

【論 説】

Early Tensions between the United States and Japan over Hawai'i

Tokumitsu Shibata

Contents

Introduction

Hawaiian intention to be independent

The coup d'état of 1893 and the conspiracies by the Americans

The first tension brought by the Americans

Conclusion

Introduction

The purpose of this research paper is to clarify that American ambition and conspiracies to overthrow the Hawaiian monarchy and annex Hawai'i promoted tension between the U.S. and Japan over the islands around the time of the coup d'état of 1893, while powers had also attempted to gain the islands. How the U.S. and Japan provided the tension over the islands being related with the native Hawaiians will be examined in this paper. It is also argued that U.S. territorial, economic, cultural, and military imperialism surpassing Japan's economic and cultural imperialism over the islands helped the rise of rivalry between the two countries and that it was the first clear conflict between the U.S. and Japan through those imperialism.¹⁾ In addition, it can probably be said that it is a natural course attempting to acquire the islands to promote national interests geopolitically.

This paper is based on a viewpoint that the period of the McKinley

Early Tensions between the United States and Japan over Hawai'i (Shibata)

administration was the fourth major turning point of Japanese-American relations from friends to rivalries for each other, up to the end of the second World War.²⁾ The further explanation about the viewpoint is offered in "The American View of the History of Japanese-American Relations during the McKinley Administration" and "Japanese-American Relations during the McKinley Administration: An Overview of the Literature," the previous work by the author of this paper.³⁾

Before examining the role of the McKinley administration in the history of Japanese-American relations, it is necessary to recognize the background to the clash during the administration and to define U.S. and Japan's actions and their relations over the islands focusing on history of the Hawaiian Islands. In those previous work by the author of this paper, the previous studies on U.S. foreign policy, Japan's foreign policy, and affairs between them were reviewed. As the third step, the literature of the tension between two countries around the time of the coup d'état of 1893 will be reviewed and the tension will be analyzed in this paper, focusing on Hawaiian foreign relations — an outline of Hawaiian foreign policy, Hawaiian relations with the U.S., and Hawaiian relations with Japan.

In terms of former studies of this theme, for example, Ralph Kuykendall, the author of *the Hawaiian Kingdom* — comprehensive books of a Hawaiian history up to the end of the kingdom—, Gavan Daws, William Russ, and others apply the word "revolution" of the coup d'état of 1893 providing their perspectives.⁴⁾ Daws even provides a negative view about Lili'uokalani, the last monarch, and notes that even the native Hawaiians did not decide whether Hawai'i should be annexed by the U.S.⁵⁾ However, as Ruth Tabrah, Tom Coffman, James Haley, and others recognize, the incident was a coup d'état but not revolution while the native Hawaiians attempted to maintain their monarchy and independence, and this viewpoint will be reviewed and highlighted in this paper.⁶⁾ In addition,

it is known that so-called the Apology Resolution (Public Law 103-105) was adopted in the U.S. Congress in 1993.

Conspiracies by Americans to annex the islands will also be emphasized here, rather than that the native Hawaiians wished to be annexed by the U.S. William Morgan, in *Pacific Gibraltar: U.S.-Japanese Rivalry over the Annexation of Hawai'i, 1885-1898*, claims that the crisis of 1897 and the Japanese immigration issues promoted the annexation expressing the clash “produced the 1897 annexation treaty.”⁷⁾ Probably, Morgan’s perspective cannot be denied. However, it was not the primary cause, and growing Japanese immigration predated 1897. Moreover, it was originally the policy of Kalākaua, the sixth crown to accept more Japanese immigrants.

In this paper, it will be clarified that American ambition and conspiracies to acquire the Hawaiian Islands promoted tension between the U.S. and Japan around the time of the coup d’état of 1893.

Hawaiian intention to be independent

In this section, the historical background of Hawai'i will be reviewed. For almost a century, the native Hawaiians and their kingdom had pursued ways to protect its independence. For about eight decades, however, European powers and the U.S. had tackled to obtain the Hawaiian Islands, with Russia first exposing its interest to do so in the 1810s. Britain and France attempted in the 1840s, and the U.S. eventually joined the competition to acquire Hawai'i in the 1850s.

James Cook named the Hawaiian Islands, the Sandwich Islands, after his patron the Earl of Sandwich, when he saw the Hawaiian Islands for the first time on January 18, 1778. The islands had been called “Sandwich Islands.”⁸⁾ It was the first time that Westerners had “officially” arrived to Hawai'i, although

Early Tensions between the United States and Japan over Hawai'i (Shibata)

the Spanish might have already reached the islands in the 16th century well before Cook's landing.⁹⁾ By 1810, Kamehameha I (r.1795–1819), originally the king (patriarch) of Hawai'i Island when each nearby island was governed by a patriarch, established the Kingdom of Hawai'i after completing the wars against the other patriarchs.¹⁰⁾ In October 1840, Kamehameha III (r. 1825–1854), officially announced the constitution of the Kingdom of Hawai'i, and the kingdom became a constitutional monarchy.¹¹⁾

Meanwhile, European powers had apparently gotten interested in controlling the islands, and they had attempted to acquire the islands in the first half of the 19th century. For example, the first power which showed its interest in Hawai'i was Russia around the 1810s.¹²⁾ Richard Pierce notes that the Russians who reached the islands "wrote memorials to the Russian government urging Russian acquisition of Hawaii as the key to trade and power in the Pacific" around the 1810s.¹³⁾ In the 1840s, Britain and France undertook to gain Hawai'i although Britain might originally have planned to take the islands earlier than Russia did.¹⁴⁾ Once, the British flag was even raised while the Hawaiian flag was hauled down in Honolulu.¹⁵⁾ In 1849, French consul Guillaume Patrice Dillon and French Rear Admiral Legoarant de Tromelin sent a list of demands to Kamehameha III threatening force, and their armed party captured the fort and government buildings.¹⁶⁾ At that time, the U.S. and Britain opposed the French intention to obtain the islands.

Around the same time, taking advantage of the confused state of affairs, the U.S. revealed ideas to annex the islands as early as in May 1849.¹⁷⁾ In 1852, a bill to annex Hawai'i was introduced into the U.S. Congress for the first time.¹⁸⁾ In 1853, which was the same year that Matthew Perry landed in Japan, the U.S. demanded Kamehameha III to promote steps that would lead to the American annexation of the islands.¹⁹⁾ Although the U.S. failed to obtain Hawai'i around that time, the U.S. began to show its interests.²⁰⁾

Kamehameha V (r.1863-1872), himself drafted the new constitution which was enacted in 1864, and the new constitution strengthened his power in order to make Hawai'i stronger.²¹⁾ While Europeans and Americans were dissatisfied with the new constitution, Hawaiians generally expected they would develop their country.²²⁾ Moreover, Kamehameha V was also cautious about American attempts to annex Hawai'i.²³⁾

The U.S. had aimed to acquire Pearl Harbor for almost 30 years.²⁴⁾ Even though Lunalio (r. 1873-1874), the sixth monarch, was in favor of leasing Pearl Harbor to the U.S., he did not sign a treaty, because a lot of native Hawaiians protested against the treaty.²⁵⁾ However, his successor Kalākaua (r. 1874-1891), who had “bitter antagonism” towards Americans, in an “increasingly American-dominated environment,”²⁶⁾ eventually signed the treaty to lease Pearl Harbor bending to the U.S. pressures in 1887, although Kalākaua opposed it.²⁷⁾ Through the treaty, the U.S. gained, “exclusive rights to the use of Pearl Harbor as a naval coaling and repair station.”²⁸⁾ As Kalākaua did, Britain opposed the cession.²⁹⁾

In 1887, with Kalākaua on the throne, Lorrin Andrews Thurston, a member of the Hawaiian Legislature formed the Hawaiian League, a secret organization against Kalākaua.³⁰⁾ The League even considered an idea to assassinate Kalākaua, although it was not put into practice.³¹⁾ Cooperating with the Honolulu Rifles, a social organization of semi-military men, the Hawaiian League demanded to dismiss Kalākaua's cabinet and to accept a new constitution, known as the Bayonet Constitution. Through a “coup d'état,” the king lost his authority to rule. In addition, Lorrin Thurston, one of the writers of the new constitution, became a Minister of the Interior after the incident.³²⁾ After that, native Hawaiians demanded to restore the former constitution.³³⁾

Kalākaua, “who had been outspokenly anti-American,” using “the slogan ‘Hawai'i for Hawaiians’,” attempted to reenact and revitalize traditional Hawaiian

Early Tensions between the United States and Japan over Hawai'i (Shibata)

culture in order to form “anticolonial nationalism” and to develop “resistance strategies and tactics” against U.S. and European imperialism.³⁴⁾ Hula, then a Hawaiian indigenous religious exercise, known today merely as a Hawaiian dance, serves as an example. Ka'ahumanu, Kamehameha I's spouse who converted to Christianity, “banned performances of the hula” in 1830 following the Reverend Bingham's policy.³⁵⁾ However, Yūjin Yaguchi expresses that “it is even said thanks to him [Kalākaua], the tradition of Hula has solidly remained in Hawaii until today.”³⁶⁾ Bell expresses that Kalākaua “was a fervent nationalist and widely regarded as anti-haole [White].”³⁷⁾

Furthermore, in order to develop Hawai'i's work force and improve Hawai'i's status in international relations, in 1881 Kalākaua traveled the world to gain immigrants to Hawai'i and ratify treaties.³⁸⁾ At that time, Kalākaua envisaged to establish “a grand Asian cooperative league with Japan and Hawaii leading the nations.”³⁹⁾ The king also pursued to make a Hawaiian princess marry a Japanese prince.⁴⁰⁾ Then, Kalākaua sought to gain the leadership in the Pacific Islands as well.⁴¹⁾ It is clear that Kalākaua would build a strong Hawai'i to keep its independence struggling against imperialism by powers especially the U.S.

Lili'uokalani (r. 1891-1893) was the eighth and last person who took the throne of the Hawaiian kingdom, and the only crown queen. She ascended the throne on January 29, 1891. Lili'uokalan struggled to promulgate a new constitution until the coup d'état of January 17, 1893, the so-called “Hawaiian Revolution” in “American” history, which established the provisional government, although she also attempted to preserve Hawai'i's independence.⁴²⁾

Namely, since the first half of the nineteenth century, European and American encroachment had increased in Hawai'i.⁴³⁾ Noenoe Silva expresses that “Hawai'i was at times the target of colonial aggression,” and Yamashita notes “in Hawaii, twice of Britain, once of Russia, twice of France, and about five times, foreign flags flew, but (Hawai'i) had kept its independence.”⁴⁴⁾ In other words, it is

clear that the Hawaiian Islands had attracted the U.S. and European powers for their new colony for more than a half century and especially, the U.S. much actively attempted to do it more than others. The kingdom of Hawai'i as well as the Kings and the Queen struggled against their invasions.⁴⁵⁾ Finally, under the American conspiracy, the kingdom of Hawai'i became "the Republic" of Hawai'i, and the republic lasted until 1897 when McKinley took office as president.

The coup d'état of 1893 and the conspiracies by the Americans

In this section, it will be clarified through former studies that American ambitions and conspiracies promoted the coup d'état of 1893. In other words, this section will be literature review.

First, Ralph Kuykendall, in *the Hawaiian Kingdom*, applies abundant U.S. documents and explains historical events in details very well, but it can be said that Kuykendall merely and simply enumerates ostensible facts, recognizing that the end of the monarchy naturally happened. On the other hand, Kuykendall's work lacks Hawaiian documents, and it can hardly be seen how the Americans in Hawai'i and the American in the U.S. contacted each other and how Lili'uokalani and the native Hawaiians recognized U.S. annexation and actions concerning the end of the monarchy.⁴⁶⁾ In fact, according to Coffman, the description by Kuykendall about political opinion before the coup d'état "provides riveting information in light of the question of who was ultimately responsible for the events of January 17."⁴⁷⁾

William Russ' *The Hawaiian Revolution* has probably been one of the well-researched works on the coup d'état, and he uses abundant sources such as the U.S. official documents, newspaper articles, and the collections in archives. However, it must be pointed that Russ' works including his *The Hawaiian Republic* are also based on one-sided research. Similarly, Daws' work is also

Early Tensions between the United States and Japan over Hawai'i (Shibata)
one-sided.⁴⁸⁾

On the other hand, many other authors consider that the Americans conspired against the Hawaiians as well as the queen to overthrow the monarchy while the Americans attempted to obtain the islands. Tabrah remarks that a small group of the Americans in Hawai'i deposed Lili'uokalani and "until their ambitions (the annexation) were satisfied, they governed the islands as an oligarchy."⁴⁹⁾ Coffman explains that "the conspiracies break out into two layers, one operating in pro-American circles in Hawai'i, one in expansionist circles in America," and he points out that those two circles were bonded to overthrow the monarchy, while the U.S. government held the "relentless pursuit of control."⁵⁰⁾ The conspiracies by the Americans in the U.S. and the Americans in Hawai'i who "had a deep antagonism for native Hawaiian culture if it reinforced native nationalism" eventually brought "an American coup" of January 1893.⁵¹⁾ Haley also mentions the conspiracies by the Annexation Club and the imperialists in the U.S. to conduct the coup, and he remarks that "it would have seemed too conspiratorial for President Benjamin Harrison to himself receive [Lorrin] Thurston."⁵²⁾

Rich Budnick argues how American annexationists had conspired to acquire the Hawaiian Islands since the U.S. attempted to conclude the secret annexation treaty with Hawai'i in 1851.⁵³⁾ Referring to the words by William Cornwell, Lili'uokalani's minister, and showing a map, Budnick points out that it was strange that the U.S. troops landed to protect American property because it was far from them but it was close to the palace.⁵⁴⁾ As others mention, concerning The Blount Report, and Budnick remarks "Blount charged that U.S.S. Boston troops had landed under false pretenses, not to protect American lives and property, but to aid in overthrowing the monarchy."⁵⁵⁾ A critique to Budnick's work is that he also uses only English sources although his viewpoint is different from Kuykendall and Daws. Silva and Julia Siler, who apply Hawaiian language

sources, also consider that the conspiracy by the Americans and the American Hawaiian as well as the coup d'état dethroned the Hawaiian monarchy.⁵⁶⁾

In short, at the end of the kingdom, Lili'uokalani and the native Hawaiians attempted to maintain their independence as the true Hawaiian state, but the Americans overthrew the monarchy and brought the power to them through their conspiracies and the coup d'état of January 1893.

The first tension brought by the Americans

In this part, it will be clarified that the American actions led happening the first tension between the U.S. and Japan. In other words, Japan passively conducted its policy when the coup d'état broke out in January 1893.

Payson Treat's *Diplomatic Relations between the United States and Japan* is a comprehensive literature providing abundant U.S. official documents. However, he hardly explains the tension between the two countries although he mentions that "it was not unlikely that Japan felt some concern in establishment of a Provisional Government in Hawaii."⁵⁷⁾ None of William Neumann, Charles Neu, Akira Iriye, William Nester, or Walter LaFeber explains the tension deeply, but a few simply mention "the Hawaiian Revolution," "a coup that overthrew the queen," and striking "to overthrow Hawaii's Queen Liliuokalani" respectively.⁵⁸⁾

Soki Watanabe, referring to the Morgan Report (the report by John T. Morgan), maintains John Stevens (American Minister) propagated Japan's threat, and Watanabe explains John Stevens demanded to dispatch the U.S. troops "to prevent a Japanese military action."⁵⁹⁾ Soki Watanabe points out John Stevens' testimony was based on hearsay evidence, and Watanabe considers that "Stevens' argument, which Hawai'i must be annexed to America because Japan was reaching for Hawai'i, was becoming the central logic for

Early Tensions between the United States and Japan over Hawai'i (Shibata)

annexationists of Hawai'i."⁶⁰ On the other hand, Watanabe notes "the country which had a possibility to threaten American interests in Hawai'i was Japan."⁶¹

Thomas Osborne, in *"Empire Can Wait"* as well as in *Annexation Hawaii*, explains:

There was no basis for the charge that Japan was plotting a takeover of the northern Pacific archipelago. This canard probably was started in Hawaii where some annexationists claimed that Nippon would intervene on behalf of her nationals if the United States did not take prompt and decisive action. The appearance of the Japanese battleship Naniwa in Honolulu probably gave the rumor a measure of verisimilitude... When Commissioner Blount submitted his final report to the Department of State in July 1893, he denied that Japan was threatening to interfere in Hawaii. In point of fact, Japan was seeking the franchise for her people in Hawaii, not annexation.⁶²

Referring to annexationists' claims and Blount's report, Osborne emphasizes it was only a rumor that Japan would acquire Hawai'i or threaten the Hawaiians.

Budnick also regards John Stevens as the person who made a great fuss about the situation related with the ships and the Japanese in the islands. Budnick even notes that John Stevens "brought Walter Smith, editor of an annexationist newspaper, the Honolulu Star, to warn Blount about rumors that a Japanese warship in Honolulu harbor would land troops to restore the Queen's authority."⁶³

Coffman argues, "It is significant that tension was mounting with Japan during 1893, and yet Japan was not portrayed by the annexationists either in Washington or Honolulu as a reason for annexation—let alone the reason for annexation."⁶⁴ Furthermore, Coffman explains, "If anything, Britain was the potential competitor of choice."⁶⁵ Similarly, Merze Tate suggests that Britain was the main competitor against the U.S. over Hawai'i.⁶⁶ In other words, it can be said that the U.S. might have watched the British over the islands but the

tension between the U.S. and Japan suddenly happened while the U.S. less carefully watched Japan.

In addition, Hayato Yamanaka notes about the coup d'état by white people and the tension touching on the battleship Naniwa commanded by Heihachirō Tōgō:

Although details are unknown, there have been episodes that some royalist leaders secretly visited [Heihachirō] Tōgō's ship and had a confidential talk with Tōgō.

In the Japanese documents, there were even people who shed tears and rejoiced at the news that dispatched Japanese battleship to menace the American sides among native people who supported the queen.

At that time, the Japanese in Hawai'i sympathized with Queen Lili'uokalani.⁶⁷⁾

In short, the actions by the Americans led to cause the first tension among the U.S. and Japan while the Americans even spread rumor against Japan. Adjusting to plotting movements by the Americans, Japan conducted its policy to protect Japan's interests around the time of the coup d'état. Furthermore, the coup d'état and the establishment of the Provisional Government by Americans happened around the time right before the Sino-Japanese War, and Japan should have paid attention to the affairs in the East Asia around Korea. In terms of the coup d'état against native Hawaiians, Yamanaka expresses, "Japanese people felt strong sense of danger against European and American imperialism, seeing those native people who lost their own country and had been becoming impoverished."⁶⁸⁾

In terms of William Morgan's perspective about the growth of Japanese immigration, it cannot be denied growing numbers of Japanese immigrants to Hawai'i threatened the U.S. However, growing Japanese immigration predated 1897, and it was originally the policy of Kalākaua to accept more Japanese immigrants. Then, since *Kan'yaku imin* [Immigrants who are contracted

Early Tensions between the United States and Japan over Hawai'i (Shibata)

through the government] started in 1885, the Japanese population had more increased in the islands.⁶⁹⁾ It did not happen suddenly, but it took 8 years to the time when the Americans overthrew the crown. As mentioned, the U.S. already had attempted to acquire the island for more than 40 years and to gain Pearl Harbor for nearly 30 years. Further critique against Morgan will be provided in the following works by this paper.

Conclusion

When powers such as Britain and Germany sought to obtain the Hawaiian Islands, the Americans with their ambition and conspiracies succeeded to overthrow the Hawaiian monarchy as the first step of the annexation. Then, a sequence of the American actions for the coup d'état of 1893 brought the first tension between the U.S. and Japan over the islands. It cannot be denied that it was the appearance of U.S. territorial, economic, cultural, and military imperialism surpassing Japan's economic and cultural imperialism towards the islands.

A major theme in the history of Hawai'i in the 19th century was the attempt by powers such as Russia, Britain, France, and the U.S. to control the islands while native Hawaiians and rulers struggled against them to maintain their independence as a sovereign nation. In this, the situation of the Hawaiian Islands was the same as other colonized countries. Around 1850, the competition to acquire the islands heated up and it lased up to the time around the time of the coup d'état of 1893.

The incident of 1893 was a "coup d'état," and it is necessary to pay attention to specific terms. In 1992, Richard Blaisdell, a native Hawaiian, asserted that "Hawai'i's two thousand-year-old story has not been told from our perspective, in our way by us Kānaka maoli. Most accounts of Hawai'i's past have been

written by foreigners through their eyes beginning with their ‘discoveries’ in the Pacific during the late eighteenth century.”⁷⁰⁾ As mentioned above concerning Kuykendall, A. Grove Day, and Daws, those former studies were based on the American views and they, in common, describe the coup d’état in January 1893, which they call “Revolution.”

Similarly, in terms of tension between the U.S. and Japan, although Japanese immigrants were growing in the islands, the American-Hawaiians actively plotted and executed the coup d’état co-operating with Americans in the U.S. Beckett, a member of the House of Commons in Britain belonging to the Conservative Party, expressed, “Queen Liliuokalani has been deposed by a small body of Americans, who without right or title, have assumed sovereignty over Hawaii, and now, to save themselves from the resentment of the people, have requested the American government to annex Hawaii.”⁷¹⁾

The following argument, based on this research and the previous research, will be clarified in the next paper of this series. A historical review of U.S.-Hawaiian relations and Japanese-Hawaiian relations may be the next theme.

注

- 1) The term “imperialism,” has been used in one or more of six ways: (1) whether the expansion was negative and aggressive; (2) whether it was the U.S. imperialistic expansion or others’ imperialistic expansion; (3) whether the expansion was caused by humanitarian intentions; (4) whether it was a limited expansion such as only economic expansion but not territorial expansion by force; (5) whether it was about control or rule over other groups; and (6) whether it was aiming to overthrow the status quo. The meaning of the last one — breaking the status quo — is most appropriate and applied in this paper. Morgenthau considers that there are three methods in imperialism: military imperialism, economic imperialism, and cultural imperialism. Hans Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations*, 7th ed, rev. Kenneth W. Thompson, and W. David Clinton (1948; repr., New York: McGraw-Hill, 1985), 69-74.
- 2) See n1 in Tokumitsu Shibata, “Japanese-American Relations during the McKinley Administration: An Overview of the Literature.” *Seiji kenkyū* 政治研究, Vol. 15 (Tokyo: Kokushikan daigaku seikei gakubu fuzoku seiji kenkyūjo), 100.

- 3) Tokumitsu Shibata, "The American View of the History of Japanese-American Relations during the McKinley Administration." *Seiji kenkyū* 政治研究, Vol. 13 (Tokyo: Kokushikan daigaku seikei gakubu fuzoku seiji kenkyūjo), 91-93, 107; Shibata, "Japanese-American Relations during the McKinley Administration," 91-93, 107.
- 4) Ralph Simpson Kuykendall, *The Hawaiian Kingdom*, Vols. I-III. (1938, 1953, 1967; repr., Honolulu: University of Hawaii, 1966-1968); William Adam Russ Jr, *The Hawaiian Republic (1894-98) And Its Struggle to Win Annexation*, Intr. by Pauline N. King (1961; repr., London: Associated University Press, 1992); William Adam Russ Jr, *The Hawaiian Revolution (1893-94)*, Intr. by Pauline N. King (1959; repr., London: Associated University Press, 1992); Gavan Daws, *Shoal of Time: A History of the Hawaiian Islands* (Honolulu, The University Press of Hawaii, 1968).
- 5) Daws, *Shoal of Time*, 264, 266. Furthermore, Kuykendall and Day's *Hawaii* also touch on Lili'uokalani and the "revolution" in a similar way. Ralph Simpson Kuykendall and A. Grove Day, *Hawaii: A History — From Polynesian Kingdom to American State*, rev. ed. (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1961), Chapter 17.
- 6) Ruth M. Tabrah, *Hawaii: A Bicentennial History* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1980); Tom Coffman, *Nation Within: The Story of America's Annexation of the Nation of Hawai'i* (Kane'ohe, HI: EPICenter, 1998); James L. Haley, *Captive Paradise: A History of Hawaii* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2014). See also Sylvester K. Stevens, *American Expansion in Hawaii, 1842-1898* (1945; repr., New York: Russell & Russell, 1968); Albertine Loomis, *For Whom Are the Stars?: Revolution and Counterrevolution in Hawai'i, 1893-1895* (Honolulu: The University Press of Hawaii, 1976); Taketoshi Yamamoto 山本武利, *Kindai nihon no shinbun dokusha sou* 近代日本の新聞読者層 [Classes of newspaper readers in modern Japan] (Tokyo: Housei daigaku shuppankyoku, 1981); Roger Bell, *Last Among Equals: Hawaiian Statehood and American Politics* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1984); Rich Budnick, *Stolen Kingdom: An American Conspiracy*, Introduction by John Waihee. (Honolulu: Aloha Press, 1992); Michael Dougherty, *To Steal A Kingdom* (Waimanalo, HI: Island Style Press, 1992); Yūjin Yaguchi 矢口祐人, *Hawai no rekishi to bunka* ハワイの歴史と文化 [Hawai'ian history and culture] (Tokyo: Chūkō shinsho, 2002); Kaname Saruya 猿谷要, *Hawai ōchō saigo no joō* ハワイ王朝最後の女王 [The last queen of the Hawaiian dynasties] (Tokyo: Bungei shunjū, 2003); Noenoe K. Silva, *Aloha Betrayed: Native Hawaiian Resistance to American Colonialism* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2004); Julia Flynn Siler, *Lost Kingdom: Hawaii's Last Queen, the Sugar Kings, and America's First Imperial Adventure* (New York: Grove Press, 2012).
- 7) William Michael Morgan, *Pacific Gibraltar: U.S.-Japanese Rivalry Over the Annexation of Hawai'i, 1885-1898* (Annapolis, MD: Naval Institute Press, 2011), 217, 240.

- 8) Lucien Young, *The Real Hawaii*, 5-6; Kuykendall, *The Hawaiian Kingdom*, I: 13; Kuykendall and Day, *Hawaii*, 14; Tabrah, *Hawaii*, 11, 19-20; Coffman, *Nation Within*, 23; Haley, *Captive Paradise*, xxv, xxix.
- 9) For example, see Kuykendall and Day, *Hawaii*, 13; Dougherty, *To Steal A Kingdom*, 22; Alton Pryor, *Little Known Tales in Hawaii History* (Roseville, Cal.: Stagecoach Publishing, 2003), 24; William Morgan, *Pacific Gibraltar*, 9; Haley, *Captive Paradise*, xi; Sôen Yamashita 山下草園, *Nihon Hawai kôryûshi* 日本布哇交流史 [An interchange History of Japan and Hawai'i] (Tokyo: Daitô shuppansha, 1943), 38. Cook himself noted about the possibility that the Spanish arrived there. Captain Clerk, Ebenezer Townsend (trader), and others wrote about it. Pryor, *Little Known Tales in Hawaii History*, 153-162.
- 10) Kuykendall, *The Hawaiian Kingdom*, I: 26, 44-51; Kuykendall and Day, *Hawaii*, 27-29; Coffman, *Nation Within*, 28-31; Robert F. Oaks, *Hawai'i: A History of the Big Island* (Charleston S.C.: Arcadia, 2003), 36-38; Haley, *Captive Paradise*, 22-30.
- 11) Kuykendall, *The Hawaiian Kingdom*, I: 167-169; Kuykendall and Day, *Hawaii: A History*, 49-55; Daws, *Shoal of Time*, 107-108; Tabrah, *Hawaii*, 53-54; Coffman, *Nation Within*, 57; Haley, *Captive Paradise*, 140-141; Yamashita, *Nihon Hawai kôryûshi*, 60.
- 12) Kuykendall, *The Hawaiian Kingdom*, I: 56; Kuykendall and Day, *Hawaii*, 35-36; Coffman, *Nation Within*, 43-47; Yamashita, *Nihon Hawai kôryûshi*, 46-47.
- 13) Richard A. Pierce, *Russia's Hawaiian Adventure, 1815-1817* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1965), 31.
- 14) Daws, *Shoal of Time*, 113, 115; Coffman, *Nation Within*, 54-57; Oaks, *Hawai'i*, 61; Yamashita, *Nihon Hawaii kôryûshi*, 47;
- 15) Kuykendall, *The Hawaiian Kingdom*, I: 216; Kuykendall and Day, *Hawaii*, 66; Daws, *Shoal of Time*, 115; Tabrah, *Hawaii*, 56; Siler, *Lost Kingdom*, 15; Haley, *Captive Paradise*, 131; Yamashita, *Nihon Hawaii kôryûshi*, 49; Saruya, *Hawai ôchô saigo no joô*, 29.
- 16) Kuykendall, *The Hawaiian Kingdom*, I: 389-394; Kuykendall and Day, *Hawaii*, 72-73; Daws, *Shoal of Time*, 132-135; Coffman, *Nation Within*, 56; Haley, *Captive Paradise*, 147-151; Saruya, *Hawai ôchô saigo no joô*, 30.
- 17) Kuykendall, *The Hawaiian Kingdom*, I: 383-384, 401-403, 410-11; Kuykendall and Day, *Hawaii*, 74-75; Daws, *Shoal of Time*, 147-151; Tabrah, *Hawaii*, 63-65; Haley, *Captive Paradise*, 152-153.
- 18) Kuykendall, *The Hawaiian Kingdom*, I: 409; Tabrah, *Hawaii*, 63.
- 19) Kuykendall, *The Hawaiian Kingdom*, I: 421; Kuykendall and Day, *Hawaii*, 74; Coffman, *Nation Within*, 58-59.
- 20) Kuykendall, *The Hawaiian Kingdom*, II: 214, 221; Daws, *Shoal of Time*, 147.
- 21) Kuykendall and Day, *Hawaii*, 111-114; Daws, *Shoal of Time*, 185; Tabrah, *Hawaii*, 71;

- Saruya, *Hawai ōchō saigo no joō*, 55–56; Yaguchi, *Hawai ōkoku*, 61–64. Kuykendall touches on the process to enact the constitution with details in *The Hawaiian Kingdom*, but he does not mention it was for building strong Hawai'i against and for confronting against Power's invasions. Rather than it, he remarks that “the Hawaiian people were strongly attached to the Kamehameha family, and this feeling of loyalty overbalanced any resentment that may have been aroused by the arbitrary action of the king.” In other words, Kuykendall implies to emphasize a negative viewpoint of the arbitrary action of the king instead of explaining Hawai'i's attempts against the powers. Kuykendall, *The Hawaiian Kingdom*, II: 133.
- 22) Yaguchi, *Hawai ōkoku*, 63–64. None of Kuykendall, Daws, Tabrah, and Haley mentions this thing, and Coffman even ignores the story of the constitution of 1864.
 - 23) Kuykendall and Day, *Hawaii*, 111–112; Kuykendall, *The Hawaiian Kingdom*, II: 226–227.
 - 24) Budnick, *Stolen Kingdom*, 59–60.
 - 25) Kuykendall, *The Hawaiian Kingdom*, II: 249, 255–257; Kuykendall and Day, *Hawaii*, 141; Haley, *Captive Paradise*, 221–223; Yaguchi, *Hawai ōkoku*, 72–73.
 - 26) Coffman, *Nation Within*, 65.
 - 27) Kuykendall, *The Hawaiian Kingdom*, III: 6–7, 397; Kuykendall and Day, *Hawaii*, 160–161; Daws, *Shoal of Time*, 259; Coffman, *Nation Within*, 65; Haley, *Captive Paradise*, 272–274.
 - 28) William N. Armstrong, *Around the World with a King*, Introduction by Terence Barrow (1903, repr., Rutland, Vt.: Charles E. Tuttle Company, 1977), xxii.
 - 29) Merze Tate, “British Opposition to the Cession of Pearl Harbor,” *Pacific Historical Review*, Vol. 29, No. 4 (November 1960), 381–394.
 - 30) Kuykendall, *The Hawaiian Kingdom*, III: 347; Kuykendall and Day, *Hawaii*, 169; Daws, *Shoal of Time*, 243.
 - 31) Budnick, *Stolen Kingdom*, 63.
 - 32) Kuykendall, *The Hawaiian Kingdom*, III: 350–366; Kuykendall and Day, *Hawaii*, 170–172; Daws, *Shoal of Time*, 240–251; Tabrah, *Hawaii*, 11, 95–97; Dougherty, *To Steal A Kingdom*, 161; Coffman, *Nation Within*, 79–90; Siler, *Lost Kingdom*, (2012), Chapter 8.
 - 33) Budnick, *Stolen Kingdom*, 72.
 - 34) Dougherty, *To Steal A Kingdom*, 130; Silva, *Aloha Betrayed*, 85, 88, 90. Also, see Coffman, *Nation Within*, 66–67; Yaguchi, *Hawai ōkoku*, 86–88.
 - 35) Daws, *Shoal of Time*, 93; Haley, *Captive Paradise*, 77. Silva mentions that “the indigenous akua as well as mele, oli, hula, and details of native medicinal remedies... were forbidden” to native Hawaiians in 1861. Silva, *Aloha Betrayed*, 78.
 - 36) Yaguchi, *Hawai ōkoku*, 80; Silva, *Aloha Betrayed*, 89. Three volumes with over 1,300 pages of Kuykendall's *The Hawaiian Kingdom* have probably been the most

- comprehensive books, and Kuykendall notes that Kamehameha V revived “some old Hawaiian customs such as the Hula and Kabuna practices.” However, although Kuykendall mentions that hula dances were shown each night during the Kalākaua’s coronation of February 1883, Kuykendall does not touch on Kalākaua’s ideas to spread Hula for the public again. Also, although Daws expresses that Kalākaua’s “reign was the very negation of missionary teaching” and mentions hula in the coronation, Daws does not touch upon it either. It is not clear that whether Kuykendall and Daws intentionally ignored Kalākaua’s policies such as the one about Hula. Kuykendall, *The Hawaiian Kingdom*, II: 125, III: 261–265; Daws, *Shoal of Time*, 162, 219. Also, see Young, *The Real Hawaii*, 11–12; Siler, *Lost Kingdom*, 105–107.
- 37) Bell, *Last Among Equals*, 22; Mary Kawena Pukui and Samuel H. Elbert, *Hawaiian Dictionary: Hawaiian-English, English-Hawaiian*, rev. and enlarged ed. (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1986), 58.
- 38) Liliuokalani, *Hawaii’s Story by Hawaii’s Queen* (1898; repr., Honolulu: Mutual, 1990), 77; Armstrong, *Around the World with a King*, xxiii; Kuykendall, *The Hawaiian Kingdom*, III: 227; Kuykendall and Day, *Hawaii*, 156, 164; Daws, *Shoal of Time*, 216; Budnick, *Stolen Kingdom*, 53; Coffman, *Nation Within*, 65–66; Haley, *Captive Paradise*, 236–238.
- 39) Armstrong, *Around the World with a King*, xxiv.
- 40) For example, see Armstrong, *Around the World with a King*, 62–62; Kuykendall, *The Hawaiian Kingdom*, III: 230; Daws, *Shoal of Time*, 162, 219; Tabrah, *Hawaii*, 89; Budnick, *Stolen Kingdom*, 54; Dougherty, *To Steal A Kingdom*, 149; Coffman, *Nation Within*, 65–66; William Morgan, *Pacific Gibraltar*, 42; Haley, *Captive Paradise*, 238, 335; Yamashita, *Nihon Hawaii kōryūshi*, 288, 295–301; Saneyuki Yoshimori 吉森實行, *Hawai o meguru Nichi-Bei kankeshi* ハワイを繞る日米關係史 [Japanese-American relations around Hawai’i] (Tokyo: Bungē shunjū, 1943), 70; Hawai Nihonjin Imin Kankō linkai ハワイ日本人移民史刊行委員会, ed., *Hawai Nihonjin iminshi* ハワイ日本人移民史 [A history of the Japanese immigrants in Hawaii] (Honolulu: Hawai nikkeijin rengō kyōkai, 1964), 78–83; Hayato Yamanaka 山中速人, *Hawai ハワイ* [Hawaii] (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1993), 125–126; Saruya, *Hawai ōchō saigo no joō*, 82, 98; Yaguchi, *Hawai ōkoku*, 80.
- 41) Young, *The Real Hawaii*, 13; Kuykendall, *The Hawaiian Kingdom*, III: Chapter 12.
- 42) In term of the expression of the incident of January 1893, probably, it is generally known as “the Hawaiian Revolution” in a part of American history but not in other kinds of history. For example, among those authors in Hawaiian history, Young, Kuykendall, Day, Daws, and Tabrah apply the words “revolution” or “the Hawaiian Revolution” only, and although they are “Hawaiian history,” they seem it as a part of American history. See the following works using the term “revolution.” John W. Foster, *American Diplomacy in the Orient* (New York: Houghton Mifflin Company,

1903), 377; John Holladay Latané, *A History of American Foreign Policy*, rev. ed. (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, Doran & Company, 1934), 567; Payson J. Treat, *Diplomatic Relations between the United States and Japan* (1938; repr., Gloucester, Mass: Peter Smith, 1963), II: 410; Francis Hilary Conroy, *The Japanese Expansion into Hawaii, 1868-1898* (1949; repr., San Francisco: R and E Research Associates, 1973), 140; Paul A. Varg, *Open Door Diplomat: The Life of W. W. Rockhill* (Urbana, IL: The University of Illinois Press, 1952), 26; Margaret Leech, *In the Days of McKinley* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1959), 146; Howard Wayne Morgan, *William McKinley and his America* (1963; repr. Kent OH: The Kent State University Press, 2003), 222; Ruhl Bartlett, *Policy and Power: Two Centuries of American Foreign Relations* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1963), 124; John A. Grenville and George Berkeley Young, *Politics, Strategy, and American Diplomacy: Studies in Foreign Policy, 1873-1917* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1966), 104, 222; Robert H. Ferrell, *American Diplomacy: A History*, rev. and expanded ed. (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1969), 364; Armin Rappaport, *A History of American Diplomacy* (New York: MacMillan Publishing, 1975), 186; Thomas G. Paterson, John Garry Clifford, and Kenneth J. Hagan, *American Foreign Policy: A History* (Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath and Company, 1977), 174; Alexander DeConde, *A History of American Foreign Policy, Vol. 1, Growth to World Power (1700-1914)*, 3rd ed. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1978), 299-300; Lewis L. Gould, *The Presidency of William McKinley* (Lawrence, KS: The Regents Press of Kansas, 1980), 48; John Dobson, *Reticent Expansionism: The Foreign Policy of William McKinley* (Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1988), 15; Walter LaFeber, *The Cambridge History of American Foreign Relations, Vol. II, The American Search for Opportunity, 1865-1913* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 79, 91, 115; Richard Immerman, *Empire for Liberty: A History of American Imperialism from Benjamin Franklin to Paul Wolfowitz* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2010), 138. Lawrence Battistini basically uses the word "revolution" although the word "coup d'état" appears in his late work. Lawrence Battistini, *Japan and America*, 48; Lawrence Battistini, *The United States and Asia* (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1955), 27; Lawrence Battistini, *The Rise of American Influence in Asia and the Pacific* (East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press, 1960), 163, 165; Bemis applies the words "revolution" and "revolt." Samuel Bemis, *A Diplomatic History of the United States*, 459-461; Henry Cox uses the word "revolution" with the quotation marks like when Haley applies the word. Henry Bartholomew Cox, *War, Foreign Affairs, and Constitutional Power: 1892-1901* (Cambridge, MA: Ballinger Publishing Company, 1984), 23, 287n; Gerard Clarfield uses the words "the Hawaiian revolution" although he also expresses "the American minister in Honolulu, John Stevens, played a major role in the coup that overthrew 'Queen Lil.'" Gerard Clarfield, *United States Diplomatic*

- History*, (1998), 242, 244, 349. Shigeru Kurobane first wrote “so-called ‘the Hawaiian Revolution’” with the quotation marks but later applied the word “revolution” without the quotation marks. Shigeru Kurobane 黒羽茂, *Nichi-Bei kōsōshi no kenkyū* 日米抗争史の研究 [Studies of a history of Japanese-American strife] (Tokyo: Nansōsha, 1973), 60, 65, 67, 76, 81; Soki Watanabe expresses that “this was the incident called the Hawaiian Revolution.” Soki Watanabe 渡辺惣樹, *Nichi-Bei shōtotsu no kongen* 1858-1908, 日米衝突の根源 1858-1908 [The roots of a conflict between Japan and America, 1858-1908] (Tokyo: Sōshisha. 2011), 353. However, on the other hand, Coffman, Silva, Haley, Yaguchi, Saruya, and others apply the words “coup,” and “coup d’état.”
- 43) Healy, “Imperialism,” 218. Young applies the words “seizure of the islands” for European attempts while he is mentioning that the U.S. “preserved the independence of the islands.” Young, *The Real Hawaii*, 6.
- 44) Silva, *Aloha Betrayed*, 35; Yamashita, *Nihon Hawaii kōryūshi*, 51.
- 45) For example, Coffman express that “how Lili’uokalani was to respond when the American marines marched through her streets in 1893 was conditioned by the more than century-long struggle of the Hawaiian chiefs to cope with the appearance of the naval powers of the west.” Coffman, *Nation Within*, 23.
- 46) For example, Kuykendall remarks, “The native Hawaiians, with a few exceptions, are known to have been strongly opposed to annexation,” but he seldom mentions the native H Hawaiians’ viewpoints. Kuykendall, *The Hawaiian Kingdom*, III: 227; Coffman, *Nation Within*, 123.
- 47) Coffman, *Nation Within*, 123.
- 48) Silva, *Aloha Betrayed*, 1, 23, 124, 165-167.
- 49) Tabrah, *Hawaii*, 4.
- 50) Coffman, *Nation Within*, 8, 69, 122.
- 51) Coffman, *Nation Within*, 86, chapter 9.
- 52) Haley, *Captive Paradise*, 285-286.
- 53) Budnick, *Stolen Kingdom*, 82, 99.
- 54) Budnick, *Stolen Kingdom*, 114-116.
- 55) Budnick, *Stolen Kingdom*, 137.
- 56) Silva, *Aloha Betrayed*; Siler, *Lost Kingdom*.
- 57) Although Treat also applies the word “Revolution” for the coup d’état, he presents “American complicity” in the coup d’état quoting Cleveland’s message. Concerning Japan’s interests in Hawai’i, Treat notes, “An examination will show how slight was Japan’s interest in the Islands until Mr. Stevens reported an aggressive disposition, which was not confirmed by any information which Mr. Dun could obtain in Japan.” In other word, does this not mean the U.S. had not generally cared about Japan’s interest in Hawai’i until around that time? Also, it is probably important that the person who reported was Stevens, one of the main persons of the coup d’état. Treat, *Diplomatic*

Relations Between the United States and Japan, II: 410-412.

- 58) William L. Neumann, *American Encounters Japan: From Perry to MacArthur* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1963), 112-113; Charles E. Neu, *The Troubled Encounter: The United States and Japan* (Malabar, FL.: Robert E. Krieger Publishing Company, 1975), 34; William R. Nester, *Power across the Pacific: A Diplomatic History of American Relations with Japan* (New York: New York University Press, 1996), 65; Walter LaFeber, *The Clash: U.S.-Japanese Relations throughout History* (New York: Norton & Company, 1997), 54.
- 59) Soki Watanabe, *Nichi-Bei shōtotsu no kongen*, 364-365. The Morgan Report is submitted on February 26, 1894 by John T. Morgan, saying, "I am directed by the Committee on Foreign Relations to submit a report giving the opinions of the members for that committee, and also to present the evidence which has been taken before the committee in regard to the recent revolution in Hawai'i and the participation of the diplomatic and military officer of the United States in that affair." *Cong. Rec.*, 53rd Cong., 2nd sess., 1894, 26, pt. 3: 2408. The Morgan Report is available online. Accessed April 25, 2024, https://morganreport.org/mediawiki/index.php?title=Main_Page.
- 60) Soki Watanabe, *Nichi-Bei shōtotsu no kongen*, 365-366.
- 61) Soki Watanabe, *Nichi-Bei shōtotsu no kongen*, 367. On the other hand, William Russ, in *The Hawaiian Revolution*, mentions, on March 1, 1893, John Stevens had "become so exercised over the arrival of two Japanese warships and another British man-of-war that he telegraphed: 'It is advisable to send here at once the most powerful American ship available,'" and Russ furthermore explained "by March 24 the Japanese menace, in [John] Stevens' eyes, had become so real that there would be danger of the Japanization of Hawaii if American troops were recalled." Russ, *The Hawaiian Revolution*, 158-159.
- 62) Osborne, "Empire Can Wait", 42-43. Concerning Blount, see Blount to Gresham, July 17, 1893, U.S. Department of State, Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States, 1894, Appendix II, 569.
- 63) Budnick, *Stolen Kingdom*, 137.
- 64) Coffman, in terms of the New Year's Eve of 1894, also remarks, "Rumors circulated that someone intended to assassinate her [Lili'uokalani]. A worried British ambassador asked the American ambassador to tell the Provisional Government to rein in the armed bands of men, or Britain and Japan would land troops from their ships." However, it should not be related with "tension" between the U.S. and Japan. Coffman, *Nation Within*, 146, 196.
- 65) Coffman, *Nation Within*, 196.
- 66) Merze Tate, *The United States and Hawaiian Kingdom*, 146.
- 67) Yamanaka, *Hawaii*, 128.

- 68) Yamanaka, *Hawai*, 128.
- 69) Toraji Iriye 入江寅次, *Hōjin kaigai hatten shi* 邦人海外発展史 [A history of the expansion of Japanese people overseas] (1942; repr., Tokyo: Hara shobō, 1981), 92-100, 143-149, 445-450; Yamashita, *Nihon Hawai kōryūshi*, 337-341, 353-355; Hawai Nihonjin Imin Kankō linkai ed. *Hawai Nihonjin iminshi*, 119, 165-166; Toshihiko konno 今野敏彦 and Yasuo Fujisaki 藤崎康夫, *Iminshi* 移民史 [History of emigrants] (Tokyo: Shinsensha, 1986), III: 56, 68-72, 89, 95-96, 102-107, 162-164; Kojiro Iida 飯田耕二郎, *Hawai nikkeijin no rekishi chiri* ハワイ日系人の歴史地理 [A history and geography of the Japanese in Hawai'i] (Kyoto: Nakanishiya shuppan, 2003), 3.
- 70) Richard Kekuni Blaisdell, "Afterword: Native Hawaiian 1992," in Dougherty, *To Steal A Kingdom*, 183.
- 71) Editorial, "Hawaii in The Commons," *Washington Post*, June 25, 1897.

【論文要旨】

ハワイを巡る日米緊張関係

本稿の目的は、アメリカ人たちによるハワイ王国転覆及びハワイ併合の密謀が、ハワイでのクーデター（1893年）の時期に、日米関係に緊張状態をもたらしたことを明確にすることである。また、本稿の問題提起は、日本とアメリカがハワイを巡り、クーデターの時期にどのように緊張状態を生じさせてきたかである。なお、本稿の内容は、マッキンリー政権期（1897-1901）が日米関係史における一つの転換期であったことを前提としている。本稿ではラルフ・クイケンダルやウィリアム・ルス、ウィリアム・モーガンなどに対する批判をしながら、当該転換期の背景について考察する。初めに、生粋のハワイ人たちは独立保持を試みてきたこと、列強によるハワイ領有の試みが19世紀末まで続いていたこと、特にアメリカ人たちがハワイ領有を試みていたことを確認する。続いて、アメリカ人たちの密謀によってクーデターが起こったことを改めて検証する。そして、アメリカ人たちが積極的に行動したことによって日米間に緊張状態が生じたことを論証する。