AMERICAN BUSINESS INTERESTS IN HAWAII IN RELATION TO ANNEXATION

AMERICAN BUSINESS INTERESTS IN HAWAII IN RELATION TO ANNEXATION

By

WILLIAM HUBERT OLIVER

Bachelor of Science

Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College

Stillwater, Oklahoma

1933

Submitted to the Department of History

Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

Master of Arts

1938

APPROVED:

T. H. Reynolds
In Charge of Thesis

T. H. Reynolds
Head of the Department of History

D. G. McIntosh
Dean of Graduate School

P R E F A C E

In this study an effort has been made to show that there were tremendous American business interests in the Hawaiian Islands previous to their annexation to the United States, that these interests caused an ever increasing amount of meddling in Hawaiian affairs of state, and that these same American interests were an important factor in bringing about that annexation.

The sources used in this study were found in the Oklahoma A and M College Library, the Oklahoma University Library, and the Library of Congress, the materials from the latter being secured through an inter-library loan.

The author wishes to acknowledge his sincere appreciation of the counsel and advice of Dr. T. H. Reynolds, Head of the History Department of the Oklahoma A and M College, and the suggestions of Dr. E. F. Willis, Assistant Professor of History, Oklahoma A and M College. Also, he wishes to express his thanks to Miss Grace Campbell and Mr. C. F. Reynolds of the Oklahoma A and M College Library staff for their efforts in securing materials needed for this thesis.

William Hubert Oliver

Agra, Oklahoma

July 5, 1938

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

THE DEVELOPMENT OF AMERICAN BUSINESS INTERESTS IN HAWAII BEFORE 1893

Although the Hawaiian Islands (formerly called Sandwich Islands) were discovered in 1777 by an Englishman, Captain Cook, the United States secured the predominating influence in the Islands almost from the beginning. The first contacts were the result of the position of the Hawaiian Islands in regard to the early trade route between the United States and China. The old sailing ships found the Islands to be an ideal place to stop for replenishing their supplies of water and food, and a restful way station on the long voyage following the trip around the Horn.

The first recorded connection of the Islands with the American nation was in 1789, when an American trading vessel, commanded by Captain Metcalf, visited the Islands on a voyage to China. In an encounter with the natives all but two of Captain Metcalf's crew were killed by the Islanders. The two Americans, Davis and Young, who escaped death were taken as captives, and after becoming reconciled to their fate, taught the natives the use of the cannon and muskets that had been captured. With the help of these two Americans, Kamehameha I was able to bring all the Islands under his rule. Thenceforth the traders who visited Hawaii

found a single government with which they could treat.[1]

Arrangements were made with the King whereby the traders could come ashore to cure the pelts which they had picked up along the Pacific Coast of North America. The cured pelts were then taken to the great fur market in China. On one trip a quantity of sandalwood was included in the cargo. This last named product, which was found on the Islands, was the first Hawaiian article of importance to enter into foreign trade. The Hawaiian chiefs took advantage of the demand for sandalwood. They wanted ships of their own like the ones which were coming to their shores. Promising to pay with sandalwood, the chiefs and their leading men bought several merchant ships, the purchase of which placed the king and his men in debt. The debt increased steadily due to the extravagance of the king and these chiefs.

The sandalwood gave out before the debts were paid. The precious wood was cut without regard for its scarcity, and even the young trees were destroyed by the serfs in order that they would not have to work so hard in later years. The trade in sandalwood which began about 1800 had, by 1820, become of small importance.

The disappearance of this valued wood did not stop the trading that had started with the Hawaiians. The king

---

[1] Edmund Janes Carpenter, America in Hawaii (Boston, 1899), pp. 11-15.

and the ruling chiefs were anxious to continue in their dealings with foreign traders. As the trade in sandalwood declined, another business was coming into the foreground. This was the whaling industry.

The Hawaiian Islands were a rendezvous for the American whaling ships, most of which were from the New England states, and had come around Cape Horn to search for whales in waters of the Pacific. The great distance from home ports necessitated stops at places nearer the whaling waters. The ships would be away from home for as long as two or three years. To the sailors of these whaling vessels the Hawaiian Islands were a veritable "haven of rest." The Hawaiians recognized that the whalers' trade was of value to them as well as necessary to the whalers. Laws were made in the Islands to favor the whalers in every way. These laws stimulated the trade that had started to grow.

Another factor which helped to prepare the way for the further development of trade and industry in Hawaii was the coming of the missionaries from the United States.

> In 1820, there arrived in Honolulu two pastors, the Reverend Hiram Bingham and the Reverend Asa G. Thurston, together with a farmer, Daniel Chamberlain; a medical man, Thomas Holman; two teachers, Samuel Whitney and Samuel Ruggles; and a printer, Elisha Loomis. These men, with their families, constituted the first constructive influence that foreign civilization brought to Hawaii and marked a new era of American interest and influence that later played a vital part in bringing about the acquisition of Hawaii by the United States.
>
> Imbued with the ideals of the still young republic of the United States of America, fired with the spirit of the pioneer and the zeal of the Christian missionary,

> these courageous pilgrims brought to the Sandwich Islands a high and idealistic concept of the best in American civilization and culture and a new idea of government and freedom for the people. Their influence became increasingly important, and eventually, with the king and the chiefs leading the movement, brought about the "Mahele," one of the most remarkable revolutions in history, whereby the common people were invested with the individual title to land in the full and unrestricted manner common in the West today.[2]

After the change in the Hawaiian landholding laws (the Mahele) the foreigners were more willing to make land investments. The foreigners knew that their titles would be guaranteed and protected by the Hawaiian government after the Mahele. Of this they had never been certain before the revolution.

An agent of the United States, Mr. John C. Jones, was sent to the Islands in 1820 to act as consul. He was given the power of general supervision of American business interests in Hawaii, and was required to keep the United States' government informed as to developments in the Islands.

In 1822, a printing press was established on the Islands, and in 1823, there were four American business establishments in Honolulu. In 1825, a ship-yard was built, making Honolulu a point of trans-shipment for the whalers. After this the whale oil could be transferred from the whaling ships to merchant vessels plying between the Islands and the United

---

[2] Jean Hobbs, Hawaii; A Pageant of the Soil (Stanford University, 1935), p. 22.

States. In 1826, James Hunnewell permanently established his mercantile house at Honolulu. This mercantile house continues to exist as C. Brewer & Co.

Captain Thomas Ap Catesby Jones of the United States Navy negotiated a treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation with the Hawaiian king in 1826, but it was not ratified by the United States government. Many of its stipulations were considered morally binding by both parties, however. Frequent visits to the Islands were made after this by United States naval vessels.

Of course, traders and merchants from other countries were interested in the new field of trade in Hawaii. English sailors had been the first to visit the Islands and had been carrying on some trade with the Islanders since shortly after Captain Cook's discovery. The French and Russians, too, had been interested in this trade with Hawaii. But these nations failed to follow up their early advantages which they, especially the English, had over their competitors from the New World.

> By 1830, the Americanization of Hawaii was well under way; British influence, long preeminent in the councils of the nation, had been superseded by American influence. To this result American traders had made an important contribution.[3]

In the five year period from 1836 to 1841, four

---

[3] Ralph S. Kuykendall, "Early Hawaiian Commercial Development," Pacific Historical Review, III (1934), 384-385.

hundred forty-seven ships stopped at Honolulu. Of these, three hundred fifty-eight were United States' vessels. The property and the holdings of Americans in Hawaii increased rapidly, too and were, by this time, assuming immense proportions. Some idea of the extent of American interests in Hawaii in 1842 may be had by an excerpt from a letter dated December 14th of that year. This was sent to Secretary of State Daniel Webster by Timoteo Haalilio and William Richards, two commissioners from Hawaii.

> His Majesty wishes also to remind the Government of the United States that the amount of property belonging to their citizens, which is either landed at or enters the various harbors or roadsteads of his dominions, and is consequently more or less dependent on the protection of his Government, can not be less than from five to seven millions of dollars annually. This property lies in some 90 or 100 whaling ships and their cargoes, and in some 12 or 15 merchant vessels, besides also a considerable amount of other property belonging to American citizens on shore. At some seasons there have been not less than three or four millions of dollars worth of American property, and some 1,400 American citizens at the same time, at the various ports of the islands.[4]

Webster emphasized the interest that the United States had in Hawaii, and also declared that the United States would not want any other nation to take possession of the Islands.

Early in 1843, there was some apprehension on the

---

[4] Foreign Relations of the United States, 1894, Appendix II, p. 43.

part of a number of the Americans living in Hawaii that the British might be intending to take possession of the Islands. William Hooper, the Acting United States Commercial Agent in Hawaii, was among those who feared such a happening. In a communication with Webster on March 7, 1843, he called attention again to the United States' interests in Hawaii.

> A census of American citizens resident in these islands taken under my direction gives the number of 404, a large proportion of which are more or less interested in landed property, and they are not a little solicitous as to the national character they shall have to assume in order to retain their estates, should the islands become British territory.[5]

The trade between our nation and Hawaii was due to receive a stimulus in the years immediately following the discovery of gold in California (1848). The great increase of population along the West coast of the United States caused a great demand for foodstuffs. The articles of food could be more easily sent from the Hawaiian Islands to California than they could be sent from the Eastern part of the United States. Therefore, until the lands of California could be put into production, Hawaii furnished a large part of the food consumed in California.

This increase in trade began to be felt during the year 1850. This year was a rather important one for Hawaii. It marked the beginning of a postal service in the Islands, the organization of an agricultural society, and the founding of

---

[5] Ibid., p. 46.

a bank in Honolulu. In addition, it was a record year for the number of ships touching Hawaiian ports, there being four hundred sixty-nine vessels stopping at these island harbors. More Americans came from the West coast of the United States to set up businesses in Hawaii, and an era of agricultural development in the Islands began.

One of the industries that began to grow in the Islands about this time was that of sugar. The soil and climatic conditions of Hawaii were well adapted to the raising of sugar cane. This product had long been raised on the Islands, some of the earliest white settlers engaging in its culture. Shortly after 1850, there were nearly three thousand acres in sugar cane cultivation. Rapidly increasing in importance, the exportation of cane sugar was soon to become the chief industry of the Islands. Most of the sugar sent from Hawaii went to the United States.[6] The sugar planations were the object of tremendous investments by American capitalists. Even persons with only a few thousand dollars invested in Hawaiian sugar plantations. Some of the plantations were owned, it is true, by people of nationalities other than American. These other investors were chiefly British, but the investments of the Americans were far in advance of those of any other country's capitalists.

---

[6] Carpenter, op. cit., p. 49.

The following excerpts from communications of Mr. Luther Severance, United States Commissioner to Hawaii, to Mr. Webster, United States Secretary of State, illustrate the extent of American investment in relation to that of the British, and also reveal the sentiment of the sugar producers toward the subject of annexation to the United States.

> There is considerable British interest here. ... Yet the American interest, missionary, mercantile, and otherwise, is altogether paramount. ...
>
> Three-fourths, at least, of the business done here is by Americans, and they already own much of the real estate. The sugar planters are nearly all Americans, and have a strong interest in annexation to the United States, as in that event they will supply our Pacific Coast with sugar at an advantage of 30 per cent over all other sugars from the East Indies or elsewhere. The subject of annexation is here often hinted at, and sometimes freely discussed in private; but it is known only to a very few that the King and his Government have the matter under consideration.[7]

In addition to vast business interests in Hawaii, natives of the United States were becoming quite influential in Hawaiian governmental affairs. Mr. Severance informed Mr. Webster in 1851, that the representative body of Hawaii, which was elected by native votes, was made up almost entirely of persons born in the United States. Not only was this true in regard to the legislative department of

---

[7] For. Rel., 1894, App. II, pp. 89-90

the Hawaiian government, but it applied to the executive and the judicial departments (the latter being especially true in the high courts).

The cabinet, too, contained several native Americans: Dr. Judd, from New York, Minister of Finance; W. L. Lee, from New York, Chief Justice; Mr. Bishop, Collector-General, also from New York; Mr. Bates, from Michigan, Attorney-General; Mr. Armstrong, from Pennsylvania, Minister of Public Instruction; and another man, Judge Andrews, from Ohio.

Since so many government positions in Hawaii were filled with men who had formerly lived in the United States, and who, for the most part, had gone to Hawaii to advance their financial interests, it was only natural that the Hawaiian Islands tended toward closer relations with the United States. This was true to the extent that the Islands might be annexed to this country from which continued to come additional capital and capitalists seeking investment and greater profit.

Some difficulties between the French consul and the Hawaiian government in 1851 brought a threat of armed interference by the French. Such an action would endanger the property and lives of Americans in Hawaii, especially in Honolulu. Accordingly, Mr. Severance wrote to Mr. Webster on March 11th, asking him how far that it would be wise to go in protecting the American flag and American property. He said that there were many persons in

Honolulu who would volunteer to defend the flag, and that many more would come to Hawaii from California as soon as they learned of any trouble. Mr. Severance was at a further loss to decide such a question because of an incident which had just occurred. This incident he described as follows:

> John Young, minister of the interior, and Dr. Gerret P. Judd, minister of finance, have just called on me at my office, and delivered to me a paper, which, after allowing me to read, they sealed in my presence and delivered to me to be kept among the archives of the legation.
>
> The paper thus sealed is a cession of the sovereignty of the Islands to the United States by proclamation of the King, to be held until some arrangement satisfactory to all parties can be made consistent with the treaty obligations already existing; and in case none such can be made, then the transfer of sovereignty to be perpetual.[8]

The King also proclaimed that the United States' flag should be flown above the Hawaiian flag on all the forts, public buildings, and Hawaiian vessels. This proclamation, of course, was to be effective only upon the occasion of an outbreak of hostilities between the French and the Islands.

The American people in the Islands were very anxious to be under a flag that would afford them protection. Mr. Severance seems to have caught some of this enthusiasm so

---

[8] Ibid., p. 92

prevalent amont the Americans. At least, in the reply which Webster sent to his question of accepting the voluntary offer of cession, Severance received a gentle reminder as to the limits of his authority in the matter of annexation.

In the same communication, Mr. Webster told Severance to abstain from encouraging American citizens to come to the Islands in the hope of the latter being annexed to the United States. This would seem to indicate that this government was not desiring annexation, and that such a movement was coming as a result of other influences. What some of these influences were can be seen by noticing the numerous references to American commercial interests, American sugar producers who desired annexation, American property owners in the Islands, and American business houses in Honolulu. These are found in the correspondence of the United States Commissioner in the Hawaiian Islands and the United States Consul in Honolulu with their respective departments in Washington.

As early as December of 1853, however, W. L. Marcy, Secretary of State, showed a difference in attitude toward the annexation of the Islands in a confidential letter sent by the Secretary to our minister at Paris. In this he asked the minister to learn, if possible, what would be the probable course of France in case the United States made an attempt to add the Hawaiian Islands to its territorial possessions. The French let it be known that they did not

favor such an action. In the same correspondence, Marcy stated that the Hawaiian government could not remain long in the hands of Hawaiian rulers, therefore, it seems inevitable that they must come under the control of the United States government.[9]

In 1854, it became apparent that some change in the sovereignty of the Hawaiian Islands might be expected. This is well shown in the following excerpt from a communication of Secretary of State Marcy with Mr. Gregg in Honolulu, dated April 4, 1854:

> In your general instructions you were furnished with the views of this Government in regard to any change in the political affairs of the Sandwich Islands. The President was aware, when those instructions were prepared, that the question of transferring the sovereignty of those islands to the United States had been raised, and favorably received by many influential individuals residing therein. It was foreseen that at some period, not far distant, such a change would take place, and that the Hawaiian Islands would come under the protectorate of or be transferred to some foreign power. You were informed that it was not the policy of the United States to accelerate such a change; but if, in the course of events, it became unavoidable, this Government would much prefer to acquire the sovereignty of these islands for the United States, rather than to see it transferred to any other power. If any foreign connection is to be formed, the geographical position of these islands indicates that it should be with us. Our commerce with them far exceeds that of all other countries; our citizens are embarked in the most important business concerns of that country, and some of them hold important public positions. In view of the large American interests there established and the intimate commercial relations existing at this time it might

---

[9] Carpenter, op. cit., p. 108.

well be regarded as the duty of this Government to prevent those islands from becoming the appendage of any other foreign power. ...

The President has deemed it proper that you should be furnished with instructions for the guidance of your conduct in such an emergency. With this dispatch you will be furnished with a full power to treat with the present authorities of the Hawaiian Government for the transfer of the Sandwich Islands to the United States. This can only be done by convention or treaty, which will not be valid until it is ratified by the Senate of the United States.

No intimation has ever been given to this Government as to the terms or conditions which will be likely to be annexed to the tender of the sovereignty. It is presumed, however, that something more than a mere protectorate is contemplated. A protectorate tendered to and accepted by the United States would not change the sovereignty of the country. In that case this Government would take upon itself heavy and responsible duties for which it could hardly expect compensating advantages. ...

It is reasonable to anticipate that the present rulers and chiefs would expect that some provision would be made as compensation to them for the surrender of their political position. ... In this respect the United States would manifest toward them a liberal spirit. Annuities to the amount of $100,000 to be distributed in such manner as they would prefer might be secured to them in the treaty. ...

I have good reason to believe that some of the leading powers of Europe would be very unwilling to see the Sandwich Islands become a part of the United States, and, if an opportunity occurred, would endeavor to defeat any negotiation for that purpose. This consideration and others, make it important that you should bring it to a close as expeditiously as possible. The treaty should be here in time to be submitted to the Senate at its present session.[10]

Considerable delay was experienced in the negotiations. During this time sailor riots and threatened filibuster raids from California kept the native government in a constant state of alarm. This, together with internal

---

[10] For. Rel., 1894, App. II, pp. 121-123.

political agitation and party strife induced an active agitation in favor of annexation to the United States. Petitions were presented to the King. These were based upon strong commercial interests, and he favored them as a refuge from the annoying demands made upon him.[11]

Further delay was caused by the Crown Prince, Alexander, who did not wish to give up his right to become ruler. Meanwhile, the condition of affairs in Hawaii was becoming almost unbearable for the foreign residents. Mr. Gregg advised Mr. Marcy of this condition in a dispatch dated July 26, 1854, in which he wrote:

> I am convinced that a revolution will soon take place if a treaty of annexation is not concluded. The foreign residents, especially Americans, are becoming impatient under the present state of things, and will not be disposed to endure much longer the feebleness and inefficiency of the Government. They have power enough in their hands, if they act in concert, to do anything they wish, and in a single week could subvert the throne and establish a republic upon its ruins.[12]

On August 7th Mr. Gregg, United States Commissioner to Hawaii, informed Mr. Marcy that a treaty had been negotiated, but not yet signed. His dissatisfaction with two of the articles was made known at this time. The most important source of dissatisfaction was the second article, which

---

[11] Lucien Young, The Real Hawaii (New York, 1899), p. 237.

[12] For. Rel., 1894, App. II, p. 123.

provided for the incorporation of Hawaii into the Union as a state. The other was the eighth article which provided for the payment of three hundred thousand dollars instead of one hundred thousand dollars as annuities. The clause for admission of Hawaii as a state was insisted upon by the Hawaiians, due, no doubt, to the influence of British and French representatives who knew that such a clause would cause the treaty to fail to be ratified by the United States Senate.[13] This would be the case because of the slavery issue which was at that time paramount in the internal affairs of the United States. A new state would bring with it the question of whether it should be slave or free. Hawaii, being favorable for raising cotton, would likely add to the number of slave states. The Senators from the North, therefore, would be unwilling to ratify a treaty which would permit Hawaii to become a state.

King Kamehameha III died on December 15, 1854. He had been very friendly toward the Americans and their interests, and had favored the United States annexing the Islands. Prince Liholiho succeeded him to the throne under the title of Kamehameha IV. The new king was more inclined to favor the British interests, especially, since he had married a girl of English parentage.[14]

---

[13] Samuel Flagg Bemis, A Diplomatic History of the United States (New York, 1936) p. 323.

[14] Carpenter, op. cit., pp. 118-119.

All hope of annexation at that time was lost with the coming of the new king to the throne. The negotiations which had been carried on with Mr. Gregg were broken off, and relations between the United States and Hawaii remained unchanged as far as Hawaiian independence was concerned. The Hawaiian Government sent Chief-Justice Lee to Washington as ambassador.

Greatly disappointed by the failure of the scheme for annexation, and spurred by the unsatisfactory American tariff rates as they affected Hawaiian exports, the commercial interests urged Judge Lee to arrange a trade treaty with the United States to make possible the admission of Hawaiian sugar at preferential rates. A treaty embodying such terms was concluded July 20, 1856.

By this treaty, such articles as Hawaiian sugar, wool, hides, and coffee were to be admitted free of duty into the United States. The Senate did not ratify the treaty, however, due especially to the agitation of the sugar producers of Louisiana who felt that the operation of such a treaty would decrease their own profits. Perhaps the Senators feared that the Hawaiian resources, which would be further developed by American capital as a result of the treaty, woulf fall into the hands of some European power.[15]

The Hawaiian sugar industry was due for a tremendous

---

[15] Osborne E. Hooley, "Hawaiian Negotiation for Reciprocity, 1855-1857", Pacific Historical Review, VII (June, 1938), 146.

boost during the years of the Civil War in the United States. The supply of sugar which the North had received from the Southern States was cut off by the opening of the war between North and South. The Northern States, therefore, had to seek elsewhere for sugar. This demand for sugar by the North was met by the sugar producers in Hawaii who profited greatly by the high prices growing out of the shortage of supply in the face of increased demand. During the course of the war the exportation of sugar from Hawaii increased almost seven fold.

Another attempt to secure a reciprocity treaty with the United States was made in 1863, but was doomed to failure, largely because of the effect such a treaty would have upon customs receipts during the trying years of the war.

Mr. James McBride in a communication with Secretary Seward on October 9, 1863, informed the Secretary of State that the English were taking advantage of King Kamehameha's favor, by trying to Anglicanize the schools, the church, and the government in Hawaii. This was perhaps an opportune time for such a thing, since the United States was engaged in civil war. Despite these attempts on the part of the English to gain ground and increase their influence in Hawaiian affairs, the Americans continued to hold the supremacy in commercial interests. Mr. McBride attested to this fact in the same correspondence as mentioned above:

> American interests greatly predominate here over all others combined, and not less than four-fifths of the commerce connected with these islands is American. The merchants, traders, dealers of all kinds, and planters are principally Americans. The English have no commerce here worthy of the name and but one or two retail stores; the Germans about the same business as the English. ...
>
> All the sugar plantations of any note on these islands, with exception of two or three, belong to Americans.[16]

The commercial and industrial value of the Islands was also reaffirmed by Mr. McBride in the same dispatch. New industries of importance were being developed on the Islands which would afford additional opportunities for the investment of capital. In regard to these possibilities of Hawaii, Mr. McBride wrote:

> The cotton-growing capacity of these islands has been sufficiently tested to demonstrate it as a fact that it is not at all inferior to Alabama, Georgia, or Mississippi, either as to quality or quantity per acre. ... The capacity of these islands for growing sugar cane is of world-wide celebrity and is known to be not inferior to that of any other country . ... Coffee grows here well and it is believed that with proper care and skill it might become equal to those more celebrated coffee-growing countries. A great deal is now raised here, although for the last few years there has been in some localities what is here called the blight of the tree. This soil grows rice of an excellent quality in great abundance. Indian corn grows well here and yields 20 to 40 bushels per acre.
>
> This group of islands under the control of our Government, in my judgment would be far more valuable than the ownership of both Cuba and the Bahama Islands.[17]

---

[16] For. Rel., 1894, App. II, pp. 135-136.

[17] Ibid., pp. 135-136

Much the same opinion was expressed in 1866, by Mr. Edward McCook, United States Minister Resident in Hawaii, in a communication with Secretary Seward. In this he also pointed out the extent of American business interests in the Islands and the great commercial value that these Islands were to this country.

> There is still another class - the planters of the country. They are nearly all Americans, both in nationality and in sympathy; they are the better class of the residents of the islands, possess its substantial wealth, control its resources, and annually ship 20,000,000 pounds of sugar to the Pacific coast of the United States. Their pecuniary interests, their political sympathies, their business relations, and their personal attachments are all with the United States and its citizens. ...
>
> The fact as I state it is undoubted, and in event that no successor to the throne is appointed the Government of the United States may be called upon to arbitrate the future of this country. For this reason I have felt it my duty to remind you of the condition of affairs here and to call your attention to the value of American business interests which do now, and always must, center in these islands.
>
> They are the resting place, supply depot, and reshipping point of all our American whaling fleet.
>
> They are the sources from which the Pacific States receive all the sugars they consume.
>
> The greater part of the agricultural, commercial, and moneyed interests of the islands are in the hands of American citizens.
>
> All vessels bound from our Pacific coast to China pass close to these shores. ...
>
> The spirit of this whole people is heartily republican and thoroughly American. The King, his half dozen half-civilized nobles, as many cabinet ministers, and the Lord Bishop of Honolulu (Staley) constitute the entire aristocratic element of the country, either in fact or in feeling. And when this dynasty ends, as end it will probably within the next year, I am sure that if the American Government indicates the slightest desire to test in these islands the last Napoleonic conception in the way of territorial

> extension you will find the people here with great uniformity "demanding by votes, freely expressed, annexation to" the United States.[18]

In 1867, Secretary Seward learned of the supposedly strong annexation sentiment in the Hawaiian Islands and advised Mr. McCook to receive any overtures made by the natives for annexation. Negotiations for a treaty of reciprocity were in progress at that time, and fearful that these negotiations might be a hindrance to annexation, Seward wrote the following confidentially to Mr. McCook:

> It is proper that you should know, for your own information, that a lawful and peaceful annexation of the islands to the United States, with the consent of the people of the Sandwich Islands, is deemed desirable by this Government; and that if the policy of annexation should really conflict with the policy of reciprocity, annexation is in every case to be preferred.[19]

Neither annexation nor reciprocity was secured at this time. The movement for annexation in the Islands did not gain sufficient strength among the mass of the people. The reciprocity treaty which was drawn up failed to be ratified by the United States Senate, although President Johnson asked the Senate to consider it favorably.

The efforts of the sugar planters to gain a reciprocity treaty or annexation to the United States did not cease, however. In fact, their efforts were multiplied. The

---

[18] Ibid., pp. 138-139.

[19] Ibid., p. 143.

effects of the close of the Civil War in the United States were being felt in all the agricultural pursuits of the Islands. Kahamehameha V interested himself with the situation, giving much attention to the difficulties of the planters.

The result of these conditions was that renewed interest and activity was manifested on the part of those interested in raising Hawaiian sugar. These interests believed that reciprocity or annexation would remedy all the ills that they were suffering due to low prices of their product.

Knowing that the United States would not be interested in granting a preference to Hawaiian sugar without considerable compensation, the problem of finding something to swap became one of tremendous concern. Advisers of King Lunalilo, who succeeded Kamehameha V in 1873, caused him to offer the Pearl River Lagoon in trade for the desired commercial treaty. This Lagoon would make a very good naval base and harbor for United States' ships in these waters. There was a great deal of opposition to such a scheme in the Islands, however; so the king finally withdrew the offer.

Knowledge that such a scheme had been considered, and that the offer might be re-opened, caused the United States Secretary of War, W. W. Belknap, to send J. M. Schofield and B. S. Alexander, two army engineers, to Hawaii to investigate the desirability of the Islands as a naval base and supply depot. They made a favorable report and stated

that they believed the Hawaiian Government would grant this harbor to the United States for a satisfactory treaty admitting sugar into the United States free of duty.

King Lunalilo died in January, 1874. No successor to the throne had been appointed, therefore, making necessary the election of a new king. Of the two candidates for the throne, namely, Dowager Queen Emma and Colonel David Kalakaua, the latter received the majority of votes. Probably one of the chief reasons for the election of Kalakaua was the fact he had pledged to work with the business and plantation interests in order to secure a reciprocity treaty. At least, he was soon confronted with the problem of arranging such a treaty.

During the winter of 1874-1875, Kalakaua made a visit to the United States. Whether this visit was for the purpose of promoting the proposed treaty or whether it was merely an acceptance of the invitation of the United States Government may not be known. He was cordially received and made a favorable impression on the people of this country.

At this juncture an effort was made to secure a market for the Hawaiian sugar crop in Australia. But this attempt to develop markets outside the United States was stopped at the very beginning.[20]

The reciprocity treaty which had been so long desired

---

20 Lippert Spring Ellis, The Tariff on Sugar (Freeport, Ill., 1933), p. 49.

by the business interests in lieu of annexation was finally attained in 1875. According to its provisions, articles of Hawaiian produce such as arrowroot, caster oil, bananas, nuts, vegetables, undressed skins and hides, rice, all unrefined sugar, syrups of sugar-cane, molasses, and tallow were to be admitted into United States' ports duty free. In return for these preferences granted Hawaiian products, the Hawaiian Government agreed to admit into the ports of Hawaii, free of duty, something over one hundred enumerated articles.

In addition to the duty-free admission of United States' products enumerated in the treaty, article four included the following important clause regarding Hawaiian territory:

> It is agreed, on the part of His Hawaiian Majesty, that, so long as this treaty shall remain in force, he will not lease or otherwise dispose of or create any lien upon any port, harbor, or other territory in his dominions, or grant any special privilege or right of use therein, to any other power, state, or government, nor make any treaty by which any other nation shall obtain the same privileges, relative to the admission of any articles free of duty, hereby secured to the United States.[21]

This clause made the treaty something more than an ordinary reciprocal trade treaty. Secretary of State Bayard later remarked that the treaty was also a political

---

21 For. Rel., 1894, App. II, p. 166.

compact. The treaty thus drawn up was to be in force for seven years from the date it went into effect. It was to continue effective until twelve months after either government should give notice of its wish to terminate the treaty. Required ratifications were exchanged, and the agreement went into effect on September 9, 1876.

The effect of the treaty on the Hawaiian sugar trade and other agricultural development was tremendous. Within a period of four years following the ratification of the treaty the production of sugar and rice increased by more than two fold.[22] A great opportunity was afforded for American capitalistic expansion. The advantage to be taken of this is foretold in a statement made in 1881, by James G. Blaine:

> Throughout the continent, north and south, wherever a foothold is found for American enterprises, it is quickly occupied, and this spirit of adventure, which seeks outlet in the mines of South America and the railroads of Mexico, would not be slow to avail itself of openings for assured and profitable enterprise even in mid-ocean.[23]

So advantageous did this treaty prove to be for the agricultural interests, that it was amended and extended in December, 1884, to last for another seven years with the provision that it might be terminated upon twelve months

---

[22] Hobbs, op. cit., p. 73.

[23] For. Rel., 1894, App. II, p. 170.

notice by either country after that time. This amended treaty went into effect on November 9, 1887.

One of the things provided for in the amended treaty, which had not been included in the former one, was the right given to the United States Government to establish a coaling and repair station at Pearl Harbor. This right amounted practically to a cession of Pearl Harbor to this country.

Under the terms of this treaty, an American development of the commerce and industry of the Hawaiian Islands was certain. Some remarks of Secretary Bayard regarding the advantages gained by these agreements are worthy of note.

> I was greatly impressed with the special advantages which our exclusive rights in the islands gave us, and would have preferred to extend the period of its duration, so that our commercial interests there would have ample time to develop and American control of the islands, in a perfectly natural and legitimate way, would be assured by the normal growth of mercantile and political relations. However, I left the term fixed by Mr. Frelinghuysen unaltered, not wishing to jeopardize the acceptance of the treaty by the Senate by any alterations. During its consideration by the Senate, Mr. Edmunds inserted a clause providing for the cession to us of Pearl Harbor as a coaling station and repair depot for naval vessels. ...
>
> I held that there could be no comparison between our rights in the Hawaiian Islands, as secured by the treaties of 1875 and 1887, with those of other nations, and I would not consent that the United States should be put upon an equality with them. We had the right of veto upon any transfer of Hawaiian territory, and consequently upon any diversion of the revenues accruing from it. We had an interest in Hawaii that no other country could have. A political union would logically and naturally follow, in course of time, the commercial union and dependence which were thus assured. When King Kalakaua proposed to pledge his revenues to English merchants for a loan, I protested

> on the ground that such action involved a violation of our exclusive rights. It was my idea that the policy originating in the Fish treaty of the Grant administration in 1875 should be permitted to work out its proper results. The obvious course was to wait quietly and patiently and let the islands fill up with American planters and American industries until they should be wholly identified in business interests and political sympathies with the United States. It was simply a matter of waiting until the apple should ripen and fall.[24]

During the first fifteen years of operation of the reciprocity treaties, the production of sugar increased from 25,000,000 pounds to more than 250,000,000 pounds. This, as may be seen, was an increase of more than a thousand per cent.[25]

Public and private enterprises grew rapidly; government buildings and many improvements of public utility were constructed; railroads and telegraph lines were put in operation; vast irrigation systems were built; numerous artesian wells were drilled; and many schools, hospitals, and churches were erected. These improvements were all the result of the reciprocity treaties.[26]

Of the great many Americans who took advantage of the reciprocal trade treaties to increase their investments in Hawaii, I will mention one of the most important, in view

---

[24] American Republics Bureau, Bulletin No. 85, (Washington, 1898), pp. 33-34.

[25] Hobbs, op. cit., p. 73.

[26] John W. Foster, American Diplomacy in the Orient (Boston and New York, 1926), p. 370.

of the extent of his holdings in the Islands. This was a Mr. Claus Spreckels. He had been a wealthy sugar-refiner in California before the advent of the reciprocity treaties. Following the ratification of these favorable treaties, Spreckels went to Hawaii, where he purchased sugar plantations comprising twenty-four thousand acres of the best sugar producing land in the Islands.

The following are some excerpts from a report of A. S. Cleghorn, Collector-General of Customs in Honolulu, made to S. M. Damon, Minister of Finance of Hawaii, on March 13, 1890. By these one may see the increased trade of the Islands with the United States.

> The exports have increased from $4,875,694 in 1880 to $13,874,341 in 1889, and the imports from $3,673,268 in 1880 to $5,438,790 in 1889.
>
> The trade with the United States has increased 5.78 per cent during the past year, and is now 79.10 per cent of our entire imports.
>
> Our exports, virtually, all go to the United States.
>
> Bananas have increased in the number of bunches exported from 1876 to the present year, when it reached 105,630 bunches.
>
> The United States received the bulk of our trade, both in exports and imports; Great Britain received 3.45 per cent, and China and Japan 1.10 per cent.
>
> The trade of the United States with this Kingdom has increased 1.61 per cent over that of 1888.
>
> The increase in the imports and exports carried by American vessels in 1868 was 66.19 per cent, while in 1889 it carried 72.34 per cent. The percentage carried by the vessels of other nations has decreased in each case.
>
> Vessels under the American flag had a total tonnage of 129,095, and in 1888, 113,459; British, 19,139, and in 1888, 29,519, Hawaiian, 54,813 against

64,607; German, 4,197, against 5,820 for the previous year.[27]

From these statements covering, for the most part, the business for the year ending at the close of December of the preceding year, it is seen that the trade with the United States far outweighed that with any other country.

American capital found its way into almost every phase of Hawaiian industry and even into the Hawaiian Government itself, in the form of loans made to that Government by American capitalists. It is small wonder then that Hawaii was rapidly becoming a country whose affairs were managed by persons who were not Hawaiians, but American citizens who owned and controlled Hawaiian industry and commerce.

---

[27] For. Rel., 1894, App. II, pp. 317-318.

CHAPTER II

THE HAWAIIAN REVOLUTION OF 1893; A RESULT OF AMERICAN CITIZENS IN HAWAII DESIRING ANNEXATION

How long such conditions of prosperity and increased trade would have continued under reciprocity, had it not been for events in the United States, is difficult to conclude. But change is continually going on, and things were taking place in the United States which were to close shortly the reign of prosperity that had existed under the terms of the reciprocity treaties.

A proposal was made in Congress to remove the tariff on all sugars imported into the United States. The effect that such a course of action would have on the Hawaiian sugar industry is revealed in the following communication of Minister Stevens with Secretary Blaine, dated May 20, 1890:

> The production of sugar is the principal business of these islands, as the figures of the nearly $14,000,000 of exports to the United States in 1889 plainly show. Sugar is the chief source of the financial life-- is the banking capital-- on which the present and future prosperity of this country depends. To destroy this productive industry and chief source of wealth is to spread ruin and disaster throughout the islands.
>
> It is certain that the present treaty is the chief cause of the present large dimensions of sugar production, having already more than doubled the entire property of the islands. In the opinion

> of all well-informed persons here to place sugar on the free list would be the virtual annulment of the reciprocity treaty and the destruction of the prosperity of the islands. Thus it is easy to understand why there is so deep an anxiety among the business men of Hawaii as to the present aspect of the sugar question in Congress . ... To all Americans here it is especially alarming, as they see plainly that the virtual destruction of the chief productive industry of the country is to weaken essentially its fraternal relations with the United States.
>
> Believing the commercial and political relations of these islands to be of inestimable importance to the United States, duty impels me to state the grave injury and danger there are involved in the proposed annulment of the sugar tariff.[1]

Despite these protests, the McKinley Tariff Act was passed by Congress in 1890. This act removed the duty from raw sugar being imported into the United States, but allowed the American sugar growers to receive a bounty of two cents on each pound of sugar raised.[2] This subsidy did not aid the Hawaiian producers. At the same time, the increase in beet sugar production in the United States furnished new competition.

The result of the tariff act was that American sugar growers enjoyed an advantage of two cents per pound over their Hawaiian competitors. Such an advantage caused the industry of the Islands to fall into decay. It became plain to these interests that their condition would not improve unless something was done to bring about closer commercial

---

[1] For. Rel., 1894, App. II, p. 320.

[2] F. W. Taussig, The Tariff History of the United States (New York and London, 1914), pp. 275-280.

or political relations between Hawaii and the United States.

Investors no longer cared to put large sums into the sugar industry. Therefore, rice, coffee, tea, bananas, tobacco, hemp, and pineapples became increasingly important as products for export. Reciprocity had caused practically all the capital to find its way into the sugar industry, which was so profitable under the terms of the treaties.

Attempts were immediately made, by those interested in Hawaiian industries, to secure a favorable revision of the agreements. Mr. Stevens urged Mr. Blaine to try to remedy the ills by helping to secure a new and more liberal treaty. He advised that the Americans in Hawaii would not be content to remain there with their investments under the conditions that were then existing, but that they were sure to turn their attention to investments in businesses on the Pacific Coast, which would be undesirable to business investments already there.[3]

In November, 1890, King Kalakaua made a trip to California in an effort to regain his failing health. The trip was not intended to be one of diplomatic importance, although proper courtesy and hospitality were shown to him while here. His health failed to improve as a result of the trip, and on January 20, 1891, he died in San Francisco.

The death of Kalakaua brought his sister, Mrs. Dominis,

---

[3] For. Rel., 1894, App. II, p. 350.

to the throne as Queen Liliuokalani. She took the oath to support the Constitution of 1887, on January 29, 1891. Almost at once Liliuokalani began to assume powers not given to her under the Constitution. The first step was to appoint a cabinet that would be under her absolute control. Net the Queen began a series of removals of government officers, replacing them in each case with favorites who would be easily dominated.

This had a tendency to cause alarm among the business elements, who saw in such a move the possible loss of their control of governmental affairs. In a confidential letter written by Minister Stevens to Secretary Blaine, August 20, 1891, Stevens discussed the question of brining about security for these elements.

> The best security in the future, and the only permanent security, will be the moral pressure of the business men and of what are termed "the missionary people," and the presence in the harbor of Honolulu of an American man-of-war. The presence of a United States vessel not only operates strongly to secure good order among the nationalities here, but it is a standing notice to foreign nations that the United States has a special care for these islands.[4]

Despite the Queen's assumption of autocratic powers and her appointment of favorites, she was unable to gain the confidence and devotion of her peoples.[5] A conspiracy

---

[4] Ibid., p. 348.

[5] Young, op. cit., p. 22.

was formed at this time by a number of half-whites of none too high character and principles, the object of this group being to remedy the evils that were in existence. Learning of this group, the Queen hit upon the idea of using these men to aid her in issuing a new constitution. The leader of the conspiracy, R. W. Wilcox, refused to support her plans in carrying out this scheme, whereupon he and his associates were arrested for conspiring against the government. The Queen prevented them from standing trial, however, for fear that her share in the plot would be exposed.[6]

The meeting of the legislature in May, 1892, found three political parties represented, each having considerable influence and of about equal strength. One of the parties, styled the Reform Party, had for its aim closer commercial relations with the United States and the discontinuance of the autocratic rule of the Queen. The party was made up largely of persons who had come to Hawaii from the United States or had been born there of parents who were natives of this country. The second party was called the National Reform Party. This group favored English interests in preference to American, and was composed of persons having, for the most part, no property holdings in the Islands. The third of these parties was the Liberal Party. The members of this party were interested in no

---

6 Ibid., p. 23.

constructive legislation, but were seeking bribes and bargains. On the whole, they were satisfied with the Queen and her policies. As may be well imagined, the party was made up of natives and the whites of the lower class.[7]

With the party groups being so nearly equal in strength, the work of enacting any legislation was greatly hampered. The Queen had some advantage in the contest by virtue of the fact that her ministers were allowed to vote on any measures considered by the legislature, excepting those concerning impeachment or voting out a cabinet. The National Reform Party cooperated with the Liberal Party in support of the Queen on questions which might prove detrimental to American interests.

The American Minister, J. L. Stevens, worked with the Reform Party in order to prevent any laws being enacted which might hurt the American cause. The English Minister was an active worker with the National Reform Party, and even went in person to lobby for measures that were in opposition to American interests.[8] By thus engaging in the domestic affairs of the country to which they were sent as ministers, these men were violating principles of international law relating to conduct of ministers.[9]

---

[7] Ibid., p. 24.

[8] Ibid., p. 25.

[9] J. B. Moore, A Digest of International Law (Washington, 1906), IV, 573.

Opposition to the Queen and her cabinet by the majority of the members of the legislature caused the cabinet to be voted out on August 30, 1892. The Queen immediately appointed, against the advice of the business men of Honolulu, another cabinet, headed by E. C. Macfarlane. He was pro-British in his sympathy, and set out immediately to get a bill through the legislature which would give England a mortgage on the port dues in return for a loan from that country. An effort to vote this cabinet out three days after they were installed failed by one vote. Another attempt in October was more successful, and the cabinet went out by a vote of 32 to 15.[10]

Again the Queen appointed a cabinet composed of men who represented in no way the business group. This time the cabinet was voted out in less than two hours.[11]

At this juncture of affairs the Queen temporarily yielded to the majority group of the legislature, and appointed a ministry known as the Wilcox-Jones cabinet. This settlement was considered as a victory for the better class and as the triumph of Americanism over anti-Americanism.[12]

The events which had been taking place caused

---

[10] Young, op. cit., pp. 29-30

[11] Ibid., p. 30.

[12] Carpenter, op. cit., p. 175.

annexation sentiment to increase in intensity, as may be seen from a communication of Captain G. C. Wiltse of the Boston with the Secretary of the Navy on October 12, 1892:

> There is a large and growing sentiment, particularly among the planters, in favor of annexation to the United States, but I am informed that the leaders do not think an opportune moment will arrive for some time to come. However, everything seems to point toward an eventual request for annexation.[13]

The same observation of this trend in sentiment was made by Minister Stevens in a note to Secretary Foster, November 20, 1892. In this, Stevens stated:

> An intelligent and impartial examination of the facts can hardly fail to lead to the conclusion that the relations and policy of the United States toward Hawaii will soon demand some change, if not the adoption of decisive measures, with the aim to secure American interests and future supremacy by encouraging Hawaiian development and aiding to promote responsible government in these islands. It is unnecessary for me to allude to the deep interest and the settled policy of the United States Government in respect of these islands, from the official days of John Quincy Adams and of Daniel Webster to the present time. In all that period, we have avowed the superiority of our interests to those of all other nations.[14]

An attempt to remove the Wilcox-Jones cabinet in December failed, an action taken to mean that the Reform Party was in the ascendancy and would exercise a greater control over the government in the future.

Such a prediction was made without reckoning to what

---

13 For. Rel., 1894, App. II, p. 185.

14 Ibid., pp. 188-189.

lengths the Queen would go, to regain her waning power in the legislature. By bribes and promises to the native members of that body, the Queen was able to put through a lottery bill and an opium bill, both of which were greatly opposed by the ministry and the higher class of people in the country. The first of these bills was to permit the Louisiana Lottery Company to carry on its operations in Hawaii. This company had been driven out of the United States because of the character of its dealings, and was considered by the better class as very undesirable. The second bill was to grant a franchise to a large opium ring with branches in such cities as San Francisco, Hong Kong, Vancouver, and Honolulu.

Members of the legislature who would accept bribes were given shares of stock in the lottery company, and promises were made that a large annual payment ($500,000) would be made to the Hawaiian Government in return for the franchise. Bribes were also given to the legislators by the agents of the opium ring.[15]

Success having crowned the Queen's efforts in putting through the lottery and opium bills, she next decided to try again to remove the Wilcox-Jones cabinet. This was accomplished by a vote of 25 to 16 on January 12, 1893,

---

15 Carpenter, op. cit., pp. 176-177.

two days before the legislature was to be prorogued.[16]

Meanwhile, Mr. Stevens was considering the desirability of bringing about closer relations between the United States and Hawaii. His desire for annexation was, no doubt, intensified by the events which had been occurring in the legislature, and by the demands of the sugar interests in the Islands, who were suffering greatly from the effects of the McKinley Tariff. The following is taken from a letter written by Mr. Stevens to Hon. John W. Foster, Secretary of State:

> It is well to consider the existing state of things here resulting from the change in the United States sugar tariff. Only personal observation and a careful investigation of the facts can give an adequate idea of the severe blow sugar raised here has received. The production of sugar being the main business of the islands, the great reduction of the market price has effected powerfully the entire affairs and conditions of the islands. I think it underestimating the truth to express the opinion that the loss to the owners of the sugar plantations and mills, etc., and the consequent depreciation of other property by the passage of the McKinley bill, wise and beneficial as that measure is proving to be for the vast interests in the United States, has not been less than $12,000,000, a large portion of this falling on Americans residing here and in California. Unless some positive measures of relief be granted, the depreciation of sugar property here will continue to go on. ...
>
> If it was wise for the United States, through Secretary Marcy, thirty-eight years ago, to offer to expend $100,000 to secure a treaty of annexation, it certainly can not be chimerical or unwise to expend $100,000 to secure annexation in the near future.

---

[16] W. D. Alexander, A Brief History of the Hawaiian People (New York, 1899), p. 315.

> To-day the United States has five times the wealth she possessed in 1854, and the reasons now existing for annexation are much stronger than they were then. I can not refrain from expressing the opinion with emphasis that the golden hour is near at hand.[17]

Internal affairs in Hawaii were, by this time, moving at a more rapid pace. Following the removal of the Wilcox-Jones cabinet, the Queen set about to secure the formation of a new ministry which would be under her control. The legislature would be prorogued on the 14th of January, and would not convene again for two years. During this two years the Queen wished to have a group of ministers that would do her bidding. Accordingly, she sent for Colburn, a half-white, and asked him to form a cabinet composed of persons she would name. The Queen's followers in the legislature were asked to absent themselves from the meeting on the next day (the 13th), in order that a quorum would not be present, which might cause the new cabinet to be voted out.[18]

All of this was part of Liliuokalani's plan to dispose of the old constitution, since it narrowly restricted her royal powers, and to proclaim a new one, that would return the power to her hands.

> According to this proposed consitution the members of the house of nobles and of the council

---

[17] For. Rel., 1894, App. II, pp. 194-195.

[18] Young, op. cit., p. 33.

> of State were to be appointed by the queen at will; and all white men, unless married to native women, were to be absolutely debarred from suffrage.[19]

The Queen's proposal to promulgate such a constitution caused a wave of native enthusiasm to be aroused, favoring a return to the old order of things. Feeling against the whites began to rise high. Honolulu became a city filled with excitement.

The white population became thoroughly alarmed by this turn of events. The danger of losing their property, their voice in the government, and possibly their lives led them to discuss open rebellion. The business interests saw that they would be likely to lose forever the chance of bringing the Hawaiian Islands under the control of the United States. Without a voice in the government of Hawaii, their plight would be worse than anything they had experienced, even during the years before reciprocity.

On Saturday, January 14th, the Queen came to the government building at noon, and read the notice of prorogation of the legislature. Immediately following this act, she went to the palace that she might get the ministry to sign the new constitution which she had drawn up. All had worked well until this time, but here the Queen encountered an unexpect obstacle.

---

[19] Carpenter, op. cit., p. 178

Mr. Colburn and Mr. Peterson, two of the ministers, refused to sign the document. The other ministers, seeing the steadfast opposition of these two, also refused to sign. By a plea for time to deliberate, the ministers were able to leave the palace and learn if the people would support them in resisting the Queen. This resistance on the part of the ministers, who the Queen supposed were loyal to her, was occasioned by their knowledge that the promulgation of this constitution would be accompanied by a revolt and probably bloodshed.[20]

The ministers were assured of the hearty cooperation of the business men and the Reform Party and were advised to continue to resist the Queen. Upon being thus assured of support, the cabinet returned to the palace, where they found the Queen making a speech to her native followers, telling them that she had been forced by her stubborn ministers to postpone for a short time the issuance of the constitution.[21]

Following this speech by the Queen, a number of the prominent business men of Honolulu met at W. O. Smith's office and organized a Committee of Public Safety, composed of thirteen members. Five of these members were American citizens, owing allegiance to the United States. Six were

---

20 Ibid., p. 179.

21 Alexander, op. cit., p. 316.

Hawaiian subjects, some of which were of foreign parentage. One was English; one was German. The five Americans were: Henry E. Cooper, chairman; F. W. McChesney; Theo. F. Lansing; John Emmeluth; and J. A. McCandless. Of the Hawaiians, three, L. A. Thurston, W. O. Smith, and W. R. Castle, had been born in Hawaii. W. C. Wilder, C. Bolte, and Henry Waterhouse were naturalized subjects. A. Brown was a Scotch citizen; Ed Suhr was a German subject.[22]

The committee decided that the Queen had acted in a manner equivalent to abdicating the throne. She had declared her intention to disregard the constitution to which she had sworn her support. Therefore, the committee believed that the people no longer owed allegiance to her.[23]

Before adjourning, the following resolution was adopted by the committee by a vote of twelve to one.

> Resolved, That it is the sense of this committee that in view of the present unsatisfactory state of affairs, the proper course to pursue is to abolish the monarchy and apply for annexation to the United States.[24]

After adopting this resolution, the Committee of Public Safety adjourned until the next morning. At that time, they again met and decided upon the course of action for the

---

[22] For. Rel., 1894, App. II, pp. 587-588.

[23] Carpenter, op. cit., p. 182.

[24] Young, op. cit., p. 175.

next day. This decision embodied the calling of a mass-meeting for the following day, at which time the assembled citizens would be asked to approve the action of the committee and to authorize the further steps toward taking the power of government into its hands. The committee also asked the Cabinet to take the lead in declaring the throne vacant, advising the ministers that unless they did so that the Committee of Public Safety would proceed without them.[25]

In the meantime the Queen, seeing that she was in danger of losing her throne through a revolution, made peace with the Cabinet. At the same time, she published a notice of her intention to give up her plan of promulgating a new constitution. The Committee of Public Safety was also advised of this intent, and asked to refrain from holding the mass-meeting. In a secret meeting, the Queen and her close followers decided they would hold a counter mass-meeting of the natives in Palace Square, a block from where the other meeting was supposed to be held.[26]

These plans were made on Sunday, January 15, 1893. The next day, it was apparent that the leading citizens of the city were uniting in determination to do away with

---

25 Ibid., p. 177.

26 Ibid., p. 180.

the monarchy. These leading citizens, of course, were the upper class whites who held offices of importance, owned considerable property, and had extensive interests in the way of loans and other investments in Hawaii. Most of them were Americans, their number being augmented by a few English, Germans, and Portuguese.

This group made no effort to conceal the purpose that they had in mind. The Cabinet was advised of their intentions on two separate days, and the Queen's Marshal, Wilson, was informed on Monday noon. The Queen's government was to be overthrown, if necessary by force of arms. Meanwhile, the Queen was making her preparations to resist.[27]

In view of the fact that several thousand American citizens and many million dollars' worth of American property was situated in the neighborhood in which the mass-meetings were to be held, the United States Minister, John L. Stevens, and Captain Wiltse, Commander of the Boston, decided that it would be wise to land a force to protect the Americans and their property. They withheld action at this time, however.

The mass-meetings were held on Monday afternoon of January 16th, the people beginning to assemble early for the occasion. In one meeting were those persons who favored the overthrow of the Queen and her government and the establishment of a republic, with a view to annexation to the United

---

[27] Ibid., p. 182.

States. In the other meeting were the royalists who wished to continue the monarchy under Liliuokalani.

In the first meeting, the report of the Committee of Public Safety was approved and the committee was given authority by the assembly to continue in their program of taking steps to secure permanent maintenance of law and order in Hawaii. In the second meeting, the Queen's assurance was given that she would not attempt any more changes except by constitutional methods.[28]

Meanwhile, many of the white residents had fled the city into the mountains and to Waikiki. The Queen had left the palace and had gone to her private residence in Washington Place. The police had been called in from the streets, while a condition bordering on anarchy existed in Honolulu.[29] At this state of affairs, the Committee of Public Safety called upon Minister Stevens to bring the troops from the Boston ashore to protect them.

> Sir: We, the undersigned citizens and residents of Honolulu, respectfully represent that, in view of recent public events in this Kingdom, culminating in the revolutionary acts of Queen Liliuokalani on Saturday last, the public safety is menaced, and lives and property are in peril, and we appeal to you and the United States forces at your command for assistance.
>
> The Queen, with the aid of armed force, and accompanied by threats of violence and bloodshed from those with whom she was acting, attempted to proclaim a new constitution; and, while prevented for the time being from accomplishing her object, declared publicly

---

[28] Ibid., pp. 184-185.

[29] Carpenter, op. cit., pp. 183-184.

that she would only defer her action.

This conduct and action was upon an occasion and under circumstances which have created general alarm and terror.

We are unable to protect ourselves without aid and therefore pray for the protection of the United States forces.[30]

(Signed by the thirteen members of the Citizens' Committee of Safety)

Troops from the Boston were landed at 5 P. M., and marched to the main part of town, that they might be on hand to protect Americans and their property. The main body of the troops was quartered for the night in Arion Hall, a place ideally situated to command a view of the government buildings, but at some distance from the largest portion of American property.

After the troops were landed and had taken up their stations in the city, the people became less fearful and the night was spent with a feeling of comparative security.[31]

The next day, Tuesday, January 17th, a great crowd gathered near the government building to hear the proclamation of the Committee of Public Safety, abolishing the Hawaiian monarchy and establishing a provisional government, "for the control and management of public affairs and the protection of the public peace,... to exist until terms of

---

30 For. Rel., 1894, App. II, p. 501.

31 Carpenter, op. cit., p. 185.

union with the United States of America" should be negotiated and agreed upon.[32]

While the proclamation was being read, two companies of volunteer troops arrived at the government building to protect the newly established government in its position. The Provisional Government, which had been thus established, had within its control, the government building, the government archives, and the treasury. It still remained for the new government to gain control of the police force, the military force, and the palace held by the Queen's forces.

The Provisional Government had its authority vested in two councils, one, an executive council of four members, and the other, an advisory council of fourteen members with legislative powers. As members of the executive council the following men were chosen: Sanford B. Dole, President and Minister of Foreign Affairs; J. A. King, Minister of the Interior; P. C. Jones, Minister of Finance; and W. O. Smith, Attorney-General. All of these men were Americans long influential in the Hawaiian Islands.[33] Of the fourteen members of the advisory council, six owed allegiance to the United States.[34]

The new government was declared by Minister Stevens

---

[32] Ibid., p. 186.

[33] Hobbs, op. cit., p. 108.

[34] For. Rel., 1894, App. II, p. 595.

to be the de facto government of Hawaii. As such it was recognized by him, January 17, 1893, within two hours after being established. The following is a copy of his note of recognition:

> A Provisional Government having been duly constituted in the place of the recent Government of Queen Liliuokalani, and said Provisional Government being in full possession of the Government buildings, the archives, and the treasury, and in control of the capital of the Hawaiian Islands, I hereby recognize said Provisional Government as the de facto Government of the Hawaiian Islands.
>
> John L. Stevens[35]

President Dole demanded the surrender of the Queen, together with all the government property which she and her forces occupied. The Queen, after failing to secure the protection of the American Minister, finally yielded under protest, appealing to the United States Government to reestablish her as the rightful ruler.

> I, Liliuokalani, by the grace of God and under the constitution of the Hawaiian Kingdom, Queen, do hereby solemnly protest against any and all acts done against myself and the constitutional government of the Hawaiian Kingdom by certain persons claiming to have established a Provisional Government of and for the Kingdom.
>
> That I yield to the superior force of the United States of America, whose minister plenipotentiary, his excellency John L. Stevens, has caused United States troops to be landed at Honolulu and declared that he would support the said Provisional Government.
>
> Now, to avoid any collision of armed forces, and perhaps the loss of life, I do under this protest and impelled by said force yield my authority until such time as the Government of the United States shall,

---

35 Ibid., p. 228.

> upon the facts being presented to it, undo the action of its representative and reinstate me in the authority which I claim as the constitutional sovereign of the Hawaiian Islands.
>
> Done at Honolulu the 17th day of January A. D., 1893.
>
> Liliuokalani R.[36]

This method of surrender was chosen by the advice of her adviser, Paul Neumann, who sought to show that the United States troops were supporting the Provisional Government.

With the surrender of the Queen, the new government came into complete control of all the government buildings and records, as well as the military and civil forces of the ousted monarchy. The next day the Provisional Government was recognized by the representatives of Germany, Austria-Hungary, Italy, Russia, Spain, the Netherlands, Denmark, Belgium, Mexico, Chile, Peru, and China. British and French representatives recognized the new government later.[37]

The revolution had thus been accomplished without the loss of life, and the business interests were now ready to seek for an immediate annexation to the United States, as shown by correspondence of Mr. Stevens with Secretary Foster on January 18th:

> All is quiet here now. Without the sacrifice of a single life this change of government has been accomplished. Language can hardly express the enthusiasm and the profound feeling of relief at this peaceful and salutary change of government. The underlying cause of this profound feeling among the citizens

---

[36] Ibid., pp. 232-233.

[37] Carpenter, op. cit., p. 187.

> is the hope that the United States Government will allow these islands to pass to American control and become American soil.[38]

The Hawaiian Provisional Government immediately sent a special commission to the United States to negotiate a treaty of annexation. This commission of six men included five Americans, two of whom were important business men in the Islands. One was president of a steamship company, and one was a leading lumber merchant, doing business with Puget Sound and Oregon. The commission arrived in Washington on February 3, 1893, presented its credentials to President Harrison, and with Secretary of State Foster, began the task of working out the terms of the desired treaty.[39]

The terms of the treaty were as follows:

> All lands and buildings and other public property of the Hawaiian Islands were ceded to the United States, the Hawaiian public debt was assumed by the United States; the ex-queen was to be paid an annual pension of twenty thousand dollars, and the heir apparent, the Princess Kaiulani, was to receive a sum of one hundred and fifty thousand dollars in satisfaction of her claims to the throne. These concessions to fallen royalty were to be made on condition of an unhesitating and continuous acquiescence in the abrogation of the monarchy and the annexation of the Islands to the United States.[40]

The ex-queen's legal adviser, Paul Neumann, came to

---

[38] For. Rel., 1894, App. II, p. 388.

[39] Carpenter, op. cit., p. 188.

[40] Ibid., p. 188.

the United States, immediately following the commission sent by the Hawaiian Provisional Government. His purpose was to represent the claims of the ex-queen, trying to secure her restoration and, failing in that, to secure for her as large a money indemnity as possible.[41]

Due to the delay of the British and French officials in recognizing the newly established government, there was some fear that a reversal of the revolution might be attempted, supported by the British and the French. This uneasiness led the Provisional Government to send the following request to Minister Stevens:

> Sir: Believing that we are unable to satisfactorily protect life and property, and to prevent civil disorders in Honolulu and throughout the Hawaiian Islands, we hereby, in obedience to the instructions of the advisory council, pray that you will raise the flag of the United States for the protection of the Hawaiian Islands for the time being, and to that end we hereby confer upon the Government of the United States, through you, freedom of occupation of the public buildings of this Government, and of the soil of this country, so far as may be necessary for the exercise of such protection, but not interfering with the administration of public affairs by this Government.[42]

Although this was entirely without sanction by the home government, Minister Stevens complied with the request. Accordingly, on February 1, 1893, he caused to be raised,

---

41 Young, op. cit., pp. 211-212.

42 For. Rel., 1894, App. II, p. 246.

above the government buildings in Honolulu, the American flag in place of the flag of Hawaii.[43]

The arrival of a British war ship, the Garnet, in Honolulu harbor, caused increased uneasiness, especially when rumors were voiced that the English were planning to raise their flag above the palace. The unfortunate situation was not relieved any by the neglect of the English officers to pay proper respect and courtesy to the new government, while they carried on friendly relations with the ex-queen and her adherents.[44]

Outside of a few personal encounters between the members of the rival crews, no incidents occurred during the stay of the Garnet, the English vessel leaving the port in a few weeks. A Japanese war ship soon came, however, and some disturbance followed as a result of Japanese resentment towards the new government of Hawaii and the unofficial United States protectorate. One instance of this was the refusal of the Japanese authorities to release an escaped Japanese prisoner, who had taken refuge on the Japanese man-of-war. After several days of heated argument and correspondence, the escaped convict was turned over to the Hawaiian authorities, and peaceful relations

---

[43] Alexander, op. cit., p. 317.

[44] Carpenter, op. cit., p. 190.

were maintained.[45]

As time progressed, the Provisional Government increased in strength and in its ability to preserve and maintain order within the Islands. Several political clubs were organized, one of which, the so called Annexation Club, had for its aim the speeding up of the time when the Islands would be a part of the United States.

Mr. Stevens was especially desirous of a speedy conclusion of the negotiations for annexation. He had seen the accomplishment of a remarkable revolution which set up an ideal opportunity for the realization of the ambitions and dreams of the American business interests in Hawaii. The goal toward which they had labored for many years was near at hand, it seemed, and Stevens wished to see the thing completed.

On February 1, 1893, he wrote to Secretary Foster:

> The Hawaiian pear is now fully ripe, and this is the golden hour for the United States to pluck it.[46]

The work of the commission in drawing up the annexation treaty was finally completed, and the treaty was signed on February 14th. The following day, President Harrison submitted it to the United States Senate for ratification. A month had elapsed since the Provisional Government took over the control of the Islands; only

---

[45] Young, op. cit., p. 218.

[46] For. Rel., 1894, App. II, p. 244.

seventeen days remained in the term of administration of President Harrison.

All the friends of annexation, knowing that President-elect Cleveland would not be likely to favor the project, were anxious for the Senate to ratify the treaty at once. Despite the desire of these interested persons to rush the treaty through the Senate, the time passed without final action being taken.

With the coming of President Cleveland into office for his second term, on March 4, 1893, the Senate was convened in extra session. However, the treaty of annexation was withdrawn from the Senate's consideration for the President's own examination. This, of course, meant the failure of the treaty, since the new president was in no sense an imperialist. He felt it to be wrong and unjustifiable for a nation as strong as the United States to take over a weaker one like Hawaii, especially since there was some doubt as to the circumstances surrounding the overthrow of the Hawaiian monarchy and the establishment of the new government there. Cleveland thought that he was duty-bound to make an investigation into the matter, in order to determine the part played by the United States or its citizens in this change of government that had been made in the Islands.

CHAPTER III

ANNEXATION REALIZED

In pursuance of Cleveland's plan for investigating the Hawaiian Revolution of January 17, 1893, he appointed Hon. James H. Blount of Macon, Georgia, as special commissioner. Blount was to go to the Hawaiian Islands for the purpose of making "an accurate, full and impartial investigation of the facts attending the subversion of the constitutional government of Hawaii, and the installment in its place of the Provisional Government."[1]

The appointment of Mr. Blount was not submitted for the approval of the Senate, thus making the commissioner a personal representative of President Cleveland. Practically as much power was conferred upon Mr. Blount, however, as if he had been duly approved by the Senate to act as an envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary. He was to have full authority to direct the removal of the United States troops from the Islands, haul down the United States flag from the Government buildings, protect American citizens, and in general, to assume many of the duties hitherto falling upon Mr. Stevens.[2]

---

[1] For. Rel., 1894, App. II, p. 447.

[2] Carpenter, op. cit., pp. 202-203.

The special commissioner, thus sent out, arrived at Honolulu on March 29, 1893. Upon arrival, he was met by Mr. Stevens who offered to provide him with transportation to a cottage which he, Mr. Stevens, and some members of the Annexation Club had selected for Blount's residence during his stay in Hawaii. Mr. Blount refused this invitation, as well as another similar one extended by a group of royal sympathizers waiting at the dock.

The special commissioner then went up to the town in a conveyance of his own hire, and took up residence in a hotel where he would not feel obligated to either of the rival factions.[3]

On March 31, 1893, two days after his arrival in Honolulu, Mr. Blount directed Rear-Admiral J. S. Skerrett, Commander of the Pacific Squadron, to haul the United States flag down from the Government Building and to return the United States troops stationed on the Islands, to their ships. This order was directed to be carried out at eleven o'clock on April 1st.[4]

Acting upon these directions, Rear-Admiral Skerrett gave orders for the flag of the United States to be removed from the Government Building, and for the troops

---

[3] For. Rel., 1894, App. II, p. 471.

[4] Ibid., p. 472.

to be sent to their ships. Captain Hooper stated that no disorder attended the hauling down of the United States flag, and no enthusiasm was evidenced by the natives when their own flag was raised. They seemed entirely indifferent as to what was taking place.[5]

Blount immediately began making inquiry into the true causes of the revolution which had overthrown Queen Liliuokalani and set up a government, controlled to a large extent by citizens of the United States. On April 8, 1893, Blount wrote to Secretary W. Q. Gresham:

> As a class, American citizens here have been the most active in dethroning the Queen, and are active in maintaining the existing Government. If they are thus to participate in the affairs of these islands, and when force is used to suppress such movements on their part the forces of the United States are to be called in to protect their persons and their property, it does seem that our Government encourages them to lawlessness, and its good faith is impugned.
>
> My present impression is that the existing Government owes its being and its maintenance to this perverted influence.[6]

Many interesting things were brought out during the course of these investigations. Men were summoned before Mr. Blount to be interviewed and to make affidavits and statements regarding the events which had transpired in the Islands for several years preceding the overthrow of the

---

[5] Ibid., pp. 474-475

[6] Ibid., p. 476.

monarchy.

The power of the sugar-planters was brought out by testimony that they had frequently bribed the former Hawaiian Government into permitting them to carry out plans and projects to advance their own interests. One instance of this was mentioned by a Mr. C. M. Hyde. He told of the permission given by King Kalakaua for the construction of an irrigation canal which would take its water from a higher point than the old canals had secured water. This greatly diminished the supply of water to be had by the poorer natives and whites who had to continue to take what water came down the old ditches. The King was persuaded to allow this injustice to be done by these powerful sugar-growers in return for a loan of $40,000.[7]

The advantage of annexation to the business and industrial interests was likewise made clear through the interviews with men engaged in the various businesses in the Islands. An interview with Fred H. Hayselden, a stock-raiser, led Mr. Hayselden to make these statements:

> My personal interests would be advanced 100 per cent by annexation. Because we only get 10 cents a pound for our wool. If we had annexation we would get 20 in California.[8]

---

[7] Ibid., p. 823.

[8] Ibid., p. 821.

In answer to a question of what caused the revolution he said:

> Simply 2 cents a pound on sugar-- to get some treaty or arrangement with America. They did not see their way clear to get it in the face of the McKinley bill. They thought Harrison would be reelected and the Republican policy would be continued.[9]

These sugar-growers, upon finding that Harrison was not reelected, decided to try to force annexation upon the Harrison administration before it went out of office. This they were unable to do in the short time between the revolution in January and the inauguration of Cleveland on March 4th.

Mr. Samuel Parker, a royalist, when questioned as to what he thought was the cause of the revolution, laid the blame on the sugar planters and capitalists, who had no confidence in the ministry. He stated that he believed this group would have taken action even if a new constitution had not been proposed by the Queen. According to his further testimony, these capitalists and planters who had become the head of the Provisional Government said that something must be done to get closer relations with the United States, since sugar was down to forty and fifty dollars a ton.[10]

---

[9] Ibid., p. 821.

[10] Ibid., pp. 495-496.

Mr. W. H. Cornwell, the minister of finance appointed January 13, 1893, supported the statements of others as to business interests being largely responsible for the revolution. In a statement made to Special Commissioner Blount he said:

> As a man who, for years, has taken an active part in Hawaiian politics, and as a practical sugar planter of many years' experience, it is not difficult for me to realize the true cause for the late revolution and for the subsequent desire for annexation. The depression in the sugar business which, since the passage of the McKinley bill, had made havoc with the handsome dividends which we have enjoyed since 1875 and the loss of power by the reform party were the only and true reasons for the revolution. The prospects of the sugar bounty was and is the main motive for the desire to be annexed on the part of the handful of responsible men who still desire such step to be taken. That such plans were fully in accord with the policy of the later American Government, from which Mr. Stevens received his instructions, was the only reason why the scheme became feasible.[11]

Mr. Claus Spreckels owned and controlled, through the Spreckels-Irwin Company, nearly one-third of the sugar business of the Islands. He said that the sugar planters favored annexation to the United States provided that the United States would allow the planters to continue to import cheap contract labor to work on the plantations. He also stated that the sugar planters generally thought that the United States would permit them to import cheap labor by some means-- if not by contract, then by some

---

[11] Ibid., pp. 495-496.

other method. At any rate they believed that they could secure cheap labor after annexation, and given cheap labor, the plantations would continue to make profits. Spreckels also stated that the movement for annexation was on the part of property holders seeking to enhance their private interests.[12]

In one of his communications with Secretary Gresham, Special Commissioner Blount affirmed that the controlling element of the white population was connected with the sugar industry. He mentioned that this element had been influential in government affairs for some time, and had, by its influence, forced the Hawaiian Government to negotiate treaties from time to time, which enabled them to obtain cheap labor for the plantations. These same interests had influenced the Government to pay out large sums of money for transportation of the persons so contracted, and for building plantation wharves and other equipment to be used solely by the sugar growers.[13] Blount also wrote:

> The repeal of the duty on sugar in the McKinley act was regarded a severe blow to their interests, and the great idea of statesmanship had been to do something in the shape of treaties with the United States, reducing their duties on agricultural products of the Hawaiian Islands, out of which profit

---

[12] Ibid., p. 980.

[13] Ibid., p. 599.

> might be derived. Annexation has for its charm the complete abolition of all duties on their exports to the United States.
>
> The annexationists expect the United States to govern the islands by so abridging the right of suffrage as to place them in control of the whites.[14]

The Hawaiian Patriotic League presented a statement to Mr. Blount during his investigation, which portrayed the character of the sugar interests in the Islands. In this statement it was said that sugar had proved to be something of a curse to Hawaii. It had been the cause of impoverishing the masses of the natives while making a few foreigners immensely wealthy.[15]

Mr. L. A. Thurston, in a statement to Secretary Gresham, stated that any attempt to restore the monarchy--a step being considered by President Cleveland-- would result in its being overthrown again by the same law-abiding, intelligent, property-owning part of the community as before. He said that a return to the old monarchy would bring the same misrule as had existed during the rule of the late Queen. Such conditions as that, he said, would be ruinous to the material interests in the Islands and to all trade and commerce, most of which was owned and carried on by American citizens and capital.[16]

---

[14] Ibid., p. 599.

[15] Ibid., p. 916.

[16] Ibid., p. 441.

The report of Mr. Blount for June, 1893, showed that there was, at that time, forty Hawaiian sugar plantation corporations operating, with a total capital stock of $28,274,000. Of these forty corporations, four were San Francisco concerns, possessing a total capital stock of $13,800,000, or nearly half of the total. In these forty corporations doing business, American citizens held shares totaling $18,594,695. The British held shares totaling only $4,303,218, and the Germans possessed only $1,233,935 worth of shares.[17]

In another report made at the same time, covering Hawaiian corporations other than sugar plantations, it was shown that there were forty-three such corporations with a total capital stock of $6,150,705. Of this capital stock, shares amounting to $2,690,994 were held by American citizens; shares totaling $1,289,520 were held by German subjects.[18]

In each of the above mentioned reports it is shown that naturalized Hawaiians and Hawaiians of American parentage also held many shares. From the figures presented, it is plain that American citizens had a great interest in the business of the Hawaiian Islands. When it is considered that these investors would be able to make

---

[17] Ibid., pp. 1082-1084.

[18] Ibid., pp. 1110-1112.

profits many times greater than the Islands annexed to the United States, it is not unreasonable to assume that they would use their influence to bring about this annexation.

Certainly the reasons given by some, that the revolution of 1893 was caused by the opposition of the better classes to the passage of the opium and lottery bills, is not very satisfactory, in view of the fact that the very men who were leaders in the revolt also voted for the bills.[19]

It was also plainly disclosed by Blount's investigation that the people of Hawaii as a whole were not enthusiastically demanding annexation to the United States. In fact there was more evidence brought out to the effect that the people of Hawaii were, for the most part, opposed to being annexed by the United States.

Before Mr. Cleveland took his oath of office as President of the United States, a petition from the Patriotic League was sent to him in which the natives, while evincing their desire to promote close political and commercial relations with the United States, expressed their belief that the time had not arrived for them to be deprived of their nationality by annexation to a foreign power. This petition was signed by delegates from five of the Islands

---

[19] Ibid., p. 496.

and by the President of the Patriotic League.[20]

The following is a petition sent to Mr. Blount by the Executive Committee of the Women's Hawaiian Patriotic League, showing the attitude of native Hawaiian women toward the question of annexation to the United States, and setting forth to some extent the reasons underlying the movement for annexation.

> We, the women of the Hawaiian Islands, for our families and the happiness of our homes, desire peace and political quiet, and we pray that man's greed for power and spoils shall not be allowed to disturb the otherwise happy life of these islands, and that the revolutionary agitations and disturbances inaugurated here since 1887, by a few foreigners, may be forever suppressed.
>
> To that effect we believe that, in light of recent events, the peace, welfare, and honor of both America and Hawaii will be better served, for the present, if the Government of the great American Republic does not countenance the illegal conduct and interference of its representatives here and the rash wish of a minority of foreigners for annexation.[21]

Mr. W. H. Cornwell, former minister of finance, stated in relation to the desire of Hawaiians for annexation that the Hawaiians did not wish to lose their independence and that many of the foreign residents were also opposed to annexation.[22] This, of course, could be imagined, since many of the foreign residents had no special business interests to be benefited by such an event.

---

[20] Ibid., p. 504.

[21] Ibid., pp. 491-492.

[22] Ibid., p. 496.

After Mr. Blount had been in the Islands for a little more than a month, he sent a communication to Secretary of State Gresham discussing the attitude of the Hawaiians toward the subject of annexation.

> Up to the period of the hauling down of the United States flag from the Government building there had been inaction on the part of those opposed to annexation. Since then, inspired by that fact, the natives have seemed to act with freedom in expressing their views on the subject of annexation and of the revolution dethroning Liliuokalani. Annexationists and antiannexationists have been active in procuring subscribers to declarations in favor of and against annexation.
>
> At this time the indications are unmistakable that a large majority of the people of the Islands are utterly opposed to annexation. I do not look for any change from this situation through future information. I shall be careful, however, to keep myself free to entertain any and all facts in relation thereto, that I may report with accuracy to you.
>
> There is a strong disposition on the part of the annexation element to suppress expressions against annexation by social and business hostility.[23]

A few weeks later, Mr. Blount reported that more than eight thousand names had been signed to petitions by the Women's Hawaiian Patriotic League asking for Queen Liliuokalani to be restored. Memorials had also been signed against annexation by seven thousand five hundred native voters. He reported also that the Annexation Club had a few more than five thousand names on their books, of persons desiring annexation. These names were, for the

---

[23] Ibid., pp. 501-502.

most part, those of American citizens. Many of these people had not registered as voters. Some natives had signed the books of the Annexation Club, but Mr. Blount pointed out that most of them who had done so, were influenced by fear of losing their means of earning a livelihood.[24]

In an interview with Mr. H. Center, manager of the Hawaiian Commercial and Sugar Company, Mr. Center stated that if the question of annexation was voted on by secret ballot that there would be an overwhelming majority against annexation. No native would vote for it unless influenced to do so. As to his own desire in regard to annexation, Center said that it would be very beneficial to his business of producing sugar.[25]

In Mr. Blount's final report on the question of the people of the Islands wanting to be annexed to the United States, he said:

> The testimony of leading annexationists is that if the question of annexation was submitted to a popular vote, excluding all persons who could not read and write except foreigners (under the Australian-ballot system, which is the law of the land), that annexation would be defeated.
>
> From a careful inquiry I am satisfied that it would be defeated by a vote of at least two to one. If the votes of persons claiming allegiance to foreign countries were excluded, it would be defeated by more than five to one.

---

[24] Ibid., pp. 532-533.

[25] Ibid., pp. 740-741.

> The undoubted sentiment of the people is for the Queen, against the Provisional Government, and against annexation. A majority of the whites, especially Americans, are for annexation.[26]

The groups favoring annexation worked continually in an effort to turn the opinion of the people of Hawaii to their side. The Annexation Club established the Hawaiian Star, a newspaper to sponsor annexation, and made Walter G. Smith, an ardent annexationist, editor. The Pacific Commercial Advertiser was another paper published in the interests of annexation. The American League was also established to help spread annexation propaganda.

Despite these efforts on the part of the Americans to gain their end immediately following the revolution, they were forced to continue their struggle for several years. Mr. Blount returned to Washington shortly after sending his final report to the Secretary of State on July 17, 1893. The report which he sent caused President Cleveland to resolve that the Queen should be restored to her throne.

Acting to carry out this resolution, Cleveland appointed Albert S. Willis to go to Honolulu as Minister. Mr. Willis was instructed to inform Liliuokalani of the President's decision, and secure from her a promise to grant full pardon and amnesty to those involved in the revolution. Following the receipt of such a promise from the ex-Queen, Willis was then to demand the President and

---

26 Ibid., p. 599.

ministers of the Provisional Government to surrender the Hawaiian Government to her.[27]

Mr. Willis reached Honolulu early in November, 1893, and proceeded to carry out the instructions which had been given to him. He informed the ex-Queen that President Cleveland would like to see her restored to her former position as Queen, but his first efforts to get her to agree that those persons engaged in the revolution should be granted pardon met with failure. Liliuokalani said that she would have them beheaded. Through his persuasion in later interviews, she agreed to modify this punishment by banishing the guilty persons and by confiscating their property.[28] At length, after numerous discussions with the American Minister, who assured her that only complete amnesty would bring action of the President in her behalf, the ex-Queen sent a letter to Mr. Willis as follows:

Washington Place,
Honolulu, December 18, 1893

His Excellency Albert Willis,
Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary,
U. S. A.:

Sir: Since I had the interview with you this morning I have given the most careful and conscientious thought as to my duty, and I now of my own free will give my conclusions:

---

[27] Alexander, op. cit., p. 318.

[28] Carpenter, op. cit., pp. 214-215.

> I must not feel vengeful to any of my people. If I am restored by the United States I must forget myself and remember only my dear people and my country. I must forgive and forget the past, permit no proscription or punishment of any one, but trusting that all will hereafter work together in peace and friendship for the good and for the glory of our beautiful and once happy land.
>
> Asking you to bear to the President and to the Government he represents a message of gratitude from me and from my people, and promising, with God's grace, to prove worthy of the confidence and friendship of your people,
>
> I am, etc.,
>
> Liliuokalani[29]

With the letter to Mr. Willis, the ex-Queen included an agreement by which she faithfully promised, upon being restored to the throne, to issue a proclamation granting full pardon and amnesty to all who had participated in the January 17th revolution.

Having received this promise from Liliuokalani, Minister Willis made ready to demand the restoration to be made. On the same day that Liliuokalani's promise was received, President Dole sent a note to Mr. Willis, asking if he was acting in any way hostile to the Provisional Government. Minister Willis did not answer this note immediately, but asked an audience of President Dole on the next day that he might inform Dole of President Cleveland's wishes in regard to restoration. Being granted

---

[29] For. Rel., 1894, App. II, p. 1269.

this privilege of an audience, Mr. Willis went to the Executive Building where he made known the desires of Cleveland. In his declaration, he said:

> It becomes my further duty to advise you, sir, the executive of the Provisional Government and your ministers, of the President's determination of the question, which your action and that of the Queen devolved upon him, and that you are expected to promptly relinquish to her her constitutional authority.
>
> And now, Mr. President, and gentlemen of the Provisional Government, with a deep and solemn sense of the gravity of the situation and with the earnest hope that your answer will be inspired by that high patriotism which forgets self-interest, in the name and by the authority of the United States of America, I submit to you the question, "Are you willing to abide by the decision of the President?"[30]

In a communication dated December 23, 1893, Mr. Dole, as Minister of Foreign Affairs, answered the demand made by Mr. Willis:

> While we accept the decision of the President of the United States, declining further to consider the annexation proposition, as the final conclusion of the present administration, we do not feel inclined to regard it as the last word of the American Government upon this subject.....
>
> We do not recognize the right of the President of the United States to interfere in our domestic affairs.
>
> If your contention that President Cleveland believes that this Government and the ex-Queen have submitted their respective claims to the sovereignty of this country to the adjudication of the United States is correct, then, may I ask, when and where

---

[30] Ibid., p. 1275.

> has the President held his court of arbitration?
> I am instructed to inform you, Mr. Minister, that the Provisional Government of the Hawaiian Islands respectfully and unhesitatingly declines to entertain the proposition of the President of the United States that it should surrender its authority to the ex-Queen.[31]

After this refusal by the Provisional Government to surrender authority to Liliuokalani, an attempt was made by the United States naval forces stationed in Honolulu harbor to bluff President Dole and his ministers into acceding to Cleveland's demand for restoration. Landing parties were formed on the decks of the Philadelphia and the Adams, two war vessels stationed in the harbor. When preparation was made on the part of the Provisional Government to oppose the landing, the troops aboard the ships were dispersed and no further threat to make the restoration by force occurred.[32]

Since President Cleveland had made known his opinion about the affairs in Hawaii, and had announced that he would not again submit the annexation treaty to the Senate, all hope of immediate annexation was abandoned by the persons interested in the project. At this time, however, the two political clubs, the American League and the Union Party, that had been working separately to bring about annexation, joined together in forming a new

---

[31] Ibid., pp. 1276-1282.

[32] Carpenter, op. cit., pp. 221-224.

organization known as the American Union Party. The purpose of this organization, of course, was to work towards the accomplishment of a political union with the United States. It became plain that President Cleveland would have to retire from office before the plan could be carried further. Meanwhile, a more permanent form of government would have to be established to govern the Islands.

On March 15, 1894, an act was passed in Hawaii which provided for the election of a number of delegates to attend a constitutional convention where a constitution would be drawn up for the new Hawaiian Government. Voters for the delegates were required to take an oath of allegiance to the Provisional Government.[33]

The constitutional convention met in Honolulu, May 30, 1894, and an executive council was chosen to work out the details of the proposed constitution. On June 1, 1894, the council submitted the original draft to the convention, where it was discussed and some revisions made.

As finally adopted, the constitution provided for the establishment of a republic. The executive power was to be vested in a President, and a cabinet composed of four members.

---

[33] For. Rel., 1894, App. II, pp. 1311-1312.

The legislative power was vested in a legislature of two houses, Senate and House of Representatives, each composed of fifteen members. The judicial power was vested in one supreme court and in as many inferior courts as might be established by the legislature.[34]

It had been the custom for many years to observe the Fourth of July in Hawaii by some sort of celebration presided over by the American Minister. Mr. Blount adhered to the custom and presided while he was in the Islands, and Mr. Willis presided in 1894. Much American sentiment was reflected in the observance of the holiday on each occasion. July 4, 1894, was no exception to this, and in addition, was a day for celebration because of reasons more strictly Hawaiian in nature.[35]

At eight o'clock on the morning of July 4, 1894, the Republic of Hawaii was proclaimed from the steps of the Executive Building by President Dole, who had been elected to the position of President of the new republic. The following proclamation was read:

> I, Sanford B. Dole, President of the Provisional Government of the Hawaiian Islands, by virtue of the charge to me given by the executive and advisory councils of the Provisional Government, and by act dated July 3, 1894, proclaim the Republic of Hawaii as the sovereign authority over and throughout the

---

[34] Ibid., pp. 1350-1371.

[35] Ibid., p. 1345.

> Hawaiian Islands from this time forth. And I declare the constitution framed by the constitutional convention of 1894 to be the constitution and the supreme law of the Republic of Hawaii, and by virtue of this constitution I now assume the office and authority of President thereof.
>
> "God save the Republic." [36]

The next day as part of a communication from Mr. Willis to Mr. Hatch, Minister of Foreign Affairs, Mr. Willis stated:

> I hereby, as far as I have the right so to do, extend to the Republic of Hawaii the recognition accorded its predecessor, the Provisional Government of the Hawaiian Islands. I do this in the belief that I represent the President of the United States, to whom, as the Executive Chief of the Government, my action in the premises will be promptly submitted for his necessary approval.[37]

President Dole appointed as his cabinet for the government of the Republic: James A. King, minister of the interior; Samuel M. Damon, minister of finance; William O. Smith, attorney-general; and Francis M. Hatch, minister of foreign affairs. All of these men had been connected with the Provisional Government as office-holders.

In the same summer that the Hawaiian Republic was proclaimed, a committee of royalists went to Washington in the hopes of securing some support in a projected uprising against the new Hawaiian Government. Upon learning that

---

[36] Ibid., pp. 1372-1373.

[37] Ibid., p. 1374.

the United States Government would not lend any assistance to such an undertaking, the committee went back to Hawaii. On the way, the committee purchased a quantity of arms and ammunition on the Pacific Coast and shipped this from San Francisco to the Islands.[38]

The following January, a revolt was inaugurated against the Republic of Hawaii. It was promptly suppressed by the forces of the Republic. On January 16, 1895, after a little over a week of revolt in the Islands, Liliuokalani was arrested and made a prisoner of the Republic. On January 25, 1895, the ex-Queen renounced her claim to the throne of the late monarchy, and took the oath of allegiance to the new Republic.[39] After nine months of imprisonment, Liliuokalani was granted a pardon by the Hawaiian Republic for the part which she had played in the revolt.[40]

Meantime, the question of Hawaiian annexation was becoming a party question in the United States. The Republican presidential convention, meeting in Chicago in the summer of 1896, made a resolution favoring Hawaiian annexation one of the planks in its platform.[41] In the

---

38 Carpenter, op. cit., p. 231.

39 Foreign Relations of the United States, 1895, Part II, (Washington, 1896), pp. 818-822.

40 Foreign Relations of the United States, 1896, (Washington, 1897), p. 388.

41 Carpenter, op. cit., pp. 241-242.

elections of that year, the Republican candidate, William McKinley, was elected President. He was known to be favorable to annexation, and this fact caused the hopes of the annexationists to rise to new heights.

Ex-Queen Liliuokalani came to the United States in the interest of preventing annexation. After visiting in Boston for a time, she took up her residence in Washington. She gave numerous social receptions during the winter, endeavoring to win support for her opposition. When Congress convened, following the inauguration of President McKinley, Liliuokalani employed a number of lobbyists to work in her behalf. It is also said that the great sugar-refining interests of our own country made similar efforts to prevent annexation from becoming a reality.[42]

While these groups were working to prevent the annexation of Hawaii, there were others working equally as hard to bring it about. The following is taken from a speech made in the Senate by Senator Perkins from California:

> It was stated by my friend from Illinois (Mr. Palmer) yesterday that we imported into the United States $12,000,000 worth of imports and exported only about $4,000,000 in value during the year 1893.
>
> It is American industry, it is American enterprise, that went down to those islands of the Pacific, that helped develop their resources and made their soil, which was barren, fruitful, by bringing streams from the mountains and irrigating

---

[42] Ibid., pp. 242-243.

> the soil on the slopes of those mountains, which has become so rich that it is producing to-day 5, 6, and as high as 7 tons of sugar to the acre. Seventy-seven per cent of the property in the islands belong to American citizens. ... and that $12,000,000 which has been brought into this country is not sent back to the islands, but 50, 60, or 70 per cent of it is kept here among our people. It is paid out for machinery, paid out to the farmer for live stock, which he sends to the islands to do the work, for there they can not raise mules and horses and cattle to advantage in sufficient numbers to supply their wants. Every week one, two or a half dozen vessels leave San Francisco, laden with the product of the farm, with live stock, with cereals, for the people in those islands. We build their vessels for them. Ninety-eight per cent of the vessels in the Sandwich Islands have been built in the United States. Six or eight have been built in the Atlantic States, and the others have been built in California, in Oregon, and in Washington.
>
> We are allied to the people of those islands by the strongest commercial ties. Their interest is our interest, and our interest is their interest. So far as making that soil productive, we have built thousands of miles of large iron and steel pipes to convey water over deep chasms, over great gulches, and over barren lava beds to irrigate and make fruitful a soil that never produced before. Our commercial interest is therefore with them, for the money which they earn comes to and is expended in this country. The money that we receive from the Hawaiian Islands is kept in this country. I could cite to you hundreds and thousands of instances where such money has built up towns in our own country.[43]

Another illustration of the interest being evidenced in desire for annexation is seen in the following excerpt from a speech made in the Senate by Senator Kyle of South Dakota:

> There is every reason why these islands should be ours. We gave them civilization; our nation colonized them, and gave them their Government. American wealth and enterprise are to-day the backbone of the islands, and nearly nine-tenths of the invested capital is

---

[43] Congressional Record, XXVII, Part 3, Fifty-third Congress, third session, (Washington, 1895), 1946.

American...

> Next to Great Britain the islands get more of the Pacific Coast trade than any other nation; the islands are midway on the ocean route from our coast to Australia; are valuable as a coaling station, and are the key to military control of the Pacific; they are of more benefit commercially to the United States in one year than Alaska will be in a lifetime; they give us more than we receive; they are and have been practically under the protection of the United States for a half century.[44]

About the same time Congress was informed that the New Hampshire Senate and House of Representatives had passed concurrent resolutions favoring the annexation of Hawaii, one of the reasons being stated as: annexation is desirable because of the large number of Americans in the Islands and the close commercial relations existing between the Islands and the United States.[45]

Meanwhile the commerce of the Islands continued to be practically monopolized by the United States.

> Among the countries participating in the foreign commerce of Hawaii, the United States is by far the most favored, enjoying fully 90 per cent of the entire trade of the Islands. In the five-year period 1887-1891, the exact portion of the total trade credited to the United States was 91.20 per cent. According to the returns for the succeeding five years, 1892-1896, our share for that period was 91.92 per cent.[46]

To these figures we may add that the total exports to

---

[44] Ibid., pp. 1937-1938.

[45] Ibid., p. 2319.

[46] American Republics Bureau, Bulletin No. 85, (Washington, 1898), p. 118.

the United States comprised 98.42 per cent of the total Hawaiian exports in 1894 and 99.04 per cent in 1895. In these same years imports from the United States into the Islands composed 76.23 per cent and 79,04 per cent of the total imports, respectively.[47]

The total value of Hawaiian exports for the quarter ending March 31, 1895, was $3,155,968.77. Of this amount sugar accounted for $3,034,129.00. The total quantity of sugar exported this period was 109,501,981 pounds.[48] Excluding transients, practically every person in the Islands prospered or failed to prosper according to the profits of the plantations. Security of market for their products would come with annexation.[49]

President McKinley's inauguration in March, 1897, was the signal for the renewing of negotiations for a treaty of annexation. While the negotiations were in progress, much was being said in Congress on the subject, and petitions favoring Congressional support of an annexation treaty were being received by the members of Congress, individually and collectively. The following is a petition from the Chamber of Commerce of Seattle, Washington, urging the annexation of Hawaii for business

---

[47] Ibid., p. 88.

[48] Consular Reports, 1895, XLVIII, (Washington, 1895), 623.

[49] Consular Reports, June, 1899, LX, No. 225, (Washington, 1900), 291.

reasons:

To the Honorable the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress Assembled:

The Chamber of Commerce of the city of Seattle presents this petition for the annexation to the United States of the Islands of Hawaii. The relations of our Republic with that country have always been of the most intimate and interesting character, and the feelings of the two peoples have been more near and more friendly than have been those of any other peoples with our own. In consequence of this good feeling and of these near relations, and of our mutual, reciprocal wants, the commercial intercourse between the peoples of these two countries has increased year by year until it has become enormous in proportions, exceeding in value anything of the kind to be found in any other part of the world, amounting to $150 per annum for every inhabitant of the islands. Were our trade with Canada in like proportion it would exceed $750,000,000 per annum instead of about $80,000,000, as at present.

Did we trade with Mexico, our next-door neighbor, in like ratio, our purchases from and our sales to our friends on the south would amount to $1,800,000,000 in a single year, instead of one-sixtieth of that figure, or $30,000,000, as they actually are in value, and would equal the entire foreign commerce of the United States. Were we so intimately connected with Great Britain and Ireland, our relations with the shrewd, clever traders of that Kingdom would amount in dollars to nearly six thousand millions per annum, a figure 1,000 per cent above the real money value of the trade in question. Did the United States deal with all foreign people upon the same basis as the Hawaiians do with us, our exports and imports would exceed the enormous figure of ten thousand million dollars and would be six times greater than they are at present.

But not only is the American Hawaiian trade so great per capita, but it is great also in volume, amounting to $15,000,000 per annum, and its destruction would be a serious and severe blow to even so numerous and strong a people as those of the United States. And not only that, but the great bulk of the trade of these friendly Hawaiians is given to the United States, upward of 90 per cent of the whole.

Further, this trade is and always has been chiefly in the hands of American citizens, who in the islands have vast interests, and who either there or at home control the shipping and all other elements that go to constitute this enormous, unequaled, and lucrative trade.

There they have been nearer home and nearer to the old flag than they could have been in any other spot outside of our own national limits. They have taken with them their schools, their churches, their fraternal societies, and they have long contemplated the day when the national emblem will wave over them undisputed and alone.

The people of Washington are vastly interested in this island group. On the 3d of May, 1897, a single ship, bound for Honolulu, took out of the port of Seattle 4,000 tons of American coal, lumber, lime, flour, and other native products. She will return in a few weeks with fruit and other produce of the islands. Hundreds of millions of feet of Puget Sound lumber have in the past gone into that friendly country, and the trade of our people is now larger than ever before. The first legislature that met in this Territory of Washington--that of 1854--asked the Federal Government to take steps necessary to secure the annexation of these islands to the United States. The importance of the matter was recognized then and has been since by succeeding legislatures and lesser bodies of a commercial and public character. We can not do better than reiterate their statements and request, which we now do formally, earnestly, and hopefully. The acquisition of this group of islands, so considerable in extent, so rich in resources, so vast in trade, so promising for the future, so situated opposite our coast, would be, it is believed, a tower of strength to the United States, which our Government should not longer delay in establishing for the protection and benefit of our own country and people.

By Edward O. Graves, President

Attest:

Ernest Shrig, Secretary.

Adopted May 12, 1897.[50]

The annexation treaty was concluded and signed June 16, 1897. While it was being considered in the Senate, the

---

[50] Congressional Record, XXX, Part 2, Fifty-fifth Congress, first session, (Washington, 1897), 1218-1219.

Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, California, California wrote to Hon. George C. Perkins, representing the state of California in the Senate. In this letter of June 29, 1897, they asked him to present an enclosed petition for annexation to Congress and to work to see that the annexation treaty was adopted. It was pointed out in the letter that the Pacific Coast interests demanded that annexation should speedily take place as a commercial necessity.[51]

The petition which the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce sent to Congress pointed out the economic value to California of Hawaiian annexation in words as follows:

> From the day that annexation is proclaimed, San Francisco and California will feel the impulse of the increased commerce, which even now goes abroad from Hawaii. Her commercial marine, of considerable volume and mostly of American build, will come under our flag, and her American population will rapidly increase. Our countrymen will have another field for their enterprise and energy. Her agriculture will become diversified instead of being restricted to the growth of sugar cane, and labor will greatly increase in value. Our beet-sugar interests should have no more fear of Hawaii under our flag than of Louisiana.
>
> It would be a serious blow to the prosperity of California to lose its Hawaiian trade. The vessels employed are largely the products of our ship-yards, manned mostly by our citizens, disbursed at our seaports, and laden hence with products of our farms and factories. Hawaii is in fact the best market that California has for its farm products and local manufactures.

---

[51] Ibid., pp. 2126-2127.

> We shall establish a naval station and coal depots there, and the islands will become the connecting link between our northwest coast and the growing commerce of Oceanica and eastern Asia.
>
> If we intend to push our commerce and manufactures in competition with the world, we need the Hawaiian Islands. Every consideration of patriotism and commercial interest should induce us to support our Government in the policy it has adopted.
>
> We deem the reasons we have presented conclusive, and we respectfully request their support from the commercial organizations and our fellow-citizens of the Pacific Coast.[52]

J. M. Schofield, retired army engineer, in a correspondence with Senator Morgan of Florida, said that Americans had rescued Hawaii from a state of barbarism, developed it into a prosperous country, taken over the government and wanted to add this country to their own native land.[53] At the same time, it was plain that the native Hawaiians had not changed their attitude toward annexation.

> The Hawaiians are nearly a unit in insisting that their national life shall not be blotted out. They have sent a remonstrance to Washington signed by nearly all their people, and have also sent a delegation of their own people to make known their views.[54]

The Chinese, Japanese, and Portuguese also opposed

---

[52] Congressional Record, XXX, part 3, Fifty-fifth Congress, first session, (Washington, 1897), 2273.

[53] Senate Document No. 62, Fifty-fifth Congress, second session, III, (Washington, 1898), 2.

[54] Senate Document No. 82, Fifty-fifth Congress, second session, IV, (Washington, 1898), 11.

annexation, as did many of the Americans.[55]

There was much opposition to the proposed treaty in the Senate, in fact, so much that Senator Davis, Chairman of the Committee of Foreign Affairs, would not report it to the Senate because it would have lacked two or three votes of securing the necessary two-thirds majority.[56]

After a prolonged discussion, it was decided that a joint resolution should be introduced in the Senate and the House of Representatives to provide for the annexation. The joint resolution could accomplish the same results as the treaty and would require only a simple majority vote to carry. According to this plan the Newlands Resolution was introduced, being nearly identical to the proposed treaty.[57]

In the meantime, the Spanish-American War had broken out, and the battle of Manilla Bay had been won. This made the Hawaiian Islands of more importance to the United States than ever before, for naval reasons. The Hawaiian Government did not proclaim neutrality as would ordinarily be the case when two other nations engaged in war. The port at Honolulu was opened to American naval vessels and

---

55 Ibid., p. 11

56 Carpenter, op. cit., p. 244.

57 Ibid., p. 244.

American troops were welcomed to Hawaiian shores.[58]

Such friendly action on the part of the Hawaiian Government made a marked impression on the people of the United States. The resolution in Congress providing for annexation was speedily passed after a brief period of debates. In the House of Representatives the vote was 209 to 91, and in the Senate it passed by a vote of 42 to 21.[59]

On July 7, 1898, President McKinley signed the resolution. Admiral Miller, of the United States Navy, was charged with the duty of carrying the message to the President of the Hawaiian Republic. At noon, August 12, 1898, the ceremony of transferring the sovereignty of the Islands to the United States took place. Following the reading of the joint resolution, President Dole yielded the sovereignty and public property of the Hawaiian Islands. Minister Sewell accepted, and Admiral Miller directed the change of flags.

The flag which had been lowered from the same flag pole five years before, by order of Commissioner Blount, had been carefully preserved during this time by Lucien Young, a naval officer aboard the Boston. This same flag was now to be raised again.[60]

---

58 Ibid., p. 244.

59 Alexander, op. cit., p. 322.

60 Young, op. cit., pp. 302-303.

The Hawaiian flag was lowered while their national anthem was played. The American flag was then raised while the American band played the "Star Spangled Banner."

The Hawaiian Islands were a part of the United States. The long struggle of the persons interested in annexation was ended. While it cannot be said that the American business interests were solely responsible for this accomplishment, nevertheless, they played a very important part in bringing it about. The events leading to annexation were a continuous process, and as President McKinley said in one of his messages to Congress, "Under such circumstances, annexation is not a change; it is a consummation."[61]

---

[61] American Republics Bureau, Bulletin No. 85, (Washington, 1898), p. 57.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

American Republics Bureau, Bulletin No. 85, Government Printing Office, Washington, 1898.

Congressional Record, XXIV, Fifty-second Congress, second session, Government Printing Office, Washington, 1893.

Congressional Record, XXVII, Fifty-third Congress, third session, Government Printing Office, Washington, 1895.

Congressional Record, XXX, Part 2, Fifty-fifth Congress, first session, Government Printing Office, Washington, 1897.

Congressional Record, XXX, Part 3, Fifty-fifth Congress, first session, Government Printing Office, Washington, 1897.

Congressional Record, XXXI, Fifty-fifth Congress, third session, Government Printing Office, Washington, 1897.

Consular Reports, 1895, XLVIII, Government Printing Office, Washington, 1895.

Consular Reports, June, 1899, LX, Government Printing Office, Washington, 1900.

Foreign Relations, 1882-83, Government Printing Office, Washington, 1883.

Foreign Relations, 1894, Appendix II, Government Printing Office, Washington, 1895.

Foreign Relations, 1895, Part II, Government Printing Office, Washington, 1896.

Foreign Relations, 1896, Government Printing Office, Washington, 1897.

House Executive Document, No. 48, Fifty-third Congress, second session, Government Printing Office, Washington, 1895.

House Executive Document, No. 70, Fifty-third Congress, second session, Government Printing Office, Washington, 1895.

House Executive Document No. 76, Fifty-third Congress, second session, Government Printing Office, Washington, 1895.

Senate Document, No. 62, Fifty-fifth Congress, second session, Government Printing Office, Washington, 1898.

Senate Document, No. 82, Fifty-fifth Congress, second session, Government Printing Office, Washington, 1898.

Moore, John Bassett, Compiler, Digest of International Law, 8 Volumes. Washington Printing Office, Washington, 1906.

Secondary Sources

Alexander, William DeWitt, A Brief History of the Hawaiian People. American Book Co., New York, 1899.

Bemis, Samuel Flagg, A Diplomatic History of the United States. Henry Holt and Co., New York, 1936.

Carpenter, Edmund Janes, America in Hawaii. Small Maynard, and Co., Boston, 1899.

Ellis, Lippert Spring. The Tariff on Sugar. The Rawleigh Foundation, Freeport, Ill., 1933.

Foster, John Watson. American Diplomacy in the Orient. Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston, 1926.

Hobbs, Jean. Hawaii: A Pageant of the Soil. Stanford University Press, Stanford Univ., Calif., 1935.

Hooley, Osborne E. "Hawaiian Negotiation for Reciprocity, 1855-1857", Pacific Historical Review, VII (June, 1938), 128-146.

Kuykendall, Ralph S., "Early Hawaiian Commercial Development." Pacific Historical Review, III (1934), 384-385.

Schofield, Guy H. The Pacific; Its Past and Future. John Murray, London, 1919.

Taussig, F. W. The Tariff History of the United States. G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York, 1914.

Whitney, Caspar. Hawaiian America. Harper and Brothers, New York, 1902.

Young, Lucien. The Real Hawaii. Doubleday and McClure Co., New York, 1899.

Typist: Pauline Streeter