. So that while the present dominant force here is without any pronounced policy regarding the future, there is a decided, strong vigorous policy in existence, created by our deeds in the past and sustained by our actions in the present. Plantation wages, the inability to purchase land in many places, the existence of the deadening leasehold system, the demands for more Asiatic labor, the absence of diversified industries are facts which of themselves create a most vigorous policy. These brush away political platforms, and idle talk about what ought to be done.

Some say that we are now at the parting of the ways, and must make the choice of the road ending in the Orient. Some of our own people and some of our intelligent visitors, and good annexationists too, believe, on the other hand that we were at the parting of the ways years ago, and that we cast the die in 1886, when we earnestly begged for Japanese immigration.

These reluctantly believe that we are rapidly traveling along the Oriental road of our own accord, with our backs towards America, though we wave, and shout for the American flag. There are some who believe that we are yet at the parting of the ways. (PCA 3/26/1898: 4)

III. Blame the Victim For The Loss of their own Government

One of the ideas promoted by the pro-annexationists was that Hawaiians were remiss in their duties to the land and resources, and therefore deserved to lose the right to self-government. This idea was found elsewhere in colonial situations. S.H. Alatas discusses the ideological biases associated with colonialism which underlie arguments against political independence of formerly colonized peoples, essentially “blaming the victim” for the loss of independence. It was thought that sovereignty could be forfeited if the government was not conforming to certain requirements. Here he quotes J.S. Furnivall, colonialist scholar of Indonesian history, discussing the colonies’ loss of independence:

“If a Government does not provide adequately for economic progress, it will be unable to maintain itself against external economic forces; it will not be permitted to survive. ...Tropical peoples forfeited their independence because, under the guidance of their native rulers, they were unable to qualify as citizens of the modern world by complying with its requirements. The usual type of colonial Government complies with them more adequately than the native tropical rulers whom it has superseded. Doubtless colonial powers, in the management of colonial affairs, look primarily to their own interest, and one source of weakness in colonial rule is the feeling in the outer world that they do not sufficiently regard the interests of non-colonial powers. Still, it is generally true, at least in British and Dutch dependencies, that the Government, though primarily responsible to the colonial power, does on the whole act as a trustee on behalf of the modern world.” (Alatas 1977: 14-15)

On the same topic, Alatas discusses the colonialist representation of native governments. In the view of colonialists,

“...native governments were fit only for evil. ... good rulers were few, they were ineffective, and there was no good native government. ...20 pages were devoted to describing the negative traits of native governments including the tyranny of their rulers.”
(Alatas 1977 :10-11)

Similarly, within the Pacific Commercial Advertiser, Hawaiians were portrayed as having caused their own demise, as opposed to being victims of exploitation and calculated theft. Here, the editor discussed the reign of Kalakaua, saying that his leadership was not in accordance with Western democratic values, and was thus faulty. The editor then suggested that perhaps allowances should be made for Kalakaua, and he should be judged by “Polynesian standards” rather than modern international standards.

“Kalakaua’s Coronation”

Today is the anniversary of the Coronation of King Kalakaua. The writer is now the only survivor of the Cabinet, which was in office, at the time the King proposed a scheme of a Coronation, and which it did not approve. The King finding a majority of the Cabinet opposed to it, went behind it and determined to secure the funds for the Coronation, without the assent of the Cabinet. His attitude caused, among other things, its sudden resignation.

No doubt the King’s successful tour around the world influenced him, in his purpose to have this superfluous ceremony. He was told that the money needed for such an exhibition, could well be better spent in internal improvements, and especially in making the native people more secure against the silent foreign invasion. But he disregarded this advice. He was neither better or worse than the average King. He failed as most Kings have failed, to see his just relations to his people and to the many races collected in his Kingdom. **As a Polynesian ruler, he should be judged by a Polynesian standard, with all of its racial inheritance. This might serve as some excuse for his conduct. But he had to submit, as all other rulers have to submit, to the inevitable evolution of events. As he did not comprehend their irresistible drift, he tried to arrest it, and although he was on the Throne, when he died, his political “hour” had nearly come.**

He did an irreparable injury to his native subjects. The whites were strongly in favor of native rule, and had the most kindly, affectionate regard for the natives; as many of them still have, and will have, in spite of recent events. But he thrust these intelligent and able supporters aside, and foolishly destroyed their loyalty to Hawaiian rule. There still remain with the “missionaries” pleasant recollections of the rule of those of the Kamehameha blood. But the failure of that line of Kings and the new conditions created by the Reciprocity Treaty, gave rise to a process of political disintegration.

Kalakaua was the only King of Hawai’i who was ever crowned with the “real article,” we believe. That crown should be a valuable relic. (PCA 2/12/1898: 4)

In the following editorial, the editor praises Kamehameha I as good and noble king, but that his successors were not as noble, so they caused their own demise, resulting in the overthrow of the Hawaiian Monarchy in 1898. This was an attempt to dismiss the responsibility for an illegal

act of greed, the overthrow, and portray it as an inevitable event which is actually better for Hawai'i.

“Kamehameha I”

...This Polynesian Monarch could neither read nor write, and in the registration books of the missionary societies, was put down as a ‘Benighted Heathen.’ History says he was a Polynesian Napoleon, on a lesser scale.

Although he wasted much precious time, ‘as a heathen in his blindness, bowing down to wood and stone,’ he still had a level head, and showed a lot of uncommon good moral sense. His royal brethren of the civilized world did not tolerate views like his, regarding their relations to their subjects. All of them believed as Pope said in: “the divine right of Kings to govern wrong.” If he had applied for admission to membership with the ‘anointed,’ they would have scored his taro patch conduct against him, and given him black balls. A large percentage of them lost their heads through personal stupidity, because they had the truer insight into the relations of Kings and subjects, which he had, though he had no books to read or statesmen to consult.

The successors of this remarkable King felt that his taro patch proclivities were not in ‘good form’ and that he was not accustomed to royal manners. He made, in his own unconscious way, his own model, and seems to have had something of the spirit of Frederick the Great, who said: ‘I must think, live and die like a King.’

Had his successors to the Throne, caught the spirit of this conduct of his life, the lives of the people would have been somewhat different. To them the statue is now for what might have been. (PCA 2/14/1898: 4)

The Revolution of 1893

Five years ago today, the Monarchy committed suicide. It threw itself on the sharp blade of the knife which the Teutonic races keep, though generally concealed, for self defense, and the defense of law and order. The Monarchy tried to kill itself in 1880, when the adventurer Moreno was made the leading man in the Government. But it pulled back when the blade had penetrated only through the skin. It tried to kill itself again in 1887, when it drove itself once more against the Teutonic knife, and cut itself badly, but not fatally. The Teutonic race was merciful, sewed up the wounds, and nursed them, and simply said to the Monarchy: “The knife never moves. Therefore, don’t jump at it.”

In ‘93, the Monarchy, once more, foolishly, but naturally enough, threw itself against the reluctant and immovable blade of the Teutonics, with such force, that it touched the heart, and was mortally wounded. Then came the Republic.

The entire process of the revolution was natural, logical and as common in the world’s history as it is natural and common to throw away a ragged coat, even if it be cast off in sorrow, because it had been gorgeous and useful.

Curiously enough, “able” men, here and elsewhere, fail to see how simple and natural the movement was. Chas Nordhoff, an experienced journalist, ad the editions of the Nation, calling themselves leading thinkers on political philosophy, saw in the movement only low, criminal purposes, and unholy energy working blindly together. They did not see, strangely enough, that the history of the United States, furnished the

reason and example for all that was done here. So with absolute confidence, they predicted a speedy “restoration” and were bitterly disappointed because it would not come. Then they got mad, just as the Siamese astronomers get mad, when they predict a comet, and it doesn’t turn up.

These “able thinkers” ignored the facts. Instead of studying the complex phenomena of political facts here, they preferred, like Josh Billings, to “eat pork and drink hard cider till midnight;” and then prophesy the rest of the night about the immediate restoration.

The work of ‘93 stands today. It finds us with more complicated problems, owing to our racial and economic difficulties, than exist anywhere else, probably, in proportion to the inhabitants. Although this is true, we shall never consider them seriously, until they breed calamities. If we suffer from calamities, we shall know it is “for our own good” and be thankful. The acts of ‘93 were a step forward. History says there is no step backward. (PCA 1/17/1898: 4)

Lili’uokalani is portrayed negatively in the Pacific Commercial Advertiser

Another theme reflected in the Pacific Commercial Advertiser which supported its annexationist agenda is the way in which Queen Lili’uokalani was portrayed. She was disrespectfully referred to as “ex-queen” (all lower case) or even Mrs. Dominis, which relegated her to the inferior position as the mere wife of a foreigner. She was also portrayed as a rebellious, greedy, power-hungry woman looking for personal aggrandizement through the restoration of her government, a scare tactic used to attack her popularity.

A significant amount of space on the front page of several issues of the Pacific Commercial Advertiser in March of 1898 was devoted to critiquing Hawai’i’s Story by Queen Lili’uokalani, attacking her integrity and motives. Lili’uokalani was represented in disrespectful, denigrating terms, sometimes racist. Her book was described as “common and bears abundant internal evidence that she did not write it, but did furnish all of the statements contained in it.” (PCA 3/9/1898: 1) The tone of the article was ridicule for Lili’uokalani and her title.

The review of Hawai’i’s Story also used a denigrating term for Native Americans, which showed that the editor saw Lili’uokalani in the same negative way that Americans had seen and portrayed Native Americans in the quest to take their land.

Her efforts in the first part of the book, are most untiring and persistent to show that she was a “big Injun” in rank. (PCA 3/9/1898: 1)

Furthermore, the editor continued to dispute Lili’uokalani’s depiction of her life with her husband, as not as good as she claimed, attacking her honesty, by saying that she was exaggerating or lying:

She describes her marriage to John O. Dominis... But she does not explain why she, of such eminent Royal descent, did not marry some high chief, instead of a lowly white man, an alien in race. She takes a very rosy view of her married life with Governor Dominis. Those who knew the couple well for many years, will be much surprised to hear of the divine harmony of their lives, especially those who heard the governor comment from time to time on the subject. (PCA 3/9/1898: 1)

The editor also attacked her connection with the other Ali'i, including Pauahi Bishop, saying that they weren't as close as Lili'uokalani says they were. He continued to portray the other Ali'i in a disrespectful manner, as if to make them seem unworthy of their titles:

King Lunalilo, when often asked to appoint Kalakaua as his successor, usually replied with the language, which one bus driver uses to another bus driver in the case of a collision. They had several personal encounters, which resulted in no damage owing to the usually limp condition in which they both were owing to the relaxing effect on the legs and arms of fermented liquor. The Queen speaks of her own engagement to Lunalilo, which was broken off and also his engagement to Victoria Kamamalu. Prime Minister (Kuhina Nui) by inheritance. That marriage never took place, owing, as Prince Billy remarked in his genial way, to the fact that 'neither of them were sober enough at the same moment to get married.' (PCA 3/9/1898: 1)

The editor furthermore disagreed with Lili'uokalani's "grossly inaccurate account of the election of Kalakaua to the throne:"

She claims that he was the choice of the people and that Queen Emma was a wicked intriguing woman. She ignores the facts that the Legislature which elected him was collected by enterprising Americans and 'corralled' until the election came off, in the interests of American dominance here, and that only the landing of American marines prevented the people from killing Kalakaua.

She describes Kalakaua, as a generous, laborious, self denying King who always sought the good of the people. She says: 'If there ever was a man who was pure in spirit, if there ever was a mortal who had perfect charity, he was that man.'

"The wealth and importance of the Islands enormously increased, and always, as a direct consequence of the King's acts." The fact that he took little interest in roads, and did not exhibit a very high standard of financial morality to his people is not alluded to. His life and services need not be discussed here. He made many and serious political mistakes.

He was affable, good natured, a generous host. Distinguished men all over the world recall his acquaintance with pleasure. His manner was dignified. In his outward bearing on State occasions, he was the peer of all sovereigns. The Queen claims that he consulted her or great affairs. This was not true. He never took her into his confidence. Even Mr. Gibson did not have his confidence, and only held his place by yielding to him.

She describes her visit to London, in 1887, at the time of Queen Victoria's Jubilee, and her sudden return to the Islands, owing to the revolution of '87. She denies that the King was involved in the insurrection of '89. But she forgets that in the State trials for treason, the

defense really was that the King was at the bottom of it. She had denounced the Constitution of '87, and was willing to tear it up, but did not believe that Wilcox was the man to do it.

On ascending the Throne she says she was tricked into signing the Constitution. She argues at length that the Sovereigns of Hawai'i could do as they pleased with constitutions, and cites the action of Kamehameha V. She did not wish to take the oath to support it, but was taken suddenly unawares. She bitterly blames Mr. Godfrey Grown and John Cummins because they refused to resign as Ministers. Even before the King was buried she showed her teeth. During the tour of Kalakaua around the world, she was Regent. Her Ministers during that period came to know her and the late Mr. H.A.P. Carter remarked to us that if she ever came to the Throne there would be abundance of trouble.

She gives some interesting details about the discussions of a new constitution. She said several were drafted while she looked on. One of the them, she says, was drafted by Mr. W.R. Castle. This is not true. He did secure a copy of one of them and caused it to be published in the Advertiser. She seems to have encouraged constitution making, because a new one was demanded by the people. (PCA 3/9/1898: 1)

The following editorial, written on March 9, 1898 (same day as the front page article) attempted to denigrate Queen Lili'uokalani's integrity and motives, revealing a vicious racism towards Native Hawaiians. First, the editor announced that Queen Lili'uokalani's memoir, Hawai'i's Story "bristles with falsehoods." According to the editor, the fact that Lili'uokalani said that she had been personally financing restoration efforts, showed that she was not supported by Native Hawaiians. This utterly discounted the widespread poverty which most cash-poor Native Hawaiians were experiencing at the time. Note the sarcastic tone in the following passage:

"While their dear Queen was pouring out her own treasure to effect her own restoration, and secure the rights of the dear people, they looked on, condemned the revolution, and refused during these long five years to chip in to the extent of giving her the price of a "square meal" or a night's lodging. They were, if she tells the truth, utterly indifferent to the restoration. There was not a cent's worth of "goad" in the entire native population. She was left to paddle her own canoe, and not one lent her a hand." (PCA 3/4/1898: 4)

Again in the next excerpt from the March 10, 1898 Pacific Commercial Advertiser, page 2:

She says that her visit to Washington was made in order to secure the rights of the native people. Though she had abdicated, she was resolved to work for her dear people, who persistently refused to "pungle up" a cent for her expenses, or furnish her the price of night's lodging.

The editor continued further to say that Native Hawaiians lacked initiative to restore the monarchy, unless a movement was organized by a white person. In other words, the opposition to the overthrow and annexation was lackadaisical. Hawaiians are portrayed as racially chauvenistic

and lazy in the following editorial:

All this presents a new phase on the native attitude towards the overthrow. One may naturally inquire how much “sand” was there, or is there now, is a people who, on racial grounds, preferred the Monarchy, but did not take “one cents’s” worth of stock in the movement to restore it. They were willing to aid in the restoration if that called only for a “walk over” or if the haoles would take the lead, as they did, in the insurrection of ‘95. They look upon the whites with some suspicion, and yet from 1820 until the reign of Kalakaua never once protested before their Kings, at the appointment of white men to high offices. When the overthrow came, their racial instincts were stirred up by their own demagogues and the white bummers, who are the scourings of all civilized countries. But, according to the Queen, they did not, would not, and have not made any sacrifice in order to right their wrongs. (PCA 3/9/1898: 4)

There is a bit of a “blame the victim” tone in the following passage, in which the editor said that if the Monarch had done something differently the overthrow wouldn’t have happened. In other words, the overthrow was the result of an action by the King?

If Kalakaua had nominated the Princess Kaiulani, as his direct successor, the Monarchy would be in existence today. The love for it was deeply rooted in the hearts of many intelligent and strong men, who winked at its weakness. The evolution of events would in time have changed the political system, but a moderately wise Monarchical Government would not have been easily disturbed. The Princess has the personal satisfaction of knowing that through no act of hers, was the Monarchy terminated. (PCA 3/9/1898: 4)

Another substantially long front-page article about Lili’uokalani, entitled “Secrets are Out: Advance Sheets from Report to the Aloha ‘Aina; Queen Wants Big Money,” (PCA 3/9/1898: 1) quotes the representatives of the Hawaiian anti-annexation commission, Jas. Kaulia, Wm. Auld and David Kaluaokalani, in broken English, so that they appear unintelligent to the reader.

This is a brief as given to the Advertiser ‘by authority’ as it were, of what will be reported to the Native Political Societies and to the Hawaiians generally: “Not in fifty years will the United States annex Hawai’i nei. We were in Washington two months and explain the situation and tell the facts to our friends we meet....Many good men are good friends for us. ... Queen Lili’uokalani want only money. She print a big book to sell for money for herself. It is a secret, but the Queen is going to stay in Washington because she thinks annexation is sure. She did not help our delegation. She believe that the United States annex us and then she have a claim. It is a secret, but she wants a claim for one hundred million dollars. Then she keeps all that money herself.... (PCA 3/9/1898: 1)

Again, Hawaiians were portrayed as lacking intelligence and initiative, as if they mindlessly followed their “race instinct” in their support of the Monarchy, but were liable to abandon this side if offered money by an aggressive “haole.”

“The Oath Amendment”

“...The natives have a sentiment which in a general way, favors the Monarchy. They believe that the taking of the present oath is a slur on that sentiment. The sentiment may be a wrong one, but there is not a grown person in this community that is not influenced more or less by its sentiments.

The native will forego that sentiment, and take the present oath, whenever the time comes for one “haole” to show the natives how they can effectively “go” for the other “haoles” and pull something out of the public crib.

... It is not an oath, but the native’s character that determines what he will or will not do. (PCA 3/9/1898: 4)

The same editorial denigrated Hawaiians further as unsophisticated:

“... as a Cabinet officer, in the Legislature, does happily recall one of the few important questions asked us. Two native members asked us privately to lend \$5.00 to each of them. There was really some point to these questions. Those members serve as an example in making points, to the young and ambitious men who are now entering upon “a long and glorious career of public usefulness.” (PCA 3/9/1898: 4)

In the following critique of Hawai’i’s Story, Lili’uokalani was viciously attacked:

“That Abdication: Conflicting Statements in the Queen’s Book; Admits to Having Had Knowledge of Plan to Overthrow --Her Unaided Efforts”

“No one, outside or inside the Hawaiian islands, has contributed a cent to the repeated outlays I have made for the good of the Hawaiian people.” At last we have a bottom fact. The down trodden Hawaiians, oppressed with grief at the loss of the Monarchy, and outraged at the destruction of their dearest rights, have not for five years given their dear Queen, even the price of a square meal. What exalted patriotism. “The true patriotism which makes heroes is in your hearts,” says Mr. Davies, but not a nickel from the 35,000 of those “deprived of their rights.” Some scores of the Royalists have very large incomes. Hundreds of the natives buy expensive fish. Thousands of them patronize the gin mills. But out of all of this burning patriotism, not one cent for aid to recover their lost rights! This is the strongest and best commentary by their own Queen, upon the value they really placed on the Monarchy-- “not one cent!” They can ride in the tram car, patronize the stores, and set up luaus for themselves. “Not one cent” to restore the Monarchy, which this unselfish toiling Queen had undertaken to do for their own good.

...She had at the time of the overthrow, an abiding faith in the cowardice of the missionaries. One of her old friends, who spoke to her the day before the overthrow took place, said: “I am a white man, and I know what white men can do. You must leave them alone. She turned on him and exclaimed: “...you too a missionary? They never fight.” She and her native friends shared this opinion. We once asked Captain Nowlein what he expected the Citizen’s Guard would do, if he and his forces had entered the city of Honolulu on January 6th, 1895. He replied that they would run away and hide. “Did you believe it?” we asked. “Yes, our white friends said they would run away, as soon as we got in town.” The Queen believed it, and we will give her the credit of believing that no blood would flow. **Poor woman, she did not understand the superior races.**

...She tells her story, but makes the reading between the lines very easy. She played a lone hand for herself. We do not blame her. But she should be more honest about it.

In summing up the story told in this book, we believe that it is just that this woman should be judged not by "foreign" but largely by Polynesian standards. She acted on racial habits and instincts. She was not capable of what no Polynesian is capable of, measuring the foreign standards, of comprehending the force and value of political institutions. Compared with many other female sovereigns, she is perhaps equal to the average of them. Like them, she was not selected by the people as a leader, but became so by the accident of her birth. She is obstinate, and suspicious. She never had the sense to seek the advice of honest and capable men. She possessed a pretty, little Kingdom, an ideal affair in the singular harmony that existed between the natives and the whites. She had abundant income from it. The whites did not stand aloof. Even "father" Beckwith urged loyalty to her from the pulpit of the Central Union Church. The faults of King Kalakaua's rule were forgotten. The rumors of her lack of a turn for permanent virtue, were forgotten. All that was demanded of her was decent government. She did not have sense enough to see it. In this she shared, by inheritance the defects of her brother's character. She went too far. The whites demanded, absolutely, stable government. In her book she gives the best and most powerful reasons for her overthrow. She undertakes seriously and solemnly to hold the right of the Hawaiian Monarchs to reject constitutions and give others in their place. This is fatal to any possibility of restoration. She has driven the last nail into her political coffin. Had she admitted her error, and claimed that she was influenced by bad advisors, she would command some sympathy from the friends of the Republic.

The ignorance of Mr. Nordhoff, and of the NY Evening Post, and other papers regarding the true condition of things, led them to cry out for the enforcement of general principles of political rule, which were tried and found inapplicable here, just as other political principles, just and reasonable in themselves, are found inapplicable in other countries. These persons saw only an attempt to do an unjust thing. The planting of a better political rule here, needed the protection of a musket and bayonet, just as a young tree from the nursery requires the aid of a post to protect it from the storms, until its roots strike out and penetrate the soil.

The chief value of this book is in the argument she makes against her own cause. She has done it better than another could do it. (PCA 3//10/1898: 2)

Here is an attempt to further discredit Lili'uokalani, by stating that even Hawaiians were against her, implying that Hawaiians did not have a clear leadership or a realistic shot at self-government.

"Anti-Annexationists"

There was a formal meeting of the local branches of the Aloha Aina Society yesterday for the purpose of hearing from the delegates lately returned from Washington. The attendance was nearly two hundred. Messrs. Auld, Kaulia and Kalauokalani, the anti-annexation commissioners sent to the States by the societies all made addresses. They told again precisely what was given in the Advertiser of last Monday as coming from them. Very little detail was added. **They are angry with Lili'uokalani, declare that annexation cannot be accomplished and that the natives will never have anything to do with the present Government. One bit of gossip brought out was that Lili'uokalani had failed to give**

the delegations such recognition or attention as they expected from her.
(PCA 3/24/1898: 1)

IV. Civilizing Mission

The Pacific Commercial Advertiser's attempts to garnish the minority white community

Attitudes found in the Pacific Commercial Advertiser reflected the attitudes of the American businessmen who were in favor of the annexation of Hawai'i to the United States. This was a distinct minority of the population, according to the 1896 census, 7,427 people out of the total population of 109,020 people in the islands, the rest of whom were of non-European descent. Racism was the primary tool used to justify this striking disparity between population size and representation in the government. Out of the total population of approximately 110,000, there were only 2,903 who voted in 1894. (Schmitt, 1977: 597) For a system claiming to be modelled after democracy, the Republic government was in direct conflict with its own values and needed to justify this. Social Darwinism was a convenient alibi. Articles found in the Pacific Commercial Advertiser discussed the tenuous status of this powerful minority, with an obvious fear of the majority non-white population found in Hawai'i. There was a sentiment in existence which suggested that whites should "band together" and support annexation efforts, which was the newspaper's choice for the insurance of the "supremacy of white civilization" in Hawai'i.

Justification Was Necessary to the Positive Self-Image of Americans:

Although America has been an expansionist country from its very beginning, it has also been committed to ideals of justice and equality. These dual values have often been at odds with one another, as expansionism, i.e. taking new lands which are already occupied, is an inherently unjust act. Therefore, the act of expansionism has required an explanation to justify it in the minds of Americans who upheld the values of justice and equality. Thus, the ideology of "civilizing mission" was born, in order to transform the oppression of imperialism into an altruistic act. American values and civilization were thus "shared" with the rest of the world through imperialism. Furthermore, the rejection of imperialism by native owners of the land was transformed into a rejection of the divinely-ordained values of equality and justice, through democracy. Native resistance to colonialism was portrayed as a negative, ignorant, ungrateful act.

The civilizing mission ideology was based on the assumption that the European or American lifestyle was the most desirable state of modernity. The world's lands were seen as open territory to be used for resource markets, in service to the superior Europeans; and the European

lifestyle was labeled as “civilization” with the idea that it was the only true civilization, juxtaposed against non-European lifestyles as the opposite of civilization.

Another element of the colonizer’s worldview was the belief that Europe was inherently superior to the rest of the world, accounting for their success at world political and economic domination. Intellectual and scientific leadership was attributed solely to Europeans, ignoring the contributions of non-Europeans into the collective knowledge of mankind. The colonial legacy which consisted of economic, political, educational and spiritual impoverishment of the colonized was also ignored. In order to justify colonialism, the colonized were told that colonialism was for their own good; they were being “helped” forward along the hierarchical path of civilization. The civilizing mission was initiated by and justified by the belief in the inherent superiority of Europeans.

This need to rationalize did not escape the Hawai’i colonial community. Many articles in The Pacific Commercial Advertiser which dealt with native Hawaiians implied that Americans were civilized and Hawai’i needed to be instructed and assisted in going up the evolutionary path of civilization. After portraying Hawaiians as sorely lacking, the Pacific Commercial Advertiser extolled the virtues of the Americans in Hawai’i, thus claiming a “civilizing” effect upon Native Hawaiians. Negative traits associated with Native Hawaiians provided the need which the Americans can claim to fill. The need for annexation having thus been established, the Pacific Commercial Advertiser, in extolling the virtues of the Americans in Hawai’i, reinforced the argument that the only answer to the problem was annexation to the United States. Editorials and articles blatantly expressed the attitude that the alternative to foreign (American) rule was not viable: Native Hawaiian rule was unacceptable.

Missionary Period in Hawai’i

These weren’t the first negative impressions of native Hawaiians in Hawai’i by Americans; in fact, American missionaries had been portraying Hawaiians negatively in their journals and letters for over 50 years prior to annexation. As Clarissa Armstrong wrote: “...O, the want of society! Week after week passes and we see none but naked filthy, wicked heathen with souls as dark as the tabernacles which they inhabit. The darkness of the people seems to destroy the beauty

of the scenery around us.” (C. Armstrong to R. Armstrong’s sisters, Mary and Jane, 10/25/1834, as quoted in Grimshaw 1989:57-58) The cultural differences which existed were portrayed as inferiority, used to justify imperialism, by establishing a need for the European “civilizing influence.”

Overview of Pacific Commercial Advertiser coverage

The bulk of the newspaper coverage was about the “civilizing” of Hawai’i, the remaking of Hawai’i into America’s image. Lengthy feature articles were written about foreign schoolmasters and other foreigners who had come to help Hawai’i “improve” itself in the image of America. Feature articles about new foreigners who were here to improve Hawai’i as well as articles about roads, schools, banks, stores being built were all presented from the perspective that Hawai’i was in need of improvement and that improvement meant westernization. These events were praised and marketed as progress, as evident in the tone and ubiquity of the articles. In 1898 Hawai’i, pro-annexationists were saying, “Hawaiians aren’t good enough to run their own country; so we must take over that task for them.”

Americans have exerted a civilizing influence on Hawai’i

The following article was a testimony claiming the positive influence which Americans have had on Hawai’i, thus appealing to the sentiment of “civilizing mission” as a justification for annexation:

“Virginia and Hawai’i”

...State Senator Wickham, one of the foremost men in the State (Virginia), in introducing the appropriation bill into the Legislature in February, alluded to the condition of the people. He said they were in a state of unrest. Poverty and scanty means were evident everywhere, that the farmers were calling for some alleviation in their distress, and were sinking deeper and deeper into the slough of despond, and it was almost impossible to pay the taxes now levied on property. He besought them to bear the burden, as it would disgrace the State to again repudiate its debts. **Perhaps the comparison we have made may suggest to many the benefits which America has bestowed on Hawai’i, and lead them to make more earnest efforts to assimilate the social condition of the Islands to that of the American States...** (PCA 3/23/1898: 4)

“White” was associated with “civilization” in the following two articles:

“Expanding Sugar Production”

...**The project of white labor has been generally abandoned because it involves civilization rather than the visible (sic) dollar.** The stream of difficulties which rises from these racial sources, especially Asiatics, is still some ways ahead. What is the use of now building bridges to cross it? Can that not be done overnight, when the stream is reached, just as pontoon bridges are built over rivers in a night, in war time? (PCA 2/8/1898: 4)

“The Value of Coffee”

...The coffee industry may be made so valuable to these Islands, as a political factor, **as the “fort” of Occidental civilization here**, we earnestly protest against statements regarding it which are probably not true, and may simply bring us trouble in the future...
(PCA 3/22/1898: 4)

Law of Progress:

In the Pacific Commercial Advertiser, references were made to the “law of progress.” This concept was based on the Social Darwinist assumption that the highest form of “civilization” was western civilization, while the rest of the world existed in varying degrees of lesser development. Natives were portrayed as objects of pity; unable to compete in the modern world. The following excerpt from The Myth of the Lazy Native discussed the idea of levels of civilization existing as a continuum; with Europe located at the top as the most advanced, and non-Europe located far behind. This theory assumed that there was one path, and that Europe had progressed furthest along this path. Professor Alatas quotes Hugh Clifford’s ethnography In Court and Kampong:

“...the significance of British rule as an agent of change. ... “What we are really attempting, however, is nothing less than to crush into twenty years the revolutions in facts and in ideas which, even in energetic Europe, six long centuries have been needed to accomplish. No one will, of course, be found to dispute that the strides made in our knowledge of the art of government, since the thirteenth century, are prodigious and vast, nor that the general condition of the people of Europe has been immensely improved since that day; but, nevertheless, one cannot but sympathize with the Malays, who are suddenly and violently translated from the point to which they had attained in the natural development of their race, and are required to live up to the standards of a people who are six centuries in advance of them in national progress. If a plant is made to blossom or bear fruit three months before its time, it is regarded as a triumph of the gardener’s art; but what, then, are we to say of this huge moral-forcing system which we call “Protection”? Forced plants, we know, suffer in the process; and the Malay, whose proper place is amidst the conditions of the thirteenth century, is apt to become morally weak and seedy, and to lose something of his robust self-respect, when he is forced to bear nineteenth-century fruit. (Alatas 1977: 46)

Likewise, the pro-annexationists in Hawai’i subscribed to this view in regard to Native Hawaiians. The following article from the Pacific Commercial Advertiser referred to “the law of Progress” as if it was inevitable:

He has been warned a thousand times of the danger of his situation. Kamehameha III told him that unless he was thrifty, the foreigner would become his master. He even admits it himself. But his racial feeling, in the time of his extremity, masters him just as it masters stronger races.

We, who are Hawaiian born say these words, with humiliation and regret. We were taught in our youth to believe in a Hawaiian State. We loved it. **But we recognize the law of Progress** and saw many years ago, the beginning of the end.

We see also in the future, that the native will be governed by his racial instinct, which will constantly lead him into foolish paths. He is not to be censured for it, but pitied rather. With or without annexation, he will always be fooled by his own people, because the native demagogue can best strike the racial cord, and next to him it is the white demagogue that will fool the native and the native demagogue besides. (PCA 1/14/1898: 4)

The following article, referring to the paternalism present in Britain's administration of Fiji, was used as evidence in support of the newspaper's pro-colonialism (pro-annexation) platform. The editor suggested that such paternalism was a good idea to be applied to Hawai'i. However, that was not a possibility since Hawaiians would not have been willing to accept the limitations of paternalism due to "a defective education." According to the editor, this defective education occurred when Hawaiians were introduced to the concepts of representative government and were led to believe that they had the ability for self-government. This editorian again used racist conceptions of Hawaiians to support the annexation Cause.

"The Fijis and Hawaiians"

When speaking of his recent visit to the Fiji Islands, Prof. Agassiz stated that the British rule over those Islands is admirable. The natives are contented and protected. All of them belong either to the Roman Catholic or Methodist Church. The Romist priests are white men, but the Methodist pastors are native. Sunday is so strictly observed that nothing is bought or sold on that day. The natives adhere to their primitive dress. The white bummers who have disgraced European and American civilization in the Pacific are not permitted to settle on the Islands, without permission, nor are they allowed to own land. **This paternal policy of Great Britain protects the native race, while it also fosters British trade. But the natives lose their sovereignty. They forego a sentiment and obtain a most substantial benefit. This was not so much the voluntary act of the natives, as it was the result of gentle British pressure.** Of course many British subjects dislike the policy, but cannot help themselves.

The native Hawaiians need the same kind of paternal government. But they would refuse it, if offered to them by any power. In dabbling with representative government, under the Monarchy, they were encouraged to believe by all classes, that they were capable of wise self-government. So they were, and are today, within limitations. But they were educated in the theory that no limitations should be put on them. Now they are suffering from defective education. Behind this defective education, is the race habit of thought, or rather feeling which can only be changed gradually by a change of environment. One cannot censure the native for thinking as he does. But the true and wise method of dealing with him cannot easily be determined, especially as the most of the people, always excepting the "missionaries," take no interest in him, and the native himself does not intend to take the advice of the

missionary. (PCA 3/21/1898: 4)

Hawaiians were portrayed as unreasonable and unintelligent in the following editorial. If the political future of Hawai'i were put to a vote, the editor says, the Native Hawaiians would vote by racial instinct (loyalty), not intelligent choice. According to the editor, Natives would cause their own further demise through independence, for they are ignorant of the dynamics of the modern world. Therefore, the Anglo-Saxons should pity Natives, while taking over their government for the greater good of society.

“A Popular Vote”

The opponents of annexation will press Senator Bacon's amendment to the joint resolution of annexation, which provides for a submission of the matter to a vote of the Hawaiian people. The debate on this amendment may cause much delay. If defeated in the Senate, it will be renewed in the House, and will, it must be candidly admitted, be regarded with much favor by some of those who favor annexation. A submission to popular vote is in accordance with democratic practice. **But probably every member of the Senate and House now understands that the Government of “missionary thieves” was the best that ever existed here, and that the native vote would be cast against annexation, more for simple and inoffensive racial reasons, than from convictions regarding good government.**

The better and intelligent men in all of the countries inhabited by the weaker races, which are now dominated by Great Britain, freely admit the inestimable blessing of British rule, in preserving law and order, and life and property. A few of our intelligent natives see that through the rule of this stronger race lies their only security from destruction by the Asiatic faction. The argument for submitting the question to popular vote loses the most of its force, and all of its sentiment, when it simply means giving the natives a chance to wipe themselves out by securing the ‘independence’ of the Islands. “Independence” so far as the native is concerned, means a friction of races here, and whatever comes of it, the native Hawaiian will, unfortunately, be driven to the wall. So Congress may see that submission of the matter to a vote really involves an injustice to the natives themselves. That they should irretrievably injure themselves by giving way to their racial sentiments in favor of independence is natural enough. Senator Morgan affirmed the right to this sentiment. But he tried very briefly to show that safety was of more importance than sentiment. The intelligent Spaniards of California resented vigorously the annexation of that territory, by force to the United States, but some of them have lived to see, and their children see the inestimable value to them of the change. It secured for them stability of government and protection by law. The native knows nothing about all this and in claiming an independent government only brings closer together the racial mill stones which will grind him to powder. One can not censure him, but pity him as he invites his own extermination.

The white races are morally responsible for many injuries inflicted on the native race. Captain Cook introduced vile disease and no civilization. The traders brought them rum, and the whaler from “Puritan” New England almost submerged them with tidal waves of immorality, which the few moral brooms in the hands of the missionaries could not sweep back. These were the crimes of civilization. But from the

best forces, laws and institutions of that same civilization, the native can now find his only refuge from speedy destruction. It is a problem which he cannot grasp.
(PCA 3/21/1898: 4)

In the article below, the editor explained that the Native Hawaiian attachment to their own Monarch was based on “race sentiment” rather than an intellectual understanding of the best form of government for Hawai’i; presumably American rule. The editor portrayed Hawaiians as ignorant and naive to the “Law of the Progress” which, like any law of nature, was unavoidable and governed all human affairs. This supposedly justified the takeover of Hawai’i; much like colonialism had been justified throughout history elsewhere.

W.N. Armstrong, Ed.

...We now briefly consider the native Hawaiian racial instinct. The well-known attitude of the large majority of the natives, in political matters is natural, consistent and in accordance with the laws which govern human nature. They do not accept the overthrow of the native Government, though in reality it was not, from its foundations, a native Government. **The racial instinct, working in them, precisely as it does in the foreigners, leads them to prefer natives in power or a native Monarchy, without regard to its fitness.** They would, if permitted, by the dominant party, soon relapse into their ancient feudal condition, because their racial instincts would irrepressibly lead them to do so. They think through racial eyes, just as the people of other nations think through racial eyes. These racial eyes have been shaping their vision for a thousand years. With them, as with the Anglo-Saxon race, the racial feeling is never suppressed until a clear self-interest demands it. Even then it often refuses to yield. So wise a man as Benjamin Franklin refused for a long time to believe in the separation of the Colonies from Great Britain, owing to his racial feeling of loyalty to the British King. That sublime instrument, the Declaration of Independence, was secured by only one vote. The majority governed by racial instincts were against it for many days. The people said; “ We love our King.” And they changed their views only when the King’s bayonets were at their breasts.

To expect the natives, with their Polynesian antecedents, their ignorance of the science of government, and their natural child-like love for their old environments, their love for the old native Monarch, to submit without some sort of protest to the new order of things, is to expect them to rise higher in the scale of reasoning beings than any white man on these Islands has yet risen.

If all races did what was the “best” for themselves to do, this world would indeed be Paradise. The very men who demand that the natives should do the “best” thing, include the very men, who refused themselves to do the “best” thing in previous years. If they had annexation would probably have taken place before this time. **In spite of their racial desires the natives will never recover the status before ‘93, because all of the other races are really against them.** There are 52, 000 foreign males to 20,000 native males. The native can figure it out for himself. The natives, like all other people on earth, must take their chances. They are subject to the law of Progress, which has driven thousands of races to the wall. The old Puritan towns of New England are now largely in the hands of Roman Catholic Canadians, and the descendent of the Puritan goes to the wall. he takes his chances. **It is the law of Progress.** The milestones on its highway are stained everywhere with blood, in the blind conflict of racial instinct. The blood cloud has never broken here,

but he who looks closely may see it, only the size of a man's hand, in the distant sky. **The racial instincts of the native, unfortunately invite him to defy this law of Progress. He does not know how to handle the six races that confront him and are led by racial instincts much stronger than his own.**

He has been warned a thousand times of the danger of his situation. Kamehameha III told him that unless he was thrifty, the foreigner would become his master. He even admits it himself. But his racial feeling, in the time of his extremity, masters him just as it masters stronger races.

We, who are Hawaiian born say these words, with humiliation and regret. We were taught in our youth to believe in a Hawaiian State. We loved it. But we recognize the law of Progress and saw many years ago, the beginning of the end.

We see also in the future, that the native will be governed by his racial instinct, which will constantly lead him into foolish paths. He is not to be censured for it, but pitied rather. With or without annexation, he will always be fooled by his own people, because the native demagogue can best strike the racial cord, and next to him is the white demagogue that will fool the native and the native demagogue besides. (PCA 1/14/1898: 4)

The following article portrays the Republic of Hawai'i Regime as "the model administration of Hawai'i" in an attempt to justify their political control over Hawai'i. It is reflective of the "civilizing mission" rhetoric which portrays Anglo-Saxon government as a good thing for the colonies:

"The Ministerial Reports"

The remarkably clear, full and able reports of the Ministers require, if justice is done to them, much extended comment. This cannot be done in a day. They are full of food for reflection. The suggestions they contain are made by men who have no 'party' behind them, but by men who have made the administration a careful business affair.

Few indeed, of the States of the American Union, have such impartial, and honest directors of public affairs. nor are any of the official reports of those States better prepared.

We repeat what we have said before, that if copies of these reports could be placed in the hands of leading Americans, and with the leading Press of America, they would indicate conclusively the way the Anglo-Saxon has handled affairs in these Islands. The community, as a whole is responsible for the political policy which has brought here so many racial elements that may involve grave consequences. But it must be conceded that the dominant racial power--the smallest in point of numbers--has created, and maintained a framework of just and honest government, which is unusual and admirable.

The administration of the present Government has proved its right to exist. The many and absolutely necessary improvements in all things, roads especially, were neglected by the Monarchy, because the real power, and influence behind it, was indifferent to the general welfare of the people. In this respect, every intelligent inhabitant, even those who are loyal to the old order of things, must see and acknowledge the great improvement of the present administration.

For several years, the new Government was on trial. It now submits its proof of fidelity, and

demands a verdict. It will get it, from all fair men. We believe it is an unnatural Government. It is 'too good,' in the sense that it does not represent the average thought. But the men who administer it, especially the unfortunate 'missionaries' will have the satisfaction of knowing that it will remain for perhaps a century to come as the model administration of Hawai'i, if history teaches us anything. (PCA 2/19/1898: 4)

“Proper use of land” as a mark of civilization

One of the indicators of a “civilized” society, according to the imperialist model, was “proper use of land.” This was determined by the values of the colonizer, which, in America and Hawai'i, was the capitalist exploitation of resources for the greatest profit.

In colonial America, for example, the rationalization used to dispossess Native Americans of their land was the argument that Native Americans did not use the land in an acceptable manner. In “The Wild Indian’s Venison: Locke’s Theory of Property and English Colonialism in America,” author Barbara Arneil discusses the basic assumptions inherent in British philosopher John Locke’s Two Treatises of Government regarding property and colonial policy. Ethical justifications found in Locke’s work mirrored those used in Hawai'i by the Pacific Commercial Advertiser pro-annexationist propaganda.

According to Arneil, European-style agriculture was portrayed as legitimate, while native-style agriculture was depicted as illegitimate. John Winthrop, New England’s first Governor, argued that the Amerindians did not have any right over the land, “for they enclose no ground, neither have they cattle to maintain it...the English appropriated some parcels of ground by enclosing it.” (Arneil 1996: 63) This policy favored European values over native values. Native Americans who had for centuries maintained their own concept of land use in America, were thus disenfranchised.

The civilizing mission asserted that natives needed Americans’ help, for they would not have been able to rise up to civilization themselves. Agrarian cultivation was the second criterion of the argument regarding the proper use of the land, and was central to the arguments of those defending the plantation both on economic and ethical grounds. (Arneil 1996: 63) Arneil cites Robert Cushman, defendant of the plantation system on ethical grounds, in his description of aboriginal land in these terms:

“The country is yet raw; the land untilled; the cities not built; the cattle not settled. We are compassed about with a helpless and idle people, the natives of the country, which

cannot...help themselves, much less us.”(Arneil 1996: 63)

The right of the Amerindians was limited to the land which they could “improve” by enclosing it and developing it through agrarian cultivation. Locke argued that the “industrious and rational” were given title to the land through their labor.

‘There cannot be a clearer demonstration of any thing, than several Nations of the Americans are of this, who are rich in Land, ...yet for want of improving it by labour, have not one hundredth part of the Conveniences we enjoy.’ Having asserted the idleness of the Amerindians, Locke then claims that the English are a hundred times more industrious, using a ratio very common to the colonial writings of his day. (Arneil 1996: 66)

This way of thinking about land use and ownership was applied to Hawai’i in an effort to justify American annexation. The editor appealed to private property and the value of “industriousness” as indicators of “civilization” and good citizenship. The argument was used to say that these marks of civilization have been perfected by Americans, therefore, their experience was irreplaceable in the task of civilizing Hawai’i.

In articles in the Pacific Commercial Advertiser, it was assumed that private property and European-style agriculture provided the best conditions for “civilization:”

“Significant Importations”

...The close students of the social condition of the Negro in America have increasing faith in the happy solution of the Negro problem, as the great plantations are being subdivided, and the Negro becomes an owner of the soil, raises food for himself and his stock, and makes cotton only his by-crop, and at the same time, his cash crop. **But only as the Negro becomes the owner of land does he really prosper, and become a reliable citizen.**

The sugar producing countries may be slowly forced, by economic and political revolutions to adopt the same course.... (PCA 3/29/1898: 4)

“Good Class of Portuguese”

...Assuming that **the tillers of the soil, who own their land, are the basis of good government and civilizing**, these figures should set the Legislature to thinking, and every man besides who wishes for good government and social stability. (PCA 3/25/1898: 4)

Anglo-Saxon use of the soil refers back to biblical “rights” to land in the following article:

“Leasehold Lands”

Mr. Allen Herbert stated in an interview published in this paper, several weeks ago, that it was now difficult to secure small farms, in desirable locations, on these Islands, owing to the ownership of long leases, which covered valuable tracts, and the ownership in fee of large tracts, by a few people.

This sort of ownership of land and leases, has confronted all of the Anglo-Saxon colonists for 200 years. They have met the difficulty in every case, by taxation, or by radical laws.

Many of the Atlantic States, Canada, California and Australia were “infested” by these unfortunate holdings, which were good and fair enough, in the days of sparsely settled communities, but became a blasting wind over agricultural thrift in thickly settled communities. In New York State, for some years, the political parties were divided on the rent question. Those who rented from the old Dutch proprietors rose even in insurrection against payment of rent. They were known as the Barn burners, and elected a governor. The State finally converted these leaseholds into fee simples.

The progressive people of New Zealand dispose of the subject in a simple way. The owner of unimproved land is required to put his own valuation upon it, for purposes of taxation....

The Anglo-Saxon race believes in the “soil.” It is very apparent that all intelligent communities of this race will hold these political and economic maxims; that if a man wishes to till the soil, he shall not fail to do so, for want of land; that the absorption of land for speculative purposes is almost in the nature of a social crime; that there shall be no artificial restrictions against the free movement of population from the cities to the rural districts; that men, women and children shall have some breathing spot on earth if they desire it. This is the gospel of American Democracy, and it has forced the free gift to the people of land enough to feed 500,000,000 of people. As people press in the future, there will be a new division. (PCA 1/31/1898: 4)

Articles in the Pacific Commercial Advertiser which reflected a value on industriousness:

In the following article the editor discussed the immigration of Portuguese to the islands. Positive values were attributed to a particular class of people. Industriousness was an important personal trait in 1898 Hawai’i, according to pro-annexationists.

“Driving Away Good Men”

The Consul General for Portugal made a remark on Thursday, during an interview, which makes the question of desirable immigration, a more serious matter than many would like to admit. He stated that he was surprised to see so many of a very good class of Portuguese who had prospered here, now willing to emigrate to Timor or elsewhere. Also that the Portuguese with large families were not considered desirable on the plantations. To this should be added the fact that a decent Portuguese laborer, with a wife and several children, cannot live as a plantation laborer on “13.50 a month, especially when the plantation refuses to give him a patch of land, upon which to raise home supplies.

Here is the situation. With a commercial prosperity upon us that is perhaps unmatched in the world, with only a small population on the Islands, we find a **“good class of Portuguese” ready to abandon the country for want of the means of making a decent living. We are not referring to the thriftless, lazy Portuguese, but to a “good class.” It may not be very numerous but it is desirable.**

Now gentlemen, Legislators, Ministers and citizens you have the matter before you. You have repeatedly declared that the Portuguese were “desirable settlers.” On excellent authority you hear that a “very good class” or them are ready to leave because they cannot

make a living. **These are not bummers, but industrious people who are familiar with the country....** (PCA 3/22/1898: 4)

In the article below, the editor was stating that annexation shouldn't be opposed due to prejudice against Asians in Hawai'i. The editor claimed that Asians were actually more industrious than Native Hawaiians, and according to American standards, this industriousness was a requirement for the ownership of land. Therefore, by this measure, Asians had more right to be on the land than Hawaiians did.

Senator Bacon's Amendment

The amendment to the Treaty offered by Senator Bacon, requiring that it should be submitted to the vote of the Hawaiian people, must open up a very funny debate on the "rights of the people" and the "rule of the majority." No one can really define what these phrases mean. They are about as vague as the phrase "be good," upon which any one can put such interpretation as one pleases. American and British political literature is full of noble sentiments about these rights. American orators, before 1861, got eloquent over the God given rights of man, but excluded the nigger and Indian. Now they exclude the intelligent Asiatics. The Americans refused to be ruled by the majority in 1776 unless they got their rights. So they went into revolution. Then when the people of the South said, in 1861: "Let us have the same rights to rule ourselves, that we all claimed in 1776, the North said: "What was sound principle then isn't sound principle now." and (as the North claims very properly) bayoneted them into submission. As to "rights" the dirty, ignorant Polish Jew and the most degraded Italian peasant may become a citizen of the United States, but an Asiatic graduate of Harvard cannot.

As for British ideas about the rule of the majority, their history is so comical it must make the angels, who follow it up, roar with laughter, especially when Ireland, India and the Fijis are in view.

The American Senators, when not talking to the galleries, and when confidentially conversing in the cloak rooms must say: "Political rights, including the rule of the majority are, after all only what force secures, or what the dominant power grants. There is no such thing as consistency in the business.

The native Hawaiian Committee in Washington, would be sadly puzzled, if the question was put to them by the Senators: "As the Asiatics are much more thrifty, and skillful in all branches of human industry than you are, why should they not vote as well as you? If you say your rights come from the soil, tell us how much soil your King and Chiefs ever gave you? How much of it do you own now?"

In the sadly mixed-up beliefs about rights, the Senators will take the title to the Islands, made by the present Government as quite sufficient. Senator White admits it. But if any Senator opposes annexation on general principles, he will club the treaty with this curious weapon of majority rule.

If Senator Bacon was asked to use the same club, in Georgia, where Blount was elected to Congress by the suppression of an overwhelming Negro vote, as the Congressional Record shows he would at once make a "distinction." You can do almost anything in law, or in

morals, if you have the wit to make a plausible “distinction.” (PCA 2/3/1898: 4)

In the following article, it is assumed that all people within an ethnic group have the same characteristics, in this case, Italians, possessing positive traits, which are highlighted here:

“For a New Labor: Mr. Marsden Will Size up European Peasants”

...(Mr. Marsden) has arrived at the conclusion that the country requires a more stable class of workers. He believes in families for the plantations, in men who will become permanent and useful citizens and while laboring in the fields, will also have small places of their own. For a suitable people he will search amongst the peasantry of the Continent. The inhabitants of Northern Italy, who have lately met with so much favor in the South of the United States, have attracted the attention of Mr. Marsden and he will visit and study them. **They are reputed to be an industrious, docile and honest people of excellent habits** and in their situations in the United States have prove to be all that their most enthusiastic advocates claimed for them... (PCA 1/21/1898: 6)

V. Conclusion

Hawai'i's independent political status underwent drastic change in 1898, when Hawai'i was annexed to the United States through a joint resolution of the U.S. Congress. However, up until the last hour prior to the Joint Resolution which provided for annexation, this decision was threatened by anti-annexationists both within the United States and in Hawai'i, thus creating a need for propaganda to promote the annexationist cause. The Pacific Commercial Advertiser was the paramount English-language foreigners' newspaper in Hawai'i which promoted the annexation cause.

Arguments supportive of annexation fell into two categories in the newspaper's editorials. First, it was claimed that Hawaiians were incapable of successful self-government in the modern world because of unavoidable "race habits." Secondly, editorials praised the abilities of the "superior races" (i.e. Anglo Americans) to properly govern the Hawaiian Islands and exploit their resources with greatest efficiency. In essence, this propaganda promoted the idea that Americans were the leaders necessary to accomplish the task of bringing "civilization" to Hawai'i.

Such pro-annexation arguments are reminiscent of pro-colonial rationalizations used in other colonial settings since the beginning of the period of European imperialism in the modern world. The rationalizations are so similar, that when placed side-by-side, they seem to be describing the same people. The representations reflect a worldview which was held by colonizers across the globe. That worldview was integral to the success of the colonial endeavor, as it aimed to satisfy the conscience of the colonizing country's citizens, or at least provide a response to anti-imperialist concerns. The basic theme underlying such colonial portrayals of the colonized was that natives were incompetent and therefore it was the 'white man's burden' to assume political and economic control.

Hawai'i was part of this vast network of colonial settings in which political myths were conveniently reproduced, perhaps slightly altered (but not much) to fit the particular situation. The Pacific Commercial Advertiser reproduced the same brand of propaganda in its efforts to promote the annexation of Hawai'i by the United States. In an effort to discredit their arguments, American anti-annexationists were portrayed as misinformed and naive. Anti-annexationists in Hawai'i, conceivably more threatening to the cause of annexation since their opinions would be

seen by Americans as being more authoritative as to the true situation of Hawai'i, were attacked more viciously. They were portrayed as insane or hysterical, with absolutely no credibility attributed to their critiques of the Republic government and the annexation question.

Annexation was also promoted in the Pacific Commercial Advertiser through indirect means. This particular method was two-sided: first, Hawaiians were portrayed as inept. Next, American influence was glorified as integral to the successful progression of Hawai'i into modernity. By portraying Hawaiians as lacking, the need for assistance was established. The exaltation of America made it the best candidate for the job of fixing Hawai'i.

The most common theme throughout the editorials and articles was the belief in the superiority of whites over non-whites. Race was portrayed as responsible for behavior, intelligence, and worth. It was clearly the basis for the argument for annexation. It was not enough that Lili'uokalani was dethroned; all Hawaiians were deemed ineligible for the position of power. The superior influence of the white community in Hawai'i came in to fix the mess. Hawaiians were no longer to be trusted with the serious business of controlling Hawai'i.

This newspaper reflected the colonial mindset at the same time that it served to shape the views of its constituency, the white minority elite which was supportive of the Republic of Hawai'i government and annexation. Arguments calling for unity among white foreigners in Hawai'i were repeatedly used in editorials, solidifying the racial divisions which existed in 1898. Non-supportive white foreigners were represented as treasonous or ignorant. Natives and other non-whites, groups which constituted the majority of the population of Hawai'i at the time were altogether discounted in the discussion regarding Hawai'i's future political status.

Again, this was not a new strategic manoeuvre for the colonial world, it happened over and over in a variety of colonial settings. It was the time-tested method of rationalizing colonial acquisition. From Southeast Asia to North America, racist justifications were made in order to legitimize the theft of land and power.

It may be suggested that the Pacific Commercial Advertiser lives on through its descendent, the leading morning commercial newspaper in Hawai'i today, The Honolulu Advertiser. Although the blatantly racist language found in the Pacific Commercial Advertiser is no longer used as often, vestiges of the colonial worldview remain. The status quo (American possession of Hawai'i) is portrayed as the standard. Hawaiians working for justice are portrayed in sensationalist terms: activists, protesters, illegal trespassers, or discounted altogether, creating

fear in mainstream readers which may preclude their obtaining the factual background necessary to develop informed political opinions.

Effects of Colonization on the Psychology of the Colonized

I have conducted this research in order to understand the way in which Hawaiians have been portrayed in the past as part of a larger process of colonialism, which functioned to dehumanize native populations in order to justify colonialism. The characterizations were not objective representations of the people they described; they were simply reflections of the worldview of the colonizer.

Modern-day Native Hawaiians inevitably face the socio-economic effects of colonialism, one of which is the phenomenon of internalized racism. These effects are not limited to Hawai'i; they have been experienced by people all over the world as a response to the experience of colonialism. Internalized racism has been eloquently described by Ngugi wa Thiong'o, a Kenyan professor of literature and world-renown author, in a compilation of a series of his essays,

Decolonizing the Mind:

The oppressed and the exploited of the earth maintain their defiance: liberty from theft. But the biggest weapon wielded and actually daily unleashed by imperialism against that collective defiance is the cultural bomb. The effect of a cultural bomb is to annihilate a people's belief in their names, in their languages, in their environment, in their heritage of struggle, in their unity, in their capacities and ultimately in themselves. It makes them see their past as one wasteland of non-achievement and it makes them want to distance themselves from that wasteland. It makes them want to identify with that which is furthest removed from themselves; for instance, with other peoples' languages rather than their own... It even plants serious doubts about the moral rightness of struggle... Amidst this wasteland which it has created, imperialism presents itself as the cure and demands that the dependent sing hymns of praise with the constant refrain: 'Theft is holy....'
(Thiong'o 1986: 3)

As a Hawaiian, I have experienced the very effects described above. I have seen my family members and other fellow Hawaiians experiencing the pain of separation from our culture. I am interested in diffusing this "cultural bomb" for myself by learning about its origins. In order to reduce its power, I have strived to learn about the historical context in which it was released in Hawai'i. The cultural bomb was released originally as a rationalization for imperialism. However, out of context, through modern eyes, it is seen as a version of reality, as truth, when it is nothing but propaganda. One way of contextualizing the cultural bomb is to explore and document the

racism which was brought by the foreigners who came to Hawai'i in the past 150 years.

Current Status of Native Hawaiians in Hawai'i

The sovereignty debate is fraught with unexamined assumptions upon which opinions are formed. In order to assist in a closer examination of these attitudes, I have attempted to bring a microscope to the year 1898 by examining the leading daily English language newspaper of that time. As the leading English language newspaper, The Pacific Commercial Advertiser was the “pulse” of the foreign, particularly American population in Hawai'i. The Honolulu Advertiser, whose predecessor is the newspaper in question, is the leading daily newspaper in the Hawaiian islands in 1998. This fact leads me to ask, “did the perspectives expressed in The Pacific Commercial Advertiser also prevail?” If the newspaper is still successful, did the political agenda expressed so blatantly also thrive? Even a cursory glance at the social, economic, and political climate in modern-day Hawai'i indicates that the American agenda has all but wiped out Native Hawaiian culture and society.

The annexation was marketed as a “good thing” for Hawai'i. Native Hawaiians must not be included in the group called “Hawai'i,” because Hawaiians have been suffering interminably since the overthrow. Today Hawai'i is hardly recognizable; it is a state of the United States of America, it is ethnically diverse, and a modern-day subscriber to capitalism and democracy. Yet, Native Hawaiians are in a crisis in their own homeland: economically, physically, psychologically, and socially. One hundred years after annexation, Hawaiians are still experiencing the ill-effects of colonialism in their own homeland.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alatas. *The Myth of the Lazy Native*. Great Britain: Frank Cass and Company Limited, 1977.
- Arneil, Barbara. "The Wild Indian's Venison: Locke's Theory of Property and English Colonialism in America," in Political Studies, London Guildhall University,(1996), XLIV, 60-74.
- Berkhofer. Robert F. *The White Man's Indian, Images of the American Indian from Columbus to the Present*. NY: Vintage Books, 1979. 261pp.
- Blaut, J.M. *1492: The Debate on Colonialism, Eurocentrism and History*. Trenton, New Jersey: Africa World Press, Inc. 1992.
- Carlson, Lewis H., and George A. Colburn. *In Their Place: White America Defines Her Minorities, 1850-1950*. USA: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1972.
- Conrad, Earl. *The Invention of the Negro*. NY: Paul Eriksson, Inc., 1966. 244pp.
- Dash, J. Michael. *Haiti and the United States: National Stereotypes and the Literary Imagination*. London: Macmillan Press, 1988.
- DeConde, Alexander. *Ethnicity, Race and American Foreign Policy*. Boston: N.E. University Press, 1992.
- Dippie, Brian W. *The Vanishing American: White Attitudes and the U.S. Indian Policy*. Middletown, Connecticut: Wesleyan University Press, 1982.
- Drinnon, Richard. *Facing West: The Metaphysics of Indian Hating and Empire Building*. NY: Schocken Books, 1980. 571pp.
- Eagleton, Terry, Fredric Jameson and Edward Said. *Nationalism, Colonialism and Literature*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1990.
- Evans, James. *The Indian Savage, The Mexican Bandit, the Chinese Heathen-Three Popular Stereotypes*. Unpublished Dissertation, University of Texas, 1967.
- Filler, Louis and Allen Guttman, Eds. *The Removal of the Cherokee Nation: Manifest Destiny or National Dishonor? Problems in American Civilization*. Boston: D.C. Heath and Company, 1962.
- Frederickson, George. *The Black Image in the White Mind: A Debate on Afro-American Character and Destiny, 1817-1914*. NY: Harper and Row, 1817.
- Gladwin, Thomas. *Slaves of the White Myth: The Psychology of Neocolonialism*. N.J.: Humanities Press, 1980.
- Gossett, Thomas F. *Race: The History of an Idea in America*. Dallas: Southern Methodist University Press, 1963. 512pp.
- Greene, Theodore P.. *American Imperialism in 1898: Problems in American Civilization*. Boston: D.C. Heath and Company, 1955.
- Grimshaw, Patricia. *Paths of Duty: American Missionary Wives in Nineteenth-Century Hawai'i*.

- Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1989. 246pp.
- Jordan, Winthrop D. *The White Man's Burden*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1974.
- Kame'eleihiwa, Lilikalā. *Native Lands and Foreign Desires*. Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press, 1992. 424pp.
- Killens, John O. *The Black Man's Burden*. NY: Trident Press, 1965. 176 pp.
- Kovel, Joel. *White Racism: A Psychohistory*. NY: Pantheon Books, 1970. 300pp.
- Krout, Mary H. *Hawai'i and a Revolution*. NY: Dodd, Mead, & Co., 1898. 330pp.
- Kuykendall, Ralph S. *Hawai'i: A History, from Polynesian Kingdom to American State*. NJ: Prentice Hall, 1961. 331pp.
- Lili'uokalani. *Hawai'i's Story by Hawai'i's Queen*. Honolulu: Mutual Publishing, 1990.
- Mazrui, Ali A. *Post-Imperial Fragmentation: The Legacy of Ethnic and Racial Conflict, in Studies in Race and Nations, Volume 1, Study No. 2, 1969-70, a publication of The Graduate School of International Studies, University of Denver*.
- Memmi, Albert. *The Colonizer and the Colonized*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1965. 153pp.
- Merk, Frederick. *Manifest Destiny and Mission in American History, A Reinterpretation*. NY: Alfred A. Knopf, 1963.
- Milbury-Steen, Sarah L. *European and African Stereotypes in Twentieth-Century Fiction*. NY: New York University Press, 1981.
- Monkman, Leslie. *A Native Heritage: Images of the Indian in English-Canadian Literature*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1981.
- Montagu, Ashley, Ed. *The Concept of Race*. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, Publishers, 1964.
- Montagu, Ashley. *Man's Most Dangerous Myth, The Fallacy of Race*. NY: Oxford University Press, 1974.
- Nadel, George H. and Perry Curtis. *Imperialism and Colonialism*. NY: The Macmillan Company, 1964.
- Osborne, Thomas J. *Empire Can Wait: American Opposition to Hawaiian Annexation, 1893*. Kent, Ohio: Kent State University Press, 1981.
- Parenti, Michael. *Land of Idols Political Mythology in America*. NY: St. Martin's Press, 1994.
- Pearce, Roy Harvey. *Savagism and Civilization: A Study of the Indian and the American Mind*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.
- Pike, Frederick B. *The United States and Latin America*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1992.
- Reynolds, Henry. *The Law of the Land*. Australia: Penguin Books, 1987. 225 pp.

Ruiz, Ramon Eduardo, Ed. *The Mexican War: Was it Manifest Destiny?* Hinsdale, Illinois: The Dryden Press, 1963.

Said, Edward W. *Covering Islam*. NY: Pantheon, 1981.

Said, Edward W. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books, 1979.

Schudson, Michael. *Discovering the News : A Social History of American Newspapers*. New York : Basic Books, 1978.

Shohat, Ella and Robert Stam. *Unthinking Eurocentrism: Multiculturalism and the Media*. London: Routledge, 1994.

Singh, Jyotsna. *Colonial Narratives, Cultural Dialogues: "Discoveries of Indian in the Language of Colonialism*. London: Routledge, 1996.

Stedman, Raymond W. *Shadows of the Indian: Stereotypes in American Culture*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1982. 269pp.

Takaki, Ronald, Ed. *From Different Shores: Perspectives on Race and Ethnicity in America*. NY: Oxford Univ. Press, 1987. 253pp.

The Pacific Commercial Advertiser. Honolulu. Jan-March 1898.

Thiong'o, Ngugi wa. *Decolonizing the Mind: The Politics of Language in African Literature*. London: James Currey, 1986.

Wax, Murray L., and Robert W. Buchanan, Eds. *Solving "The Indian Problem:" The White Man's Burdensome Business*. NY: The New York Times Company, 1975.

Weinberg, Albert K. *Manifest Destiny: A Study of Nationalist Expansionism in American History*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1935.

Wellman, David T. *Portraits of White Racism, Second Edition*. NY: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Will, Donald G. *Stereotypes of Maoris held by Europeans, a Study Based on Four Newspapers of the Liberal Period*. Unpublished M.A. Thesis, Massey University, 1973

Yanarell, Ernest J. and Lee Sigelman, Eds. *Political Mythology and Popular Fiction*. NY: Greenwood Press, 1988.