

“A Dangerous Theorist”:
Romanzo Adams and
The Professional Rhetoric of Race

Lori Pierce
Wabash College
September 10, 2001

In January of 1928, Romanzo Adams delivered a paper on “the second generation problem” in Hawai’i before the Institute of Pacific Relations. Adams, among the first full professors hired to teach at the newly chartered University in the fall of 1920, was the founding member of the Sociology and Economics Department,. Although he came to Hawai’i with no special expertise or interest immigration or race, Adams used his extraordinary grasp of demography to the problems of labor, economics and immigration in Hawai’i.

In the paper, “The Education of the Boys of Hawai’i and their Economic Outlook: A Study in the Field of Race Relationship,”¹ Adams and his research associate, Dan Kane-zo Kai, surveyed grade school and high school aged boys about their ambitions and future plans. They found, not surprisingly, that a majority of the boys did not plan to continue to labor on the plantations. The second generation had decidedly negative attitudes toward the plantations and wished to work in business or technical trades. For plantation owners, the dissatisfaction of the second generation meant that they could not rely on these young men work as stoop laborers after completing their education. The sons and daughters of Asian immigrants who had been brought to Hawai’i solely to work on the plantation could not be relied upon to replace their parents. Plantation owners would have to look elsewhere for laborers. For middle class business owners and tradesmen in larger towns and cities, a newly educated class of Asian Americans would mean competition for jobs and resources. For the young men and women who had

watched their parents work hot, back breaking jobs in miserable conditions for low wages, education was the key to improving their lives and the lives of their families. They did not want to confine their prospects to the plantations, For Asian Americans, the plantations offered little chance of advancement to managerial or supervisory positions which, by tradition, were reserved for Whites. But Hawaii's economy was too small, too narrowly focused on the cash crop of sugar to support the thousands of men and women who, with rising expectations, would hit the labor market in the third decade of the twentieth century.

Adams' paper was not a policy statement and therefore did not propose any remedies. He did note that if plantation owners expected to keep at least some of these young men "down on the farm" as it were, they would have to improve working conditions and wages on the plantations. And, he maintained, because of the limited economic opportunity in Hawai'i, many of these boys would have to accept that their ambitions would not be met; if they wished to remain in Hawai'i, many would have to remain on the plantations.

Adams' findings generated a wide variety of public private responses. Several months after delivering his speech and having it reported on in the local papers, Adams received a letter from Edward Perry, pastor of Wailuku Union Church on Maui. Apparently the editors of the Maui News had denounced Adams' findings, demonstrating, according to Perry, that they were in league with the plantation owners. Perry expressed his frustration at the degree to which the plantation owners seemed to exercise control over the local community. "There is not a single phase of life on this island... that is not controlled indirectly by the financial interests...all take their orders from the plantations." He signed off on the letter, adding "I do wish that you would come back at the people who call you a 'dangerous theorist.' It makes me disgusted to see such a charge made by men who have [no] experience as scientific investigators..."²

Not long after receiving this letter from Perry, Adams received a copy of a letter from Wook Moon, a young man from Hawai'i living on the mainland, to a Mr. Cary, one of Adams' correspondents living in New York City. Moon had read a newspaper story about Adams work, but his reaction was decidedly different from Perry's. "Professor Adams stated the problem well, but his solutions... were feeble." The idea that sugar planters would willingly make conditions better was, in his mind, ridiculous. "In the first place...the planters are hard-headed businessmen and as such, more interested in gold than in social welfare; and in the second there is a limit in making agricultural work attractive." He rejected suggestion that a well educated class of young men should accept their fate as plantation workers: "To send a young man through high school and then ask him to labor in the field is, under the present social system, an absurdity."³

The second generation problem affected all of Asian America, but it was felt more acutely in Hawai'i than elsewhere because Asian immigrants and their children in 1920 represented more than 60% of the population of the territory.⁴ Their prospects were limited, as Adams noted, by the size of Hawai'i and its singularly focused economy. There was bound to be a sense of frustration as their expectations to do better than their parents were thwarted.

But Wook Moon was more than just a little frustrated. His chances for economic success were being thwarted, not just because the local economy could not support a large number of young workers, but because his ability to advance off the plantation was hampered by the racial hierarchy that helped to determine the fate of Asian Americans in Hawai'i. He articulated the anger of his compatriots, saying that "the majority in the category will simply have a beastly time of life for having been born with a yellow skin and educated as if his skin were white. I have seen a great many Oriental students from Hawai'i gone to seed on the mainland simply because they don't belong."⁵

Romanzo Adams arrived in Hawai'i at a crucial time. The first two decades of the Territorial era were marked by political turmoil, residual enmity between Hawaiians and Haoles because of the overthrow of the monarchy some twenty-seven years earlier. The White cabal who had instigated the overthrow had to fight much harder than they had anticipated, biding their time by establishing the interim Republic of Hawai'i while waiting for Congress to agree on a treaty of annexation. The American public had to be convinced that an off-shore territory populated by Asian immigrants and indigenous Hawaiians was the proper political and social course to take. For five years, from 1893 to 1898, a public relations war was waged in the popular press, debating the whether or not Hawai'i could (or should) be Americanized.

By 1920, when Romanzo Adams arrived at the University of Hawai'i, the Euroamerican ruling class of Hawai'i still worked tirelessly at remaking Hawai'i into an American territory. Building a full fledged university was part of that effort. Beginning as a land grant college in 1907, the University of Hawai'i was fully incorporated and funded by the Territorial legislature in 1920. Adams was hired primarily to teach Economics, but since the disciplines of Economics and Sociology were still closely linked in many colleges and universities, it was not uncommon that he would have been expected to take charge of both departments. Gradually, however, as his expertise and interest grew, Adams began to teach social theory and method almost exclusively. By the time of his death in 1942, he was the pre-eminent spokesman on matters of immigration and race.

Under Adams' leadership, Hawai'i briefly became an important outpost in the development of sociological theory in the United States. Hawai'i hosted a diverse mix of cultures from Asia, Europe, and the Pacific, all living in close proximity in a relatively uncomplicated social environment. Robert Park, the eminent University of Chicago sociologist, was a

contemporary of Adams and came to the University of Hawai'i as a visiting scholar in 1931-32. His student, Andrew Lind would go on to become one of Adams' successors at the University of Hawai'i. E.B. Reuter, William Carlson Smith, Jitsuichi Masuoaka, Margaret Lam, and Clarence Glick, all known for their work on race relations or early Asian American studies, studied in or wrote about Hawaii's "racial laboratory."⁶ But what made Hawai'i even more attractive as a racial laboratory was the fact that Hawai'i seemed to not have a race problem. Hawai'i had gained a reputation as something of a racial paradise – a place where people from a variety of backgrounds apparently got along without the usual amounts of racial strife, struggle or infighting. Hawai'i appeared to have the solutions to the race problems that troubled the rest of the world. As Kum Pui Lai, editor of Social Process in Hawai'i put it in the first volume of that journal, "...the writers [of Social Process] ... are keenly interested in the harmonious integration of many cultures in the making of the neo-Hawaiian community."⁷

The image of Hawai'i as a racial paradise, of course, exists in stark contrast to Wook Moon's analysis of the significance of race in the Territory. It was clear to him, as it was to most Asian Americans and Hawaiians, that White supremacy, the belief in the normative value of European and American values, institutions, beliefs and customs, was a crucial factor in the life of the Territory. Moon recognized that the American education he received that taught him to believe in equality and justice was no match for the racial hierarchy that determined the social structure of island life. Hawaiians had been stripped of control of their government because White residents believed that they had the right to impose their mode of government and their economic strategies onto Hawai'i. White plantation owners scoured the world looking for laborers who could be paid as little as possible to do work that they understood White men were not suited for. The social, political and economic structures established in Hawai'i - Christianity,

western land tenure and private property, capitalist trade - mirrored White American values to the near exclusion of all others.

In this paper, I examine this contradiction; how can a place that is so clearly structured around a racial hierarchy, also be considered a racial paradise? Why did sociologists come to Hawai'i to study it as an example of a racial harmony and good will? How did Adams come to conclude that Hawai'i possessed and "unorthodox doctrine of race"? Adams work established a professional rhetoric of race that sanctioned the long held local belief that Hawai'i was a racial paradise. This image of Hawai'i, represented both discursively and pictorially, pre-dated Adams. In fact, the tradition of writing about Hawai'i as a paradise – both climactically and socially – dates back to journals, diaries and letters of the earliest explorers, sailors and missionaries. I contend that this rhetorical representation of paradise, paired with the work of professional observers like Adams, created what might be called a discourse of aloha. This discourse was articulated in popular and scholarly writings, newspaper and magazine articles and other monographs. It was depicted in the innumerable photographs that were used to sell Hawai'i as a tourist destination. And it was enacted by the members of Hawaii's ethnic communities in public celebrations and holidays. Within the terms of this discourse, Hawai'i was a place where race relations "worked." Just as Hawai'i enjoyed a reputation as a tropical paradise because of its bucolic scenery and temperate climate, it also was seen as a racial paradise, where ethnic relationships were calm. The diversity of Hawaii's population – Asians, Native Hawaiians and Europeans and Americans – did not cause undue friction, tension, or conflict. The Discourse of Aloha appropriated the Hawaiian value of aloha - loving kindness and compassion - as a way of regulating social behaviors regarding racial and ethnic relations. Race and racism were not

acknowledged to be a problems, nor did they represent significant factors in the politics, economics, or history of Hawai'i. The Discourse of Aloha helped to configure the ethnic identity of Asian immigrant workers by asserting Anglo-conformity within a context of a racial hierarchy. This discourse also helped to structure the public representation of Hawaiian ethnicity. The Discourse of Aloha severed the relationship between Hawaiian ethnicity and Hawaiian political nationalism that was asserted in wake of the overthrow of the Hawaiian monarchy. Hawaiians appealed to their ownership over Hawaiian culture as a way of resisting annexation. Under the Discourse of Aloha, Hawaiian ethnicity was relegated to the realm of the "ancient" kingdom and, as a result, represented no threat to the ruling White minority government. Because of the Discourse of Aloha, a rigidly racially stratified society could be conceived of as a racial paradise.

Romanzo Adams didn't invent this discourse or the perception of Hawai'i as a racial paradise, but his work made a significant contribution to it. Adams never challenged the notion that Hawai'i was a racial paradise, but rather constructed a theory of how race relations worked in Hawai'i that gave intellectual authority to the fantasy of paradise. Adams fixated on describing why race relations worked, rather than investigating whether or not this was true. His work played a central role in giving intellectual validation to the image of Hawai'i depicted and reproduced in the Discourse of Aloha. As often as he challenged the White ruling class for their treatment of Asian plantation workers, Adams also dismissed the signs of institutional racism and discrimination against Hawaiians and Asian plantation workers.

What is most significant about Adams' work on Hawai'i is the way in which racism in a multiethnic environment was successfully effaced. By adopting the rhetoric of American liberal democracy, and adding to that a discourse unique to Hawaii's multiethnic environment, the

Discourse of Aloha was used to distract attention away from the institutional structures that sustained White supremacy. Although Adams acknowledged the fact that Asian and Hawaiian workers faced prejudice, he saw it as a part of a larger social process that would dissipate through the normal social process of assimilation. The sociology of race relations in the early twentieth century functioned with an impoverished understanding of racism. The race relations cycle that was the basis of Adams' work, construed racism as an epiphenomenon of economic competition. Once the sources of economic conflict were removed, racism naturally would be abated. This understanding of racism as race prejudice - an irrational response by an individual or group to a threat or perceived threat by another - can't explain the larger ideological force of White supremacy that was responsible for establishing Jim Crow segregation, Asian exclusion and the overthrow of the Hawaiian monarchy. By re-examining Adams work on Hawai'i we can begin to see how White supremacy was reinforced in a multiethnic environment.

The Perception of Paradise

Hawai'i was annexed as a territory of the United States in the midst of an ongoing national debate over American imperialism. While a significant number of American business and political leaders advocated United States control in the Pacific, an equally strong contingent of anti-imperialists argued that extra-territorial control of Hawai'i, the Philippines, and Guam, was not in U.S. self interest. The political lines drawn over American imperialism did not evenly sort liberals from conservatives. Carl Schurz and E.L. Godkin were equally resistant to the annexation of Hawai'i, both arguing that it would be too difficult to assimilate brown peoples into American values and traditions.⁸ Many questioned the wisdom of "giving" non-Whites the ability to govern themselves as independent states or territories. The thought that a plurality of

non-Whites might, as independent states or territories, have some say so over “American” political affairs was unthinkable.

White Americans had long ago asserted their control over the political economy of Hawai'i. White Christian missionaries arrived in Hawai'i in 1820 and converted many of the Hawaiian ali'i soon afterward.⁹ White sailors, missionaries and traders established business interests in Hawai'i and then instituted a system of Western land tenure in 1848, foisted a constitution favorable to them on the king in 1877, and finally ousted the ruling monarch, Lili'uokalani in 1893.¹⁰ Over the near constant objections of Hawaiians, Euroamericans gradually gained complete political control over Hawai'i.

Their hegemony, however, was restricted by the scarcity of Whites in Hawai'i. By the middle of the nineteenth century, the Island's economy was nearly entirely dependent on the sugar. By the middle of the nineteenth century, sugar was being grown on enormous plantations that required a great deal of human labor. Since the Native Hawaiians population was nearly decimated by the diseases spread by Europeans, White plantation owners relied on imported labor, mostly from Asia. Between 1890 and 1920, the population of Hawai'i jumped from 89,000 to 255,000. Nearly all of that explosive growth represented Japanese, Korean and Filipino laborers and their families. White inhabitants never represented more than twenty percent of the population.¹¹

The campaign to annex Hawai'i as a territory of the United States was fraught with racial tension. The White conspirators who had overthrown the monarchy were unexpectedly chastised by Grover Cleveland, who, upon reading the report of his representative, James Blount, recommended that the American flag be taken down and the Hawaiian monarchy restored. In spite of the fact that the United States minister to Hawai'i, John L. Stevens, had helped them

foment their revolution, members of the “Committee of Safety” as they called themselves, had to embark on a five year campaign to gain public sympathy for their cause.¹² Acting as agents of the “Republic of Hawai’i” the hastily constituted oligarchy that replaced the monarchy, Sanford Dole, Lorrin Thurston and other prominent supporters of annexation set out on a public relations campaign to gain American sympathy. They wrote newspaper and magazine articles, and hosted travelling reporters in Hawai’i who would return and write favorable accounts about the Islands. They disseminated pictures, monographs and other forms of propaganda designed to depict Hawai’i in a favorable light. The debate was played out in series of articles in Overland Monthly and The North American Review. Initially, the discussion focused on the legality, necessity, and morality of the annexation. In March of 1893, weeks after the overthrow, Lorrin Thurston, a descendant of a storied missionary family, argued that since 1826, under John Quincy Adams, that the United States had always pursued a policy of intervention with regard to Hawai’i. It was, he contended, in the best interest of the U.S. to continue to protect Hawai’i lest Hawai’i and American business and military interests fall into the hands of foreign (read Asian) powers. This long history of contact had benefited Hawai’i as well as the United States, and it was in the best interest of both to continue that relationship.¹³

The leaders of the Republic of Hawai’i, who succeeded the monarchy, continued to lobby the American public for their cause when it became clear that Hawai’i would not immediately gain annexation. The lobbying shifted focus – from a practical, legalistic argument of mutual economic and political benefit – to one that attempted to sell Hawai’i as “already American.” The debate came on the heels of a successful campaign to prohibit Chinese immigration in the West. Since the bulk of Hawaii’s population was Asian, selling Hawai’i as a place that had the potential to become an American territory was challenging. What the annexationists from Hawai’i had

working in their favor was a long history of good publicity about Hawai'i. Members of the Hawaiian monarchy had traveled to the world and, except for a few incidents of Jim Crowism in the United States, were favorably received. New England Christian missionaries regularly reported on the success of the Hawai'i mission in civilizing the pagan nation. Hawai'i was often acclaimed as an example as a well run mission because of there was (apparently) so little resistance to conversion and a willingness on the part of the Natives to adopt the accouterment of western civilization. Travelers to the islands consistently produced written narratives that praised the islands bucolic splendor and peacefulness.

Nevertheless, admitting Hawai'i into the union as a territory, a stepping stone toward statehood, was seen by some as a threat to American interests, American identity and American racial purity. Writing in 1895 in the Overland Monthly, Rev. Sereno Bishop, editor of Hawaii's missionary newspaper, The Friend, answered the query "How has Hawai'i become Americanized?" by describing all the institutions of Hawai'i and their roots in or connection to American interests. A small number of Americans - not British or German Whites but Americans - "are practically the ruling class." The dominant language: "the English tongue, and that not of the British, but the American type." The children who go to school in Hawai'i learn American English, read American texts, take home American style newspapers to their parents. American flags fly over homes and businesses; American born men run the government and other social agencies. "In religious concerns Americanism is completely in the lead." Bishop concedes that there is a French Catholic church and schools, and a British Anglican cathedral, but its communicants are American Episcopalians. "The country" Bishop concludes, "has become practically an American colony."¹⁴

Like Thurston, Bishop concentrated on Hawaii's institutions and the long history of social and political relationships between Hawai'i and the United States. There was, they seem to suggest, no need to worry about Americanizing Hawai'i. Hawai'i was already assimilated in the ways that counted most. If its institutions were American in values and practices, then the territory would continue in that direction.

After annexation, there was a proliferation of books, monographs, journal and newspaper articles and other dispatches which served the purpose of educating the American public about the far distant territory. They continued to sell Hawai'i both as a tourist destination and as a safe, but exotic American territory. Albert Palmer's The Human Side of Hawai'i is typical both in terms of its rhetoric and its use of images to decorate and enhance the message of assimilation and Americanization. The first image, of a young Japanese American boy is entitled "Youth comes up! An "American Citizen of Japanese Ancestry" inquires what the future holds in store for him!" The other images follow suit, unfailingly reinforcing the image of Hawai'i as modern and the home of immigrants who are assimilating into American life by going to Christian Churches, attending American style schools, wearing western clothing. "Hawai'i" Palmer asserts, "is a fascinating interracial experiment station, where under the American flag, with white leadership and a Christian missionary background, on the foundation of a brown-skinned Polynesian basic population, there is being built up a community combining representatives of the leading races in the Pacific area...If this sociological experiment succeeds, it will throw rays of light to both sides of the Pacific Ocean."¹⁵

The marketing of Hawai'i was a critical part of assimilating Hawai'i as an American territory. Hawai'i was a modern vibrant place that still retained features of its ancient past.

Further, it was a place that welcomed foreign immigrants and readily assimilated them. William Atherton DuPuy described encountering the ethnic diversity of modern Honolulu:

[O]ne in ten is conventional Anglo-Saxon pink, one in ten is of a darkness beyond that of the American Indian and with no yellow glow back of it. These are Hawaiians. There is a sprinkling of Latins - swarthy Portuguese from the Azores. But the mass of the population shows the yellow of the Orientals - Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Filipino- each with distinctive traits but each also postmarked, as it were, on that other fringe of the Pacific. All of these wear American clothes (there is not a pigtail in Honolulu) and disport themselves much as do Natives of Vermont or Virginia, but their skins are yellow. And the young people are blends of these, emerging blithely from the melting pot and setting forth impudently to find what life under a western flag has to offer.¹⁶

The ethnic diversity of Hawai'i was always contextualized within an American assimilationist framework. Hawaiians, Chinese, and Japanese were regularly depicted as groups on their way to becoming fully American. Given their dominance, the Haole elite rarely felt the need to assert their control through bigotry or racial terrorism. Cultural diversity was rarely seen as a threat, so long as that diversity could be contained within a paradigm of ethnicity that insured the continuity of White Supremacy through control of the political, economic and social institutions of Hawai'i.

The threat of Asian dominance underlay the Discourse of Aloha. White hegemony was not maintained by legal proscriptions against voting or other forms of sanctioned segregation. Rather, the Discourse of Aloha was put into full force, producing a never ending supply of newspaper and magazine articles bestowing the virtues of Hawaii's multiethnic environment. Given the fact that non-Whites were the majority in Hawai'i, White power brokers relied on their patronage and support to maintain control. During labor strikes, when workers organized around ethnic lines (because they lived and worked in segregated camps, in order to induce them to "compete" and work harder than their rivals), White ruling class decried "the appeal to race" as a

violation of the aloha spirit. The Discourse of Aloha was always linked to the effort to retain White supremacy as the primary means of reinforcing White supremacy.

Sociology and the Professional Rhetoric of Race

Sociology was still a relatively new discipline in the United States in 1920. The American Sociological Association was founded in 1895, during the era of the consolidation of academic disciplines. Sociology's intellectual genealogy, according to Robert Park, dates back to the growth of political philosophy in Enlightenment Europe. He cites Comte, Locke, Hobbes, and Hume as the intellectual progenitors of sociology, which he defined as "the study of man as ... a political animal, participating with his fellows in a common fund of social traditions and cultural ideals."¹⁷

Park was an advocate of social theory that emphasized the natural history of human communities. Societies were organisms that had natural life cycles; a sociologist was like a biologist, dissecting, examining, matching hypothesis to lived experience. His work was far more theoretical and speculative than that of others of his contemporaries. Sociology in the United States grew up along side of social reform movements. It was not uncommon for sociology departments to be involved in the training of a growing class of professional social workers. These two aspects of sociology worked hand in hand to create a methodology that marked American sociology as distinct from its European counterpart. American sociologists used the kind of field-work that was common to social workers who worked in settlement houses and charity wards. Whether their aim was reform or mere observation, sociology students practiced the discipline of sociology by observing living social organisms; the urban ghetto, a rural farm town, a plantation church, or a taxi dance hall.

Race was not an abiding concern of the first generations of American sociologists. During its first fifteen years of publication (1895-1910), the American Journal of Sociology published only a dozen articles or book reviews concerning race.¹⁸ James McKee argues that race fell out of the purview of sociological study for three reasons: "... first race relations were not included in the sweeping reforms of the Progressive Era ...second, in a milieu of strong racial attitudes and emotions, studying race relations often seemed to sociologists to be a thankless task; and third, in a period when assimilation of the European ethnics into American life became accepted policy, nonwhite populations were viewed as unassimilable."¹⁹ Race, in the mind of sociologists, was not a symptom of social disorganization like alcoholism or child-abuse therefore there was little to be done about it. Further, as a social problem it raised complicated questions of personal irrational prejudice and social custom, not subjects that lent themselves readily to objective scientific analysis. Sociologists approached race as did most Whites of the day; they ignored it as much as possible.

James McKee argues that Franz Boas' influence on American anthropology helped move the study of race out of the realm of evolutionary biology and into the realm of social theory. Boas' helped to popularize the early notion that phenotypical markers of race were incidental to cultural and social practices – in other words that race had no essential biological reality. This meant that sociologists could and should rightly considered race relations as a legitimate sub-field of sociology.

Robert Park is rightly recognized as the most prominent sociologists of race relations in the early twentieth century. This is, in part, because he had the intellect, the charisma, the contacts and the will to draw attention to himself and his concerns. He published broadly, lectured widely and traveled around the world studying racial systems. Park came to his interest

in race relations as the result of his association with Booker T. Washington and the Tuskegee Institute. Park worked as a reporter before going on to graduate school, earning degrees at the University of Michigan, Harvard, and the University of Heidelberg, (where he received his Ph.D. in 1904). He lost patience with the academic life and met Washington while working with the Congo Reform Association. It was Washington who suggested that if he was interested in the problems of Africa, he might learn something from studying the Negro in the south. Thus, he spent seven years at Tuskegee Institute as assistant and amanuensis to Booker T. Washington. Park moved to the University of Chicago in 1914 where, drawing on his experiences in the south, taught courses on “The Negro in America.”²⁰

Park made his mark on the study of race by describing the race relations cycle. This social process described what happens to groups as they encountered each in the modern, urban settings. Park used this model to describe how immigrants went from being foreigners to assimilated members of American society. He theorized that immigrant groups moved through several stages - contact, competition, accommodation, and assimilation - a process that was inevitable and irreversible. Eventually immigrant groups dropped their language, institutions and other practices which made them anathema to the outside community. Once their behavior changed, once they assimilated, they would no longer be the recipients of discrimination. Racism, in this model, was a natural result of the social process for immigrants. Left alone and without any outside interference, immigrants would naturally assimilate. Prejudice would eventually be abated once immigrants assimilated into the larger society.²¹

The race relations cycle is premised on an understanding of the concept of “social distance.”²² Social distance was used as a way measure of “race consciousness.” As Park understood it, “[t]he terms ‘race consciousness’ and ‘class consciousness’ with which most of us

are familiar, describe a state of mind in which we become... conscious of the distances that separate, or seem to separate us, from classes and races whom we do not fully understand.”²³ The consensus on which any society is built relies on distinguishing “self” from “other.” Prejudice arises as a part of this process, helping to maintain group consciousness and consensus. Prejudice was a normal reaction and was something of a self protective move, to safeguard the group. “Prejudice is on the whole not an aggressive but a conservative force; a sort of spontaneous conservation which tends to preserve the social order and the social distances upon which that order rests.”²⁴

Park elaborated on the concept of social distance as a way of measuring the process of assimilation in immigrant communities. Emory Bogardus was also influential in disseminating this idea as a way of studying the social process of immigrants. Bogardus was trained at the University of Chicago, receiving his Ph.D. in 1911. He founded the department of sociology at the University of Southern California and is renowned for his development a survey which measured an individuals reactions to various ethnic groups. This “social distance scale,” asked participants questions like “would you willingly admit members of another race to my street or to your workplace. The scale worked from the distance to the intimate, measuring the reaction of an individual asked to consider how close he or she would allow a member of another race to move into his or her life. From exclusion from the country altogether, to marriage and kinship, the social distance scale tracked, over several decades, the gradual assimilation (or lack thereof) of Armenians, Filipinos, Greeks, Irish, Italians, Japanese Jews, Mexicans, Negroes, Scots and Fins. Whereas Park speculated on the idea of social distance, Bogardus took up the task of actually measuring and quantifying it. He devised “racial distance quotients,” 1.00 being as close as kinship and 7.00 being as distant as exclusion from the country.”²⁵

Both of these theoretical models for understanding the social process of assimilation influenced Adams' work. His work reflects the centrality of these ideas in the sociology of race relations in the early twentieth century. These two premises are the foundation of all Adams' work – first that there is a social process of assimilation that is moving groups inevitably closer to one another and second, that the closeness of groups, measured by these gauges of social distance, can be used as some indication of how successful ethnic groups are being assimilated. With that in mind it becomes obvious why Adams chose interracial marriage as the subject of his only full length book on Hawai'i.

Romanzo Adams and Robert Park were contemporaries and shared an intellectual kinship through their association with the University of Chicago. Adams was born in Wisconsin in 1868, the son of a pioneer farmers. After earning a teaching degree from Iowa State Teachers college, he served as principal of schools in Ireton, Iowa, before returning to the University of Michigan to earn his Bachelor's and Master's degrees. Adams and his wife Nellie moved to the University of Nevada in 1902 where he a professor of education and sociology until 1911. He earned his Ph.D. from the University of Chicago in 1904 and from 1911 to 1920 he was professor of Economics and Sociology.

In 1919 Romanzo Adams asked the trustees of the University of Nevada to grant him an unpaid leave in order to take an appointment at the newly incorporated University of Hawai'i as the head of the Department of sociology and economics. In his letter to the regents, he sited health problems and apparently wanted to find out if the climate of Hawai'i was better suited to him. Adams was past fifty when he arrived in Hawai'i, embarking on a second career that would turn his attention away from economics of transient labor to race relations.

Adams served as chair of sociology and economics at the university of Hawai'i when he first arrived. Initially he spent more time teaching basic economics and commerce, but gradually this gave way to a focus on sociology. Eventually economics became a separate department and he taught only sociology. From examining his course notebooks, it appears that Adams taught the standard course of basic sociological theory which emphasized distinguishing hereditary vs. acquired social traits, distinguishing racial characteristics (“racial stocks”), theories of contact and competition between societies, factors which influence social change, the influence of invention and technological innovation on society, the importance of class and caste in various societies.²⁶

Adams' approach to teaching introductory sociology reveals that he was very much grounded in the current theory about race and ethnicity which owed much to both the University of Chicago emphasis on social process and assimilation. From Adams, students learned that race is loosely defined by biological characteristics such as skin color, eye fold, hair color and texture. With his class, he speculated as to whether temperament and mental attitude were inborn racial characteristics. In his lectures on race, he gave students an overview of the theories of Lamarck, Cuvier, Darwin, and Mendel, but moved quickly on to the relationship between racial groups and society. The focus of his teaching on race seemed to be to get students to question their assumptions about what kinds of social and personal characteristics could be rightly considered acquired or inborn. What, he asked them, are merely habits or learned behaviors and what is inborn? He asked, for example:

- There are more Filipino murders than Japanese murderers. Is this the result of inborn or acquired traits?
- Chinese families larger than that of Caucasians in North European Descent in Hawai'i. Inborn or acquired
- Illocanos more thrifty than Visayan. Inborn or acquired?²⁷

Adams teaching suggests a complicated relationship between inborn and acquired traits, and thus the difficulty of saying anything definite about the relationship between race and biology. By using common stereotypes about groups that his audience of Hawai'i undergraduates would have been familiar with, Adams is urging his students to question their ability to determine what might be an essential trait and what might be learned behavior. What we might think of as inborn traits and habits, he taught, were influenced by social circumstances. Slavery had an impact on the inborn characteristics of the Negro; the samurai code of behavior changed the social behaviors of Japanese of that class. What Adams is stressing in his lectures is the complicated relationship between nature and nurture. In his approach to the study of sociology what mattered was what impact the acquired and inborn traits had on various social problems.

A key feature of Adams leadership of the department was the promotion of student research. In 1935, the Sociology Club, with his encouragement and guidance, began to publish Social Process in Hawai'i. From 1935 to 1963, Social Process was the pre-eminent venue for publishing research material about race and ethnicity in Hawai'i. Although many of the contributions were raw and unsophisticated, they were all based on careful observation and conscientious reporting on a wide variety of problems and issues in Hawai'i. Social Process remains one of the most important sources of primary documentary evidence on race and ethnicity in the early territorial period. The contributions – most by students but many by other faculty members (including Bernhard Hormann and Andrew Lind, Adams successors in the Sociology Department) reflect Adams' influence. The contributions rely nearly exclusively on oral history and demographics for their methodology. There is no speculative sociology and very little in the way of theory. The writers who contributed to Social Process followed Adams example faithfully and produced spare, concise reports free from conjecture.

Adams and his students understood Hawai'i as a racial laboratory, one that would redefine the field of race relations. Park and others were fascinated with Hawai'i with so many "racial stocks" came into contact with each other. Because the territory was geographically contained, and because the immigrant workers were undergoing a classic transition, from rural to urban, Hawai'i was the perfect place from which to redefine the problems of race relations. Underneath the flurry of activity that marked the first decades of social research in Hawai'i was a palpable sense of enthusiasm. Not only was Hawai'i a racial laboratory, Hawai'i would be the model for how race relations ought to take place. The underlying presumption is that because Hawai'i lacked the racial tension that marked the coming together of cultural and ethnic groups in other areas, that it should be studied more carefully. If race relations could succeed in Hawai'i with its complex and diverse populations and long history of intermarriage, there was hope for a future free from the specter of racial antagonisms.

"Hawaii's experience derives its importance because of its ability to throw light on the general subject of race relations. In our age race contacts are increasing throughout the world and antagonisms related to race tend to complicate social and political problems generally. If race prejudice as between two races manifests itself in different ways and with varying degrees of intensity, the conclusion would seem to be warranted that racial differences do not constitute the sole cause of the phenomena, but that there are other factors – factors which have their origin in the historic circumstances under which contacts were established and in the existing social situation. To the extent that the social factors are able to be understood and controlled, the phenomenon of prejudice and conflict can be modified."²⁸

In other words, Hawaii's situation was unique not just because of the number and variety of groups coming into contact with one another. Hawai'i was unique because of a specific set of historic circumstances. Hawaii's "Unorthodox Race Doctrine" could be explained by a careful explication of the past and the values and traditions upon which the society was founded.

Adams summarized his thinking on these matters in a fourteen- point program, but he fully explicated them in his book Interracial Marriage. There, Adams gives a full account of the race doctrine of Hawai'i and, using marriage as a barometer of social distance.

Adams' argument was founded on four central ideas: first, equality had been an esteemed social value in Hawai'i since first contact with the west. Second, this value of egalitarianism was publicly enacted and symbolized. Third, the diversity of groups that came to Hawai'i after the initial contact between Hawaiians and Haole adopted this set of values, and enjoyed relatively close social contacts. Fourth, close social contacts and a pre-existing code of egalitarianism led to a high rate of interracial marriage, resulting in a class of hybrids or mixed-race people.

Adams argued that the pattern of stable race relations in Hawai'i was premised on a "historic accident" – the precedent set by the encounter between Hawaiians and Haole beginning in 1778. "Why, in Hawai'i, did the people of British and American origin fail to set up obstacles that are so commonly found where English-speaking people have established contacts with the darker races?"²⁹ In a chapter entitled "The Social Background" he described Hawaiian cultural values that, in his mind, dictated the terms of this first interethnic encounter. Hawaiians, he suggested, had a relatively more relaxed view of marriage and family relationships, enjoying a tradition of "free" marriage, that enabled Hawaiian women to "choose" to be with White men. These pairings resulted in the first generation of mixed-race children who were accepted within the Hawaiian community, not cast out or ostracized. The pattern of race relations, then, was established within the context of social/sexual relations. Because Hawaiian women had sex and children with Haole men, Adams argued that this determined the pattern of interethnic relations from that point forward.

Once the pattern of egalitarianism in sexual relations had been set, Adams argues that all of those who subsequently migrated to Hawai'i learned to moderate their own cultural values in order to harmonize with Hawaiian values. Here Adams stresses the public nature of racial mores. The initial encounter between Hawaiians and Haole, and the continuation of the alliance between these two groups in ruling Hawai'i for many generations, meant that racial segregation of any type was never legislated. There could be no "Jim Crowism" in Hawai'i because Hawaiians would not allow it. This lack of legal proscription against racial discrimination, along with a pre-established sense of egalitarianism led to a set of public mores to which all groups subscribed. No matter what their private sentiments, they were tempered by public actions that symbolized equality. "A man of any race is addressed as "Mister" in Hawai'i. ... [I]n Honolulu a Chinese man or a man of any other race may be entertained in any hotel and white men may sit at the table with him."³⁰ Adams drew a sharp contrast to the rampant Jim Crow segregation that was the norm in most American cities. He was forceful and reiterated the importance of this public, ritualistic enactment of racial equality in nearly every piece of his writing. No matter what a person or a community believed in private, if the community values dictated a certain kind of equal treatment and lack of strict and over segregation, this eventually would effect the nature of race relations. "He may not accept all the implications of the ritual [of equality]... he may profess doctrines of a contrary character. But the existence of these contrary sentiments and beliefs is a matter of second-rate importance. The really important thing is the general body of tradition that inhibits the open and constant avowal of such attitudes. In the conflict between antagonistic mores, the sentiment that cannot be openly avowed, that cannot be expressed in slogans, and that cannot influence civil law or the social code is ineffective..."³¹

This public code is crucial to explaining Hawaii's race relations. They symbolized a value of egalitarianism, but they also led to closer social contact between the various ethnic groups in Hawai'i. Public schools, for example, were not legally segregated because they *could not* be. Racial segregation would be a violation of this public ethos. Therefore, children of all groups mixed and socialized, decreasing the social distances and leading to a greater chance of interracial marriage. The chance of interracial marriage in Hawai'i were increased by the fact that plantation owners imported a large number of unmarried men who married local women, and because they imported laborers from so many different places in so short a period of time.

In Interracial Marriage Adams carefully examines the rates of intermarriage for all the ethnic groups in Hawai'i, determining that not all groups intermarry at the same rate. The Japanese and Haole, for example had a relatively low rates of intermarriage when compared to other ethnic groups. But overall, Adams predicted that interracial marriage would continue apace in Hawai'i. "If marriage across racial lines is permitted it will take place, and, through such marriage, there will gradually come into existence a more or less homogenous mixed-blood population."³² Because of the value of egalitarianism Adams believed that this homogenous class could play a special role in de-fusing any possible source of racial tension. "The mixed-bloods have an especial role in relation to the further process of cultural assimilation of the parent groups and in relation to further amalgamation."³³ Because Hawai'i had none of the problems of a caste-based society, mixed race children were not consigned to an inferior status, but were free to move about the society and establish contacts across ethnic lines. As members of two groups, in a society where there was no allowance for public antagonisms between groups, the mixed-race population did not feel pushed to identify strongly with either parent

group. Over time, this would lead to a diminution of tension between groups and the existence of private prejudices.

All of these elements, working in concert with the natural social process of immigrant groups assimilating to a new culture, helped to explain Hawaii's unorthodox race relations. Race relations in Hawai'i work, in part because they have always worked. The unique historical circumstances established a pattern of behavior that other groups adopted. The lack of legalized discrimination based on race led to a public sentiment that in time Adams believed would effect private belief. Interracial marriage facilitated by the natural social process of assimilation of immigrants established a emergent class of mixed race people who might eventually replace distinct ethnic communities and the exclusive loyalties they demand. Hawai'i truly could be the model for race relations for the rest of the country, perhaps the world.

The problems with Adams' model reveal themselves when we expand our understanding of racism in order to account for the structural inequities that sent young Wook Moon and his compatriots to the mainland. Adams defined racism as prejudice and relegated it to the realm of private action. He repeatedly stressed the importance of public symbolic enactment of egalitarianism. So, even if there were no laws to keep Wook Moon from getting a high school education, there was also nothing to keep private businesses from not hiring him because he was Chinese. And although Moon received an American public school education, it is likely that he and his compatriots did not attend the informally segregated "English Standard" high school that isolated White students from local Asian American and Hawaiian students based on their ability to speak "standard" English.³⁴

There are several significant critiques of Adams model that need to be considered. First, Adams presumes what he sets out to prove. Adams perceives Hawai'i as a place of tranquil

ethnic relationships because it did not exhibit same patterns of race relations that was common on the mainland. Of course, just because Hawai'i did not seem to resemble the mainland was not a reason to believe that it was free from racial antagonism. Adams acknowledged that there are numerous instances of racial prejudice in Hawai'i, but these are always construed as exceptions to the rule. For example, Adams describes the discrimination Chinese workers faced as they moved off the plantations:

The literature of this period abounds in expressions of fierce hatred. There were no words in the English language too strong to express the disapprobation of the publicists of the time. Of all the undesirable people the Chinese were the worst and the plantation interests were severely condemned for importing them as labor. But in all this anti-Chinese movement the language of hostility was not in terms of color. Public sentiment was directed to their behavior, not to them as representatives of the non-white race. White propagandists did not use their color or other physical traits to symbolize things that were held to be mean and contemptible in Chinese character.³⁵

Racial prejudice was largely the result of the natural conflict and competition that arose between groups competing in a capitalist economy. It would pass when the source of the conflict is relieved.

But racism is not confined to instances of racial prejudice or bigoted behavior on the part of individuals. Racism is a larger institutional force, and a manifestation of White supremacy. Even as Adams reiterated the pattern of racial egalitarianism, he failed to consider the pattern of racism in the broader context of the history of Hawai'i. For example, Adams argued that the history of the encounter between Hawaiians and Haole established the value of egalitarianism in ethnic relations. Sexual contact between Hawaiian women and Haole men was a barometer of social relations. Adams presumes that those relationships were voluntary, that Hawaiian women “chose” White men of their own free will. Here Adams failed to consider the fact of rape and coercion that may have accounted for the first group of mixed race children in Hawai'i. In the

case of White men marrying members of the ali'i class, these alliances eventually facilitated the western land tenure system that alienated many Hawaiians from their land. When we judge racism by the institutional impact it has on a society, it is necessary to reconsider whether the pattern established in these early encounters was egalitarian or exploitative. Sexual conquest is as much a part of colonial domination as economic and political conquest. No matter how peacefully Hawaiians seemed to welcome Haole explorers, Western imperialism is, by its very nature, violent, injurious, and implicitly racist in that it presumes that indigenous people do not have the right or the ability to rule their own lands. That very encounter that Adams reads as calm and peaceful because there was sexual contact can also be read as viciously racist. Because Adams believes that interracial sexual contact was an indicator of the collapse of social distance, and because he is trying to explain the pattern of racial harmony, not a pattern of racial tension, he takes the sexual encounter between Hawaiians and Haole out of the larger political context of Western imperialism.

Adams' understanding of racism is also problematic because he insists on the importance of private versus public displays of racial attitudes. Private actions, he contends, are not important because the public ethos is so strongly opposed to bigoted attitudes that their public expression is not tolerated. But what happens when private acts have public consequences? The plantations, for example, were private enterprises. The White men who ran these plantations relied on a racial hierarchy of hiring and wages. Asian workers rarely rose to the level of management or to jobs out of the fields. Those jobs were reserved for White immigrants. Adams correspondent on Maui testified to the power of the plantation interests to assert their control over the community, protecting their interests as private business owners. Their views were clearly antithetical to the racial egalitarianism that Adams describes as the rule, not the

exception in Hawai'i. And yet because these men had the power guaranteed to them as privileged members of a racial hierarchy, their private views had the potential to have very serious public consequences. Their private actions effected the life chances of young men like Wook Moon who left the islands in order to advance further than stoop labor in the fields.

Private attitudes, expressed in the context of a social system based on a racial hierarchy might seem harmless. But those egalitarian laws and the public ethos that symbolized racial equality did not protect the a young Hawaiian man who was hijacked and killed by a White navy lieutenant in 1931. Unable to accept the fact that the young man, Joseph Kahahawai had been acquitted of the accusation of raping his wife, Lieutenant Massie and his mother-in-law took the law into their own hands and kidnapped and killed Kahahawai. Massie was convicted of the murder by a local jury, but served only one hour of his sentence in the office of the Governor. White supremacy, expressed in the ability of Whites to control institutional structures, trumped both the law and Hawaii's famous unorthodox race doctrine.³⁶

Because Adams was attempting to explain racial equality rather than racial inequality, we have reason to call his interpretation of history into question. His perspective was shaped by an understanding of Hawai'i as a place where racism is virtually non-existent. If we interpret the initial encounter between Hawaiians and Haole not as egalitarian but White supremacist, we come to a completely different set of conclusions about Hawai'i's race doctrine. Adams does not question the inherent racism of plantations owners who based their pay scales on ethnicity, always paying Whites more than Asians. Adams does not question the inherent racism of the overthrow the Hawaiian monarchy. He does not interpret these events as part of a larger pattern of White supremacy, but rather focuses on the public ethos of egalitarianism that emerged because Whites did not have sufficient numbers to assert their control more overtly.

Looking back across the twentieth century with an expanded definition of racism that more fully encompasses the wide range of structural inequities in Hawai'i provides a platform from which to critique Adams model of ethnic assimilation. His work was easily co-opted into the prevailing Discourse of Aloha because it did not challenge racism as an institutional manifestation of White supremacy. The Discourse of Aloha celebrated ethnic diversity so long as the various ethnic groups were moving inexorably toward assimilation. Just as Hawai'i was assimilated, transformed from an indigenous kingdom into an American territory, Hawaii's residents were shaped into Americans, gradually losing their foreign cultures as they moved through the social process.

¹ Romanzo Adams and Dan Kane-zo Kai, “The Education of the Boys of Hawai’i and Their Economic Outlook: A Study in the Field of Race Relationship.” University of Hawai’i Research Publications # 4 (Honolulu: University of Hawai’i, 1928).

² Uncatalogued Material: Romanzo Adams Social Research Laboratory, University of Hawai’i Archives [RASRL Notes p. 18]

³ Uncatalogued Material: Romanzo Adams Social Research Laboratory, University of Hawai’i Archives [RASRL Notes p. 19]

⁴ See Table 3-1 of Eleanor Nordyke, The Peopling of Hawai’i 2nd edition (Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 1989), 178-179.

⁵ Uncatalogued Material: Romanzo Adams Social Research Laboratory, University of Hawai’i Archives [RASRL Notes, p. 19]

⁶ Examples of their research, especially those that pertain to Hawai’i include: Edward Byron Reuter, The American Race Problem, Introduction by Jitsuichi Masuoka, (New York: Crowell, 1970); Race and Culture Contacts, (New York: McGraw Hill, 1934); William Carlson Smith, Americans in Process: A study of our citizens of oriental ancestry, Introduction by Romanzo Adams (Ann Arbor, MI: Edwards Brothers, 1937); Americans in the Making; The Natural History of the Assimilation of Immigrants, (New York: Appleton-Century Company, 1939); Clarence Glick, Sojourners and Settlers: Chinese Migrants in Hawai’i (Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 1980); Jitsuichi Masuoka, “Race Preference in Hawai’i” American Journal of Sociology, 41:5 (Mar. 1936) 168-178; and “The Structure of the Japanese Family in Hawai’i” American Journal of Sociology, 46:2 (Sept. 1940); Margaret Lam, “The Racial Future of Caucasian-Hawaiians,” Social Process in Hawai’i 1 (1935), 6-7. Lam also worked as a research assistant on the Survey of Race Relations, sending research notes and transcriptions of interviews to Robert Park who headed up the study. On Margaret Lam and the role (or lack thereof) of other Asian Americans in the social sciences, see Henry Yu, Thinking Orientals (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000).

⁷ Kum Pui Lai, “Diagonosing Social Process in Hawai’i” Social Process in Hawai’i, 1 (1935), 1.

⁸ See Matthew Frye Jacobson, Barbarian Virtues: The United States Encounters Foreign People at Home and Abroad, 1876-1917, (Hill and Wang, 2001).

⁹ On the breaking of the Aikapu by the alii, see Lilikala Kame’eleihiwa, Native Land and Foreign Desires: Pehea La E Pono Ai? (Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press, 1992). The traditional system of Hawaiian religion was abrogated by Ka’ahumanu and Liholiho months before the arrival of Christian missionaries. Historians of Hawai’i have often written about the

abolition of the aikapu and the conversion of Hawaiians to Christianity in the same breath, tacitly supporting that the missionary narrative that saw this coincidence as an act of God. Kame'eleihiwa makes a complex argument based on Hawaiian cultural metaphors that contends that the breaking of the traditional religious system of values was a political maneuver on the part of Ka'ahumanu, as well as a response to the decimation of the Hawaiian population due to the introduction of western pathogens.

¹⁰ See, Lili'uokalani, Hawai'i's Story By Hawai'i's Queen, (Honolulu: Mutual Publishing, 1990). A more recent account that implicates the Haole ruling class as well as representatives of the United States government, see Tom Coffman, Nation Within: The Story of America's Annexation of the Nation of Hawai'i (Kaneohe, HI: Epicenter, 1998). For a contemporary counter-argument that supports the more traditional ruling class perspective, see Thurston Twigg Smith, Hawaiian Sovereignty: Do the Facts Matter? (Honolulu: Goodale Publishing, 199#?). Twigg Smith is a descendant of the first company of missionaries and remains loyal to his grandfather, Lorrin Thurston, one of the members of Committee of Safety that fomented the coup. He argues that Thurston and his contemporaries made the right decision for Hawai'i and that the Islands have benefited from Annexation and Statehood.

¹¹ See Table 3-1 of Eleanor Nordyke, The Peopling of Hawai'i 2nd edition (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1989), 178-179.

¹² Tom Coffman, Nation Within.

¹³ Lorrin A. Thurston, "The Sandwich Islands: The Advantages of Annexation" North American Review, 436 (March 1893), 257-384

¹⁴ Sereno Bishop, "How Has Hawai'i Become Americanized?" Overland Monthly, 25:150 (June 1895), 600

¹⁵ Albert Palmer, The Human Side of Hawai'i (Boston: Pilgrim Press, 1924), 3.

¹⁶ William Atherton Du Puy, Hawai'i and its Race Problem, (Washington, DC: Department of the Interior, 1932), 19-20.

¹⁷ Robert Park, "Sociology and the Social Sciences", American Journal of Sociology, 26:4 (Jan 1921) 411.

¹⁸ James McKee, Sociology and the Race Problem: The Failure of a Perspective. (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1993), 29

¹⁹ James McKee, Sociology and the Race Problem, p. 4-5

²⁰ On Robert Park, see Winifred Raushenbush, Robert Park: Biography of a Sociologist, (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1979).

-
- ²¹ Robert Park, “Racial Assimilation in Secondary Groups with Particular Reference to the Negro” American Journal of Sociology 19:5 (606-623). [is this the best one?]
- ²² See Philip Ethington, “The Intellectual Construction of Social Distance: Toward a Recovery of Georg Simmel’s Social Geometry” in Cybergeog, refereed electronic edition of European Geography Journal, posted September, 1997 a <http://www.cybergeog.presse.fr>.
- ²³ Quoted in Philip Ethington, “The Intellectual Construction of Social Distance,” 4
- ²⁴ Quoted in Philip Ethington, “The Intellectual Construction of Social Distance,” 4
- ²⁵ See Philip Ethington, “The Intellectual Construction of Social Distance”
- ²⁶ The Romanzo Adams Social Research Laboratory has copies of Adams teaching notebooks. My remarks here are drawn from his handwritten notes and comments in these books.
- ²⁷ Adams Class Lecture Notes.
- ²⁸ Adams, Race Contacts, 4 [need fuller citation]
- ²⁹ Romanzo Adams, Interracial Marriage: A Study of the Mutually Conditioned Processes of Acculturation and Amalgamation (New York: Macmillian, 1937), 44
- ³⁰ Romanzo Adams, “Hawai’i’s Unorthodox Doctrine of Race”, 82.
- ³¹ Adams, “Unorthodox” 83
- ³² Adams, Interracial Marriage, 45
- ³³ Adams, “Summary Statement” Social Process in Hawai’i [one page summary – which volume?]
- ³⁴ On English Standard Schools, see Judith L. Hughes, “The Demise of the English Standard School System in Hawai’i.” Hawaiian Journal of History 27 (1993): 65-90
- ³⁵ Adams, Interracial Marriage, 59.
- ³⁶ On the Massie trial, see Eric Takayama, “Error in ‘Paradise’: Race, Sex and the Massie-Kahahawai Affair of 1930’s Hawai’i.” Master’s thesis, University of Hawai’i, 1997. [others?]