Assimilating Hawai‘i:
Racial Science in a Colonial "Laboratory," 1919-1939

A DISSERTATION
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
BY

Christine Leah Manganaro

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Sally Gregory Kohlstedt, Co-Adviser

David A. Chang, Co-Adviser

July 2012

Acknowledgments

Completing this dissertation would not have been possible without the support of many, many talented and generous people. My first thanks must go to Sally Gregory Kohlstedt, who has advised this project from the beginning. In addition to modeling scholarly and professional habits that have made me a better historian and writer, Sally took my interests and ideas seriously even as she consistently challenged me to clarify them. Her support was particularly important during the first years when it may have seemed like a dissertation project that took me to Hawai'i was a bit of a boondoggle. I owe Sally an enormous debt for insisting, when this project sometimes felt too big and too unwieldy to finish, that I simply explain what happened in the clearest terms. All the while, she gave me the necessary room to think through some ideas that I had to sit with for many months to articulate. Sally has ushered an impressive list of historians into their professional lives, and I am fortunate to count myself among her advisees.

David A. Chang became co-adviser in practice long before he took on the official title. I thank him for challenging me in his graduate seminars and in our conversations in his office and for encouraging my participation in the American Indian Studies Workshop at the University of Minnesota. My am most grateful, though, for his encouragement and direction when the institutional and intellectual history threads of this dissertation threatened to eclipse the colonial context that interested me in the first place, and which matters to a much broader conversation about American settler colonialism. While working on this project, I have had one foot in the history of human science and the other in a discussion among historians of the United States, American studies scholars, and indigenous studies scholars interested in imperialism and its ongoing effects. David guided me as I developed a

scholarly voice and a clear understanding my kuleana – my responsibility and privilege – as a historian working on Hawai'i.

In addition to my advisors, I would like to thank my dissertation committee members Mark Borrello, Jennifer Gunn, and Jole Shackelford. Mark provided timely commentary on the first chapter at an October 2011 meeting of the Biology Interest Group (BIG) in the Minnesota Center for the Philosophy of Science. Jennifer spent many hours in her office talking with me about this project in the earliest stages and has been an unfailing advocate since I was a prospective student. Jole Shackelford read drafts of all the chapters, and they are much more crisp in both ideas and language because of his attention. As this project oscillated between going well and stalling, Jole also talked with me about why we do this work in the first place.

I cannot imagine a better place to complete this project than at the University of Minnesota. The Department of History graciously welcomed my participation in a number of their workshops and seminars. Tom Wolfe, Kevin Murphy, and Elaine Tyler May socialized me into graduate-level work and influenced a number of the analytical directions this dissertation took. Sincere thanks to Saje Mathieu and Malinda Lindquist for their comments on drafts of chapters two and four (which were one chapter when Saje encountered the text) and chapter five in the Graduate Workshop in Modern History. Mitch Ogden and Katie Levin of the Writing Center worked with me as a teacher and a writer to see how those activities are mutually sustaining.

A number of archivists and librarians provided exceptionally personalized support. Jim Cartwright at the University of Hawai'i Archives welcomed me during the semester I spent in his reading room in 2007 and acknowledged my research efforts with a gift of an

original (duplicate) archival photo of scholars attending a conference on race relations at the University. Sherman Seki retrieved box after box of materials. Many were un- or minimally processed, and as I waded through a wealth of sources that was almost too much, Sherman helped me use the finding aids most effectively as he also talked frankly with me about life in Hawai'i. Joan Hori and Stuart Dawrs in the Hawaiian and Pacific Collections of the University of Hawai'i Library helped me locate hard-to-find materials and learn how to access unfamiliar periodicals. At the Bishop Museum Library and Archives, DeSoto Brown, Charles Myers, Leah Caldeira, Kim Okahara, and B.J. Short helped make my time in their reading room as productive and enjoyable as possible. Special thanks to DeSoto and Charley for their willingness to talk with me about the history of Hawai'i, to DeSoto for sharing pieces from his personal collection, to Charley for inviting me to hear local music among locals, and to Leah for granting me unsolicited access to the staff snack stash. In the Collections department at the Bishop Museum, I thank Wanda K. Anae-Onishi and M. Kamalu duPreez for helping me locate the plaster busts that remain from the collection shown at the 1921 International Congress of Eugenics and for allowing me to see them for myself. At the University of Chicago Special Collections, many thanks to Julia Gardner for relaxing the photocopy maximum several times over to allow me copies of all of the interview material that Margaret Lam sent to Robert Park in the early 1930s. These documents were crucial sources for chapter four. I acknowledge Kristin Mable at the American Museum of Natural History's Division of Anthropology Archives for granting me access to the collections. Also at the American Museum of Natural History, but in Special Collections, I owe Barbara Mathe thanks and gratitude for her assistance and generosity in the midst of numerous demanding projects. Finally, thanks to Valerie Lutz and the staff of

the American Philosophical Society and James Green of the Library Company of Philadelphia for making my fellowship month in Philadelphia productive and comfortable.

Funding for this dissertation came from several sources. A library fellowship from the American Philosophical Society funded four weeks of research. A travel grant and doctoral dissertation fellowship from the University of Minnesota Graduate School, fellowship funding from the Program in the History of Medicine and the Biological Sciences, and a grant from the National Science Foundation (Dissertation Improvement Grant #0849126) funded research in Honolulu and New York and time to write. Travel grants from the University of Minnesota Graduate and Professional Student Association, the History of Science Society, and the International Society for the History, Philosophy, and Social Studies of Biology allowed me to present works in progress. Thanks, also, to the East-West Center at the University of Hawai'i for accepting my application for the subsidized and beautiful accommodations that allowed me to live across the street from the library and archives for six weeks in 2009.

A number of individuals supported me throughout the process of research and writing by sharing their resources, homes, and time. Professor Karen Jolly in the University of Hawai'i's Department of History helped me secure visiting student status during the spring semester of 2007 so that I could use the library and other necessary campus resources. Brian Keoki Faria allowed me to sit in on his conversational Hawaiian language class and graciously shared his wisdom about nineteenth century Hawaiian history resources. My father Bill Manganaro and my mother Dianne Manganaro helped me financially and with the gift of a reliable car just when I needed them most. My mom also gave me the camera that I used in the archives. Thank you, Dad, and thank you, Mom. In Honolulu, Bronson

Shimabukuro offered his friendship as soon as we became roommates and ended up being the single best island guide a haole girl could ask for. My sister Kate Manganaro hosted me during several visits and secured me a temporary job cataloguing historical prints at the art gallery where she worked in 2007, an immersion in the history of art produced in and about Hawai'i that becomes more important and helpful to me with each passing year. Jole and Frankie Shackelford shared their home and were always there with advice and encouragement as I toiled in the Twin Cities. In Minneapolis, I thank Dave Pollatsek for sharing his house and for helping me raise the spectacular Gompers the Bullmastiff, who took me away from work in ways that helped me keep things in perspective.

Kyle Whittinghill, Alex Hobson, and Jason Bant read drafts of grant proposals and inspired me with their own triumphs. Members of the American Indian Studies Workshop at the University of Minnesota read several chapter drafts, and I thank David Chang, Jean O'Brien, Rob Gilmer, Demetri Debe, and Michael Wise in particular for their helpful feedback. Special thanks to Mike Wise for his pitch perfect comments on chapter five, for helping me think big, and for his camaraderie at the West Bank's best watering holes. I am fortunate to count Megan Raby and Cornelia Lambert as collaborators and friends even though we have never lived in the same place. I look forward to many more years of learning from them and enjoying their good company whenever possible. Jessica Namakkal read chapter drafts and kept me thinking broadly by sharing her own research in progress. More importantly, though, her friendship and care during the more difficult periods of writing helped keep this historian and this project going. My dear friends Julie Weiskopf, Suzanne Fisher, Robin Bachor, Elisabeth Pollock and Christian Ray, and Renee and Michael Pollock never doubted that this project could get finished. During the 2010-2011 academic

year, my writing group, Nathan Crowe, Jacob Steere-Williams, and Frazier Benya, who are also excellent cooks, shared chapters in progress over a number of delicious dinners. This ritual reminded me about the best parts of this vocation and this life. At least two chapters of this dissertation are far better because of Nathan's, Jacob's, and Frazier's careful reading.

Mark Largent deserves a substantial amount of the praise and the blame for introducing me to the history of science and placing me in graduate school. His encouragement kept me from leaving the program during the first difficult year. Mott Greene, Paul Farber, and Keith Benson, long-time members of the Columbia History of Science Group, provided oyster-shucking lessons and crib-notes on how the field works at all the right times. When I chose Minnesota, little did I know that I was joining a genealogy of history of science graduates who are as kind as they are brilliant. Like Mark, John P. Jackson, Jr., Chris Young, Michael Reidy, Erik Conway, and Juliet Burba looked out for me from the beginning. They have unfailingly offered their professional example, their advice, and their friendship, for which I cannot thank them enough.

Finally, Christopher J. Crawford arrived on the scene in the late stages of this process. He immediately took my research seriously and decided that this project was important. Chris' enthusiasm helped propel me through the finish line, and I will always be grateful that our paths met when they did.

Table of Contents

Introduction

"The ease and rapidity with which aliens, under existing conditions in the United States, have been able to assimilate themselves to the customs and manners of American life have enabled this country to swallow and digest every sort of normal human difference, except the purely external ones, like the color of the skin."[1] – Robert E. Park, 1914

"This paradise at the crossroads of the Pacific has been in very truth a centre of miscegenation perhaps not equaled in the same number of people anywhere else in the world. This study of the racial complexity here opens up a fertile field for the eugenist, the student of heredity, the sociologist, the psychologist, and the economist as well as for the anthropologist. I cannot urge too strongly upon the local scientists this unexampled opportunity for profitable research which they have in their midst. This situation shows in very truth that the hands across the Pacific are in many cases the hands of marriage."[2] – Alfred Tozzer, 1921

"Among my Hawaiian relatives, I am Pilikani [family, kin], among the Americans I am Hawaiian. My parents are American, one of English, the other of English-Hawaiian descent. I am a curiosity somewhere in between…. People's reactions must run in accordance with convention, and people are seen in the light of cultures, of nations, and of races, and that I am an exception who is part of all yet belong to none."[3] – A 20-year-old "Caucasian Hawaiian girl," circa 1932

Since their arrival on Hawai'i's shores, European and American migrants have developed a variety of perceptions and stories about the islands. The received narratives are many, layered, and punctuated by numerous frames and fictions that continue to influence public imagination. Despite the presence of Kānaka Maoli (Native Hawaiians) in the islands for hundreds of years, most Euro-American histories of Hawai'i begin with Captain James Cook's "discovery" of Hawai'i, where he encountered primitive people who thought he was

---

[1]Robert E. Park, "Racial Assimilation in Secondary Groups with Particular Reference to the Negro," *The American Journal of Sociology* 19, no. 5 (Mar. 1914), 608.

[2]Alfred Tozzer, "The Anthropology of the Hawaiian Race." *Proceedings of the First Pan-Pacific Science Conference, Under the Auspices of the Pan Pacific Union, Honolulu, Hawaii, August 2 to 20, 1920: Part I* (Honolulu: Honolulu Star-Bulletin, 1921), 74.

[3]Student about 20 yrs. of age, "A Caucasian Hawaiian Girl's Attitude Toward Intermarriage," Box 12, Folder 11, Robert Park Collection, Special Collections Research Center, University of Chicago, 7. The use of pilikani is in the original. The translation in brackets is mine.

one of their gods, Lono, and later killed him.[4] At the end of the nineteenth century, Anglo travelers and settlers produced what Cristina Bacchilega calls *legendary Hawai'i*, "a space constructed for non-Hawaiians (and especially Americans) to experience, via Hawaiian legends, a Hawai'i that is exotic and primitive while beautiful and welcoming."[5] While the history of encounters between Kānaka Maoli and haole visitors and settlers has not been free of violence, the loss of Hawaiian sovereignty and the establishment of American colonial control was a gradual, largely discursive process that initially occurred through the law.[6] The consolidation of this control persisted through the production of history grounded in social science. Beginning in the 1920s, American scientists researching race and race relations began developing a history of Hawai'i, which included predictions, that had scientific authority and the aura of the natural.

---

[4]Noenoe Silva, *Aloha Betrayed: Native Hawaiian Resistance to American Colonialism* (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2004), 1; Marshall Sahlins, *How "Natives" Think about Captain Cook, for Example* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995). For an analysis on Sahlins' debate over the meaning of culture with fellow anthropologist Gananath Obeyesekere, which included disagreement over the Cook-as-Lono argument, see Michael T. Bravo, "The Anti-Anthropology of Highlanders and Islanders," *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science* 29A, no. 3 (1996), 369-390.

[5]Cristina Bacchilega, *Legendary Hawai'i and the Politics of Place: Tradition, Translation, and Tourism.* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007), 5.

[6]See Sally Engle Merry, *Colonizing Hawai'i: The Cultural Power of Law* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000); Jonathan Kay Kamakawiwo'ole Osorio, *Dismembering Lāhui: A History of the Hawaiian Nation to 1887* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2002); Lilikalā Kama'eleihiwa, *Native Land and Foreign Desires: Pehea Lā E Pono Ai?* (Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press, 1992); and Noenoe K. Silva, *Aloha Betrayed: Native Hawaiian Resistance to American Colonialism* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2004). Although the original definition of the Hawaiian word haole is "foreigner" or someone not indigenous to Hawai'i, since the mid- to late nineteenth century it has been used primarily as a synonym for a white or Euro-American person. Moon-Kie Jung defines haoles as "non-Iberian people of European descent." See Jung, *Reworking Race: The Making of Hawaii's Interracial Labor Movement* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2006). Throughout the remainder of this paper I do not italicize haole, keeping with "the recent movement to resist making the native tongue appear foreign in writing produced in and about native land and people." See Noenoe K. Silva, *Aloha Betrayed*, 13.

Helped by the tourism industry and the state, the idea that Hawai'i has long been a peaceful melting pot – a place so filled with aloha that people on the continent would do well to emulate its race relations – persists in the national imagination. Meanwhile, most Americans are unaware of how Hawai'i became part of the United States and that that history is part and parcel of empire as the American "way of life."[7] As Lisa Kahaleole Hall puts it,

> The history of Hawai'i and its colonization remains unfamiliar to most non-Hawaiians. The curriculum of the US educational system does not generally include a discussion of the US imperial past or present. Even attempts at counter-hegemonic education, such as the ethnic studies movement in the United States, rarely if ever examine in detail the colonization of Hawai'i, Puerto Rico, Guam, and "American" Samoa, or consider their central relation to the histories of slavery and Indian genocide, which are more commonly explored. Authors of high school social studies textbooks remain content to tell a story of the happy fiftieth state, whose diverse peoples are full of aloha, engaged in tourism, and growing pineapples.[8]

Rather than focusing on the history of Hawaiian dispossession and cultural persistence outside the expectations and desires of non-Hawaiians, since the 1920s the history of Hawai'i has been circulated as a history of an experiment in race relations and democracy that came to symbolize the possibilities for race relations on the continent.[9] This history has ongoing ideological power.

---

[7]See William Appleman Williams, *Empire as a Way of Life: As Essay on the Causes and Character of America's Present Predicament Along with a Few Thoughts About an Alternative* (Brooklyn: Ig publishing, 1980). See also Amy Kaplan, *The Anarchy of Empire in the Making of U.S. Culture* (Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 2002).

[8]Lisa Kahaleole Hall, "'Hawaiian at Heart' and Other Fictions," *The Contemporary Pacific* 17, no. 2 (2005), 405-406.

[9]For some discussion on the way non-Hawaiians have written Hawaiian history, see Silva, *Aloha Betrayed*. Gavan Daws, *Shoal of Time: A History of the Hawaiian Islands* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1968) and James Michener, *Hawaii* (New York: Random House, 1959) are arguably the most popular history and fiction books, respectively, read by the general public. As Michener developed the plot for *Hawaii*, he was informed by the interaction cycle theorized by University of Chicago sociologists, several of whom worked at

In recent studies of postcolonial Hawai'i, residents are identified as either Native or settlers.[10] Native refers to the indigenous people of Hawai'i, including those with Euro-American and Asian ancestors. Native does not refer to race or blood quantum. It is a genealogical term: a descriptor for indigenous or aboriginal descent as well as citizenship in the Hawaiian Kingdom. Everyone else living in Hawai'i is a settler, "not an immigrant," says Haunani-Kay Trask, a Native Hawaiian nationalist and professor of Hawaiian studies at the University of Hawai'i. When Native Hawaiians assert their rights to sovereignty and nationhood as indigenous people whose position within the United States and relationship with the federal government is categorically different from that of settlers, many settlers interpret these assertions as ahistorical, as forms of "reverse racism," and (correctly) as rejection of the value of American citizenship, in part because the history of Hawai'i has been naturalized as progressively assimilationist, as this dissertation demonstrates. By naturalized, I mean that historical processes and events have been portrayed as essential to Hawai'i and the product of either biological and ecological processes or social and cultural processes that were subject to natural laws. Scientists and their institutions, with their cultural authority and abilities to reproduce and disburse knowledge, have buttressed this assimilationist narrative.

This dissertation examines scientific research on race and race mixing in the American territory of Hawai'i. Beginning in the interwar period, American anthropologists

---

the University of Hawai'i. The "Golden Man" in his book was strikingly similar to Chicago sociologists' "marginal man," who in the Hawaiian context became redefined as a racially mixed "cosmopolitan" figure – a departure from the continental version. On Michener's writing and activism, see Christina Klein, *Cold War Orientalism: Asia in the Middlebrow Imagination, 1945-1961* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003).

[10]Candace Fujikane and Jonathan Y. Okamura, eds., *Asian Settler Colonialism: From Local Governance to the Habits of Everyday Life in Hawai'i* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2008).

and sociologists became interested in using Hawai'i as a human laboratory for understanding the consequences of miscegenation or racial amalgamation and assimilation into American culture. American social scientists framed the processes they studied, such as the assimilation of mixed race people and Asian migrants into American culture and identity, as natural rather than ideological. Defining assimilation as a natural process that needed to be better understood rather than as a discursive project of colonial governance supported the consolidation of settler colonialism in the islands.

When physical anthropologist Louis R. Sullivan of the American Museum of Natural History began research on racial types at Honolulu's Bernice Pauahi Bishop Museum and sociologist Romanzo Adams joined the faculty at the University of Hawai'i in 1920, they established a pattern of scientists from the continent traveling to Hawai'i to conduct research in the human sciences. In April 1926, University of Hawai'i President Arthur L. Dean sought funding from the Rockefeller Foundation to establish a permanent Station for Racial Research. The institutionalization of racial research aligned with the escalation of concerns among businesspeople and a select group of residents about Hawai'i's territorial status and fitness for statehood. Dean identified three pressing research problems: the study of racial characteristics, the response of various racial groups to new environments, and the effects of hybridization, or racial mixing. Regarding racial mixing, Dean commented that "Many assertions have been made relative to the character of hybrids of Pacific races. Practically no data are available on which to base assertions. The physical, mental and social characteristics of the progeny of mixed marriages should be known as a basis for political action."[11] The

[11]Arthur Dean, "A Proposed Station for Racial Research at the University of Hawaii, Honolulu, T.H.," April 1926, folder 2, box 1, series 214S, RG 1.1, Rockefeller Foundation Archives, Rockefeller Archive Center (RAC).

result of Dean's request was funding to begin an interdisciplinary research project that would allow physical anthropologists, sociologists, and psychologists to bring together and increase their research on recent migrants to Hawai'i, indigenous Hawaiians, and mixed race people.

Dean's desire to found a Station for Racial Research and the Rockefeller Foundation's substantial funding of his proposal in 1927 built upon a century of U.S. intervention in the islands. American influence in Hawaiian affairs began with the work of missionaries in the 1820s. As these families accumulated land and ran sugar and pineapple plantations, they gained economic and political power and overthrew Queen Lili'uokalani in 1893 in an armed coup. They declared themselves leaders of the Republic of Hawai'i, which was annexed by the United States in 1898 and made a territory in 1900 in spite of a petition against annexation signed by more than 40,000 Hawaiians.[12] Thus, Dean's appeal for scientific research that might inform political action was consistent with this history of American involvement in Hawai'i, although the specific intention to create a research center designed to study Hawai'i's racially mixed population was new.

University of Hawai'i researchers' framing of Hawai'i as an important laboratory for investigating the concept of race mixing as well as a testing ground for social scientific theories of assimilation fit the scientific priorities of the interwar period, when scientists' and governmental officials' concerns about the consequences of race mixing and anxiety about the behaviors of majority nonwhite territorial populations intensified. Race mixing emerged in the 1910s as both a scientific research area and a social and political concern in the United States. Physical anthropologists and the first generation of American geneticists were intrigued by the practice and outcomes of interracial marriages that yielded bi- or multi-race

[12]Silva, *Aloha Betrayed*.

children.[13] This was especially true during the 1920s and 1930s, when race was widely understood as a biological phenomenon and was related to revitalized questions about the role of environment in producing differences in human types.[14] Scientists saw mixed-race individuals as part of a so-called natural experiment that could help them better understand the biological basis for certain perceived physical and social characteristics. Research advocates argued that nowhere was this natural experiment more extensive than in Hawai'i.[15] Indeed, records from the 1890s onward in anthropology, eugenics, and genetics contain references to Hawai'i as a racial paradise whose diversity and isolation made it seem like the perfect human laboratory.

This dissertation expands the history of the scientific study of race and examines the relationship between human research and cultural production in the context and service of American imperialism. It also traces the production of the tenacious narratives the laboratory frame authorized – narratives that have been at the heart of the settler colonial project in Hawai'i. American scientists argued that mixing in this "racial laboratory" improved the quality of the majority non-white population, that migration and colonization were features of a natural historical trajectory of Americanization, and that race relations in the islands were the product of a human ecology that went hand in hand with capitalist

---

[13]Charles B. Davenport, *Race Crossing in Jamaica* (Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Institution of Washington, 1929); Leslie C. Dunn, "Some Results of Race Mixture in Hawaii," in *Eugenics in Race and State, Volume II, Scientific Papers of the Second International Congress of Eugenics, Held at American Museum of Natural History, New York, September 22-28, 1921* (Baltimore: Williams & Wilkins Company, 1923), 109-124.

[14]Tracy Lang Teslow, "Representing Race to the Public: Anthropology in Interwar American Natural History Museums," (PhD diss., University of Chicago, 2002).

[15]A number of authors made this argument. See Frederick L. Hoffman, "Race Amalgamation in Hawaii," in *Eugenics in Race and State*, 90-108; and Romanzo Adams, *Interracial Marriage in Hawaii: A Study of the Mutually Conditioned Processes of Acculturation and Amalgamation* (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1937).

development. All of these ideas became the racial common sense that traveled to the continental U.S. and perpetuated American amnesia about empire.

Moreover, social scientists' framing of Hawai'i as a racial paradise – even as it functioned as a racially hierarchical plantation economy controlled by elite white Americans – reinforced the colonial paradigm. The paradise characterization apparently derived from a lack of obvious racial tension reminiscent of race relations in the American South; the idea was that a lack of legal segregation and racial violence like lynching demonstrated that the spirit of aloha negated tensions over racial differences. The University of Hawai'i was (and is) located in a valley removed from plantations and slums, and social scientists were part of the elite white social circle in Honolulu, making it perhaps unsurprising that they perceived the islands as idyllic and their ethnic diversity, which was introduced because of colonialism, as universally beneficial.

By closely examining the methods, actual data, and conclusions of scientists whose work shaped their disciplines, this dissertation demonstrates how racialist thinking persisted in work that has been characterized as either questioning the race concept, as politically progressive, or both. Taking cues from recent scholarship in studies of settler colonialism in Hawai'i and recent debate about the actuality of a retreat of scientific racism in the United States, I demonstrate how American scientists naturalized the islands' incorporation into the United States as a story about integration rather than colonization, legitimating American power in the islands. Throughout, I make several arguments that challenge and enhance the current historiography on the human sciences in America, which has focused minimally on American territories, and American imperialism.

Scientific studies of race

Most historical research on the scientific study of race in the United States has focused on scientists' concerns with race relations and mixing between black people and white people in North America.[16] Such analysis obscures the importance of the colonial system in the generation and maintenance of racial thought within the sciences. One exception is *Reproducing Empire: Sex, Race, Science, and Imperialism*, in which Laura Briggs examines how early twentieth-century physicians, public health officials, and social scientists used the territory of Puerto Rico as a human laboratory.[17] These experts located the roots of Puerto Rican poverty in women's deviant sexuality. First by instituting population control programs, and eventually by testing the contraceptive pill there in the 1950s, American experts used Puerto Rico as a testing ground for public health programs meant to influence sexual practices and familial formations and encourage economic development. Similarly, the Philippines served as a "laboratory of hygienic modernity" in Warwick Anderson's *Colonial Pathologies*.[18] American medical officers located the Philippines' hope for self-government in its ability to sustain American-style health and hygiene standards, which would transform Filipino "natives" into "modern citizens." Both of these books argue that experts drew on their personal and professional assumptions about what constituted normal, "civilized" behavior to draw racial categories out of Puerto Rican and Filipino nationalities.

---

[16]See Audrey Smedley, *Race in North America: Origin and Evolution of a Worldview* (Boulder: Westview Press, 2007); John P. Jackson, Jr., *Social Scientists for Social Justice: Making the Case against Segregation* (New York: New York University Press, 2001); Paul Lawrence Farber, *Mixing Races: From Scientific Racism to Modern Evolutionary Ideas* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2011).

[17]Laura Briggs, *Reproducing Empire: Race, Sex, Science, and U.S. Imperialism in Puerto Rico* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002).

[18]Warwick Anderson, *Colonial Pathologies: American Tropical Medicine, Race, and Hygiene in the Philippines* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2006).

This project builds on Briggs' and Anderson's work by detailing how American experts adopted a similar laboratory orientation toward their work in Hawai'i and, through their research methods and language, promoted the idea that racial mixing, or amalgamation, and cultural assimilation were preparing nonwhite Hawai'i residents for American citizenship. I also build on the work of Henry Yu, who has examined Chicago sociologists' construction of Chinese and Japanese people (specifically excluding people with south Asian and southeast Asian ancestry) as "Orientals."[19] Yu focuses primarily on Chinese and Japanese people living in California and other parts of the American West, where they were in the minority. Chicago sociologists hypothesized that "Orientals" could be assimilated once popular attitudes about race became more liberal and looked to Hawai'i as an experiment that would prove them right. However, knowledge produced in this colonial plantation economy complicated American race studies, which focused primarily on urban areas in the continental U.S., and contributed to the assimilationist ideology that permeated discourse about national progress after World War II.

Historical analyses of academic research on race, especially the phenomenon of race mixing, are fundamental to understanding American racial thought and racial projects. My research elaborates on and, at the same time, modifies recent scholarship about the scientists who challenged racial theories in the late 1930s and 1940s. Historians have thoroughly researched American scientists who, because of their concerns about American fitness and white racial purity, lent their expertise to anti-immigration and anti-miscegenation legislation in the 1920s. In recent years, historians of science such as Elazar Barkan, William Provine, and Nancy Stepan have described how these American and British scientists warned against

[19]Henry Yu, *Thinking Orientals: Migration, Contact, and Exoticism in Modern America* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001).

the degenerating effects of race mixing, as reflected in European colonial law as well as United States anti-miscegenation laws until 1967.[20] Geneticists and social scientists from the continental United States generally advised that interracial marriage was dangerous or, lacking clear evidence, at least socially undesirable. However there was weakening consensus on the science and thus many called for more research on the subject.[21] Racial studies intensified in the 1930s, when the discipline of genetics began to professionalize and both politicians and patrons of race research, such as the Carnegie Foundation, identified the nation's growing racially mixed population as a potential hindrance to national progress. Although it would take another few decades of deliberation before scientists began speaking with clarity and consistency about the lack of evidence for racial types and taxonomy, the first generation of results of empirical research on the actual consequences of race mixing challenged the bases for overt scientific racism.[22]

Racial thought as it developed in Hawai'i, and in the Pacific more generally, departed significantly in its findings and policy implications from commonly studied Anglo-American racial science. While there is a vast literature on scientific studies of race and another on "miscegenation," historians have paid less attention to specifically scientific studies of racially

---

[20]Elazar Barkan, *The Retreat of Scientific Racism: Changing Concepts of Race in Britain and the United States between the World Wars* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992); William B. Provine, "Geneticists and the Biology of Race Crossing," *Science* 182, no. 4114 (1973), 790-796, and Nancy Leys Stepan, *Picturing Tropical Nature* (London: Reaktion Books, 2001), especially chapter three. On anti-miscegenation laws in the United States, see Peggy Pascoe, *What Comes Naturally: Miscegenation Law and the Making of Race in America* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009).

[21]Diane B. Paul, *Controlling Human Heredity: 1865 to the Present* (Amherst, N.Y.: Humanity Books, 1998).

[22]Provine, "Geneticists and the Biology of Race Crossing." The emergence of the modern evolutionary synthesis in the late 1930s also destabilized definitions of biological racial categories.

mixed populations.[23] The longstanding historical consensus is that scientists were unified in their anti-miscegenation beliefs. However, many believed in amalgamation in certain contexts such as the U.S. colony of Hawai'i, where there appeared to be hereditary benefits as well as acculturative effects for "hybrids." Chapters one through three illustrate how scientists working in Hawai'i argued that race mixing was desirable because it improved and stabilized the population. These findings, along with Warwick Anderson's preliminary work on racial science in Australia and in the islands of the Pacific by American, European, and Australian scientists, interrupt longstanding narratives about scientists' positions on the wholesale undesirability of race mixing. They also show that favorable positions toward race mixing as well as moves away from racial essentialism were compatible with at least one colonial project in the Pacific – the American one.[24]

Many ideas associated with racial essentialism, or racialism, have persisted as scientific thought on race evolved rather than retreated or became replaced after the so-called triumph of racial egalitarianism. For the last twenty years, since sociologist of science Elazar Barkan traced what he called the "retreat of scientific racism" beginning in the 1920s, scholars have more or less accepted a narrative arc that links "the demise of scientific racism to the rise of a vanguard of social scientists led by the cultural anthropologist Franz Boas." In this treatment, "when modern social science emerges, racism runs out of intellectual steam."[25] All the while, historians of science have considered critiques of scientific racism

---

[23]Warwick Anderson also notes this historiographic void. See Anderson, "Ambiguities of Race: Science on the Reproductive Frontier of Australia and the Pacific between the Wars," *Australian Historical Studies* 40 (2009), 149. Two overviews of the science of race mixing are in Provine, "Geneticists and the Biology of Race Crossing"; and Paul Lawrence Farber, "Race-Mixing and Science in the United States," *Endeavor* 27, no. 4 (2003): 166-170.

[24]Anderson, "Ambiguities of Race."

[25]Pascoe, "Miscegenation Law and Ideologies of Race," 47.

from within the scientific community.[26] Most recently, specifically in response to historians who "have generally castigated the scientists who used and abused their science to justify racist social policy," the call has been to be aware of "the role that science itself played in transforming modern notions of race and in combating racism."[27] The latter part of this agenda suggests a line of thinking in the history of racial science that has been rather unhelpful as a basis for research, in large part because crucial proceedings in racial science between the era of essentialist and romantic racial ideologies of the Gilded Age and the Progressive era and post-World War II emphases on culture rather than race have been obscured by the oversimplified "retreat" narrative. This dissertation focuses on critical research during the black box, so to speak, of the interwar era.

Searching for evidence that scientists became anti-racists has helped reveal how individual researchers' positions evolved and influenced their peers. However, the efficacy of correctives by scientists in combating racism has been over-prescribed and research has been too narrowly focused on biological science. A complete reckoning of the science of race must examine the transformation *of* rather than retreat *from* racialism and incorporate social scientific studies into the history of research on racial difference. Historians of science have debated whether scientists' politics changed their science or the results of scientific work itself challenged scientists' politics. Chapters one and two in particular demonstrate that both of these mechanisms were at work. They, along with the other chapters, also show that the outcome was not a wholesale "retreat from scientific racism," but a particular kind

---

[26]Bentley Glass, "Geneticists Embattled: Their Stand against Rampant Eugenics and Racism in America during the 1920s and 1930s," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 130, no. 1 (1986), 130-154; Stephen J. Gould, *The Mismeasure of Man* (New York: Norton, 1996 (1982)); Smedley, 2007 (1999).

[27]Farber, "Race-Mixing and Science in the United States," 166.

of racialism that might have been liberal for its day, but whose credibility as progressive is questionable.

Scientists' deliberation about race has always happened in the context of larger racial projects.[28] One place where scientists developed and refined their methods and theories about racial categories, traits, and heredity in directions that supported a racial project was Hawai'i. This racial project has been assimilationist. Assimilation has symbolized both charitable inclusion and a mechanism for getting rid of undesirable nonwhite or indigenous groups biologically and culturally, one facet of a longer history of genocide.[29] I argue that both angles were important to the colonial project in Hawai'i and not mutually exclusive. Rather than situating research on race and relations in Hawai'i vis-à-vis the retreat of scientific racism, the following chapters illustrate the production of this new racialist ideology. Consistent with intellectual and cultural shifts on the continent, scholars working in Hawai'i participated in the elaboration of an ideology that persists in American law and popular thought about the meanings of race as well as the meanings of racial discrimination and equality. During the 1920s, Peggy Pascoe argues, "American racialism was challenged by

---

[28]Robin D. G. Kelly, *Freedom Dreams: The Black Radical Imagination* (Boston: Beacon Press, 2002), 8. See also Omi and Winant, *Racial Formation in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1990s* (New York and London: Routledge, 1994 [1986]). On racial projects, Omi and Winant explain, "We argue that racial formation is a process of historically situated *projects* in which human bodies and social structures are represented and organized. Next we link racial formation to the evolution of hegemony, the way in which society is organized and ruled" (55-56, original emphasis).

[29]On assimilationist thought in the United States, see Omi and Winant, *Racial Formation in the United States*, 15; Gerstle, *American Crucible*; and Nikhil Singh, *Black is a Country: Race and the Unfinished Struggle for Democracy* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004). On Hawaiian genocide in the nineteenth century, see David E. Stannard, *Before the Horror The Population of Hawai'i on the Eve of Western Contact* (Honolulu: Social Science Research Institute, 1989).

several emerging ideologies, all of which depended on a modern split between biology and culture."[30] Over forty years, through the 1960s,

> Those competing ideologies were winnowed down to the single, powerfully persuasive belief that the eradication of racism depends on the deliberate nonrecognition of race. I will call that belief *modernist racial ideology* to echo the self-conscious 'modernism' of social scientists, artists, and cultural rebels of the early twentieth century. When historians mention this phenomenon, they usually label it 'antiracist' or 'egalitarian' and describe it as in stark contrast to the 'racism' of its predecessors. But in the new legal scholarship called critical race theory, this same ideology, usually referred to as 'colorblindness,' is criticized by those who recognize that it, like other racial ideologies, can be turned to the service of oppression.[31]

Before the nonrecognition of race could happen, however, scientists working in Hawai'i made several arguments about race and race mixing that served as a foundation for later arguments for both multiculturalism and colorblindness as societal goals and, particularly, as quintessentially American. By arguing that mixing produced biologically and culturally improved people, that the population was "Americanizing" as it mixed itself into a new biologically amalgamated race, and that race relations were a facet of "human ecology," a natural outcome of competition, American experts framed supposedly assimilative practices such as interracial marriage and reproduction as symbolic of racial progress and naturalized historically produced inequalities.[32]

---

[30]Peggy Pascoe, "Miscegenation Law and Ideologies of 'Race' in Twentieth-Century America," *Journal of American History* 83, no. 1 (June 1996), 48. On the mistaken theoretical and historical argument that deracialization has been necessary for interracialism or interracial cooperation, see Jung, *Reworking Race*, 3-4. Hawai'i's working class formed in the 1940s through an interracial labor movement that Jung argues remade race rather than nullifying it.

[31]Pascoe, "Miscegenation Law," 48. Original emphasis.

[32]Expertise has long been a research focus and narrative theme in the history of science, namely how scientists have positioned themselves as experts and deployed their knowledge since the late nineteenth century as the sciences professionalized. In the context of interwar Hawai'i, the scientists profiled herein generally claimed expertise as disciplinarians as well as authorities whose specific combination of outsider status, having not been born or raised in

Research on race, population, and citizenship

In the midst of popular concerns over the biological and social effects of mass immigration to the United States, scientists in a number of fields made human heredity, racial types and traits, and measurements of psychological and cultural fitness for inclusion and citizenship the focus of their research. During the same decades that eugenics emerged and evolved professionally and theoretically alongside the new discipline of genetics, scientists attempted to define racial categories morphologically and to discern racial affiliation, or how the races of man, as they understood them, were related to one another. I examine physical anthropological research, particularly anthropometric study, in Hawai'i, a territory thought to hold so much promise as a research site that it was the subject of the featured exhibit at the Second International Eugenics Congress in New York in 1921. The exhibit, which was installed in the Hall of Man at the American Museum of Natural History, illuminates the centrality of race mixing to scientists' questions during a period of intensive disciplinary definition and professionalization.[33] It also demonstrates that eugenicists, geneticists, and others interested in the American population included territories in their purview. Thus, this study challenges the assumption that concerns about the biological

---

the islands, and insider experience living in the territory positioned them as uniquely deft observers and impartial analysts of social relations.

[33]*Eugenics in Race and State*, including the supplemental plates illustrating installations and photographs. See also Ronald Rainger, Keith R. Benson, and Jane Maienschein, eds., *The American Development of Biology* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1991 [1988]); Dorothy Ross, *The Origins of American Social Science* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991); and Craig Calhoun, ed., *Sociology in America: A History* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2007).

future of the nation were focused solely on white American citizens and immigrants to the continental U.S.[34]

Physical anthropologists and sociologists working in Hawai'i generally did not invoke eugenics when discussing their research or its applicability. Yet, the exhibit on Hawai'i, with its photos of Hawaiian hybrids and busts cast from mixed race people, and even a lift-size cast of a David, one of the then-famous surfing and swimming Kahanamoku brothers, provided the background for the international eugenics conference at the American Museum of Natural History. Historian and anthropologist Ann Laura Stoler reminds us that, "If an explicit eugenics discourse was a latecomer to colonial projects, the fear of racial degeneracy and the harnessing of nationalist rhetoric was not."[35] Because heredity, good and bad, has been used as a justification for a wide variety of policies and practices alleged to improve or protect the nation, historian Alexandra Stern has called the United States a "eugenic nation," the title of her book.[36] Similarly, historian Nancy Stepan has argued that eugenics in South America manifested in a series of biologically informed nationalist projects.[37] While the kinds of eugenic practices Stern and Stepan illustrate were basically absent in Hawai'i, there was indeed a biologically informed nationalist project at work. Building on studies that focus

---

[34]Natalia Molina, *Fit to Be Citizens?: Public Health and Race in Los Angeles, 1879-1939* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006); Alexandra Minna Stern, *Eugenic Nation: Faults and Frontiers of Better Breeding in Modern America* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005); Erika Lee, *At America's Gates: Chinese Immigration During the Exclusion Era, 1882-1943* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2003); Wendy Kline, *Building a Better Race: Gender, Sexuality, and Eugenics from the Turn of the Century to the Baby Boom* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001); and Matthew Frye Jacobson, *Whiteness of a Different Color: European Immigrants and the Alchemy of Race* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998).

[35]Ann Laura Stoler, *Carnal Knowledge and Imperial Power: Race and the Intimate in Colonial Rule* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002).

[36]Stern, *Eugenic Nation.*

[37]Nancy Stepan, *"The Hour of Eugenics": Race, Gender, and Nation in Latin America* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1996).

on the quality and racialized traits of citizens and migrants, I examine how social scientific expertise was employed in nation-building in Hawai'i, which manifested as a series of arguments that racial mixing produced desirable "hybrids" and was in the process of creating a racially amalgamated population that was itself an argument for the inevitability and rationality of formal statehood for the territory.

A number of group "problems" – the Negro Problem and the Indian Problem in the nineteenth century and the "Oriental" and "Mexican problems" in the twentieth – have organized social research in the United States.[38] The "Japanese problem" and native Hawaiians' supposed need for "rehabilitation" appeared in Hawai'i in the 1920s as experts working in other colonial contexts also identified problems organized around indigenous people.[39] While generally not labeled with capital letters, social scientists, medical and epidemiological researchers also took up questions about Puerto Rican and Filipino colonial subjects beginning at the turn of the twentieth century, and the Polynesian Problem surfaced in Hawai'i in the 1910s as biologists and anthropologists, mainly, began developing institutions and networks to study questions about migration, mixing, fitness, and extinction.

---

[38]See Stern, *Eugenic Nation*, chapter 6. Experts defined the "the Mexican Problem" as excessive reproduction. Congress formed a special committee in 1920 to investigate the "Japanese question," which precipitated out of white anxieties about immigration. See Molina, *Fit to Be Citizens?*, 106. The framing of an Oriental Problem was imbedded in a history of the identification of nonwhite groups as "problems," as in the case of slaves being perceived as a social problem by the early 1840s, the Negro Problem gaining definition in the context of Jim Crow, and government agencies' and social reformers' identification of an Indian Problem that necessitated the management of American Indian peoples. See Hamilton Cravens, "History of the Social Sciences," in Sally Gregory Kohlstedt and Margaret Rossiter, eds., *Osiris* 2nd Series, Vol. 1, *Historical Writing on American Science* (1985), 186. On the intellectual construction of the "negro problem," see Michael Rudolph West, *The Education of Booker T. Washington: American Democracy and the Idea of Race Relations* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2006).

[39]Ann Laura Stoler, *Along the Archival Grain: Epistemic Anxieties and Colonial Common Sense*, (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2009), 6. Stoler refers to "the Indo problem" in Dutch Indonesia.

These problems intersected in Hawai'i, where members of the Chicago School studied race relations, particularly interracial reproduction and family formation. Chicago sociologists focused on what they called the "Oriental Problem," an intellectual framework for describing a number of social anxieties among white people, primarily, reflected in the longstanding "Yellow Peril" discourse about competition for jobs and "Orientals'" supposed inability and unwillingness to adapt to American culture. Yu notes that "Americanization was a focal term in the debate that surrounded the image of America as a 'melting pot.'"[40] As such, Chicago sociologists organized the Oriental problem around the question of assimilation, which they assessed by examining people's attitudes about racial difference as the most revealing index of social progress.

A two decades-long debate over whether Hawai'i had a race problem or was exceptionally harmonious was diffused by arguments that Hawai'i was an experiment that was biological, social, or both.[41] Race problem usually meant, especially in the 1930s, the possibility, or even probability depending on the position of an author, that Hawai'i's Japanese majority would take over by voting as a bloc as well as concerns that they were unwilling and incapable of Americanization. Race problem in this context decidedly did not refer to legal, institutional, or everyday discrimination or political or economic inequality. Yu argues that Chicago sociologists and their missionary colleagues expanded their work on the Oriental Problem to Hawai'i because the islands' history of "racial invasions," intimate encounters between migrants, and allegedly peaceful race relations would demonstrate their

---

[40]Yu, *Thinking Orientals*, 25.

[41]A number of articles from the late 1920s and into the 1930s argued both of these positions. See Leo L. Partlow, "The Hawaiian Experiment," *Asia* 31 (June 1931), 364-368. See also Hugh Patrick, "Troubles in Paradise," *American Mercury* 14 (June 1928), 218-24; and Samuel Wilder King, "Hawaii Has No Race Problem," *Asia* 39 (March 1939), 152-154.

theory of the interaction cycle, also known as the race relations cycle and, in a revealingly teleological vein, as the assimilation cycle.[42] The cycle consisted of four stages: contact, conflict, accommodation, and assimilation.[43] As the cycle was applied to research in the territory, University of Hawai'i sociology department chair Romanzo Adams confirmed the cycle's veracity and argued that biological amalgamation was an additional characteristic and mechanism of genuine assimilation. If the social problem in Hawai'i was a large population of presumably unassimilable "Orientals," Adams and his colleagues advanced the argument that assimilation was indeed occurring, slowly but surely, in this context free of the continent's legal restrictions on intermarriage.

The relationship between the biological and social sciences

This dissertation contributes to the history of science by analyzing the changing relationship between biological and social science in the first half of the twentieth century, and the significant development of quantitative methods in physical anthropology and sociology. American missionaries, their descendents, and visitors from the U.S. mainland collected cultural artifacts and studied Hawai'i's natural history beginning in the early nineteenth century.[44] In the early twentieth century, research on humans became a focus at the Bishop Museum and, later, at the University of Hawai'i. In particular, physical anthropologists studied Hawai'i's population by taking thousands of physical measurements and taking photographs of mixed types while sociologists collected population data, such as

---

[42]Yu, *Thinking Orientals*, 80-81.

[43]Robert E. Park and Ernest W. Burgess, *Introduction to the Science of Sociology* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1921).

[44]Roy MacLeod and Philip F. Rehbock, eds., *Darwin's Laboratory: Evolutionary Theory and Natural History in the Pacific* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1994); and MacLeod and Rehbock, eds., *Nature in Its Greatest Extent: Western Science in the Pacific* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1988).

birth, marriage, and death rates of various races, and conducted interviews. Hawai'i served as a scientific laboratory for these researchers, who viewed their subjects as part of a natural experiment.

However, it was also a *disciplinary* laboratory for physical anthropology and sociology. From a present vantage point, much early twentieth century research in physical anthropology and sociology seemed to be interdisciplinary in premise and methodology. This dissertation examines how researchers staked intellectual boundaries out of this seemingly interdisciplinary work. Through his work on race, race crossing, and migration, anthropologist Harry Shapiro explored the relationship between biology and environmental factors in human development. He was interested in the stability of racial types, particularly the effect of changed environment that accompanied migration, and modeled the study he began in 1930 on anthropologist Franz Boas' *Changes in Bodily Form of Descendents of Immigrants* (1912), a study of immigrant head forms focused on European immigrants to the United States and their offspring. Boas' study was intended to show whether changed environment affected morphology. Shapiro added a control group of subjects for comparison from the home country, which he called "sedentes." "To obtain a valid cross-section of the physical characteristics of the Chinese, we could not accept uncritically any sample of Chinese resident in Hawaii as representative," Shapiro noted.[45] Comparing anthropometric measurements of sedentes and migrants to Hawai'i was an innovation that Shapiro and his colleagues implemented not to test whether race had integrity as a category, but to

---

[45]Harry L. Shapiro, "The Chinese Population in Hawaii," Preliminary Paper Prepared for the Fourth General Session of the Institute of Pacific Relations to be held at Hangchow, China, October 21st to November 4th, 1931, Folder: 1930-1932 Hawaiian/Chinese Research, Anthropometric Forms, Box: 3, Papers of William Armand Lessa, National Anthropological Archives, 6.

understand how plastic phenotype was within a given racial group. The statistical work involved in processing over forty types of data from thousands of subjects revealed challenges and limitations to the biometric approach, which perhaps paradoxically supported scientists' calls for the long term use of Hawai'i as a human laboratory, and also helped propel physical anthropology toward its modification into the biological anthropology of the postwar years.

In a similar vein, within his research on "human ecology," University of Hawai'i sociologist Andrew Lind applied the concept of succession drawn from plant ecology as he investigated social phenomena such as labor issues and migration. "During the interwar years," according to Gregg Mitman, "a number of biologists conducted research on animal societies with the implicit assumption that these investigations bore directly on problems in human sociology."[46] More than any other biological discipline, "ecology contributed the most to this comparative sociology."[47] Lind applied ecological concepts as he theorized about race relations, an analytical choice that made sense to him because of University of Chicago sociologists' preoccupation with space, which included property ownership, land use, residential proximity, and racial and familial intimacy. He also saw economic competition as analogous to the competition among plants for numerical and spatial dominance, and he treated the colony of Hawai'i as analogous to a plant "community" operating within a bounded space. According to many plant ecologists working in the 1920s, competition resulted in eventual equilibrium known as the "climax." Lind argued that economic competition in Hawai'i and elsewhere determined demographic equilibrium in

---

[46]Gregg Mitman, *The State of Nature: Ecology, Community, and American Social Thought, 1900-1950* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1992), 74.

[47]Mitman, *The State of Nature*, 74.

the form of an age- and sex-balanced population. He also argued that racial prejudice was a natural by-product of competition. In this way, Lind framed Hawai'i's highly regulated migration and labor management practices as natural rather than imperial as he also treated the expansion of global capitalism as organic and as an engine of progress for islands developing away from their "feudal" past into modernity.

Human sciences in an Expansive America

The history of anthropology in the United States has received significant attention. Historians have detailed the early history of the discipline in the nineteenth century, which focused on American Indian origins and languages, as well as the development of museums as research institutions that supported anthropometric and ethnographic studies.[48] They have also examined the changing meaning of race within anthropology, tensions between physical anthropology and cultural anthropology particularly after the turn of the twentieth century through World War II (and indeed since then), and theoretical shifts within anthropology throughout its history.[49] The first and second chapters of this dissertation

---

[48]Curtis M. Hinsley, Jr., *Savages and Scientists: The Smithsonian Institution and the Development of American Anthropology, 1846-1910* (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1981); Curtis M. Hinsley, Jr., "Anthropology as Science and Politics: The Dilemmas of the Bureau of American Ethnology, 1879 to 1904," in Walter Goldschmidt, ed., *The Uses of Anthropology* (Washington, D.C.: American Anthropological Association, 1979), 15-32; and Robert E. Bieder, *Science Encounters the Indian, 1820-1880: The Early Years of American Ethnology* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press 1986).

[49]George W. Stocking, Jr., *Race, Culture, and Evolution: Essays in the History of Anthropology* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968); Stocking, *Bones, Bodies, and Behavior: Essays on Biological Anthropology*, History of Anthropology Vol. 5 (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1988); Stocking, *The Shaping of American Anthropology, 1883-1911: A Franz Boas Reader* (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1974 [1989]); Stocking, *The Ethnographer's Magic and Other Essays in the History of Anthropology* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1990 [1992]); Stocking, "The Turn-of-the-Century Concept of Race," *Modernism/Modernity* 1, no. 1 (1994): 4-16; Elazar Barkan, *The Retreat of Scientific Racism: Changing Concepts of Race in Britain and the United States between the World Wars* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992); and Jonathan Marks, "Race Across the Physical-Cultural

build on recent histories of twentieth century research on indigenous peoples living in the U.S. empire.[50] As Pacific acquisitions opened up opportunities, physical anthropologists expanded their research on indigenous people by studying Hawaiians and Hawaiian "hybrids." During this period, there were more than seven ethnic groups living in the islands including indigenous Hawaiians. Anthropologists predicted that migrants had arrived sufficiently recently to bring the results of racial crossing into clear relief. In this way, the colonization of Hawai'i presented opportunities for anthropologists and other scientists, particularly offering new topics for those in the early stages of their careers. That the first meeting of the Pan-Pacific Science Congress in Honolulu in 1920, at the Bernice Pauahi Bishop Museum, drew sixty delegates representing every field within the life and physical sciences was emblematic of the breadth and concentration of scientific attention that Hawai'i began to receive during the interwar years.

Historians of science and medicine have examined the role of science in colonial spaces, but they have focused primarily on European empires and rarely on social scientific research.[51] Historians of American social science have paid particular attention to the

---

Divide in American Anthropology," in Henrika Kukick, ed., *A New History of Anthropology* (Malden, MA and Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing, 2008), 242-258.

[50]Juliet Burba, "'Whence Came the American Indians?': American Anthropologists and the Origins Question, 1880-1935" (PhD diss., University of Minnesota, 2006); and Margot Iverson, "Blood types: A History of Genetic Studies of Native Americans, 1920-1955" (PhD diss., University of Minnesota, 2007). For one example of Indian people responding to U.S. expansion and domination, see Jeffrey Ostler, *The Plains Sioux and U.S. Colonialism from Lewis and Clark to Wounded Knee* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004). On research on indigenous people in the context of American expansion, see David Hurst Thomas, *Skull Wars: Kennewick Man, Archaeology, and the Battle for Native American Identity* (New York: Basic Books, 2000). On the politics and effects of research on indigenous peoples more generally, see Linda Tuhiwai Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples* (London and New York: Zed Books, 1999).

[51]Lucile H. Brockway, *Science and Colonial Expansion: The Role of the British Royal Botanic Gardens* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002 [1979]); Lewis Pyenson, *Cultural Imperialism*

formation of the professional social sciences in the late nineteenth century, particularly social scientists' attempts to replace social reform with research. These histories are focused on the continental U.S. and on sociology at the University of Chicago in particular.[52] My project incorporates social science in Hawai'i into the historiography and extends the history of social scientists' involvement in public affairs, which when focused on race has primarily focused on race relations between black and white people in the continental U.S.[53]

Sociologists at the University of Hawai'i provided expert information on attitudes among various groups about other races and about mixing to Hawai'i's plantation employers and the general public – a form of participation in colonial management that differed considerably from, but drew upon, the practices of European powers. American social scientists working in Hawai'i participated in what was largely a cultural project. They produced knowledge that became the basis for popular conceptions of Hawai'i's history and relationship, past and future, to the United States. Edward Said has written about the importance of research to the development and maintenance of colonial power. Indeed, the

---

and Exact Sciences: German Expansion Overseas, 1900-1930 (New York: Peter Lang, 1985); Pyenson, *Civilizing Mission: Exact Sciences and French Overseas Expansion, 1830-1940* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993); Michael A. Osborne, *Nature, the Exotic, and the Science of French Colonialism* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1994); David Arnold, *Colonizing the Body: State Medicine and Epidemic Disease in Nineteenth-Century India* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993); David Arnold, ed., *Warm Climates and Western Medicine: The Emergence of Tropical Medicine* (Amsterdam and Atlanta: Rodopi, 1996); and Roy MacLeod, ed., *Nature and Empire: Science and the Colonial Enterprise*, *Osiris* 15 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000).

[52]Stow Persons, *Ethnic Studies at Chicago, 1905-45* (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1987); Dorothy Ross, *The Origins of American Social Science* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991); Yu, *Thinking Orientals*; and Eckard Toy, "Whose Frontier?: The Survey of Race Relations on the Pacific Cost in the 1920s," *Oregon Historical Quarterly* 107, no. 1 (2006), 36-63. See also Craig Calhoun, ed., *Sociology in America: A History* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2007).

[53]Jackson, *Social Scientists for Social Justice*; and Ellen Herman, *The Romance of American Psychology: Political Culture in the Age of Experts* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995).

first thing Napoleon did after his army arrived in Egypt was build a research institute.[54] Sociologists working in Hawai'i departed from the professional values of objectivity and detachment from social reform that they had supposedly inherited from Robert E. Park. While Park and other members of the Chicago school of sociology espoused a commitment to objectivity that prohibited them from engaging in conversation about reform in the continental United States, they participated liberally in such conversations. Indeed, University of Hawai'i sociologists Romanzo Adams and Andrew Lind were crucial expert witnesses on the promise of territorial residents' certain Americanization, which they argued was in progress and inevitable.

Notably, historian Dorothy Ross has argued that American social scientists developed an American exceptionalist vision between the late nineteenth century and the end of the First World War.[55] Social scientists argued that American history progressed along natural lines that made it inherently different from Europe, an understanding of American history modeled on natural history. Henry Yu argues, in contrast, that Chicago sociologists' views of human interaction such as immigration and assimilation as natural are what made them *not* American exceptionalists. For example, Robert Park predicted that the entire world would eventually become a melting pot of sorts, meaning that he did not see assimilative processes in the United States as limited to the United States.[56] My dissertation resolves this historiographic divergence by examining research by American social scientists outside the continental United States. Researchers in Hawai'i claimed that what they were doing was of global interest and importance. Chicago sociologists in particular made a series

---

[54]Briggs, *Reproducing Empire*, 8; Edward Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Vintage Books, 1978).
[55]Ross, *The Origins of American Social Science*, 22-50.
[56]Yu, *Thinking Orientals*, 42, 70-71.

of arguments that had exceptionalist undertones, such as when they pointed to amicable race relations of American-controlled Hawai'i and argued that social processes happening there served as an example not just for the continental United States, but for the world.[57] Chicago sociologists' treatment of Hawai'i as a laboratory also allowed them to ignore its colonial status. Ultimately, whether or not there was a consistent exceptionalist ideology operating within the social science discourse produced in and about Hawai'i, the discourse was consistently assimilationist.

Assimilation and American imperialism

This project adds to the historiography on American imperial practices in the twentieth century that supported rapid expansion of American power overseas and ongoing migration to the United States. The "problem" of nonwhite migrants that social scientists took on in the 1920s originated as a labor problem in the nineteenth century as American companies sought to expand consumer markets overseas and their needs for inexpensive workers grew enormously. Mass migration to the United States from Europe and Asia began in the mid-nineteenth century and persisted in waves regulated by the federal government starting in the early 1880s with formal rules excluding Chinese workers and national quotas implemented in 1924 to limit numbers from southern and eastern Europe. A shortage of cheap exploitable labor was the focus of transnational conversation between

---

[57]Researchers in Africa made similar claims. See Helen Tilley, *Africa as a Living Laboratory: Empire, Development, and the Problem of Scientific Knowledge, 1870-1950* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011), 232. There was an internationalist, comparative imperial discussion in progress throughout these years. On inter-imperial discussion and collaboration between the United States and Britain, see Paul Kramer, "Empires, Exceptions, and Anglo-Saxons: Race and Rule between the British and United States Empires, 1880-1910," *Journal of American History* 88, no. 4 (March 2002), 1315-1353; and Briggs, *Reproducing Empire*, chapter one: "Sexuality, Medicine, and Imperialism: The International Traffic in Prostitution Policy," 21-45.

settler societies at the end of the nineteenth century as rapid and dramatic demographic changes in the United States, particularly in cities where ethnic enclaves developed, stimulated a conversation about national destiny and identity.[58]

This conversation was, at base, about tensions between American civic nationalism and racial nationalism. What was the essence of America? Was it a history of the commitment to the political ideals of freedom and democracy? Or were Americans "a people held together by common blood and skin color and an inherent fitness for self-government"?[59] The primary attempt to cope with this dialectic at the turn of the twentieth century was ideological. In the context of Jim Crow, the "Negro problem" defined the gap between black people's subjection to structural and cultural barriers to full social membership and the civic ideology that the United States was originally and perpetually a nation whose opportunities were open to everyone.[60] Barbara Fields and Michael R. West have argued that the term "Negro problem" was a tactful way to state the status quo of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries: that black people were denied full social membership, that white people did not want them to have it, and that corresponding racist practices and sensibilities caused racial tensions, which manifested as negative attitudes

---

[58]Matthew Guterl and Christine Skwiot, "Atlantic and Pacific Crossings: Race, Empire, and 'the Labor Problem,'" *Radical History Review* 91 (Winter 2005), 41.

[59]Gary Gerstle, *American Crucible: Race and Nation in the Twentieth Century* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001), 4.

[60]There is a difference between legal citizenship and social membership. During this period "the highest levels of government determined legal citizenship, but institutions, such as public health departments" in the case of Los Angeles "determined who had access to social membership," "marking some people as worthy, capable, and deserving members of society and others as correspondingly unworthy and incapable of participation" and, I would add, deserving of social mobility and political power. See Natalia Molina, *Fit to Be Citizens?: Public Health and Race in Los Angeles, 1879-1939* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006), 5.

toward people of different races.[61] As a proposed solution to this problem, Booker T. Washington coined the term "race relations" as shorthand for an approach that he hoped would uplift black people and help eradicate racial tensions. Race relations meant changing one's feelings. As Michael West explains, invoking Washington's mindset, "The solution of the Negro problem will not be found in an extension of democracy; neither is the solution found in slavery or religion… No one of these, but magical 'Progress' to conjure good 'race relations,' a seemingly practical, but in fact fundamentally idealist abstraction – how black and white people *feel* about each other – as a solution."[62] Race relations became a civic ideology that is perhaps most familiar to contemporary readers in the guise of Rodney King's plea in the aftermath of the 1992 Los Angeles race riots, "Why can't we all just get along?"[63] This kind of race relations is about being courteous and having a good attitude, not about structural equality.

The other answer to the racial versus civic nationalism dialectic was assimilation, and in Hawai'i experts advanced biological assimilation – amalgamation or race mixing – as the "natural" resolution to the tension between civic and racial nationalisms. This national project, then, was predicated upon people of different races, including mixed race people, reproducing and forming families. Laura Briggs has pointed to scholars of Asia, Africa, and Latin America as at the forefront on research on how "ideologies of family, sexuality, and reproduction… animat[ed] imperial and racial projects," who have "begun to greatly expand

---

[61]See Barbara Fields, "Whiteness, Racism, and Identity," International Labor and Working-Class History 60 (Fall 2001), 54; and Michael Rudolph West, *The Education of Booker T. Washington: American Democracy and the Idea of Race Relations* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2006).

[62]West, *The Education of Booker T. Washington*, 57. Emphasis added.

[63]For a scholarly appraisal of Rodney King's beating by the Los Angeles police officers in 1991, their acquittal in 1992, and the aftermath of these events, see Robert Gooding-Williams, ed., *Reading Rodney King/Reading Urban Uprising* (New York: Routledge, 1993).

our imagination of how 'the colonial' works. Colonialism, in this account, is a modernist institution, fundamentally a practice – not of atavism in savage lands, as the *Heart of Darkness* would have it – but of producing modern citizen-subjects in metropoles as well as colonies"[64] Examining the development of academic racial thought in Hawai'i and the political and cultural work it performed contributes to a burgeoning literature on colonial and imperial practice in the twentieth century, when the United States has been presumed to be done expanding its borders if not its power. The production of modern citizen-subjects, which was entangled with a number of American scientists' questions about human biology and the operation of society, did not just happen far, far away, in the most isolated archipelago on earth. These ideas traveled to the continental United States, and beyond, and back.

Although the idea that America is a melting pot strikes many people as a story about inclusion and multiculturalism, assimilative expectations and attempts have been experienced extremely differently by migrant and indigenous groups living in the United States and have had widely variant meanings. American Indian peoples have generally experienced assimilation as a series of cultural and physical assaults – on battlefields and reservations, at boarding schools, and through blood quantum laws that legally define indigenous people out of existence.[65] Conversely, European migrants have largely become white. After "achieving" whiteness, they have attempted to reclaim ethnic identities in response to the

---

[64]Briggs, *Reproducing Empire*, 16.

[65]There is a substantial literature on programs with the objectives of assimilation, acculturation, or civilization – all part and parcel of managing indigenous peoples in a settler colonial nation-state. On boarding schools, see Brenda Child, *Boarding School Seasons: American Indian Families, 1900-1940* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1998). On blood quantum law as it applies in Hawai'i, see J. Kēhaulani Kauanui, *Hawaiian Blood: Colonialism and the Politics of Sovereignty and Indigeneity* (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2008).

civil rights and Black power movements.[66] Meanwhile, regardless of how long their ancestors have lived in the United States, which in some cases is far longer than European migrants who arrived after the turn of the twentieth century, people with Chinese and Japanese ancestry, who began the century as "Orientals" and later became "Asian Americans," have been framed as a "model minority."[67] Barred from recognition as archetypal Americans because their physical features mark them as perpetually "Oriental," Asian Americans continue to be asked, "Where are you from?" and expected to report origins in Tokyo or Beijing rather than Seattle or Chicago.[68]

Questions about race and nation have been particularly salient in Hawai'i. Unlike the Philippines, which claimed independence in 1946, and Puerto Rico, which remains an unincorporated territory, Hawai'i became a state in 1959. The process by which Hawai'i became racially and culturally eligible for statehood in the eyes of white Americans, particularly legislators who assessed the territory multiple times between the first exploratory statehood hearings in the early 1930s and the referendum in 1959, reveals the centrality of race to national conversations about fitness for citizenship.[69] Chapter four of this dissertation examines how people with mixed ancestry identified racially and nationally. The details of the messy processes surrounding the reckoning of pedigree and identity claims are important in light of recent scholarship that has positioned the categories of Native and

---

[66]See George Lipsitz, *The Possessive Investment in Whiteness: How White People Profit from Identity Politics* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2006); Eric L. Goldstein, *The Price of Whiteness: Jews, Race, and American Identity* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006); and Matthew Frye Jacobson, *Roots, Too: White Ethnic Revival in Post-Civil Rights America* (Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 2006).

[67]Yu, *Thinking Orientals*, 187-191.

[68]Yu, *Thinking Orientals*, vi.

[69]The decision to admit Hawai'i as a state was economic and political as well, particularly as a military strategy.

settler as opposing and clear-cut.[70] Part of the colonial apparatus in Hawai'i has been producing a population of American-identified settlers instead of more Native-identified people. Yet the literature on settler colonialism does not currently attempt to address how to square the Native-settler dichotomy with Hawai'i's history of mixing. As demonstrated in chapter four, the voices of people variously resisting and participating in racialization in interwar Hawai'i contribute crucial historical context as scholars continue to investigate the workings and limitations of that apparatus.

A number of the issues in this dissertation are also relevant to the unfinished business of Hawaiian colonization. One of the most contentious issues within public debate in the state of Hawai'i is Hawaiian nationalist activity. Hawaiian sovereignty activists generally frame their activities and arguments as working toward recognition as a nation.[71] However, opponents usually label these activities and arguments as racist or a sign of "reverse racism" toward white people primarily.[72] Resistance to Hawaiian nationalism vis-à-vis cries of racism from ancestrally non-Hawaiian people, however, was predicated by American government officials' and academic experts' redefining the lāhui – nation – as a race in the first place. Because American social scientific experts played a primary role in this process, racialization requires analysis as a political strategy that continues to shape

---

[70]Fujikane and Okamura, eds., *Asian Settler Colonialism*.

[71]Rona Tamiko Halualani, *In the Name of Hawaiians: Native Identities and Cultural Politics* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2002); and J. Kēhaulani Kauanui, "Off-Island Hawaiians 'Making' Ourselves at 'Home': A [Gendered] Contradiction in Terms?" *Women's Studies International Forum* 21, no. 6 (1998), 681-693.

[72]Halualani, *In the Name of Hawaiians*. A Hawaiian nationalist group that occupied the lawn of 'Iolani Palace in May 2008 received hundreds of on-line comments accusing the group and sometimes Hawaiians in general of "reverse racism" in response to coverage by the *Honolulu Advertiser*. See archived comments in particular from *Honolulu Advertiser* articles May 1-21, 2008, available online at www.honoluluadvertiser.com, last accessed: 7/22/08.

discourse about Hawaiian rights, what constitutes a legitimate claim to indigeneity, and what comprises truthful history about the relationship between Hawai'i and the United States.

Patrick Wolfe argues that settler colonialism is not an event but a structure.[73] Notions that the territory constituted an exceptional and internationally useful racial experiment as well as an experiment in democracy institutionally and discursively structures settler colonialism in Hawai'i. Rather than recognizing the ways that their residency and economic ascendancy in Hawai'i was possible because of Hawaiian dispossession, non-native people in Hawai'i – former plantation workers and haole elites alike – participated in education and public discussion about the islands that emphasized the naturalness and inevitability of cultural assimilation and biological amalgamation. These processes, as they were perceived, rendered Hawai'i an exceptional, emulation-worthy part of America and framed the islands' territorial status not as an illegal form of colonial occupation, but a form of political inequity that could be remedied by statehood.

Chapter one illustrates how, during the 1920s, American scientists working in Hawai'i came to agree that there appeared to be hereditary benefits as well as acculturative effects for racial "hybrids," or mixed race people. Through their conjectures that interracial marriage between some groups was both inevitable and socially stabilizing, anthropologists in particular concluded that Chinese-Hawaiians – the product of mixing between colonized native people with supposedly unassimilable "Orientals" – were superior to their "pure" parents. Although they attempted to increase the specificity and accuracy of research on race, by making qualitative judgments about the consequences of mixing, Louis Sullivan and

---

[73]Patrick Wolfe, *Settler Colonialism and the Transformation of Anthropology: The Politics and Poetics of an Ethnographic Event* (London and New York: Cassell, 1999), 2.

L.C. Dunn persisted in a racialist approach to human research during a period that historians of science have associated with the retreat of scientific racism.

During the 1930s, Hawai'i was established as a long-term laboratory for race-focused human research. Chapter two depicts how the University of Hawai'i, with funding from the Rockefeller Foundation, established the Station for Racial Research and sponsored two studies of racial mixing and racial plasticity by physical anthropologist Harry Shapiro as well as research on race psychology and the sociology of interracial marriage. Shapiro's research on racial plasticity was largely inconclusive, yet its large sample size and statistical precision convinced scientists and university officials that such research was enormously promising and required long-term work. Hawai'i was thus claimed for science as well as the United States.

Meanwhile, Romanzo Adams' sociological research on interracial marriage and reproduction asserted to colleagues, members of the public, and several years' worth of students that Hawai'i residents were becoming Americans. Chapter three, which relies heavily on Adams' publications and correspondence with local leaders, reveals how he popularized his history of Hawai'i as a natural history of amicable racial contact and mixing, an anti-conquest narrative that downplayed the colonization of Hawai'i and instead framed the islands (erroneously) as lacking the race problems of the continent. Commissioned by the Territory, this purportedly scientific history supported the burgeoning statehood movement of the 1930s. This chapter lays essential groundwork for chapter four, which focuses on testimony by Hawai'i residents that provided a decidedly different picture of race relations.

Chapter four illustrates how Hawai'i residents, namely couples in interracial marriages and people with mixed ancestry, understood racial categories and the social order in the Territory. University of Hawai'i sociology graduate student Margaret M. Lam conducted approximately 300 interviews in the early 1930s that yielded direct commentary on racial differences, race prejudice, and lay people's positions on interracial marriage. The testimony of people interviewed contradicted a number of Romanzo Adams' assumptions about the process, and progress, of assimilation and revealed how even though they did not create the racial hierarchy in which they maneuvered, Hawai'i residents participated in the processes of maintaining racial categories, rearticulating the meanings of those categories, and exploring the relationship between race and culture. This chapter contributes to recent scholarship on settler colonialism in Hawai'i, which positions Native and settler categories as exacting and opposite political positions in which Natives are colonized and settlers are invested in ongoing occupation. The history of family formation in Hawai'i, however, does not adhere to the Native-settler dichotomy. This chapter will examine how people of mixed ancestry came to claim or inhabit a singular ethnicity, providing an operational window into how intelligible subject positions were forged out of the so-called "glorious mess" of race, ancestry, and kinship.[74]

Chapter five illustrates how social scientists at the University of Hawai'i, particularly sociologist Andrew W. Lind, advanced the idea that Hawai'i's race relations were part of a natural, competitive process analogous to the workings of plant communities. Working in the sociological subfield of human ecology, which drew heavily from plant ecology, Lind

[74]Margaret Lam used the term "glorious mess" to describe the Davis family, as explained further in chapter four. See the letter from Margaret Lam to Robert Park, Feb. 14, 1933, Box 14, Folder 1, Robert Park Collection, Special Collections Research Center, University of Chicago.

combined economic history, the history of land use, and the study of race relations to conclude that the population of Hawai'i was involved in a collective struggle toward social stability. He framed Hawai'i's incorporation into the United States as the inevitable climax of modern social and economic development, arguing that the processes by which some groups (in this case racialized groups) become dominant was ostensibly natural – essentially organic – rather than intentional and historically contingent. In this way, social scientists naturalized historically created social relations in Hawai'i.

Together, these chapters demonstrate how American scientists researching race and race relations in Hawai'i during the interwar years produced a usable history of the islands and made authoritative predictions about their demographic and political destiny. The next chapter explains how American scientists developed racial research projects in Hawai'i and how they resolved, at least temporarily, a set of surprisingly persistent questions about the biology and social consequences of race mixing.

Chapter One

"Biologically Better" Studies and Hybrids: The Persistence of Racialism in Studies of Race Mixing in Territorial Hawai'i, 1916-1932

In the fall of 1921, delegates to the Second International Congress of Eugenics gathered at the American Museum of Natural History (AMNH) in New York City. They sat a room or two away from the Museum's new Hall of Man, where an elaborate display of photographs, demographic data, and plaster cast busts of residents of Hawai'i served as a feature of the meeting. Louis R. Sullivan, who had created the exhibit, and L.C. Dunn both presented their research on race mixing in Hawai'i and on people with both Chinese and Hawaiian ancestry in particular. Sullivan and Dunn were at the beginning of their careers. Beginning in 1918, Sullivan served as assistant curator of physical anthropology at the AMNH. Dunn had been a graduate student in genetics at Harvard when he initially became involved in research begun by Alfred Tozzer and Earnest Hooton. After finishing his doctorate at Harvard in 1920, Dunn worked at the Agricultural Experiment Station in Storrs, Connecticut until 1928. Both Sullivan and Dunn took on research projects on race mixing in Hawai'i at the urging of senior members of their fields who were interested in the broadly construed but scientifically measurable consequences of miscegenation and saw work in Hawai'i as an imperative. AMNH curator of anthropology Clark Wissler made arrangements for Sullivan's work at the Bishop Museum in Honolulu, and Harvard professor Hooton, who had co-designed a small anthropometric study with Tozzer, asked Dunn to take over and process Tozzer's data.

While Sullivan's and Dunn's approaches to their research are notable in the history of racial science because of the ways that they innovated upon previous projects, their

conclusions have been particularly influential because they argued that Chinese-Hawaiian "hybrids," as they called them, were superior to their "pure" Chinese and Hawaiian parents. They came to this conclusion during the 1920s, a decade that historians have argued was a period when scientists generally assumed that race crossing, especially "wide race crossing," was dysgenic and recommended against it.[1] In 1921, Sullivan commented publicly that Chinese-Hawaiians were "biologically better" than their parents and better equipped to participate in modern civilization.[2] In 1932, Dunn wrote in a textbook that Chinese-Hawaiian hybrids were "bigger and better" than Chinese and Hawaiians.[3] He also speculated that there was potentially a new racial type in the making in Hawai'i. William Provine has argued that by the mid-1930s "geneticists' published statements about the effects of race crossing changed from condemnation to agnosticism."[4] In the midst of this presumed agnosticism, however, people with Chinese and Hawaiian ancestry remained singled out as desirable crosses because of their supposedly enhanced abilities, over their "pure" relatives, to adapt to modernity and civilization.[5] This supposed adaptability was increasingly identified as a type of fitness that was treated as a racial trait, at least in part, because of physical anthropologists' interest in determining how races were related to one another.

---

[1]William B. Provine, "Geneticists and the Biology of Race Crossing," *Science* 182, no. 4114 (Nov. 23, 1973), 792.

[2]"Discussions of Papers Read at the Congress," *Eugenics in Race and State, Volume II, Scientific Papers of the Second International Congress of Eugenics, Held at American Museum of Natural History, New York, September 22-28, 1921* (Baltimore: Williams & Wilkins Company, 1923), 456.

[3]See L.C. Dunn, *Heredity and Variation: Continuity and Change in the Living World* (New York: The University Society, Inc., 1932), 99.

[4]Provine, "Geneticists and the Biology of Race Crossing," 794. See also John P. Jackson, Jr. and Nadine M. Weidman, *Race, Racism, and Science: Social Impact and Interaction* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2006).

[5]"Discussions of Papers Read at the Congress," *Eugenics in Race and State*, 456.

The story of how these men, especially Sullivan, went about their studies of race mixing among people with Chinese and Hawaiian ancestry is an important episode in the history of racial study, the history of anthropology, the histories of the institutions involved, and the colonial history of Hawai'i. It contributes a new way for historians to understand both the content and legacies of scientific studies of race in the twentieth century. Sullivan's and Dunn's research places them at a critical juncture in the history of American racial science during the interwar years. As they honed their studies – improving their precision and methodological sophistication and eventually finding that "hybrids" were intermediate between their parents or sometimes taller or bigger, but almost never shorter or smaller, for example – they also arrived at qualitative conclusions based less on their empirical data than on subjective assessments of subjects' adaptation to life in the American territory. Moreover, in spite of the urgency with which research on race commenced during these years, there was no clear, perfect plan for what Sullivan or Dunn were going to learn. The importance of collecting and analyzing the data was considered self-evident and contributed toward intensifying arguments that Hawai'i was the ideal human laboratory, a seemingly neutral frame for the colonized islands.

Perhaps because of the methodological carefulness and political moderation of the scientists involved, these conclusions may appear as part of a retreat from scientific racism, if scientific racism is defined by strong support for white supremacy, hard hereditarian arguments, or personal feelings of disgust toward non-white people.[6] Scientific studies of

---

[6]There are a number of scholarly accounts of the "retreat of scientific racism." See Elazar Barkan, *The Retreat of Scientific Racism: Changing Concepts of Race in Britain and the United States between the World Wars* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996 [1992]). See also Paul Farber and Hamilton Cravens, eds., *Race and Science: Scientific Challenges to Racism in Modern America* (Corvallis: Oregon State University Press, 2009).

race in the 1920s were increasingly characterized by large sample sizes, number of traits being measured and assessed simultaneously, descriptions of heredity in specific cases of "crossing," and attempts to understand how races were affiliated with one another. These bigger and therefore presumably improved studies yielded conclusions that were racialist because they assumed that racial categories had integrity as categories defined by largely consistent morphological and psychological traits. Peggy Pascoe reminded us that nineteenth century racialism was a broad ideology that encompassed both scientific racism and the romantic racialism described by George M. Frederickson.[7] By using the term racialism rather than racism as a frame for scientists' work in the interwar years and beyond, Pascoe sought to

> counter the tendency of twentieth-century observers to perceive nineteenth-century ideas as biologically "determinist" in some simple sense. To racialists (including scientific racialists), the important point was not that biology determined culture (indeed, the split between the two was only dimly perceived), but that race, understood as an indivisible essence that included not only biology but also culture, morality, and intelligence, was a compellingly significant factor in history and society.[8]

This chapter points to one emerging ideology in which a specific type of mixing of biological and cultural tendencies as delineated by race was socially beneficial and thus a qualitative improvement upon the "pure" types being mixed. Studying amalgamation and assimilation may indicate a retreat from particularly vicious forms of racism in some cases, but they did not constitute a retreat from racialism. Sullivan and allied colleagues did not question whether race existed. They sought to improve their techniques for precisely discerning and describing individuals and the racial groups to which they supposedly

---

[7]Pascoe, "Miscegenation Law and Ideologies of 'Race' in Twentieth-Century America," *Journal of American History* 83, no. 1 (June 1996), 44-69; and George M. Frederickson, *Black Image in the White Mind*, as cited in Pascoe on page 48.

[8]Pascoe, "Miscegenation Law," 48.

belonged. Belief in race had not weakened. Rather, distinguishing racial traits and maintaining exactness in their study had become more of a challenge given the acceleration of contact and mixing that accompanied modern life. Sullivan and others attempted to hone the parameters of race as a category and increase the precision with which scientists studied it and drew conclusions.

Sullivan's and Dunn's approaches to hybrid research, the term sometimes used as a shorthand, led them to conclude that Hawaiian-Chinese hybrids were superior and that the defining feature of the Hawaiian islands was pervasive interracial mixing through marriage and reproduction. As an anthropologist, Sullivan sought to document the physical characteristics of "pure" Hawaiians and Hawaiian "hybrids" and the pattern of mixing and to assess Hawaiians' racial affiliations or relationships between races. As a graduate student geneticist, Dunn examined data from crosses between F_1 individuals and subsequent generations to trace the heredity of specific biological traits.[9] He was primarily interested in mechanisms of heredity, particularly Mendelian heredity. Hawai'i's characterization as the location of extraordinarily high rates of interracial mixing, which produced "bigger and better" people and contributed toward the probable creation of a new race, powerfully shaped scientific, political, and historical conceptions of the Territory of Hawai'i.

A Racial Laboratory

During the interwar era, American scientists identified Hawai'i as a perfect "laboratory" for human science for a number of reasons. There was institutional support for fieldwork by the Bishop Museum and the University of Hawai'i, whose administrators had been trained in the continental United States. It was also a colony with notable diversity,

---

[9] F_1 refers to a first generation cross, presumably of pure types.

and scientists viewed it as a better site to investigate some specific questions about the outcomes of mixing and mechanisms of heredity than the continental United States. Hawai'i had been colonized by American settlers such as Sanford Dole, perhaps best known for his family's pineapple plantations. His and his compatriots' coup against Queen Lili'uokalani in 1893 was supported by the U.S. military, and the United States government annexed Hawai'i by a joint resolution of Congress in 1898. This new colony was already home to Native Hawaiians, Euro-American settlers, second- and third-generation migrants from China, and migrants from Europe, the Mediterranean, Japan, and the American colonies of the Philippines and Puerto Rico – more than seven ethnic groups.

Studying the outcomes of reproduction between Hawai'i residents of various ancestries was appealing to scientists who had concluded that the continental U.S. had two major problems in terms of their research interest in race crossing. Two centuries of illicit interracial coupling between black and white people meant that knowing, without a doubt, the precise ancestry of people with both black and white relatives was impossible. Meanwhile, "white people" were such a heterogeneous group that it was difficult to verify F_1 "hybrids." The term "hybrid" can read as dehumanizing for people with mixed ancestry because it places them in the same category as cross-bred animals and plants. It is also theoretically problematic because it reifies the race concept (since there can be no hybrids without the existence of "pure" racial types).[10] Scientists used the hybrid concept as a category of research, which is an example of naturalization and the work it did. Consistent with their naturalization of racial types, scientists turned socially and culturally created

[10]Throughout the rest of the chapter, however, I do not put hybrid in quotation marks in the interest of simplicity. Such use without scare quotes is not intended to communicate acceptability of the term.

identities such as Chinese-Hawaiian into biological phenomena. Because they understood human heredity in racial terms, researchers decided that the continent was not a good place to investigate hybrids.

America's colonial venture to Hawai'i thus provided an opportunity for developing theories about the biological and social circumstances of mixed race people as well as the racial affiliations of indigenous people and mechanisms of heredity.[11] People with both Chinese and Hawaiian ancestry in particular did not emerge until around 1870, which made the outcomes of mixing, particularly first generation crosses, presumably easy to see – to assess with the naked eye – which was one of the methods that researchers relied upon as they sorted subjects into people with supposedly known and unknown ancestry. Researchers argued that, like black and white mixing on the continent, white-Hawaiian mixing had been happening long enough to make its study extremely difficult. While Dunn and others noted that studying Hawaiian-white "hybrids" was too difficult because of more extensive mixing than that of Hawaiians and Chinese, Dunn also commented that Hawaiian-white people were "important." In spite of their importance, scientists did not systematically study people with white and Hawaiian ancestry. The scientific, mostly methodological reasons for focusing away from Hawaiian-white mixing are apparent, but there appear to be other reasons that this specific mixing went unstudied that require further investigation. Additionally, some observers' perceptions that race prejudice was nonexistent or at least

---

[11]There is a long history of interest among scientists employed by American institutions in how races mixed on an individual or small scale. See Nancy Stepan, *Picturing Tropical Nature* (London Reaktion Books, 2001), chapter 3, "Racial Degenerations," on Louis Agassiz's research on race mixing in Brazil, 1865-1866. Charles Davenport and Morris Steggerda studied the effects of race mixing in Jamaica in the mid-1920s and Harry Shapiro conducted studies on the mixed race population of two islands in the Pacific, Norfolk Island and Pitcairn Island, from the mid-1920s into the early 1930s, respectively.

much milder in Hawai'i than on the continent led them to treat it as an insignificant factor in shaping people's lives, supposedly making racial characteristics related to intelligence and personality easier to observe.[12]

American researchers saw Hawai'i as offering them a rare and fleeting opportunity to study large-scale racial mixture, a project with both social and scientific urgency. The question of whether races, large scale, were mixable and in what ways were questions that emerged in the early twentieth century. They coincided with post-World War I hysteria among white, "Anglo-Saxon" Americans over mass immigration and accompanying nativist activism that led legislators to limit immigration generally, but particularly from southern and eastern Europe and Asia. Immigration from Asia was already restricted by the Chinese Exclusion Act (1882) and the Gentlemen's Agreement with Japan (1907). The effect of a changed environment on physical characteristics was a problem that anthropologist Franz Boas worked on in his initial study of immigrant head forms, which was not motivated by nativist hysteria as much as his interest in studying the effects of environment on racial characteristics as part of a study chartered by the U.S. Immigration Commission in 1908.[13] Studies in Hawai'i were similarly motivated by questions about the characteristics of the Territorial population during the same years of nativist activism around immigration restriction on the continent, especially since by the early 1920s the majority of Hawai'i's

---

[12]Frederick L. Hoffman alluded to this. See Hoffman, "Race Amalgamation in Hawaii," in *Eugenics in Race and State, Volume II, Scientific Papers of the Second International Congress of Eugenics, Held at American Museum of Natural History, New York, September 22-28, 1921* (Baltimore: Williams & Wilkins Company, 1923), 90-108. The idea that a generalized amount of race prejudice effected individuals' choice of mate suggested a role for environment that these researchers did not address.

[13]See George W. Stocking, Jr., ed., *The Shaping of American Anthropology, 1883-1911: A Franz Boaz Reader* (New York: Basic Books, 1974), especially Selection 29, "Changes in Immigrant Body Form," 202-214.

residents had Asian ancestry. Sullivan's and Dunn's conclusions that Chinese-Hawaiians were superior to their Hawaiian and Chinese parents because of their adaptability to modernity spoke to contemporary concerns about the quality – and qualities – of the national population, including distant territorial residents.

Underscoring the importance of large-scale race mixing research in Hawai'i, Sullivan was the only researcher that Henry Fairfield Osborn discussed in his opening remarks at the 1921 Eugenics Congress held at the American Museum of Natural History. Osborn was the director of the museum and one of the prominent members of the Galton Society organized by Madison Grant, which historians have generally characterized as nativist and anti-Semitic. Osborn hoped that studies in Hawai'i would help answer questions about the consequences of mixing, especially since in his mind, the three racial divisions of Caucasian, Mongoloid, and Negroid were stable, but mixing was "as likely to unite the vices of all three as the virtues."[14] Osborn was already convinced that "from biological principles there is little promise in the 'melting pot' theory" because of its probability of uniting vices.[15] While he expected evidence that racial crossing was dangerous, Osborn believed that Sullivan's work would provide important proof or disproof of hybrid inferiority.

Osborn's comment that the races might be stable yet combinable appears to be contradictory. If they were stable types, how could they be combinable? This was precisely the question, and speculation about the combinability of races and the stability of racial crosses shaped the intertwined assumptions about both the science and social consequences

---

[14]Osborn, "Address of Welcome," *Eugenics, Genetics and the Family: Second International Eugenics Congress*, Vol. 1, (Baltimore, Williams and Wilkins Co, 1923), 2. Note that Osborn did not refer to the Polynesian race, which only a few years later, as questions about racial affiliation intensified, was a focus of Louis Sullivan and Earnest Hooton.

[15]Osborn, "Address of Welcome," 2.

of race crossing that drove research during the 1920s. This is how the logic unfolded: Perhaps individuals of different races merely "mixed," meaning that they could reproduce offspring with some combination of different racial traits (and who were not sterile, as some hereditarians and racial essentialists had insisted during the nineteenth century in the face of widespread evidence that that was untrue). However, by logical extension the stability or lack of blendability of races prevented "amalgamation," large-scale stable fusion, and instead produced an unstable intermixture of traits that would always tend toward separating themselves out the way that oil separates from water even after being shaken together. Or, perhaps, quite dangerously, amalgamation was possible but produced large-scale degeneracy. These possibilities appeared, often as insinuations, in works referring to race mixing such as Osborn's commentary at the Eugenics Congress. It was not contemporary racial categories or the existence of races themselves that were under examination, but rather how combining them might work or not – a question of stability – and how to discern them given the increasing difficulty of identifying the racial components of individuals of mixed ancestry.

After World War I, as the United States escalated its imperial control of the islands through increased military occupation and Hawai'i's economy became more closely tethered to the American economy, research in Hawai'i was presented by a number of American writers and scientists as an essential part of securing world peace. The United States' venture into the Pacific in the early twentieth century meant an expanded sphere of influence, both economically and politically, which was framed as "internationalism" by a number of contemporary observers.[16] By the time that research on race mixing began in Hawai'i,

---

[16]Examples include Alexander Hume Ford and David Starr Jordan. On Ford see Philip F. Rehbock, "Organizing Pacific Science: Local and International Origins of the Pacific Science Association" in Roy MacLeod and Philip F. Rehbock, eds., *Nature in Its Greatest*

American officials had, since its military expansion into the Pacific during the Spanish American war, viewed the occupation of the Philippines and the annexation of Hawai'i as part of an internationalist project in which "the United States was attempting something entirely new to human history: not 'empire,' but 'expansive republicanism'; not colonial rule, but 'tutelage in self-government'; not oppression, but 'benevolent assimilation.'"[17] This internationalism also developed in the context of continuing labor importation and plantation work conditions characterized by indentured servitude and plantations' "ruthless" anti-organizing tactics, as well as the consolidation of colonial control of the Pacific by the United States, France, and Britain.[18] "Internationalism" as it was envisioned and practiced by proponents such as Alexander Hume Ford, founder of the Pan-Pacific Union in Hawai'i, a major sponsor of the first Pan-Pacific Science Congress held at the Bishop Museum in 1920 and publisher of *Mid-Pacific Magazine* (1911-36), constituted cooperation among imperial powers rather than cooperation among all Pacific nations.[19] These ideas became common currency among intellectuals and parts of the public.

Extent: Western Science in the Pacific (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1988), 195-221. On Jordan see John Laurent, "Varieties of Social Darwinism in Australia, Japan, and Hawaii, 1883-1921" in Roy MacLeod and Philip F. Rehbock, eds., *Darwin's Laboratory: Evolutionary Theory and Natural History in the Pacific* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1994), 493.

[17]Paul Kramer, "Empires, Exceptions, and Anglo-Saxons: Race and Rule between the British and United States Empires, 1880-1910," *The Journal of American History* 88, no. 4 (March 2002), 1350. See also Vicente L. Rafael, *White Love and Other Events in Filipino History* (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2000).

[18]On labor migration and plantation labor in Hawai'i during this period, see Moon-Kie Jung, *Reworking Race: The Making of Hawaii's Interracial Labor Movement* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2006), 28 and chapters two and three; Matthew Guterl and Christine Skwiot, "Atlantic and Pacific Crossings: Race, Empire, and 'the Labor Problem,'" *Radical History Review* 91 (Winter 2005), 40-61; and Gary Okihiro, *Cane Fires The Anti-Japanese Movement in Hawaii, 1845-1945* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1991).

[19]On Ford's internationalism and its role in scientific institution building in Hawai'i, see Philip F. Rehbock, "Organizing Pacific Science: Local and International Origins of the Pacific Science Association," in Roy MacLeod and Philip F. Rehbock, eds., *Nature in Its*

In 1919 and 1920 American scientists from several disciplines agreed that multi-disciplinary human research in Hawai'i specifically and in Polynesia more generally was an urgent priority.[20] In the summer of 1920, the Bishop Museum in Honolulu hosted the first meeting of the Pan-Pacific Science Congress, which was funded largely by the territorial government. Held from August 2-20, it was the first scientific meeting under the auspices of the Pan-Pacific Union.[21] The meeting attracted sixty delegates with expertise in geography, geology, zoology, botany, and anthropology, fifty of whom where from outside Hawai'i.[22]

Greatest Extent: Western Science in the Pacific (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1988), 195-221.

[20]Researchers from Australia, New Zealand, and the United States began to focus their research on the entirety of Polynesia during these years, in part because they sought to compare island cultures and to investigate population changes and race mixing, which happened relatively uninhibited in this region. See Warwick Anderson, "Ambiguities of Race: Science on the Reproductive Frontier of Australia and the Pacific between the Wars," *Australian Historical Studies* 40 (2009), 143-160. Polynesia seems to have referred quite generally to either the islands of the Pacific, sometimes including Micronesia and Melanesia, or the groups of islands that make up a triangle shape with Hawaiian islands at the northern point, Easter Island at the eastern point, and New Zealand at the south western point.

[21]On the Pan-Pacific Union and its relationship with the Pacific Science Association, see Philip F. Rehbock, "Organizing Pacific Science: Local and International Origins of the Pacific Science Association," in Roy MacLeod and Philip F. Rehbock, eds., *Nature in Its Greatest Extent: Western Science in the Pacific* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1988), 195-221. The Congress, which had received funding from both the Territory of Hawai'i and the Pan-Pacific Union, turned into the Pacific Science Association. Alexander Hume Ford founded the Pan-Pacific Union in 1917. It was modeled on the Pan-American Union and its goal was to improve "relations among the peoples of the countries within and bordering on the Pacific." See Rehbock, 200. Convening the Pan-Pacific Science Congress was part of Ford's internationalist vision following World War I, which included scientific cooperation. Rehbock notes that, "The circumstances surrounding the First Pan-Pacific Science Conference were decisively shaped by movements for internationalism and science in Honolulu, beginning shortly after the turn of the century" (199). For additional commentary on post-WWI internationalism as it relates to American imperial activity, see chapter two.

[22]"Anthropological Notes," *American Anthropologist* n.s. 22, no. 4 (Oct. – Dec., 1920), 392; A.L Kroeber, "Observations on the Anthropology of Hawaii," *American Anthropologist* n.s. 23, no. 2 (April-June 1921), 129-137. Delegates included F. Wood-Jones, Gerard Fowke, Clark Wissler, W.E. Safford, A.M. Tozzer, A.L. Kroeber, K. Kishinouye, N. Yamasaki; at Bishop Museum: W.T. Brigham, J.F.G. Stokes, K. Emory, J.S. Emerson, T.G. Thrum, R.T. Aiken, L.R. Sullivan. See page 129. Notably, this list of scholars interested in Hawai'i, aside from

Keeping with the purpose of the meeting, delegates deliberated on the state of research in the Pacific rather than presenting original research. They also networked and socialized on grand field trips and at receptions with businessmen and local leaders.[23] Anthropologist Alfred Kroeber reported that the meeting's lively spirit was unprecedented in his experience.[24]

Delegates concluded that more organized and focused anthropological work throughout Polynesia should begin immediately. There was consensus at the meeting that research on racial types and race mixing was the most urgently needed. Even Herbert Gregory, a geologist, argued that Polynesian ethnology and physical anthropology surpassed all other fields in importance in that, "The much desired researches in geology and botany can scarcely be classified as urgent and the marine fauna will probably be here for centuries, but if the history of the Polynesian race is to be more than a collection of expanded notes, it must be written during this generation."[25] American Museum of Natural History curator of anthropology Clark Wissler added that, "the fauna of our subject is on the verge of extinction. The rocks at the bottom of the sea will remain, but the old Polynesian is passing the last mile post of his career. Hence, if anything is to be done with the Polynesian problem, it must be done now."[26] Wissler represented the delegates' agreement that the

---

being a veritable Who's Who of human researchers during this period, contains both Kroeber, a Boas student, and Wissler.

[23]Edwin H. Bryan, Jr, "The First Pan-Pacific Science Conference," *Bulletin of the Pan-Pacific Union* 15 (Jan. 1921) (Honolulu: Published by the Union, 1921), 3-6. This was originally published in *The Friend*, a missionary publication.

[24]Kroeber, "Observations on the Anthropology of Hawaii," 129.

[25]Herbert Gregory in F. Wood-Jones, Herbert E. Gregory, Alfred G. Mayor, and A.F. Judd, "Race Relations in the Pacific: Introductory Remarks," *Proceedings of the First Pan-Pacific Science Conference, Under the Auspices of the Pan Pacific Union, Honolulu, Hawaii, August 2 to 20, 1920: Part I* (Honolulu: Honolulu Star-Bulletin, 1921), 49.

[26]Wissler, *Proceedings of the First Pan-Pacific Science Conference,* 59.

most pressing research demanded "the long and persistent labor of two or three of the best scientific minds, capable of synthesizing the results of many sciences."[27]

In a notable transition in thought among scientists and Anglo commentators, in the 1920s the idea that Hawaiians were disappearing through assimilation became another explanation for declining numbers of "pure Hawaiians." Although Hawaiians' pending extinction was frequently cited as the most compelling reason for their immediate study, Pan-Pacific Science Congress delegates emphasized that they were "on the road to extinction and *assimilation*."[28] Late nineteenth century publications on the plight of Hawaiians generally assumed that they faced extinction because of infectious diseases and a general inability to adapt to modern Western civilization. Now, in addition to deaths, predictions of eventual mixing beyond researchers' ability to accurately identify mixed race peoples' pedigrees motivated Congress delegates to begin documenting racial types in Hawai'i and the current state of mixing. Delegates recommended that photographs, plaster casts, and skeletal material be gathered posthaste, preferably by specialists, except in the case of plaster casts, for which trainees were acceptable.[29] These recommendations represent a rather new idea that hybrids occupied an intermediate position between two "pure" races, with more mixing causing eventual amalgamation.

For American scientists, race mixing was both a scientific problem and, perhaps, the answer to the national problem of racial and cultural heterogeneity. It was intermixture and amalgamation specifically – types of biological combination – rather than a more general

---

[27]Wissler, *Proceedings of the First Pan-Pacific Science Conference*, 54.

[28]"Recommendations for Anthropological Research in Polynesia Prepared Under the Direction of the Section of Anthropology," *Proceedings of the First Pan-Pacific Science Conference*, 116. Emphasis added.

[29]"Recommendations for Anthropological Research," 116-117.

study of human evolution that attracted researchers of different disciplines. The idea that Hawaiians, like American Indians, were assimilating was not a radical departure from the extinction discourse of the late nineteenth century.[30] Depending on their positions on the meanings of racial differences, amalgamation or assimilation symbolized inclusion and a step toward the eradication of racial prejudice or else it symbolized the eradication of inferior minority or even subject groups' difference itself. As Henry Yu has put it, "Throughout the twentieth century, intermarriage," which most scientists used interchangeably with race mixing, "has been conceptualized in two ways: as the meeting point of different things, and as the ultimate erasure of the difference between things."[31] During this period, assimilation seems to have invoked both concepts for some racial progressives. For example, Franz Boas, known for his relatively liberal views about race, was an advocate for interracial marriage as a way of eradicating racial prejudice. He thought that the disappearance, submergence, or integration of African Americans and American Indians would solve problems caused by their "differentness" from white Americans.[32]

---

[30]The words amalgamation and assimilation were sometimes used interchangeably in human research in the early 1920s, which suggests the flexibility and overlap of ideas about biological and cultural mixing. Sociologists differentiated these processes, but there was still overlap. In discourse focused on indigenous peoples, the possibility of their assimilation or absorption into to the Euro-American population and their pending extinction have been intertwined. See David Hurst Thomas, *Skull Wars: Kennewick Man, Archaeology, and the Battle for Native American Identity* (New York: Basic Books, 2000). For examples of arguments that Hawaiians were on their way to extinction, which was a consequence of failure to cope with civilization, see S.E. Bishop, "Why are the Hawaiians Dying Out? Or, Elements of Disability for Survival Among the Hawaiian People," read to Honolulu Social Science Association, November, 1888; and W.B. Elkin, "An Inquiry Into the Causes of the Decrease of the Hawaiian People," *The American Journal of Sociology* 8, no. 3 (Nov., 1902), 398-411.

[31]Henry Yu, "Mixing Bodies and Cultures: The Meaning of America's Fascination with Sex between 'Orientals' and 'Whites,'" in Martha Hodes, ed., *Sex, Love, Race: Crossing Boundaries in North American History* (New York: New York University Press, 1998), 446.

[32]Carl N. Degler, *In Search of Human Nature: The Decline and Revival of Darwinism in American Social Thought* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), 80.

Like many scientists interested in human differentiation, Wissler selectively emphasized the social (or cultural) and scientific value of studying race mixing. He viewed assimilation and Americanization not just as a cultural issue, but as a zoological one.[33] This zoological interest, according to Wissler, came from a detached scientific interest in the human tendency toward mixing, which "has gone on for ages" and therefore was not a modern phenomenon.[34] Wissler's and some of his colleagues' occupation with questions about assimilability and biological compatibility of immigrants and the "hybrids" they sometimes created led them to cite ethnic enclaves in the Northeastern United States as evidence of lack of assimilation by non-Nordic immigrants. The mechanisms and consequences of this phenomenon required further research in a place that provided large numbers of subjects yet was supposedly untainted by overtly political concerns. In Wissler's

---

[33]See Warren Shapiro, "Some Implications of Clark Wissler's Race Theory," *Mankind* 15, no. 1 (April 1985), 3. Shapiro quotes Wissler, "Opportunities for Coordination in Anthropological and Psychological Research," *American Anthropologist* 22, 1-12. Shapiro has noted how much of a contrasting figure Wissler was with Boas and points out that Wissler worked on the National Research Council's Committee on Scientific Problems of Human Migration, which was responsible for ranking immigrant groups' worth to inform immigration legislation in 1924 (4). Note that there does not seem to have been a similar committee to work on how to deal with the incorporation of colonized peoples like Native Hawaiians and migrant and Asian settler-workers who were prohibited from U.S. citizenship, all of whom scientists treated as immigrants rather than colonial subjects. Asian migrants became the focus of discussion about whether they could ever become American enough to make Hawai'i statehood a reasonable proposition. Meanwhile, Hawaiians were treated similarly to Native Americans in these discussions. (The zoological focus of the Galton Society drew members such as Wissler and Sullivan who were not especially committed to the anti-Jewish, anti-Boas and anti-cultural anthropology, nativist, and eugenic agenda of founders Madison Grant and Henry Fairfield Osborn. Whether their political agenda was aligned with the founders or not, Wissler and Sullivan were mostly physical rather than cultural anthropologists, and their commitment to physical and hereditary studies appealed to more politically active hereditarians. See Jonathan Shapiro, "Nordic vs. anti-Nordic," 42-43.)

[34]Clark Wissler, "Man in the Pacific," *Proceedings of the First Pan-Pacific Science Conference,* 53. This talk was reprinted for public consumption in *Mid-Pacific Magazine* 23, No. 3 (March 1922), 223-227. Kroeber's paper on the anthropology of the Philippines was also published in this issue.

formulation, the opportunity to study race mixing in Hawai'i was unprecedented because "in some parts of the Pacific we have [recent] race mixture on an extensive scale and for once the phenomenon can be accurately observed." "Hence, regardless of any social or political interest," Wissler emphasized, "race mixture should be one of the problems to come before this congress."[35] He argued that historians could not solve one of the problems created in "this single historic century," the problem of race mixture.[36] Race mixing was not just a scientific problem, but it was a problem for science. This problem was taken up by Louis R. Sullivan, whose anthropometric, biometric, and photographic study was already underway.

Louis R. Sullivan

Anthropometric research began at the Bishop Museum in earnest following the 1919 arrival of the museum's second director, Yale geology professor Herbert Gregory, and his collaboration with the American Museum of Natural History to bring Louis R. Sullivan to Hawai'i.[37] The Bishop Museum was founded in 1888 and funded by Charles Bishop as a memorial to his wife, Hawaiian princess Bernice Pauahi Bishop. During its first two decades of operation, under the direction of Yale graduate William Tufts Brigham and coinciding with both the coerced restructuring of the Hawaiian government and its overthrow in 1893 by American settlers, the Bishop Museum focused on building natural history and local anthropology collections and researching acquired objects. When Gregory arrived, there were few public programs and minimal museum hours. The museum remained a research-oriented institution after Gregory took over, but the focus expanded to include fieldwork

---

[35]Wissler, "Man in the Pacific," 53.

[36]Wissler, "Man in the Pacific," 53.

[37]Note that this was the same year that Romanzo Adams arrived in Honolulu as part of the expansion of the largely agricultural, technical College of Hawai'i into a University. He founded the sociology department. See chapter 3.

and expeditions throughout Polynesia because of the increased funding that coincided with the museum's affiliation with Yale.[38] Gregory presided over a number of research projects, which nearly monopolized museum resources during the next two decades. Soon after Gregory's arrival, in December 1919, Clark Wissler wrote to him proposing that the Bishop Museum take Sullivan on as a research associate to investigate "the Polynesian elements in the Hawaiian population" and to study the museum's skeletal material.[39] Wissler and Gregory were acquainted through membership in the Galton Society.[40] Wissler proposed that the Bishop Museum fund fieldwork by Sullivan and provide support for his wife Bessie Pathers Sullivan, who would help with research and calculations. In exchange, the American Museum of Natural History (AMNH) would fund a photographic survey, plaster casting for AMNH exhibits, and pay Sullivan's salary. Sullivan needed one year to complete his work, but Wissler suggested that Sullivan stay six extra months to assist the Bishop Museum with

---

[38]In 1920, the Bishop Museum received funding through Yale University to pursue the "Polynesian Problem." The $40,000 donation for the project, which encompassed research on Polynesian origins as well as race mixing in Hawai'i, came from Bayard Dominick, a Yale alumnus living in New York who became the benefactor for a multi-disciplinary fieldwork project that came to be known as the Dominick expeditions. The ties between Yale and Hawai'i date back to the early nineteenth century, when three graduates established missions in the islands. (See Dean Wilber L. Cross, "Yale in Hawaii," *Mid-Pacific Magazine* 19, No. 3 (March 1921), 250.) If there was a moment when the Museum's priorities switched from collection building to field research, this was it. The museum's primary activity during the 1920s was as a headquarters for the Dominick research trips. Yale had formerly partnered with the Bishop Museum with its hiring of geology professor Herbert Gregory, who spent half the year in New Haven and half the year in Honolulu, linking the two departments.

[39]Wissler to Gregory, December 9, 1919, Folder: MS, SC, Sullivan, L.R.; Louis R. Sullivan (1892-1925); Correspondence, reports.; 1919-1925, Bernice Pauahi Bishop Museum Archives (BPBM).

[40]Wissler to Gregory, December 23, 1919, Folder: MS, SC, Sullivan, L.R.; Louis R. Sullivan (1892-1925); Correspondence, reports.; 1919-1925, BPBM. ("MS, SC, Sullivan, L.R.; Louis R. Sullivan (1892-1925); Correspondence, reports.; 1919-1925" is the full title of the folder.)

expanding exhibits.[41] The arrangement between the American Museum of Natural History and Bishop Museum was formalized in March 1920 and Sullivan began research two months later.[42]

While Sullivan's research was slated to provide definitive results from a large sample of subjects, his was not the first investigation of race mixing in the islands. Ernest Hooton of Harvard University had encouraged Alfred Tozzer's study starting in 1916, in which he gathered anthropometric data on Hawaiians both "pure" and of mixed ancestry, but never analyzed the set. Likewise, Vaughan MacCaughey of the College of Hawai'i in Honolulu published an article in the *Journal of Heredity* in 1919 on "Race Mixture in Hawaii."[43] MacCaughey's focus was demographic change and especially interracial marriage, which would later become a nearly twenty year focus for University of Chicago-trained sociologist Romanzo Adams, as detailed in chapter three.

Born in Houlton, Maine on May 21, 1892, Louis R. Sullivan earned his B.A. from Bates College in Maine and M.A. at Brown University before pursuing two additional years of training in anthropology, paleontology, and anatomy at Columbia from 1916-1918.[44] Sullivan earned his Ph.D. in 1922.[45] At Columbia, Sullivan trained mostly in anatomy rather than anthropology, which during his student years was shaped by Franz Boas' cultural focus. Sullivan took a course that Boas taught on "Growth" and used data that Boas collected as

---

[41]*Ibid.*

[42]Gregory to Sullivan, March 9, 1920, Folder: MS, SC, Sullivan, L.R.; Louis R. Sullivan (1892-1925); Correspondence, reports.; 1919-1925, BPBM.

[43]Vaughan MacCaughey, "Race Mixture in Hawaii," *Journal of Heredity* 10 (1919), 41-47, 90-95.

[44]"Sullivan, Louis R.," Folder: MS, SC, Sullivan, L.R.; Louis R. Sullivan (1892-1925); Correspondence, reports.; 1919-1925, BPBM. See also the *Report of the Director* (1925).

[45]Earnest A. Hooton, "Louis Robert Sullivan," *American Anthropologist* 27, No. 2 (Apr. 1925), 357.

source material for one of his first articles.[46] In 1918, Sullivan took two positions: one as an assistant anthropologist in the Army and another as an assistant curator of anthropology at the American Museum of Natural History working with head curator Clark Wissler. While in the army, Sullivan was a Second Lieutenant in the Sanitary Corps and served in the office of the Surgeon General of the Army in the Section of Physical Examinations, for which he compiled statistical data.[47]

Louis Sullivan's approach to research on Hawaiians was informed by his research on American Indians.[48] He was interested in using the study of anatomical structures to establish relationships between groups and used the same anthropometric and statistical techniques on Hawaiians that he had used to study American Indians, Sioux people in particular, whom a number of researchers assumed were somehow related because of their perceived similarities.[49] When biologist Charles Davenport visited Hawai'i, for example, he

---

[46]See Sullivan, "Growth of the Nasal Bridge in Children," *American Anthropologist* 19, no. 3 (July-Sept., 1917, 406-409. Sullivan used data that Boas collected in 1890 on school children in Worcester, Massachusetts, which Boas and Wissler had used in a previous publication (Boas, Franz and Wissler, Clark, "Statistics of Growth," *Report of the Commissioner of Education for 1904*.) Sullivan wrote, "The following report is in the nature of a laboratory exercise in a course on 'Growth' at Columbia University under Franz Boas who planned and supervised the work" (406). He concluded that, "A full appreciation of racial differences in anatomical structures must be preceded by a knowledge of the process of growth" (409). See also Tracy Lang Teslow, "Representing Race to the Public: Anthropology in Interwar American Natural History Museums" (PhD diss., University of Chicago, 2002), 78.

[47]Wissler to Gregory, December 23, 1919, Folder: MS, SC, Sullivan, L.R.; Louis R. Sullivan (1892-1925); Correspondence, reports.; 1919-1925, BPBM.

[48]Sullivan did anthropometric and other anthropological research on Sioux people before beginning work on Polynesia. See Louis R. Sullivan, *Anthropometry of the Siouan Tribes* (Anthropological Papers, American Museum of Natural History 23, Part 3, 1920). He resumed research on American Indians after he finished his anthropometric research in Hawai'i and the calculation process continued.

[49]See Louis R. Sullivan, "The Fossa Pharyngea in American Indian Crania," *American Anthropologist* 22, no. 3 (July-Sept., 1920), 237-243. Sullivan wrote, in regard to the study of the fossa pharyngea, that, "The point I wish to make is that such characters as the fossa pharyngea have a similar distribution to that of the cephalic index, stature, etc., and are of

was struck by Polynesians' resemblance to American Indians.[50] Bishop Museum director Herbert Gregory declared that, "The two problems of outstanding importance in the study of native races with which the United States is now concerned are the origin of the American Indian and the origin and migration of the Polynesians."[51]

One of the problems that required attention was the number and variance of theories about Polynesian origins and racial affiliation.[52] There was no consensus on whether Polynesians were part of a major racial group like the Caucasian or Malay or whether they constituted another racial group altogether. Sullivan emphasized that, "The racial affinities of the Polynesians are as confused and obscured in literature as are their origin and migrations."[53] Further physical anthropological research was necessary to

> accurately define and describe the Polynesian groups. [Physical anthropology] can prove beyond a reasonable doubt the racial origin and affinities of the Polynesians. It can designate fairly accurately to what branch of a given race they belong. It can determine the degrees of relationships between the various Polynesian groups. It can point out the probable types with which the Polynesians have come in contact and have inter-mixed during their migrations and in recent times. This data, when interpreted with the results of other phases of Polynesian research, may throw some light on the more general problems.[54]

---

equal value in determining the relationship of local groups. I hope that other collections of American crania may be studied for the presence or absence of the fossa pharyngea" (242).

[50]Charles Davenport to Louis Sullivan, August 3, 1922, Folder: Sullivan, Louis R., Charles B. Davenport Papers, American Philosophical Society Archives (APS).

[51]Lorin Tarr Gill, "The Bernice P. Bishop Museum, Honolulu, Hawaii, U.S.A.," *Paradise of the Pacific*, December 1923, 72. On the history of anthropological study of the origins of Native Americans, see Juliet Burba, "'Whence Came the American Indians?': American Anthropologists and the Origins Question, 1880-1935" (PhD diss., University of Minnesota, 2006).

[52]Sullivan, "The Status of Physical Anthropology in Polynesia," *Proceedings of the First Pan-Pacific Science Conference,* 63.

[53]Sullivan, "The Status of Physical Anthropology in Polynesia," 63.

[54]Sullivan, "The Status of Physical Anthropology in Polynesia," 64.

This survey of the capabilities of physical anthropologists was in large part a response to frustration over the prevalence of amateur practitioners of physical anthropology, many of whom naïvely assumed that the cephalic index, or the ratio of the width and length of the cranium, was a universally useful singular test of race.[55]

Sullivan's comments supported physical anthropologists' professionalization efforts during the 1920s. This decade was marked by a lack of conceptual and methodological consensus, yet entailed making university-trained career researchers the authorities on anthropometry as they demarcated the possibilities and limitations of physical anthropological methods.[56] To these ends, Sullivan outlined what he called biological and biometric methods for anthropometric or somatological research (study of the human body). The "biological method" focused on anatomical characteristics and required that the researcher have experience working with living human subjects to ensure accurate description and determination of racial relationships. The "biometric method," which was used by "various other biological sciences," was based on the law of averages and was focused on statistical calculation, which meant that field experience was unnecessary.[57] This also meant that the best physical anthropological research required trained, experienced researchers whose judgments provided an integral component to data collection. While the

---

[55]Sullivan, "The Status of Physical Anthropology in Polynesia," 66.

[56]On the professionalization of physical anthropology during this period, see Frank Spencer, "The Rise of Academic Physical Anthropology in the United States (1880-1980): A Historical Overview," *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* 56 (1981), 353-364. See also Tracy Lang Teslow, "Representing Race to the Public: Anthropology in Interwar American Natural History Museums" (PhD diss., University of Chicago, 2002); and Burba, "'Whence Came the American Indians?'" See also Margot Iverson, "Blood types: A History of Genetic Studies of Native Americans, 1920-1955" (PhD diss., University of Minnesota, 2007).

[57]Sullivan, "The Status of Physical Anthropology in Polynesia," 66-67.

biometric method offered important data that could be gathered by non-specialists, it was by itself incomplete. It required that specialists be on the scene.[58]

According to Wissler and Sullivan, one of the challenges that required this high level of training and expertise was the classification of Hawaiians' racial proximities or affiliations: their relationships to other races. The problem of discerning racial affiliation reflected a central issue in interwar physical anthropology, namely a "lack of consensus… over the classification of human races" that "reflected the difficulty of adequately defining them."[59] Although there was no consensus on Hawaiian or Polynesian racial affiliation, Sullivan noted that when considering researchers' opinions by discipline, their opinions were more uniform. "The biologists are almost unanimous in regarding the Polynesians as of mongoloid origin," he reported, "while the ethnologists and others have a tendency to regard them as Caucasian."[60] Alfred Tozzer of Harvard's Peabody Museum had alluded to the idea that Hawaiians' affiliations were Caucasian rather than Mongoloid and that racial proximity or "affiliation" explained the frequency of marriages between white men and Hawaiian women. Chinese-Hawaiian marriages, conversely, could be explained by demographics more than compatibility: "The frequency of this [Caucasian-Hawaiian] mixture is probably due far more to racial and social causes than in the case of the Hawaiian-Chinese mixture, where it was

---

[58]Harvard-trained anthropologist Harry Shapiro of the American Museum of Natural History took a different approach to research on Chinese-Hawaiians in the early 1930s. He had spent a lot of time in the field by that point, measuring subjects and interacting socially with Norfolk Islanders in particular. The vast majority of the data for the Rockefeller Foundation and University of Hawai'i sponsored study he oversaw, however, was collected by graduate research assistants rather than Shapiro himself. They consulted with him about the "doubtful" cases they encountered. See chapter two.

[59]Paul Farber, "Changes in Scientific Opinion on Race Mixing," in Farber and Cravens, *Race and Science,* 137.

[60]Sullivan, "The Status of Physical Anthropology in Polynesia," 65.

due to the relatively few Chinese women in the country."[61] This interpretation was supposedly corroborated by the fact that marriages between Hawaiians and Japanese – Japanese being presumably mongoloid-affiliated, like Chinese – were rare.[62]

Sullivan thought assessments of affiliation should be data-driven, which required far larger sample sizes than were typical to physical anthropological studies. Increasing what constituted a significant sample size was a recent biometrical, statistical development. In his remarks to the congress about "The Status of Physical Anthropology in Polynesia," Louis Sullivan outlined the state of human research in Polynesia and campaigned for specialists, trained physical anthropologists in particular, to conduct full-time anthropometric studies as stand-alone projects rather than additions to other scientific projects with other goals.[63] He lamented that data from research to date on Polynesia and its inhabitants was "entirely inadequate for conclusions as to the racial or inter-insular affinities of the Polynesians from a physical standpoint." However, he commented that most observers "have appreciated the meagerness of their data and have carefully refrained from drawing any such conclusions or elaborating any theories of origin or migrations. They have been content to stop with descriptions more or less detailed as their interests dictated."[64]

---

[61]Alfred Tozzer, "The Anthropology of the Hawaiian Race," *Proceedings of the First Pan-Pacific Science Conference*, 73.

[62]Scholars argued during this period that the arrival of large numbers of Japanese two decades after the first arrival of Chinese men, the marriage of Japanese men in Hawai'i to "picture brides" from Japan, and the migration of Japanese women in numbers more closely aligned with the number of male migrants from Japan all explained the lower rate of Japanese "out-marriage" than that among Chinese, with whom Japanese people were primarily compared.

[63]Sullivan, "The Status of Physical Anthropology in Polynesia," *Proceedings of the First Pan-Pacific Science Conference,* 69. Note that this was the same year that the Bishop Museum received funding from Yale alumnus Bayard Dominick to pursue a number of Polynesian research projects.

[64]Sullivan, "The Status of Physical Anthropology in Polynesia," 63.

Sullivan used both the biological and biometric approaches, which required the mix of experience with subjects (biological) and training (biometric) that he argued were necessary for successful study of Polynesian peoples. He relied on anthropometry and photography to fully document the physical characteristics of his subjects. With the help of his wife Bessie Pathers Sullivan, Sullivan kept notes of the physical measurements that he planned to analyze statistically to find averages he could use to compare racial types. In addition to his own scouting, Sullivan collaborated with the Kamehameha Schools, Punahou School, and the University of Hawai'i to secure subjects.[65] During the spring of 1921, when he worked intensively in the schools, he finished collecting data on 11,000 people, including measurements and notes on forty characteristics.[66]

Photography was essential to Sullivan's work documenting both various types of hybrids and the supposedly "vanishing race" of Hawaiians for research purposes if not for publication or display.[67] Sullivan took approximately 1200 photos to use in his comparative work, recognizing that he was also documenting racial mixing at a specific point in history. Sullivan attempted to document what various racial combinations looked like, including a phenomenon human scientists documented called "backcrossing" (a "hybrid" reproducing with a person of the same race as one of his or her ostensibly "pure" parents). Underneath all of his photos of subjects, Sullivan listed their racial combination with fractions, e.g. ½

---

[65]Louis R. Sullivan, "Annual Report of Louis R. Sullivan, Research Associate in Physical Anthropology," Folder: Correspondence, notes, MS SC Sullivan, BPBM.

[66]Wissler to Gregory, April 12, 1921, Folder: MS, SC, Sullivan, L.R.; Louis R. Sullivan (1892-1925); Correspondence, reports.; 1919-1925 and Annual Report of Louis R. Sullivan, MS SC Sullivan, correspondence notes, BPBM.

[67]The quality and style of the many subject photos differed considerably from the photos Sullivan presented at the eugenics exhibit at the American Museum of Natural History. See Louis R. Sullivan Photo Collection in the Bishop Museum Archive (BPBM) compared with Folders 1-9, Box: Sullivan, Louis R. & Wissler, Clark, *The People of Hawaii* Exhibition, Photographs and Label Copy, Division of Anthropology Archives, AMNH.

Hawaiian ½ Chinese, as a way of documenting the direction and frequency of mixing – findings that were highly anticipated by Henry Fairfield Osborn, who directed the American Museum of Natural History in New York, which hosted the Second International Congress of Eugenics in the fall of 1921.[68]

An International Stage

Even at its most preliminary, Sullivan's research in Hawai'i found a prominent outlet at the Second International Congress of Eugenics in 1921. He did not give a paper, but his exhibit, "The People of Hawaii," was displayed in the Hall of Man, where general assemblies were held.[69] Sullivan's exhibit contained a full figure of David Kahanamoku, 54 plaster busts cast from life by Gordon U. Usborne, and seven large charts about Hawai'i's population, rate of intermarriage, and vital statistics as well as photographs of the racial types and description cards that accompanied groups of photos of Hawaiian, Chinese, Chinese-Hawaiian,

---

[68]Keeping with the sense of urgency regarding the study of Hawaiians, most of Sullivan's time was spent studying the living population of Hawai'i, but he also examined skeletal material from 300 Hawaiians. He also studied fifty nearly-complete skeletons and 2,000 people living in Tonga. See Sullivan to Gregory, April 19, 1921, Folder: MS, SC, Sullivan, L.R.; Louis R. Sullivan (1892-1925); Correspondence, reports.; 1919-1925, BPBM. Sullivan likely used skeletal material gathered by Bishop Museum employees such as Kenneth Emory, who reported that he gathered skeletal remains on the islands of Molokai and Lanai. See Kenneth Emory to Louis Sullivan, August 20, 1923; Folder: Fibial – Descriptions and Measurements; Box: Sullivan, Louis Robert, Hawaiian Data Sheets, Anthropometric Studies; Division of Anthropology, AMNH. Emory said that he did not know why museum director Herbert Gregory did not include this information in official museum reports, but noted that it was "probably for a reason." The reason went unnamed. Note, however, that Emory had to have acquired skeletal material by excavating graves, which was and is considered desecration by Kānaka Maoli (Native Hawaiians).

[69]Alfred Tozzer also put together an exhibit using nine photographs by Mrs. C.H. Gurrey of Honolulu: one of a "pure" Hawaiian and eight of people with Hawaiian mothers and French, Portuguese, Chinese, Irish, Filipino, and American-Tahitian fathers. See plate 5 at back of *Eugenics in Race and State*.

Caucasian-Hawaiian, Anglo-Saxon, Mediterranean, Japanese, Korean, and Filipino people.[70] Because the calculations from his anthropometric measurements were far from finished, Sullivan's exhibit served as a partial answer to questions about the results of race mixing among the mélange of people in Hawaii.[71] Sullivan also participated in the discussion of papers by Frederick Hoffmann and L.C. Dunn, both of whom presented on race mixing in Hawai'i.

With its photographic evidence of mixing, the exhibit emphasized intermarriage and the reproduction of mixed race children as the defining feature of Hawai'i. Indeed, Sullivan used photography to showcase "hybrids'" phenotypic variability as well as what representative "pure" types looked like. The description cards of each racial group explained their status in Hawai'i, as in Chinese-Hawaiians being supposedly "universally" well liked in the Territory. The exhibit's approximately 4x6" and 8x10" portraits were accompanied by descriptions of each ethnic group that provided detail on the number, period of immigration, physical characteristics, health, and intermarriage rates.[72] The card on Chinese-Hawaiians reported that, in addition to producing people with variable physical characteristics,

---

[70]Approximately 30 busts are housed in Bishop Museum's collections department, but no remaining busts have been located at the American Museum of Natural History. Some of the people cast were Bishop Museum employees. David Kahanamoku came from a Hawaiian family known for its surfing and general athletic prowess. David's brother Duke, an Olympic swimmer, was the most famous member of the family. David's sculptural likeness was intended to represent a standard example of a Hawaiian male, although the argument can be made that his was an exceptional rather than average physique.

[71]In addition to the AMNH and the Bishop Museum, the University of Hawai'i, Kamehameha Schools, and Punahou School helped pay for the exhibit. A substantial number of Sullivan's subjects attended these schools. See "The Material," Folder 1: "The People of Hawaii" Exhibition: The Hawaiians, Box: Sullivan, Louis R. & Wissler, Clark; *The People of Hawaii* Exhibition, Photographs and Label Copy; Division of Anthropology Archives, AMNH.

[72]Folders 1-9, Box: Sullivan, Louis R. & Wissler, Clark; *The People of Hawaii* Exhibition, Photographs and Label Copy; Division of Anthropology Archives, AMNH.

"Marriages between Chinese men and Hawaiian women are very fertile. The resulting mixed-bloods are also fertile to a high degree. The health record of the Hawaiian-Chinese is a very decided improvement on the health record of the Hawaiians and approaches very closely that of the Chinese."[73] The method that Sullivan used to arrive at these conclusions is unclear. He also concluded that "part-Hawaiians" were more amenable than Hawaiians to the process of Americanization and that Hawaiians were being "absorbed" by Chinese.

In his commentary on the findings of the meeting, including papers on research in Hawai'i by Hoffman and Dunn, Sullivan had this to say:

> The Hawaiian white man marries a Hawaiian woman, the Hawaiian white woman marries a Hawaiian or Chinese. We have one race throughout; in this case of course it must be that the Hawaiian is gradually absorbed by the Chinese, white and Portuguese. The value of this hybrid stock varies with the individual. The Hawaiian-Chinese is regarded as worth while [sic]… The vital statistics show that the part-Hawaiian is an improvement on the Hawaiian stock although the birth rate is considerably less. I think it is fair to say that at the present time the part-Hawaiian is biologically a better individual than the full Hawaiian, – more capable of coping with modern conditions of life and civilization.[74]

Sullivan emphasized that there was a social or cultural hybrid vigor of sorts as evidenced by part-Hawaiians' improved abilities over "pure" Hawaiians to cope with modernization. Chinese-Hawaiians were fitter ("biologically better") because they were adaptable. Sullivan later received accolades from American biologist Charles Davenport, who thought that Sullivan's research on Polynesian somatology "advanced the subject more in one year than

---

[73]"The Chinese-Hawaiian," Folder 1: "The People of Hawaii" Exhibition, The Hawaiians, Box: Sullivan, Louis R. & Wissler, Clark; *The People of Hawaii* Exhibition, Photographs and Label Copy; Division of Anthropology Archives, AMNH.

[74]"Discussions of Papers Read at the Congress," in *Eugenics in Race and State*, 456. Sullivan commented that, "The Hawaiian-whites are looked upon as the negroes are in this country." It is unclear what this means.

all the other researches of the last twenty-five years."[75] Sullivan's emphasis on adaptability echoed concerns about the fitness of the peoples immigrating to the continental United States as well as decades of public policy discourse on the assimilability of American Indians.

Sullivan's commentary and some of the memorable findings communicated by his exhibit were supported by anecdotal evidence and his (and presumably his Honolulu contacts') perceptions. In an example of the kind of social commentary Sullivan felt he had the authority to make, one of the cards in his exhibit reported that, "The Hawaiian-Chinese are universally well liked in the Territory and play a very important part in the social, business, political, and educational affairs of the Islands."[76] The idea that Chinese-Hawaiians were a superior "hybrid" had surfaced in policy discussion during the hearings in February 1920 on H.R. 12683, which introduced a homesteading program for native Hawaiians. During the hearing, Hawai'i Governor Charles J. McCarthy commented that, "The Chinese and Hawaiian mixture makes a fine people."[77] McCarthy praised "the racially mixed Hawaiians and Chinese" more than once during these hearings, "as if to assure others that this was the next-best hybrid besides those of Hawaiian and European ancestry."[78]

While Sullivan's exhibit emphasized the frequency of mixing in Hawai'i, Frederick Hoffman specifically argued against this perception as well as against the conclusion that

---

[75]B.P. Bishop Museum, "Report of the Director for 1922," 12.

[76]"The Chinese-Hawaiian," Folder 1: "The People of Hawaii" Exhibition The Hawaiians, Box: Sullivan, Louis R. & Wissler, Clark; *The People of Hawaii* Exhibition, Photographs and Label Copy, Division of Anthropology Archives, AMNH.

[77]U.S Congress 1920C, House, Committee on Territories, *Proposed Amendments to the Organic Act of the Territory of Hawaii*, Hearings, 66th Congress, 2d session February 3-5, 7, 10: 45, as quoted in J. Kēhaulani Kauanui, *Hawaiian Blood: Colonialism and the Politics of Sovereignty and Indigeneity* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2008), 112. See also R.S. Kelly, "Mixing in Hawaii," *Paradise of the Pacific* (December, 1921), 38-40.

[78]Kauanui, *Hawaiian Blood*, 112.

social barriers were being broken down by intermarriage.[79] Hoffman presented trends in racial amalgamation through marriage, primarily using a statistical study that he conducted in 1915 using death records and which he had already presented to the Medical Society of Hawai'i. As a statistician at the Prudential Life Insurance Company in Newark, New Jersey, Hoffman's primary data for all his analysis were vital statistics archived in territorial offices in Honolulu. His employer's reliance on making predictions from vital statistics meant that Hoffman was invested in a conservative approach to interpreting data that did not analytically overreach. Staying close to the quantitative data might have been particularly important to him given that the exhibit that Sullivan put together seemed to communicate that mixing in Hawai'i was dramatically widespread and, based on some of the highly stylized portraits of subjects, socially harmonious.[80]

In marked contrast with Sullivan's exhibit, with its presentation of Hawai'i as a sort of nascent melting pot, Hoffman argued that the frequency of intermarriage was often exaggerated. "Racial intermixture in the Hawaiian Islands," he noted, "is much more restricted than is generally assumed to be the case." Hoffman and others apparently recognized that the logical extension of widespread mixing was social change, yet intermarriage had not occurred enough to fundamentally change the basic social situation in the islands. "The available data," he said, "indicate nothing very startling or that would be

---

[79]On Frederick L. Hoffman's career, see Megan J. Wolff, "The Myth of the Actuary: Life Insurance and Frederick L. Hoffman's *Race Traits and Tendencies of the American Negro*," *Public Health Reports* Vol. 121 (January-February 2006), 84-91; and Beatrix Hoffman, "Scientific Racism, Insurance, and Opposition to the Welfare State: Frederick L. Hoffman's Transatlantic Journey," *Journal of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era*, Vol. 2, No. 2 (Apr. 2003), 150-190. Frederick Hoffman has no relation to Beatrix Hoffman.

[80]Sullivan did not use photos from his research collection, which contained a mix of facial expressions from smiles to boredom to obvious distain. The exhibit photos are similar in style to today's "glamour shots."

suggestive of promiscuous racial intermixture or the breaking down of the social barriers which keep separate the different races, otherwise peculiarly suggestive of unrestricted racial amalgamation."[81]

Hoffman further emphasized that race intermixture and race amalgamation were not the same. He explained,

> The question with which the present discussion is concerned, however, is the extent to which the population of Hawaii is the result of race intermixture, which is hardly equivalent to race amalgamation. It requires to be said, however, that in Hawaii most of the race intermingling is on the basis of lawful marriage, much as this is the case with our native Indians, while a glaring contrast is presented by the offspring of illicit sex relations between white men and negro women.[82]

In Hoffman's use, which others employed as well, amalgamation was a scientific term for a stable, predictable racial blend while intermixture represented unstable, impermanent jumble. This comment also insinuated that there was social stability that accompanied true amalgamation, which was impossible in contexts in which mixing resulted largely from "illicit sex relations." In his formulation, amalgamation connoted stability.

In spite of its unremarkable rate of mixing, however, Hoffman affirmed that Hawai'i was an ideal place to observe the race mixing that *was* happening since Westermark's law of similarity of biological attraction could be more clearly observed because of a lack of social interference.[83] Regarding the relative absence of racial prejudice that meant researchers could observe "natural" affinities between people of different races, Hoffman said,

---

[81]Hoffman, "Race Amalgamation in Hawaii," 96. The idea that social barriers were not necessarily breaking down in the ways that some researchers and other mostly Anglo observers suggested was also borne out in University of Hawai'i graduate researcher Margaret Lam's interview transcripts. See chapter four.

[82]Hoffman, "Race Amalgamation in Hawaii," 92.

[83]Hoffman was likely referring to the work of Finnish anthropologist Edvard Westermarck who wrote a book titled *The History of Human Marriage* (1891).

> There is probably nowhere in the world a lesser amount of racial strife and antagonism, so that the non-intermixture or non-intermarriage is governed by the higher law of racial similarity rather than by political or economic advantage. Both of these factors, however, figure conspicuously in the preference which all foreigners show (when they intermarry at all with other races) for women of native Hawaiian origin.[84]

Thus, the phenomenon of foreign men marrying Hawaiian women was not explained by the historical reality of single men arriving in Hawai'i where the single women available were Hawaiian, but rather by natural laws of racial similarity that were observable because of a lack of restrictions on intermarriage.

The notable undercurrent to Hoffman's approach was that he explained historical choices as presumably innate "tendencies" and he suggested that Hawaiians were the most blendable of the races. Because "the racial amalgamation which does take place follows by preference the line of intermingling with native-born Hawaiian women or with people of similar racial affiliation," the assumption was that Hawaiians were racially proximate to their white and Chinese partners.[85] In a contrasting example that supported Hoffman's argument in favor of the law of similarity attracting people of closely affiliated races, L.C. Dunn, who also gave a paper at the Eugenics Congress, noted the rarity of Japanese intermarriage. Dunn pointed out that most intermarriages were between Hawaiians and whites or Chinese and Hawaiians, with the most common tri-racial crosses among these groups. To date, however, Japanese had overwhelmingly married other Japanese even though they made up more than 50 percent of the population.[86] Rather than explaining this outcome as related to the chronology of various groups' arrival in Hawai'i, Hoffman described these practices as

---

[84]Hoffman, "Race Amalgamation in Hawaii," 96.

[85]Hoffman, "Race Amalgamation in Hawaii," 96.

[86]L[eslie] C. Dunn, "Some Results of Race Mixture in Hawaii," in *Eugenics in Race and State*, 111.

"tendencies," which sounded similar to or functioned like supposed racial traits: Hawaiians had the most tendency toward amalgamation while Japanese had the least.[87] While Dunn did not compare groups' "tendencies" toward mixture, he did attempt to understand the genetic consequences of mixture, particularly what kinds of phenotypes were emerging and whether Chinese-Hawaiians specifically exhibited hybrid vigor.

L.C. Dunn

Around 1920, when Leslie Dunn was a Harvard student, professor of anthropology Earnest Hooton asked him to analyze a set of data collected by Alfred Tozzer of the Peabody museum because Dunn's genetics training would bring important contributions to the project.[88] In a study co-designed by Tozzer and Hooton in 1916, Tozzer had measured 508 people living in and around Honolulu during the summers of 1916 and 1920.[89] The study's objective was to "secure accurate anthropometric data on pure (native) Hawaiians and on the hybrids between them and other races in the Hawaiian Islands, to trace if possible the inheritance of the physical characters entering the crosses and to determine in a general way the results of hybridization among such races and under such conditions as obtain in Hawaii."[90] Dunn focused on Hawaiian-Chinese hybrids. While he noted the

---

[87]Hoffman, "Race Amalgamation in Hawaii," 92-93.

[88]Melinda Gormley, "Scientific Discrimination and the Activist Scientist: L.C. Dunn and the Professionalization of Genetics and Human Genetics in the United States," *Journal of the History of Biology* 42 (2009), 48.

[89]Tozzer collected data in summers of 1916 and 1920. He visited Hawai'i regularly following his marriage on April 10, 1913 to Margaret Penny Castle, daughter of George Castle of Castle & Cooke, one of the Big Five sugar conglomerates. See "Yesterday's Weddings; Several Spring Ceremonies Performed in New York," *New York Times*, Apr 11, 1913, 9. Note, too, that Hooton was Harry Shapiro's advisor when he did his research on Norfolk Islanders as a graduate student and a fellow at Bishop Museum circa 1923-24. Shapiro earned his doctorate in 1926. See chapter 2.

[90]Dunn, "Some Results of Race Mixture in Hawaii," 109. Note here that Dunn treated nativity or indigeneity as synonymous with racial purity.

important presence of tri-racial hybrids, he mostly argued that research on racial types and hybrids needed to be focused to include studies on development from childhood to maturity.

In a move consistent with efforts to increase the precision of research on heredity, Dunn articulated the imprecision of the category "white" as well as the diversity within the variously used category "American." This lack of precision and consistency contrasted with that of the Hawaiians and Chinese-identified subjects in the study. According to Dunn, Hawaiians were probably inbred to a degree and had a short range of variability in characteristics. Chinese in Hawai'i were almost all from the Quantung Province, meaning that their ancestry was traceable and their physical type was low in variability as well. The category "white," on the other hand,

> includes a large number of European types. In most cases it is only possible to know that a certain ascendant of a subject was white, but even in cases where the nationality can be identified no definite racial type is guaranteed. Many of the 'whites' who have participated in the crosses with Hawaiians have been Portuguese who reached Hawaii by way of the Cape Verde Islands and there is considerable evidence of Negro blood in the offspring of some of these 'whites.' Other 'whites' have come from America and certainly 'American' as a layman's description of race may mean anything at all.[91]

Here we see Dunn assessing the "white" racial type as too imprecise and thus too vague to be useful for the purposes of genetic research, which was a primary concern as he worked as a geneticist at the Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station in Storrs, Connecticut (1920-1928).[92]

---

[91]Dunn, "Some Results of Race Mixture in Hawaii," 113-114.

[92]There has been a debate during the last few decades about the motivations for scientists' changing conceptions of race in the first half of the twentieth century. Scholars such as Elazar Barkan and Carl Degler have argued that scientists' personal politics shaped their scientific conclusions while others such as Paul Farber have argued that scientists used science itself to arrive at the eventual conclusion that race was an erroneous form of human

Interestingly, Dunn's paper presented the data, but made few conclusions other than that first generation hybrids tended to be intermediate between their parents and that Chinese traits appeared to be dominant relative to Hawaiian traits.[93] This approach contrasted with Sullivan's in that Sullivan presented very little data other than demographic information, but he made a clear qualitative assessment of the outcome of coupling between Hawaiians and Chinese. At the least, Dunn concluded that there was no evidence of hybrid vigor as defined by physical size.[94] Hybrid vigor was, however, "in crosses of races not extremely divergent in size, more often expressed in greater speed of maturity, greater fecundity, resistance to disease, etc., on the part of the hybrid. Our evidence on these matters is insufficient and we can form no judgment upon them."[95] There was some initial unpredictability and instability to hybrids, but generally they looked more Chinese than Hawaiian, probably because "the genetic constitution of the Chinese includes relatively more dominant factors than that of the Hawaiians. This will tend to give the hybrid population arising from the amalgamation of Hawaiians and Chinese a Mongoloid rather than a Polynesian appearance."[96] During years that Hawaiian authenticity was tied to blood quantum, which was often confirmed or questioned depending on phenotype, this type of

---

categorization (with intermediate adjustments along the way, such as Dunn's rejection of the categories "white" and "American"). Both things were happening. These cannot be separated as if science and culture or politics were divorced from each other. See Barkan, *The Retreat of Scientific Racism*, Degler, *In Search of Human Nature*, and Farber and Cravens, *Race and Science*, especially Paul Farber, "Changes in Scientific Opinion on Race Mixing: The Impact of the Modern Synthesis," 130-151.

[93]Dunn, "Some Results of Race Mixture in Hawaii," 123. Sullivan cited this rule of the intermediacy of first generation hybrids in his 1922 paper on "Blond Eskimos." See Sullivan, "The 'Blond' Eskimo – A Question of Method," *American Anthropologist* n.s. 24, no. 2 (Apr.-Jun., 1922), 225-228.

[94]Dunn, "Some Results of Race Mixture in Hawaii," 123.

[95]Dunn, "Some Results of Race Mixture in Hawaii," 116.

[96]Dunn, "Some Results of Race Mixture in Hawaii," 124.

observation about the relative weakness of Hawaiian traits helped support the idea of Hawaiian absorbability.

While it might look more "Mongoloid" than "Polynesian," Dunn concluded that there was very likely a new race in the making. He predicted that eventually, because "the characters which enter this cross do not all blend in inheritance" and "some of them probably depend on relatively few Mendelian factors," it was likely that "the new population will have a new appearance due to the recombinations of traits from both races and will on this account be for sometime [sic] to come more variable in its physical (and probably its mental traits) than either of the conservative racial types from which it originated." Dunn wrote,

> The parental types are to become less numerous in the population, the Chinese by exclusion and the pure Hawaiians by natural decrease and out-marriages, so that crosses of hybrids inter-se [sic] will increase, with greater opportunities for the recombinations of traits. Finally the increasing frequency of hybrids between Hawaiians and the white races, bringing in still additional physical traits, will result in more and more combinations of Caucasian, Mongolian and Polynesian characteristics out of which extremely diverse types will be formed and if this combination survives physical and economic competition with the Japanese it will constitute an important element of the future population of Hawaii.[97]

Among the first generation of hybrids, Mongoloid characteristics were more apparent, but eventually, mixed race people in Hawai'i would assume diverse physical appearances that were blends of these three types if Japanese did not take over biologically and socially.[98] This

---

[97]Dunn, "Some Results of Race Mixture in Hawaii," 124. Dunn defined competition in this case as two-pronged: physical (biological, evolutionary) and social. Later in the 1920s, sociologist Andrew W. Lind applied ecological concepts of competition to sociological studies of Hawai'i's economic development and race relations. See chapter five.

[98]The idea that race mixing in Hawai'i was contributing toward the creation of a new race, later called the "neo-Hawaiian" race or in the 1960s, as popularized by James Michener's novel *Hawaii*, a kind of cosmopolitan "golden man," was canonized in the work of University of Hawai'i sociologist Romanzo Adams, as detailed in chapter three. On

prediction has persisted in various forms, but has largely been characterized as part of Hawai'i's supposedly exceptional multicultural history and culture and even its qualities as a model society rather than part of a persisting racialist tradition. The idea that a new race can be made relies on the integrity of the race concept.

Sharpening Conclusions (1923-1932)

After Sullivan completed his trip to Hawai'i and the exhibit for the eugenics conference, he returned to the American Museum of Natural History and began doing calculations on the mountain of anthropometric data that he and his wife gathered during the photo survey. The museum's clerical staff remained at work on his Hawaiian data while he was ill for four months and away in Tucson working more slowly on his calculations.[99] Sullivan published preliminary impressions in *Asia* in 1923. He implied that the process of mixing defined what was happening in Hawai'i by arguing that the research question "Who are the Polynesians?" was no longer useful since pure Polynesians, if they existed, were mostly a thing of the past. Instead, the pertinent question was "Who are the people who inhabit Polynesia?"[100] In this way, even though he could not reach specific conclusions about hereditary mechanisms, Sullivan and others persisted in the argument that Hawai'i was the location of dramatic amounts of mixing in spite of Frederick Hoffman's assessment that

---

Michener's "golden man," see James Michener, *Hawaii* (New York: Random House, 1959), chapter six; and Christina Klein, *Cold War Orientalism: Asia in the Middlebrow Imagination, 1945-1961* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003), 252-262, especially 258. Klein writes, "Although Michener invented this term [Golden Man] for the novel, the narrator ascribes it to a group of sociologists who in 1946 perfected a concept whose outline had preoccupied them for years" (258). These sociologists were undoubtedly the mostly University of Chicago-trained sociologists who staffed the University of Hawai'i's sociology department from the 1930s onward.

[99]See notes from the Anthropological Division Archives at the AMNH. Many of the numbers and notes from fieldwork were in Sullivan's wife Bessie Pathers Sullivan's handwriting. She also helped him when they were in Tucson.

[100]Sullivan, "New Light on the Races of Polynesia," *Asia* (Jan. 1923), 18.

neither the amount of mixing nor its social affect was extraordinary. Sullivan's results appeared in *American Anthropologist* in 1924. While anthropologists had previously classified Polynesians as Mongols, Caucasians, or a separate race altogether, there was no consensus. Sullivan concluded that instead of a uniform racial type, they were "a badly mixed people," a hybrid strain similar in concept to an American type made from Anglo-Saxon, Slavic, Mediterranean types, and so on, as in the United States.[101]

Following his return to the continental United States, Sullivan also worked for the National Research Council on "a problem allied to the Polynesian problem," presumably his studies of American Indians.[102] He turned his attention to mixing between groups of American Indians, working in California first before traveling to Nevada and Oregon to continue work in Indian schools. In March of 1924, while he measured students at the Chernawa Indian school in Oregon, he told an assistant at the American Museum of Natural History, Bella Weitzner, that he examined 120 students that day, all of whom had "complicated pedigrees." This complication slowed his work, and he wrote, "I don't know what I am up against here but I do see a bigger and slower job… There are apparently 40 tribes in Washington and Oregon who have mixed up pretty badly with each other. They all look pretty much alike to me tho [sic]."[103] Here, Sullivan admits his lack of ability to discern, visually, the differences between groups. He also noted the ways in which specific Native people had adopted "white" practices. From the Sherman Institute in Riverside, California,

---

[101]Sullivan, "Race Types in Polynesia," *American Anthropologist* n.s. 26, no. 1 (Jan. – Mar., 1924), 22. It is unclear when the idea of "strains" as intermediate or hybrid races entered this discourse. This requires further research and contextualizing within the history of the development of racial taxonomies.

[102]Sullivan to Miss Jones, January 17, 1925, Folder: MS, SC, Sullivan, L.R.; Louis R. Sullivan (1892-1925); Correspondence, reports.; 1919-1925, BPBM.

[103]Sullivan to Weitzner, March 10, 1924, File 768, Division of Anthropology Correspondence, Division of Anthropology, AMNH.

Sullivan reported that he had encountered an "Indian flapper" for the first time, a woman who was decidedly different in appearance and behavior from other Indian women he had observed. "Heretofore the girls have looked pretty much like all Indian squaws – short heavy and dumpy," he wrote. Then he added, "But here they are up and coming – they trim their eyebrows, use lining pencils, lipsticks, rouge, flour or white wash, and put their hair up in curlers every night so the matrons say. It surely amused me but I suppose thats [sic] a part of white civilization now. This is one of the very finest schools I have ever been in. They are most cordial to me and my work."[104]

In 1925, at the age of 33, Sullivan died of tuberculosis in Tucson.[105] Fellow Galton Society members Charles Davenport and William K. Gregory, who was also a colleague at the American Museum of Natural History, eulogized him in the journal *Science*.[106] They praised his work on the "racial history of the Polynesians" and his progress toward "important conclusions concerning the classification and evolutionary history of the races of mankind."[107] Sullivan's wife, Bessie Pathers Sullivan, who had worked side by side with him doing the calculations on the 11,000 subject files produced in Hawaii, sent his materials to Clark Wissler, who later published more of Sullivan's data.[108] After Sullivan's death, L.C. Dunn continued his assessment of Hawaiian types.

---

[104]Sullivan to Weitzner, February 29, 1924, File 768, Division of Anthropology Correspondence, Division of Anthropology, AMNH. Underlining in original.

[105]Earnest A. Hooton, "Louis Robert Sullivan," *American Anthropologist* 27, no. 2 (Apr. 1925), 357-358.

[106]Charles B. Davenport and William K. Gregory, "Minute on the Death of Louis R. Sullivan," *Science*, n.s, 62, No. 1617 (Dec. 25, 1925), 583.

[107]Davenport and Gregory, "Minute on the Death of Louis R. Sullivan," 583.

[108]Louis R. Sullivan, "Observations on Hawaiian Somatology," prepared for publication by Clark Wissler, *Memoirs of the Bernice P. Bishop Museum*, Vol. IX, No. 4, Bayard Dominick Expedition Publication Number 13, (Honolulu: Published by the Museum, 1927). See also Clark Wissler, "Growth of Children in Hawaii, Based on Observations by Louis R. Sullivan,

A few years after he spoke at the Second International Eugenics Congress, Dunn built upon his initial impressions of what Alfred Tozzer's data demonstrated. In a paper he gave at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association in 1924, Dunn said that, "In Hawaii the physical measurements of hybrids, while they do not indicate a pronounced hybrid vigor, show that the hybrids are not inferior. And in the opinion of more than one observer some of the hybrid groups, e.g., the Hawaiian-Chinese, represent a physical improvement of the parent types."[109] Earlier in the paper, he said that "the first important observation to make concerning the biological data of race mixture is that they are both few and fragmentary."[110] This was consistent with his position in 1921. The limitation on research was a lack of data, not conceptual challenges or weaknesses inherent to "race." He continued, "The rise of physical anthropology with its insistence on exact measurements statistically analyzed," – Sullivan's method – "and the new knowledge of inheritance with its present emphasis on specific traits rather than on the body as a whole have quite altered the nature of the evidence required."[111] Dunn thus predicted that as the study of race mixture became more complex due to the number of traits studied and interpreted, "the large

---

Memoirs of the Bernice P. Bishop Museum XI, No. 2 (1930). Bessie Sullivan's handwriting is the only handwriting in one of Sullivan's field notebooks and he noted in at least one letter to the AMNH how important she was for completing the calculations. Given that Sullivan's work was funded in part by the Bayard Dominick Expedition budget at the Bishop Museum, the American Museum of Natural History might have also had an obligation to ensure publication of Sullivan's data. According to Freed and Freed, one of Wissler's goals was to produce as many publications as possible, which helps explain his involvement even if the AMNH was not under contract to deliver Sullivan's results.

[109]L.C. Dunn, "A Biological View of Race Mixture" in *The Trend of Our Civilization: Papers and Proceedings of the Nineteenth Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Society Held at Chicago, December 29-31, 1924, Volume XIX* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1925), 54.

[110]Dunn, "A Biological View of Race Mixture," 50.

[111]Dunn, "A Biological View of Race Mixture," 50.

problem of race mixture will become progressively broken up into single problems which will deal with each case of race mixture as a special case."[112]

In the mid-1920s, Dunn increasingly took issue with approaches that mirrored some of Sullivan's research, specifically his work on mental traits.[113] Sullivan had developed his opinion about part-Hawaiians' superiority to Hawaiians as he conducted a parallel study with Katharine Murdoch on mental traits, in which a large number of school children were studied.[114] Dunn complained that conclusions like Sullivan's, which were drawn from anthropometric and less-than-rigorous studies of mental capacity, were representative of the overreaching typical of eugenics research. However, by 1932 he concluded that Chinese-Hawaiian hybrids were a superior mix, which he used as an example of hybrid vigor in his textbook *Heredity and Variation*.[115]

In the late 1920s, even though the results of race mixing suggested that the outcome was intermediate between parents yet rather unpredictable and that there was insufficient evidence to assess the presence of hybrid vigor, researchers familiar with Hawai'i's population agreed with Sullivan's conclusion that Chinese-Hawaiians were superior hybrids. Charles Davenport, whose controversial study *Race Crossing in Jamaica* (1929) argued that crossing produced inferior offspring, had argued in 1927 at the International Congress of Anthropologists in Amsterdam that the exceptions to the rule about race crossing were

---

[112]Dunn, "A Biological View of Race Mixture," 56.

[113]Sullivan developed his opinion about part-Hawaiians' superiority to Hawaiians as he conducted a parallel study on mental traits, in which a large number of school children were studied. See Katharine Murdock and Louis R. Sullivan, "A Contribution to the Study of Mental and Physical Measurements in Normal Children" *American Physical Education Review* 28 (1923), 209-215, 278-88, 328.

[114]Murdock and Sullivan, "A Contribution," 328-330.

[115]L.C. Dunn, *Heredity and Variation: Continuity and Change in the Living World* (New York: The University Society, Inc., 1932).

Chinese-Hawaiian hybrids and Dutch-Javanese hybrids.[116] Davenport's opinion was that, "The mixed progeny of the Chinese and the Hawaiians in the Hawaiian Islands stand first among all hybrids in industry and self support… They have the intelligence of the Chinese with the well-stabilized, docile and patient temperament of the Polynesian."[117] Like Sullivan's perception that Chinese-Hawaiians were "biologically better" and more adaptable than their Chinese or Hawaiian parents, Davenport's position was based on his subjective assessment of personality traits.

Sullivan's death in 1925 before he finished calculations and published substantive analysis motivated the Peabody Museum to make Tozzer's and Dunn's data available, even though Sullivan's study had been much larger in scale. Earnest Hooton ensured publication after Dunn took over the data and analysis.[118] Hooton was administratively involved in this research on race mixing and its dissemination, a role he played again when his doctoral advisee Harry Shapiro developed a dissertation topic on race mixing among the "Mutineers of the Bounty."

In the late 1920s, the major development in Dunn's work on race mixing among people living in Hawai'i was an intensified focus on how race worked, exactly. This was located in a paper published by Harvard's Peabody Museum in 1928, which was an expanded

---

[116]"Science News," *Science*, n.s., 66, no. 1708 (Sept. 23, 1927), x; William B. Provine, "Geneticists and the Biology of Race Crossing," *Science*, n.s., 182, no. 4114 (Nov. 23, 1973), 793.

[117]"Science News," *Science*, n.s., 66, no. 1708, (Sept. 23, 1927), x.

[118]Tozzer's father-in-law, George P. Castle of Castle & Cooke in Honolulu, helped pay for publication. See "Note" by Charles Willoughby in L.C. Dunn, "An Anthropometric Study of Hawaiians of Pure and Mixed Blood," ("Based Upon Data Collected by Alfred M. Tozzer") *Papers of the Peabody Museum of American Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard University*, Vol. 11, No. 3, (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Peabody Museum, 1928), 87. Castle was one of the vice presidents of Castle & Cooke in the mid-1920s. See Moon-Kie Jung, *Reworking Race: The Making of Hawaii's Interracial Labor Movement* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2006), 20.

version of his 1921 Eugenics Congress paper. Dunn reiterated in several places that the sample sizes were too small to make the study's results statistically significant or adequate as the basis for generalization.[119] He also restated his observation that Hawaiian and Chinese subjects' racial purity relative to "white" people made their mixed offspring more "interesting" and of more "scientific value" than the more numerous and "important" Hawaiian-white hybrids.[120] Finally, he said again that the category "white" was inclusive of various European groups, which made it difficult to generalize about phenotype, making the transference and intermediate manifestation of racial traits much more difficult to observe. Meanwhile, Chinese and Hawaiians presented specific phenotypic characteristics that were easier to see, both as blended traits and as a "mosaic" of Chinese and Hawaiian traits in a single person, simplifying the study of hereditary morphology.[121]

Dunn expanded on his earlier prediction that a uniform type was potentially in development, but that its appearance was unpredictable. This view was predicated upon the assumption that mixing would continue and increase.[122] Dunn questioned what was *racial*, exactly, about traits, as he continued to use *type* as a kind of categorization and participated in this active discussion focused on refining the race concept. He wrote,

> So far as the measurements go, there appear to be no absolute criteria of race or of stage of mixture. The results of crosses between 'races' show that 'race' as it applies to a congeries of physical characters, must be used only in a relative or comparative sense, since 'races' as such do not segregate from crosses, but break up into their separate component features. Thus from the

---

[119]Dunn, "An Anthropometric Study of Hawaiians of Pure and Mixed Blood," 92.

[120]Dunn, "An Anthropometric Study of Hawaiians of Pure and Mixed Blood," 130. It is not exactly clear what Dunn meant by "important." It is possible that he was referring to the wealth and political power held by people with white – Northern and Western European – and Hawaiian ancestry.

[121]Dunn, "An Anthropometric Study of Hawaiians of Pure and Mixed Blood," 147-48.

[122]This also supported the idea Hawai'i was an ongoing human experiment that would continue providing evidence of how race worked.

> crossing of races in Hawaii there emerges a heterogeneous population which does not contain distinctly Hawaiian, or Chinese, or White individuals, although many may reproduce the Hawaiian, or Chinese or white condition of one or a number of traits. Such a group departs from its parent types not so much in 'racial' traits, but rather by exhibiting in its physical features the potentialities for the development of a future more uniform type which may be more or less Hawaiian, or Chinese, or white, depending on combinations of circumstances which cannot at present be foretold.[123]

Even as he used race relatively or comparatively in an attempt to understand how traits were inherited, Dunn was interested in how race worked – how boundaries were drawn when people with mixed ancestry had such variant phenotypes and in some cases displayed blended traits and in others displayed what were identified as Hawaiian or Chinese or white features. The analysis Dunn did in the 1920s on mixing among Chinese, Hawaiian, and white people living in Hawai'i is evidence of an intellectual struggle to understand race and mechanisms of heredity related to it, not evidence that he discarded race as having integrity or usefulness as a biological category as might be assumed from his anti-discrimination activism or the historical narrative of the "retreat of scientific racism" supposedly occurring during these years.[124] He did assess racial affiliation among Hawaiians, Chinese, and Europeans, finding that Hawaiians were "intermediate between Europeans and Mongoloids," but he did not at that time make qualitative judgments about either Hawaiian-Chinese or Hawaiian-European "crosses."[125]

---

[123]Dunn, "An Anthropometric Study of Hawaiians of Pure and Mixed Blood," 175-76. Dunn's capitalization and non-capitalization of white are consistent with the original text.

[124]On Dunn's anti-discrimination beliefs and activism, see Gormley, "Scientific Discrimination and the Activist Scientist." See also Barkan, *The Retreat of Scientific Racism*, and Farber and Cravens, *Race and Science*.

[125]Dunn, "An Anthropometric Study of Hawaiians of Pure and Mixed Blood," 175.

By 1932, however, Dunn concluded that Chinese-Hawaiian hybrids were a superior cross.[126] Indeed, he used Chinese-Hawaiians as *the* example of how human migration was fueling human mixing and variation.

> With increasing ease of travel and constant migration of races the human population is gradually becoming more mixed and more variable, and where many races meet and mingle (as in Hawaii) one can find human types never before seen under the sun – the wooly hair of the Negro with the slanting eyes and folded lids of the Oriental, the blue eyes of the European, combined with the beautiful skin color and physique of the Polynesian. Thus cross-breeding maintains and even increases average variability by making new combinations possible, but it does not provide *new* or *original* variations.[127]

This commentary was positioned next to a photograph of a "full blooded Hawaiian" taken by Alfred Tozzer. On the next page, however, there was another picture taken by Tozzer of a "new racial type by recombination," according to the caption: a photograph of a boy with Hawaiian, Chinese, and Irish ancestry and another with a German father and a Hawaiian mother.[128] This contradicted Dunn's comment that mixing produced new combinations but not new or original variations and thus presented a confusing position on whether mixing could produce new "types" or not.

Regarding hybrid vigor, Dunn had this to say:

> "The progeny of such crosses are not only bigger and better than their parents; they may be even better than the parent strains were before inbreeding began. This great vigor is a frequent result of crossing pure types: witness the sturdy mule which is superior in many ways to its parents, the horse and the ass. The mule is sterile and this is fortunate, for the vigor of hybrids is dissipated when they are inbred. The offspring of human crosses often show these same excellencies. The children of Chinese fathers and Hawaiian mothers, for example, constitute one of the best types physically and mentally in Hawaii."[129]

---

[126]Gormley, "Scientific Discrimination and the Activist Scientist," 49. See Dunn, *Heredity and Variation*, 99-102.

[127]Dunn, *Heredity and Variation*, 84.

[128]Dunn, *Heredity and Variation*, 85.

[129]Dunn, *Heredity and Variation*, 99.

It is not clear what motivated Dunn to make this judgment or to see it as socially useful to make after a decade of refusing to do so. Still, this assessment aligned with Sullivan's and Davenport's opinions about people of Chinese and Hawaiian ancestry, and it appeared in a textbook on human heredity, whose audience was meant to accept the assessment as well-founded and to see the example of Chinese-Hawaiians as emblematic of a principle of genetics.

Conclusion

A lot happened in the 1920s as American scientists working in Hawai'i worked to make their studies bigger and better and they found, in L.C. Dunn's words, that Chinese-Hawaiians were "bigger and better" than their parents. Conclusions about this particular hybrid being superior were described in behavioral terms or, in the case of Dunn, presented without clear justification. This should not be surprising given that for most researchers during this period, physical and behavioral traits were racial traits, and there was no solid line categorically separating biological from cultural phenomena.[130] If these researchers concluded that the Chinese-Hawaiian "cross" was a superior "hybrid" because Chinese and Hawaiians were closely racially affiliated according to the racial taxonomy of the time, they never argued this point as such from their data. Sullivan had increased the sample size and number of measurements of his study to 11,000 subjects with the intention of improving the precision of biometry and the empiricism of race study. Dunn called the usefulness of the racial category "white" into question and insisted on at least two occasions that the sample size of the study he analyzed was too small to support strong conclusions about the effects

[130]See John P. Jackson, Jr. and Andrew S. Winston, "The Last Repatriationist: The Career of Ernest Sevier Cox," in Farber and Cravens, *Race and Science*, 61-62.

of race mixing. Still, these two researchers ultimately drew conclusions about this question that rested almost entirely on subjective assessments related to subjects' phenotypes, social position, and perceived progress or the promise of progress toward assimilation.

People with significantly differing politics and judgments of eugenics agreed upon the superiority of Chinese-Hawaiians over their "pure" Chinese and Hawaiian ancestors. Hard hereditarian eugenicist Charles Davenport was persuaded that Chinese-Hawaiians were a desirable mix because of their supposed combination of strong work ethic, self-support, intelligence, stability, and docility – all ideal qualities exhibited by a specific group of residents in a territory perhaps poised for eventual statehood.[131] Within a few years of Davenport's assessment, L.C. Dunn, who beginning in the 1920s also had tendencies toward racial liberalism and anti-discrimination scientific activism, as Melinda Gormley has detailed, called Chinese-Hawaiians "better" than their parents.[132] The reasoning that led to this conclusion was decidedly more vague than Davenport's, as Dunn did not list Chinese-Hawaiians' supposedly improved traits or combination of traits, but his position was clear.

These qualitative judgments are evidence of the racialism that persisted into the 1930s, even if overt scientific discrimination appeared to be on the wane. A number of histories of racial science have argued that the "retreat of scientific racism" was accelerated by anthropologist Franz Boas and other "culturalists," as Peggy Pascoe has called them. Culturalists did not prevail in the scientific debate about race in the 1920s and 1930s, however, nor did hereditarians successfully maintain the racialism of the nineteenth

---

[131]"Science News," *Science* n.s. 66, no. 1708 (Sept. 23, 1927), x.
[132]Gormley, "Scientific Discrimination and the Activist Scientist," 49.

century.[133] During these decades, scientists like Sullivan and Dunn, relative moderates compared with Boas and his nemesis Madison Grant, continued to hone their methods and theories about racial categorization and traits. They were neither committed "typologists" nor skeptics who began to chip away at the race concept. Although Sullivan and Dunn were members of the Galton Society during the early 1920s, this was far from a defining characteristic of their science and does not appear to have significantly influenced their approaches.

Rivalry between hereditarians (biological determinists) and culturalists (who promoted the primacy of culture over race in the study of humankind) began to heat up in the mid-1910s, but the extent of this divide has been exaggerated in the historiography. This dichotomy misrepresents the focus and mode of a number of researchers who worked on zoological and morphological questions that they did not attach to explicitly nativist or eugenic agendas. This false dichotomy has also played a supporting role contextualizing the ostensible "retreat of scientific racism," in which racial essentialists were discredited by enlightened culturalists.[134] In 1918, Madison Grant had organized the Galton Society, a kind of gentlemen's society for both laymen and professional scientists interested in the zoological study of humans, to counter the increasing influence of Franz Boas and his

---

[133]In fact, the idea that "culture" won at some point, even after World War II, has not been particularly well supported by historical evidence beyond a few public statements that scientists made, such as the UNESCO statements in 1950, 1951, 1967, and 1978, whose influence on public discourse remains rather indeterminate.

[134]Peggy Pascoe has questioned the racialist-culturalist dichotomy, as mentioned in the introduction to this chapter. See Pasco, "Miscegenation Law and Ideologies of Race." Diane Paul has examined the persistent and related "nature-nurture debate" about human difference and development. See Paul, "A Debate that Refuses to Die," in Diane B. Paul, *The Politics of Heredity: Essays on Eugenics, Biomedicine, and the Nature-Nurture Debate* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1998), 81-93.

students over the American Anthropological Society.[135] Jonathan Spiro has pointed out that because of its leadership by Madison Grant, the Galton Society has been dismissed by a number of scholars as "an ineffectual cabal of right-wing screwballs." This characterization has obscured the diversity of anthropological and political positions among its members. Not all of the participants were "hard-core Nordicists," and a number of them, including Clark Wissler and Louis Sullivan appear to have joined because the American Museum of Natural History, where they worked, and Henry Fairfield Osborn, their boss, sponsored the Society.[136] Many of the men on the Society roster in its initial years were the "elite of the eugenic establishment" and, with few exceptions according to Spiro, were respected scientists.[137]

Galton Society members demonstrated more diversity of opinion and did more genuinely scholarly work than has sometimes been stated, and Sullivan and Dunn are important examples. Moreover, the dogmatic positions that Grant and Boas assumed regarding the roles of nature (heredity, biology) versus nurture (environment, culture) in human difference and development were somewhat confined to the intellectual scene on the eastern seaboard of the United States, as others have pointed out, and were generational as well.[138] Researchers working in Hawai'i, particularly Sullivan and Dunn, although they, too, were most interested in somatological (the human equivalent of zoological) and hereditary racial studies, worked outside an increasingly adversarial and in some cases intellectually

---

[135]Jonathan P. Spiro, "Nordic vs. anti-Nordic: the Galton Society and the American Anthropological Association," *Patterns of Prejudice*, vol. 36, No. 1 (2002), 37.

[136]*Ibid.*, 42.

[137]*Ibid.*

[138]*Ibid.*, 46. The early 1920s were "a time when their [namely Lothrop Stoddard, Henry Fairfield Osborn, and Charles Davenport] younger and more liberal colleagues in the research laboratories or the South Pacific were increasingly challenging the pillars of hereditarian faith."

stifling debate.[139] They attempted to use what they viewed as improved tools and methods to study racial affiliation, heredity, and the outcomes of mixing in the supposedly ideal location, under ideal social circumstances to do so. In this way, they honed their studies of race. They did not retreat from race as the object of scientific inquiry or social significance.

The years of supposed agnosticism about the biological outcomes of race mixing coincided with a decade in which the social and cultural effects of mixing could only be speculated upon. This void left room for scientists who were undecided about the social effects of race mixing to imagine its possibilities as well as its pitfalls. Research in the colony of Hawai'i played a key role in the development of agnosticism toward and even advocacy for race mixing in that it mostly focused on mixing between nonwhite peoples. Instead of focusing on fitness, a concern of biological scientists on the continent such as Harry Laughlin, which was often associated with competence for citizenship, studies in Hawai'i focused on racial proximity and assimilability or blendability. Scientists' conclusions that Chinese-Hawaiian hybrids were a superior type appeared as particularly modern as well as politically useful because they provided expert support for the idea that biological amalgamation produced assimilative results – more docile, self-sufficient, racially proximate (to Caucasians), and more American-acculturated territorial subjects – an outcome that appealed to American scientists across the political spectrum.

The conclusions about mixing in Hawai'i in the 1920s were not radical departures from conclusions about mixing elsewhere, namely that hybrids were intermediate between their parents, but they did introduce scientific authority to the popular notion that Hawaiian "blood" was becoming diluted through interracial reproduction and that Hawaiians were

[139]Sullivan's and others' use of the term somatology differentiated their physical anthropological work from that of cultural anthropologists.

more blendable or assimilable than Chinese. Sullivan and Dunn concluded that supposedly pure-blooded Hawaiians were probably mixed; indeed, the Polynesian race was itself a mixture. Regardless of Dunn's deliberations over whether there was evidence of hybrid vigor among Hawaiians of mixed ancestry, he said that mixing – with the exception of "backcrossing" between Hawaiian hybrids and "pure" Hawaiians – was diluting Hawaiian blood. This argument about dilution contrasted with arguments about miscegenation producing disharmony, as Davenport presented in *Race Crossing in Jamaica*, or taint, as characterized by the American "one drop" rule that made people with any African ancestry legally black in many states.[140] It was not the case that "pure" races like Caucasians or Mongoloids were becoming dilute in Hawai'i, but rather that Hawaiians, who were already mixed, continued (perhaps at an accelerated speed) mixing with others – a supposedly natural process. Departing from late nineteenth century arguments that less fit races such as American Indians would become extinct *because* of lack of fitness or ability to adapt to modernity, a number of researchers came to argue that "pure" Hawaiians were mixing themselves into extinction and, along with other groups who intermarried, helping to produce a racial type unique to Hawai'i. This argument did not depend upon overt Social Darwinist thinking about survival of the fittest, a la Spencer, but instead suggested a

---

[140]See F. James Davis, *Who is Black?: One Nation's Definition* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1991); Martha Hodes, "Fractions and Fictions in the United States Census of 1890," in Ann Laura Stoler, ed., *Haunted by Empire: Geographies of Intimacy in North American History* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2006), 240-270; and Peggy Pascoe, *What Comes Naturally: Miscegenation Law and the Making of Race in America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009). See also Kauanui, *Hawaiian Blood*, for reference to differently racialized constructions of dilution and taint as created by interracial reproduction as well as the parallel triangulations of white-black-Indian on the continent and white-Asian-Hawaiian in Hawai'i. The line of scientific argument about Hawaiians disappearing by assimilation echoed policy development in Hawai'i.

narrative of benign blending rather than draconian competition.[141] This theme continued in the work of University of Hawai'i sociologists Romanzo Adams and Andrew Lind, the subjects of chapters three and five.

The argument that Hawai'i was an ongoing experiment in racial intermixture, with the prediction of eventual amalgamation gaining momentum in sociology as well as physical anthropology and genetics, became fixed as a frame for Hawai'i's scientific and social importance. Hawai'i was seen as containing a "great natural experiment in racial hybridization," as Dunn put it in 1928. This laboratory frame came to define Hawai'i as a U.S. territory and research site. However, in the process of researching race mixing in Hawai'i and focusing on it as a defining feature of social relations in the Territory, the frequency of mixing became exaggerated, something that Frederick Hoffman noted in 1921. This exaggeration solidified the idea that Hawai'i's defining feature was interracial mixing, a frame that served as foundational for additional research projects on mixing and migration as well as the argument by University of Hawai'i sociologist Romanzo Adams that the islands' history of interracial marriage represented a process of biological amalgamation and cultural assimilation that would culminate in the emergence of an emergent "neo-Hawaiian" racial type. The next chapter details how Hawai'i's importance as a long-term racial laboratory was established in the 1930s, as the studies discussed in this chapter became touchstones for subsequent investigation and extension by physical anthropologist Harry Shapiro and researchers at the University of Hawai'i began to study race biology under the auspices of a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation.

---

[141]Spencer "was an evolutionist, but he was distinct in that he tried to develop a synthetic philosophy-cum-theory that would connect both biological and cultural evolution." Audrey Smedley, *Race in North America: Origin and Evolution of a Worldview*, (Boulder: Westview Press, 2007), 265.

Chapter Two

A Racial Laboratory for the World: Establishing Studies of Race Mixing, Migration, and Environment in Hawai'i in the 1930s

When, in his 1928 paper for Harvard's Peabody Museum, geneticist L.C. Dunn called Hawai'i a "great natural experiment in racial hybridization," he could not have known how his characterization would be scientifically and institutionally realized in the 1930s. Starting in 1926, faculty at the University of Hawai'i and scientists employed by continental institutions such as the American Museum of Natural History and Harvard University, with the help of a Rockefeller Foundation grant, began a series of coordinated studies of racial traits. In spite of the limited conclusions of these studies, however, the promises of physical anthropological research in particular for answering questions about racial plasticity, the effect of environment on morphology, and changes to racial groups over generations affirmed Hawai'i's status as a human laboratory. In the 1930s, the idea that an unparalleled racial experiment was in motion in Hawai'i became fixed as a frame for its importance as a long-term scientific and social research site.

Hawai'i was not the only island colony that was identified or envisioned as a laboratory in the early twentieth century. Other U.S. territories had been treated as laboratories since their occupation in 1898 as shown by Laura Briggs about Puerto Rico and Warwick Anderson about the Philippines, a "laboratory of hygienic modernity."[1] American officials and academic researchers generally treated Puerto Rico and the Philippines as locations to test whether particular American policies and public health interventions

[1]Laura Briggs, *Reproducing Empire: Race, Sex, Science, and U.S. Imperialism in Puerto Rico* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002) and Warwick Anderson, *Colonial Pathologies: American Tropical Medicine, Race, and Hygiene in the Philippines* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2006).

changed colonial subjects' sexual, family formation, and personal hygiene practices. Elsewhere in the Pacific, Australian researchers studied racial traits and environmental adaptation.[2] Meanwhile, British colonial officials and scientists increasingly treated Great Britain's formal political empire in Africa, territories overseen by the Colonial Office such as Kenya, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia (Northern Rhodesia), Nigeria, and Ghana (Gold Coast), as a "living laboratory."[3]

While colonial regions were always the sites of some kind of research, specific use of the word laboratory to describe a possession, as Helen Tilley argues about African sites, "suggested a space of knowledge production touted for its rigorous and robust truth claims. It also suggested a site in which manipulation might be manageable."[4] This was the spirit in which human research unfolded in Hawai'i. Academic researchers in Hawai'i sought to examine, over the course of several generations, the effects of social contact and sexual reproduction, specifically interracial marriage and the children produced by interracial marriage. While the instigators of racial research in Hawai'i tended to support statehood, there was no overtly stated political ideology behind the studies other than that research was inherently valuable.

In the mid-1920s, faculty and administrators at the University of Hawai'i spearheaded a research project that treated Hawai'i's history as racial history and promoted the archipelago as the site of a natural experiment. In consultation with the Rockefeller Foundation's Edwin R. Embree, director of the Division of Studies, sought to expand

---

[2]Warwick Anderson, *The Cultivation of Whiteness: Science, Health, and Racial Destiny in Australia* (Durham: Duke University Press), 2006.

[3]Helen Tilley, *Africa as a Living Laboratory: Empire, Development, and the Problem of Scientific Knowledge, 1870-1950* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011).

[4]*Ibid.*, 12.

research on Hawai'i's population into a permanent human biology program supporting psychological, physical anthropological, and sociological inquiry. Romanzo Adams, professor of economics and sociology, Stanley Porteus, professor of psychology and the director of the University's psychological clinic, and Arthur Dean and David Crawford, presidents of the University of Hawai'i, claimed that Hawai'i was *the* place where researchers could discover biological and sociological truths about race. Indeed, Porteus claimed that Hawai'i was the single best place to answer "a question of universal interest – what is race."[5] He and his colleagues positioned Hawai'i as *the* racial laboratory, not just for the United States but for the world, and claimed that it would take decades of concentrated research to fully reveal the biological and social mechanics at work where the Orient and the Occident came together. This claim was convincing enough to elicit nearly $250,000 in funding over eleven years, 1926-1937 – a substantial sum given the financial effects of the Great Depression and the fact that researchers were slow to develop publishable results.[6] While conclusions emerged slowly, suggestions of coming scientific riches if researchers stayed the course convinced the Foundation to provide continued funding. Noteworthy but not altogether conclusive results by anthropologist Harry Shapiro in particular promoted the need for decades long monitoring of additional generations of migrants and settlers. This project, then, was predicated on the idea that ongoing research was necessary rather than a facet of the American colonial project.

---

[5]S.D. Porteus, "Human Studies in Hawaii," page 1, folder 6, box 1, series 214S, RG 1.1, Rockefeller Foundation Archives, RAC.

[6]University of Hawaii – Race Research," 1938, pages 4-5, folder 9, box 1, series 214S, RG 1.1, Rockefeller Foundation Archives, RAC. In 1932, the University of Hawai'i reported that it spent $15,000 per year on the research program.

Funding for racial studies increased markedly in the 1920s, when scientists' and governmental officials' concerns about the consequences of race mixing and anxiety about majority nonwhite territorial populations intensified. Charles Davenport's and Morris Steggerda's study *Race Crossing in Jamaica*, funded by the Carnegie Institution of Washington and published in 1929, is a frequently cited example. It is representative of only part of the American research on race crossing in the 1920s, however. Because of the extensive work on eugenics within the history of biology, which has overshadowed the history of anthropology within history of science, *Race Crossing in Jamaica* has received attention disproportionate to its role in scientific discourse about race crossing. Historians of biology have used Davenport's study to demonstrate how one of the most prominent American eugenicists engaged in research on race mixing, as well as to show how his interpretations and methods were losing favor among biologists and biometricians. Davenport and Steggerda concluded that crossing between black and white Jamaicans caused slight physical disharmony and significant disharmonies in mental traits like intelligence. They argued that their quantitative study demonstrated race crossing's qualitative results: degeneracy.[7] Their conclusion has eclipsed conclusions by Louis R. Sullivan (chapter 1) and Harry Shapiro, anthropologists who have received less attention from historians of science, that mixing

[7]Two exceptions seem to have been Chinese-Hawaiian crosses and Dutch-Javanese crosses. See chapter one for the former. Other scientists suggested that Chinese-Hawaiian crosses were sometimes desirable because they ostensibly exhibited the intelligence of the Chinese (but not their cunningness) and the docility of Hawaiians (but not their laziness) – the ideal smart, hardworking, good-natured hybrid. The study received mixed reviews and was "thoroughly discredited in a review by [biometrician] Karl Pearson." Pearson critiqued Davenport and Steggerda's questionable methodology and the small sample size, as well as their method of selecting subjects. He also "made clear the magnitude of the difficulty of conducting experiments necessary to reveal disharmonies in race crossings" and invoked other studies published by geneticists and anthropologists in the late 1920s that failed to reveal significant disharmonies. See Provine, "Geneticists and the Biology of Race Crossing," 793-794.

among their particular research subjects produced improved hybrids.[8] Findings of vigor rather than degeneration have also been counterintuitive to historians focused on the racist or discriminatory perspectives of eugenicists as well as scholars who have assumed – erroneously, as explained in chapter one – that findings of improvement among hybrids were not racialist.

In spite of the notoriety of *Race Crossing in Jamaica*, the decade of the 1920s was a time when some scientists began arguing that racial hierarchies of intelligence and morality had no basis in science. They still believed in race, however, and thought it required further study. While there was a contingent that became increasingly vocal about the foolishness and injustice of scientifically justified discrimination, they did not think the idea of race itself was a problem. Indeed, there was increased focus on the mechanisms and consequences of mixing and attempts at precisely defining racial traits and how significantly they were changed by mixing and changes in environment as studies of race crossing grew in sample size and complexity.

In the years following the end of World War I, University of Hawai'i administrators and officers at the Rockefeller Foundation presented human research in Hawai'i as an internationalist project in the interest of world peace and understanding. The minutes of the May 26, 1926 meeting of the Rockefeller Foundation Board included the statement that, regarding the study of the characteristics of races and the descendents of interracial marriage, "The relationship of the several races of the Pacific is a matter of moment both to scientific

---

[8]"Discussions of Papers Read at the Congress," *Eugenics in Race and State, Volume II, Scientific Papers of the Second International Congress of Eugenics, Held at American Museum of Natural History, New York, September 22-28, 1921* (Baltimore: Williams & Wilkins Company, 1923), 456; and Harry L. Shapiro, "Descendents of the Mutineers of the Bounty," *Memoirs of the Bernice P. Bishop Museum* XI, no. 1 (Honolulu: The Bishop Museum, 1929).

knowledge and to the peace of the world."[9] Relationships between the races, in both the racial affiliation and sexual reproduction senses of the word, were not only a scientific problem, but also critical to the cultivation and preservation of global social harmony, an argument that characterized an "internationalist" ideology that had been in development in the United States for at least twenty years.[10] The Institute of Pacific Relations in Honolulu wanted to host the research program and supported University President Arthur Dean's appeal to the Rockefeller Foundation.[11]

Researchers affiliated with human research in Hawai'i in the mid 1920s and early 1930s approached the program's primary questions with varying backgrounds, assumptions, and methods. There was no uniform sensibility about race nor a centrally controlled the agenda that stipulated how results might be used. Contrast psychologist Stanley Porteus and Shapiro for example. Porteus had co-authored *Temperament and Race* (1926) and generally focused his research on psychological studies of intelligence that relied on an essentialist, hierarchical approach to so-called racial traits. Shapiro, while he certainly believed in the concept of race, argued later in the 1930s that it was unclear how one might assess quality when studying the physical consequences of migration and interracial reproduction.[12] Porteus has been accused of being a racist whose work remained on the fringe of respectable

---

[9]"University of Hawaii – Studies in Race Biology," folder 8, box 1, series 214S, RG 1.1, Rockefeller Foundation Archives, RAC.

[10]See Donald W. White, "History and American Internationalism: The Formulation from the Past after World War II," *Pacific Historical Review* 58, no. 2 (May 1989), 145-172. See also Alan Dawley, *Changing the World: American Progressives in War and Revolution* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003).

[11]In April 1926, Embree said in a letter to Foundation president Raymond Fosdick that he thought a university rather than a "detached committee" should serve as the research center. See Embree to Fosdick, April 27, 1926, folder 2, box 1, series 214S, RG 1.1, Rockefeller Foundation Archives, RAC.

[12]Harry L. Shapiro, "Quality in Human Populations," *The Scientific Monthly* 45, no. 2 (Aug. 1937), 109-118.

science even by the mid 1920s.[13] Shapiro has been characterized, similarly to Franz Boas, as anti-racist or anti-discrimination yet someone who retained a belief in race.[14] While the first part of Porteus' study of racial psychology was funded by the Hawaiian Sugar Planters Association (HSPA), who believed such research could help in controlling workers and preventing strikes, Shapiro's funding came from the University of Hawai'i, which was funded largely by the Rockefeller Foundation. The Foundation joined the University in allowing Shapiro to design and conduct his study without interference.

One of the problems researchers faced was racial ambiguity. Some subjects did not easily fit into researchers' presumptions about what a "purely" Chinese or Japanese person was supposed to look like. They attempted to solve the problem of racial ambiguity by removing subjects whose reported race fell outside their conception of what could be true based on their assessment of the person sitting in front of them, a continuation of a practice that had started with Sullivan, Tozzer, and Dunn. (See chapter one.) The idea that genotype did not translate directly to phenotype (or that there was more than one phenotype associated with the same genotype) was not part of their framework. Shapiro would conclude in the late 1930s that there was plasticity within racial groups *to a point*.[15] This conclusion appears to have been possible, at least in part, because people who were (subjectively assessed) outliers were effectively treated as liars or mistaken.

---

[13]David Stannard, "Honoring Racism: The Professional Life and Reputation of Stanley D. Porteus," *Social Process in Hawai'i* 39 (1999), 85-125.

[14]Tracy Lang Teslow, "Representing Race to the Public: Physical Anthropology in Interwar American Natural History Museums," Ph.D. diss., University of Chicago, 2002.

[15]Harry L. Shapiro, "Quality in Human Populations," *The Scientific Monthly* 45, no. 2 (Aug. 1937), 109-118; and Shapiro, *Migration and Environment: A Study of the Physical Characteristics of the Japanese Immigrants to Hawaii and the Effects of Environment on their Descendents* (London and New York: Oxford University Press, 1939).

Because there was a seemingly quite narrow range of physical presentations that researchers accepted as being true to type or a match for particular ancestries, their ability to truly test the plasticity of race was limited. One could argue that removing them from the study artificially narrowed the data set used to support the conclusion that race was plastic in a notably limited way. It is unclear how this practice affected results or how significantly the results would have differed if they had accepted subjects' self-reports of racial pedigree as a way of making the method of selection uniform. However, this practice represented scientists' persistent assumption that racial categorization was possible and that lots of people, especially experts in anthropometry, could discern race by phenotype and so they continued to treat phenotype as indicative of race and race as expressed by phenotype.

Regardless of researchers' sometimes widely variant commitments to racial essentialism and hierarchy, with the financial support of the University of Hawai'i and the Rockefeller Foundation, they all contributed toward establishing Hawai'i as a laboratory, a frame – and a claim for science and for the United States – with decades-long persistence. Shapiro's study in particular, published in 1939 as *Migration and Environment*, helped establish Hawai'i as a long-term research site. His research on thousands of migrants and their children made ongoing research seem not only promising, but necessary as scientists struggled to clarify how heredity and environment worked together.

Human Research at a Colonial University

Less than a decade after American takeover in 1898, the territory's haole elite envisioned a more cosmopolitan, less peripheral relationship between Hawai'i and the continental United States and argued that a college was necessary to Americanize the archipelago. Building a college was a strategy employed by annexationists who became

proponents for Hawai'i statehood. In their history of the University of Hawai'i, Robert M. Kamins and Robert E. Potter explain that, "The further integration into the United States desired by those who had sided against the Hawaiian monarchy, if it was to work politically, required the further development of American culture here…. Without one [college] of its own, the far offshore Territory of Hawaii would present itself as not only remote and exotic but also as a backwater and uncultured, territorial indeed."[16] Several sugar executives were less than enthusiastic about putting tax dollars toward higher education for residents who were likely to become plantation employees. However, a number of executives carried a sense of philanthropic duty and support for education in particular because of their missionary ancestry, which apparently prevented them from expressing formal opposition.[17]

Business and community leaders began organizing the College of Agricultural and Mechanical Arts in 1907. When searching for its first college president, the board of regents looked to Cornell because it was "the most prestigious university supported by the Morrill Acts" that created land grant research universities with an agricultural focus in the continental U.S.[18] The board hired John W. Gilmore, a professor of agriculture who had organized agricultural schools in China and advised the Indian Commission of Agriculture and the Philippine Department of Agriculture. He had also taught agriculture for one year at Hawai'i's Normal School.[19] Gilmore recruited colleagues from Cornell to accompany him to

---

[16]Robert M. Kamins and Robert E. Potter, *Malamalama: A History of the University of Hawai'i* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1998), 3.

[17]Kamins and Potter, *Malamalama*, 4.

[18]Kamins and Potter, *Malamalama*, 9.

[19]Kamins and Potter, *Malamalama*, 9. Willis T. Pope served as acting president the year before Gilmore was hired.

Honolulu, and faculty from Cornell supplemented those with connections to Yale.[20] Arthur L. Dean, Harvard Ph.D. and professor of chemistry, was hired away from Yale in 1914 to serve after Gilmore.[21] Dean was quickly absorbed into the haole professional community, joining the Social Science Association, whose membership was made up of business and community leaders.

What connected officials at the College of Hawai'i and then University of Hawai'i with haole sugar capitalists was a mutual concern with the education level and qualities of Hawai'i's workforce. Territorial Hawai'i was a profoundly undemocratic place. Haole sugar capitalists "wield[ed] virtually unfettered control over the territory's economy and politics, the latter unwaveringly through the Republican party."[22] The Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association was more powerful than the territorial government, and some referred to it as the Hawaiian House of Lords.[23] This arrangement was still in place in 1937 when the National Labor Relations Board reported about Hawai'i employers' anti-unionism, in "pointed if overstated terms": "'If there is any truer picture of Fascism anywhere in the world than the Hawaiian islands, then I do not know the definition of it.'"[24] Starting with the 1909 labor strike by Japanese workers that became a multi-plantation strike, sugar

---

[20]A number of people with connections to Yale already staffed the Bernice Pauahi Bishop Museum, which maintained close ties with the College of Hawaii and the university through the 1920s.

[21]Kamins and Potter, 14.

[22]Jung, *Reworking Race*, 2. For a contemporary account of the oligarchy made up of plantation owners, see Ray Stannard Baker, "Wonderful Hawaii: A World Experiment Station; I. How King Sugar Rules in Hawaii," *The American Magazine* LXXIII, no. 1 (Nov. 1911), 28-38. The next two of three articles in this series are also notable: Baker, "Wonderful Hawaii: A World Experiment Station; II. The Land and the Landless," *The American Magazine* LXXIII, no. 2 (Dec. 1911), 201-214; and Baker, "Human Nature in Hawaii: How the Few Want the Many to Work for Them – Perpetually, and at Low Wages," *The American Magazine* LXXIII, no. 3 (Jan. 1912), 328-339.

[23]Baker, "Wonderful Hawaii," 29.

[24]Jung, *Reworking Race*, 10.

capitalists developed what became their signature response: adopting the changes that striking workers requested only after the strike was over. Plantations claimed that the changes they made to working and living conditions were "acts of altruistic paternalism rather than of capitulation."[25] As relationships between workers and sugar capitalists became more contentious in the 1910s and especially after the "Dual Union Strike" of 1920, haole businessmen became interested in the personality traits and social tendencies of various races. Moon-Kie Jung points out that, "A part of [the opinions of] Porteus and Babcock (1926) appeared earlier as one among many reports that comprised an external study of the industry commissioned by the HSPA in the aftermath of the 1924 strike."[26]

Dean oversaw the expansion of the mostly technical college as it transformed into the University of Hawai'i in 1919. That was the year when the faculty expanded to include Romanzo Adams, professor of economics and sociology and chair of the first social science department, and the College physically expanded to a new campus in Mānoa, a valley adjacent to downtown Honolulu known as the traditional location of Hawaiian royalty's summer residences. While Adams researched Hawai'i's demographics and economics, focusing on statistical studies of Hawai'i's population and of intermarriage, Stanley Porteus ran the University's psychological clinic, which opened in 1922, and conducted research first publicized in his book co-authored with Marjorie Babcock, *Temperament and Race* (1926). Dean attended the 1920 Pacific Science Congress at the Bishop Museum, which attracted

---

[25]Jung, *Reworking Race*, 29.

[26]Jung, *Reworking Race*, 216, n104. Sugar capitalists' anti-labor efforts created "two decades of racial divisions among Hawaii's workers," as Jung puts it on page 55. Meanwhile, sociologists working at the University of Hawai'i in the late 1920s and 1930s – the years of the racial divisions – studied race relations in the territory as if they were the product of ostensibly natural contacts and inevitable conflicts.

sixty delegates, most of whom were from outside Hawai'i, and in 1925 solicited funding for university research on race and race relations.[27]

Edwin Embree, the director of the Rockefeller Foundation's Division of Studies, visited Honolulu in September 1925, where he met with Dean and Bishop Museum director Herbert Gregory about putting together a project on the "problem of race biology."[28] Embree's stop in Hawai'i was part of a tour of the Pacific that included stops in New Zealand, Australia, and Japan to acquaint himself with biological scientists and their work. Embree made arrangements to visit Honolulu at the same time as Clark Wissler, the curator of anthropology at the American Museum of Natural History, and Edwin G. Conklin, professor of biology at Princeton University. Embree told Dean that he specifically wanted to talk about human biology, an interest of the Rockefeller Foundation.[29] Dean filed a

---

[27]Embree to Wilber, July 1, 1925, folder 2, box 1, series 214S, RG 1.1, Rockefeller Foundation Archives, RAC. Following a conference that brought together Stanford biologists and associates on the Survey of Race Relations on the Pacific Coast, four Stanford professors also sought to establish an Institute of Race Biology in 1925. Lewis M. Terman, L.L. Burlingame, C.H. Danforth, and L.B. Becking to R.L. Wilber, June 8, 1925; and R.L. Wilder to Edwin R. Embree, June 12, 1925, folder 2, box 1, series 214S, RG 1.1, Rockefeller Foundation Archives, RAC. On the Survey of Race Relations on the Pacific Coast, see Eckard Toy, "Whose Frontier? The Survey of Race Relations on the Pacific Cost in the 1920s," *Oregon Historical Quarterly* 107, no. 1 (2006), 36-63; and Henry Yu, *Thinking Orientals: Migration, Contact, and Exoticism in Modern America* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001).

[28]A.L. Dean to Edwin R. Embree, June 16, 1925, folder 2, box 1, series 214S, RG 1.1, Rockefeller Foundation Archives, RAC.

[29]Embree to Dean, August 8, 1925, folder 2, box 1, series 214S, RG 1.1, Rockefeller Foundation Archives, RAC. The human biology program was Embree's brainchild and was part of a larger effort within the Division of Studies, which Embree "created in January 1924 with himself as director. The division cultivated small projects that lacked attention from major medical research managers and functioned as a "nursery of philanthropic ideas and surveys" and a "nursery of new operating programs." Embree acknowledged that his division focused on a motley group of projects – he called it the "Division of Trial and Error, Division of Lame Ducks, Division of Half-Squeezed Lemons" – but the workings of the division were relatively unimportant. The "Division of Studies was Embree's chance to become a divisional baron himself." See Robert E. Kohler, *Partners in Science: Foundations and Natural Scientists, 1900-1945* (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1991),

formal application for Rockefeller Foundation funding for a "Station for Racial Research" at the University of Hawai'i in April of the next year.[30]

Dean identified Hawai'i as a "natural laboratory for the comparative study of the more important Pacific races." In his estimation, Hawai'i required research in three areas: the study of racial characteristics, the response of various racial groups to new environments, and the effects of hybridization or racial mixing. He insisted that thorough study of physical, mental, and social characteristics was essential for future studies, as was understanding the effects of migration. He argued that, "Knowledge of the somatic changes and the alterations, if any, in mental and temperamental characteristics due to changed environment is of fundamental importance. The adjustment of any people to institutions which are not the product of its own racial evolution is a basic factor in judging the probable effects of migration."[31] Regarding mixing, Dean pointed out, "Many assertions have been made relative to the character of hybrids of Pacific races. Practically no data are available on which to base assertions. The physical, mental and social characteristics of the progeny of mixed marriages should be known as a basis for rational political action."[32] By "political action,"

---

125. A program appraisal memorandum in 1937 cites the "original" interest "from the standpoint of the RF program in human biology." The Foundation's interest shifted as the grant continued toward providing support for regional research centers and the "general development of the social sciences." See "University of Hawaii – Race Research," 1938, page 1, folder 9, box 1, series 214S, RG 1.1, Rockefeller Foundation Archives, RAC.

[30]Arthur Dean, "A Proposed Station for Racial Research at the University of Hawaii, Honolulu, T.H.," April 1916, folder 2, box 1, series 214S, RG 1.1, Rockefeller Foundation Archives, RAC.

[31]Arthur Dean, "A Proposed Station for Racial Research at the University of Hawaii, Honolulu, T.H.," April 1926, page 3, folder 2, box 1, series 214S, RG 1.1, Rockefeller Foundation Archives, RAC. Note the importance of adjustment to new conditions, which had been a scientific question for at least two decades and gained interest in the early 1920s in light of American nativist concerns about immigration.

[32]Dean, "A Proposed Station for Racial Research at the University of Hawaii, Honolulu, T.H.," April 1926, folder 2, box 1, series 214S, RG 1.1, Rockefeller Foundation Archives,

Dean likely meant advocacy for statehood for Hawai'i, an objective that his successor David Livingston Crawford took up with fervor. The demographics and characteristics of Hawai'i's population were central to discussions about the future of the territory among members of the business community and administrators at the University of Hawai'i. Dean was involved in these discussions as both a university administrator and an executive at one of Hawai'i's five major sugar companies as he left the university for an executive position at the Alexander & Baldwin sugar company not long after the Rockefeller grant was secure.[33]

Scientists on the continent, namely biologist Edwin G. Conklin and anthropologist Clark Wissler, supported funding for human research in the islands. In a letter of support that arrived before Dean had submitted his formal proposal, Conklin argued that,

> There is probably no place in the world where problems of human races, hybrids, heredity, and evolution could be carried on as successfully as in the Hawaiian Islands, and the Bishop Museum would seem to be the logical center for such work. Owing to their wide separation from the continents, the islands of the Mid-Pacific have long been recognized as ideal places for the study of evolution and distribution of land flora and fauna.[34]

RAC. The last sentence in this paragraph was, "The existence of the Mendelian types of inheritance and of linked characters should be sought for."

[33]The news of Dean's departure and Crawford's appointment was "unpleasant" for Herbert Gregory, director of the Bishop Museum, who reported that "The new President, David L. Crawford, formerly an entomologist now in charge of extension lectures, etc., at the University, has no established position of confidence or leadership in education, scientific, or business circles, and though an attractive fellow socially, his future is a gamble…. With Dean at its head, the University had good prospects of becoming a center of research; with Dean out, the probabilities for advance are not too hopeful and going backward is a possibility. Few of us interested in the cooperative development of Pacific science had realized that the 'University' meant Dean." See Gregory to Embree, January 24, 1927, folder 1, box 1, series 214S, RG 1.1, Rockefeller Foundation Archives, RAC. In 1950, Dean was still at Alexander & Baldwin. See Jung, 201n70.

[34]Edwin G. Conklin, "Report on Possibilities and Needs of Research in Biology in Hawaii," March 1926, folder 1, box 1, series 214S, RG 1.1, Rockefeller Foundation Archives, RAC. Conklin cited John Gulick's research on land snails thirty years prior as an example. On Gulick and his work on the role of isolation in speciation, a central concept in evolutionary theory, see Ron Amundson, "John T. Gulick and the Active Organism: Adaptation, Isolation, and the Politics of Evolution," in Roy MacLeod and Philip F.

Wissler echoed Conklin's position, reiterating that "the Island population offers an ideal place for the study of racial problems in metabolism, health, genetics, psychology, and anthropology."[35]

In May 1926, the Rockefeller Foundation granted the University of Hawai'i $20,000 a year for five years to develop "research into the biological, mental and social conditions of the peoples of Hawaii."[36] The institutional support and structure for racial studies in Hawai'i precipitated out of cooperation between Dean, Embree, and Crawford without evident input from territorial officials. The Rockefeller Foundation did not have a long term philanthropic or research agenda in Hawai'i. Rather, Embree wanted the program at the University as part of his administrative fiefdom, the Division of Studies. He and Dean worked to secure additional money for research that had already begun and for which Dean sought continued support. Embree emphasized that the Foundation hoped to "enable the University to strengthen its already good work in the biological and social sciences and to unify these

---

Rehbock, eds., *Darwin's Laboratory: Evolutionary Theory and Natural History in the Pacific*, (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1994), 110-139.

[35]Clark Wissler, "Supplementary Statement Concerning the Research," folder 1, box 1, series 214S, RG 1.1, Rockefeller Foundation Archives, RAC. Conklin and Wissler agreed that the Bishop Museum was much better prepared to support a research program and that if the University were to receive funding, it should either be part of a joint effort between the two institutions or, as Wissler suggested, or two separate grants to support the Bishop Museum's work and set up a stand-alone university unit focused on human biology. Albert F. Judd and fellow trustees of the Bishop Museum worked toward a plan to move the museum, concluding in the fall of 1926 that the move was impossible because of the expense of rebuilding. See A.F. Judd to Embree, October 20, 1926, folder 1, box 1, series 214S, RG 1.1, Rockefeller Foundation Archives, RAC.

[36]Edwin R. Embree to President Arthur L. Dean, May 28, 1926, folder 2, box 1, series 214S, RG 1.1, Rockefeller Foundation Archives, RAC.

departments with a view to developing a concentrated approach to what may be described as Human Biology."[37]

Keeping with the Foundation's need to limit its long term funding commitments, the intent of the grant was to make the human biology program a permanent fixture at the university.[38] The Rockefeller Foundation requested more focus on biological and psychological research than on sociology. In a letter to Dean following the initial announcement of the award, Embree explained that the Foundation hoped that "the specifically social aspects may eventually be supported from other sources," although the University could allocate funds as it saw fit in the initial stages of the project. "Our action,

---

[37]*Ibid.* Human biology brought together a number of fields to comprehensively study humans. Raymond Pearl's *Studies in Human Biology* (1924) is an example of an early publication that surveyed interdisciplinary approaches including physical anthropology, genetics, vital statistics, and studies of the "population problem." While human biology on the continent has been described as "a fashionable but ill-defined rubric for a congeries of related fields: human heredity, growth and development, psychology, anthropology, constitutional medicine, and others," in Hawai'i it was unified by its focus on the documentation and assessment of the local mostly non-white population's physical and psychological traits. See Kohler, *Partners in Science*, 126. Kohler added, "It [human biology] is probably best understood as one of many attempts, in the wake of the medical reform movement, to capture the biological and behavioral side of medicine for university science departments. In any case, Embree probably picked up the idea from the biometrician Raymond Pearl, one of the liveliest leaders of the movement and a trustee of the RF." Funding research at the University of Hawai'i was also a response to calls for collaborative research that characterized the first Pan-Pacific Science Congress in 1920. Improvements in statistical techniques suggested new possibilities for large-scale studies that were more precise and statistically significant. The promise of human biology was not that it defined race as entirely separate from culture, but that the disciplines and results made possible by human biological research had empirical reach and value. This was pertinent especially as science in general, including the social sciences, became more quantitative. The journal *Human Biology* emerged in 1929 with precisely this orientation and breadth of content, demonstrating the ways in which the field gained momentum during the precise years that the Rockefeller Foundation funded research at the University of Hawai'i.

[38]Edwin R. Embree to Arthur Dean, May 28, 1926, folder 2, box 1, series 214S, RG 1.1, Rockefeller Foundation Archives, RAC. (This is the 3rd letter in that folder dated May 28. All three are from Embree to Dean.) On the Rockefeller Foundation's stretched budget in the 1920s, see Kohler, *Partners in Science*, 105-106. It reorganized in 1928 away from institutional grants toward individual and project grants (5).

however, makes it possible for you to use this fund in any way that you think best for the racial studies generally, including social as well as biological aspects."[39] Thus, the Foundation allowed for flexible use of grant money, trusting that the recipient departments would honor the biological emphasis of the grant while including pertinent social research. This hands-off approach was motivated in part by Foundation officers' long-term visions. In a letter to Dean, Embree emphasized the Foundation's hopes that the university would permanently study human biology rather than have the project end when the grant ran out.

Once the funding was assured, the University sought a leader for the project who was qualified in both anthropology and human genetics.[40] Frederick Wood-Jones, professor of anatomy at the University of Adelaide, had combined work in medicine with work in zoology and had already worked with Herbert Gregory at the Bishop Museum. He accepted a position managing the race biology program at the University of Hawai'i in the fall of 1926.[41] Although the University of Hawai'i was not the first to host a research unit on human biology and race questions, Wood-Jones insisted that Hawai'i was the ideal place to establish one. "There is room here for an Institute of Human Biology in which all aspects could be studied," he asserted.

---

[39]Edwin R. Embree to A.L. Dean, May 28, 1926, RF, 1.1, 214S, Box 1, Folder 2, RAC. In a letter to Rockefeller Foundation president Raymond Fosdick on April 27, 1926, Embree wrote that he expected that the Memorial could fund sociological side of studies and that the Foundation wanted to help with "biological aspects of the project."

[40]Arthur Dean, "A Proposed Station for Racial Research at the University of Hawaii, Honolulu, T.H.," April 1926, page 6, folder 2, box 1, series 214S, RG 1.1, Rockefeller Foundation Archives, RAC.

[41]Embree to Dean, July 20, 1926; Dean to Embree, August 27, 1926; Embree to Dean, September 8, 1926; Dean to Embree, October 5, 1926; and Embree to Dean, October 19, 1926, folder 2, box 1, series 214S, RG1.1, Rockefeller Foundation Archives, RAC. Otto Mohr from the University of Oslo and Raymond Arthur Dart from the University of the Witwatersrand in Johannesburg also received consideration.

> I have in mind such an institution as the Rasbiologiska Institute established as Uppsala and under the direction of Dr. Lundborg. This institute has just made its first magnificent publication upon the Swedish population. Similar institutes have been started since the war in Japan, in Warsaw and Paris. This is the place for the best one of them all. I believe that only in some such institution could the whole racial question be dealt with adequately. There would be no lack of workers and wholehearted local cooperation if the project could be secured.[42]

Even as the Station for Racial Research's conditions were presented as superior to all others, it became part of a global array of racial research stations.

After Arthur Dean left the University in late 1926, succeeding president David Crawford began overseeing the "research program in Anthropology and Racial Comparisons."[43] Funding began in 1927. By 1931, the University was directing studies on metabolism, skin pigment, psychology, muscular efficiency, memory ability, and "common judgment tests."[44] This represented a marked growth in research activity since racial studies began in 1920. Wood-Jones, however, focused on personal research interests more than the mission of the program. After Wood-Jones left his post in the spring of 1930, Harry L.

---

[42]Frederick Wood-Jones to Edwin R. Embree, August 1, 1927, folder 3, box 1, series 214S, RG 1.1, Rockefeller Foundation Archives, RAC.

[43]Herbert Gregory to Edwin Embree, Jan. 24, 1927, RF, RG 1.1, Series 214S, box 1, folder 1, series 214S, RG 1.1, Rockefeller Foundation Archives, RAC; D.L. Crawford to Richard M. Pearce, October 21, 1927, box 1, folder 3, series 214S, RG 1.1, Rockefeller Foundation Archives, RAC. Pearce was the director of the Rockefeller Foundation. Commentary in relevant files at the Rockefeller Foundation Archive Center suggest that Crawford worked enthusiastically as a booster for the University and had a reputation as a less-than-serious scientist and lacked intellectual talent, generally speaking. The letters from the University soliciting ongoing funding from the Foundation came almost entirely from Crawford rather than from individual researchers or faculty members.

[44]"Research at the University of Hawaii (1930-1931)," box 1, folder: Crawford, D.L. 1931-32, Harry L. Shapiro Manuscript Collection (MSS S537), Special Collections, American Museum of Natural History (SC-AMNH). Shapiro's study did not include mental testing. This was part of research conducted by Stanley Porteus and others at the psychological lab at UH.

Shapiro, assistant curator of anthropology at the American Museum of Natural History, began to direct studies on Chinese-Hawaiians and Japanese migrants.

Harry Shapiro

As the first graduate of the first physical anthropology degree program in the U.S., Shapiro completed his doctorate at Harvard University under Earnest Hooton in 1926, the same year that the University of Hawai'i received its grant from the Rockefeller Foundation. He immediately took a position at the American Museum of Natural History as an assistant curator of anthropology. He was hired in part to replace Louis R. Sullivan, who had conducted anthropometric research in Hawai'i in the early 1920s and died in 1925 before he could publish final results. Shapiro's dissertation research on the effects of mixing between mutineers from the *Bounty* and Norfolk Island locals made him an understandable successor to Sullivan.

Shapiro's involvement in Pacific research and connection to Hawai'i began during his doctoral research in 1923 when he was awarded a Bernice Pauahi Bishop Museum Fellowship funded by Yale University as part of the Bayard Dominick expedition. He embarked from Panama in July 1923 with the intention of conducting research on Pitcairn Island, from which he would travel to Norfolk Island. A tropical storm prevented the *Paparoa* from stopping on Pitcairn, so he continued to Australia, where he was able to take a different boat to the barren outpost of Norfolk. He lived on Norfolk from September 1923 through February 1924, where he studied "inheritance, society and the effects of inbreeding" as initially planned.[45] Shapiro documented the physical and social effects of relationships between English sailors and Tahitian residents of Norfolk, a sample size of 64. He recorded

[45]Harry L. Shapiro, "Descendents of the Mutineers of the Bounty," *Memoirs of the Bernice P. Bishop Museum* XI, no. 1 (Honolulu: The Bishop Museum, 1929), 3.

detailed genealogies, photographed subjects, and took approximately twenty anthropometric measurements, for head length and width, height, and so on, and recorded information on features such as hair, eye, and skin color, hair texture, and the presence of an epicanthic fold.[46] Once these measurements were averaged and a range was established for Norfolk Islanders, Shapiro compared his data with averages and ranges documented by other researchers such as Charles Davenport and Ales Hrdlicka.[47]

Researching race mixing during a time that the vigor question loomed large, Shapiro claimed that his Norfolk study ended speculation on the question of whether later generations of "hybrids" demonstrated delayed degeneration.[48] Scientists working in the 1910s and into the 1920s had speculated that first and second generation crosses might not exhibit signs of physical degradation and might even show signs of initial vigor, but that subsequent generations might degenerate. According to Shapiro, his results from Norfolk were generalizable, in that,

> This study of race mixture on the whole rather definitively shows that the crossing of two fairly divergent groups leads to a physical vigor and exuberance which equals if not surpasses either parent stock. My study of the Norfolk Islanders shows that this superiority is not an ephemeral quality which disappears after the F_1 or F_2 generation, but continues even after five generations. Furthermore, the close inbreeding which the Norfolk hybrids have practiced has not led to physical deterioration.[49]

Shapiro concluded that vigor, a combination of health, fertility, and longevity, could continue through several generations. This conclusion fueled his interest in studying long

---

[46]Shapiro, "Descendents of the Mutineers of the Bounty," 64-68.

[47]Shapiro, "Descendents of the Mutineers of the Bounty," 65.

[48]Geneticist William E. Castle, one of Shapiro's advisers at Harvard, wrote about heterosis, also known as hybrid vigor.

[49]Harry L. Shapiro, "Descendents of the Mutineers of the Bounty," *Memoirs of the Bernice P. Bishop Museum* XI, no. 1 (Honolulu: The Bishop Museum, 1929), 69.

term, generational trends, something he had already attempted by documenting the genealogies of Norfolk residents by producing detailed pedigree charts.[50]

Illustrating the degree to which biological and social studies remained intertwined during the 1920s, Shapiro concluded that there was also social vigor associated with hybridization, too – that "the physical vigor of the Norfolk hybrids applies also to their social structure." Norfolk social structure was not negatively effected by cultural or sexual contact with English migrants. In fact,

> …Pitcairn was not only superior to the society instituted by the Englishmen themselves, but also contained elements of successful originality and adaptability. Although the Norfolk Island society is much influenced by European contacts, it has maintained itself, — a fact which acquires increased significance in view of the deterioration of the fiber of Polynesian life as the result of European influences.[51]

Shapiro was not overreaching when he made this social assessment along with his findings about morphology, fertility, and longevity. Anthropology was still a multi-faceted field during these years and did not draw strict boundaries between the physical and the cultural, despite what a number of historical accounts suggest was a stark debate about zoological versus cultural approaches to anthropology.[52]

During the same years that the human research agenda in Hawai'i was coalescing, Harry Shapiro's generation of physical anthropologists began to grapple with questions about the role of environment in shaping human differences. This concern with environment built in part on the work of Franz Boas, who is perhaps best known for insisting that anthropologists eschew biological determinism, and other anthropologists,

---

[50]Shapiro, "Descendents of the Mutineers of the Bounty," 60 (fertility), 62-63 (health defined as disease resistance, longevity). The pedigree charts are on pages 98-106.

[51]Shapiro, "Descendents of the Mutineers of the Bounty," 69.

[52]Jonathan P. Spiro, "Nordic vs. anti-Nordic: the Galton Society and the American Anthropological Association," *Patterns of Prejudice* 36, no. 1 (2002), 35-48.

including physical anthropologist Louis R. Sullivan, who took into account the role of environment in shaping human development, particularly morphology.[53] Boas was one of the first anthropologists to argue that people of different races were not inferior to one another. Still, he and his followers thought that there were indeed races and that races differed from each other in measurable ways. The next generation of anthropologists, including Harry Shapiro examined factors that contributed to these differences.[54]

Shapiro approached research in Hawai'i using a combination of his training by Earnest Hooton (perhaps best known for his productive anthropometric laboratory, his interest in racial affiliation, and his commitment to racial typology) and his opinion that Boas' study of the cephalic indices of European immigrants and their children was both path-breaking and underappreciated as a scientific breakthrough on the plasticity of any singular supposed "racial" trait: head form.[55] Chartered by U.S. Immigration Commission in 1908, Boas published *Changes in Immigrant Body Form* in 1912.[56] Although his graduate adviser

---

[53]Louis R. Sullivan, "Variations in the Glenoid Fossae," *American Anthropologist* 19, no. 1 (Jan.-Mar., 1917), 19-23. This was a preliminary report read before the American Anthropological Association in New York in 1916. Citing papers on the glenoid fossae, Sullivan commented that, "The important question raised by these papers is the cause of its structural variation. Is it a racial characteristic linking those individuals or races which possess it to the apes or is it a caenotelic character recently acquired by the race or by the individual *as an adaptation to environment*, food habits, and methods of mastication?" (19, emphasis added).

[54]See Rachel Caspari, "From Types to Populations: A Century of Race, Physical Anthropology, and the American Anthropological Association," *American Anthropologist* 105, no. 1 (Mar. 2003), 65-76, especially page 8; and George W. Stocking, Jr., *Race, Culture, and Evolution: Essays on the History of Anthropology* (New York: Free Press, 1968). There is also a discussion of this generational transition in Jonathan Marks, "Race Across the Physical-Cultural Divide in American Anthropology," in *A New History of Anthropology*, ed. Henrika Kuklick (Malden, MA and Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing, 2008), 242-258.

[55]Shapiro, *Migration and Environment*, 4.

[56]Franz Boas, "Changes in Immigrant Body Form," Selection 29 in George W. Stocking, Jr., ed., *The Shaping of American Anthropology, 1883-1911: A Franz Boaz Reader* (New York: Basic Books, 1974), 202-214.

had a decided commitment to studying races as essential groups, Shapiro shared many of the opinions and research objectives of Boas, who argued for a cultural and environmental view of race, which was simultaneously historical and biological. Along with his Norfolk research, Shapiro's anthropological training with Ernest Hooton and Alfred Tozzer and training in genetics positioned him as one of the best qualified researchers to conduct a broad anthropological study of Chinese and Chinese-Hawaiians.

When Shapiro began his work for the University in 1930, he proposed a study of Chinese and Chinese-Hawaiians and an unprecedented study of Japanese in Hawai'i and Japan.[57] Chinese immigration to Hawai'i was recent enough that substantial genealogical records existed. Yet migrants had been in the islands long enough that there were two generations that could be studied and correspondingly there was a large enough population to "make adequate sampling possible."[58] This was a continuation of the reasoning behind Sullivan's research in 1920 and 1921. Shapiro argued that the research value of Hawai'i's population came from its usefulness for solving "complex genetic problems which have arisen from race mixture," especially since "the large population of mulattoes in the United States has not been found to provide ideal scientific material, largely because the mixture is

---

[57]H.L. Shapiro, "Memorandum for President Crawford," dated September 4, 1930, box 1, folder 5, series 214S, RG 1.1, Rockefeller Foundation Archives, RAC. It is not exactly clear whether Shapiro used funding from the Rockefeller Foundation and the University of Hawai'i to continue with his own research plans or he departed from his agenda to satisfy the University's priorities. Shapiro's comments about how no once had emulated or built upon Boas' study of immigrant head forms even though the study was important for science demonstrates that he had some interest in pursuing a similar study in the Pacific, where he had done his doctoral research.

[58]Shapiro, "Summary of the Anthropological Studies conducted in behalf of the University of Hawaii," Box 4, Folder: 1933, AMNH-SC.

old and lacks the genealogical precision which is so essential for genetic studies."[59] Shapiro and his assistants completed fieldwork for the two studies between 1930 and 1932. In addition to measuring Chinese living in Hawai'i, their offspring, people with both Chinese and Hawaiian ancestry, and a control group of Chinese living in Canton, the original location of most migrants, the study also included data collected by Sullivan.[60] Starting in February 1932, Shapiro and his assistant Frederick Hulse completed fieldwork measuring Japanese migrants to Hawai'i, their offspring, and relatives who never left Japan. Shapiro called the subjects residing in Japan "sedentes," presumably from the word sedentary.

In his first publication about his research in Hawai'i, Shapiro wrote about the islands' "racial history" and his and others' reasons for studying people with Chinese and Hawaiian ancestry. In so doing, he established the need for monitoring racial changes into the far future by treating the past as racial history. In January 1931, the American Museum of Natural History in New York published "Race Mixture in Hawaii" in its magazine, *Natural History*. This was the only article he published on the Chinese-Hawaiian study other than a preliminary paper contributed to a meeting of the Institute of Pacific Relations in

---

[59]H.L. Shapiro, "Memorandum for President Crawford," dated September 4, 1930, folder 5, box 1, series 214S, RG 1.1, Rockefeller Foundation Archives, RAC. Shapiro also gave a talk in the Human Genetics session of the Sixth International Congress of Eugenics in August 1932. See *Proceedings of the Sixth International Congress of Genetics*, Vol. 1, "Transactions and General Addresses," ed. Donald F. Jones, (Menasha, WI: Brooklyn Botanic Garden of Brooklyn, New York, USA, 1932), 56-57. The text of Shapiro's talk is not published in this volume. The Hawaiian Pineapple Canners and the Hawaiian Sugar Planters Association were two of the $100-level sponsors of the Congress (see page 5 for acknowledgement).

[60]Shapiro's comments in a conference paper include Sullivan's data for preliminary analytical purposes. See Harry L. Shapiro, "The Chinese Population in Hawaii," Preliminary Paper Prepared for the Fourth General Session of the Institute of Pacific Relations to be held at Hangchow, China, October 21st to November 4th, 1931, Folder: 1930-1932 Hawaiian/Chinese Research, Anthropometric Forms, Box: 3, Papers of William Armand Lessa, National Anthropological Archives.

Hangchow, China in 1931.[61] Reminiscent of *National Geographic* in its tone and appearance, the text was accompanied by a photo essay that made up half of the total article space. Photographs of mixed race people joined photos of a grass hut and a man wearing a loin-cloth-like piece of clothing, sitting on a mat while eating poi, paste made from pounded taro root, with his fingers. With the exception of ongoing consumption of poi, Hawaiians had not participated in scenes like this for decades. Presenting Hawaiians (who had worn American style clothing for decades) as exotic primitives cultivated intrigue about Hawai'i as it also suggested that as nonwhite people in Hawai'i modernized, the racial effects of that modernization demanded documentation. Likewise, Hawai'i's high relative frequency of interracial coupling and minimal prejudice toward people of mixed ancestry added novelty for readers.[62] This article is a prime example of how American scientists framed Hawai'i for the public (and for funders) as a space where scientifically and socially significant biological processes were in motion, but it ignored the ways in which demographic processes were driven by intentional economic and political maneuvers.

Shapiro was interested in documentation just like Sullivan and Dunn, but his primary objective was examining the stability of racial types, particularly the effect of changed environment that accompanied migration. Shapiro's addition of a control group from the "mother country," so to speak, was an innovation intended to make the study more precise and revealing of physical changes. While Boas had simply documented changes in head form to show that the classic supposedly racial trait was not static or essential, Shapiro sought to test racial plasticity much more extensively by comparing anthropometric

---

[61]Harry L. Shapiro, "Race Mixture in Hawaii: The Story of the Polyglot Inhabitants of Hawaii, with a Discussion of a Few of the Resulting Population Problems," *Natural History* 30, no. 1 (New York: American Museum of Natural History, 1931), 31-48.

[62]Shapiro, "Race Mixture in Hawaii," 46.

measurements of three generations of one racial group, including the generation that remained in the original environment. The Japanese study is the one that was eventually published.

The study, titled *Migration and Environment: A Study of the Physical Characteristics of the Japanese Immigrants to Hawaii and the Effects of Environment on their Descendents*, contained 2594 subjects, whom Shapiro thanked in his acknowledgements. This pool included children and adults, including workers of all types. Shapiro estimated that 2.5% of Hawai'i's Japanese population was included in the study.[63] The full field schedule, or form used for recording data, included 43 measurements, 21 indices, and 41 observations of qualitative features such as eye shape, hair texture, and skin color. The final analysis included 28 measurements, 28 indices, and 41 observations.[64] The data was processed using punch cards and tabulation machines in Earnest Hooton's Harvard laboratory, which took between two and three years – at least as long as the fieldwork itself.

At 594 pages, at least 400 pages of which contain tables of statistical data, calculations, and graphs, *Migration and Environment* first appears as an enormous book that contains an overwhelming amount of data represented in various types of tables and graphs. Shapiro's major finding was that measurable changes occurred in migrants and their offspring. He also organized the data by age, occupation, prefectural origins, and socio-economic status and still found that there were differences. Shapiro concluded that "selection and modification by environment" explained the differences between Japanese

---

[63]Shapiro, *Migration and Environment*, 9.

[64]Shapiro, *Migration and Environment*, 9. Shapiro refers to Rudolf Martin, *Lehrbuch der Anthropologie*, 2nd ed., Jena, 1928.

"born and bred in Hawaii" and their relatives in Japan.[65] But he could not explain how selection or modification actually worked, and even with nearly 200 pages of precise and varied analysis, Shapiro called for further research. He claimed that his study showed changes, but that more work was absolutely necessary. "There is no doubt that the relationship of physical man to his environment is a problem of the greatest complexity," he said, "and that in statistical studies precise weighting for environmental influences is hardly possible at this stage of investigation. Yet the fundamental import of the problem demands continued effort to understand it and to express it in quantitative terms."[66] To the question, "is race plastic?" Shapiro's answer was, yes, but on a limited basis. The next step was tracing how and why changes occurred: a process that would necessarily unfold over many years.

Unlike Louis R. Sullivan, whom he had succeeded at the American Museum of Natural History, Shapiro relied upon research assistants for data collection. This contrasted dramatically with Sullivan's methodological commitments and fieldwork experience. While Sullivan had insisted that on-site observation by experts was required for the most accurate data collection, Shapiro hired two research assistants recommended by Earnest Hooton: Harvard students Frederick Hulse and William Lessa. Hulse, who conducted fieldwork for the Japanese study, would earn his PhD at Harvard while Lessa went on to complete his at Chicago under Frederick Eggen after finishing work on the Chinese-Hawaiian project. Shapiro's commitments as assistant curator of physical anthropology at the American Museum of Natural History in New York City kept him busy, which helps explain why he hired assistants to complete the bulk of the field research. After he accompanied William Lessa to Honolulu to set the project in motion, Shapiro returned to New York. He made

[65]Shapiro, *Migration and Environment*, 202.
[66]Shapiro, *Migration and Environment*, 185.

occasional return visits to Honolulu as well as one to China and one to Japan, trips that necessitated several months of leave from the museum.

Shapiro worked remotely for a variety of reasons. The University's struggles for funding and Shapiro's half-time appointment directing this research point to limited budget that had more room for graduate researchers than a full time on-site professional. In his correspondence, Shapiro never indicated that he doubted the abilities of his assistants. Indeed, he sometimes responded to their anxiety about the accuracy of their data by encouraging them and downplaying the likelihood that the study was compromised by ambiguous subjects or questionable data. When William Lessa worried that some of the Chinese-Hawaiians he was measuring had haole ancestry that they were either hiding or were unaware of, Shapiro encouraged him not to "be discouraged about the haole fly in the Hawaiian ointment. It will surprise you after a while to realize how many we really are getting who are Chinese, Hawaiian or a mixture without extraneous elements."[67] As explained in chapter one, Louis Sullivan had been of the opinion that the nature and volume of data collection characterizing these large scale studies demanded experienced physical anthropologists. By experienced, he meant professional: trained specifically in anthropometry *and* familiar with morphological diversity. Shapiro had to assume that Earnest Hooton's graduate students received training almost identical to his and, given the logistics of the project, their competence mitigated their relative inexperience in the field.

Although the focus of the study of Chinese and Chinese-Hawaiians was supposed to be the heredity of physical traits among "mixed Chinese-Hawaiians," Shapiro was particularly interested in the stability of the so-called Chinese type. He explained that,

[67]Harry Shapiro to William Lessa, Oct 28, 1930, Box 3, Folder: 1930 – July – Dec., SC-AMNH.

> Those Chinese migrating to Hawaii were only one small branch of a population stream which has spread to many corners of the globe, where they have encountered and adapted themselves to various environments. The stability of the Chinese physical type under these diverse environments, differing from each other as well as from the original habitat, has never been determined. For the purpose of our genetic study of the Chinese-Hawaiian it is of utmost importance to know whether or not the Chinese type is being modified in Hawaii.[68]

Shapiro's research on Norfolk Island had convinced him that race mixing was not only hereditarily benign, but that hybrid vigor could be expected, which he appears to have generalized as the expected outcome of all mixing in the Pacific. His interest, then, in the hereditary physical traits of Chinese-Hawaiians was part of a larger focus on the stability of racial types.

One of the issues that came up during the first year of the study, when the Chinese study was well along, was how to tell whether morphological changes were due to age – developmental stage – or environment. Shapiro was tentative about whether differences in subjects born in China versus Hawai'i were indicative of fundamental changes or age-related differences. He used data that Sullivan gathered in 1920 and 1921 and Clark Wissler published on his behalf in 1927.[69] When Shapiro reported that "the age distribution of the Hawaiian-born males and females is overwhelmingly in the younger age range" and "it is obvious that some of the differences to be observed are correlated with age and are not the result of a change in the physical structure of the Chinese-born in Hawaii," he was relying upon Louis Sullivan's measurements of students in Hawai'i as young as elementary school

---

[68]Harry L. Shapiro, "The Chinese Population in Hawaii," Preliminary Paper Prepared for the Fourth General Session of the Institute of Pacific Relations to be held at Hangchow, China, October 21st to November 4th, 1931, Folder: 1930-1932 Hawaiian/Chinese Research, Anthropometric Forms, Box: 3, Papers of William Armand Lessa, National Anthropological Archives, 5.

[69]Shapiro, "The Chinese Population in Hawaii," 12.

age. This same question about the effect of normal development versus environmentally influenced changes in development surfaced again in the Japanese study, as discussed below.

While Shapiro and his assistants were confident about the pedigrees of Chinese and Japanese people living in Asia, they struggled with confidence about the pedigrees of their Hawai'i-born subjects, Chinese in particular. Their anxieties about maintaining accuracy reveal assumptions about race – phenotypic presentation specifically – that they maintained even as they sought to document and assess the outcomes of both race mixing and migration.

The Challenge of Racial Ambiguity

As the challenge of racial categorization heightened and Shapiro and his assistants attempted to maintain precision in their biometric study, they introduced a teleology into their studies. Approximately 3000 people were measured for the Japanese study, but about 400 of them were eliminated prior to final analysis of the data. Shapiro and his assistants determined subjects' race subjectively – by sight – rather than examining race as an object *itself* that was variable, revealing tension between the idea that race was a biological unit, category, or essence with phenotypic manifestations that potentially varied beyond the presumed range and the idea that phenotype itself constituted race. Shapiro's research assistants' assumptions about the range of phenotypes that constituted a particular race determined whom they included in the study. That the study demonstrated, according to Shapiro, the plasticity of race within a limited range, comes as no surprise given that the range was restricted from the outset.

The elimination of "doubtful cases" was a continuation of a practice initiated when anthropometric studies began in the 1910s.[70] In addition to their own visual assessments, Shapiro and his assistants selectively used subject testimony to make racial determinations. Because he was trying to understand how changes in phenotype correlated with changes in environment, Shapiro needed to know precisely how F_1 and F_2 "hybrids" were blending. His research assistants filtered subjects, usually after measuring or interviewing them. They decided whether they thought subjects' accounts of their own racial background were authentic by how they looked, and if they simply could not be sure, they marked the questionable subject's data for probable elimination. Removing doubtful cases narrowed the range of phenotypes in the study. Regardless of the precise effect on results, which is

---

[70]When he took measurements in the summers of 1916 and 1920, Alfred Tozzer decided which cases to keep and which to discard because of racial ambiguity. L.C. Dunn analyzed this data at the behest of Harvard's Earnest Hooton. In his paper at the Second International Congress of Eugenics at the American Museum of Natural History in 1921, Dunn reported that, "Race and parentage were determined from information supplied by the subject, verified wherever possible by other records and by the knowledge and judgment of the observer. Our data on this last point probably contain some errors, since occasional individuals reporting themselves of one race or pedigree have been found on analysis to have traits outside the normal range or variation for the race or type. All such doubtful cases have been omitted from our calculation and summary." See Dunn, "Some Results," 109. In Dunn's 1928 paper on the study, regarding the "classification of the subjects," he reiterated that, "All subjects reporting themselves as of one pure race were provisionally grouped together; and if no evidence from other records or from physical traits appeared to contradict the statement of pedigree, they were regarded as members of that racial group." See Dunn, "An Anthropometric Study of Hawaiians of Pure and Mixed Blood," 95. Similarly, in a Bishop Museum publication on data Sullivan collected but did not publish before his death, Clark Wissler reported, "As to the accuracy of the proportional determinations of mixture, it can only be said that, in so far as he could, Doctor Sullivan checked the information supplied by the individuals examined, rejecting the very doubtful records, and finally assigning to each the classification used in the tabulations." See Louis R. Sullivan, "Observations on Hawaiian Somatology," prepared for publication by Clark Wissler, in *Memoirs of the Bernice P. Bishop Museum*, Vol. IX, No. 4, Bayard Dominick Expedition Publication Number 13, (Honolulu: Published by the Museum, 1927), 272.

impossible to know, this method over-determined the conclusion in the Japanese study about the plasticity of phenotype as well as the limitations on the role of environment.

Struggles over choosing subjects for the Japanese study are not discussed in Shapiro's book *Migration and Environment*, but correspondence between Shapiro and his assistants working on the Chinese-Hawaiian study reveals their frustrations as they tried to make judgments about race. We can assume similar problems with the Japanese fieldwork. The central problem with these studies was that subjects' bodies resisted clear categorization. Rather than representing a challenge to the idea that pedigree was visually available for fieldworkers' discernment, it frustrated fieldworkers' efforts to collect data quickly and easily. During the Chinese-Hawaiian study, William Lessa and another assistant, Margaret Lam, a University of Hawai'i graduate student in sociology, complained to Shapiro that their jobs were made aggravating and in some cases extremely difficult because of what they viewed as subjects' noncompliance or ignorance about their own ancestry. Their moments of exasperation signify the difficulty of characterizing subjects at all.[71] In their letters about how research was progressing, they primarily commented about cases of suspected haole blood when they mentioned classification problems. Lessa reported that when he asked subjects what their racial makeup was, some of them told him they were "purely" Hawaiian or Chinese-Hawaiian when he suspected that they had haole blood. "Many of those who claim to be pure Hawaiians are quite apparently mixed," he explained. "Unless we can get a

[71]Note that migrants arrived in Hawai'i with understandings of race and racial hierarchy that differed with white American researchers', for example Chinese migrants who maintained that Chinese were superior to other races. Because they did not arrive without racial ideologies of their own or derived from their parents, subjects certainly did not unquestioningly adopt Anglo researchers' assumptions.

good number from the other islands, we shall be in a bad fix."[72] Lessa later complained that the few available Chinese-Hawaiians were mixed with other races, but "rarely do they tell me that. They lie right to your face and it is only by roundabout ways that I do discover other mixtures."[73] Eliminating subjects with white or European blood was essential to maintaining the parameters of the study. Researchers resisted the reality of racially ambiguous bodies by limiting the subject pool.

Lessa and Lam did not use the term racially ambiguous, however. They indicated that the problem was not racial ambiguity or variability in phenotype, but subjects' inaccurate reporting. Lessa's concern that subjects misrepresented their backgrounds, especially in cases when he thought they were concealing haole ancestry, is representative of a struggle over racial categorization both within anthropological methodology and in the lives of ordinary people living in colonial Hawai'i. It also reveals how, echoing Louis Sullivan's argument that field experience was a necessary credential for primary researchers studying human morphology and heredity (see chapter one), Lessa, Hulse, and Shapiro were so confident that they could detect race that they did not trust subjects' claims if they did not meet phenotypic expectations.[74] Lessa, Hulse, and Lam did not simply conjure or guess

---

[72]William Lessa to Harry Shapiro, Oct. 14, 1930, Box 3, Folder: 1930 – July – Dec, Shapiro Papers, SC-AMNH.

[73]Lessa to Shapiro, Nov. 11, 1930, Box 3, Folder: 1930 – July – Dec., Shapiro Papers, SC-AMNH.

[74]Regarding the role of expectations in the production of knowledge about racialized and indigenous peoples, see Philip Deloria, *Indians in Unexpected Places* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998). On ways in which white people have historically insisted that they can detect race using their senses of smell and hearing as well as their eyes and that they "just know" what race someone is, see Mark M. Smith, *How Race is Made: Slavery, Segregation, and the Senses* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006). The bulk of primary source material on how Hawaiians understood white people is Hawaiian language newspapers in circulation from the 1840s through the turn of the twentieth century. On nonwhite

subjects' genealogy without consulting them, however.[75] Researchers needed to be presented with a genealogy to either validate or reject it as inaccurate or inadequately precise. That these fieldworkers were actually dependent on subjects' genealogical accounts to make their assessment was never acknowledged.

Even within statements about not being able to discern racial pedigree, however, researchers made assumptions about subjects' and their families. In August 1931, for example, Lam wrote to Shapiro, using what must have been a familiar shorthand:

> The case of Solomon Koki is to my personal opinion a doubtful one. He doesn't show physically any trace of Chinese. He is exceptionally dark – if he is Chinese-Hawn & fifty-fifty as he claims to be – but I have my doubts. No one takes him for Chin-Hawn as he himself admits. I can swear he is Hawn, altho something in him makes me think he has an infinitesimal drop of European blood. This is merely my empirical observation. I'm almost convinced that his mother jumped over the fence, but Hawn. life was rather a promiscuous one anyway.[76]

---

conceptions of whiteness, see Mia Bay, *The White Image in the Black Mind: African-American Ideas about White People, 1830-1925* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000).

[75]This is not a question of whether they *could* or not. Note also that, from what I can tell, Louis R. Sullivan recorded what subjects told him about their background. In the case of students, he eliminated them from the study or corrected their record if he thought their self-reporting could not be right. This seems to have been a rare choice, but it did happen according to Sullivan's correspondence with Bella Weitzner of the American Museum of Natural History. See Division of Anthropology Correspondence, File 768, Division of Anthropology Archives, American Museum of Natural History.

[76]Margaret Lam to Harry Shapiro, August 28, 1931, Box 2, Folder: Lam, Margaret 1932, Shapiro Papers, SC-AMNH. Notably, the confidence with which Lam supposedly identified haole blood also led her to characterize the sexual practices of Hawaiians, particularly Hawaiian women who "promiscuously" coupled with haole men and were, by Lam's logical extension, responsible for undocumented mixture by having illegitimate children. It is also notable that Koki "admitted" to Lam that his Chinese and Hawaiian ancestry did not make itself readily known through his phenotype. Lam, Lessa, and Hulse were suspicious about hidden haole ancestry because it could taint the accuracy of the project and because they were aware that during in the initial years of migration to Hawai'i, many unaccompanied white men coupled with Hawaiian women. There was also, as detailed by L.C. Dunn as discussed in chapter one, ambiguity about the white, Caucasian, and American categories that researchers sought to avoid.

Rather than identifying Koki's looks as signaling unremarkable phenotypic variation, Lam read this as evidence of hidden white "blood" and a probably false claim to Chinese ancestry as well as evidence of his mothers' promiscuity – history revealed by Koki's body itself.

The elimination of questionable cases continued in the calculation room at Harvard University's Peabody Museum, where the data were compiled and statistically tabulated to produce averages for comparative use.[77] In spite of the largess of the calculation project, technicians checked with Shapiro about individual cases. He corresponded frequently with the calculation team from 1932 to 1936 about how to determine which subjects with allegedly questionable pedigrees should be removed from the study. Shapiro encouraged the team's attention to detail and ongoing communication, which suggests that precision at the individual subject level remained a priority even as the project fell behind schedule and surpassed its budget.[78]

This lengthy process put the project years behind schedule and made it increasingly expensive. One year into the calculations process, in November of 1933, Shapiro wrote to Crawford at the University of Hawai'i to update him. He explained that the study was behind in large part because of the amount of calculation involved:

> As to the state of the work, I've been checking over the statistical material completed thus far and I can report that a large part of the Chinese-Hawaiian group is done, but with the addition of almost 3000 Japanese and about 1000 Chinese born in China… I think that three more years at about $2000 a year will be required to complete the entire corpus of material. One must remember that almost 10,000 records are involved and that each record

---

[77]Earnest Hooton, Shapiro's graduate advisor, supervised the anthropology laboratory. See Shapiro to Crawford, June 17, 1931, Folder: Crawford, D.L. 1931-32, Box 1, Shapiro Papers, SC-AMNH.

[78]See correspondence between Shapiro and the Peabody Museum, primarily with Constance 'Connie' Tyler, from 1932-36, Folder: Shapiro, H.L. Chinese-Hawaiian Study Correspondence, Box 1, Harry L. Shapiro Collection, Division of Anthropology, AMNH.

> contains over 40 measurements, 30 indices, 30 observations and other data, making a total of 400,000 measurements.[79]

Once the Harvard team finished calculating averages, standard deviations, and other statistical analyses, Shapiro still had to analyze these figures and, in the case of the Japanese study, arrange the data a few different ways to assess the effect of various factors such as age and occupation on morphological differences. Turning the numbers into understandable and properly substantiated conclusions was its own challenge.

One way that Shapiro attempted to reduce subjectivity in the Japanese study was by assigning a single researcher, Frederick Hulse, to take all the measurements. "Experience has demonstrated only too often that different investigators of the same populations may achieve varying degrees of divergence in their results," Shapiro wrote. "It is well known that the difficulty of taking certain measurements such as nose height often leads to large personal equations." Between January 1931 and February 1932, Frederick Hulse did everything except clerical work in both Hawai'i and Japan.[80] This concern with consistency in combination with the removal of doubtful subjects was a an outright if understated admission of the subjectivity inherent to racial research that Shapiro was trying to minimize.

Even though Shapiro reported in 1933 that most of the calculation on the Chinese-Hawaiian data was complete, he never published findings and appears to have left that project aside to working on the Japanese part of the study. He did, however, over the course of the two studies, shift from studying the *stability* of the Chinese "type" to the *plasticity* of the Japanese "type," a difference in vocabulary that shows how his thinking about race was

---

[79]Harry Shapiro to D.L. Crawford, November 29, 1933, Box 4, Folder: 1933, Shapiro Papers, SC-AMNH.

[80]Shapiro, *Migration and Environment*, 11.

shifting during these years toward an orientation that assumed change and sought to document it and explain why it happened.

Because Shapiro focused on documenting differences among three groups of Japanese and did not include any work on mixing, the calculations and analysis of the Japanese data were simpler; not simple, but simpler because of the lack of having to deal with an entirely different set of questions about hereditary mechanisms and outcomes. Additionally, Shapiro could be sure that morphological differences in the Japanese study were attributable to changes in environment, a vague set of forces and geographical differences, or perhaps a selective mechanism of some kind rather than combinations of racial traits. Even leaving the morphological effects of racial mixing aside, Shapiro's conclusions about the Japanese study pointed to the plasticity of race and suggested reasons for change, but once again argued for the necessity of additional long-term research.

The Finding of Plasticity Shifts the Terrain of Racial Research

Shapiro's primary finding was that there were statistically significant differences between the three groups of Japanese people in his study no matter how he parsed the data: by age, occupation, or family origin. This represented a shift away from his interest in the *stability* of the Chinese type, as he put it in the early stages of his work in Hawai'i, toward racial *plasticity*. Anthropologists, for the most part, had begun to acknowledge individual variation among people of the same race. Since statistical averaging of anthropometric data had arrived as a method, racial studies focused on average characteristics that were unchanging over time. According to Shapiro, "the vast bulk of comparative racial studies

rests on this tacit belief in the stability of the statistical balance of the component variables of a population."[81]

Shapiro found plasticity, but he also concluded that plasticity was finite: physical change was limited by "the fundamental structure of the organism." This meant that Japanese who migrated to Hawai'i or were born in Hawai'i would never become identical to Native Hawaiians or entirely lose their similarity from Japanese living in Japan.[82] In the last paragraph of the text, in which he explained his opinion about the limits of plasticity, Shapiro argued that understanding plasticity as a "response… common to all organisms" required additional research. He could be certain that his data demonstrated plasticity, but ultimately scientists knew so little about the nature of plasticity that it was neither possible "to predict how much change in milieu is necessary to produce physical alteration, nor to single out which of the many elements composing the environment are especially effective."[83]

Although he did not speculate extensively on every element of "environment" that could have been at work, Shapiro emphasized the complexity and near boundlessness of what constituted "environment." He also acknowledged that the "environment" was constantly changing and that separating environment and organism was an act of artifice. In spite of the plethora of physical, climactic, social, and cultural variables, the study considered environment as an entity anyway and, despite the inability to "correlate modifications in bodily characteristics with specific environmental forces," the pressing problem was "to demonstrate whether or not bodily modifications do occur under environmental changes,

---

[81]Shapiro, *Migration and Environment*, 184.
[82]Shapiro, *Migration and Environment*, 202.
[83]Shapiro, *Migration and Environment*, 202.

whatever may be the specific environmental factor involved."[84] This was a preliminary, foundational research question. It followed Boas' study, which demonstrated that environmental change did correlate with changes to head form. Shapiro argued that scientists needed time to tease out specifics about how specific environmental mechanisms affected morphology, an argument that strengthened the claim that Hawai'i necessitated monitoring for several generations.

In the interest of making it understandable and navigable for readers, Shapiro carefully outlined the contents of the book, which he arranged into nine chapters. After introducing the study and explaining his methods (chapters one and two), he reported findings in two chapters comparing the total series of sedentes, immigrants, and Hawaiian born subjects to each other (chapters three and four). In chapters five through seven, he rearranged his data to test how differences between the groups emerged when age, occupation and socio-economic status, and prefectural origin in Japan were taken into account.[85] The last two chapters contained assessment of qualitative traits that could not be measured anthropometrically, such as eye and skin color, and a detailed "recapitulation and conclusions" of the voluminous data. Shapiro provided a summary at the beginning of each chapter to provide readers a "kind of 'life line' in the sea of details which follows."[86] This "sea of details," however, was an important characteristic of the study and helped convince readers of the scientific integrity of the project and the necessity of continued research: If Shapiro completed a study this mathematically complicated, yet precise, and developed three

---

[84]Shapiro, *Migration and Environment*, 6.
[85]Shapiro, *Migration and Environment*, 12.
[86]Shapiro, *Migration and Environment*, 12.

interpretive approaches to ensure an accurate reading of the data, yet the findings remained general, then this was an enormous yet presumably solvable problem for anthropology.

The study had significance as a foray into studies of selection, whether it was "natural" selection or something else, and thus evolution. Shapiro concluded that "selection and modification by environment" explained the differences between Japanese "born and bred in Hawaii" from their relatives in Japan.[87] However, it was not clear how selection was at work. For Shapiro, selection was a biologically significant event that had an explanation or rationale even if it was not immediately apparent or accessible given available research tools. Shapiro highlighted the

> possible significance which the physical history of the Japanese in Hawaii may possess for the understanding of human evolution and differentiation. If migratory groups represent selected strains of a population which may later undergo additional modification through environmental influences, then a mechanism is provided here to explain some of the variation which is encountered among related populations. I do not suggest that selective migration and environmental modification are the only or even the major forces in evolution or in producing group variations, but they do offer contributory factors to the complex process of differentiation and evolution. I see no reason why evolution and variation need necessarily be confined to a single mechanism. It seems to me that a truer picture would include the combined inter-action of a large number of factors and circumstances.[88]

Reviewers were particularly interested in Shapiro's commentary about selection and how complicated it was to study. One wrote that "the chain of events which he has disclosed seems to him to constitute a type of evolutionary process which should be born in mind whether one is immersed in theoretical questions of racial development or in practical research into historical relationships."[89]

---

[87]Shapiro, *Migration and Environment*, 202.

[88]Shapiro, *Migration and Environment*, 201-202.

[89]W. W. Howells, review of *Migration and Environment*, by Harry L. Shapiro, *American Anthropologist* 41, no. 4 (Oct.-Dec. 1939), 638.

Migration and Environment was widely and favorably reviewed for its voluminous data, careful multiple-angle analysis, and forthrightness about limitations and weaknesses. After it came out in 1939, the geographers, biologists, and other scientists who reviewed it agreed that *Migration and Environment* was "pioneer work," as H.R. Ross put it, and that more research was required to continue making progress on the question of how environment affected morphology. While Shapiro was praised for definitively showing that race was plastic, he was also praised for his careful analysis and refusal to overreach. He made a convincing case that a significant process had occurred, change produced by some combination of selection and environmental factors, but that the specifics of how these worked exactly were unclear, and would need sustained scientific attention for multiple generations.

Reviewers also noted that *Migration and Environment* was an improvement over Boas' *Changes in Bodily Form of Descendents of Immigrants.* While one reviewer, Joseph S. Roucek, noted that, "It is a credit to the author that his analysis has revealed to him the necessity of additional data," another, W.W. Howells of the American Museum of Natural History, compared the study to Boas', which had created a "sensation a generation ago," and praised Shapiro for attempting to pin-point the causes of physical changes rather than simply documenting them as Boas did (even thought Boas' results represented an important intervention in racially essentialist thought).[90] Notably, Shapiro's data convinced them about the plasticity of race, not the concept of race itself. Howells continued, "Dr. Shapiro has now produced a clearer case of measurable change arising from migration to a new environment, and has proceeded with such care, both before and after the fact, that any

[90]Joseph S. Roucek, "Japanese Migrants in Hawaii," *Geographical Review* 29, no. 3 (Jul. 1939), 516; Howells, review of *Migration and Environment,* 635.

'debunking' explanation of his findings will have to be a subtle one.'[91] Howells also reported that because Shapiro included "sedentes," Japanese residing in the precise locations from whence his Hawai'i-residing subjects came, "no doubts can be raised against the community of ancestry of all three divisions, as was the case with Boas' material.'[92] Still, even if it was the first word on the question of racial plasticity in nearly three decades, since Boas' study in 1912, it was far from the last word.

One of the things this study did was precipitate questions about the next steps in racial studies and in anthropology specifically. Anticipating significant shifts in scientific understandings of race not just among individual researchers, but at the disciplinary level, *Geographical Journal* reviewer "R.P." asked,

> Will anthropologists turn from the question of the supposed influence of race on culture to the reverse hypothesis? Will questions of physiology, ecology, and sociology loom larger in the future study of race than cherished anthropometric postulates? What are the quantitative and qualitative limits to the influence of environment on race? And what will be the effect of studies such as this on theories of evolution and migration? In stressing problems such as these, and in suggesting a more dynamic conception of racial characteristics, Professor Shapiro's work is an outstanding contribution, the significance of which is difficult to overestimate.[93]

The questions prompted by Shapiro's study were the precise questions that occupied human scientists in a variety of fields in the 1940s and 1950s.

While *Migration and Environment* was significant for a number of fields, its "real significance," according to another reviewer, was "the extent to which his results affect our present conceptions of physical anthropology.'[94] H.R. Ross wrote that there was insufficient

---

[91]Howells, review of *Migration and Environment*, 636.

[92]Howells, review of *Migration and Environment*, 636.

[93]R.P., review of *Migration and Environment*, by Harry L. Shapiro, *The Geographical Journal* 94, no. 1 (Jul. 1939), 84-85.

[94] H. R. Ross, "Review: 150," *Man* 40 (Aug. 1940), 127.

evidence to show that the form of selection that perhaps happened or was happening within the Japanese study was

> cumulative or could in any way produce an effect comparable to a new type of *Homo sapiens*. This seems to be supported by the fact that the differences between Hawaiian-born and Immigrants are merely those of degree and may be due to the influence of environment on genetical expression alone. If this is so, the changes might be expected to become rapidly static, and thus the selective effect on the gene-complex would be strictly limited in extent.[95]

"The only way to test the validity of such a suggestion would be to continue the experiment over a number of generations and, if possible," he wrote, "to make observations of a sample of Hawaiian-born brought back to Japan – both extraordinarily difficult feats to accomplish." The key to the problem, then, lay in genetics, a science that Ross indicated was so young that it had thus far not been of much help to anthropology. Reviewers said what Shapiro did not or could not: that a combination of classic research methods in physical anthropology with genetic research was required to pursue some of the more complicated questions about selection and the influence of environment on morphology. This line of research is something Shapiro took after World War II as he attempted to advance the new biological anthropology.

Conclusion

Shapiro's research laid the intellectual groundwork for a continuing focus on "the race problem" in Hawai'i. As Shapiro's book went to press, an unidentified author at the University, likely University of Hawai'i president David Crawford, sociology and economics professor Romanzo Adams, or both of them, asserted that such studies would be "of undoubted value to scientists and of significance to educators, governmental officials, and all

[95]Ross, "Review," 127. Note here that Ross, writing in 1940, says explicitly that a new racial type could not be in the making. This is the opposite of what Dunn projected in the 1920s and what Adams predicted in the late 1930s. See chapters one and three, respectively.

who have an interest in the Hawaiian Islands as a strategic point in the Pacific." Influenced by the author, the press also presumed that work should be ongoing.[96] The report also explained that, "With two assistants from Harvard University, he undertook a series of studies on the results of racial hybridizing, concentrating on the crossing between Chinese and native Hawaiians and using the Japanese as a check. These studies were the most extensive ever undertaken in this field and indicated that within a generation profound changes occur in physical traits formerly considered to be stable. The speculative consequences of these investigations are of considerable importance."[97] Shapiro had argued that measurable changes occurred. Whether these were changes profound or not is subjective, but it is clear that the probable authors of the report viewed the finding of plasticity itself profound.

While he had started out interested in the examining the stability of racial types like Chinese, Shapiro eventually concluded that race was plastic, but that there were limits on how much an environment could affect change.[98] Tracy Teslow has suggested that Shapiro "was trying to isolate environment as an independent variable" in his studies in Hawai'i.[99] By the end of the Japanese project, this was true, but it was true largely because he was convinced of the limited plasticity of race; he did not need evidence beyond what he had gathered. Shapiro's reviewers were also satisfied that his study demonstrated that there was flexibility and variance of physical features within the persistent category of race. Shapiro and his reviewers did not press for further research on the extent of plasticity, in general or

---

[96]"University of Hawaii – Race Research," 1938, folder 9, box 1, series 214S, RG 1.1, Rockefeller Foundation Archives, RAC.

[97]"University of Hawaii – Race Research," 1938, pages 3-4, folder 9, box 1, series 214S, RG 1.1, Rockefeller Foundation Archives, RAC.

[98]Shapiro, *Migration and Environment*, 202.

[99]Teslow, "Representing Race to the Public," 110.

among specific groups other than Japanese. Rather, they advocated for rather long-term research on how environment influenced development and morphology, and reviewers in particular demonstrated interest in how selection might have worked.

At the beginning of the University of Hawai'i's coordinated race research project, its instigators presented the work as of universal value and of primarily scientific rather than political significance. Rockefeller official Edwin Embree claimed that, "The opportunity of the University to study sympathetically yet scientifically a fascinating group of diverse peoples is unique. The trustees and officers of the Rockefeller Foundation count it an honor to be able to have some part in making possible work which may be of significance not only to the Pacific but to Human Society generally."[100] Like studies that began in the 1910s, the research opportunities in Hawai'i promised valuable general knowledge about racial biology. At the end of Harry Shapiro's project, he reiterated the primacy of biology. "Our concern here, however, is with only one of the innumerable currents, spiritual, social, economic, and biologic, which these wholesale movements set into complex motion," he wrote, singling out biology as the focus of his work. "Although biologists have exhibited some interest in the effect of migration on the lower organisms, students of man have lamentably neglected this aspect of their investigations of human biology, even though, as we have seen, migration has always been and is especially now profoundly characteristic of his behavior."[101]

In 1931, in his article in *Natural History*, which highlighted Hawai'i's "racial history" and provided photographic evidence of its supposedly rapidly mixing, yet still relatively primitive peoples, Shapiro established human migration and settlement in Hawai'i as part of an experiment rather than part of the expansion of global capitalism and the development of

[100]Teslow, "Representing Race to the Public," 110.
[101]Shapiro, *Migration and Environment*, 4.

Hawai'i's plantation economy. By 1940, he still argued that Hawai'i functioned as a laboratory, but with a different emphasis in his approach. In the June 1940 issue of *Asia*, a popular magazine focused on East Asia and the Middle East, Shapiro wrote an article titled "Certain Aspects of Race: A Study of Japanese Immigrants and Their Children in the Environment of Hawaii Shows Clear Changes in Physical Traits."[102] It was the second in "an illuminating set of articles on race and racial problems as viewed by leading anthropologists." Franz Boas had published the first article, titled "Racial Purity," the previous month, and now Shapiro argued that the "controlled experiment" of Hawai'i demonstrated that what scientists thought they knew about race as a zoological phenomenon needed complete revision. This did not mean that the concept of race itself was a problem. It meant that, "even admitting the validity of a racial classification for mankind, the physical foundations of the current divisions require a thorough revision."[103] Shapiro made the argument that race was "nothing more than biology," as Peggy Pascoe has put it, and had unfortunately accumulated hierarchical and discriminatory overlays over two centuries.[104] This was one of two arguments about race that scientists began to make in the 1930s. The other was that race was not biological. Both of these arguments found their way into popular and legal discourse and remain persistent. According to Shapiro, social meanings had been attached to what was originally and truly a zoological concept.[105]

---

[102]Harry L. Shapiro, "Certain Aspects of Race: A Study of Japanese Immigrants and Their Children in the Environment of Hawaii Shows Clear Changes in Physical Traits," *Asia* 40 (June 1940), 323-326.

[103]Shapiro, "Certain Aspects of Race," 326.

[104]Pascoe, "Miscegenation Law and Ideologies of 'Race' in Twentieth-Century America," *Journal of American History* 83, No. 1 (June 1996), 54-55.

[105]Shapiro, "Certain Aspects of Race," 323.

Tracy Teslow has suggested that Harry Shapiro eventually resolved his uncertainties about the definition of "environment," shifting his regard for "humans as creatures whose appearance and heredity were incomprehensible without recourse to their culture and history… to a view of humans as primarily evolved organisms – a species – whose culture is encompassed in a biological notion of environment. Thus, culture became an element of the biological history of man, rather than biology being understood through the lens of particular histories and cultures."[106] It was the very uncertainty and flexibility of environment as a concept that made studies of race seem important and worth pursuing even when the methods did not reveal causal relationships, help narrow the meaning of environment, or narrow the findings to a recognizable part of environment.

Shapiro appears to have abandoned the Chinese-Hawaiian project, which yielded no publications save the article in *Natural History*, which contained preliminary observations. In the end, it was not the subject pool that rendered the Chinese-Hawaiian study inconclusive. It was the combined project of studying plasticity of race and the hereditary mechanisms of mixing at the same time. The size of the subject pool might have also been a complicating factor. Ultimately, however, what the history of that project tells us about racial research in the early 1930s is how ubiquitous racial ambiguity was, how anxious it made researchers, particularly junior scholars like William Lessa and Margaret Lam, and how persistent belief in race was. Precisely categorizing subjects was a necessary step in the data collection process because it rendered otherwise arbitrary and unconnected data meaningful. In other words, collecting people's measurements became a useless endeavor if the measurements were not attached to a racial pedigree since a clear race or pedigree did not emerge out of the

---

[106]Teslow, "Representing Race to the Public," 76.

accumulated data. Being forced to decide – and make extremely difficult judgments in some cases – before including subjects' measurements in the study could have negated the assumption that race was obvious or self-evident. However, this practice represented researchers' persistent assumption that expected phenotype and racial pedigree were aligned and recognizable by experts' naked eyes.

Scientists like Shapiro treated Hawai'i as a racial laboratory by framing its ethnically diverse population as the product of naturalized migration, contact, and in some cases, interracial reproduction. This was a way of thinking about the islands rendered them internationally important for science while helping to claim them for the United States. By biologizing the process by which Hawai'i became diverse in the first place, scientists shifted attention away from the political and economic processes that brought races into contact. They did not deal with the essential social context for meeting and mixing. Instead they shifted attention to the mere fact of biological proximity and the demographic and individual changes this proximity produced. This helped render American colonialism increasingly invisible both among settlers in Hawai'i as well as to "mainland" Americans during a period when officials at the University of Hawai'i and their contacts in the local plantation-centered business community were interested in the qualities of Hawai'i's population as part of their labor management agenda and discussions about achieving statehood – issues that they rarely made explicit.

Shapiro's work helped frame Hawai'i itself as a crucial laboratory for studying race, and not just for physical anthropometric and genetic work. After Shapiro published *Migration and Environment*, in part because his work was one component of a larger project headquartered at the University of Hawai'i, research on race mixing and migratory

adaptation continued among sociologists in particular. Indeed, as race was increasingly interpreted by social scientists in ways that were not simply biological, Hawai'i remained idealized as the ideal place to do sociological work.

Chapter Three

Turning a Colony into a Melting Pot: Romanzo Adams' *Interracial Marriage in Hawaii* and the Natural History of Hawai'i's Americanization, 1919-1937

Just as scientists working in Hawai'i in the 1920s established it as a perfect laboratory for studying the biological consequences of race mixing, social scientists such as University of Hawai'i sociologist Romanzo C. Adams framed it as the perfect location to study race relations. "Hawaii has some characteristics suggestive of a race relations laboratory," he reported to the Rockefeller Foundation in 1931. "Hawaii's governmental, industrial, and educational systems are such as to yield a constant stream of data relating to the various racial and hybrid groups."[1] Hawai'i's position as a global conduit that was relatively geographically isolated also made it an exceptionally promising place to study social processes. "The historic development of the islands has been influenced by forces coming from the outside world," Adams wrote, "but their comparative isolation due to distance has been favorable to a relatively independent development in response to internal forces. Hawaii's pattern of race relations is not copied from America or Asia. It is a product of local conditions and experience. Hawaiian attitudes toward race are distinctively Hawaiian."[2] According to Adams, Hawai'i's distinctiveness is precisely what made it a globally important research site. In his report to the Rockefeller Foundation on the progress of and possibilities inherent to "The Study of Race Relations in Hawaii," Adams reminded his benefactors that, "The study of race relations in Hawaii is not primarily for local purposes.

---

[1]Romanzo Adams "The Study of Race Relations in Hawaii" (1931), folder 7, box 1, series 214S, RG 1.1, Rockefeller Foundation Archives, RAC, 2. The Rockefeller Foundation, which supported Harry Shapiro's physical anthropological work, began providing funding for sociological research in July 1929. See "University of Hawaii: Payments," September 28, 1931, folder 6, box 1, series 214S, RG 1.1, Rockefeller Foundation Archives, RAC.

[2]Adams, "The Study of Race Relations in Hawaii," 3.

It is intended to throw light on a world situation."[3] While Adams argued that research in Hawai'i had international relevance and value, its ongoing scientific and social experiment in "inter-racial co-operation" was also, in the words of University of Hawai'i president David Crawford, of "even greater value to the nation than its defensive structures at Pearl Harbor and Diamond Head."[4]

In the late 1920s, as part of the larger research agenda on race biology, psychology, and race relations at the University of Hawai'i, Adams intensified his research on interracial marriage. This chapter outlines Adams' assumptions, which reflected and elaborated upon Chicago race relations theory. It also explains how his sometimes erroneous conclusions supported the American colonial project in Hawai'i. The natural history style narrative of demographic change in Hawai'i and his predictions of eventual complete racial amalgamation naturalized the territory's permanent incorporation into the United States.

Adams' scholarship on Hawai'i fell into two thematic periods. During the 1920s, Adams worked on local projects related to demographic questions, for which he mostly relied on vital statistics. While physical anthropologists working in Hawai'i focused on people with Chinese and Hawaiian ancestry, as detailed in chapters one and two, Adams' local publications focused instead on Hawai'i's increasingly settler, majority Japanese, rather than migrant population. He also wrote extensively about public education, particularly as it related to employment issues in the territory and predictions about population relevant to the intensifying statehood discussion and territorial lobby in the late 1920s.[5] During the

---

[3]Adams, "The Study of Race Relations in Hawaii," 1.

[4]David Livingston Crawford, *Paradox in Hawaii* (Boston: Stratford, 1933). See the book jacket.

[5]See Dean Itsuji Saranillio, "Seeing Conquest: Colliding Histories and the Cultural Politics of Hawai'i Statehood," Ph.D. diss., University of Michigan, 2009.

1930s and culminating with the publication of his book in 1937, Adams dedicated himself to the study of interracial marriage. He made a lasting name for himself by serving as a local authority on race relations, which set the stage for his magnum opus, *Interracial Marriage in Hawaii* (1937), published five years before his death in 1942, to become a landmark synopsis – *the* source on the racial situation in Hawai'i that is still cited for its demographic data. The fact of Hawai'i's ethnic diversity became, in Adams' hands, a definitive history that focused on population change in a broad sense with little to no mention of crucial political and business practices that governed the islands' population. Adams' outlook may have garnered especially broad interest and staying power because of its predictions and their implications for the statehood lobby, as well as its seeming relevance to the lives of Hawai'i residents, who were purportedly evolving into a new "neo-Hawaiian" race.[6]

During the 1920s and 1930s, Adams institutionalized the idea that Hawai'i's race relations were both unorthodox and notably harmonious. In his work as an academic and public intellectual in the territory, Adams told the history of Hawai'i as a natural history of racial contact and mixing, a narrative that downplayed the colonization of Hawai'i and instead framed the islands as becoming increasingly American while lacking the race relations problems of the continent.[7] Adams' history had authority because it was a work of social

---

[6]Adams's history was not the only one writing Hawai'i's history during the interwar years. In 1923, Ralph Kuykendall began his work at the University of Hawai'i on a history commissioned by the territory that became a public school textbook that was adopted in 1926. Herbert Gregory, director of the Bernice Pauahi Bishop Museum helped with the project. See also Sidney L. Gulick, *Mixing the Races in Hawaii: A Study of the Coming Neo-Hawaiian American Race*, (Honolulu: The Hawaiian Board Book Rooms, 1937). Gulick's book argued more emphatically for the eventuality of the neo-Hawaiian American type and drew heavily on Adams' and other University of Hawaii scholars' work as he did so.

[7]Mary Louise Pratt details the production of narratives of anti-conquest by European travel writers and natural historians in *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation* (New York: Routledge, 1992), 7, 39, 78. See also the introduction to Christina Klein, *Cold War*

science. Moreover, it served as a foundational narrative and research framework for students of the sociology department at the University of Hawai'i. It naturalized the idea that Asian settlers were immigrants rather than migrant labor recruits who were initially expected to return to their home countries and the presumption that they would never politically overpower Hawai'i's haole elite. It also publicized the idea that pure or full-blooded Kānaka Maoli (Native Hawaiians) were disappearing while "part-Hawaiians" or "mixed-bloods" were increasing and contributing toward an emerging thoroughly hybridized people.

Sociologists working in Hawai'i marveled at what they perceived as naturally racially peaceful social conditions. They observed race relations in Hawai'i in the 1920s and 1930s as calm relative to the continental United States, as the islands lacked the Jim Crow legal segregation, anti-miscegenation laws, and white-on-black racial violence of the American South. Indeed, the idea that Hawai'i, as a supposed biological and cultural melting pot, was a positive example for the continental United States was a racially progressive claim in the context of the times of Jim Crow.[8] This relativist stance was central to Adams' and most of his colleagues' approach to their studies in Hawai'i. However, recent critics have registered dismay that anyone could perceive territorial Hawai'i as egalitarian given its racial, class, and

---

Orientalism: Asia in the Middlebrow Imagination, 1945-1961, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003), 13.

[8]The United States has been imagined as a melting pot in a variety of ways since mass immigration began in the mid-nineteenth century. First and second-generation European immigrants rather than Anglo-Saxon nativists first espoused this vision. The term melting pot was coined by Israel Zangwill in his 1908 play *The Melting Pot*. See also Matthew Frye Jacobson, *Barbarian Virtues: The United States Encounters Foreign Peoples at Home and Abroad, 1876-1917* (New York: Hill & Wang, 2001).

increasing settler-native inequality during the territorial period.[9] Nonetheless, Adams characterized Hawai'i's race relations as unusual and peaceful based on his understanding of continental American race relations as well as race relations in South Africa, Australia, and other settler societies.[10]

Adams' prediction that a new race was in the making relied on the Chicago interaction cycle, also know as the race relation cycle and the assimilation cycle. Developed by University of Chicago sociologists Robert E. Park's and Earnest W. Burgess, the interaction cycle consisted of contact, competition or conflict, accommodation, and assimilation.[11] Park, Burgess, and their colleagues and their students studied race relations

---

[9]Okamura, *Ethnicity and Inequality*, 8. On social conditions in Hawai'i prior to World War II, see David E. Stannard, *Honor Killing: Race, Rape, and Clarence Darrow's Spectacular Last Case* (New York: Penguin Books, 2005); Moon-Kie Jung, *Reworking Race: The Making of Hawaii's Interracial Labor Movement* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2006); and Gary Okihiro, *Cane Fires: The Anti-Japanese Movement in Hawaii, 1865-1945* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1991).

[10] Adams, Lind, and others were preoccupied with race and said almost nothing about the colonial contexts with which they compared Hawai'i. For example, until 1948, when apartheid as a system of legal racial segregation began, South Africa was much more obviously a colonialist regime than an explicitly racist one, yet Adams and his American colleagues had little to say about colonialism. Comparing Hawai'i's race relations with other societies' race relations fundamentally informed their approach to the study of Hawai'i and its history. Adams treated Hawai'i as having race problems – but fewer race problems than on the continent – but did not identify Hawai'i as being colonial the way South Africa was. One explanation for this is that Adams understood race prejudice as a pervasive attitude and social practice. Racism as a structural or institutional phenomenon was not part of his analytic frame. On the distinction between colonialist and racist regimes, see George Frederickson, *Racism: A Short History* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002), 184 n2. On settler colonialism (and the ongoing invasion that it comprises) as a structure rather than an event, see Patrick Wolfe, *Settler Colonialism and the Transformation of Anthropology: The Politics and Poetics of an Ethnographic Event* (London: Cassell, 1999), 2.

[11]See Robert E. Park and Ernest W. Burgess, *Introduction to the Science of Sociology* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1921). The copy I am using is the third edition published in 1969. See also Yu, *Thinking Orientals*. Yu says that Chicago sociologists saw through the "myth" of racial harmony and hospitality championed by white planter class "boosters" (80-84). Perhaps this is so, but they also identified a lack of racial antagonism that placed Hawai'i farther along the assimilation cycle than any place in the United States and

and conceptions of difference as well as progress through this cycle by assessing the social distance between members of different racialized groups, particularly in urban settings. Chicago sociologists' focus on marriage and "mixing" precipitated out of their spatial orientation toward sociological questions, and became, for many of them, the single best way to study race relations. They conflated interracial marriage and interracial reproduction without apparent concern because they were interested in social distance and in individuals' behaviors and consciousness rather than legality, except to the degree that anti-miscegenation laws hindered "natural" behaviors. According to Henry Yu,

> Intermarriage stood at the most intimate point along these boundaries of difference, and American social scientists in the 1920s went so far as to make it the ground zero in their attempts to quantify and measure the amount of difference between cultures. In theories about what they labeled 'social distance,' sociologists asserted that the quantity of difference between cultures was equal to the degree of intimacy and abhorrence that members of one group felt toward the other. In this way, sexual relations and reproduction came to represent the most intimate of social relations, equated with the most profound lack of measurable distance (both physical and social) between two races and cultures.[12]

Notably, Chicago sociologists saw interracial sex and marriage as both symbols of closing distance as well as the most efficient actual pathways to assimilation if they produced children. In other words, they were both the cause and effect of assimilation.

Henry Yu points out that there was public and academic fascination in the continental United States with miscegenation and interracial sex and marriage, particularly between white women and nonwhite "Oriental" men.[13] This fascination was imbedded in widespread fear of white race suicide and disgust over "Oriental men preying upon helpless

---

overlooked how assimilating native Hawaiians and Asian migrants preserved colonial control by the haole (white) settler elite who mostly wished to permanently incorporate Hawai'i into the United States.

[12]Yu, "Mixing Bodies and Cultures," 447.

[13]Yu, *Thinking Orientals*, 57.

white women."[14] Interracial sex and marriage between Orientals and other nonwhite people, such as Hawaiians, did not motivate these same fears because the color line between white and nonwhite was not transgressed. It seems as though interracial marriage in Hawai'i was something white academics sentimentalized because it was a manifestation of their assimilationist ideals, which simultaneously maintained sexual and familiar boundaries between white and nonwhite people. In other words, intermarriage in Hawai'i served as evidence of the islands' racial harmony, and thus progress through the Chicago race relations cycle, but did not compromise control of the islands by the haole elite and in fact helped strengthen the islands' intensifying American settler culture.

In *Interracial Marriage in Hawaii*, the amalgamation supposedly occurring in Hawai'i functioned variously as a companion to the fourth stage of the interaction cycle, assimilation, and a virtual fifth stage. Park and Burgess, as they worked on the continent and especially as they theorized about black-white relations, did not speculate that there would ever be amalgamation of white people and black people. As they studied the social position of "Orientals" in America, defined as people of Chinese and Japanese ancestry, Chicago sociologists never argued that white people and "Orientals" on the west coast would amalgamate, but rather that "Orientals" would blend in culturally with white people.[15] Adams' argument that amalgamation was producing a new race was specific to Hawai'i. It was also exceptionalist. Amalgamation suggested a degree of assimilation so far unrealized by any other society.

---

[14]Yu, *Thinking Orientals*, 58.

[15]While University of Chicago sociologists and their students conducted research in the urban environment of Chicago, the primary organized research project on the West Coast was the Survey of Race Relations on the Pacific Coast from 1924 to 1926. See Eckard Toy, "Whose Frontier?: The Survey of Race Relations on the Pacific Cost in the 1920s," *Oregon Historical Quarterly* 107, no. 1 (2006), 36-63; and Yu, *Thinking Orientals*.

In twentieth century Hawai'i, a specific racial project was used to support the consolidation of American settler colonialism. This project was the creation of an exceptionalist narrative about Hawai'i's racial harmony and physical blending.[16] This project focused on assimilation. While it was presented as anti-racist, its intellectual basis and political aims reveal a particular kind of racialism at work. The aim of assimilation was not inclusion defined by the liberation or equality of nonwhite people, but rather making them less like their ancestors, culturally and perhaps physically as well. This project was a settler colonial project. Racism and colonialism have generally been aligned historiographically, as the production of race itself and the development of racist governing and social practices that have been central to a number of colonial projects.[17] Lest we assume the opposite, however, John P. Jackson, Jr. and Andrew Winston remind us that "the link between anticolonialism and antiracism is contingent rather than necessary."[18] Eric Love has demonstrated that many American anti-imperialists at the end of the nineteenth century

---

[16]On racial projects, see Omi and Winant, 56. We should "think of racial formation processes as occurring through a linkage between structure and representation. Racial *projects* do the ideological 'work' of making these links. *A racial project is simultaneously an interpretation, representation, or explanation of racial dynamics, and an effort to reorganize and redistribute resources along particular racial lines.* Racial projects connect what race *means* in a particular discursive practice and they ways in which both social structures and everyday experiences are racially *organized*, based upon that meaning." Original emphasis.

[17]The literature on racist colonial practices is vast. See Ann Laura Stoler, *Race and the Education of Desire: Foucault's* History of Sexuality *and the Colonial Order of Things* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1995); Stoler, *Carnal Knowledge and Imperial Power: Race and the Intimate in Colonial Rule* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002); and Warwick Anderson, *Colonial Pathologies.* On racism in the context of settler colonialism specifically, see Warwick Anderson, *The Cultivation of Whiteness: Science, Health, and Racial Destiny in Australia* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2006); and Fujikane and Okamura, eds., *Asian Settler Colonialism.* On parallel processes in the American colony of Puerto Rico, see Laura Briggs, *Reproducing Empire: Race, Sex, Science, and U.S. Imperialism in Puerto Rico* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002).

[18]John P. Jackson, Jr. and Andrew W. Winston, "The Last Repatriationist: The Career of Earnest Sevier Cox," in Paul Farber and Hamilton Cravens, eds., *Race and Science: Scientific Challenges to Racism in Modern America* (Corvallis: Oregon State University Press, 2009), 59.

made racist arguments against colonizing the Philippines and Hawai'i.[19] In territorial Hawai'i, social scientists generally made assimilationist arguments for ongoing colonial occupation and further incorporation of Hawai'i into the United States. These arguments carried the mantle of anti-racism because they were not overtly discriminatory, and helped obscure the colonial project at hand. Adams in particular deployed his social theory and vision, which was relatively progressive in the context of the times, for colonial, not anticolonial, ends.

Meanwhile, overtly racist practices continued to bolster American hegemony in Hawai'i in the face of a majority ancestrally Asian population, particularly Japanese, whose presence "was deemed antithetical to the goal of Americanizing the islands, especially after World War I."[20] For example, the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act (1921) legally defined native Hawaiians as people with one-half blood quantum as part of a supposedly extinction-preventing rehabilitation program that was explicitly anti-Asian.[21] In detailing the negotiations around this bill and its legacy, J. Kēhaulani Kauanui argues that "white supremacist racism and colonialism worked together with xenophobic anti-immigration sentiments" to forcibly eliminate Hawaiians by encoding their legal disappearance and to exclude people of Asian ancestry. "Orientals," as white commentators often referred to Asian migrants, were configured as economic and political threats to haole control, yet considered possibly susceptible to Americanization.[22] Kauanui points out that the possibility of Americanizing, or assimilating, Asian people was a racist project intended to get rid of

---

[19]Eric T.L. Love, *Race over Empire: Racism and U.S. Imperialism, 1865-1900* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004).

[20]Kauanui, *Hawaiian Blood*, 20.

[21]J. Kēhaulani Kauanui, *Hawaiian Blood: Colonialism and the Politics of Sovereignty and Indigeneity* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2008), 107.

[22]Kauanaui, *Hawaiian Blood*, 19-20.

their undesirable Asianness. In Adams' hands, the Americanization of people of Asian ancestry became expected as they moved through the interaction cycle and supposed amalgamation became a symbol of anti-racist sentiment in Hawai'i, a civic mythology of racial progress.[23]

Adams' prediction of total amalgamation began to sound like promotion, and interracial marriage, something only relative racial liberals condoned, supposedly functioned to Americanize Hawai'i. Unlike white supremacists who supported anti-miscegenation laws, Adams and his Chicago School colleagues believed that racial problems would be solved by reducing social distance between people of different races. This position made them relatively liberal about race. In their minds, interracial marriage represented the pinnacle of reduced social distance because it was the most intimate relationship possible. Good intentions, which for Adams and his colleagues included increasing awareness of the social processes involved in reducing racial prejudice caused by social distance, did not prevent them from producing knowledge that statehood advocates relied upon, however loosely, to argue for permanent incorporation into the United States. Adams and his colleagues, generally speaking, promoted the legitimacy and development of Hawai'i as a permanent American settlement.[24]

---

[23]The idea of a civic mythology of racial progress is borrowed from Nikhil Singh, who argues that an account of the civil rights era focused on Martin Luther King, Jr. "has become central to a civic mythology of racial progress in late twentieth-century America." Singh, *Black is a Country*, 5.

[24]For an accounts of Hawai'i's colonization through the installation of Western law, the usurpation of the power of the King, and the overthrow of the Hawaiian government and later annexation by the United States, all of which have been deemed illegal under Hawaiian, American, and international law, see Sally Engle Merry, *Colonizing Hawai'i: The Cultural Power of Law* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000); Jonathan Kay Kamakawiwo'ole Osorio, *Dismembering Lāhui: A History of the Hawaiian Nation to 1887* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2002); and Noenoe K. Silva, *Aloha Betrayed: Native Hawaiian Resistance to American*

Although they emphasized different frames at different times during the 1920s and 1930s, Adams and others, including Robert Park, treated race as heavily social in significance, but still biological. Adams assumed that studying interracial marriages and the offspring who were the product of reproductive sex within those marriages would reveal important truths about race relations. His approach differed somewhat from that of Robert Park, who proposed a social understanding of race and attempted to remove bodily difference from his studies.[25] As Park and his colleagues attempted to theorize about race in social rather than biological terms, Adams treated race as socially important, to be sure, but also significantly biological and physical, and mixing as socially important *because* of its physicality, as evidenced by his focus on amalgamation. His definition of mixing assumed the stability of the racial categories he examined one by one in his book. As explained earlier, Louis Sullivan and Harry Shapiro understood the racial categories they used in their research as biological, morphological categories. Adams' used similar categories, which had been established by the Bureau of the Census, during a time when some academics were developing the idea that race was not biological and others began, in some cases, to argue that it was *merely* biological.[26] Adams' focus on amalgamation kept race biology in sociology, which was otherwise heading toward an almost solely social approach to race. The malleability of the definition of race during these years allowed for a powerful narrative

---

Colonialism (Durham: Duke University Press, 2004). See also the official apology from the U.S. government to Native Hawaiians, U.S. Congress, *100th Anniversary of the Overthrow of the Hawaiian Kingdom*, Public Law 103-150, 103d Cong., 1st Sess., 107 Stat 1510, S.J. Res. 19, November 23, 1993.

[25]Yu, *Thinking Orientals*, 77-79. See also Michael Omi and Howard Winant, who characterize Park's approach to race as "social" in *Racial Formation in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1990s* (New York and London: Routledge, 1994), 165n7.

[26]Peggy Pascoe, "Miscegenation Law and Ideologies of 'Race' in Twentieth-Century America," *Journal of American History* 83, no. 1 (June 1996), 54-55.

about mixing and assimilation to develop which was itself flexible and tenacious, as it was able to incorporate new information while retaining its basic form.

Like other Chicago sociologists, Adams' approach to studying race relations in Hawai'i was based on assumptions about intimacy and its sociological meanings. The islands' alleged egalitarianism suggested that the mixed population was moving especially rapidly through the interaction cycle. Adams attributed what he called Hawai'i's unorthodox racial doctrine to Hawaiians' lack of "social bias" against intermarriage and the first American missionaries' ability to adapt to Hawaiian practices. He asserted that missionaries' origins in New England, where, supposedly, there had never been any slavery and there was a long tradition of abolitionism, "predisposed them against doctrines and practices that would tend to reduce Hawaiians… to a status of racial inferiority."[27] Adams also theorized that the presence of eleven statistically significant racial and mixed racial groups explained Hawaii's relative racial harmony.[28] These assumptions about the islands have been criticized and corrected by scholars of Hawai'i, who have illustrated the history of social inequality in the islands.[29] Moreover, a number of historians have written about interracial intimacies and

---

[27]Adams, *Interracial Marriage in Hawaii*, 47 and 54.

[28]Adams, *Interracial Marriage in Hawaii*, 182. See also his 1931 report to the Rockefeller Foundation, in which he explained that "The attitudes of the people are not such as to create any serious obstacles to the ascertainment of relevant factual information. Probably there is as little prejudice or sentiment of a sort to bias information as is to be found anywhere. The fact that in Hawaii there are not just *two* but *several* racial groups has especial value from the standpoint of the isolation and measurement of causal factors" (2-3, original emphasis). Adams, "The Study of Race Relations in Hawaii" (1931), folder 7, box 1, series 214S, RG 1.1, Rockefeller Foundation Archives, RAC. Adams also wrote a paper on this subject for the 1934 meeting of the American Sociological Society. See Adams, "The Unorthodox Race Doctrine of Hawaii," in E.B. Reuter, ed., *Race and Culture Contacts* (New York and London: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1934), 143-160.

[29]See Jonathan Y. Okamura, *Ethnicity and Inequality in Hawai'i* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2008); Gary Okihiro, *Cane Fires: The Anti-Japanese Movement in Hawaii, 1845-1945*, (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1991); Jung, *Reworking Race*; Jonathan Kay

the boundaries maintained in the midst of, or even marked by, physical closeness. Myriad histories reveal that physical closeness including sex, childrearing, housekeeping, and breastfeeding did not "naturally" determine identities or power relations within relationships or promote cultural or familiar assimilation, let alone symbolize equality.[30]

Although Adams and others described Hawai'i as ideal for human research because of a lack of anti-miscegenation laws, Jim Crow practices, and other obstacles to "natural" behaviors that were inhibited and obscured by the continent's regulations and social mores, in reality Hawai'i's social order was heavily managed. The Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association (HSPA) controlled the islands' sugar, pineapple, and longshoring industries and the workers employed by them, a majority of the population. The HSPA had support from the territorial government, which was run largely by haole businesspeople, most of whom descended from missionaries, and the U.S. military.[31] This planned economy, Robert Park noted, was what made Hawai'i an advantageous research site.[32] As shorthand for the economic and political situation in the islands, planned economy is a rather flat

---

Kamakawiwo'ole Osorio, *Dismembering Lāhui: A History of the Hawaiian Nation to 1887* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2002); and Candace Fujikane and Jonathan Y. Okamura. *Asian Settler Colonialism: From Local Governance to the Habits of Everyday Life in Hawai'i.* Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2008).

[30]See Ann Laura Stoler, *Carnal Knowledge and Imperial Power: Race and the Intimate in Colonial Rule* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002); Stoler, "Tense and Tender Ties: The Politics of Comparison in North American History and (Post) Colonial Studies," *Journal of American History* 88, no. 3 (2001): 829-865; and Micki McElya, *Clinging to Mammy: The Faithful Slave in Twentieth-Century America* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2007).

[31]For a description of how the U.S. Navy and territorial officials cooperated to maintain social order, see Stannard, *Honor Killing.*

[32]Robert E. Park, "Introduction," in Romanzo C. Adams, *Interracial Marriage in Hawaii: A Study of the Mutually Conditioned Processes of Acculturation and Amalgamation* (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1937), xiv.

characterization of the labor and material conditions of most of the residents.[33] None of the workers in Hawai'i were slaves, but conditions of employment and day-to-day life were in keeping with other plantation economies. The influence of owners and the territorial government on all matters of life – labor conditions, housing, education – meant a concerted effort at maintaining a social order arranged around differences in class, race, and migration status. This social structure was the context in which Adams, who arrived in Honolulu in 1919, began to study changes to Hawai'i's population since the first Euro-Americans arrived at the turn of the nineteenth century.

Melting, Marriage, and the "Oriental Problem"

While it has been argued that the "longstanding, widespread view" that Hawai'i was a melting pot was "first advanced in the 1920s by Romanzo C. Adams," in actuality he was not the first to make this claim.[34] Following both the annexation of Hawai'i, which was officially completed in 1900, and the release of Israel Zangwill's play *The Melting Pot* in 1909, which popularized the term, a number of articles in lay publications identified Hawai'i's population as undergoing racial and cultural fusion.[35] In 1911, *The Westminster Review* published an article titled "A New Race in the Making: Many Nationalities in the Territory of Hawaii – Process of Fusion Proceeding – The Coming Pacific Race."[36] Liddell Kelley wrote,

> East and West have met in the Hawaiian Islands… and there, amid the isolation secured by thousands of miles of surrounding ocean, an interesting experiment in race fusion is being carried out – an experiment all the more valuable because it is an unintended one. The result must be the evolution of a new type of humanity, distinct from any now in existence, with new social,

---

[33]Jung, *Reworking Race*; Takaki chapter 4 of *Strangers from a Different Shore*? See also Gary Okihiro, *Cane Fires*.

[34]Okamura, *Ethnicity and Inequality in Hawai'i*, 6-7.

[35]Israel Zangwill, *The Melting Pot: Drama in Four Acts* (New York: Macmillan, 1909).

[36]J. Liddell Kelly, "A New Race in the Making," *Westminster Review* 175, no. 4 (Apr. 1911), 357-366.

> moral, and religious ideas. The only thing that can stop the process is an influx of people of Caucasian race in sufficient numbers to constitute the great majority of the community, and of that there is no prospect. Hawaii has for several generations been a sort of ethnological melting-pot, into which people of many and diverse races have been cast, and the Territory is at present given over to the brown, the yellow, the copper-coloured, and the olive-tinted races, with a large admixture of whity-brown people, and the merest sprinkling of whites.[37]

As Kelley noted the widespread mixing, he also predicted that "the outcome will be a race in which the East will predominate."[38]

Adams was first, however, to give scientific authority to the idea that Hawai'i was a melting pot. In 1926, Adams gave a talk to the Pac-Pacific Research Institution that was later published in the *Mid-Pacific Magazine* as "Hawaii as a Racial Melting Pot." In this talk, he reported his first findings and projections based after his first years of work in the Territory.[39] Regarding the question of what the consequences of racial amalgamation were going to be, Adams labeled this a biological question. He cited a letter he had received from physical anthropologist Louis Sullivan explaining that the offspring of parents of different races would be "good if the parents are good" but inferior if the parents were "inferior representations of their racial groups." While some researchers thought that mixed race offspring exhibited the best traits of their parents, at least in the first generation of the cross, others such as Harvard's E.M. East thought that mixed race children were inferior to both of their parents. Adams insisted that, "we do not know yet what the result of all this intermarriage is going to be. If someone should study it for the next fifty years and keep accurate statistics, then the chances for finding out something definite are fair, but it will be a

---

[37]Kelly, "A New Race in the Making," 357-358.

[38]Kelly, "A New Race in the Making," 361.

[39]Romanzo Adams, "Hawaii as a Racial Melting Pot," *Mid-Pacific Magazine* 32, no. 3 (Sept. 1926), 213-216.

long study over a long period of years."[40] Still, Adams had said previously, "Take the 13 Japanese women who married other Caucasians, and if in the next 50 years they have 30 children, it will be more natural for them to marry out than for their parents, and finally you get ¼ and 1/8 strains and finally the racial boundaries are obscured and within 3 or 4 hundred years people will not know what blood they have in their veins."[41]

Between 1919, when Adams arrived in Honolulu, and the 1930s, when he developed and popularized his arguments about amalgamation and Americanization, there was a shift in the stance and tone of scholars' accounts of Hawai'i's social conditions. Although a number of commentators presented Hawai'i as a melting pot, a number of them also described the islands as dominated by plantation agriculture and droves of workers from East Asia. The shift parallels the statehood movement that involved a number of faculty at the University as well as its president, David Livingston Crawford. Both Adams and Vaughan MacCaughey of the College of Hawaii agreed that there was a lot of intermarriage in Hawai'i. They used the term intermarriage synonymously with mixture. MacCaughey predicted that the supposedly new type that was emerging would be fit for "leadership in the minor business and clerical

---

[40]Adams, "Hawaii as a Racial Melting Pot," 216.

[41]Adams, "Hawaii as a Racial Melting Pot," 215. Adams followed this comment immediately by writing, "In fact nearly everyone here will be entitled to go to Kamehameha Schools." He was referring to the school for Hawaiian children founded and maintained by the trust Charles Bishop set up in memorial to his wife, Hawaiian princess Bernice Pauahi Bishop, the namesake of Honolulu's Bishop Museum. The politics of who is eligible for enrollment at the Kamehameha Schools became controversial as Hawaiianness was racialized, particularly as a legal category in the early 1920s and as Adams does in his comment by suggesting that mixing will eventually make everyone at least a little bit racially Hawaiian. While it is Hawaiian ancestry that makes one eligible to attend Kamehameha, some parents, on behalf of students who are not ancestrally Hawaiian, have identified the schools' admission policy as discriminating based on race and have in some cases sued. For a summary of the history and issues, see Kauanui, *Hawaiian Blood*.

activities of the islands."[42] His article is not about heredity, but about demographics. He characterized his *Journal of Heredity* article "Race Mixture in Hawaii" as the "first of a series of eugenic studies of Hawaii's polyglot and polychrome population."[43] He wrote:

> The Hawaiians are the remnants of the splendid Polynesian stock that formerly solely possessed this lovely mid-Pacific archipelago. The Americans, North Europeans, and other 'white men' represent the traders, missionaries, beachcombers, sailors, fugitives from justice, merchants, sugar planters, professional, military and capitalistic classes that have completely dominated and exploited the life and resources of the islands. All of the other races – Japanese, Chinese, Korean, Filipino, Spanish, Portuguese, Porto Rican, Russian, Negro, South Sea Islanders, etc. – have been *imported* wholesale by the agricultural corporations to work in the sugar cane fields. At present the population of Hawaii is predominantly Asiatic, alien, male, illiterate, non-English-speaking, non-Christian, landless, and homeless.[44]

MacCaughey observed that Hawai'i contained a motley collection of peoples, the majority of whom represented the antithesis of Americanness.

Only a few years later, Adams began to deemphasize these demographic characteristics, which also began to shift because increasingly settled workers were in the process of raising Territory-born children. He identified Japanese residents in particular as stable permanent residents who were politically and culturally benign. Adams argued for the momentum and inevitability of amalgamation in spite of the fact that scientists before him argued the contrary. As explained in chapter one, demography and vital statistics expert Frederick Hoffman argued in 1921 that the frequency of racial mixing, meaning miscegenation, in Hawai'i was significantly overstated. Later, in the early 1930s, Harry Shapiro commented that, "The myth of a Hawaiian melting pot in which all racial elements

---

[42]MacCaughey, "Race Mixture in Hawaii," *Journal of Heredity*, vol. x (1919), 43.

[43]MacCaughey, "Race Mixture in Hawaii," 41.

[44]MacCaughey, 41. Italics in original. This comment about the majority of the population is notable given that "aliens" made up the majority of the population that transformed from migrant labor into settlers.

are fusing is obviously inexact."[45] By the time his book was published in 1937, Adams had spent at least a decade advancing the idea that Hawai'i was populated primarily not by single, uneducated, working class Asian men, but rather neighbors of different races who were in the process of Americanization and creating a new uniquely local race.

Colonial states have long regulated marriage, whether it has been prohibited, encouraged, or condoned, as a technique of governance. According to Ann Stoler, "For India, Indochina, and South Africa, colonial contexts usually associated with sharp social sanctions against interracial unions, 'mixing' in the initial period of colonization was tolerated and even condoned."[46] Jennifer Spear has detailed how intermarriage between French men and American Indian women assisted a colonial project in North America.[47] Similar to these examples, American colonialism in Hawai'i did not depend upon prohibitions against interracial marriage. Indeed, Adams argued that the history of intermarriage and interracial coupling was both the engine and result of Americanization.

One of the problems Adams had to resolve in the interest of his developing prediction that Hawai'i would become thoroughly amalgamated was that Japanese married non-Japanese in extremely small numbers. As his research on Hawai'i's population got off the ground, scholars from his alma mater began work on The Survey of Race Relations on the Pacific Coast from 1924 to 1926. It was the first formal study of Asian migrants in North America, and served as an opportunity for Chicago sociologists and their

---

[45]Harry L. Shapiro, "The Chinese Population in Hawaii," Preliminary Paper Prepared for the Fourth General Session of the Institute of Pacific Relations to be held at Hangchow, China, October 21st to November 4th, 1931, Folder: 1930-1932 Hawaiian/Chinese Research, Anthropometric Forms, Box: 3, Papers of William Armand Lessa, National Anthropological Archives, 7.

[46]See Stoler, *Carnal Knowledge and Imperial Power*, 76.

[47]Jennifer Spear, "Colonial Intimacies: Legislating Sex in French Louisiana," *The William and Mary Quarterly* 60, no. 1 (Jan. 2003), 75-98.

collaborators, missionaries and former missionaries to East Asia affiliated with the Institute for Social and Religious Research, to study what they called the Oriental Problem.[48] Park and his colleagues joined the survey to study the Oriental Problem as it was broadly conceived by J. Merle Davis, his missionary colleagues, and the Institute for Social and Religious Research, which disbursed Rockefeller Foundation funds.[49] Henry Yu has argued that Hawai'i, which the Survey's architects initially planned to include in the survey and where "the formation of the cultural melting pot they had predicted for the West Coast was already taking place," became the site where Chicago sociologists continued their study of the Oriental Problem with the intention of testing the integrity of the assimilation cycle as a theory.[50]

Romanzo Colfax Adams

The 1910s saw increasing demand for higher education in the territory, particularly among Asian migrants and settlers who, unlike most haole families, did not have the resources or network to send their children to the continental U.S. In 1919, William Kwai Fong Yap, assistant cashier with the Bank of Hawaii, advocated for the expansion of the College of Hawaii into a university. His eight sons and three daughters sought an affordable university education, so this "member of the first non-haole ethnic group that had come to

---

[48]See Eckard Toy, "Whose Frontier?: The Survey of Race Relations on the Pacific Cost in the 1920s," *Oregon Historical Quarterly* 107, no. 1 (36-63); and Yu, *Thinking Orientals*. The ISRR, based in New York, distributed funding from the Rockefeller Foundation to social research projects (Yu, 21). The link between the Institute of Pacific Relations, founded in Honolulu in 1926, and the Survey of Race Relations was the Institute of Social and Religious Research.

[49]Yu, *Thinking Orientals*, 21-23.

[50]Yu, *Thinking Orientals*, 81. Hawai'i was not part of the Survey because administrators "could not make arrangements in time." See page 82. The time constraint possibly stemmed from the University of Hawai'i's lack of institutional resources, such as enough faculty and administrative support for community research, for hosting this kind of study in the early 1920s.

the Islands in numbers, and the first to break into large-scale business and the professions," namely Chinese, consulted with President Arthur Dean and Wallace Farrington, chairman of the College of Hawaii Board of Regents. Farrington had been the editor of the *Honolulu Advertiser* and the *Honolulu Star-Bulletin*, Hawai'i's largest newspapers, as well as mayor of Honolulu. Yap then petitioned the territorial legislature on behalf of "thousands of other parents in the Territory" who "had to face the same problem."[51] In 1920, the College of Hawai'i became the University of Hawai'i.[52] As part of the expansion of the small college, which graduated five students in 1919, into a university, president Arthur Dean hired Romanzo Colfax Adams, a graduate of the University of Chicago, to conduct research in economics and sociology and to run the new social science department.[53]

---

[51]Kamins and Potter, *Malamalama*, 17. The Chinese fathers that Adams' graduate research assistant Margaret Lam interviewed generally aspired to provide cultural and primary school education in China to establish Chinese culture in their children. Higher education in the territory was perhaps acceptable and even desirable for its potential cost-savings. For more on Margaret Lam, see chapter two.

[52]Chinese and Hawaiian "tenants" living on the university's current Mānoa valley site were evicted to make room for the new campus. They were referred to as squatters, whom the attorney general removed in 1911. See Kamins and Potter, *Malamalama*, 12-13. The first president of the College of Hawaii, John Gilmore, told the regents in May of 1911, "Rapid progress is being made in bringing the Puahia lands into service but… the Hawaiians now dwelling on the land are an obstacle. They are scattered over the land in about seven groups. One group tills the land. Some of them carouse and loaf a great deal" (13). This report is consistent with a centuries-long tradition of Americans identifying native people as lazy and therefore undeserving of land.

[53]Note that Adams did not show up because Hawai'i was a promising location for studying race mixing; he was hired by territorial officials to do very specific work at the new university. He was professor of economics and sociology at UH from 1920-27 and then professor of sociology from 1927 until his death in 1942. The timing of Adams' hiring suggests that the university had its own research agenda only indirectly tied to the Chicago School before the mid-1920s. "Biographical data of Romanzo Adams," Box 44,2 (A1979:042e; legal size matter), Folder 2, Romanzo Adams papers (RA MSS), Romanzo Adams Social Research Laboratory (RASRL) collection, University of Hawai'i Archives (UH).

Adams was born on March 22, 1868 on a farm near Bloomingdale, Wisconsin. He worked as a teacher in rural Wisconsin and Iowa and as a high school teacher and principal in Ireton, Iowa, prior to attending college. He earned his undergraduate degree in 1897 from the University of Michigan and completed his Ph.D. at the University of Chicago in 1904, writing a thesis entitled "The Nature of Social Unity: An Examination of the Theory that Society is a Psychic Unity."[54] The style of Romanzo Colfax Adams' correspondence and his

---

[54]"Biographical data of Romanzo Adams," legal size box, folder 2, RA MSS, RASRL, UH. This biographical sketch reports that Adams worked at the University of Nevada, but his published doctoral thesis lists him as a faculty at Nevada State University. See also Romanzo Adams, "The Nature of the Social Unity: An Examination of the Theory that Society is a Psychic Unity," PhD diss, University of Chicago, 1904. This thesis was reprinted in the *Journal of Sociology* 10 (Sept. 1904), 208-227. This dissertation was essentially a long paper examining the question of whether social unity was psychic, or psychological, in nature. Adams was interested in the nature of social unity, and his first intellectual product was a paper that argued that social unity was not psychic. He also argued that society was organic in the same ways that a plant is organic (227). Several themes of this paper emerged in his later work as well as in his colleague Andrew Lind's, as explained in chapter five. Adams was interested in the characteristic facts of social unity, as he put it, specifically questions about whether society was biological, psychological, or mechanical, but analogously, but actually; and he settled early on the conclusion that society was organic. He wrote, "Society, then, in virtue of this interdependence of parts, this circuitousness of process, is organic. It remains yet to say in what sense it is organic" (216). He also argued that "social ends are objective," adding that the most important part of studying social processes was producing a "scientific description" of the "objective" rather than psychological terms (220, 223). Adams theorized that "In a social group all the members may think and feel and act with reference to the same objective situation" (223). Adams' reliance on vital statistics and other demographic data aligns with his concerns about describing objective phenomena – in this case the number and type of interracial marriages, which had been recorded. Although he argued against their position on the psychic nature of social unity, Adams noted psychological sociologists' useful "attention to the importance of a correct analysis of the psychic individual as a means to the explanation of social phenomena" (226). Reliance on individual consciousness to study social phenomena and processes emerged minimally in Adams' work, but characterized his graduate assistant Margaret Lam's research as well as that of his colleagues who studied subjectivity of "marginal men," or mixed race individuals. See chapter four on Lam's work. Note also that the ideas of ends versus means figured prominently in Adams' theory about social unity. He wrote, "Stated summarily, the concept of unity involves purpose, or end in consciousness. The various grades or stages of unity are marked by the way the concept of end is involved. If the end lies outside of the thing itself, if it is a mere means, it is not an organic unity. If the end is involved in the nature of the

relative lack of fame compared with Robert Park and other Chicago sociologists of his generation make it difficult to gain a sense of his personality. What is clear is that he generally shared provenance and other traits common to members of the Chicago School, whom Henry Yu has called "Strangers from the Midwest: Robert Ezra Park and Other Men with Three Names."[55] Like Park, William Carlson Smith, Emory Stephen Bogardus, William Isaac Thomas, and Ernest Watson Burgess, Adams was raised in a rural area in the upper Midwest. (Roderick Duncan McKenzie, whose research at the University of Washington in Seattle is discussed in chapter five, was raised "on the Canadian prairies," making him also from the "West," which is what the Midwest was in the late nineteenth century.) Yu points out that "the recurring three-word mantras of their names bespoke white Protestant family heritages."[56] Chicago sociologists, Adams included, had small-town, rural backgrounds that they felt made them outsiders to much of what they studied, particularly urban communities, and made them particularly well-prepared to describe and analyze what were for them unfamiliar problems.[57]

In his first professorial position at Nevada State University, Adams conducted a study of "the migratory laborers of the West and the economic conditions that produce[d] them," which was published in the *American Journal of Sociology* in 1916. This topic may have

---

thing, it is an organic unity. The grade of inorganic unity depends upon the degree to which it represents a specialized purpose. The hammer represents a higher grade of unity than does the pebble, the engine a higher grade than the hammer. There is no real organic unity except the unity of experience; only a reflective individual can have an end in consciousness. The concepts of purpose, function, means, and ends are objectified and carried over and applied to certain non-conscious unities, thus making them *objectively organic or quasi-organic*. Such are the unities of biological science, so far as consciousness is ignored. The objectively organic unity of the plant resembles the organic unity of experience in that it is a circuitous, self-reinstating process with interdependent parts" (215, original emphasis).

[55]Yu, *Thinking Orientals*, 32.

[56]Yu, *Thinking Orientals*, 32.

[57]Yu, *Thinking Orientals*, 33.

made him attractive to the administration of the College of Hawaii, which was closely connected to the sugar industry.[58] Adams arrived at the end of a decade of increasing labor agitation, which ended with a strike in 1920. While it is not clear whether Adams was hired specifically to provide expertise to the Big Five sugar corporations, he did join the University of Hawai'i faculty at precisely the time when managing the labor force was an urgent concern for the sugar conglomerates.

In the first years of his career at Nevada State, Adams demonstrated an interest in school policy and education. In 1904 he was elected president of the Nevada State Educational Association after which he spent five years studying the school system and helping to pass legislation that would increase its efficiency. He also served on the Citizens Committee "and as secretary made the studies needed in connection with the campaign to secure a revision of the system of assessment."[59] This combination of research and civic experience made him a desirable hire for a new department at an institution transitioning from its role as a colonial agricultural and vocational college to a university modeled on the land-grant state universities in the continental United States.[60]

---

[58]"Biographical data of Romanzo Adams," legal size box, folder 2, RA MSS, RASRL, UH. There is a graduation photo available on the UH archives website that includes ex-governor Sanford Dole, illustrating the alignment of territorial government, including UH as a territorial unit, and business. Dole was president of the haole provisional government implemented upon its 1893 overthrow of Lili'uokalani, a move declared illegal by U.S. President Grover Cleveland. See Silva, *Aloha Betrayed*, chapter 4.

[59]"Biographical data of Romanzo Adams," legal size box, folder 2, RA MSS, RASRL, UH.

[60]Although the University of Chicago had an exceptional reputation in sociology and psychology in the early twentieth century, Adams was probably hired because of his work on labor and education as much as his intellectual pedigree. The Chicago School of Sociology was not yet *the* Chicago School when he finished his doctorate in 1904 and was in the beginning stages of being defined by the race relations cycle when Adams was hired in 1919. What developed at the University of Hawai'i was not so much an deliberate installation of "Chicago sociology" as a Chicago-influenced set of projects and approaches that took cues

The reports Adams wrote aligned with sugar interests and the challenges of dealing with a plantation economy that was increasingly supported by settled rather than migrant labor. Adams published mostly in lay and institutional publications – much more than he did in the academic journals in which the work of the profession was carried on among other Chicago sociology graduates who were contemporaries of Robert Park. Adams' publications were largely local and a lot of them were official reports on economic conditions or newspaper articles. He was accepted as an expert on economics, education, cultural change, and social issues more generally. Within his first two years at the university, for example, Adams chaired a committee comprised of David Crawford, an entomologist who later became university president, and professors F.G. Krauss and Louis A. Henke. They produced the March 1922 *Bulletin of the Hawaiian Homes Commission* on "Honolulu as a Market for Hawaiian Produce," a survey of local marketing conditions. Another of Adams' early projects after he arrived was to examine historical census data. This research produced a pamphlet entitled *The Peoples of Hawaii: A Statistical Study* co-authored by T.M. Livesay and E. H. Van Winkle and published by the Honolulu-based Institute for Pacific Relations in 1925. This study eventually became the foundation for the first chapter of his book *Interracial Marriage in Hawaii: A Study of the Mutually Conditioned Processes of Acculturation and Amalgamation* (1937). Adams' early research on the history of the census since missionaries began taking counts in the 1830s made him an authority on the census, including its categories and methods and positioned him as the principal expert on population change in the territory. As he attempted to make sense of the censuses conducted by missionaries (1832), the Hawaiian Kingdom and the colonial government under Sanford Dole (1849-

---

from Adams as much as they did from Robert Park. On the development of the social sciences during these years, see Ross, *The Origins of American Social Science*.

1896), and the United States (1900 onward),[61] Adams made decisions about how to group data and combine categories of people to make population changes intelligible.[62] He also relied on the Territorial Bureau of Vital Statistics for data related to births, deaths, and marriages.[63] In the years prior to Andrew Lind's arrival in 1927, Adams worked on reports on issues important to territorial officials and the business community and continued researching Hawai'i's "racial situation."

In the first several years he was on campus, Adams' did as much popular teaching as academic instruction; possibly more. In 1920, Adams offered four courses at the University, one of which enrolled ten students, while he offered a Special Course in Economics at the Public Library that drew 103 participants. Most of these participants were men working in business who were born outside Hawaii.[64] Similarly, the intended audience of his book was broadly public. In the mid 1920s, when the project was in its nascent stages, Adams had plans to send *Interracial Marriage in Hawaii* to all plantation managers first; then to principles

---

[61]Adams gives all these dates. See *Interracial Marriage in Hawaii*, 4. Below the graph on page 8, Adams explains that, "The first census taken under the United States governmental authority was in 1900 and the attempt to use mainland racial classifications was not successful. The Hawaiian and part-Hawaiian population for 1900 have been revised by estimate based on data of the 1896 and the 1910 censuses." Note that the Hawaiian Kingdom could not have conducted a census in 1896; it must have been the provisional government run by Sanford Dole and others who overthrew Queen Lili'uokalani in 1893.

[62]Adams also noted that the term part-Hawaiian used in the 1896 census replaced the term half-caste, which referred to "the hybrid descendents of Hawaiians and foreigners." See Adams, *Interracial Marriage in Hawaii*, 8.

[63]Adams, *Interracial Marriage in Hawaii*, vi. On the sometimes obscuring or oversimplifying affect of statistics and the importance of statistics, especially vital statistics, to the construction of the state and its authority, see Ian Hacking, "How Should We Do the History of Statistics?" in Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon, and Peter Miller, eds., *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991), 181-195; and Theodore M. Porter, "How Social Numbers are Made Valid," chapter two of *Trust in Numbers: The Pursuit of Objectivity in Science and Public Life* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995), 33-48.

[64]Class Records, 1920 [#6-2], Notebooks, Box 2, RA MSS, RASRL.

of all schools, public and private, that had four or more teachers including language schools; territorial officers; members of the University of Hawai'i faculty; members of the Institute of Pacific Relations; universities on the department exchange list; pastors of churches; directors of sugar and pineapple companies; and members of the Hawaii Sugar Planters Association.[65]

In a series of pamphlets, articles in magazines like the tourism- and business-focused *Mid-Pacific Magazine*, and newspaper articles, Adams established himself as an expert on Hawai'i affairs.[66] When newspapers on the continent took an interest in social issues in Hawai'i, they called upon Adams as an authority. The author of a 1925 *New York Times* article argued that "defense, federal ties, wealth centralization and race diversity are closely linked" and that "the race question," which focused on Japanese, required close study by scientific experts.[67] The newspaper highlighted "the race question" because it was an obstacle to statehood. Notably, the author asserted that Hawai'i was "not yet ready for admission to the Union" because "she has too large a group of unassimilated aliens," a frame that paralleled Adams' work. For Adams and other sociologists working within the

---

[65]Page 110, Notebooks – Class Records 1925/1926 [#6-5], Box 2, RA MSS, RASRL.

[66]Adams authored a pamphlet entitled "Education and the Economic Outlook for the Boys of Hawaii" (1927) published by the Institute of Pacific Relations. See "Status of Orientals in Hawaii," *Hawaii Hochi*, May 30, 1927, Folder: Newsclippings, 1928-1929 photocopies; legal size box (A1979:042e staff call number). The *Hawaii Hochi* was an English-language newspaper for a Japanese audience. See also Adams, "Hawaii as a Racial Melting Pot," *Mid-Pacific Magazine*, vol. 32, no. 3 (Sept. 1926), 213-216, a reprint of a paper presented before the Pan-Pacific Research Institution. See also Adams' article in the *Honolulu Star-Bulletin*, Aug. 26, 1922 on predictions that the "Japanese Factor in Hawaii Will Diminish." This was one of a six-part series on "The Japanese in Hawaii." Adams' predictions of decline regarding Japanese population trends and the impossibility of Japanese seizing political power turned out to be incorrect. See Fujikane and Okamura, eds., *Asian Settler Colonialism: From Local Governance to the Habits of Everyday Life in Hawai'i* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2008).

[67]"Hawaii Presents Four Large Issues; Defense, Federal Ties, Wealth Centralization, and Race Diversity Are Closely Linked," *New York Times*, July 12, 1925. The special correspondent who wrote the article quoted Adams heavily. See scrapbook in Box 3, RA MSS, RASRL.

framework of the interaction cycle, cultural assimilation – not just the result, but involvement in the process toward assimilation – was presumed necessary for incorporation into the nation. The argument that assimilation was both a process and a result helped statehood advocates. For statehood advocates among Hawai'i's business and university communities, whether Hawai'i should ever be granted statehood was not in question; it was a question of when, and the answer to this question was tied to the rate of cultural assimilation of its residents. By assimilation, they seemed to have meant a sensibility more consistent with so-called American ways and values than those of the nations of their ancestors. The same summer, the *Chicago Daily News* printed a four-part series on the racial situation in Hawai'i, culminating with an article highlighting the territory's importance as a laboratory for social science and "nations having race problems to solve."[68]

Consistent with his prediction that Hawai'i residents were becoming acculturated into Americanness, Adams attempted to convince haole settlers and concerned audiences on the continent that large numbers of people of Japanese ancestry relative to other groups – approximately forty percent of the total population in 1930 – did not mean that they would take over and assume permanent political power. He also had to convince white Americans that the integrity of Japanese cultural practices such as language use did not signal that they refused American acculturation or were incapable of it. This was the "Japanese Problem" in Hawai'i: haole concern that people of Japanese migrants and their offspring would form voting blocs and assume political power because of their numerical majority. The Japanese Problem, then, differed markedly from the "Oriental Problem" on the West Coast of the

[68]"Hawaii a Laboratory for Social Science; Making Tests of Value to Nations Having Race Problems to Solve," *Chicago Daily News*, July 25, 1925. See scrapbook in Box 3, RA MSS, RASRL.

continental United States, where Japanese migrants and their children were in the minority. The Oriental Problem meant different things to different people, but was focused on the social problems caused by the presence of migrants and second generation people of East Asian ancestry. As the "problem" was defined variously on the West Coast, it focused initially, consistent with "Yellow Peril" rhetoric from the nineteenth century, on the threat of cheap labor to white jobs and later on the question of assimilation, particularly "Orientals'" presumed unassimilability and white people's fears about miscegenation. Meanwhile, white commentators in Hawai'i referred to the Japanese Problem as the set of dangers posed by a majority population presumed to be not only unassimilable, but perhaps hostile to American ways of life.[69]

Although most of Adams' writing was geared toward territorial officials and haole residents, other Honolulu residents followed his publications and responded to his agenda, sometimes with obvious indignation. He and the University of Hawai'i itself came under scrutiny among at least some Japanese parents who castigated Adams for singling them out as objects of his research on education and labor issues. In a 1926 editorial in the *Hawaii Hochi*, the editors of the paper took on Adams' proposed study of why Japanese parents sought higher education for their children, a focus he adopted in light of other research that demonstrated that the number of high school and college graduates in Hawai'i was beginning to outstrip the number of technical and white collar jobs available.[70] (Adams also addressed this in his report for the Institute of Pacific Relations in 1927.) The author,

---

[69]On Chicago sociologists' work on the Oriental Problem, see Yu, *Thinking Orientals*. Note that the category "Oriental" referred to people with East Asian ancestry, especially Chinese and Japanese, but not Southeast Asian or South Asian peoples. See Yu, 24-25 and 192.

[70]"Why Parents Educate Their Children," *Hawaii Hochi*, April 30, 1926, vol. 1, no. 169. See Adams' scrapbook, box 3, RA MSS, RASRL.

insisting that it was curious that Japanese were singled out, wrote that Adams should comment on white American parents' desires to educate their children, including those of Adams himself, who took "considerable pains and expense to send his daughter away to the mainland to finish her education."[71]

The author of this editorial indicates that there is nothing mysterious about why any parents, including Japanese parents, would endeavor to educate their children as much as possible. The tone suggests that the author thinks of Japanese in Hawai'i as no different from anyone else, or at least not significantly different enough to warrant targeted research. This anger at being singled out was a precursor to a more emphatic espousal of American identity and ideals that seems to have intensified after the bombing of Pearl Harbor by the Japanese army in 1941. In the meantime, the author of this editorial also critiqued the university for employing a faculty and administration who were prejudiced and ingratiated with commerce.[72]

Adams' approach to resolving the Japanese problem took two courses: demographic prediction and social explanation. He reported that, although they constituted an obvious majority, the Japanese birth rate was falling. He predicted that Hawai'i would not maintain a Japanese majority by 1945 and that under present conditions, meaning rates of immigration, there could never be a Japanese majority.[73] Japanese intermarried with other ethnic groups in extremely low numbers, which worked against both racial amalgamation and cultural

---

[71]"Why Parents Educate Their Children," *Hawaii Hochi*, April 30, 1926, vol. 1, no. 169. See Adams' scrapbook, box 3, RA MSS, RASRL.

[72]The author also criticized the university for supporting a strong athletic program while maintaining academic mediocrity.

[73]"Japanese in Hawaii Far From a Majority; Fear of Rule by Nippon Based on Incorrect Calculations," *Chicago Daily News*, July 25, 1925. This is the second article in a four-part series. See scrapbook in Box 3, RA MSS, RASRL.

assimilation driven by interracial marriage. Indeed, in Chicago theory, resistance to interracial marriage was at least partly explained by racial prejudice. How could Adams turn a lack of Japanese outmarriage into an asset? He praised Japanese marriage practices, especially parents' strong influence over their children's selection of mates, as based in reason rather than racial prejudice. He also deemphasized the implications of low rates of out-marriage. In "The Japanese An Organized Group," one of the shorter chapters in *Interracial Marriage in Hawai'i*, Adams describes Japanese (as well as Chinese) opposition to out-marriage as practical compared with the "ritualistic" opposition of Americans, which Adams uses synonymously with white. He wrote, "One might distinguish between the attitude commonly manifested by Americans and that of the Chinese and Japanese by saying that in one case the opposition to interracial marriage rests on a code of race relations that is ritualistic in character while in the other it tends to be determined by considerations relating to the probable success of the marriage as affected by differences in religion and other things that belong to culture."[74] In other words, Adams' thought that Japanese parents' practical considerations about compatibility were evidence of superior awareness about the importance of culture in marriage success, not a signal of their race prejudice. These two approaches – emphasizing the falling Japanese birthrate and deemphasizing ongoing Japanese resistance to mixing – attempted to alleviate concern about Japanese takeover without framing Japanese practices as significant obstacles to the Americanization of Hawai'i.

Adams' predictions of the inevitable assimilation and amalgamation of Hawaiians and Asian migrants into a race that was new and unique to Hawai'i, but thoroughly

---

[74]Adams, *Interracial Marriage in Hawaii*, 167.

American, was forged at the University of Hawai'i in the Social Research Laboratory. Adams devoted his career at the University of Hawai'i to authenticating the archipelago's historical trajectory as a racially amalgamated, culturally American settlement as he helped develop the university, which was established specifically to bring the territory into cosmopolitan modernity. The University was the only research and higher education institution in the territory during this period and it produced and disseminated these ideas through teaching and other forms of public engagement by faculty and administrators. Adams served as a consultant to the territorial government and to plantation owners soon after his arrival in 1919. Eventually, the department that Adams developed also sponsored visiting professorships largely for members of what has become known as the Chicago School of sociology. In 1927, Robert Park's graduate student Andrew Lind left Chicago for Honolulu to conduct dissertation research. Lind earned his degree in 1931 and stayed on as permanent faculty. As a department of two, Adams and Lind hosted a number of visiting scholars, including Park, who spent two years in Honolulu, 1931-1933, and started what became a wave of Chicago sociologists visiting the University of Hawai'i. Ample funding from the Rockefeller Foundation beginning in the mid 1920s supported the department's projects and, starting in 1934, periodic conferences on race relations.[75]

---

[75]The social scientists managing the Rockefeller grant money seem to have preferred calling their unit the Social Research Laboratory rather than the Station for Racial Research, which the Foundation initially funded. See chapter two for more on this funding related to the work of physical anthropologist Harry Shapiro. Department correspondence indicates that close working quarters along with researchers' families accompanying them produced a social atmosphere and network similar to that of the Woods Hole research station at the turn of the twentieth century. See the Philip J. Pauly, "Summer Resort and Scientific Discipline: Woods Hole and the Structure of American Biology," in *The American Development of Biology*, Ronald Rainger, Keith R. Benson, and Jane Maienschein, eds. (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1988), 121-150.

Predicting the numerical ratio of various ethnic groups and their political orientation as potential voting blocs became one of Adams' chief activities during the 1930s when Statehood Commission members began their work.[76] In a social milieu that made them the acquaintances of territorial officials, to whom university administrators answered, and sugar managers, whose family ties and economic power lent them enormous political influence, professors at the University of Hawai'i like Adams enjoyed particularly close professional and personal relationships with local power brokers. During his tenure as a professor of economics and sociology, Adams mostly worked toward describing and forecasting demographic patterns and the forces that shaped them as well as assessing various groups' progress through the assimilation cycle. It was this forecasting, predictive function that made Adams' work interesting to men in local business and government.

Statehood

In the early 1930s, while Adams was at work on *Interracial Marriage in Hawaii* and preparing to retire from the University, primarily white elite proponents framed annexation as the beginning of Hawai'i's evolution toward statehood.[77] They cited the historical precedent of other states, argued that territorial status was never supposed to be permanent, and insisted that the majority of Hawai'i's population desired statehood. During this time, faculty at the University of Hawai'i began performing significant ideological work within the statehood movement. Adams' role as an expert on local conditions meant that his testimony during statehood hearings was valuable to the pro-statehood commission. Adams and his

[76]On the statehood lobby, see Saranillio, "Seeing Conquest: Colliding Histories and the Cultural Politics of Hawai'i Statehood," especially chapters two and three.

[77]Adams retired in 1934. See "Romanzo Adams Biographical Sketch," University Archives at the University of Hawaii-Mānoa Library website, http://libweb.hawaii.edu/libdept/archives/univarch/colsch/rasrl/bio.htm, last accessed 4/20/12.

colleagues, particularly Andrew Lind, continued to educate primarily Asian students about the race relations cycle, which they presented as a natural process with assimilation as its natural conclusion. Adams extended his predictions about biological amalgamation and cultural assimilation to include statehood – permanent political incorporation – as the culmination of the assimilation cycle.[78]

According to Kuykendall and Day, "the year 1935 really marks a turning point in the history of the statehood movement, both in Hawaii and in Washington" because it was when "public opinion in the territory gave powerful support to the movement."[79] Significantly, 1935 marks the year when Romanzo Adams testified at the first statehood hearing in Honolulu. In October of 1935, Adams testified as a member of David Crawford's Citizens' Committee on Statehood. Crawford, then the President of the University of Hawai'i, made a statement at the hearing and then introduced Adams. In a dramatized way, the ideas Adams cultivated within the University of Hawai'i sociology department were put into the public record.

---

[78]Meanwhile, University president David Crawford's book *Paradox in Hawaii* was published in 1933. Crawford wrote *Paradox in Hawaii* in a way that presented problems of colonial management such as balancing industry, education, labor migration, and settlement not as problems of colonial management but of intellectual and popular social scientific interest. "Hawaii is commonly thought of as a 'possession,'" the book jacket announced, "but the fact of the matter is that it has almost the same political relationship to the United States as have the several states. The annexation of Hawaii to the United States was not a case of one nation treating with a conquered and subject nation, handing out such conditions and stipulations as it might desire to concede, but two free and independent republics treating on a basis of equality to unite for mutual benefit." Actually, Hawai'i was indeed a subject nation. Crawford's framing of Hawai'i a laboratory rather than a colony was based on a false representation of the history of the islands. For a copy of the book jacket, which is infrequently attached to library copies of this text, see folder 8, box 1, series 214S, RG 1.1, Rockefeller Foundation Archives, RAC.

[79]Ralph S. Kuykendall and A. Grove Day, *Hawaii: A History, From Polynesian Kingdom to American Commonwealth* (New York: Prentice-Hall, 1948), 289.

At this hearing Adams reiterated what he had written about the role of education in Americanization, his students' progress through the assimilation cycle, and Hawai'i's Japanese population. He told the committee that Asian students socialized freely with other students in ways that they did not in the continental U.S., that these students in Hawai'i were transforming into Americans because they "just can't help themselves," and, perhaps most importantly, that the Japanese population was actually shrinking rather than growing as feared by some statehood opponents.[80] Early opponents of statehood within the United States as well as haole in Hawai'i cited concerns about the Japanese problem, "as exemplified by plantation labor strikes and by foreign language schools."[81] Adams' role at this hearing was to assure that Japanese numbers were dropping and even in the midst of this downward trend, Japanese as well as Chinese students were moved by the American flag and responded emotionally to the oratory of American heroes such as Abraham Lincoln and Patrick Henry.[82] Adams' thought his students of East Asian ancestry came to feel like Americans because Americanization was inevitable.

Following the 1935 hearings, Adams published a piece titled "Statehood for Hawaii" in *Social Process in Hawaii*, the collaborative journal of the university's student sociology club and department faculty. Its focus was attitudes, one of the primary subjects of Chicago research during the 1930s, especially as they related to race prejudice. Adams' argued that

---

[80]Statehood for Hawaii, Hearings Before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Territories, House of Representatives, Seventy-fourth Congress, First Session on H.R. 3034. A Bill to Enable the People of Hawaii to Form a Constitution and A State Government To Be Admitted Into the Union On An Equal Footing With the States, October 7 to October 18, 1935 (Washington: United States Printing Office, 1936), 40.

[81]Kuykendall and Day, *Hawaii: A History*, 288.

[82]H.R. 3034, 41.

the question of statehood was an issue shaped by attitudes as much as practicalities. He wrote:

> There is something that belongs to sentiment rather than to the more superficial practical considerations. When people participate in the democratic traditions of America they tend to feel the need of full equality. They do not want to regard themselves as a subject people…. As the people of Hawaii become more American in outlook and sentiment it is probable that their attitude toward statehood will be determined even more by sentiment than by considerations relating to the obvious practical advantages.[83]

Students in sociology courses at the University of Hawaii learned about the interaction cycle, their roles as people moving through the cycle, and the direction of the population of Hawai'i as predicted by Adams.[84] In the 1920s and 30s, many haole families (including Adams) sent their children to universities on the continent. The student body at the University was largely made up of students of Asian ancestry from the very beginning. These students became an audience for Adams' and his colleagues' narratives about their place in Hawai'i and predications of its future. These students largely went on to influential professional careers in the islands such as teaching, public office, and military service. Adams and his colleagues educated their students into a particular mode in which they understood their feelings as part of a sociological process that made intellectual sense and had scientific validity as a way of explaining their experiences. Adams and his colleague Andrew Lind concluded that students felt increasingly strongly, as part of their Americanization, that Hawai'i should have "equality" by becoming a state.

---

[83]Romanzo Adams, "Statehood for Hawaii," *Social Process in Hawaii* 2 (May 1936), 5.

[84]A collection of student papers completed between circa 1928 and 1955 is archived in the Romanzo Adams Social Research Laboratory collection in the University of Hawai'i archives.

Adams testified again at the next round of statehood hearings in 1937, the same year that his book *Interracial Marriage in Hawaii* was published, providing information about population trends in Hawai'i, specifically statistics on Japanese births and migration to and from Japan, and the role of culture and the family. He argued that numbers of Hawaiians and part-Hawaiians were increasing and predicted, again, that the Japanese population would fall after members of the oldest generation passed on and the effect of Japanese couples having smaller families became pronounced. Adams told the committee that his personal opinion was that the importance of teaching American culture was being underestimated in the territory, because this education would minimize social unrest as Japanese young people and other children of migrants lost their ancestral cultures.[85]

Adams called upon his experiences talking with students when testifying on the state of social relations. During the question and answer period about the connections between loss of culture and delinquency, Adams commented, "I talked to a Chinese boy recently who said, 'My father is just an old Chinese, and his views are not important.' A great many youngsters lose respect for their parents and ancestral group. They think they are a lot smarter than their parents, and at the same time they don't get in a workable way anything from our Americanization. I don't say that always holds true, but very often." Although he did not care for the Japanese family system, which was popularly characterized as stubborn about maintaining cultural practices, Adams said it was successful at keeping young people out of trouble and therefore a stabilizing factor. He thought that the second generation of any migrant group could not be fully Americanized. However, Adams reassured the

[85]U.S. Congress, Joint Committee on Hawaii, Transcript of Proceedings Had and Testimony Taken at the Statehood Hearings before the Congressional Committee in the Throne Room, Iolani Palace, 1937, 373. University of Hawai'i-Mānoa Hawaiian and Pacific Collection.

committee that the third generation would Americanize if they were continually provided with Americanization education but were not overly rushed through the process.

An Assimilationist Narrative

During Adams' time at the University of Hawai'i, which culminated with *Interracial Marriage in Hawaii*, he developed a number of explanatory threads that supported his history of Hawai'i and his predictions about its future. The first and most pervasive thread was that mixing in Hawai'i was much, much more common than on the continent and widespread enough to be the most notable feature of the archipelago. Actually, the history of interracial coupling was not as ubiquitous as Adams' suggested. He exaggerated the amount of mixing at the time of his research as well as previous mixing, an approach that at least one other researcher, Frederick L. Hoffman, had warned against in the early 1920s when Hawai'i's mixed race population became a popular research subject. Hoffman commented in 1921 that the frequency of intermarriage in Hawai'i in the late nineteenth century was often exaggerated and "the available data indicate nothing very startling or that would be suggestive of promiscuous racial intermixture, or the breaking down of the social barriers which keep separate the different races, otherwise peculiarly suggestive of unrestricted racial amalgamation."[86] Moreover, the mixing that had taken place in Hawai'i was not necessarily more voluminous than that on the continent; it was just better documented. The public nature of interracial marriages, in contrast to the illegal and secretive conjugal relationships

[86]Frederick L. Hoffman, "Race Amalgamation in Hawaii," in *Eugenics in Race and State, Volume II, Scientific Papers of the Second International Congress of Eugenics, Held at American Museum of Natural History, New York, September 22-28, 1921* (Baltimore: Williams & Wilkins Company, 1923), 96. See also chapter one.

that Adams insinuated were common in the continental U.S., meant that "very valuable statistical data are available."[87]

Adams identified intermarriage as a culturally rather than structurally determined phenomenon even as he identified factors other than emotions and beliefs that significantly influenced marriage and family formation patterns. Adams predicted that by the end of the twentieth century, if further immigration did not significantly influence the racial composition of the population, over half of births would be "mixed-bloods."[88] This would be expedited because Hawai'i was an open society that allowed interracial marriage rather than a caste system that prohibited it.[89] Adams noted that his forecasts were predicated on stable economic and political conditions, so that if there were a major change in the economic situation, if a military government were set up, or if there were a war, social relations could be modified, potentially for a long time.[90] Keeping with his emphasis on culture as a cause for human behavior and attitudes, which was also an intellectual convention of the Chicago school of sociology, Adams simply identified "local conditions" and "local sentiment" as an explanation for significant sociological phenomena such as relatively high intermarriage rates.

Amalgamation was a newly revived word for a practice that had captivated social commentators and academic experts for decades: miscegenation.[91] Park and Burgess defined

---

[87]Adams, *Interracial Marriage in Hawaii*, 20. Note that in Hawaiian kinship practice, anyone with a Hawaiian parent was considered Kānaka Maoli and rank was more important than race, an idea first imported by Euro-Americans.

[88]Adams, *Interracial Marriage in Hawaii*, 25.

[89]Adams, *Interracial Marriage in Hawaii*, 68.

[90]Adams, *Interracial Marriage in Hawaii*, 326.

[91]The literature on miscegenation from several disciplines is vast. Henry Yu's graduate researcher at UCLA, Anthony Yuen, produced a bibliography of almost 700 articles and books published between the 1850s and the 1960s on interracial sex and mixed marriages.

amalgamation, distinguished from assimilation, as a biological process, "the fusion of races by interbreeding and intermarriage."[92] They saw it as both a process and a result.[93] "Figuratively speaking," they wrote, "it is the process by which the aggregation of peoples is changed from a mere mechanical mixture into a chemical compound."[94] They also posited that, "Amalgamation, while it is limited to the crossing of racial traits through intermarriage, naturally promotes assimilation or the cross-fertilization of social heritages."[95] There is no evidence that assimilation, mediated by marriage or not, has happened naturally. While Park and Burgess do not state where their evidence for this argument came from, Park's initial sociological interest in assimilation among European migrants may point to the limited basis on which he generalized about people of all ethnic or racial backgrounds regardless of context. Park and Burgess also argued that, "The offspring of a 'mixed' marriage not only biologically inherits physical and temperamental traits from both parents, but also acquires in the nurture of family life the attitudes, sentiments, and memories of both father and mother. Thus amalgamation of races insures the conditions of primary social contacts most favorable for assimilation."[96]

See Yu, "Tiger Woods," 1408. See also Elise Lemire, *"Miscegenation": Making Race in America* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2002); and Paul Lawrence Farber, *Mixing Races: From Scientific Racism to Modern Evolutionary Ideas* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2011).

[92]Robert E. Park and Ernest W. Burgess, *Introduction to the Science of Sociology* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1921). (Third edition, 1969), 737.

[93]Park and Burgess, *Introduction to the Science of Sociology*, 741.

[94]Park and Burgess, *Introduction to the Science of Sociology*, 741.

[95]Park and Burgess, *Introduction to the Science of Sociology*, 737.

[96]Park and Burgess, *Introduction to the Science of Sociology*, 737-738. Note that the level at which amalgamation occurred was somewhat vague in Park and Burgess' description. It appears to have stood in for individual cases of miscegenation or mixing as well as the fusion of races at a larger scale.

Park and Burgess decided that assimilation was natural and ideal, noting that, "As social contact initiates interaction, assimilation is its final perfect project."[97] The type of social interaction was integral to the "rapidity and completeness" of assimilation. They theorized that, "Assimilation naturally takes place most rapidly where contacts are primary, that is, where they are the most intimate and intense, as in the area of touch relationship, in the family circle and in intimate congenial groups. Secondary contacts facilitate accommodations, but do not greatly promote assimilation. The contacts here are external and too remote."[98] As an example of the effectiveness of intimate relationships to assimilation, they noted that, "By curious paradox, slavery, and particularly household slavery, has probably been, aside from intermarriage, the most efficient device for promoting assimilation."[99]

The hallmark idea of Adams' career – that Hawai'i was on its way to complete biological amalgamation and cultural assimilation – rested on predictions made from demographic data imbued with social meaning. According to his data, in 1930 15.4% of Hawai'i's civilian population was mixed race.[100] Adams estimated that of the marriages that took place between 1920 and 1934, nearly one third were mixed; between 1931 and 1933, a quarter of children born had mixed ancestry. This was not just about numbers or demographic trends. It was about closing social distance. He interpreted his data as evidence that social distance was closing between people of various races as they intermarried and produced mixed race offspring, who would in turn close social distances

---

[97]Park and Burgess, 736.
[98]Park and Burgess, *Introduction to the Science of Sociology*, 736-737.
[99]Park and Burgess, *Introduction to the Science of Sociology*, 739.
[100]Adams, *Interracial Marriage in Hawaii*, 15-17. Including military residents, 7.6% of the entire population was mixed race.

further by intermarrying themselves, thus continuing the cycle of intimate behavior leading to complete both biological amalgamation and cultural assimilation.

Because he assumed that pedigree, a racial, biological entity, would determine racial, ethnic, or national identification, Adams assumed that future mixed race people would identify themselves and be identified as mixed race rather than as part of one of their ancestral groups. The assumption was that children with Chinese and Hawaiian ancestry, for example, would identify themselves primarily as a mixture rather than primarily Chinese, primarily Hawaiian, or *both* Chinese and Hawaiian – fully Chinese *and* fully Hawaiian at the same time.[101] Even if there was an enormous amount of mixing, the idea that the population would transform into one characterized by people who identified as mixed is based on the belief that race was a real thing rather than attention to racialization as a social practice and process.[102] But, racial categories are not natural; they have been produced by processes of racialization and domination.[103] Thus, despite Adams' predictions, mixing them did not and does not automatically undo racial hierarchies.

---

[101]I have not found examples of individuals who identified themselves as both fully Chinese and fully Hawaiian in the sociology department's collected student papers or in interview material collected by University of Hawai'i graduate researcher Margaret M. Lam. This question requires further research given the relatively small slice of student papers I have seen. The point is that Adams' conception of how mixed race individuals would identify themselves and be identified was one view among several rather than the single logical explanation.

[102]See Barbara Fields on the substitution of race where scholars should investigate racialization: Fields, "Of Rogues and Geldings," *American Historical Review* 108, No. 5 (Dec. 2003), 1397-1405. She addresses historians and other scholars working in the late twentieth century, but her critique is helpful for understanding how Adams' interpretations of data and his predications reveal a reliance on race as a biologically or bodily real thing during a time when Chicago sociologists such as Robert Park attempted, unsuccessfully, to remove bodies from discussions about race. On this attempt, see Yu, *Thinking Orientals*, 77-78.

[103]On racialization, see Omi and Winant, *Racial Formation in the United States*.

Adams also argued that Hawaiians were mixing themselves to the point that there were few "pure," or real, Hawaiians left. He reported that the longest process of mixing was between white people – Western Europeans and Americans – and extrapolated that Hawaiians naturally (and singularly) tended toward mixing with other peoples. Adams interpreted this history of intermarriage as demonstrating *Hawaiians'* natural affinity for mixing, not white Americans'.[104] Hawaiians' assumed mixed race origins at the time of Captain James Cook's arrival in the islands supported this conclusion.[105] Naturalizing Hawaiian intermarriage as a "tendency" toward racial amalgamation and cultural assimilation isolated the practice of intermarriage from the context of global labor migration linked to capitalist and colonial expansion. It also presented it as analogous to a racial trait. It also, in Adams' treatment, insinuated that racial discrimination was minimal and that this had always been the case.

Adams operated under the assumption that social distance was an objectively measurable entity and that interracial sex and marriage were truly the shortest social distances. These marriages did close a kind social distance, but they did so as part of a political alliance, not because of a racial prejudice vacuum or an abundance of (presumably naturally occurring Hawaiian) good will. The argument that these relationships were

---

[104]Adams, *Interracial Marriage in Hawaii*, 23 and Chapter VI: "The Hawaiians an Amalgamating Race," 69-84. Adams argued that haoles "played the most important role in amalgamation by reason of not only their numbers, recently augmented by service men, but also by reason of their long period of contact." Most researchers at the University of Hawai'i came to focus on people with Chinese and Hawaiian ancestry. Presumably Adams and his colleagues focused on Chinese and Hawaiians because they were interested in their intermixture and the possibility of eventual amalgamation as well as assimilation into Americanness, which was treated synonymously with Caucasianness.

[105]Adams, *Interracial Marriage*, 69. He likely drew this conclusion based on research conducted through the Bishop Museum. Louis Sullivan had concluded in the mid 1920s that Polynesians, including Hawaiians, were a mixed race group. See chapter one.

formalized because there were few white women available to white men who had migrated or settled is only a partial explanation. As elsewhere, in the Hawaiian Kingdom of the nineteenth century, interracial marriage and "miscegenation" signaled neither the presence nor the absence of racial discrimination.[106] Marriages between haole men and chiefly Hawaiian women were not simply condoned; they were accepted or encouraged by ali'i nui (high chiefs), many of whom developed consultative relationships with haole men. These marriages were also a product of Hawaiian adaptations to encounters with increasing numbers of visitors.[107] Marriages did not only take place between Hawaiian women and haole men. Chinese migrants and Hawaiian women also married in relatively high numbers compared with Chinese intermarriage in the continental United States. In the Hawaiian Kingdom, before American control of Hawai'i began, these mixed marriages generally produced more children identified by Hawaiians as Hawaiians[108] – as kin – not more Americans or more Chinese. This mode of identification is notable given that in the 1920s

---

[106]See Stoler, *Carnal Knowledge and Imperial Power*, 76.

[107]According to J. Kēhaulani Kauanui, "Hawaiians are people who have historically treasured and relished encounters with outsiders. Indeed, marriage across racial lines was legally sanctioned by Hawaiian kingdom law in 1840 (Lind 1980:12), and Kānaka Maoli are still an inclusive people, with a long history of incorporating outsiders." Kauanui, *Hawaiian Blood*, 15.

[108]Adams, *Interracial Marriage in Hawaii*, 64. Adams' comments refer to *hapa haole* – "half white" – children being regarded as Hawaiians. The vast majority of these children had white fathers and Hawaiian mothers (or, similarly, Chinese fathers and Hawaiian mothers) as there are so few records of Euro-American women marrying Hawaiian men and cases of white women bearing the children of Hawaiian men are, to my knowledge, undocumented. In other words, mixing overwhelmingly took place between Hawaiian women and migrant and settler men. The literature is minimal but underway on the contemporary and long-term effects of Hawaiian women's "outmarriage" and of colonization on Hawaiian men. See Ty P. Kawika Tengan, *Native Men Remade: Gender and Nation in Contemporary Hawai'i* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2008), especially chapter one.

U.S. federal law would establish that, in its Territory of Hawai'i, mixed-ancestry Hawaiians were decreasingly Hawaiian because they did not meet blood quantum requirements.[109]

Finally, in his narrative, Adams' treated pre-colonization Hawai'i as "feudal" and post-1898 Hawai'i as having achieved modernity and an improved state of freedom as an American territory. These themes became central to his colleague Andrew Lind's work, as illustrated in chapter five. Prior to the Māhele land division (1845-1855), when land tenure in Hawai'i transformed from the ahupua'a system, in which Kānaka Maoli collectively managed pie-shaped pieces of land from mountains to the ocean, to a Western-style system of private property, the social hierarchy in the Hawaiian kingdom was determined by genealogy rather than race. (Genealogy continued to function as an organizing force even after land organization changed and remains salient among Kānaka Maoli today.) Adams sometimes referred to rank to describe Hawaiian social hierarchy, which mostly failed to capture the reciprocal relationships of duty and privilege that bound ali'i (chiefs) and maka'āinana (commoners) together. "Rank" makes Hawaiian social organization appear to be feudal along the lines of medieval Europe.[110] By suggesting that nineteenth century

---

[109]On federal law establishing the legal categories of Hawaiian and Native Hawaiian, see Kauanui, *Hawaiian Blood*. On federal and tribal legal definitions that regulate American Indian racial formations, see Eva Marie Garroutte, "The Racial Formations of American Indians: Negotiating Legitimate Identities within Tribal and Federal Law," *American Indian Quarterly* 25, no. 2 (Spring 2001), 224-239. Regarding racial formations in Hawai'i, University of Hawai'i graduate student Margaret M. Lam interviewed people with both Chinese and Hawaiian ancestry, many of whom identified as Chinese. This represented a shift in individual and societal constructions of identity based on considerations of kinship, cultural practice, and understandings of racial inheritance and superiority. See chapter four.

[110]Other writers shared this approach. See Andrew Lind, *An Island Community: Ecological Succession in Hawaii* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1938); and Alexander MacDonald, *Revolt in Paradise: The Social Revolution in Hawaii after Pearl Harbor* (New York: S. Daye, 1944). On rank in Hawaiian social organization, see Lilikalā Kame'eleihiwa, *Native Land and Foreign Desires* (Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press, 1992); and Osorio, *Dismembering Lāhui*. For a comparative case of a kin-based native social and political order, see Juliana Barr, *Peace Came*

Hawai'i remained in a state that had declined in Europe hundreds of years prior, Adams framed Hawaiian society as developmentally behind the West and commoners as in need of saving from oppressive chiefs. This narrative of altruistic rescue and modernization, the "white man's burden," recapitulated rationales for the colonization of the North American continent. While pre-Māhele Hawai'i was hierarchically structured, Adams assumed that a capitalist system of private land ownership (as well as the installation of Western law) created a more free people than the old system, evidence that maka'āinana – commoners – actually experienced large-scale land divestment and reduced access to representation within the Hawaiian government notwithstanding.[111] This characterization betrays not only a misunderstanding of the specific conceptual bases for pre-colonization Hawaiian society but demonstrates that Adams, like other social scientists who studied colonies during this period, placed his history of Hawai'i in a longer history of the development of capitalism. He included the transition from a feudal to a capitalist system of private land ownership in his location of the origins of Hawai'i's supposedly egalitarian social structure.[112]

---

in the Form of a Woman: Indians and Spaniards in the Spanish Borderlands (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007).

[111]For an accounts of the affects of the Māhele land divide and the installation of Western law and government structures in the Hawaiian Kingdom, see Osorio, *Dismembering Lāhui*; Merry, *Colonizing Hawai'i*; and Kame'eleihiwa, *Native Land and Foreign Desires*.

[112]Notably, Adams' history of Hawai'i did not include details about white settlers accumulating land and political power and migrant laborers toiling on plantations, growing haole racism in the 1870s, the overthrow of Queen Lili'uokalani in 1893, the practices of the provisional government under Sanford Dole, the annexation of Hawai'i by the United States despite overwhelming protest by Kānaka Maoli, or plantation owners' practice of importing laborers from different locations to minimize the risk of labor organizing. This approach to Hawai'i's history avoided the politics of colonization. University of Hawai'i colleague Ralph Kuykendall wrote the history of Hawai'i in parallel with Adams' book project. It is extremely unlikely that Adams was unfamiliar with the details above. It is unclear whether he left these out because they complicated his arguments or he saw them as irrelevant to his focus and not particularly interesting or important.

One of the themes of *Interracial Marriage in Hawaii* was that native Hawaiians experienced cultural progress as Hawai'i underwent structural change. Intermarriage in particular represented progress for Hawaiians, in Adams' formulation, because it encouraged cultural development even among a people who had inherent problems adapting to modernity. Adams viewed culture as an explanation for human behavior. He viewed cultures as differentially evolved, which explains his references to Hawaiian society prior to colonization as a "stone age culture."[113] One of the effects of marriages between Hawaiian women and Chinese men was that Hawaiian women adapted to "the *more advanced culture* of their husbands relating to the choice and preparation of foods and to household affairs generally – the use of chairs, tables, beds, dishes, cooking utensils, clothing, – so that they are able to live together agreeably. Apparently the women take pride in this cultural progress and sometimes they are very careful to bring their children up to be as much like the father's people as possible."[114] In this way, marrying Chinese men helped Hawaiian women evolve culturally as they produced children capable of adapting to modernity – a necessary condition for integrating Hawai'i into the United States. With this explanation, Adams constructed Chinese-Hawaiian marriages as producing children who were both racially and culturally mixed with a significantly Chinese pattern of acculturation. This was a significant departure from how inheritance was understood to have worked prior to American

---

[113]Adams, *Interracial Marriage in Hawaii*, 245. On the next page Adams noted that it took Hawaiians a century or two to achieve an advanced commercial civilization while it took Nordics two thousand years.

[114]Adams, *Interracial Marriage in Hawaii*, 49. Emphasis added. Frank H. Hankins argued in the same vein that "mulattoes" stood a good chance of adapting to "advanced culture" in his book *The Racial Basis of Civilization* (1926). See George Frederickson, *Racism: A Short History*, 159-161.

colonization, when children with Chinese fathers and Hawaiian mothers were identified as Hawaiians, not Chinese.

Adams' Historiographic Legacy

University of Hawai'i sociologist Romanzo C. Adams advanced the prediction that Hawai'i's population was evolving toward a singular mixed race. Although this race or type has not materialized, the idea that Hawai'i represents an ongoing human experiment characterized by harmonious mixing persists in the public imagination.[115] Since scientists began characterizing Hawai'i as a laboratory of racial and cultural mixing starting in the 1910s, conclusions about the extent and meanings of these processes have varied, yet the idea that the islands are always progressing toward revealing important insights about race relations has remained constant.

Adams' predictions of complete assimilation were particularly influential because they rested on scholarly work that amounted to an authoritative history of Hawai'i. They have persisted as explanations of Hawai'i's exceptionalism as a multi-ethnic society because of their lack of overt hierarchical orientation, even if they remained somewhat essentialist. They were also specific about ethnic groups of concern – they answered territorial officials' questions about the future of the Japanese population and Japanese political power – while maintaining a tone of detached worldliness. Bolstered by the authority of census data, sociological data in the form of life histories (a sociological form of ethnography and auto-ethnography), and statistical analysis of practices and phenomena like intermarriage and group solidarity, Adams' account of Hawai'i as a history of immigration, amalgamation, and

---

[115]Jonathan Y. Okamura, *Ethnicity and Inequality in Hawai'i* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2008), 6-7. See also Lisa Kahaleole Hall, "'Hawaiian at Heart' and Other Fictions," *The Contemporary Pacific*, 17:2 (2005), especially 405-406.

acculturation emphasized population change and biological and cultural melding. It rarely referenced the roles of labor management and American colonization in the shaping of conditions in the human laboratory of Hawai'i. The argument that Hawai'i was a relative racial paradise essentially confirmed that regardless of the circumstances surrounding the colonization and settlement of the islands, the population of Hawai'i, "If it is granted that local sentiment will continue to be the most important factor in the situation… may look forward to the amalgamation of all the races of Hawaii and to their complete assimilation. There will be common interests, common memories, and common loyalties. The peoples of Hawaii will become one people."[116]

Adams devoted most of his career to communicating the sociology of Hawai'i. What he produced was an assimilationist history of Hawai'i featuring a projection of complete amalgamation that, according to his public testimony, would be helped along by a policy of education that emphasized Americanization. While some statehood supporters argued that Japanese and other nonwhite residents of Hawai'i had earned statehood because of their loyalty, within the framework of University of Hawai'i sociologists, statehood was merely the next step in a natural process and therefore inevitable. This line of argument is important because the projected history of Hawai'i had public and political impact. It framed natural sociological processes as determining political processes. Keeping with their supposed commitment to objectivity and refraining from advocacy activity, Adams and his colleague Andrew Lind did not participate on the very front lines of the statehood lobby. Their social circle, however, did.

---

[116]Adams, *Interracial Marriage in Hawaii*, 326.

The historical narrative structured by the Chicago interaction cycle also provided a usable framework for students as they attempted to understand their role in the history of the islands and to articulate an identity as people who were neither fully accepted as Americans within a society focused on their "Orientalness" nor able to identify culturally with the country of their ancestors. Adams' ideas were reproduced by this generation of students who learned the basics of sociology from him and from sympathetic colleagues. A largely Asian student body at the University of Hawai'i learned about Hawai'i's history and social relations from members of the sociology department, who were recognized by the public as experts. Students learned a history of Hawai'i that included an explanation for the struggles they and their parents experienced on their way to Americanization and full inclusion. Adams and other social scientists who worked at the University were architects of a particular type of settler rationality: that the territory that was coming of age in terms of its race relations and that cultural and political assimilation was the natural next step in Hawai'i's emerging history. As the following chapters demonstrate, essays from undergraduate courses and masters theses that Adams and Lind advised indicate that students responded to the ideas and vocabulary embedded in race relations cycle theory, thus reproducing it in their work and relating personal experiences within its associated narrative forms.

Adams' approach has proponents among recently published historians whom have argued that the history of the United States "has been a successful (albeit episodic) history of 'amalgamation' overcoming group differences."[117] Adams made this argument about Hawai'i in 1937 as he attempted to place the archipelago's trajectory as racially amalgamated and

[117]Here Henry Yu refers to David Hollinger's argument in a 2003 *American Historical Review* forum on race mixing. See Yu, "Tiger Woods is Not the End of History: or, Why Sex Across the Color Ling Won't Save Us All," *American Historical Review* 108, no. 5 (Dec. 2003), 1406.

culturally American within the arc of U.S. history. Chicago sociologists' assumption that interracial intimacies both produced and symbolized assimilative process and results (which have also been presumed to be productive of equality) has been tenaciously discursively productive. This notion is still with us; and not just as public narrative, but as a frame that professional historians have perpetuated as a way of understanding American history. David Hollinger has argued that a primary characteristic of U.S. history has been mixing and has suggested that ongoing mixing will remedy ongoing problems related to race. The problem with this line of commentary is the lack of precision about what constitutes an empirical research program and what is desirable. An example of this approach lies within Hollinger's piece, in which an "'empirically warranted narrative of amalgamation' for U.S. history" and an "extravagant" "amalgamation fantasy" became blurred.[118] Similarly, historian of biology Philip Pauly has cited amalgamation as primary to what he calls a progressive nationalist vision of the United States that needs to be reclaimed. In the introduction to his book *Biologists and the Promise of American Life*, Pauly cites Michael Lind's book *Next American Nation* as his book's sequel because it is "a polemical tract that forcefully reasserts the positive value of American nationalism, provides a realistic yet progressive historical overview of the meaning of American national identity, and points toward a future that could be fundamentally egalitarian, free, and *racially amalgamated*," which for Pauly appears to be the ultimate national achievement.[119]

The idea that racial amalgamation has been and continues to be good for America is premised on two ideas. One is that interracial reproduction will save us from race by ridding

---

[118]Yu, "Tiger Woods," 1414.

[119]Philip J. Pauly, *Biologists and the Promise of American Life: From Meriwether Lewis to Alfred Kinsey* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000), 11. Emphasis added.

us of race. The other is that interracial sex is somehow both transgressive and progressive. Contrary to the assumption that racial mixing challenges and might even help eliminate racial boundaries, Henry Yu points out that,

> A racially 'mixed' individual and the sexual boundary crossing that produced such an individual do not in themselves challenge the existence of the boundaries between categories. Indeed, they can serve to highlight the conceptual stability of the categories being mixed, even as they purport to challenge the effectiveness of boundaries in maintaining a sense of difference. People cross national borders constantly, for instance – their crossings to not lessen a sense of national difference, they in fact produce and exacerbate it.[120]

Moreover, whether interracial sex or romantic relationships have been transgressive has been historically predicated upon the racialized genders of the people involved and the context in which the acts have occurred. In almost every setting regardless of geography and political economy, "there was no lack of sexual contact between white men and non-white women, so not all sexual acts across racial lines were equally transgressive of the racial order."[121]

---

[120]Yu, "Tiger Woods," 1407.

[121]Yu, "Tiger Woods," 1409. This explains why the Massie affair became a bit of a narrative problem for Adams. In 1931, white Navy wife Thalia Massie's alleged that five local nonwhite men raped her. The subsequent trial, in which the defendants were acquitted because of a lack of evidence that any crime happened at all, became a news sensation in the continental U.S. A second trial occurred several months later after Massie's mother, husband, and family friend murdered one of the acquitted men, Joseph Kahahawai. The three defendants were convicted and sentenced to an hour's detention in the governor of Hawai'i's office, where they drank Champagne before disembarking to California. The outcome of this trial, in which three white U.S. Navy-affiliated murderers went unpunished for lynching a Hawaiian man, provoked tensions around race and locality to Hawai'i as it intensified outrage among Hawaiians who publicly grieved Kahahawai. It is impossible to overstate the sensational media coverage of this case, which was the last case argued by Clarence Darrow, also known for his work as lawyer for the defense during the Scopes Trial. Adams referred to this series of events in a footnote to his book, but did not directly address them. How Adams understood the Massie affair relative to his arguments about Hawai'i's race relations requires further research, but is beyond the scope of this particular chapter. For more on this episode, see Stannard, *Honor Killing* and John P. Rosa, "Local Story: The Massie Case Narrative and the Cultural Production of Local Identity in Hawai'i," *Amerasia Journal* 26, no. 2 (2000), 93-115.

Since Adams' completed *Interracial Marriage in Hawaii*, social scientific literature and histories of Hawai'i, both academic and popular, began treating Asian migrant laborers as immigrants. Some scholars locate the beginnings of this immigrant narrative in the work of the first Asian American studies scholars, but this actually started much earlier with people like Adams, whose view of the U.S. as a nation of immigrants informed his assumption that Hawai'i and its diverse population would be absorbed fully into the United States. In her introduction to *Asian Settler Colonialism*, Candace Fujikane cites a 1920 publication by the Hawaii Laborers' Association, "Facts About the Strike on Sugar Plantations in Hawaii," as an early example of an Asian settler ethnic history that focused on Asian migrants building Hawai'i. More of these Asian settler ethnic histories came out in the 1980s. Where did Asian settlers acquire the idea that they were immigrants in the same sense that Europeans considered themselves immigrants to the continent? Students at the University of Hawai'i in the 1920s and 1930s learned this from Adams and his colleagues. Adams' work was a formative contribution to a settler historiography (along with Kuykendall) that helped form "a generational model of Asian historiography in Hawai'i" beginning in the 1920s and ending with 1990s studies on pan-ethnic "local" identity.[122]

The surging popularly of statehood in Hawai'i in the 1930s and especially after World War II was due, in part, to changing ideas within the settler population about their role in Hawai'i and the future of the islands. It is difficult to discern the impact of Adams' testimony in 1937 on the committee's findings or on public opinion. However, ideas that we associate with the pro-statehood movement – evidence of the Americanness of Hawai'i's Asian population, the rights of Hawai'i residents to proper representation under democracy,

[122]Fujikane, "Introduction," *Asian Settler Colonialism*, 3.

and a deep personal desire among residents for recognition as Americans – were cultivated within the University of Hawai'i Social Research Laboratory and its classrooms. Adams' opinion that Americanization was not yet complete yet was inevitable was widespread in his teaching as well as in his participation in local networks of businessmen, government officials, and haole social circles.

Interracial Marriage in Hawaii (1937) carried the authority of demography as well as sociology. Making demographic predictions allowed Adams to present his observations, which he supported with historical demographic data, as social science focused on how a society actually worked and what was objectively true about it. This obscured what was in point of fact a set of unfounded assumptions about assimilation and the functions and meanings of interracial relationships of all kinds, whether sexual, familial, or intimate in other ways. Adams' assumption that mixing solves racial problems was not borne out in the research of his graduate student Margaret Lam, whose interviews with mixed race couples, along with student papers collected from University sociology courses, revealed in many cases the subtlety and fluidity of identity claims as well as the tenacity of racial stereotypes and racialist thinking among Hawai'i residents.

Chapter Four

Narrating Colonial Racial Formation: Race Consciousness and Identity in the Vernacular, 1928-1936

> Hawaii's pattern of race relations is not copied from America or Asia. It is a product of local conditions and experience. Hawaiian attitudes toward race are distinctively Hawaiian.[1] – Romanzo Adams, 1931

> "You little kanaka, you are not fit to play with my little boys. I don't see how Mrs. B_____ ever allowed you to play with her little boy Howard. You dirty little black kanaka." I believed that I had committed a terrible sin by being a black kanaka. I didn't show any Hawaiian traits physically – Not unless you saw my mother would you know that I had Hawaiian blood. My mother explained that because she had Hawaiian blood we had [it] and so mothers of white children would not allow us to mingle with their children.[2] – A "Chinese-Hawaiian girl," circa 1934

In the early 1930s, while American social scientists increasingly imagined Hawai'i as an ideal laboratory in which to study race relations, rather incongruously, dissonance developed between academic findings and the experiences of many Hawai'i residents whose ideas were more common, perhaps not in white society, but in their own communities. The two quotations above, the first by the University of Hawai'i's preeminent sociologist and the second by a young woman, likely a student at the University, are illustrative of a significant percepual chasm. While Romanzo Adams functioned under the assumption that Hawai'i's race relations were unique, and that this uniqueness was central to the islands' extraordinary research opportunities and social scientific lessons, a woman who could very well have been one of his students reported treatment at the hands of a neighbor that demonstrated the

---

[1]Adams "The Study of Race Relations in Hawaii" (1931), folder 7, box 1, series 214S, RG 1.1, Rockefeller Foundation Archives, Rockefeller Archive Center (RAC), 3.

[2]From extract of an autobiography of a Caucasian-Hawaiian girl, Box 12, Folder 11, Robert Park Collection (RPC), Special Collections Research Center, University of Chicago (SCRC-UC).

portability and tenacity of American racial codes, which had informed discourse in the territory since before it was formally colonized, indeed, since the nineteenth century.

As demonstrated in the previous chapter, Adams, the chair of the sociology department at the University, had focused his research mostly on population trends based on census data and vital statistics. This analysis lent itself to the production of a teleological narrative about amalgamation that took racial harmony for granted. Adams drew from genealogical and ethnographic research as needed to add human dimension to a historical account largely derived from quantitative analyses. That genealogical and ethnographic research was conducted by Margaret M. Lam, one of his graduate students. While aspects of Lam's research were useful to Adams, ultimately the interviews she conducted with a few hundred residents revealed that social relations in Hawai'i were much more complicated than his account portrayed. Adams' principal conclusions and predictions were challenged by what Lam's informants reported about their own experiences and about what they saw as the order of things in Hawai'i. Subjects' testimony did not universally contradict Adams' position and it does not appear as though he used selective evidence, meaning that he intentionally discarded Lam's interview data en masse. However, his focus on census data and statistical analysis led him to a different, less nuanced account of race relations in the territory and permitted more speculative conclusions than Lam's observations would support.

Lam worked as a research assistant to physical anthropologist Harry Shapiro (see chapter two) as she also performed fieldwork for sociologists Romanzo Adams and Robert E. Park, whose interaction cycle (also known as the race relations cycle and the assimilation cycle) framed sociological theory on immigration and racial conflict from the 1920s through

the early 1960s. Lam's research for Park commenced during his visiting professorship at the University of Hawai'i from 1931 to 1933, and was funded by a Rockefeller Foundation grant.[3] Lam conducted interviews with interracial couples modeled on Park's and his colleagues' format during the Survey of Race Relations (1924-1926) on the West Coast of the United States and his ongoing work on assimilation and the "Oriental Problem."[4] While in that Survey, "documents related to sex between Oriental and white Americans made up about 10 percent of the approximately four hundred life histories and interviews collected by the surveyors," all of the interview transcripts that Lam sent to Park were with interracial couples, who were of primary interest to these sociologists.[5] She continued to send him selected interview transcripts and student autobiographies after he returned to the continent.

This chapter, which is different from the others in this dissertation because it attempts to center the voices of people who were not academics, illustrates how a sample of territorial residents talked about race with a Chinese-American researcher and how their testimony made its way into social science about Hawai'i. Lam was Chinese American and from Hawai'i. In contrast to her advisers' approaches, which largely precluded talking to average people, Lam's attention to racial consciousness and to social class led her to more nuanced conclusions about race mixing made possible by qualitative rather than almost purely quantitative analysis. Although she, too, emphasized attitudes over structural facets

---

[3]Henry Yu, *Thinking Orientals: Migration, Contact, and Exoticism in Modern America* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 243n6.

[4]As described in chapter 3, the "Oriental Problem" was sociologists' shorthand for the conflicts and obstacles experienced by both individuals and groups of people from East Asia as they moved through the race relations cycle. This Oriental Problem precipitated out of other problems of "race relations" epitomized by the Negro Problem, as detailed in chapter 5. For more on the Chicago School's definition of, theorization about, and institutional and disciplinary commitment to the Oriental Problem see Yu, *Thinking Orientals*.

[5]Yu, *Thinking Orientals*, 62.

of racism, her ethnographic approach allowed her to argue that people with mixed ancestry made identity claims, arguments about racial differences, and emphasized particular parts of their family history to secure social status and to maintain self-regard in the face of discrimination.[6] Lam's most important contributions were making known that none of the people of mixed ancestry that she interviewed or wrote about emphasized their mixedness or claimed a "hybrid" identity. This chapter also illustrates the messiness of ongoing processes of racialization.

Interview transcripts, even considering the power dynamics and performances inherent to this type of documentation, are revealing.[7] Lam's reporting provided insights into various peoples' claims to particular positions in Hawai'i's social order during this time. The multivocality of these sources also reveals various tensions, including the ways that "Chinese-Hawaiian hybrids" simultaneously complained about Chinese aloofness and exclusiveness even as they sought belonging in the Chinese group. Lam's line of questioning, which was determined largely by the focus of her mentors' research and the enormous project on race mixing going on at the University of Hawai'i in the late 1920s and

---

[6]Margaret M. Lam, "Racial Myth and Family-Tradition Worship among the Part-Hawaiians," *Social Forces* 14, no. 3 (March 1936), 405-409.

[7]Using these interview transcripts poses a variety of challenges that other scholars have encountered as they have attempted to use the minimal sources available to access the voices of colonized and subaltern people. In their studies of Cherokee people with black ancestry and black thought about white people, respectively, Tiya Miles and Mia Bay have grappled with the limits, distortions, hidden power relationships, and voids within accounts written by missionaries, travelers, and ethnographers as well as interviewers who recorded slave narratives for the Works Progress Administration in the 1930s. See Tiya Miles, *Ties that Bind: The Story of An Afro-Cherokee Family in Slavery and Freedom* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005), Appendix One: Research Methods and Challenges, 207-213; and Mia Bay, *The White Image in the Black Mind: African-American Ideas about White People, 1830-1925* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 113-116.

into the 1930s, led her to focus her conclusions on "racial consciousness," particularly attitudes and perceptions about racial differences.

Informants' testimony about racialization and racial identity serve as counternarratives to Adams' principal predictions and assumptions. While he minimized and took a relativist stance toward discrimination in the islands, as explained in chapter three, informants reported on the kinds of prejudices they experienced as well as their prejudices toward people from particular groups, which they frequently attempted to support as empirically true. Although in the transcripts they generally talked about race prejudice as an attitude, at least in part because of the Chicago vocabulary Lam used as she interviewed, informants also reported that prejudice had a basis in some material reality; it was not just about feelings. A white American man married to a second generation Chinese woman insisted that "There is surely plenty of race prejudice in Hawaii" and that it was "largely economic."[8]

Perhaps most significantly, given Adams' arguments, whether taken individually or as a whole archive of local understandings of social processes, in the transcripts Lam produced there was no evidence that the kind of assimilation that Adams envisioned was in obvious motion or inevitable. For Adams, the commonality of intermarriage was indicative of future amalgamation. Within the interviews that Lam conducted, however, the processes through which racial boundaries were being negotiated and maintained were repeatedly on display. These boundaries were influenced by earlier racialization that occurred on plantations as well

---

[8]Case VIII A, French and Chinese, Box 12, Folder 10, RPC, SCRC-UC, 2. Lam assessed this man as having a French "nationality," but it merits noting that he was born and reared in Chicago in a middle class family. Both his parents were born in America. This informant had been in Hawai'i 10 years and was about 40 years old at the time of his interview. He lived in the Kaimuki neighborhood in Honolulu.

as by ideas imported from migrants' countries of origin, whether they were from China or the United States, and coalescing perceptions of race and culture as related but not necessarily synonymous. Significantly, there was no mixed race identity that people seemed to occupy comfortably or in a sustained way. Indeed, Chinese fathers who insisted that their Chinese-Hawaiian children be raised as Chinese as possible were actively working against their children occupying the positions of mixedness required for the creation of a new race. Finally, one of the foundational assumptions of Chicago sociology during the interwar years and a significant factor in the interaction cycle, that marriage represented the apex of human intimacy and was symbolic of the shortest "social distance" between two people, was contested by informants' reports of any number of marriages arranged or sought out for reasons other than or in addition to love, namely economic stability and social mobility.

Complicated and Contested Categories

The processes of racial formation in interwar Hawai'i were much more complicated than categories long used in scholarship and in the continental United States suggest. Moon-Kie Jung reminds us that,

> Taking the salience of an 'Asian' or Asian American' category for granted, much of the scholarship, particularly by Asian Americanists, inadvertently effects a double conceptual overextension – from the present onto the past and from the metropole onto Hawai'i. As Yen Espiritu (1992) and Jonathan Okamura (1994) remind us, respectively, 'Asian American' as a panethnic racial category is a postwar and a continental U.S. construct that, to this day, enjoys little currency in Hawai'i. An important consequence of such conceptual overextension is the obscuration of racialized inequalities and divisions *among* Hawaii's Asian-origin workers.[9]

---

[9]Jung, *Reworking Race*, 56. See also Yen Le Espiritu, *Asian American Panethnicity* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1992); and Jonathan Y. Okamura, "Why There Are No Asian Americans in Hawai'i: The Continuing Significance of Local Identity," *Social Process in Hawaii* 35, 161-78.

In fact, in prewar Hawai'i, categories like Japanese and Filipino were *themselves* panethnic categories.

> Japanese from different prefectures were categorized together as the Japanese 'race' by the colonial state, haole, and other non-Japanese; Visayans, Ilocanos, and Tagologs were categorized together as the Filipino "race." These preconstructed, ascribed racial identities thereby gained salience for the people thus categorized, even if regional and ethnic differences did not disappear altogether. In other words, the Japanese and Filipinos came to see themselves as Japanese and Filipino "races." But they did not seem themselves, nor were they seen by others, as together belonging to *one* Asian "race."[10]

It bears mentioning that the racial categories that researchers in previous chapters used were ones they inherited largely from plantation management and also from the censuses that began in the mid-nineteenth century. These categories did not reflect a natural taxonomy, but rather an imposed hierarchy that structured local discourse about race even though it was not unquestioningly accepted by the people placed within it.

Migrants from all over the world arrived with distinct national perspectives, which usually included their own ethnic or racial superiority. Haoles' treatment of "Caucasian-Hawaiians" as nonwhite was influenced by racial common sense on the continent.[11] The epigraph of this chapter, of a white American woman calling her neighbor girl, whose parents were Chinese and Hawaiian, a "black kanaka," is emblematic of how settlers who encountered new kinds of differences applied racial codes from home. Occupation also

---

[10]Jung, *Reworking Race*, 56.

[11]One source of analysis on racial common sense in the United States is Peggy Pascoe, *What Comes Naturally: Miscegenation Law and the Making of Race in America* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009). Another on a non-U.S. colonial context is Ann Laura Stoler, *Carnal Knowledge and Imperial Power: Race and the Intimate in Colonial Rule* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002). Amy Kaplan also explains how plantation management and the racialization of slaves in the U.S. South was applied in Hawai'i by white Americans who traveled there in the mid- and late nineteenth century, notably Mark Twain. See Kaplan, "The Imperial Routes of Mark Twain," chapter two of *The Anarchy of Empire in the Making of U.S. Culture* (Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 2002).

effected both residents' perspectives and other people's perceptions about them. The difference between plantation work and other employment, especially business ownership, was correlated with perceived adaptability, which was akin to assimilability. Since the earliest migrations to Hawai'i, Chinese, for example, had worked as merchants and entrepreneurs, often working for each other rather than haole. As they "[found] a niche in the growing ethnic and 'middle-man' sectors of the economy that enabled upward mobility without threatening the haole elite," Moon-Kie Jung explains, "Chinese laborers continued their exodus from sugar plantations after U.S. annexation."[12] During the years under investigation herein, "increasingly emptied of bodies, the 'coolie' category that had contained Chinese laborers fell into disuse."[13]

One of the effects of the meeting and mingling of ideas about race and identity was a cacophony of voices and variant, flexibly coded vocabulary used to identify and sort people.[14] Social scientists referred to "hybrids," "part Hawaiians," "white-Hawaiians," "Caucasian-Hawaiians," and "Chinese-Hawaiians." "Part-Hawaiian" referred to people with any Hawaiian ancestry.[15] Lay people used the term "hapa haole" to refer to a person with

---

[12]Jung, *Reworking Race*, 72.

[13]Jung, *Reworking Race*, 72.

[14]This type of interchangeability was common to colonial contexts during these years in which peoples and ways of understanding differences collided. For example, Helen Tilley notes that, "In African settings colonial administrators and their critics used the terms tribes, races, peoples, primitives, and natives loosely and relatively interchangeably." See Tilley, *Africa as a Living Laboratory: Empire, Development, and the Problem of Scientific Knowledge, 1870-1950* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011), 230.

[15]Margaret Lam used the term "part-Hawaiians" to refer to both "Chinese-Hawaiians" and "Caucasian-Hawaiians." See Lam, "Racial Myth and Family-Tradition Worship among the Part-Hawaiians." While the term Caucasian-Hawaiian showed up in Lam's interview transcripts, in her descriptions of informants, this article in *Social Forces* contains one of the first references I have seen in a publication. The term Caucasian came into use in the 1920s. See Matthew Frye Jacobson *Whiteness of a Different Color: European Immigrants and the Alchemy of Race* (Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press 2002 [1998]), chapter three,

white and Hawaiian ancestry, typically one white parent and one Hawaiian parent.[16] In social research during these years, "race" translated closely to what is now often identified as ethnicity. Chinese and Japanese, for example, were treated as different races.[17] A number of informants referred to others' "nationality" when presumably answering Lam's questions about race relations. This tendency echoed shifts in the terminology used in plantations' demographic records. In 1929, for example, what was in other years in the 1930s and 1940s labeled as "racial ancestry" was labeled "nationalities." Likewise, "Anglo-Saxons" was changed to "Americans" in the account books.[18] Jung notes that, "In prewar Hawai'i, workers struggled, with their employers and among themselves, over classifications like 'coolie,' 'cheap labor,' 'citizen,' 'haole,' and 'American,' defining what these categories meant and determining who belonged to them and how."[19] By the end of World War II, and according to some scholars as early as the late 1930s, the concept of being "local" – born

---

"Becoming Caucasian, 1924-1965." Note that this term largely originated in the continental United States as the meanings of whiteness were under negotiation in the face of mass migration from Europe. That Lam, a locally born researcher working in Hawai'i, would use this term serves as additional evidence against Romanzo Adams' argument that Hawai'i's racial code was original.

[16]"Hapa" remains in colloquial use. While the originally used hapa haole meant a person with half Hawaiian and half Euro-American, or white, ancestry, hapa now sometimes appears as a synonym for mixed, which has been criticized for disregarding important specific historical meanings and co-opting a particular form of Hawaiian identity by those claiming a mixed "Asian-Pacific Islander" or Pacific Rim identity. One example of this inclination is the book of portraits by Kip Fulbeck, *Part Asian, 100% Hapa* (San Francisco: Chronicle Books, 2006). The forward to the book is by Sean Lennon, whose parents are white British and Japanese. The colonialist undertones of ancestrally Asian but not Hawaiian people claiming hapa identity arose in Keala Kelly's session commentary at the 2009 Association for Asian American Studies meeting in Honolulu.

[17]Although no marriages between Chinese and Japanese were recorded in the source material for this chapter, it appears as though a marriage between Chinese and Japanese partners would have been considered an interracial marriage.

[18]See Table 3.2, "Number of Employees by Year, Skill, Gender, Minor Status, and Racial Category, Olaa Sugar Company," in Jung, *Reworking Race*, 63.

[19]Jung, *Reworking Race*, 61.

and raised in Hawai'i regardless of race – came into use, replacing some of the above terminology with a deracialized term that obscured colonial processes.

The utility and meanings of various ways of categorizing people in Hawai'i continue to be fraught. The delicacy of connecting family histories to imperial processes has also contributed to the plurality and shifting of vocabulary.[20] Recent scholarship that positions "Native" and "settler" categories as exacting and opposite political positions (Natives being colonized and settlers invested in ongoing colonization) necessitates examining the historical production of people of mixed ancestry who have claimed or inhabited a singular ethnicity.[21] In Hawaiian genealogical epistemology and kinship practices, Hawaiian ancestry makes one Hawaiian. J. Kēhaulani Kauanui explains that "Hawaiians' traditional form of considering who belongs and who descends from the *'āina* (land) relies on bilateral descent over and above constructions of blood quantum."[22] The question that looms is, How did some people who had both Hawaiian and Chinese ancestry, for example, come to be variously identified as either Hawaiian or Chinese, which makes some of them Native and some settlers according to this framework? This chapter serves as an operational exploration of this question by examining the testimony of the very people who experienced and participated in processes of racialization. The people that Margaret Lam interviewed did not

---

[20]Two scholars who have used family histories to trace how race, identity, and belonging were negotiated in the context of colonialism and slavery are Tiya Miles, *Ties that Bind*; and Claudio Saunt, *Black, White, and Indian: Race and the Unmaking of an American Family* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).

[21]All of the contributors to *Asian Settler Colonialism*, edited by Candace Fujikane and Jonathan Okamura, work in this framework. Haunani-Kay Trask is credited with first articulating the essential difference between Native and settler positions and critiquing the idea of "Local" identity as a colonial formation. See Trask, "Settlers of Color and 'Immigrant' Hegemony: 'Locals' in Hawai'i," in *Asian Settler Colonialism*, 45-65.

[22]J. Kēhaulani Kauanui, *Hawaiian Blood: Colonialism and the Politics of Sovereignty and Indigeneity* (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2008), 15.

create the racial categories with which they contended upon arrival, but they did variously challenge and elaborate on them. By "conceptualizing Portuguese, Japanese, Filipino, and other migrant laborers in racially disparate ways," Jung reminds us, "haole capitalists set the initial terms of these struggles and wielded preponderant influence. Facing qualitatively different racisms that articulated with class and nation differentially, workers responded in incompatible ways, in the process contributing to the reproduction of working-class racial inequalities and divisions."[23] In addition to challenging Adams' narrative, the voices of informants who navigated and helped shape racial knowledge and practice in everyday life help ground recent scholarship on settler colonialism in Hawai'i, filling a crucial historical gap on the specifics of racial projects in Hawai'i between annexation and World War II.[24]

Margaret M. Lam

When Lam began working for both Harry Shapiro and Robert Park in 1930, she was studying for a master's degree in the combined sociology and anthropology department at the University of Hawaii-Mānoa. Shapiro hired her to interview "Chinese-Hawaiian" couples and inquire about their children to supplement his investigation of physical differences between Chinese immigrants, Chinese people born and raised in Hawaii, Hawaiians, and people with both Chinese and Hawaiian ancestry.[25] While the majority of the subjects Lam interviewed as part of Shapiro's project were working class people living in Honolulu or near plantations, she selected a doctor and his wife, a small business owner, a

---

[23]Jung, *Reworking Race*, 61.

[24]There has been less scholarship on Hawai'i between 1900 and the bombing of Pearl Harbor in 1941 than on the much more voluminously studied nineteenth century and postwar eras.

[25]Transcripts for the interviews Lam conducted for Shapiro and also Robert Park are all in English with a mix of what appears to be verbatim pidgin, or Hawaiian Creole English in scholarly parlance. There is no evidence that Lam conducted interviews in languages other than English.

nurse, and other middle class couples as well as a wealthy Chinese-Hawaiian woman who claimed an elite Hawaiian family on Maui and Queen Liliʻuokalani as ancestors. She also collected the life stories of some students from the University of Hawaiʻi, who routinely wrote about their experiences and racial consciousness in sociology courses. In these interviews, Lam's line of questioning focused on subjects' perceptions about each racial group, the groups of children with which they allowed their children to socialize, if they regretted marrying outside their race, whether they had racial prejudices, and what the sources of marital conflicts were, the underlying question being whether racial or cultural differences caused marital conflict.[26] For Park, Lam collected case studies of interracial couples much more broadly defined. Interracial meant that a husband and wife did not have precisely matching ancestry. Chinese and Japanese were considered different races, not "Asiatics" as some biologists and physical anthropologists defined an East Asian racial branch in the early twentieth century, and Portuguese were not usually not considered white, as they were understood as different from haoles.[27] Like her mentors Romanzo Adams and Robert Park, Lam was interested in the sociology and psychology of "racial hybrids,"

---

[26]See the interviews Lam sent to Park, Box 12, Folders 10 and 11, RPC, SCRC-UC. In many of the interviews, the first several paragraphs of the transcripts indicate that subjects answered questions or reported in detail about their perceptions of all the major racial groups in Hawaiʻi: Japanese, Chinese, Portuguese, Filipino, Hawaiians, and haoles. When subjects spoke about their ancestral group or groups, they commented on whether they had close friends from that group and their social relationship or lack thereof with the group.

[27]For more discussion on how national groups were viewed as different races during the interwar period, see Jung, *Reworking Race*, 56-61; 69. "By the 1920s and 1930s, there was arguably as much difference in racialization between the Japanese and Filipinos as between Hawaiians and 'Asians'" (69). Jung also notes that "By the turn of the century, the Portuguese as become a 'race' separate from haole" (75).

specifically their family traits and adaptations to society, how they understood themselves, and their perceptions about racial differences, both traits and typical ("cultural") practices.[28]

While Lam was one of two graduate students who conducted interviews in the early 1930s, she appears to have been the designated person for interviewing about the sensitive subject of race consciousness.[29] Both of them were young women, just like the vast majority of the eugenics field workers Charles Davenport hired to work for the Eugenics Records Office between 1910 and 1924. Davenport thought women were particularly suited for this work since they could exercise their "feminine tactfulness" to coax intimate details from informants.[30] Similarly, Lam was encouraged to collect as many case studies as possible and to conduct interviews in ways that increased the likelihood of drawing out candid details about marriage and family life as well as frank commentary on the races of Hawai'i. For example, she recorded the life story of a "part-Hawaiian" student sent to her by Edgar P. Thompson, a Chicago trained sociology Ph.D. who was on a visiting appointment at the University of Hawai'i. As Lam put it, "Dr. Thompson sent this girl to me with the hope that

---

[28]Lam, "Racial Myth."

[29]Lam's colleague Doris M. Lorden, another student of Romanzo Adams, also conducted interviews in 1931 that appear to have focused on Chinese-Hawaiians as a group, although she interviewed a wide variety of informants that included white people. See Folder 3-32 – Hawaiians and Part-Hawaiians. Mixed Families and Homesteading, Box 3, RA MSS, RASRL-UH. During the early 1930s the only people at the University of Hawai'i doing this work were graduate women. Graduate student Douglas Yamamura did similar fieldwork under the advising of Andrew Lind in the 1940s, which raises questions not just about gender, but about the practice of assigning nonwhite field workers to interview nonwhite people.

[30]Amy Sue Bix, "Experiences and Voices of Eugenics Field-Workers: `Women's Work' in Biology," *Social Studies of Science* 27, no. 4 (1997), 625-668. The investigators in New York, however, had very confining questionnaires unlike the more "qualitative" interviews of Lam.

I'd 'tap' her & induce her to write freely of her racial problems."[31] Lam conducted what she called an intimate interview with this student.

Lam's mentors appear to have viewed her position as a Hawai'i born woman of Chinese ancestry as an asset as she attempted to access the most authentic testimony from mostly nonwhite informants.[32] Born in Honolulu on July 6, 1905, Lam was raised on Kukui Street, immediately adjacent to Chinatown, by her father Quon Lam and mother Yum Sim Lam, both racially Chinese also born in Hawai'i according to the U.S. Census of 1930.[33] (All four of Lam's grandparents were born in China.) She was the oldest of seven children. In 1930, then 25-year-old Margaret lived at home while she worked as a schoolteacher and pursued her degree at the University. Many of the people in their early twenties whom Lam interviewed were essentially her peers. Indeed, the frankness and the frequency with which those with both Chinese and Hawaiian ancestry reported to Lam that they felt most comfortable around Chinese raise interesting and complicated questions about the role of the identity of interviewers in shaping interview content. Moreover, Lam's use of first person pidgin in the transcripts simultaneously authenticated the interviews and the

---

[31]Margaret Lam to Robert Park, Feb. 14, 1933, Box 14, Folder 1, RPC, SCRC-UC.

[32]Yu, *Thinking Orientals*, especially chapter 5: "Wanted: Interpreters and Informants – Orientals, Please Apply," 93-110. In a letter of recommendation, University of Hawai'i sociology professor Andrew Lind mentioned Lam's potential to work in China, a rare reference to her Chinese language aptitude presumably due to upbringing. See Andrew Lind to the University of Chicago Committee on Fellowships and Scholarships, Nov. 30, 1934, Box: Lind, Corresp., Administration Files, Folder: Administration – General, 1930-35), Andrew Lind Papers, RASRL-UH.

[33]United States of America, Bureau of the Census, *Fifteenth Census of the United States, 1930* (Washington, D.C.: National Archives and Records Administration, 1930): T626, 2,667 rolls. Accessed through ancestry.com, last access: 4/26/2012. (See also *1930*; Census Place: *Honolulu*, *Honolulu*, *Hawaii Territory*; Roll: *2635*; Page: *16B*; Enumeration District: *78*; Image: *171.0*; FHL microfilm: *2342369*.) Margaret M. Lam's birth and death dates are listed in the Social Security Death Index, Number 575-40-5152, Issue State: Hawaii, Issue date: 1957-58. Lam died on February 2, 1999.

candidness with which informants spoke as it positioned her as a conscientious and detail-oriented interviewer. It also documented the dialect of working class people and established them as having an identifiably different mode of communication than Lam herself, a way of documenting a significant difference between the subjects' and the observer's social position. The fact that Lam could understand pidgin, which was positioned as an inferior language form by the territory through its public school and university curricula, went without comment.[34]

As a researcher who did most of the ethnographic fieldwork in Hawai'i for Shapiro, Adams, and Park, Lam was the common factor in all of their research. She conducted approximately 207 interviews for Harry Shapiro between 1930 and 1932 that were intended to provide social data to supplement his largely physical anthropological research. This work provided her with the opportunity to explore her interests while contributing to Shapiro's study.[35] When writing "Hawaiians an Amalgamating Race," a chapter in *Interracial Marriage in Hawaii* (1937), Adams drew upon Lam's research, which became part of the department's vast archive of life histories, autobiographies, and other data on Hawai'i residents. He noted, "In the files of the Department of Sociology at the University of Hawaii are the data of the family histories of the descendants of white and Chinese men who married native Hawaiian women at so early a date that there have been four to six generations of their hybrid

---

[34]Thomas J. Sugrue describes a parallel episode in which white sociologist Marvel Daines transcribed interviews with Eight Mile-Wyoming residents in the 1930s in dialect, which Sugrue notes was "a standard convention of white writers in the 1930s." See Sugrue, *The Origins of the Urban Crisis: Race and Inequality in Postwar Detroit* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996), 39. "The use of dialect," Sugrue notes, "simultaneously conveyed to a white readership the authenticity of black voices, and a message of black inferiority."

[35]The Division of Anthropology at the American Museum of Natural History in New York holds transcripts of these interviews, which include information about subjects' parents, immediate families, occupation or student status, social activities, the races of primary acquaintances, and notes on housing quality, car ownership, and other class markers.

descendants. The data were collected and organized by Miss Margaret Lam."[36] This credit both acknowledged and, in some ways, minimized the essential contribution of a woman graduate student whose research, in actuality, challenged a number of Adams' conclusions.[37]

Lam was the first and appears to be the only researcher affiliated with the University of Hawai'i during these years who used genealogy and ethnography to study race mixing. Her master's thesis research was on the genealogy of a single family mostly characterized as "Caucasian-Hawaiian," particularly marriage trends, which led to additional genealogical work after her degree was conferred.[38] "Six Generations of Race Mixture in Hawaii," approved by Romanzo Adams on May 5, 1932, detailed the genealogy of the Beckley family,

---

[36]Romanzo Adams, *Interracial Marriage in Hawaii: A Study of the Mutually Conditioned Processes of Acculturation and Amalgamation* (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1937), 71. Adams' use of Lam's fieldwork in this chapter specifically demonstrates how he interpreted her data: Hawaiians were amalgamating.

[37]On women researchers' collaborative contributions as well as their underrecognition in the 1920s and 1930s, see Margaret W. Rossiter, *Women Scientists in America: Struggles and Strategies to 1940* (Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1982), especially chapter 10, "Double Standards and Underrecognition: Territorial and Hierarchical Discrimination." Margaret Lam's and her colleague Doris Lorden's positions as ethnographic researchers relative to their more quantitatively concerned professors, as well as the complimentary but not formative ways that their fieldwork was used by their professors, helps illustrate how the research program at the University of Hawai'i produced certain sorts of people as experts and others as not. Based on the available evidence, none of the graduate students who worked as research assistants had Hawaiian ancestry. Both Lam and Lorden were understood as single-race and nonnative – Lam as Chinese and Lorden as American white. While the department mentored a number of men into professional academic sociology in the 1930s and 1940s, women graduate students during the 1930s did not join the ranks of academic sociology. Lam moved to Chicago to work toward a doctorate as Park's advisee, but left the program before she completed the degree. Lorden met sociologist Edward Byron Reuter at the University and later married him. She published her first and only article on Chinese-Hawaiian families in the *Journal of American Sociology* in 1935, making her career much shorter than his.

[38]Margaret M. Lam, "Six Generations of Race Mixture in Hawaii," Master's thesis, University of Hawai'i, 1932, i. See also Margaret Lam to Robert Park, Sept. 11, 1934, Box 14, Folder, 1, RPC, SCRC-UC. Genealogical studies of families were also common in eugenics research in the 1920s.

starting with the marriage of an English sea captain and a Hawaiian "chiefess." Lam reported major findings in an article in *Sociology and Social Research*.[39]

In what appeared to be a highlighting of differences between her work and her adviser's Lam noted that, "Although considerable attention has been devoted by sociologists to intermarriage, there has been very little research with regard to its *social consequences*. In other words, the specifically *human* side of miscegenation has not been as well explored as its biological or statistical side."[40] She identified three primary factors determining marriage choices: cultural isolation, romance, and propinquity (proximity).[41] While cultural isolation (which she defined as cherishing and worshipping family traditions) maintained racial solidarity, she thought romance and propinquity "tend[ed] to break down racial solidarity."[42] Lam later encountered informants who reported experiences and positions, especially on intermarriage and childrearing, that challenged this theory about racial solidarity. For example, interracial marriage did not necessarily break down racial solidarity, but rather contributed to the formation of different solidarities. Many of Lam's informants explained how strongly children with Chinese fathers and Hawaiian mothers were directed toward Chinese socialization and identification. If this meant a breakdown in "racial solidarity" among Hawaiians, it meant an intensification of a kind for Chinese men. Lam's ethnographic research on mixed race families, including nearly 300 interviews with mixed

---

[39]Margaret Lam, "Intermarriage in Hawaii: A Case Study," *Sociology and Social Research* 17, no. 2 (Nov.-Dec., 1932), 159-166.

[40]Lam, "Intermarriage in Hawaii," 159.

[41]Lam, "Intermarriage in Hawaii," 161.

[42]Lam, "Intermarriage in Hawaii," 161.

race couples and individuals, revealed that people with a combination of Chinese and Hawaiian ancestry in particular were usually raised as Chinese.[43]

Lam's work for all three scholars was shaped by her interests in the race consciousness of people either involved in interracial relationships or who had mixed ancestry. Her interviews confirmed one assumption of Chicago sociologists, namely that some individuals with mixed ancestry experienced conflict over feeling like perpetual outsiders to the group with which they identified. This finding, while corroborated by researchers' work on the mixed race "marginal man" type on the continent, contradicted social scientists' assumptions and predictions about race relations in Hawai'i and the inevitability of racial amalgamation and the production of what Adams had called a "neo-Hawaiian type."

While the interviews Lam conducted on behalf of Harry Shapiro contained extensive data on the size, layout, decoration of their homes and inventories subjects' possessions, whether the family had a piano or a car, whether the family held a one year birthday luau for babies, and other information that would allow for categorization or comparison, usually three to four pages before the interview transcript began, the transcripts that Lam sent to Park were almost completely narrative. Most of the people Lam interviewed as part of Shapiro's research on Chinese-Hawaiian mixing were current or former plantation workers, their wives, or their children. During interviews, subjects answered at length about domestic issues. They reported about whether they ate mostly Chinese or Hawaiian style foods at

[43]Lam completed 207 interviews for Harry Shapiro. There are approximately 85 transcripts in Robert E. Park's papers and an unknown, but not tremendously large, number interspersed in Romanzo Adams' papers. It is unclear if Lam completed any additional interviews for her personal research projects. The historical record on Lam is confined almost entirely to her correspondence with her mentors, the research materials and drafts of papers that she sent to them, and a few published articles.

home, how often they ate haole-style meals, and what foods were considered disgusting or culturally repugnant. They also reported whether parents and children spoke English, Chinese, or Hawaiian and the difference between how children communicated with their mothers and fathers.[44] During interviews whose transcripts she eventually sent to Robert Park, Lam asked about both family-related topics and general opinions about various racial groups. These topics, which she mostly discussed privately with individuals and only occasionally by interviewing husbands and wives at the same time, included their family background and childhood memories, their marriages, how they were raising their children, cultural differences within the household, and their opinions about the various ethnic groups living in Hawaii, as well as people of mixed ancestry. She also interviewed individuals as young as 12 years old.

Although the transcripts did not make their way to Shapiro's and Park's files, some of Lam's interviews provided data for her masters thesis, in which she argued that accurate genealogical work on families that included Hawaiians was nearly impossible. In 1933, she reported to Park that she was researching the family of Isaac Davis, one of the two haole advisors of Kamehameha I, the Hawaiian monarch in the early nineteenth century. Lam said that Davis' family was "one glorious mess with all the illegitimacies, irregularities & what-nots – all so characteristic of the Hawaiian family." She recorded five different versions of family history from Davis descendants, "none of these are alike in detail," which suggested to her that discerning an accurate family history was unlikely.[45]

---

[44]Most subjects also explained how the family celebrated births and grieved deaths, with detail about whether they observed Hawaiian or Chinese customs and why.

[45]Margaret Lam to Robert Park, Feb. 14, 1933, Box 14, Folder 1, RPC, SCRC-UC.

With this commentary, Lam described practices such as having children out of wedlock or practicing a form of adoption called hānai (in which members of an extended family raise their nieces, nephews, grandchildren, or cousins as their children) as evidence of "disorganization." This was sociological language rather than biological, but the ideas were somewhat parallel. The language and construct of disorganization ostensibly described family formation and family life, as well as individuals, in scientific language that contrasted with labels such as degenerate, as some eugenicists used to label "unfit" families. The idea that these families or individuals were disorganized reflected a shift in outlook in the 1920s, when social scientists emphasized assimilation and assimilability as the primary goal of socialization in American life. Thus, the lack of socialization or organization was somehow pathological, which set up a cultural framework for essentialist ideas about particular sorts of families and ethnic groups. This is an example of "the new racism" described by George Frederickson. "What has been called 'the new racism' in the United States, Great Britain, and France," he explains, "is a way of thinking about difference that reifies and essentializes culture rather than genetic endowment, or in other words makes culture do the work of race."[46] Studies of "disorganization," because they focused on contemporary individuals and families and ascribed social practices to culture, which was understood as something inherent, rather than history, which is contingent. These studies thus presented individual and family situations as essential to them or, in other words, explained by their "tendencies," including either adaptive or pathological behaviors.[47]

---

[46]George Frederickson, *Racism: A Short History* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002), 141.

[47]This shift has been identified as central to postwar social science as well. See John Jackson and Nadine M. Weidman, *Race, Racism, and Science: Social Impact and Interaction* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2006 [2004]); and Gunnar Myrdal, *An American*

Ascribing "tendencies" and essential, supposedly cultural attributes to racial groups was a practice common among Lam's mostly nonwhite informants as well as white plantation managers. While the focus of most ethnographic research at the University of Hawai'i was on people of mixed ancestry, particularly Chinese-Hawaiians, psychologists Stanley Porteus and Marjorie Babcock did small amounts of interviewing with white residents in 1926.[48] Porteus and Babcock had both come to Hawai'i from the Training School in Vineland, New Jersey, where he was the director of research in the psychological laboratory and she was a research assistant in the same laboratory and clinical examiner for the Child Study Department of the Rochester Public Schools.[49] At the University of Hawai'i, Porteus was a professor of clinical psychology and the director of the Psychological and Psychopathic Clinic and Babcock was an assistant psychologist at the clinic. Their results "unintentionally offered a telling assessment of haole beliefs about the Portuguese and Hawaii's other 'races,' although the original intention was to provide unbiased ratings of those groups by ostensibly objective haole arbiters."[50] These haole arbiters had been the architects of Hawai'i's plantation-based social structure since the mid-nineteenth century. In addition to any personal beliefs that led them to regulate plantation life, they purposefully

---

Dilemma: The Negro Problem and Modern Democracy (New York: Harper, 1944). Laura Briggs has also detailed how sociologist Daniel Patrick Moynihan, in his 1965 report to the U.S. Department of Labor, *The Negro Family: The Case for National Action*, described the black family in America as socially pathological. See Briggs, *Reproducing Empire*, 163-164. Moynihan never argued that there was something biologically inferior about black families. His contention was rather that the large number of families with a single mother as the head of household plagued black people as a race. This argument has proven persistent as an explanation for the black "culture of poverty" – a biology-free reincarnation of racial degeneracy – that allegedly overburdens the welfare system.

[48]Stanley D. Porteus and Marjorie E. Babcock, *Temperament and Race* (Boston: Roger G. Badger, 1926).

[49]Porteus and Babcock, *Temperament and Race*, title page.

[50]Jung, *Reworking Race*, 75.

imported workers from different countries to reduce the likelihood that workers would unionize.[51]

Life in Hawai'i during this period was rife with racial tensions that had been cultivated by sugar, pineapple, and longshoring companies for decades and maintained by "a cohesive oligarchy of haole capitalists" who were in the distinct minority.[52] Racial divisions among workers were intensified when Hawaii's sugar conglomerate known as the Big Five defeated the cooperative strike by Japanese and Filipino sugar workers in 1920.[53] Porteus and Babcock's study of haole plantation managers', doctors', and educators' attitudes about race was commissioned by the Hawaiian Sugar Planters Association (HSPA) after another strike in 1924 and published in several parts as reports to the HSPA before being included in their book *Temperament and Race* (1926).[54] Porteus and Babcock asked interview subjects to rate people of different races on eight traits: "planning capacity," "self determination," "inhibition of impulse," "resolution," "self control," "stability of interest," "tact," and "dependability."[55] Porteus and Babcock concluded that Japanese rated highest among the

---

[51]Jung, 57; Gary Okihiro, *The Anti-Japanese Movement in Hawaii, 1845-1945* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1991), 81. In a demonstration of the agenda to control labor, Okihiro explains that planters and the territorial government "launched a national campaign to reintroduce Chinese migrant labor," which had been prohibited by the 1883 Chinese Exclusion Act, "hoping to rid themselves of the Japanese." This move to replace a group of problem workers with new workers suggests that all workers were commodities with which the plantations could and should manipulate to maximize control and profit. It also demonstrates that the ethnic diversity that later became a hallmark of Hawai'i was not natural, an accident of history, or symbolic of racial harmony. It was very intentionally engineered by sugar capitalists working to maintain unilateral control in the islands, and was predicated upon the assumption that workers from different countries would *not* work in solidarity.

[52]Jung, *Reworking Race*, 55.

[53]Jung, 55. See also Yu, *Thinking Orientals*, 80-81.

[54]Jung, *Reworking Race*, 216n104.

[55]Porteus and Babcock, *Race and Temperament*, 92-94.

races, with Chinese following in the second position. Haole were not included in the assessment.[56]

Locating Conflict

Although Chinese-Hawaiian "hybrids" had been lauded as superior to their "pure" parents, as explained in chapter one, Lam sought to reveal, using interviews, how "hybrids" experienced inner conflict and social difficulties associated with being between two groups.[57] Interviews later suggested to Lam that it was not simply having mixed ancestry that caused difficulty for people; it was their efforts to be accepted as one ethnicity and being rejected by an exclusive group, Chinese in most cases, or invalidated as authentically Chinese. Lam explains in a draft manuscript that "hybrids" developed antagonistic attitudes toward Chinese because they wanted to be accepted into the Chinese group, to be part of the group "above" them. As explained above, the University of Chicago sociologists' shorthand for these conflicts was "disorganization," an umbrella term for social disorder of any kind but especially individuals' feelings of being outsiders, family dysfunction, and crime associated

---

[56]This kind of commentary continued in the work of other social scientists at the University. See Andrew Lind, *An Island Community Ecological Succession in Hawaii* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1938), 217. He quotes from a *Report of the President of the Board of Immigration* (Honolulu, 1880, 1886). In 1880, a planter reported, in what Lind said reflected the "plantation sentiment of the time," "'When properly handled I think they [South Sea Islanders] are 'tractable and willing workers,' to the best of their ability, which is not very much….. I would take more if young and free from disease, but would prefer good, healthy Chinamen, as they can do more work….. The Portuguese are the strongest and most intelligent of the laborers. The Chinese are most generally useful and reliable. The Kanakas are variable, and the S.S. Islanders are ignorant but willing'" (217). Lind comments on the next page about the supposed cunningness of Chinese and other racial traits.

[57]See Margaret M. Lam, "Chapter III: Social Relationships and Attitudes Toward the Chinese," page 1, Folder: Shapiro, H.L. Chinese-Hawaiian Study Miscellaneous Notes, Box 1, Harry L. Shapiro Collection, Division of Anthropology Archives, American Museum of Natural History (DAA-AMNH). The presumed social and psychological instability of mixed race people, which is what made mixing socially if not biologically problematic, was the focus of a number of sociologists' research on "mulattoes" on the continent.

with racial problems. Disorganization was central to American sociological theory, especially at Chicago during the 1910s and 1920s, when the study of "mulattoes," people with both black and white ancestry, began.[58] One of the objectives of studying individual racial consciousness was assessing the level of individual disorganization in order to extrapolate the findings to the group.

Lam reported that Chinese were culturally superior to Hawaiians and that this belief was so widespread that people with both Chinese and Hawaiian ancestry subscribed to it. This was comparable with the behavior of "mulattoes" on the continent who sought identification with and validation from white people:

> Obviously and unquestionably the Chinese are considered culturally superior to the Hawaiian. Their superior status is accepted by the native themselves as well as by the Chinese-Hawn hybrids. Generally speaking, a Chinese-Hawaiian hybrid is just as anxious to secure recognition from the Chinese social group as the mulatto is from the white social group.[59]

In her reading of where "hybrids" fit into Hawai'i's social hierarchy, Lam treated the hierarchy as a form of organization, but did not explicitly name it as such. Organization, in this case characterized by "hybrids"' understanding of Hawaiian inferiority and efforts to assimilate into a superior group – Chinese – was essentially treated as a natural step in a cycle that included disorganization as a product of contact.[60]

---

[58]For examples of scholarship that precipitated out of this research focus, see Edward Byron Reuter, *The Mulatto in the United States* (Boston: R.G. Badger, 1918); and Edward Byron Reuter, ed., *Race and Culture Contacts* (New York and London: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1934).

[59]Margaret M. Lam, "Chapter III: Social Relationships and Attitudes Toward the Chinese," page 1, Folder: Shapiro, H.L. Chinese-Hawaiian Study, Miscellaneous Notes, Box 1, Harry L. Shapiro Collection, DAA-AMNH. "Hawn" was shorthand for Hawaiian.

[60]On University of Hawai'i sociologist Andrew Lind's ecological approach to race relations, which naturalized conflict, including prejudice, as a product of contact, see chapter five.

Available interview transcripts indicate that the majority of Chinese-Hawaiians identified as Chinese rather than Hawaiian, although Lam reported that both the number of Chinese-Hawaiian children raised in predominantly Chinese "environments" and the number who were "successful" at being accepted as Chinese were small. According to Lam, successfully raising children as Chinese required "superior and tactful and autocratic" Chinese fathers who insisted on Chinese cultural education for their children and whose wives, their children's Hawaiian mothers, acquiesced to the idea that Chinese ways were superior to Hawaiian.[61] In a draft report on her interviews, Lam relates how a "hybrid mother" acknowledged her own Hawaiianness as she insisted that her children were better off marrying into Chinese families.[62] In this way, many children with both Chinese and Hawaiian ancestry were raised to reject Hawaiian cultural practices and project a personality consistent with the "Oriental pattern."[63] In these cases, Chinese fathers positioned their children as Chinese by educating them in Chinese culture (sometimes enlisting the help of mature Chinese women to socialize their children after school), insisting on displays of Chineseness at home, and downplaying Hawaiian "blood."[64] However, Lam said that "In this study, there was not a single case where a hybrid reared by his Hawaiian mother and Chinese father successfully adjusted himself in the Oriental group."[65] So, even though Chinese-Hawaiian informants typically expressed more comfortable affiliation with Chinese, apparently they were very rarely accepted as full members in the group.

Revealing Testimony

---

[61]Lam used these descriptors in a draft manuscript. See Lam, "Chapter III," 4.
[62]Lam, "Chapter III," 10.
[63]Lam, "Chapter III," 6.
[64]Lam, "Chapter III," 5-6, 23.
[65]Lam, "Chapter III," 7.

Lam's informants offered a direct challenge to University of Hawai'i and University of Chicago sociologists' findings, particularly about race prejudice, which they generally downplayed or assessed as relatively insignificant compared with race prejudice on the continent. Their testimony contradicted other key assumptions as well, such as the idea that, generally speaking, "hybrids" were improved in some way, whether it was biologically or in terms of their adaptability over their "pure" parents. It also challenged the assumption that race was always the single most important factor in social relations, particularly family formations. In a few cases, similarity of religious beliefs and practice was more important than race in individuals' choice of partners. Class and degree of adaptation to life in an American territory also sometimes superceded the importance of making a same-race marriage match. While sociologists assumed that interracial marriages represented the zenith of intimacy, informants reported that marriages were not always for love, either primarily or at all. Finally, nonwhite people often disapproved of mixing. This works against assumptions that the only people concerned with racial purity, racial traits, or the color line were white.

All of Lam's informants asserted that there was race prejudice in Hawai'i. Some of them, including white people who were new to Hawai'i, reported serious race prejudice. For example, one informant who insisted that racism pervaded social relations in Hawai'i, especially plantation life, was a continental U.S.-born white woman married to a Hawai'i-born doctor of Japanese ancestry. (She was also one of the only interviewees to express regard for Hawaiians.) She explained that it was serious enough that nonwhite workers, especially Filipinos, who were widely understood as the migrants with the least social status,

experienced physical abuse from the white plantation physicians.[66] Another informant, Hawai'i born Mollie Visher-Moore recalled visiting her haole husband's parents in Stockton, California, where she insisted, "No, no, there is no race prejudice in California…. You find race prejudice in Hawaii only – not in California."[67]

Another way in which race prejudice in Hawai'i manifested itself, according to a number of informants' testimony, was families' rejection of their sons or daughters, and sometimes their grandchildren as well, when they married outside their race. One white woman who claimed German and Bohemian ancestry was rejected by her family for marrying a Chinese man. This experience helped her to "feel a sort of relationship with all Chinese as a race."[68] Similarly, a Caucasian-Hawaiian young woman's paternal grandmother, a white woman, did not acknowledge her or her brother till their father passed away when her brother was eighteen. After insisting to her son, who married a woman with Hawaiian and English ancestry, "You made your bed, go lie in it," this grandmother reached out to her grandchildren after nearly two decades of refusing to have anything to do with the family.[69]

---

[66]Case XX, Japanese and Caucasian, Honolulu, May 1934, Box 12, Folder 11, RPC, SCRC-UC, 1. "Goodness knows there is a lot of race prejudice in Hawaii. I didn't know this before I came, but I sure see a lot of it. My husband thinks there is quite a bit too. It's terrible the way some of these doctors treat their patients on the plantations. They tell me that when a Filipino comes in they just grab them by the wrist and take a knife and cut the boil open. They have the idea that the Filipinos are such ignorant people and I don't think they know that the Filipinos know they are not being treated a human beings. These things hurt me – I don't see how they could treat anyone like this. The patients tell my husband how the doctors treat them."

[67]Case XII – Life History of Mrs. Molly Visher-Moore, Box 12, Folder 11, RPC, SCRC-UC, 11, 21. Her husband was a luna, an overseer, on a plantation. Visher-Moore reported that she and her husband lived in the "haole style."

[68]From an autobiography of a German-Bohemian women who married a Chinese man, Box 12, Folder 11, RPC, SCRC-UC, 2.

[69]From extract of an autobiography of a Caucasian-Hawaiian girl, Box 12, Folder 11, RPC, SCRC-UC.

A New Jersey born white woman married to a Japanese doctor from Kauai reported that her parents did not approve of their marriage until a granddaughter was born.[70]

Informants generally saw race prejudice in Hawai'i as separate from their own behavior. Many subjects insisted that they did not "have race prejudice" or were not prejudiced toward anyone in particular, yet explained in detail why people of various races were undesirable spousal matches for their children. This suggests that by the early 1930s, overt racial prejudice was widely understood as either irrational or socially inappropriate. The commentaries that followed subjects' declarations of their lack of race prejudice have a matter-of-fact tone and include detailed descriptions – sometimes with qualifiers that the speaker did not think *all* people of a group *always* behaved in a certain way. As mentioned above, informants generally attempted to frame their judgments of various races' undesirable qualities and behavioral patterns not as judgments, but as observations and as savvy cultural commentary. They sometimes said outright or suggested that it was a group's "culture" or ways of doing things that made them socially problematic or simply annoying. A Japanese foreman married to a Portuguese woman reported that he had no race prejudice and that he treated "everybody alike in my work and every day," yet he said he wanted his children to marry Portuguese people for their own benefit. He said that Hawaiians were too easy going and "not very much up to the standard" and Filipinos had too low of a standard of living. Only Japanese who were "Americanized" were probably appropriate matches for his

[70]Case XX, Japanese and Caucasian, Honolulu, 1934, Box 12, Folder 11, RPC, SCRC-UC, 2.

children, he said.[71] White people did not have a monopoly on anxieties over the social consequences of interracial marriage.

In their criticism of haoles, who did not want their relatives intermarrying, for having a "superiority complex," informants used language about race prejudice as a psychological phenomenon that also came into use in the continental United States in the 1930s.[72] Some informants also accused hapa haoles, or people with Hawaiian and haole ancestry, of acting white. Helen Kapela of Honolulu said she did not like being around hapa haoles because they were too critical and "haolified," and they "try to act like a haole and they try to talk like a haole."[73] In some of the interviews and in Lam's 1936 article in *Social Forces*, white racism was framed as exhibiting a superiority complex or being "high hat," or in the case of people with some white ancestry who wished to emphasize that part of their ancestry, "trying to act haolefied." These were attitudes, personal beliefs about superiority, or modes of public presentation and social discourse. This deemphasized how the racial hierarchy was produced and embedded structurally and what its material affects were and instead emphasized feelings and perceptions about difference – the psychology of race prejudice rather than structural racism. One informant, however, located haole superiority in the history of Hawaiian dispossession. Although the history of Hawai'i being written at the

---

[71]He also said that if one of his children married into a haole family, he worried that members of the family might look down on him or try to save face socially by telling visitors that he was the "yardman" rather than one of their in-laws. See Case II, interview 2, husband, Box 12, Folder 10, RPC, SCRC-UC, 2. While his comments serve as evidence of his belief in a hierarchy of worthy mates for his children, he framed his feelings essentially as anxieties about navigating relationships created by interracial marriage.

[72]The concept and term "racism" entered the social science and lay lexicon in the 1930s. See John P. Jackson, Jr. and Nadine M. Weidman, *Race, Racism, and Science: Social Impact and Interaction* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2006), 129.

[73]Case 85: Mrs. Helen Kapela of Hilo, 39 years old, and husband, Folder: *Shapiro, H.L. Anthropo-Social Data (1930-1931) Interviews: Case #76-100*, Box: 1, Harry L. Shapiro Collection, DAA-AMNH.

university generally emphasized the islands' demographic "natural history," modernization, and integration into the United States, he understood haole migrants as responsible for what he viewed as the most significant events in Hawaiian history, Hawaiian commoners' land divestment and colonization. He said,

> All haoles are not good. They can run down other nationalities. They think they are superior and above all. They cheated the early Hawaiians and got them under their thumbs. That's why so many of them own so many lands and are so rich now. Where do you think they got everything? They came here poor; they didn't have much money. Look were [sic] they are today? The Hawaiians were so easy and they trusted the whites so much that they did as the whites told them. It's the haoles who brought most of the diseased into these Islands. The early Hawaiians never knew anything about these diseases that you find today…. Some haoles are good. They realise [sic] everything and they understand. They are nice and they are good friends.[74]

With this caveat that some haoles make good friends, even though generally haoles benefited from Hawaiian dispossession, this informant displayed what appeared to be a self-consciously sophisticated, measured assessment of the past that allowed for exceptions and complexity.

A complex understanding of race and American racial hierarchy emerged in a number of informants' commentary. Some interviews made it patently clear that Hawai'i residents were familiar with continental racial codes and tensions, some of which found their way into racial common sense as it had developed and continued to percolate in the territory. On the topic of racial affiliation and detecting race, one Chinese woman commented that,

> Hawaiian or part-Hawaiian boys generally marry girls of their kind. They don't care for white girls because they (white girls) classify the Hawaiians with the negroes. You know Hawaiians do not like to be classified with the negroes altho [sic] they haven't any real prejudice against them. I think one can easily tell the difference between Hawaiians and negroes. I know we can.

---

[74]Case IIIA, interview 1, with wife, Box 12, Folder 10, RPC, SCRC-UC, 6.

> You know how? The Hawaiians don't have the awful odor that negroes have. Oh, the negroes have terrible odor. That's how we can tell.[75]

This particularly physical understanding of race points to the way in which racial difference was a multi-faceted concept for regular people in Hawai'i during this period.[76] Although social scientists studying racial difference and racial consciousness were in the process of separating race and culture, effectively turning race into a biological concept, for nonwhite people and white people alike, in common parlance race was discrete and detectable using a variety of senses.

In a particularly stark contrast to Romanzo Adams' opinion that cultural assimilation was significantly underway, many informants described their efforts at socializing their mixed ancestry children as Chinese. Parents understood, even if they did not say so explicitly, that the cultural training of their children into the desired racial group required education about appropriate behaviors and mindsets. Generally speaking, parents were sensitive to who their children socialized with because they wanted to assure their children's appropriate cultural education with racial and class appropriate habits.[77] A continent-born white woman married to a Japanese doctor said she did not mind if her daughters attended Japanese language school, but emphasized, "I don't like the children they mingle with there" because Japanese

---

[75]Case IIIA, interview 1, with wife, Box 12, Folder 10, RPC, SCRC-UC, 1. Emphasis in original.

[76]On the use of one's sense of smell to detect race and on the idea that people of different races have different odors, see Mark M. Smith, *How Race is Made: Slavery, Segregation, and the Senses* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006).

[77]Some of the best work on the racialized cultural training of young children is by Ann Laura Stoler. See *Carnal Knowledge and Imperial Power: Race and the Intimate in Colonial Rule* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002).

children were "so rude, ill-mannered and fresh."[78] She seemed to worry that her children were taunted and mischaracterized as haoles.

> The funny thing is that these children of the later generation – those that go to school with my children – regard my children as haoles. They say, "You haole don't have to go to Japanese school." And the strange thing is that anything that isn't good they attribute to their white side. When my girls answer these youngsters these Japanese would reply, "You sassy like your haole mother." But Dorothy is so proud that she is part-American and part-Japanese. She tells people very proudly, "I'm part-American and part-Japanese."[79]

In response to Lam's question about who would be appropriate spouses for her daughters, this woman said,

> I don't care whom my children marry. It is their business. Of course I think they will be happier with white people. Only I don't want [them] to marry a Japanese from Japan with old ideas, for their own sake. I don't think they will be happy with these old customs and ideas, like filial piety. This is for their own happiness. They get along with people who are Americanised. I can get along with Japanese who are Americanised.[80]

Parents' concerns with proper cultural training reflected efforts in what Ann Laura Stoler has called the "education of desire": child-rearing practices intended to teach children not just proper behavior, but with whom they should want and cultivate romantic and familial relationships – which were not simply about love, but about status bound up in race and class.[81] While historians have focused primarily on racialized cultural training by white

---

[78]Case XX, Japanese and Caucasian, Honolulu, 1934, Box 12, Folder 11, RPC, SCRC-UC, 7.

[79]Case XX, Japanese and Caucasian, Honolulu, 1934, Box 12, Folder 11, RPC, SCRC-UC, 7.

[80]Case XX, Japanese and Caucasian, Honolulu, 1934, Box 12, Folder 11, RPC, SCRC-UC, 8.

[81]See Ann Laura Stoler, *Race and the Education of Desire: Foucault's* History of Sexuality *and the Colonial Order of Things* (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 1995); and Stoler, *Carnal Knowledge and Imperial Power*. On childrearing practices among missionaries in nineteenth century and their concerns about their children's adoption of local culture

or European parents in colonial settings, the largely nonwhite parents with whom Lam spoke expressed the same sorts of concerns and efforts with their children.[82] The order in which Lam asked questions influenced the way subjects answered, but not necessarily the forcefulness with which they spoke about their thinking about who their children should marry. A Portuguese woman married to a "Swede" said she did not send her six year old to the local school, Lili'uokalani School in the Kaimuki neighborhood, because she did not want her children mingling with the "many mixtures in the school" and learning slang or pidgin.[83] She said she did not mind who her children played with as long as they spoke nicely. She did not want her children to intermarry with "Orientals:" "I want them to marry whites. Portuguese? Yes, Portuguese are whites too. I don't mind Portuguese if the Portuguese is ambitious. So many of these Portuguese are interested in getting a home and making a living merely to support their family. I want them to marry men who are ambitious."[84] Unlike the white New Jersey born mother above, this Portuguese woman spoke more emphatically about the necessity of financial stability – having an ambitious husband – than making a racial match.

In spite of sociologists' assumption that marriage symbolized the shortest social distance possible between two people because of a love relationship, some subjects' testimony indicated that choices about marriage depended on factors other than affection.

Hawai'i, see Patricia Grimshaw, chapter six, "Faithful Mothers," in *Paths of Duty: American Missionary Wives in Nineteenth-Century Hawaii* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1989).

[82]One similarity between the cultural education practices of Chinese fathers married to the Hawaiian mothers of their children, for example, and white Dutch or white Dutch men partnered with native women raising their children in Indonesia, to use the example from Ann Stoler's scholarship, was the desire of migrant or settler fathers to educate their children against native cultural practices and familiarity, in the literal sense of the term, with native peers. This parallel is important and requires further research.

[83]Case VI B, Box 12, Folder 10, RPC, SCRC-UC, 2.

[84]Case VI B, Box 12, Folder 10, RPC, SCRC-UC, 2.

A Hilo-area Portuguese woman married to a Filipino reported that she did not love her husband before marrying him, but grew to love him by the time of her interview.[85] This paralleled other situations in which families married their daughters off to gain financial support (as in this case, in which her mother made her marry at a young age and even seems to have arranged it), or in the case of Mollie Visher Moore's second marriage, or women who were older than the typical age of marriage and widowed or single and worried about the consequences of resisting the pressure to marry. In contrast to Chicago sociologists' assumptions, these marriages were not primarily for love or intimacy.[86] Some Hawaiian women sought Chinese men as husbands because of their success holding down jobs. In the case of a Hawaiian woman who had been married to Chinese man, she reported that she had had lots of trouble with Hawaiian women, notably a neighbor that she treated like a sister before the neighbor seduced her husband.[87] She insisted that this neighbor tried to take her husband away because, unlike her own lazy husband, he had a job. In other words, desire for financial stability motivated this neighbor to obtain a Chinese husband.

The way that some informants described Hawaiian women who sought non-Hawaiian husbands suggested that their preferences made them race conscious – conscious of the realities of marrying men of particular races – but not prejudiced.[88] In fact, Hawaiian

---

[85]Case XIV B, Box 12, Folder 11, RPC, SCRC-UC, 4.

[86]They assumed this, I think, because the small number of cases of intermarriage between "Orientals" and others, usually white people, were usually told as love stories – love in the face of racial prejudice and marriage prohibited by anti-miscegenation laws. In Hawai'i, where there were no such laws and where there were so many nonwhite people because of plantations' labor imports, people married for all sorts of reasons, sometimes deliberately for financial stability.

[87]Case X, Box 12, Folder 11, RPC, SCRC-UC, 2.

[88]Recall that in Chicago theory, generally speaking, race consciousness caused prejudice. See Yu, 41. It is beyond the scope of this chapter to delve deeply into what researchers in Hawai'i during these years thought the causes of racial prejudice were. However, chapter

women's willingness to marry Chinese men was interpreted as a lack of race prejudice. A "Chinese-English-Hawaiian" woman (marked as having ½ Hawaiian, ¼ Chinese, and ¼ English nationality from her "Chinese-Hawaiian" mother and "English-Hawaiian" father) married to an Italian migrant said that "the Hawaiians have no racial prejudice whatever" and that "A Hawaiian girl will marry any man of any nationality who will provide her with everything she wants."[89] She said that a haole man generally made a superior husband "because he above all others will provide freely for the comfort of his wife."[90] She reported that Hawaiian men beat their wives and insisted that they help support the family financially as well as keep house while Chinese and Japanese men were good providers, but "stingy" with their money.[91] These comments, whose tone suggested the intent of being informative and matter-of-fact about the realities of marrying men of different races, reveal how racial consciousness was presented as social competence (signaled by the focus on culture and behavior) rather than a form of essentialism or racism.

Similar to informants' reported concerns about financial stability, in continuing contrast to the race-centric work of Romanzo Adams and Robert Park, Lam's interviews revealed that another factor than race played a significant role in marriage decisions. Religion was primary in the case of a Filipino man from Hilo married to a Portuguese woman. In response to a question about whether he would marry a "girl of his race" if he married again, he replied that he said he would marry an Adventist if he had to do it again because he was deeply upset by differences between his and his wife's religious

---

five details Andrew Lind's human ecological approach to race relations, which framed prejudice as a natural by-product of economic competition.

[89]Case IIIA, interview 1, with wife, Box 12, Folder 10, RPC, SCRC-UC, 1.

[90]Case IIIA, interview 1, with wife, Box 12, Folder 10, RPC, SCRC-UC, 1.

[91]Case IIIA, interview 1, with wife, Box 12, Folder 10, RPC, SCRC-UC, 1.

observances.[92] He said his children could play with anyone regardless of "nationality," but his preference was that they play with church children.[93]

All but one of the informants whose transcripts were analyzed for this study criticized interracial marriage as undesirable because it was hard on children and fundamentally unstable, although no one seems to have identified his or her intermarriage as fundamentally unstable. The exceptional comment came from a Chinese woman married to a white American who thought that interracial marriage would produce "universal peace" and understanding.[94] Everyone else presumed that mixed race children, as a product of interracial marriages, were likely to be socially maladjusted and therefore unhappy people. Molly Visher-Moore, who indicated that her mother was an upper class Hawaiian, but that her father raised her in a strict Chinese way, said she did not think mixture was good because hybrids were "not steady like the pure bloods."[95] A New Jersey born white married to a Hawai'i-born Japanese physician insisted that she had always opposed intermarriage and continued to oppose it even though she herself was in an interracial marriage.[96]

> If you want to know the truth I am opposed to intermarriage. I have always been opposed to intermarriage – ever since I was a little girl. I still oppose it, but I feel my intermarriage case is an exceptional one. I guess oppose it [sic] because of the children. No, I'm not worrying over my children. I think they will not meet many problems. *They are now in the White group* and they are bright and I think they will adjust themselves nicely. *But in general the children come out of it suffer*. Now for instance. I know a part-Hawaiian girl – she has a little Hawaiian blood – maybe only one eighth Hawaiian, certainly she shows

---

[92]Case XIV A, Box 12, Folder 11, RPC, SCRC-UC.

[93]Case XIV A, Box 12, Folder 11, RPC, SCRC-UC, 4.

[94]Case VIII B, French and Chinese, Box 12, Folder 10, RPC, SCRC-UC, 1.

[95]Case XII – Life History of Mrs. Molly Visher-Moore, Box 12, Folder 11, RPC, SCRC-UC, 19. Lam spelled her last name both with the hyphen and without. Moore's preference is not clear. Visher-Moore also reported that her aunt was a cousin of Queen Lili'uokalani. See page 20.

[96]Case XX, Japanese and Caucasian, Honolulu, 1934, Box 12, Folder 11, RPC, SCRC-UC, 2.

> very little Hawaiian. She told me one day that she feels so inferior. Her mother married a white man and she married a white man, but she felt so inferior to the whites. She said, 'we part-Hawaiian girls have our crying spells. We all feel this way because we feel so inferior. Yes, we part-Hawaiians feel so inferior.' I don't know why she feels so inferior, but I think it is due to her Hawaiian relatives. I am inclined to think it is because [she is ashamed] of her Hawaiian relatives in her case.[97]

This testimony suggests that mixed children would be alright as long as they were identified or treated as white like her own children were, or at least not Hawaiian.[98]

While it did not necessarily contribute to their positive reception in white society, this same informant said that she had mixed feelings about the restraint she and her husband felt they had to exercise regarding public displays of affection. "There is one thing we don't do," she insisted. "We don't love in public. We never love in public. I think loving in public attracts attention and people resent to it [sic]. You know, especially two people of different races."[99] One of the effects of this practice was that no one believed they could possibly be happy in an interracial marriage. "People resent to this [sic] and because we don't love in public or show any sign of affection people think we are cold toward each other; that we are unhappy and that we don't love each other. But that isn't true and itsn't [sic] our policy to be affectionate in public."[100] Notably, it appears as though this family policy, which suggested something that was not true, was perhaps not sufficient on its own,

---

[97]Case XX, Japanese and Caucasian, Honolulu, 1934, Box 12, Folder 11, RPC, SCRC-UC, 9-10. Emphasis added. She said she feels that intermarriage is only successful among educated people and did not think it could be successful among uneducated people (10).

[98]Case XX, Japanese and Caucasian, Honolulu, 1934, Box 12, Folder 11, RPC, SCRC-UC, 8.

[99]Case XX, Japanese and Caucasian, Honolulu, 1934, Box 12, Folder 11, RPC, SCRC-UC, 9.

[100]Case XX, Japanese and Caucasian, Honolulu, 1934, Box 12, Folder 11, RPC, SCRC-UC, 9.

but necessary to the kind of social reception that this woman sought for her marriage and her children.

Racial Formations – "Adaptable" Chinese, "Disorganized" Hawaiians

As informants discussed their feelings about Chinese, Hawaiians, and their relationship to these groups, they generally insinuated and in some cases said outright that Chinese adapted to modern, American ways while Hawaiians did not. Most informants reported that they did not like Hawaiians or thought they were dysfunctional. Their reasons varied, but focused on character issues such as laziness and dishonesty. Some people reported that Hawaiians rudely expected to be fed any time they called on someone and were quick to become frequent visitors who quickly cleaned out the larder. Notably, even informants who readily identified their backgrounds as part Hawaiian distanced themselves from Hawaiians by saying that they felt more of an affinity with the Chinese community and told people that they were Chinese when asked.[101] Some people with Hawaiian ancestry, either solely or partly, expressed general disappointment about Hawaiians and indicated that they were glad their children were being raised Chinese and that they wanted their children to marry non-Hawaiians. Several teens, some of them quite young, reported discomfort with Hawaiians and negative feelings about hapa haoles, wishes that they did not have Hawaiian blood, and insisted that they prefer the company of Chinese and other "Chinese-Hawaiians."[102]

---

[101]Case 78: Violet Ah Ting, 17 years old, Folder: *Shapiro, H.L. Anthropo-Social Data (1930-1931) Interviews: Case #76-100*, Box: 1, Harry L. Shapiro Collection, Division of Anthropology Archives, American Museum of Natural History (DAA-AMNH).

[102]See Case 86: Maile Lin Heong Chow, Folder: *Shapiro, H.L. Anthropo-Social Data (1930-1931) Interviews: Case #76-100*, Box: 1, Harry L. Shapiro Collection, DAA-AMNH.

Notably, many informants' commentary about Hawaiians specifically highlighted their generosity and easy-going attitudes, yet understood them as shortcomings. Sometimes they listed these negative characteristics while insisting that they actually liked Hawaiians. A Japanese foreman whose wife was Portuguese said,

> I don't like Hawaiian ways. They are too easy-going, too kind, and too ready to give their things away. They call everybody brother and sister, and treat everybody too good and don't leave any money for themselves. I don't hate the Hawaiians, I like them. I don't mean to run them down, you know. I feel deep down in the bottom of my heart that Hawaiians are too-easy-going and *not very much up to the standard*, altho [sic] I like them.[103]

In another case, a Chinese minister married to a Tongan woman, in the midst of describing Hawaiians as open-hearted and the most genuinely generous people, characterized them as simple and child-like; they were "children of nature" who did not think toward the future very much because of their lush, food-rich surroundings, very similar to Tongans.[104] (He noted that Chinese, then, went "to the other extreme," obsessing about the future.[105]) This commentary also suggests that non-Hawaiians at this time were developing a sensibility toward Hawaiians that acknowledged their supposedly unfortunate ways or faults, but without vicious language usually associated with racism. Instead, a paternalistic approach, in which Hawaiians were treated as childlike or misguided people, ran through the commentary of Lam's informants. In a few cases, Hawaiians who were married to people of other races, typically Hawaiian women married to Chinese men, shared these sentiments.

Descriptions of Hawaiians as overly trusting, poor planners, and otherwise ill equipped to cope with the realities of modern life – even if these qualities made them

---

[103]Case II, interview 2, husband, Box 12, Folder 10, RPC, SCRC-UC, 2. Emphasis added.

[104]This recapitulated the mythology of the "noble savage" as it also invoked a broader racialization of Polynesians.

[105]Case VII B, Box 12, Folder 10, RPC, SCRC-UC, 1.

pleasant to be around – existed alongside descriptions of Chinese as careful, industrious, financially savvy, and otherwise adaptable. Adaptability was aligned with similarity to haoles or Americans (who were generally understood as one and the same) and willingness to conform. One informant, an American man married to a Chinese woman, reported that a frequent source of domestic friction, food, was not an issue in haole-Chinese marriages because "the margin between Chinese and American food is very small," as were ideas about housekeeping and family life. "That's why we find that haole and Chinese marriages are more successful than other inter-racial marriages. The Chinese can easily adapt themselves to American ways. They adapt themselves very easily. They adapt themselves to haole food easily too."[106] The informants who said Chinese were similar to haoles were identified as haoles themselves. Some Chinese mentioned that they did things in the American style or adhered to the American standard.[107] There was no mention of the fact that Chinese and haoles had been in Hawai'i the longest. Thus, similarities due to longevity of contact were interpreted as adaptability, a trait supposedly inherent to Chinese.

Linking Class to Race

One of Lam's most important contributions to social research in Hawai'i was her attention to class. None of her mentors genuinely dealt with it since they were focused on race, which to them had more to do with bodies than social position. It is not clear whether Lam considered class as a factor as she sought informants because she saw it as a salient factor in individual and group consciousness, because she wanted the most diverse sample of

---

[106]Case VIII A, French and Chinese, Box 12, Folder 10, RPC, SCRC-UC, 3. The comment that haole-Chinese marriages were especially successful was this informant's observation. I have not established whether social scientific data or public records support this claim.

[107]One example is Case I B, Box 12, Folder 10, RPC, SCRC-UC.

interview subjects as possible, or because she wanted a representative sample. Lam noted the almost uniformly working class position of her informants when she suggested, multiple times, to Harry Shapiro that they should diversify the subject pool to include higher class people.[108] She became increasingly insistent about this suggestion. In Shapiro's Rockefeller funded study, his two physical anthropology fieldwork assistants' choices of subjects largely determined her choice of people to interview, since Shapiro wanted social data about the same subjects undergoing anthropometric measurement.[109] Lam sent Shapiro an example of what she thought they should be doing:

> You will notice that I sent you a supplementary case. This Chinese-Hawn. [sic] hybrid is not our subject, but I had an opportunity to interview while I was in the country… I took her case because she is of the 'alii' class. If you will pardon my frankness, I sincerely believe that Lessa has been concentrating too widely on the lower class of Chinese-Hawns [sic]. As far as I can see, the long Visher-Moore case and her sister are the only subjects of the 'alii' class. I really think we should secure more middle class and grab as many from the 'alii' class. Of course you are running all this. This is merely a suggestion – pardon my impudence to dare my opinion to you…[110]

As a student, she appeared to be very concerned with Adams' and Shapiro's opinions of her work. She wanted to be accepted by these men; and so she did not critique their approaches, at least not very much, while working within their intellectual framework. However, as her

---

[108]Margaret Lam to Harry Shapiro, May 21, 1932 and Aug. 28, 1932, Box 2, Folder "Lam, Margaret 1932," Harry L. Shapiro Papers, SC-AMNH.

[109]Harry Shapiro to Fred Hulse, Dec. 5, 1930, Box: Box 3 (MSS S537), Folder: 1930 – July – Dec, Harry L. Shapiro Papers, SC-AMNH. Shapiro said, "I don't care whether or not Miss Lam actually goes to Hawaii with you at the same time but I want her there while you are. The point is that she has to use the very same subjects that you have measured and it is much easier if you both can work to-gether." Shapiro seems to have meant the island of Hawai'i, the Big Island, since Lam was an Oahu resident. For more on this study, see chapter two.

[110]Margaret Lam to Harry Shapiro, Aug. 28, 1932, Folder "Lam, Margaret 1932," Box 2, Harry L. Shapiro Papers, SC-AMNH. The Hawaiian word "alii," which is actually spelled "ali'i," refers to the chiefly class, which is determined by genealogy. See Silva, *Aloha Betrayed*, 237. The Visher-Moore interview is reproduced in Park's papers. See Case XII Life History of Mrs. Mollie Visher-Moore, Box 12, Folder 11, RPC, SCRC-UC.

comment to Shapiro about the importance of finding interview subjects outside of the working class foreshadowed, Lam departed from Adams' routine, at least, by examining the testimony of her subjects to access what their claims meant about their social position.

Lam's attention to class also expanded the scope of sociological research in Hawai'i by documenting racialist claims among mostly nonwhite residents, and how regular people understood social position as the product of racial differences and therefore natural. Lam concluded from her interviews that Chinese-Hawaiians identified social status as evidence of biological racial differences. In other words, achievement, status, wealth, and so on were evidence of inherent Chinese superiority; and by extension, anyone of Chinese lineage was superior to those with Hawaiian lineage only. By this time Lam was aware of arguments about the relationship between status and biological difference and did not conflate them or assume their relationship was self-evident. She noted that some Chinese-Hawaiians used claims to biological racial difference from Hawaiians – superiority, specifically – as an explanation for their higher social status. She concluded that status shaped her subjects' understandings of race:

> In sum, the Chinese-Hawaiians have evolved a doctrine of biological racial differences which is based partly on the social status of each of their parent races as defined by Hawaiian society, and partly on their intimate in-group social contacts with the Chinese and the Hawaiians. The abstract desirable traits are attributed to the Asiatics, while to the natives are imputed all the undesirable as well as obnoxious characteristics.[111]

This comparative work would not have been as possible or as rich if Lam had interviewed mostly working class Chinese-Hawaiians by following Lessa's and Hulse's lead rather than expanding her search for subjects.

---

[111]Lam, "Racial Myth," 407.

Lam's attention to race and class also extended to a comparative study of Chinese-Hawaiians and people with white and Hawaiian ancestry. In an 1936 *Social Forces* article, Lam focused on upper class people and "hapa haoles" (people with white and Hawaiian ancestry) in ways that the focus on Chinese-Hawaiians had precluded thus far. In the course of her interviewing, Lam spoke with another large group of Chinese-Hawaiian couples, most of whom emphasized their "Chinese blood" and denied the influence of their "Hawaiian blood."[112] Some of them said they thought Chinese blood was more robust than Hawaiian blood, that it had more of an effect of making them who they were than Hawaiian blood. They emphasized the association of ambitiousness with Chineseness as if ambitiousness (as opposed to laziness) was typical of Chinese and rare among Hawaiians.[113] Lam explained that Chinese-Hawaiians adhered to what she called a "racial myth," namely that their Chinese blood was vastly superior to their Hawaiian blood. Quoting heavily from her interviews, Lam reported that many of her informants believed strongly in "the destructiveness of Hawaiian blood" and that Chinese blood produced ambition, among other positive traits. "This racial myth," she said, "is a real thing to these hybrids," whom she says claimed biological superiority to Hawaiians.[114]

In contrast to the blood rubric at the focus of the Chinese-Hawaiian "racial myth," Lam reported that white-Hawaiians, as she called them, engaged in "family-tradition worship" focused on claims to specific kinds of ancestry. She reported that "Caucasian-Hawaiians" "[found] self-gratification not in race doctrines, but in family traditions of

---

[112]Lam, "Racial Myth."
[113]Lam, "Chapter III," 23-24.
[114]Lam, "Racial Myth," 409.

antiquity."[115] They took pride in their ancestors' connection to ali'i – Hawaiian chiefs or royalty – or connections to a distant white male relative, usually, who was an assistant or confidant to the king. Sometimes they also referred to a maternal ancestor who was ali'i of very high rank. According to Lam, claiming eminent Hawaiian and elite white ancestry was motivated by the exclusivity of the white social groups, who it must be noted exerted a large degree of control over business and governance in the islands. Caucasian-Hawaiians claimed "ancestors of distinction, chiefly status, wealth, as well as ability," a collection of historical and biological attributes.[116] Lam's treatment of her informants' sensibilities was focused on drives, desires, inner wishes, and reactions to race discrimination.

The 1936 *Social Forces* article comparing the use of racial myth by "hapa haoles" and "Chinese-Hawaiians" represents a significant shift in Lam's tone and her increasing sophistication and independence as a sociologist. In 1932, Lam had said explicitly that Hawaiians were inferior. She wrote in a matter of fact, detached way about Hawai'i's racial hierarchy: haoles as "favored," Hawaiians as "inferior," and Chinese as superior to Hawaiians.[117] Four years later, as she concluded her article on the kinds of claims that people made about race, blood, and superiority to accommodate their "bi-racial constitution and to the attitudinal behavior of their parent races toward them," Lam noted that her findings were limited by the specific group of "hybrids" that she studied and that more research was needed to "ascertain how general this accommodation pattern is with regard to the entire mixed blood population in Hawaii."[118]

---

[115]Lam, "Racial Myth," 407.
[116]Lam, "Racial Myth," 409.
[117]See Margaret M. Lam, "Fashion: Its Role in Hawaii," *Sociology and Social Research* 23, no. 1 (Sept.-Oct., 1938), 54-61; and Lam, "Chapter III."
[118]Lam, "Racial Myth," 409.

Lam continued with interviewing and examining individuals' life stories for a few years after her work for Shapiro was completed in 1933. She sent copies of selected interview transcripts to Robert Park in Chicago, including excerpts from University of Hawai'i students' autobiographies and what appear to be highlights from what were in some cases very long, multiple session interviews with especially distinctive or frankly speaking subjects.[119]

Conclusion

In the 1930s, a variety of words and concepts circulated for types of people as ideas about race that had arrived in Hawai'i with migrants and had become institutionalized on plantations were negotiated, contested, and used in different settings. All of this was very messy and complicated, and people shared different information at different times for different ends (such as being aware that Lam was Chinese or Chinese-Hawaiian), yet Adams and Lind persisted with predictions of total assimilation in face of evidence that no one seemed to occupy the mixed-race category all that comfortably, although mixed ancestry was sometimes claimed by people, as Lam demonstrated, who were identified as haoles but who claimed ancestry connection to ali'i (usually women), an eminent Euro-American male relative, or both. In other words, they claimed mixed ancestry but not necessarily mixed race.

The archive from which this chapter derives evidence represents only a sample of Hawai'i residents' experiences, observations, positions, and sensibilities. This archive of

[119]It is unclear whether Lam sent these to Park because they were the most interesting and frank or because they challenged or corroborated his ideas. Additionally, there is no evidence that these autobiographies came from students who were Lam's students specifically or if she did any teaching. These autobiographies were likely student assignments from introductory courses and were crucial to the pedagogy and research of the department. See chapter 5.

interviews with interracial couples, spread across three institutions separated by thousands of miles, which was intended to represent behaviors and consciousness typical of Hawai'i residents, is perhaps most representative of what Chicago sociologists were mainly interested in. The majority of people living in Hawai'i in the 1930s had not "intermarried." Henry Yu has pointed out that within interwar social science, "there was a peculiar fascination with sex between 'Orientals' and 'whites,' particularly between 'Oriental' men and 'white women,' which was disproportionate to the small numbers of publicly reported cases."[120] Still, the consistency of informants' commentary on the dynamics between people who reported Chinese or Chinese and Hawaiian ancestry in particular reveals a process that was underway during the interwar era – a process by which people with Chinese and Hawaiian ancestry, whether they were raised to identify as Chinese or not, sought acceptance as Chinese. Informants involved in this process generally rejected a mixed race identity in favor of a singular affiliation. This is a very different outlook that deviates from the assimilation process that Romanzo Adams observed and predicted.

These individuals' and couples' accounts established that intermarriage did not necessarily solve racial problems or automatically improve race relations, consistently symbolize a reduction in racial prejudice, or fundamentally change the way that people who were not academics thought about racial categories. Informants' testimony also reveals how culture began to do the work of race during the decade that the ideas of racism and racial prejudice entered the lexicon and developed negative connotations. Because racial tensions persisted even though intermarriage was relatively common compared with the continental

[120]Henry Yu, "Mixing Bodies and Cultures: The Meaning of America's Fascination with Sex between 'Orientals' and 'Whites,'" in Martha Hodes, ed., *Sex, Love, Race: Crossing Boundaries in North American History* (New York: New York University Press, 1998), 445. See also Yu, *Thinking Orientals*, 57.

United States, further historical research is required to create a full account of how members of a broader sample of racialized groups resisted as well as actively participated in the maintenance of racialized categories.

The next chapter details how Adams' colleague Andrew Lind, whose tenure at the university and public influence continued into the 1960s, studied and explained race relations in the Territory and further articulated the history of Hawai'i as one of integration – into a global capitalist system as well as the United States – rather than an evolving imperial process.

Chapter Five

Defining an "Island Community": Race Relations as Ecological Succession, 1927-1939

In the decade after World War I, some politicians and academics began to explain American imperial practices and relationships as a combination of economic and social policies that supported the expansion of the global capitalist system and the modernization of places like the Territory of Hawai'i. In the first chapter of his book *An Island Community: Ecological Succession in Hawaii*, University of Hawai'i sociologist Andrew W. Lind wrote that, "Hawaii's political independence was for a time in the balance, but the 'manifest destiny' of Hawaii as an American dependency was already evident in the figures of Island import and exports and immigration."[1] In this treatment, Hawai'i's incorporation into the United States was inevitable as the culmination of economic development, demographic stabilization, and stabilization of "race relations" as defined by the University of Chicago interaction cycle of competition, conflict, accommodation, and assimilation.[2] The study of these interdependent factors constituted "human ecology." This field of sociology, which was less than a decade old, treated "race relations," a focus of research at the University's Social Research Laboratory, as a facet of a collective struggle toward social stability. Studying race relations in the territory, which these sociologists identified as a nearly ideal human laboratory,

---

[1]Andrew W. Lind, *An Island Community: Ecological Succession in Hawaii* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1938), 13.

[2]Robert E. Park and Ernest W. Burgess, *Introduction to the Science of Sociology* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1921). This cycle was also known as the race relations cycle and the assimilation cycle.

became a vehicle for talking about the prospect of assimilating nonwhite subjects in a settler colony.[3]

This research was motivated as part of an extensive interwar debate within the biological and social sciences about the seeming instability in the United States. Researchers in multiple disciplines began to look for natural conditions of stability in society.[4] The University of Hawai'i sociology department was focused on conditions in the Territory, whose rapid population increase, commercial and military development, and subsequent competition for jobs and land "constitute[d] a threat to the stability of race relations in the Islands."[5] While Romanzo Adams concentrated on interracial marriage as an assimilating practice, as explained in chapter three, Andrew Lind combined economic history, the history of land use, and the study of "race relations" as facets of an ecological process – "human ecology."

Much of the sociological research and teaching at the University of Hawai'i that began in the late 1920s fit into "human ecology," which applied ecologists' conception of "succession," a defining process in plant and animal ecology, to human affairs. The idea of succession was that organisms in a defined location would develop toward a mature or stable

---

[3]For accounts of Hawai'i's colonization through the usurpation of the power of the King in 1887, the overthrow of the Hawaiian government in 1893, and annexation by the United States in 1898, all of which have been deemed illegal under Hawaiian, American, and international law, see Jonathan Kay Kamakawiwo'ole Osorio, *Dismembering Lāhui: A History of the Hawaiian Nation to 1887* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2002) and Noenoe K. Silva, *Aloha Betrayed: Native Hawaiian Resistance to American Colonialism* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2004). See also the official apology from the U.S. government to Native Hawaiians, U.S. Congress, *100th Anniversary of the Overthrow of the Hawaiian Kingdom*, Public Law 103-150, 103d Cong., 1st Sess., 107 Stat 1510, S.J. Res. 19, November 23, 1993.

[4]Sharon E. Kingsland, "Toward a Natural History of the Human Psyche: Charles Manning Child, Charles Judson Herrick, and the Dynamic View of the Individual at the University of Chicago," in Keith R. Benson, Jane Maienschein, and Ronald Rainger, eds., *The Expansion of American Biology* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1991), 196.

[5]Lind, *An Island Community*, 16.

state. The biological theory of succession helps explain how forests mature, but it also describes how raspberry bushes overtake gardens and lemon balm overwhelms less hardy herbs. In these latter two examples, one type of plant can, by using resources required by other plants or reproducing more quickly, proliferate to become the most prominent plant in a given area. Succession insinuated a less violent process than competition in the style of the "survival of the fittest."[6] Plant succession in particular, in contrast to animal, insinuated a benign process devoid of human agency to exploit others. In the Chicago interaction cycle (or race relations cycle) modeled on plant succession, there were no oppressors (or, for comparison, in animal ecology terms, predators); only individuals and groups clamoring for space and numerical predominance. In ecological terms, plants did "invade," but this was framed as a natural, value-free process. Chicago-trained sociologists applied Frederic Clements' principles of plant ecology to human phenomena, suggesting a process by which some groups (in this case racialized groups) became dominant in circumstances that were ostensibly natural – essentially organic – rather than intentional and historically contingent. In this way, historically created social relations in Hawai'i were naturalized.[7]

Ecology, a developing field with enormous breadth and eclectic approaches, provided a flexible framework for scientists to examine natural laws that they saw as common to the biological and social sciences. Depending on their opinions about how ideas from plant and animal ecology applied to human societies, researchers with variety of political orientations and social visions emphasized different processes. Generally speaking,

---

[6]"Survival of the fittest" was coined by sociologist Herbert Spencer, not Charles Darwin, to whom it has frequently been misattributed in public discourse.

[7]Theorists continued to apply observations and perceptions of the non-human natural world to human affairs after World War II, following a number of social scientists' reframing of competition during the interwar years as synonymous with individual freedom and as a part of a necessary, natural process of societal development.

while the idea that society was a natural object remained consistent, the ecological view of nature allowed for various arguments and perceptions about the relative importance of competition and cooperation in the development of a "community." Gregg Mitman has shown how animal ecologists at the University of Chicago during the interwar years were more interested in cooperation than competition, largely because of their pacifist and socialist leanings.[8] Their colleagues, liberal Chicago sociologists, drew much more heavily from plant ecology than animal ecology. The frame that Lind applied to Hawai'i took cues from Frederic Clements' *Plant Succession*.[9]

As it was applied at the University of Hawai'i, the ecological approach in sociology attributed rationality or logic to history and to the economy and, by extension, to demographic, political, and land use changes, including the commodification of land under American property law, and to global processes of modernity as defined by the global expansion of capitalism.[10] This explains the centrality of the comparison of Hawai'i with other colonies as part of University of Hawai'i sociologists' method.[11] Lind's commitment to comparison in his book was part of a larger project of placing Hawai'i in a process of global development, an ostensibly universal process.[12] Park framed Lind's study as having a

---

[8]Gregg Mitman, *The State of Nature: Ecology, Community, and American Social Thought, 1900-1950* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1992).

[9]Frederic E. Clements, *Plant Succession: An Analysis of the Development of Vegetation* (Washington: Carnegie Institution of Washington, 1916).

[10]See Timothy Mitchell, *Rule of Experts: Egypt, Techno-Politics, Modernity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002), 13-14.

[11]Both Andrew Lind and Romanzo Adams compared Hawai'i to South Africa and Australia. Lind also compared Hawai'i to Dutch Indonesia while Adams made comparisons with the U.S. South, as discussed in chapter three.

[12]Adams did not do this as consistently. His concern with comparison was in the interest of qualifying the state of race relations in Hawai'i and demonstrating its exceptionalness. Note that Lind and Adams did not say much at all about the Hawaiian government, but

particular rationality because it included but went well beyond previous works of "natural history" within sociology. It was a contribution to the history of civilization and modernity, as "natural history is interested not merely in what actually happened at a time and place but also in the historic process by which things have come to be what they are or seem."[13]

Human ecologists reformulated the work of social scientists as studying systems and identifying universal social forces and processes. Their method was examining the factors in specific locales, among particular "communities" as case studies. In his introduction to *An Island Community*, for example, Robert Park noted that Andrew Lind's book was a work of "natural history," with the caveat that, "The author of this volume has chosen to connect and correlate, so far as that is practicable and possible, the economic and racial history of the Hawaiian islands, with the story of the land. In doing this, he has made the succession of types of land utilization the signature and index of all other changes. The effect has been to give his account of events a character that is *systematic* rather than historical."[14] In other words, *An Island Community* was a work of both natural history and human ecology. It documented Hawai'i's "natural history" of human migration, contact, settlement, and so on as it also situated these processes as part of a global process of modernizing underdeveloped societies and incorporating them into the global capitalist system.

Human ecology provided a framework for elaborating American civic ideologies into a natural process coinciding with the progress of capitalism and modernity. Those ideologies underscored contemporary assumptions by many experts that economic competition was the basis for freedom, that improved attitudes toward people of different

---

what they did say alluded to its backwardness (even though they relied on Kingdom documents for vital statistics and legal references) and oppressiveness toward commoners.

[13]Robert Park, "Introduction" to Lind, *An Island Community*, xvi.

[14]Robert Park, "Introduction" to Lind, *An Island Community*, xi. Emphasis added.

races would solve the "race relations" problem, that cultural assimilation (assisted by "biological amalgamation" – interracial reproduction) would also solve problems with race relations, and that society adhered to natural laws. Lind's *An Island Community* was emblematic of this approach. Lind, as Park's student, was a primary contributor to the development and disseminated these ideas through his scholarship – his dissertation and book on human ecology, land, economy, and history – but also, perhaps more importantly, through the sociology department's education of both students and the Honolulu public. University of Hawai'i students took classes and completed assignments that trained them into ecological thinking and some of them even produced scholarship for the department's sociology club journal, *Social Process in Hawaii*, which Lind supervised. As both undergraduate and graduate students were mentored into ecological thinking about race relations, Lind's status as a public intellectual was impressed upon members of the public in Honolulu through his newspaper articles and decades-long identification as an expert commentator on race relations in Hawai'i. Throughout his career, he advanced the idea that Hawai'i's race relations were part of a natural, competitive process analogous to the workings of plant communities.

Human Ecology

During the interwar period, sociologists began to apply ecological and biological concepts, especially from plant studies, as explanatory tools as they attempted to assert the legitimacy of sociology as a science. The "predictability, uniformity, cooperation, stability, and certainty" inherent to Clements' approach helped sociologists Robert Park, his student Roderick McKenzie, and both of their student Andrew Lind develop a human ecology that explained societal development – progress – with their precise mix of social and economic

liberalism.[15] Ideas such as succession, elaborated under the human ecology framework, and their foundational narrative became imbedded in both academic and public discourse about the history and destiny of Hawai'i and its residents.

The ecological process of plant succession was first investigated by Danish botanist Eugenus Wärming and American geologist-turned-botanist Henry Chandler Cowles with his 1899 study of the life history of the sand dunes of Lake Michigan.[16] Succession was, at base, the process by which organisms in a particular location developed toward a collective maturity, which he termed climax, of stability. Cowles' contemporary Frederick Clements adopted Cowles' ideas and developed them into a theoretical system that the plant community was "a kind of organism is the sense that it arose, grew, matured, and died."[17] This conception of succession, in which groups of organisms in the same geographical area were understood as a "community" that behaved like an organism, dominated American ecology until a transitional period between 1947 and 1959 when ecologists began moving away from the "association-unit theory" of succession, with its emphasis on communities as natural, objectively real units, toward an "individualistic model" that took as a given the complexity of species distributions and interactions.[18]

---

[15]Michael G. Barbour, "Ecological Fragmentation in the Fifties," in William Cronon, ed., *Uncommon Ground: Rethinking the Human Place in Nature*, (New York: W.W. Norton, 1996 [1995]), 238. While this might seem like a case of sociologists appropriating ecological ideas into the science of society, note that the idea that society was a natural object in the first place was central to Lester Ward and Herbert Spencer's social science, which then, along with other nineteenth century ideas, informed Frederic Clements as he developed his organismic view of nature (Barbour 248).

[16]Joel B. Hagen, "Organism and Environment: Frederick Clements's Vision of a Unified Physiological Ecology," in Ronald Rainger, Keith R. Benson, and Jane Maienschein, eds., *The American Development of Biology* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1991 [1988]), 257.

[17]Hagen, "Organism and Environment," 258.

[18]Barbour, "Ecological Fragmentation in the Fifties," 237-242.

Park's and Burgess's book contains one of the first mentions of human ecology. In *Introduction to the Science of Sociology*, Park and Burgess cited Frederic Clements' *Plant Succession* (1916) in their selected bibliography for the "Society and the Group" chapter along with Danish botanist Eugenius Wärming's earlier research on succession as detailed in *Oecology of Plants* (1909).[19] In their chapter on "Competition," in a section on "Competition and Segregation," Park and Burgess included a section titled "Plant Migration, Competition, and Segregation," which was adapted from Clements' *Plant Succession*.[20] Later in the chapter on competition, in a section on biological competition as one of the "investigations and problems" in sociology, Park and Burgess noted that recent biological research had moved away from the theory of evolution toward the field study of plant and animal communities. They referred to the "life-histories" of some the communities Clements' described in *Plant Succession* and *Plant Indicators*, noting that "His analysis of the succession of plant communities within the same geographical area and of the relations of competitive co-operation of the different species of which these communities are composed might well serve as a model for similar studies in human ecology."[21] By pinpointing "competitive co-operation" as an important site of research, Park and Burgess applied Clements' ecological succession to their human ecology. One of their discussion questions at the end of the chapter was, "How far can the terms migration, ecesis, and competition, as used by Clements in his analysis of the invasion of one plant community by another, be used in the analysis of the process by which

---

[19]Robert E. Park and Ernest W. Burgess, *Introduction to the Science of Sociology* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1921), 217. Hagen notes that while Wärming's work "foreshadowed" the work of Henry Chandler Cowles, "the study of succession became something of an American speciality." See Hagen, "Organism and Environment," 257.

[20]Park and Burgess, *Introduction to the Science of Sociology*, 526-528.

[21]Park and Burgess, *Introduction to the Science of Sociology*, 554.

immigrants 'invade' this country, i.e., migrate, settle, and are assimilated, 'Americanized'?"[22] The idea that different types of people living as part of the same "community" – the neighborhood, the city, or even nation, it seems – engaged in competition as part of a socio-economic experiment continued in Lind's research. He simultaneously examined the role of competition in modernizing Hawai'i and the role of cooperation in the eventual production of "an island commonwealth," the title of the last chapter of his book.

Park's student Roderick McKenzie contributed to human ecology's earliest conceptualization and mentored Andrew Lind into the field.[23] McKenzie completed his doctorate in sociology at the University of Chicago in 1921, the same year that Park and Burgess published *Introduction to the Science of Sociology*, after which McKenzie joined the faculty at the University of Washington, where he would spend the rest of his career working on human ecology, neighborhoods, and Chinese and Japanese on the West Coast. Raised in Seattle, Andrew Lind matriculated at the University of Washington and studied under McKenzie as an undergraduate (B.A. 1924) and underwent training in human ecology as a masters degree candidate. Upon completing his masters degree in 1925, Lind continued his work at the University of Chicago for two years under Robert Park before moving to Honolulu in 1927 to conduct dissertation research funded by the same Rockefeller Foundation grant that supported the human biology research agenda at the University of

---

[22]Park and Burgess, *Introduction to the Science of Sociology*, 571.

[23]Paul Shepard, "Whatever Happened to Human Biology?" *BioScience* 17, no. 12 (Dec., 1967), 891. McKenzie published his first piece on human ecology in 1924: R.D. McKenzie, "The Ecological Approach to the Study of the Human Community," *The American Journal of Sociology* 30, no. 3 (Nov., 1924), 287-301.

Hawai'i.[24] Lind completed his dissertation in 1931 on "Economic Succession and Racial Invasion in Hawaii."[25] He stayed on as a faculty member, joining Romanzo Adams to make a two-man sociology department that also focused on economics and anthropology. Lind remained at the University for the rest of his career, succeeding Adams as the chair of the department and the director of the Social Science Research Institute.[26]

The Chicago interaction cycle (also known as the race relations or assimilation cycle mirrored the Clementsian notion that individual development and ecological succession (or the life cycle of a complex organism-like "community") were analogous.[27] Writing about human ecology, McKenzie observed that, "The structural growth of community takes place in successional sequence not unlike the successional stages in the development of the plant formation."[28] He continued, citing Clements again in a footnote, "And just as in plant communities successions are the products of invasion, so also in the human community the formations, segregations, and associations that appear constitute the outcome of a series of

---

[24]See chapter two. See also Lind, *An Island Community*, v; and also Henry Yu, *Thinking Orientals: Migration, Contact, and Exoticism in Modern America* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 210.

[25]Andrew W. Lind, "Economic Success and Racial Invasion in Hawaii," Ph.D. diss., University of Chicago, 1931.

[26]The Sociology Laboratory of the 1930s became the War Research Laboratory during World War II as part of a university administration mandate. After the war it was renamed the Hawaii Social Research Laboratory and then renamed the Romanzo Adams Social Research Laboratory (RASRL) in 1955 as an homage to its founder. Lind left the RASRL in 1961 to direct the Social Science Research Institute, which absorbed the RASRL in the mid 1960s. Lind retired circa 1967. For a brief history of social research centers at the University of Hawai'i, see the "History of the Romanzo Adams Social Research Laboratory (RASRL)" on the University of Hawai'i Archives website (last accessed 5/19/2012): http://libweb.hawaii.edu/libdept/archives/univarch/colsch/rasrl/history.htm.

[27]Hagen, "Organism and Environment," 265.

[28]Roderick McKenzie, "The Ecological Approach to the Study of the Human Community," in Robert E. Park, Ernest W. Burgess, and Roderick D. McKenzie, eds., *The City* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1925), 74.

invasions."[29] The concept of racial "invasion" that Lind and some of his colleagues used mirrored the idea of invasion by new plants in plant ecology.[30] Lind referred to mid-to-late nineteenth century labor migrants to Hawai'i (but not earlier Anglo migrants) as "invaders."[31]

Comparing human "communities" with plant communities, perhaps as opposed to animal communities in which predation often determined interaction, rendered "invasion" and competition as benign processes of shift and change rather than violent practices or concerted attempts at dominance. In human ecologists' formulation, "dominance" referred to position, but not to process. There were positions of dominance, but no domination – just succession. Scholars working in this vein deployed the framework in the passive voice in which nobody dominated; they *became* dominant, so to speak. This syntax allowed for evasion in that it obscured what was happening and why, obscuring the role of capitalist and imperial practices in the making of social structure and removing domination from the conversation while merely noting relative position. This approach also appears to have driven a process of deduction in which sociologists looked at relative positions and then inferred the process that produced the positions rather than examining the contingencies and labors that produced them. A prime example of this was noting the diversity of labor migrants living in Hawai'i and deducing (erroneously) that racial diversity in Hawai'i was simply produced by migration rather than by plantation owners' specific importation of

---

[29]McKenzie, "The Ecological Approach," 74.

[30]Hagen, "Organism and Environment," 268. In plant ecology, "community structures were dictated by a number of processes or functions, perhaps the most important of which were invasion and reaction."

[31]Lind, *An Island Community*, 104. This label appears in chapter V, "Biological Competition and Survival."

workers from different countries to "divide and rule" a workforce that was at risk of striking.[32]

The ecological approach to social science, which began development in the early 1920s, was flexible enough to accommodate shifts from biological to social or cultural definitions of race without having to reformulate theories about space or mechanisms. For example, both plant and animal scientists emphasized competition as a primary developmental force, but articulated slightly different understandings of the purpose of competition within ecosystems. Their understandings of competition were not so different that the entire framework broke down; rather, the role of competition in the mechanisms of succession remained the focus of study and debate. In this way, the ecological approach was a flexible framework for understanding processes of interaction, whether biological, social, or a combination of the two. This debate about how competition worked and to what ends would continue into the postwar era, when ecologists began to change the way they thought about competition, cooperation, and what constituted a community or ecological unit. But competition remained an important element nonetheless.[33]

---

[32]Lind himself noted the "divide and rule" approach. See Lind, *An Island Community*, 218. On labor control strategies, see also Moon-Kie Jung, *Reworking Race: The Making of Hawaii's Interracial Labor Movement* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2006). See also Ronald Takaki, *Pau Hana: Plantation Life and Labor in Hawaii, 1835-1920* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1983); and Gary Okihiro, *Cane Fires: The Anti-Japanese Movement in Hawaii, 1845-1945* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1991).

[33]Mitman, *The State of Nature*, 141. "Although plant ecologists such as Frederic Clements had emphasized the importance of competition in succession, community ecologists working within an organicist framework interpreted competition as a cooperative force. By establishing patterns of dominance and subordination, competition created a functional division of labor that ensured greater efficiency and coordination in the social organism…. In contrast, ecologists such as Gause and Hutchinson, who were working in an explicitly nonorganicist mode, saw community and species distributional patterns arising simply from competitive interactions between closely related species. Like the ecosystem, competition became a major conceptual focus for ecologists in the postwar era."

Building on Robert Park's and Roderick McKenzie's work, Lind applied the Chicago urban studies and human ecology approaches to Hawai'i. While Chicago sociological research had focused almost completely on urban areas, Lind took up the entirety of Hawai'i, which was largely rural and, with the exception of Honolulu and a few established towns like Hilo, made up of plantations. The entirety of Hawai'i appeared, through a Chicago lens, not only appropriate but ideal for Chicago-style human ecology research because its size and relatively isolated island geography created supposed laboratory conditions. These approaches also produced a study that expanded on Adams' content, scope, and analytical paradigm. Lind took a functional or physiological approach to Hawai'i's population that complimented and broadened the natural historical approach epitomized in Adams' *Interracial Marriage in Hawaii.*

While Adams emphasized the early history of race mixing as precedent for ongoing, increasing race mixing through intermarriage, Lind moved away from Adams' elaborate, statistical demographic description toward physiology, which "suggested the study of processes and structural-functional relationships" that interested early plant ecologists.[34] Adams' focus on interracial marriage also fit into the natural history tradition's emphasis on description and classification, while Lind's study included Adams' work on interracial marriage in a larger study of Hawai'i's economy and land use, almost as if Hawai'i was a human science quadrat in which he could monitor many concurrent processes.[35] While Adams' argued that Hawai'i's ostensibly nonexistent racial prejudice was a product of

---

[34]Hagen, "Organism and Environment," 261.

[35]First used in 1897 by Roscoe Pound and Frederick Clements, a quadrat is a meter square area that ecologists or geographers use to isolate and monitor a sample over time, sometimes years. See Robert E. Kohler, *Landscapes and Labscapes: Exploring the Lab-Field Border in Biology* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002), 100.

Hawaiians' lack of "social bias" against interracial marriage and early missionaries' origins in New England rather than the U.S. South, Lind argued that observable race prejudice was the product of groups' attempts to move up the social order or out of their place. In this way, Lind conceded that there was some race prejudice in Hawai'i, but it was the product of a natural process and was thus expected and temporary. Predictability or inevitability or naturalness rendered it unalarming – almost mundane – as part of the order of things.

Even within what is now often referred to as the "Chicago School," some sociologists viewed inadequate and imprudent human ecology projects as examples of what Edward Byron Reuter identified as inappropriately conflated "biological sociology." "That there is confused thinking in respect to the relation of organic and social reality," Reuter wrote, "is patent and notorious."[36] The primary example of this was eugenic programs, "pseudo-scientific structures erected upon the assumption of a relationship between organic and social reality that has no existence in fact."[37] A decade after registering his concerns about "social biology" and uncritical biological sociology, in the fall of 1938 Reuter identified another example of this sort of folly in his review of Lind's book *An Island Community: Ecological Succession in Hawaii.* A number of reviews published in other journals praised the book for its contribution to the sociology of Hawai'i and about societal development and human relations.[38] Reuter, however, assessed the book as lacking objectivity, failing to make

---

[36]Edward Byron Reuter, "The Relation of Biology and Sociology," *American Journal of Sociology* 32, no. 5 (Mar., 1927), 706.

[37]*Ibid.*

[38]See William O. Brown, "The Natural History of a Social Order," *Journal of Negro Education* 8, no. 1 (Jan. 1939), 81-82; I.C. Greaves, [untitled review], *Journal of Farm Economics* 20, no. 4 (Nov. 1938), 900-901; William C. Smith, [untitled review], *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 198 Present International Tensions (Jul. 1938), 176-177; and Victor S. Clark, [untitled], *American Economic Review* 28, no. 4 (Dec. 1938), 768-769. All

a substantive argument, and overreaching and therefore providing a poorly executed "general analysis of a historical situation" rather than an appropriately narrow work of human ecology. He pointed out that the book provided a blurry account of human ecology and lacked "historical and descriptive detail necessary to a well-rounded presentation."[39] This characterization, among other critiques, sparked a debate with Lind in the pages of the *American Journal of Sociology*.[40]

In the debate that ensued, however, Lind focused mostly on the authority of knowledge claims about Hawai'i and minimally on methodology or analysis. Lind responded to Reuter's critique by correcting him. To Reuter's claim that "there is not even a passably objective account of any single aspect of Island history or organization," Lind cited the work of Adams and histories written by his colleagues Ralph Kuykendall at the University of Hawai'i and E.S.C. Handy at the Bishop Museum as supporting evidence for his analytical choices. He positioned all of them as unequivocal experts on Hawai'i and insinuated that Reuter had not spent enough time in Hawai'i to have a grasp of the social situation. Knowing that Reuter spent one year as a visiting faculty member at U.H. while Lind was on leave to finish his dissertation, Lind pointed to the false impressions that visitors often developed, essentially claiming experience living in Hawai'i as authority.[41]

---

of these reviews, to varying degrees, summarized the history of Hawai'i as Lind explained in human ecological terms.

[39]E.B. Reuter, "Review of *An Island Community*," *The American Journal of Sociology* 44, no. 3 (Nov., 1938), 461.

[40]Letters to the editor, *The American Journal of Sociology* 44, no. 5 (Mar., 1939), 722-729.

[41]The year that Reuter was a research professor on a temporary appointment at the University of Hawai'i, 1930-31, Lind was on leave to finish his doctorate. See Romanzo Adams, "Sociological Studies of Race and Culture Contacts in Hawaii," Folder: Administration – General, 1930-35, Box: Lind, Corresp., Administration Files, AL MSS, RASRL.

The rift between Lind and Reuter was emblematic of tension in sociology during the 1930s between the ecological approach and one that took history into account as something other than a universal process with a particular logic.[42] It also emerged out of a larger interwar effort among practitioners in the biological and social sciences to delineate topical and methodological boundaries, i.e. where the sciences met and overlapped and where the limitations of their questions and methods emerged. This, then, was a disagreement over social reality and how to study it. While Lind treated inequities as part of an organic process, Reuter treated them as historically produced and structurally embedded in ways that would not be undone by ongoing "development" and "island maturation," terms Lind used to describe Hawai'i's achievement of modernity and stability.

Notably, as a long-time proponent of conservatism and precision in the study of natural processes as they related to personality and culture, Reuter did not attack human ecology as a field or perspective. Rather, he critiqued Lind's approach to it. Despite the problems Reuter identified in Lind's study, it was Lind's perspective on Hawai'i that reigned in the field and in the curriculum at the University of Hawai'i.[43]

"Race relations" was the part of human ecology focused on spatial arrangement and distribution, demographic equilibrium (meaning a stable population with balanced age and sex ratios), and functional social relations. In its current uses, "race relations" sometimes serves as shorthand for the state of civil rights, but this was not the case for social scientists

---

[42]See Mitchell, introduction to *Rule of Experts*, especially page 3.

[43]In the debate in the *American Journal of Sociology*, Reuter appears to have won the battle, but lost the war. His response to Lind, which included a reiteration of his original review, was difficult to argue with because it was written in a less dramatic and accusatory tone than Lind's response to the original review. Reuter addressed the books content and analytical shortcomings while Lind generalized about newcomers' naïve perspectives on Hawai'i and quibbled with Reuter's language and few very minor misstatements.

during the interwar period, however, Lind and his colleagues included. To them, the state of race relations, which contributed to social equilibrium or stability, was not measured by the equality of people of different races. It was measured by social and spatial proximity and associated personal attitudes or feelings. It was the perceived quality of social interactions that characterized race relations. By shaping his entire research program around human ecology, Lind turned a minor idea within the larger discourse on competition, one of the four stages of the Chicago "race relations cycle," into an accepted way to understand Hawai'i's development, which he identified as being similar to "many other colonial regions" experiencing economic development or, as he put it, "drawn within the dominance of the world economy."[44] By dominance, Lind did not mean political dominance associated with violent political oppression or illegal occupation. Rather, he used dominance in its contemporary sociological meaning, which was informed by perceptions of the natural world. In this instance, succession had a stabilizing effect.[45] Indeed, he presented dominance as a function of "the economy" rather than part of imperial practices. As various groups struggled within the same economy, Lind argued that competition shaped how their economic and social positions shifted and how those shifts determined the state of race relations. In this way, race relations were determined by spatial relationships (physical proximity, familiarity and emotional intimacy, or both), which were produced by natural

---

[44]Lind, *An Island Community*, v.

[45]Robert Park, "Dominance," in *Human Communities: The City and Human Ecology, Collected Papers of Robert Ezra Park, vol. 2* (New York: Free Press, 1952), 162. (This is a reprint from R.D. McKenzie (ed.), *Readings in Human Ecology*, (Ann Arbor: Geo. Wahr, 1934), 381-385.) "The function of dominance in the case of the institution is to so modify and adapt the institution as to meet most effectively the demands upon it which changing conditions impose. In this case dominance functions in the human community in much the same way as it does in the individual organism. Thus the fundamental function of dominance seems to be everywhere the same. It is to stabilize, to maintain order, and permit the growth of structure in which that order and the corresponding functions are embodied."

processes, as were all social relations, according to Chicago theorists who also discussed the "Negro problem" and later the "Oriental problem" and race problems in Hawai'i.

From the Negro Problem to the Study of Race Relations

That racial attitudes were of paramount importance was one of two of the essential assumptions American social scientists made as they began studying race prejudice in the 1930s (the same decade that the term "racism" was coined).[46] The other was that race relations were a function of spatial relationships, meaning proximity as measured by both emotional and geographic proximity. These two phenomena, which operated at different levels but were part of the same social process of "race relations," are perhaps best summarized as being psychological and functionally systemic (physiological, ecological, or organismal), respectively. One was an individual approach or flaw while the other assumed a systemic view that took racial competition and struggle as natural and part of moving toward equilibrium. These perspectives, which located racism as either a psychological problem (beliefs or feelings that were sometimes irrational) or a by-product of competition, placed the production of racial inequality and, indeed, racial formations themselves, outside sociological inquiry.

"The Negro problem," the precursor to "race relations," can be traced back as far as the writing of Thomas Jefferson, the "godfather of the Negro problem before it had that

---

[46]John P. Jackson, Jr. and Nadine M. Weidman, *Race, Racism, and Science: Social Impact and Interaction*, (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2006 [2004]), 129. Both psychologists and sociologists studied racial prejudice. Sociologists conducted many separate studies of social process focused personality and culture, which took up individual and societal level issues, respectively. Edward Byron Reuter noted in 1927 that, "the present separation into problems of personality and problems of culture is more a difference in point of view and type of questions for concrete investigation than a logical division of the process itself." See Reuter, "The Relation of Biology and Sociology," *American Journal of Sociology* 32, no. 5 (Mar., 1927), 707.

name."[47] Persistent in the nineteenth century as an idea, it underwent a vocabulary change at the turn of the twentieth century and became "race relations" in the hands of Booker T. Washington. Although academics and public intellectuals generally treated "race relations" as deserving of concentrated attention, "race relations" was never simply an object of empirical research; "race relations" was itself a theory. This theory elucidated by Washington was "not a theory *of* race relations, but race relations as theory" itself. This theory, which historian Michael West argues is persistent in American thought, "takes off from wide-ranging and difficult economic questions on the ground where black people live in order to render those issues harmless to the business of America and beyond the purview of any democratic creed."[48] In the 1920s and 1930s, it had also become the answer to race problems, as articulated by black and white liberals alike.[49] As West puts it, "The solution of the Negro problem [was] not [to] be found in an extension of democracy… but magical 'Progress' to conjure good 'race relations,' a seemingly practical, but in fact fundamentally

---

[47]Michael Rudolph West, *The Education of Booker T. Washington: American Democracy and the Idea of Race Relations* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2006), 38.

[48]West, *The Education of Booker T. Washington*, 56. Liberal and conservative white people agreed that race relations were disturbed by nonwhite people's competition with white people for jobs, housing, and political power. The difference was that liberals, including most of the white social scientists profiled in previous chapters, apparently thought that competition was the natural or proper process for racial uplift. Booker T. Washington and a number of other black intellectuals believed this, too. Meanwhile, white conservatives supported the use of the disciplining forces of law and extralegal consequences for black people striving to transcend their supposedly proper social position. On the threat of economic competition from black men as a motivation for the rise of the second Ku Klux Klan, see Nancy MacLean, *Behind the Mask of Chivalry: The Making of the Second Ku Klux Klan* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994).

[49]For a discussion of more worldly, egalitarian visions of black figures such as W.E.B. DuBois, Martin Luther King, Jr., and others beginning in the 1930s and developing into black radical thought and critique in the 1970s, see Singh, *Black is a Country*. These visions often concentrated on critiques of capitalism and demands for economic justice as central to black liberation. See also Robin D.G. Kelley, *Freedom Dreams: The Black Radical Imagination*, (Boston: Beacon Press, 2002), especially chapters one and two.

idealist abstraction – how black and white people *feel* about each other – as a solution."[50] It was these feelings that Robert Park focused on in his research and trained his students to examine.

Robert Park first learned about race relations from Washington, for whom he worked for seven years as his press secretary at the Tuskegee Institute in Alabama.[51] Park's expanded interest in race relations was fueled by his friend and colleague William Isaac Thomas, who helped him get his job at the University of Chicago in 1913 and who helped cultivate Park's application of the parameters of the Negro problem to concerns produced by European immigration. Thomas' research on the assimilation of Polish immigrants to the U.S. primed him to work with Park on *Old World Traits Transplanted* (1921), a study examining recent immigrants.[52]

In the early 1920s, when public and academic concerns about the effects of mass immigration were at a fever pitch, Chicago sociologists elaborated their theory about spatial relationships to include ecological principles. Writing about human ecology in 1925, Robert McKenzie specified that competition and selection produced spatial relationships, which continually changed as new factors disturbed competitive relations or facilitated mobility. "Human institutions and human nature itself become accommodated to certain spatial relationships of human beings. As these spatial relationships change, the physical basis of social relations is altered, thereby producing social and political problems."[53] In other words, if members of specific group, for example, began making higher salaries and moving into more expensive neighborhoods where their group was largely unrepresented, social

---

[50]West, *The Education of Booker T. Washington*, 57. Emphasis added.
[51]Yu, *Thinking Orientals*, 38.
[52]Yu, *Thinking Orientals*, 38.
[53]McKenzie, "The Ecological Approach," 64.

problems were inevitable. This position exemplifies the sensibility that human ecology proponents were developing, namely that changes produced "problems," which they treated as intellectual problems necessitating study. By identifying changing relationships as altering spatial relationships, McKenzie left institutional and political history that were deeply implicated in spatial relationships out of his analysis and characterized people's relative positions as the product of competition and selection rather than social or policy decisions and enforcement. The approach thus avoided or obscured intervening forces affecting position.

The ecological approach to race relations helped social scientists position themselves as detached experts who eschewed social intervention in the name of objectivity.[54] Human ecologists positioned their field as scientific and themselves as experts interested only in describing universal forces affecting universal processes through specific situations as case studies. McKenzie sought to raise sociology to a comparable level of "precision of observation or in method of analysis" as those in plant and animal ecology.[55] He and many peer sociologists worked under the assumption that race was a natural factor with which communities contended rather than a product of human construction. Focusing on "race relations" allowed them to identify spatial divides between black and white people such as segregation without assuming strong positions on the biological integrity of racial categorization. Treating race functionally, like speciation, as a way of understanding

---

[54]On the tensions between advocacy and objectivity in the history of social science, see Mary O. Furner, *Advocacy and Objectivity: A Crisis in the Professionalization of American Social Science, 1865-1905* (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1975); Thomas L. Haskell, *The Emergence of Professional Social Science: The American Social Science Association and the Nineteenth-Century Crisis of Authority* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1977); and Hamilton Cravens, "History of the Social Sciences," *Osiris* 2nd Series, Vol. 1, *Historical Writing on American Science* (1985), 183-207.

[55]McKenzie, "The Ecological Approach," 63.

competition between groups within a "community" was a form of scientism that relieved social scientists doing human ecology from feeling compelled to acknowledge that black people and other people of color and non-Anglo immigrants, generally speaking, were deliberately prohibited from full enfranchisement and other facets of citizenship.

Hawai'i's "race problem" differed from the Negro problem on the continent because of the islands' majority "Oriental" population. However, the core of the "problem" was the same: how to explain animosity between groups as a function of competition and also culture. As noted above, Michael West contends that the ideology of "race relations" rendered "difficult economic questions on the ground where black people live" as "harmless to the business of America."[56] Lind's scholarship and the sociology department's curriculum did similar work in Hawai'i by institutionalizing an account of Hawai'i's development that reified expansion of "the economy" as natural and inevitable. Making race relations dependent on the economy, which was itself being produced as a system with its own logic and coherence, simultaneously removed race itself from the object of study as it obscured racism as a set of social and institutional practices that affected individuals' and groups' position in the social order.[57] "Race relations" was one part of a system – a facet of "community" development toward an equilibrium. The equilibrium predicted by Adams, Lind, and any number of social scientists and socially liberal experts was complete assimilation. Notably, however, as the end of a natural process that included conflict and competition, assimilation did not preclude exploitation as ecologically defined. Struggle was part of the process. Assimilation, then, did not necessarily entail complete social

[56]West, *The Education of Booker T. Washington*, 56.

[57]For a discussion on the substitution of race for racism in American historical literature and history itself, see Barbara Fields, "Of Rogues and Geldings," *American Historical Review* 108, no. 5 (Dec. 2003), 1397-1405.

membership or equality; it was something the unassimilated worked toward, even if they were citizens.[58] It meant the adoption of the language and cultural customs of the primary group, national allegiance, and identification with a unified group: becoming part of one people, whether that "people" defined themselves as Americans or members of an "island community."[59]

Lind's *Island Community*

The unquestioned expert on the "human ecology" of Hawai'i was, and in some ways remains, Andrew Lind. Scholars continue to cite his 1938 book *An Island Community: Ecological Succession in Hawaii* as a source of social and historical information about the territory, even in cases in which they disagree with his basic approach and findings. Although Lind published well into the 1960s, in this first book he laid out what became a consistent scholarly and pedagogical agenda by explaining the history of Hawai'i and its residents as a process of succession and modernization. *An Island Community* was based on the dissertation he researched and wrote in Honolulu and Chicago between 1928 and 1931.

---

[58]On the concept of social membership, which "mark[ed] some people as worthy, capable, and deserving members of society and others as correspondingly unworthy and incapable of participation" and, I would add, deserving of social mobility and political power, see Natalia Molina, *Fit to Be Citizens?: Public Health and Race in Los Angeles, 1879-1939* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006), 5. See also Lisa Lowe, *Immigrant Acts: On Asian American Cultural Politics* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1996). Lowe says, "The failure of citizenship to guarantee truly equal rights to all the nation's citizenry is not only an index of the historical and persistent racial, class, and gender contradictions of American society but also a condition exacerbated since World War II by the contradiction between U.S. national institutions and the imperatives of the global economy," (ix). I argue that that this practice began long before and it remains in practice in parts of the continental U.S. and particularly in U.S. colonies such as Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and so on where residents are U.S. nationals, but not citizens per se.

[59]Robert E. Park, "Racial Assimilation in Secondary Groups with Particular Reference to the Negro," *The American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 19, No. 5 (March 1914), 606, 612,

In the very first paragraph of the book, Lind describes his study with language that mirrored plant ecology:

> This volume was first conceived as a study in human ecology. The presence in the Territory of large numbers of several diverse ethnic stocks – Polynesian, Mongolian, Malayan, and Caucasian – lends special interest to the manner in which population is distributed over the Islands. Each of the major immigrant groups, which in Hawaii are popularly termed "races," may be conceived as invaders whose position in the new land is determined by the intensity of the existing occupation and their ability to compete. The latest arrivals occupy the places of lowest esteem in the region, and their subsequent locations measure their rise in status. In the final analysis race relations are revealed through spatial relations.[60]

Lind noted that Hawai'i's "present racial situation" was a "so much a product of the past and so much a part of the entire complex of physiographic and economic forces operating in the region that the scope of the study has inevitably expanded."[61] Lind expanded his dissertation to include analysis of Hawai'i's position in the "world-economy," a comparison of Hawai'i with other colonies, and a commentary on Hawai'i's "economic destiny" and the development of an "indigenous culture based upon the contribution of the several immigrant and native peoples which are now becoming one."[62]

The focus of the book and of Lind's whole sociological paradigm was succession as the process leading to stability: of land use, of population, and of race relations. The book is

---

[60]Lind, *An Island Community*, i. Note that Lind uses the terms from scientific racial typology here rather than ethnic or national designations.

[61]Lind, *An Island Community*, i.

[62]Lind, *An Island Community*, i, iii. Here, "indigenous" serves as an analog for the idea of the "local" in Hawai'i: a sensibility and claim to the islands that John Rosa and a few other historians have argued began gelling in the 1930s, especially in the context of the Massie affair. See Rosa, "Local Story: The Massie Case Narrative and the Cultural Production of Local Identity in Hawai'i," *Amerasia Journal* 26, no. 2 (2000), 93-115; and David Stannard, *Honor Killing: Race, Rape, and Clarence Darrow's Spectacular Last Case* (New York: Penguin Books, 2005). Haunani-Kay Trask argues that "local" is a product of settler colonialism. See Trask, "Settlers of Color and 'Immigrant' Hegemony: 'Locals' in Hawai'i," 45-65 in Fujikane and Okamura, eds., *Asian Settler Colonialism: From Local Governance to the Habits of Everyday Life in Hawai'i* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2008).

organized in a developmental economic history as part of a history of modernity unfolding. Lind highlighted the stages Hawai'i passed through beginning as a (1) "stone age," (2) "feudal" society through the (3) "era of agricultural expansion" culminating with the era of (4) "stabilization," 1900-1936.[63] The book's thirteen chapters trace changes to the land and demographics, economic development, including plantation construction and labor issues, and in the last three chapters, whose titles reflect Lind's initial interests in race relations and the development of a modern Hawai'i, "occupational succession," "the maturation of island civilization," and "an island commonwealth." The unifying themes of the book are Hawai'i's ecology, as defined by economics, land use, and demographic shifts, which was development toward equilibrium.

Lind's source material was eclectic and relied upon content and reasoning from a number of disciplines. It included government reports produced by both Hawaiian Kingdom and Territorial officials, vital statistics similar to those Adams used in *Interracial Marriage in Hawaii*, and selections from academic publications on economics, colonization, demographics, geography, and substantial history texts. The vast majority of Lind's sources were published materials and there is no evidence that he conducted surveys or interviews or otherwise collected primary source data for his study. Nevertheless, he and other scholars of human ecology claimed that their work was scientific because of the ecological concepts they applied to explain the forces governing human society.

Throughout the book, Lind noted how the development of Hawai'i mirrored the processes that folded elsewhere in the world. By comparing Hawai'i with other colonies, he

---

[63]Lind, *An Island Community*, 15. This was the anthropological development identified by the 1870s. This was not new with Lind. Rather, he adapted it to Hawai'i, which would have resonated with an academic audience.

contributed a universal history of the development of the global economy.[64] Lind connected the history of colonies elsewhere in the Pacific as well as Africa and Asia to demonstrate that following the destabilizing effects of Euro-American expansion, all of those "communities" were progressing toward equilibrium. Lind wrote that in Hawai'i the labor cycle was in its final phase, meaning that residents outnumbered migrants, and the relation between population and resources was gradually being restored to its pre-European status. "Hawaii's experience is typical of that in other plantation areas" he wrote, and "corresponds in the main with the trends in the Western world generally."[65] Hawai'i, in Lind's formulation, was passing through stages in expected ways that connoted a system or similar systems at work. When commenting about the relationship between local demand and foreign imports, he noted that "Articles of trade, like news, depend upon local demand, and the pattern of the indigenous culture largely conditions the order and nature of the foreign importations. Hawaii's experience in this field parallels closely that of other oceanic islands. For this reason the details of Hawaii's early trade with the West assume *more than historic meaning*."[66] He interpreted similarities of practice among plantation sites and their respective colonies as evidence of the expectedness – indeed, naturalness – of this kind of development rather than

---

[64]Timothy Mitchell argues that the comparative sensibility developed in the social sciences in the early twentieth century precipitated out of a universalizing approach. See Mitchell, *Rule of Experts*, 7. This comparative sensibility also came out of actual historical connections and knowledge-sharing between empires. See Laura Briggs, *Reproducing Empire: Race, Sex, Science, and U.S. Imperialism in Puerto Rico* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002), especially chapter one; and Paul Kramer, "Empires, Exceptions, and Anglo-Saxons: Race and Rule between the British and United States Empires, 1880-1910," *Journal of American History* 88, no. 4 (March 2002), 1315-1353.

[65]Lind, *An Island Community*, 207-208.

[66]Lind, *An Island Community*, 143. Emphasis added. Here, again, Lind uses indigenous as a synonym for local. He was not referring to Native Hawaiians.

evidence of these shared practices' common goal of expanding markets and their market share. Lind placed Hawai'i in a world history of capitalist expansion and development.

The decade of the 1930s encompassed a number of events, emergent practices, and intellectual products that shaped social science. Mitchell argues that the 1930s was when "the economy" was born.[67] This was the decade in which "a global network of European and other empires" was collapsing, a series of events that was central to the making of the economy as something defined as separate from government or governance.[68] In a way, "the economy" was an ecological construction: an entity and process, or set of processes, constructed as part of modernity's supposed singular logic, with humans operating within it rather than producing it.[69]

While comparable with other colonies in its development, as defined by Lind, Hawai'i was exceptional for three primary reasons, all of which saved the American imperial venture from some of the attacks of brutality waged against European colonies in the Caribbean and Southeast Asia in particular. First, there was never any slavery "commonly associated with the capitalistic exploitation of colonial areas."[70] Second, workers were paid better in Hawai'i than in other plantation areas. Apparently the only place where unskilled

---

[67]Mitchell, *Rule of Experts*, 4, 6. Other scholars have suggested that the idea of the economy can be traced back to Adam Smith or at least to John Stuart Mill and his cohorts. Mitchell argues that the 1930s was when "practices of government… formed the economy as a field of political regulation" (4). He explains that previous studies have "overlooked an unexpected fact. No political economist of the eighteenth or nineteenth century wrote about an object called 'the economy.' The term 'economy' in that period carried the older meaning of 'thrift,' and in a larger sense referred to the proper husbanding of resources and the intelligent management of their circulation" (4).

[68]Mitchell, *Rule of Experts*, 4-7.

[69]On the idea of modernity's singular logic, see Mitchell, 2.

[70]Lind, *An Island Community*, 192.

laborers made more was Queensland, Australia and those workers were white.[71] Finally, Hawai'i was a settler colony – a term Lind did not use, but this was his intent – as opposed to the kind of "impermanent" European "plantation colony" in which planting interests abandoned the venture if it was not profitable enough, thus putting the colony, as Lillian Knowles put it, "in serious danger of collapse."[72] With this last comment, Lind established the U.S. colony as more stable than the European colonies he used for comparison and portrayed the interests of British plantation owners as decidedly more greedy than those of the owners of plantations in Hawai'i.

In Lind's ecological framework, colonization stabilized Hawai'i and other colonies whose balance was disturbed after European contact due to the introduction of new goods and trading practices, and colonization also liberated Hawaiian commoners. Given the progress of global capitalism and the economic development in the islands, he judged that the colonization of Hawai'i was also inevitable and comparable with European colonialism. Lind wrote explicitly that colonial practices were defensible because they brought order to Hawai'i in the form of improved governance and law. (He does not acknowledge that the Hawaiian Kingdom's government was modeled on British and American practices or allow that colonization compromised Hawaiian sovereignty.) Referring to the course of Euro-American expansion and takeover in the late nineteenth century, he suggested "That the resident trader should concern himself extensively with the evolving political order was no less *inevitable* in Hawaii than in colonial Africa, America, or Asia."[73] In a footnote to this

---

[71]Lind, *An Island Community*, 200-201.

[72]Lind, *An Island Community*, 168. Lind cited L.C.A. Knowles, *The Economic Development of the Overseas Empire* (London, 1928), noting that he found "the impermanence of the planting interests in British colonies to be one of their outstanding characteristics."

[73]Lind, *An Island Community*, 146. Emphasis added.

comment, perhaps meant to address critique of the American colonization of Hawai'i as inappropriate, Lind argued that the stabilizing effect of colonization made it defensible:

> The penetration of colonial regions by Western administrative devices, amounting often to the transfer of sovereignty, has so often been described in terms of exploitation and conquest that the more permanent and fundamental demands for "peace, order, and juridical guarantees which mean better administration, better police, and better jurisprudence" ordinarily escape attention. The thesis that "the more capital invested, the greater the development necessary in the equipment of the administration of the country," applied by Schrieke and Knowles to Dutch and British colonial experience is *equally defensible* in Hawaii's history.[74]

Lind also argued that introducing capitalism to Hawai'i supposedly emancipated Hawaiian commoners from the grip of their chiefly "overlords," whose adherence to the Native system of kapu (or "taboo," as Lind wrote) restricted individual freedom.[75] Indeed, it introduced the idea of freedom itself to Hawai'i because

> Emancipation from these onerous restrictions consisted of the freedom to compete – doubtless the basis of every other form of freedom – which is guaranteed by the incipient trading economy. The education of the native in the fine points of Western trading practice constituted the necessary initiation into the 'freedom of capitalism,' in which the *haole* trader was the unwitting but effective preceptor.[76]

Assessing the people who introduced this profound change as "unwitting haole" (plural) established those haole as innocently participating in the natural unfolding of modernity out of a "feudal" system.[77]

---

[74]Lind, *An Island Community*, 146. Emphasis added.

[75]Kapu, sometimes recorded as tabu, translates to taboo, prohibition, forbidden, sacred, or a special exception from ordinary taboo. See Mary Kawena Pukui and Samuel E. Elbert, *Hawaiian Dictionary: Hawaiian-English, English-Hawaiian, Revised and Enlarged Edition* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1986), 132.

[76]Lind, *An Island Community*, 139.

[77]Mary Louise Pratt highlights the rhetoric of innocence inherent to anti-conquest narratives like the narrative the ecological approach supported. See Pratt, *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation* (London: Routledge, 1992). To Lind and his cohort, this was not conquest, it was modernization. Lind repeatedly called late eighteenth and early nineteenth

In Lind's formulation, capitalism introduced class mobility, which was itself a form of emancipation because it freed workers to sell their labor and compete with one another. He noted that the "the class stratification in Old Hawaii was in part occupational" and argued that "the capitalistic economy upset the existing occupational equilibrium and initiated an internal or vertical mobility, unknown under the old regime."[78] Just as participating in Hawai'i's developing economy allegedly liberated Native Hawaiians, migrants experienced enhanced freedom as participants in Hawai'i's economy. Although they all started "on the lowest rung of the ladder," Lind reported that, "the immigrant is, however, *emancipated* from the old country standards and is free to compete for status in the new country upon the only basis available, i.e., economic success measured in monetary terms."[79] Work in cane fields and sugar factories, then, "has afforded the largest base from which people of all colors and conditions in Hawaii have climbed the economic and social ladder" – never mind that it was the *only* base from which some workers had to climb and thus not a special opportunity. He did note that plantation labor was "for many" the only occupation available and that "they have lived, labored, and died on the plantation."[80] Still, "In the wider fields outside, unassisted by the plantation, as a *free agent in free competition*, the immigrant may seek his fortune on the basis of his own capacity and interests," which was the very definition of freedom: the freedom to compete.[81] Competition was, by logical extension, an exercise of personal freedom.

---

century Hawai'i "feudal," but it must be noted that European feudalism was based on a substantively different history and worldview than konohiki (Hawaiian land management) and kapu practices.

[78]Lind, *An Island Community*, 245-246.

[79]Lind, *An Island Community*, 249. Emphasis added.

[80]Lind, *An Island Community*, 250.

[81]Lind, *An Island Community*, 251.

Workers were free to compete, however, in a labor market controlled by planters, who purposely imported workers of different ethnicities and more workers than they needed to prevent strikes and to have the upper hand in matters of wages and benefits. Lind explained that these tactics contributed to the stability of plantations' productivity and the islands' "race relations." Planters continued lobbying to import "cheap and tractable labor" from China through 1921 to maintain labor control threatened by majority Japanese workers' ability to refuse to work.[82] Although Lind discusses the continuation of large-scale labor importation as a method of labor control, by his assessment, "the existence of this excess and the assurance of an uninterrupted flow from abroad have unquestionably served as *stabilizing forces* upon the labor market in the Islands."[83] He continued, "The value of a labor surplus both as a means of depressing wages and as a means of labor control is so well recognized that the planters have never willingly allowed the doors to immigration to be completely closed, not even during the recent years of economic depression and unemployment."[84] By depicting labor control as a stabilizing force, Lind demonstrated how, in an ecological framework, exploitation and control of workers' contributed toward producing and maintaining stability; and in a system modeled on physiology and organismal function, the ends justified the means as the means were merely part of the process.[85]

---

[82]Lind, *An Island Community*, 219.

[83]Lind, *An Island Community*, 219. Emphasis added.

[84]Lind, *An Island Community*, 210-220.

[85]In his review of *An Island Community*, E.B. Reuter accused Lind of being in collusion with planters. It is beyond the scope of this chapter and this dissertation to delve deeply into Lind's loyalties, but it must be noted that Lind assessed workers' accounts of poor treatment on plantations as not possibly as poor as they said. While Lind describes the power of planters, he also suggests that workers exaggerated the problems with working conditions and treatment, to the point of saying that workers had "alleged grievances" and that former plantation workers' children continued to tell stories about "plantation brutality and compulsion" that "could not well have occurred these last thirty years" (221, 225). Lind

Although Lind framed his book as focusing on Hawai'i's "racial situation" and race relations, the first ten of his thirteen chapters do not directly address these things. Rather, they set up the ecology of Hawai'i as defined by economy, land use as spatial orientation, and population. In chapter thirteen, which he notably titled "Occupational Succession," Lind joined together the process of occupational succession and the phenomenon of race prejudice. The former was an ecological process and the latter was a by-product of that process; a by-product presumed to be both inevitable and temporary as the "community" developed.

According to Chicago sociological theory, race prejudice was caused by people of different racial groups upsetting the social order by attempting to advance. By this logic,

> Had the labor immigrants, through some fundamental difference between themselves and the other racial groups, failed to manifest a desire for advancement, had they been content to remain always the uncomplaining laborers, the phenomenon of race prejudice might never have appeared. For race prejudice is, as Dr. Park has pointed out, *a consequence of the escape of a racial or cultural group from its expected place; it is a function of the struggle between groups for status.* Had there been room at the top for all who aspired, the protective measure of prejudice might also have been less prominent. The

---

notes that "a labor force which is completely repressed does not complain, certainly not publicly, and it is doubtless the facility offered for the expression of labor discontent in Hawaii which has distinguished its labor system from those of other plantation areas" (221). Lind himself described the high rate of desertion in the 1870s and 1880s – rates high enough to warrant a response from planters (225), yet quoted a Bureau of Immigration report from 1899 that reported that workers used "some real or fancied grievance" to "break the monotony" and that "the leaders harangue their followers and the mob, most of them ignorant of the real cause, rush off to demand redress." The grievance "is not generally felt very deeply, and in most cases a little tact smoothes out everything and the even flow of events is again attained" (233). It is possible that Lind was attempting to present what he viewed as a neutral or balanced account of the relationship between capital and labor on plantations. However, the way that he discounted workers' accounts of abuse as dramatized illustrates either his lack of empathy for workers, his ignorance of plantation working conditions, or both. This is notable given that he presented his scholarship as a scientific and therefore objective account of human activity in Hawai'i.

> *relatively* slight manifestation of racial feeling in Hawaii is doubtless largely owing to the continuing abundance of occupational opportunity.[86]

The prejudice that precipitated out of competition would, however, in keeping with Chicago race relations theory, eventually be eradicated by personal contact between races, which arises with "common experience" in school, on the street, and in offices. Lind, Adams, and their colleagues expected that the "common tradition and heritage" and intermarriage that they saw as natural consequences of contact would eventually, as Adams argued in *Interracial Marriage in Hawaii* (1938), produce "assimilation and amalgamation – the final stage in the cycle of race relations."[87]

In his last chapter of *An Island Community*, Lind considered what he called the more formal ecological aspects of the questions of whether the residents of Hawai'i had become one people and "to what extent… competing languages and alien cultures survived the leveling and standardizing influence of capitalistic civilization."[88] Focusing on racial amalgamation and what he viewed as the development of an "indigenous culture," Lind

---

[86]Lind, *An Island Community*, 268-269.

[87]Lind, *An Island Community*, 269. Note that "amalgamation" was not a part of the race relations/assimilation cycle as it was initially theorized. This appears to be an addition by Adams and then Lind. Park and Burgess, as they worked on the continent and especially as they theorized about black-white relations, did not speculate that there would ever be amalgamation of white people and black people. Neither did they or others argue that white people and "Orientals" on the West Coast would amalgamate, but rather that "Orientals" would blend in with white people.

[88]Lind, *An Island Community*, 298. In a footnote, he noted that Adams took up the social-psychological aspects of these questions in *Interracial Marriage in Hawaii.* Adams' book was largely focused on demographic research and did not contain any formal psychological analysis. That Lind viewed Adams' work as social-psychological is suggestive of the overlap among research fields in University of Hawai'i studies of race mixing and race relations. Psychologist Stanley Porteus held a full time appointment at the University starting in 1922 directing the Psychological and Psychopathic Clinic and conducted comparative studies of intelligence and other psychological research through the late 1940s. As detailed in chapter two, Porteus and Adams worked closely with University of Hawai'i presidents Arthur Dean and David Crawford on securing and maintaining research funding from the Rockefeller Foundation.

concluded that "an island commonwealth is coming into being."[89] If *An Island Community* was emblematic of Lind's explanation for Hawai'i's social situation, the sociology department, of which he was chair from 1934 till the mid-1960s, was a vehicle for educating residents about the forces behind both their place in the territory and the direction of its development. What students learned, however, was not human ecology, but specific facets the human ecology paradigm relevant to their experiences as second generation migrants and residents of a U.S. territory, which they reproduced in their scholarly and reflective writing.

The Pedagogy of "Race Relations"

Members of the sociology department viewed education in social science as essential to the development of modern citizens capable of responding appropriately to human differences and truly understanding themselves. In his 1932 commencement address at the university, visiting faculty member Robert Park emphasized the role of the university in the cultivation of a social scientific and "cosmopolitan" sensibility among students and the local "community." He said,

> There is a growing sense among colonial officials of the importance, to colonial administrators, missionaries and teachers, of the insight that anthropologists have gained through the studies into the ways of people whose lives are simpler than ours. It has even been suggested by Malinowski that "all government servants and others-especially missionaries-coming into direct contact with natives should take, as part of their preparatory studies, a course in anthropology." But the study of human nature, by direct methods which anthropologists employ, need not and should not be confined either to primitive or non-European peoples. Political policy and political administration anywhere can be improved by a more intimate acquaintance with people-even those people we are supposed to know, because we see them, trade with them and jostle them every day in the streets. It is true, also, as Kipling has pointed out, that things that you learn from the yellow and brown will help you a lot with the white."[90]

---

[89]Lind, *An Island Community*, 316.

[90]Robert E. Park, "The University and the Community of Races," *Pacific Affairs* 5, no. 8 (Aug. 1932), 700.

The "cosmopolitanism" espoused by Park, Lind, their colleagues, and, eventually, their students was a precursor to the multiculturalism that came into vogue in the later twentieth century.[91]

The University of Hawai'i, a colonial university, was the site of the elaboration of intertwined civic ideologies grounded in the social science of human ecology. As such, a particular ideology of race relations associated with concepts of cosmopolitanism was grounded in the ecological idea of Hawai'i being a natural "community" unit. Nikhil Singh reminds us that civic ideologies such as claims to American exceptionalism "can never be proven or falsified," but should rather be "understood as performative, that is, they seek to produce what they purport to describe." The civic ideology of Hawai'i's residents moving though an ecological process toward equilibrium as a hybridized, culturally assimilated community of Americans was a normative and pedagogical statement "that attempted to create or reinforce a particular narrative of national identity."[92] Robert Park said as much, unselfconsciously, in his commencement address, when he asserted that "the University is giving not merely an intellectual training to its students, but is gradually forming for the community a conception of life in which each of the different peoples of these Islands may share and toward which each may make some contribution."[93]

---

[91]Park, 703. See also Jonathan Okamura, *Ethnicity and Inequality in Hawai'i*, on multiculturalism. It appears as though the celebration of the presence of lots of ethnic groups itself was the focus, obscuring the conditions under which they arrived in Hawai'i in the first place. Examining these conditions was never the point of human ecology, but it merits a mention that the analytical limitations of the human ecological approach allowed certain dynamics to be made invisible. Therein lied its power.

[92]Nikhil Singh, *Black is a Country: Race and the Unfinished Struggle for Democracy* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004), 18-19.

[93]Park, "The University and the Community of Races," 703.

One of the venues in which students contributed toward forming a community conception of life, as Park put it, was the university sociology club. In 1935, when Lind was chairman of the department and advisor to the club, students began producing the journal *Social Process in Hawaii.* "Student sociologists," as editor Kum Pui Lai referred to himself and his classmates, collaborated with faculty "to answer felt need in the popular dissemination of research findings" on "forces and processes" related to "the interaction of diverse cultures and the amalgamation of different races in Hawaii."[94] Like his professors, Lai identified forces and processes as the focus of sociological research and indicated that "social processes" related to race relations and race mixing. In other words, Lai's introduction to the first issue of *Social Process in Hawaii* suggests that when sociologists at the university spoke about social forces or processes, they always had race in mind.

Student contributors to *Social Process in Hawaii* researched and wrote in ways that reproduced the faculty approach, which was reinforced further by student-faculty collaboration on the journal. The first issue of the journal published in May 1935 contained eleven student-written articles such as "The Racial Future of Caucasian-Hawaiians: A Genealogical Study" by Margaret Lam, "Attitudes toward Intermarriage" by Leatrice and Marion Wong, "Occupational Succession on the Plantation" by Clarence C. Robinson, and "Japanese Etiquette in Hawaii" by James Kashiwahara. Editor Kum Pui Lai noted that "several of the papers originated as student reports in sociology classes."[95] Faculty member Everett V. Stonequist contributed an article titled "The Marginal Man in Hawaii," which he later expanded for the professional *Journal of Sociology*. Andrew Lind contributed three

---

[94]Kum Pui Lai, "Diagnosing Social Processes in Hawaii (Forward)," *Social Process in Hawaii* (May 1935), 1.

[95]Lai, "Diagnosing Social Processes in Hawaii (Forward)," 1.

articles: "Voting in Hawaii," "Current Vital Statistics," and a report on "Sociological Research at the Univ. of Hawaii."[96]

Whether they belonged to the sociology club or not, students who enrolled in sociology courses at the University of Hawai'i in the late 1920s through the mid 1950s were asked to write in a specific genre: the life history or autobiography.[97] Many of these papers were archived in the department and remain in the University Archives as part of the Romanzo Adams Social Research Laboratory collection. The creation of this departmental archive was both a documentary project and a pedagogical project. Student papers demonstrate one of the research methods used by sociologists, which was collecting student papers on race relations problems and topics, as they also indicate one of the primary pedagogical tools of the department.[98] Given their personal subject matter focused on the contemporary moment, these papers serve as an archive of historically situated writing by lay people about their experiences. However, these papers also demonstrate, very importantly, what students were asked to think and write about and their education in producing narratives about their lives that aligned with the theory of race relations and the assimilation cycle. Neither Lind nor Adams cited student life histories as primary sources for their

---

[96]Contents, *Social Process in Hawaii*, May 1925, i.

[97]On life histories, see Yu, 96-102. "These sociological narratives of category became a specific genre for the expression of ethnicity" (97). These papers are archived in the Romanzo Adams Social Research Laboratory files and also in War Research laboratory files housed at the University of Hawai'i. They were collected for initially as part of building an archive and during World War II as part of a morale-surveillance project assigned to the University by the U.S. military.

[98]See Yu, 95. He points out that university students working under Chicago sociologists, who were "open to instruction and direction from their professors (and unpaid for their services), proved to be the most amenable and easily disciplined research workers. Many research surveys, such as the massive Pittsburgh survey of industrial workers a decade earlier, had relied on social workers or church networks to supply volunteer researchers, but the sociologists in 1924 took advantage of an abundance of university students."

analysis and arguments. Still, the archive they amassed demonstrates that their investment in collecting these accounts was central to their jobs as stewards of an institutional sociology "laboratory" and repository as well as central to their approaches to teaching undergraduates and students preparing for careers in education and social work. Colleagues appointed at universities on the continent, however, used student life histories in their work. For example, William Carlson Smith, whose *Americans in Process: A Study of Our Citizens of Oriental Ancestry* (1937) contained an introduction by Romanzo Adams, used excerpts from student papers.[99]

The educational objective of life history production and the theoretical framework that it promoted was to help students develop a modern, social scientifically informed sensibility and, more specifically, to help them see how their lives and the lives of those around them fit into the progressive race relations cycle: competition, conflict, accommodation, and assimilation. Students were being taught and required to engage in autoethnographic reflection and narrative making as part of course assignments. These focused on the moment when they developed a racial consciousness or had an epiphany about their identity, their "chief characteristic," the role of travel and hardship in their development as racially conscious or American, and their feelings about racial prejudice.[100] The common narrative structure was one of a life of hardship that was transformed or

---

[99]William Carlson Smith, *Americans in Process: A Study of Our Citizens of Oriental Ancestry* (Ann Arbor: Edwards Brothers, Inc., 1937). Student papers and interviews were cited anonymously.

[100]On autoethnography, see Mary Louise Pratt, *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*, (London: Routledge, 1992), 7, 9. Pratt defines autoethnographic expression, which she believes to be a "very widespread phenomenon of the contact zone," this way: "If ethnographic texts are a means by which Europeans represent to themselves their (usually subjugated) others, autoethnographic texts are those the others construct in response to or in dialogue with those metropolitan representations."

"metamorphosis," as one student put it.[101] Students who described their arrival at racial consciousness usually explained their family history and the moment when they discovered how their ideas about who they were clashed with other people's assumptions about them. One student reported, "It was while I was in high school that I first became race-conscious. It didn't matter whether I was ¾ English, I was spoke of as Hawaiian: since then I have never forgotten it, partly because of the peculiar things my being Hawaiian has occasioned and partly because I'm interested in how people under diverse conditions and of varying social and cultural backgrounds accept a person of mixed bloods."[102] This student expressed being affected by her peers' perceptions of her even as she claimed intellectual interest in the sociology of race mixing.

Students, many of whom reported East Asian ancestry, doubled as both subjects and researchers. They were sources of authentic accounts of "Oriental" experience, mostly, when they wrote about themselves and amateur sociologists whose papers served as data-gathering tools when they were focused on their families and neighborhoods. Requiring students to exercise sociological methods was a particular type of education in ways of viewing themselves and their worlds as well as ways of positioning themselves as they observed and wrote. In other words, the assignments required that students move back and forth between participation and detached observation – between being an insider and an outsider and back.[103] At the University of Hawai'i, this approach produced classes of students every year that had been exposed to this mode of subjectivity. Many of Lind's and

---

[101]Autobiography #12 – Title: "A Profound Metamorphosis," Box 12, Folder 12, Park Papers, SCRC-UC.

[102]Student about 20 yrs. of age, "A Caucasian Hawaiian Girl's Attitude Toward Intermarriage," Box 12, Folder 11, Park Papers, SCRC-UC, 4.

[103]See Yu, 147 on this practice.

his colleagues' students eventually entered careers as public school teachers, public officials, and members of the military. Before they left the university, however, they learned about statehood for Hawai'i as a likely end to the naturalized social processes laid out in the race relations cycle.

Advocacy for Statehood

The popularly of statehood in Hawai'i in the 1930s and thereafter was fueled, in part, by changing ideas within the majority ancestrally East Asian settler population about their role in Hawai'i and the future of the islands. In his book *Thinking Orientals*, Henry Yu elucidates just how important learning the race relations cycle became for Asian students under the tutelage of Chicago sociologists working on the continent. It provided a framework as students attempted to understand themselves and to articulate an identity as people who were neither fully accepted as Americans nor able to identify culturally with the country of their ancestors because they were second generation migrants who had never been to the country of their parents' birth. Ideas associated with the pro-statehood movement – evidence of the Americanness of Hawai'i's Asian population, the rights of Hawai'i residents to proper representation under democracy, and a deep personal desire among residents for recognition as Americans were all cultivated within the University of Hawai'i's Social Research Laboratory and its classrooms.[104]

Andrew Lind filed a brief with the 1935 Committee as a non-testifying, noncommittal member. This meant that he filed an expert brief, but did not state his opinion about statehood. By 1940, however, he supported statehood by helping to debunk

---

[104]On the statehood movement and resistance to it, see Dean Itsuji Saranillio, "Seeing Conquest: Colliding Histories and the Cultural Politics of Hawai'i Statehood," Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 2009.

the myth of potential Japanese dominance of the islands if Hawai'i was made a state. In a full-page spread in the October 31, 1940 *Honolulu Star-Bulletin*, Lind's expertise on this issue was used to educate readers and advocate for statehood. When the House Committee on Territories conducted another set of statehood hearings in 1946, Lind served as an expert on population issues on the first day of the hearing. After Romanzo Adams passed away in 1942, Lind succeeded him as department chair at the University of Hawai'i. Like Adams, Lind testified that the Japanese population of Hawai'i was decreasing, that race relations in Hawai'i were exceptionally cordial, and that despite labor strikes and religious differences, Japanese people were indeed assimilating. After the war, "outmarriage" among Japanese increased and class issues were usurping race as a unifying factor. Japanese were not a threat as a voting bloc.

In the last chapter of *An Island Community*, titled "An Island Commonwealth," Lind explained that primary and secondary school students, with the exception of Hawaiians, participated heartily in school and accepted Americanization. Lind wrote,

> It is worth noting in this connection that the immigrant groups whose cultures are ordinarily thought to be consonant with American traditions have embraced the opportunities of American education most enthusiastically. The children of Chinese, Japanese, and Korean ancestry show higher percentages of school attendance in the upper age levels, where attendance is not compulsory, than do the children of any other of the ethnic stocks in Hawaii, except the *haole*'s [sic] and the Caucasian-Hawaiians.[105]

Lind later published about statehood in a University of Hawai'i publication called *What People In Hawaii Are Saying and Doing*, but only after further study of the issue. He polled sociology students at UH to gain an understanding of the "range, depth, and

[105]Lind, *An Island Community*, 303-304.

complexity of the attitudes regarding statehood."[106] Lind framed differing opinions about statehood as evidence of underlying attitudes, not about statehood itself. In this way, Lind turned the statehood debate into a sociological study of attitudes as people moved through the assimilation cycle. He took for granted that statehood was supported by the majority of Hawai'i residents and read anti-statehood rhetoric as evidence of underlying discomfort or prejudice. In this 1950 article, after summarizing longstanding arguments from both statehood opponents and proponents, Lind declared, "The statehood issue in Hawaii is pau" – finished and final.[107]

Conclusion

The ideology of race relations in twentieth century Hawai'i was embedded in human ecology. Led by Lind, the University of Hawai'i sociology department represented race relations as a natural cycle rather than a civic ideology. Ecology, then, was more than a metaphor in interwar sociology.[108] It was an epistemology, a new way of conceptualizing racialized groups' interactions as part of a teleological struggle toward societal stability and modernity. Borrowing from biological ecology allowed the production of a universalizing

---

[106]Pau is the Hawaiian word for "finished" or "over." Andrew Lind, "Hawaiian Statehood," in *What People In Hawaii are Saying and Doing*, Hawaii Social Research Laboratory, University of Hawaii, June 30, 1950; Report No. 16: 7.

[107]Lind, "Hawaiian Statehood," 15. Original emphasis.

[108]According to Emanuel Gaziano, Chicago sociologists selectively appropriated ecological concepts as metaphors for human activity rather than extending biological concepts into the study of society. Gaziano likely arrived at the conclusion that biological ideas served as metaphors rather than structuring concepts for the study of human "communities" (similar to plant and animal communities) because he did a quantitative analysis of references to ecology within sociology articles and found few of them. The evidence suggests, however, that the leaders of the sociology department, Robert Park and Edward Burgess, incorporated Frederic Clements' concept of succession quite literally into their paradigm. See Emanuel Gaziano, "Ecological Metaphors as Scientific Boundary Work: Innovation and Authority in Interwar Sociology and Biology," *American Journal of Sociology* 101, no. 4 (Jan., 1996), 875.

narrative with scientific objectivity and authority. The vocabulary of ecology as applied to human relations naturalized the history of Hawai'i as a history of succession of various kinds and promoted its inclusion in the geography of modern capitalist expansion. Rather than the product of concerted political and economic choices, experts in Hawai'i positioned the installation of private property, the construction of plantations, labor importation by plantation owners, specific migrations to the islands, political conflict between Hawaiians and Euro-Americans, and American colonization as part of progressive development toward capitalist maturation.

That the situation in Hawai'i shared characteristics with other colonial plantation economies in the second half of the nineteenth century served as reinforcing evidence of Hawai'i's destiny as part of advanced capitalist society and, by extension, the United States. Lind compared Hawai'i with Dutch Indonesia, for example, not because it was a natural analog to Hawai'i, but because comparing Hawai'i with that specific colony helped substantiate his argument that Hawai'i's trajectory was both typical, given common processes influencing succession, and exceptional. As part of its educational mission, the sociology department simultaneously promoted and predicted the development of a uniform island culture and sense of singular peoplehood that, in the opinion of Lind and a number of other faculty and powerful businesspeople, should culminate in statehood. While colonial officials and businesses formed the territorial infrastructure and policy associated with state-building, university faculty did the cultural work of nation-building. They educated students about the processes of succession and assimilation and argued that Hawai'i residents' place in the United States was natural.

While human ecology was rather short lived as an approach within sociology, its great flexibility gave it wide appeal and incredible discursive power and persistence as an explanatory framework for racial inequalities. The human ecology paradigm could accommodate a central paradox in American life and identity: that Americans cooperate as a nation but that their freedom is founded on the opportunity to compete with one another for wealth and political power.

While the interwar years have been established historiographically as part of the "retreat of scientific racism," the shifts in approach to studying race and race relations in Hawai'i in the 1920s and 1930s point to the elaboration of a more subtle form of scientific racism than older natural history paradigm. Scientific racism has been framed quite narrowly as essentialist, taxonomic ideas about race. Scientific racism emerged, at base, from arguments about how the world worked – a model of nature defined by a hierarchy composed of groups defined by essential physical and psychological characteristics. The model of nature that emerged in the interwar period, an ecological one, was one focused less on taxonomy (and less insistent on the fixity of characteristics) and more interested in process, function, and adaptation (which was fuzzily related to the characteristic "adaptability").[109]

What changed with the development of an ecological paradigm focused on systems, function, and process out of a natural historical one focused on description and taxonomy was that experts who formerly explained inequality as the product of essential inequalities inherent to nonwhite peoples began to explain it as a product of competition. As

[109]For another account of this transition, see Donna Haraway, "Universal Donors in a Vampire Culture: It's All in the Family: Biological Kinship Categories in the Twentieth-Century United States," in William Cronon., ed., *Uncommon Ground: Rethinking the Human Place in Nature* (New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1996 [1995]): 321-375.

sociologists like Lind presented unfettered competition as natural and the pathway to social equilibrium, they also advanced the idea that the opportunity to compete was what made people equal and free. The important continuity between these two paradigms was a focus on progress as scientific experts defined it.[110]

Human ecology relied upon liberalism in both the social and economic senses of the word to yoke race relations and the economy together. Lind, like many of his Chicago-trained colleagues, was relatively socially liberal considering the period in which he worked and also supported economic liberalism. The liberalism underlying human ecology, including race relations, has fueled its tenacity. According to Barbara Fields, "race relations" as a rather vague object has persisted since the turn of the twentieth century because it "so suited the liberal thought of the time, and has been so well able to accommodate the internal twists of liberal and neo-liberal thought since, that it remains a vital part of the prevailing public language today."[111] This persistence has been possible because "race relations" was naturalized in the 1920s and 1930s as competition between individuals and groups of

---

[110]This progress-oriented ecological perspective has persisted to influence historians who have argued that racial mixing or amalgamation is synonymous with social progress. One example is the idea is that if put together, differently racialized people or ethnic groups will inevitably engage in sex and reproduction, producing inevitable progress toward some kind of equilibrium. See David A. Hollinger, "Amalgamation and Hypodescent: The Question of Ethnoracial Mixture in the History of the United States," *The American Historical Review* 108, no. 5 (Dec., 2003), 1363-1390, and Philip J. Pauly, *Biologists and the Promise of American Life*, 11. Henry Yu argues against the idea that the history of the United States has been a history of amalgamation overcoming group differences in his contribution to a roundtable in the *American Historical Review* on racial mixing that Hollinger's article introduced. See Henry Yu, "Tiger Woods Is Not the End of History: Or, Why Sex across the Color Line Won't Save Us All," *The American Historical Review* 108, no. 5 (Dec., 2003), 1406-1414.

[111]Barbara Fields, "Whiteness, Racism, and Identity," *International Labor and Working-Class History* 60 (Fall 2001), 54. This idea was developed in a 2000 Columbia dissertation by Michael R. West. "West dates the origin of *race relations* as a tactful formulation of the Negro Problem to the era of Booker T. Washington, who was its most talented and successful popularizer," (56, n24).

different races. Experts argued that in a "free" economy some of them, presumably the white people who went unnamed, came to dominate others and "secondary groups" such as immigrants and black people gradually assimilated. Like the idea of liberalism itself, the ecological paradigm's ideological flexibility has supported its longevity: claims that universal equality is an original American value coexist with recognition that racism persists in the form of racial prejudice or discriminatory attitudes.

In the 1950s, the idea that "community" was a construct of human thought rather than a natural unit began to gain traction among ecologists.[112] Likewise, in the 1980s, the idea that nations were "imagined communities" rather than social units with an ahistorical essence was widely taken up by scholars who sought to historicize and denaturalize the nation as a formation.[113] However, consistent with interwar sociology's incorporation of plant ecologists' theories of succession, Lind constructed human society in Hawai'i as a natural unit. In this way, plant ecologist Frederic Clements' idea of ecological succession proved useful to sociologists like Lind because it helped them address the parsing and use of space, "the economy," and problems related to racism in one framework. Ideas from plant ecology were used in the service of imagining a connected globe: "communities" connected by "the economy."

---

[112]Frederic Clements argued that groups of species living together were organized into units called communities. Overturning half a century of ecological doctrine, Henry Gleason argued in the 1950s that communities were constructs of human thought and that "in reality the distribution and behavior of every species were unbounded by the imagined holistic bonds to all the surrounding species." Ecologists in the United States generally shifted their opinions to reflect Gleason's view by the 1960s, which Michael G. Barbour calls a revolution in scientific opinion and rhetoric. See Barbour, "Ecological Fragmentation in the Fifties," in William Cronon, ed., *Uncommon Ground: Rethinking the Human Place in Nature* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1996 [1995]), 234.

[113]Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso, 1991 [1983]).

The ecological approach has been powerful as a political ideology because of its identification of group interaction as the mechanism of social change without acknowledging historically produced inequities in wealth, social mobility, and political power.[114] As such, the ideas elaborated under the human ecology framework as it was employed and elaborated at the University of Hawai'i, especially its explanations for social conditions in the islands and the social and emotional experiences associated with competition, succession, and assimilation, became imbedded in both academic and public discourse about the history and destiny of Hawai'i and its residents. Thus, colonialism and the consolidation of American political power in Hawai'i was naturalized and presented as inevitable.

[114]There is continuity here with social Darwinism: that people with power and resources have them because they have competed for them and won. This also mirrors celebratory rhetoric of American individualism and the notion that the United States is a meritocracy by suggesting that people with power and resources always have them because they have worked hard and are exceptional rather than starting from positions of privilege.

Conclusion

In the 1910s, American scientists announced that Hawai'i was the most racially and ethnically diverse place in the world. Because of its island geography and ethnic diversity, they saw it as a human laboratory revealing insights into race biology and race relations impossible to find elsewhere. Scientists working on race conducted physical anthropological research on racial traits and sociological studies of interracial marriage, and concluded that biological and cultural assimilation in Hawai'i was not only in motion, it was inevitable. They argued that race mixing was desirable because it improved and stabilized the population and that cultural assimilation, rather than structural change, economic justice, or expanded political participation, represented the fulfillment of American principles of equality. Their findings had special validity because they were the yield of laboratory conditions.

Perhaps most prevalent among the additional themes that emerge from the history of research on race and race mixing is the making of new racial ideologies during the interwar years. This is a corrective to the argument that scientists were "retreating" from scientific racism, which has obscured more than it has revealed about the development of racial thought in the sciences and in general. American scientists' debates about racial proximity and affiliation, one of the foci of chapter one, was about refining the boundaries of race as a category, not about retreating from the race concept. The racial ideologies under construction during these years, which have been hidden by the focus on scientific *racism*, are accessible when examined as part of the history of *racialism* in scientific and popular thought. While racism, because of the way it was defined in the 1930s as akin to racial prejudice, a psychological phenomenon manifesting as attitudes and feelings, has long connoted

individuals' discriminatory beliefs, racialism refers to a broader spectrum of essentialist beliefs about race. While understanding scientists' opinions and their political commitments relative to race is important, to place their research and arguments in broader historical perspective it is more important to understand what their ideas accomplished or authorized. Racialist arguments did an enormous amount of cultural work during these years. Arguing that mixing produced disharmonious results was racialist, and so was arguing that mixing produced good results. Qualitative judgment about race mixing was and is racialist.

Just as the "retreat" narrative has limited historians' understanding of interwar racial science, the existing literature has also tended to frame debates about race and culture and nature and nurture (environment) as dichotomous, in which figures such as Madison Grant and Franz Boas assumed extreme, dogmatic roles in favor of race/nature and culture/environment, respectively. The middle ground was enormous, however, and, has been poorly understood and not much analyzed. This dissertation illuminates some of that middle ground. The scientists profiled herein had a diversity of views and methods and were not extremists. For the most part, they were racial progressives in their historical context who attempted to answer extremely difficult questions, even if those questions were racialist and based on assumptions that were later discredited. While these scientists' conclusions were indeed a departure from overtly white supremacist research, it is notable that these politically centrist and left-of-center experts played a central role in the discursive operation of empire.

In focusing on how scientists such as Romanzo Adams and Andrew Lind naturalized historical events and processes, I have addressed how they framed American control of Hawai'i as a form of integration rather than colonization. For example, Hawai'i's ethnic

diversity was engineered, for the most part, by plantation owners, but social scientists celebrated it as a human experiment. American scientists' narratives rendered American settler colonialism in Hawai'i natural and inevitable during a period when the United States government had a supposedly internationalist, not imperial, agenda. Beginning with arguments by scientists such as Louis Sullivan, who argued that some race mixing was beneficial since it produced "hybrids" with more desirable traits than their "pure" parents, working in the tradition of University of Chicago sociologists who saw assimilation as both the process and result of race mixing, Romanzo Adams advanced total cultural assimilation and biological amalgamation as natural and desirable, bordering on idyllic. Historically, assimilation has been a subjugating project as much or more than it has been a form of inclusion. Melting into the pot, so to speak, while often celebrated as an inclusive, quintessentially American process, has been about eradicating certain forms of ethnicity that run counter to a universalist American identity; it has also meant the disappearance of indigenous peoples. For native and black people in particular, the historical erasures associated with assimilation have been necessary to obscure the circumstances under which people of African ancestry and native peoples were initially incorporated into the nation incompletely and against their will.

Regarding the experiences of nonacademic participants, this dissertation has addressed how a sample of Hawai'i residents understood the processes of racialization underway in the territory very differently from the sociology faculty at the University of Hawai'i. Although they did not create the racial hierarchy that they encountered when they or their immediate families arrived, the people whom Margaret Lam interviewed participated in the process of rearticulating the boundaries and meanings of race. Part of the process of

settler colonialism in Hawai'i has been producing a population of settlers – or people who identify as Americans – instead of more natives. Chapter four is a contribution to what needs to be a more rigorous examination of the historical specifics of this process. While Adams predicted that interracial marriage and reproduction would eventually produced a new "neo-Hawaiian" race, Lam's informants with Chinese and Hawaiian ancestry generally reported strong identification with one group, usually Chinese. The idea that race mixing helped lessen, minimize, or eradiate racial differences and do away with the concept of race itself has not been supported by the historical record.

While experts' accounts of Hawai'i served to educate university students and members of the general public, the knowledge produced about the largely nonwhite territorial population was but part of the knowledge about racial identity being produced and reproduced in Hawai'i during this period. The persistence and evolution of Hawaiian kinship and cultural practices in the face of an onslaught of cultural, legal, military, and population threats is primary in any discussion of the history of Hawai'i that centers and confronts the history of colonization in its various forms. Experts from the continent produced accounts of who Hawaiians and Asian migrants were, but Native Hawaiians, Asian migrants, and mixed race people produced and deployed cultural knowledge and forms of identity that sometimes resisted American experts' framing and at other times contributed to the rearticulation of racial categories. These experts' authority, granted to them by their institutions, where they reproduced their ideas, as well as their recognition as public intellectuals, gave them incredible power to write history, over which they claimed authority in contemporary discussions about the meanings of race and acculturation and the islands' readiness for statehood.

During the interwar period, the definition of race within academe became less clear, allowing for the elaboration and diversification of its explanatory power. It is true that some scientists began to question the biological bases for the race concept because of developments in research methods as well as personal distaste for racism, but scientists did not begin to reject the use of race in scientific research until well after World War II. The introduction of culture to discourse about the meanings of race made the race concept bigger and more complex and allowed for a more diverse vocabulary for talking about difference and, more specifically, inferiority. The setting in which there were so many terms in use – hybrid, hapa haole, part-Hawaiian, white-Hawaiian, Caucasian-Hawaiian, Chinese-Hawaiian, and so on – reveals how the messiness of the colonial context defied scientific logic. It was this context in which "culture" and even "nationality" were often used as synonyms for race rather than new, non-essentialist ways of understanding bodies and practices shaped by history. This phenomenon of using culture as a proxy for race continued into the mid-twentieth century and remains with us. The remaking of the meanings of race has been disguised as a transition away from the biological toward the socially constructed. The idea of race as cultural rather than biological did not do the work of undoing essentialist ideas about race, but rather created an ambiguity and kind of relativism that allowed race to function with even more flexibility.

Finally, the application of human ecology to Hawai'i was the lasting extension of scholars' naturalization of the colony's incorporation into both the United States and the global capitalist system. Race moved from a facet of natural history, as illustrated in Romanzo Adams' scholarship, to a factor in the ecology of a "developing" colony, which Andrew Lind treated as a natural system. That system was defined by competition, in which

racialized groups competed with each other for status, jobs, and other resources and forms of power. This framework naturalized wealth, opportunity, and social mobility as the prizes for successful competition. In the framework that Lind worked in, settler colonialism was a form of succession and colonialism itself was a stabilizing force. In many ways, Lind conflated the study of society and the study of the nation. The nation is not a natural unit, however. Lind's developing "island community" was an imagined community, in the parlance of Benedict Anderson, and was produced not by natural, ecological forces applicable to plants and humans alike, but largely by discourse. This might seem particularly evident given what nonacademic observers said about their lives in Hawai'i. While for Lind, individuals' experiences were irrelevant since his definition of community was modeled on plant communities, the testimony of Margaret Lam's informants reveal the constructedness of unity and community in Hawai'i and the significant disconnect between what university sociologists observed and predicted (and even hoped for) and what was happening on the ground.

Michel-Rolph Troulliot reminds us that "in vernacular use, history means both the facts of the matter and a narrative of those facts, both 'what happened' and 'what was said to have happened.' The first meaning places the emphasis on the sociohistorical process, the second on our knowledge of that process or on a story about that process."[1] This dissertation is not about race in Hawai'i. It is about social scientific thought in Hawai'i and, more specifically, what happened in racial science as it was done in Hawai'i in the 1920s and 1930s – what a group of American researchers said about Hawai'i's past, which they emphasized as a natural, racial history, and how they saw the past as predictive of the future.

[1]Michel-Rolph Trouillot, *Silencing the Past: Power and the Production of History* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1995), 2.

As they helped construct an assimilationist history of Hawai'i, the scholars profiled in this dissertation often blurred "is" and "ought," meaning that the line between what was evident and what they imagined for the territory were conflated. Parallel to how it has functioned in the continental United States, in colonial Hawai'i assimilationism was marshaled in the interest of statehood, a form of American nation building, and has helped perpetuate amnesia about America's founding and expansion as a settler society. Assimilationist discourse included arguments that racial mixing improved the colonial population, that Hawai'i was the United States' laboratory rather than its colony, that assimilation was both inevitable and the solution to racial problems, and that race relations played out in an ecological way. These arguments about Hawai'i's history make up "what was said to have happened" and underlie popular understandings of social relations in Hawai'i today. Making the politics of knowledge production in interwar Hawai'i more clear, as well as revealing the specifics of the content of racial science and its political and cultural work, is a necessary step toward accounting for "what happened."

Bibliography

Archival sources

SC-AMNH	Harry L. Shapiro Manuscript Collection (MSS S537), Special Collections, American Museum of Natural History, New York, NY
BPBM	Bernice Pauahi Bishop Museum Archives, Honolulu, Hawai'i
DAA-AMNH	Division of Anthropology Archives, American Museum of Natural History, New York, NY
NAA	National Anthropological Archives, Suitland, Maryland
RAC	Rockefeller Foundation Papers, Rockefeller Archive Center, Sleepy Hollow, NY
RASRL	Romanzo Adams Social Research Laboratory Records, Archives and Manuscripts, Hamilton Library, University of Hawaii at Mānoa, Honolulu, Hawai'i
SCRC-UC	Special Collections Research Center, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois

Unpublished sources

"Exhibit I (c) Europe as an Immigrant-Exporting Continent and the United States as an Immigrant-Receiving Nation, Hearings Before The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, House of Representatives, Sixty-Eighth Congress, First Session, March 8, 1924, Serial 5-A, Statement of Dr. Harry H. Laughlin," 1305.

U.S. Congress, Joint Committee on Hawaii, Transcript of Proceedings Had and Testimony Taken at the Statehood Hearings before the Congressional Committee in the Throne Room, Iolani Palace, 1937, 373. University of Hawai'i-Mānoa Hawaiians and Pacific Collection.

U.S. Congress, *100th Anniversary of the Overthrow of the Hawaiian Kingdom*, Public Law 103-150, 103d Cong., 1st Sess., 107 Stat 1510, S.J. Res. 19, November 23, 1993.

Published sources

Adams, Romanzo. *Interracial Marriage in Hawaii: A Study of the Mutually Conditioned Processes of Acculturation and Amalgamation.* New York: The MacMillan Company, 1937.

----------. "Statehood for Hawaii." *Social Process in Hawaii* 2 (May 1936): 4-6.

----------. "The Education and the Economic Outlook for the Boys of Hawaii: A Study in the Field of Race Relationships." Institute of Pacific Relations 2d Conference, Honolulu, 1927. Preliminary Paper Prepared for Second General Session, July 15-29, 1927. Honolulu: University of Hawaii, 1927.

----------. "Hawaii as a Racial Melting Pot." *Mid-Pacific Magazine* 32, no. 3 (Sept. 1926): 213-216.

----------. "Preface." In *The Peoples of Hawaii: A Statistical Study.* Honolulu: Institute for Pacific Relations, 1925.

Adams, Romanzo, T.M. Livesay, and E.H. Van Winkle. *The Peoples of Hawaii: A Statistical Study*. Honolulu: Institute of Pacific Relations, 1925.

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism.* London and New York: Verso, 1991 (1983).

Anderson, Warwick. "Ambiguities of Race: Science on the Reproductive Frontier of Australia and the Pacific between the Wars." *Australian Historical Studies* 40 (2009): 143-160.

----------. *Colonial Pathologies: American Tropical Medicine, Race, and Hygiene in the Philippines.* Durham: Duke University Press, 2006.

----------. *The Cultivation of Whiteness: Science, Health, and Racial Destiny in Australia.* Durham: Duke University Press, 2003.

"Anthropological Notes." *American Anthropologist* 22, no. 4 (Oct. – Dec., 1920): 392.

Arnold, David, ed. 1996. *Warm Climates and Western Medicine: The Emergence of Tropical Medicine.* Amsterdam and Atlanta, GA: Rodopi.

----------. *Colonizing the Body: State Medicine and Epidemic Disease in Nineteenth-Century India.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.

Ayala, César J. 1999. *American Sugar Kingdom: The Plantation Economy of the Spanish Caribbean, 1898-1934.* Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press.

Bacchilega, Cristina. *Legendary Hawai'i and the Politics of Place: Tradition, Translation, and Tourism*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007.

Barbour, Michael G. "Ecological Fragmentation in the Fifties." In William Cronon, ed. *Uncommon Ground: Rethinking the Human Place in Nature*. New York: W.W. Norton, 1996 [1995]: 233-255.

Barkan, Elazar. *The Retreat of Scientific Racism: Changing Concepts of Race in Britain and the United States between the World Wars*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Barr, Juliana. *Peace Came in the Form of a Woman: Indians and Spaniards in the Spanish Borderlands*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007.

Bay, Mia. *The White Image in the Black Mind: African-American Ideas about White People, 1830-1925*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Beaglehole, Ernest. *Some Modern Hawaiians*. Research Publications No. 19. Honolulu: University of Hawaii, 1937.

Benson, Keith R., Jane Maienschein, and Ronald Rainger, eds. *The Expansion of American Biology*. New Brunswick and London: Rutgers University Press, 1991.

Bieder, Robert E. *Science Encounters the Indian, 1820-1880: The Early Years of American Ethnology*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1986.

Bishop, S.E. *Why Are the Hawaiians Dying Out?* Read to the Honolulu Social Science Association, Nov. 1888.

Bix, Amy Sue. "Experiences and Voices of Eugenics Field-Workers: 'Women's Work' in Biology." *Social Studies of Science* 27, no. 4 (1997): 625-668.

Bravo, Michael T. "The Anti-Anthropology of Highlanders and Islanders." *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science* 29A, no. 3 (1996): 369-390.

Briggs, Laura. *Reproducing Empire: Race, Sex, Science, and U.S. Imperialism in Puerto Rico*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002.

Brockway, Lucile H. *Science and Colonial Expansion: The Role of the British Royal Botanic Gardens*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002 (1979).

Bryan, Edwin H. Jr. "The First Pan-Pacific Science Conference." *Bulletin of the Pan-Pacific Union* no. 15 (Jan. 1921). Honolulu: Published by the Union, 1921: 3-6. Reprinted from *The Friend*.

Bulmer, Martin. *The Chicago School of Sociology: Institutionalization, Diversity, and the Rise of Sociological Research*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1984.

Burba, Juliet. "'Whence Came the American Indians?': American Anthropologists and the Origins Question, 1880-1935." Ph.D. diss., University of Minnesota, 2006.

Calhoun, Craig, ed. *Sociology in America: A History.* Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2007.

Caspari, Rachel. "From Types to Populations: A Century of Race, Physical Anthropology, and the American Anthropological Association." *American Anthropologist* 105, no. 1 (March 2003): 65-76.

Choy, Catherine Ceniza. *Empire of Care: Nursing and Migration in Filipino American History.* Durham: Duke University Press, 2003.

John M. Cinnamon, "Missionary Expertise, Social Science, and the Uses of Ethnographic Knowledge in Colonial Gabon," *History in Africa* 33 (2006), 413–432

Condliffe, J.B., ed. *Problems of the Pacific: Proceedings of the Second Conference of the Institute of Pacific Relations, Honolulu, Hawaii, July 15 to 29, 1927.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1928.

Conant, Melvin. *Race Issues on the World Scene: A Report on the Conference on Race Relations in World Perspective, Honolulu, 1954.* Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1955.

Conn, Steven. *Museums and American Intellectual Life, 1876-1926.* Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1998.

Cott, Nancy F. *Public Vows: A History of Marriage and the Nation.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2000.

Crawford, David Livingston. *Paradox in Hawaii: An Examination of Industry and Education and the Paradox They Present.* Boston: The Stratford Company, 1933.

Cravens, Hamilton. "History of the Social Sciences." In Sally Gregory Kohlstedt and Margaret Rossiter, eds. *Osiris* 2nd Series, Vol. 1, *Historical Writing on American Science* (1985): 183-207.

Cravens, Hamilton, ed. *The Social Sciences Go to Washington: The Politics of Knowledge in the Postmodern Age.* New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2004.

Cronon, William, ed. *Uncommon Ground: Rethinking the Human Place in Nature.* New York: W.W. Norton, 1996 [1995].

Cross, Dean Wilber L. "Yale in Hawaii." *Mid-Pacific Magazine* 19, no. 3 (Mar., 1921), 249-251.

Crunden, Robert M. *Ministers of Reform: The Progressives' Achievement in American Civilization, 1889-1920*. New York: Basic Books, 1982.

Davenport, Charles B. and Morris Steggerda. *Race Crossing in Jamaica*. Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Institution of Washington, 1929.

Davenport, Charles B. and William K. Gregory. "Minute on the Death of Louis R. Sullivan." *Science* 62, no. 1617 (Dec. 25, 1925): 583.

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

Davis, F. James. *Who is Black?: One Nations' Definition*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1991.

Dawley, Alan. *Changing the World: American Progressives in War and Revolution*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003.

Degler, Carl N. *In Search of Human Nature: The Decline and Revival of Darwinism in American Social Thought*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991.

Deloria, Vine, Jr. *Red Earth, White Lies: Native Americans and the Myth of Scientific Fact*. Golden, CO: Fulcrum Publishing, 1997.

Dunn, Leslie C. *Heredity and Variation: Continuity and Change in the Living World*, (New York: The University Society, Inc., 1932).

----------. "An Anthropometric Study of Hawaiians of Pure and Mixed Blood, Based Upon Data Collected by Alfred M. Tozzer." *Papers of the Peabody Museum of American Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard University* 11, no. 3. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Peabody Museum, 1928: 89-211.

----------. "A Biological View of Race Mixture." In *The Trend of Our Civilization: Papers and Proceedings of the Nineteenth Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Society Held at Chicago, December 29-31, 1924, Volume XIX*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1925: 47-58.

----------. "Some Results of Race Mixture in Hawaii." In *Eugenics in Race and State, Volume II, Scientific Papers of the Second International Congress of Eugenics, Held at American Museum of Natural History, New York, September 22-28, 1921*. Baltimore: Williams & Wilkins Company, 1923: 109-124.

Eugenics in Race and State, Volume II, Scientific Papers of the Second International Congress of Eugenics, Held at American Museum of Natural History, New York, September 22-28, 1921. Baltimore: Williams & Wilkins Company, 1923.

Espiritu, Yen Le. *Asian American Panethnicity.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1992.

Farber, Paul Lawrence. *Mixing Races: From Scientific Racism to Modern Evolutionary Ideas.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2011.

----------. "Race-Mixing and Science in the United States." *Endeavor* 27, no. 4 (2003): 166-170.

----------. "Changes in Scientific Opinion on Race Mixing: The Impact of the Modern Synthesis." In Paul Farber and Hamilton Cravens, eds. *Race and Science: Scientific Challenges to Racism in Modern America.* Corvallis: Oregon State University Press, 2009: 130-151.

Farber, Paul and Hamilton Cravens. *Race and Science: Scientific Challenges to Racism in Modern America.* Corvallis: Oregon State University Press, 2009.

Frederickson, George. *Racism: A Short History.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002.

Fujikane, Candace and Jonathan Y. Okamura, ed. *Asian Settler Colonialism: From Local Governance to the Habits of Everyday Life in Hawai'i.* Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2008.

Fujikane, Candace. "Introduction: Asian Settler Colonialism in the U.S. Colony of Hawai'i." In Candace Fujikane and Jonathan Y. Okamura, eds. *Asian Settler Colonialism: From Local Governance to the Habits of Everyday Life in Hawai'i.* Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2008: 1-42.

Fulbeck, Kip. *Part Asian, 100% Hapa.* San Francisco: Chronicle Books, 2006.

Fields, Barbara. "Of Rogues and Geldings." *American Historical Review* 108, no. 5 (Dec. 2003): 1397-1405.

----------. "Whiteness, Racism, and Identity." *International Labor and Working-Class History* 60 (Fall 2001): 48-56.

Furner, Mary O. *Advocacy and Objectivity: A Crisis in the Professionalization of American Social Science, 1865-1905.* Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1975.

Garroutte, Eva Marie. "The Racial Formation of American Indians: Negotiating Legitimate Identities within Tribal and Federal Law." *American Indian Quarterly* 25, no. 2 (2001): 224-239.

Gaziano, Emanuel. "Ecological Metaphors as Scientific Boundary Work: Innovation and Authority in Interwar Sociology and Biology." *American Journal of Sociology* 191, no. 4 (Jan., 1996): 874-907.

Gerstle, Gary. *American Crucible: Race and Nation in the Twentieth Century.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001.

Gill, Lorin Tarr. "The Bernice P. Bishop Museum, Honolulu, Hawaii, U.S.A." *Paradise of the Pacific* (Dec. 1923): 70-84.

Glass, Bentley. "Geneticists Embattled: Their Stand against Rampant Eugenics and Racism in America during the 1920s and 1930s." *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 130, no. 1 (1986): 130-154.

Gooding-Williams, Robert, ed. *Reading Rodney King/Reading Urban Uprising.* New York: Routledge, 1993.

Melinda Gormley, "Scientific Discrimination and the Activist Scientist: L.C. Dunn and the Professionalization of Genetics and Human Genetics in the United States," *Journal of the History of Biology* 42 (2009), 48. (total pages 33-72)

----------. "Geneticist L.C. Dunn: Politics, Activism, and Community." Ph.D. diss., Oregon State University, 2007.

Gould, Stephen J. *The Mismeasure of Man.* New York: Norton, 1996 (1982).

Gregory, Herbert. "Race Relations in the Pacific: Introductory Remarks." In *Proceedings of the First Pan-Pacific Science Conference, Under the Auspices of the Pan Pacific Union, Honolulu, Hawaii, August 2 to 20, 1920: Part I.* Frederick Wood-Jones, Herbert E. Gregory, Alfred G. Mayor, and A.F. Judd, eds. Honolulu: Honolulu Star-Bulletin, 1921: 49-59.

Grimshaw, Patricia. *Paths of Duty: American Missionary Wives in Nineteenth-Century Hawaii.* Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1989.

Gulick, Sidney L. *Mixing the Races in Hawaii: A Study in the Coming Neo-American Race.* Honolulu: The Hawaiian Board Book Rooms, 1937.

----------. *Evolution of the Japanese: A Study of their Characteristics in Relation to the Principles of Social and Psychic Development.* New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1903.

Guterl, Matthew and Christine Skwiot. "Atlantic and Pacific Crossings: Race, Empire, and 'the Labor Problem.'" *Radical History Review* 91 (Winter 2005): 40-61.

Hacking, Ian. "How Should We Do the History of Statistics?" In Burchell, Graham, Colin Gordon, and Peter Miller, eds. *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991: 181-195.

Hagen, Joel E. "Organism and Environment: Frederick Clements's Vision of a Unified Physiological Ecology." In Ronald Rainger, Keith R. Benson, and Jane Maienschein,

eds. *The American Development of Biology.* New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1991 [1988]: 257-280.

Hall, Lisa Kahaleole. "'Hawaiian at Heart' and Other Fictions." *The Contemporary Pacific* 17, no. 2 (2005): 404-413.

Halualani, Rona Tamiko. *In the Name of Hawaiians: Native Identities and Cultural Politics.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2002.

Handy, E[dward] S[mith] C. "Chapter 1: Race," *Ancient Hawaiian Civilization: A Series of Lectures Delivered at the Kamehameha Schools*, 1933.

Haraway, Donna. "Universal Donors in a Vampire Culture: It's All in the Family: Biological Kinship Categories in the Twentieth-Century United States," in William Cronon., ed., *Uncommon Ground: Rethinking the Human Place in Nature* (New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1996 [1995]): 321-375.

----------. *Primate Visions: Gender, Race, and Nature in the World of Modern Science.* New York: Routledge, 1989.

Harris, Cheryl. "Whiteness as Property." *Harvard Law Review* 106, no. 8 (June 1993): 1710-1744.

Harvey, David. *The New Imperialism.* Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2003.

Haskell, Thomas L. *The Emergence of Professional Social Science: The American Social Science Association and the Nineteenth-Century Crisis of Authority.* Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1977.

"Science News: Hawaiian Racial Problems." *Science* 75, no. 1934 (Jan. 22, 1932): 8a-10a.

Herman, Ellen. *The Romance of American Psychology: Political Culture in the Age of Experts.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995.

Hinsley, Curtis M., Jr. *Savages and Scientists: The Smithsonian Institution and the Development of American Anthropology, 1846-1910.* Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1981.

----------. "Anthropology as Science and Politics: The Dilemmas of the Bureau of American Ethnology, 1879 to 1904." In Walter Goldschmidt, ed. The *Uses of Anthropology.* Washington, D.C.: American Anthropological Association, 1979: 15-32.

"History of the Romanzo Adams Social Research Laboratory (RASRL)." University Archives. Hamilton Library. University of Hawai'i. of Hawai'i. http://libweb.hawaii.edu/libdept/archives/univarch/rasrl/history.htm. Last accessed: April 19, 2012.

Hoffman, Beatrix. "Scientific Racism, Insurance, and Opposition to the Welfare State: Frederick L. Hoffman's Transatlantic Journey." *Journal of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era* 2, no. 2 (Apr. 2003): 150-190.

Hoffman, Frederick L. "Race Amalgamation in Hawaii." In *Eugenics in Race and State, Volume II, Scientific Papers of the Second International Congress of Eugenics, Held at American Museum of Natural History, New York, September 22-28, 1921.* Baltimore: Williams & Wilkins Company, 1923: 90-108.

Hollinger, David A. "Amalgamation and Hypodescent: The Question of Ethnoracial Mixture in the History of the United States." *The American Historical Review* 108, no. 5 (Dec., 2003): 1363-1390.

Hooton, Earnest A. "Development and Correlation of Research in Physical Anthropology at Harvard University." *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 75, no. 6 (1935): 499-516.

----------. "Progress in the Study of Race Mixtures with Special Reference to Work Carried on at Harvard University." *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 65, no. 4 (1926): 312-325.

----------. "Louis Robert Sullivan." *American Anthropologist* 27, no. 2 (Apr. 1925): 357-358.

Howells, W.W. Review of *Migration and Environment*, by Harry L. Shapiro. *American Anthropologist* 41, no. 4 (Oct.-Dec. 1939): 635-638.

Iverson, Margot L. "Blood Types: A History of Genetic Studies of Native Americans, 1920-1955." Ph.D. diss., University of Minnesota, 2007.

Jackson, John P., Jr. "*Argumentum ad Hominem* in the Science of Race," *Argumentation and Advocacy* 43 (Summer 2006): 13-28.

----------. *Social Scientists for Social Justice: Making the Case against Segregation.* New York: New York University Press, 2001.

Jackson, John P., Jr. and Nadine M. Weidman. *Race, Racism, and Science: Social Impact and Interaction.* New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2006 [2004].

Jackson, John P., Jr. and Andrew W. Winston. "The Last Repatriationist: The Career of Earnest Sevier Cox." In Paul Farber and Hamilton Cravens, eds. *Race and Science: Scientific Challenges to Racism in Modern America.* Corvallis: Oregon State University Press, 2009: 58-80.

Jacobson, Matthew Frye. *Roots Too: White Ethnic Revival in Civil Rights America.* Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 2006.

----------. *Barbarian Virtues: The United States Encounters Foreign Peoples at Home and Abroad, 1876-1917*. New York: Hill and Wang, 2000.

----------. *Whiteness of a Different Color: European Immigrants and the Alchemy of Race*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998.

Jones, Donald F., ed. "Transactions and General Addresses." In *Proceedings of the Sixth International Congress of Genetics, Vol. 1*. Menasha, WI: Brooklyn Botanic Garden of Brooklyn, New York, 1932.

Jung, Moon-Kie. *Reworking Race: The Making of Hawaii's Interracial Labor Movement*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2006.

Kameʻeleihiwa, Lilikalā. *Native Land and Foreign Desires: Pehea La E Pono Ai?* Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press, 1992.

Kamins, Robert M. and Robert E. Potter. *Malamalama: A History of the University of Hawaiʻi*. Honolulu: University of Hawaiʻi Press, 1998.

Kaplan, Amy. *The Anarchy of Empire in the Making of U.S. Culture*. Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 2002.

Kauanui, J. Kēhaulani. *Hawaiian Blood: Colonialism and the Politics of Sovereignty and Indigeneity*. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2008.

----------. "'For Get' Hawaiian Entitlement: Configurations of Land, 'Blood,' and Americanization in the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1921." *Social Text* 59, vol. 17, no. 2 (Summer 1999): 123-144.

----------. "Off-Island Hawaiians 'Making' Ourselves at 'Home': A [Gendered] Contradiction in Terms?" *Women's Studies International Forum* 21, no. 6 (1998): 681-693.

Kelley, Robin D.G. *Freedom Dreams: The Black Radical Imagination*. Boston: Beacon Press, 2002.

Kingsland, Sharon E. *Modeling Nature: Episodes in the History of Population Ecology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995 [1985].

----------. "Toward a Natural History of the Human Psyche: Charles Manning Child, Charles Judson Herrick, and the Dynamic View of the Individual at the University of Chicago." In Keith R. Benson, Jane Maienschein, and Ronald Rainger, eds. *The Expansion of American Biology*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1991: 195-230.

Kirk-Kuwaye, Christine. "Seeing (for) Ourselves: The Contexts of Louis R. Sullivan's Photographs of Hawaiians." *History of Photograhy* 25, no. 3 (Autumn 2001): 269-278.

Kline, Wendy. 2001. *Building a Better Race: Gender, Sexuality, and Eugenics from the Turn of the Century to the Baby Boom.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Klein, Christina. *Cold War Orientalism: Asia in the Middlebrow Imagination, 1945-1961*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003.

Kohler, Robert E. *Landscapes and Labscapes: Exploring the Lab-Field Border in Biology.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002.

Kramer, Paul A. *The Blood of Government: Race, Empire, the United States, & the Philippines.* Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2006.

----------. "Empires, Exceptions, and Anglo-Saxons: Race and Rule between the British and United States Empires, 1880-1910." *Journal of American History* 88, no. 4 (March 2002): 1315-1353.

Kroeber, A.L. "Observations on the Anthropology of Hawaii." *American Anthropologist* 23, no. 2 (Apr.-Jun. 1921): 129-137.

Krogman, Wilton Marion. "[untitled]." *American Sociological Review* 4, no. 5 (Oct. 1939): 749-750.

Kuklick, Henrika, ed. *A New History of Anthropology.* Malden, MA and Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing, 2008.

----------."The Color Blue: From Research in the Torres Strait to an Ecology of Human Behavior," in Roy MacLeod and Philip F. Rehbock, eds. *Darwin's Laboratory: Evolutionary Theory and Natural History in the Pacific.* Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1994: 339-365.

----------. "The Sins of the Fathers: British Anthropology and African Colonial Administration." In Robert Alun Jones, ed. *Research in Sociology of Knowledge, Sciences and Art: An Annual Compilation of Research.* Vol. 1. Greenwich, Connecticut: Jai Press, Inc., 1978: 93-119.

Kuykendall, Ralph S. and A. Grove Day. *Hawaii: A History, From Polynesian Kingdom to American State*. Rev. edition. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1961.

----------. *Hawaii: A History, From Polynesian Kingdom to American Commonwealth.* New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1948.

Lai, Kum Pui. "Diagnosing Social Processes in Hawaii (Forward)." *Social Process in Hawaii* (May 1935): 1.

Lam, Margaret M. "Fashion: Its Role in Hawaii." *Sociology and Social Research* 23, no. 1 (Sept.-Oct., 1938): 54-61.

----------. "Racial Myth and Family-Tradition Worship among the Part-Hawaiians." *Social Forces* 14, no. 3 (Mar. 1936): 405-409.

----------. "Intermarriage in Hawaii: A Case Study." *Sociology and Social Research* 17, no. 2 (Nov.-Dec., 1932): 159-166.

----------. "Six Generations of Race Mixture in Hawaii." Master's thesis, University of Hawai'i, 1932.

Laurent, John. "Varieties of Social Darwinism in Australia, Japan, and Hawaii, 1883-1921," in ed. Roy MacLeod and Philip F. Rehbock, *Darwin's Laboratory: Evolutionary Theory and Natural History in the Pacific* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1994): 474-510.

Lee, Erika. *At America's Gates: Chinese Immigration During the Exclusion Era, 1882-1943*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2003.

Lemire, Elise. *"Miscegenation": Making Race in America*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2002.

"Letters to the editor," *The American Journal of Sociology* 44, no. 5 (Mar., 1939): 722-729.

Lind, Andrew W.. ed. *Race Relations in World Perspective: Papers Read at the Conference on Race Relations in World Perspective, Honolulu, 1954*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1955.

----------. *An Island Community: Ecological Succession in Hawaii*. New York: Greenwood Press, 1938.

----------. "Economic Success and Racial Invasion in Hawaii." Ph.D. diss., University of Chicago, 1931.

Lorden, Doris. "The Chinese-Hawaiian Family." *The American Journal of Sociology* 40, no. 4 (Jan., 1935): 453-463.

Love, Eric T.L. *Race Over Empire: Racism and U.S. Imperialism, 1865-1900*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004.

Lowe, Lisa. *Immigrant Acts: On Asian American Cultural Politics*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1996.

MacCaughey, Vaughan. "Race Mixture in Hawaii." *Journal of Heredity* 10 (1919): 41-47; 90-95.

Nancy MacLean. *Behind the Mask of Chivalry: The Making of the Second Ku Klux Klan.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994.

MacLeod, Roy, ed. *Nature and Empire: Science and the Colonial Enterprise. Osiris* 15. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.

MacLeod, Roy and Philip F. Rehbock, eds. *Darwin's Laboratory: Evolutionary Theory and Natural History in the Pacific.* Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1994.

----------. *Nature in Its Greatest Extent: Western Science in the Pacific.* Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1988.

Marks, Jonathan. "Race Across the Physical-Cultural Divide in American Anthropology." In Henrika Kukick, ed. *A New History of Anthropology.* Malden, MA and Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing, 2008: 242-258.

Matthews, Fred H. *Quest for an American Sociology: Robert E. Park and the Chicago School.* Montreal and London: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1977.

McKenzie, Roderick D. "The Ecological Approach to the Study of the Human Community," in Robert E. Park, Ernest W. Burgess, and Roderick D. McKenzie, eds., *The City* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1925), 63-79.

McKenzie, Roderick D. "The Ecological Approach to the Study of the Human Community." *The American Journal of Sociology* 30, no. 3 (Nov., 1924): 287-301.

Merry, Sally Engle. *Colonizing Hawaii: The Cultural Power of Law.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000.

Miles, Tiya. *Ties That Bind: The Story of an Afro-Cherokee Family in Slavery and Freedom.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005.

Michener, James. *Hawaii.* New York: Random House, 1959.

Mitchell, Timothy. *Rule of Experts: Egypt, Techno-Politics, Modernity.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002.

Mitman, Gregg. *The State of Nature: Ecology, Community, and American Social Thought, 1900-1950.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1992.

Molina, Natalia. *Fit to Be Citizens?: Public Health and Race in Los Angeles, 1879-1939.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006.

Murdoch, Katharine and Louis R. Sullivan. "A Contribution to the Study of Mental and Physical Measurements in Normal Children." *American Physical Education Review* 28, no. 7 (Sept. 1923): 328-330.

Myrdal, Gunnar. *An American Dilemma: The Negro Problem and Modern Democracy.* New York: Harper, 1944.

O'Brien, Jean M. *Firsting and Lasting: Writing Indians Out of Existence in New England.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2010.

Okamura, Jonathan Y. *Ethnicity and Inequality in Hawai'i.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2008.

----------. "Why There Are No Asian Americans in Hawai'i: The Continuing Significance of Local Identity," *Social Process in Hawaii* 35: 161-78.

Okihiro, Gary. *Cane Fires: The Anti-Japanese Movement in Hawaii, 1845-1945.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1991.

Omi, Michael and Howard Winant. *Racial Formation in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1990s.* Second edition. New York and London: Routledge, 1994.

Osborn, Henry Fairfield. "Address of Welcome." In *Eugenics, Genetics and the Family: Second International Eugenics Congress.* Vol. 1. Baltimore, Williams and Wilkins Co, 1923.

----------."Scientific Work in the Hawaiian Islands." *Science* 51, no. 1329 (Jun. 18, 1920): 613-614.

Osborne, Michael A. *Nature, the Exotic, and the Science of French Colonialism.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1994.

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

Ostler, Jeffrey. *The Plains Sioux and U.S. Colonialism from Lewis and Clark to Wounded Knee.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Park, Robert E. "Introduction." In Romanzo Adams, *Interracial Marriage in Hawaii: A Study of the Mutually Conditioned Processes of Acculturation and Amalgamation.* New York: The MacMillan Company, 1937: vii-xiv.

----------. "Dominance: The Concepts, Its Origin and Natural History." In *Human Communities: The City and Human Ecology, Collected Papers of Robert Ezra Park, vol. 2.* New York: Free Press, 1952: 159-164.

----------. "The University and the Community of Races." *Pacific Affairs* 5, no. 8 (Aug. 1932): 695-703.

----------. "Racial Assimilation in Secondary Groups with Particular Reference to the Negro." *The American Journal of Sociology* 19, no. 5 (March 1914): 606-623.

Park, Robert E. and Ernest W. Burgess. *Introduction to the Science of Sociology.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1921 (1924, 1969).

Pascoe, Peggy. *What Comes Naturally: Miscegenation Law and the Making of Race in America.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

----------. "Miscegenation Law, Court Cases, and Ideologies of 'Race.'" In Martha E. Hodes, ed. *Sex, Love, Race: Crossing Boundaries in North American History.* New York: New York University Press, 1999.

----------. "Miscegenation Law and Ideologies of 'Race' in Twentieth-Century America." *Journal of American History* 83, no. 1 (June 1996): 44-69.

Paul, Diane B. *Controlling Human Heredity: 1865 to the Present.* Amherst, N.Y.: Humanity Books, 1998.

Pauly, Philip J. *Biologists and the Promise of American Life: From Meriwether Lewis to Alfred Kinsey.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000.

----------. "Summer Resort and Scientific Discipline: Woods Hole and the Structure of American Biology." In *The American Development of Biology.* Ronald Rainger, Keith R. Benson, and Jane Maienschein, eds. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1988: 121-150.

Pearl, Raymond. *Studies in Human Biology.* Baltimore: Williams and Wilkins Company, 1924.

Persons, Stow. *Ethnic Studies at Chicago, 1905-45.* Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1987.

Porter, Theodore M. *Trust in Numbers: The Pursuit of Objectivity in Science and Public Life.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995.

----------. *The Rise of Statistical Thinking, 1820-1900.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986.

Porteus, Stanley D. *A Century of Social Thinking in Hawaii.* Palo Alto: Pacific Books for the Hawaiian Historical Society, 1962.

----------. *Calabashes and Kings: An Introduction to Hawaii.* Palo Alto: Pacific Books, 1945.

----------. *Primitive Intelligence and Environment.* New York: The MacMillan Company, 1937.

Porteus, Stanley D. and Marjorie E. Babock. *Temperament and Race.* Boston: The Gorham Press, 1926.

Pratt, Mary Louise. *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation.* London: Routledge, 1992.

Provine, William B. "Geneticists and the Biology of Race Crossing." *Science* 182, no. 4114 (1973): 790-796.

Pukui, Mary Kawena and Samuel E. Elbert. *Hawaiian Dictionary: Hawaiian-English, English-Hawaiian, Revised and Enlarged Edition.* Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1986.

Pyenson, Lewis. 1993. *Civilizing Mission: Exact Sciences and French Overseas Expansion, 1830-1940.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

----------. 1985. *Cultural Imperialism and Exact Sciences: German Expansion Overseas, 1900-1930.* New York: Peter Lang.

R.P. Review of *Migration and Environment*, by Harry L. Shapiro. *The Geographical Journal* 94, no. 1 (Jul. 1939): 84-85.

Rafael, Vicente L. *White Love and Other Events in Filipino History.* Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2000.

Rainger, Ronald, Keith R. Benson, and Jane Maienschein, eds. *The American Development of Biology.* New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1988, 1991.

"Recommendations for Anthropological Research in Polynesia Prepared Under the Direction of the Section of Anthropology." In *Proceedings of the First Pan-Pacific Science Conference, Under the Auspices of the Pan Pacific Union, Honolulu, Hawaii, August 2 to 20, 1920: Part I.* Honolulu: Honolulu Star-Bulletin, 1921.

Rehbock, Philip F. "Organizing Pacific Science: Local and International Origins of the Pacific Science Association." In Roy MacLeod and Philip F. Rehbock, eds. *Nature in Its Greatest Extent: Western Science in the Pacific.* Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1988: 195-221.

"Report of the Director for 1922." *Bernice P. Bishop Museum – Bulletin.* Honolulu: Bishop Museum, 1922: 5-24.

Reuter, E.B., ed. *Race and Culture Contacts.* New York and London: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1934.

Reuter, Edward Byron. "Review of *An Island Community*," *The American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 44, No. 3 (Nov., 1938), 459-462.

----------. "The Relation of Biology and Sociology," *American Journal of Sociology* Vol. 32, No. 5 (Mar., 1927), 705-718.

Rosa, John Chock. "The Coming of the Neo-Hawaiian American Race": Nationalism and Metaphors of the Melting Pot in Popular Accounts of Mixed-Race Individuals." In Theresa Williams-Leon and Cynthia L. Nakashima, eds. *The Sum of Our Parts: Mixed Heritage Asian Americans*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2001: 49-55.

Rosa, John P. "Local Story: The Massie Case Narrative and the Cultural Production of Local Identity in Hawai'i." *Amerasia Journal* 26, no. 2 (2000): 93-115.

Rose, Roger G. *A Museum to Instruct and Delight: William T. Brigham and the Founding of Bernice Pauahi Bishop Museum*. Bernice P. Bishop Museum Special Publication 68. Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press, 1980.

Ross, Dorothy. *The Origins of American Social Science*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Ross, H.R. "Review: 150." *Man* 40 (Aug. 1940), 127.

Rossiter, Margaret W. *Women Scientists in America: Struggles and Strategies to 1940*. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1982.

Roucek, Joseph S. "Japanese Migrants in Hawaii." *Geographical Review* 29, no. 3 (Jul. 1939): 516.

Rumore, Gina. "A Natural Laboratory, A National Monument: Carving Out a Place for Science in Glacier Bay, Alaska, 1879-1959." Ph.D. diss., University of Minnesota, 2009.

Rydell, Robert W. 1984. *All the World's A Fair: Visions of Empire at American International Expositions, 1876-1916*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Sahlins, Marshall. *How "Natives" Think about Captain Cook, for Example*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995).

Sanderson, Dwight. "Interracial Marriage in Hawaii by Romanzo Adams." *American Journal of Psychology* 51, no. 2 (Apr. 1938): 449.

Saranillio, Dean Itsuji. "Seeing Conquest: Colliding Histories and the Cultural Politics of Hawai'i Statehood." Ph.D. diss., University of Michigan, 2009.

Saunt, Claudio. *Black, White, and Indian: Race and the Unmaking of an American Family.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

"Science News." *Science* n.s. 66, no. 1708 (Sept. 23, 1927): x.

Shapiro, Harry L. *Race Mixture.* Paris: UNESCO, 1953.

----------. "The Responsibility of the Anthropologist." *Science* 109, no. 2831 (Apr. 1, 1949): 323-326.

----------. *Migration and Environment: A Study of the Physical Characteristics of the Japanese Immigrants to Hawaii and the Effects of Environment on their Descendents.* London and New York: Oxford University Press, 1939.

----------. "Quality in Human Populations." *The Scientific Monthly* 45, no. 2 (Aug. 1937): 109-118.

----------. "Race Mixture in Hawaii: The Story of the Polyglot Inhabitants of Hawaii, with a Discussion of a Few of the Resulting Population Problems." *Natural History* 30, no. 1 (1931): 31-48.

----------. "Descendents of the Mutineers of the Bounty." *Memoirs of the Bernice P. Bishop Museum* 11, no. 1 (1929): 3-106.

Shapiro, Warren. "Some Implications of Clark Wissler's Race Theory." *Mankind* 15, no. 1 (Apr. 1985): 1-17.

Sheets-Pyenson, Susan. *Cathedrals of Science: The Development of Colonial Natural History Museums during the Late Nineteenth Century.* Kingston and Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1988.

Shepard, Paul. "Whatever Happened to Human Biology?" *BioScience* 17, no. 12 (Dec., 1967): 891-894, 911.

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

Singh, Nikhil. *Black is a Country: Race and the Unfinished Struggle for Democracy.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004.

Smedley, Audrey. *Race in North America: Origin and Evolution of a Worldview.* Boulder: Westview Press, 2007.

Smith, Mark M. *How Race is Made: Slavery, Segregation, and the Senses.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006.

Smith, William Carlson. *Americans in Progress: A Study of Our Citizens of Oriental Ancestry.* Ann Arbor, Michigan: Edwards Brothers, Inc., 1937.

----------. "The Hybrid in Hawaii as a Marginal Man." *The American Journal of Sociology* 39, no. 4 (1934): 459-468.

Smith, Linda Tuhiwai. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples.* London and New York: Zed Books, 1999.

Spear, Jennifer. "Colonial Intimacies: Legislating Sex in French Louisiana." *The William and Mary Quarterly* 60, no. 1 (2003): 75-98.

Spencer, Frank. "The Rise of Academic Physical Anthropology in the United States (1880-1980): A Historical Overview." *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* 56 (1981): 353-364.

Spiro, Jonathan P. "Nordic vs. anti-Nordic: the Galton Society and the American Anthropological Association." *Patterns of Prejudice* 36, no. 1 (2002): 35-48.

Stannard, David E. *Honor Killing: Race, Rape, and Clarence Darrow's Spectacular Last Case.* New York: Penguin Books, 2005.

----------. "Honoring Racism: The Professional Life and Reputation of Stanley D. Porteus." *Social Process in Hawai'i* 39 (1999): 85-125.

----------. *Before the Horror The Population of Hawai'i on the Eve of Western Contact.* Honolulu: Social Science Research Institute, 1989.

Stepan, Nancy Leys. *Picturing Tropical Nature.* London: Reaktion Books, 2001.

----------. *"The Hour of Eugenics": Race, Gender, and Nation in Latin America.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1996.

Stern, Alexandra Minna. *Eugenic Nation: Faults and Frontiers of Better Breeding in Modern America.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005.

Stocking, George W., Jr. "The Turn-of-the-Century Concept of Race." *Modernism/Modernity* 1, no. 1 (1994): 4-16.

----------. *The Ethnographer's Magic and Other Essays in the History of Anthropology.* Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1992 [1990].

----------. *Colonial Situations: Essays on the Contextualization of Ethnographic Knowledge*, ed. George W. Stocking, Jr., History of Anthropology series, Vol. 7, Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1991.

----------. *Romantic Motives: Essays on Anthropological Sensibility.* History of Anthropology, Vol. 6. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1989.

----------. *Bones, Bodies, Behavior: Essays on Biological Anthropology.* History of Anthropology, Vol. 5. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1988.

----------. *The Shaping of American Anthropology, 1883-1911: A Franz Boas Reader.* New York: Basic Books, 1974.

----------. *Race, Culture, and Evolution: Essays in the History of Anthropology.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968.

Stoler, Ann Laura. *Along the Archival Grain: Epistemic Anxieties and Colonial Common Sense.* Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2009.

----------. *Carnal Knowledge and Imperial Power: Race and the Intimate in Colonial Rule.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002.

----------. "Tense and Tender Ties: The Politics of Comparison in North American History and (Post) Colonial Studies." *Journal of American History* 88, no. 3 (2001): 829-865.

----------. *Race and the Education of Desire: Foucault's* History of Sexuality *and the Colonial Order of Things.* Durham and London: Duke University Press, 1995.

Striffler, Steve and Mark Moberg, eds. *Banana Wars: Power, Production, and History in the Americas.* Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2003.

Sugrue, Thomas J. *The Origins of the Urban Crisis: Race and Inequality in Postwar Detroit.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996.

Sullivan, Louis R. "Observations on Hawaiian Somatology." Prepared for publication by Clark Wissler. *Memoirs of the Bernice P. Bishop Museum* 9, no. 4, Bayard Dominick Expedition Publication Number 13. Honolulu: Published by the Museum, 1927.

----------. "Race Types in Polynesia." *American Anthropologist* 26, no. 1 (1924): 22-26.

----------. "New Light on the Races of Polynesia." *Asia.* Jan. 1923: 17-20.

----------. "The 'Blond' Eskimo – A Question of Method." *American Anthropologist* 24, no. 2 (Apr.-Jun., 1922): 225-228.

----------. "The Status of Physical Anthropology in Polynesia." In *Proceedings of the First Pan-Pacific Science Conference, Proceedings of the First Pan-Pacific Science Conference, Under the Auspices of the Pan Pacific Union, Honolulu, Hawaii, August 2 to 20, 1920: Part I.* Honolulu: Honolulu Star-Bulletin, 1921: 63-69.

----------. "The Fossa Pharyngea in American Indian Crania." *American Anthropologist* 22, no. 3 (July-Sept., 1920): 237-243.

----------. *Anthropometry of the Siouan Tribes.* Anthropological Papers, American Museum of Natural History 23, Part 3, 1920.

----------. "Growth of the Nasal Bridge in Children." *American Anthropologist* 19, no. 3 (1917): 406-409.

----------. "Variations in the Glenoid Fossae." *American Anthropologist* 19, no. 1 (1917): 19-23.

Takaki, Ronald. *Pau Hana: Plantation Life and Labor in Hawaii, 1835-1920.* Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1983.

Tengan, Ty P. Kāwika. *Native Men Remade: Gender and Nation in Contemporary Hawai'i.* Durham: Duke University Press, 2008.

Teslow, Tracy Lang. "Representing Race to the Public: Anthropology in Interwar American Natural History Museums." Ph.D. diss., University of Chicago, 2002.

Thomas, David Hurst. *Skull Wars: Kennewick Man, Archaeology, and the Battle for Native American Identity.* New York: Basic Books, 2000.

Tilley, Helen. *Africa as a Living Laboratory: Empire, Development, and the Problem of Scientific Knowledge, 1870-1950.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011.

Toy, Eckard. "Whose Frontier? The Survey of Race Relations on the Pacific Cost in the 1920s." *Oregon Historical Quarterly* 107, no. 1 (2006): 36-63.

Tozzer, Alfred. "The Anthropology of the Hawaiian Race." In *Proceedings of the First Pan-Pacific Science Conference, Under the Auspices of the Pan Pacific Union, Honolulu, Hawaii, August 2 to 20, 1920: Part I.* Honolulu: Honolulu Star-Bulletin, 1921: 70-74.

Trask, Haunani-Kay. "Settlers of Color and 'Immigrant' Hegemony: 'Locals' in Hawai'i." In *Asian Settler Colonialism: From Local Governance to the Habits of Everyday Life in Hawai'i,* edited by Candace Fujikane and Jonathan Y. Okamura, 45-65. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2008.

----------. *From a Native Daughter: Colonialism and Sovereignty in Hawai'i.* Monroe, Maine: Common Courage Press, 1993.

Troulliot, Michel-Rolph. *Silencing the Past: Power and the Production of History.* Boston: Beacon Press, 1995.

Turner, Ralph H., ed. *Robert E. Park on Social Control and Collective Behavior: Selected Papers.* Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1967.

West, Michael Rudolph. *The Education of Booker T. Washington: American Democracy and the Idea of Race Relations.* New York: Columbia University Press, 2006.

White, Donald W. "History and American Internationalism: The Formulation from the Past after World War II." *Pacific Historical Review* 58, no. 2 (May 1989): 145-172.

Williams, William Appleman. *Empire as a Way of Life: As Essay on the Causes and Character of America's Present Predicament Along with a Few Thoughts About an Alternative.* Brooklyn: Ig publishing, 1980.

Wissler, Clark. "Man in the Pacific." In *Proceedings of the First Pan-Pacific Science Conference, Under the Auspices of the Pan Pacific Union, Honolulu, Hawaii, August 2 to 20, 1920: Part I.* Honolulu: Honolulu Star-Bulletin, 1921: 53-59.

Wolfe, Patrick. *Settler Colonialism and the Transformation of Anthropology: The Politics and Poetics of an Ethnographic Event.* London: Cassell, 1999.

Wolff, Megan J. "The Myth of the Actuary: Life Insurance and Frederick L. Hoffman's *Race Traits and Tendencies of the American Negro.*" *Public Health Reports* 121 (2006): 84-91.

Yu, Henry. "Tiger Woods Is Not the End of History: Or, Why Sex across the Color Line Won't Save Us All." *The American Historical Review* 108, no. 5 (Dec., 2003): 1406-1414.

----------. *Thinking Orientals: Migration, Contact, and Exoticism in Modern America.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

----------. "Mixing Bodies and Cultures: The Meaning of America's Fascination with Sex between 'Orientals' and 'Whites.'" In Martha Hodes, ed. *Sex, Love, Race: Crossing Boundaries in North American History.* New York: New York University Press, 1998: 444-463.

Zangwill, Israel. *The Melting Pot: Drama in Four Acts.* New York: Macmillan, 1909.