HAWAI'I AND THE AMERICAN WEST: A REASSESSMENT

Matthew Kester
Brigham Young University Hawai'i

EVERY SO OFTEN, one happens upon stories that place one on the borders of widely shared and generally accepted academic boundaries. Occasionally, these stories force a rethinking of the fundamental assumptions of academic disciplines and collective understandings. More commonly, these stories and experiences simply beg a more nuanced understanding of the ways that communities, both historical and contemporary, are connected in the modern world. For the past five years, my own research has focused on Iosepa, a small religious community established in the desert of northwestern Utah in 1889 and abandoned twenty-eight years later, in 1917. Transient, short-lived communities in rural nineteenth-century North America are hardly uncommon, but this community, comprised of Native Hawaiian converts to Mormonism, possessed some (obviously) unique and interesting qualities. As I sought to understand this community and to try to place it into a larger historical and cultural framework, I came upon an interesting problem. Was Iosepa part of the larger history of the U.S. West, where it was located? Certainly it was. The development of Mormonism as a uniquely American religious tradition, defined by the "frontier experience," was an undeniable and important part of Iosepa's history. However, this was also a community of indigenous Hawaiians. Their conversion to Mormonism took place in Hawai'i, in a context radically different from the one they found after their arrival in Utah, and their experience with nineteenth-century racism in the western United States surely only served to solidify their identity as Hawaiians. In addition, Iosepa bridged the

Pacific Studies, Vol. 32, No. 4—December 2009

earliest communities of Native Hawaiians who settled in the Pacific Northwest and the significant migration of Pacific Islanders who began to settle in the western United States in the post–World War II era and in that sense becomes an integral part of the larger narrative of the modern Pacific diaspora to the United States. As a historian of the western United States with an interest in U.S. expansion and imperialism in Oceania, studying Iosepa placed me on academic borders and caused me to reflect on the ways that Oceania is integrated into both world and regional history. In this article, I assess some of the ways that Hawai'i has been integrated into the history of the western United States, identify some potential pitfalls in past approaches to writing Hawai'i into the larger narrative of U.S. history, and make a few suggestions as to how historians and scholars might proceed in the future. My focus is on the historiography of the western United States, not only because that is my own area of expertise but also because recently, it is scholars of this "American West" who have endeavored to include Hawai'i into the larger narrative of U.S. history. Despite this narrow historiographical focus, I hope that the ideas and observations I express here will resonate with those who care deeply about the regional integrity of Oceania[1], and the ways that history can, intentionally and unintentionally, colonize the past in ways that have a profound impact on the present.

For the majority of Western history's existence as a discipline, Hawai'i was not considered a part of the U.S. West. This began to change, albeit slowly, in the early 1990s, when Western history underwent a period of intense revision and self-reflection. In 1992, John Whitehead responded to a prevailing sentiment among many Western historians that Hawai'i lacks a "commonly shared history" with the West. His article "Hawai'i: the First and Last Far West?" makes a detailed and convincing argument for Hawai'i's inclusion as part of the U.S. West.[2] In 1997, Whitehead retraced the history of the forces that brought both Alaska and Hawai'i under the political influence of the United States in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries and offered some thoughts on how both places might influence the Western region in the future.[3] The *Oxford History of the American West*, published in 1994, includes a chapter by Victoria Wyatt that highlights themes in the history of both Hawai'i and Alaska that resonate throughout the U.S. West.[4] A sentence from Wyatt's introduction lists the general arguments among some scholars for including Hawai'i in the history of the U.S. West: "the convergence of indigenous peoples, European newcomers, and non-European immigrants; dispossession of native peoples, economic enterprises based on eastern U.S. or foreign capital; dependence on natural resources for both industry and tourism; and tensions generated by a substantial federal presence in regions far from the center of federal

government." Wyatt argues, and rightly so, that all these themes certainly apply to both nineteenth- and twentieth-century Hawaiian history as well as the history of the U.S. West. Walter Nugent's 1999 synthesis *Into the West: The Story of Its People* specifically includes Hawai'i, at least in the twentieth century, and addresses thematic elements of Hawai'i's history throughout. However, Nugent's survey of Western historians, writers, and journalists the same year revealed that Hawai'i was not considered part of the West by a majority of those surveyed, if they acknowledged it at all.[5] Elliott Barkan, Paul Spickard, and other scholars of American immigration have long recognized Hawai'i's role as an entry point and, for many, a final destination for East Asian immigrants and settlers. Barkan's look at the West from the perspective of immigration almost makes Hawai'i *more* Western than places like Montana, Utah, and Idaho; he locates Hawai'i as part of the "Primary West," one of the many places that people from other places first encountered the dizzying complexity of race, ethnicity, class, and gender that shaped the experiences of migrant populations in the West. Hawai'i's emergence in many synthetic accounts of Western history as an important part of the U.S. West has, in the minds of many scholars of the U.S. West, solidified its position as politically, economically, and even culturally part of the U.S. West. Interestingly enough, including Hawai'i into the larger narrative of the American West allows Western historians to revisit some of the debates that breathed new life into Western history in the 1980s and 1990s, a fact certainly not lost on scholars interested in the U.S. West.

There are some potential problems with this approach, however, and scholars of the U.S. West must be aware of the pitfalls inherent in simply including Hawai'i (and, by extension, other parts of Oceania that currently fall under U.S. influence) as a part of the U.S. West based on a set of defining principles according to scholars in that field, whatever those may be. In a recent essay, Chris Friday advocates a "fundamentally different task than simply extending the West into the Pacific." He advocates using concepts such as space, place, and regionalism in thinking about the Pacific and the U.S. West, a useful model for recognizing that the so-called Pacific region (a designation that usually all but ignores Oceania) is a historical invention that relies on colonial relationships to sustain itself as a region.[6] Generally speaking, I agree with this approach for several reasons. As a historian with interests in the West, I am sympathetic toward the efforts of many scholars to include Hawai'i in the regional story of the U.S. West in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The history of the western United States certainly has much to gain by including Hawai'i in its story.[7] As a historian with an interest in the history of Oceania, however, I feel it

important to acknowledge two things: first, that Hawai'i has historically been part of Oceania for much longer than it has been a part of western North America (in many ways, Hawai'i is culturally tied not to the U.S. West but to Oceania and East Asia), and, second, that the history of U.S. military and political influence in Hawai'i differs substantially from much of the present-day U.S. West. Because of this, the implications for including Hawai'i in the dominant narratives of the U.S. West leaves us in a situation not unlike being caught between Scylla and Charybdis. Leaving Hawai'i out of the story of U.S. expansion obscures the story of U.S. imperialism in Hawai'i as well as the role of Hawai'i in the economic, political, and social world of the nineteenth- and twentieth-century U.S. West. However, narrating Hawai'i into the larger story of the West bears the danger of naturalizing or even tacitly justifying its place under American influence and unmooring it from its cultural and historical affiliation with Oceania and the Pacific. For example, few scholars question California's current political status, although many criticize the racist justifications and aggressive means by which it was ultimately acquired from Mexico by the United States. Few scholars of the U.S. West applaud the methods by which indigenous peoples were removed from their lands to make way for White settlement, but very few advocate restoring or even revisiting questions of political boundaries in New Mexico, Colorado, or Montana, for instance. Native Hawaiians are currently engaged in a struggle for recognition as the indigenous people in their homelands and to restore, in some form, their sovereign nation. Unlike many First Nation peoples in the continental United States and Alaska, in 1893 Native Hawaiians were a single indigenous population unified politically under a representative constitutional monarchy. The Kingdom of Hawai'i was recognized by Western nations with a commercial, political, or military presence in Oceania. The overthrow of the Hawaiian government was perpetrated by U.S. citizens with the aid of a U.S. official and the U.S. military. The overthrow was acknowledged by the U.S. government to have been an illegal act under international law. Native Hawaiian citizens actively resisted the overthrow of their government by petition and by attempting to influence public discourse on the issue, and the U.S. government issued a formal apology for the 1893 overthrow in 1993.[8] Native Hawaiians continue to resist the political presence of the United States in various ways. If Hawai'i becomes an uncritically accepted part of the history of the U.S. West, do we risk the same uncritical acceptance of its current political status as well? So the question becomes, how do we responsibly include Hawai'i's story into the larger regional history of the U.S. West without perpetuating a discourse that invokes a sort of retroactive Manifest Destiny on a people and place actively engaged in resisting more than a century of U.S. imperialism?[9]

I believe that a possible answer to how we might navigate this historical problem lies in shifting our regional perspective. In the pages that follow, I would like to suggest several ways to narrate Hawai'i into the larger story of the western United States. These models shift the perspective on Hawai'i's relationship with the America West based on its inclusion in other regions to which it is culturally and historically much more closely affiliated. In addition, shifting our regional perspective regarding the historical relationship between Hawai'i and the United States, as well as other nations of Oceania, offers a new perspective on U.S. history, especially the history of the western United States, and challenges the east–west paradigm that has long held sway on our collective historical and geographical imagination.[10] I would humbly suggest that as scholars of the U.S. West we acknowledge that Hawai'i lies not at the margins of North America (a regional perspective perpetuated, at the most banal level, through the common practice in Hawai'i of referring to the continental United States as the "mainland") but as central to the larger "Pacific world" that emerged at the beginning of the nineteenth century. Viewing Hawai'i as a central location in the Pacific in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries emphasizes both its ties with the West as well as its much deeper historical and cultural ties with the nations and peoples of Oceania. In arguing for Hawai'i's central position, I do not offer it as the most important, strategic, or profitable location in the Pacific maritime trade. My goal in placing Hawai'i at the center in this model is to demonstrate the importance of perspective in writing history and to correct a pattern in *world* history that places Oceania on various historically constructed peripheries, on both the eastern and the western edges of the Pacific Ocean.

The Transpacific Trade

Hawai'i's role in the transpacific trade, both early on as a supplier of trade goods and later as a supplier of provisions for foreign ships and services for foreign seamen, is well documented.[11] The Pacific maritime trade emerged in the last decade of the eighteenth century and was dominated commercially by England and the United States after roughly 1830. Early efforts by French, Russian, and Spanish entrepreneurs were ambitious but less successful; those traders ultimately failed to link goods and markets between eastern, western, and central Pacific ports. Hawai'i entered this trade network as a supplier of agricultural products as well as a market for manufactured and luxury goods from Europe and China. The United States and Britain struggled to dominate emerging markets in Canton, California, Mexico, South America, and Hawai'i. The British-owned Hudson Bay

Company (HBC) purchased American John Jacob Astor's failed Pacific Fur Company in 1813. The HBC dominated the interior Columbia River fur trade of the Northwest coast and under the direction of George Simpson expanded into exporting salmon and lumber from the region in addition to furs. HBC trappers worked the Columbia and Snake rivers east to the Rocky Mountains through a network of forts and agents and eventually ranged as far south as northern California and north into present-day British Columbia. Fort George, Fort Victoria, and Fort Vancouver all emerged as HBC's regional outposts and major settlements, and the HBC managed transactions through local agents in Honolulu and Yerba Buena (San Francisco). American traders took a different approach, working the coastal fur trade from Vancouver Island north to the Russian Fur Company outpost at Sitka, while they diversified their commercial activities with whaling and sandalwood operations in Hawai'i and the southern Pacific and maintained relationships in China. The HBC's weak presence in East Asian ports opened the way for American domination of the trade between the Northwest coast, Honolulu, and China. HBC activities in Canton were discouraged by the provincial nature of the East India Company and their jealous protection of the London market for East Asia's regional commodities. California emerged after Mexican independence in1821 as a market for American and British foodstuffs and manufactured goods and as a source of hides and tallow; the hide and tallow trade remained the mainstay of California's export economy until 1846. Spanish ports in San Blas, Acapulco, Lima, and Valparaiso were also common stops for ships heading back and forth from Cape Horn.[12]

The hub of all these commercial ventures in the Pacific became Hawai'i. Beginning in the late eighteenth century, Hawai'i emerged as a central location for refitting and resupplying foreign vessels in the burgeoning transpacific trade. The American North Pacific whaling fleet wintered there annually, and visiting ships could easily obtain provisions year-round. Following a period of warfare in the islands between about 1782 and 1794, the Hawaiian government emerged as a stable and hospitable polity that spanned all the major islands except Kauai. Under the leadership of Kamehameha I, Hawai'i eagerly participated in foreign trade and exported raw materials like sandalwood and sold provisions to foreign ships.[13]

By 1830, the transpacific trade connected such geographically dispersed Pacific ports as Honolulu, Canton, Fort George and Fort Vancouver, Valparaiso, and Manila. American hide and tallow vessels visiting the California coast long before San Francisco's emergence as a commercial and financial center after 1850 routinely used Hawai'i as a place to obtain both supplies and crew members. Native Hawaiians left Hawai'i in

substantial numbers as sailors on whaling ships or as laborers in the fur trade in Washington and Vancouver.[14] Others went to California to work in the gold diggings and came here to Utah as Mormon émigrés.[15] And some left Hawai'i as Christian missionaries to other parts of Oceania.[16]

Transpacific Labor and Immigration

From an immigration perspective, we can easily recognize Hawai'i's central position in the transpacific labor movement of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, as Hawai'i became a destination for East Asian laborers, some who eventually made their way to locations throughout the American West and others who came to Hawai'i from places like California. The rise in East Asian labor recruitment in Hawai'i corresponded with the rise of sugar production in Hawai'i following the onset of the American Civil War. The vast majority of East Asian sojourners and settlers in Hawai'i between the early 1860s and World War II labored on Hawaiian sugar plantations. Even after the decline of the Hawaiian sugar industry, Hawai'i remained a "portal" for immigration to the western United States from East Asia until the early 1980s.[17] Consider the stories of just one of the groups of East Asian migrants to Hawai'i, the Chinese, in the century between 1850 and 1950. Their story demonstrates the profound regional ties that connect Hawai'i with both the western United States and the western Pacific.

The Chinese were the first large group of East Asian migrants to Hawai'i in the nineteenth century. Chinese immigration to Hawai'i began as a result of the burgeoning transpacific trade that linked Canton, Honolulu, and West Coast ports in North and South America. Despite the Chinese government's emigration ban, Chinese residents composed approximately 12 percent of the foreign population in Honolulu in 1828. Chinese settlers continued to migrate to Hawai'i throughout the first half of the nineteenth century, marrying Hawaiian women and going into business for themselves, often in sugar cultivation and other commercial endeavors. However, the Chinese population in Hawai'i exploded after 1852 with the consolidation of agricultural interests firmly placed in the hands of the Haole elite in Hawai'i after the Māhele, a set of laws passed between 1846 and 1854 that divided Hawaiian lands among chiefs, commoners, and the state and privatized large tracts of Hawaiian land for sale to non–Native Hawaiians. The recruitment of East Asian laborers to work on Hawaiian sugar plantations began when the first Chinese contract laborers came to Hawai'i in 1852 to work on sugar plantations in Kauai. The slow trickle of Chinese laborers who came to Hawai'i (from both China and the western United States)

expanded exponentially in 1876 after Hawai'i signed the Reciprocity Treaty with the United States, allowing for Hawai'i sugar to enter the U.S. duty free. In 1882, when the United States enacted racist laws restricting Chinese immigration, many Chinese left the western United States for Hawai'i as well. Chinese immigration to Hawai'i continued to expand until Hawai'i's annexation to the United States in 1898 extended the provisions of the 1882 Exclusion Act to the Hawaiian Islands. Many Chinese in Hawai'i between 1876 and 1898 also increased their personal landholdings and grew rice commercially, which, like sugar, could be imported to the United States duty free. After annexation, Chinese in Hawai'i resisted exclusionary laws, consolidated business networks and relationships, and negotiated the early twentieth century Americanization campaigns through various shared organizations and institutions. My intent is not to argue that the experience of the Chinese in Hawai'i should represent the experience of East Asian labor in Oceania but simply to demonstrate that Hawai'i has been a central location for people moving through the Pacific throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries and that its people have been part of the story of western North America from the early nineteenth century on.

Looking at the West from the perspective of immigration also shifts Hawai'i from the periphery of the continental United States to the center of the Pacific region. In a 2002 article, Elliot Barkan suggested a redefinition of the American West from the perspective of immigration. That redefinition includes a spatial reconceptualization of the West. Barkan argued that "'the West' consists of a primary arc of immigrant entry ports and destinations extending to Texas, across New Mexico and Arizona, to California, Oregon, Washington, and Alaska, out to Hawai'i."[18] Recognizing immigration's role in creating the West's ethnic diversity, Donald Worster stated that "the West has . . . been a place where white Americans ran smack into the broader world." With a spotlight on immigration, Worster and Barkan evoked a similar kind of spatial repositioning: a sort of "exterior West," which includes Honolulu as a regional borderland where a global and multiethnic population erases any notion of a clearly demarcated frontier. In both of these observations, however, Hawai'i remains a Far Western outpost, an entry point for immigration like Houston, Seattle, or Los Angeles. Popular discourses also depict Hawai'i as an outlying part of the West where, presumably, tourists from the continental United States can safely engage specters of exotic Otherness.[19] A new conceptual map that places Hawai'i not as peripheral to North America but as central to the Pacific and part of the global region of Oceania reveals Hawai'i's role as a way station for immigrants who continue on eastward to enter the American West or who remain in Hawai'i as both settlers and sojourners.

In addition (and equally important in my mind), this opens up a discussion of immigration to the western United States that includes Pacific Islanders as well.

Hawai'i's role in the transnational Pacific Islander diaspora underscores its central position in the Pacific as well as its position as part of the cultural and geographic region of Oceania. Hawai'i has emerged in the twentieth century as a destination for transnational populations of Pacific Islanders who have migrated to urban centers in Australia, Aotearoa/New Zealand, and the United States.[20] Honolulu has the largest population of Pacific Islanders of any U.S. city, and the majority of Pacific Islanders in the United States reside in seven western states.[21] Samoans, Tongans, Native Hawaiians, Chamorros, and Marshall Islanders are all well represented in cities throughout the western United States, including Los Angeles, Las Vegas, Seattle, Salt Lake City, and San Francisco, and many of them either come through Hawai'i or rely on extended family networks located in Hawai'i. Many diasporic Pacific Islanders boast family networks that span the Pacific and connect the urban West to cities like Auckland and Sydney. Within the larger group of diasporic Pacific Islanders that experience the West as East, Native Hawaiians, despite their current political status, retain strong cultural attachments to Oceania and Asia. This is not to say that the political influence of the United States over the past century has had a negligible effect on Hawai'i and its peoples culturally. Quite the opposite. The emigration of Filipinos to Hawai'i as laborers on sugar plantations beginning in 1906 is an example of the role of U.S. foreign and domestic policy shaping Hawai'i's cultural landscape. The emigration of Samoans and Marshallese to and through Hawai'i based on their home nations' political relationship with the United States is another example. But these demographic changes in Hawai'i have only served to strengthen the cultural ties of its people with global regions other than the U.S. West.

Indigenous scholarship on this trans-Oceanian diaspora also reflects a shift away from economic determinist models that assume a core–periphery relationship between Oceania and surrounding regions toward models that emphasize indigenous ways of understanding the diasporic experience. This theoretical trajectory was set in motion by Epeli Hau'ofa's 1994 article "Our Sea of Islands," which criticized the dominant discourses regarding economic development and migration as "belittling" and charted a new course for understanding Oceania both past and present. Since then, indigenous scholars have advanced indigenous methodologies to address indigenous peoples, places, and issues. Linda Tuhiwai-Smith's 1999 book *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples* both critiques colonial ways of knowing and representing indigenous peoples, their

cultures, and their histories and charts a course for how indigenous researchers might best approach their subjects from their own perspectives and cultural frameworks. Although her work is intended for indigenous scholars generally, her critiques of colonial methodologies and the problems inherent in representing indigenous people come from her position as a *tangata whenua* woman. Her critiques originated in the postcolonial world of Oceania. Tevita Ka'ili and Sa'iliemanu Lilomaiava-Doktor, two scholars who work specifically on Tongan and Samoan diasporic communities, respectively, have advanced theoretical frameworks for understanding both sociospatial relationships as well as "population movement" (as opposed to the more ideologically laden term "migration") using concepts (*Vā, Tauhi vā*, and *Malaga*) but from Oceania.[22] By using indigenous concepts to describe indigenous communities, these scholars avoid the assumptions that continue to pervade U.S. scholarly literature on migration and migrant communities. Ka'ili also advocates jettisoning the use of the words "Pacific" and "Oceania" in favor of "Moana," which is not shared in all regional linguistic traditions but is at least a term from the region that better reflects regional sensibilities. Reading the work of these scholars (both of whom work with communities in both Hawai'i and the western United States), it seems impossible to continue thinking in terms of the political boundaries and economic influence of the United States pushing ever westward into and over the people of Oceania. For these communities, they are pushing the boundaries of their region and not the other way around.

Relocating Hawai'i away from the periphery of the U.S. West does not diminish its role in the region's history. In this model, Hawai'i's ties to the twentieth-century West can in fact become more apparent. However, its ties within Oceania become more visible, as do its ties to the region that it has been attached to culturally and historically for a much longer time: Oceania. (If we were to shift our historical perspective to the sixteenth, seventeenth, and early eighteenth centuries and before, it would perhaps be more accurate to see Hawai'i not as central to a burgeoning Pacific trade between North America and East Asia but as a remote outlier of Oceania.) Contemporary evidence of these strong cultural ties can be found in the recent voyage of the *Hokulea*, Hawai'i's voyaging canoe, to Satawal to present navigator Mau Pialug with a traditional Oceanian voyaging canoe as a gesture of thanks for the sharing of cultural knowledge over the past forty years that has made possible the resurgence of traditional long-distance voyaging in Hawai'i and throughout Oceania. The *Hokulea*, from its inception to its earliest voyages to Tahiti in the late 1970s, validated the cultural ties between Hawai'i and other nations in Oceania even as it inspired younger generations if indigenous Hawaiians to rediscover a

cultural heritage obscured by the experience of American rule in the twentieth century.[23] The diaspora of indigenous Hawaiians and Pacific Islanders to urban areas in the western United States has been interpreted by Pacific Islander scholars as a continuation of the voyaging and settlement tradition of Pacific peoples.[24] From this perspective, the strong ties that Native Hawaiians and Pacific Islanders have fostered with the American West are an extension of their deeply rooted cultural and historical ties to Oceania. In an essay surveying different approaches to Western history, Martin Ridge referred to the psychological fault line that separates and defines regions in the United States. He suggests an organizing principle for studying the U.S. West based on the region as a "cultural phenomenon." This West is defined by "all the things that a group of people inhabiting a common geographical area do, the way they see things . . . and their values and symbols." In Ridge's model, I think, we can readily see some of the difficulties of uncritically including Hawai'i as part of the U.S. West. Cultural ties to the West in Hawai'i are slippery and will presumably ebb and flow based on the forces that expand or constrain the movement of Pacific Islander people in and out of the West. And Hawai'i 's cultural and historical ties to Oceania and East Asia will continue to foster a set of values and symbols that will remain largely unintelligible to many (non–Pacific Islander) residents of the western United States.[25]

In light of these issues, what are some of the practical ways historians and scholars can include Hawai'i into the broader story of the U.S. West in a way that recognizes Hawai'i's unique position both politically and geographically?

First, Hawai'i opens the door for an expanded conversation about how the West as a region has interacted with other global regions economically, politically, and culturally. John Whitehead observed that "diplomatic rather than Western historians have claimed Hawai'i as their own" in the sense that diplomatic historians are almost by definition interested in the global reach of national affairs.[26] This is due to Hawai'i's central role in the redefinition of the United States as a self-acknowledged imperial power in the late nineteenth century as well the goal of U.S. military leaders to create "an American lake" in the Pacific.[27] In the case of Hawai'i, Western historians have an opportunity to think comparatively about themes that are already familiar: conquest, territorial versus state government, and the political status of indigenous people. Whitehead argues that "some native Hawaiians might well feel that the inclusion of their islands in the American West is yet one more act of dispossession" and that "Hawai'i provides the opportunity to come to grips with its western frontier."[28] However (and depending upon the historical time period in question), recognizing Hawai'i

as part of Oceania allows historians to see the way that regions both interact and shift their boundaries historically. Hawai'i can become part of the Pacific world both past and present in much the same way that scholars have argued for an "Atlantic world," with a sea that acts as a conduit, not a barrier, for commerce, ideologies, and people.[29] Studying the West as an integral part of the Pacific world creates new regional histories that change our understanding of its economic and cultural development. In addition, we can follow the lead of scholars like Gary Okihiro, whose recent path-breaking book *Island World: A History of Hawai'i and the United States* focuses on the ways that Hawaiians' push eastward has influenced the cultural and historical landscape of the United States in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.[30] Hawai'i should, as has been advocated, place scholars of the U.S. West on "academic borders," but they should be the borders of other regional narratives, not merely of different subfields of U.S. history.[31]

Second, scholars of the U.S. West can play closer attention to the histories of Hawai'i being produced by Native Hawaiian scholars. Many of these new histories focus on Native Hawaiian resistance to U.S. imperialism in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Scholars like Lilikalā Kame'eleihiwa, Jonathan Kamakawiwo'ole Osorio, Noenoe Silva, Isaiah Helekunihi Walker, Davianna Pomaika'i MacGregor, and others all focus their work on the protracted resistance of Native Hawaiians to U.S. colonialism in Hawai'i in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Jonathan Kamakawiwo'ole Osorio's work on the political transformation of the Hawaiian Kingdom in the nineteenth century reveals the slow but steady "dismemberment" of the Hawaiian nation by political transformation that replaced an indigenous-led constitutional monarchy with a U.S.-dominated republic that took advantage of a decimated indigenous population outnumbered by increasing waves of foreign settlers.[32] Noenoe Silva's work focuses on the resistance of all classes of Native Hawaiians to the same processes Osorio describes through popular media such as Hawaiian-language newspapers and grassroots political organization throughout all the islands.[33] Davianna Pomaika'i McGregor and Isaiah Helekunihi Walker focus their attention on continuity and change in Hawaiian culture post–World War II Hawai'i, respectively.[34] All these scholars' work underscores the many ways Native Hawaiian leaders looked to the colonial experiences of other Pacific Islanders to develop strategies of resistance and accommodation to imperial powers most beneficial to their people and nation. Many of these same Native Hawaiian scholars, as well as community activists and leaders, continue to build and maintain relationships with other indigenous peoples in the U.S. West in order to assess potential models for asserting sovereignty, even as

they reassert cultural and historic ties throughout Oceania. From the perspective of this scholarship, the relationship between the United States and Hawai'i is quite simply the relationship between the colonizer and the colonized, a familiar theme in the Pacific especially. These perspectives cannot be ignored, and I would argue that they should take a center stage in any discussion of Hawai'i and the American West.

Third, scholars of the U.S. West need to recognize Hawai'i's place in regional histories of Oceania and the Pacific. The historical trajectory of Hawai'i after the arrival of Europeans in 1778 parallels that of many Pacific Islands nations, whether the colonizing nation in question was Britain, France, Germany, New Zealand, or the United States. Viewed from this perspective, Hawai'i's history has far more in common with a place like Aotearoa/New Zealand than it does with the American West or the rest of the United States. While former colonized nations like Fiji, Samoa, Vanuatu, or the Marshall Islands negotiated their independence after World War II, the United States and Britain have solidified and naturalized their control over Hawai'i and New Zealand, respectively. Yet, while the Maori in New Zealand have successfully petitioned the government for redress based on the 1840 Treaty of Waitangi, Native Hawaiians have not yet achieved recognition by the U.S. government as the indigenous people of their lands despite the 1993 Apology Bill acknowledging U.S. complicity in the illegal overthrow of the Hawaiian government in 1893. Comparisons between Hawaiian and New Zealand history also reveal the obsessively geographical component of U.S. history that produces the "east-to-west gaze": few other imperial powers in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries have included such a profoundly geographical component in their early formulations of empire. This geographical imagining of an expanding frontier that extends its reach into the Pacific differs substantially from the way that Australian and New Zealand scholars have written about the Pacific, if only because the latter seem to more fully accept the colonial and imperial implications of their political and economic hegemony in Oceania.

Scholars of Oceania recognize the cultural, linguistic, and historical ties between Hawai'i and the rest of Oceania. Synthetic treatments of the history of the Oceania and the Pacific Islands include Hawai'i in comparative discussions on indigenous rights, issues of land tenure, and discussions on the development of economies based on agribusiness and tourism, common themes throughout the history of Oceania.[35] The University of Hawai'i Press remains one of the preeminent academic publishers of works on Oceania and the Pacific. Native Hawaiian scholars and artists remain at the forefront of issues of cultural authenticity and representation in the Pacific.[36] Hawai'i is and will remain an important part of regional scholarship on

Oceania and the Pacific. While its century-and-a-half history of dealing with the United States remains an integral part of Hawaiian history, scholars of Oceania will rightly continue to emphasize Native Hawaiians' deep and abiding cultural and historical connections with other indigenous peoples throughout Oceania. For U.S. scholars as well as scholars of the western United States, these regional ties are instructive. Scholars of the West should look comparatively at Hawai'i versus other places in Oceania like Samoa, which sends a nonvoting delegate to the U.S. Congress (like Hawai'i did in the territorial period from 1900 to 1959); Guam; the former Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands, including the Marshall Islands; and the Federated States of Micronesia.[37] Studying Hawai'i in the context of U.S. imperialism in the late nineteenth century also opens possibilities for discussing comparative empires within Oceania, something that Walter Nugent has explored for the rest of the American West.[38]

In conclusion, Hawai'i is best integrated into the history of the western United States when it forces scholars to face the colonial and imperial presence of the United States in Oceania and the West's relationship with the Oceania and the larger Pacific world. While scholars of the U.S. West can no longer afford to ignore Hawai'i in synthetic accounts of Western history, Hawai'i (and the rest of Oceania) can hardly be thought of as a frontier, or as the Far West, when we take into account the perspectives of those who are indigenous to its soil or who have established it as a node in the global movement of people from Oceania to the lands on its borders.

NOTES

1. My intent here is not to stake a claim in the robust debate regarding Oceania as a cohesive cultural region. While the issues with the anthropological designations of Micronesia, Melanesia, and Polynesia have been laid bare in recent years (and are now being revisited and debated anew), my treatment of Oceania as a recognizable cultural region, both past and present, is in relation to its neighbors to the east and west. While we can ably debate the similarities between the cultures of "Micronesia" and "Polynesia," for example, I feel comfortable asserting that whatever differences one might reasonably find, they would pale in comparison to the differences between the cultures of either East Asia or Euro-America, for instance.

2. John Whitehead, "Hawaii: The First and Last Far West?," *The Western Historical Quarterly* 23 (May 1992): 153–77.

3. John Whitehead, "Noncontiguous Wests: Alaska and Hawaii," in *Many Wests: Place, Culture, and Regional Identity*, ed. David M. Wroebel and Michael C. Steiner (Lawrence, KS: Univ. Press of Kansas, 1997), 315–41.

4. Victoria Wyatt, "Alaska and Hawai'i," in *The Oxford History of the American West*, ed. Clyde Milner II, Carol A. O'Connor, and Martha A. Sandweiss (New York: Oxford

Univ. Press, 1994), 565–602. Hawai'i is often considered alongside of Alaska by virtue of their "noncontiguity." It is my feeling that both Hawai'i and Alaska—and the means by which they came under the political sphere of the United States—deserve to be considered independent of one another.

5. Walter Nugent, *Into the West: The Story of Its People* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1992); Walter Nugent, "Where Is the American West: A Report on a Survey," in *The American West: A Reader*, ed. Walter Nugent and Martin Ridge (Bloomington: Indiana Univ. Press, 1999), 11–23.

6. Chris Friday, "The Pacific, Place, and the U.S. West," in *A Companion to the American West*, ed. Bill Deverell (Oxford, U.K.: Blackwell, 2004), 271–85.

7. For instance, it is difficult to understand the U.S. maritime presence in the nineteenth-century Pacific without including Hawai'i. The story of the California gold rush and of transpacific labor in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries is also obscured when Hawaii is ignored. John Whitehead makes this case convincingly. See Whitehead, "Noncontiguous Wests," 316–24; See also Dorothy Fujita-Rony, *American Workers, Colonial Power: Philippine Seattle and the Transpacific West* (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 2003).

8. U.S. Public Law 103-150, Joint Resolution to Acknowledge the 100th Anniversary of the January 17, 1893, Overthrow of the Kingdom of Hawai'i, and to Offer an Apology to Native Hawaiians on Behalf of the United States for the Overthrow of the Kingdom of Hawaii. See also Noenoe K. Silva, *Aloha Betrayed: Native Hawaiian Resistance to U.S. Colonialism* (Durham, NC: Duke Univ. Press, 2004); Merze Tate, *The United States and the Hawaiian Kingdom: A Political History* (New Haven, 1965); Liliuokalani, *Hawaii's Story by Hawaii's Queen* (Tokyo: Tuttle, 1964); Tom Coffman, *Nation Within: The Story of America's Annexation of the Nation of Hawai'i* (Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i Press, 1998).

9. The issue of federal recognition for Native Hawaiians as well the issue of Hawaiian sovereignty are complex and multilayered. There is no consensus, even among Native Hawaiians, as to what that sovereignty should look like. The vision for Hawaiian sovereignty falls somewhere along a continuum from federal recognition as indigenous peoples to an outright end of what is considered an overtly military occupation of the Hawaiian Islands by the United States.

10. There are many scholars who argue that a shift away from an east-looking west perspective challenges the predominant view of Western history. See Pekka Hamalainen, "The Rise and Fall of Plains Indian Horse Culture," *Journal of American History* 90, no. 3 (December 2003), 833–62; Dorothy Fujita-Rony, *American Workers, Colonial Power: Philippine Seattle and the Transpacific West* (Berkeley, 2003), and "Water and Land: Asian Americans and the U.S. West," *Pacific Historical Review* 76, no. 4 (2007): 563–74; Elliot R. Barkan, "Turning Turner on His Head: The Significance of Immigration in the 20th Century American Western History," *New Mexico Historical Review* 77 (Winter 2002): 68; Laurie Maffly-Kipp, "'Eastward Ho!' American Religious History from the Perspective of the Pacific Rim," in *Retelling American Religious History*, ed. Thomas A. Tweed (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1996), 128–47; Paul Spickard, Joanne L.

Rondilla, and Debbie Hippolite-Wright, eds., *Pacific Diaspora: Island Peoples in the United States and Across the Pacific* (Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i Press, 2002).

11. Richard Mackie, *Trading beyond the Mountains: The British Fur Trade on the Pacific, 1793–1843*, (Vancouver: Univ. of British Columbia Press, 1997); Ralph Kuykendall, *The Hawaiian Kingdom*, vol. 1 (Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i Press, 1965); John Meares, *Voyages Made in the Years 1788 and 1789 from China to the North-West Coast of America*, (New York: De Capo Press, 1967); Richard Henry Dana, *Two Years before the Mast: A Personal Narrative of Life at Sea* (Los Angeles: Lane Book Company, 1964); Samuel Kamakau, *Ruling Chiefs of Hawai'i* (Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press, 1992); Ralph Kuykendall, *The Hawaiian Kingdom* (Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i Press, 1957).

12. Mackie, *Trading beyond the Mountains*.

13. See Mackie, *Trading beyond the Mountains*; Arthur Power Dudden, *The American Pacific: From the China Trade to the Present* (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1992); Walter McDougall, *Let the Sea Make a Noise* (New York: HarperCollins, 1993); Ralph Kuykendall, *The Hawaiian Kingdom, Volume 1: Foundation and Transformation, 1778–1854* (Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i Press 1938).

14. Jean Barman and Bruce McIntyre, *Leaving Paradise: indigenous Hawaiians in the Pacific Northwest, 1787–1898*, (Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i Press, 2006).

15. Dennis Atkins, "A History of Iosepa: The Utah Polynesian Colony," MA thesis, Brigham Young Univ., 1958.

16. Nancy J. Morris, "Hawaiian Missionaries in the Marquesas," *Hawaiian Journal of History* 13 (1979): 46–58.

17. Elliot R. Barkan, "The Forgotten Port of Entry: Honolulu: America's Western Portal to the East" (paper presented at the Pacific Coast Branch meeting of the American Historical Association, Honolulu, Hawai'i, 1986).

18. Elliot R. Barkan, "Turning Turner on His Head: The Significance of Immigration in the 20th Century American Western History," *New Mexico Historical Review* 77 (Winter 2002): 68.

19. Haunani K. Trask, "Lovely Hula Hands: Corporate Tourism and the Prostitution of Hawaiian Culture," in *From a Native Daughter* (Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i Press, 1999); Jane C. Desmond, *Staging Tourism: Bodies on Display from Waikiki to Sea World* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999).

20. Paul Spickard, Joanne Rondilla, and Debbie Hippolite-Wright, eds., *Pacific Diaspora: Island People in the United States and across the Pacific* (Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i Press, 2002); Cluny McPherson, Paul Spoonley, and Melanie Anae, eds., *Tangata O Te Moana Nui: The Evolving Identities of Pacific Peoples in Aotearoa/New Zealand* (Auckland: Dunmore Press, 2001).

21. Elizabeth M. Grieco, *The Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Population: 2000* (Census 2000 Brief) (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Commerce, December 2001).

22. Tevita Kaili, "Tauhi va: Nurturing Tongan Sociospatial Ties in Maui and Beyond," *The Contemporary Pacific* 17, no. 1 (2005): 83–117; Sa'iliemanu Lilomaiava-Doktor, "Beyond "Migration": Samoan Population Movement (*Malaga*) and the Geography of Social Space (*Vā*)," *The Contemporary Pacific* 21, no. 1 (2009): 1–34.

23. Ben Finney, *Voyage of Rediscovery: A Cultural Odyssey through Polynesia* (Berkeley, 1994). The initial voyage of the Hokulea was a monumental event that has inspired Pacific Islander artists, musicians, and subsequent voyagers and cultural ambassadors.

24. Epeli Hau'ofa and Eric Waddell, eds., *A New Oceania: Rediscovering Our Sea of Islands* (Suva, 1993). Epeli Hau'ofa's essay "Our Sea of Islands" marks an unprecedented historiographical turning point in scholarship on Oceania and has inspired a generation of scholars to reconceptualize the study of anthropology, economics, history, and politics in the region. Most recently, Paul D'arcy's study of the relationship between cultural change and the oceanic environment the Pacific has borne out many of Hau'ofa's arguments. Paul D'Arcy, *The People of the Sea: Environment, Identity, and History in Oceania* (Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i Press, 2007).

25. Martin Ridge, "The American West: From Frontier to Region," in Nugent and Ridge, *The American West*, 24–38.

26. Whitehead, "Hawaii," 176. See also Friday, "The Pacific, Place, and the U.S. West," 276–78.

27. See especially Hal M. Friedman, *Creating an American Lake: United States Imperialism and Strategic Security in the Pacific Basin, 1945–1947* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2001).

28. Whitehead, "Hawaii," 176.

29. For a retrospective analysis of the concept of the Atlantic world, see John R. Gillis, *Islands of the Mind: How the Human Imagination Created the Atlantic World* (New York: Macmillan, 2004).

30. Gary Okihiro, *Island World: A History of Hawai'i and the United States* (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 2008).

31. The idea of a Pacific world, or a "Pacific Rim," is not without its critics. Arif Dirlik and others have called the very idea of a Pacific region into question as a "Euro-American invention." See Arif Dirlik, ed., *What Is a Rim? Critical Perspectives on the Pacific Region Idea*, 2nd ed. (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 1998). However, the region of Oceania certainly pre-dated any Euro-American–conceived "Pacific Rim," and Hawaii was a part of it. The cultural region of Oceania shaped the actions of Europeans and Americans in the eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth centuries and I would argue retains its coherence as a region today.

32. Jonathan Kamakawiwo'ole Osorio, *Dismembering Lāhui: A History of the Hawaiian Nation to 1887* (Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i Press, 2002).

33. Noenoe K. Silva, *Aloha Betrayed: Native Hawaiian Resistance to American Colonialism* (Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i Press, 2004).

34. Isaiah Helekunihi Walker, "Terrorism or Native Protest?: The Hui o He'e Nalu and Hawaiian Resistance to Colonialism," *Pacific Historical Review* 74, no. 4 (2004): 575–601; Davianna Pomaika'i McGregor, *Na Kua'aina: Living Hawaiian Culture* (Honolulu: Univ. of Hawaii Press, 2007).

35. See Donald Denoon, *The Cambridge History of the Pacific Islanders* (New York: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1997); K. R. Howe, Robert C. Kiste, and Brij V. Lal, *Tides of History: The Pacific Islands in the Twentieth Century*; Paul D'Arcy, *The People of the Sea: Environment, Identity, and History in Oceania* (Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i Press, 2006); Steven R. Fischer, *A History of the Pacific Islands* (New York: Palgrave, 2002); I. C. Campbell, *A History of the Pacific Islands* (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1989).

36. See especially J. Kehaulani Kauanui and Vicente M. Diaz, "Native Pacific Cultural Studies on the Edge," *The Contemporary Pacific* 13, no. 2 (Fall 2001, special issue): 315.

37. As noted by John Whitehead, U.S. diplomatic and military historians have proved much more adept at this, for obvious reasons. The key here, I think, is to strike a balance between recognizing the Pacific as a cultural region with a limited but important amount of cohesiveness and yet also emphasize the historical differences that have produced very different places culturally, economically and politically. Hawai'i, Samoa, the Marshall Islands, and other form Trust Territories of the Pacific share a historical relationship with the United States, but that relationship is unique to each place. In addition, these places each have unique histories within the regional history of Oceania. Dorothy Fujita-Rony has also advocated integrating studies of U.S. imperialism across the Pacific as a way of rethinking dominant narratives of the U.S. West. Dorothy Fujita-Rony, "Water and Land: Asian Americans and the U.S. West," *Pacific Historical Review* 76, no. 4 (2007): 568.

38. Walter Nugent, "Frontiers and Empires in the Late Nineteenth Century," in Nugent and Ridge, *The American West*, 39–55.