

Ka Hae Kalaunu: How Haoles Used Lili'uokalani's Proposed Constitution to Overthrow the Hawaiian Monarchy

Isaac Alter

On January 14, 1893, a proud Queen Lili'uokalani of Hawaii first informed her Cabinet—and later her subjects—of her intention to proclaim a new constitution for the islands. This new constitution included some controversial elements, which she admitted would detain its promulgation, but only temporarily. In her address to her subjects that day, she promised it would take effect in the near future. Tragically, her promise was never fulfilled, as her actions set into motion events that would forever change the fate of the Kingdom of Hawaii. On January 17, 1893, white foreigners, or *haoles*, instigated a revolution, abrogating the monarchy and declaring a Provisional Government. They claimed to be protecting the islands from the Queen's revolutionary attempt to alter the Hawaiian constitution.¹ *Ka hae kalaunu*—"the flag of the crown"—was lowered, and the monarchy that had ruled the Hawaiian Islands for decades was no more.²

While the *haole* leaders asserted—after the Revolution of 1893—that Queen Lili'uokalani's "illegal" attempt to alter the Hawaiian constitution compelled them to act, there were ulterior reasons for their rebellion. Granted, the changes Lili'uokalani made to the constitution increased monarchical power, returned the vote to native Hawaiians, and disenfranchised non-citizens, including *haoles* who controlled much of the island nation's economy. As Merze Tate argues in *The United States and the Hawaiian Kingdom: A Political History*, the new constitution was a significant cause of the Revolution; the whites in the islands feared a regression into pure monarchy from the more republican constitutional monarchy that had governed since 1887.³ In addition, the shift of voting power into the hands of "heathen" natives and out

This paper was written for Dr. Charles Hanson's Advanced Placement U.S. History class in the spring of 2011.

of the control of wealthy plantation owners (who, by one estimate, owned nine-tenths of all private property on the islands) alarmed those who would be disenfranchised, who feared that their rights and their political and economic interests were at stake.⁴ However, Gavan Daws asserts in *The Shoal of Time: A History of the Hawaiian Islands* that the revolutionaries used the new constitution simply to rationalize a rebellion that had far different motives. Prior to the overthrow, Daws argues, annexationists were lying in wait for Lili'uokalani to make a misstep that could be construed as illegal or outside the scope of her power, so that they could launch the Revolution with a legitimate rationale.⁵

Lili'uokalani's new constitution was not the main cause of the Revolution of 1893; it was merely a justification for rebels to overthrow the monarchy and set the gears of annexation into motion. For one thing, contradictions between the annexationists' alleged motives and their actions both prior to and following the Revolution suggest the fallacy of their rationalizations. The *haoles'* preemptive planning for the overthrow before the new constitution was even proclaimed, as well as the absence of the "anti-constitution" ideals in their dealings and private correspondences prior to the Revolution, reveals that the new constitution was not the true motive for the overthrow. Furthermore, the annexationists had several more significant, more compelling reasons to establish their own government. For example, the McKinley Tariff of 1890 left sugar plantations in crisis and in desperate need for a means to reverse sugar's plummeting demand and price. Also, the general disrepair of the Hawaiian economy and the Queen's controversial attempts to rehabilitate it—like the implementation of a lottery and the legalization of opium—enraged some and proved to others the instability of the monarchist regime, generating significant opposition to Lili'uokalani. Finally, *haoles* harbored overarching grievances against the monarchy, which could only be resolved by its permanent dissolution.

*‘Onipa‘a Ko Kākou Kumukānāwai*⁶: The Threat of the Proposed Constitution

Lili‘uokalani’s proposed constitution stripped Hawaii’s privileged *haoles* of voting rights unless they became naturalized citizens of the kingdom and relinquished their citizenship to any other country.⁷ This measure prompted *haoles* to fear for their political and economic interests on the islands should they wish to retain other citizenships, because their influence over the government and economy of the islands would be significantly diminished. In addition, the proposed constitution restored power to the monarch and the native Hawaiians, a complete regression, in the eyes of white foreigners, from the former government, which placed restrictions on the monarchy and on the largely uneducated native populace.

Under King Kalakaua’s Constitution of 1887, a property qualification was required to vote in elections for “nobles,” as members of one of the two houses of the Hawaiian legislature were called. This left native Hawaiians with only a quarter of the total vote, according to the Blount Report, a summary of “affairs in Hawaii” written after the Revolution for the U.S. House of Representatives Foreign Affairs Committee.⁸ In voting for “representatives,” members of the second, and lower, house, there was no property requirement, but simply a literacy test—in Hawaiian, English, or “some European language.”⁹ As a result, unnaturalized Americans, Portuguese, Germans, and British in the islands—whether poor laborers or rich landowners—could vote. Consequently, plantation owners could bring many of their foreign laborers to the voting booths to help neutralize the native Hawaiian vote. Most notably, according to the Blount Report, over 10,000 laborers imported from the Madeira and Azores Islands—colonies of Portugal—were brought to polling places to vote based on their plantation owners’ directions, in order to “balance the native vote with the Portuguese vote.”¹⁰

Lili'uokalani's proposed constitution allowed only "subjects," or naturalized citizens, of the islands to vote, thus disenfranchising most foreign laborers and *haole* landowners. In addition, the house of nobles was to be appointed by the Queen instead of elected by propertied voters.¹¹ These changes alarmed the white foreigners on the islands, some of whom formed a "Committee of Safety," otherwise known as the Annexation Club. Led by Sanford B. Dole and Lorrin A. Thurston, the Club's intent was to prepare for action should Lili'uokalani threaten their rights.¹² Thurston's explanation of the formation of the Annexation Club suggests that the rebels' primary grievance was the new constitution, which they saw as a regression into monarchy. Seeking "enlightened," democratic government, the *haoles* opposed both their own disenfranchisement and Lili'uokalani's increased power conferred by the proposed constitution. The Queen herself noticed, even before the drafting of her constitution, the tendency of whites both inside and outside the government to oppose measures that attempted to extend the rights of natives or abridge those of the *haoles*, because they threatened the *haoles*' chokehold on Hawaiian politics.¹³ It was therefore not unexpected that foreigners would react forcefully when their rights were threatened, and the natives' rights expanded, by the constitution.

After Lili'uokalani announced her intention to instate a new constitution, the Annexation Club fomented and led an armed rebellion, and, once they had gained control of the government offices, released a proclamation abrogating the monarchy. In this address, the Annexation Club described Lili'uokalani's constitution as an attempt by a power-hungry monarch to seize power back from voters and regress into a despotic regime. The proposed constitution was characterized as an act of "royal aggression," from which the people of Hawaii needed protection.¹⁴ Thurston called the constitution a "menace to our liberties."¹⁵ This account of the Revolution suggests that it was the proposed constitution that prompted the overthrow of the Queen: fearing for their own voting rights and the well-being of the islands, both of which were threatened by Lili'uokalani's constitution, the Annexation Club had no choice but to revolt.

If nothing else, Lili'uokalani's new constitution was a step outside the power granted her by the Constitution of 1887, an act of revolution that necessitated a response. Thurston cited the Queen's oath to uphold the constitution, upon ascending to the throne, as clear evidence that her abrogation of that constitution was a betrayal of her people and a violation of her duties as a monarch.¹⁶ Similarly, Dole recounted that the rebels overthrew the government because they were unwilling to accept the Queen's attempt to tamper with the constitution that she had sworn to implement.¹⁷ The Morgan Report, submitted to the Senate in 1894 to bolster the annexation movement and supplant the less politically useful Blount Report of the previous year, characterized Lili'uokalani's action as "a violation of her constitutional obligations, revolutionary in its character and purposes."¹⁸ In other words, because the promulgation of the new constitution was an act of revolution, *haoles* had the right to overthrow the government, even if Lili'uokalani's constitution had not threatened them or their interests.

Falsehood of the Annexationists' Rationalization

The rebels claimed publicly that they rebelled in response to the proposed constitution, but the absence of the alleged "anti-constitution" ideals in the Annexation Club's private correspondences and actions prior to the Queen's overthrow suggests that these ideals were not what truly fueled the rebellion.

Lying in Wait

Before anything but unconfirmed rumors were circulating about the Queen's intention to create a new constitution, the annexationists were already preparing for an overthrow of the monarchy, biding their time until the Queen made a crucial misstep. In the first place, the formation of the Annexation Club in early 1892, almost a year before the proposed constitution was introduced to the public, suggests that the orchestrators of the Revolution were already plotting and planning for annexation.¹⁹ In addition, Thurston explained that the Club was founded to "be ready to act quickly and intelligently, should Liliuokalani move against the constitution, tending to revert to absolutism or

anything of the nature.”²⁰ This statement suggests that the members of the Club were merely waiting for an action by the Queen that could be construed as illegal, revolutionary, or outside her power, which would serve as a justification for the revolt. Furthermore, Thurston visited the United States in early 1892 to determine the American government’s position on Hawaiian annexation.²¹ This suggests that not only was the Annexation Club planning for the overthrow before the proposal of the Queen’s constitution, but they were also attempting to secure the American government’s tacit approval of their ultimate goal: annexation. Finally, Thurston, in a private letter in December 1892 to Archibald Hopkins, who represented the Annexation Club’s interests in the United States government, admitted that he wished he could set his plans for annexation into motion sooner.²² This further illustrates that the annexationists were prepared to launch their plans at any time, but were waiting for a misstep by the Queen to serve as a pretext for launching the Revolution.

Inconsistent, Illegitimate Ideals

The self-proclaimed goals of the Revolution, which the annexationists publicly declared immediately before and during the overthrow, were not consistent with the *haoles’* past actions or the intentions that the rebels expressed in alternative fora, nor were they based in sound ideals. For one thing, the revolutionaries’ grievances against the constitution because of their disenfranchisement were baseless. Lili’uokalani’s decision to restrict franchise to only naturalized Hawaiian citizens was neither novel nor without merit. Most “civilized” countries, she asserted, did not allow non-citizens to vote or hold office, because this would have permitted them to seek “protection under the guns of a foreign man-of-war at the moment when [they] should quarrel with the government under which [they] lived[.]”²³ Furthermore, the disenfranchisement of white foreigners was self-inflicted; they could have retained their right to vote if they had become Hawaiian citizens—and relinquished citizenship to other countries—but instead preferred to remain citizens of other, stronger countries, privy to their protection when necessary.²⁴ Thus, the complaints against this aspect of the proposed constitution were specious; not only were the foreigners enjoying unprecedented privileges as non-citizens before

the new constitution, but they could have easily continued life on the islands either as non-voters or as naturalized citizens.

Haoles' attitudes towards the legitimacy of Lili'uokalani's new constitution also diverged markedly from those that informed the creation of the Bayonet Constitution in 1887, the one that preceded Lili'uokalani's. In 1887, white foreigners threatened King Kalakaua—Lili'uokalani's predecessor and brother—with assassination and an overthrow of the monarchy if he did not sign into law the constitution that they had prepared. The Bayonet Constitution—so named because Kalakaua was threatened with violence if he refused to sign it—was submitted to neither the people nor the Legislature for ratification.²⁵ The *haoles* accepted this constitution because it decreased the power of the natives by enacting a property qualification to vote for one of the two houses of the Legislature; weakened the King, who no longer had the power to remove unsatisfactory ministers from office and required a minister's approval to create a law or amend the constitution; gave *haoles* control of one of the houses of the Legislature; and allowed them and their dependent laborers to vote.²⁶

On the other hand, Lili'uokalani was petitioned for a new constitution by over two-thirds of her people, and would have been “deaf to the voice of the people” if she had not acted.²⁷ However, *haoles* now declared Lili'uokalani to be acting illegally before she had even formally promulgated the new constitution. The white annexationists viewed the Bayonet Constitution—which had no democratic mandate—as perfectly legal. By contrast, they deemed Lili'uokalani's proposed constitution—which was petitioned for by a vast majority of the Hawaiian populace—as an act of revolution before it was even put into effect. This inconsistency demonstrates the fallacy of the rebels' argument against the constitution, having forced into law one with far less basis in “democratic” ideals when it suited them.

Finally, as Thurston himself points out in his memoir, the Queen could have, in her proposed constitution, given herself the power to instate a new constitution without the signature of a minister. Under this circumstance, Thurston claims, the Revolution would have been much more violent, because Lili'uokalani could have then supported

the new constitution by force, using the Hawaiian army.²⁸ This reveals the ambiguity of the rebels' claim that the Queen's actions were illegal, because Thurston believes she herself had the power to make it legal. However, even if Lili'uokalani had legalized the promulgation of her constitution, Thurston claims that the Revolution still would have occurred, thus disproving the rebels' claim that they revolted because the constitution was illegal. The rebels themselves, evidently, did not even believe in their own alleged reason for the overthrow, suggesting other motives were at play.

*I Laila Ka 'Ano'i*²⁹: The True Motives for the Revolution

Overarching economic and political problems—both recent and long-standing—afflicting the islands were the true impetus for revolt. The implementation of the McKinley Tariff of 1890 left the sugar-dependent Hawaiian economy in ruins, and Lili'uokalani's attempts to reconstruct it—by proposing to legalize opium and put in place a state-sanctioned lottery—were neither effective nor popular. In addition, *haoles* saw the monarchy, no matter how fettered or impotent, as an anachronistic and ineffective form of government.

Sugar Crisis Sours Haoles

The dependence of the Hawaiian economy on sugar and the avarice of *haole* planters, combined with the economic devastation wrought by the McKinley Tariff, produced a major motive to overthrow the monarchy and push for annexation to the United States. Under the Reciprocity Treaty of 1875 between the United States and Hawaii, goods from Hawaii, most notably sugar, were imported duty-free into the United States.³⁰ This privilege continued when King Kalakaua renewed the treaty in 1887, supposedly for another seven years.³¹ While the treaty was in effect, the Hawaiian economy flourished; an almost insatiable demand for sugar in the United States meant Hawaiian sugar planters reaped huge profits. J. D. Spreckels, the owner of the largest sugar plantation in the islands, acknowledged that sugar was the sole and vital crop in the Hawaiian economy; without it, he said, Hawaii would “collapse into a big cow pasture.”³² The McKinley Tariff of 1890 allowed for duty-free importation from any foreign sugar

producer, dramatically decreasing demand for Hawaiian sugar and wreaking havoc on the Hawaiian economy. The income from exports to the United States—which comprised 99.5 percent of total Hawaiian income from exports—plummeted from \$13 million in 1890 to \$8 million in 1892.³³ However, the McKinley Tariff also subsidized sugar grown on American soil by forty dollars per ton. Thus, if Hawaii were considered American territory, planters would collect enormously increased incomes; with each Hawaiian sugar plantation producing up to 14,000 tons of sugar a year, forty dollars per ton was no small sum for profit-hungry *haoles*.³⁴

This subsidy, as well as the economic ruin the McKinley Tariff was creating in Hawaii, prompted *haole* plantation owners to consider an overthrow of the monarchy and annexation to the United States. Spreckels asserted that sugar interests, and the hunger of planters for the subsidy offered by the McKinley Tariff, were the most important factors contributing to the Revolution. Sugar planters “cared nothing of the Queen’s character, nor had any reason to complain of her government”—only the greediness for profit spurred the overthrow.³⁵ An advertisement in *The Daily Bulletin*, a Hawaiian newspaper, also described the Revolution as an economic venture designed to benefit sugar planters. This posting claimed that the rebellion “benefited the plantation managers in particular and the stockholders in their respective companies in general,” characterizing it as a “mercantile revolution.”³⁶

The plight of the American sugar planters in Hawaii was brought to Congress’s attention by an 1892 Senate report written by John L. Stevens, the strongly pro-annexation American minister in Hawaii, who suggested annexation as an alternative to simply leaving Hawaii to itself. In order to bolster the Hawaiian economy, which was singularly dependent on sugar profits, Stevens’ report urged immediate intervention.³⁷ The seeming willingness for annexation on the American side—exaggerated by this ardently annexationist report—encouraged the revolutionaries with the false hope that the United States government would support their rebellion, annex the islands as soon as the monarchy was out of the way, and grant Hawaiian planters the sugar subsidy they sought. Spreckels asserted that “the planters thought that the United States would eagerly embrace their

offer of annexation; then all the plantations [would instantly become] American soil, and each planter would be entitled to the bounty on his whole crop of sugar.”³⁸

The Queen Inadvertently Foments Revolution

Lili'uokalani's two highly controversial bills—proposing a state-authorized lottery and the legalization of opium, introduced and passed during the legislative session of September 1892 to January 1893—were part of her attempt to resuscitate the Hawaiian economy. Not only did they fail to do so, but they also made the Queen many enemies. The lottery bill granted a United States lottery company an exclusive charter licensing them to work in Hawaii. Lili'uokalani hoped revenues from the lottery could pull the islands out of their economic slump by financing public works projects that would employ native Hawaiians. In addition, the lottery company would organize the construction of a railroad around the island of Hawaii.³⁹ Lili'uokalani characterized the lottery bill as an attempt to right the wrongs of the sugar economy, in which very few received disproportionate profits—which were subsequently invested in foreign interests—while most of the native population and the urban middle class did not benefit at all. “When the people of native and part native birth prosper, business is good and the community is prosperous,” she wrote.⁴⁰ She hoped that the proceeds from the lottery would employ natives, thus bringing “prosperity” to the islands.

In tandem with the lottery bill, Lili'uokalani introduced a bill to legalize opium in the islands. The large Chinese population in the islands was already smuggling vast quantities of the drug in and out of Hawaii at will, so the Queen wanted to “adopt measures for restricting and controlling a trade which it [was] impossible to suppress.”⁴¹

Both bills were met with significant opposition, both inside and outside the Legislature. The majority of *haoles* opposed the lottery bill, and only one white man in the Legislature voted for it.⁴² White women also submitted the “mothers’ petition” to protest the bill’s passage.⁴³ And although white opponents of the opium bill acknowledged that the illegal opium rings caused “quite a bit of trouble” in Hawaii, they

still sent petitions to the Queen, attempting to “stand between her and temptation.”⁴⁴ Once both bills passed, the white community responded with uproar, “aroused almost to the point of desperation, certainly of the deepest indignation.”⁴⁵ Lili’uokalani was portrayed by *haoles* as “a grand vender of lottery tickets, by which [she] was to become rich and powerful.”⁴⁶ In addition, it was alleged by some of the most strident anti-monarchist whites that Lili’uokalani promised portions of the lottery money to members of the legislature who would vote for the lottery bill.⁴⁷ The backlash against these two bills created such significant unrest and resentment among the white community that it likely contributed to the Revolution.

Thurston quotes a newspaper editorial in his memoir, which asserts that the lottery bill was a tipping point that pushed the annexationists towards rebellion.⁴⁸ Interestingly, earlier in his memoirs, Thurston claims that at the time of the passage of the lottery and opium bills, he was “disappointed,” but was not pondering any form of opposition to the Queen at the time.⁴⁹ However, the Annexation Club had been formed long before the passage of the two bills; thus, Thurston was already preparing for a rebellion. This contradiction demonstrates that the lottery was indeed a factor in the overthrow, because it generated significant *haole* opposition to the Queen during a time when the Annexation Club was attempting to stir up such sentiments. Lili’uokalani, in her own memoirs, also cited both the lottery and opium bills as “‘intolerable’ measures” in the eyes of the whites who overthrew her, indicating that the lottery and opium bills were significant causes for the Revolution.⁵⁰

An Anachronistic, “Heathen” Government

The annexationists who led the Revolution had harbored significant grievances against the monarchy for years, long before Lili’uokalani attempted to change the constitution. Although the constitution was seen as a regression into a more despotic form of monarchy, general *haole* discontent with the “heathen” government was a more significant cause for the Revolution. Lili’uokalani’s monarchy was described as an “obstruction to the prosperity and progress of the Islands” by Americans in Hawaii.⁵¹ In the eyes of Americans, especially those

living in the islands, a monarchy was a thing of the past, and even the severe restrictions placed on the monarch by the Bayonet Constitution could not mask the fact that a Queen ruled the islands. *Haoles* were especially suspicious of the Queen's alleged hunger for increased power. In their proclamation abrogating the monarchy, the Committee of Safety criticized Lili'uokalani's rule as rife with attempts to extend her own powers at the expense of her people, most notably white foreigners.⁵² In addition, Peter C. Jones, a member of the Annexation Club, admitted that the Revolutionist movement was motivated by the drive for an effective, moral, and democratic government—which he claimed had been missing during Lili'uokalani's reign—including an end to corruption.⁵³ This evidence demonstrates that the Annexation Club had more significant and lasting grievances against the monarchy than against the proposed constitution.

Haoles saw Lili'uokalani as an uncivilized, “heathen” Queen, lacking the sophistication and the intelligence to rule over an independent nation. For example, her observance of the traditional Hawaiian polytheistic religion was denounced and mocked by the predominantly Christian *haoles*.⁵⁴ A cartoon published by *Judge*, a New York newspaper, portrayed Lili'uokalani as a savage unfit to be Queen. (See Appendix.) Lili'uokalani is pictured with her crown askew and feathers in her hair, a degrading, racist caricature of the “heathen” Queen. The papers in her hands read “scandalous government” and “gross immorality,” suggesting that her “heathenness” is leading her to create an “immoral,” “scandalous,” and ineffective government. This depiction of Lili'uokalani illustrates the prejudicial view that many *haoles* had of the Queen, which helped spur the Revolution. In fact, the *New York Herald* attributed the overthrow of the Hawaiian monarchy directly to the “relapse into heathenism”—an embrace of Hawaiian traditions such as the hula, for example—that was characteristic of Lili'uokalani's and Kalakaua's reigns.⁵⁵ One annexationist acknowledged that *haoles* viewed Lili'uokalani and her brother, Kalakaua, as heathens, but waited for public opinion to “ripen,” hoping that future events would give them a chance to show the monarchy's shortcomings and revolt.⁵⁶ These accounts reveal that the constitution was at most a secondary cause for the Revolution, while general objections to the monarchy were more significant.

Perhaps more telling was the Annexation Club's steadfast resistance to the continuation of any form of monarchy following the overthrow. Although Archibald Cleghorn—the father of the heir to the throne, Princess Kai'ulani—pled with Thurston, Dole, and the other leaders of the Revolution to appoint Kai'ulani as Queen, promising a completely different regime from the government of Lili'uokalani, the Annexation Club ardently refused.⁵⁷ This reveals that the annexationists were not simply opposed to the new constitution, or even just to Lili'uokalani; the true political motive for the Revolution was to oust the monarchy and establish a government on the islands that they could better control.

Conclusion

The Hawaiian Revolution of 1893, and the subsequent annexation of the Hawaiian Islands by the United States in 1898, were acts of American imperialism that, unfortunately, were not unique. Beginning with the first American colonies, Native Americans with pre-existing traditions and ways of life were pushed out of their land, and once the United States government ran out of places to put them, Native Americans were forced to assimilate or be isolated in reservations, which destroyed the part of their culture that tied them to their land. Similarly, in the case of Hawaii and other coeval American acquisitions such as Puerto Rico and Samoa, foreign interests overpowered the native culture, as well as their existing societies and traditions. No one cared what the native Hawaiians wanted; they were uncivilized heathens who didn't deserve a voice in their own government in the eyes of white foreigners. Thus, native interests slowly but surely took a backseat to those of the *haoles*, who simultaneously gained control over the Hawaiian government and limited the power of the Hawaiian monarch. Along the way, native cultural traditions, like the hula and the polytheistic religion of the Hawaiians, were discouraged and discriminated against. This pattern was a repetition of an established American tradition: acquiring the land and the resources the United States wanted, no matter what the consequences. In this case, the consequences for Americans were insignificant; the Revolution was bloodless, and annexation, though delayed, was eventually achieved. However, the consequences for Lili'uokalani and the native people of Hawaii were devastating: they lost their country, their culture, and their right to self-determination. The Kingdom of Hawaii had ceased to exist. ●

Appendix



Source: "We Draw The Line At This." In Judge [New York], December 2, 1893.

Notes

1. *Two Weeks of Hawaiian History: A Brief Sketch of the Revolution of 1893* (Honolulu: Hawaiian Gazette Company, 1893), 21.
2. Lili'uokalani, "Ka Hae Kalaunu," in *The Queen's Songbook*, ed. Barbara Barnard Smith (Honolulu: Hui Hānai, 1999), 153. Translates to "The Flag of the Crown."
3. Merze Tate, *The United States and the Hawaiian Kingdom: A Political History* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1965), 158.
4. Ibid.
5. Gavan Daws, *Shoal of Time: A History of the Hawaiian Islands* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1968), 268.
6. Lili'uokalani, "Onipa'a," in *The Queen's Songbook*, 255. Translates to "Stand firm [for] our constitution."
7. Lili'uokalani, *Hawaii's Story by Hawaii's Queen* (1898; reprint, Honolulu, HI: Mutual Publishing, 1990), 237.
8. James H. Blount, "Affairs in Hawaii," July 17, 1893, *Hawaiian Kingdom*, <http://www.hawaiiankingdom.org/blounts-report.shtml> (accessed February 22, 2011).
9. Ibid.
10. Ibid.
11. Ibid.
12. Lorrin A. Thurston, *Memoirs of the Hawaiian Revolution*, ed. Andrew Farrell (Honolulu: Advertiser Publishing Company, 1936), 229.
13. Lili'uokalani, *Hawaii's Story*, 233-234.

14. Sanford B. Dole, *Memoirs of the Hawaiian Revolution*, ed. Andrew Farrell (Honolulu: Advertiser Publishing Company, 1936), 85-86.
15. *Two Weeks*, 20-21.
16. Ibid.
17. Dole, 74.
18. *Compilation of Reports of Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate, 1789-1901* (Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1901), vol. 6, 365.
19. Thurston, 228.
20. Ibid., 229.
21. Ibid.
22. Lorrin Thurston to Archibald Hopkins, on board S. S. Australia, December 14, 1892, in Thurston, op. cit., 240.
23. Lili'uokalani, *Hawaii's Story*, 238. Essentially, it was this quality of the Bayonet Constitution that allowed for the Revolution's success; the annexationists, mostly American citizens, called on American forces to land on the islands to protect American interests, which forced Lili'uokalani's hand in surrendering to the Provisional Government.
24. Blount, op. cit.
25. Lili'uokalani, *Hawaii's Story*, 180-182.
26. Blount, op. cit.
27. Lili'uokalani, *Hawaii's Story*, 231.
28. Thurston, 274.

29. Lili'uokalani, "Kēhaulani," in *The Queen's Songbook*, 205. Translates to "There is what I desire."
30. "Treaty of Reciprocity Between the United States of America and the Hawaiian Kingdom," April 17, 1875, *Hawaii Nation*, <http://www.hawaii-nation.org/treaty1875.html> (accessed February 23, 2011).
31. Kalakaua, "The King's Speech at the Opening of the Legislative Assembly," (speech, Honolulu, HI, November 3, 1887), *Hawaii Nation*, <http://www.hawaii-nation.org/treaty1875.html> (accessed February 23, 2011).
32. Charles Nordhoff, "Special Report on Hawaii," *New York Herald*, May 13, 1893.
33. Schmitt, Robert C. *Historical Statistics of Hawaii* (Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii, 1977), 541.
34. Julius A. Palmer, Jr., *Memories of Hawaii and Hawaiian Correspondence* (Boston: Lee and Shepard, 1894), 14.
35. *Ibid.* It is important to note that Spreckels himself opposed annexation, because he feared that American labor standards would force sugar planters to increase wages for their laborers. Notwithstanding his own personal counterargument, however, Spreckels still believed that the vast majority of sugar planters pushed for annexation because of the appeal of the McKinley Tariff's subsidy for sugar grown on American soil.
36. "Hawaiian Hardware Co., Ltd," *Daily Bulletin* [Honolulu], February 4, 1893.
37. Foreign Relations of the United States, 1894, Affairs in Hawaii, S. Rep. No. 52-77, at 194 (1894), <http://digicoll.library.wisc.edu/>.
38. Palmer, 30-31.

39. Lili'uokalani, *Hawaii's Story*, 239.
40. *Ibid.*, 240.
41. *Ibid.*, 241.
42. *Compilation of Reports of Committee on Foreign Relations*, 823, 684.
43. *Ibid.*, 824.
44. *Ibid.*, 537.
45. *Ibid.*, 1095.
46. Lili'uokalani, *Hawaii's Story*, 240.
47. *Compilation of Reports of Committee on Foreign Relations*, 925.
48. Thurston, 363.
49. Thurston, 227.
50. Lili'uokalani, *Hawaii's Story*, 237-241.
51. *Foreign Relations of the United States*, 192.
52. Dole, *Memoirs*, 85.
53. Palmer, 49.
54. "Relapse Into Heathenism: True Cause of Revolt in the Islands and of the Monarchy's Overthrow," *New York Herald*, February 16, 1893.
55. *Ibid.*
56. *Compilation of Reports of Committee on Foreign Relations*, 870.
57. Thurston, 255.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Blount, James H. "Affairs in Hawaii." July 17, 1893. *Hawaiian Kingdom*. <http://www.hawaiiankingdom.org/blounts-report.shtml> (accessed February 22, 2011).

Compilation of Reports of Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate, 1789-1901, vol. 6. Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1901.

Dole, Sanford B. *Memoirs of the Hawaiian Revolution*. Edited by Andrew Farrell. Honolulu: Advertiser Publishing Company, 1936.

"Hawaiian Hardware Co., Ltd." *Daily Bulletin* [Honolulu], February 4, 1893.

Kalakaua. "The King's Speech at the Opening of the Legislative Assembly." Speech, Honolulu, HI, November 3, 1887. *Hawaii Nation*. <http://www.hawaii-nation.org/treaty1875.html>.

Lili'uokalani. *Hawaii's Story by Hawaii's Queen*. 1898. Reprint, Honolulu: Mutual Publishing, 1990.

"Mass Meeting. Citizens Determined to Resist Aggression." *Hawaiian Gazette*, January 24, 1893.

Nordhoff, Charles. "Special Report on Hawaii." *New York Herald*, May 13, 1893.

Palmer, Julius A., Jr. *Memories of Hawaii and Hawaiian Correspondence*. Boston: Lee and Shepard, 1894.

The Queen's Songbook, edited by Barbara Barnard Smith, 153. Honolulu: Hui Hānai, 1999.

"Relapse Into Heathenism: True Cause of Revolt in the Islands and of the Monarchy's Overthrow." *New York Herald*, February 16, 1893.

Thurston, Lorrin A. *Memoirs of the Hawaiian Revolution*. Edited by Andrew Farrell. Honolulu: Advertiser Publishing Company, 1936.

“Treaty of Reciprocity Between the United States of America and the Hawaiian Kingdom.” April 17, 1875. Hawaii Nation.
<http://www.hawaii-nation.org/treaty1875.html>.

Two Weeks of Hawaiian History: *A Brief Sketch of the Revolution of 1893*. Honolulu: Hawaiian Gazette Company, 1893.

“We Draw the Line at This.” In *Judge* [New York], December 2, 1893. Political Caricatures of the Hawaiian Kingdom.
<http://library.kcc.hawaii.edu/~soma/cartoons/>.

Secondary Sources

Allen, Helena G. *The Betrayal of Liliuokalani: Last Queen Of Hawaii, 1838-1917*. Honolulu: Mutual Publishing, 1982.

Daws, Gavan. *Shoal of Time: A History of the Hawaiian Islands*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1968.

Kuykendall, Ralph S. *The Hawaiian Kingdom*, vol. 3. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1967.

Osorio, Jonathan Kay Kamakawiwoʻole. *Dismembering Lāhui: A History of the Hawaiian Nation to 1887*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2002.

Pratt, Julius W. “The Hawaiian Revolution: A Re-Interpretation.” *Pacific Historical Review* 1, no. 3 (September 1932): 273-294.

Schmitt, Robert C. *Historical Statistics of Hawaii*. Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii, 1977.

Silva, Noenoe K. *Aloha Betrayed: Native Hawaiian Resistance to American Colonialism*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2004.

Tate, Merze. *The United States and the Hawaiian Kingdom: A Political History*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1965.

