



# THE SCRIBLERIAN

Spring 2013 Edition

Sponsored by the English Department and the Braithwaite Writing Center, the Scriblerian is a writing contest and on-line journal for students by students. Revived during Fall Semester 2004 after a two-year hiatus, the essay competition is organized each semester by Writing Center tutors for ENGL 1010 and 2010 students. Winning essays are published on-line on the English Department website and past winners were also published in the print textbook SUU Guide to English Composition 2010-2011. The Spring 2013 Scriblerian Contest was planned and supervised by Chair Wes Van de Water with the help of Abbie Pipes, James Pollard, Jared Komoroski, Emily Moss, and Violet Wager. A total of 18 essays were submitted for the Spring 2013 contest.

## Contents

Argumentative- English 1010.....	2
1st Place Winner: Lauren Shafer, “Classical Monsters and Glittery Youngsters” .....	2
Argumentative- English 2010.....	6
1 <sup>st</sup> Place Winner: Danielle Smith, “The Choices that Resulted in Annexation” .....	6
2 <sup>nd</sup> Place Winner: Melissa Funk, “The Torch of Indignity” .....	10
Honorable Mention: Bryan Brimhall, “A Brain-Rattling Experience” .....	14

## Argumentative- English 1010

1st Place Winner: Lauren Shafer, "Classical Monsters and Glittery Youngsters"

For Dr. Julia Combs

It's raining outside, and the power is out. Holed up in bed, you notice the floorboards creaking outside the door. Snuggling deeper down into the blankets and ignoring the sounds, you write them off as paranoia. The doorknob turns, the door slowly squeaks open, and footsteps echo faintly, crossing the threshold. Shivers run down your spine, and you sense it: the dark monster from your darkest nightmares. Throughout the years of human existence, people have created stories of mythical creatures, or for those who believe, real monsters, as our coping mechanism with what's happening around us. Monsters change as society changes, and our perception of them changes as well. For instance, Dracula didn't start out as a moody teenager, and if he did I can't decide if puberty went well for him or not. Monsters like vampires, werewolves, and zombies have evolved over the centuries; this idea of evolution represents what is happening in society.

In Bram Stoker's *Dracula*, the count is portrayed as a dark, cryptic figure of a man who traps Jonathan (the protagonist) in his castle and plans on killing him when he's done using him to get to England. In *Dracula*, Stoker describes the count as "a tall old man, clean-shaven save for a long white mustache, and clad in black from head to foot, without a single speck of color about him anywhere" (15). The colors that are seen in Dracula's appearance make him seem formidable and terrifying. A figure in all black, who has white hair and is tall, has a correlation with death. Death also dresses in black and has a dark figure. Through his appearance Dracula is being portrayed as a dangerous and sinister villain. Dracula is seductively violent. He has this master power of manipulation; call it magical compulsion or straight-out fear, people do what he wants. Dracula is the vampire, the master of late nights with your night light on and the covers pulled over your head.

Maybe it's just me, but when I think about vampires as they are represented now, it reminds me of the stereotypical Vegas experience: I just hope and pray that I don't remember it in the morning. Today's famous vampires are a little different in personality and in appearance than their classical counterparts. They are often seen as sexy and misunderstood. As a specific example, Edward Cullen, the glittery prize of twelve year olds all over the world, is seen as an attractive and peaceful vampire, which is definitely contradictory to Dracula. The main difference is seen in Bella's description of him: "Edward in the sunlight was shocking. I couldn't get used to it, though I'd been staring at him all afternoon. His skin, white despite the faint flush from yesterday's hunting trip, literally sparkled, like thousands of tiny diamonds were embedded in the surface" (260). The modern vampire glitters in the sun, instead of burns like its predecessors. Edward is also a vegetarian, of sorts, in comparison to Dracula. Edward doesn't want to be seen as a blood-sucking monster. He does not want to be compared to the dark, scary monsters of the world; he just wants to be the same as regular kids his age. Edward as a vampire is much different than Dracula. The two are almost polar opposites, which shows how vampires have evolved and adapted to the wants of society.

There are several reasons why one could say that vampires have become less fearsome and more present in teen romance novels. In society right now there is a movement toward the weakening of the traditional male role. In Heather Chaet's article "The Demise of the Doofus Dad", she states that the

male role is changing from the man who used to not be able to change diapers and run households to men who do. She adds that women are becoming the breadwinners and men are the stay-at-home dads. This is demonstrating how men are changing and becoming more feminine and maternal. Also in some teen magazines men are becoming more and more fashionable and feminine. This can be seen in various articles and advertisements portraying them as soft and womanly. Social media and commercial advertising targeted towards youth is becoming more androgynous. Vampires don't need to be scary; they can be stylish and sensitive. Female standards have also changed. Often women want men who have class, high-end jobs, and style. They are not looking for big buff cavemen who can hunt for food and fight off grizzly bears. Media has changed the outlook on men, so men are no longer needed to be regarded as burly lumberjacks. They need to be dependable and have a higher status. The ability to fight off tribal adversaries is no longer needed, and what creates the status of a man is his job and his position in society. Whatever woman can do, man can do too. Werewolves can also be seen as having changed into something more modern and very different from their traditional counterparts.

If we look at werewolves, they are classically men who have been cursed with changing into a wild monster at the full moon. They are known for tearing up villages and viciously mutilating people. Werewolves were classically viewed as being brutal, savage creatures that were meant to be feared. An example of this can be seen in *Bisclavret* by Marie de France: "A werewolf is a savage beast; while his fury is on him he eats men, does much harm, goes deep in the forest to live" (907). Many men were accused of being werewolves and killed as the paranoia heightened. The idea of the classical werewolf is that of a cursed man; he's not evil or out to destroy the world. However, he is evil when the full moon is out and the curse is active. As a werewolf, he no longer has control. The cursed monster does. Werewolves are the kind of monsters that cause people to stock up on silver ammunition and lock up at night.

Werewolves of today are very different from their classical counterparts. They are looked at as more of shape-shifters, who can either change at will or on the full moon. They tend to be sensitive, kind hearted, and protective of their friends, as well as fighting off the bad guys. Examples of this can be seen also in *Twilight* with Jacob, the topless wonder. He is concerned with the wellbeing of his friend Bella, and he loves her even though she loves his nemesis, Edward. Another example could be that in the MTV show *Teen Wolf*, Scott (the protagonist) is out to stop the villainous werewolves from harming the innocent. For the most part werewolves do not destroy towns and kill handfuls of people. Werewolves of today's pop culture stay with their kind and keep their identity a secret. They also are shape-shifters more than cursed men, and today's werewolves can often change at will.

Werewolves have changed in comparison to their ancestors, and this may be due to society's new perceptions and ideals. Roles and relationships are being redefined in America, and all over the world more and more things are becoming acceptable in society. As our society and generations change and evolve, so does our understanding of things, so thus new formations of old tales are created and tweaked to fit today's standards and tastes. Another point that can be brought up in this argument is that because vampires have changed, so have werewolves. A recent influx can be seen where more novels about romances with monsters and the undead are becoming popular. So thus, because one monster is generating an abundance of popularity and profit, more and more monsters are turning into the Romeos of today's pop culture.

Zombies are the other side of the spectrum. Vampires, and werewolves get more feminine, and delicate. Zombies of old were creatures that moved slowly and hungrily searched for brains. Traditionally, they have been thought of as being slow but numerous. However, being caught inside a gang of zombies wouldn't be ideal. Thrillingly enough, one could end up becoming one of them and having a ghostly dance scene while sporting red leather. Even in more recent cases such as the film *Shaun of the Dead* (2004), the zombies are slow moving and vegetable like in their activity, they are strong however.

Zombies are coming out as more brutal and more ferocious monsters today. They form the exception to the rule that monsters are becoming more feminine. We can see this in television, movies, and literature. Zombie culture is becoming more graphic and dangerous. In *The Walking Dead*, zombies are ugly, menacing, human-hungry creatures that roam the world looking for their next snack. They are gross and not attractive or "sexy" by any means. Why has society created "sexy" monsters and excluded zombies? Why is it that society is redefining monsters so differently?

Zombies represent one way people are redefining monsters. In Dr. Kyle Bishop's lecture "Why Zombies Matter" Bishop states that zombies are our coping mechanism when dealing with pandemics and the fear that infection will wipe us out. They are relevant to pandemics because in a way they are a pandemic. Zombies are an outbreak of a virus, or a nuclear reaction, etc. This fear has increased over the years, as more hysteria about viruses like Swine Flu comes out. We look at the scariest possibility to remind ourselves that it's not as scary as it could be and that we're far better off. Zombies are a form of pop culture that is used for our own sanity. It helps us to feel safe about the chaos going on in the world.

However, new developments in the zombie genre have arisen. Recently novels have come about that depict sexy zombies. One specific example of this is the novel *Warm Bodies* by Isaac Marion. Marion's view of zombies is that although they are mean, brain-hungry monsters, they have a redeemable quality. R, the protagonist, falls in love with Julie, and through his feelings he becomes human again. This idea of love starts generating a movement with the other zombies, and slowly they start turning human again. Are zombies becoming loving, feminine monsters as well? This could be starting a trend towards the feminizing of all the popular monsters today. Zombies could be joining the realm of Count Glitter and Viscount de Topless. Zombies are becoming romantics, which is the slippery slope that vampires and werewolves traversed as well. The top three monsters in pop culture all are becoming romantic and in some regards feminine. Will a new, more terrifying monster have to rise above the rest as the new master of the scary noises emanating from the closet?

There are new developments daily in our societies that, like viruses, can frighten us. However, there are also developments that have changed our society in other ways. It has become an instant-gratification society. We've become complacent. We don't work as hard. We are weaker. Not everyone cares for the scary monsters that keep us up at night, scared to let one's toes hang over the edge of the bed. For some, the idea of a monster that cares about their feelings, and falls in love with them, is the ideal. The idea of being scared by a creature that could kill in the blink of an eye is no longer entertaining. People are no longer curious about things that go bump in the night. Pop culture has created a new diversion in the monster genre. Society is being told that a romantic, dreamy monster is cool. This phase caught on fast. Once one book got huge, the idea grew into something more. Now there is a whole young adult phenomenon with mythical romance novels. In a way it exhibits the "monkey see, monkey do" objective when selling novels. Many saw one novel become successful and decided that by writing along the same lines they would too.

Since monsters are changing and in a sense selling out, what will happen to monster culture? Monster culture is ever changing and always evolving to fit the wants of society and the time period. The question to be asking is "Will another monster rise from the depths and turn into society's new coping mechanism?" People need that form of monster. Society always has a scary monster that hides under the bed waiting to grab the foot that hangs just a little too far off the edge. What will the next monster be?

All that glitters is not gold; sometimes it's teenage vampires. Monsters have changed over time to fit society's needs. Vampires sucked the blood out of people and killed them. Werewolves were cursed men, who killed and wrecked villages. Zombies represent the part of our pop culture that needs to cling to a life preserver to stay afloat in our fears. They keep us afloat because they represent something so scary and unreal that the idea of a pandemic is less scary because it seems almost impossible. Zombies are, however, at the turning point where they can join their fearsome friends at the alter of teen romance novels. Monsters are changing as we change. They represent us, and our time's needs and desires. The dark and daunting count has become a glittery teenager who wants to be accepted. Acceptance plays a large role in our society right now. Monsters have evolved over the centuries, and adapted to the present environment that we call today to fit our demands and represent our society. Classic monsters have been pushed aside to put "monsters" like Edward on a pedestal. Are all the good old classic monsters joining Edward at the top of Mount Imposter Monster? Will they join the ranks of becoming that which sells? I'm honestly not sure if I want a glittery, stylish member of the undead representing my generation.

---

#### Works Cited

Bishop, Kyle. "Why Zombies Matter." *Why Zombies Matter*. UT, Cedar City. 31 Aug. 2012. Lecture.

Chaet, Heather. "The Demise Of The Doofus Dad. (Cover Story)." *Adweek* 53.23 (2012): 16. MasterFILE Premier. Web. 4 Apr. 2013.

Marie de France. "Bisclavret." *The Longman Anthology of World Literature*. Ed. David Damrosch et. al. Vol. B. New York: Pearson Longman. 904-915. Print. 3 vols.

Marion, Isaac. *Warm Bodies*. New York, NY: Atria Paperback, 2011. Print.

Meyer, Stephanie. *Twilight*. New York, NY: Hachette Book Group, 2005. Print.

*Shaun of the Dead*. Dir. Edgar Wright. 2004. DVD. Universal, 2013.

Stoker, Bram. *Dracula*. Garden City, N.Y.: The Country Life Press, 1897. Print.

*Teen Wolf*. Dir. Robert Hall, Russel Mulcahy, Tim Andrew, Toby Wilkins. 2011-2013. TV. MTV. 2013.

*The Walking Dead*. Dir. Frank Darabont. 2010-2013. TV. AMC. 2013.

## Argumentative- English 2010

1<sup>st</sup> Place Winner: Danielle Smith, "The Choices that Resulted in Annexation"  
For Professor Toa Tawa

Hawaii's annexation began to formulate with just five boys on a mercantile ship. Teachers of Christianity believed these Hawaiian boys, as well as the people of the Hawaiian Islands, were in need of what they had to offer. They set sail towards Hawaii with Christian teachers, men, and women on board with the intention to spread the word of God and transform Hawaiian beliefs to their own Christian beliefs. The "missionary diaries testify to the perception of Hawaiians as a 'degraded' and 'ignorant' people; missionaries earnestly believed, however, that they might provide Hawaiian islanders with the dual gifts of civilization and salvation," according to Jennifer Thigpen in her article, "You Have Been Very Thoughtful Today: The Significance of Gratitude and Reciprocity in Missionary-Hawaiian Gift Exchange" (548-549). The Christian Missionaries played a central part in United States involvement with Hawaii, which ultimately led to Hawaii's annexation. However, the bonds that began to formulate between the missionary wives and the ali'i appeared to be a positive thing in the beginning, but this mutual trust was betrayed when the Hawaiians were stripped of everything they ever knew.

Hawaiians once had a society that had all their needs met and all of its residents were taken care of in every aspect. Their way of life may have been different than what Americans had seen or been used to, but it worked for them. The Natives prospered in their native land until Capt. James Cook discovered their island along with their generosity. His discovery didn't stay hidden long and, soon after, the Natives began to have numerous encounters with "western travelers and traders." Forty years later "The American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, sent a band of Missionaries" to Hawaii in order to convert the natives. The wives who accompanied their husbands on this mission were forbidden to play a dominant role, but the women of ali'i began to formulate relations with the missionary wives and this intimacy is what led to the respect and trust of the missionaries. Although these relations were formed, both the ali'i and the missionaries had their own personal agendas that they were working toward fulfilling. The relationships did continue to progress due to the fact that each was getting their needs met, or the needs that seemed crucial at the time. They did not know that having their needs met by these relationships would be the beginning to an end (Thigpen 545-553).

As soon as the first boat of Christian Missionaries set sail, the Annexation of Hawaii began to formulate. This may not have been the intentions of the missionaries, but this journey to Hawaii was the start of events that led to Hawaii's annexation. The Christian Missionaries got to work as soon as they arrived on the island. According to Irma Tam Soong in her article "Christianity and Dr. Sun Yat-Sen's Schooling in Hawai'i," the arrival of the missionaries took place in 1820 and by 1822 they had formulated "an alphabet and orthography of the Hawaiian language in order to spread the gospel through the written word [and in] less than twenty years the first public schools for the Hawaiians had been established" (76). The Hawaiians were given the opportunity to learn how "to read through Christian textbooks." The missionaries were encouraging the Hawaiians to change their values, beliefs, and their way of life, but they were also offering something else in place of what they were giving up. Many of the Hawaiians were receptive to this change and open to learning about what the missionaries were offering (76). Henry Z. Niedzielski tells us in his article "The Hawaiian Model for the Revitalization of Native Minority Cultures and Languages" that after a few years English was the dominant language used in schools. "This was, in part, because Hawaiian Chiefs, the ali'i's, wanted their children to learn an international

language. A law was even passed in 1860 making it illegal to give a child a Hawaiian name, unless an English Christian first name accompanied it” (369). This law quite may have caused some discomfort in the Natives and disrupted the relationships that they had begun to build with the missionaries.

The missionaries’ objective when they showed up to Hawaii was to show the Hawaiians another way of life and convert them to Christianity. Their objectives changed along the way not by their own will, but by the specific needs of Hawaii. Helena G. Allen in her novel *The Betrayal of Liliuokalani Last Queen of Hawaii 1838-1917* states that the missionaries “came simply to ‘Christianize the heathen,’ [and] by economic need and by the request of the alii [chief] they [missionaries] entered into commerce and government” (144). The missionaries supposed that their own beliefs of “economic prosperity would be Hawaii’s also: there was, only one way to prosper the country; that was to Americanize it” (144). The Annexation of Hawaii falls upon the missionaries as well as some of the Hawaiians. They sought guidance and counsel from the missionaries and some, not all, believed it would be better for economic purposes to ally with the United States. King David “Kalakaua was a paradox; on one hand, he gave the Hawaiians exactly what they wanted; a flamboyant king, a leader reaching out to other nations, establishing an entity for his people; on the other, he gave the commercial classes exactly what they wanted: Hawaii’s first economic boost—and opening for annexation” (143). The king was doing what he could to keep the peace and ensure prosperity for his country, but ultimately he is one who must endure accountability for the annexation of Hawaii.

The last hope for Hawaii to restore their independence was with the reign of Queen Liliuokalani which was cut short. If she’d been given more time and had the support of the United States through the missionaries, she may have been able to save her homeland from annexation. According to Vivian Ducat in her PBS television program *Hawaii’s Last Queen*, Queen Liliuokalani took over the throne in 1891 after her brother died. The queen was “born in 1838 [and]... was trained by missionaries in Western academic disciplines and the ways of polite American society.” However, she never forgot where she came from. She valued her Hawaiian roots and was devoted to her people (“Hawaii’s Last Queen”).

She formulated a secret plan to regain independence for her people and her country, but shortly after she began her reign, the United States rescinded Hawaii’s part in the “sugar market.” Due to this revocation, Hawaii was on the brink of economic depression, and the sugar growers believed there was only one way to avoid financial disaster and that was through the annexation to the United States. “The clash of interests that ensued drew plantation owners, native Hawaiians, the US government, and the Queen’s cabinet into the fray.” The Queen did all she could, but all hope in saving her homelands was lost when “four boatloads of United States Marines armed with Gatling guns and hundreds of rounds of ammunition came ashore in Honolulu...heading for the palace. The following day, she surrendered at gunpoint, yielding her throne to the government of the United States. A provisional government led by wealthy white sugar growers assumed control of Hawaii and petitioned the US for annexation.” When the queen yielded her throne, Hawaiians were forced to yield their home (“Hawaii’s Last Queen”).

The Hawaiians trusted their Queen and were loyal to her until the end. The original missionaries, who went out to Hawaii, went with the intention to offer Hawaiians a better way of life, and they did for a short time. However, progenies of the missionaries became greedy and wanted to make profit from the sugar fields. Lilikala Kame’eleihiwa says in her article “Lil’uokalani” in order to increase their revenue “Lorrin Thurston... along with other descendants of American missionaries led a coup d’état, in collusion with the U.S. minister to Hawai’i, John L. Stevens. Stevens ordered troops from the USS Boston ashore,



ostensibly to support Thurston and what became known as the 'Provisional Government' so Hawaiian sugar could be marketed in America without payment of the duties imposed on foreign sugar" (par.3). Their greed overpowered their Christian principles that they were taught to live by, and the Hawaiians have suffered tremendously. Kame'elehwa in "Lil'uokalani" expresses the people's loyalty to their Queen, as well as the Queen's brave actions and loyalty to her people. Hawaiians were so loyal to their Queen and they were ready to stand against the soldiers who came to steal her throne, but in order:

To prevent bloodshed, Queen Lil'uokalani forbade her people to engage militarily with U.S. troops or American citizens, although armed Hawaiian volunteers outnumbered the American forces. Hawaiians, regarding their queen as a spiritual as well as political leader, unhesitatingly obeyed. The queen sent emissaries to Washington, D.C., to seek peaceful removal of American troops, but the American military chose the Pearl Harbor lagoon as headquarters for the Pacific fleet. The United States annexed Hawai'i in 1898, without allowing the Hawaiian people to vote on the matter. Because the queen ceded the country under military threat, the coup has been deemed illegal under international law. (par.3)

The Queen sacrificed her throne and her homelands so that her native peoples' lives could be spared. The United States took this for weakness, but her actions proved humble and powerful. They didn't get to keep their independence but they were able to keep their pride and morality through this injustice which is more than can be said for the greedy individuals responsible for this unspeakable act.

The annexation of Hawaii caused great controversy between US officials who disagreed on the benefits that could be made and the consequences that would have to be endured. Lauren L. Basson in her article "Fit for Annexation but Unfit to Vote" expresses what those disagreements were, "U.S. officials who favored annexation as a form of geographical and market expansion and those who opposed it due to the racial character of the Hawaiian population that would become eligible for U.S. citizenship," this caused tension (575). Those who were pro annexation were equally prejudice towards Hawaiians as those who opposed it. Not only did the Natives lose their land, independence, and life as they knew it, but they were also forced to endure constant judgment and scrutiny from the people who now had control over their land, their laws, and their lives.

The Christian Missionaries went with the intention to save these people from their way of life and ultimately their presence destroyed every aspect of life as the Hawaiians knew it. Haunani-Kay Trask in her book *From a Native Daughter* testifies that "Native society was a familial relationship organized by tribes...in which the necessities of life—land, water, food, collective identity, and support were available to everyone" (25). The Hawaiians may not have had all the opportunities that people have in the United States, but it's impossible to miss something that you've never had. They were content with the lifestyle they'd always lived. It's the only lifestyle they'd ever known and the missionaries had to come in with the belief that they could show them something better. Who are they to decide what lifestyle is better? How are they qualified to make that judgment? They began with pure motives but ultimately were corrupted by material goods and money.

Our basic needs are food, water, and shelter. Next on the list would be security, love and safety. If the former is met, then we have what we need in order to survive; if the latter is met, then gratitude should come into play because that brings about a sense of peace and serenity. The Hawaiians had these needs met before the missionaries came into the picture. Hawaiians, having experienced the new lifestyle, were now reformed to missionary standards and beliefs. However, been given the choice to go back to

the lifestyle that brought about peace or a life of luxury only to later suffer agonizing pain and destruction. I would bet that many Hawaiians and Americans alike would chose the former. The United States can't go back and take back the irreparable damage that was done. The public apology was a start, but it will take a lifetime of performing living amends if we are ever to deserve forgiveness for the injustice that was done to the Natives of Hawaii.

---

#### Works Cited

Allen, Helena G. *The Betrayal of Liliuokalani Last Queen of Hawaii 1838-1917*. Glendale, California; The Arthur H. Clark Company. 1902. Print.

Hawaii's Last Queen. Dir. Vivian Ducat. PBS. 1997. Web.

Kame'eleihiwa, Lilikala. "Lil'uokalani." *The Oxford Companion to United States History*: Oxford University Press, 2001. Oxford Reference. 2004. Web. 1 Feb. 2013.

Basson, Lauren L. "Fit For Annexation But Unfit To Vote?" *Social Science History* 29.4 (2005): 575-598. Academic Search Premier. Web. 1 Feb. 2013.

Niedzielski, Henry Z. "The Hawaiian model for the revitalization of native minority cultures and languages." *Maintenance and Loss of Minority Languages* 1 (1992): 369

Soong, Irma Tam. "Christianity And Dr. Sun Yat-Sen's Schooling In Hawai'i, 1879-83." *Chinese America: History & Perspectives* (2010): 75-86. Academic Search Premier. Web. 14 Jan. 2013.

Thigpen, Jennifer. "You Have Been Very Thoughtful Today": The Significance of Gratitude and Reciprocity in Missionary-Hawaiian Gift Exchange." *Pacific Historical Review* 79.4 (2010): 545-572. Academic Search Premier. Web. 14 Jan. 2013.

Trask, Haunani-Kay. *From a Native Daughter Colonialism and Sovereignty in Hawai'i*. Honolulu, Hawai'i; University of Hawai'i Press. 1999. Print.

2<sup>nd</sup> Place Winner: Melissa Funk, "The Torch of Indignity"  
For Professor Toa Tawa

Europeans found a hot-pot when they arrived in America and, without question, they owned it at first landing. Native Americans were inconsequential to the white men as they conquered the American continent. Even though the arrival of these intruders was initially their own mistake, the flame was ignited, and this characteristic supremacy became a constant with them as they expanded their empire. With greed they conspired to add the Sandwich Islands to their fire, disregarding the eruption that would ensue, and again the match was lit. A study of the early exploration of Pearl Harbor and the Hawaiian islands gives concrete evidence of the harassment the Hawaiian monarchs dealt with as power and control were seized from their hands by white supremacists. Studying Hawaii's political history is essential in understanding Pearl Harbor's role in Hawaii's annexation, and how the harbor was used as a bargaining tool in attempting to safeguard the nation's independence.

For hundreds of years the indigenous peoples of the Hawaiian Islands enjoyed a peaceful, self-governing home. Hawaii's Annexation a Story of Betrayal by Teri Sforza shares with us that the Islanders were independent and presumably content (par. 5). The film *Then There Were None* directed by Dr. Elizabeth Kapu'uwailani Lindsey depicts an untainted Hawaiian nationality, happy with their homeland and comfortable with their lifestyle (Then). But, as Sforza continues, in 1778 James Cook arrived on the sands of this haven, and some 42 years later missionaries were greeted with generous gifts of hospitality by the Hawaiians. These missionaries soon found the islands to be quite attractive, and their purposes grew as they made themselves more and more at home, taking up farm lands and positions in government. The Hawaiian's hospitality was coddled deep in the hearts of the haole. Some became sugar farmers; others found positions under the king's direction. As the guests became more permanent on the islands the king's power diminished, and the influence of the visitors flourished (pars. 6 and 7).

The Islands had been used for maritime aid for many years and now were being favored as a naval port as well. In *Small Planet Communications, Inc.'s "The Age of Imperialism"* audiences read that because of its position in the Pacific Ocean, Pearl Harbor was sought after as clearly the only suitable shipping station. "Pearl Harbor, on the island of Oahu, offered one of the most attractive natural bases in the Pacific" (par. 16). In *The Navy Department Library's "The U.S. Navy in Hawaii"* it states that in 1840 Commodore Charles Wilkes was charged to map the Pacific Islands, while King Kamehameha III asked him to survey Pearl Harbor. At no other time had the U.S. undertaken such a study of the area. In his report concerning the harbor Wilkes stated that "if the water upon the bar should be deepened, which I doubt not can be effected, it would afford the best and most capacious harbor in the Pacific" (par. 9).

"*The US Navy in Hawaii*" gives more evidence for the island as a desirable military base. Authorities were brought to the islands for reconnaissance work to decipher its "military capabilities and commercial facilities" (par. 13). William W. Belknap was given orders to gather this information undercover. He states, "Its shores are suitable for building proper establishments for sheltering the necessary supplies for a naval establishment such as magazines for ammunition, provisions, coal, spars, rigging, etc. while the Island of Oahu upon which it is situated could furnish fresh provisions, meats, fruits, and vegetables in large quantities" (pars. 13 and 14). This further illustrates that the islands are not only at a convenient place in the mid-Pacific for a home base, but would also offer adequate, if not tempting living

conditions. Earlier scouting of the islands demonstrates more of America's interest in Hawaii. In her article "The Beginning" Ronna Bolante explains that "In 1846, Lt. I.W. Curtis. . . saw Pearl Harbor's potential as a naval base. . . he noted "the perfect security of its harbor, the excellence of its water, the . . . ease with which it can be made one of the finest places in the Islands, according to Paradise of the Pacific" (par. 1). Curtis confirmed with Wilkes and Belknap that Pearl Harbor would give the U.S. a coveted naval base.

In 1873, the current monarchial voice, King Lunalilo, was asked to join forces with the U.S. and present Pearl Harbor as an incentive. "The King conveyed to the U.S. Minister Resident at Honolulu . . . the original treaty proposal in which was included the cession [emphasis added] of the Pearl River lagoon; and on 7 July 1873, the American Minister notified his government at Washington that the King had offered to negotiate a treaty on that basis" ("U.S." par. 15). However, Lunalilo was not convinced that a treaty to secede Pearl Harbor would pass the Constitution of the Kingdom, and removed the treaty from their counsel. An article had been written in the Hawaiian Gazette stating that the document had initially offered to lease [emphasis added] Pearl Harbor, not to secede it to the U.S. ("U.S." par. 15). Offering America an access right to Pearl Harbor was used as a bargaining tool to hold off a full overtaking of the islands by the States. Hawaiians were not interested in giving their sovereignty to another nation as was illustrated by the fact that documents had been signed by, among others, England and in fact the U.S. "recognizing Hawaii's independence" (Sforza par. 5). By attempting to gain control of Hawaiian soil, Europeans were again endeavoring to increase their power, broaden their empire, and better the world by gaining power over those less informed and resourceful than they, echoing their triumph of Native American soil.

The U.S. encroachment on the islands, which now included settlers and capitalists, precipitated their desire to control the islands. Audiences understand in an article from The Merrie Monarch entitled "King David Kalakaua" that during this time the political face of Hawaii was changing. Power shifted from King Kamehameha V to Prince William Charles Lunalilo to David Kalakaua all within just over one year. There is some controversy among the residents when King Kalakaua won his election. "Kalakaua won handily over Queen Emma, widow of Kamehameha IV. . . . [However], Supporters of the queen rioted" (pars. 4 and 5). At this, King Kalakaua called for help from both "American and British warships in the harbor, and the uprising was quelled" (par. 5). International relations were beginning to simmer.

Sugar grew to be one of the islands' most profitable commodities, and selling the sugar to the U.S. was not only on the rise, but was flourishing. The U.S. farmers wanted an allegiance between Hawaii and America to alleviate tariffs on sugar trade to the states (Sforza Par.8). King David Kalakaua visited the U.S. in 1875 and discussed The Reciprocity Treaty which allowed the marketing of sugar to the U.S. duty-free (Merrie par. 6). In 1887 the U.S. senate revised the treaty to include that King Kalakaua ". . . grants to the Government of the U.S. the exclusive right to enter the harbor of Pearl River . . . and to establish and maintain there a coaling and repair station for the use of vessels of the U.S. and to that end the U.S may improve the entrance to said harbor and do all things useful to the purpose aforesaid" ("U.S." par.16). The National Archives document, "Teaching with Documents" further explains that King Kalakaua was threatened with violence if he did not sign a treaty giving the U.S. power over Hawaii and reorganizing its government. This treaty is known as The Bayonet Treaty because its signing was coerced (par. 3). It allowed American men the right to vote in Hawaii, giving them subtle, but growing power and control of Hawaiian government. Under this guise "the right of voting [was reduced] only to citizens who

owned property and had enough money” (Katz par. 1), which eliminated most of the indigenous Hawaiians.

By this time the U.S. was highly involved in dealing with the Hawaiians, their government and the desire to have command over the islands. Annexation was looming and the islanders were steaming.

The fate of Hawaii’s independence lay in the hands of sibling royalty. King Kalakaua worked toward amiable relations with the states, however his sister was unable retain power over her nation. “Teaching with Documents” gives a more detailed account of her demise:

When King Kalakaua died in 1891, his sister Lili'uokalani succeeded him, and members of the native population persuaded the new queen to draft a new constitution in an attempt to restore native rights and powers. The move was countered by the Committee on Annexation, a small group of white businessmen and politicians who felt that annexation by the United States, the major importer of Hawaiian agricultural products, would be beneficial for the economy of Hawaii. Supported by John Stevens, the U.S. Minister to Hawaii, and a contingent of Marines from the warship, U.S.S. Boston, the Committee on Annexation overthrew Queen Lili'uokalani in a bloodless coup on January 17, 1893 and established a revolutionary regime.

Without permission from the U.S. State Department, Minister Stevens then recognized the new government and proclaimed Hawaii a U.S. protectorate. The Committee immediately proclaimed itself to be the Provisional Government. (“Teachings” pars. 4 and 5)

Encyclopedia Britannica’s article, “Liliuokalani” furthers our understanding of her downfall. Upon understanding that her nation was in fact being overtaken, “To avoid bloodshed (the queen) surrendered” (Encyclopedia par. 5).

Shortly after Queen Lili’uokalani’s defeat, U.S. president, Benjamin Harrison, submitted a treaty to congress to annex Hawaii to the U.S., but in 1897 the treaty was frustrated by a native union known as the Hawaiian Patriotic League who requested the U.S. Congress to resist the treaty. Their plight won the victor, however, in 1898 when the Spanish-American war broke out the U.S. felt it was vital to establish a naval base in the Mid-Pacific Ocean. Hawaii being the obvious location; the islands were officially annexed to the U.S. (“Teaching” par. 1).

When President Grover Cleveland took office and faced the issues of annexation, he did not share the opinion of his predecessors. He asked James Blount to study the Hawaiian situation. Blount discovered the inappropriate behavior of Minister John Stevens “and ordered that the American flag be lowered from Hawaiian government buildings” (“Teachings”, par. 6). Blount also demanded that Queen Lili’uokalani’s power be restored, but this was interrupted by Stanford Dole, president of the Provisional Government, who repudiated the act. William McKinley took office in 1897 supporting expansion in general, and annexing Hawaii in particular. He, along with Lorrin Thurston, Francis Hatch, and William Kinney sent a treaty to the senate to annex Hawaii (“Teachings” par. 6).

By now the pot was boiling. Hawaiians supported the Queen in droves, forming committees to petition in Washington against annexation, but their efforts were for naught. “The Hui Aloha Aina for Women and the Hui Aloha Aina for Men” (“Teachings” par. 9) acquired over 21,000 signatures of both pure Hawaiians and mixed-blood Hawaiians on an appeal entitled Petition Against Annexation that was sent to Washington. It was debated in the senate, but in the end the islanders were defeated. “Annexation

was approved on 6 July 1898, and on 12 August 1898, the U.S. flag was run up over the palace” (“Teachings” par. 9). Hawaii was indeed annexed to the U.S., despite the fact that its very inhabitants were adamantly against it. Immediately plans were made for “Wharfs, coal sheds and warehouses for naval purposes” (Age, par. 20). The indigenous peoples of Hawaii were spewing. However, the pot was covered all too quickly by the Americans, attempting to douse the flame before the sting of fire singed their souls.

Europeans portrayed a greedy and arrogant self-concept in taking control of the American continent, and their pot grew deeper as they grasped control of Hawaii. However, since 1970 island activists have formed movements to regain Hawaii’s autonomy from the U.S. as HaunaniKay Trask clearly points out in her book *From a Native Daughter* (67-79).

My opinion on this controversy is in favor of Hawaii’s control of their lands. Their home was seized from them under inconsiderate, unfeeling, and unethical circumstances, not to mention the unlawful requisition of it. Many Americans may not like giving Hawaii their independence because of the changes it may have on tourism, and because of the military post that Pearl Harbor is to the U.S.. Conversely, Hawaiians deserve the return of their self-determination, their native lands and culture, and their dignity. This torch, blazing in the faces of the innocent, continues to flare as its victims inhale.

---

#### Works Cited

“The Age of Imperialism.” Small Planet Communications. Small Planet Communications, 2013. Web. 24 Jan. 2013.

Bolante, Ronna.”The Beginning”. Honolulu Magazine. AIO. 2013. Web. 23 Jan. 2013.

Trask, Haunani-Kay. *From a Native Daughter; Colonialism and sovereignty in Hawai’i*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press. 1999. Print. 2 Feb. 2013.

Katz, Marissa Malie. “The Bayonet Constitution”. *Overthrow of the Hawaiian Kingdom*. Mt. Holyoak College. Web. 24 Jan. 2013.

“King David Kalakaua”. *The Merrie Monarch*. Aloha-Hawaii. n.d. Web. 26 Jan. 2013.

Liliuokalani. *Encyclopedia Britannica Facts Matter*. 2013. Web. 5 Feb. 2013.

"Teaching with Documents: The 1897 Petition Against the Annexation of Hawaii." National Archives. U.S.National Archives and Records Administration, n.d. Web. 31 Jan. 2013

Then There Were None. Dir. Dr. Elizabeth Kapu’uwailani Lindsey. PBS and University of Hawaii, Manoa. May 19, 1996. DVD. 30 Jan. 2013.

“The U.S. Navy in Hawaii, 1826-1945: An Administrative History.” The Navy Department Library. Naval History and Heritage Command, n.d., Web. 23 Jan.. 2013.

Sforza, Teri. *Hawaii's Annexation a Story of Betrayal*. N.p., 9 Nov. 1996. Web. 26 Jan. 2013.

Honorable Mention: Bryan Brimhall, “A Brain-Rattling Experience”  
For Dr. Bryce Christensen

In a recent radio interview, Baltimore Raven’s safety Bernard Pollard expressed his feelings about the current status of the NFL saying,

From what I see, we’re gonna be running around with helmets and flags on in about seven year. It’s getting out of hand. This is not powderpuff football, this is not flag football. This is a violent sport. And it’s a fun sport — we all love playing this game. And we’re blessed by God to even go out there and display our talent to the world, but at the same time you can’t sit there and say, ‘We want guts, we want glory, we want heart.’ You can’t give a player heart but at the end of the day you tell him, ‘Well, hold on but be careful when you go to make that hit.’ We wear helmets and shoulder pads. That means you’re supposed to go knock somebody around. We ain’t wearing flags. (qtd. in Smith)

Although there are many players and fans out there that agree with Pollard and his claim that the NFL is turning into flag football, as someone who has grown up around sports and has first had knowledge of the game of football, I would not go as far as to say that it is becoming “flag football.” However, medical research is providing concrete evidence supporting the claims that football needs to alter its policies in order to protect its players from short term and long term life changing injuries.

Throughout history, medicine has influenced almost every aspect of society in one way or another. Tobacco, cigarettes in particular, up until the mid-20th century were socially accepted and were widely believed to have multiple health benefits and to prolong life. It wasn’t until 1964, when the Surgeon General’s report “Smoking and Health” was released, that the true effects of smoking started to be revealed to the public (Randall). Thanks to medical research, the tobacco industry in the U.S. has gone from being one of the most profitable and powerful industries in history to a major public health concern, even though tobacco companies long denied the claims that it causes cancer among other health problems.

The more medical evidence that is provided to prove that a certain habit or activity is harmful to our health, such as smoking, the more willing society becomes to make the necessary changes in order to preserve it. Medical evidence has drastically changed things as simple as what shoes people buy to things such as what car they drive or what food they eat. It is now even influencing the sports society choose to participate in, such as football.

The government still allows the sale of tobacco products, despite the medical evidence about tobaccos harmful effects, but it has placed certain rules and regulations that the tobacco industry must abide by in order to continue to sell its products. They have to place warning labels on almost every item produced. Football, the NFL especially, faces a similar situation when it comes to the health risks that are involved with the game, and its obligation to the players to do everything possible to insure their safety.

Pollard mentioned that football, “is a violent sport. And it’s a fun sport — we all love playing this game. And we’re blessed by God to even go out there and display our talent to the world” (qtd. in Smith). Like smoking cigarettes, there are health risks involved with the game of football, and the NFL needs to place

boundaries on the game in order to reduce the amount of risk involved. In the film *Head Games*, Christopher Nowinski, a former college football player and concussion activist, stated that “this is a major public health issue. Radical measures are needed in order for football to continue safely.”

As more and more evidence is gathered proving the health risks in football, and more and more players lives are being changed because of it, the NFL has begun to recognize the evidence that the medical world is providing and the need for extreme changes to be made to policies and procedures. Thousands of injuries occur on the football field from the professional level to the local peewee leagues each season, and the most common and arguably one of the most devastating injuries suffered by thousands of players is a concussion.

The Indianapolis Colts drafted Austin Collie, a wide receiver from Brigham Young University in the fourth round of the 2009 NFL draft. Austin’s future looked bright and his checkbook looked even brighter. But after three incomplete seasons in the league and multiple concussions sustained on the field, his future and his dreams came to a brain-rattling stop. Austin had suffered from multiple concussions and, although subconsciously aware of the health risk involved with playing football, there was a lack of boundaries set by the NFL concerning concussion; consequently, medical professionals have advised Austin to walk away from the game to preserve his personal health (Harmon). The medical world describes a concussion as a minor traumatic brain injury (TBI) often caused by being struck in the head with enough force to rattle or shake the brain. Concussions are common injuries that occur in most sports but have become extremely common in the football and publically seen in the NFL where players constantly collide with their helmets with enough force to rattle the brain.

Before the year 2011, players suffering from a concussion were put through a series of minor tests before being allowed to return to play, not thinking twice about the potential long-term effects of the injury such as dementia and brain deterioration (chronic traumatic encephalopathy) (Sugra). Although the NFL introduced a new concussion policy in 2011, attempting to place some form of boundaries to increase player safety, the new policy still fails to address the seriousness of this particular injury and the long-term effects it has on players and their families’ lives. This attempt to protect the players is similar to the tobacco companies’ attempt to hide the major health effects from the public by simply stating that smoking can be hazardous to one’s health without revealing the true effects of tobacco products.

Before the NFL instituted the new concussion policy, players who had suffered a concussion were asked to follow the finger of the team trainer with their eyes as he moved it up and down and side to side. If the player was able to follow the finger with a limited amount of difficulty and no major signs of trauma, he was cleared to return to play. In 2011, quarterback Colt McCoy suffered a violent helmet-to-helmet hit, causing a concussion. Colt was taken off the field by the team’s medical staff and then returned to the field after only two plays. Proving true the statement from Pollard that football is violent but also proving true the lack of boundaries in the NFL; similar to the tobacco companies’ lack of warning before the 1960’s. The failure of the medical staff to properly test and diagnose Colt’s injury put him at major risk for an even more serious injury and sparked a large investigation on concussion awareness and prevention which led to the NFL’s new policy on concussions.

Concussion symptoms do not always present themselves immediately after the accident, causing the medical staff to misdiagnose the player and allow him to return to play before completely knowing what



the true problem is. Charles B. Brimhall, a behavioral psychologist at the Head and Neck Clinic in Provo, Utah, in a personal interview, commented on concussions by saying,

Concussions are extremely dangerous and most of the cases we treat dealing with concussions are because of sports, particularly football. Players and people in general who have suffered a concussion often present themselves with symptoms like headaches, vomiting, the wobbles or balance problems, sensitivity to light or noise, difficulty remembering and difficulty concentrating. (Brimhall)

These symptoms often present themselves days after the accident so attempting diagnosis a concussion like the one made with Colt McCoy in no way allows enough time to completely understand the seriousness of the concussion (Lovell). Athletes who are tested and cleared to play using inadequate tests are oftentimes at risk for a second concussion, or what is known as Second Impact Syndrome, due to the effects from the first concussion on the brain and is caused by the slightest jarring or movement of the head. Because of the fragile state of the brain from the first concussion, the second impact stops the brain's ability to regulate the amount of blood that is pumped through it. This causes a build up of blood that can lead to a herniated brain and death. The player might not show signs or symptoms of Second Impact syndrome right away, but because of the seriousness of the injury, medical attention is needed immediately. Unfortunately, medical attention is often times not administered because of the "importance of the game," exposing once again the desperate need for stronger boundaries to reduce such risks (Zeigler).

Effects of concussion on the brain can occur instantly or they can also present themselves years after the player has retired from the league. Jim McMahon knows all too well what a concussion feels like, having suffered from multiple diagnosed concussions during his career in the NFL. Much like Austin Collie, Jim McMahon made a name for himself as a player at Brigham Young University. In the early 80's he led the football team to two Holiday Bowl appearances, and twice being selected as an AllAmerican. His achievements at the college level led him to a promising 15-year career in the NFL and two Super Bowl championships. But Jim's achievements in football came at a heavy price, and he is now facing an uphill battle with dementia as a result of the countless brain-rattling blows he received while playing (Roselle).

McMahon has not battled on the football field since 1996, but battles every day with short-term memory loss because of the many concussions he suffered during his career. McMahon is among a large group of both former and current NFL players who have filed a lawsuit against the league claiming, "The league failed to properly treat concussion and concealed information about the long term effect." McMahon said the whole reason behind the lawsuit is because "the league knew the effects of concussion and kept the information from the players" (qtd. in Smith). Similar to the lawsuit filed against the tobacco companies because of their failure to recognize and warn about the health effects that come with smoking.

Effects like the memory loss that Jim McMahon is suffering from can be considered minor compared to three cases of players whose head trauma led them to take their own lives. Among those three was one of the most respected and loved players of all time, Junior Seau. Seau was found dead in his home in San Diego California on May 2, 2012 by a self-inflicted gunshot wound to the chest and was later diagnosed with a degenerative brain disease caused by brain trauma known as Chronic Traumatic Encephalopathy (CTE). Similar to Junior Seau, Dave Duerson, a former teammate and close friend of Jim McMahon, was

found dead with a gunshot wound to the chest and a note asking that his brain be donated to the research of football head injuries. Seau and Duerson were both part of the lawsuit against the NFL (Bishop).

In 2009 the commissioner of the NFL, Roger Goodell stood in front of the House Judicial Committee and was heavily scrutinized on the NFL's concussion policy, which led Goodell to make several drastic changes to concussion protocol and concussion research and development. The NFL pledged one million dollars to concussion research and instituted a rule stating, "Each team was required to make an independent doctor available to examine players and determine whether a player should return to play after sustaining a concussion (Hanna)."

These changes led the NFL to finally release a statement linking concussion sustained on the field to long-term brain problems saying, "It's quite obvious from the medical research that's been done that concussions . . . lead to long-term problems." (Hanna). Like the tobacco companies and their product's link to cancer, medical evidence led to the NFL take full responsibility for the link between football and major health problems. Even though this statement was long overdue, and changes had been made concerning concussions, the NFL's new policy still does not acknowledge the seriousness of concussions and the effects they were having on players' lives.

When Colt McCoy returned to the game two plays after he had suffered a major concussion, the NFL once again reviewed its policy and made drastic changes to it in order to protect players even more. In addition to the team trainers, the NFL now requires a third-party athletic trainer to exam the player before he is cleared to return to play and has hired personnel specifically to monitor for illegal hits, and players showing signs of a concussion. If a player has been diagnosed with a concussion and has not been cleared by the third party, he is then required to sit out one game or until cleared to play by the medical staff.

The medical world has just begun to understand the true effects of concussions on the brain and as more evidence is gathered, more people are beginning to question the safety of such activities and whether or not it is worth it to participate. In the movie *Head Games*, Dr. Douglas Smith was asked how many concussions were too many. His response was that "one is too many" (*Head Games*). Although Dr. Smith expresses his opinion and supports it with medical evidence, millions of Americans continue to participate in football, shrugging off the warnings that have been provided by the medical world.

Because of the seriousness of concussions and the strength of the medical evidence that has been shown linking head trauma sustained during football to short-term and long-term medical issues, the NFL has fortified its efforts to protect and prevent such injuries from happening. But like Pollard said, "This is a violent sport. And it's a fun sport — we all love playing this game" (qtd. Pollard). Too many people across the country and throughout the world enjoy the violence that is involved in football and, although there are serious health risks involved, they are still willing to go out and compete. Like the tobacco companies' efforts to warn consumers about the harmful effects of smoking through direct messages printed on the package and nationwide media, millions of people continue to willfully consume tobacco products despite the warnings and definitive medical evidence on the harmful effects.

Some level of health risk will always be involved in sports, especially football. Despite the medical world's efforts to persuade the NFL to change in order to reduce these risks, there is nothing that can be done to eliminate them completely. As more medical evidence is gathered, more boundaries must be

set like has been done with the tobacco industry in order to protect players at all levels from such life changing injuries. Football has not changed enough to support the claim that it is turning into “flag football,” but medical evidence is causing certain changes to be made, leading the NFL and ultimately all of football in a safer direction (qtd. in Smith).

---

#### Works Cited

- Bishop, Greg. “Junior Seau, Famed N.F.L. Linebacker, Dies at 43; Suicide Is Suspected” *New York Times*, 2 May 2012. Web. 6 Jan. 2012.
- Brimhall, Charles B. Personal Interview. 16 Mar. 2013.
- Harmon, Dick. “Should Austin Collie take his concussion and walk away from the NFL?” *Deseret News*. 24 Aug. 2012. Print.
- Head Games. Dir. Steve James. The Film. 2012. Film
- Lovell, Mark. “Traumatic Brain Injury in Sports.” *Journal of Head and Trauma and Rehabilitation*. 2004. Print. 24 Feb. 2013
- Smith, Michael David. “Bernard Pollard: Goodell’s goal is to turn NFL into flag football.” *NBC Sports*. 5 April 2012. Web. 26 Mar. 2013
- Taking its Toll. Dir. Pete Roselle. Perf. Jim McMahon. *Outside The Lines*. 2012. Film.
- Zeiger, Terry. “Second Impact Syndrome.” *SportsMD Media*. 2 Nov. 2013 Web. 3 Mar. 2013.