Abstract

There were different and opposing national identities claiming to represent Hawai‘i in 1894. A year after the illegal overthrow of the Hawaiian Kingdom, the same insurgents now calling themselves the Provisional Government of Hawai‘i (PG) were putting on a one-year anniversary celebration. Depending on the newspapers and other records from the day, completely different stories could be told on this same event. The PG attempted to spread political myth as fact, to legitimize their cause, and give them the appearance of embodying American values. Opposing English language newspapers however, were able to unravel many of these political myths, thus delegitimizing the PG and highlighting President Cleveland’s rejection of annexation. Meanwhile, Hawaiian language writers, first demonstrating an intimate and expert knowledge of Hawai‘i’s situation, then published and used this knowledge to express themselves and find answers in a very Hawaiian way – through the use of metaphor and kaona - to further delegitimize the PG. Because these writings were published and kept, these writers simultaneously preserved Hawaiian thought and action from this turbulent time for Hawaiians today. These stories can act as an example of Hawaiian identity and Hawaiian Nationalism in a time of great political change, thereby perhaps showing one way to move forward in today’s politically changing environment.
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Chapter 1. Introduction

It’s 8 ’o clock in the morning and a somewhat large yet exclusive crowd has gathered to celebrate and witness the raising of the American flag. The flag is enormous, 60 by 30 feet, and the crowd cheers as the band plays “The Star Spangled Banner.”

Generally speaking, nothing about this event would seem out of the ordinary, except that this affair is not in the United States of America. This is Hawai‘i, on January 17, 1894, long before Hawai‘i was named the 50th State and a few years before the U.S. congress claimed to have annexed Hawai‘i as a U.S. Territory. On this day, one year after the infamous and illegal overthrow of the Kingdom of Hawai‘i, the Provisional Government (PG) was hosting a one-year anniversary celebration, a birthday party of sorts.

Looking at newspapers of the time, we find clear differences in opinions on those festivities that took place, some in support of the event and others in staunch opposition. One newspaper wrote that the celebration was a complete success, that it “seemed nearly every body in the city was heart and soul in the observance of the first regular Fourth of July for Hawaii,” and that as cheers rang through the air, “Each succeeding explosion of patriotism was more hearty than the one before.”

Another newspaper from Honolulu during January 1894 wrote:

1 “Was A Day of Days,” Hawaiian Star, January 18, 1894, 3.

2 Liliuokalani, Hawaii’s Story By Hawaii’s Queen (Honolulu: Mutual Publishing, 1990), 257-258. Lili‘uokalani explains that the term “P.G.”, as used to denote those in support of the Provisional Government of Hawai‘i, became a term of embarrassment and shame for them and their children after the PG’s actions came to light, so much so that the PG openly solicitated to be referred to as “Annexationists” instead. I choose to employ their earlier alias.

3 “Was A Day of Days,” Hawaiian Star, 3.
The shouts of happiness of the PG sounded long on their day to commemorate one year since they stole this land and took it without the approval of the people...It was not enthusiastic, their happiness was severly lacking, in the same way that they might feign goodwill while entertaining their in-laws.

These opposing stories are very representative of the definitive contrasts printed in these Honolulu newspapers.

Benedict Anderson explains how the creation of “print-capitalism” provided a space for individuals separated in space to conceive of themselves as connected through their reading of the newspapers, as “imagined communities” they began to feel a part of a common nation. Anderson says that nations are imagined “because the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion.” Utilizing these ideas, we can see from the conflicting information in these 1894 newspapers that both sides were claiming to represent the thoughts, desires, and ideals of Hawai‘i and yet

---

4 Ka Makaainana, “Huai Ka Ulu O Lele,” Ka Makaainana, January 22, 1894, 4; When quoting Hawaiian newspapers, the words will be preserved as printed, meaning without diacritical markers. If the author uses Hawaiian language not quoted, modern diacritical markers will be used.

5 Unless otherwise stated, all translations from ‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i, the Hawaiian language, to the English language in this work are done by the author.


7 Ibid., 6.
publish very different stories. Ultimately, the controversy over this event shows that even a year after the overthrow there was still clear, documented opposition to the PG, conspicuously characterizing different national identities. This thesis will employ Hawai‘i newspapers from January 1894 which report on the PG celebration to examine the division in the community caused by two opposing identities attempting to occupy the same space and time.

Eventually, the United States of America would go on to claim an annexation of Hawai‘i, but at this point in the island’s history the white population only made up 637 out of the 13,593 registered voters, a far cry from representing Hawai‘i’s total population. There have been little studies by ‘ōiwi into the history of Hawai‘i during the PG period, in fact our limited knowledge of this period only preserves American power. It is no wonder that this time period, between the 1893 overthrow of the Queen and the 1898 annexation to the U.S., while the power and authority of the PG is unsanctioned and uncertain, is often glossed over in contemporary history books.

Throughout my schooling, from pre-school through my undergraduate schooling, the

---


9 For example, in Ruth Tabrah’s *Hawaii: A Bicentennial History*, after the author discusses the overthrow, she comments on U.S. President Harrison, the Blount Report and its investigations, U.S. Minister Willis mishearing the word “behead” as Lili‘u‘s impending punishment for the PG, a newspaper clipping by the PG on if they should keep the Hawaiian flag or not, a protest put on by 3,000 chinese residents against persecution by the PG, Robert Wilcox’s counter-revolution, and the Queen’s subsequent arrest before skipping ahead to 1898’s claim of annexation. In Allen Seiden’s *Hawai‘i: The Royal Legacy*, after the time of the overthrow, the author discusses how both the Queen and Dole had representatives arguing their case in Washington D.C., the Blount Report, Willis mishearing the word “behead”, the Morgan Report, Wilcox’s counter-revolution and the Queen’s subsequent arrest, before skipping ahead to 1898’s claim of annexation of Hawai‘i to the U.S.
only things from this time period I can remember learning about were the Blount Report, the Morgan Report, the Queen’s imprisonment in ‘Iolani Palace, and maybe a little about royalist Robert Wilcox. The argument here is not that we have no stories written from these five years between the overthrow of 1893 and the supposed annexation in 1898, as works like William Adam Russ Jr.’s *The Hawaiian Revolution (1893-1894)* and Noenoe K. Silva’s *Aloha Betrayed*, as well as many others provide much on major events during this time period. But one of the desired outcomes of this project is to bring forward more stories to describe what was happening in Hawai‘i during this period of conflict. Hopefully, as more information becomes easily accessible, future generations of Hawaiians will not need to wait until they reach a university education to learn of the courage, skill, and ingenuity of these ancestors that they themselves are descended from.

My research will explore what was happening during this time period, as well as illuminate a Hawaiian point of view from this era.

In total, the 125,000 individual pages of Hawaiian-language newspapers written during Hawai‘i’s history make up about the equivalent of over one million modern-day letter sized pages worth of text. Not only is there more to learn from all of the words written, but word choice, article and advertisement placement, and quotes and letters published can all add to the knowledge base. Clearly there is a need to pull more knowledge out of these pages and give voice to what our ancestors already knew, especially when these Honolulu newspapers are reporting so differently about the same event.

---

In regards to this controversy, if one took a trip in time back to this week, it is likely that one would believe that this first PG anniversary would be its last. President Cleveland was not accepting annexation and was trying to bring back Hawai‘i’s rightful government. While my research would be of interest to any student of American history, by exploring the differences between what is recorded in the dominant portrayal of this history, and telling the story using ‘Ōiwi Optics, this study can particularly create a greater understanding and appreciation for what our Hawaiian people had to live through and can serve as models of strength for us as their descendants. In highlighting contrasting histories between various English language records and Hawaiian language records, life in Hawai‘i during an underexamined point of the island’s history is brought to light. By analyzing Hawaiian action and strategy amidst the threats, political tactics, and essentially what was a smear campaign against Queen Lili‘uokalani and the Lāhui Hawai‘i (the Hawaiian Nation) by the PG, these stories can act as an example of Hawaiian identity and Hawaiian Nationalism in a time of great political change, thereby perhaps showing one way to move forward in today’s politically changing environment.

Benedict Anderson explains that the modern idea of a nation is an imagined community in that the members of the nation might never in reality see each other in person, yet still feel connected to these fellow nationals even if the connection is only an imagined connection. He claims that the growth of these modern nations was facilitated by the spread of print and what he calls print-capitalism. Over the course of time as


12 Anderson, 44-45.
materials such as books and newspapers spread, one outcome was that the readers came to realize that there were others who were reading this same print in this same language connecting them together and creating an exclusive group. Anderson says these “fellow readers, to whom they were connected through print, formed, in their secular, particular, visible invisibility, the embryo of the nationally imagined community.”

Hawai‘i in 1894 was not at this embryo stage of national identity. Puakea Nogelmeier writes about how Hawai‘i stands out among the Pacific Islands who adopted literacy because of its rapid acceptance of this new technology. In addition, among our writings, newspapers made up the largest repository of the written records. By the mid 1820’s, only a few years after the missionaries’ arrival, when mission schools were finally opened, “much of the adult population had already mastered basic literacy” and by 1859 there were foreign reports claiming that Hawaiian literacy rates had surpassed their own. This once oral society had taken a foreign technology, reading and writing, and fully integrated it into their culture and everyday use at an amazingly accelerated rate. This was done to the point that by the time local newspapers were widespread across the Hawaiian islands, the writers of those newspapers could assume that “they were writing for, and reading along with, a fully literate populace.”

13 Ibid.


16 Ibid.
These writers did not need to simplify their vocabulary or wonder who might read their words. The general population would be able to understand and read whatever was printed in these papers. From the outside looking in, Hawaiʻi had transformed itself in a very short amount of time from an oral society, isolated in the middle of the pacific, to an internationally recognized “coequal sovereign state” with literacy rates highest in the world and governing systems adapted from the foreigners but still purposefully and distinctly Hawaiian. Hawaiians showed an inept ability to maneuver what was already theirs while adding new along the way. As Hawaiʻi and its people made these modernizing transitions, Hawaiʻi was also able to transfer aspects of their oral society into the realm of print, especially through the medium of newspapers.

Nogelmeier discusses the foundations of Hawaiian oral society being a system where the orator could share knowledge, allowing opportunity for the knowledge shared to be either validated or refuted by peers. The fluidity and dialogue of newspapers allowed for a similar validation process where anyone who could read could participate and respond to things published in the paper. Indeed, the “loss of chiefly authority over knowledge that accompanied literacy further empowered a general public to participate in the process of validation that the newspapers provided.” One reason newspapers are being used to study this time period is that while they may not represent the opinion of the entire public, they represent public knowledge and public dialogue of the day. Another reason is that newspapers were published to include responses and active debate.


The danger of not taking this into account is that taken “in isolation, pieces of that dialogue can appear factual, final and uncontested.”\textsuperscript{19} This paper will show that the story as told by the PG supporters is not factual, final, or uncontested.

My thesis topic focuses on the conflicting narratives published about a single date, that date being January 17, 1894 and the events surrounding that time period in Hawai‘i and Honolulu specifically. It involves piecing together the story of that day from various vantage points and opinions as published in the newspapers of the day. Linda Tuhiwai-Smith states that from “the vantage point of the colonized, a position from which I write, and choose to privilege, the term ‘research’ is inextricably linked to European imperialism and colonialism.”\textsuperscript{20} This is why I intend to include not just English language sources, but the Hawaiian voice from Hawaiian language newspapers and others who supported the Queen and the Kingdom of Hawai‘i’s sovereignty in my research.

As discussed earlier, M. Puakea Nogelmeier’s \textit{Mai Pa‘a I Ka Leo: Historical Voice in Hawaiian Primary Materials, Looking Forward And Listening Back} delves into the use of primary Hawaiian-language sources going unused or even misused and taken out of context. He claims that this has happened throughout Hawai‘i’s history as historians without the ability to understand the Hawaiian language try to write about Hawai‘i. Nogelmeier begins his introduction by stating:

\begin{quote}
Ibid., 126.
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\end{quote}
Some stories have no voice now. A century of Hawaiian “stories,” ranging from social commentaries to ancient epics, have remained silent in archives for generations. Knowledge about Hawai‘i’s past has been drawn from every language ever linked to these islands, assembling pieces from two centuries of observation and written history. Ironically though, most of the Hawaiian-language material, the core of that collective knowledge, has been neglected. Modern audiences have not heard the “stories,” retold them, or made them part of what we know and believe today.

The impact of leaving most of the Hawaiian writings out of the mix of modern knowledge is that every form of history written, every cultural study undertaken, and every assumption made over most of the last century should be revisited in light of those neglected sources.21

Nogelmeier suggests that every history of Hawai‘i should be carefully reexamined due to its exclusion and omission of Hawaiian sources. Noelani Arista also emphasizes that the concept of Hawaiian language and Hawaiian thinking are “sufficiently different from Euro-American premises of linguistics and knowledge production” which leads her to argue that “interpreters of archival sources have to use exegetical strategies to excavate layers of cross-cultural interaction.”22 Even if the researcher has all of this, Arista proclaims that without an intimate knowledge of how Hawaiian sources were created and how they are to be interpreted, it would still not be enough to understand what these sources mean. Yet, Arista notes that this is no excuse for why “historiography on Hawai‘i has long ignored the existence of Hawaiian-language source materials,” saying that to do so “seems inexplicable.”23

---

21 Nogelmeier, Mai Pa‘a I Ka Leo, XI.


23 Ibid., 665.
Kamanamaikalani Beamer’s *No Mākou Ka Mana* disseminates the idea that if the dominant colonial optics could be lifted from our eyes while learning of the ali’i or chiefs during this time period of the 1800s, and if ‘Ōiwi optics were used instead to interpret the actions of Hawaiians, we could achieve a greater understanding of how the Hawaiian nation was able to use its agency to remain Hawaiian, even while utilizing foreign tools and technologies.²⁴ What makes this more interesting as applied to this project is, as mentioned earlier, the power of print empowered the general public to gain and share knowledge that might once have only been reserved for or recorded by the chiefs. So now these records are not just of how the chiefs were able to act, organize, and strategize, but how the greater Hawaiian population was able to use their agency in an inherently Hawaiian way.

Noenoe Silva begins her book *The Power Of The Steel-Tipped Pen* explaining how native writers from this era saw their responsibility as teachers to not just perpetuate and conceptualize Hawaiian culture and identity to their contemporaries, but to the future generations as well. Calling this thought process “mo’okū‘auhau (genealogical) consciousness” Silva says, “In the twenty-first century, we are who they foresaw: descendants whose primary language is now that of the colonizer, but who need and are benefiting from their efforts to write in Hawaiian.”²⁵

This thesis will in part, build upon the works of Nogelmeier, Silva, Arista, and Beamer, arguing for and justifying the need for this project and other projects like it,

²⁴ Beamer, 12.

which examine Hawaiian thought and action using Hawaiian language sources. It is clear to me that ancestors wrote not just for themselves and those they knew, but with future generations in mind. Visiting this time period with a Hawaiian lens is vital to understanding this history of Hawaiʻi. To showcase this, this thesis will show how vastly different a historical event can be portrayed depending on who the writer is.

My second chapter will be split into two sections. The first section will give a brief introduction to the time period leading up to January 1894. By setting up the story with details from the time leading up to the overthrow and then on to the next year, readers will be able understand where the various players in 1894 came from and how they ended up where they were. Related to this, the second section of this second chapter will give an overview of the nine Honolulu newspapers used in this paper, who was involved, and what kind of writing they produced. I will begin to show that it does matter who is writing, to whom they are writing to, and what other motivations these writers might have had besides just printing the news.

In my third chapter, I will compare and contrast the reporting done by the English language papers mentioned earlier, as they give commentary on and speak more specifically to the celebration itself. As the day’s activities commence, and as the various controversies that occur are understood, the idea of what it must be like to live during this time period can more easily come to light. Even more specifics and examples of who is publishing, what is published, and why certain things are published will be argued. On one side, the PG attempted to build an imagined community through popular support with these celebrations and in their affiliated newspapers. At the same time, other English language newspapers against the PG refute the PG’s political myths by discrediting their
celebration and their administration. The PG also attempted to portray themselves as embodying American values and becoming a part of the United States, while simultaneously trying to distance themselves from the president of the United States. Contrasting this theme, the other English language newspapers focus on President Cleveland’s rejection of annexation and the impending doom facing the PG.

In my fourth chapter, after using these English language newspapers to demonstrate two opposing sides in Hawai‘i, with the PG newspapers striving for public support and American recognition, while the other side demonstrates that the PG have neither, I will add the analysis from the Hawaiian language papers that are opposed to the PG to add commentary on Hawaiian life during this time. These records will show that these Hawaiian writers had an intimate understanding of what was happening in Hawai‘i at the time. They then used this knowledge to express themselves and find answers in a very Hawaiian way – through the use of metaphor and kaona, thus preserving for today Hawaiian thought and action from this turbulent time. The Hawaiian metaphor found in these Hawaiian language papers will be examined. These Hawaiian language newspapers also add to the repository of English language sources that dismiss the PG’s legitimacy and discredit their right to govern in the Hawaiian Kingdom territory.

My fifth and final chapter will be a conclusion reviewing findings from throughout the thesis. As opposing nationalities try to occupy the same space and place there will obviously be conflict and drama, and this so-called celebration is rife with examples. But in a broader view, this chapter will analyze the question what can we take away from the actions these Hawaiian royalists/nationalists took in the face of an enemy

26 Arista, 664-665. Arista says kaona “can be understood as metaphoric, allegorical, or symbolic meaning.”
who appeared to control the government? My analysis will help attempt to conceptualize some examples of Hawaiian identity and nationalism from January 1894. This conclusion will then briefly look at what these actions and the outcomes of this time period might mean for a Hawaiian nation today facing great political trials and changes.
Chapter 2. Introduction to the Time Period and Newspaper Background

Historical Context

On January 17, 1893, a group of conspirators, mostly American businessmen residing in the Kingdom of Hawai‘i, put in motion their plans to overthrow the Hawaiian Monarchy and its Queen that they might control the islands of Hawai‘i, and thereafter achieve annexation of the Hawaiian Islands to the United States of America. Minister John L. Stevens called 160 U.S. marines on shore to invade and assist these conspirators and insurgents in their scheme. After proclaiming that the monarchy of Hawai‘i was no more, Stevens “extended diplomatic recognition to the Provisional Government that was formed by the conspirators without the consent of the Native Hawaiian people or the lawful Government of Hawaii and in violation of treaties between the two nations and of international law.”27

With the backing of the United States military, Queen Lili‘uokalani saw surrendering under protest to the President of the United States as the best means of avoiding bloodshed among her people, but also as a way to present her case to America and be reinstated as the rightful head of Hawaiian government. These insurgents set themselves up over the islands and called themselves the Provisional Government of Hawaii (PG), and did their best to distance themselves from the old government, with such actions as renaming ‘Iolani Palace the “Executive Building.”28 They also were

27 U.S. Congress, Senate, Senate Joint Resolution 19 : To acknowledge the 100th anniversary of the January 17, 1893 overthrow of the Kingdom of Hawaii, and to offer an apology to Native Hawaiians on behalf of the United States for the overthrow of the Kingdom of Hawaii, Calendar No. 185 103d Cong., 1st sess, 1993, S. Rep. 103-126, 1-2.

taking designs to create a new flag for Hawai‘i, to replace “the Mongrel Ensign of the Discarded Monarchy.”

Upon the one-year anniversary of the overthrow of the Hawaiian monarchy the PG put on an elaborate celebration. This they did in spite of the fact that at this point in time the Blount report had already been published on July 17, 1893 making their proposed alliance with the United States quite tenuous. This report, commissioned by then United States President Grover Cleveland, published U.S. Special Commissioner James H. Blount’s experiences investigating the overthrow of the Hawaiian Monarchy and the presence of a newly set up Provisional Government requesting annexation to the United States.

From the very beginning Blount established himself as non-partial to any particular side, refusing accommodations and servants that the annexation club offered free of charge as soon as he arrived in the islands, but also declining even a ride to the hotel with Lili‘uokalani’s carriage. Blount’s final report found that the PG improperly used American assistance and resources to secure control of the Hawaiian Kingdom. It was the findings of this significant report that lead U.S. President Grover Cleveland to conclude that the U.S. Minister to Hawai‘i of the time, John L. Stevens, had made it the

---


mission of his ministry to annex Hawai‘i to the United States. It was Minister Stevens who ordered 160 U.S. marines to land at Honolulu. President Cleveland says that the only way this act would not be considered an act of war would be if the Queen had invited them, or if American lives were directly in danger. All evidence pointed to there being peace in the streets of Honolulu at the time, and because the soldiers marched straight to the Palace instead of the residencies of the American citizens, Cleveland further concluded that the overthrow should not have happened, and that it could not have happened if not for the improper and unauthorized use of American soldiers. This led to his decree that Queen Lili‘uokalani be reinstated and the PG be disbanded.

Occurring within the PG’s first year in power, it is this report and the subsequent decision by President Cleveland that caused so much uncertainty among the PG supporters. Annexationists now needed to find traction in their goal of becoming a part of a United States of America that did not accept them, while supporters of the Queen felt justified knowing that the PG had no claim to the government they were trying to establish and legitimize. Although many history books glaze over this time period, going from the overthrow, maybe mentioning certain resistance acts by Kānaka Maoli, and then skipping ahead to 1898, it is interesting to note that, against the previously dominant narrative of inevitable annexation following the overthrow of the monarchy, in early

32 Cleveland, 448.
33 Ibid., 448-452.
34 Ibid., 458.
1894 hopes of annexation to the United States of America were all but dead.\textsuperscript{35} James Blount’s report and the testimonies included all lead up to the setting of January 17, 1894.

**The Newspapers**

In portraying English language viewpoints on this day, my primary reads will include six Hawai‘i newspapers. The *Pacific Commercial Advertiser*, a precursor to the *Honolulu Advertiser*, was established in 1856 by Henry M. Whitney, a Hawai‘i-born son of a missionary, educated in New England, who would eventually return to become Hawai‘i’s first postmaster general.\textsuperscript{36} He started work at the government printing office which published *The Polynesian*, before starting the *Advertiser* independently.\textsuperscript{37} Through the time of the overthrow and during 1894, he simultaneously acted as business manager and editor of the *Hawaiian Gazette* in addition to his duties at the *Advertiser*.\textsuperscript{38} The *Gazette* was for the most part, historically anti-monarchy.\textsuperscript{39}

\textsuperscript{35} Again, there are works out there that discuss this time period. But, for example, Neil Thomas Proto’s *The Rights of My People: Liliuokalani’s Enduring Battle with the United States 1893-1917* is a book which highlights the time period and yet while recent Hawaiian work’s were consulted, the sources used to talk about 1893-1898 in Hawai‘i were almost exclusively from English language sources, including pro-annexationist newspapers. This paper is in part to combat the general narrative that has always been told, and to assist in highlighting the Hawaiian voice from this time.

\textsuperscript{36} “H. M. Whitney Founder Of This Paper Is Dead,” *Hawaiian Gazette*, August 19, 1904, 1.

\textsuperscript{37} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{38} *Hawaiian Gazette*, January 19, 1894, 1.

The Hawaiian Star was founded by J.B. Atherton, who came to the islands in 1858, and who would go on to become the president of Castle and Cooke, Ltd. After marrying Juliette M. Cooke.\textsuperscript{40} J.B. Atherton was also the Chairman of the evening assembly and also the first to speak among those who gave speeches at the evening assembly, the crowning event of the anniversary celebration.\textsuperscript{41} At the time however, Walter G. Smith was the editor of the Star. Smith was also a speaker at the mass meeting celebrating the PG, even though he had not been living in Hawai‘i at the time of the overthrow.\textsuperscript{42} These first three newspapers, The Hawaiian Gazette, The Pacific Commercial Advertiser, and The Hawaiian Star all present very similar information glorifying the celebration, while the Hawaiian language newspaper Ka Nupepa Kuokoa, also established by Whitney as the Hawaiian language companion to the Commercial Advertiser and with Joseph U. Kawainui as editor, adds the same information but translated into Hawaiian.\textsuperscript{43} They look down on the Queen, the Hawaiian Kingdom, and anyone who opposes their goal of annexation to the United States.

Presenting an opposing view, the English language newspaper Hawaii Holomua rejected the PG and their celebration. At the time it was edited by Edmund Norrie, who was originally from Denmark but utilized this paper to defend the Hawaiian Kingdom

\textsuperscript{40} Ibid., 40; Mary Kawena Pukui, Samuel H. Elbert, and Esther t. Mookini, Place Names of Hawaii (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1974), 13.

\textsuperscript{41} “The Speeches,” Hawaiian Gazette, January 19, 1894, 2.

\textsuperscript{42} “A Pen Picture: Some Truth and Some Fiction,” Hawai‘i Holomua, January 17, 1894, 2.

\textsuperscript{43} Chapin, 80; “He La Kamahao,” Nupepa Kuokoa, January 20, 1894, 2.
and the Queen, and was both jailed and fined for his words against the PG. A supplemental reading for this section will include the earlier mentioned Blount Report commissioned by U.S. President Grover Cleveland. The last primary source for this theme will be *The Daily Bulletin*, a newspaper that supports U.S. annexation, but does not support the PG as a suitable government or its actions in overthrowing the Queen. The paper itself had a complicated past, from the time it was first established by H. Whitney, absorbing other papers and hiring different editors such as J. W. Robertson and Daniel Logan, eventually going on to combine with the *Hawaiian Star* to become the *Honolulu Star-Bulletin*. Although connected to many of the pro-annexationist newspapers in the past, during the 1890’s the *Daily Bulletin* had strong things to say against the PG. They admit that in their view it would be “of incalculable advantage to the United States” to take control of Hawai‘i, but they do not condone the drastic measures the PG took in attempting to facilitate that shift of control. These two newspapers are vital in that they were written by non-Hawaiian writers, and in the case of the *Daily Bulletin* even a writer who desired annexation to the US, but yet could see through the façade that the PG were trying to invent as they portrayed the last year of their rule and its anniversary celebration as anything besides a farce. The *Holomua* and the *Daily Bulletin* do not shy away from criticizing the PG and pointing out the PG’s failures.

44 Chapin, 36.


46 Chapin, 15.

In displaying a Hawaiian point of view, my primary reads will include three Hawaiian newspapers, *Ka Leo O Ka Lahui*, *Nupepa Ka Oiaio*, and *Ka Makaainana*. *Ka Makaainana* was edited by Francisco J. Testa and was viewed by the PG “as a thorn in their side.” Testa, also known as Hoke, was born on Molokaʻi June 7, 1861, attended Lahainaluna School, and was a long-time close associate of Edmund Norrie. At his passing in 1915, the *Gazette* wrote that he was “one of the best known Hawaiians in the Territory.”

John E. Bush was editing both *Ka Leo O Ka Lahui* and *Ka Oiaio* during this time period, with *Ka Leo* being published daily, and *Ka Oiaio* being published weekly. Born in Honolulu on February 15, 1842, Bush lived a long life serving the Hawaiian Kingdom in various capacities from Minister of Finance to Minister of the Interior and even Minister of Foreign Affairs. He was originally working as a whaler when his interest in print led him to a job at the *Hawaiian Gazette*, where he would actually go on to become foreman of their office. Under Kālākaua’s reign, Bush was a part of the envoy to Samoa to create a Polynesian alliance. As a strong supporter of Hawaiian rights, he and

48 Chapin, 69.

49 “Frank J. Testa Dies At Queen’s Hospital,” *Hawaiian Gazette*, December 17, 1915, 8.

50 Ibid.

51 Chapin, 54, 82.


54 Ibid.
the *Gazette* eventually parted ways over differences in ideologies, with Bush then beginning his own newspapers. By 1892, Bush had stopped publishing the English edition of *Ka Leo* in protest of the “growing Caucasian oligarchic power,” and was also jailed and fined by the PG for the things he printed against them.\(^{55}\)

These Hawaiian language sources written by Hawaiians from a Hawaiian point of view are vital to this project’s telling of Honolulu during January 1894. Contrasting these themes and points of view will add Hawaiian knowledge to the narrative of this time period for today’s world.

In discussing “nation-ness, as well as nationalism,” Anderson states that to “understand them properly we need to consider carefully how they have come into being, in what ways their meanings have changed over time, and why, today, they command such profound emotional legitimacy.”\(^{56}\) Perhaps this statement is no more relevant than during this Hawaiian Kingdom Territory era of Hawai‘i’s history after the illegal overthrow of Hawai‘i’s monarchy. The PG as well as Minister Stevens had all expected a swift annexation of Hawai‘i to the U.S. following the overthrow. Now, abruptly having to build and run a government on their own, these newspapers became a printed battleground of sorts that the PG used as they attempted to establish themselves as legitimate. This battle did not go unopposed as supporters of the Queen and detractors of the PG had the ability to use these same tools to question the PG’s legitimacy.

\(^{55}\) Ibid.

\(^{56}\) Anderson, 4.
Chapter 3. January 17, 1894, According to English Language Newspapers

This chapter will present what happened on January 17, 1893, according to the English language newspapers published from the time as they give commentary on and speak more specifically to the celebration itself, more so than their Hawaiian language counterparts. Analyzing an amalgamation of these English records is perhaps the quickest way to showcase that something is awry in Hawai‘i, as not only do the opposing newspapers publish conflicting stories, but the PG supported newspapers at times even contradict themselves. These contradictory and flawed PG supported newspapers would go on to become the main sources used for U.S. government records and at least one other contemporary text that documented this 1894 celebration.57 Indeed, Arista notes that many scholars would rather avoid “obtaining linguistic and cultural fluency, opting instead to continue basing their histories about Hawai‘i and Hawaiians largely on sources written in English.”58 From Kanalu Young’s Rethinking Native Hawaiian Past, Young hopes that Native Hawaiian scholars will be able to come forth out of all of the destruction and devastation that has been done to Hawaiian history by foreign scholars, entities, and agendas.59 Young uses some of Leonard Thompson’s ideas of the political

57 Albert S. Willis, Mr. Willis to Mr. Gresham, January 19, 1894, letter, in Foreign Relations of the United States 1894 Affairs in Hawaii, 1194-1208. Minister Willis gives a little of his own testimony, otherwise most of his report back to Washington D.C. on this anniversary celebration is quoted from the Pacific Commercial Advertiser and the Hawaiian Star; Julia Flynn Siler, “Secrets of the Flower Beds, 1894-1895” in Lost Kingdom: Hawaii’s Last Queen, the Sugar Kings, and America’s First Imperial Adventure, (New York: Atlantic Monthly Press, 2012), 245-247.

58 Arista, 665.

myth, defining it as a “tale told about the past to legitimatize or discredit a regime.” 60 Young talks about how these myths are openly spread until they are viewed as fact. Now, as the PG attempted to spread their political myths, their inability to consistently weave a coherent tale results in the unravelling of the stories they wish to publish as truth. Much of what the pro-annexationist newspapers publish about this day falls under this idea of the political myth, but none more so than when the PG try to ignore the findings of the Blount Report and the subsequent decision by President Cleveland to deny annexation and support Queen Liliʻuokalani. This was not the story that the PG wanted spread so they created their own political myths that further established their own regime as legitimate. After a short review of the stances of these Honolulu newspapers, this chapter will layout a summary of the celebration activities from January 17, 1894. Then an analysis of the day’s events will explore contrasting themes found in these newspapers. On one side, the PG attempted to build an imagined community through popular support with these celebrations and in their affiliated newspapers. At the same time, other English language newspapers against the PG refute the PG’s political myths by discrediting their celebration and their administration. The PG also attempted to portray themselves as embodying American values and becoming a part of the United States, while simultaneously trying to distance themselves from the president of the United States. Contrasting this theme, the other English language newspapers focus on President Cleveland’s rejection of annexation and the impending doom facing the PG.

Review of Nūpepa

60 Ibid.
As a quick review for the reader’s convenience, nine Honolulu newspapers published during the time of this celebration. Three Hawaiian language newspapers published in support of the Queen. These are *Ka Leo O Ka Lahui*, *Nupepa Ka Oiaio*, and *Ka Makaainana*. As these Hawaiian language nūpepa for the most part focus less on the day’s celebrations and more so report on the predicament of Hawai‘i and its people in general, these nūpepa will be read and analyzed more in depth in the ensuing chapter. But the conflicting narratives found in the nūpepa that do publish specifics about what happened on January 17, 1894, are on their own able to show bounteous examples of burgeoning opposing national identities in Hawai‘i.

The *Hawai‘i Holomua* is a Hawaiian newspaper written in English that is a supporter of restoring Queen Lili‘uokalani to her throne, and therefore is also against the celebration of January 17th as an anniversary. The *Daily Bulletin* is a white-run English language newspaper that claims to not be pledged to any sect or party in Hawai‘i, but is also against the one year anniversary. They do support the annexation of Hawai‘i to the US, but do not view the PG as a sufficiently qualified government to lead them.

The *Hawaiian Gazette* as well as the *Hawaiian Star* are both pro-annexationist newspapers. In general both the *Gazette* and the *Star* praise the celebration. The editor of the *Star*, Walter G. Smith, is even one of the speakers at the crowning event of the
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evening.\textsuperscript{64} Unless otherwise stated, the following summary of events from January 17th, comes from an article called, “A Wonderful Celebration: What Honolulu Did On Its Government’s First Birthday” published on the front page of the \textit{Hawaiian Gazette} on January 19, 1894.

\textbf{Summary of the Celebration}

At 6:00 am, a crowd began to gather on Fort Street between King St. and Hotel St., along with those who would be participating in what was once known as the parade of the Antiques and Horribles (see Figure 1). The Merriam-Webster dictionary defines the Antiques and Horribles as “fantastic impersonation forming part of a parade” and an article for \textit{Visual Thesaurus} claims the tradition “began in the mid-19\textsuperscript{th} century” in the New England States and that the parade was an excuse for “locals to get dressed up in silly costumes and poke fun at those in power” during celebrations like the fourth of July.\textsuperscript{65} At 6:30am the parade began up Fort Street, parading “through the principle streets” until about 7:30am. One man was dressed as Blount, and carried a rat-trap to represent the instruments he used to write the Blount Report. Other impersonations included Mrs. Vina King and George Washington, with the only really popular horrible being a man
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\textsuperscript{64} “The Speeches,” \textit{Hawaiian Gazette}.

dressed as Satan.

Half an hour later, a crowd gathered once more at the corner of Nuʻuanu Avenue and King Street (Figure 1) for an 8:00am flag raising ceremony. The flag was enormous, 60 by 30 feet, raised on a 120-foot flagpole. The crowd cheered as the flag was hoisted to the sound of the band playing The Star-Spangled Banner and firecrackers being set off.

Following the flag raising ceremony there was a show put on by the Provisional Government’s military back at what was once known as Palace Square. The square is right in front of ʻIolani Palace, or what the Provisional Government was calling the Executive Building, where Merchant Street merges into King Street. There was a short preliminary drill done with Colonel J. H. Soper, after which Lieutenant-Colonel Fisher put the men through “the manual of arms.” This was successively followed by a march southeast along King Street until they hit Punchbowl Street, marching northeast up Punchbowl Street until Beritania Street, northwest up Beritania to Fort Street, southwest along Fort going back to King Street, and then northwest along King Street until the festivities once more arrived at the corner of King Street and Nu'uanu Avenue where the military parade stopped to salute the new American Flag. After another round of The Star-Spangled Banner, the parade ended and the troops went back to their barracks located somewhere along King. The military for the PG apparently did not stay in the barracks that once housed The Kingdom of Hawaiʻi’s troops. The Gazette reports a big crowd following wherever the parade went. As far as the number of troops in this PG army, the paper reports that when the first line of troops had reached the corner of Beretania and Fort Street, the last company of troops was still two blocks back by Richard Street, as noted in Figure 2.
Around 11:00am it was reported that the first guests started to arrive at the “Executive Building,” for the reception being held by President and Mrs. Dole, and that “The stream of people came in double file, and flowed unceasingly from 11 o’clock until ten minutes of 12 after which it began to intermit.” The Vice President, the members of the cabinet and members of the Supreme Court and their ladies, were all present. Judges Cooper and Whiting of the Circuit Court were also in attendance, as were Col. Soper, Lieut.-Col. Fisher, and a Major Mcleod. The Gazette lists the names of all the ladies who helped Mrs. Dole in preparing for the reception, even publishing the hundred or so names that were signed on the guest list, claiming that there were so many people at the reception that “hundreds went away without” getting to sign their names. The actual party was held in the large council chamber that was decorated simply with chrysanthemums, but people spilled over into all the halls and verandas. The party began with a 21-gun salute by the artillery company at 12 noon.

In the ensuing hours after the reception there were no official activities planned until the evening assembly and speeches that were held at the “Executive Building,” specially decked out with a press stand and green and red lights lighting up the grounds. As the speeches were about to commence, a large “Portuguese Procession” marched
down Richard Street along the perimeter of the palace grounds. They showed their support with torches, a marching band, and signs with phrases like “America is Our Goal” and “P.G. and Portugee, We’re the 400” and “No Monarchy in Ours.” They stopped at the southwest corner of the grounds, and stood at the corner of King and Richards as the speeches took place.

As for the speeches themselves, there were eight speakers in all. The Chairman of the evening, J.B. Atherton spoke first on how even though Grover Cleveland had come against them, the PG “has stood firm and has been sustained by the best and the most trustworthy men in Hawaii. The future is in the hands of men whom we can trust.” Next came J. B. Castle, another famous Hawai’i sugar businessman, who spoke much the same, adding that generations from that night their descendants will thank God for what they did in overthrowing the monarchy. The other speakers of the night were A. S. Hartwell, President F. A. Hosmer, H. T. Waterhouse (who spoke briefly in Hawaiian), with W. O. Smith, attorney general for the Provisional Government, speaking next. W. O. Smith says that he wishes someone “worthier” than him could come and represent the Provisional Government, perhaps referring to those who are higher up the government. Judge A. G. M. Robertson followed, with Walter G. Smith, editor of the Hawaiian Star, as the concluding speaker. Smith’s final words talked about how annexation was a prize worth fighting for, that it was not a pointless endeavor, and that “Standing here upon ground once consecrated to the pomp of monarchy, face to face with the de-royalized house of government, knowing no flag so dear as the Stars and Stripes, we appeal to our
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countrymen to open their gates to us of kindred blood; but we pledge ourselves, if that cannot be, to at least be worthy of the service by the work we shall do on this soil for the glory of American principles.”

After the concluding speaker, there were fireworks launched from the palace grounds (see figure 3). There were also fireworks launched from across the street to the south on the grounds of the judiciary building, and there were even fireworks set to be launched from the roof of the palace, but they unfortunately and very dangerously “caught fire and went up in one big blaze.” This pretty much concluded the day’s activities, with people remaining in the area for about an hour after the meeting ended either talking amongst themselves or watching the last of the fireworks. If the Gazette was the only source used to tell the story of this day, this first anniversary celebration put on by the PG would seem for the most part to be a pretty standard affair. Further analysis using multiple newspapers will show the danger in excluding newspapers that perhaps better represent the majority of the population of Hawaiʻi.

Analysis

PG Legitimacy In Question

68 Ibid.
The *Gazette* calls this day the “greatest anniversary in Hawaiian history” and “a day that by us and our descendants will be considered a day of rejoicing and gladness, a day that will be celebrated by everyone.”

This last statement was the paper’s first reaction to the anniversary. With statements like the “largest crowd ever gathered together in Hawaii” the PG started off the day at least on paper looking like they had the popular support of the people. A quick look into the numbers shows that their statement is a contradiction. The writers of the *Gazette* and their descendants, who are white, pro-American residents of Hawai‘i, consider this day a day to rejoice. This would be a reasonable conclusion. But then the *Gazette* claims that this will be a day for everyone to celebrate. Even two years later, in the 1896 Census of Hawai‘i, the American population of Hawai‘i was listed at only 3,086 out of a total population of 109,020 people. How confident was the Gazette that their pro-annexation to America ideals were shared by the other 97% of the population made up of Hawaiian, British, German, French, Norwegian, Portuguese, Japanese, Chinese, and others living in Hawai‘i at the time? Either the *Gazette* does not count most of the population of Hawai‘i when they say “everyone,” or the ideals of the PG are the ideals expressed by all residents of Hawai‘i. Other sources of the time reveal that the latter is simply not true. The dialogue between these English language papers continue to publish a story of dissonance as one side seeks legitimacy while the other refutes their claims.
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The *Holomua* is filled with evidence of Hawai‘i’s disapproval of the PG and its claims of legitimacy. The *Holomua* reports that the PG were in talks to rename Palace Square as Union Square to “show the harmony and united feelings which we are told prevail in the P.G. camp” and of course to distance themselves even more from the palace and its monarchy. The *Holomua* comments that anyone “noticing the constant bickering and daily quarelling...that ‘Discord Square’ would be a more appropriate name.”

The *Holomua* reported that Hawaiians showed “their good sense and natural dignity” by not participating in the day’s events. The *Holomua* was also very sarcastic towards these PG activities. For example, the PG planned to launch fireworks as the penultimate demonstration of their anniversary celebration. Meanwhile, the *Holomua* surmised that if the fireworks were bright enough, they would be seen by the number of society ladies who had left the town to “avoid...contact with the rabble in the PG ranks.” The *Holomua* suggests that those employed by the PG have attributes too questionable for proper ladies to be associated with. Although meant to demonstrate their validity, we know that the fireworks meant to be launched from the roof of ‘Iolani Palace exploded prematurely, with the *Star* making note that a Corporal Kelby of E Company needed to be admitted to the hospital because of injuries sustained to his hand during the explosion. What more could go wrong with the final activity of the night of this
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74 Ibid. The following fireworks example also comes from this same section.

anniversary? Well, a private from the very same E company decided to add to the festivities by firing off his own homemade bomb. The bomb explosion lead to “five panes of glass...shattered and some stucco work loosened” from the front of the Palace.76

Always looking for shortcomings of the PG, the *Holomua* is also the only paper to report that neither the Government nor the Board of Education had notified the public that the schools would be observing the holiday. Thus, many children reported to school only to find out that school had been cancelled.77 In the evening, at the mass meeting on the Palace grounds, and perhaps relating to W. O. Smith’s comments about wishing worthier men could address the people, the *Holomua* was quick to point out that none of the high PG officials were speaking. Considering this was a meeting with speakers celebrating the events of the year prior, the Holomua noted that three of the speakers, A.S. Hartwell, Judge A. G. M. Robertson, and Walter G. Smith were not even a part of the overthrow. Hartwell had reportedly gotten cold feet and distanced himself from the insurgents’ rebellion a few days before the overthrow happened. Even more ironic was that Robertson and Smith, besides not being a part of the movement, were not even living in the country of Hawai‘i at the time of the overthrow and had only moved to the islands within the last year.78 How could men who were not a part of the revolt, let alone not in the country, honor and exalt this revolution? The newspapers continue to show inconsistencies like these about this day and question the celebrations generally.
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Further arguing against the activities and celebrations, the *Daily Bulletin* adds its own thoughts. Sending a message to the PG, they write that just because one shouts that we have a good government does not make it a fact, and they wonder why those who are shouting it are not discussing the PG’s actual record. From this snippet of news, the *Daily Bulletin*’s views on the PG as a government are not very high. Before the mass meeting of the evening, the *Daily Bulletin* published a satirical piece on what the speakers of the meeting might speak on. In the *Daily Bulletin*’s view, if the speakers spoke on “what is nearest their mouths,” then the program for the evening would hilariously be as follows:

J. B. Atherton, chairman: “Chinese Labor vs. Annexation; or, A Bird in the Hand is Worth Two in the Bush.”

W. O. Smith: “How I Have Improved the Police and Reduced the Incidentals.”

A. S. Hartwell: “Why I Have Always Preferred to Live Under the Hawaiian Monarchy Rather than Under the Glorious Flag of the Free,” with interludes on, “How I Helped Stevens to Lay the train of Revolution,” and “My Millions (prospectively) at Stake in a Pacific Cable.”

F. A. Hosmer: “Teaching the Young Idea How to Shoot Peaceable Kanakas; or, The Higher Education at Punahou.”
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W. G. Smith; “Playing the Tinker and the Tasmanian for Suckers; How to Get Solid with the Boys; The Lower California Parallel; No Royal Road to a Seat in the Councils.”

A. G. M. Robertson: “Climbing the Bench without Crossing the Bar; Tempering Justice with Mercy to the PG Lambs.”

J. B. Castle: “The Path of Glory Leads but to the Custom House”80

Evidently, both the undertones as well as the overtones are meant to insult, as the Daily Bulletin brings up the past rumors, actions, and matters of pride that tarnish these men’s reputations. This is not what the speakers went on to use as their topics, but without knowing about these people at all, one might infer much from this mocking piece of writing. All of these examples are meant to shake the foundation of the imagined community that the PG were attempting to build. With over a thousand candles and about the same number of incandescent light bulbs illuminating the grounds of ‘Iolani Palace for the evening’s mass meeting, the PG could not hide their faulty claims of representing the ideals of Hawai‘i’s citizens. Most of Hawai‘i did not recognize the PG as their leaders, and were waiting patiently for swift justice to be wrought by the very nation the PG had hoped to join.

Americanism In Question

There was no brooking the tide of patriotism. It was universal and resistless. The sentiments of [freedom] and independence pervaded and governed everywhere. Vent was given to the spirit of the day by actions endorsing fully the Provisional

Government and reaffirming the principles which actuated the overthrow of monarchy.\textsuperscript{81} – *Hawaiian Star*

So called Americans, with so-called American officers bearing Hawaiian commissions, carrying a Hawaiian flag which they are supposed to honor and defend, saluting a secret political organization! “What a sight was there my countrymen.”\textsuperscript{82} – *Hawaii Holomua*

The men who established the PG colluded with U.S. Minister John L. Stevens to “overthrow the lawful government.”\textsuperscript{83} A huge motivating factor was their desire to achieve annexation of Hawai‘i to the United States. Indeed, much of the PG’s actions were an attempt to portray themselves as embodying American values and running Hawai‘i as if it were under American rule, striving to appear more attractive to the U.S. The PG supporting newspapers many times published as if Hawai‘i were already a part of the U.S. This is despite the fact that President Cleveland had already rejected annexation and the PG regime. Further analyzing these English language newspapers, the PG attempted to paint a picture of American values and patriotism, while constantly being reminded that Hawai‘i was not America, and at the time looked like it never would be.

Even the smallest of the events of the day could not escape controversy. Both the *Gazette* and the *Star* celebrated the patriotic pull felt by all present during the raising of the stars and stripes of the flag of America on this beautiful Wednesday morning.\textsuperscript{84} The

\textsuperscript{81} “Was A Day of Days,” *Hawaiian Star*, 3.

\textsuperscript{82} Hawaii Holomua, *Hawaii Holomua*, January 17, 1894, 2.

\textsuperscript{83} U.S. Congress, Senate, *Senate Joint Resolution 19*, 1-2.

\textsuperscript{84} “A Wonderful Celebration,” *Hawaiian Gazette*, 2.
*Star* specifically mentions “glorious music,” “moistened eyes,” and how this inspiring scene represented “all that is best in man.” The *Holomua* makes witty commentary of the affair however. Noting that this ceremony was a part of a supposed Hawaiian Independence Day, the *Holomua* ponders why “an *American* flag was hoisted under the salute of *Chinese* bombs while the flagpole and flag were washed in *Portuguese* wine, and saluted by a little *German* band!” One would think that perhaps a Hawaiian Independence Day would better involve Hawaiians in some shape or form. The *Daily Bulletin* went on to point out that again, none of the prominent members of the PG were present for the flag raising. They also give credit to a man named Sampson for the washing of the pole in wine, and report that he only did so after he had at first tried to break the bottle of wine on the ropes and failed. This was the way that the PG started off their celebration of Hawaiʻi’s freedom.

Merely a year after the overthrow, or the illegal and forceful occupation of the Hawaiian Kingdom, this incident was still fresh in the minds of all people present. Conversely, perhaps because of the orders of the Queen, there had been virtually no hostile rebellion by the Native Hawaiian people at any point during that year. And yet as the *Holomua* notes, the State Reception by President Dole seemed to be prepared for an outbreak of violence. Sharpshooters “occupied various vantage points in and about” the

---
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former palace, with the building’s boundaries protected by bags of sand. 88 The *Holomua*
remarked:

> Look backward, gentlemen of the P.G. and then reveal to us, if you will, what you see in your oligarchic reign, of one whole year, to be proud of. The same men who were pushed into office by the prestige of America’s power, yet remain there, not a hand has been lifted against them, yet you meet to-day behind breastworks of sand, guarded by alien soldiers, hessian like in their willingness to kill for coin, and sleep at night with your several homes specially guarded by your secret police. Was this thus one year ago? Look backward gentlemen, upon that picture and then on this. 89

Clearly, the *Holomua* believed that a government that had to have protection in this fashion was not very secure in its position. Apparently, the government of Queen Liliʻuokalani had not felt the need to be protected thus. If that is the case, then what kind of stable government was being run? If they truly had the best interests of the people at heart, what need did the PG have for hired guns and secret police? Did they feel their actions would lead someone to come against them? The plain answer is that the PG were not stable. They did not want to speculate what might happen if they were indeed forced to return rule of the nation back to the rightful Queen. They feared the very same insurgency from their subjects that they put into action the year before against the previous government. Perhaps this was why high-level PG officials were repeatably absent from the day’s public festivities. With a palace set up by President Dole and the PG looking like they were prepared for war, the PG revealed their insecurity and, from
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88 “Local News,” *Hawai‘i Holomua*.

89 *Hawai‘i Holomua*, January 18, 1894, 2.
the beginning, polluted any hope for true celebration. Their quest for stability and legitimacy in the eyes of Hawai‘i, and in the eyes of America, did not pass the eye test.

Even more on the forefront of the collective minds of the residents of Hawai‘i was the results of the now well-known Blount Report, causing U.S. President Grover Cleveland to declare the overthrow illegal and that the PG should dissolve itself. In one of the speeches of the evening, chairman of the event J.B. Atherton brings up that the last time they were all gathered together was for a meeting the previous November in protest of those actions by President Cleveland. This night though, was to be a night of celebration, Atherton continued. He says that the PG had survived the trials of their first year and stood strong and ready to continue until these islands should be blessed enough to be absorbed by America. Atherton’s speech is one of the examples of the annexationists trying to forget the impending realities and focus on what they have been able to accomplish. Many of the speakers, as reported in the Gazette, also spoke of finding the light, happiness for years to come, and the future success of annexation despite Cleveland’s current rejection of the process.90 The speeches from this night were clear examples of the PG portraying themselves as American while ignoring the wishes of the American president and its government.

Cleveland gained disapproval from many across America. In searching through the mass number of digitized American newspapers from 1894, none so far have specifically brought up this anniversary celebration outside of Hawai‘i. Many newspapers however, were commenting on the Hawai‘i situation in general, many times supporting the PG, poking fun at Queen Lili‘uokalani, and questioning U.S. President

90 “The Speeches,” Hawaiian Gazette.
Grover Cleveland’s loyalties to America. In fact, when searching for the term “Provisional Government” on Chronicling America, an online newspaper database, roughly 4000 pages of newspapers popped up. Even if they only dedicated a small paragraph to comment on Hawai‘i and the United States, there were still 194 cities across 34 states and territories (including Washington D.C. but not including Hawai‘i cities and newspapers) on record reporting the news and stating their opinion on the subject. There might even be more cities and newspapers as these were just the ones that had been collected and digitized by Chronicling America. There was much learned from simply using a GIS mapping tool to put markers on each city where these newspapers were publishing on America’s relations to Hawai‘i.¹ Figure 4 shows these cities in Map form.

Figure 4. Map of United States cities with newspapers commenting on Hawai‘i and annexation.

¹ What was most surprising was that some of the 1894 newspapers came from towns that were home to thousands of people in the 1890s, but today are ghost towns that are no longer populated. Some of these 1894 newspapers were coming from areas that had not even received statehood yet, such as Utah Territory, Indian (Oklahoma) Territory, New
There is more evidence of the dislike of Cleveland and his administration by the annexationists in the Hawai‘i newspapers. The Gazette published an article called “A Vicarious Apology,” in which they write what should be U.S. Minister Willis’ apology for not having the American Warships in the harbor fire a salute in honor of the holiday. To be fair, it seems not a single one of the foreign representatives took part in the celebration, and that no “salutes were fired from the American, English, or Japanese war vessels in port.” The Gazette was appalled at this dishonorable action, but makes note that they are not surprised considering Cleveland had already demanded that the PG disband and surrender itself. The Star expressed disgust when they reported that they “did very well without (Willis)” as he forbade any U.S. military to participate in the festivities except as civilians. The Hawaiian language newspaper Ka Makaainana writes of hearing that the PG wrote letters to “na luna kiekie o na aina e no ko lakou kumu o ka hele nui ole ana aku e ike ia Peresiden Kole,” basically demanding answers to why these foreign diplomats did not come to see President Dole at the celebration, before threatening to have them banished from Hawai‘i, which is a surprising threat.

Mexico Territory, and Arizona Territory. The three states with the most cities represented were Kansas, Vermont, and Missouri, with 13, 12, and 12 different cities respectively publishing on the Hawai‘i situation.


93 Willis, Mr. Willis to Mr. Gresham, 1194.

considering the PG themselves have almost been banished themselves by America at this point.\textsuperscript{95}

These objections are in surprising opposition to the Star’s earlier statements of the celebration being “a Day of Days” and that the “celebration program was carried through with a dash…So far as could be observed none held aloof from the occasion.”\textsuperscript{96} So which was it? Were they upset that Minister Willis and the US military did not participate? Or were they jubilant that “none held aloof from the occasion”? The Star could not even dispel contradictions from its own pages when speaking about this day.

In contrast to the “Day of Days,” Holomua and the Daily Bulletin again bring up the questionable future of the PG due to Cleveland’s stance on the overthrow. Analyzing the earlier discussed parade of caricatures, among other things, the Holomua reports that the Antiques and Horribles were “the most horrible show of that kind witnessed in this city…there is really no enthusiasm among the followers. They all wonder, and fear, what to-morrow will bring.”\textsuperscript{97} Surprisingly, even the Gazette somewhat agrees, saying, “The caricatures were not horrible enough, and so created but little mirth and laughter.”\textsuperscript{98} Comparing the PG’s reign to a play, the Holomua claims that this PG regime started off as nonsense, and that this new fourth act is still the same. They believe the play almost to
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\textsuperscript{95} Ka Makaainana, “Huai Ka Ulu O Lele,” January 22, 1894, 4; It is also interesting to make mention, that in a language such as Hawaiian that emphasizes duality and multiple meaning in words, that President Dole’s name had been Hawaiian-ized to become the duly earned Peresidena Kole.
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\textsuperscript{97} Hawai‘i Holomua, January 17, 1894, 2. The following “play” metaphor comes from the same section in the Holomua.

\textsuperscript{98} “A Wonderful Celebration,” Hawaiian Gazette, 2.
be over as well, and are ready to watch the finale. So great was the impact of the developments in Washington D.C. that statements like these did not seem incredible for the Holomua to suggest at the time.

The Loyalists made sure this impact was heard during the days of this celebration. They had gone through hardships and were glad to see that abstaining from violence and trusting in the U.S. legal system was paying off. Advocating its distaste of the PG and the events of the birthday, the Holomua published a letter on the 19th, two days after the great jubilee. The letter was signed “Young Hawaiian” and written in response to the speech by H.T. Waterhouse at the anniversary’s mass meeting. In the speech Waterhouse was quoted as saying, “The light has broken upon us-we have lived in darkness. Let us now embrace the light.” The Young Hawaiian identifies, from a Hawaiian point of view, the light from the PG that we are expected to embrace:

Light to …overthrow the legitimate Government, to rush to America and offer the Islands to Uncle Sam, …to constitute a Legislature…without consulting the public, to organize a military force from among sailors, bummers, convicts, hoodoos etc. costing the country $154,000 to keep, to have posted at every prominent Loyalist citizen’s house ruffian cut-throats to insult the Queen with opprobrious epithets; to sing sweetly to God on Sunday’s, in spite of being stamped traitors; to raise one’s eye to Heaven, keeping the other on the pocket.99

From this insight we can see the hurt that the PG had caused to the people who, a little over 100 years prior, had been the only inhabitants of the island. This celebration simultaneously mocked the people who had been overthrown, as well as the phony government that had been set up in the Hawaiian Monarchy’s place.

Lastly, a *Daily Bulletin* article called “What They Celebrate,” questions the PG’s future, and calls the celebration “a hollow fraud.” After posting extracts from the Blount Report where Blount interviews the PG Minister of Finance Mr. S. M. Damon, the *Daily Bulletin* says that this is not only a fraud government, but one that has dismally failed as well. Instead of securing for itself annexation with the U.S., the PG has instead been put “under notice of ejectment as a fraudulent tenant” by the U.S. Government, and have been informed that “the question of annexation is a dead issue.” According to the article, the PG has spent $31,000 more in one year than the old government did in the previous two years combined. Crime has increased and capital has been blocked from entering the country.\(^\text{100}\) Both the *Holomua* and the *Daily Bulletin* report dissension, argument, and disaccord among the ranks of the PG.\(^\text{101}\) There seems to be confusion on what is most important and what their plans are to survive. Closing ever so ominously, and as a perfect example of the instability of the PG, and their inability to gain acceptance by America, the “What They Celebrate” article by the *Daily Bulletin* advises its readers to let the PG celebrate all they want because, “Even while the sulphur of their fireworks fills the air, the smoke of the approaching mail steamer may be writing their doom in the sky.”\(^\text{102}\)

In this chapter I have given a basic overview of the Honolulu newspapers and their summary of events as context for the PG’s first anniversary celebration. This is important for my overall argument because these records show how two opposing


\(^{101}\) *Hawai‘i Holomua*, January 17, 1894, 2; “What They Celebrate,” *Daily Bulletin*, 2.

imagined communities were attempting to occupy the same space and time. Again, because these English language newspapers speak more specifically about the day and the festivities itself, analyzing these records is perhaps the quickest way to showcase this point. I have given examples of how the newspapers that support the PG attempted to spread political myth by portraying themselves as having the popular support of Hawai‘i, and how they attempted to hold elaborate celebration activities to help solidify their claim of being a legitimate government. At the same time other English language newspapers descredit their celebrations and their administration, pointing out flaws and questioning the PG’s legitimacy. The PG and their newspapers also attempted to portray themselves as embodying American values and patriotism, while other sources make it blatantly obvious that the U.S. had rejected the PG and its desire of annexation, and that Hawai‘i was definitely not America.
Chapter 4. Nūpepa Hawai‘i

While much can be learned by perpetuating the stories of January 1894 from the English language newspapers, Hawai‘i’s story should be unacceptable without inclusion of Native language records. This chapter will highlight Hawaiian language newspapers that are opposed to the PG. These records will show that these Hawaiian writers had an intimate understanding of what was happening in Hawai‘i at the time. They then used this knowledge to express themselves and find answers in a very Hawaiian way – through the use of metaphor and kaona, thus preserving for today Hawaiian thought and action from this turbulent time. Indeed, Arista discusses kaona by saying, “Understood as the multiple (and sometimes artistically hidden) meanings of words, kaona is a general phenomenon in the Hawaiian language; we could start with ‘metaphoric meaning’ as a translation, but kaona implies more than just figurative multiplicity.”103 Shes posits for example, how one might “use kaona to think,” or how does one “conceptualize history…in a kaona-conscious way?”104 These layered meanings and levels of understanding found in Hawaiian language newspapers add to the repository of English language sources that dismiss the PG’s legitimacy and discredit their right to govern in the Hawaiian Kingdom territory.

It perhaps goes without saying however, that since the time of the illegal overthrow of the Hawaiian Kingdom, exorbitant shifts occurred in Hawai‘i’s status quo. Beamer argues that the “loss of the mō‘ī-and with it the loss of control over the Government and Crown Lands-has had lasting effects on Hawaiians” including an

103 Arista, 666.
104 Ibid.
“occupation that produced faux-colonial events.” Reading Nogelmeier, the exclusion and omission of Hawaiian language sources in the telling of Hawai‘i’s history must be included in this list of faux-colonial events. As foreigners have continued to populate the Hawaiian islands, the percent of Hawai‘i’s population who prioritize native ideas and Hawaiian language sources has decreased. It is up to the descendants of these kupuna of foresight intellectualism, to ensure that their voice is heard, and to not let the Western faux-colonial events dominate the telling of Hawai‘i’s history. After all, despite “the success of his pacification, in spite of his appropriation, the colonist always remains a foreigner.” Although western imperialism and colonization ran rife through Hawai‘i for over a century, Indigenous voices have been perpetuated through time because they were published in print.

To be clear, these native voices are being highlighted not just because they have been marginalized in their own homeland. Even if that were the case, it would still be a nice story for their descendants to hear. But no, if one wishes to understand Hawai‘i’s history, it is important to include Hawaiian thought and action because they were well-informed and well-educated on the topic. These were not clueless savages, as much as the PG attempted to portray them as such. They understood how the government

105 Beamer, 222.


107 Hawaiian Gazette, “The Election Scheme,” Hawaiian Gazette, November 7, 1893, 3. The Gazette writes that a “return to power of Queen Liliuokalani would be most demoralizing. For many years some of the most devoted religious workers the world has ever known have labored for the salvation of the Hawaiian people, and their efforts have resulted in an elevation of the moral tone as pleasing to decent people as it has been disgusting to the leprous-minded horde that has ever surrounded the so-called royalty
system worked, they were able to articulate their thoughts on why they disagreed with what was published against the Queen and the Hawaiian people, and they were able to then use the knowledge they had on the subject and combine it with their background in Hawaiian poetry to express themselves and find answers in metaphor and allusion.

**Hawaiian Understanding of the Situation**

Re-learning this narrative as told by Hawaiians in the Hawaiian language is important because they had an intimate understanding of the situation of Hawai‘i. For example, *Nupepa Ka Oiaio* published an article entitled “Na Lono Laauhea, Ke Oiaio Hoi” in which they discuss the rumors they heard recently about the PG. According to the article, “ka poe e noho mana kaulei,” the people who sit in authority insecurely, wanted to proclaim themselves as an “Aupuni Kuokoa,” an Independent Nation.108 *Ka Oiaio* states that in their personal opinion, this isn’t something that the PG can do, clarifying that:

Aia ke aupuni malalo o Amerika i keia mau la. aole he aupuni oia i ku nona iho.  
Aka, ua ku oia maluna o ke kahua o ka mana kaua o ka moku Bosetona : a he hu ka aka ke nana aku ina io e hookolo ia ana keia lono laauhea i keia la.109

which once reigned at Honolulu. A relapse into the condition of barbarian monarchy could not fail to bring with it such a lowering of the moral tone as would prove to be much more of a burden than President Cleveland could well bear.”; Hawaiian Star, “League Has Its Say,” *Hawaiian Star*, February 3, 1894, 3. The Star also shares a message from the American League on the negative impact the Queen had on the government, and how she was “unfit to rule barbarians.”
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The government at this time is under America. It is not a government that can stand on its own. Instead, it stands on the foundation of the military power of the ship Boston. And it makes us laugh to see if this will be true when investigating this rumor today.

This newspaper understood that Queen Lili‘uokalani had never abdicated her thrown to the insurgents that set up the PG. She had only surrendered under protest to the American government. What power then, did the PG have to declare themselves an Aupuni Kūʻokoʻa, an Independent Government? If not for the marines from the U.S. warship Boston that had landed the year previous, the insurgents would have never been able to proceed with their plans. Thus, these Hawaiians knew that it was America’s decision that mattered in this situation, as much as the PG were pretending otherwise, which is apparently the exact situation that Ka Oiaio was observing with hilarity. After a short paragraph detailing the difference between “1 Aupuni Kuikawa, 2 Aupuni Repubalika, 3 Aupuni Kuokoa,” that being a Provisional Government, a Republic Government, and an Independent Government, Ka Oiaio ends by stating, “E nana aku nae hoi kakou i ka oiaio a me ka ole.”

We will all look to see what is true and what is not.

A few weeks later, Ka Oiaio published another article entitled, “Na hana hoino i ka Moiwahine.” In it, Ka Oiaio reports on the defamation campaign of many of the U.S. newspapers against Queen Lili‘uokalani and why these were just lies being spread

---
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by the PG. The latest claim the newspapers were making was that Queen Lili‘uokalani was punikoko, or blood thirsty, and that she wanted to ‘oki po‘o, or behead the insurgents who overthrew her. *Ka Oiaio* then systematically and succinctly exposed why each of these claims were false.

*Ka Oiaio* first asks why is the Queen being blamed for anything? They continue:

> na keia poe kipi no lakou i hookomo i loko o ka pilikia a ina i hoopaiia lakou no ia hana, alaila aole maluna o ka Moiwahine Liliuokalani ia hewa, oiai, aole na ka Moiwahine i hookikina aku ia lakou e hana ia mea.  

*It was these people who committed treason that put themselves in trouble, and if they are punished for their crimes, the wrong is not on Queen Lili‘uokalani, since it was not the queen who urged them to break the law.*

*Ka Oiaio* next interprets the word punikoko saying:

> Ua hoomaopopo makou i ke ano io maoli o ia huaolelo punikoko, oia ka luku ana, a pepehi wale ana aku i na poe hewa ole. O ka hoopai ana i na poe hana hewa maoli, aole ia he hana e kapaia mai ai he punikoko.  

*In our understanding of the true meaning of the word bloodthirsty, it is the slaughter and killing of innocent people. If people have truly committed a crime and are being punished for it, that is not called bloodthirsty.*

The next idea *Ka Oiaio* discredits is the claim that the Queen wants to ‘oki po‘o, to behead the PG saying:

> He mea i maa ole loa e olelo ia e na mea a pau ma Hawaii nei; no ka mea…loaa ka ahewaia ma ke kanawai. O ka Li ia maluna o ka laau olokea ka mea maa mau no ka poe i ahewaia no ka make; aole o ke okipoo ana.  
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This is not something ever said in all of Hawai‘i; because there is a condemnation in the law. Hanging on the gallows is what is done to those who are condemned to death; not beheading.

The article goes on to cite instances when the PG members who were formerly of King Kalākaua’s cabinet executed laws and punishments and yet they were never called punikoko. They also discuss how the missionaries came to preach peace, and yet their descendants committed treason and called the Queen the vicious one. These descendants slept with the young women of Hawai‘i and then proclaimed that Hawaiians were adulterous and defiled. *Ka Oiaio* said of the PG’s actions, “He lua ole keia mau hana hookamani,” meaning these are unequaled or incomparable acts of hypocrisy.¹¹⁶

In articles like these we are able to find deep analysis of the conditions in Hawai‘i from 1894, and what Hawaiian action and response was to these situations. When the actions of the PG and the political myths they attempted to spread are explained and discredited so clearly, it really does become he hū ka ‘aka ke nānā aku, a laughable thing to see.

**Metaphor against the PG**

As mentioned earlier, many nūpepa ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i, Hawaiian language newspapers, did not always directly state what they saw happening in Hawai‘i. Many used metaphor to express their ideas, feelings, and observations. For instance, *Ka Leo o Ka Lahui* also referenced that the various warships docked at the harbor had not flown their flags on this PG holiday. They said that the lack of flair on the ships were a hō‘ailona or representation of the lack of enthusiasm among the PG.¹¹⁷ The metaphor

¹¹⁶ Ibid.

can be deepened even more, using the *Hawaiian Star*’s report that U.S. Minister Willis did not allow the sailors to recognize the holiday, meaning that the main flags flying from their ship were “their weekly washing” and all the other laundry hung out to dry.\(^\text{118}\) The PG’s hopes for recognition and annexation were rebuffed by America’s laundry day. It was metaphor such as these that the Hawaiian language newspapers employed to discredit the PG and its celebration.

Without naming the title of the story specifically, simply calling it “He Moolelo Kupaianaha Loa”, *Ka Leo* uses a telling of the story of Frankenstein’s Monster to describe conditions in Hawai‘i. The article tells of a professor in Germany who once wanted to create a man. He gathered all the things needed to create a man saying, “ua loaa ke kino, me na lala, na aa koko…he mau maka, me na pepeiao, he ihu hoi me ka waha a pela aku.”\(^\text{119}\) These were the body, the limbs, the veins, eyes, ears, nose, mouth, etc. Then the professor put life into the body and it became alive. The story goes on saying “Aka, eia kona pilikia; ua kanaka makua kona kino…aka, o kona noonoo a me kona ike…i kupono i ke keiki uuuk loa.”\(^\text{120}\) Although the body was fully grown and large like a man, his thoughts and knowledge, because he only just began to think for the first time, were like a small child. Because of this, problems arose and eventually both the professor and the man he created would suffer and die.

*Ka Leo* says that these men who overthrew the monarchy, they gathered

\(^{118}\) “Did Very Well Without Him,” *Hawaiian Star*.

\(^{119}\) “He Moolelo Kupaianaha Loa,” *Ka Leo O Ka Lahui*, January 18, 1894, 2.

\(^{120}\) Ibid.
everything they needed to create the appearance of a body of government, meaning the
eyes, the ears, the hands, the feet, the ministers, the soldiers, the police ect. But, “eia ka pilikia, ua nui ke kino Aupuni, aka, ua uuku a ua papau loa kahi noonoo i hookomoia i loko o keia kino Aupuni hou.”121 Just like Frankenstein’s creation, the government’s body might seem fully grown, but their thoughts are small and shallow. Ka Leo concludes that the professor and his creation eventually died, and so too will this government and the people who created it.

This is an example of Hawaiian metaphor in that they were able to explain what was happening in the world around them through a telling of this story.122 They made observations of how the PG was running and demonstrated their knowledge by relating it to this story of Frankenstein’s monster. Not only did they use this story to demonstrate the current state of the government and why it was not working properly however, but they were also able to find answers in what they saw happening in Hawai‘i’s future from this story as well. In their view, a monster of a government such as this could not stand on its own and would surely perish like the monster and its creator in the story.

Ka Makaainana added more metaphoric commentary against the PG, saying:

Mai kahiko loa mai no hoi ka mea i oleloia e na haole – “E like no me ka makua, pela no me ke keiki,” oia hoi, e like me ka maikai o ke kumulaau, pela no auanei kona hua, a i ino no hoi, hookahi ke ino like ana.123

From the ancient days the foreigners would say, “As the parent is, so too will the child be,” or more specifically, If the tree is good, the seed will be the same, and if the tree is bad, then so too will the seed be bad.

121 Ibid.
122 Arista, 666.
123 Ka Makaainana, “Huai Ka Ulu O Lele,” Ka Makaainana, January 22, 1894, 4.
Ka Makaainana says that this is telling of the last year, of “na welo mikanele a pau i noho aihue nui iho la no hookahi makahiki a me na la keu,” all the descendents of the missionaries who have reigned as thieves, and how soon will be the time “e waeia ae ai ka huita palaoa mai ka nahelehele,” meaning the time that the wheat will be separated from the weeds.124

These examples show how Hawaiian writers were able to use their intimate knowledge of the world around them and express themselves through metaphor. The meaning of these metaphors helped to conceptualize a Hawaiian understanding of the problems they saw in the PG running Hawai‘i, and in turn share that Hawaiian understanding with the general, Hawaiian language understanding public.

**Biblical Metaphor Against the PG**

A common theme of the metaphor found throughout the nūpepa are references to many of the PG officials being descendants of the Christian missionaries who came to Hawai‘i to preach Christianity. For instance, one article from *Ka Leo* compares the PG to the wickedness of the biblical cities of Sodom and Gomora, and how all that is left to happen is for fire to come down from heaven and destroy what is here like in the scripture story.125 In this manner, a Hawaiian people who love metaphor and poetic devices utilized Christian doctrine and stories from the Holy Bible to ironically contradict and describe what they saw happening in Hawai‘i under PG rule.

A letter to the editor of the *Hawaii Holomua*, signed under the name Molokai, references a story found in the New Testament book of John, chapter eight, which tells of

---
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the scribes and Pharisees bringing a woman to Jesus Christ after finding her committing adultery. To paraphrase the King James Translation of the Bible, they told Christ that according to the law, the woman should be stoned, but they asked what He had to say about it. Christ’s answer was that whoever among them was without sin, let them cast the first stone at the woman. Because they all knew they were sinners, one by one the crowd dispersed until Christ was alone with the woman, to whom He said go, and sin no more.

Moloka’i uses this story in response to accusations of immorality among the Hawaiian people and the Queen specifically among both local and American newspapers. Moloka’i points out the actual track record of the Hawaiian people against the PG and its supporters, saying that although Hawaiians were not perfect, there was no way they were any worse than the PG. “Tried before the all-seeing eye of the Creator, these stalking pagodas of iniquity themselves would as silently slink away from sight as did those in the instance mentioned in Scripture.”127 Much like the story from the scripture, this commentary highlights the difference between God’s teachings and what these descendants of the missionaries were actually doing. The PG calling into question the morality of the Hawaiian people is much the same as the sinning Pharisees presenting the adulterer to be judged of Christ. From this example, we see Hawaiians not backing down when their morality or their legitimacy was put into question. They were able to clearly articulate how and why the accusations brought against them were both illogical and irrelevant.

126 Molokai, letter to the editor, Hawaii Holomua, January 19, 1894, 3.

127 Ibid.
Another biblical reference from *Ka Leo* and written by Puuwaialoha, uses metaphor to more directly comment on the festivities of the day.\textsuperscript{128} It involves the story of Belshazzar found in the Old Testament. In the story, Belshazzar, a king of Babylon, is feasting with over a thousand people, drinking wine from the vessels his people stole from the temple of Jerusalem, when suddenly the finger of God appears before them and writes the phrase “MENE, MENE, TEKEL, UPHARSIN” on the wall.\textsuperscript{129} The story goes on to say that translated, the phrase is God’s message to Belshazaar that his time of rule is over because of his unworthiness.

In this way, Puuwaialoha says “o ka la o ka hauoli o ke Aupuni P.G….oiai ua ike kakou i ka lakou mau hana, i hanaai iloko o keia makahiki okoa. Aole he mau hana hooholo mua i ka aina, aka, he mau hana hoopilikia maopopo.”\textsuperscript{130} So similar to the feasting of Belshazzar, the PG were also celebrating and making merry, but Puuwaialoha recognizes that their actions were not worthy, they have clearly lead Hawai‘i into difficulty. So, “e na haipule, mai hoopoina i ka hoomanao ana ia Iehova ke Akua, a nana no e kokua mai ia kakou.” Puuwaialoha asks all those who are religious, do not forget the remembrance of the God Jehovah, He will be the one to help us.

Puuwaialoha shows two insights into Hawaiian thinking from this metaphor. He relies on the very Christianity that was taught to Hawaiʻi by the ancestors of the PG. Puuwaialoha highlights faith in Iehova ke Akua by admonishing the Hawaiian people to remember Christ, and that He will be the one to bring the Kingdom of Hawaiʻi justice.

\textsuperscript{128} Puuwaialoha, “Ka La o ka Hauoli oia no ka La o ka Luuluu,” *Ka Leo O Ka Lahui*, January 17, 1894, 2.

\textsuperscript{129} Daniel 5 KJV.

\textsuperscript{130} Puuwaialoha, 2.
Perhaps he feels it is out of the hands of man, so as long as the people of Hawai‘i continue in righteousness, their God will sustain them in their cause.

Although it might seem contradictory to turn to the Christian God for strength, the Hawaiian people had been taught Christianity for the previous 74 years. Beamer utilizes Queen Liliʻuokalani’s eventual imprisonment in 1895 as an example of how practicing Christianity is consistent with traditional Hawaiian thought and action. During her imprisonment, Queen Liliʻuokalani used her time to both translate the Kumulipo, an ancient Hawaiian cosmogonic genealogy, as well as to compose Christian hymns seeking strength from the Christian God.131 Beamer posits:

Is it not ironic that a native sovereign in the midst of the most tragic period of her life would seek comfort by looking to a god that was not the god of her ancestors, a god who had been introduced to Hawai‘i by the ancestors of those who had recently imprisoned her? Though Liliʻuokalani would have recognized the irony of her situation, she would have seen no contradiction in her behavior.132

Beamer continues to argue that “aliʻi selectively appropriated Euro-American tools of governance while modifying existing indigenous structure to create a hybrid nation-state as a means to resist colonialism and to protect Native Hawaiian and national interests.”133 Puuwaialoha and others show that in 1894, it was not just the Hawaiian chiefs that took part in this action, but the common Hawaiian as well.

Another point of importance from Puuwaialoha’s writings also includes comparing the feast of Belshazzar to the PG anniversary. In essence, Puuwaialoha almost seems to be saying, let the PG celebrate. Remembering what they’ve done, how

131 Beamer, 2.
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annexation had been denied them, and remembering that they also claimed to follow this same Jehovah from the Bible, while they drank and feasted, the writing was already on the wall.

So again, these Hawaiian writers were able to use their agency and their deep understanding of the situation to take Christian teachings and stories, and use them to describe the current state of the Hawaiian Islands. In doing so, not only were they able to use metaphor to express themselves, but they intentionally chose these stories because they understood the irony of many of the PG members being descendants of the Christian missionaries who originally taught the Hawaiian people these stories. By doing this these Hawaiian nūpepa were able to simultaneously show their deep understanding of their situation and through their writings counter the PG’s claims of being the legitimate government of Hawai‘i.

**What the Hawaiian People Did On This Day**

Besides what Hawaiians wrote about, what did Hawaiians actually do on January 17, 1894? Considering it was a day celebrating the one-year anniversary of an illegal overthrow of their beloved Queen and their Kingdom, what Hawaiians did on this date will probably not be much of a surprise. They did not participate. Two days after the anniversary, the newspaper says:

> Ua ku kaawale ka Lahui Hawaii, mai waena ae o na hana lealea apau, aole i kokua, aka ua malama lakou i ka maluhia o ka aina… oia ka ikaika nou e Hawaii, a pela io no, ua lokahi io no ka poe Aloha Aina a pau e malama i ka maluhia.¹³⁴

*The Hawaiian Nation separated themselves from all of the celebrations, we did*

---

¹³⁴ “Nui ka Maluhia,” *Nupepa Ka Oiaio*, January 19, 1894, 2.
not support them, but we kept the peace of the land. That is your strength oh Hawai‘i, truly, those people who Aloha Aina are united in keeping the peace of the land.

The celebration itself was not a big issue to the Hawaiian people of the time because it was so small compared to the developments in Washington from the month previous. Even in Queen Lili‘uokalani’s Hawai‘i’s Story By Hawai‘i’s Queen, her words on this time period perhaps most appropriately say, “Nothing of importance seems to have transpired during the early part of the year 1894.”

At the beginning of the day, the Hawaii Holomua writes that, “Hawaiians have shown their good sense and natural dignity by absenting themselves from the P. G. celebrations to-day.” Even the annexationist supported Hawaiian Star mentions that the “crowds were very orderly throughout the day and evening. Not a single disturbance occurred.”

This nonviolence is in stark contrast to the actions from the year previous. This day there was order, conduct, and peace. One year earlier, there were armed U.S. marines marching towards ʻIolani Palace with canons in tow. In fact, as mentioned in the previous chapter, there is evidence in the newspapers of the PG almost expecting a violent uprising, worrying that the Hawaiian Nation would do the same thing to them that they had done to the Queen. Although the PG have been in power for a year at this
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point, without any violent uprising by the Hawaiian Nation, they still felt the need to deck the grounds of the palace with a military bunker type of security, paying for snipers and mercenaries to be posted at various posts around the area. To have that much “security” for a celebration of the supposed government’s first birthday, it would seem that the PG was not very secure it all.

But why did the Hawaiian people kū kaʻawale, stand apart from the activities? From a numbers perspective it doesn’t seem to make a lot of sense. An 1890 census of Hawaiʻi has Hawaiians and Part Hawaiians making up 40,622 of Hawaiʻi’s 89,990 people. An 1896 census puts the Hawaiian and Part Hawaiian populations as 39,504 of Hawaiʻi’s 109,020 people, far exceeding the size of any other single demographic of people in the islands at the time. To those unfamiliar with Hawaiian identity, it might seem perplexing that the Hawaiian Nation did not rise up and overpower the PG through sheer numbers. If we find clear evidence of Hawaiian defiance to the PG published in newspapers and other documents from this time, why did they “malama ka maluhia o ka aina”, keep the peace of the land?

*Ka Leo* gives a reason on why they do not take up arms and yet do not tire, are not weary and are not discouraged, saying, “ua kupaa ka lahui Hawaii oiaio, mahope o ke aloha aina, aloha lahui, a aloha alii oiaio hoi.” The true Hawaiian people stand strong in support/because of aloha ʻāina, aloha lāhui, and aloha aliʻi, their love for their land, their nation, and their leader. *Ka Makaainana* posted a similar message in a letter to the
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editor written by a Sam K. Kamakaia, which said in part, “E kuu lahui aloha, e kupaa no ka pono o kou Moi, kou aina a me ka lahui.” These Hawaiian writers knew that the Queen was the rightful ruler of this Hawaiian Kingdom territory, with Ka Leo going on to quote Queen Lili‘uokalani’s instructions from the year previous, that is to be patient and keep the peace of the land until “ka la o ka lanakila,” the day of our victory.

In conclusion, this chapter uses sources published in Hawai‘i newspapers from 1894 to show the Hawaiian people’s intimate knowledge of their unique situation. They understood how government was supposed to work, and they knew that the overthrow, the subsequent request for American annexation, and the PG as a governing body was not legitimate or successful. These writers were able to use kaona and metaphor to express their thoughts. They understood the irony of not only alluding to western stories to dismiss the PG, but using the very Bible that the PG’s forefathers introduced to Hawai‘i against them. All of this is important to my argument, as it exemplifies how Hawaiians were not passive. Viewing the story of this celebration with ‘Ōiwi Optics, Hawaiians were able to use their agency to take a foreign tool such as writing, publish foreign stories such as the story of Frankenstein’s monster and Biblical examples as well, and express and preserve Hawaiian thought and action against the PG for the Native people of 1894, as well as for their descendents today.
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Chapter 5. Conclusion

So, what can we take away from the PG’s first birthday celebration? The first chapter of this work introduced contemporary works from Nogelmeier, Beamer, Silva, and Arista to justify the need for further study in Hawaiian language materials. Anderson’s ideas of nations and imagined communities helped to frame the idea that there were different and opposing national identities claiming to represent Hawai‘i in 1894.

The second chapter of this work added context to the situation, from the overthrow of the Hawaiian monarchy in January 1893 up until the anniversary event, with background on the various editors and publishers of each of the newspapers used, hopefully showing future researchers of Hawai‘i’s history that it matters who was writing and where they were coming from.

Chapter three contrasts the reporting of the English language newspapers of Honolulu, showing how the PG attempted to spread political myth as fact, to legitimize their cause, and give them the appearance of embodying American values while simultaneously distancing themselves from U.S. President Cleveland and his decision to support the Queen. Meanwhile, opposing English language newspapers were able to unravel many of these political myths, thus delegitimizing the PG and highlighting President Cleveland’s rejection of annexation. Some people were trying to create a new imagined community while others were trying to keep the previous one at the same time and place.

Chapter four added the analysis of Hawaiian language writers, first demonstrating these Hawaiian’s intimate and expert knowledge of Hawai‘i’s situation, and then
publishing and using this knowledge to express themselves and find answers in a very Hawaiian way – through the use of metaphor and kaona. Both secular and, even more ironically, religious metaphor were used to further delegitimize the PG. Because these writings were published and kept, these writers simultaneously preserved Hawaiian thought and action from this turbulent time for Hawaiians today.

The PG was a mockery after the overthrow, with the insurgents’ plans of a quick annexation to the U.S. having failed. The controversy over this anniversary celebration shows that the government was still a mockery a year later. From the events of the day, to the condition of the country, this counterfeit burlesque of a government that had racked up the national debt of Hawai‘i to an outrageous $3,380,616.95 in one year of rule, could not and should not have survived.\textsuperscript{144} Everything at this point in history seemed to lead to the imminent restoration of Hawai‘i’s Queen and the downfall of the poorly executed PG. If one took a trip in time back to this week, one would think that this first PG anniversary would be its last. President Cleveland was not accepting annexation and was trying to bring back Hawai‘i’s true government.\textsuperscript{145} Yet, many history books of today tell the tale of how just a few short years after this date Hawai‘i is allegedly annexed into the United States of America, becoming the dominant narrative and almost suggesting an inevitable timeline from Cook’s arrival up until statehood.

So what happened? What changed? What made the overthrow less illegal? From January 16, 1893, we have the letter where the conspirators write, “We are unable to protect ourselves without aid, and therefore pray for the protection of the United States

\textsuperscript{144} Ka Makaainana, \textit{Ka Makaainana}, January 22, 1894, 4.

\textsuperscript{145} Argonaut, quoted in Hawaiian Gazette, “The Death-Knell of Democracy,” 5.
forces,” to gain support from Stevens and the U.S. military. When Blount’s findings say that American forces were then illegally utilized, thus leading Cleveland to order the PG to disband, we have the letter from these same conspirators to the U.S. asking what right do they have to interfere in Hawai‘i’s business? With blatant discrepancies such as this, what eventually made the PG’s claim of annexation more legitimate? Why was the rightful government never reinstated? More study could be done to track what happened in this cold war of sorts taking place in the newspapers of Hawai‘i. However, we can clearly see that there were two national identities trying to exist in this same space on January 17, 1894. Nogelmeier already highlights the danger of not considering the bounteous Hawaiian language sources available to research, while Arista makes note of the ease at which Hawai‘i historians have been doing just that.

A dominant motivating factor for this thesis was to combat the PG’s lasting effects on history, and present evidence demonstrating how they attempted to publicize political myths as fact, to discredit the former regime of the Queen and establish themselves, while the other side did not have to try very hard at all to poke holes in these myths for them to completely unravel. So again, what happened? Of all the festivities that took place during the day of the so-called “greatest anniversary in Hawaiian history,” this time might now be remembered most for the event that was never completed: the restoration of Hawai‘i’s rightful government and leader.

146 Cleveland, 451.
147 Sandford B. Dole, Mr. Dole to Mr. Willis December 23, 1893, letter, in Foreign Relations of the United States 1894 Affairs in Hawaii, 1277.
148 Nogelmeier, Mai Pa’a I Ka Leo, XI; Arista, 665.
Hawaiian Defiance

Remembering Queen Liliʻuokalani’s instructions to be patient, and keep the peace of the land, until “ka la o ka lanakila,” the day of our victory, we fast forward 125 years and that day of victory for the Kingdom of Hawaiʻi has yet to come. But with each new generation in today’s Hawaiʻi, there seems to be a stronger and stronger political shift in the air for the Lāhui Hawaiʻi. Beamer writes:

With dignity, patience, and aloha, ʻŌiwi have endured successive attacks on our national identity, our lands, and our language. This adversity has forged a stronger degree of determination and resolve within the lāhui. Many ʻŌiwi have simply refused to allow the Hawaiian past to be obliterated. Through the reclamation of our collective past and a surge of political and cultural awareness, the national consciousness has reemerged.  

As we move forward, it is important that we remember that the foundation we stand on comes from those who came before us.

These ancestors from 1894 have shown us ways to hold onto our Hawaiian identity through modern times of change. We can see the world and find answers through metaphor, and use imagery both Hawaiian and foreign to express our ideas, feelings and observations. The more we understand and are educated about those who impede the progress of the Lāhui, the more we are able to articulate our thoughts and proper action. Do not be afraid to answer when accusations of Hawaiian legitimacy are questioned. To those haʻipule, don’t forget ke Akua will sustain. After all the tragedy, wrongdoing, deceit and lies that the PG brought against the Hawaiian people and Queen Liliʻuokalani, through Aloha ʻĀina, Aloha Lāhui, and Aloha Aliʻi Hawaiians were still able to say:

---

149 Beamer, 227.
E hoolana kakou e na poe Hawai‘i, e uumi i ka hanu, a e hana lokomaikai aku i ka poe e hoino mai ana ia kakou, a e noi hoi i ke Akua, e kala mai ia lakou, no ka mea, aole no lakou i ike i ka lakou mea e hana nei.150

*Have hope and cheer oh the people of Hawai‘i, hold your breath, brace yourself, do goodwill to those who do evil to us, and ask God to forgive them, for they know not what they do.*

Perhaps by ensuring that we as Hawaiians, even over a century later, still kūpa‘a ma hope o ke Aloha ‘Āina, Aloha Lāhui, and Aloha Ali‘i, Lili‘uokalani has already reached ka lā o ka lanakila.

---

150 Ka Oiaio, “Na hana hoino i ka Moiwahine,” 2.
Bibliography


Ka Makaainana. “Huai Ka Ulu O Lelo,” Ka Makaainana, January 22, 1894, 4.

Kamakaia, Sam K. “Mr. Lunahooponopono,” Ka Makaainana, January 15, 1894, 3.


U.S. Congress. Senate. *Senate Joint Resolution 19 : To acknowledge the 100th anniversary of the January 17, 1893 overthrow of the Kingdom of Hawaii, and to offer an apology to Native Hawaiians on behalf of the United States for the overthrow of the Kingdom of Hawaii*. Calendar No. 185 103d Cong., 1st sess, 1993. S. Rep. 103-126.


