

From “Vanishing Race” to Friendly Ally: Japanese American Perceptions of Native Hawaiians during the Interwar Years

*Hiromi MONOBE**

INTRODUCTION

This article explores how the perceptions of Native Hawaiians among Japanese residents in Hawai‘i shifted in the context of race relations in the islands during the interwar years of the late 1910s through the early 1940s.¹ Guided by the theory of racial formation, the author pays particular attention to the interconnected nature of representation and social structure whereby local white-Japanese relations exerted a constant influence, not only on the form and state of interactions between Japanese and Native Hawaiians, but also on how the former viewed the latter.² Existing scholarship on the pre-World War II history of Japanese in Hawai‘i focuses primarily on their relationship to white elites (plantation owners), characterizing the former as “oppressors” and the latter as “the oppressed.” This article adds a third—and complicating—dimension to the typical binary view of race relations in the islands by examining how Japanese residents—both immigrants and their local-born Nisei children—looked at and interacted with Native Hawaiians under white hegemony.

*Associate Professor, Doshisha University

During the 1920s and 1930s, Japanese Americans found their social, economic, and political status gradually rising, although they remained less influential politically than Native Hawaiians, who held U.S. citizenship and had certain other privileges due to being indigenous to the islands.³ Having been brought to the islands as a labor force for sugar plantations, first-generation Japanese immigrants, known as Issei, occupied the bottom rung of the socioeconomic ladder in Hawai‘i. Their legal status as “aliens ineligible for citizenship” rendered them, in the words of historian Yuji Ichioka, a “political pariah,” without voting rights. This was despite their significant economic ascent as a community leading up to the 1920s and afterward.⁴ To fight racial marginalization and discrimination, the first two generations of Japanese in Hawai‘i, Issei and Nisei, devised various strategies of racial self-representation, which also affected their attitudes and behavior toward Native Hawaiians. Initially, many immigrant intellectuals were strongly influenced by the racial ideology of imperial Japan, which borrowed the language of civilization and progress to portray Japanese as racially equal to Euro-American whites and placed peoples of non-Japanese nonwhite origin in a position of inferiority. Native Hawaiians were viewed and thought about accordingly, for a negative perception and skewed representation both justified and predicted the inevitable ascendancy of the Japanese in Hawai‘i over other minority races there.

This initial strategy of racial self-empowerment nonetheless underwent a notable transformation in the thinking of key community leaders, who, in the context of their permanent settlement in Hawai‘i, reoriented their perspective to the local reality under which they lived their everyday lives. Whereas their compatriots back home could rely on Japan’s sovereign military might to dominate other groups, the conditions of white hegemony in Hawai‘i made it difficult for Issei and Nisei to imagine an easy overturning of the existing racial order solely on the basis of their belief in their own innate racial superiority. Against this background, a number of Japanese Americans, especially of the second generation, began to forge a more amicable and sympathetic view of Native Hawaiians as a people who shared a similar set of issues as themselves—as racialized minorities under the dictate of white plantation owners and the local Republican oligarchy. Working toward the goal of a more racially equitable Hawai‘i, some Nisei leaders even developed a sense of interracial “partnership” with Native Hawaiians, similar to what post-1980s scholars have termed a “local identity.”⁵

Focusing on the historical evolution of the Japanese immigrant-Native Hawaiian relationship under white rule provides a more nuanced and complete understanding of race relations in Hawai‘i. The theory of “racial triangulation” is especially useful for re-visioning the racial entanglements of peoples in the islands. While Claire Jean Kim developed this theory to unveil the complex mechanism of racial formation (the formation of socially constructed racial identities) among Asians, whites, and blacks, this present article proposes to treat Japanese Americans as “occupy[ing] a distinctive ‘third’ position” relative to whites and Native Hawaiians.⁶ From the 1990s onward, studies on Asian immigrant settler colonialism draw on a similar kind of multiracial formation in critically examining the power that Asian Americans—especially Japanese Americans—have exerted over Native Hawaiians in *contemporary* Hawai‘i.⁷ Yet, the way that triangular race relations looked and unfolded in the islands prior to World War II has not been fully investigated. Rather, it appears as if some scholars presume that Japanese Americans have always held the upper hand over Native Hawaiians, even during the prewar years.⁸ As a result, racial conflict and oppression are the predominant themes in studies of Asian settler colonialism. To help provide a more complete picture, this article examines not only conflict but also collaboration between the two nonwhite groups in the society of Hawai‘i. Decades before the dramatic ascendancy of the Nisei, local Japanese and Hawaiians did struggle to rise above each under white hegemony. At times, however, individuals from the two groups also developed close personal ties and cooperated politically as allies in an effort to improve their common status as racialized minorities in prewar Hawai‘i.

THE EMERGENCE OF MULTIFACETED RACE RELATIONS AND WHITE HEGEMONY IN HAWAI‘I

Hawai‘i was originally a kingdom of indigenous people. After the 1820 arrival of Christian missionaries from the East Coast of the continental United States, many whites settled in Hawai‘i and became involved in the sugar industry, beginning in the 1830s. To develop and expand their sugar business, these whites needed land and labor. To secure these, they persuaded leaders of the Hawaiian government to establish a new land system and labor law. Previously, all land in the islands belonged to the king, and private ownership was not allowed. In

1848 a drastic land reform, the Great Mahele, was carried out, which allowed white foreigners as well as native commoners to gain title to land. While many natives did not understand the meaning of land ownership, white capitalists clearly did, and this paved the way for them to obtain vast tracts of land for sugar plantations. In 1850, the government also enacted the Masters and Servants Act, which contained clauses governing the relationship between plantation owners and plantation laborers. The act allowed an employer to prosecute a worker if the worker broke his side of the labor contract (for example by running away from the plantation), thus giving employers more control over their employees. In these ways, the enactment of the new land and labor laws contributed to solidifying the plantation system in Hawai‘i.⁹

Initially, Hawaiians were employed as sugar plantation laborers, but they tended to quit when their contract ended and return to their traditional self-sufficient lifestyle. Next, Chinese workers were brought over as laborers, but after the passage of the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882, Chinese were prohibited from entering Hawai‘i. In 1885, Japanese immigrants began arriving in the islands under an agreement reached between the Hawaiian and Japanese governments, and an influx of Japanese continued until the early twentieth century. In 1893, the Reform Party, composed mainly of white sugar businessmen, overthrew Hawai‘i’s monarchy and established a provisional government. In the following year, the same group of whites established the Republic of Hawaii. The Republic’s government sought to strengthen political and economic ties with America, and in 1898 Hawai‘i was annexed by the United States, becoming the Territory of Hawaii. Hawai‘i remained an American territory for more than half a century before finally joining the union as the fiftieth state in 1959.¹⁰

One of the most conspicuous characteristics of Hawai‘i was the rich variety of its racial and ethnic mix. Immigrants came not just from China and Japan but also, around the turn of the century, from Portugal, Norway, Germany, and Puerto Rico. This contributed to diversifying the islands’ population. Among the immigrants, the most powerful were the descendants of Christian missionaries and other groups of Anglo-Saxon origin. Although they intermarried with the Hawaiian royal family and were thus of mixed blood, these people constituted a “white elite segment” that occupied the pinnacle of Hawai‘i’s social hierarchy. In the 1920s and 1930s, Japanese were numerically dominant, constituting nearly 40 percent of the territorial population. In terms of the racial dynamics of

Hawai‘i, however, they were positioned as a minority. Native Hawaiians, the original residents of the islands, constituted 14 percent, including part-Hawaiians. While Native Hawaiians' proportion of the population continuously declined after the arrival of Westerners, they retained solid political power in the territory because they had the largest number of registered voters among all ethnic groups in the islands, as well as influential statesmen representing their collective interests.¹¹

JAPANESE INTELLECTUALS' PERCEPTIONS OF NATIVE HAWAIIANS

Before examining Issei views, it is useful to discuss how intellectuals in Japan viewed Native Hawaiians, as Issei were subject to the influence of contemporary Japanese ideology. After the Meiji Restoration of 1868, which embraced the motto "leaving Asia and entering the West" (*dat-sua nyuo*), the Japanese government eagerly introduced Western systems and ideas as a foundation upon which to build a modern Japan. Their goal was to gain international recognition for Japan as a developed country and to elevate their nation, through modernization, to a level equivalent to that of the Western superpowers. This eventually led Japan to tread a path of imperialism and colonialism, following in the footsteps of the superpowers.¹² It was as part of this process that Japanese intellectuals absorbed the idea of social Darwinism, a crucial component of late-nineteenth-century Western thought and values. This caused them to look down on the indigenous people of the Pacific, particularly those in Micronesia, where Japan had started to reach its imperial hand. Referring to indigenous people in the tropical islands as *dojin* (literally "land people"), a derogatory Japanese term for "aboriginal," intellectuals claimed that the "dark-skinned" natives were physically, mentally, and culturally inferior to Japanese and that they should therefore be "taught and guided" by "more advanced" Japan. This viewpoint also shaped Japanese perceptions of Native Hawaiians, on whom they projected negative images such as "primitive," "uncivilized," "irrational," and "lazy."¹³ Such Japanese-versioned Orientalism was captured in "Current Circumstances in Hawaii and Japanese Suffrage" (*Hawai no Gensei, Nihonjin no Sanseiken*), one of the essays found in *Selected Essays on Yankees (Yanki Sho)*, written by philosopher and journalist Betten Nagasawa (1868–99) in 1894. In 1893, the same year that whites overthrew the Hawaiian monarchy, Nagasawa stopped in Hawai‘i on his way to the continental United States. Immediately after arriving in

Honolulu, he went to see Iolani Palace, the former residence of the royal family, and then Washington Place, the private home in which Queen Liliuokalani was confined. While appreciating the beauty of the European-style palace and showing respect and sympathy for the tragic fate of the noble queen, Nagasawa also made the following comments on the Hawaiian masses:

“Kanaka” (or *dojin*) are ignorant, idiotic people who understand neither the honor of the nation nor the significance of autonomy. . . . Shaking their buttocks, they gather together in front of the statue of King Kamehameha to sip blood and enjoy a feast. Among them, there are very few who warn against white predominance and foreign threats to national dignity and who are willing to devote themselves to protecting the state. Instead, most only dance the so-called “hula hula” and entertain themselves. It is no wonder that the Reform Party, proposing the establishment of a provisional government, gained authority.¹⁴

Native Hawaiians illustrated here—sipping blood and dancing a wicked, promiscuous dance—fit the image in Western imagination of stereotypical barbarians still in the stage of precivilization.¹⁵ Infused with Western thought and spurred by Japanese ethnocentrism, Nagasawa developed this particular view of Hawaiians because they were neither white, the race that served as a role model for modern Japan, nor of the Yamato (Japanese) race, who were nonwhite but supposedly gifted with physical and intellectual excellence. Dismissing the fact that many Native Hawaiians had been strenuously fighting against white elites to preserve the sovereignty of the Hawaiian kingdom, Nagasawa assumed that a large majority of Hawaiians lacked the intellectual and moral capacity to understand the importance of pledging loyalty to and protecting the autonomy of their mother country. Nagasawa was a populist who believed that the masses, not just a handful of nobility, should constitute the backbone of the nation. Although feeling somewhat sorry for the usurped queen, he despised the majority of Hawaiians as “backward” *dojin* and considered it inevitable that their country should be taken over by the “more advanced” whites. In addition, like many other Japanese intellectuals in this period, Nagasawa was an expansionist and lamented that Japan had “lost” Hawai‘i to the white Americans who had overthrown the monarchy. Japan, he argued, which was on a par with white nations, should have stepped forward to annex Hawai‘i because of its

geopolitical importance in the Pacific, just as Russia had gained control over Sakhalin. Nagasawa believed that Hawai'i could serve as the first landing place and a valuable stopover to start their new lives abroad for Japanese emigrants headed for further destinations such as Mexico, South America, and Australia. Viewing Japanese and whites as equal in terms of inherent ability, he also contended that Hawai'i was an arena in which the "Japanese race" and the "white race" would compete with each other to demonstrate their strength.¹⁶ In the eyes of Japanese expansionists like Nagasawa, Hawai'i was nothing more than a target for Japan's colonial ambitions, and the Hawaiian people were merely objects of conquest and control.¹⁷

ISSEI PERCEPTIONS OF NATIVE HAWAIIANS

If Japanese intellectuals saw Hawaiians as inferior to Japanese, how did first-generation Japanese immigrants in Hawai'i view Native Hawaiians during the interwar years? Many Issei intellectuals, before leaving Japan, had become familiar with Progressivism and social Darwinism, which placed whites at the top of the racial hierarchy and Western culture at the pinnacle of the world social order. When they emigrated to Hawai'i and began living in a society dominated by elite whites, however, they were forced to deal with racial hierarchy, not merely as an abstract idea but as the reality of their daily life. While in Japan they could dream of being equal to whites, but in Hawai'i most Japanese immigrants found themselves in the lower strata of society, struggling to survive, in a position of inferiority vis-à-vis the existing hegemony. To redeem their ethnic pride and mobilize their community, they often employed Native Hawaiians as a negative exemplum in discussions of their own future in the islands. They called indigenous Hawaiians "*dojin*" and referred to them as a "vanishing race" (*horobiyuku minzoku*), doomed to disappear in the natural course of history.

Shinsai Sagawa, a Protestant minister at the Hilo Japanese Church on the island of Hawai'i, was one such Issei. Calling Native Hawaiians a "vanishing race," he proclaimed them to be the polar opposite of the Japanese. In the essay titled "Discussing Our Compatriots in Hawaii" (1939), Sagawa elaborated on "Japanese racial expansion" and the mission of Nisei in Hawai'i, painting a striking contrast between the flourishing, vigorous young Nisei and the diminishing, frail Native Hawaiians. With the concept of social Darwinism deeply embedded in his mind, he

saw a parallel between Native Hawaiians and Native Americans, and contended that Hawai'i-born Nisei would prosper in the islands because of their racial superiority, while Hawaiians, physically and mentally inferior to the Japanese, would eventually die out. In the essay, Sagawa stated:

Some people are pessimistic about the future of the Nisei in Hawaii. What will happen to them if their population continues to increase? . . . Yet, power lies in numbers. . . . The more they increase, the more strength they will gain. . . . Like American Indians, Native Hawaiians were given various kinds of protection by the government, and they have fallen into the same fate as the Indians. If they cannot survive competition, perhaps it is inevitable for them to disappear. . . . God gives the right to survive to those who are useful and beneficial to society. The Yamato race is exuberant and expansible . . . the Nisei will overcome all difficulties and contribute to making Hawaii into a paradise in the coming Pacific Age.¹⁸

Japanese racial expansion, as presented here by Sagawa, was a widely advocated concept among Japanese American intellectuals in Hawai'i and the continental United States during the interwar years. It was a Japanese American version of the pioneer thesis, comparing Japanese immigrants moving eastward across the Pacific to European pioneers moving westward in the process of American colonial expansion. As Japanese progressed eastward, first Hawai'i and then the West Coast would turn into lands of fertility and prosperity. By juxtaposing themselves with white settlers, Issei intellectuals attempted to make Japanese immigrants a part of mainstream American history in order to gain recognition for their contribution to American society and, ultimately, to empower their ethnic community. Underlying this concept was the argument that Japanese have an "expansive character" inherited from their ancestors; it thus followed naturally that Japanese should emigrate to Mexico, South America, the North Pacific, and the rest of Asia, building new communities abroad rather than confining themselves to the narrowness of their home islands. Overseas they would successfully settle down in these unknown lands and eventually become an integral part of the host societies, demonstrating their racial superiority through such virtues as diligence, perseverance, self-sacrifice, tranquility, and loyalty, which they believed to be rooted in their Yamato blood. Since all people of Japanese descent were seen as *doho*, or compatriots (literally "com-

ing from the same womb"), regardless of their place of birth or residence, they could be widely scattered overseas to construct sturdy social, political, and economic foundations for their race.¹⁹ As Hawai'i was the first designated destination for Japanese immigration in the modern period, Issei in Hawai'i found this concept of the Japanese pioneer to be particularly pertinent to their situation, and they exhorted the Nisei, the Hawai'i-born generation, to embrace the same mission as a vanguard of Japanese racial expansion.²⁰ In the process of the racial expansion in Hawai'i, Issei also claimed that Nisei should avoid intermarriage and find their spouses within the Japanese race to maintain the "purity of their blood," which the parents' generation regarded as the foundation of Japanese excellence.²¹

In this context, it was perhaps not surprising that Issei intellectuals superimposed the image of Native Americans on that of Native Hawaiians, perceiving both groups to be destined to succumb to the pioneers and to the more advanced civilizations the newcomers brought with them.²² Like Francis Parkman Jr., the author of *The Oregon Trail* (1849), who wrote that American Indians "received their final doom," Japanese immigrants like Sagawa believed that progress ruled history and that Native Hawaiians could not avoid their fate.²³ They believed that the Native Hawaiians' displacement by Nisei confirmed the principle of survival of the fittest; no matter how protected they were, they were too weak in terms of body and mind to survive "natural selection."

In contrast to white settlers' perceptions of Native Americans in the mid-nineteenth century, however, Issei intellectuals never perceived Native Hawaiians as a dangerous or troublesome threat who *should* be repressed or tamed. Partly because local Japanese and Hawaiians never actually fought each other with guns and bows, as whites and Native Americans did, many Issei projected an amicable, peaceful image on Hawaiians, and felt pity and sympathy for this indigenous people who had been marginalized and whose population was dwindling sharply, even though they were the islands' original residents.²⁴ Certain Issei publically expressed sorrow for the tragic fate of Native Hawaiians, and even indignation toward the white colonizers, who had more fatally affected the lives of Hawaiians than Japanese settlers ever could. Yasutaro Soga (1873–1957), publisher of the *Nippu Jiji*, the Japanese-language newspaper that boasted the largest circulation in the Territory of Hawaii, held such a view toward Native Hawaiians. Soga was one of the most influential leaders in the local Japanese community, as his newspaper

enabled him to help shape public opinion among the Japanese American community in Hawai‘i. In June 1934 he wrote an editorial titled “At the Kamehameha Festival—the Rise of Ethnic Consciousness among Natives” in which he offered his observations on an annual Hawaiian festival and his thoughts concerning the tragic history of Native Hawaiians.²⁵ The Kamehameha Festival was started in order to commemorate King Kamehameha, the person who first unified the Hawaiian Islands into a kingdom.²⁶ At the festival, the Hawaiian Royal Band played music, choirs sang songs, dance troupes performed chants and hula, and a grand procession with floats paraded the streets of Honolulu, drawing thousands of spectators. Impressed by the dazzling extravaganza, Soga expressed sincere respect for Hawaiian culture and revealed how he felt about the circumstances that Hawaiians had been stranded in since the demise of the monarchy:

In any society, the conquering of one civilization by a more advanced civilization is always accompanied by historical tragedy. If you look at the transformation of Hawai‘i’s society over the past century from the perspective of natives, you cannot say that it has contributed greatly to enhancing their happiness. Seeing their daily life, I cannot help sensing a tragic shadow on them as an ethnic group. . . . Transplanting capitalism to Hawai‘i was part of a process of great advancement, not only in our economic activities but also in our material culture at large. For the natives, however, it also led to ethnic demise, economic and political enslavement, and collective tragedy.²⁷

Here Soga appears to be caught between reason and emotion. While trying to rationalize the displacement of Native Hawaiians as an inevitable part of the natural course of progress, he also repeatedly uses the word “tragedy,” showing empathy toward Hawaiians’ hardship, distress, and laments. Toward the end of the editorial he becomes even more compassionate, stating:

This year’s festival was held on an unprecedentedly grand scale, but we should not view it merely as merrymaking. The rise of Native Hawaiian ethnic awareness is not just something in people’s imaginations; it is emerging as a real and substantial source of power in our society. We must recognize it as an ongoing social phenomenon in Hawai‘i.²⁸

Soga gave his blessing to the ethnic nationalism taking shape among Hawaiians and concluded his piece in a highly optimistic tone, as though

predicting that Hawaiians and their culture would revive in the future. He emotionally supported the indigenous movement for multiple reasons: he was Japanese, he was a permanent alien ineligible for U.S. citizenship, and he was indignant about the dominance of elite whites over the rest of Hawai'i's populations. He had a strong sense of social justice, so much so that he endorsed a plantation strike and was even imprisoned as a labor ringleader in his younger days.²⁹ Living in the same island community with other minorities, he was able to relate to the plight of Hawaiians and develop transracial ties with them.

In addition to the vanishing race image, another notable image of Native Hawaiians held by Issei during this period was that of the noble savage. The noble savage is an idealized concept of uncivilized humanity, usually personified as a rugged man of nature, bravery, freedom, and innocence. The noble savage is heroic and respectable, his fate dramatic and tragic. He often represents nostalgia for a past when humans were still pure and simple, before they were exposed to civilization. In the continental United States, liberal whites often projected such a romantic image on Native Americans.³⁰

Interestingly, the noble savage image of Hawaiians appears in Japanese language school textbooks edited by local Issei teachers in the prewar period. In the early 1930s, there existed more than 170 Japanese language schools in the Territory of Hawaii, and nearly 90 percent of Hawai'i-born Nisei receiving compulsory public education also studied at Japanese language schools in the afternoon and on weekends.³¹ Japanese language schools in Hawai'i originally used textbooks published by the Japanese Ministry of Education, with the intention of educating children to be assets of Imperial Japan. From 1929 onward, however, the Hawaii Japanese Education Society (Hawai Kyoiku-kai), formed by Japanese language schoolteachers, compiled textbooks specifically designed for local Nisei students.³² In compiling these textbooks, the society adopted the following policy: "Japanese language school textbooks are intended to enable our youth to grow into well-rounded persons and American citizens, embracing American ideals as well as acquiring middle-level Japanese language proficiency."³³ For textbooks on moral education, the society decided to "include a number of lessons based on materials with local [Hawaiian] elements" and to "adopt fairy tales, legends, fables, and proverbs where suitable."³⁴ As this editorial policy pursued the twin goals of Americanization and localization, Native Hawaiian characters came to appear in Japanese language

school textbooks as a symbol of local culture, along with Benjamin Franklin and Abraham Lincoln, representative figures of mainstream American history.³⁵ Yet, while mainstream representatives were actual persons, the Hawaiians in these textbooks were uniformly mythical and supernatural figures. For instance, one textbook story recounts a famous Hawaiian legend about the boy who invented sails. To look for his father on another island, this young boy attempts to cross the ocean, and to do so devises a boat with a canvas sail. In the end he finds his father, and he and his parents live happily ever after. This story not only teaches readers about courage, filial piety, family ties, a creative mind, and an adventurous spirit; it also inspires respect toward traditional Hawaiian culture as represented by advanced navigation and seamanship.³⁶ Another example of a Hawaiian character in a textbook is a young boy named Moemoe. In the Hawaiian language, “moe” means “sleeping,” and a demigod named Moemoe appears in a number of Hawaiian legends. This tall tale begins as follows: “Moemoe was a very lazy boy who was always sleeping. When his mother worked in the taro field, he did not help her. When his father went out fishing, he did not go along.” Moemoe continues to sleep even as a stream rises up and covers his face. He finally wakes up when a kukui tree starts growing in his nostril and tickles him. The story ends with Moemoe’s deep regret for taking an extended nap; he makes up his mind to help his parents and work hard. Though the character of Moemoe reflects a stereotypical image of a “lazy” Hawaiian, he is also portrayed as honest, innocent, good-natured, and wise enough to learn from his failure.³⁷ As these examples show, Issei textbook editors held favorable, romantic views of Hawaiians as noble savages, and they passed these on to the Nisei generation through Japanese language school education.

NISEI PERCEPTIONS OF NATIVE HAWAIIANS

If the foregoing represents Issei views of Native Hawaiians, then what kind of perceptions did Nisei hold of Hawaiians during the interwar years? While some Nisei adopted the social Darwinist notions of their parents, many developed their own views of Hawaiians, based on their personal experiences. Unlike their parents’ generation, whose lives were mostly confined to local Japanese communities where they did not speak English or associate with non-Japanese on a daily basis, Nisei had close

interactions with Hawaiians in the classroom and on the playground. During the 1920s and the 1930s, the racial/ethnic student body mix in Hawai'i's public schools was diverse: Japanese made up nearly 50 percent, Hawaiians and part-Hawaiians 15 percent, Chinese 9 percent, Portuguese 7 percent, Filipinos 6 percent, whites (most of Anglo-Saxon lineage) 5 percent, Koreans 3 percent, and others 4 percent.³⁸ In higher education, however, the percentages accounted for by Chinese, Japanese, whites, and Hawaiians increased, so that these four groups constituted an even greater part of the student body. *Black and Gold*, the Honolulu McKinley High School yearbook, and *Ka Palapala*, the University of Hawai'i yearbook, show that all the athletic clubs and most student organizations of this period were interracial, while some associations were race-based. On the University of Hawai'i campus, for example, the agriculture club, commerce club, home economics club, and religious groups were interracial. On the other hand, fraternities and sororities were race-based; for example, Phi Delta Sigma was for white men, Hakuba-kai was for Japanese men, Yang Chung Hui was for Chinese women, and Ke Anuenue was for Hawaiian women.³⁹

While more open to interracial relations than their parents' generation, Nisei generally did not develop friendships with whites (other than Portuguese and Spanish) as much as they did with Hawaiians. Why was this? As various evidence shows, some Nisei felt envy and admiration—and therefore distance—toward whites because of whites' more privileged social and economic position. A female student at the Territorial Normal and Training School (teachers' college), growing up on a plantation on the island of Kaua'i, wrote in an essay of what she thought about whites as a child: "I used to dream and wish sometimes, I were a *haole* [white in the Hawaiian language] because I thought only white children wore shoes, hats, owned dolls, and lived in better houses than we did."⁴⁰ In another essay, a Territorial Normal School student from the rural area of the island of Hawai'i complained about favoritism given to white students by white teachers: "Did I ever wish I were a *haole*? Yes, I have. I know how impossible it is for me to have such a wish but I did. Aren't the *haoles* given better marks than we who work just as hard for the work? We 'sweat' over the work; the *haoles* glance over the work; results in the teacher's record are startling—A for the *haole*, D or C for us. Doesn't this make someone wish he were a white?"⁴¹ These essays were written as responses in an extensive research study on local race relations

conducted by Chicago-school sociologists at the University of Hawai‘i from 1924 to 1927. They succinctly capture Hawai‘i-born Nisei perceptions of whites in that period.⁴²

Interestingly, Nisei who grew up on sugar plantations often tended to look at whites more negatively than did Nisei from Honolulu and other urban districts on O‘ahu. A plantation was a racially stratified community headed by elite whites, and it seems clear that growing up within such a hierarchical system led Nisei to feel greater distance from whites, and to even possess hard feelings toward them. A male student at the Territorial Normal School from the island of Hawai‘i stated: “People living in the country districts usually do not have a kindly feeling toward the *haoles*—represented in those districts by the plantation officials, *lunas* [overseers] and office-workers. They do not mix with the other peoples.”⁴³ While giving a wide berth to whites, however, this student also mentioned that he would choose a person from the Chinese or Hawaiian group if he were to associate with someone other than a Japanese. In terms of social and economic status, most Chinese and Hawaiians were in a position similar to that of Japanese, though it was true that some, especially Hawaiians, were struggling financially. Judging from the fact that this student’s favorable view of these two ethnic groups appears to have developed after he came to Honolulu to attend the normal school, the “Chinese and Hawaiians” he discussed here were likely people from social, economic, and educational backgrounds similar to his own.

Like this student, Nisei youth were often quite willing to associate with Hawaiians and become friends with them, despite the general tendency to socialize with members of one’s own ethnic group. A male Nisei student at the normal school stated in his essay for the above-mentioned research project: “Do I favor any group more than any other? Chinese and Hawaiians, aside from my own group, seem to meet with my favor. Of course there are many faults in all of these groups, and there are many good points, too. However, there are certain groups that I am inclined toward more favorably.”⁴⁴ In another essay, a female Nisei student at the normal school wrote that she had made a small number of very close friends at school, and that most of them were Hawaiian or part-Hawaiian. She also mentioned that she herself was often mistaken for a person of Hawaiian blood. Amused by others’ puzzlement, she wrote: “Many girls at the Normal asked me if I was part-Hawaiian and when I replied in the negative they all stood back astonished to hear my answer.”⁴⁵ For this

girl, being mistaken for a Hawaiian was something that made her feel special and proud.

The following remarks by Issei educator Takayuki Asano, the principal of a prestigious Japanese language school in Honolulu run by a Buddhist mission, similarly reveal that some Nisei youth regarded Hawaiians favorably and became good friends with them, sometimes even copying their appearance. In 1925 Asano indignantly stated:

There are quite a few local Japanese children who decolorize their hair with vinegar to turn it a reddish brown color because, they say, they want to look not like whites but like Natives. . . . It is lamentable that they hope not to be Americans in a true sense, but to be Hawaiians.⁴⁶

While this educator, the head of a conservative school, referred to the Nisei tendency to copy Hawaiians' appearance as "despicable degeneration," many Nisei themselves appear to have found brownish wavy hair fashionable and attractive.

Further, some Nisei even regarded Hawaiians as potential love interests and possible future spouses. When asked about their marriage prospects in the research project, almost all young Nisei answered that they would marry other Hawai'i-born Japanese. Yet, in response to the question of whom they might marry other than persons of Japanese ancestry, nearly all of them chose Hawaiians or part-Hawaiians, along with Chinese. One Nisei female student at the normal school answered: "I would never care to marry anybody outside my nationality [race] but if I had to make a choice, I would say that I prefer the Hawaiians."⁴⁷ Similarly, a male Nisei student from McKinley High School remarked: "I would prefer to marry a Hawaiian-born member of my race since we were brought up under like conditions and would live with more understanding and harmony which would bring happy home life. If I should marry someone else outside of my own race in Hawaii I prefer to go to the Chinese or Hawaiian-Chinese group. I have no special reason to give except that they are generally closely related with my race and of the mildest and quiet sort of people."⁴⁸ In his book titled *Interracial Marriage in Hawaii* (1937), Romanzo Adams, a sociology professor at the University of Hawai'i, contended that while interracial marriage was not a common practice among local Japanese, the Hawai'i-born generation was more open-minded toward interracial marriage than the immigrant generation. Adams also indicated that among the spouses of local Japanese men who

married outside their race, there were more people of Hawaiian ancestry than of any other group.⁴⁹ For example, between 1930 and 1934, 83 out of 3,358 local Japanese men married Hawaiians or part-Hawaiians, compared with 29 who married Chinese, 17 who married Portuguese and Spanish, and 10 who married Caucasians (mostly of Anglo-Saxon ancestry). More local Japanese women in this period (29) married whites than did Japanese men, but still a relatively large number chose Hawaiians and part-Hawaiians as their spouses (43).⁵⁰ In contrast to intellectuals in Japan and some Issei, who contended that maintaining the “purity of blood” of the Japanese race was essential to successful “racial expansion of the *Yamato* race,” Nisei tended to regard Hawaiians as their equals, as long as they were from a similar social background, and they did not consider intermarriage with Hawaiians to mean degradation or deviation from local Japanese “norms,” as some Issei did.⁵¹ In this way, by choosing Hawaiians as friends and spouses, many Nisei in the interwar years perceived Hawaiians neither as a “vanishing race” nor as “noble savage,” but rather as real flesh-and-bone human beings with soul and spirit.

NISEI POLITICAL COOPERATION WITH NATIVE HAWAIIANS

During the 1930s, such amicable Nisei perceptions of Native Hawaiians also developed into a cooperative relationship between local Japanese and Hawaiians in the political arena. In 1930, Andy Masayoshi Yamashiro (1896–1960) was elected to the Territorial House of Representatives, becoming one of the first three Americans of Japanese ancestry to win public office as a legislator in the land of the United States. Before running for office, Yamashiro had no formal political experience, although he was well known as a baseball player, not just in the local Japanese community but in the broader society of Hawai‘i as well.⁵² He starred for an amateur team in Honolulu in his student years, and later played for professional baseball teams in Pennsylvania and Connecticut. Unlike other Nisei candidates, Yamashiro ran on the Democratic Party ticket and was not associated with the sugar interests, who formed the base of the Republican Party in the islands. Yamashiro carried out his political work according to his personal vision of interracial amicability.

In the early days of Yamashiro’s political career as a young Democrat, he was helped significantly by two Hawaiian men. One was David K. Trask, a famous Hawaiian statesman and representative figure of the territory’s Democrats.⁵³ After beginning his working life as a stevedore,

Trask trained himself to be an attorney and later served as a sheriff in Honolulu and as a territorial senator. He became acquainted with Yamashiro through a mutual friend. Trask saw political potential in Yamashiro, who was already widely known as a celebrated local athlete, and persuaded him to run for legislative office as a Democrat candidate from the Fifth District of O'ahu.⁵⁴ Another Hawaiian who helped Yamashiro was John Hoomano, a part-Chinese storeroom clerk at the Honolulu Iron Works. Hoomano had long known Yamashiro from their days as teammates on a local baseball team and devotedly served as his campaign manager.⁵⁵

In the Territorial House of Representatives, Yamashiro at times allied himself with Native Hawaiian statesmen, even working for the advancement of Hawaiians' welfare. For example, he cooperated with Manase K. Makekau, a representative elected from the island of Maui, in an effort to support and promote the rights of the Hawaiian minority as indigenous inhabitants of the islands. On March 17, 1931, with the aim of helping preserve traditional Hawaiian culture, Makekau introduced a bill to establish a committee that would conduct research on and preserve various Hawaiian historical and literary materials, including myths and legends. Under Makekau's bill, however, the committee would receive no salaries or remuneration, other than being paid for research expenses.⁵⁶ On the next day, to assist Makekau, Yamashiro introduced a follow-up bill asking the territorial government to allocate an explicit amount of money to Makekau's project: \$1,500 to support the activities of the research committee and the Hawaiian historical archives.⁵⁷ In this way, Yamashiro backed up Makekau's efforts to promote Native Hawaiian heritage and pride, even though he was of Japanese, not Hawaiian, ancestry. As a local Nisei, born and raised in Hawai'i, Yamashiro was familiar with Hawaiian culture and viewed it with respect. At the same time, as a minority American, he was sympathetic with Makekau's efforts because he understood that the enhancement of ethnic awareness was essential for mobilizing and empowering any ethnic community. As he had close Hawaiian acquaintances who had helped his career both publicly and privately, it was not surprising that he lent a hand to Makekau to help promote Native Hawaiian interests.

Yamashiro's sense of belonging to Hawai'i as a minority American was manifested even more clearly in his public defense of Hawai'i from "outsiders" in the island community. In 1932, in the aftermath of the infamous Massie Affair—an alleged assault by locals on a U.S. Navy

officer's wife—Rear Admiral Yates Stirling, commander of Pearl Harbor and the highest-ranking naval officer in the islands, announced that multiracial Hawai'i, especially in view of its large Japanese population, should be deprived of autonomy and be controlled instead by a commission of government officials sent from the continental United States.⁵⁸ Admiral Stirling stated: "Present government control should be by men primarily of the Caucasian race; by men who are not too deeply imbued with the peculiar atmosphere of the Islands. . . . Actual control of the laws, their inception, promulgation and enforcement should be by the National Government."⁵⁹ In response, Yamashiro eloquently defended Hawai'i and its residents, stating: "The most astounding thing to me is that the admiral, who has been stationed at the naval base probably less than two years, thinks he knows it all. . . . He is without a background to be any authority on conditions among the citizens of oriental ancestry." According to the *Honolulu Star-Bulletin*, dated April 1932, Yamashiro asserted that "he considered himself just as good a citizen as the admiral and possibly a member of the community more concerned with its welfare because of his birth here." The Nisei statesman continued: "Both Republicans and Democrats here have been advocating home rule and we know that we can govern ourselves."⁶⁰ The racial group that Stirling most explicitly attacked was the local Japanese. But, by repeatedly using the word "we," Yamashiro strove to mobilize and unify the entire island population, regardless of race, ethnicity, social class, or political ideology, in an attempt to organize a fight against a mutual "enemy": a grave threat to Hawai'i's self-governance from the continental United States. It was his vision of racial cooperation in the islands that enabled him to devise such a strategy, which drew on and raised people's pride as local residents and attracted many sympathizers from various segments of the society of Hawai'i.⁶¹

CONCLUSION

This article has examined how Japanese American perceptions of Native Hawaiians shifted in the context of local race relations during the interwar years in Hawai'i. The divergent views of Native Hawaiians held by the people of Imperial Japan and by Japanese American residents of Hawai'i illustrate how differing material conditions and political status can override a common racial ideology to produce differing forms of

racial representation. Of course, not all first- and second-generation Japanese Americans in Hawai'i conformed to the patterns and examples described here; there were a minority of Issei, and even some Nisei, who maintained racist viewpoints similar to those of Japanese imperialists of the time. For the majority of Japanese immigrants and Nisei U.S. citizens in prewar Hawai'i, however, a strategy of racial cooperation made better sense in their quest for social advancement than one of racial conflict.

It is important to look at historical context when evaluating the meaning of Japanese Americans' racial representations in prewar Hawai'i where local Japanese were numerically dominant but still socially underprivileged. At first glance, the idea of racial cooperation between Japanese and Hawaiians, the two minority races in prewar Hawai'i, resembles what some scholars and political commentators have celebrated as the "aloha spirit" of the islands. Proponents of this concept depict Hawai'i as a racial paradise, where different cultures and races have formed a real melting pot—a model for a diverse America. Dennis Ogawa and Glen Grant, for example, contend that Hawai'i is a post-racial society in which individual merit outweighs and effaces racial differences.⁶² On the other hand, scholars of settler colonialism criticize such a concept, arguing that it veils the reality of Hawai'i, where social, political, and economic discrepancies exist between different racial and ethnic groups.⁶³ Indeed, in postwar Hawai'i, as critics of the "aloha spirit" argue, Japanese Americans have actually dominated the political economy and often take advantage of the less-privileged positions of Native Hawaiians and Filipinos.⁶⁴ Those in the dominant group regard racial harmony and cooperation as a means to enhance their power and control over the rest of the society, while those members of minority groups utilize it to challenge a hegemonic structure that places them in a subordinate position below a white ruling class. The examples in this article of positive, or at least benign, Japanese views of Native Hawaiians, and their occasional pursuit of interracial collaboration, are inseparable from the essential context of racial subordination under white elites in prewar Hawai'i. Despite superficial similarities between the interracial harmony of the postwar years and Japanese-Hawaiian cooperation during the interwar period, the political meanings of these phenomena are almost completely opposed if one takes into account the disparate forms of race relations that prevailed in the respective historical periods.

NOTES

¹ Some of the materials used in this article were previously published in Hiromi Monobe, “Senkanki no Hawai ni okeru Taminzoku-sei to Nikkei-jin no Ichi: Senjyu Hawai-jin tonon Jinshu-kankei ni okeru Ichikosatsu,” [In the relation with Native Hawaiians: A study on the Japanese American position in the racial hierarchy in interwar Hawai‘i] *Gengo Bunka Kenkyu* [Ritsumeikan University Kiyo] 21, no. 4 (March 2010): 163–73. In the current article, however, I have introduced a new framework of analysis, incorporated additional data, and presented more elaborate argument and interpretations.

² Michael Omi and Howard Winant, *Racial Formation in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1990s* (New York: Routledge, 1994), 55–61.

³ Later, Filipino laborers were transplanted to Hawai‘i and placed at the lowest strata of the society, even below Japanese.

⁴ Yuji Ichioka, *The Issei: The World of the First Generation Japanese Immigrants, 1885–1924* (New York: Free Press, 1988), 2.

⁵ “Local identity” means a cultural identity that collectively categorizes local-born/local-raised people of Hawai‘i. While uniting people with different backgrounds, this concept obscures social, political, and economic inequalities between the dominant group and minority groups. For further details of “local identity” in Hawai‘i, see Jonathan Y. Okamura, “Why There Are No Asian Americans in Hawai‘i: The Continuing Significance of Local Identity,” *Social Process in Hawai‘i* 35 (1994): 161–78.

⁶ Claire Jean Kim and Taeku Lee, “Interracial Politics: Asian Americans and Other Communities of Color,” *Political Science and Politics* 34, no. 3 (September 2001): 633. As an example of the triangular relations, see Claire Jean Kim, *Bitter Fruit: The Politics of Black-Korean Conflict in New York City* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000); Scott Kurashige, *The Shifting Grounds of Race: Black and Japanese Americans in the Making of Multiethnic Los Angeles* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008); Eiichiro Azuma, *Between Two Empires: Race, History, and Transnationalism in Japanese America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), 187–207.

⁷ In the concept of Asian settler colonialism, Asian immigrants and their descendants in Hawai‘i are regarded as “settlers” who have benefited from the dispossession and displacement of Native Hawaiians. See Candace Fujikane and Jonathan Y. Okamura, eds., *Asian Settler Colonialism: From Local Governance to the Habits of Everyday Life in Hawai‘i* (Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 2008); also see the special issue of the *Amerasia Journal*, edited by Fujikane and Okamura, “Whose Vision?: Asian Settler Colonialism in Hawai‘i,” *Amerasia Journal* 26, no. 2 (2000).

⁸ For example, see the section “Nisei Gains, Native Hawaiian Losses” in Taro Iwata’s *Race and Citizenship as American Geopolitics: Japanese and Native Hawaiians in Hawai‘i, 1900–1941* (PhD diss., University of Oregon, 2003), 226–32.

⁹ Gavan Daws, *Shoal of Time: A History of the Hawaiian Islands* (Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 1968); Lawrence H. Fuchs, *Hawaii Pono: An Ethnic and Political History* (Honolulu: Bess Press, 1997); Sally Engle Merry, *Colonizing Hawai‘i: The Cultural Power of Law* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000).

¹⁰ Tom Coffman, *Nation Within: The Story of America’s Annexation of the Nation of Hawai‘i* (Kaneohe, HI: EpiCenter, 1998).

¹¹ Daws, *Shoal of Time*; Fuchs, *Hawaii Pono*; Merry, *Colonizing Hawai‘i*.

¹² Kazutomi Sakai, *Kindai Nihon Gaiko to Ajia Taiheiyo Chitsujō* (Kyoto: Showa-do, 2009), 31–34.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 80–84.

¹⁴ Betten Nagasawa, "Yanki-Sho," in *Meiji Shisoka Shu* (Tokyo: Kodansha, 1968), 291. This is an anthology of the works by Meiji intellectuals.

¹⁵ Sakai, *Kindai Nihon Gaiko to Ajia Taiheiyo Chitsujō*, 80–84.

¹⁶ Eiichiro Azuma, *Interstitial Lives: Race, Community, and History among Japanese Immigrants Caught between Japan and the United States, 1885–1941* (PhD diss., University of California, Los Angeles, 2000), 34–36.

¹⁷ Yujin Yaguchi discusses Japanese tourists' views of Hawaiians during the 1920s and 1930s. See Yujin Yaguchi, *Akogare no Hawaii: Nihonjin no Hawaii-kan* (Tokyo: Chuokoron-sha, 2011), 47–51.

¹⁸ Shinsai Sagawa, "Hawai no Doho wo kataru" [Discussing our compatriots in Hawaii], in *Rakuen Soshō*, ed. Takie Okumura (Kyoto: Naigai Shuppan, 1939), 23–24.

¹⁹ Azuma, *Between Two Empires*, 91–98, 100, 105–22, 213–15.

²⁰ During the interwar years, some Hawai'i-born Nisei enthusiastically embraced this concept of Japanese racial expansion. For further details, see the section on Masao Sakamoto in Hiromi Monobe's "The Intersection of 'Americanization' and 'Racial Expansion': Nisei Identity Politics in Prewar Hawai'i," in *The Transnational Politics of Asian Americans*, ed. Christian Collet and Pei-Te Lien (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2009), 159–63.

²¹ Azuma, *Between Two Empires*, 190–92.

²² Robert F. Berkhofer, Jr., *The White Man's Indian: Images of the American Indian from Columbus to the Present* (New York: Vintage, 1978), 49–61.

²³ Known for living with the Sioux and possessing more tolerant views of Native Americans than his contemporaries, Parkman stated, "For the most part, a civilized white man can discover very few points of sympathy between his own nature and that of an Indian. . . . He must be conscious that an impassable gulf lies between him and his red brethren . . . if expedient, he could shoot them with . . . little compunction." Francis Parkman, Jr., *The Oregon Trail* (New York: Putnam, 1849; Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1969), 292–93.

²⁴ Regarding Western binary perceptions of Native Hawaiians (savage/benevolent) in the early period, see Rona Tamiko Halualani, *In the Name of Hawaiians: Native Identities and Cultural Politics* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2002), 1–37.

²⁵ "Kamehameha-Sai ni saishite: Taito suru Dojin no Minzoku-ishiki" [At the Kamehameha Festival: The rise of ethnic consciousness among natives], *Nippu Jiji*, June 11, 1934. An English translation of a Soga editorial almost always appeared in the *Nippu Jiji* on the day following its appearance in Japanese. However, no English version of this particular editorial was ever published in the newspaper.

²⁶ "Thousands See Colorful Parade," *Nippu Jiji*, June 11, 1934.

²⁷ "Kamehameha-Sai ni saishite," *Nippu Jiji*, June 11, 1934.

²⁸ *Ibid.*

²⁹ Keiho Soga, *Gojyu-nen no Hawaii Kaiko* (Honolulu: Gojyu-nen no Hawaii Kaiko Kanko-Kai, 1953), 189–245.

³⁰ Berkhofer, *The White Man's Indian*, 28, 73–80, 118.

³¹ *Hawaii Nenkan 1932–1933* (Honolulu: Nippu Jiji, 1932), 177–78; Eileen H. Tamura, *Americanization, Acculturation, and Ethnic Identity: The Nisei Generation in Hawaii* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1994), 146.

³² Gijyo Ozawa, *Hawai Nihongo Gakko Kyoiku-shi* (Honolulu: Hawaii Kyoiku-kai, 1972), 147–235.

³³ *Ibid.*, 149.

³⁴ In one of the stories in a textbook, local Japanese children make jack-o'-lanterns on Halloween, carving papayas in place of pumpkins. This is an example of localized

American culture that Nisei children could easily relate to. See Hawai Kyoiku-kai, *Nihongo Tokuhon* 3 (Honolulu: Hawai Kyoiku-kai, 1930), 21–34.

³⁵ Ozawa, *Hawai Nihongo Gakko Kyoiku-shi*, 191.

³⁶ Hawai Kyoiku-kai, *Nihongo Tokuhon* 4 (Honolulu: Hawai Kyoiku-kai, 1930), 23–31.

³⁷ Hawai Kyoiku-kai, *Nihongo Tokuhon* 3, 70–75.

³⁸ *Hawai Nenkan 1928* (Honolulu: Nippu Jiji, 1928), 175; *Hawai Nenkan 1937–1938* (Honolulu: Nippu Jiji, 1937), 185–86.

³⁹ *Ka Palapala for 1932* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii, 1932).

⁴⁰ Student Essays, box 3, folder 2, N-33, William Carlson Smith Papers, University of Oregon (hereafter cited as WCS). These essays are all written in English.

⁴¹ WCS, box 3, folder 3, N-70.

⁴² In the 1920s, a group of sociologists associated with the University of Chicago viewed Hawai‘i as a “racial frontier” where various racial groups coexisted, interacted, and intermarried before being fully assimilated. Based on this assumption, Chicago sociologists, such as William Carlson Smith, Romanzo Adams, and Andrew Lind, conducted research on race relations in Hawai‘i to prove their theory of assimilation. For further information on their research, see Henry Yu, *Thinking Orientals: Migration, Contact, and Exoticism in Modern America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), 80–84.

⁴³ WCS, box 3, folder 4, N-79.

⁴⁴ WCS, box 3, folder 3, N-65.

⁴⁵ WCS, box 3, folder 3, N-61.

⁴⁶ Takayuki Asano, *Ohai no Kage* (Honolulu: Jitsugyo-no Hawaii, 1925; Tokyo: Busei-shoin, 2007), 246.

⁴⁷ WCS, box 3, folder 3, N-70.

⁴⁸ WCS, box 4, folder 14, MK-27.

⁴⁹ Romanzo Adams, *Interracial Marriage in Hawaii: A Study of the Mutually Conditioned Processes of Acculturation and Amalgamation* (New York: Macmillan Company, 1937; Glen Ridge, NJ: Patterson Smith, 1969), 168–69.

⁵⁰ Adams, *Interracial Marriage in Hawaii*, 340.

⁵¹ *Hawai Nihonjin Nenkan* 18 (Honolulu: Hawai Shimposha, 1922), 60–63; Azuma, 187–192.

⁵² Joel S. Franks, *Asian Pacific Americans and Baseball: A History* (Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 2008), 134–37.

⁵³ “Yamashiro Masayoshi-shi Shukugakai Gaho” [A report on Mr. Masayoshi Yamashiro’s celebration party], *Nippu Jiji*, November 7, 1938.

⁵⁴ “Strong Minority in Government Is Advocated by Andy Yamashiro,” *Honolulu Advertiser*, October 2, 1930.

⁵⁵ “Yamashiro and Hold Honored: Party Is Given at Teahouse for Victors in Election,” *Honolulu Star Bulletin*, November 17, 1930.

⁵⁶ “Hawai Shiryo Shushu-an” [A proposal for the project of compiling Hawaiian materials], *Nippu Jiji*, March 17, 1931.

⁵⁷ “Ippan Yosan chu ni Sengohyaku-doru Tsuika” [\$1,500 added to the general budget for the next fiscal year], *Nippu Jiji*, March 18, 1931.

⁵⁸ The Massie case of 1931–32 was an alleged rape case that aroused vehement controversy not only in Hawai‘i but also in the continental United States. In September 1931, Thalia Massie, wife of a Navy lieutenant, accused five local youths—two Hawaiians, two Japanese, and one Hawaiian-Chinese—of raping her. Because of insufficient and contradictory evidence, the jury, comprised of multiethnic local residents, brought in a verdict of not guilty, and the five defendants were released on bail. One of the Nisei

defendants, Horace Ida, was later lynched by a group of unknown Navy vigilantes. Thalia's mother, husband, and several white sailors then kidnapped and killed Joseph Kahahawai, one of the Hawaiian defendants. His murderers were arrested and sentenced, but following severe criticism from whites both in Hawai'i and in the continental United States, Territorial Governor Lawrence Judd commuted their sentences from ten years in prison to one hour in his office. Daws, *Shaol of Time*, 319–27.

⁵⁹ Ernest K. Wakukawa, *A History of the Japanese People in Hawaii: The Pioneer Historiography of the Japanese in Hawaii, Written in the English* (Honolulu: Toyo Shoin, 1938), 362–64.

⁶⁰ "Stirling Ideas Unfair, Belief of Yamashiro/Pearl Harbor Chief Lacks Background for Views, Legislator Asserts," *Honolulu Star Bulletin*, April 9, 1932.

⁶¹ John Rosa argues that the Massie Case contributed to the formation of "local identity" in Hawai'i during the 1930s. John P. Rosa, "Local Story: The Massie Case Narrative and the Cultural Production of Local Identity in Hawaii," *Amerasia Journal* 26 (2000): 93–115.

⁶² Dennis Ogawa and Glen Grant, "Living Proof: Is Hawaii the Answer?" *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 530 (November 1993): 137–54.

⁶³ Jonathan Y. Okamura, "The Illusion of Paradise: Privileging Multiculturalism in Hawai'i," in *Making Majorities: Constituting Nation in Japan, Korea, China, Malaysia, Fiji, Turkey, and the United States*, ed. Dru G. Gladney, (Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 1998), 264–84.

⁶⁴ For further details of Japanese political dominance in postwar Hawai'i, see Tom Coffman, *The Island Edge of America: A Political History of Hawai'i* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i, 2003).