Book Reviews


Linda McCullough Decker’s Edward Bailey of Maui narrates the story of the missionary’s life from the time of his young adulthood in Holden, Massachusetts in the 1830s until his death in California at the age of 89. The majority of the book examines his years in the Sandwich Islands, including the voyage to the islands, his first postings at the mission station of Kohala on Hawai‘i island and Lahainaluna on Maui, and his life and labors at Wailuku, Maui. In particular, it focuses on his missionary work, especially as a teacher for the Wailuku Female Seminary; his labor for the Sandwich Island government; his various business enterprises; and his work as a naturalist, engineer, and artist. In addition, Decker has added passages, set aside in light green, that she found interesting, but did not flow with the narrative of Bailey’s life.

Decker writes her book in the hagiographical style of 19th and 20th centuries. She does not use any historiography, theory, or analysis. The book consists mainly of long quotes from Bailey or other missionaries interspersed with short explanatory sentences from the author. Because Bailey and his wife Caroline did not leave an account of their voyage to the islands, Decker copies, but does cite, large parts of Mary Atherton Richards’s Amos Starr Cooke and Juliete Montague Cooke in chapters 3, 4, and 5. The author’s word choice is also occasionally problematic. For example, in the early chapters, she refers to “nations of heathens in the Pacific,” (p. 1) and the missionaries’ journey to “the primitive islands” (p. 12). These are terms that current historians and scholars either avoid, or at least, problematize.

Edward Bailey of Maui is a beautiful book. It is printed on high quality glossy paper with 61 color illustrations—mostly of Bailey’s paintings—interspersed throughout the work, along with several photographs. While many people will enjoy perusing these illustrations, the book will be most useful to those
who are interested in the lives of American Board missionaries who came to Hawai‘i. In particular, scholars can use this book to identify primary sources that can be accessed later during research.

Jennifer Fish Kashay
Associate Professor of History
Colorado State University


Patrick Kirch is a productive and provocative Pacific archaeologist. In How Chiefs Became Kings, Kirch revisits a topic he has explored before, though less systematically. Hawai‘i is usually described as a complex chiefdom at the time of contact with the West. It is Kirch’s intent to “overturn” this thesis and demonstrate that Hawai‘i was, instead, a collection of three or four archaic states at the time of contact.

Kirch argues that Hawai‘i fulfilled a number of criteria that define archaic states and differentiates them from chiefdoms. These include, for instance, “the development of class stratification, land alienation from commoners and a territorial system of administrative control, a monopoly of force and endemic conquest warfare, and, most important divine kingship legitimated by state cults with a formal priesthood” (p. 27).

His argument is constructed with what he describes as the “process-practice theory” that recognizes complex evolutionary processes combined with the importance of agency, or individual actions, in shaping society. Harnessing evidence from linguistics, ethnography, archaeology, and what he calls “insider” perspectives from Hawaiian mo‘olelo, and “outsider” historical perspectives from archaeologists, explorers, and missionaries, Kirch describes the process by which Hawai‘i evolved from a collection of chiefdoms to an archaic state.

By 1400, population pressure encouraged expansion into previously unused dry land sweet potato fields on the islands of Hawai‘i and parts of Maui and intensified mono-cropping of taro on terraced land and flooded pond fields watered by irrigation canals on Kaua‘i, O‘ahu, and parts of Maui. While the Kohala Field System began to develop in the early 1300s, field embankments that divided sweet potato plots were not present until about
AD 1400, and the subdivision of large plots into narrow ahupua’a and smaller ‘ili and mo‘o did not begin until about 1650. Similarly, the sweet potato dominated Kona Field System was not divided into small fields until sometime between 1600 and European contact. The Kahikinui field systems in Maui experienced a similar expansion, as did Kalaupapa on Moloka‘i.

More complex government structures began evolving in response to population growth and the emerging complex agricultural economy. Kirch notes that Kamakau credits Mā‘ilikūkahi for developing the layered land divisions present at contact. About 1490, Mā‘ilikūkahi became the first to unite all of O‘ahu under one ruler. O‘ahu prospered under his rule due to this innovation in land management and to his aggressive program of intensified construction of terraces, irrigation canals, and taro pond fields.

It is possible that Mā‘ilikūkahi was also the first to institute the tradition of ho‘okupu, tribute paid to the ali‘i, initially based on surplus production. His irrigation systems and fishponds constituted “monumental architecture,” another of Kirch’s criteria for archaic statehood. In spite of these achievements, Kirch does not credit Mā‘ilikūkahi as the originator of the archaic state. Mā‘ilikūkahi did not worship Kū and did not practice human sacrifice. He did not develop an elaborated priestly class and ritual to support his rule, and he did not separate himself completely from the maka‘āinana, important ingredients of divine kingship.

Liloa was the first to unite the island of Hawai‘i, and Pi‘ilani was the first to do the same thing in Maui, but unification was not enough to qualify as a transition from chiefdom to an archaic state. Instead, Kirch argues that about 1590, it was the sons of these two men, ‘Umi-a-Liloa on the island of Hawai‘i and Kiha-a-Pi‘ilani on Maui, who first created polities that qualified as archaic states in Hawai‘i.

According to Kirch, one essential ingredient in the formation of archaic states was a strong, specialized priesthood, something missing on O‘ahu during Mā‘ilikūkahi’s chiefdom. Sometime in the fourteenth century, Pā‘ao, a priest who voyaged from Tonga or Porapora Island in the Society Islands, brought the cult of Kū and the practice of human sacrifice to the island of Hawai‘i. In one of the last roundtrip voyages recorded in mo‘olelo, La‘a-mai-Kahiki (La‘a from Tahiti) brought idols and the pahu temple drum to Hawai‘i before returning to his homeland. A strong priesthood ritualized the divinity of the king and emphasized his distinction from the common folk. In contrast, traditional Polynesian chiefs were linked to their people through kinship bonds. In an archaic state, kings ruled by divine right. They were themselves gods.

Supported by the cult of Kū, Kiha-a-Pi‘ilani and ‘Umi emerged as divine kings. At about the time of their reigns, Hawaiian society morphed into an
elitist society in which the ali‘i were distinct and apart from the maka‘āinana. By this time, commoners had no personal or landownership rights. For example, according to Kirch, maka‘āinana were only allowed to stay on the land by paying regular tribute, collected primarily during the Makahiki, a season of tribute that supported the divinity of kings and conspicuous consumption of luxury goods and symbols of power, such as feather capes. To sever any possible kinship bonds between the maka‘āinana and ali‘i, maka‘āinana were forbidden from keeping their own genealogies beyond their grandparents, while the ali‘i traced their genealogies back to their descent from the gods, twenty-three generations before Western contact.

Both ‘Umi and Kīha-a-Pi‘ilani built monumental structures, such as heiau and elaborate royal centers, both designed to separate the ali‘i from the maka‘āinana. Both ‘Umi and Kīha-a-Pi‘ilani waged nearly constant wars of conquest, and both redistributed lands to subchiefs as spoils of war, regardless of kinship hereditary rights. On Hawai‘i, ‘Umi established the first kō‘ele system of chiefly farms which the maka‘āinana worked to yield tribute.

As the state developed, economies were centralized and heavily controlled by the king to serve diplomatic and military needs. Bureaucracies emerged to manage the new state system. Ho‘okupu became a cornerstone of the archaic state, as the king demanded resources to support his retinue. To keep supplied, the king’s entourage moved from place to place, as they used up the resources in each area. A Hawaiian proverb encapsulated the situation: chiefs were “sharks that traveled on land” (p. 50).

Kirch clearly states his thesis, and then marshals the evidence to support his argument. While he is not the first to make this argument, his argument is currently the most complete and compelling. Many readers will struggle through the relatively arcane Polynesian linguistic section that begins the book, but those who stick with it will have their efforts rewarded with important evidence that supports his argument.

It has been emphasized by recent Hawaiian historians that the traditional importance of household production and the ‘ohana values of kinship-based ties were sundered by Western influence and, especially, capitalism. Kirch contributes to this conversation by arguing that traditional household production and kinship ties were shattered long before the introduction of capitalism by the independent, native emergence of a class-based polity, the concept of the divine right of kings, and the mechanism of ho‘okupu, which supported class-based tax support and service to the elite and their political and military aspirations. Similarly, Kirch is sure to engender hostility among some readers for his controversial assertion that the pre-Māhele Hawaiian land system closely resembled the Medieval European feudal system, even though the maka‘āinana were not serfs (p. 73), always a contentious comparison.
Although not suitable for beach reading, this is an important book, and everyone with a serious interest in Hawaiian history should read it.

*Thomas A. Woods, Ph.D.*
*Executive Director, Mission Houses Museum*
*Honolulu, Hawai‘i*


William Michael Morgan has written a historically based study that looks in detail at the U.S. annexation of Hawai‘i in 1898. This work, written in 15 chapters (plus an introduction and conclusion), discusses both often studied and little examined aspects of this period in history. Overall, he claims that the United States annexed Hawai‘i for strategic and defensive purposes. Great fear existed at this time over potential attacks on the West Coast of the continental United States, as well as the growing aggression of Japan in the Pacific. Partisan politics in Washington D.C. also led Republican Congressmen to develop a strong annexationist stance by 1896 that they committed to until the passing of a joint resolution to acquire Hawai‘i in 1898. Morgan acknowledges that the overthrow of Queen Lili‘uokalani, which he calls the revolution of 1893, was a move “to preserve white preponderance and privilege” based in sugar interests in Hawai‘i (p. 238). He also believes U.S. Minister to Hawai‘i, John L. Stevens, inappropriately supported this revolution on several occasions.

The strengths of *Pacific Gibraltar* involve Morgan’s discussion of the influence that the Japanese government, partisan politics, as well as military considerations had on the annexation of Hawai‘i. In chapters 14 and 15, Morgan discusses what he calls the U.S.-Japan Crisis of 1897. With Japan’s increasing desire to gain equality for its country and people on the international stage, the Japanese government reacted negatively toward anti-Japanese policies being developed by the white-controlled Republic of Hawai‘i in 1897. Japanese officials sent four separate and increasingly aggressive messages of protest to the U.S. government that year. Leaders in Washington D.C. became progressively alarmed by the mounting protests lodged by Japanese leaders over the treatment of their citizens in the islands, their disapproval of U.S. annexation of the region, and their sending of warships to the area. Worried that Japan would attack in the short or long term, U.S. Congressmen viewed
this situation as a major justification for the annexation of Hawai‘i. Throughout his book, Morgan also consistently emphasizes pro-annexationists’ belief in the need for Hawai‘i as a strategic position for Pacific region dominance and West Coast defense, a naval bastion to become “America’s Pacific Gibraltar” (p. 3).

Another well-explained aspect of this text involves the role that partisan politics played in acquisition debates. In chapters eight through ten, Morgan details the different approaches that Democratic President Grover Cleveland had, who at one point supported the restoration of the Hawaiian monarchy, versus the subsequent Republican President William McKinley, who supported annexation but did not prioritize such a move until the U.S.-Japan crisis of 1897. Morgan additionally discusses the various versions of acquisition approaches that were developed, such as a secret annexation treaty, as well as the final filibuster that became the last stand of anti-annexationists in Congress.

The author also provides an interesting perspective on the impact of the War of 1898 with Spain. He states that “this war only reconfirmed that modern war required the use of midocean bastions” and further justified the prioritization of Pacific strategy and coastal security among Congressional Republicans (p. 226). He quotes U.S. Congressman Francis Newlands as saying “Hawaiian annexation does not rest at all on colonial expansion and should be considered entirely apart from it. . . . The Philippines question is new; the Hawaiian question is old. . . . The Philippines means conquest; Hawai‘i means defense” (p. 227). Making no commentary on whether or not the acquisition of a region is conquest or not, Morgan’s use of this quote implies a belief that obtaining a location for security purposes is not a form of imperialism or colonialism. Such subtleties and silences in Pacific Gibraltar will likely seem troublesome to many indigenous studies scholars of Hawai‘i.

There are also unnecessary value-laden comments throughout Morgan’s work. In one example, he called the Queen and the Royalists “timid and fearful” (p. 95). While he is validating the fact that this group understandably interpreted the landing of U.S. troops as threatening, he did not need to attack the character of these individuals in such a personal way. In fact, he strongly judges the Royalists’ surrender, stating that “no one in the royalist camp had any imagination” (p. 103). Even though he provides a caveat at the beginning of his work that he is not writing from the perspective of Native Hawaiians, such an omission severely limits the breadth of Morgan’s analysis. This major weakness in approach prevents Morgan from acknowledging other factors that might have come into play during these events, such as the Queen’s desire to avoid bloodshed (Noenoe Silva, Aloha Betrayed, 2004, p. 165).

Another major criticism of Morgan’s work is his use of two main sources to
prove his interpretation of the deposition of the Hawaiian monarchy. While his close study of the Morgan report reveals some interesting details about the chronology of events, he almost completely relies on the Morgan report for his examination of the overthrow/revolution in chapters six and seven. He also uses the Department of State’s *Foreign Relations of the United States* annual publication to access government documents, as well as some *Pacific Commercial Advertiser* articles. However, he takes all of these documents at face value. His literal analysis of these materials with little critical evaluation leaves the reader wanting more information or verification of the author’s ideas and claims. The detail with which he examined the annexation debates in chapter 15 is a much better example of his ability to consider historical documents with an appropriate amount of context.

Finally, Morgan spends a lot of time describing the people in his study, sometimes providing very specific information such as a person’s hair color, stature and childhood upbringing for several pages. While such particulars can be interesting to some, this minutiae often distracts the reader from the larger arguments of his book. Overall, Morgan provides some insightful information about the events leading up to the annexation of Hawai’i, especially towards the second half of the book. However, his lack of analysis at certain points, and his overly judgmental statements at other moments, makes this piece problematic.

*JoAnna Poblete*  
*Assistant Professor of History*  
*University of Wyoming*

---


Hawai’i’s story of water development is a rich one and only partially told. Carol Wilcox’s *Sugar Water* (1996) began the recent endeavor with a detailed documentation of sugar plantation ditches. There is a less well-know story about water development for settlement rather than sugar. A chapter in Jessica Teisch’s *Engineering Nature: Water Development, & the Global Spread of American* places Hawai’i within the context of global water development projects at the turn of the 20th century. In the chapter “Nothing but Commercial Feudalism: California’s Hawaiian Empire,” Teisch looks at the how one
prominent California engineer, Elwood Mead, came to Moloka‘i in 1921 at the request of the new secretary of the Hawaiian Homes Commission (HHC), George P. Cooke, to assess the potential for water development and Hawaiian resettlement on government lands.

The larger task of this interesting book is a discussion of the California engineers who envisioned themselves as social reformers building water development projects at the request of governments in far-flung locations such as Australia, Palestine, and South Africa. The Moloka‘i project is one of four case studies, but it is a valuable read that places Hawai‘i in the orbit of engineers who used water as a means to design social change in the image of Western agriculture and culture. Teisch’s main argument is that California’s engineers at the turn of the 20th century emerged out of the mining fields and agricultural districts with a vision of hydraulic and social reform intertwined, including concepts of race and culture tailored to harness settlers in the national image. They were deemed some of the best engineers in the world by national governments in far-flung locations, sought out for their unique California hydraulic experience, and were imbued with social visions that would help enfold wayward populations in the arms of the national economic development projects.

Teisch discusses engineers practicing between 1880 and 1920. Utilizing the papers of William Hammond Hall (1846–1934), George Chaffey (1848–1932), and Elwood Mead (1858–1936) and other more minor engineers from the Bancroft Library and Water Resources Center Archives at University of California, Berkeley, she weaves a tale of global ambition that ties water and irrigation projects for mines and farms to programs of cultural imperialism. Unfortunately, the more noted San Francisco engineers who developed Hawai‘i’s sugar irrigation projects appear as minor actors in her account. Herman Schussler (builder of Spreckels’ 1879 Haiku Ditch on Maui), James D. Schuyler (consultant on O‘ahu water projects at Honolulu, Kahuku, and Wahiawā in 1889 and 1903), and Michael M. O’Shaughnessy (1904 Olokele Ditch on Kaua‘i, 1905 Koolau Ditch on Maui, and the 1907 Kohala Ditch on Hawai‘i) were important figures in sugar industry development. Hired primarily for their engineering skills, they were not tasked with social reform agendas, and thus are largely absent from this book—a minor criticism. Instead, hired by the sugar companies rather than the government, their engineering projects figured more directly in the physical transformation of Hawai‘i, so pivotal to the societal changes wrought by sugar’s rise in power during that same 1880–1920 time frame. The papers of J. D. Schuyler and M.M. O’Shaughnessy are available, however, at the University of California, Berkeley.

Teisch’s account of the Moloka‘i project, however, makes a nice connec-
tion between water development, engineering’s societal vision, and government designs for cultural and economic assimilation. She places Hawai‘i in a global framework of the time period, reminding Hawai‘i readers of the mainland forces that swept the islands during the early Territorial era. Elwood Mead, who accepted George P. Cooke’s invitation to Moloka‘i, also worked in Australia and Palestine. In all of these projects, he combined his technical advice with a social prescription—the promotion of a national identity through socialization of minority communities into family farm enterprises. Quoted in a June 1922 issue of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, Mead argued that “[i]t is realized by practically every civilized country of the world today that proper settling of its people upon the land and rooting patriotism in the soil is the political and social problem that is most vital to the welfare of the nation” (p. 154). By the time Mead arrived in Hawai‘i, he had applied his ideas of “scientific colonization” in California. After advising the Hawaiian Homes Commission, he continued his work in Palestine and again in Australia (New South Wales).

Mead’s vision for Hawai‘i was unsuccessful in its application. The Moloka‘i experiment aimed to settle Hawaiians on government-owned homesteads, provide water for agriculture, and inculcate patriotism and Americanism in Hawaiian homesteaders through small farm production schemes. Mead was also convinced that success of his agricultural settlement projects rested in the hands of experts who would advise Hawaiians (many of whom were transplants from urban and plantation districts) about appropriate agricultural techniques and marketing. As with his work in Australia and Palestine, Mead exported his vision of settlement and nationalism into communities with vastly different histories and cultures. He also promoted assimilation through intermarriage in his schemes: “No race that does not intermarry and mingle freely with the whites, is or can be a good American” (p. 158).

Teisch argues throughout her book that engineers such as Mead, who spread their technology along with American ideas of progress and superiority of Anglo-Saxon culture, met with problems that often doomed their projects. It was their blindness to cultural nuance, ethnic history, and local agricultural knowledge that set the stage for failure. In the case of Hawai‘i, Mead failed to recognize the dominance of sugar and pineapple in marshalling human and natural resources, the importance of Hawaiian cultural history, and the unwillingness of the Territorial government to provide the resources for Hawaiians to succeed. The Moloka‘i Kalaniana‘ole settlement opened in 1922 on the heels of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act (1920) signing, which included a clause that kept the more fertile lands out of the HHC jurisdiction and in the hands of sugar and pineapple planters. Mead served as a consultant rather than a resident engineer, and thus, unlike his work in
Palestine and Australia, he spent little time in the islands. He planned and mapped the settlement for HHC, and returned to advise it in 1923 when it appeared the plan was not working.

Kalaniana‘ole homesteaders could not make ends meet under his plan and grew reliant on Moloka‘i’s pineapple companies who leased their farm land for money rent. Homesteader strategies also included hiring others to work their land. Mead’s insistence on making homesteading a capitalist enterprise producing for a Honolulu market, and HHC’s policies that mirrored this vision, made it difficult for his experiment to thrive. Water development for the Moloka‘i settlement did not go well—there proved to be an inadequate supply for the already poor lands designated. The program, driven by an ideology of social improvement, was in the end, inflexible when faced with local conditions—especially government priorities to support sugar and pineapple production first.

This is not surprising, as the story was much the same in other homesteading districts in Hāmākua, Waiākea, and Ōla‘a on the Big Island prior to the HHC Act. Beginning in the late 1880s, the Hawaiian government attempted to carve out non-sugar lands for small farmers. They too were in districts with poor soils, removed from adequate roads to carry products to markets, without agricultural advice to help the transition to small farm export crops, and located in districts adjacent to and above sugar plantations. The same outcome occurred—homesteaders leased their lands to nearby plantations, abandoned them altogether, or tried unsuccessfully to combine full-time work for sugar planters with small farm production. Predating the HHC settlement on Moloka‘i, these experiments were designed with much the same aim—to create a small class of farmers invested in property and marketing that would transform Hawaiians and other immigrants into American-like agriculturalists. Mead’s vision added the additional element of engineering design and water development in hopes of achieving success.

For the Hawai‘i reader, the strength of a global focus on water engineering is also its weakness. The author provides a rich account of the cultural and technical frameworks California engineers carried to different global regions, and a read of the other cases is eye-opening. Yet, Teisch’s account suffers somewhat from the larger story which doesn’t allow her to explore the Hawaiian context and perhaps provide an account more in sync with local history. The treatment of the Moloka‘i settlement focuses more on Elwood Mead’s vision, to the detriment of some of the important back story to the earlier failed homesteading initiatives, the Hawaiian Homes Commission politics in the 1920s, and to other equally important water development projects for sugar agriculture. Thus her explanation of why the project failed is not as robust, and perhaps not as accurate, as it might be. In spite of this shortcom-
ing, I still recommend this book to Hawai‘i readers because of its global focus on the cultural imperialism of engineering in the early 20th century and for her uncovering of a heretofore little known water and settlement project on Moloka‘i. There is much to understand about water development in this era, and Teisch opens the door to a less well-known part of that story.

Carol MacLennan
Associate Professor of Anthropology
Michigan Technological University


In his most recent work, Organized Agriculture, Valdés seeks to draw attention to the important labor organizing that took place decades before the arrival of César Chávez and the United Farm Workers (UFW). Though both Chávez and the UFW loom large in the public imagination, they have unfortunately overshadowed a much longer history of agricultural activism and militancy. Equally important, Valdés adopts a transnational perspective in telling this largely untold history of labor activism by looking closely at Puerto Rico, Hawai‘i and California. These three case studies—linked by a long history of economic, political and military conquest and annexation by the United States—offer Valdés an opportunity to raise big issues, including the fact that incorporation into the United States “did not widen political participation or spread democracy to the rural working people newly incorporated into the empire” (p. 23). However, neither did this incorporation stop rural workers from asserting their rights as workers and as political actors. With varying success, agricultural workers in all three places challenged obdurate employers, hostile local officials, powerful national governments, and uncooperative labor leaders, to assert fundamental rights and to remake their societies to reflect the democratic aspirations that undergirded their labor organizing in the first place.

Valdés’ account of Puerto Rico challenges the conventional historical understanding of the American Federation of Labor (AFL) and agricultural labor, thereby providing nuance to a complicated history. In this case, the AFL at times acted as an important ally, though a somewhat unpredictable one, with its local affiliate, the Federación Libre de Trabajadores. In fact, Val-
des argues that in spite of American domination, the conditions for labor organizing in Puerto Rico were much better than in California and elsewhere in the United States. After decades of labor organizing, with much jockeying between various labor organizations and political allies, the Puerto Rico legislature in the 1930s passed legislation that granted Puerto Rican agricultural workers rights sorely lacking in the continental United States, including an eight hour day and collective bargaining rights. Though enforcement varied and was further undermined by the Sugar Act, these legal victories still mark a significant achievement. By the 1940s, labor unionism in Puerto Rico took on an increasingly political cast as the Confederación General de Trabajadores emerged to challenge the AFL’s Federación domination. This drew the concern of colonial officials who feared the overlapping of labor issues and calls for independence. Ultimately, divisions that emerged within the Confederación, including a faction that wanted to stabilize and moderate the labor movement, provided room for the United Cannery, Agricultural, Packing, and Allied Workers of America, a Congress of Industrial Organizations affiliate, which contrary to its political radicalism on the continent, acted as a largely conservative force in Puerto Rican labor unionism and politics, reigning in what had been an activist labor movement.

Turning next to Hawai‘i, Valdés directly confronts the conventional wisdom that Hawai‘i agricultural workers’ organizing can be traced to the heroics of labor organizer Jack Hall. Instead, Valdés highlights the collective efforts of plantation workers and local leaders whose grass roots militancy made labor organizing successful. Valdés notes that the highly paternalistic sugar and pineapple plantation owners touted their labor camps as superior to labor camps elsewhere in the world. Though Valdés argues that these camps were never as rosy as the planters described, they nonetheless did provide a somewhat stable setting in which workers created a sense of community and even some autonomy. Equally important, Valdés describes the arrival of the International Longshoremen’s and Warehousemen’s Union as the key turning point. Resuming union militancy in 1944, which Valdés notes was built on the labor organizing and militancy of previous decades, the Longshore Union pushed for democracy for workers both at the workplace and in the polling place. Through its Political Action Committee formed in July 1944, the Longshore Union engaged in voter registration drives and demanded organizing rights. Success came in 1945 with the passage of the Hawaiian Employment Relations Act, which provided collective bargaining, minimum wages and maximum hours. Though the Longshore Union would experience some significant defeats and adopt a less radical agenda in years to come, it nonetheless proved crucial in helping to make Hawaiian agricultural work-
ers better paid and treated than their counterparts elsewhere in the United States and its empire.

Valdés begins his discussion of California by challenging the scholarly view that the organizing campaign of the National Farm Labor Union (NFLU) in California was largely doomed to defeat due to structural and political constraints. During World War II, the NFLU called for the government to provide transportation for domestic workers to meet labor shortages, thereby challenging the American Farm Bureau Federation’s insistence that only Mexican Braceros could meet the growing labor needs. Looking closely at the period from 1947–1952, Valdés stresses that in comparison to the more well known UFW that would follow later, the NFLU tried valiantly to establish itself as a national union, pushing for national legislation to deal with the plight of displaced tenants and sharecroppers as well as health and housing concerns. After recounting the 2½ year DiGiorgio strike, Valdés explains how defeat was hardly surprising considering the hostile legal and political environment of the emerging Cold War era. In spite of these challenges, the NFLU continued to try to organize California’s agricultural workers, crossing over both racial and national divisions. At times, the NFLU even experienced some successes, including gaining higher wages and winning support from local business leaders and small farmers. Ultimately, however, the power of both the U.S. and the Mexican governments proved to be too overwhelming. As a result, California employers maintained a great deal of control over the labor force, a labor force increasingly dominated by single, mobile, and vulnerable male workers.

Valdés is to be commended for laying out the history of agricultural laborers in the early to mid 20th century. In doing so, he has described a long neglected historical period and long neglected workforce. Valdés should also be commended for bringing together the history of agricultural workers in Puerto Rico, Hawai‘i and California, thereby providing a transnational perspective. While the chapters are rich in detail and narrative with respect to each individual case study, Valdés’ work would have benefited from more explicit and extended discussions of how this history revises or challenges our historical understanding of U.S. expansionism and imperialism. Nonetheless, this book represents a good place to start that conversation.

Kathleen Mapes
Associate Professor of History
State University of New York at Geneseo

Waves of Resistance is an important contribution to the historiography of he‘e nalu [surfing] as a traditional and customary practice of Kānaka Maoli. The overall narrative is framed in a discussion about he‘e nalu, its spiritual connection to Hawai‘i and its transformation to recreational activity away from the very community responsible for its birth. What fills the frame are rich discussions of historical, political and cultural events about Hawai‘i, its people, and the relationships located in ka po‘ina nalu [the surf zone].

Each chapter can be seen as a series of Waves of Resistance, creating a timeline that explains the history and further contextualizes events unfolding both on land and in the ocean of Hawai‘i. From this dualistic vantage point, Walker closely observes, examines, and analyzes what has occurred, starting with the colonial violence of the illegal overthrow of the Hawaiian monarchy, to newcomers claiming Hawai‘i and its culture as their own, and ultimately to the introduction of tourism. Collectively these events created tension for Kānaka Maoli. In the water, these tensions were evidenced among different groups like Hui Nalu, Outrigger and the Waikīkī Beachboys, hui [groups] that were negotiating for territorial control and the preservation of identity and culture. Other tensions were sparked by the exploitation of he‘e nalu through national competition events, spearheaded by organizations like International Professional Surfing (IPS), as well as environmental concerns against commercial development limiting access to the ocean on O‘ahu’s South and North shores.

Walker creates a space for critical discussion about the identity of Kānaka Maoli. Dominant history created myths and stereotypes about the identity of Kānaka Maoli women and men. Over time, tourism and later Hollywood films would sustain these myths and stereotypes, propelling them toward truth narratives. In these narratives, Kānaka Maoli women were cast as the exotic hula girl. Even today, this image is highly sought after and heavily promoted, especially for marketing tourism about Hawai‘i. Walker asserts the oversaturation of this image is responsible for the absence of images of Kānaka Maoli men. He further contends if any image is offered, it is usually insignificant compared to that of the exotic female. In Waves of Resistance, the counter-narratives offered through this section are significant because they add to the collection of scholarship needed to permanently erase these dominant narratives.
Among the elements that make this text noteworthy is the Native perspective from which it is told. This is of great importance because dominant history has silenced and controlled the narratives that were written about Kānaka Maoli. *Waves of Resistance* is but one example of new scholarship being created by Native Hawaiian scholars. In addition, what makes this text convincing is the evidence gathered to support the claims within it. I applaud Walker’s efforts to use oral history and personal interviews from practitioners of he’e nalu, whose own lived experiences were used to construct the text. This is essential because it validates and values the lived experiences of the Hawaiian people. From a Kānaka Maoli tradition of mo’olelo [storytelling], Walker is clearly demonstrating his kuleana [right, responsibility and authority] as the ha’i mo’olelo [storyteller]. Furthermore, what makes this text unique is the location from which its observations, examinations and analysis were conducted, ka po’ina nalu. At this time, I do not know of any other author who conducted research from this location. What makes this text equally important is the presentation of new knowledge and the possibility it offers for social justice. As such this text should join its rightful place among the scholarship of Kānaka Maoli resistance. *Waves of Resistance* should be of interest to every reader.

*Lia O’Neill M. A. Keawe  
Assistant Professor, Kamakakūokalani Center for Hawaiian Studies  
Hawai‘inui‘akea School of Hawaiian Knowledge  
University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa*

*Airborne Dreams: “Nisei” Stewardesses and Pan American World Airways.*  

In the early 1960s, my aunt was selected to be in the first group of native Japanese-speaking stewardesses for the German airlines, Lufthansa. Just as Christine R. Yano describes of the first “Nisei” stewardesses for Pan Am, these hires for Lufthansa made the news: my aunt and the other stewardesses-to-be got their picture in the newspaper. And similar to Pan Am in the “jet age,” Lufthansa invested in their new, “oriental” stewardesses. In addition to a crisp stewardess uniform, they outfitted my aunt with an extremely expensive, high-quality kimono—one so beautiful that my grandmother recalled it wistfully a quarter-of-century later. My aunt had to return the kimono and the uniform
because she decided to relinquish her “airborne dreams” in order to attend college in the United States on a scholarship.

Yano’s nuanced and sophisticated study of the “Nisei” stewardesses, who worked for and traveled with Pan Am during its heyday, analyzes the post-war, jet set story in which my aunt almost participated as an employee. Yano focuses on a group of stewardesses—not “flight attendants,” as one of her interviewees insisted—at a specific moment in commercial aviation and post-war history to tell us more about the history and those who participated in it. The stewardesses of East Asian ancestry may have been Chinese or sansei rather than second-generation Japanese American, but the fact that Pam Am called them all “Nisei” is telling and a major insight of the book. The lack of differentiation not only indicated chauvinism of a liberal persuasion—after all, the women were respectfully called “Nisei” at a time when many Americans still casually said “Nips” or “Japs”—but also reflected the prescribed roles the women were to perform in their capacity as hostesses in the air. They were to be “exotic”-looking in ethnicity, but familiar as girls-next-door in the consistency of their western, military-style uniforms, their gracious manners, and their perfect English.

In fact, although the “Nisei” women were ostensibly hired to be bilingual Japanese-English hostesses, many of them did not speak Japanese fluently. The company did not care. It “hired for the racialized look first, and then brought the women up to an acceptable level of in-flight performance through company tutors, classes, and eventually a book of in-flight announcements [written] in romanized Japanese” (p. 62). Moreover, as Yano points out, the numbers of Japanese nationals traveling abroad in the mid-1950s through the early 1960s were quite small, and those going abroad who didn’t speak English and required assistance in their native tongue was quite likely even smaller. What mattered to Pan Am was the inclusion of their nonwhite, Asian and reassuring, female faces to the crew. This was why it was often only the “Nisei” stewardesses who were required to fly around the world, whereas other crewmembers worked only parts of the route. To the airline, “Nisei” representation helped achieve the liberal and worldly flair it was seeking. This image reflected elite American notions of U.S. power and culture, both corporate and state. Thus the presence of a “Nisei” stewardess aboard a Pan Am flight was intended to signify not only the beneficent spread of U.S. empire and the pluralist tolerance of its minorities, but also the excellence in service that supposedly came naturally to Asian women.

Pan Am’s decision to hire those with Japanese language ability before any other non-western language was not idiosyncratic, but tells us about the immediate postwar landscape during the “jet-age,” which—images of James Bond in Monte Carlo aside—coincided with the rise of U.S. global hege-
mony. Japan was the crown jewel in the American empire, as East Germany was in Russia’s, said the late Chalmers Johnson; they were former World War II enemies, each with an educated, industrialized society, which were rehabilitated and polished into “workshops” that showcased the superiority of either the capitalist or socialist systems.\(^1\) The U.S. choice to mold Japan into an international model minority rested on decisions to deny opportunities and attention to others, including its former colony, the Philippines, or the victims of Japanese imperialism such as the Koreans. Moreover, the path to U.S. hegemony and later the troubles besetting it are roughly mirrored in the corporate history of the airline, as shown in Yano’s helpful appendix, “Chronology of Pan American World Airways, 1927–1991.” It is a corporate history that did not simply parallel the events in U.S. foreign relations; Pan Am’s every development was closely tied to U.S. policy, its military, and/or its policymakers. (Juan Trippe, founder of the airlines, was even a brother-in-law of wartime Secretary of State Edward Stettinius, who was also later the first U.S. ambassador to the UN.) Thus a back-cover blurb of Yano’s book does not do it justice when it says “Airborne Dreams paints big compelling themes from the experiences of a small group of women who put a distinctive spin on the stewardess mystique.” This comment has it backwards, as if Yano simply succeeding in pulling out larger lessons or analyses about a select group of women whom she happened to be studying. What is important to recognize is that the group itself was created and that their experiences occurred because of a specific confluence of Asia-Pacific wartime legacies; mid-century U.S. globalism and “one-worldism” liberalism; U.S. technology and corporate expansion in new realms; and existing hierarchies of gender, race, and class. We shouldn’t think of how the “Nisei” stewardesses put a “distinctive spin” on the jet age, but understand how the jet age was predicated on participation of nonwhite others, especially Asian women.

In Yano’s telling, most of the “Nisei” stewardesses were proud, even grateful, that they were able to be part of the jet age. They took pride in Pan Am’s status as the premier airline and also for being able to be a part of history—occasionally in dramatic ways, such as the airlifting orphans out of Saigon in 1975. Yano realizes that her pool of interviewees were self-selecting, but was unable to find past employees who were highly critical of the airline (p. xi). Although Yano imparts the “Nisei” women’s sense of celebration and nostalgia for Pan Am—she notices, for example, that one woman said that she “traveled with,” not “worked for” Pan Am—she is careful to point out that Pan Am did not extend such opportunities to African Americans, Latinas, and other minorities. The company only did so at a much later date. In the meantime, the “Nisei” women for the most part played the model minority—trying to establish and maintain a high level of professionalism and competence for
their ethnic group—rather than recognizing or acknowledging the lack of similar openings for others. As recent targets of wartime hatred, the Japanese American women continued to live in a legacy of colonial, plantation racism if from Hawai‘i, as most of them were, or under the shadow of the internment if from the mainland. “This was the one instance [it seemed to them] in which it was actually an advantage to be of Japanese ancestry—rather than of Chinese, Korean, Filipino, Hawaiian, or white ancestry” (p. 83). They therefore focused on “their own upward trajectory,” the “excitement of their own accomplishment,” or the chance, as one former stewardess put it, to earn “a master’s degree in the world” (pp. 39, 83).

Yano does a wonderful job of weaving together disparate threads—theoretical concepts, historical information, and cultural vectors—to tell and analyze the Pan Am “Nisei” stewardess story. As a historian, however, I must admit that I was a bit uncomfortable with the effort to use the frontier as an etic, a concept for analysis (pp. 5–6). I’m not sure we can undo, modify, or recuperate what Frederick Jackson Turner did, so entrenched has “the frontier” become in the ideology of American exceptionalism since Turner’s 1893 address. It has enabled or rationalized racism, imperialism, and sometimes genocide. That most Americans didn’t and don’t recognize this is, of course, how it functions as a hegemonic concept in U.S. culture. Yano realizes this, I am sure, and our differences and my strong feelings are no doubt due to my positionality as a specialist in the history of U.S. empire. Likewise, I wished for more elaboration of her use of “cosmopolitanism.” Postcolonial literary critics have indeed recuperated that term to signify a particular stance, usually political, vis-à-vis colonial legacies of displacement, diaspora, continuing structural inequities, and constraints. I was uncertain of how this analytic device related to the Pan Am “Nisei” stewardess story, but this could have likely been my own limitation. These quibbles aside, I found Airborne Dreams to be a thoroughly enjoyable, incisive, and enlightening read.

Naoko Shibusawa
Associate Professor of History & American Studies
Brown University
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