Crossing Seas and Labels: Hawaiian Contracts, British Passenger Vessels, and Portuguese Labor Migrants, 1878–1911

ABSTRACT: During the last quarter of the nineteenth century, over 13,000 European men, women, and children, predominantly from Madeira and the Açores, emigrated to the Kingdom of Hawai‘i on contracts of government indenture. Their modality of migration was a contemporary anomaly, as it was restricted in other global contexts at this time to peoples racialized as non-European. This atypical conjuncture of white bonded labor and a government headed by a Polynesian monarch not only upset the contemporary racial geo-politics of the age of New Imperialism, but likewise has long complicated attempts to locate this migration trajectory in comparative histories of migration and indenture. Through a close study of the vessels used to transport European indentured laborers to Hawai‘i and the conditions of transhipment they endured aboard, this article probes a boundary case between the two commonly identified global historical migration patterns of the late nineteenth century: (i) European “voluntary” migration to the Americas and Australia and (ii) Asian “indentured” immigration to Euro-American dominated plantation colonies in Asia, Africa, the Caribbean, the Mascarene Islands, and the South Pacific. By tracking the diverse passages made by the same ship, sail and steam, in-between different migrant commissions, this article suggests that a strict delineation of the onboard experience between indentured and voluntary migration is untenable. Further, this article considers the potential and limits of the study of the onboard passenger experience to study racialization processes in migration history, including for the complex context of pre-annexation Hawai‘i.
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RESUMO: No último quarto do século XIX, mais de 13.000 homens, mulheres e crianças Europeias, predominantemente da Madeira e dos Açores, emigraram para o Reino do Hawai‘i sob contratos de servidão por escritura. A sua modalidade de migração foi uma total anomalia para a época, visto que esta estava normalmente restrita a povos
racializados como não-brancos. Esta conjuntura atípica de trabalho “branco” junto com um governo liderado por um monarca polinésio não só perturbou a geopolítica racial contemporânea da era do Novo Imperialismo, como também complexificou as tentativas de localizar essa trajetória de migração na História comparativa da migração e servidão por contrato. Através de um estudo das embarcações usadas para transportar trabalhadores europeus contratados para o Hawai`i e as condições de transbordo que encontraram, este artigo investiga um caso que se situa na fronteira dos dois padrões de migração global mais comuns do final do século XIX: (i) a migração “voluntária” Europeia para as Américas e Austrália e (ii) a imigração asiática “contratada” para as plantações na Ásia, África, Caribe, Ilhas Mascarenhas e Pacífico Sul. Ao rastrear as várias viagens feitas pelo mesmo navio, entre as diferentes comissões de migrantes, este artigo sugere que um delineamento estrito da experiência a bordo entre a migração contratada e voluntária é insustentável. Este artigo demonstra o potencial e os limites do estudo da experiência do passageiro a bordo para estudar os processos de racialização na história da migração, inclusive para o contexto complexo de pré-anexação do Hawai`i.
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Disembarking around the World

On April 14, 1911, the Hawaiian Gazette printed a cover story about the arrival of the “British immigrant steamer Orteric” with “many laborers aboard” from Portugal and Spain. “Death [had] stalked among the fifteen hundred Spanish and Portuguese immigrants,” with fifty-eight deaths recorded, all children, mainly due to measles. Grateful to be off the ship, the migrants ran down the pier to the immigration depot at Kaka’ako. A Spanish man reportedly exclaimed, “Vive le Republique!” A Portuguese migrant shouted, “Away from that jail—away from that jail,” looking back with disgust at the steamer, perhaps unaware of what lay ahead. After U.S. officers discovered scarlet fever among the new arrivals, the migrants were promptly interned on Sand Island, which had served as a quarantine site for arriving passenger ships since the mid-nineteenth century.

Contracted to Hawai`i’s Territorial Board of Immigration, the migrants represented what Edward P. Irwin called, in a 1910 piece titled “Importing a Population,” a continuity and a conclusion. Hawai`i’s “assisted immigration” program, he contended, began with the arrival of the Priscilla in Honolulu on
September 30, 1878, “with 180 Portuguese contract laborers.” Their presence was designed to satisfy labor gaps created by the decline of the Native Hawaiian population and the rise of the sugar industry following the 1875 signing of a free trade agreement between the Kingdom of Hawai‘i and the United States. Irwin noted that the system had “in some form or other” persisted “up to the present time,” bringing more than 100,000 workers to Hawai‘i over the course of three decades and across shifting governing formations of kingdom, republic, and U.S. territory. Fortunately, from Irwin’s post-annexation perspective, it was finally due to end: “For while there have been some good results from the system, the evil effects are today a curse to the country.” The identified problems lay not in the system’s punitive characteristics but in the unwelcome demographic changes induced by the most recent arrivals. The latest migrants from Portugal were “poorer mentally, physically and morally than those who came earlier.” There had also been the “serious mistake” of “the importation of Russians” and the “blunder that was hardly less than a crime” of the “bringing into the country of about 5,000 Porto Ricans.”

“Portuguese Immigrants Landing Yesterday,” the Gazette’s caption for its striking image of disembarkation, did not quite fit the general tenor of the cover story. Why were Portuguese migrants specifically mentioned, given the article’s claim that the majority of the “fourteen hundred are Spaniards”? Why did the reporter
state that “the Spanish were easily distinguished from the Portuguese, because of their headgear and corduroy clothing,” when the so-called “Portuguese” passengers depicted in the image wore the same items? The reason for these perplexities lies in the origin of the image itself. Although the paper never mentions the fact, the scene did not take place in Honolulu’s harbor. More than a month earlier, the picture had been printed alongside a cover story in the *Illustração Portugueza*, the photo-rich weekly edition of the Portuguese newspaper *O Século*. The Jewish Portuguese photojournalist Joshua Benoliel had captured the scene from the docks of Lisbon as these migrants were on the early stages of their voyage from the Iberian Peninsula to Hawai‘i.

At this point the migrants had traveled barely seven kilometers by sea. Recruited from Portugal’s Alentejo region, they had traveled over land to the port of Barreiro, just across the Tejo River from Lisbon. Now they were disembarking in Lisbon to wait for paperwork. The article spoke harshly of the *Orteric*, the British passenger steamer chartered for the voyage to Hawai‘i. Dr. Victor Clark of Hawai‘i’s Board of Immigration may have contended that it was “a new ship, everything spick and span, and probably in general presented a far better appearance than many irregular lines carrying immigrants,” but the *Illustração* depicted a dungeon, accusing the Hawaiian Board of Immigration of misleading the Alentejano migrants. In the cover article, titled “Os que a fome escorraça” (Those Chased Away by Hunger), the reporter accused the board’s special agent, Alexander J. Campbell, of deceptive tactics. Labeling him an engajador (a labor recruiter), the writer claimed that the ship was barely capable of transporting its passengers safely and predicted their disillusionment on arrival: “the rest they shall see there on the ground, under the blazing sun, working on the plantation, at the summit of the smoking volcanoes.” The article employed a charged term to define the plight of the passengers aboard: escravatura branca (white slavery).

How did these migrants fit into the oft-posited trichotomy among the deportation of enslaved Africans, the indentured immigration of Asians to plantation colonies, and the “voluntary” migration of Europeans to North America and Australasia? In general, the 20,000 European contract laborers, mostly Portuguese, who came to Hawai‘i between 1878 and 1911 straddled the latter two categories. The *Illustração*’s suggestion of slavery reflected the rhetoric of contemporary labor politics rather than the actual plight of these migrants. The contested local and international politics inherent in Hawai‘i’s contract labor system persisted throughout its thirty-three-year history, beginning during the
kingdom and persisting after annexation. This contest likewise applied to the terms used to describe the migrants and the modality of their passage. In this piece, my goal is to reflect on the riddle of labels used historically and historiographically to refer to the same migrant or the same ship, as in this case of the photograph in the *Hawaiian Gazette* and the *Ilustração Portugueza*. The essay considers the labels for the migrants themselves: free migrants, assisted immigrants, indentured laborers, white coolies, and white slaves. It also examines the labels used to describe the ships that carried them, interrogating an often implicit and underconsidered distinction in the literature on nineteenth-century long-distance passenger ships: that between “emigrant ships” associated with European “free migrants” and “coolie ships” associated with Asian indentured laborers. Finally, like other contributions to this collection, it considers the life of labels during the onboard experience of Portuguese migrants to Hawai‘i and the extent to which ocean passage was preparation for the world of national and ethnic distinction and difference that defined plantation life.

**Labels of Passage**

Free migrants or white coolies? This question was posed persistently between 1878 and 1888 by consuls, newspaper columnists, foreign ministers, and port authorities in Lisbon, London, Berlin, Copenhagen, Honolulu, San Francisco, and Funchal. During this decade, more than 13,000 European men, women, and children from Norway, Germany, and, above all, Portugal, traveled by sail and steam to the Kingdom of Hawai‘i on contracts of government indenture. The period marked the intensification of Hawai‘i’s contract labor system, the only time in which Europeans constituted a major component of total Hawai‘i-bound labor migrants. The framing of the issue belied the central conceits and dissonances of the contemporary liberal notion of indentured labor as a form of voluntary migration premised on the autonomous individual’s contract-making capacities. It also spoke to the implicit racialization of indenture in the figure of the Asian coolie, whether Chinese or South Asian.

From a formal perspective, these European migrants were no doubt indentured. In exchange for free passage, each putatively agreed to bind him or herself for a set period of time, usually three years, to labor on a plantation, assigned after arrival by the Kingdom’s Board of Immigration. The penalty for breaking the contract was imprisonment. This provision was routinely enforced, to the fury of the migrants’ home governments.
an American adventurer turned Hawaiian foreign minister, used the term assisted immigrants.16 He and other government officials argued that bonded labor contracts were the only way in which the kingdom could meet the high costs of transoceanic passenger transport; its modest coffers could not cover full subsidization. They further justified the government’s approach to immigration using King Kalākaua’s populationist discourse of Ho’oulu Lāhui: to raise a nation. That is, they argued that the migrants were intended to amalgamate with the Native Hawaiian population and thus ensure the long-term survival of an independent kingdom.17

The use of Ho’oulu Lāhui to justify a rendition of nineteenth-century contract labor migration was both creative and strategic—an attempt to appease a broad spectrum of interests in Hawai‘i’s small local polity (native elite voters, Sinophobic tradesmen, and Euro-American planters), while remaining consistent with the prevailing passenger shipping and anti-human-trafficking regulations of the major powers, particularly Great Britain, as well as the migrants’ origin countries.18

In 1881, the Pacific Commercial Advertiser, then a government organ, declared, “The ‘Suffolk’ from the Azores, brings a welcome addition to the population of the Kingdom. The assisted Portuguese immigrants may have been more costly, man for man, than those which the Government, or private individuals, have induced to come here from other parts of the world, but they have assuredly proved more valuable, as laborers and settlers, in a still greater proportion.”19 Targeting its assertions at the kingdom’s English-reading public, it presented Portuguese indentured laborers as simultaneously “assisted” immigrants, laborers, and settlers. Yet critics, including newspaper columnists across North America and Europe as well as local abolitionists concerned about the humanitarian abuses of the system, dismissed such explanations as a mask for white servitude or slavery.20 Discussion was fierce in government assemblies across Europe during the 1880s.21 Legislators from the sending countries were livid about the insult to national status posed by citizens who were migrating to serve as laborers in a setting ruled by an indigenous monarch. This upset them far more than the possibility that their poorest citizens might find the terms of passage preferable to their present status at home.22 These reactions, which often revealed racialized notions about the unsuitability of white labor for plantation work in the tropics, continued to define the discussion well after U.S. annexation, when populationist goals were explicitly linked to increasing the white population in the island territory.
Labels of Vessels
Hawai‘i occupies a curious place in global accounts of the history of colonialism and labor migration, and perhaps no group is as anomalous as the more than 10,000 Portuguese who ventured there as contract laborers in the decade before U.S. annexation of the islands. There has been no shortage of commemorative work by members of this community, and the importance of it for scholarship on the contextually- and temporally-specific nature of racial categorization has long been of prime interest. Scholars have long been intrigued by the way in which these migrants straddled the distinctive ethnic and racial labels of plantation Hawai‘i: as Caucasian but not haole (Anglo-Saxon), as local but not Polynesian or Asian. Yet the onboard story of their migration to Hawai‘i has yet to receive extended attention. This is curious, given the importance of these ships in the local structuring of Portuguese heritage: the names of each vessel are well known and appear in nearly every article, book, and documentary about the Portuguese community of Hawai‘i. But despite their importance in local identity formation, we know little about the broader history of the vessels themselves. Who owned them? What were their onboard conditions like? How should we label them?

In the controversy over European migration that erupted in the transatlantic press and the international diplomatic system, the passenger ship loomed large. Critics widely shared complaints about onboard conditions, including abysmal food, unsanitary conditions, and deficient medical attention, to frame them as coolie rather than emigrant ships. Gibson’s term of choice, assisted immigrants, was not accidental; it was typically used to describe the subsidized transport of hundreds of thousands of poor Britons to Australia during this same period. However, scholarship on labor migration to Hawai‘i ignores the fact that more than mere labels connected these migrations. Seven of the ships that brought Portuguese indentured immigrants to Hawai‘i had previously sailed to Australia with assisted migrants aboard; this was more than half of the ships used on the route from Madeira and the Azores before the fall of the Hawaiian monarchy. These seven ships were the High Flyer (a bark), the Earl Dalhousie (a bark), the Dacca (a steamship), the Monarch (a steamship), the Abergeldie (a steamship), the Stirlingshire (a clipper), and the Victoria (a steamship). In most cases, the ship’s owner did not change between the passages. In other words, the same ship, at different times, transported passengers who were labeled consecutively as assisted migrants or indentured immigrants. If we use migrant ship as a term to describe a nineteenth-century ship whose passengers were mainly migrants and coolie ship
as a subcategory to describe a vessel whose passengers were mainly indentured laborers, do we have sufficient grounds to say that these ships morphed between the status of coolie ships and emigrant ships?

The plot thickens even if we restrict the definition of coolie ship to apply only to non-European migrants. Ironically, the relevant ships here were those that traveled from Portugal and Spain to Hawai‘i after U.S. annexation, when the kingdom’s British Empire–style indentured labor system (the one featuring an imprisonment clause) was formally abolished. Between 1906 and 1911, several thousand migrants were brought to Hawai‘i from the two countries, and the only ships used were large steamships owned by the Bank Line and Century Shipping Company. The Swanley, which arrived in Honolulu in 1909, had transported thousands of indentured Chinese mine workers to South Africa in 1904. The Kumeric, after landing 1,000 Portuguese migrants in Honolulu in 1907, then took on 1,177 Japanese migrants who were on a temporary layover in Hawai‘i. It brought them to Vancouver, British Columbia, where they faced some of the most violent anti-Asian riots in Canadian history.

Was the onboard experience materially different during the different passages of these label-crossing vessels? Limited evidence suggests it was not. Death rates during the passages varied widely, but no significant difference can be discerned in the small sample size provided by ships that made both Queensland and Hawai‘i passages. In his magisterial study of British-registered long-distance passenger ships during the nineteenth century, Kevin Brown emphasizes that journey length and mortality rates were subject to great variation due to the quality of crew, the misfortune of disease, and the vagaries of wind, particularly before the steamship came into general use. “The stories of those emigrants who sailed from Europe to the Americas, Australia and New Zealand, and on the coolie ships from India and China to the West Indies, Mauritius and South America, are all diverse.” Differences may depend more on the era in which the ship sailed rather than on its putative type.

Let us consider three ships that made both Australian and Hawaiian passages from Europe. The British bark Earl Dalhousie, which landed in Honolulu from the Azores on March 27, 1882, had previously made at least half a dozen voyages between Britain and Australia carrying government-assisted migrants, including one immediately before sailing from the Azores. Sailing times between Plymouth and Adelaide (South Australian emigration in 1874 and 1875) or Brisbane (Queensland emigration between 1879 and 1881) ranged between
eighty-one and ninety days. The total number of migrant passengers on each voyage ranged from 303 to 381. While the Hawai‘i-bound trip from the Azores took somewhat longer (113 days), the number of passengers aboard (322) was within the range of the Australia-bound sailings. Similar conditions also prevailed in the British-registered High Flyer, the only one of these ships to have sailed to Hawai‘i twice (in 1880–81). On a passenger crossing between London and Marlborough, Queensland, in 1878, it had a total travel time of 122 days and landed 340 passengers, about half of whom were government-assisted, with five deaths on board.34 The two sailings between the Azores to Hawai‘i ranged between 99 and 130 days and landed 337–52 men, women and children.35

The first steamship to be used between the Azores and Hawai‘i, the British-registered and Orient Company-owned Abergeldie, was later used several times to bring assisted migrants from Britain to Australia. The Hawai‘i-bound voyage (1883) took sixty-two days, and the ship carried 945 passengers, nine of whom died. There was an outbreak of measles aboard, but supposedly no one died from it.36 The Abergeldie was likewise proclaimed as the “first immigrant steamship to enter Port Jackson [Sydney]” after having returned to Britain and collected assisted migrants at Plymouth.37 The total number of passengers it carried on its voyages between Britain and New South Wales was fewer than those it brought to Hawai‘i, ranging from 595 to 612.38 Deaths per voyage ranged between two and ten, mainly among children (as was usually the case). In July 1884, the Sydney Morning Herald declared that there had been no “material alterations in the fittings of the Abergeldie since her first voyage here.”39 Given the short turnaround time between the ship’s return from Honolulu and its voyage to Sydney from Plymouth, it is likely that these Australia-bound migrants experienced the same ship conditions that the Hawai‘i-bound passengers from Portugal had, except that each individual had somewhat more space.

The journey of Portuguese migrants to Hawai‘i was formidable, lasting in many cases well over a hundred days, featuring the double-crossing of the equator, and the rounding of Patagonia. Those aboard steamships made the passage faster, though more than half of the voyages were done by sail. None of the ships on which the Portuguese emigrants sailed were registered in Hawai‘i or Portugal. The first, the Priscilla, was a German ship charted via the agency of the powerful Hawai‘i-based German firm Hackfeld and Company, which had its European headquarters in Bremen. Hackfeld was awarded the concession in 1877–78 by the German medic, botanist, and immigration commissioner Wilhelm Hillebrand,
who had moved to Madeira after leaving Hawai‘i and was empowered to initiate contract labor migration from Portugal. After Hillebrand’s initial work, the business passed the following year to the management of John Hutchison, an Irish-born merchant who served as a Hawaiian consul. With the approval of Honolulu, the concession was next awarded to Abraham Hoffnung in 1878, a Polish-born businessman of Jewish descent and British upbringing, who later served as Hawaiian consul in Britain from 1884 until the overthrow of the monarchy.

Hoffnung was not a shipowner but a well-placed business intermediary specializing in antipodal shipping and migration. His brother, Sigmund, was a successful businessman in Brisbane. Sponsored European migration to Queensland dwarfed that to Hawai‘i: roughly 250,000 Europeans arrived in Queensland between 1860 and 1900, 150,000 of whom were sponsored. Hoffnung’s familial network placed the Portuguese migration to Hawai‘i within the similarly antipodal assisted emigration of poor British and Irish migrants to Queensland. The embedding of the business of shipping migrants from Portugal to Hawai‘i within British-focused trading networks was hardly unique; it reflected the semi-dependent character of both sites to a British-dominated global maritime marine during the period. For instance, most of the hundreds of thousands of Portuguese emigrated to Brazil at the end of the nineteenth century traveled aboard foreign, mostly British, ships. While the Hoffnung nexus is hazy to track, given the absence of relevant archives for his firm or its successors, it likely explains the overlap between Hawai‘i- and Queensland-bound ships. In contrast, none of the New Zealand-bound emigrant ships were used for Europe-to-Hawai‘i indentured passenger shipping.

Hoffnung’s role was consistent but controversial. He was seen with contempt by many Hawai‘i-born Americans active in the 1888 coup d’état that forced King Kalākaua to sign the Bayonet Constitution stripping him of most of his effective power and forcing the resignation of Walter Murray Gibson, and which presaged the 1893 coup d’état that overthrew the Hawaiian monarchy. Controversies about shipboard conditions mingled with criticism of his management; dissatisfaction with the high cost of his brokerage services was linked to political critiques of the patrimonial nature of Kalākaua-era governance. As these issues spread through the global press, European governments resolved to study the situation themselves. In September 1882, for instance, Antonio de Souza Canavarro, the newly appointed Portuguese consul in Hawai‘i, was commissioned to examine the passenger ships that were transporting thousands
of emigrants from the Azores and Madeira. After visiting the recently arrived Hansa in Honolulu’s harbor, he noted conditions on board and drew up a set of recommendations for their improvement. Canavarro met and became friendly with Hoffnung, who had come to Hawai‘i to lobby for the establishment of a regular shipping line between London and the islands that would also stop at the Azores and Madeira. Even in 1884, a year in which there was a staggering number of fatalities among child passengers, the consul stressed that Hoffnung, his firm, and their Hawai‘i-based partners were trying to create the best-possible onboard environment. Given our limited sources, it is difficult to untangle how politics, careerism, and reality affected the behavior of these elites, each of whom had something to gain from claims of abuse or improvement.

The two steamships that arrived in 1884, the City of Paris and the Bordeaux, had unusually high mortality rates, particularly among children, and both also had unusual ownership characteristics. Hoffnung had purchased the City of Paris earlier that year, apparently as part of his ultimately unsuccessful attempt to secure government subsidies for a regular shipping line between Britain and Hawai‘i. The Bordeaux was a British-built ship that had been recently acquired by a French firm and carried a French crew. Canavarro commissioned a series of interviews with the parents of the deceased, putatively to determine the cause of death and recommend improvements. In fact, the resulting reports largely blamed the parents, particularly the mothers. Yet the controversies did have a substantive effect on the management of Portuguese migration to Hawai‘i. Hoffnung sold the City of Paris to a French company, and the ship sank the following year off the coast of Marseille, en route to Bạch Kỳ (Tonkin) with French troops aboard. No other French-registered vessel was ever used for shipping Portuguese to Hawai‘i.

The onboard reality on migration ships was more complicated than their dominant passenger population might suggest. For instance, most of the vessels also carried commercial goods. With the exception of the Priscilla, management of the cargo on most of the ships bringing Portuguese laborers to Hawai‘i before 1893 was consigned to George Walter Hunter Macfarlane (1849–1921). Macfarlane had been born in Honolulu to parents of Scottish and English descent, three years after their migration to Hawai‘i from New Zealand. He was a close confidant of King Kalākaua, served on his military staff, traveled with him on his 1881 world tour, and served as his chamberlain. Macfarlane’s proximity to power enabled him to craft business ties with Hoffnung. In Honolulu newspapers, the arrival of Portuguese migrant ships tended to be announced alongside Macfarlane’s
advertisements for newly arrived goods. Some migrant ships also transported import symbolic cargo. In 1883, the bark Earl Dalhousie, which had sailed at least six times between Britain and Australia as an emigrant ship, carried more than 320 Portuguese indentured laborers along with the famous Kamehameha statue presently located in front of Ali’iolani Hale in Honolulu. Even as passenger transport, these ships were not just vessels of indenture. With limited transportation options between Europe and the Pacific, they afforded a smaller set of higher-status individuals the opportunity to travel to the islands. On later voyages, relatives of successful earlier migrants arrived with their passage fully paid, which allowed them to forego contracts of indenture. This was the case for seventeen of the passengers aboard the Stirlingshire (1886). Aboard the same ship was Hugo Kawelo, a young Hawaiian ali‘i, who had studied iron working with Mirrlees, Wattson, and Company in Glasgow as part of the kingdom’s program to educate select Hawaiian youths abroad. He had boarded the ship upon its initial departure from Liverpool.

**Labels of Difference**

Much recent literature about the onboard experiences of contract laborers has focused on the crossing of the kalapani, or black waters, by South Asian emigrants en route to European colonies in the Mascarene Islands, the Caribbean, Fiji, and elsewhere. Martin Dusinberre has extended this analysis to the Hawaiian context in his study of the scattered archive relating to ships transporting Japanese contract laborers in the late 1880s and the 1890s. Indentured passengers’ own words about the experience are rare, but in the case of the Portuguese migration to Hawai‘i we have access to a voyage diary kept in 1887–88 by João Baptista d’Oliveira and Vicente d’Ornellas on their 156-day sail from Madeira to Honolulu aboard the Thomas Bell—the longest journey time of any passenger ship bringing Portuguese migrants to Hawai‘i. The Thomas Bell was the last ship to make the passage between Portugal and Hawai‘i for over a decade; it was also the last time a sailing ship was used for the route. It is unclear if it had ever served as a passenger ship to Australia, but the Pacific Commercial Advertiser noted it “has been trading mostly in the Colonies and East Indies and is a pretty good sailer [sic].” The ship’s owner was John Swanson of Liverpool, its captain was James Low, and its medical officer was J. M. Campbell.

The diary left by d’Oliveira and d’Ornellas is typical of the genre, reflecting the writers’ gradual adaptation to late-nineteenth-century shipboard life, including
their desensitization to the brutal realities of passage. During the first few days, they recorded minutiae about their daily meals; after a few weeks, only particularly terrible instances received mention. This was also the case with child mortality. The first death aboard occurred a week and a half out, when a young boy passed away after having fallen seriously ill. At 6:15 a.m. on the morning of November 25, 1887, his mother mourned his passing, and the ship crew arranged a funeral.

The body was placed in a shroud, which was merely a sack, with some pieces of coal to weigh it down. Around the shroud, the flag of the Sandwich Islands had been wrapped. At 9 a.m., the captain ordered all persons to come up to the poop deck. As we went up, we noticed the English flag at half-mast, and the flag-covered shroud now was placed on a heavy plank at the edge of the ship.

In d'Oliveira and d'Ornellas's description of this ocean funeral, the symbols of sovereignty, nationality, and power loomed large. The child was wrapped in the flag of the state to which his family was bound on a contract of indenture, though disease had denied him the opportunity of developing any personal feeling of nationality toward that symbol. The ceremony was conducted by a British captain, reading from his English-language Bible, with the symbol of the ship's nationality of registration lowered to half-mast in recognition of the personal loss of one of its passengers. Between the Portuguese jurisdiction of departure and the Hawaiian jurisdiction of arrival sailed a legally and symbolically British space of migration.

As the voyage continued and the discomfort of the long passage intensified, the passengers devised new ways for mocking a crew they described, in national terms, as “the Englishmen.” When a plague of bedbugs struck in mid-March, while the ship was crossing the long stretch of ocean between Chile and Hawai‘i, d'Oliveira and d'Ornellas made repeated mention of the passengers' nicknames for the pests: “English soldiers” and “red-coats.” If this indicated a feeling of solidarity among the passengers versus a crew they perceived as ethnically or nationally different, it was a solidarity that could be ruptured, at least from the perspective of the diarists, by intercultural communication differences. On January 15, 1888, while rounding Patagonia, one of the diarists noted the tension that existed between him and the Portuguese nurse aboard, a woman named Isabel. He claimed she did “not care for me because I know a little English and the officers always send for me when they want information from the passengers. Truly she is a very jealous woman, and has been the cause of many unpleasant experiences.”
The social order aboard the migrant ships were clearly distinguished by nationality: the crews were mainly British, and the passengers were mainly Portuguese. The national origins of the crew manning the few non-British-registered ships were less consistent. The Hillebrand- and Hackfeld-brokered German bark Priscilla (1878) had a British captain, whereas the Braunfels (1895) had a largely German crew. As I have discussed, the Bordeaux (1884), a British-built steamship owned by a French firm, had a mainly French crew, who were subject to extensive inquiries on arrival in Hawai‘i due to an unusually high volume of deaths in transit. The nationalities aboard remained largely unchanged as governments shifted in Hawai‘i. After U.S. annexation, all ships were registered in Britain, with the exception of two small New Zealand ships, the Warrimoo (1900) and the Aorangi (1901), which sailed from the West Coast of the United States, bringing only about a hundred migrants to the islands, most of whom had previously settled in New England.

A curious reoccurring phenomenon on these ships before the twentieth century was the gig nature of the contracted ship’s surgeon. Most were British, and most seem not to have been ordinarily employed in the role. At least one German and two British doctors migrated to Hawai‘i between 1880 and 1900 by serving as ships’ surgeons aboard migrant ships from Portugal. Dr. St. David Gynlais Walters, formerly a house surgeon at Stanelo Hospital in Liverpool, reached Hawai‘i in 1882 after serving as ship’s surgeon aboard the Monarch (1882). He subsequently served as a government physician at Lihue, Kaua‘i in 1882–97; as medical superintendent of the O‘ahu Insane Asylum beginning in 1902; and as president of Honolulu’s Pacific Club, formerly the British Club, in 1917. Three years later, Dr. S. Ernest Craddock crossed as ship’s surgeon aboard the Dacca (1885). The eldest surviving son of William Craddock of the Indian Medical Service, he set up shop at 104 Fort Street in Honolulu, advertising his Portuguese-speaking abilities in local newspapers. A German doctor named Dr. E. C. Surmann also established a practice on Fort Street after arriving in Hawai‘i as ship’s surgeon aboard the only German-registered ship to make the journey after 1878, the Braunfels (1895), advertising his services in Hawaiian- and English-language newspapers as a “Kahuna lapaʻau Geremania” (German medical practitioner). In some cases, the role of ship’s surgeon was simply a means to cover the costs of antipodal transit. In 1886, Dr. Joseph Wardale served as ship’s surgeon aboard the Amana on his return home from Scotland to New Zealand, where he worked as a physician in Invercargill, Otago, at the Southland District Hospital. Remarkably, due to adverse weather,
the steamer took 147 days to reach Hawai‘i from Madeira, a longer time than most sailing ships had taken, though still shorter than the Thomas Bell’s.82

Alcohol played a central role in d’Oliveira and d’Ornellas’s narration of their long passage. Port wine and liquor were used to celebrate and relax; their excess consumption threw individuals into rages and sickness. Here a telling gap emerges between what the institutional and personal archives can tell us. British crew lists for Hawai‘i-bound vessels, such as the Abergeldie (arrived in 1883) and Amana (arrived in 1886), reveal an explicit alcohol ban in crew contracts.83 Even if alcohol was not formally proscribed aboard the Thomas Bell, the migrants managed to subvert official regulations at various stages. Despite strict laws in Hawai‘i banning the import of alcohol by individual migrants, the diarists reported in one of their final entries that this rule was widely broken. When port officials went to inspect migrants’ trunks, “we know of many passengers who passed the guards with their liquor securely tucked away in their clothes.”84

Arrival
As I have discussed, the emigration of Portuguese nationals to Hawai‘i as indentured laborers occurred mainly aboard British passenger vessels, a substantial portion of which had previously brought government-assisted migrants to Australia from Britain. The major difference between these passengers lay neither in their onboard experiences nor in the hoped-for permanence of their settlement. Rather, it lay in the modality of the sponsorship of their passage. In the case of nineteenth-century Portuguese migrants to Hawai‘i, mobility costs were sponsored via contracts of indenture with the government’s Board of Immigration, adapted from British practice usually associated with Asian labor in plantation colonies. This led to a paradox in their contemporary setting born from a crossing of typologies: these were indentured laborers travelling aboard ships that were also used in the Australian context for assisted immigration. Those typologies became inverted after annexation. Migrants continued to travel on British passenger vessels (now solely steamers), but some of those steamers were also used to transport Asian laborers to South Africa and British Columbia. Despite the formal abolition of the kingdom-era contract labor system after annexation, these “free” laborers were traveling aboard vessels that were also decried as coolie ships.

The mobility of indentured Europeans to Hawai‘i in the final decades of the nineteenth century complicated not merely the labels used to describe migration
modes or types of passenger vessels but also the implicitly racialized character of these distinctions in present comparative scholarship. This type of logic also framed actor experience. On April 13, 1888, while their ship was being towed into the harbor at Honolulu, the diarists d’Oliveira and d’Ornellas noted a “house” at the center of the port, “which, we are told, is a hospital for the Chinese and Japanese immigrants.” To their apparent surprise, this was precisely where they were going. The following morning, at 11 a.m., they were given individual numbers during a roll call. At 3 p.m., they were unloaded to walk down a long pontoon leading them to the Quarantine Depot, the destination of the Portuguese man mentioned at the beginning of this essay, the one who exclaimed joyously on April 13, 1911, about finally being away from “that jail” of a ship, the Orteric. Once d’Oliveira and d’Ornellas had entered the depot, they got their first glimpse of Native Hawaiians, whom they termed “Canecas,” and settled in at the depot, which featured “four rows of wooden houses, a large kitchen, and a place where we could wash our clothes, a bathroom, a park, and a magnificent house where we registered.” The hospital for Chinese and Japanese immigrants had become their next station. D’Oliveira and d’Ornellas did not reflect on the apparent change in their own station, merely noting that the depot was “an interesting place,” surrounded by “beautiful shade trees whose names we do not know.”

What changed for indentured passengers during the months’ long journey from Macronesia to Polynesia? At least as relayed by d’Oliveira and d’Ornellas, it was an introduction to a world of opportunities channeled aboard British passenger vessels. The onboard experience was an introduction to a realm of international mobility increasingly defined by national characteristics—not merely in terms of the politics of the destination country but also in the dominance of global passenger shipping by a small network of British and occasionally German businessmen. Nationality as a means of distinction, twinned with power status, emerged as a social reality. And not incidentally, the passengers would soon be working on plantations owned mainly by families who spoke the captain’s language.
NOTES
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2. This ship’s name is sometimes alternately rendered as the Osteric due to unclear handwriting in manuscript ship logs and port documents.
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22. See the documents relating to controversies over Portuguese, German and Norwegian indentured emigration to Hawai'i collected by the German Auswärtiges Amt in 1883: Berlin Bundesarchiv, BArch R 901/30723.
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