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There is no doubt that America occupies a place of greatness in the affairs of the World today. There is no doubt either that her actions are being "weighed in the balance" by other nations. Whether or not she retains her seat of honor in world affairs may depend to a great extent upon the kinds of impressions her actions make upon other free nations, especially the neutral nations of Asia.

"Statehood for Hawaii" is a study of the question of her qualifications for it and the reasons for the continued refusal of Congress to grant it to her. Situated in the Pacific Ocean 2,400 miles southwest of San Francisco, 3,900 miles east of Tokyo and about 5,400 miles east of Manila, Hawaii is one of the two remaining incorporated territories of the United States. "To the millions of Oriental peoples now facing the fundamental choice between freedom and communism," says Senator Bennett of Utah, "Hawaii has become a point of intense and historic interest. What we demonstrate in Hawaii will probably have infinitely more effect on the future of Asia than what we say or do on the mainland."

The writer is indebted to the Chairmen of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives and to the secretary of the late Delegate Joseph F. Farrington of Hawaii, for much of the material used in the study.

Grateful acknowledgement is made to Dr. C. A. Bacote, of the History Department of Atlanta University who became the writer's adviser at the request of the late Dr. William Boyd when he realized that his illness would not permit him to resume his work; to Dr. Robert Brisbane, of the Political
Science Department of Morehouse College, who read the thesis and offered helpful suggestions for the improvement of it; to Mrs. E. D. Billingslea, Head of the English Department of Fair Street High School, who read it for possible English errors and offered helpful criticisms; to the members of the Atlanta University Library who were very kind, courteous, and helpful during the periods of research there; and to Mr. E. D. Billingslea, the writer's Principal for his sympathetic understanding of the work involved in completing such a study during the school year.

To the memory of the late Dr. William Madison Boyd, under whose guidance the study was begun, the writer wishes to dedicate this thesis. His unselfish life, his love for humanity, his devotion to his work, and his genuine interest and concern for his students, will serve as an inspiration to those he taught to render more efficient service that our world may be better for the generations which are to follow.
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Today, the pendulum of world power swings between two great nations, the United States and Russia. The eyes of the world are focused upon these two countries as each tries to out-maneuver the other in world affairs. The United States, which considers herself as the beacon light of democracy in a murky, confused and frustrated world, is faced with the problem of meeting the aggression of communist Russia in such a way as to impress favorably other nations of the world, especially the recently recognized nations of Asia. Faced with this threat of aggression, the United States has embarked upon a great effort to help establish world peace. The world watches her every move. Every action that is taken in Congress, or by the President of the United States must be measured against the test of whether it helps to meet the threat of Communist aggression and whether it is a move toward world peace.

Despite the fact that America is aware of the eyes of the world upon her, the first session of the 84th Congress adjourned without availing itself of an excellent opportunity "to show to the world that we practice what we preach in our party platform and in the halls of our legislatures, including the Congress of the United States" by passing the Hawaiian

---


3Congressional Record, 83d Congress, 2d Session (daily edition, April 1, 1954), pp. 4071-4072.
statehood bill which would enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and state government and be admitted into the United States on an equal footing with the original states.

Hawaii is an incorporated territory of the United States. As an incorporated territory, all United States laws not locally inapplicable have the same force in Hawaii as in the states. Yet, Hawaii's one delegate in the Congress of the United States has no vote! The Founding Fathers of this great republic defied the Mother Country because there was taxation without representation. Now, however, residents of Hawaii pay the same rate on income tax as citizens of New York and California, yet they do not have a decisive voice in Congress when any new laws are drawn nor when new taxes are levied.

Hawaii's Efforts to Achieve Statehood

For more than a half century the Territory of Hawaii has sought admission to the United States as a state. In 1903, the legislature of the territory by joint resolution, requested Congress to pass "an act enabling the people of this territory, who are citizens thereof and duly qualified to vote, to meet in convention to frame and adopt a state constitution, whereby and whereunder this territory may be admitted as a state into the Union."3

Since that time, either by petition or resolution of the territorial legislature, the desire for statehood has been brought to the attention of

1James W. Pratt, America's Colonial Experiment (New York, 1950), p. 197.


Congress at least on fourteen occasions. A bill granting statehood for
Hawaii was introduced in the second session of the 66th Congress and since
that time no less than thirty-three bills have been introduced granting
statehood to this territory.\footnote{Hawaii Statehood Commission, \textit{Showcase for Americanism}, (Hawaii, 1953), p. 28.}

Granting statehood to Hawaii would establish a precedent to the effect
that ethnic differences and lack of contiguity are no barrier to state¬
hood. The importance given to these two factors cause much of the difference
of opinion in Congress and elsewhere.\footnote{Edward Latham, \textit{Statehood for Hawaii and Alaska} (New York, 1953), p. 3.} There are, however, other questions
on the issue of statehood for Hawaii: Is Hawaii qualified for statehood?
Would commonwealth status like that of Puerto Rico be better than statehood
for Hawaii? Can Hawaii afford statehood? What is the danger of the Com¬
munist influence becoming predominant?

These and other questions have been raised and debated. It is the
purpose of this study to answer them in the light of the data gathered.
Before attempting to answer them, however, it is necessary to relate a bit
of the history of the island and to discuss how they became incorporated
territory of the United States and the events which led to the acquisition.

\textbf{A Brief History of Hawaii}

The territory of Hawaii is a semitropical archipelago about 2,100 miles
southwest of San Francisco. The islands were created by volcanic action
under the floor of the Pacific Ocean. Lava produced by this upheaval of
nature left a chain of underwater mountains. The tops formed a series
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Granting statehood to Hawaii would establish a precedent to the effect
that ethnic differences and lack of contiguity are no barrier to state¬
hood. The importance given to these two factors cause much of the difference
of opinion in Congress and elsewhere.\footnote{Edward Latham, \textit{Statehood for Hawaii and Alaska} (New York, 1953), p. 3.} There are, however, other questions
on the issue of statehood for Hawaii: Is Hawaii qualified for statehood?
Would commonwealth status like that of Puerto Rico be better than statehood
for Hawaii? Can Hawaii afford statehood? What is the danger of the Com¬
munist influence becoming predominant?

These and other questions have been raised and debated. It is the
purpose of this study to answer them in the light of the data gathered.
Before attempting to answer them, however, it is necessary to relate a bit
of the history of the island and to discuss how they became incorporated
territory of the United States and the events which led to the acquisition.

\textbf{A Brief History of Hawaii}

The territory of Hawaii is a semitropical archipelago about 2,100 miles
southwest of San Francisco. The islands were created by volcanic action
under the floor of the Pacific Ocean. Lava produced by this upheaval of
nature left a chain of underwater mountains. The tops formed a series
of islands extending from Midway to the big island of Hawaii, a thousand miles out southeastward. These make up the Hawaiian archipelago. The primary group known today as the Hawaiian Islands, however, is a closely situated chain of eight principal islands: Hawaii, Maui, Kohoolawe, Lanai, Molokai, Oahu (on which Honolulu is located), Kauai and Nihiwai.

The original settlers were probably Polynesians. No one knows for sure just how or when they got there, but most conjecture has it that they made their way from southeastern Asia by way of the East Indies, the Philippines, the Carolines, Solomons, Tahiti, and the Marshalls -- in big sea-going canoes. They were the progenitors of the Hawaiian people.

Recorded history appears to begin in 1758 with the birth of Kamehameha the Great, who turned out to be a better-than-average warrior. He undertook the task of bringing all the Hawaiian Islands under a single ruler. After twenty years of intermittent warfare the last island, Kauai, came under his sovereignty.2

Hawaii remained isolated from the world at large until Captain James Cook, the English navigator and explorer, landed at Kauai in 1778 and named his "discovery" the Sandwich Islands.3

The first American ship touched Hawaii in 1791 under a Captain Kendrick of Boston: Kendrick originated the sandalwood trade between Hawaii and China.4 The first Americans to settle in the islands were a few traders and adventurers, but in 1820, a group of New England missionaries arrived.

1Hawaii Statehood Commission, op. cit., p. 30.


4Pro and Con Discussion, op. cit., p. 269.
They established a permanent colony. In 1840 the kingdom adopted its first constitution which was modeled along American democratic lines. The monarchy came to an end in 1893 when Queen Liliuokalani was deposed and a provisional government set up with a president. The Republic of Hawaii was established the following year. It became a part of the United States in 1898.1

How the United States Acquired Hawaii

The annexation of the Republic of Hawaii by the United States was accomplished by the Newlands Resolution of July 7, 1898.2 An organic act for Hawaii as contemplated by the joint resolution, was enacted in 1900.3 Hawaii, therefore, became an incorporated, organized territory of the United States, with the Organic Act serving as its Constitution. Annexation as a territory was by voluntary action of the government of Hawaii.4

The war with Spain furnished the United States the impetus necessary to bring about the long-delayed annexation.5 Before this, however, the discovery of gold in California in 1848 had brought about increasingly intimate relations between the United States and Hawaii.6 In May 1849, the Northern Journal, a newspaper of Lowville, New York, advocated, in a two-column editorial, annexation and statehood for the Hawaiian Islands.7 In 1853,  

---

1Hawaiian Statehood Commission, op. cit., p. 30.

230 U. S. Statutes-at-Large, 750 (1898).

331 U. S. Statutes-at-Large, 141 (1900).


5Pratt, op. cit., p. 74.


7Hawaii Statehood Commission, op. cit., p. 28.
King Kamehameha III actually entered into negotiation with the government of the United States to this end. A Treaty providing for the annexation of Hawaii as a state "enjoying the same degree of sovereignty as other states and admitted as such--to all rights, privileges, immunities of a state on a perfect equality with the other states"\(^1\) was drafted, after negotiations with the Department of State. This treaty received the approval of Kamehameha III and was awaiting his signature at the time of his death. According to Mr. Pratt, however, "Only opposition in the United States prevented annexation in the fifties and ratification of reciprocity treaties of 1855 and 1867."\(^3\)

This demand for reciprocity treaties came chiefly from the American sugar growers who had made Hawaii their home and who wanted to get their produce into this country free of duty. The sugar-growers were able to get such a treaty in 1875 with the added stipulation that no part of the territory of Hawaii might be leased or disposed to any other country. In 1884, the treaty was renewed. There was an additional clause to the renewal which gave to the United States the exclusive right to use Pearl Harbor as a naval base.\(^4\)

The treaty of 1875 was of great importance to the history of Hawaii. Trade was stimulated to the extent that the sugar export to the United States was fifteen times as great in 1890 as it had been in 1875 when the treaty was made. The prosperity of the sugar-growers was suddenly brought

\(^1\) H. Report No. 109, p. 65.
\(^2\) Ibid.
\(^3\) Pratt, op. cit., p. 75.
\(^4\) Faulkner, op. cit., p. 76.
to an end when the McKinley Tariff of 1890 put sugar on the free list, but protected the domestic producer by paying a bounty of two cents upon sugar produced in the United States. The price of Hawaiian sugar was cut almost in half. This stimulated again the movement of annexation.\(^1\)

The economic difficulties and the desire for a stable white government very probably precipitated the revolution of 1893 and the setting up of the Provisional Government in Hawaii which preceded the request in 1893 for annexation.\(^2\) Many white business men and lawyers in the islands were of the opinion that annexation by the United States would be granted. They felt that annexation would be a guarantee for a stable government and economic prosperity. The plan to persuade or compel Queen Liliuokalani to abdicate and then offer the islands to the United States was put into effect.

Queen Liliuokalani had no desire nor intention of giving up her throne. Instead her ambitions were to recover for herself and her native subjects the perogatives and rights which the white elite had caused her puppet brother Kalakaua to sign away.\(^3\)

The Queen's unwillingness to yield her authority was not in accord with the plans of the pro-annexationists of Hawaii, nor with the thinking of President Benjamin Harrison, some members of Congress (who had been approached by Lorrin A. Thurston, one of the leaders of the movement to have the Queen abdicate) and L. I. Stevens, the American Minister of Hawaii. Therefore, when the Queen, in January of 1893, tried to promulgate a new constitution, a committee led by two American residents held a mass meeting of 1300 "principal citizens" merchants, bankers, professional men, business men, and

\(^1\)Ibid.

\(^2\)Pratt, op. cit., p. 18.

\(^3\)Ibid., p. 19.
mechanics, (Americans, British, and Germans) and organized a committee on public safety, and called on the American minister for aid. Stevens promptly asked the United States warship Boston to land marines. The committee proceeded to take over the government buildings and the treasury. They proclaimed the Hawaiian government buildings and the Hawaiian government at an end, and organized in its place a Provisional Government with Americans at its head.

The government which the revolutionists displaced was liberal enough, under all circumstances, for white men and foreigners to live under. However under the circumstances, there was no course for the Queen but to yield her authority as she said "to the superior force of the United States of America" until such time as the United States Government should "undo the actions of its representatives," and reinstate her as "the constitutional sovereign of Hawaiian Islands."  

The Republic of Hawaii Seeks Annexation

Soon after the new government was organized by the Americans, Commissioners were sent to Washington with an annexation treaty which President Harrison placed before the Senate February 15, 1893. When the President sent the treaty to the Senate for the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands as "an integral part of the United States" he asked for a life annuity of $20,000 to be paid to the deposed queen. "The treaty", says Mr. Pratt, might have received Senate approval had not the President-elect, Grover

---

3 Pratt, op. cit., p. 19.
4 Moon, ut supra, p. 401.
Cleveland let it be known that he preferred it left for him to deal with after the fourth of March."  

President Cleveland Rejects Treaty

One of the first official acts of President Cleveland was to withdraw the annexation treaty. He sent a commission to the Hawaiian Islands to investigate. He especially wanted to know whether Minister Stevens had taken part in the revolution and whether annexation was actually desired by any large proportion of the natives or only by the ruling clique of whites.

The report confirmed his suspicions. The new minister was instructed to press for the restoration of the monarch with amnesty to the revolutionists. Queen Liliuokalani was reluctant to promise amnesty to them.  

The Provisional Government under Sanford B. Dole refused to follow President Cleveland’s wishes unless forced to do so by the United States army. President Cleveland, unprepared for war, sent the question to Congress. Congress decided to refrain from interference in Hawaii’s affairs.

Hawaii was proclaimed a republic in 1894 by the Provisional Government. A constitutional convention was held in that year and a republican constitution which perpetuated the power of the white minority was adopted. There was a small royalist uprising in 1895, but it was quickly repelled. The tariff of 1894 restored Hawaii sugar to its favored position so that there was peace and prosperity in the islands. Annexation was the objective of the Republic just as it had been the objective of the Provisional Government.

---

1Pratt, op. cit., p. 20.

2Ibid., p. 21.

3H. Report. 109, p. 64.
Government, but it was thought advisable to wait for the return of an administration in the United States more favorable to annexation than the incumbent administration.  

Hawaii Again Seeks Annexation

The Republicans returned to power in 1897 with William McKinley as the President. Mr. McKinley was visited on March 25, by two Hawaiian commissioners who reported to their government that the final differences between McKinley's administration and that of Cleveland was "the difference between daylight and darkness." McKinley gave consent to the negotiation of a new treaty of annexation, and such a treaty, providing for the annexation of the Republic of Hawaii as a territory was signed on June 16, 1897 and sent to the Senate that same day.

The Treaty was not welcomed with outstretched hands by all the people of America. It was strongly opposed by Democrats and domestic sugar men. The treaty was discussed favorably and unfavorably in the press. Such men as Thomas M. Cooley, James Bryce, James Schouler and Arthur James, wrote articles about it. Mr. Cooley argued that Hawaii's government was a defacto one, that the wishes of the Hawaiians were not known nor considered; and that annexation would bring about racial problems.

Daniel Agnew, a Republican, deemed the treaty unwise, dangerous, and unconstitutional! He wrote very critically of President McKinley as

---

1Pratt, op. cit., p. 21.

2Ibid., p. 37.

What has taken place? The President of a great republic nurtured in religion, marked for intelligence, refinement, love of justice, and high civilization, the despoilers of an innocent people, robbed of their own government, their property, and their country. He agrees to accept at the hand of these despoilers the fruits of insurrection and of base ingratitude toward a confiding people. By his personal act, he makes the American people, who love justice and right, accessories after the fact to a great wrong. This is no fancy flight, no romantic tale, but a simple story of the truth, a recital of wrongs known to the world.1

Mr. Agnew was not alone in his criticisms concerning the illegality of the treaty and of those who advocated the acceptance of it. The Nation magazine carried an editorial which was hardly less critical. It said in part:

The feature of the proposed annexation of Hawaii which ought to excite the most comment and the greatest repugnance, has received scarcely any attention, and among advocates of annexation none at all. This is the fact that the American republic, based upon the doctrine that all governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, proposes to change the government of a distant country, without asking the consent of the governed in any way whatsoever.2

Senator Morgan of Alabama, an advocate of annexation, was included in Mr. Agnew's criticism of those who supported the policy of annexation.

That Senator Morgan of Alabama should argue this question as though the people of Hawaii have no rights which white men are bound to respect, is not to be wondered at. He is an ex-slave holder. He belongs to a class who are in office by virtue of suppressing the votes of the black men and also of such whites as do not vote their ticket.3

James Bryce, an Englishman, was asked to write his opinion of the matter of annexation. His broad knowledge of both European and American history enabled him to discuss at length many problems which would come with the

---

1 Daniel Agnew, "Unconstitutionality of the Hawaiian Treaty," The Forum, XXIV (December, 1897), 468.
3 Ibid.
annexation. He not only discussed the problems; he reminded Americans that it would not be in keeping with the ideals and principles upon which this country was founded. Said he:

It would be for her (America) a descent from what may be called the pedestal of wise and pacific detachment on which she now stands, were she to yield to that earth-hunger which has been raging among the European States and to initiate the aggressive methods which some of them have pursued. The policy of creating great armaments and of annexing territories beyond the sea would be, if a stranger may venture to say so, an un-American policy, and a complete departure from the maxims—approved by long experience—of the Republic.¹

Mr. Bryce further pointed out that America was not in need of land to accommodate an over-crowded population such as Britain had, nor had she the crop of trained personnel as Britain to govern colonies or territories.

Other reasons were given by those opposed to annexation. One of these was noncontiguity of the islands to the United States. This, it was thought, would necessitate a strong navy for their protection.² The danger of leprosy was another of the reasons given.³ The heterogeneous population of the islands which was due mainly to the importation of 10,000 Portuguese and 20,000 Chinese and Japanese laborers after the reciprocal treaty of 1875,⁴ was to many persons, the objection of most concerned. Discussing this phase of the issue, James Schouler wrote the following:

...not withstanding our innate and earnest desire to diffuse the blessings of freedom which we enjoy over the rest of the globe, one would think that, with the Indians not yet reclaimed, negroes,

---

¹James Bryce, "The Policy of Annexation for America," The Forum, XXIV (December, 1897), 461.
⁴Faulkner, op. cit., p. 551.
emancipated only by the bloodiest and costliest of civil strifes, and as the latest factor, Chinese disturbing our peace of mind—not to speak of the refuse of European nations cast lately upon us; so constantly by the Atlantic tides—the Union had enough of the problem of amalgamating races into one brotherhood to last at least for the rest of this century.¹

All of the opposition was not within the United States. Anti-annexationists of Honolulu held a mass meeting and drew up resolutions which were presented by a committee of fifteen, to the President Dole and his Cabinet two days before the annexation treaty was adopted by the Senate of the Republic of Hawaii in an extra session called by President Dole for that purpose.²

The half whites of Hawaii, especially the upper class women, opposed annexation because they feared an influx of American people, who would disorganize the society of Hawaii and they would suffer the loss of social position. One woman expressed their opinion of the matter to an American officer as follows:

We don't want them. They will come and look down on us and think we are no better than niggers. They will sneer at our customs, and hold up their hands in horror at the idea of the hulah.³

Arguments for Annexation

Those who favored annexation were not without arguments. There were those who sought annexation with the cry of "manifest destiny" that is, that any opposition was a struggle against fate. John R. Proctor, an American Civil Service Reformer, discussing the issue in The Forum, declared that,

¹Schouler, op. cit., p. 671

²William Garrison, "Annexation Hawaiian Style," The Nation, November 7, 1898, p. 27.

"Our interests as well as our national honor now demand annexation of the Hawaiian group." ¹

Mr. Proctor and others emphasized the need for the islands as a coaling station for ships and for the protection of the Pacific Coast. The point was stressed that if America failed to annex the islands another nation would. Mr. Proctor expressed this fear in an article in The Forum.

In the possession of a hostile power, Hawaii would give an additional based for coaling and repair from which to attack our extended coast-line. With Hawaii in our possession, and Pearl Harbor fortified with coal—furnishing a safe harbor for merchantmen, we need fear no attack from across the Pacific.²

He expressed much less fear of the large percent of Orientals in the population.

Having annexed possessions of France, Spain, Mexico and Russia—with their alien peoples and laws—and, with ease incorporated them into our system, we care little whether there are a few thousand more or less Orientals now in Hawaii. If this be an evil, with annexation; it may become incurable.³

Arthur C. James, writing in the North American Review was not so sure that the Orientals would not prove to be a problem. He thought the Japanese very arrogant, but he thought it is only natural that the whites should govern the islands, and only natural that the new government would wish to connect itself with a strong government such as the United States. "Indeed, the question of deepest concern is not annexation," he said, "for this is inevitable—but to what country shall Hawaii be annexed? Shall it be Japan or England or the United States?"

He was not disturbed that the Hawaiians were not consulted by the new government of Hawaii before it sought annexation. He wrote as follows:

---

¹John R. Proctor, Hawaii and the Changing Front of the World," The Forum, XXIV (September, 1897), 42.
²Ibid.
³Ibid.
"Have the natives been consulted?" No, but were the American Indians consulted in the early days here or the natives of Alaska in the later times? The natives have proved themselves to be incapable of governing and unfitted for the condition of civilization, as shown by their rapid decline in numbers and their inability to adapt themselves to conditions; and the importance of their supposed opinions of annexation has been greatly exaggerated.¹

Annexation by Resolution

The determined opposition to annexation which was manifested by the many expressions of the public at large and the Congress was not without effect. The array of opposition sufficed to hold the question of annexation in abeyance for more than a year. No action was taken on the treaty in the special session of the Senate. When Congress assembled in December 1897, President McKinley repeated his expressions in its favor. The treaty was reported to the Senate from the committee on foreign relations, early in 1898; but the two-thirds majority needed for its ratification could not be obtained. Attempts to accomplish the annexation by that method were given up in March of 1898, and the advocates of the acquisition determined to gain their end by the passage of a joint resolution of Congress, which required no other than a majority of each House. The battle over the questions in this form, was fiercely fought. However, the "joint resolution to provide for annexing the Hawaiian Islands to the United States" was passed in the House of Representatives June 15, and in the Senate July 6, 1898. It was signed by President McKinley the next day, July 7, 1898.² Evidence points to the assumption that it might have failed passage had it not been for the Spanish American War.³

¹ Arthur Curtis James, Advantages of Hawaiian Annexation, North American Review, CLXX (December, 1897), 758.

² Donald E. Smith, et. al., The New Lamed History (Springfield, 1923), V, 4032.

³ Ibid.
CHAPTER II

HAWAII'S TERRITORIAL STATUS AND ITS IMPLICATIONS

The granting of territorial status to Hawaii was nothing new under our scheme of government. However, the acquisition of Hawaii as a dependency by joint resolution was without precedent. All extensions of the borders of the United States, except in the case of Texas, had been made by the exercise of treaty-making power vested in the President and the Senate. Texas was admitted to the Union by joint resolution but was admitted as a State and not as a possession. ¹

Daniel Webster and other able lawyers maintained that the United States Constitution was changed when Texas was admitted as a State by joint resolution, and the opposition to the annexation of Hawaii contended that no precedent existed for the acquisition of territory by joint resolution. Nevertheless, on July 7, 1898, when Senate Joint Resolution ² of the fifty-fifth Congress, sponsored by Senator Francis G. Newlands, of Nevada was adopted, the Hawaiian Islands were made a part of the territorial domain of the United States.

The Organic Act for Hawaii of 1900 ³ which made Hawaii a Territory of the United States, was contemplated in the Newlands Resolution. Under this organic act Hawaii is an incorporated, organized territory of the United

¹Wendell P. Garrison (ed.), "Changing the Constitution," The Nation, July 21, 1898, p. 44.

²30 Stat. 750 (1898).

³31 Stat. 141 (1900).
States, resembling in every material respect the Territories which were created in the continental United States as a preliminary to statehood.¹

Incorporation

The Hawaiian Statehood Commission has the following definition or description of an incorporated territory:

An incorporated territory is a political subdivision of the United States which has been made an integral part of the United States) and which has been brought fully under all of the provisions of the Constitution of the United States.

Incorporation cannot be assumed; it must occur by express declaration of Congress or by implication so strong as to exclude any other view.

Incorporation is a step toward statehood—a declaration of intention to make a territory a State. Thus the courts have referred to organized incorporated territories as "inchoate" (begun but not completed) states; as states "in childhood"; as states in "adolescent youth"; as states "in pupilage"; as "embryo" states; as states in "leading strings"; and as states in their "minority."

An incorporated territory cannot disincorporate itself nor can it separate itself from the Union. To admit an opposite view would be to concede the validity of the repudiated doctrine of cession.²

Historical Background of Statehood

By the end of the American Revolution several of the thirteen original colonies had extended their state boundaries hundreds of miles west of the Alleghenies and north of the Ohio River. This territory became known as the Northwest Territory. There were frequent controversies among the states

over the boundaries because of the conflicting British and French charters. In an effort to secure unity among the thirteen states, the land comprising the Northwest Territory was ceded to the Federal Government.

The Congress of the Confederacy of 1787 passed, one of the outstanding measures of American history—the famous Northwest Ordinance. This measure created and defined a new political form, the Territory, designed to serve as an interim government until the community under it could qualify for statehood.

The intent for ultimate statehood was clearly shown. With executive, judicial and legislative branches in its government, the territory was in effect, the rudimentary state, incorporated into the Union by specific extension of the Constitution and applicable laws of the Federal Government to it.

Out of the incorporated Northwest Territory came the states of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, and Wisconsin. Their transition from territoriality laid the pattern for twenty-four other states of the Union. Today, all of the incorporated territory of the United States has achieved statehood except Alaska and Hawaii. The other outlying possessions of the United States are not incorporated territories.

In each of the twenty-nine cases, Congress enabled each territory to become a state after it had met three simple but historically effective tests:

(1) That the territory had attained a sufficiently large population to support statehood in the time in which it was admitted;

(2) That the population was imbued with, and was wholeheartedly in support of, democracy and the American form of government; and
(3) That the people of the territory desired statehood.  

Supreme Court Rulings Regarding Statehood

The strong precedent which established territoriality as a preparation for statehood has been reaffirmed time and again by rulings of the United States Supreme Court and opinions of other authorities on constitutional law.

Chief Justice Taney in the celebrated Dred Scott case, declared that a territory "is acquired to become a state, and not to be held as a colony and governed by Congress with absolute authority."

As late as 1894, the United States Supreme Court handed down a similar decision using language obviously borrowed from the Ordinance of 1787:

The territories acquired by Congress whether by deed or cession from the original states, or by treaty with a foreign country, are held with the object, as soon as their population and conditions justify, of being admitted into the Union as States upon an equal footing with the original States in all respects.

In still another instance, the Supreme Court ruling, holding that the District of Columbia Court of Appeals was a constitutional court of the United States, concluded:

The absence from the Constitution of such guaranties for territorial judges was no doubt due to the fact that the organization of governments for the territories was but temporary, and would be superseded when the territories became states of the Union.

---


2H. Rept. 109, 83d Cong., (1953).

3Ibid.

4Ibid.
In O'Donoghue v. United States, the Supreme Court ruled:

Since the Constitution provides for the admission by Congress of the new states, it properly may be said that outlying continental domain, of which the United States was the proprietor, was, from the beginning, destined for admission as a state or states into the Union; and that as a preliminary step toward that fore-ordained end—to tide over the period of ineligibility—Congress, from time to time, created territorial governments, the existence of which was necessarily limited to the period of pupilage.  

In Shively v. Bowlby, the Supreme Court ruled:

And the territories acquired by Congress, whether by deed or cession from the original states, or by treaty with a foreign country, are held with the object, as soon as their population and condition justify it, of being admitted into the Union as states, upon an equal footing with the original states in all respects;...  

In Balzac v. Porto Rico, the Court ruled that "Incorporation has always been a step, and an important one, leading to statehood." The Supreme Court also said, in Nelson v. United States, that, "The territorial state is one of pupilage at best, and may include the mere child as well as the adolescent youth."

Implications for Hawaii

The evidence points conclusively to the fact that territorial status has implied ultimate statehood. The question is now posed: Did Congress, by virtue of the Newlands Resolution of 1898 and the Organic Act of 1900, which granted territorial status to Hawaii, commit the United States to the ultimate granting of statehood?

\[1\] 1289 U. S. 537.
\[2\] 152 U. S. 49.
\[3\] 3258 U. S. 311.
\[4\] 30 Fed. 115.
By virtue of the Newlands Resolution, the President appointed a commission of five to formulate the Organic Act for Hawaii. As early as September 10, 1898, Senator Morgan of Alabama, who was one of the five commissioners, said, "The Territory of Hawaii has a great future before it, and with the increase of population and business that must come from annexation and all that is implied by it, the road to statehood cannot be a long one."¹ Apparently this was the view of the commission which drafted the Organic Act.

An opposing opinion was held by Senator Aldrich of Connecticut. When the Organic Act was being debated in the Senate, Senator Platt offered the following amendment to the bill:

Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed, taken or held to imply a pledge of promise that the Territory of Hawaii will at any future time be admitted as a State, or attached to any state.²

But Senator Platt's proposed amendment was defeated in the Senate. The same amendment was offered by Representative Hill of Connecticut when the bill reached the House of Representatives for debate. The amendment was rejected by the House. Hon. A. G. M. Robertson, chief counsel for Equal Rights Commission, Hawaii (1946), expressed the opinion of other legal minds as well as of his own, when he made the following statement:

By that action of the gentlemen of Congress, Congress committed itself not only to the organization of the islands as a Territory of the United States, but regarded the status of territory as a stepping stone to statehood, and by the rejection by Congress of Senator Platt's proposed amendment in the Senate, and Congressman Hill's proposed amendment in the House, Congress at that time went clearly on record.³

²Ibid., p. 57.
³Ibid.
Hon. Ingram Stainback, former governor of Hawaii was also of the opinion that Congress committed the United States to the ultimate granting of statehood. In a statement prepared by him for the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, he expressed the following opinion:

The Northwest Ordinance established that the ultimate destiny of an incorporated Territory of the United States is statehood. When Congress, by the Newlands Resolution, accepted the cession made on the terms that Hawaii should be incorporated into the United States as an integral part thereof and should be granted Territorial status, Congress then and there committed the United States to the ultimate granting of statehood.¹

It was definitely the opinion of the people and government who voluntarily sought annexation.² The hope of statehood was pointed out to the people at the very inception of territorial government. In his inaugural address as the first Presidentially appointed governor of the Territory of Hawaii, Governor Sanford B. Dole made the following statement:

Hawaii is forewarned by its past experience for this new essay in government. The honorable competition of sister Territories, the hope of statehood, and the glorious history of America must inspire her.³

Successive governors since Dole have labored for statehood, up to and including the Hon. Oren E. Long, who took office in May 1951.⁴

The people of Hawaii want statehood. They ratified a proposed Constitution by 3 to 1 in 1950. They are a politically mature people—88 percent of them voted in the 1952 Territorial election. The last Joseph R.


³S. Rept. 314, op. cit., p. 10.

⁴Ibid.
Farrington who for a number of years was the delegate from Hawaii to the United States Congress (he was serving in this capacity at the time of his death, June, 1954) felt that Hawaii was promised statehood and that all of the requirements of statehood had been met. Speaking before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs he said:

If the promise of statehood is to be repudiated now in the light of the record made by the people of Hawaii, then a course will have been chosen that is, indeed, a new precedent for this great country. The United States will have been put in the position of having broken its word and assigned a large group of its citizens permanently to an inferior position. It will have embarked on a policy of colonialism. And it will be inviting all the evils that inevitably follow in the train of colonial system.1

Senator James E. Murray, senior Senator from Montana and a member of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs expressed the opinion that withholding statehood from Hawaii is not in keeping with American policy. It has been the policy of the United States to give to the people what they themselves have wanted, that is, in every instance except with the two incorporated Territories of Hawaii and Alaska. "To do anything different, to hold people under a form of government not to their liking, would be tyranny. The United States was created, not to perpetuate tyranny, but to over throw it."2

There is no proper alternative to statehood for the incorporated Territory of Hawaii. It has been ruled, by the highest courts, and it has been the repeated opinion of constitutional authorities, that territorial status is but a prelude to statehood; and that an incorporated territory cannot secede from the United States nor disincorporate itself.

The only alternative, therefore, is continued bureaucratic control of Hawaii by the Central Government in Washington. Although the Hawaii Legislature is empowered to act in purely local matters, the people of Hawaii are now compelled to depend upon the rulings of the Office of Territories in the Department of the Interior for executive action and upon the Congress of the United States for legislative action on major Territorial matters. They are deprived of full local self-government and are denied any voting representation in the Congress which governs and taxes them. This is not in keeping with the American ideal of freedom, and it is not acceptable to the people of Hawaii.¹

Statehood for Hawaii fits the logical pattern developed for the granting of statehood to territories which have been incorporated and which have satisfactorily served their period of tutelage.² Hawaii has had more than a fifty year period of tutelage, longer than any of the territories which have become states of the Union except New Mexico. Is Hawaii now ready for statehood? Does she meet the requirements which the twenty-nine other incorporated Territories met when they were admitted as States? What are her qualifications for statehood?

²Hawaii Statehood Commission, op. cit., p. 31.
CHAPTER III

HAWAII'S QUALIFICATIONS FOR STATEHOOD

The answers to all of the questions which have been raised concerning Hawaii's qualifications for statehood may be found in the reports of the investigations which have been made, and the hearings which have been held by Congressional committees to determine Hawaii's qualifications for statehood. "The record of testimony and information built up around the question of statehood for Hawaii is more complete than was the case for any other state prior to admission" according to the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee report of 1951.¹

Since 1935, Congressional committees have made more than six on-the-spot investigations and have held hearings in at least twelve different sessions (1935, 1937, 1946, 1947, 1948, 1949, 1950, 1951, 1953, 1954, and 1955) of Congress to determine Hawaii's readiness for statehood.² The record of these investigations and hearings includes more than 5,000 pages of printed material and reports covering 57 subjects; it includes the viewpoints of more than thirty Congressmen who have visited Hawaii as members of statehood investigating committees; it includes a record of a hundred or more days of hearings, and the testimony of more than 700 witnesses.³

¹House Hearings, 85th Cong., op. cit., p. 56.
³Hawaii Statehood Commission, op. cit., p. 28.
An examination of the record shows that Hawaii has met the requirements for statehood according to the "traditional yardsticks which have been used to determine whether a Territory qualifies for statehood."\(^1\) Does it have sufficient area and population? Will its resources and economy be sufficient to assure funds to carry the burden of State government expenditures? Do the people of the Territory manifest a desire for statehood? Last, and perhaps most important of all: Have the people of the Territory proven their belief in the American republican form of government and have they demonstrated an ability for self-government? The 1951 report of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee stated that Hawaii has "fully" and "unequivocally" met every historic qualification for statehood.\(^2\)

Area and Population

Hawaii has an area of approximately 6,450 square miles, an area greater than any of three states -- Connecticut, Delaware, and Rhode Island. The five major islands would extend from Washington, D. C., to Cleveland, Ohio, or from New Orleans to Memphis.\(^3\)

Hawaii's present population (489,794, United States Census, 1950) exceeds that of any other Territory at the time of admission as a State with the single exception of Oklahoma.

It exceeds today the population of four states, as based on the April 1,

---

\(^1\) *House Hearings, 84th Cong., 1st sess. (1955), p. 87.*

\(^2\) *Hawaii Statehood Commission, op. cit., p. 31.*

\(^3\) *Ibid.*
1950, Federal census:

Nevada .......................................................... 160,083
Wyoming ......................................................... 290,528
Delaware ......................................................... 318,085
Vermont .......................................................... 377,747

It borders the population of several other States, notably Idaho, Montana, and New Hampshire. The population is not static. The 1950 gain is 18.1 per cent over that of 1940. Approximately 87 per cent of the population of Hawaii are United States citizens.1

Hawaii's Economic Stability and Resources

The financial condition of the Territory appears sound. Being subject to the same Federal taxation as the 48 States, it consistently pays into the United States Treasury considerably larger amounts than the Federal Government spends in Hawaii (not including national defense).2

In 1953, Hawaii contributed nearly $136 million in Federal taxes. This was a greater contribution than any of nine States of Nevada, New Hampshire, Montana, Vermont, Idaho, South Dakota, North Dakota, Wyoming, and New Mexico. In the past decade the Territory paid over one and one-fourth billion dollars in Federal taxes.3

Hawaii has a self-sustaining economy and substantial resources in its lands and industries. It outstrips, by far in real property assessments, goods produced and business turnover, any of the 29 territories heretofore admitted to statehood. Sugar production, its largest industry, takes up about 5.4 per cent of about 6,435 square miles of land usable at present

1H. Rept. 109, op. cit., p. 62.
2Hawaii Statehood Commission, op. cit., p. 31.
3Ibid.
for intensive agriculture. The value of the 1952 sugar crop was $139 million. The pineapple crop, second in importance was valued at $100 million in 1952. The tourist income was just under $35 million. Other industries include coffee, cattle ranching, tuna fish canning, fresh flowers and foliage, and wood products.

Hawaii ranks as one of the best customers of the continental United States. Purchases from the mainland of food, clothing, shoes, motor cars, household appliances, construction materials, machinery and equipment, fuel, medical supplies and other items amounted to more than $380 million in 1951. Retail sales in 1952 were above $500 million.

In the fiscal year of 1952-1953, clearings of Hawaii's forty-four banks amounted to two and one-half billion dollars. Net assessed valuation of real property was $640 million, an amount greater than that of several States.

Statehood is Desired

There was some doubt as to whether many of the people of Hawaii wanted Hawaii to become a territory of the United States, but there is no need for doubt as to the people's desire for statehood. Repeatedly the Legislature of Hawaii has made appropriations to underwrite the expenses of successive Congressional commissions which have visited the Territory to study its qualifications for statehood. Such appropriations included those of the years 1907, 1911, 1913, 1915, 1917, 1925, 1932, 1933, 1937, and 1939.

---

5 H. Rept. 109, (1953), *op. cit.*, p. 65.
Upon the recommendation of a joint Congressional committee that spent seventeen days in the Territory in 1937, the Territorial legislature authorized a plebiscite of the electorate of the Territory to determine its actual sentiment on statehood. By a majority of more than two to one, the people voted in favor of statehood.¹

Since 1940 Hawaii's support of the statehood movement has grown even stronger. When Tom O'Brien, radio commentator and newspaper correspondent of Hilo, Hawaii, testified before the Senate Committee on Interior Affairs that the average resident of Hawaii does not want statehood, Chairman Hugh Butler received the following telegram from Henry Nye of Honolulu:

Strongly protest statements made by Mr. O'Brien that majority of people of Hawaii desire commonwealth status. Variety polls here reveal great majority favor immediate statehood, overwhelming vote State Constitution shows Hawaii ready for statehood now.²

The State Constitution to which Mr. Nye's telegram refers was drafted in 1950 by a constitutional convention which was convened in April, 1950 with 63 delegates representing a cross section of Hawaii's population from all parts of the Territory. It was signed by 62 of the 63 delegates on July 22, 1950 and, by an almost unanimous vote, the legislature of the Territory enacted a joint resolution approved the Constitution, as drafted, without alternative proposals. Provision was made for a ratification vote of the electorate of Hawaii at the general election on November 7, 1950. The electorate approved the constitution as drafted, by a three to one majority, with 82 per cent of the eligible voters having voted on the

¹Ibid.

question.¹

Hawaiians realize that territorial status means a curtailment of some of the privileges that most American citizens take for granted. They don't get to vote for the President of the United States nor for their own governor. They don't always get their share of federal aid funds when such funds are distributed to States. They are often overlooked when money is appropriated for education and internal improvements unless the bills include the phrase "provisions to be extended to Hawaii." The late Joseph R. Farrington expressed their feeling about the advantage of statehood when he said: "We would have the great satisfaction that comes of being the equal of every other American."²

Patriotism and Loyalty

If the ultimate test of loyalty and patriotism is the willingness to fight and die for one's country, Hawaii has nobly met this test for statehood. The record of Hawaii's participation in World War II and the Korean Conflict is conclusive proof of Hawaii's thorough Americanism and absolute loyalty.³

In January of 1943 the War Department had ended the restriction on enlistment by Nisei and called for volunteers to form all-Nisei combat team. The response was spontaneous and overwhelming. Forty per cent of the eligible number in the population on the islands volunteered. Of these volunteers, nearly twice the quota of 1,500 were chosen. The 2,600 chosen, together with mainland Japanese-Americans formed the 442d Combat Team, which

²Edelman, op. cit., pp. 119-120.
³H. Rept. 109, op. cit., p. 63.
eventually joined its fellows of the 100th Battalion, has been described by General Clark as "the most decorated unit in the United States."

The war record of the entire population of Hawaii was exemplary, not one single case of sabotage by a Hawaiian civilian was reported throughout the war. More than 22,000 of her young men selected at random from all walks of life, and representative of all racial groups served with honor in the Korean Conflict. Not one case of desertion to the Communist enemy occurred.

Capacity for Self Government

Since 1840 Hawaii has had a functioning, orderly government patterned on a constitutional form. The first legislature to include elected representatives of the people was convened by the king on May 20, 1845. Executive branches of the government were formed, civil and criminal codes of law were established in the manner of western nations. In 1852, a new and liberal constitution was granted by which the people were given the opportunity to share in the administration of the nation's governmental affairs. In 1892 the legislature of the kingdom provided that the "common law of England as ascertained by English and American decisions shall be the common law of Hawaii."

The influence of American constitutional concepts can be observed at work

---

1 Ibid.
2 Ibid., p. 11
4 House Hearings, op. cit., p. 57. 79th Cong. 2d sess. (1946).
5 Ibid.
in Hawaii since annexation in 1898. An examination of its legislative record will show that Hawaiian legislation has been progressive, constructive, and intelligent; it has kept pace with the times and compares favorably with the legislation passed by our most progressive States.\(^1\)

Hawaii has adopted 20 of the mainland's uniform laws... Hawaii has a civil service law, a modern retirement system for all employees. In the field of public health the Territory has enacted a crippled children's act, created a bureau of mental hygiene, passed uniform narcotic drugs act, a public medical care program, a public assistance program, labor legislation and unemployment compensation.\(^2\)

The ability of the legislature to accept its responsibilities was demonstrated in 1949, when it was called in special session to stop the shipping strike of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union which was endangering the economy of Hawaii. Governor Stainback called the special session after he had appealed to Washington for help and was told, "That is your province. You go back and attend to it."\(^3\) The Governor and the legislature accepted that responsibility. Adequate legislation to protect the interests of the people was passed. Workers went back to work on the same recommendation that a fact-finding commission had made six months before.\(^4\) Hawaii's legislative record is cogent and irresistible evidence of its ability to govern itself.\(^5\)

Hawaii was the first jurisdiction in the United States to fully adopt the recommendations of the American Bar Association with respect to re-

\(^1\)Ibid.
\(^2\)Ibid., p. 550a.
\(^3\)Senate Hearings, 83d Cong., Part 2, op. cit., p. 543.
\(^4\)Ibid., p. 547.
quirements for admission to the bar. As might be expected, it has a bar of high standing and ability. Every member of the bar has studied in a mainland college or university; this naturally enhances American influence in the Territory's legal and governmental affairs. The courts of the Territory are functioning satisfactorily. The judges are men of learning; most of them are graduates of accredited law colleges of the United States and are highly regarded by the legal profession.

Education

The public schools of Hawaii have been surveyed at least once every decade since 1920. The opening paragraph of the 1946 report on education in the Hawaiian Islands, made by the American Council on Education, states:

The Territory of Hawaii has convincing evidence in the days which followed December 7, 1941, that its educational program has faced a critical test, and that the objectives and ideals of democratic citizenship had become a part of a people of many races and backgrounds. Every American citizen owes a debt of gratitude to those people in the Territory who had the vision to plan and develop a democratic school program. Few other communities can boast of having done so much educationally in such a short period of time.

Hawaii's school system is patterned after the best in American tradition. Modern dental-hygiene facilities, hearing and vision testing is a part of the regular program. The cafeteria and nutrition program is exemplary. It is not surprising that Hawaii's educational system includes health education since Hawaii's official board of health preceded that of any state

---

1H. Rept. 109, op. cit., p. 12.


3House Hearings, 83d Cong., No. 1, op. cit., p. 46.
Hawaii's schools are well-equipped and are better attended than the schools of any state except Maine and Michigan. Hawaii's expenditures per pupil exceeds those in thirty-three states. Teachers are required to have certificates based upon five years of college training; they are higher paid on an average and have a lighter teaching load than the teachers in mainland schools.

As a result of legislation the control of schools in Hawaii is more highly centralized than in any state in the Union. This has resulted in a higher degree of equality of educational opportunity for all the children than is generally found. There is one salary schedule for all the teachers regardless of whether they work in city schools or in rural schools; education requirements are the same for teachers in all localities; the same educational supply and equipment items are provided for each school. To an unusual degree, rural schools are on a par with city schools. Very few, if any, states could truthfully say the same of their rural schools.

In view of the unusual racial composition of Hawaii's population, the development of sound qualities of citizenship has for many years, been a primary objective of the public schools. As a part of their curriculum, they inculcate the basic principles of American democracy. The inter-racial tolerance so characteristic of Hawaii is, in no small measure, the emphasis

---

1Ibid.

2Edelman, op. cit., p. 50.

3House Hearings, 83d Cong., No. 1, op. cit., p. 46.

in the public school program.¹

Since education is the true bedrock upon which good citizenship must be built, Hawaii may well be proud of a public school system which offers equal educational training for citizenship to all of her children. The worth of such a program is revealed in a study of comparison tables which were sent to the Mississippi State Legislature by Mr. George H. Lehleitner of Bay St. Louis, Mississippi who was perturbed over some remarks made in the Senate by Mississippi's Senator Eastland, in opposition to statehood for Hawaii.²

The tables reveal that in 1952 the per cent of citizens of voting age in Hawaii who voted in the election for her delegate to Congress was 68.7 while in Mississippi only 23.7 of the citizens of voting age, voted in the presidential election. The median school years completed by persons twenty-one years of age is shown to be 12.2 in Hawaii and only 9.4 in Mississippi. In the crime area, Hawaii's percentage is much lower. For murder and manslaughter per 100,000 inhabitants, Hawaii's 3.68 per cent is more than tripled by Mississippi's 13.05. For robbery, 13.9 per cent is shown for Hawaii while Mississippi has 18.9 per cent. For aggravated assault, Mississippi's 86.2 per cent is more than five times Hawaii's 15.3 per cent.³ These figures may be readily understood when they are compared with those which show that the cost per pupil in Hawaii in 1952 was $214.82 while for

³Ibid.
the State of Mississippi the average amount spent per pupil was $79.69, or just a little more than one third as much. The average salary for teachers in Hawaii was given as $4,178. In Mississippi the average was $1,741.1

Only a portion of Mr. Lehleitner's comparison figures are given here, but one may see that in the area of education, Hawaii is better qualified for statehood than is the State of Mississippi.

Public Opinion Toward Statehood

Hawaii has established beyond doubt its capacity to meet the responsibilities of State government. In area and population, economic and social development, political experience and maturity, and devotion and loyalty to this country and its principles, Hawaii passes all the tests heretofore required of Territories. What now of public opinion toward statehood for Hawaii? Do stateside Americans favor a 49th State? In an editorial of February 11, 1954, in the Moline (Illinois) Dispatch, the following statements are found:

Congress first considered Hawaiian statehood in 1903. Every President since then has supported it. Six Congressional committees have made on-the-spot investigations of qualifications for statehood, and the last four (1946, 1947, 1948, 1950) have recommended immediate action. The House of Representatives has approved statehood three times, including the action in the present Congress.

One of the outstanding features of Hawaii's campaign for statehood has been the aggressive and vigorous support of the press. Most of the newspapers

1Ibid.

of the country have been on Hawaii's side. The Hawaii Statehood Commission has tabulated editorials in newspapers, dailies and weeklies, large and small, in all sections of the country. According to this tabulation, only fifty-two editorials opposed immediate statehood, while over 2,750 favored the action.\footnote{House Rept. No. 88, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 10.} Represented in the press compilation favorable to admission of Hawaii are newspapers turning out the bulk of the Nation's 54 million copies which reach the great majority of the American public every day.\footnote{Senate Hearing, 83d Cong., \textit{op. cit.}, p. 53.}

George Gallup, director of the American Institute of Public Opinion, has stated that if Congress makes Hawaii the 49th State "it will be putting into effect a proposal which has had the backing of the American public for more than twelve years."\footnote{\textit{Ibid.}, p. 52.}

As early as 1941, and at repeated intervals since, surveys of the Institute have found opinion in favor of admitting Hawaii into the Union.\footnote{\textit{Ibid.}} A national poll in February 1955, on the question "Would you favor or oppose having Hawaii admitted as a State of the Union?" The per cent favoring statehood was seventy-eight. Only 12 per cent opposed and 10 per cent had no opinion.\footnote{\textit{Ibid.}}

Nearly two-score national organizations with combined membership running into tens of millions of persons have endorsed statehood for Hawaii. Represented in these organizations are persons in the professions, in veterans

\footnote{House Rept. \textit{ut supra}, p. 10.}
affairs, the church, labor, the farming industry, political organizations, women's professional organizations, service clubs, education, business and industrial groups, civic and fraternal bodies and commercial societies.\(^1\) The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the 84th Congress has stated that it knows of only one national group in recent years, namely, the Southern States Industrial Council, that has gone on record as being opposed to statehood.\(^2\)

Both major parties in the United States included a recommendation of statehood for Hawaii in their party platforms of 1944, 1948, and 1952.\(^3\) The presidential candidates of both major political parties in the 1952 campaign unequivocally endorsed it.\(^4\)

In each of his state-of-the-Union addresses, President Dwight D. Eisenhower has urged immediate statehood for Hawaii. In his address of January 6, 1955 the President stated, "... there is no justification for deferring the admission to statehood of Hawaii. I again urge approval of this measure."\(^5\)

Former President Harry S. Truman made a direct appeal while in office to the then chairman of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee asserting that -- "The case for statehood rests on both legal and moral grounds."\(^6\)

Statehood for Hawaii has received endorsement of the State Department, the Defense Department and the Department of the Interior. Secretary of

\(^1\)Ibid., p. 101.
\(^2\)Ibid.
\(^3\)Ibid., p. 10.
\(^4\)Ibid., p. 96.
\(^5\)Ibid., p. 10.
\(^6\)Ibid.
the Interior, Douglas McKay is the fourth Secretary of the Interior to support statehood for Hawaii. When testifying before the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on February 4, 1955, Mr. McKay stated that the passage of statehood legislation for Hawaii is a "must" of national policy.¹

¹House Hearings, 84th Cong., op. cit., p. 211.
LEGISLATION TOWARD STATEHOOD

If Hawaii has met the criteria for statehood and if, as the Moline Dispatch points out, that immediate action has been recommended by the Congressional committees that made on-the-spot investigations of her qualifications for statehood and the House of Representatives has approved statehood three times, why has Hawaii failed to receive the same endorsement of the Senate?

Since 1920, no less than 41 bills for statehood have been introduced into successive Congresses. The first time either House acted on a Hawaiian statehood measure was in 1947, when the House of Representatives passed a bill, approving statehood by a vote of 196 to 133.\(^1\) President Truman indicated that he would sign the bill, but the Senate Committee decided on further investigation.\(^2\)

During 1948, three separate investigations on the subject of statehood for Hawaii were held. In January the chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Territories and Insular Affairs, Senator Guy Cordon, of Oregon went to Hawaii at the direction of the full committee in connection with the Hawaiian Statehood Bill. Public hearings were held for sixteen days on the major islands. Of the 231 witnesses testifying, 215 favored statehood and 16 opposed it. Senator Cordon recommended that the bill be favorably

---

\(^1\) House Rept. 88, op. cit., p. 18.

\(^2\) Ibid.
reported to the Senate with a recommendation for speedy action. This was not done, however. The Senate committee decided to hold further hearings in the Nation's capital to determine national interest.¹

The second hearing of 1948 was begun on April 15. Eight witnesses were heard and even though not one of the eight was in opposition to statehood, the committee decided to take no action on the report of the subcommittee and instead authorized the chairman, Senator Hugh Butler, to arrange a trip to Hawaii for committee members wishing to study the matter on the ground.²

The third investigation of 1948 was held in Hawaii in November. Chairman Butler conducted an investigation of Communist activities in the Territory. More than seventy interviews were made a part of the record. However, the report of the investigation was not made until June 1949. It then carried a recommendation that statehood be deferred until Communism had been effectually controlled in the Territory.³

In March 1950, the House of Representatives again passed the Hawaii Statehood bill after Congress had been strongly urged to act favorably on the Hawaii legislation by a House Public Lands Committee, Special Committee on Pacific Territories, after an extended trip throughout the Pacific area in January, 1950. The House voted on March 10, 262 to 110 to admit Hawaii into the Union as a state.⁴ The Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee held public hearings in Washington on the bill. Sixty witnesses,

¹Ibid., p. 93.
²Ibid.
³Ibid.
⁴Senate Hearing, 83d Cong., op. cit., p. 18.
none of whom were in opposition, were heard.\textsuperscript{1} The committee reported favorably on the bill in June 1950, but the time element and impending legislation involving international matters kept the bill from reaching the floor of the Senate before Congress adjourned.\textsuperscript{2}

A Statehood bill, introduced by the House chairman of the Subcommittee on Territories, John P. Saylor of Pennsylvania, was passed by the House March 10, 1953. The vote was 274 to 138.\textsuperscript{3} The Senate committee held a full-dress investigation from June 29 through July 11, in Washington and again on January 7, 8, 1954. On January 27, the full committee by a vote of 12 to 3 reported favorably, the Hawaii Statehood bill.\textsuperscript{4} The Senate, however, amended the bill to include Alaska and on April 1, 1954, the Hawaii-Alaska Enabling Act was passed by the Senate by a vote of 57 to 28.\textsuperscript{5} The House Rules Committee tabled the request for a rule on the legislation the last week in July.\textsuperscript{6} No further action was taken on the Hawaii statehood legislation in the 83d Congress.

In December 1954, a subcommittee of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs visited the Territory of Hawaii and made the seventh on-the-spot investigation. Notice was carried via press and radio that statehood hearings would be held on December 16, and 17. Only one of the 21 witnesses

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{1}Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{2}House Rept. 88, op. cit., p. 18.
\item \textsuperscript{3}Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{4}Ibid., p. 95.
\item \textsuperscript{5}Ibid., p. 18.
\item \textsuperscript{6}Letter from Mrs. Margaret C. Turner (Secretary to Delegate Joseph R. Farrington of Hawaii, United States Congress, July 29, 1954).
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who volunteered to be heard was opposed to statehood.¹

"A Bill to enable the people of Hawaii and Alaska each to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original states,"² is the latest Hawaiian Statehood bill to be considered by Congress. It was introduced into the House of Representatives January 20, 1955, by Clair Engle of California. After hearings for 10 days by the full committee of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee the bill was reported with amendments. By a vote of 19 to 6, the committee reported favorably on the bill.³ This was the first time a joint bill for Alaska and Hawaii was ever reported out by a committee⁴ despite the passage of the Hawaii-Alaska Enabling bill by the Senate in April, 1954.

Due in part to the indefatigable perseverance of Mrs. Joseph R. Farrington, the widow and successor of the late Delegate Farrington, the bill came before the House of Representatives May 9, 1955.⁵ The House voted 322 to 66 to consider the combined Hawaii-Alaska Statehood bill under procedure barring any amendments.⁶ The opponents of statehood for either Territory figured their chances of defeating the bill were better if no amendments

¹House Rept. 88, op. cit., p. 95.
²House Hearings, 84th Cong., op. cit., p. 1.
³Ibid., p. 475.
⁴Ibid., p. 434.
were permitted.\textsuperscript{1} After a "loud-voiced, low-swinging" debate, the House voted on May 10, 218 to 170, to send the statehood bill back to committee.\textsuperscript{2} This undoubtedly means that no further action will be taken on the legislation in this session of Congress. Why did the House fail to pass this bill? What are the reasons that Congress has failed in previous Congresses to honor the reports of the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs by enacting statehood legislation for Hawaii?

\textsuperscript{1}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{2}"Loud and Low," \textit{Time}, May 23, 1955, p. 25.
CHAPTER V

OBJECTIONS TO STATEHOOD

Communism

One of the most frequently repeated arguments against granting statehood to Hawaii in recent hearings has been that Communists "have a stranglehold on the economy of the Hawaiian Islands, and that they have such political power that communism is a threat to the political stability of the Territory as well—that officials are now and, under statehood would continue to be, subject to communist pressure."\(^1\) Republican Representative John Pillion of New York, who according to Time has never been to Hawaii, used anti-communism as his chief weapon in leading the opposition to the passage of the Statehood bill. He charged that communism has infiltrated "every phase of Territorial activity in Hawaii in an alarming degree."\(^2\)

"Statehood at this time," asserted Mr. Pillion, "would only serve to deliver the Hawaiian State government to the Communist Party on a silver platter."\(^3\)

The proponents of statehood for Hawaii make no claims that there are no Communists in Hawaii, but they do contend that the presence of Communists there does not justify the withholding of statehood inasmuch as many Communists are known to be in some of the states. In reply to the charge of Representative Pillion, Nebraska's Republican Representative A. L. Miller


\(^2\)Pearson, op. cit., p. 14E.

pointed out that a 1951 report of the Federal Bureau of Investigation listed only thirty-six known Communists in Hawaii (as opposed to more than 20,000 in John Pillion's home state.\(^1\)

Under date of January 13, 1954, the Attorney General of the United States, who has under him the Federal Bureau of Investigation and other fact finding and law enforcement agencies, reported to the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs as follows:

The facts known to me concerning communism in Hawaii do not indicate any reason to believe that communism is a greater menace in Hawaii at the present time than it was in 1950. As a matter of fact, the known members of the Communist Party in Hawaii appear to be fewer in number at present than they were in 1950. Undoubtedly, the recent conviction of the leaders of the Communist conspiracy in Hawaii has contributed to this decline in Communist Party membership. I believe it inevitable that this conviction will have a weakening effect on the strength of communism in Hawaii.

The fact that it has been necessary to prosecute the leaders of the Communist conspiracy in Hawaii is, in my opinion, no more of an indication of the strength of the party in that area than the convictions of the Communist leaders in New York, Pittsburgh, Seattle, and Los Angeles are indications of party control and dominance in those areas.\(^2\)

In the past six years there have been at least six investigations by subcommittees of Congress into the threat of Communist control, political and economic, of the Territory.\(^3\) A subcommittee of the House Un-American Activities Committee conducted an investigation of communist activity in Hawaii. This was done at the petition of the Territorial Legislature.

\(^1\)Ibid.

\(^2\)Senate Rept. 886, op. cit., pp. 7-8.

\(^3\)Senate Rept. 886, op. cit., p. 8.
Neither the subcommittee chairman, Francis E. Walter of Pennsylvania, nor the ranking minority member, Harold H. Velde, reported any cause whatsoever for withholding statehood from Hawaii.\textsuperscript{1} Congressman Velde made the following statement:

No one is more keenly aware of the menace to communism than the people of Hawaii themselves. It is my conviction that communism can be more effectively dealt with under a strong State government than under the present territorial status.\textsuperscript{2}

The late Senator Hugh Butler, who in 1949 recommended that statehood for Hawaii be deferred indefinitely, made another on-the-spot investigation in the fall of 1952. As a result of this investigation, he reported as follows:

In conclusion, therefore, I believe that the residents of Hawaii during the past 4 years since publication of my 1949 report have demonstrated by positive action their awareness of the Communist danger and their determination to face it frankly and never let it strengthen its foothold. During those years they have fought it boldly, have restricted its influence, and to some degree have driven it underground. I believe they have shown that they are as well able as the Federal Government to cope with this menace.\textsuperscript{3}

The record is full of evidence that the leaders and the people of Hawaii are alert to the Communist danger and intend to fight it at every opportunity. The Territorial Legislature has set up a commission on Un-American activities. In spite of the efforts of the leaders of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, seven Hawaii residents were recently tried and found guilty of the Smith Act.\textsuperscript{4} The proponents of statehood for Hawaii contend (1) that the general public in all strata of society in

\textsuperscript{1}\textit{Ibid.}

\textsuperscript{2}\textit{Congressional Record, 84th Cong. (daily edition, May 9, 1955), p. 5020.}

\textsuperscript{3}\textit{Senate Rept. 886, op. cit., pp. 8-9.}

\textsuperscript{4}\textit{Ibid.}
Hawaii have become far more alert to the Communist menace during the past several years; (2) that Communist power and influence have strikingly declined during the past few years; and (3) that communism in Hawaii is no more of a threat to the present Territorial government or the proposed State government than it is in any of the existing States.¹

In a letter to Senator Wayne Morris of Oregon, Buck Buchwaok, a newspaper reporter of Honolulu, but a former resident of Oregon, expressed his views as to how the Communists might use the arguments of the opposition to further their own cause in the Far East. He wrote as follows:

The most bitter medicine is the charge that we are completely controlled by the Communist and would be a "Communist State." That is false testimony. It is the Communists most of all, who don't want Hawaii to be a State and for good reason. Day by day the Reds are pouring out propaganda in the Far East, denouncing the United States as an important nation that preaches democracy and treats all non-Caucasians as second class citizens. The Communists encounter difficulty when they try to explain Hawaii, where there is tolerance and understanding and goodwill, and the color of the skin is as unimportant as the color of a man's hair.

If Hawaii were admitted to the Union, the Communists would reel under the impact of a psychological blow whose importance cannot be overestimated. Their lies and their charges against the United States would be blown to bits, and Hawaii would be a symbol of democracy and hope for millions of little people of the Far East to whom action speaks far more than words.²

Racial Heterogeneity

Mr. Buchwaok laments the fact that to many Americans the color of the skin is very important. The following portion of his letter tells how this fact is used by the Communists.

¹Ibid.

But the Communists, fortunately for them, are provided with ammunition that strikes right to the target among the minds of millions of non-Caucasians in the Far East. That ammunition is that the United States refuses to let Hawaii be admitted to the Union, not because she is not fully qualified, not because her citizens have not demonstrated their patriotism and Americanism, but because of the many Americans who are non-Caucasians.¹

Racial heterogeneity has been listed as the second objection to statehood.² However, this objection is not expressed nearly so frankly and openly as are the other main objections. An editorial from the Moline Dispatch offers the following comment on this objection to statehood:

The Southern bloc has two major objections to Hawaiian statehood, neither of which they express in debate—Hawaii is strongly Republican and has a high ratio of non-white population, most of whom are Orientals.³

The Kansas City Star of March 13, 1954 also has an editorial discussing this phase of the opposition to statehood. It states that:

A number of southern legislators, especially in the Senate, are maneuvering to try to scuttle the statehood ambitions of both Hawaii and Alasksa. Their motive is a fear that from additional Senate seats thus created would be lined up on the side of civil rights legislation long obstructed by the parliamentary tactics of southern leaders.⁴

According to the late Delegate Farrington, one of the two main reasons that the joint Congressional committee of 1937 was deterred from recommending immediate statehood for Hawaii was that there were doubts about the loyalty of the Americans of Japanese ancestry in event of war with Japan. These doubts were eliminated by their magnificent record made in World War II.⁵

¹Ibid.
²House Rept. 88, op. cit., p. 10.
⁴Ibid.
⁵Senate Hearings, 83d Cong., 1st and 2d sess. op. cit., p. 112.
Hawaii has long been a proving ground that peoples of divergent races can live well together in a democratic society. The census figures for 1950 show that there were in Hawaii 86,091 Hawaiians and part-Hawaiians, 114,793 Caucasians, 32,376 Chinese, 184,611 Japanese, 61,071 Filipino, out of a total population of 499,794. A careful study of the population data by race, 1900-1950, reveals that the percentage of the various races has fluctuated from decade to decade up and down. The percentage of Caucasians increased in the half century, from 17.9 to 23, while of the Japanese there was a decrease from 39.7 to 36.9.\(^1\) Intermarriages between the various racial groups are taking place in increasing numbers. Already 38.5 per cent of the marriages are interracial. Among the Japanese people marriage outside the race was unheard of at the time of annexation, but recent figures show 21 per cent of Japanese women marrying non-Japanese.\(^2\) An increasing number of children are being born with three or four different racial strains in their heredity. Census figures indicate that 84 per cent of the population are native born American citizens and 99.2 per cent of all school children of the Territory are native born.\(^3\)

Despite the heterogeneous population, Hawaii meets the test of true democracy. It is generally assumed that equality of schooling and civil rights are the birthright of all persons. As a legal body, the Territory permits no discriminations. In public and in law Hawaii is the land of the free, the lighthouse of democracy in the Pacific.\(^4\)

---

1\(^1\) House Rept. 88, op. cit., pp. 19-21.

2\(^2\) Senate Hearings, 83d Cong., op. cit., p. 512.

3\(^3\) House Rept., 88, p. 9.

4\(^4\) James A. Michener, "Hawaii," Holiday XIII (May, 1953), 41.
Noncontiguity

Another objection to statehood is that Hawaii is a noncontiguous area. This is an objection of long standing, having been used by the opposition when the question of annexation of Hawaii was before Congress. However, noncontiguity did not prevent the annexation, nor did it prevent Hawaii from becoming an incorporated Territory with the promise of statehood.\(^1\)

In the House debate on the Hawaiian Statehood bill May 9, 1955, Representative Clair Engle of California, pointed to the fact that as recently as April 11, 1955, the United States Supreme Court has reviewed our historical precedents on the question of territories. He read the Court's statement which follows:

A vital distinction was made between incorporated and un-incorporated territories. The first category had the potentialities of statehood like unto continental territories. The United States Constitution including the Bill of Rights fully applied to an "incorporated" territory. (See Rossmussen v. U. S. 197 U. S. 516) The second category described possessions of the United States not thought of as future States. To these only some essentials withdrawal undefined, of the Constitution extended.\(^2\)

Representative Engle pointed out further than an incorporated territory cannot disincorporate itself nor can it separate itself from the Union. "To admit the opposite view," declared Mr. Engle, "would be to concede the validity of the repudiated doctrine of secession."\(^3\)

The noncontiguity objection has far less validity than in 1850 when it was used as an argument against the admission of California which was then reachable from Washington only by the covered wagon or by sailing ship around

\(^1\)Senate Hearings, 83d and 84th Cong., op. cit., p. 12.


\(^3\)Ibid.
the Cape Horn. In this air and electronic age of modern day communications and transportation, Hawaii is far closer to Washington than were even New York and Boston, at the time the pattern of our national growth was formed by the Founding Fathers.¹

The fact that the area is noncontiguous has not prevented the complete integration of the life of Hawaii in all of its aspects, economic, social, spiritual, and otherwise with the rest of the country in the same degree as the States.²

Dilution of Representation

The other point raised in opposition to statehood is that the citizens of Hawaii would have disproportionate power in the Senate in comparison with certain more populous States and would thus "dilute" large-State representation.³ Proponents of this argument are attacking the provisions of the United States Constitution and the plan of government under which it has operated for more than 165 years. The Constitution provides that each State regardless of population, shall have two Senators. The contention that "one Hawaiian would have a voice in the Senate equal to 17 Californians" loses its validity considering that Nevada now has the same voice in the Senate as 66 Californians.⁴

Statehood for Hawaii would mean that two Americans would sit in the Senate and two in the House of Representatives who are thoroughly familiar

¹Senate Hearings, 83d and 84th Cong., op. cit., p. 12.
²House Rept. 88, op. cit., p. 16.
³Hawaii Statehood Commission, op. cit., p. 2.
⁴Ibid.
with the problems and the peoples of the Pacific. Such representation would be able to make highly constructive contributions to solution of the problems facing America in the Pacific today. Considering world conditions and the place of the United States as a world power, the future may present a great need of the services such representation in Congress could render.¹

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

For more than half a century, the people of Hawaii have lived under and have been faithful to the American system of government. Notwithstanding the arguments to the contrary, hardly anyone doubts their ability to govern themselves and, in every way perform the functions of a state. Their educational system is of the best; their rate of literacy is high. Their health facilities are above the average. They have served with satisfaction their period of tutelage. They rightfully feel that they have earned statehood. To deprive such a people of the rights of full citizenship is contrary to traditional American principles.

Admission of Hawaii to statehood would give it full and equal participation in the American system of government. It would accord the half-million American citizens who are also citizens of Hawaii the following specific rights which they do not have under the present Territorial system of government by the Congress in Washington:

1. The right to full voting representation in both the United States Senate and House of Representatives;

2. The right to vote for the President and Vice President of the United States;

3. The right to choose their own governor to carry on functions of government by their own selected officials instead of Federal administrators;

4. The right to determine the extent of the powers to be exercised by
their own legislature;

5. The right to have justice administered by judges selected under local authority rather than by Federal appointees;

6. The right to freedom from overlapping of Federal and local authority;

7. The right to an equal share on a per capita basis in Federal grants for education, health, highways and other public improvements; and

8. The right to a voice in any proposed amendment of the Federal Constitution, as well as on the taxes which the people of the Territory must pay.

The United States would also gain by admitting statehood to Hawaii. It would be an action that speaks louder than any words of the Communists, and would do much to create good will and confidence in the United States among all the peoples of the Pacific area. It would also do the following:

1. Enhance its reputation as a nation which keeps its promises and meets its obligations to all of its citizens;

2. Demonstrate to the world that America still subscribes to the great principles which underlie our way of life;

3. Create goodwill for the United States in the Pacific basin;

4. Give the United States a state in the Pacific;

5. Strengthen our Union by binding it more closely together;

6. Help the United States avoid any stigma of "colonialism" by granting self-determination to its citizens;

7. Help complete progression to territorial maturity -- Hawaii is one of the last two remaining incorporated territories of the United States;

8. Send to the United States Congress from Hawaii men of caliber with an intimate knowledge of the Pacific Ocean area at their fingertips;
9. Strengthen our nation's defenses in the Pacific;
10. Relieve the federal government of the financial responsibility of supporting a territorial regime.

Any concept of permanent inferiority for the residents of any American Territory who have qualified for statehood by every historic and economic, standard, and the vast majority of whom fervently desire it, is foreign to the American ideal. Yet, year after year Congress fails to enact statehood legislation for Hawaii.

The main objections presented by the opposition, in summary, appear to be:

1. That Communists, through the control of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, which has its headquarters on the mainland, have a stranglehold on the economy of the islands, and that they have such political power that communism is a threat to the political stability of the Territory as well—that officials are now and under statehood would continue to be subject to Communist pressure;

2. That the so-called Caucasians are outnumbered by other racial groups;
3. That the Territory is "noncontiguous" and hence outside the pattern of the present Union of States; and

4. That two senators from Hawaii would give the new state representation in Congress disproportionate to its population in comparison with the more populous states.

Through the long history of Hawaii's efforts to gain statehood, the three latter objections—that of racial heterogeneity, noncontiguity, and disproportionate representation—have been presented by the opposition. That of communism in Hawaii was new with postwar discussion of statehood.
All four of these objections have been examined thoroughly and at length by Congressional committees. The writer, after a careful study of the findings of these committees, of the Congressional hearings, and Congressional debates on Hawaiian statehood bills, would summarize the major facts developed with respect to each of the objections as follows:

Communism

Investigations prove without a doubt that Communists have infiltrated labor unions in Hawaii. Proponents of Hawaiian statehood have not denied this fact. However, because of the threat of communism and the fear of Communists in the world today, opposers of statehood for Hawaii have used the Communist danger to defeat passage of Hawaiian statehood legislation. Representative Pillion of New York, for instance, who used anti-communism as his chief weapon in opposing the Hawaiian statehood bill in the first session of the 84th Congress, had previously been more concerned with disproportionate representation. Reports of investigating committees as recent as 1954, reveal that the territorial government of Hawaii has been able to deal more effectively with communists than have some of the states. As a world threat, however, the Communist danger seems greater. Therefore, Mr. Pillion could use anti-communism as a very effective weapon in his opposition to statehood for Hawaii. Perhaps it would not be correct to assume that there has been no fear on the part of the opposition to the Communist threat in Hawaii, but it does appear that it has been over-emphasized to defeat statehood legislation.

Racial Heterogeneity

Racial heterogeneity in Hawaii is an objection which appears to be based
on reasons which for the most part are not expressed frankly and openly. With the entire free world looking to America for moral and spiritual leadership, it is not to the best interest of the United States to have members of the Congress state frankly and openly the real reasons why the presence of senators and representatives from the heterogeneous population of Hawaii would be objectionable to some of the members of Congress. It is much safer to talk about the dilution of representation or the non-contiguity of the islands than it is to say that there is opposition to statehood because Caucasians are outnumbered by other racial groups. It so happens that millions of the people of Asia whom the United States would like to impress favorably, are non-Caucasians.

Despite the fact that these reasons have not been discussed openly and frankly, evidence points up the fact that they are keenly felt. The study reveals that even though there is some racial discrimination in the social life of Hawaii, (especially since so many Americans from the continent have been living there because of World War II and the Korean conflict), there is none whatever in the political and business life. Qualified persons of any of the racial groups may aspire to any political office which the voters of Hawaii may grant. This being true, a Japanese or Chinese citizen of Hawaii might be chosen to represent Hawaii in the United States Senate if Hawaii becomes a state. Southern members of Congress might well assume that should this happen, these persons from Hawaii would be likely to vote for the civil rights legislation which the Southern members of Congress always fight so hard to defeat. The idea of accepting "Orientals" as equals when they have been considered undesirable as citizens of the United States, is as repugnant to many as is accepting as equals descendants of former slaves.
Perhaps no other objection raised against statehood for Hawaii is so keenly felt as that of racial heterogeneity.

Noncontiguity

The argument that Hawaii should forever be denied statehood because the islands are not physically contiguous by land to the continental United States is brought forward each time a Hawaiian statehood bill is introduced in Congress. While there may be sincerity on the part of some of those who use this objection in opposition to statehood, the writer agrees with the Congressional committee that it is a fallacious argument. In terms of modern communication Hawaii is nearer Washington today than Georgia was to Philadelphia in 1787, when the Constitution was adopted. California was physically noncontiguous when it was admitted to the United States, yet who would question now the wisdom of the Congress that admitted her as a state?

With modern methods of transportation and communication--air, sea, radio, and telephone--Hawaii is in fact contiguous to the mainland for all practical purposes. The United States is more than a mere geographic arrangement. It is a union that comes of a common loyalty and a common purpose. In these respects, most of us would agree that Hawaii is, in fact, contiguous.

Disproportionate Representation

The first great compromise of the Constitutional Convention of 1787 settled the question of representation in Congress by the various states. The provision of this compromise which permits each state, regardless of size or population, to have equal representation in the Senate has withstood
the test of time and events. Yet the wisdom of this provision is now being questioned by opposers of Hawaiian statehood. One of these would propose an amendment to the Constitution which would limit a new state’s representation in the Senate. Under the proposed amendment a new state, if Congress so decided, could be denied any representation in the Senate until it attains a population of one-half the average population represented by each senator of all the other states.

While it is true that the senators from New York represent more than twenty-six times the number of persons senators from Hawaii would represent, such a disproportionate representation would not be new. The population of Hawaii exceeds four of our present states. These four states have two senators and only one representative in Congress. Mr. Pillion, of New York, may be sincere in his arguments against further "dilution" of representation in the Senate, but it hardly seems valid as an objection to statehood. Hawaii would not have more than two representatives in the House of Representatives as compared to New York’s forty-five. Mr. Pillion’s objection was made by Daniel Webster to the admission of Texas and by Stephen Douglas to the admission of California, but the admittance of these two areas to the United States has been an asset to this great country.

Politics

Besides the aforementioned objections, it seems obvious that politics have played a great part in preventing the granting of statehood to Hawaii. Both political parties have endorsed statehood for both Hawaii and Alaska, but it appears that neither party really wants statehood for both territories. The Republican Party would favor the admission of Hawaii, but not the admission
of Alaska. The Democrats, on the other hand stand to gain by the admission of Alaska, but they fear that the Republicans might gain by the admission of Hawaii.

Someone has said that "time, patience, and perseverance conquer all things." It appears now that the proponents of Hawaiian statehood may need a goodly portion of each of these if Hawaii is to become the forty-ninth state of these United States. Yet, who can predict the future? Annexation of Hawaii came sooner than was wished by many, because of the Spanish American War and Dewey's victory at Manila. Perhaps world conditions and America's vital role of leadership may cause opponents of statehood legislation to grant statehood to Hawaii, to "demonstrate to the peoples of the Pacific that whenever and wherever they come under the American flag they will be treated with equality in accordance with the traditions and basic principles of this country" as the late Delegate Farrington once said that granting statehood to Hawaii would do.
BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books


Official Documents


30 Statute 750 (1898)
31 Statute 141 (1900)
289 U. S. 537.
152 U. S. 49
258 U. S. 311
30 Federal 115.

Periodicals


Proctor, John R. "Hawaii and the Changing Front of the World," The Forum, XXIV (September, 1897), 42.


Newspapers


Miscellaneous

