Mr. President, I rise in opposition to S. 50, which would admit the State of Hawaii into the Union.

Mr. President, I have great respect and admiration for the people of the Territory of Hawaii. Their Islands are famous for the hospitality of its citizens, and the lure of Island life is so strong that it provides a temptation for many men, young and old alike, to forsake the mad and ambitious pace of competitive living that typifies our North American continent. I suspect that the tourist information and pictures, which so pleasantly depict life in the Hawaiian Islands, have instilled in many, if not all, of us, a fascination and longing for the easy and pleasant life of the beachcomber.

I do not mean to imply, Mr. President, that all of the admirable qualities of the Hawaiian people stem from their traditionally patient and unhurried approach to life, or the recreational possibilities offered by their enviable climate and Island geography. Their courage and stamina have been more than proved in war; their industry and efficiency have been demonstrated by the growth and diversification of their peacetime economy. The aesthetic of Hawaiian culture is more than adequately balanced by the utilitarian.

Admiration of a people, however, Mr. President, regardless of the degree, is not a sufficient foundation on which to base such an irrevocable and far-reaching political decision as granting to those people Statehood in the United States of America. There are many admirable people in the world, and the number of groups which merit our appreciation increases proportionately to our knowledge and understanding of them, and also according to the degree of self-expression accorded to them under their system of government. The English speaking people of the world, generally speaking, enjoy a latitude of political freedom, as we understand the term, which allows self-expression of qualities which, from our earliest training, we have learned to admire and appreciate. Other peoples in the world share these qualities, and others that are highly commendable, although, unfortunately, many of them are suppressed to the extent that we are hardly aware of the existence of such qualities.
Looking South, from the United State of America, we behold immediately beyond the Rio Grande the Republic of Mexico. Here, too, we observe a people with a more unhurried approach to life than our own, and also a country with the recreational attraction that is common in the more advanced semi-tropical countries. Here, too, in recent years, is the easy pace of life matched by industry and productivity, as is most graphically illustrated by the competitive position enjoyed by certain Mexican products, among them cotton textiles, which are gaining increased shares of the world market.

This country lies adjacent to our own, and in fact parts of what were originally Mexican territory have long since been incorporated as States of the United States, including our second largest State, Texas, and those States formed from the Gadsen Purchase.

Despite the admirable qualities of the Mexican people, a productive capability which would support and does support State Governments, and a parallel, if somewhat slower democratic development, would these factors sufficiently support an application for Statehood, even if requested and conditioned on a period of territorial status? Of course not! An affirmative answer would indicate a fallacious and unbalanced concentration on similarities and a neglect of the glaring dissimilarities.

Such a fallacious concentration on similarities has led us too far along the road of no return to Hawaiian Statehood. We are so engrossed in the day-dream of benevolence and good wishes for these warm-hearted people, that we are in danger of condemnation for what is almost culpable neglect of the basic political factors which should control our decisions. We are not elected to office for the purpose of exercising our emotions—for, at least theoretically, we were sent here to exercise our judgment, individually and collectively, in the best interests of the people of the 49 States in the Union. I propose now, that we consider some of the facts on which our judgment should rest.

The democratic principles of self-government, as practiced in
our Constitutional Republic, are not the result of merely an enlightened philosophy which our Founding Fathers conceived as an answer to the latent desires for self-determination. The Constitution, itself, while novel in many functional respects, was in reality a formalized implementation of those ideas which had been tried and found, from actual experience, to be worthy of implementation. The institutions which comprise our Government were shaped by experiences beyond common recollection; yet the results and lessons which stemmed from those experiences have become ingrained in our political philosophy.

It is appropriate that we review briefly, at least a few of the developments which have contributed to our rich political heritage, and which have, to a surprising extent without our conscious realization, shaped and formed our basic outlook toward the institutions of government.

Underlying and fundamental to our most basic philosophy is our concern and respect for the dignity of the individual. It is so deeply ingrained upon the hearts of the overwhelming majority of the populace of the United States that it approaches the quality of instinct. It is so submerged in our essential character that its origin is often obscured. Origins of such concepts assume tremendous importance in relation to questions which affect the unity of the peoples of the 49 States, such as those posed by the issue of Hawaiian Statehood.

Upon reflection, it is easy for us to realize that our concept for the dignity of the individual could have originated only in Christianity. This concept is only one of the many of the facets of our religious heritage which find expression in our political thoughts and institutions.
Not only is it important to recall the origin of such concepts in order to put the issue we are considering in proper perspective, but it is equally vital to be aware of the route of transmission of the concepts of Christianity to and through our ancestors, and thereafter and thereby into our very subconscious.

It is imperative that we recollect that Christianity, after its birth on the eastern shores of the Mediterranean Sea, spread almost exclusively with the flow of civilization to the West: its spread repulsed, and if anything, reflected away from the East and Orient by the solid wall of the possibly older, already-entrenched wall of Oriental cults and religions. Christianity flowed ever Westward, through Macedonia and Rome, and on the crest of Roman conquest and civilization, to the shores of Western Europe and the Islands of Britain. The acceptance and embracement of the West was so eager, and the repulsion of the East so aggressive, that in shortly more than a thousand years after the birth of Christianity in the land of Palestine, the Christian crusaders of the West were engaged in Holy War to wrest the land of Christian origin from the Oriental non-Christians who had surged in from the East. Thus the Christian Religion, born on the border of East and West, found its acceptance in the West, and became a part of the heritage and culture of the West, as contrasted to the East of the Orientals.

Our heritage is not of single origin. Although our sense of values, such as the premium which we place on the dignity of man, as well as many other basic ideals which guide our relationships, is largely derived from the teachings of Christianity, there are other historical experiences which have contributed immeasurably to our political and philosophical heritage.

Many of these other influences had their origin in antiquity, and indeed, many are undoubtedly without historical recordings. Lest we doubt their existence in antiquity, and mistakenly attribute them to the astuteness of ourselves or our immediate forefathers, I would cite an example of the birth of one of our political tenets.
During the days preceding and coinciding with the beginnings of the Roman Empire, there roamed over the lands of Northern Europe a nomadic people, who were termed by their more civilized contemporaries of the South as "barbarians," and who we recall today as the ancestors of those men led by the famous victor at the Battle of Hastings, William the Conqueror.

These early Germans and Saxons lived in a tribal society, ruled by Chiefs or councils, who were thought to derive power from a higher and non-human source. Even at this early state of non-civilized development, the value of fixed rules of conduct, generally applicable to all men, were realized. The chiefs or councils, even at this early point in antiquity, unenlightened by the forces of Christianity or "civilization," realized that those empowered to govern had limitations, and almost without exception they adhered to the philosophy that they, as rulers, had no power to make laws, but on the contrary were limited to applying and enforcing existing rules. To remedy the absence of any law-making authority, which could enact new rules to meet new and changing conditions, these chiefs and councils resorted to the most questionable practice of, not creating, but "finding," if you please, laws not commonly--nor uncommonly, for that matter--known to have previously existed. A rationalization, to be sure, but this early acceptance by German tribal rulers of a limitation on their absolute power to rule, grew and contributed to our present-day philosophy that not only is the power of a ruler limited, but that government should be with the consent of the governed.

Advancing in point of time from these ancient contributions, political and philosophical crystallizations of thought, though usually uncodified, contributed to definite and positive conclusions in the minds and consciences of Western peoples. These conclusions have descended as a part of our heritage, and many of these have found codification in our basic documents of guaranty, such as the principles of the Magna Carta which were documented for our posterity in the Constitution. Other concepts, while
not codified, and perhaps even elusive of precise definition, have become so engraved in our minds and on our philosophy that they are equally a part of our governmental system.

By seeking to recall the contributions of antiquity to our heritage, Mr. President, I would not leave the impression that our political philosophy is without distinct contributions from post-revolutionary days. Our relatively young republic—and often our conduct suggests childishness—has been blessed with profitable experience. Some of our experience has been severely painful—it is hard to imagine an experience more dreadful than the "civil war" which ravaged our homeland—but each experience has tempered our thought and judgment, and only from the close association with the consequences and effects of these experiences are we able to meet the inevitable problems that confront us with solutions that are in keeping with our basic beliefs.

Our heritage is so rich and rewarding that even a cursory review of its history and formation would require more words than even a United States Senator can muster. Its cumulative impact on both our conscious and sub-conscious, nebulous as it may appear, is the common denominator of our thought process which enables us, even when in disagreement, to reason together for the common good, while safeguarding the rights of the individual. It is the condition of mentality which permits an intercourse of ideas bounded by the same walls of moral attitude and permits harmonious interchange of ideas just as a common language makes possible a comprehensible exchange of words.

Ours is emphatically not the only heritage on earth, and I might add that it has no monopoly on admirable characteristics. Many other peoples than our own share a major portion of our traditions and principles, differing only in extent and route of development. With some peoples, such as the English, we share almost all of our basic political philosophy, and our differences appear primarily in the political institutions and procedures which are the expression of our very similar
philosophies. The degree to which we share our heritage with other peoples obviously depends on the coincidence of ideas and the degree of their acceptance among and by our several ancestors.

Just as there are those with whom we share, in differing degrees, our heritage, there are also those in this world who are the devisees of a totally different heritage and with whom we have no identity in either antiquity or modern times. There are many shades and mixtures of heritages in the world, but there are only two extremes. Our society may well be said to be, for the present at least, the exemplification of the maximum development of the Western civilization, culture and heritage.

At the opposite extreme, exists the Eastern heritage, different in every essential, not necessarily in a way that it is inferior, but different to the very thought process within the individual comprising the resultant society. As one of the most competent, and certainly the most eloquent, interpreters of the East to the West, Rudyard Kipling felt the bond of love of one for the other, but at the same time had the insight to express the impassable difference with the immortal words, "East is East, and West is West, and never the Twain shall meet."

The chasm of difference between the two, possibly geographical in origin, has ceased eons ago to be geographical in nature. The difference is in heritage, the force that shapes the man to form unchangeable, except, if at all, by the infinite passage of time.

It behooves us, at this point, to briefly review some of the influences and occurrences which have contributed to the Eastern culture.

Initially, let us recognize the fact that the Eastern, or Oriental, heritage antedates that of the West. A heritage begins, not with the discernible history of a generic group of people, but with the birth of lasting ideas which contribute to the development, good or bad, of a people.

History reveals that even at the time of the birth of Christianity, the Eastern society was
completely impregnated with the ideas contributed from ancestors' experiences in pre-historic times. For example, one of the contributions of their heritage which was evident even at this early period was their possession of a high respect for their parents—a quality which persists in an even more refined state today, and which, needless to say, is most admirable.

It is not pertinent, however, whether the attributes of the Eastern heritage meet with our admiration or disapproval—what is important is the fact that they are vastly different, and even more important, the fact that the differences are so deeply embedded as to be practically incomprehensible to the product of the Western heritage, and visa versa.

Our best approach to understanding of the product is through study of the processes that formed it. As I have stated, the traditions and heritage of the East commenced earlier in point of time than did our own, and has, like our own continued to the present. It would, therefore, be impossible to attempt to approach any degree of exhaustiveness in treating the formation of Eastern heritage. I will merely mention a few of the periods of Oriental history which contributed substantially to the fabrication of things oriental.

As I have mentioned, one of the facts which most sharply illustrates that from inception, the heritages of East and West were different, is that the origin of the former antedates the origin of the latter. For instance, the early history of China is shrouded in fable, but it is certain that civilization was much advanced among these Oriental people when it was only beginning to dawn on the nations of Europe. In fact, the names of numerous dynasties belonging to a period two or three thousand years before Christ are still preserved. The fact that a recitation of the names of these dynasties would strike no familiar chord to us, does not detract in the slightest from the contributions of this early civilization to the composit of what is known to us as the "Eastern Mind." Probably the earliest Chinese figure whose name has a familiar ring to us was Confucius, born in 551 B. C. under the rule of Ling-Wang in the
declining days of the Chow dynasty. This one philosopher and
teacher, made an immeasurable impact on the formation of the
Chinese thought process and outlook, and indeed on the entire
Eastern world, despite the fact that subsequent to his lifetime,
an Emperor, or "Whang" ordered all books in China, including
those containing the teachings of Confucius, burned. In order to
establish this book-burning episode in point of time, we might
note that the same Emperor, was he who commenced construction
of the Great Wall of China. It is also worthy of note that at
the time of the "book burning" in China, written languages were
rare, and books almost unknown in the Western world.

There was no interrelation of the Eastern and Western
heritages—no contributions in the early development of one to
the other. For all intents and purposes, each went its own
course, uninfluenced by the other. Apparently the first time even
the vaguest exchange of ideas occurred was following the visit of
Marco Polo to China in the relatively recent period of the
thirteenth century.

The moral attitudes and rules of human relationships of the
East are derived, not merely from the teachings of Confucius,
but from mixtures of Taoism and a form of Buddhism and various
superstitions which originated in the fables handed down from
a form of civilization that antedated history.

The Eastern heritage cannot be characterized by merely
observing its descendancy in China, however, any more than Western
heritage can be appreciated by a study of say England, to the
exclusion of other Western cultures. A look at the heritage of
Japan will illustrate the point.

Japan's early heritage unquestionably lies in the same
pre-historic Oriental civilization as did that of China. The
development of what we might loosely term the "national temperament"
of each is similar to the extent of the influences of their early
common history. The difference is one of degree, rather than
substance, and is attributable to the separate and dissimilar
influences of more recent times.

Japan, like China, reflects the influence in its thinking
of the precepts of Confucian ethics as well as those of Buddhism.
The ancient respect for parents is reflected in forms of what we consider "ancestor worship." Nevertheless, neither China alone, nor Japan alone reflects the ultimate in the result of Eastern heritage, any more than France alone, nor Germany alone, could reflect all the facets of the development of the Western heritage.

There is one factor about Japan which is so illustrative of one aspect of the problem I am discussing, that it cannot be omitted. This is the odd historical fact of the relative isolation of Japan from other cultures in what can be called the medieval history of their country. The effects of this isolation are most ably summarized in the words of George Trumbull Ladd, late Emeritus Professor of Metaphysics and Moral Philosophy at Yale University. (and I quote)

"In a word, there is probably no other one of the foremost and equally populous nations of the world whose mental characteristics, as developed on a basis of race temperament, are more strongly marked."

Now consider this, if you will, in the light of the fact that the Japanese people are not an ethnologically homogenous race, but on the contrary are a mixture of two distinctly different racial groups, the Tartars or Mongolians and the Malayans, with traces of other indigenous elements. This proves beyond doubt that it is the total heritage of a people which shapes their temperament and philosophy, rather than their racial strains.

Now let us turn to the outward manifestations of what we may generally call the resulting "oriental philosophy." There are many such manifestations which illustrate the mental approach inspired by their heritage, but the purpose is served just as well by quoting a conclusion of such an eminent authority as George Trumbull Ladd, who concluded that the Japanese temperament is characterized, by, among other things, "a disposition to deal with moral and religious truths as though they are matters worthy of only a passing curiosity rather than concerned with the profounder insights and most important activities of human life."

In the other direction, after noting the fundamental difference between the Japanese and Western moral outlook, Mr. Ladd concluded,
"We may safely declare that the Japanese are as truly moral as any other race of civilized human beings."

It is obvious, then, that there is a fundamental difference in the heritages of East and West, which in turn has resulted in the existence of equally fundamental differences in mental approach to the conduct and regulation of society. It is not necessary for us to attempt a judgment as to which heritage will ultimately result in the better society, nor yet which mental approach is superior, if indeed we were so presumptuous as to imagine that those devisees of either heritage could completely comprehend the thought processes of the other. History has shown that societies with such different heritages and resulting outlooks can co-exist, and in fact, each profit from contemporary experiences of the other.

It is the fact of the difference that we must first recognize and acknowledge. Once this basic premise is accepted, we can better understand perhaps, why Christianity found ready acceptance in the Western world, and was rejected in the East; yet the Eastern mentality is quite probably susceptible to the lure of ideologies which those of Western heritage are inclined to study and reject.

Having realized that the various heritages have formed fundamentally different mental outlooks, and that they can and do peacefully co-exist, we must turn to the next question which naturally arises in our minds, to wit: Can two diametrically opposed mental approaches be fused with a harmonious result?

The answer is an emphatic NO. Once again history has provided a clear cut illustration of this answer in Japan. Subsequent to World War II, the Americans occupied Japan and not only voided the power of the Emperor, but established, at least in form, democratic institutions of Western heritage in the Japanese Islands. Despite the fact that the Japanese were tutored intensely for a period in excess of ten years in the operation of these institutions, and despite the ability of the Japanese to copy Western accomplishments, the development of these borrowed democratic institutions has taken on a
peculiarly Japanese flavor, and to many in the Western world, has been both surprising and disappointing. Political parties have increased alarmingly, and it has become almost impossible to determine from day to day just who belongs to what party. This and other similar circumstances have led to a quality of instability that, from the Western point of view, is most disturbing. Many have attributed these developments to what is naively called "lack of experience in democracy." Actually, the developments are due to the fact that the Japanese must of necessity operate these Western institutions from a basically oriental mental approach. Undoubtedly, the Japanese, as any other devisee of oriental heritage, is capable of a democratic existence, but only when that existence is the outgrowth of the mental perspective of the Japanese. A fusion of Western form with Japanese mental approach can never be successful. Only by devising institutions that will be singularly expressive of Japanese ideas and ideals can the Japanese obtain a truly workable democracy.

It is not only in the field of government that a fusion of Western and Eastern mental outlooks is impossible, but in all areas of human relationships. For instance, no institution was more stable than the pre-war Japanese family. With the advent of the American occupation, Japanese women were tendered "emancipation" in the Western tradition. Actually, the Japanese family had played an even more vital role in the structure of their society than it plays in Western society. However, the Japanese have a totally different approach to the subject of sex than that prevailing in the West. This emancipation of Japanese women from sources without the Japanese heritage, therefore, left a gaping void in the Japanese structure of society, the harmful consequences of which will be felt for generations of Japanese to come. It is quite possible, even probable, that left to their own approach, the Japanese would have progressed toward an "emancipated" status for women which would have been orderly and entirely beneficial, but an attempted fusion of Western habits
with Eastern heritage to produce harmonious results was impossible from the outset.

We arrive, then, at the unmistakable conclusion, that the mental attitudes resulting from the different heritages of East and West are fundamentally different; and while the two mental approaches and the resultant diffused societies are capable of co-existence, they are at the same time impossible to fuse with harmonious results.

Let us turn now to the Hawaiian Islands, and from a look at outward characteristics, determine how the question of heritages should influence our judgment on the issue of Statehood.

The Central Pacific archipelago, known as the Hawaiian Islands, is located approximately 2040 miles across the Pacific Ocean from the North American continent. There are eight principal islands and many smaller ones having a total area of approximately 6,400 square miles. As of July, 1958, the civilian population of the Islands numbered some 578,000, which was augmented by some 35,000 military personnel.

The population density of the Hawaiian Islands is in the neighborhood of 80 persons per square mile. It is significant, also, that 49 per cent of the Hawaiian population resides in the city of Honolulu, and 70 per cent of the population is concentrated on the Island of Oahu, on which Honolulu is located.

From the standpoint of agricultural development, it is worthy of note that Hawaii has approximately 308,580 acres under "intensive" cultivation. That figure represents the near maximum potential because of terrain and rainfall factors. There were 5,750 farms in 1950, encompassing 2,432,069 acres.

The first contact of the Western world with the Hawaiian Islands was at the relatively recent date of 1788, when the English explorer, Captain Cook, visited the Islands. Western intercourse, both commercial and cultural, has been prevalent since about 1820. In 1900, Hawaii was incorporated as a Territory of the United States, and has continued in this status to this time.
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Although Hawaii has a territorial legislature elected by popular vote, the Governor of the Islands is appointed by the President of the United States, and the Islands have one non-voting delegate to Congress. The franchise, as to elective offices, is extended to United States citizens in the Islands who can read and write English.

Turning to population composition, according to the Bureau of Census figures for 1950, we find that approximately 23 per cent of the population is Caucasian, having declined somewhat, percentage-wise since 1940. The remainder of the population is comprised of Japanese, 36.9 per cent; Hawaiian, including part Hawaiian, 17.2 per cent; Filipino, 12.2 per cent; Chinese, 6.5 per cent; and others, 4.2 per cent.

Even when the large numbers of military personnel are included—and they have little if any bearing on the facts which should influence our judgment on this question—Oriental and Hawaiian groups constitute in excess of 70 per cent of Hawaii’s population.

This large segment of the population has a heritage allied and similar to that of the Japanese and Chinese—in a word, Eastern. It is a rich heritage, more ancient than our own, but above all, fundamentally different from that of which we are the beneficiaries. It would be foolish to presume that this heritage of the East, which extends back in time for thousands of years, could be replaced by contact with the West for a century, especially when we consider the fact that ties of culture have also been maintained with the East. To make such a fallacious assumption would be an injustice to these people, for they are not so easily brainwashed of their basic mental approach.

A distinction must be recognized at this point between existence of individuals of Eastern heritage under Western institutions of government administered and directed by people of Western heritage, on the one hand, and Western institutions of government administered by
individuals of Eastern heritage, on the other hand. The people of Hawaii under territorial status is an example of the former, while the people of Japan subsequent to the occupation is an example of the latter. They are quite different in result. The former can and often does have beneficial results to the people concerned; the latter is doomed to disastrous consequences. Fortunately, the Japanese have sufficient latitude of self-determination to recover by adapting and modifying the Western institutions imposed on them to suit their own mental processes. If the constitutionally-bounded status of Statehood is imposed on Hawaii, including the responsibility for conformation to the harmony of political and sociological ideas essential to the successful operation of our peculiarly Western, federated Republic, there will be no room for adaptation, and the attempted fusion will work to the disadvantage of both the people of Hawaii and the people of the previous 49 States. And lest there be any doubt, the interest of the people of the 49 States, our constituents, bear considerably--yes primarily--on this issue.

The conclusion which I suggest is not in derogation of the principle of local self-government. Self-government is and should be the aim of all peoples, and it is in the interest of all of us who enjoy it to promote it among other peoples.

I am also conscious of the mutual advantages to the United States and to Hawaii which result from close political and economic ties. The beneficial bonds between the United States and the Islands must be preserved.

Statehood, however, is not the only vehicle of self-government; neither must a denial of statehood to Hawaii necessarily sever the political and economic bonds of Hawaii and the United States. It is not because of, but rather in spite of, our heritage that we of the Western world are often inclined to limit ourselves to the rut of unimaginative thinking.

The answer to the desire of all of us to assist Hawaii to realize the maximum degree of self-government and determination, while maintaining--even strengthening--the political and economic
bonds which now exist between us in the commonwealth status. Through the mechanics of commonwealth status, Hawaii could realize self-government through political institutions conforming to the dominant Oriental heritage and outlook. At the same time, the commonwealth act could provide for the defense and support of the Islands by the United States, with the assistance of Hawaiians and Hawaiian bases. Commercial ties of mutual benefit could similarly be preserved.

There is serious doubt in my mind as to whether the Hawaiian people would not be seriously handicapped, possibly even precluded, in defending themselves from such as the communist-dominated Longshoremen's Union by the imposition upon them of Western institutions of government, since their heritage has not equipped them to comprehend the philosophy essential to the effective operation of these institutions. Left to their own resources with respect to the inauguration of democratic institutions to implement self-government, they would surely achieve more harmoniously and more effectively, the benefits accruing from self-rule.

There is even greater doubt in my mind that the Hawaiian people could contribute to the degree of harmony remaining in the conduct of affairs of our Federated Republic through instrumentalities singularly Western. I am impressed with the difficulty of this operation resulting from the slight differences in heritage across our complex nation, in spite of our very substantial identity of heritage and ideals. I fear that an abandonment of the United States of America in favor of a United States of America and Pacific—precedenting a United States of the World—would actually benefit no one but toll the death-knell of our Federated Republic.

I move, therefore, Mr. President, that S. 50 be recommitted to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with directions to make such investigations as it deems necessary, and to report to the Senate a bill to provide commonwealth status for Hawaii.