

KAHIKI
NATIVE HAWAIIAN RELATIONSHIPS WITH OTHER PACIFIC ISLANDERS
1850-1915

by

Kealani R. Cook

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
(History)
in The University of Michigan
2011

Doctoral Committee:

Associate Professor Damon I. Salesa, Chair
Professor Susan M. Juster
Associate Professor Vicente M. Diaz
Associate Professor Amy K. Stillman

© Kealani R. Cook 2011

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I want to thank all the people who made this work possible.

First and foremost I want to thank my parents, Frank and Eluwene, who continued to love and support me even when I left a much more reasonable career as an engineer to go to school for ten more years. Thanks Mom and Dad.

I also want to thank Robyn's parents, Evelyn and Gilbert Tasaka, for all their kindness and support during the past year.

I also want to thank my committee, Damon Salesa, Vince Diaz, Amy Stillman, and Sue Juster, who helped me not just to shape this into something resembling a dissertation, but also for being kind, sane, and having a sense of humor through the process. I've heard enough horror stories to know I was very fortunate to have you four.

Various people helped me locate resources for this work, including: Iokepa Salazar, Lu'ukia Archer, David Forbes, Puakea Nogelmeier, and most especially Paul Meredith. If it was not for Paul, I never would have known about John Baker's voyage and would have been left with a much thinner and arguably far weaker dissertation. In addition I would like to thank a number of people who listened to me ramble on about this dissertation at some point and provided support, direction, and the occasional confused looks that told me I needed to rethink things. In addition to those listed above, this includes: Ty Tengan, Noelani Arista, Noenoe Silva, Rochelle Fonoti, Anna Christianson, Alice Sommerville, Aroha Harris, Teresia Teaiwa, Keith Camacho, Kehaulani Kauanui, Kerri Inglis, Kamana Beamer, Glenn Petersen, and Joel Tannenbaum.

I also want to thank anyone who is still reading this even though I started every paragraph with some variation of "I want to thank..." Thanks for sticking around, I promise the writing gets a touch better once the actual dissertation starts.

I also want to thank all the people in Michigan that helped us deal with being so far from home, without whom I would have gone crazy. Dean Sarnillio and Sharon Lee, who helped convince us that Michigan was liveable, Lani Teves, Kiri Sailiata, Chris Finley,

Angie Parker, Kithika St. John, Millington Lockwood, Susan Najita, Jenny Salesa, Tina DeLisle, Brian Chung, Lee Ann Wang, Jessi Gan, Jason Smith, Mindy Mizobe, Lloyd Grieger, Mike Nakasone, Stacey Pigg, and Aaron Ford. One of these people is not real. A dollar to whoever figures out who that is.

I also want to thank Louise McReynolds, who convinced me that I should go for my PhD and also suggested applying to Michigan. Without her I never would have gone through with any of this. She also once told me my writing was as wooden as the ships I wrote about (it was 2003, pirates were in that year). I hope she sees some improvement.

Most importantly, however, I want to thank Robyn Tasaka. Her love and advice helped me push through the tough spots. She was always there to talk over a problem, reassure me when I had dissertation paralysis, tell me to stop being crazy when I was scared to read my advisor's comments, or to go for coffee when I needed to get out of the house. Plus she finished her dissertation in less than a year, which kept the pressure on me not to spend too long to finish this thing. ILYTBB.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS_____	ii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS_____	vii
GLOSSARY_____	viii
CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION_____	1
Fluid Natives _____	5
Geographic Mobility_____	11
Sea of Islanders_____	15
Kinship and Na‘auao, Islanders and Empires_____	23
Chapter 2. KA MĀLAMALAMA A ME KA PŌULI:	
NATIVE HAWAIIAN CONGREGATIONALIST ANXIETY, 1850-1900_____	29
From Mission Stations to Missionaries_____	32
Mālamalama and Pouli_____	37
Na'auao Kristiano_____	42
Huli, Mau, Hoi Hope: Conversion, Steadiness, and Backsliding_____	47
Native Hawaiian Protestant Anxiety_____	55
Mission Security_____	70
Racial Stratification and Brotherhood in Christ_____	77
Conclusion_____	82
CHAPTER 3. AMONG THE WILD DOGS:	
NATIVE HAWAIIAN MISSIONARIES IN THE PACIFIC, 1853-1908_____	84
The Defilement and the Ignorance: A Discourse of Superiority_____	86
Acting the Part_____	102
Silence and Purge_____	114
Mission and Empire_____	124

Host Perceptions	135
Conclusion	137
CHAPTER 4: THE MŌ‘Ī, THE KINGDOM, AND THE WORLD: 1880-1887	140
Cultural and Political Contestation, 1819-1872	142
Around the World with the <i>Mō‘ī</i>	151
The King’s Reception Abroad	154
Empires and Natives	162
The <i>Mō‘ī</i> and Hawaiian National Culture	173
Hale Nauā	177
Foreign Policy	184
The Polynesian Confederacy	188
Conclusion	199
CHAPTER 5. MŌ‘Ī AND TAMA‘ĀIGA	201
Diplomats, Kings, and Treaties	201
Sāmoa and the Powers: Realpolitik in the Pacific	208
Building Support: February through July	212
Genealogy, Race, and Kinship	217
Aloha Among Confederates, Diplomacy within the ‘Ohana/‘Āiga	224
“Very Few Live with <i>Na‘auao</i> Like Ours”:	
A Hawaiian Discourse of Progress	233
Hawaiian Assumptions	240
Hawaiian Sāmoa	252
Securing the <i>Mō‘ī</i>	256
Law, Education, and Nationalism	263
Conclusion	273
CHAPTER 6. THE LĀHUI BESIEGED	277
The Lāhui Unified	278
Oligarchs, Party Politics, and Territorial “Democracy”	283
Ho‘oulu Lāhui	290
The Limits of Collaboration:	

Homesteading, Plantations, and the Republican Kalai‘āina_____	295
Plantation Economics and the Independence of <i>Lāhui</i> _____	307
Americanization, Individual Success, and the Future of Native Hawaiian Culture_____	312
<i>Ali‘i</i> Old and New: The Limits of Patronage_____	322
Conclusion_____	332

CHAPTER 7. “AOHE NŌ HE WEHENA MAI KAKOU”:

NO DIFFERENT FROM US_____	335
John Tamatoa Baker: Native Hawaiian Capitalist, Politician, and Traveler__	337
He Leta Mai ka ‘Āina Mamao Mai, A Letter from a Distant Land_____	342
Tahiti: Networks and Connections_____	346
Savai‘i and Hawai‘i: Land Claims_____	354
The Haka Meets the Hula at Lake Rotorua_____	356
Poroi’s Complaint: Greed and Sufficiency_____	365
Old Time Religion_____	378
Pomare, Carroll, and Baker:	
<i>Kanaka Na‘auao</i> , Westernization, and Political Unity_____	381
Conclusion_____	392

CONCLUSION_____	396
-----------------	-----

APPENDIX: A NOTE ON TRANSLATIONS AND SOURCES_____	401
---	-----

BIBLIOGRAPHY_____	404
-------------------	-----

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ABCFM-American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions.

BOG-Board of Genealogy.

CPIRP-Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto [sic] Rico.

FO&EX: Foreign Office and Executive (Hawai'i State Archive).

HBCFM-Hawaiian Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions.

HEA-Hawaiian Evangelical Association.

HMCS-Hawaiian Mission Children's Society.

HSA-Hawai'i State Archive.

OHA- Office of Hawaiian Affairs.

GLOSSARY

This glossary contains a mix of Hawaiian, Samoan, Maohi, and Māori words. The default is Hawaiian, in cases when words are from another language, it is noted.

For Polynesian terms in a quotation, I have left out the *‘okina* (glottal stop) and the *kahakō* (macron), unless used in the original. This glossary and any usages of Polynesian words in the text use both types of markings.

A

‘Ahahui- Group, organization.

‘Āiga- Samoan. Family.

‘Āina- land, also an older term for ‘ohana, family.

Akamai- Clever, intelligent.

Ake- Liver, the metaphorical site of desire in Hawaiian culture.

Akenui- Great desire, greed, consuming desire.

Akua- Deity, supernatural being.

Ali‘i/arii/ariki- Hawaiian & Samoan/Māohi/Māori. Chief.

Ali‘i nui- High chief.

Ali‘i ‘ai moku- A chief with supreme rule over a district or island. lit. Chief that consumes the island/district.

Aloha- Love, affection.

Aupuni- Government, nation, administration.

‘Awa- A mildly narcotic beverage, often with ceremonial uses, or the plant that it is derived from.

F

Fa‘a Sāmoa- Samoan. The Samoan way, the set of values and worldviews that define Samoan culture.

H

Halau- Hula group or the meeting space for that group.

Hana- Work, occupation, action.

Hānai- To adopt or raise.

Haole/Pakeha/Palagi- Hawaiian/Māori/Samoan. Foreign or foreigner, particularly Euro/Americans.

Haule- To fall, tumble down. In a Christian context, backsliding.

Hewa- Unbalanced, improper, sinful, something that upsets the *pono*.

Hihū- Wild.

Hoahānau- Relative, brethren, fellow congregants.

Ho‘i hope- To turn back, return. In a Christian context, backsliding.

Ho‘ike- To show or test. Also large celebrations associated with religious schools, which typically involved feasting, exhibitions, and testing on certain subjects.

Hui- Group, organization, corporation, typically a small collection pooling resources, be they economic, labor, or political resources.

Hula/Haka- Hawaiian/Māori. Dance, particularly Native dance.

Huli nui- Conversion.

Hūpō- Ignorant, stupid

I

‘Ike- To see or knowledge.

‘Ilikeokeo- White skinned, specifically Euro/Americans.

‘Ili‘ula‘ula- Red/brown skinned. Used to denote Hawaiians, other Islanders, and other non-Euro/American peoples.

‘Ino- Evil, wicked, cruel.

K

Kahiki- Hawaiian pronunciation of Tahiti, also used as a generic term for other Pacific Islands, Polynesia.

Kahuna/Kāhuna- sing/plural. An expert in various forms of knowledge, particularly medical and religious knowledge.

Kalai‘āina- Political, politics, the ancient practice of redistributing lands as a demonstration of *mana* and strength when a new *ali‘i* took power. lit. Carving of the lands.

Kama‘āina- Child of the land, native born. In current usage, someone with a Hawai‘i driver’s license that gets a discount at Bishop Museum.

Kanaka- Man, an individual.

Kapu- Prohibitions and privileges, typically associated with the interactions and overlap between the secular and supernatural worlds.

Ka‘imiloa- To look far, to search with intensity.

Ki‘i/tiki- Hawaiian/Maohi. Carved images, especially images used to house *akua*.

Kuleana- Right and privilege, also a small land holding obtained after the Great Mahele.

Kū‘auhau- Genealogy or genealogist.

L

Lāhui- A people, collective, tribe, nation, race.

Lawa- Sufficient, enough.

Lā‘au lapa‘au- Native medical practice.

Le‘ale‘a- Pleasure, enjoyment.

Loko‘ino- Cruel, evil, wicked. lit. evil intestines.

Lū‘au- Feast or celebration, typically in use from middle Kingdom period.

M

Makua/Mākua- sing./plural. Parent, ancestors.

Mālamalama- Light

Malihini- Stranger, foreigner.

Mana- Spiritual power, status, influence.

Marae- Māori. The ceremonial space that serves as the practical and spiritual hub for a village, town, or group.

Matai- Samoan. A chiefly title, typically associated with a specific ‘āiga and a region or polity. Includes *ali‘i* titles and *tulafale*.

Mau- Continual, stable, steady.

Mele- Song or chant, often accompanied by hula.

Moekolohe- Adultery, sex outside of marriage.

Mō‘ī- Monarch or sovereign, largely associated with the head of state of the Hawaiian Kingdom from the 1830s onward.

Mo‘olelo- Native Hawaiian narrative style, includes legends, myths, histories.

N

Na‘au- Intestines, the metaphorical center of knowledge in Hawaiian culture.

Na‘auao- Educated, civilized, enlightened, often with a religious connotation. lit. Bright/light intestines.

Na‘aupō- Uneducated, uncivilized. lit. Dark intestines.

O

‘Ohana- Family, relative, kin.

Oli- Chanting, not accompanied by hula.

P

Palapala- Literacy, paper.

Palau- Sweet potato and coconut pudding.

Pa‘a- Firm, held fast, stuck.

Pō- Darkness, night, also the primordial darkness and source of all being.

Pono- Balance, proper, righteous, just.

Pōuli- Darkness

S

Sā- Samoan. Prefix used to denote prominent ‘aiga, ie. Sā Malietoa.

T

Tama‘āiga- Samoan. Titled head of an extended ‘āiga.

Tulafale- Samoan. Orator chief. One of the two types of *matai*.

W

Wahine- Female.

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

As the two youngest sons of the ali‘i ‘ai moku¹ of O‘ahu, Olopana and Moikeha stood to inherit only small land holdings if they remained in the domain of their father. Like many other young ali‘i² before them, the brothers sought fame and status by venturing out from their home districts. They traveled first to Waipi‘o Valley, which later became the seat of power for the line of Hawai‘i Island ali‘i ‘ai moku like ‘Umi and Liloa. Olopana, the older of the two, established himself as the ruler of the valley and married the ali‘i wahine³, Lu‘ukia. For a time things went well, but a few years into his rule a flood devastated the valley. Olopana, Lu‘ukia, Moikeha, and La‘a, Moikeha’s adopted son, abandoned Waipi‘o and headed south to Tahiti/Kahiki.⁴

In Tahiti Olopana again rose to the status of a ruling chief, in part through the counsel of Moikeha, who also gained fame and influence as a host, sportsman, and patron of the arts. Mua, a Tahitian ari‘i, grew jealous of the brothers’ successes and of Lu‘ukia’s beauty. According to different accounts, Moikeha and Lu‘ukia developed a relationship, though there is some disagreement over whether they did so with or without the approval of Olopana. Mua used this relationship to drive a wedge between Olopana and Moikeha, causing Moikeha to leave Tahiti with a number of his followers. Some of the Tahitians

¹ *Ali‘i ‘Ai Moku*: lit. Chief that consumes the island/district. A chief with supreme rule over a district or island

² *Ali‘i*: chief. Also *ari‘i* or *ariki* in other parts of Polynesia.

³ *Wahine*: female, *Ali‘i Wahine*: Chiefess

⁴ This version of the mo‘olelo, or legend, of Moikeha-La‘amaikahiki comes from David Kalākaua, *The Legends and Myths of Hawai‘i* (Honolulu: Mutual Publishing, 1990), 115-135.

that followed him included the prophet Kamahualele and the navigator La‘amaomao⁵, who could command the winds by holding them and releasing them from a sacred gourd. This La‘amaomao is not to be confused with Moikeha’s adopted son, La‘amaikahiki, who remained in Tahiti under the care of Olopana and Lu‘ukia.

When they arrived at Kaua‘i, Moikeha identified himself only as a touring chief from Kahiki. At the court of Puna, the ali‘i ‘ai moku of Kaua‘i, Moikeha was struck by the beauty of Puna’s daughter Ho‘oipo. Though she had many suitors, Ho‘oipo had yet to express an interest in any of them until the arrival of the mysterious chief from Kahiki. At the bequest of her father, however, Ho‘oipo had already agreed to marry the winner of a canoe race between her suitors. Upon hearing this Moikeha revealed his true identity and genealogy. Much to Ho‘oipo’s delight, he then entered the race. The other suitors had the maximum four men with them to manage their canoes. Moikeha had only one companion, a strange-looking fellow carrying a gourd. Chanting out requests to the winds around Kaua‘i, La‘amaomao opened his gourd, swiftly driving Moikeha’s canoe past the other suitors. Moikeha and Ho‘oipo wedded and Moikeha eventually succeeded Puna as ali‘i ‘ai moku on Kaua‘i.

Decades later, as his death neared, Moikeha summoned his sons and told them of his desire to see his stepson, La‘a, who he had left in Tahiti many years before. He sent Kila, his youngest and cleverest son, to fetch La‘a, but La‘a was reluctant to leave Olopana, who was also near death. He eventually conceded and voyaged to Hawai‘i, traveling, like Moikeha had several decades earlier, northwest through the chain. Though he sought to hurry to Kaua‘i as quickly as possible, at the request of the O‘ahu chiefs he married three chiefly women of O‘ahu, and had three sons by them, each born on the same day. When he reached Kaua‘i he witnessed Moikeha’s last days, reuniting with his

⁵ In many other Hawaiian oral traditions, La‘ama‘oma‘o is a female deity, also associated with the wind gourd, or a female descendant of that deity.

adopted father after decades apart. He then returned to Tahiti, where he inherited Olopana's lands after his death. The three sons he fathered on O'ahu eventually became the heads of their own chiefly lines, preserving the memory and mana⁶ of their father, who became known as La'amaikahiki, La'a-from-Tahiti.

The *mo'olelo*⁷ of La'amaikahiki composed just one of many oral traditions that linked Hawaii and the south after physical communication ended. Though there is no agreement on exactly when and why voyaging ended, it is clear that at some time before the eighteenth century the benefits of such long, dangerous, and arduous voyages no longer surpassed the costs. In many cases the individual names of southern lands slowly drifted out of the popular consciousness, conflated into Kahiki, the Hawaiian pronunciation of Tahiti. First and foremost, Hawaiians retained a memory of Kahiki as the ancestral land from which the Hawaiian people and their *akua*⁸ originated. They also remembered it through *mo'olelo*, such as that of La'amaikahiki, which recounted the period of voyaging between Hawai'i and Kahiki after settlements were established.

During the mid-nineteenth-century, at least three nationalist historians/antiquarians—Representative Samuel Kamakau, King David Kalākaua, and Judge Alexander Fornander, a naturalized Swede—published variations of the La'amaikahiki *mo'olelo*. In doing so they showed not just the preservation of knowledge about Kahiki in Hawaiian culture, but also the importance of remembering such connections in mid-nineteenth-century Hawai'i. Each of them explicitly presented the *mo'olelo* to support a broader theme of the connections between Hawai'i and the rest of the Pacific. Kamakau recounted the legend in his newspaper column in 1867 as part of an effort to establish the “pre-contact” context of foreign contact for the arrival of Captain

⁶ *Mana*: Spiritual presence or power.

⁷ *Mo'olelo*: Story, history, legend.

⁸ *Akua*: God or supernatural being.

Cook. Fornander recounts the *mo'olelo* in *Account of the Polynesian Race*, a three-volume set dedicated to tracing the racial origins of Native Hawaiians and other Polynesians. In his *Legends and Myths of Hawai'i*, Kalākaua nestled the story of La'amaikahiki within a broader narrative of a wave of prominent chiefly immigration from the South, which, not coincidentally, included the shared ancestors of the Kalākaua and Kamehameha dynasties.⁹

By the mid-nineteenth century these traditions of ties to the south composed only part of a complex Hawaiian understanding of their contemporary relationships with other islanders. Captain Cook's "discovery" of the Hawaiian Islands established new networks for physical communication between Hawai'i and the rest of the Pacific. As passengers and crews of whalers, traders, mission packets, and the occasional warship, Hawaiians and other Islanders established new connections as well as a new set of understandings regarding the relationships between Pacific Islanders. At the same time, however, Hawai'i's introduction to global biological, cultural, economic, and political networks caused massive internal changes at home. Drastic depopulation from foreign diseases, the adaptation of western culture, political structures, religion, and material goods, the political influence of foreign empires, and the social upheaval all of these factors caused also forced Native Hawaiians to constantly rethink who they were as a *lāhui*.¹⁰ Within the context of such changes, Native Hawaiians also began to rethink and reshape the *lāhui*'s relationships to other Islanders.

This dissertation examines how Native Hawaiians understood, promoted, and shaped relationships with other Pacific Islanders between 1850 and 1907 and explores the

⁹ Abraham Fornander, *An Account of the Polynesian Race, Its Origin and Migrations, and the Ancient History of the Hawaiian Peoples to the Times of Kamehameha I*, Vol. II (London: Trubner & Co., 1880), 48-58; Kalākaua, *The Legends and Myths of Hawaii*, 115-135; Samuel Manaiakalani Kamakau, *Tales and Traditions of the People of Old* (Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press, 1991), 105-109.

¹⁰ *Lāhui*: A people, race, a broad collective identity.

ways these relationships proved critical. It examines three different projects Native Hawaiians initiated in order to develop and define relationships with other Pacific Islanders: Native missionary efforts in Micronesia and the Marquesas, King Kalākaua's legation to Sāmoa in 1887, and politician and businessman John T. Baker's tour of Polynesia in 1907. It also examines the domestic and international contexts that shaped them, particularly the growth of formal empire in the Pacific and the threat of that imperial growth to the interests of the *lāhui*. Specifically it looks at how Native Hawaiians sought to develop relationships with other islanders as part of a broader effort to further the *lāhui*'s interest at home, in the Pacific, and in the world in general.

Fluid Natives

This dissertation describes and analyzes Native geographic and cultural fluidity. Traditionally the Euro/American¹¹ imperial imagination has constructed the Native as static, frozen in space and time at the moment of contact with the ever-expanding edge of empire and lacking the capability for change. In this static vision of the Native, Euro/Americans created a rhetorical weapon with which to devalue or deny Native claims to the land, their labor, and other resources. By arguing that Natives were incapable of change they created a rhetorical foundation for claims of Native childishness, simplicity, savagery, lack of civilization, and a general incapability for self-governance, which they then used to justify the dispossession, enslavement, murder, or general exploitation of Natives. In the rare situations when Natives managed to secure some sort of recognition of their claims, imperial and colonial actors could simply attack their "authenticity" as Natives. Any sort of cultural change, particularly the adaptation of the imperial legal tools and knowledge needed to secure their rights could provide the grounds for such claims of inauthenticity, since real Natives were incapable of change. Thus Natives have

¹¹ "Euro/American" is used throughout this dissertation as shorthand for "European and American," and not to be confused with "Euro-American."

often found themselves invested in the somewhat self-defeating task of defending a colonially defined discourse of static authenticity because of the lack of useful pro-Native recognized within the colonial setting.¹²

Within the Euro/American tradition, academic histories have long reflected such visions of the Native. In the Island-group/national sub-fields, like Hawaiian history, both settler-colonial historians and early Native-nationalist historians have followed such logics, albeit for very different purposes. Ralph Kuykendall's three-volume *The Hawaiian Kingdom*, for instance, largely follows the colonial script by making a case for Native-Hawaiian incapability for self-rule. Kuykendall downplayed Native Hawaiians as bumbling and anachronistic, unable to cope with the modern world, thus portraying the overthrow and annexation as justifiable acts carried out by capable, modern, and largely benevolent Euro/American colonizers. Though written in part as a critique of Kuykendall, Gavan Daws' *Shoals of Time* still relied heavily on the premise that Native Hawaiians were an archaic remnant of pre-contact Hawai'i and thus irrelevant and unimportant in the modern world. His almost total lack of attention to Native Hawaiians after 1900, in a book that traced Hawaiian history through the 1950s, neatly captures his underlying view of Natives.¹³

Trained within the settler-colonial tradition but antagonistic to its arguments, the first cohort of Native-nationalist historians in Hawai'i frequently made appeals to Native authenticity in order to critique two centuries of imperial knowledge production. Lilikala Kame'eleihiwa's *Native Lands, Foreign Desires* and John Osorio's *Lāhui Dismembered*, for instance, both posit a pure Native Hawaiian past infected and diseased by adapting

¹² Nicholas Thomas, *Colonialism's Culture: Anthropology, Travel, and Government* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1994), 33-36, 176-178; Haunani-Kay Trask, *From a Native Daughter: Colonialism and Sovereignty in Hawai'i* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1999), 127-129.

¹³ Gavan Daws, *Shoal of Time: A History of the Hawaiian Islands* (Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii, 1968); Ralph S. Kuykendall, *The Hawaiian Kingdom* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii, 1938).

western ways. Even at the time, however, both Osorio and Kame‘eleihiwa seemed to have acknowledged the dangers in such a position and both explicitly argued for the validity of modern Native culture and knowledge, be they disfigured by contact with the west or not. Osorio followed a similar idea in a 2001 article, noting the folly of equating Native authenticity with American-derived visions of racially and culturally pure/static Natives.¹⁴

Between the 1980s and 2000s Pacific academics, such as Albert Wendt and Epeli Hau‘ofa, began questioning the very premise of static Natives. These academics argued that by necessity the Native possessed a fluid nature, since the very act of remaining a Native under colonial and imperial pressures required fluidity and agility. Such cross-disciplinary and cross-field conversations allowed for the development of a theoretical and conceptual framework for examining Natives and indigeneity in opposition to the imperial vision of the static Native. The vision of the fluid Native allows the historian the ability to examine Native cultural change, including the adaptation of imperial culture and ideas, without surrendering the still analytically useful category of Native. Similar work has also occurred in related fields, such as Native American history.¹⁵

In the Pacific much of the recent work challenging the concept of static Natives has emerged from the group of primarily Pacific Islander scholars associated with the emerging field of Native Pacific Cultural Studies (NPCS). Teresia Teaiwa’s dissertation, *Militarism, Tourism, and the Native*, employs James Clifford’s articulation theory to examine how Native Fijians and other groups have imagined and positioned these three concepts in efforts to understand and shape Fiji. Each has done so in different ways, in

¹⁴ Lilikala Kame‘eleihiwa, *Native Lands and Foreign Desires: Pehea Lā E Pono Ai* (Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press, 1992); Jon Kamakawiwo‘ole Osorio, *Dismembering Lāhui: A History of the Hawaiian Nation to 1887* (Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 2002).

¹⁵ Philip Joseph Deloria, *Indians in Unexpected Places* (Lawrence, Kan.: University Press of Kansas, 2004); Robert Allen Warrior, *The People and the Word: Reading Native Nonfiction* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2005).

different contexts, creating multiple points of articulation that connect each concept to the other. As such the meaning of each is constantly in flux. Many Natives, for instance, critique militarism as being a determinedly anti-Native element of the colonial past in certain situations, yet many Fijian Natives also celebrate nationalist militarism as a cultural institution. Teaiwa argues that deeper study of both colonial and nationalist articulations of Fijian society and culture must be undertaken for any effective form of decolonization to occur. In conjunction with Clifford and others, Teaiwa's work has illustrated the utility of articulation theory for examining Native fluidity and critiquing colonization in ways not possible under the old understanding of Natives as static.¹⁶

In *Repositioning the Missionary*, another NPCS scholar, Vince Diaz looks at the push for the beatification of Diego Luis de San Vitores in light of contemporary decolonization efforts around the Pacific and in Guam. A preeminent figure in the Spanish colonization of Guam, San Vitores' memory has been reconditioned into a cultural hero for many Chamorro, despite his death having come at the hands of Chamorro resisting Spanish colonization. By recognizing the knowledge-production capabilities of the Chamorro, Diaz is able to show the multiple points of articulation that connect them to San Vitores. Different groups, including the Catholic Church, Catholic Chamorro, and Protestant Chamorro promoted their own constructions of San Vitores in a struggle to define not just San Vitores, but also the Chamorro. Again the cultural fluidity of the Native provides a focus for the work, following the many often-oppositional shapes that Native identity can take in efforts by different Chamorro to protect their perceived communal interests.¹⁷

¹⁶ James Clifford, "Indigenous Articulations," *The Contemporary Pacific* 13, no. 2 (2001); Teresia Teaiwa, "Militarism, Tourism and the Native: Articulations in Oceania" (University of California, Santa Cruz, 2001).

¹⁷ Vicente Diaz, *Repositioning the Missionary: Rewriting the Histories of Colonialism, Native Catholicism, and Indigeneity in Guam* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2010).

Though not normally associated with NPCS, Nicholas Thomas' work on colonialism in *In Oceania* and *Colonialism's Culture* shares many views, sympathies, and ideas with NPCS and has been influential in the early imagining of this dissertation. He shares, for instance, their critique of the concept of the static Native and particularly contemporary claims of Native inauthenticity. He also argues that differing local and imperial interpretations of ideas such as tradition can be used to better understand the thinking and values of each group, as well as to recognize the colonial in modern writings and thinking about Oceania. Finally he argues for an understanding of colonialism as a set of separate and often competing projects based on local and imperial variables, an idea which this dissertation employs to understand the various colonial projects Native Hawaiians were targeted with or engaged in.¹⁸

Other Pacific academics have examined the development of racial discourses within empire as a reflection of beliefs about racially/"biologically"-static Natives. In part such works build off of Foucault's concept of biopower and Ann Laura Stoler's meditation on Foucault and empire, *Race and the Education of Desire*. Kēhaulani Kauanui's work on Native Hawaiians and blood quantum argues that the United States, following established colonial precedents, sought to use blood quantum to eventually define Native Hawaiians out of existence. Damon Salesa has done similar work on British imperial and colonial knowledge production regarding mixed-race Samoans and Māori. Going a step beyond Stoler, these works also examine the tensions and interplay between strict racial definitions of the Native and changes in how Natives defined themselves.¹⁹

¹⁸ Thomas, *Colonialism's Culture*; Nicholas Thomas, *In Oceania: Visions, Artifacts, Histories* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1997).

¹⁹ Kēhaulani Kauanui, *Hawaiian Blood: Colonialism and the Politics of Sovereignty and Indigeneity* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2008); Damon Salesa, "Race Mixing: A Victorian Problem in Britain and New Zealand" (Dissertation, University of Oxford, 2000); Ann Laura Stoler, *Race and the Education of*

As shown by Kauanui's work, the idea of the static Native has begun to lose its former strength in Hawaiian academic circles. In her work on *hula* and *mele*, for instance, Amy Stillman has examined the fluidity of arts many *haole* and Native Hawaiians often view as static traditions. Viewing them as unchanging and static has instilled them with greater cultural power, but it also denies the historian the ability to trace how Native Hawaiians have adapted and used introduced styles, instruments, and influences to fit changing contexts. The *mele* "Kaulana Nā Pua," for instance, began as a popular expression of royalist sentiment, often accompanied by the *hula ku'i*, itself a form of *hula* that combined western and traditional elements. In the modern day, however, it has evolved into a solemn expression of Native Hawaiian loss, rendered sacred by the passage of time and thus out of bounds for *hula*. Examining it only as a static sacred artifact allows the historian minimal insight into the era of its creation by treating it as a text alone. Treating it as a cultural product having a history of its own in terms of performance and publication, Stillman shows it to be far more fluid and powerful, both for the historian and for Native Hawaiians.²⁰

In the foreword to the 2007 edition of Kepelino's *Traditions of Hawai'i*, Noelani Arista also proposed an understanding of the Hawaiian intellectual tradition rooted in fluidity and agility. Kepelino, she argued, came from within a cadre of Hawaiian intellectuals, including Kamakau, who combined Native knowledge bases, value systems, and beliefs with western literary and historiographic techniques to develop a new form of Hawaiian *mo'olelo*. It was this sort of intellectual adaptation and agility that preserved the values and content of traditional forms of knowledge production while still allowing for needed room to address new types of knowledge production, technology, and the

Desire: Foucault's History of Sexuality and the Colonial Order of Things (Durham: Duke University Press, 1995).

²⁰ Amy Stillman, "'Aloha Aina': New Perspectives On 'Kaulana Nā Pua,'" *Hawaiian Journal of History* 23 (1989).

changing needs of the *lāhui*. In his 2008 dissertation Kamana Beamer also argued that adaptation was a central characteristic of Hawaiian life, as one could claim, it is of all humanity. In describing the Hawaiian culture that ensues, Beamer relied heavily on Homi Bhabba's definition of hybridity. Expressing some discomfort with using the term hybrid to define people, he referred to the Hawaiian people as having a complex-identity, one that cannot be simply broken down to traditional and colonized worldviews.²¹

Geographic Mobility

In addition to trying to define Natives as culturally fixed in time, Euro/American empires have traditionally viewed Natives, and particularly Pacific Islanders, as fixed in space as well. Yet except on some of the larger landmasses of Melanesia and the distant corners of Polynesia, most Pacific Islanders maintained contact with other groups long before and long after European "discovery." Yet even in the face of overwhelming evidence to the contrary, their assumptions of Native technological and intellectual inferiority led Euro/Americans to assume Native immobility. Furthermore, the creation of colonial and national boundaries has reified such assumptions through laws and other measures that enforce such isolation. The academy has been central to such efforts. This has led to a significant lack of analysis of Islander geographic mobility and Islander-oriented, inter-island or inter-group networks. In fact most histories in the Pacific treat the sea as an impassable barrier, or at least impassable to Natives, while ignoring the various maritime networks that Native life depended on. In many cases this has meant ignoring even intimate cultural ties and heavily traveled networks for the sake of preserving relatively recent colonial and national boundaries. This is the standard treatment, for instance, in histories of Sāmoa in which Tutuila and Manu'a mysteriously

²¹ Noelani Arista, "Foreword," in *Kepelino's Traditions of Hawaii*, ed. Martha Warren Beckwith (Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press, 2007); Kamana Beamer, "Na Wai Ka Mana" (Dissertation, University of Hawaii at Manoa, 2008).

disappear after the imperial division of Sāmoa in 1900. Such works often reflect and strengthen colonial and imperial reimaginings of Pacific Islanders, reinforcing a historical dismemberment of the Pacific, a rupturing of often essential ties in the name of preserving the fiction of imperial, and now national, boundaries.²²

This vision of static Natives has also had a conceptually limiting impact on the small number of histories that examine the Pacific as a whole. Most of the attempts to write regional histories of the Pacific have fallen into two categories, both of which are built on the foundational concept of geographically static Natives. Some, like Ian Campbell's *World's Apart* accept a colonial narrative in which the only truly significant actors in the Pacific are Euro/Americans, and thus they organize their histories around those actors. In Campbell's case he envisions Pacific history as a battle between two groups, good Euro/Americans, predominantly missionaries, and bad Euro/Americans, predominantly traders, who battle over the future of the Pacific and the barbaric/helpless Islanders then occupying it. On the other hand there are works like Kerry Howe's *Where the Waves Fall*. Wanting to allow for Native agency but still envisioning Islanders as static and isolated, Howe split the immobile and isolated Island groups into three categories based on their reactions to European contact. Both approaches reinforce the conceit that only Euro/Americans had the ability or desire to view the world beyond "the beach," and that thus there is no way of organizing these broad regional histories except around the actions of or reactions to Europeans.²³

Rejecting this model of Native immobility and isolation, this dissertation instead builds upon the growing literature that recognizes Pacific Islander geographic mobility.

²² For example: J.W. Davidson, *Samoa Mo Samoa: The Emergence of the Independent State of Western Samoa* (Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1967).

²³ I. C. Campbell, *Worlds Apart: A History of the Pacific Islands*, Rev. ed. (Christchurch, N.Z.: Canterbury University Press, 2003); K. R. Howe, *Where the Waves Fall: A New South Sea Islands History from First Settlement to Colonial Rule* (Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 1984).

Such works argue that Pacific Islanders were not, in most cases, isolated and immobile as in the imperial and colonial imagination, but rather had the means, the desire, and often the absolute need to develop and access travel networks beyond their shores. The impetus behind much of the work has come from a short piece economist and novelist Epeli Hau'ofa wrote in 1994, "Our Sea of Islands." In that and subsequent works Hau'ofa argued against the colonial-era understanding of Pacific Islanders as trapped by the vastness of the ocean, and thus geographically static. The ocean, he argued, was a pathway, a means of connecting Islanders, not separating them. While primarily concerned with how such a vision limited developmental planning in the Pacific to colonial and neo-colonial networks, Hau'ofa also argued that it perpetuated an unrealistic view of Islanders in other fields.²⁴

Since the publication of "Our Sea of Islands," a number of subsequent works have explicitly and implicitly strengthened the case for recognizing the geographic mobility of Pacific Islanders. David Chapell's *Double Ghosts*, for instance, covers the lives of Pacific Islander sailors in Euro/American maritime work and makes more explicit claims about the need to address Native mobility in seeking to understand the nineteenth-century Pacific. Vince Diaz's often cited but still unpublished piece "Moving Islands," goes further by building an Indigenous theoretical model for understanding this fluidity through the lens of Carolinian navigational techniques. Diaz uses this geographic fluidity as a metaphor for the sort of cultural mobility discussed earlier. Damon Salesa's article "'Travel-Happy' Samoa" also posits an inherent fluidity in Pacific Island cultures, specifically among Samoans. Bridging between pre-contact histories of Samoan traveling and post-WWII migration, Salesa demonstrates continuity in the ways that Samoans embraced and maintained this geographic fluidity. Going a step further he argues that

²⁴ Epeli Hau'ofa, "Our Sea of Islands," *The Contemporary Pacific* 6, no.1 (1994).

travel inside and outside of Sāmoa was and continues to play an important role in *fa'a Sāmoa*.²⁵

The anthology *Pacific Diasporas* includes a number of essays that dealt with geographic fluidity of Islanders through the lens of diaspora and the cultural and the theoretical implications of Natives in a diasporic context. Similarly, Tevita Ka'ili's work on the Tongan diaspora has made significant statements about Native understandings of their own geographic fluidity. Ka'ili's work focuses on the performance of *tauhi vā*, translated roughly as the caring for the "space between people." Following a common Polynesian practice, Tongans who met within the diaspora engaged in a process of placing one another within the extended network of family, friends, and places. This allows them to develop the space between them in such a way as to connect them to one another. This process not only helps the creation of a network of resources within the diaspora, but also maintains links and ties to Tonga, the Tongan people, and Tongan identity despite the geographic and cultural separation.²⁶

Other historians have contributed through examinations of "Islanders in unexpected places."²⁷ Two monographs look specifically at nineteenth-century Hawaiians in the Pacific Northwest, Jean Barman's *Leaving Paradise*, and Tom Koppel's *Kanaka: Hawaiians on the Northwest Coast*. Both texts are largely descriptive, covering the reasons for Hawaiian migration to the Northwest, their role as laborers and "Indian fighters" for the various fur companies, their eventual exclusion from white society, and their inclusion into Native families and societies in the Northwest. Though somewhat

²⁵ Vicente Diaz, "Moving Islands: Towards an Indigenous Tectonics of Historiography in Guam," (University of Michigan, 2005); Damon Salesa, "'Travel-Happy' Samoa: Colonialism, Samoan Migration, and a 'Brown Pacific'," *The New Zealand Journal of History* 37, no. 2 (2003).

²⁶ Paul R. Spickard, ed. *Pacific Diaspora: Island Peoples in the United States* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2002).

²⁷ Reflecting the themes, if not always the depth of analysis, of Phil Deloria in: Deloria, *Indians in Unexpected Places*.

weak on analysis, these two texts illustrate the potential topics and sources available in examining Native-to-Native relationships beyond the Pacific Islands.²⁸ Another work of this type is *Hariru Wikitoria*, which follows a group of Māori touring London in 1863. It looks at the meaning of the voyage to different groups involved, including the Māori travelers, the tour's promoter, and various aspects of the London Public. Mark Belich also briefly discussed Māori in London in *Making Peoples*, arguing that Māori visits to England were part of broader Māori attempts to engage with Europe and build their *mana* as part of local power struggles.²⁹

Sea of Islanders

In “Our Sea of Islands” and a later piece, “The Ocean in Us,” Hau‘ofa also argued for a more specific examination of how Islanders have used their fluidity to develop and maintain networks and relationships with one another. Hau‘ofa’s piece reflected and reinforced a broader shift towards collaboration between Islanders involved in academics, politics, and cultural activism. Prominent examples include the use of the Māori Kohanga Reo model for language rejuvenation across the Pacific and collaborative traditional voyaging projects such as the 1995 fleet voyage between Nukuhiva and Hilo. A more pertinent example for Hau‘ofa’s work were the number of conferences that purposefully or accidentally gave Native Pacific scholars a chance to share and build upon each others’

²⁸ Jean Barman and Bruce McIntyre Watson, *Leaving Paradise: Indigenous Hawaiians in the Pacific Northwest, 1787-1898* (Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 2006); Tom Koppel, *Kanaka: The Untold Story of Hawaiian Pioneers in British Columbia and the Pacific Northwest* (Vancouver: Whitecap Books, 1995).

²⁹ James Belich, *Making Peoples: A History of New Zealanders, from Polynesian Settlement to the End of the Nineteenth Century* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2001), 141-145, 154-155; Brian Mackrell, *Hariru Wikitoria!: An Illustrated History of the Maori Tour of England, 1863* (Auckland ; New York: Oxford University Press, 1985).

work. Indeed, Hau'ofa wrote "Our Sea of Islands" as a reflection on such a conference and on other Islander-to-Islander engagements.³⁰

In the field of Pacific history, the examination of Islander-to-Islander relationships helps expand upon the centrality of the Native that has been building steadily for the past half-century. Many early academic Pacific histories barely acknowledged Islanders at all, imagining Pacific history largely as a contest between empires. Such histories portrayed Islanders largely as objects, with little or no agency.³¹ When they did examine Islanders, they typically did so in an effort to "prove" Native ineptness and justify the onset of empire, thus no explanation of the Islander worldview would be needed, desired—or could be accommodated.³² Since the Davidson school emerged in the fifties, Pacific historians have acknowledged that Islanders actually were important actors in their own histories, though they often lacked the tools and/or desire to analyze the thinking and values behind Islander actions.³³ With the popularity of Greg Denning's and Marshall Sahlins's anthro/history approach in the eighties, historians began to regard how Islanders and other Natives thought and understood the world to be just as important as what the European "strangers" believed.³⁴ Some Native-driven nationalist histories, often heavily influenced by the anthro/history approach, have gone even further

³⁰ Hau'ofa, "Our Sea of Islands."

³¹ Jean Ingram Brooks, *International Rivalry in the Pacific Islands, 1800-1875* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1941).

³² Kuykendall, *The Hawaiian Kingdom*; Ralph S. Kuykendall and A. Grove Day, *Hawaii: A History, from Polynesian Kingdom to American Commonwealth* (New York: Prentice-Hall, 1948).

³³ James W. Davidson, "Problems of Pacific History," *Journal of Pacific History* 1 (1966); Howe, *Where the Waves Fall*.

³⁴ Greg Denning, *Islands and Beaches: Discourse on a Silent Land, Marquesas, 1774-1880* (Chicago, Ill.: Dorsey Press, 1988); Marshall David Sahlins, *Islands of History* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985).

and privileged Islander interests above those of the colonizers, including a new emphasis on the relationships within a specific people or *lāhui*.³⁵

But even in these last two categories, any examinations of external relationships or Native understandings of the globe and their place in it remained focused on the Native/Empire encounter. Clearly relationships with the Euro/American powers had a substantial influence on the Pacific. This dissertation even argues that those relationships played a key role in how Native Hawaiians understood their relationships to other Islanders. However significant these relationships may have been, they still formed only a single lens through which Islanders understood the world and their individual and collective place in it. By following Hau‘ofa’s model and analyzing relationships between Islanders, historians can end the systemic hegemony of the Native/Empire relationship, thus broadening and deepening our understanding of how Pacific Islanders understood themselves and the world.

This is not to say that Pacific historians have completely ignored Islander-to-Islander relationships, as in some cases they are far too significant to ignore completely. Such is the case with Native missionaries. In his three-volume project on Christianity in the Pacific, John Garrett frequently highlighted the work of Islander missionaries.³⁶ Niel Gunson’s *Messengers of Grace* includes a discussion and some short biographies of Tahitian missionaries. A 1983 collection called *Polynesian Missions in Melanesia* focused entirely on Islander mission work. The contributors to the anthology *The Convent Makers: Islander Missionaries in the Pacific* also fleshed out the experiences and

³⁵ Kame‘eleihiwa, *Native Lands and Foreign Desires*; Osorio, *Dismembering Lāhui: A History of the Hawaiian Nation to 1887*.

³⁶ John Garrett, *To Live among the Stars: Christian Origins in Oceania* (Geneva; Suva, Fiji: World Council of Churches, in association with the Institute of Pacific Studies, University of the South Pacific, 1982); John Garrett, *Footsteps in the Sea: Christianity in Oceania to World War II* (Suva, Fiji: Institute of Pacific Studies, University of the South Pacific, in association with World Council of Churches, 1992); John Garrett, *Where Nets Were Cast: Christianity in Oceania since World War II* (Suva: Institute of Pacific Studies in association with World Council of Churches, 1997).

impact of selected Islander missionaries and groups of Islander missionaries across the Pacific. Nancy Morris's 1987 dissertation, *Hawaiian Missionaries Abroad*, provides a general overview of the Native Hawaiian missions. It examined their training by and ties to the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions and gives general outlines their different missions. Morris also included an incredibly helpful appendix with biographies of every Hawaiian missionary.³⁷

For the most part these works focused on establishing the importance of Islander missionaries in the conversion of the Pacific. In doing so they challenged Euro/American "ownership" of both mission work and the massive success of Christianity in the Pacific. Considering the significant role of Christianity in Pacific historiography, such work also promotes the Native as a historical agent in Pacific History in general. Yet such work also challenges understandings of the Pacific that vilify conversion as cultural betrayal,³⁸ and those histories of the Pacific that portray Euro/American missionaries as the omnipotent saviors and protectors of Pacific peoples.³⁹ The primary focus, however, is typically on the relationship between missionaries and converts, both of whom happen to be Islanders, rather than a specific analysis of Islander-to-Islander relationships.

There has also been a substantial discussion of Islander attempts to build polities beyond "traditional" cultural and political boundaries. There has been a somewhat protracted argument, for instance, on how to categorize Tongan interactions with Fiji and Sāmoa. Neil Gunson's 1990 article, "The Tonga-Samoa Connection, 1777-1845," and

³⁷ R.G. and Marjorie Crocombe, ed. *Polynesian Missions in Melanesia: From Samoa, Cook Islands, and Tonga to Papua New Guinea and New Caledonia* (Suva: Institute of Pacific Studies, 1983); Niel Gunson, *Messengers of Grace: Evangelical Missionaries in the South Seas 1797-1860* (Melbourne; New York: Oxford University Press, 1978); Doug Munro and Andrew Thornley, *The Covenant Makers: Islander Missionaries in the Pacific* (Suva, Fiji: Pacific Theological College and The Institute of Pacific Studies at the University of the South Pacific, 1996). Nancy Morris, "Hawaiian Missionaries Abroad, 1852-1909," (Dissertation, University of Hawai'i, 1987).

³⁸ For example: Haunani-Kay Trask, *From a Native Daughter: Colonialism and Sovereignty in Hawai'i* (Monroe, Me.: Common Courage Press, 1993), 6.

³⁹ Campbell, *Worlds Apart*.

sections of I.C. Campbell's monograph on Tonga, *Island Kingdom*, both argue that while the Tongan influence in Fiji and Sāmoa was considerable, it does not fit their model of Empire since it lacked a true metropole-over-periphery power dynamic. In the article "Imperialism, Dynasticism, and Conversion: Tongan Designs on Uvea (Wallis Island)," Campbell *does* argue that Tongans, particularly Tupou I, *intended* to create a Polynesian empire spearheaded by Tongan missionaries. It was only "fortuitous" French intervention that kept this Tongan empire from becoming a reality. As with much of the work on Native missionaries, Campbell and Gunson spend relatively little effort to examine or analyze how Islanders viewed these relationships, spending more time debating how much the structure of these relationships did or did not resemble Euro/America empires.⁴⁰

Glenn Petersen, however, argues for recognizing both the Tongan and Yapese areas of influence as empires in "Indigenous Island Empires: Yap and Tonga Considered." By paying greater attention to how the Islanders involved actually understood these relationships and how they negotiated them with one another, he is able to develop a much more nuanced understanding of the relationships in question and of the idea of empire itself. He maintains that claims that Tonga and Yap never achieved imperial status are flawed, since they are based on a narrow nineteenth-century, European vision of empire. The Yapese and Tongan Empires were built on indigenous models of power that allowed far more negotiation and autonomy than nineteenth-century models. Thus they provide important comparisons to nineteenth-century empires, allowing us to

⁴⁰ I. C. Campbell, "Imperialism, Dynasticism, and Conversion: Tongan Designs on Uvea (Wallis Island), 1835-52," *The Journal of the Polynesian Society* 92, no. 2 (1983); I. C. Campbell, *Island Kingdom: Tonga Ancient and Modern*, 2nd. Rev. ed. (Christchurch, N.Z.: Canterbury University Press, 2001); Niel Gunson, "The Tonga-Samoa Connection 1777-1845," *The Journal of Pacific History* 25, no. 2 (1990).

analyze those empires as products of their time rather than continuing to normalize their peculiarities as the natural features of empire.⁴¹

Another key article about the Tonga-Fiji connection is John Spurway's "Why Ma'afu Brought his Floor Mats to Fiji in 1847." Spurway never takes a direct stance on whether or not Tonga's sphere of influence is actually imperial, but instead looks at the circumstances and causes of a key moment in Fijian/Tongan relations. He argues that Ma'afu's journey and eventual rise to power in Fiji were a reflection of older traditions of Tongan roles in Fijian society. Seeing little hope for gaining any real power in Tonga under Tupou, Ma'afu followed a Tongan custom of going to Fiji to make his own way in the world.⁴² Spurway's work could be used either to support or oppose the idea of Tongan empire. Ma'afu's purpose in heading to Fiji does not reflect an imperial Tongan mission to conquer as some have proposed. At the same time the traditions of Tongan mercenary voyaging to Fiji, their ties to Fijian chiefs, and the presence of numerous Tongan warriors in Fiji indicate that patterns of Tongan power in Fiji were already well established. This could support the loose, negotiated, and somewhat reciprocal style of Islander empire proposed by Peterson, or an even looser system that complicates the idea of Tonga and Fiji as two isolated and discrete cultures and polities. Like Petersen, Spurway's focus on how Islander's viewed these relationships allows him to create not just a more nuanced view of the issue at hand, but also of the histories of Tonga and Fiji in general.⁴³

In their work on Islander diasporas, some Pacific Historians have also examined relationships between islanders. Although the primary focus is often on the diasporic experience rather than on such relationships, in many cases it is the understanding of

⁴¹ Glenn Petersen, "Indigenous Island Empires: Yap and Tonga Considered," *The Journal of Pacific History* 35, no. 1 (2000).

⁴² The similarities to the story of Moikeha and other Polynesian *mo'olelo* hint that this sort of travel was likely part of a broader Polynesian custom.

⁴³ John Spurway, "Hiki Mo E Faliki: Why Ma'afu Brought His Floor Mats to Fiji in 1847," *The Journal of Pacific History* 37, no. 1 (2002).

these relationships that allows the academic to properly understand that experience. This is the case in Morgan Tuimaleali'ifano's study *Samoans in Fiji*, whose focus is largely on the factors encouraging and detracting from modern Samoan integration into Fijian society. Diaz's article, "Fight Boys, Till the Last," looks at the role of Hawaiians and Hawai'i locals in establishing Pop Warner football on Guam. In the complicated overlap between collaborating in the colonization of others and attempting to maintain a Hawaiian identity, Diaz's childhood coaches represented the difficult and messy realities of global colonization that neither anti-imperial nationalism nor traditional colonial histories can capture. Though not explicitly about the Islander-to-Islander relationship, Diaz's understanding of such relationships, including his own relationships as a player under the Hawaiians, a Pacific Islander, and a non-Chamorro Guamanian help develop much of the complexity in his analysis.⁴⁴

Outside of the field of history, Native Pacific academics have also examined the role of Islander-to-Islander relationships in the academy and the arts. Alice Te Punga Sommerville's dissertation includes an examination of Māori authors' understandings of themselves as part of a larger Pacific community in her dissertation on English-language Maori writing. In "Our Sea of Islands" Hau'ofa discussed the role of Islanders at academic conferences on the development of his ideas. Teresia Teaiwa greatly expanded on the theme of Islander-to-Islander relationships in creating a Native intellectual space in "Lo(o)sing the Edge." In that reflection on the state of Native Pacific Cultural Studies, Teaiwa recounted her own experiences with other Islander academics and argued that

⁴⁴ Vicente Diaz, "Fight Boys, Till the Last: American Football and the Remasculinization of Indigeneity in Guam." in *Pacific Diaspora*, ed. Paul R. Spickard (Honolulu: University of Hawaii, 2002); Morgan A Tuimaleali'ifano, *Samoans in Fiji* (Suva: Institute of Pacific Studies, University of the South Pacific, 1990).

such relationships and networks have had a tremendous impact on the creation and direction of the field.⁴⁵

The current academic literature that draws upon the relationships between Islanders, however limited it is, has shown that students of the Pacific have much to gain by examining how Islanders understood and developed those relationships. Specifically it has shown that the more directly Islander's views of such relationships are examined, the more nuanced and useful such work can be. Building off of this and Hau'ofa's concepts, this dissertation makes the argument that the analysis of Islander-to-Islander connections is an important subject of inquiry in its own right. Using Native Hawaiian connections to other Islanders as an example, it seeks to show that a purposeful analysis of such relationships broadens and deepens our understanding of how Pacific Islanders viewed the world and their place in it.

Though no more a panacea for the problems facing Pacific history than the Davidson School, anthro-history, or Native nationalism, the examination of Islander-to-Islander relationships also provides some utility with regards to certain historiographic issues and problems. It would clearly provide a greater understanding of how Pacific Islanders understood the limits of belonging in different contexts beyond "the beach." Such work could also provide the basis for a broad and coherent regional history of the Pacific that does not rely entirely on Euro-centric assumptions, actors, and worldviews like Campbell or Howe. Finally, the examination of the history of Islander-to-Islander relationships allows us to put contemporary academic, cultural, and economic relationships between islanders into a historical context.

⁴⁵ Alice Te Punga Somerville, "Nau Te Rourou, Nau Te Rakau: The Oceanic, Indigenous, Postcolonial and New Zealand Comparative Contexts of Maori Writing in English" (2006); Teresia Teaiwa, "Lo(O)Sing the Edge," *The Contemporary Pacific* 13, no. 2 (2001).

Kinship and Na‘auao, Islanders and Empires

Building off of these previous works and as part of a broader effort to demonstrate the utility and importance of the analysis of Islander-to-Islander relationships, this dissertation examines Native Hawaiian relationships with other Pacific Islanders between the last years of Kamehameha III’s reign and the beginning of WWI. As mentioned earlier, it examines three specific Native Hawaiian-initiated projects centered around connections to other Islanders: Native Hawaiian missionary efforts in the Marquesas and Micronesia, the Hawaiian legation to Sāmoa, and the Polynesian cruise of former Royal Governor of Hawai‘i Island, John Tamatoa Baker. In the examination of these events and projects, certain common threads emerged with regards to Native Hawaiian understandings of other Islanders. Throughout the period in question the idea of a shared past or shared roots remained a constant presence, though the light in which the different Native Hawaiian groups and individuals viewed this differed dramatically. In all three cases Native Hawaiians also tended to judge other Pacific Islanders by standards based on Euro/American norms. Though the type of Euro/American norms that they privileged varied significantly, Native Hawaiians tended to refer to them with the term *na‘auao*, enlightenment/civilization. In most cases, the one exception being Baker’s time among the urban Māori, the Native Hawaiians being examined in this dissertation considered themselves superior to their southern brothers in terms of the *na‘auao*, both as individuals and as a *lāhui*, and rarely missed an opportunity to point this out.

These two threads often combined themselves in a common Hawaiian understanding of other Pacific Islanders as archaic versions of Hawaiians, of “how we used to be.” Often this refrain was supported by some measure, often the possession of western material goods, which would provide a seemingly objective basis for such a comparison. As with Euro/American uses of the same sort of comparisons, Native Hawaiians typically made such claims from the prospective of a specific

Protestant/Enlightenment understanding of human civilization in which man steadily progressed towards a perfected or perfect state. Nicholas Thomas has traced such thinking to a pre-modern European discourse in which, “non-Western peoples tend to be characterized not in any anthropologically specific terms, but as a lack or poorer form of the values of the center.”⁴⁶ Some civilizations, however, typically one’s own, moved faster or more steadily towards that state than others. Such views also excused various colonial projects purportedly intended to drag the stragglers to a higher level of civilization. By no coincidence such efforts typically resulted in far greater benefits for the dragger than the dragee. Just as various Euro/Americans sought to bring civilization to the Hawaiians, Hawaiians often sought to spread their *na‘auao* out to other islanders. They were, however, far less successful than the Euro/Americans at profiting from their attempts. Despite these broad similarities, the details of how Native Hawaiians viewed other Islanders varied greatly with time and within different elements of the *lāhui*. To be more specific, these perceptions dictated whether they privileged their shared past with other Islanders or their perceived superiority in the *na‘auao*.

Between 1850 and 1907 the primary factor in how Native Hawaiians understood and developed their relationships with other Islanders was their perception of the relationship between the *lāhui* and the Euro/American empires active in the Pacific. To the degree that they viewed the Euro/American empires as sympathetic to the interests of the *lāhui*, they developed their relationships with other Islanders through discourses of difference and Native Hawaiian superiority. In doing so they hoped to strengthen their cultural alliances with the Euro/American empires by claiming a shared superiority over other Islanders. To the degree that they viewed the Euro/American powers as antagonistic to the interests of the *lāhui*, they developed their relationships to other Islanders through discourses of closeness, kinship, and alliance against the shared threat of empire. The two

⁴⁶ Thomas, *Colonialism’s Culture*, 71.

views were not mutually exclusive; they coexisted throughout the period in question. In general, however, between 1850 and 1907, Native Hawaiians experienced a gradual shift from the first view to the second in response to growing imperial threats to the preservation of the *lāhui*.

As noted above, this dissertation examines a period from 1850 until 1907, spanning the mid-to-late Kingdom period, the Republic, and the early Territorial period. The selection of this time period stems partially from the availability and density of the archive. The incompleteness of Hawaiian Kingdom records as well as the limited participation of Hawaiians in the newspaper industry before the 1850s make it much easier to research events occurring in the second half of the nineteenth century. The end limit of the dissertation was largely driven by the individual episodes chosen for study, particularly the end of the HBCFM missions and Baker's voyage. An endpoint in the early 1900's was also attractive because it created a manageable range of dates for the dissertation while pushing the ending point into the period of formal American Empire. Typically historians choose either the 1893 overthrow or 1898 annexation as "natural" end points for Native-oriented Hawaiian histories. This approach emphasizes a loss of continuity and reinforces the American colonial narrative of Hawai'i, relegating Native Hawaiian relevance to the nineteenth century. Instead this dissertation will reach into the opening decade of the twentieth century and examine both continuity and changes in Hawaiian relationships with the rest of the Pacific as Hawaiians adjusted to life under imperial rule.

The chapters of this dissertation are organized in pairs. The first chapter of each section establishes Native Hawaiian understandings of the connection between the *lāhui* and the Euro/American powers in a certain period and among certain segments of the *lāhui*. The second chapter of each section details a specific project Native Hawaiians developed to reshape their relationships with other Islanders based on these

understandings. Chapters 2 and 3 look at Native Hawaiian mission work as an expression of Native Hawaiian Congregationalist theology. Chapter 2 argues that in the 1840's through 1860's, the key period with regards to establishing the support for Native Hawaiian mission work, the devout core of Native Hawaiian Congregationalism embraced a Protestant vision of the world as separated between the *mālamalama*, the light and the *pōuli*, the dark. In such a scheme the greatest threat to the *lāhui* came from the remnants and reminders of their own *na'aua*, unenlightened, past. For them, the future worldly and spiritual prosperity of the *lāhui* relied entirely on embracing the *na'aua* of the Euro/American empires, perceived as the standard bearers for God's Kingdom. Mission work provided them the ability to strengthen their status as a *lāhui na'aua*, placing them on an equal theological and cultural footing with the empires.

Chapter 3 argues that as a result of this worldview, the Native missionaries and many of their supporters perceived themselves as far superior to the polytheist and Catholic Islanders who they worked among. They developed and portrayed their relationships with these islanders in ways that reflected and reinforced their perceived superiority, distancing themselves from the *na'aua* islanders among whom they had chosen to work and who they sought to remake in their own image. In doing so they sought to not only establish their own separation from the perceived *na'aua* of the Native Hawaiian past, but to simultaneously push them closer to the other *lāhui na'aua*, namely the Euro/American powers.

Chapters 4 and 5 pivot around Kalākaua's efforts to consolidate and extend the *na'aua* while protecting and reviving the *lāhui*. Chapter 4 examines Kalākaua's foreign and domestic policy between 1880 and 1887 as a reflection of how he understood Hawai'i's contemporary and future place in the world. It argues that the king and his administration rightly perceived the growing threat posed by the official and unofficial representatives Euro/American empires. Domestically the king promoted a monarchy-

oriented nationalist culture that combined ancient and contemporary Native Hawaiian traditions with Victorian-era cosmopolitanism. In doing so he sought to rebut *haole* denials of both the validity of Native culture and the ability of Natives to adapt Euro/American *na‘auao*. In his foreign policy Kalākaua sought to eliminate the threat of invasion or occupation through high-level engagement with Euro/American diplomatic and social networks based on Hawai‘i’s treaty status. Sensing this was not enough, however, Kalākaua and his administration sought to hedge their bets by developing an explicitly anti-colonial confederation of Polynesian states, elevating Hawai‘i’s status among the Euro/American empires while keeping those same empires at bay.

Chapter 5 follows the 1887 legation that Kalākaua sent to develop the groundwork for the confederacy in Sāmoa. On the one hand the legation made constant appeals to the Samoans as kin, as fellow Polynesians, and as allies against the shared threat of the Euro/American powers. Yet they also declared and promoted their supposed superiority in the *na‘auao*, this time defined through the political and economic structures of Euro/American nation states. They even sought to reshape the Samoans in their own westernized image, seeking to convince the Samoans, the Euro/American powers, and themselves that Hawai‘i had the *na‘auao* and the influence to lead Polynesia.

Chapters 6 and 7 address the radically different situation that the *lāhui* was confronted with after annexation by the United States. Chapter 6 posits that with the start of both the new century and life under formal imperial rule, Native Hawaiians understood the *lāhui* as being under a state of constant siege. During the early Territorial years, from 1900 until WWI, most Native Hawaiians recognized American imperial control, settler colonialism, and a plantation economy as the greatest combination of threats ever faced by the *lāhui*. Most Native Hawaiians believed that they needed to engage with the plantations and the oligarchs to some degree in order to gain the individual economic and political success needed to assure the future of the *lāhui*. The debate over when and how

closely to work with or against these forces dominated Native Hawaiian cultural and political life in this period but resulted in only limited successes for the *lāhui*.

Chapter 7 focuses on one development that both followed and epitomized the challenges of this period, John Tamatoa Baker's voyage to Tahiti, the Cook Islands, New Zealand, Sāmoa, Tonga, and Fiji. It argues that in the context of Native Hawaiian fears over their future under American rule, Baker promoted and developed a vision of the *lāhui* as intimately connected to other Polynesians, validating its values and attitudes as normative by Polynesian standards rather than as deviant by Euro/American ones. Furthermore, he used this cultural solidarity to critique Euro/American empires and their proponents, marking *them* as deviant for their deep inadequacies under Polynesian social and cultural norms. At the same time, however, Baker promoted an agenda of increased Polynesian economic initiative and support for Westernized leaders as the best available path for Polynesians under imperial rule. When promoting these agendas, however, Baker did not use other Polynesians as a foil to promote the idea of Hawaiian superiority, the way the HBCFM missionaries and the 1887 legation had. He instead used Native Hawaiian connections and similarities to other Polynesians to put such agendas in a broader context, even rethinking and reframing them based on Polynesian-derived critiques.

CHAPTER 2
KA MĀLAMALAMA A ME KA PŌULI:
NATIVE HAWAIIAN CONGREGATIONALIST ANXIETY, 1850-1900

In 1808, a young orphan named ‘Ōpūkaha‘ia left Hawai‘i on an American vessel, signing on as a cabin boy along with a friend named Hopu. After traveling to Canton, Macao, and New York, the two stayed for a period with the ship’s captain in New Haven, Connecticut. Befriended by students and faculty at Yale, including then Yale President Timothy Dwight, ‘Ōpūkaha‘ia quickly developed his skills in written and spoken English and other subjects. ‘Ōpūkaha‘ia, who began going by the name Henry, also became involved in Yale’s religious life, including joining in the twice-daily Dwight family prayers. Following a deep period of melancholy over the state of his soul, ‘Ōpūkaha‘ia converted, an experience marked by a moment of deep introspection in the Connecticut woodlands. In addition to bringing him into the good graces of his friends and sponsors in New England, the experience also allowed him to focus his anxiety over his personal salvation outward through the dream of missionary work. From that day forward he pledged to return home and share the *na‘auao* of Christianity with his fellow Hawaiians, who he saw as benighted by the same darkness he had once felt.¹

‘Ōpūkaha‘ia’s conversion set in motion a series of events that eventually resulted in the mass conversion of the *lāhui*. His conversion and subsequent fundraising on the revival circuit helped initiate and fund a mission to the Hawaiian Islands under the

¹ Edwin W. Dwight, *Memoir of Henry Obookiah: A Native of the Sandwich Islands, Who Died at Cornwall, Connecticut, February 17, 1818, Aged 26* (American Sunday School Union, 1830), 17-18, 23, 30-35.

auspices of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions (ABCFM), as well as inspiring prospective New England missionaries with the “Macedonian Call” to head into the Pacific. His untimely death before the departure of the mission also provided them with their first martyr and another boost to the Board’s coffers. The missionaries arrived in Hawai‘i in 1820 to find Kamehameha the Great dead and the *kapu*² system overturned, both of which they counted as blessings. After a few slow years, the missionaries made several powerful allies among the *ali‘i*, which led to the rapid spread of Congregationalist teachings. By 1830 churches and meeting houses had sprung up across the Kingdom, initiating an 80-year period of significant missionary influence, and occasionally hegemony, over the political, social, and cultural life of the islands.

Ōpūkaha‘ia, the arrival of the mission, the conversion of the *lāhui*, and nineteenth-century Congregationalist dominance have retained a strong presence in both the popular historical consciousness and the historiography of Hawai‘i. Relatively little, however, has been written about how Native Hawaiian Congregationalists actually understood the world, the *lāhui*, and the future of the islands. This chapter examines how Native Hawaiian Congregationalists viewed the *lāhui*’s place in the world between 1850 and the end of the Kingdom in 1893. It places a special emphasis on the period between 1850 and 1870, which was both the period of the church’s greatest strength and the period when the first generation of Native Hawaiians raised within the church came into prominence. By no coincidence, the vast majority of the Native Hawaiian missionaries discussed in the next chapter also trained and departed for foreign mission work during this period.

² *Kapu*: Religious sanctions and rules. “*Kapu* system” is used to denote the religious system the *kapu* supported.

This first section of the chapter examines Native Hawaiian Congregationalists' theological understanding of the world as split into two realms, the *mālamalama*, the light, and the *pōuli*, the darkness, associated with Christ and Satan respectively. Such an understanding, which remained relatively stable throughout the mid-to-late nineteenth century, channeled the ABCFM's Puritan-descended strain of Protestantism through existing Native Hawaiian concepts, causing subtle and not so subtle changes in both. The second section argues that in addition to the standard anxiety regarding personal salvation found in all Calvinist-descended Protestantism, Native Hawaiian Congregationalists between the 1850s and 1870s also battled with an additional layer of anxiety stemming from the context of their recent collective past. Their close temporal proximity to what they saw as the *pōuli* of the Hawaiian past, their spatial and cultural proximity to real and rumored remnants of that *pōuli*, and their exposure to the onslaught of new expressions of the *pōuli* all threatened not just the salvation of individual Native Hawaiian Congregationalists, but the salvation of the *lāhui* as a whole.

Many feared that they would never rid themselves, individually or collectively, of the taint of the *pōuli*, particularly in comparison to their American teachers. The American missionaries in Hawai'i encouraged such thinking through their education programs, publications, and the pastor's pulpit, using the ensuing insecurity to maintain their continued domination of Hawaiian Congregationalism. Following 'Ōpūkaha'ia's example, Native Hawaiian Congregationalists embraced mission work as a means to divest themselves of some of their personal and collective anxiety, thus further aligning the *lāhui* with the predominantly Euro/American community of Christian peoples. In doing so they also gained a significant rhetorical lever for negotiating a Native Hawaiian presence in the leadership of the Congregational Church in Hawaii.

From Mission Stations to Missionaries

The story of Hawai‘i’s conversion often hinges on the creation of an alliance between the missionaries and Queen Ka‘ahumanu. The favorite wife and advisor of Kamehameha the Great, Ka‘ahumanu effectively seized power after his death in 1819, symbolically destroying the *kapu* system as a means of demonstrating and strengthening her political position. When the missionaries first arrived, neither they nor Ka‘ahumanu saw much use for one another. Once they realized her power, however, the missionaries began courting her favor through various means. Though commonly left out of the American mission narrative, it seems that Tahitian lay preachers traveling with British missionaries from the London Mission Society played a prominent role in initially drawing Ka‘ahumanu and her sister queen, Keōpūolani, towards Christianity. After the restoration of communication between Hawai‘i and the rest of the Pacific in the post-contact era, Tahiti quickly earned a special place in the Hawaiian mind for the linguistic and cultural similarities between the two peoples. William Ellis, one of the LMS missionaries, wrote that Kamehameha the Great and Pomare I, the Tahitian king, had even planned marriages amongst their children, though the death of Pomare and the irregularity of shipping between the two lands derailed the plans.³

Before the arrival of the LMS party in 1822, Ka‘ahumanu’s court already included a Tahitian favorite named Moe who served as a clerk and advisor. Among the Tahitians traveling with the LMS party were Auna and his wife, who just happened to be Moe’s sister. After a pleasant and surprising reunion, Moe introduced the two to the queen, who welcomed the entire party as her guests. She and the rest of the court seemed particularly interested in hearing the Tahitians’ opinions of the missionaries’ religion and of events in Tahiti and Hawai‘i. Auna remained with Ka‘ahumanu while the rest of the

³ William Ellis, *Narrative of a Tour through Hawaii, or Owhyhee; with Remarks on the History, Traditions, Manners, Customs, and Language of the Inhabitants of the Sandwich Island* (London: H. Fisher, Son, and P. Jackson, 1826), 63-4.

party toured the islands. His journal hints that it was his stories of the burning of the *tiki*⁴ that inspired Ka‘ahumanu’s subsequent *ki‘i*-burning tour around Hawai‘i, during which he continued to act as her tutor and advisor.⁵ Another Tahitian lay preacher, Taua, established himself within the court of Keōpūolani, who frequently requested that he come to her in the evenings to discuss Christianity. The official mission narrative often credits the ABCFM mission with the conversion of Keōpūolani, the most sacred of Kamehameha’s queens and the first *ali‘i nui*⁶ to convert. Ellis’ account, however, indicates that much of the groundwork for her conversion was laid by Taua, whose Hawaiian was far more fluent than any of the ABCFM missionaries and whose conversational style was more to the queen’s liking.⁷

After the visit of the Tahitians, the conversion and death of Keōpūolani, and the services of the mission wives during a serious illness, Ka‘ahumanu grew increasingly close to the ABCFM missionaries, particularly their de facto leader, Hiram Bingham. Once she converted, Ka‘ahumanu Hou, the new Ka‘ahumanu, put the full weight of her political, cultural, and personal influence behind the mission. With Ka‘ahumanu came many of the *ali‘i nui*, particularly the close relatives of Ka‘ahumanu who owed their status to her continued patronage. Soon after her conversion, “blue laws” emerged from the Chiefs’ Council, banning alcohol, prostitution, all manner of non-religious activity on

⁴ *Ki‘i/Tiki*: Hawaiian/Tahitian for an image or representation, often carved images of a god.

⁵ Daniel Tyerman and George Bennet, *Journal of Voyages and Travels by the Rev. Daniel Tyerman and George Bennet, Esq.: Deputed from the London Missionary Society, to Visit Their Various Stations in the South Sea Islands, China, India, &C. Between the Years 1821 and 1829* (London: Crocker and Brewster, 1832), 33, 45, 93-4; William Ellis, “Extract of a Letter from Mr. Ellis,” *The Evangelical Magazine and Missionary Chronicle* (1823), 210.

⁶ *Ali‘i nui*: High chiefs

⁷ Ellis, *Narrative of a Tour through Hawaii*, 48, 53.

Sundays, *hula*, gambling, polygamy, and whatever else the mission fathers portrayed as *hewa*,⁸ sinful.⁹

When Ka‘ahumanu died in 1832, Kauikeaouli, Kamehameha III, attempted to break free of the mission through a cultural rebellion led by the Tahitian/Hawaiian court favorite Kaomi. The period of “revolt” ended after a few years, though the king remained distant from the mission. In 1836, however, the death of the king’s sister and lover, Nāhi‘ena‘ena, left Kauikeaouli emotionally distraught and compliant to the wishes of the mission and the Protestant chiefs. The missionaries’ informal advisory roles became formal in 1842 when Dr. Gerritt Judd left the mission to become a government official, a move soon followed by other missionaries. In addition to “blue laws” reinforcing New England morals, the government also followed a number of mission suggestions regarding land tenure, government organization, and other issues, “reforming” Hawai‘i according to the ideals of capitalist, republican, Protestant New England.¹⁰

One of the keys to the mission’s success was the education system it developed in conjunction with the government. Due to the high place of literacy in Protestant doctrine, the mission prioritized the establishment of a written language and schools from the start. In conjunction with the government, the mission developed and managed a system of New-England-style day schools, Sunday schools, and boarding schools. The missionaries and Native teachers taught reading, writing, arithmetic, geography, and religious matters using New England pedagogical methods and tools, including translations of American reading primers, hymnals, geography texts, and religious texts. Mission print shops in

⁸ *Hewa*: Commonly translated as sinful or wrong, in Hawaiian culture *hewa* indicated something that had created a moral, ethical, or social imbalance, something that disturbed the *pono*, the balance.

⁹ Kame‘eleihiwa, *Native Lands*, 142-3,153-5.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 74-9, 150-157.

Honolulu and at the Lahainaluna College churned out pamphlets, primers, texts, and periodicals, all aimed at turning the Hawaiian people into proper Congregationalists.¹¹

The success of the Sandwich Islands Mission resulted in its own demise and the creation of what, technically, was an independent Hawaiian church. Starting in the 1840's, Dr. Rufus Anderson, the Secretary of the ABCFM, pushed the Sandwich Islands Mission towards the creation of a self-sufficient church.¹² This meant not only a financially self-sufficient church, which was not yet fully plausible, but also a church that did not depend on Americans for its ministers and management. As Anderson argued in 1846, the Hawaiian church could not obtain its independence without the cultivation of a predominantly native ministry. Through a combination of racism and a desire to maintain their elite positions among the Hawaiian people, the ABCFM's missionaries in Hawai'i persistently fought against the creation of a substantive Native ministry. In the late 1840's they made a token gesture by beginning to ordain a few token Hawaiians, many of whom, like Rev. James Kekela, served as missionaries before or after ordination. In 1854 they officially disbanded the Sandwich Islands Mission, reorganized themselves as the Hawaiian Evangelical Association (HEA), declared themselves an independent church with ties to the ABCFM, and resumed business as usual.¹³

It was in this atmosphere of constrained and token independence that ABCFM missionaries proposed a joint missionary effort to Micronesia to be carried out by the ABCFM and Hawaiian congregations. Native Congregationalists quickly rallied to the cause, outfitting several Hawaiian families for mission work. The ABCFM/HEA missionaries in Hawai'i organized the Hawaiian Board of Commissioners for Foreign

¹¹ For example; Sheldon Dibble, *He Hoikeholoholona Na Na Kamalii* (Lahainaluna: Mea Pai Palapala no ke Kula Nui, 1835); William Channing Woodbridge; S. Whitney, *He Hoikehonua, He Mea Ia E Hoakakaí I Ke Ano O Ka Honua Nei, a Me Na Mea Maluna Iho* (Oahu: Mea Pai Palapala A Na Misionari, 1845).

¹² Ralph Kuykendall, *The Hawaiian Kingdom, Volume I, 1778-1854, Foundation and Transformation* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1968), 337.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 339-341.

Missions (HBCFM) to manage the Hawaiian missionaries and coordinate efforts for ABCFM missionaries arriving from the United States. Soon after the first missionaries left for Micronesia, Native congregations also took on a mission of their own in the Marquesas, with only minimal and begrudging support from the ABCFM. Excited by such developments Native churches supported mission work in Micronesia from 1853 until 1904 and in the Marquesas from 1853 until 1908. Over that time nearly forty Hawaiian families set out as missionaries, in addition to others who went out as domestics, unofficial helpers, or teachers. The Marquesas mission, originally restricted to Omoa on Fatuhiva, soon spread to Ua Pou and Hiva Oa, with brief attempts to create mission stations on Ua Huka and Tahu Ata. With the exception of the short-lived stay of James Bicknell, the Marquesan mission remained almost entirely Native Hawaiian in personnel and at all times was funded entirely by Congregationalist churches and groups in Hawaii.

The Micronesia mission, however, was always a joint ABCFM/HBCFM project. Early disputes over the role of the Hawaiian missionaries, who refused to be the domestics of their American “co-workers,” led to a national/ethnic division of labor. The ABCFM missionaries took the more populated and comfortable high islands of Ponape and Kosrae, while the Hawaiians stayed primarily in the low atolls of the Marshalls and Kiribati. While the *haole*-dominated HBCFM only reluctantly supported the Hawaiian mission in the Marquesas after the early 1860’s, they gladly supported the joint ABCFM/HBCFM mission until the turn of the century. Only the rise of formal colonialism, in Hawai’i and Micronesia, brought an end to the Micronesia mission. Aided only by small begrudging payments of the HBCFM and reinforced largely from the growth of their own families in the Marquesas, the Marquesan mission officially ended in 1909, when the Rev. Samuel Kauwealoha died in the field. The Kekela and Hapuku

families, however, continued on their own and remained active in the Marquesan church throughout the twentieth century.¹⁴

Mālamalama and Pouli

In their day-to-day life, Native Hawaiian Congregationalists of the mid-to-late nineteenth century saw the world through a series of contextual divisions. Divisions by family, occupation, congregation, political loyalties, places of residences and/or familial connection all mattered, and mattered deeply in certain situations. Theologically, however, all of these divisions paled in comparison to the division between the saved and the unsaved, between those who stood in the *mālamalama* and those who stood in the *pōuli*. This division was by no means specific to Hawaiian Congregationalism, indeed it has been a key feature of Christianity since its inception. Christianity's emphasis on the afterlife and salvation placed a significant emphasis on understanding one's position with respect to the saved/unsaved division, and thus the ability to judge and maintain one's own salvation. An examination of the terms Native Hawaiians used to describe this division, however, can help provide greater nuance in how they, specifically, understood it.

Mālamalama and words with similar meaning, including *ao*,¹⁵ found heavy usage among Hawaiian Protestants as Christian metaphors. Missionary Samuela Kaaia, for instance, described the goal of the mission on Tabiteuea as encircling the island with, “the *malamalama* of [Christ's] victory.”¹⁶ Similarly, missionary James Kekela urged his

¹⁴ A much more in-depth summary of the history of the missions can be found in the second chapter of: Morris, “Hawaiian Missionaries Abroad, 1852-1909.”

¹⁵ *Ao*: light, day, and/or the temporal world.

¹⁶ In some cases the specific Hawaiian-language words or phrases used in the original are significant to the arguments of the paper. In such cases I have left the significant word or phrase in Hawaiian but provided the rest of the quotation in English only. At times this has meant editing the translations of others by

fellow Hawaiians to pray to God on behalf of the pagans of Hivaoa, that they would be turned, “from the *pouli* to the astounding *malamalama* of Christ.¹⁷ Clearly the source of such light metaphors rested in traditional Christian language. The Bible, for instance, contains many such light metaphors, such as 1 John 1:5 (KJV) “This then is the message which we have heard of him, and declare unto you, that God is light, and in him is no darkness at all.” The *Baibala Hemolele*, the ABCFM’s Hawaiian translation of the *Bible*, translates this as “*Eia mai no ka olelo a makou i lohe ai nona, ke hai aku nei no hoi makou ia oukou; he malamalama ke Akua, aohe pouli iki iloko ona.*” Through the Congregationalist emphasis on the study of scripture, Hawaiian Congregationalists were well versed in these Christian light metaphors.

Yet Native Hawaiians also had specific cultural understandings of concepts like *pōuli* and related terms like *pō*, which can be used to represent the night, generic darkness, and the time/being that was the primordial darkness, often referred to as Pō. According to Hawaiian genealogies, Pō came before anything else and birthed the rest of the universe. Pō was the ancestor of the Hawaiian people, the *akua*¹⁸, and even the *ao*, which in different contexts could mean light, daytime, the temporal world, and/or the present post-Pō era. As such, Pō was a space/time/being of great power, importance, and reverence. Furthermore, Pō and *pō*, the night, were also associated with *pō*, the realm of the *akua*. As a space parallel to the *ao*, the temporal world, the *pō* was seen as divine, mostly inaccessible to living man, but inhabited in part by the ancestors. Thus Hawaiians imagined the *pō* as a space and time of potential wholeness and reunion beyond the *ao*,

searching out and restoring some of the original wording. See Appendix: A Note on Translations and the Archive.

¹⁷ Samuela Ka‘ai to Forbes, October 17, 1887, HMCS-Micronesia; James Kekela to Gulick, August 7, 1867, AWAI AULU.

¹⁸ *Akua*: Gods or supernatural beings and people.

the known world, the realm of men, as well as a frightening realm of powerful beings and uncontrollable forces.¹⁹

With Christianization the meanings of *ao* and *pō* with regards to time and space remained relatively stable while the values surrounding them changed dramatically. Even before the coming of Christianity, Hawaiians saw *ao* and *pō* as an oppositional pair, but only through Christian theology did they assign them opposite values. The *ao/mālamalama* became unequivocally positive, the *pō* unequivocally negative. As both a time and a space, the *pō* remained the realm of the *akua*. Yet the mission's teachings transformed the *akua* from powerful though somewhat ambiguous beings into the demonic minions of Satan. Spatially, *pō* gained an added dimension. Where previously it had been a realm of the *akua* and the ancestors, now it included earthly realms, specifically those dominated by the unsaved. As a time the *pō* became the pre-Christian Hawaiian past, a time of darkness and evil from which the ancestors could not escape.

In both the Christian and polytheistic views, Native Hawaiians understood the *pō* not as an abstract or metaphor, but as a very “real” presence that overlapped the *ao* around certain times, places, and people. In both views these overlaps held great spiritual significance. In the polytheistic view such overlaps represented great and dangerous powers that could be negotiated with and understood through knowledge, ritual, and *kapu*. Certain places, certain spaces, and certain people, particularly the *ali'i* and *kahuna*, contained elements of both *pō* and *ao*, elements of the unknown realms of the *akua* and of the known, temporal realm of men. These people and spaces allowed Hawaiians to interact with and even manipulate the *pō* from within the *ao*, but also represented a dangerous manifestation of such unearthly powers on the earthly plane.

¹⁹ Mary Kawena Pukui, *Nana I Ke Kumu Vol. I* (Honolulu: Hui Hanai, 1972), 35, 40; Samuel Elbert; Mary Kawena Pukui, *Hawaiian Dictionary, Revised and Enlarged Edition* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1986), 333; Valerio Valeri, *Kingship and Sacrifice: Ritual and Society in Ancient Hawaii*, trans., Paula Wissing (Chicago: University of Chicago press, 1985), 3-7, 35-6.

Most Native Hawaiian Congregationalists, however, came to understand the overlap between *ao* and *pō* specifically as spaces of confrontation. Such overlaps continued to be points of both opportunity and danger. The mission field, a space dominated by the *pō*, represented opportunity for those on the side of the *ao* to expand God's Kingdom. Native missionaries celebrated every step towards conversion of their hosts as a victory within the larger conflict of *ao* and *pō*. Christian marriage, for instance, showed a people taking a first step towards eradicating the darkness, a "*Kukui hoomalamalama*," an illuminating lamp penetrating an otherwise dark land. This sort of overlap, where the *mālamalama* encroached upon or penetrated the *pō*, excited the hearts of Native Congregationalists. Even Hawai'i, however, remained a place of overlapping and confronting *pō* and *ao*, though in such cases the confrontation was a source of concern and insecurity. When visiting home in 1859, for instance, Kekela decried what he saw as places of overlap in Hawai'i, urging the *hoahānau*, the brethren, to remain strong against the *pōuli*.²⁰

Another key difference between Protestant and polytheistic representations of overlap between the *pō* and *ao* was the issue of control. In the polytheistic vision, no single entity controlled or directed either the *pō* or the *ao*, they simply were. In the Protestant view Christ and Satan actively directed and profited from the respective progress of the *ao* and the *pō*. The *pō* was the explicit domain of Satan, the *ao*, the explicit domain of Christ, and the overlap of the two was a direct confrontation between the forces of Satan and Christ. A church report from Abaiang, for instance, declared that there were two types of people, those who progressed and those who moved backwards,

²⁰ Hezekiah Aea to Clark, January 16, 1864, HMCS-Micronesia; J.D. Ahia to Forbes, August 2, 1870, HMCS-Micronesia; Samuela Ka'ai to Forbes, October 14, 1886, HCMS-Micronesia; Samuela Ka'ai to Emerson, December 20, 1890, HMCS-Micronesia; James Kekela, "J. Kekela's Farewell Letter to All of the Church Members Here in Hawaii Pt 1(Awaiulu Translation)," translated from: *Ka Hae Hawaii*, Jan 19 1859.

“the first group are steadfast behind Jesus and the second group behind Satan, the majority of the entire people of the world.”²¹

While the Protestant vision of the relationship between the *ao* and the *pō* dominated public discourse by the 1850’s, it should be noted that many Hawaiian Protestants retained a situational understanding of that relationship, favoring one interpretation or the other throughout the nineteenth century. Even among the HBCFM missionaries, who were clearly the most devout and dogmatic of Hawaiian Protestants, the older meanings could occasionally override their training. In a case from the 1890’s, Kekela, Kauwealoha, and the HBCFM accused Rev. Hapuku of having dealings with a demon. When the Hapuku’s daughter fell suspiciously ill, Rev. Hapuku asked a local *ali’i wahine* known for her familiarity with such matters to examine the girl. She declared that a demon or a spirit had seized the young woman and now demanded a horse she had recently ridden on. When contacted about the incident, Kekela, who agreed the girl had a *ma’i demonio*, or demon sickness, denounced the Hapuku family for participating in pagan rituals and reported their actions to the HBCFM. This resulted in Hapuku’s temporary expulsion from the mission and a long simmering feud between Hapuku and Kekela.²²

The moment illustrates a clear clash between Christian and polytheistic understandings of the overlap between the *pō* and the *ao*. Faced with a difficulty that Christian prayer and *haole* medicine seemed unable to deal with, Hapuku saw the incident as an encounter with the *pō*, with the dark world of the *akua*, here recast as demons. He responded by asking the *ali’i wahine* to intervene, as she was known as both a supporter of the mission and as a person of great power in such matters. In a nod to his

²¹ Joel Mahoe, “Apaiang Church Report 1872-73,” HMCS-Micronesia.

²² James Kekela to Emerson, October 19, 1893, Awaiaulu; James Kekela to Emerson, September 12, 1898, Awaiaulu.

Protestant bias, he argued that she was not a *kahuna*, who Hawaiian Congregationalist dogma had clearly marked as belonging to *pō* and Satan, but merely a wise woman who understood how to battle the *pō*. In the traditional sense, she, like a *kahuna*, had easy access to the space where the *pō* and the *ao* overlapped. By finding someone who could intervene between *ao* and *pō*, Hapuku sought to rescue his daughter from the demon and cleanse her of the *pō*. For Kekela and the HBCFM, however, the moment of overlap between the *pō* and the *ao* came when the forces of Satan, represented by both the demon and the *ali'i wahine*, tempted Hapuku away from the *ao*. Rather than trying to rescue his daughter from the *pō*, Hapuku had surrendered to it. For Kekela, the *pono*²³ thing to do was to combat the *pō* through Jesus alone, to combat the overlap on Christian terms rather than to manipulate it through “traditional” methods.²⁴

Na'auao Kristiano

As part of their education system, the ABCFM printed *Hoikehonua* in 1845, a Hawaiian-language geography text they adapted loosely from W. C. Woodbridge's *A System of Universal Geography*. In the section called *Ko Kanaka Noho Ana*, or the lifestyles of man, the text separates the world into two main groups, the *na'auao*, the civilized/educated and the *na'aupō*, the uncivilized/uneducated. It describes the *na'aupō* as: illiterate, lacking skill in different forms of labor, unable to care for the land, oppressors of women, and disobedient to the word of the Lord. It describes the *na'auao* as: literate, skilled, constantly looking for proper things, knowing the best ways to care for the land, and obeying the Lord. Because of such things, the text argued, the *na'auao* are strong, wealthy, and crush their enemies. The text leaves their treatment of women

²³ *Pono*: proper or balanced.

²⁴ Zakaria Hapuku to Emerson, September 5, 1893, HMCS-Marquesas; Samuel Kauwealoha to Hapuku, December 8, 1892, HMCS-Marquesas.

suspiciously unclear.²⁵ A third group, really just a subgroup of the *na‘aupō* created to understand Asia, have skills and some literacy, but are otherwise the same as the *na‘aupō*.²⁶

As with the use of *mālamalama* as a metaphor for the illumination of Christianity, the use of *ao* and other phrases equating “light” with education are also fairly straightforward. Light allows you to see, and to see is to know. This is particularly true in Hawaiian, where the word *‘ike* describes both concepts. It should come as no surprise that Hawaiian assessments of education also make frequent use of light and dark metaphors, particularly the words *na‘auao* and *na‘aupō* to denote the educated and the uneducated, respectively. Among Native Hawaiian Congregationalists the term *na‘auao* also served as a boundary regarding what counted as education. Among the ABCFM missionaries and Native Congregationalists, *na‘auao* was strictly associated with Euro/American-style education, primarily literacy-based, formal lessons on geography, theology, mathematics, chemistry, political science, and so forth. This led, by no accident on the part of the American missionaries, to a further devaluing of local knowledge systems in Hawai‘i and elsewhere in the Pacific. Thus a man could be *akamai*, or clever, in certain types of Native knowledge, but without the *palapala*, or literacy, he would never be considered *na‘auao*. Furthermore Native knowledge came from the past, from the time of *pō*. Though someone whose grasp of hula chants, indigenous medicinal practices, genealogy, or fisheries and land resource management might dwarf the learning of a “*kanaka na‘auao*,” they might find themselves in the peculiar position of being called “*na‘aupō*,” ignorant and unenlightened.

²⁵ As part of teaching Native Hawaiians proper gender roles, both the *na‘auao* and the *na‘aupō* are implicitly gendered male, with women being presented only as objects acted upon by different types of men.

²⁶ Whitney, *He Hoikehonua*, 38.

As shown in *He Hoikehonua*, American and Native Congregationalists also equated educational *na'auao* and *na'aupō* with salvation, an inheritance of the fetishization of the written word in the Puritan tradition. While some have argued that literacy was an important attribute of pre-reformation lay Catholicism,²⁷ the Protestant love affair with the written word still had its roots in Martin Luther's and John Calvin's arguments for the importance of reading scripture. The New England Puritans, who subscribed to many of Calvin's ideas, attempted to convert the Native peoples of the region with a heavy focus on developing and spreading an alphabet, literacy, and a print culture.²⁸ This fascination with the written word remained with their descendants into the era of the early Republic. Timothy Dwight, who was a major influence on the ABCFM, placed a renewed importance on Christian education and public worship as the keys to both salvation and a proper Protestant republic. These deeply embedded ties between education and salvation were an essential part of the Congregationalist culture and theology that came to Hawai'i with the ABCFM.²⁹

In Hawai'i, Micronesia, and the Marquesas, Native Hawaiian Congregationalists displayed and celebrated this Christian *na'auao* through school exhibitions called *hō'ike*. At these *hō'ike* students were publicly examined on a number of subjects, sung hymns, and recited scripture for their communities. In a bow to Islander traditions the events also incorporated a fair amount of pageantry and feasting. The children's religious paper *Alaula* reported on one *hō'ike* thrown by the Sunday school of Wailua in 1866. An audience of 500 watched the students display their knowledge of "Bible stories, mental arithmetic, general arithmetic, geography, zoology, handwriting, and the signs of the

²⁷ Eamon Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England 1400-1580*, Second ed. (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2005), 87.

²⁸ William Kellaway, "The Indian Library," in *The New England Company 1649-1776* ed. William Kellaway (London: Longmans, 1961).

²⁹ Sandra Wagner-Wright, *The Structure of the Missionary Call to the Sandwich Islands, 1790-1830: Sojourners among Strangers* (San Francisco: Mellen Research University Press, 1990), 37.

Lord.”³⁰ At the *hō‘ike*, and in the minds of many Native Hawaiian Congregationalists, there was no *na‘auao* without Christ, and no Christianity without the *na‘auao*.

Similarly Congregationalist Hawaiians in the mid-to-late nineteenth century often used the term *na‘aupō*, or ignorance, to denunciate any remnants of Polytheism that remained in Hawai‘i. Such usage is relatively common in both the independent Hawaiian-language press and in the various Hawaiian-language papers owned or operated by the ABCFM/HEA or their allies. Articles and letters headlined “*NAAUPO!*” appeared frequently in both types of papers, detailing various practices deemed to be of a heathenish or uncivilized nature. In February 1862, for instance, the independent newspaper *Ka Hoku o Ka Pakipika* published a letter about a “*kahuna* bundle” washing up on shore, with an editor’s comment decrying the continuation of such *na‘aupō*.³¹ A report of a woodcutter returning to polytheism met with another cry of *Na‘aupō!* in the March 13th issue.³²

Yet the development of an independent press also signaled a desire among many Native Hawaiians to question the American missionaries’ monopoly over defining the *na‘auao* and *na‘aupō*. The creation of *Ka Hoku o Ka Pakipika* [*KHOKP*] in the 1860’s became something of a referendum on the issue. When an ‘*ahahui*’³³ of Native Hawaiians created a newspaper independent of government and mission control, the ABCFM missionaries declared the project a great moral danger, claiming that Hawaiians lacked the *na‘auao* to publish their own paper without supervision. Furthermore the paper included such supposed *na‘aupō* as Native *mo‘olelo*, often portraying the *akua* in a neutral or even positive light. This sent the ABCFM/HEA and many rigid Native Congregationalists into a frenzy of self-righteousness. The paper and its supporters,

³⁰ *Alaula*, July 1866.

³¹ “*Naaupo!*,” *Ka Hoku o ka Pakipika*, February 20, 1862.

³² Ikepono, “*Kanaka Hoomanaia*,” *Ka Hoku o ka Pakipika*, March 13, 1861.

³³ *Ahahui*: Organization or group.

however, argued that the newspaper's very existence proved the secular *na'auao* of the Hawaiian people in that it required a high degree of education and knowledge to produce an independent paper. In a letter one contributor even argued that the newspaper was the *ao* in a realm of darkness, a light penetrating the *pōuli* of the mission-dominated press.³⁴

Na'auao and *na'aupō* could also be translated as civilized and uncivilized, though according to ABCFM teachings this was essentially the same thing as being educated and Christian. One of the ABCFM missionaries' basic assumptions was that Christianity was the natural religion of civilization. Only a civilized people could create the needed structures and organizations to lead Christian lifestyles, while only Christian teaching could truly civilize a people. Thus the Christianizing mission was also a civilizing one, with civilization being defined strictly as that of Western Europe and the United States, particularly New England. This is why Hiram Bingham claimed one of his first signs of success among the *ali'i nui* was being invited to a tea party during which Ka'ahumanu and the other *ali'i nui* dressed and acted like properly civilized and gendered New Englanders.³⁵

A letter to the editor from January 9, 1962, "He Koena 'Naaupo,'" combined the association of the *na'aupō* with both the past and the limits of civilized behavior. The letter, which the author prefaced by stating, "I have a little piece to show to the public and for you to swiftly send to the places that love the naauao." The author goes on to describe a man who debased himself by eating *palau*³⁶ off the floor after a barrel had split. Sweeping the *palau* into his mouth, along with whatever else lay on the ground, the man

³⁴ *Ka Hoku o ka Pakipika*, January 9 1862; Kauwale, *Ka Hoku o ka Pakipika*, December 9, 1861; Noenoe Silva, *Aloha Betrayed: Native Hawaiian Resistance to American Colonialism* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2004), 64-67.

³⁵ Hiram Bingham, *Selected Writings of Hiram Bingham 1814-1869: Missionary to the Hawaiian Islands to Raise the Lord's Banner*, Studies in American Religion; V. 31 (Lewiston, New York, USA E. Mellen Press, 1988), 283.

³⁶ *Palau*: A sweet potato and coconut pudding.

proceeded with little care for hygiene, standards of decent conduct that predated Protestant times, or the jeering of the large crowd gathered around him. The author derided the man as *na‘aupō*, but the tone of his report also seemed to consider the crowd’s behavior to be *na‘aupō* in that none attempted to stop him, preferring to mock and gawk. The paper’s headline, “He Koena ‘Naaupo,”” played upon the dual meanings of *koena*, leftovers/scraps, literally the things that remain. The title referred to both the residue/scraps of *palau* the man ate off the floor while also evoking the common understanding of the *na‘aupō* as stemming from the Hawaiian past. The use of quotes around “Naaupo,” however, may have indicated that the paper’s editors were also having a bit of fun at the expense of the author’s moralistic tone.³⁷

Huli, Mau, Hoi Hope: Conversion, Steadiness, and Backsliding

*Ina mai ke Akua mai keia huli nui ana mai o kanaka i ka pono o ka Haku.
Alaila e mau ana, a ina mai kanaka mai keia huli nui ana mai i ka pono o ka
haku, Alaila, e hiolo koke ana no.*

If the conversion to the righteousness of the Lord comes from man, than it will be continuous/steady, and if the conversion to the righteousness of the Lord comes from man, and then, it will soon collapse.³⁸

This statement from the missionary David Kanoa captures some of Congregationalism’s core beliefs about the transition and movement of individuals, and by extension larger groups, across the division between *pō* and *mālamalama*. First, the *huli nui* must come directly from God, a remnant of Congregationalism’s Calvinist past. Second, Kanoa showed another Calvinist inheritance, a deep fear that the converted would *hiolo* back into the wickedness of their former lives rather than remaining *mau*, steady and persistent in their conversion. While such beliefs were widespread amongst

³⁷ J. Kailiukea, “He Koena ‘Naaupo,”” *Ka Hoku o ka Pakipika*, January 9, 1862.

³⁸ J.W. Kanoa to Bingham, December 13, 1880, HMCS-Micronesia.

most Puritan-descended Protestant groups, the recentness of their collective conversion gave Native Hawaiian Congregationalists a particularly strong fear of sliding back into the darkness.

While the convert crossed the boundary between the saved and the unsaved at the moment of conversion, only those conversions that God played a role in, those *mai ke Akua mai*, would persevere, *e mau ana*. This was the standard that Congregationalists sought, stability within God's kingdom, the sign of true conversion. The earthly symbol of such conversion was membership within a congregation, one of the reasons most upheld rigorous standards for membership. This was one of the reasons that the ABCFM missionaries had initially been wary of recognizing the conversion of Native Hawaiians, even though they had traveled thousands of miles from New England in search of converts. Despite her devotion and what most accounts viewed as a true conversion, they were even reluctant to admit the dying Queen Keōpūolani into the church since deathbed conversions allow no opportunity to prove post-conversion consistency. In the end it was Rev. William Ellis of the visiting London Missionary Society who accepted the first major Native convert into Christian fellowship. Had he not done so it is quite likely the history of the ABCFM in Hawai'i would have unfolded quite differently. With the exception of the Hawaiian Revival, a surge of enthusiastic preaching and mass conversions in the 1830's, for the most part the ABCFM missionaries stuck to their rigorous standards for membership. Most of the other ABCFM missionaries met the Finneyite preaching of Rev. Titus Coan of Hilo and Rev. Lyons of Waimea, who set off the Revival, with more than a touch of skepticism. Despite the influence of Coan and his disciples, however, the standards for membership and the theological understanding of

conversion among most ABCFM missionaries and their own Native disciples remained remarkably stable during the nineteenth century.³⁹

Thus it should come as no surprise that Native Hawaiian Congregationalists placed a particularly heavy emphasis on the steadiness of conversions as proof of its legitimacy. The word Kanoa used, *mau*, described a state of continuation and steadiness, something that exist persistently. By using the word *mau* to describe a God-inspired conversion, Kanoa displayed a belief that such a conversion was ongoing and continuous. A similar sentiment can be found in Kanoa's descriptions of the progress at his station. In 1883 he described the works as having been steady and continual that year, for instance, "*ua mau ke kula*," the school was steady. All the good works were all "*mau*," the conversions, meetings, and offerings, all being maintained steadily and continuously. In 1885 he summarized the stability of the mission by saying simply, "the *pono* people are *mau* ." ⁴⁰ Similarly, Native Congregationalists also used the word *pa'a*, stuck/fixed, to describe a true convert's place in Christ's kingdom. In a letter to Rev. E.W. Clark, Kekela asked Clark to visit his parents and, "encourage them to stand *pa'a* in the *pono* of the Lord Jesus Christ." In refusing to leave his flock when ordered home by the HBCFM, the Rev. Laioha told the board that he would stay. He was there not for them, he argued, but for the *pono* of Christ. Thus his, "vow to the Lord [was] *pa'a*," and could not be broken.⁴¹

Remaining *mau/pa'a* clearly required work and sacrifice, both of which acted to further open one's heart to Christ and to advance the earthly strength his kingdom. Turning again to the mission field, the standardized reports of the Native

³⁹ Daws, *Shoal of Time*, 99-102; Charles Samuel Stewart, *Journal of a Residence in the Sandwich Islands: During the Years 1823, 1824, and 1825* (New York: John P. Haven, 1828), 230-231.

⁴⁰ J.W. Kanoa to Forbes, February 10, 1883, HMCS-Micronesia; J.W. Kanoa to Forbes, Jan 21, 1885, HMCS-Micronesia.

⁴¹ James Kekela to Clark, May 8, 1862, Awaiaulu; G.W. Laioha to Gulick, May 3, 1862, HMCS-Marquesas.

Hawaiian missionaries reflect the expectations Native Hawaiian missionaries and the Hawaiian board had for prospective and current congregation members, specifically the work expected of them to remain *mau* on the path of Christ. Reports normally included the congregation's regularity in meeting attendance, educational achievement, marriage, and the willingness to donate cash or goods, usually coconut oil. The standard reports also included book sales, which represented both a form of offering and a commitment to one's spiritual and secular education. Native Hawaiian missionaries in both the Marquesas and Micronesia transplanted the *hō'ike*, where it became an important event in celebrating local congregations as well as creating a system of standards and benchmarks for students. The missionaries often included the results of these *hō'ike* in their reports. Both the ABCFM and the HBCFM missionaries demanded a significant portion of time be devoted to *pule*, prayer, as a congregation, a family and as an individual. These activities did not guarantee one's commitment or conversion, but to do such work helped open one's soul to conversion and help maintain it if the desire to convert was sincere and God given.⁴²

The greatest source of anxiety for the Native Congregationalist, and the source of much Protestant anxiety in general, was the fear of failing to be *pa'a*, the fear of backsliding. The proper Congregationalist, in New England, Hawai'i, Nukuhiva, or Kiribati, remained ever vigilant for signs of backsliding, often referred to as *ho'i hope*, to return, or *hiolo*, to tumble down. Hawaiian Protestants also used similar terms such as the simpler *ho'i*, to return, or *haule*, to fall. The ideas behind each term reflect the basic assumptions of Christianity. Kekela, for instance, described his congregation by saying, "some of the *hoahanau* live *pono*, some have *hoi hope* to their old ways." The use of the

⁴² Richard Armstrong and Sheldon Dibble, *Ka Wehewehele, Oia Hoi Ka Hulikanaka* (Oahu: Mea pai palapala a na misionari, 1847), 78-88. Example reports: Hapuku to Clark, April 11, 1861, HMCS-Marquesas; Robert Maka to Bicknell, Sept 7, 1888, HMCS-Micronesia.

terms “*hoi hope*” and “*hana kahiko*,” the old ways, reinforces a narrative of the conversion as a purposeful and continued movement out of and away from the *pōuli*. The convert originally lived within the *pōuli* and had once moved out of it. The failure to maintain the path, to keep moving away from the *pōuli*, was to *ho‘i hope* back to one’s natural/benighted state.⁴³

In addition to reflecting the wording of the initial fall of man, *hiolo* and *haule* also imply giving in to gravity and collapsing to the low natural state from which the convert had struggled so hard to climb out of. Several times Kekela described former *hoahānau*, including other missionaries, as *haule*. He noted with great sorrow, for instance, “the *haule* of the wife of Levi Kaiwi into adultery.” As with *ho‘i hope*, the underlying theme is the natural/original state of man in the *pōuli*. To climb out of the *pōuli* is the work of a convert, but without constant effort to maintain and advance one’s place in the *mālamalama*, one naturally falls back into the *pōuli*.⁴⁴

This fear of backsliding, its disastrous consequence for the individual, and the potential harm that the backslider could do to the collective *hoahānau*, led not just to rigorous standards for admission into the congregation, but also to the continual surveillance of the congregation by both the minister and laity. In Hawaii and in the mission stations, Native Hawaiian Congregationalists remained on the alert for the failings of themselves, their *hoahānau*, and their flock. Sometimes, when the *ho‘i hope* was a momentary lapse, it resulted only in a brief period of repentance, demonstrations of a return to grace, and eventual readmission.⁴⁵ In other cases, far more terrifying to the remaining members, the former convert had a complete remission, returning to the old ways and recommitting to old gods, old practices, and old beliefs. This was the case of

⁴³ James Kekela to Gulick, September 24, 1868, Awaiaulu.

⁴⁴ James Kekela to Smith, April 10, 1861, Awaiaulu.

⁴⁵ Kanoa to Bingham December 13, 1880.

Nan Teitei of Tabiteuea, who backslid after the death of his brother and his own assumption of power in February of 1879. After becoming “utterly pagan,” by the end of the year, Nan Teitei eventually made signs of renewing his Christianity in 1883, when he divorced all but one of his wives. In the mean time, however, he created deep anxiety within the missionary camp for fear his *hoi hope* would cause others to return to the *pōuli* as well.⁴⁶

Hawaiian Protestants feared a broad range of actions as marks of *ho'i hope*. The failure to continue working further into the *mālamalama*, of course, presented a passive manifestation of *hoi hope*, but actions that actively weakened the *mālamalama* caused far greater concern. They considered such actions to be *hewa*, which the missionaries translated as sinful. *Hewa* had a much fuller meaning to Hawaiians, however, who understood *hewa* as an unbalance, something that would upset peace and society, any act that was harmful to not just the individual but also the community. For the good of all, *hewa* had to be corrected in order for *pono*, the correct balance, to be reestablished.

Native Hawaiian Congregationalists, as well as their converts in Micronesia and the Marquesas, understood the avoidance of *hewa* in large part through Christian *kapu*. While there were many forms of *kapu*, the most common modern understanding is that of a prohibition on certain types of action, which, not coincidentally, is the form through which the ABCFM and HBCFM missionaries promoted their own behavioral agendas. Pre-Christian *kapu* ensured the favor of certain *akua*, and the violation of these *kapu* resulted in the wrath or loss of favor of the *akua* whose *kapu* was violated. Thus it was an easy theological transition from maintaining *kapu* in order to retain the favor of an *akua* to maintaining *kapu* in order to retain the favor of *Ke Akua*, the Christian God. Some of the more prominent Christian *kapu* forbid elements of indigenous polytheism. The

⁴⁶ J.W. Kanoa to Bingham, October 31, 1879, HMCS-Micronesia; J.W. Kanoa to Bingham, February 19, 1879, HMCS-Micronesia; Kanoa to Forbes February 10, 1883.

preservation and maintaining of *ki'i*, clearly violated such *kapu*, as did the observation of any non-Christian *kapu*. As seen in the cries of “*Naaupo!*” in *Ka Hoku o ka Pakipika*, many Native Hawaiian Congregationalists spared little effort in deriding and disowning any who still followed or respected the old polytheism.⁴⁷ Traditional medicine also fell under the trope of “the devil’s work,” since much of it combined medical and religious practice.⁴⁸

Following the ABCFM lead, Native Congregationalists also followed strict *kapu* on *hana le‘ale‘a*, any sort of behavior that was seen as glorifying earthly pleasure for its own sake. The ABCFM missionaries and their followers condemned games of skill, athleticism, or chance, like racing, surfing, or *kōnane*. Such games also provided the opportunity for gambling contests, which the ABCFM and their students also considered utterly immoral. *Hula* posed an even higher risk to salvation due to its relationship to the *akua*, the dedication of serious practitioners, and its real and imagined sexual overtones.⁴⁹ Sex outside of monogamous marriage also concerned the notoriously prudish New Englanders a great deal, and thus became one of the strongest of the Christian *kapu* in Hawai‘i as well. Any sex outside of heterosexual, monogamous marriage reeked of *hewa*, and was a sure ticket back to the ranks of the damned. Though Native Congregationalists, including some of the Native missionaries, pursued more liberal sexual ethics in private, on the surface and regarding the behavior of others they portrayed it as a great *hewa*.

One of the most significant of the Christian *kapu*, and the first that American and Hawaiian missionaries usually sought to have legally enshrined, was the Sabbath *kapu*. Following the lead of their ABCFM teachers, Native Hawaiian Protestants maintained the Sabbath as a day of rigid restrictions, forbidding any behavior except that which glorified

⁴⁷ James Kekela to Clark, February 4, 1854, Awaiaulu.

⁴⁸ Marvin Puakea Nogelmeier, “Mai Pa‘a i Ka Leo: Historical Voice in Hawaiian Primary Materials, Looking Forward and Listening Back” (Dissertation, University of Hawaii, 2003), 140-141.

⁴⁹ Kekela, “J. Kekela’s Farewell Letter to All of the Church Members Here in Hawaii Pt 1.”

or enhanced the Kingdom of God. For some this even included the lighting of cooking fires, which proved to be a major issue of contention between the anti-fire traditionalist Rev. Kapu and the pro-fire-lighting liberal Rev. Nalimu on Tabiteuea. Many islanders found Sabbath restrictions relatively easy to understand, as *kapu* days played a heavy role in societies throughout Polynesia. In expressing his displeasure regarding Kekela's disrespect for his *kapu* days, the Marquesan chief Matuunui argued for mutual religious respect, "Hah, I am to observe your sacred days, and yet you don't heed my sacred days." The concept of the Sabbath as a *kapu* day made sense to him, even when the basic nature of monotheistic Christianity did not.⁵⁰

Finally Native Hawaiian Protestants considered any behavior that threatened the civil/social fabric of society to be both *hewa* and a sign of *hoi hope*. The abuse, or even the simple use of intoxicants, particularly alcohol, not only hindered the worship of God, but also the stability of society, earning it the wrath of conservative Protestants from London to Abaiang. Depending on a congregation's particular leanings and whether or not one's minister was an addict, tobacco sometimes warranted expulsion from membership.⁵¹ Theft, defined through Western notions of private property and contract, violated the eighth commandment and complicated attempts to introduce the *na'auao* of capitalism. Warfare and personal violence also disrupted society and earned one's place among the damned. Exceptions could be made, however, for violence committed on behalf of God's kingdom. The missionary Kauwealoha, for instance, found Marquesan feuds and wars to be proof of the presence of Satan among Islanders, though when French warships threatened and engaged in violence among the those same Satanic Islanders, he considered it a clear sign of God's favor.⁵²

⁵⁰ Dibble, *Ka Wehewehela, Oia Hoi Ka Hulikanaka*, 89-100; W.B. Kapu to Pogue, July 15, 1872, Kapu HMCS-Micronesia; Kekela to Clark, February 4, 1854.

⁵¹ Samuel Kauwealoha to Gulick, March 23 1867, HMCS-Marquesas.

⁵² Samuel Kauwealoha to Forbes, August 16, 1881, HMCS-Marquesas.

As the Native Hawaiian Congregationalist church slowly moved into maturity, its followers understood the general precepts of their Puritan-derived faith through Native Hawaiian lenses. While highly reflective of Congregationalism in general, the Native understanding of their faith also reflected and built upon pre-existing understandings of the *ao*, the *pō*, *kapu*, and *hewa*, concepts around which much of their Christianity was built. Furthermore, the recentness of their collective conversion, the fears of the supposed *na‘aupō* of the Native past, and their ABCFM teachers distrust of Native faith led to an even greater fear of backsliding and of false conversion than in the already fearful Puritan tradition. The next section examines this heightened anxiety in greater depth and its effects on Native Congregationalist fears for the future of the *lāhui* as a whole.

Native Hawaiian Protestant Anxiety

For Native Congregationalists the division of the world into *ao* and *pō* affected them not only as individuals, but also as part of the *lāhui*. Seeing the salvation of both the *lāhui* and the individual at stake, early Native converts put great effort into the conversion of the *lāhui* as a unit. Thus they must have been quite relieved by the 1853 declaration of Rufus Anderson, secretary of the ABCFM, that Hawai‘i was no longer a “heathen” land but rather a Christian one. Like the conversion of the individual, however, the conversion of the *lāhui* had to be proven through its constancy, it had to be shown to be *pa‘a*. Like the recent convert, who had to work to strengthen and maintain conversion, the Hawaiian *lāhui* needed ways to move steadily forward in the light. Many Native Congregationalists, however, felt deep concern over whether or not the *lāhui* could do so.

The theological basis for Hawaiian anxiety came in part from the inherent insecurities that simultaneously drove and plagued Calvinist-descended Protestants for centuries. Initially this anxiety involved the bothersome debate over the importance of free will versus God’s will. For Calvin the division between saved and unsaved was

unknowable. It was a line set by God and therefore it was impossible to argue for or against one's salvation without assuming to know the mind God. Over the years the knowability of conversion varied. The Puritans, for instance, assumed a certain level of knowability regarding conversion, which they argued was marked by a clear conversion experience that could be narrated and approved by other converts. Acceptance of the conversion narrative and membership in the congregation provided a terrestrial mark of heavenly selection. The importance of the conversion experience, however, resulted in a different type of anxiety. This anxiety over the legitimacy of reported conversion, one's own and those of others, helped create an introspective mass of unconverted, second-generation Puritans that eventually resulted in the Half-Way Covenant. For generations theological splits and trends swayed New England's Protestant establishment one way or another in an attempt to account for the primacy of God's will while avoiding the numbing spiritual anxiety of predestination.⁵³

In the 1810s many of the early ABCFM missionaries studied under Lyman Beecher, a student of 'Ōpūkaha'ia's mentor Timothy Dwight. Concerned over the moral direction of the new Republic, particularly the growth of Unitarianism and other unorthodox theologies, Dwight called for a push towards orthodoxy, conformity, and obedience to the will of God as the young nation's path to righteousness. The original Calvinist anxiety regarding predestination was largely put to rest. Now a proper republican, God offered salvation to all who truly desired it, though it could only be obtained through rigorous religious study, public worship, and personal commitment. Beecher built upon this, arguing that man could guarantee his salvation through a persistent and dogged pursuit of God's plan. This erased the old anxiety of not knowing

⁵³ Wagner-Wright, *Sojourners*, 11-33.

when you became saved, but introduced a new anxiety, whether or not one had the discipline and self control to stick it out in the long run, to remain *pa‘a*.⁵⁴

Yet the specific anxiety of nineteenth-century Native Hawaiian Congregationalists also came from their chronological and physical proximity to the *na‘aupō*. In particular, the recentness of Hawaiian conversion concerned many Native Congregationalists. Unlike New Englanders, Native Hawaiians did not have a long historical connection with Christianity to prop themselves up on. What Hawaiian history they were in the ABCFM-dominated schools taught only served to increase their anxiety. The mission schools trained them to understand the Hawaiian past as a long dark reign of Satan, only recently ended. Any positively portrayed aspects of their history, like Henry ‘Ōpūkaha‘ia’s story or Ka‘ahumanu’s conversion, were restricted to the recent past and within the context of strong denunciations of the Hawaiian past in general. ‘Ōpūkaha‘ia’s story, for instance, often started with a portrayal of Hawai‘i as a site of savage warfare, during which his little brother is speared to death as he and Henry flee an attack on their home. *Ka wa kahiko*, or the old days, were a time of ignorance, *hewa*, and barbarity, as seen in another popular expression for pre-Christian Hawai‘i, *ka wa na‘aupō*. As such were of little reassurance to the insecure Native convert.⁵⁵

The ABCFM missionaries did not just teach histories equated *ka wa kahiko* with the *na‘aupō*, they actively encouraged them to take part in the process. At Lahainaluna, where many future missionaries were trained, students were encouraged to denounce the Hawaiian past in their schoolwork. In an 1841 essay, a student named Kaluau lists the things that marked his ancestors as *na‘aupō*, ranging from illiteracy to *hula*. In the same essay Kaluau claimed that in respect to marriage, “In the old days, the way of living was

⁵⁴ Ibid., 37-44.

⁵⁵ “He Mau Wahi Manaao No Ke Kiaaina Hou O Hawaii. Helu 2,” *Ka Nonanona*, September 17 1844; “He Waiwai Maoli Ka Olelo a Ke Akua No Ko Hawaii Nei,” *Ka Hae Hawaii*, March 5 1856.

not *pono*, therefore the man did not properly take the woman [as his wife], also, the children and the parents were not properly cared for.” Another 1841 essay by David Aumai stated that the people before the coming of the word were *na ‘aupō* and that the *na ‘aupō* were the same as animals.⁵⁶

An 1834 article in the Lahainaluna newspaper, *Ka Lama Hawai‘i*, follows a similar theme. The author, likely a student, claimed that both *pono* and *hewa* practices existed in the old days, but only details the *hewa*. The article describes the ignorance, polytheism, polygamy, hula, and “indulgent games.”⁵⁷ Kekela, another Lahainaluna graduate, later echoed these themes in a sermon given at the Seaman’s Bethel at the commencement of the Micronesia mission in 1852. He informed the crowd that his parents:

were idolaters, and I was born in times of darkness. A short time ago all our people were heathen; they worshipped a great variety of gods; they were engaged in war; they were addicted to stealing and robbery. Man and wife did not live together and eat together as now; they took no care of their children. The chiefs were oppressive and the people degraded.

Though the speech highlighted the “progress” of the Hawaiian people, it is clear that Kekela had internalized the mission teachings regarding the evils of the Hawaiian past, as well as being eager to publicly repent and distance himself from it.⁵⁸

Of course not all histories told at that time were slanted against the Native past. Many Hawaiians never converted, including many of those nominally considered Protestants. Even among the converted, the *mo‘olelo* of Kamehameha’s times and those of previous eras remained strongly imprinted in their minds and hearts. Even among the Lahainaluna students, there were many who never completely bought the mission line

⁵⁶ Daniel P. Aumai, “Lahainaluna Essay, 1841,” HMCS-HEA; Kaluau, “Lahainaluna Essay, 1841,” HMCS-HEA; Translations of both by author.

⁵⁷ “No Ka Pono Kahiko a Me Ka Pono Hou,” *Ka Lama Hawaii*, February 21 1834.

⁵⁸ “Remarks of Rev. Mr. Kekela,” *The Friend*, August 1852.

regarding their own history. Alumnus Samuel Kamakau, who later converted to Catholicism, collected and published numerous *mo‘olelo* to promote a secular nationalist sentiment in the 1850’s and 1860’s, frequently countering the mission’s version of pre-contact Hawaiian history. Yet the continued ABCFM strength in the public school system, the promulgation of the American viewpoint from pulpits, Sunday School classrooms, and the constant stream of abuse churned out by the extensive publishing interests of the ABCFM/HEA meant that the view of the past as *ka wa na‘aupō* remained strong throughout the Kingdom era and into the twentieth and twenty-first centuries.⁵⁹

Part of the reason the chronological proximity of the *na‘aupō* remained so pertinent for Native Hawaiian Protestants was that many of the practices that supposedly marked the *na‘aupō* never really ended. During her regency Ka‘ahumanu and her supporters had actively repressed *hula*, sexual relations outside of marriage, polytheism, the sale of alcohol, and other practices. As noted earlier, in 1822 she personally sought out and destroyed many hidden *ki‘i*, or idols.⁶⁰ Yet even at the height of her power, many Hawaiians resisted Ka‘ahumanu and her morality campaigns. Boki, the Governor of O‘ahu, and his wife, the *ali‘i nui* Liliha, openly eschewed mission morality, allowing or supporting *hula*, sexual “promiscuity,” and drinking. As favorites of Kamehameha I and II and the guardians of Kamehameha III, this *ali‘i nui* couple had a great deal of influence among Hawaiians, in addition to being popular with non-mission foreigners. In 1829 Boki sailed to Mangareva in an attempt to solve the Kingdom’s debt through a sandalwood expedition, never to return.⁶¹ In Hawai‘i, a distraught Liliha, now the

⁵⁹ Kamakau, *Tales and Traditions of the People of Old*.

⁶⁰ Hiram Bingham, *A Residence of Twenty-One Years in the Sandwich Islands* (Canandaigua, NY: H.D. Goodwin, 1855), 162; Samuel Manaiakalani Kamakau, *Ruling Chiefs of Hawai‘i* (Honolulu: Kamehameha Schools Press, 1992), 288.

⁶¹ Kalākaua’s legation to Sāmoa (see Chapter 7) found several intriguing pieces of evidence that suggested that the *ali‘i nui* Boki had lived out the remainder of his life on Savai‘i. Most Hawaiians believed, and still believe, that Boki was lost at sea in the 1820s, the casualty of an ill-fated and ill-conceived expedition for

governor of O‘ahu, continued to resist Ka‘ahumanu and the new moral order, though her influence fell sharply after an aborted rebellion in 1831.⁶²

After the death of Ka‘ahumanu in 1832, the regency went to Kamehameha III’s sister Kina‘u, but the 18-year-old king soon broke free of her control and renounced the blue laws on Oahu. The outer islands, still under the control of Christian *ali‘i nui*, remained *mau* in Ka‘ahumanu’s laws. For a brief period life on Oahu reflected the times of Liliha, Boki, and Kamehameha II, with the king, his half-Tahitian favorite, Kaomi, and the rest of the court publicly partaking of all of the old pastimes and a fair amount of drinking. After Nahi‘ena‘ēna’s death, however, Kamehameha III reinstated the blue laws on Oahu, though the rigorousness of their enforcement never equaled the ardor that had marked Ka‘ahumanu’s reign. Alcohol remained technically illegal until the reign of Kalākaua. *Hula* was never formally criminalized, though a law was passed in Kamehameha IV’s time that fined paid practitioners operating without a license. Hawaiians, however, willingly paid the fines or the license fee, much to the chagrin of the mission and Hawaiian Protestants. Unpaid performances were never regulated.⁶³

Against the expectations of the ABCFM missionaries, their descendants, and Native Hawaiian Congregationalists, elements of supposed *na‘aupō* actually seemed to strengthen during the second half of the nineteenth century, ruining the linear narrative of a progressive march of Christendom. By the time of Kalākaua, *hula* fell once again under the open patronage of the *mō‘ī*.⁶⁴ The openness with which many Hawaiians committed “adultery” and “licentiousness,” appalled the more devout Native Congregationalists and

sandalwood and conquest in the New Hebrides. According to some Samoans, however, he had shipwrecked of Savai‘i and spent the rest of his lifetime embroiled in the chiefly politics of that island. Henry Poor to Webb, March 12, 1887, HSA-FO&EX.

⁶² Kamakau, *Ruling Chiefs*, 276-88, 290-1, 297-300.

⁶³ Ibid., 333-337, 340; Noenoe Silva, “He Kānāwai E Ho‘opau I Na Hula Kuolo Hawaii: The Political Economy of Banning the Hula,” *Hawaiian Journal of History* 34, (2000).

⁶⁴ *Mō‘ī*: Monarch or sovereign, largely associated with the head of state of the Hawaiian Kingdom from the 1830s onward

the ABCFM missionaries. In an 1854 letter to the *Mission Herald*, the ABCFM missionary Rev. Smith included a short rant on Hawaiians who happily spent their money supporting *hula* and paying fines for “licentiousness” but were unwilling to contribute to the support of *haole* pastors. In her work on efforts to ban *hula* in the late 1850s, Noenoe Silva also uncovered numerous editorial letters from the period decrying the persistence of *hula*, one of which claimed that a deacon of the Congregational church in Wailua (O‘ahu) was also a *kumu hula* and led his students in the worship of idols.⁶⁵

The missionary James Kekela expressed a great deal of conflict over his visit home in 1858-59 due to the seeming rebirth of *hula*. Part of him rejoiced to be home:

Revisiting my birth land, my parents, the children, the family, cousins, the congregations, the ministers, and all the friends of the land as well as the chiefs; and at seeing the new things carried out in this period, a new bridge, new stores, wooden houses, stone houses, steam ships, dredging ships, fine roads built.

He was also overjoyed to see the large congregations that greeted him throughout the Kingdom and the evidence of the continuing religious work in Hawai‘i. At the same time, however, the trip forced him to reflect on how many of the *hewa* he had been railing against on Nukuhiva remained a part of life in Hawai‘i. In Hawai‘i things were worse, he argued, for the people of Hawai‘i had been educated, they had heard and read the word of the Lord and still they chose to ignore him. Worst of all, Kekela had noted that some of those indulging themselves in this manner were *hoahānau* who had fallen back into the *na‘aupō*. Despite numerous signs of success, the fear of the *lāhui* slipping back into darkness remained foremost on his mind, and he was quick to point out and rail against any signs of slippage. Kekela’s voyage home illustrates the anxiety of Native Hawaiian

⁶⁵ “Ke Kaua Ma Hawaii,” *Ka Hoku Loa*, March 1861; Ralph Kuykendall, *The Hawaiian Kingdom, Volume Iii, 1874-1893, the Kalākaua Dynasty* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1967), 257; Silva, “He Kānāwai E Ho‘opau I Na Hula,” 38; L. Smith, “Sandwich Islands: A Letter from Mr. L. Smith,” *Missionary Herald* 50, no. 11 (1854), 341.

Congregationalists, who, regardless of success, often saw the *lāhui* as too near the *na‘aupō* in time and space to guarantee their status as a Christian people.⁶⁶

The memory of the old gods also remained strong among the populace. As mentioned earlier, enough of the old ways remained for published revelations and denunciations of such *na‘aupō* to be a regular feature in the newspapers. Even the independent newspaper *Ka Hoku o ka Pakipika*, which many saw as an anti-mission paper, frequently included such letters. Of particular concern were any signs of active participation in the old polytheistic religion, such as a letter from 1862 that decried the continuity of the *na‘aupō*, citing a woodcutter who had openly returned to the worship of the *akua*. In addition to decrying the *na‘aupō*, however, Noenoe Silva and Puakea Nogelmeier both note that the detail involved in some such letters might also have served as a secretive form of preserving and promoting such religious knowledge.⁶⁷ Silva points out a letter in *Ka Hae Hawaii* that described in detail the ceremonies and chants of Puna people on a pilgrimage to visit the goddess Pele, ending, “I thought the darkness was ended in Hawai‘i; but here it is traveling along with the government of Christ. Aue! Shall we return to the ways of darkness?”

The newspapers were also the scene of a long-standing debate over the practice of *lā‘au lapa‘au*, traditional Hawaiian medicine, which included a number of explicitly polytheistic elements. From the late 1840’s the practice was discussed in various newspapers, though an 1858 series of articles in *Ka Hae Hawai‘i* set off a more substantial discussion in the following years. In addition to debates over the merits of the practice, there were also significant debates over the merits of individual practitioners,

⁶⁶ Kekela, “J. Kekela's Farewell Letter to All of the Church Members Here in Hawaii Pt 1.”; James Kekela, “J. Kekela's Farewell Letter to All of the Church Members Here in Hawaii Pt 2(Awaiaulu Translation),” Original in: *Ka Hae Hawaii*, Jan 26 1859.

⁶⁷ Ikepono, “Kanaka Hoomanaia”; “Naauupo!” *Ka Hoku o ka Pakipika*, February 20 1861; Nogelmeier, “Mai Pa‘a”, 141; Silva, *Aloha Betrayed*, 62.

which indicate that it was still quite openly practiced. Lot Kapuāiwa, as a government official under his brother Kamehameha IV and as the monarch Kamehameha V, even issued permits for *lā‘au lapa‘au* from 1859 onwards. For the devout Native Congregationalist, the persistence of *kahuna lā‘au lapa‘au* could be seen as one thing only, a remnant of the *na‘aupō* and more evidence of the dangers faced by the *lāhui*.⁶⁸

The strong cultural connections between the *akua* and the Hawaiian landscape also kept the *akua* ever present in the Hawaiian imagination, even in the imaginations of the *hoahānau*. In his autobiography, the former Native Hawaiian missionary Rev. William N. Lono twice referenced places as belonging to or touched by the *akua* of the volcanoes, Pele. Being from the southern side of Hawai‘i Island, where Pele’s presence is constantly felt, no amount of mission schooling or mission work was enough to erase Pele from his mental geography. Hapuku’s tribulations involving his daughter’s illness showed that he also retained polytheistic ideas about the supernatural, though what once would have been an *akua*, he, Kekela, and Kauwealoha all defined as a *daimonio*.⁶⁹

While ties to the polytheistic past continued to raise the anxiety levels of Native Congregationalists, introduced *hewa* constantly offered new forms of *na‘aupō*. While missionary accounts of Native alcoholism were certainly overblown, its use and abuse were a legitimate issue of social concern, as it was anywhere that cheap booze was available. By the 1850s alcohol was a familiar evil, the effects of which the *hoahānau* often witnessed despite various laws banning the selling of alcohol to Native Hawaiians. The presence of dancehalls, theatres, the opera, and even the occasional circus also worried Hawaiian Congregationalists and their ABCFM pastors.⁷⁰ These introduced

⁶⁸ Collette Leimomi Akana, “Kahuna Ho‘opuniuni Letters of 1863,” *Hawaiian Journal of History* 36, (2002); Nogelmeier, “Mai Paa”, 140-142.

⁶⁹ Kauwealoha to Hapuku, December 8, 1892; William Nehemiah Lono, “Lono, W.N., Journal,” HMCS-Journal Collection.

⁷⁰ Smith, “Sandwich Islands: A Letter from Mr. L. Smith.”

entertainments joined Hawaiian sports, *hula*, games, and gambling in the Congregationalist rogues' gallery of profane, merit-less, and thoroughly enjoyable traps for the unwary.

As noted earlier, the ABCFM missionaries did their best to encourage Native Congregationalist anxieties over their proximity to the *na'auḡō*. By the 1850s they lost their previous monopolies over the schools, churches, and publishing, but they still retained a great deal of influence in all three. The attitude of the missionary establishment towards the continued Native Hawaiian culture remained steadily negative throughout the nineteenth century and they used all the resources at their disposal to make Native Hawaiians aware of their disapproval. Among the missionary complaints regarding *Ka Hoku o Ka Pakipika*, for instance, was the paper's publication of pre-Christian *mo'olelo*. The mission papers, of course, had previously refused to publish such works, and attacked their publication within *KHOKP*. Popular demand and the desire to undercut the independent press, however, forced the publishers of the mission-allied *Kuokoa* to begin publishing such stories in succeeding years, though with far less regularity than in the independent press.⁷¹

Besides the standard denunciations of the Hawaiian past and of the remaining elements of Hawaiian culture, the ABCFM missionaries also did their best to prevent Hawaiians from moving upward within the supposedly independent Hawaiian church. Despite the constant demands the ABCFM home office and the desire of many Native Hawaiians to move upwards, the ABCFM missionaries and their descendants made only token gestures towards relinquishing their control of the church. A handful of token ordinations for mission loyalists like David Malo around and after mid-century allowed them some breathing room. By limiting their appointments to isolated rural churches and foreign missions, however, the Americans retained control of most minor congregations

⁷¹ Silva, *Aloha Betrayed*, 67-71, 105, 108-109.

and all of the major ones. This also limited Native involvement in the HEA, whose voting membership was restricted to the ordained ministers of recognized congregations.

Despite the missionaries' claims that Hawaiians were either unsuited for or unready to control the church, there was a strong Native foundation for an independent church and a Native ministry. The mission and government schools had developed a highly literate population, certainly more literate than many parts of the United States. At the lower levels of the schools and churches Hawaiians did most of the teaching, and many of them also taught in the upper-level schools like Lahainaluna. The Hawaiian laity and "licensed preachers" did most of the preaching and outreach work outside of the major cities and towns and a great deal of such work even where ABCFM missionaries were stationed. From these religious and secular teachers came the crop of individuals who the mission slowly and reluctantly groomed for leadership positions. During a month-long debate in 1863, Anderson harangued the HEA into accepting the need for a native ministry, though they did not act on it until 1865. The project proved a major success. Even missionaries who originally opposed a Native ministry, such as Lorenzo Lyons of Waimea, later praised the capabilities of the Native ministers and their popularity among the congregations. While the administration of the HEA remained largely under the control of the mission families, by the 1870's Native ministers occupied an increasing percentage of Hawai'i's pulpits. Until the 1900's, however, the ABCFM's paternalism, their denial of Native cries for a stronger role in the church, and their treatment of Native congregations as their personal fiefdoms contributed a great deal to Native insecurity over *lāhui*'s ability to remain *pa'a*.⁷²

The combination of the "recentness" of Hawaiian conversion and the paternalistic control exerted by the mission left many Native Hawaiian Congregationalists with a

⁷² ABCFM, *Missionary Herald* 59, no. 11 (1863), 332; Lorenzo Lyons, "Letter from Mr. Lyons, May 1865," *Missionary Herald* 61, no. 9 (1865); Morris, *Hawaiian Missionaries Abroad*, 188-190.

sense of communal indebtedness to the Americans, and the ABCFM in particular. Thus for the *hoahānau*, even those few who were pastors or missionaries themselves, the fact that the ABCFM missionaries had brought the *mālamalama* to Hawai'i required endless expressions of gratefulness. When George Leleo expressed his anger over Hawaiian conversions to Catholicism and Anglicanism in 1872, he prefaced it with "You [the ABCFM missionaries] brought the lamp of life to the ignorant Hawaiian people," casting the conversions as a matter of ungratefulness rather than religious choice. Hawaiian Protestants often expressed their gratitude through the use of parental metaphors. In an 1858 letter to Rev. Clark of the ABCFM, HBCFM missionary Kanoa proclaimed that, "the Hawaiian people are a child sucking on your [collective] milk." In 1883, Kanoa was still signing his letters "I am your little child." This sense of indebtedness even extended to American Protestants not involved in the missionization of Hawai'i. Despite being ordained himself, Rev. Kapali referred to the Rev. Lacy of California as "our [inclusive] father," in a letter to Lacy's Sunday school students, who were sponsoring Kapali's mission. This sense of communal indebtedness not only helped perpetuate Native Congregationalist anxiety, but it also helped to shore up the influence and power of the ABCFM missionaries in Hawai'i.⁷³

Finally, despite Congregationalism's position as the hegemonic religion in Hawai'i, the mere presence of other religions created yet another source of anxiety for the *hoahānau*. As far back as the late 1820s, Congregationalism dominated the religious landscape. With the polytheistic religion of Hawai'i officially defunct, though still practiced quietly, the ABCFM and Hawaiian Protestants had little religious competition. Even Kauikeaouli's "revolt" against the missions was more of a cultural movement than

⁷³ J.W. Kanoa to Clark, September 23, 1858, HMCS-Micronesia; J.W. Kanoa to Forbes, July 30, 1883, HMCS-Micronesia; David Kapali to Lacy, March 30, 1865, HMCS-Micronesia; George Leleo to Pogue, July 13, 1872, HMCS-Micronesia.

an attempt to officially reinstate traditional polytheism. In 1853 official members of Congregationalist churches made up 30% of the kingdom's 71,019 citizens. The census also counted 56,840 citizens as Protestant, including those who had not yet received membership or whose membership had been revoked, yet still remained nominally faithful to the church and its teachings. Despite their dominance, however, the missionaries and the *hoahānau* remained constantly vigilant against the threat of other Christian sects, particularly that most dreaded of all Protestant boogey men, the Catholic Church.⁷⁴

Catholic priests first came to Hawai'i in 1826, quickly developing a small cohort of followers. Ka'ahumanu's Protestant government immediately began a campaign of suppression targeting both the priests and their converts. With some urging from the missionaries, Kamehameha III expelled the priests in 1831. He also expelled a second mission in 1836, though one priest remained by masquerading as a lay missionary. In 1837 Kamehameha III issued a law officially rejecting the Catholic religion. These actions raised the ire of the French, who rarely needed much of a premise to send warships to threaten Polynesian kingdoms. Fresh on the heels of a land grab in Tahiti, which occurred under similar circumstances, Captain LaPlace of the frigate *L'Artemise* arrived in Hawai'i in 1839. He forced a large indemnity upon the cash-poor kingdom, as well as a treaty that privileged the French in legal matters and forced the Kingdom to allow the import of French liquor.⁷⁵

Despite the end of official restrictions and the incorporation of Catholic schools into the Kingdom's school system, Catholics remained somewhat marginal to the religious and secular life of the Kingdom. By 1853 it had only 11,401 followers, about 16 percent of the total population. Yet the Catholics remained a viable alternative, and thus a

⁷⁴ Kuykendall, *The Hawaiian Kingdom*, Vol. I, 336.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 165-167.

threat, to Protestant domination. In 1861, Father Lyman of Hilo reported that the Catholics, or Papists as he insisted on calling them, were starting to draw significant support away from the Congregationalists. This was especially clear when high profile public figures, like prolific writer and legislator Samuel Kamakau, converted in the 1860s. In an effort to prevent such conversions, the missionaries attempted to continually inoculate its students by increasing the already substantial anti-Catholicism in the mission press. In 1861 *Ka Hoku Loa*, for instance, ran a multi-part story titled, “For the True Religion,” that consisted of little more than attacks on Catholicism.⁷⁶

While it never achieved numerical significance, the Episcopalian Church, officially named the Reformed Catholic Church of Hawai'i, also caused significant worries for the mission in the 1860s. Likely stemming from their educations in the mission's notoriously strict Royal School, Kamehameha IV and V were both somewhat cool to the ABCFM and worked to break the mission's influence over the government and the people. Kamehameha IV and his part-British bride Emma worked to reestablish close ties to Britain that had waned during the previous reign. Having enjoyed his time in Britain during a trip in the 1840's, the same trip in which he received firsthand experience of racial regimes of the United States, the King saw in Anglicanism a religion more suited to both a Native monarchy and to his own temperament.⁷⁷

The mission had no quarrel with, and even encouraged, an Anglican chapel in Hawai'i for the British population. When word got out, however, that the Anglicans were sending a full-fledged mission, including a bishop, the ABCFM expressed outrage at what Rufus Anderson considered a breach of “THE LAW OF CHRISTIAN

⁷⁶ Kamakau, *Ruling Chiefs*, v; Kuykendall, *The Hawaiian Kingdom, Vol., I*, 140-46, 163-66, 341-44; Lyman, “Recent Intelligence: Sandwich Islands,” *Missionary Herald* 17, no. (1861); “No Ka Ekalesia Oiaio,” *Ka Hoku Loa*, November 1860.

⁷⁷ Ralph Kuykendall, *The Hawaiian Kingdom, Volume II, 1854-1874, Twenty Critical Years* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1966), 85-87.

COURTESY.” The missionaries stationed in Hawai’i were equally livid over what they understood, correctly, as an assault on their privileged place in Hawai’i. When Kamehameha IV, his cabinet, and his heir, Kamehameha V, all converted to Anglicanism within weeks after the arrival of Bishop Staley, it became clear to all that the souls of the rulers were no longer the province of the ABCFM. Of the monarchs after Kamehameha III, only the two with the shortest reigns, Lunalilo and Lili’uokalani, remained within the Congregationalist flock.⁷⁸

Despite being recognized as a Christian nation by the ABCFM and others, many Native Hawaiian Congregationalists of the mid-nineteenth century remained perpetually insecure about the salvation of the *lāhui* as a whole. For a number of reasons, the Hawaiian church feared for the firmness, the *pa‘a*, of its conversion. Theologically their Calvinist heritage predestined them for anxiety, but the circumstances of the Hawaiian church gave them a unique set of worries. The recentness of their collective conversion left the *hoahānau* worried, not just that their individual pasts might reclaim them, but that the collective past they had renounced would not be abandoned so easily. In addition contemporary *na‘aupō* infested the *lāhui* and surrounded the convert, ranging from traditional practices like *hula* to introduced ones like the theater. Finally spiritual “poaching” of other Christian sects continuously assaulted the church as an organization and further added to Native Congregationalist anxiety over the future of the *lāhui*. With each soul lost to *hula* or the Catholic mass, the anxiety grew, the fear that perhaps the conversion of the *lāhui* was not truly from God, and that perhaps the *lāhui* as a whole would *hoi hope*, return to the darkness and drag even the true converts back with it.

⁷⁸ ABCFM, *Missionary Herald*, Vol. 60 (Boston: T.R. Marvin, 1864), 339; Kuykendall, *The Hawaiian Kingdom, Volume II*, 91-93.

Mission Security

As was the case for many in the Puritan tradition, Native Hawaiian Congregationalists' individual and collective insecurities drove to great lengths to prove their devotion and secure their personal berths in Heaven and the *lāhui*'s place among the Christian nations of the world. They prayed, sang, gave, studied, and preached in order to strengthen their status as Christians in the eyes of their American mission fathers, other Christian peoples, and themselves. Yet no activity or project allowed them to express and exercise their collective dedication to Christ and ease their anxiety the way that mission work did. As the missionary Joel Mahoe said in an 1862 letter, "the missionary profession is the golden necklace of the Kingdom of Hawai'i, a source of praise from the islands of the sea."⁷⁹ Many Hawaiians, including some of the missionaries themselves, even used the Hawaiian missions as a rhetorical lever to pry open the paternalistic grasp of the *haole* missionaries, easing not just the general Protestant anxiety but also the much more specific insecurities brought on by the colonial overtones of the ABCFM's work.

The model for Hawaiian foreign mission work, and the initial instigation of it, came from the ABCFM. The techniques and organizations for funding, managing, and carrying out the mission came from the playbook established by the Sandwich Islands Mission some thirty years earlier. ABCFM missionaries in Hawai'i even came up with the very idea of Hawaiian missionary service in Micronesia. For them the success of the Sandwich Islands Mission in fortifying New England congregations during the theological and secular challenges of the early nineteenth century made participation in foreign missions the obvious answer for the challenges facing the fledgling Hawaiian church. The 1848 annual report of the ABCFM presents the sentiments of both the ABCFM missionaries and the home office, arguing:

⁷⁹ Joel Mahoe, "He palapala no Maikonisia mai," *Nupepa Kuokoa*, November 22, 1862.

Religious efforts that are purely domestic are not enough to keep the graces of a strong church in vigorous exercise, much less to raise up infant and feeble churches. This is strikingly seen at the Sandwich Islands, where experience has shown the impossibility of developing the graces of the native churches as they need to be, without constantly directing their attention to foreign objects.

In 1853 the Board's prudential committee added that the Micronesia mission was "likely to prove exceedingly beneficial to the churches of the Sandwich Islands, from the opportunity it will afford them to exercise their benevolence in co-operating with this Board in the prosecution of its design."⁸⁰

The Micronesia mission also gave the ABCFM and its associated congregations, now spread much further than New England, a new focus for prayer and fundraising. While the ABCFM could hold Hawai'i up as a model of success, by the 1850's the Sandwich Islands Mission had lost some of its allure. A mission to a people, "who build their own chapels, support their own pastors in whole or in part, send Christian missions to other island groups of the Pacific, and furnish funds to the government for their primary schools through every part of the kingdom," did not enflame the imagination like a mission to the "heathen." Furthermore, missions to "heathens" in other regions of the world had not fared nearly as well, and the ABCFM hoped that they could recreate their success in the Pacific.⁸¹

While the original mission party to Micronesia contained two Hawaiian families, perhaps the most important Hawaiian participant on that voyage was James Kekela. Sent to gather information on Micronesia and to report back to Hawaiian congregations, Kekela traveled through the Islands on a speaking tour upon his return, bestowing

⁸⁰ ABCFM, *Report of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Mission, 1850* (Boston: T.R. Marvin, 1850), 181; ABCFM, *Report of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Mission, 1853* (Boston: T.R. Marvin, 1853), 15.

⁸¹ ABCFM, *The Missionary Herald, Volume 49*, Vol. 49 (Boston: T.R. Marvin, 1853), 369.

Hawaiian congregations with the mission spirit. Though the mission had already attracted considerable attention, a thousand people had gathered to celebrate the commissioning of the mission in 1852, Kekela's sermons further excited the Hawaiian imagination. His descriptions of familiar symptoms of *na'aupe*, like *hula*, tobacco, alcohol, and nakedness, no doubt played upon the insecurities of his listeners. He also described unfamiliar forms of *na'aupe*, such as large ear piercings and Kiribati funerary rites.⁸² The Micronesia mission and Kekela's tour enthralled Hawaiian congregations, so much so that when the Marquesan chief Matuunui arrived in Hawai'i asking for American missionaries, and guns, the Hawaiian people responded by offering to take the entirety of the mission burden onto themselves.

Through the collective effort of expanding the boundaries of God's kingdom on Earth, Native Hawaiian Congregationalists sought to secure the status of the *lāhui* within that kingdom. In doing so they would ease their own insecurities about their individual and communal progress, since mission work was the ultimate sign of individual and collective commitment to Christ's kingdom. Furthermore, the missions allowed Hawaiian Protestants a chance to display their progress before their teachers and the entire Christian world. It was the ultimate *hō'ike*, securing their earthly status as a Christian *lāhui* as well as their heavenly one.

Some incidents and writings indicate that Hawaiians also saw mission work as an opportunity to recast the paternalistic relationship between themselves and the ABCFM missionaries. Hawaiian missionaries openly expressed their gratitude to the American missionaries through filial language, referring to the missionaries as their *mākuā* and expressing their gratefulness directly. Yet from the start the missionaries also showed a clear desire to be perceived as the equals of the ABCFM missionaries, desiring to be their peers in practice, while remaining their children in gratitude. In 1858 unordained mission

⁸² James Kekela to Alexander, November 26, 1852, Awaiaulu.

printer Simeon Kanakaole used this argument for Christian equality between the *lāhui* and the Christians of the United States, writing to the HBCFM, “You, the parents, brought the Gospel of Christ to the Kingdom of Hawai’i...and now Hawai’i stands and goes to dark lands to spread the Gospel of Christ and joins America in the Pacific Ocean here.” Though acknowledging the communal sense of indebtedness to the American missionaries by referring to the missionaries as “the parents,” he also used the mission work to bring Hawai’i to the same standing as America. Missionary Hezekiah Aea echoed this sentiment in an 1865 letter to Gulick, where he portrayed himself as both “Your child,” in his greetings, but as Gulick’s “*hoa kauwa*,” fellow servant, when discussing his work.⁸³

While acknowledging the administrative and mentorship roles of their ABCFM *mākua*, the Hawaiian missionaries were fiercely protective of their status in the field. One of the first Hawaiian “assistant missionaries” sent to Micronesia, Berita Kaaikaula, was a man of some wealth and status in Hawai’i, the result of years spent working in the Northwest fur trade. Rev. Albert Sturges, the ABCFM missionary in charge of the station on Ponape, saw the Hawaiians as little more than uppity domestics and attempted to treat them as such. He also tried to appropriate a rocking chair sent to Kaaikaula by a Hawaiian church, arguing that Hawaiians were far too big for such chairs. Fed up with the treatment of the American missionaries, and quite possibly over the appropriation of goods like his rocking chair, Kaaikaula moved to a plot of land given to him by a local chief and built a home there, living separately from the American missionaries. This

⁸³ Hezekiah Aea to Gulick, September 15, 1865, HMCS-Micronesia; George Haina, “Parish Report of Tarawa, 1871,” HMCS-Micronesia; Simeon Kanakaole to Clark, January 15, 1858, HMCS-Micronesia.

caused quite a bit of resentment, leading to stern rebukes from the American missionaries running the HBCFM.⁸⁴

Kaaikaula's resistance to being turned into a servant of man rather than of God pushed Rev. Sturges to declare that he and his fellow ABCFM missionaries did not welcome any Hawaiian who came expecting to be an equal and that the Hawaiians should be answerable to himself or another white missionary who could control their wages and their labor. The Hawaiians lacked the intelligence and linguistic skills to be real missionaries and were fit only for domestic work. Not coincidentally, he also noted that without someone to do their domestic work the *haole* missionaries would be in dire straits. Forced to cook and clean for themselves, he argued, they would surely die. The Hawaiian board replied that they had a great deal of sympathy for Sturges' position, but that the Native churches simply would not support such an arrangement. Indeed Hawaiian congregations and prospective missionaries were already threatening to withhold further support based on reports of Kaaikaula's treatment. As a compromise they disciplined Kaaikaula, sent the Sturges family a stipend to pay for domestic help—at a rate that just happened to be equal to the pay of a Hawaiian missionary—and vowed to assign American and Hawaiian missionaries to separate stations in the future.⁸⁵

The HBCFM's missionaries in the Marquesas were particularly keen to project the *lāhui* as the equals of the Americans through their mission work. It was the Hawaiian congregations, after all, that had received the Macedonian call directly from the Marquesas, and with the exception of James Bicknell and a few French-language teachers later required by French law, Native Hawaiian missionaries made up the entirety of the

⁸⁴ Clark to Kaaikaula, December 15, 1854, HMCS-Micronesia; Berita Kaaikaula to Clark, January 31, 1854, HMCS-Micronesia; Berita Kaaikaula to Clark, January 30, 1854, HMCS-Micronesia; Morris, *Hawaiian Missionaries Abroad, 1852-1909*, 289-90.

⁸⁵ Kaaikaula to Clark January 30, 1854; Berita Kaaikaula to Clark, January 12, 1856, HMCS-Micronesia; L. Smith, "General Letter to the American Missionaries at Ascension, July 10, 1857," HMCS-Micronesia.

mission's complement. The Marquesas mission also represented the possibility to succeed where ABCFM and LMS missionaries had both failed. In the 1830's ABCFM missionaries from the Sandwich Islands Mission had only lasted for eight months in the Marquesas before fleeing. LMS attempts had not lasted much longer. Rather than discourage the Hawaiians, as it did some of their reticent HBCFM and ABCFM backers, the failures of the Americans and the British inspired them. In 1860 Kauwealoha suggested as much in a letter to the Board:

[ABCFM Missionary] Armstrong and his associates who left Nuuhiva...if they stayed there until now, then they would have had converts and some persons who wished to learn writing. We men do not know God's thoughts for this people. In human thought, God has abandoned this people for the land being full of filthiness and corruption, all evils of this world.

In my opinion God has not deserted this people at all...If God had the idea of abandoning this people, why has he frequently sent workers to this parish and to work?

Kauwealoha's insinuation was clear, the LMS and ABCFM may have abandoned the Marquesas but God and the Hawaiians would not.⁸⁶

The Hawaiian missionaries may have considered the Marquesas a chance for an explicitly Hawaiian success, but the HBCFM and the ABCFM saw it only as an inevitable disaster because it was an explicitly Hawaiian venture. And they were willing to starve out and undercut the Hawaiians in order to prove it. After Bicknell left they ignored cries for more missionaries, cut the Hawaiians' wages to starvation levels, and stopped sending the ABCFM's supply vessel to the Marquesas while increasing its role in Micronesia. Despite decades of understaffing, minimal material support, and repeated attempts to close the mission or separate it from the *lāhui*, the Hawaiian missionaries

⁸⁶ Bingham, *A Residence of Twenty-One Years in the Sandwich Islands*, 459-66; Samuel Kauwealoha to Smith, January 7, 1860, HMCS-Marquesas.

persisted, in large part because they saw their successes and failures as the success and failures of the *lāhui* as a whole. Kauwealoha summed up their position in a response to HBCFM desires to abandon the mission, explaining to Smith, “this is a parish given by God, for the Christian people of Hawai’i, so we should be very sinful if we abandon this parish and return to Hawai’i.”⁸⁷

By the 1860s even those Native Hawaiians openly opposed to the power and influence of the ABCFM and HEA began using the HBCFM missions as a rhetorical tool against the ABCFM’s paternalism in Hawai’i. The ABCFM missionaries and many of the Native devout demonized the ‘*ahahui* behind the newspaper *Ka Hoku o Ka Pakipika (KHOKP)*. Though often seen as anti-missionary, at least with respect to the ABCFM missionaries in Hawai’i, the ‘*ahahui* and its supporters embraced the HBCFM missions as a rhetorical defense against attacks by the American mission establishment in Hawai’i. A song featured in the first issue, “He Mele Aloha no ka Naauao,” resulted in a letter to *Ka Hae Hawai’i* condemning the *mele* and KHOKP as filth. Reprinting the letter in their next issue, *KHOKP* also included a reply from a Hawaiian who had studied under Rev. J. Kaiwi, identifying the song as one of Kaiwi’s composition, essentially daring *KHOKP*’s detractors to say anything disparaging about one of the HBCFM missionaries.⁸⁸

KHOKP also portrayed the HBCFM missionaries as kindred spirits to the newspaper itself, another sign of Hawaiian mastery of formerly foreign *na’auao*. Some of this can be seen indirectly in the exchange described above, but often the comparisons were much more direct. On October 3, 1861, *KHOKP* included the following:

⁸⁷ “He Ahaolelo Misionari Ma Ko Nuuhiva Pae Aina (Marquesas Mission General Meeting), 1861,” HMCS-Marquesas; “He Ahaolelo Misionari Ma Ko Nuuhiva Pae Aina (Marquesas Mission General Meeting) 1862,” HMCS-Marquesas; Isaiah Kaiwi to Smith, April 9, 1861, HMCS-Marquesas; Samuel Kauwealoha to Smith, May 4, 1862, HMCS-Marquesas; Morris, *Hawaiian Missionaries Abroad*, 105.

⁸⁸ Puni Nupepa, “Ka Hoku O Ka Pakipika, Aloha Oe.” *Ka Hoku o ka Pakipika*, September 26, 1861; Silva, *Aloha Betrayed*, 65.

The thing the opposition [to the paper] is objecting to is the *malamalama* of the Hawaiian people, the thing desired by the ABCFM is the obtaining of the *malamalama* in the pagan lands, like the desire of the HBCFM to have the *malamalama* be obtained in Fatuhiva.

Therefore... if the opposition conceals the *naauao* of the Hawaiian people, [by opposing independent newspapers] they might as well stop sending the missionaries to Fatuhiva; The emergence of the wisdom in the lands of darkness like here in Hawai'i is a positive thing, and like what the opposition is covering, the *naauao* of publishing an newspaper.

The newspaper also reported on a meeting held at Kaumakapili church to discuss the new newspaper. In response to claims that *KHOKP* was a detriment to the *na'auao* of the *lāhui*, S. Haleole made a statement touting the *na'auao* of both the newspaper and the *lāhui*, again referencing the missions as an illustration of Hawaiian *na'auao*.⁸⁹

Racial Stratification and Brotherhood in Christ

Much of the ABCFM's paternalism in the Pacific contained clearly racial overtones, with Sturges' treatment of Kaaikaula being a particularly blatant example. Many Hawaiians of the mid-to-late nineteenth century, including the HBCFM missionaries, understood the role of race, as dictated by American racial discourses, in shaping their relationships with the *haole*. Most Native Hawaiian Congregationalists received their formal understanding of race in large part through their mission schools, where the missionaries enshrined American racial discourses in their pedagogy. In the 1845 edition of the *Hoikehonua*, for instance, the missionaries placed a popular racial vision of the world's population as a frontispiece. The short illustrated piece describes the "five races of man" in terms of their geographic spread and their supposed physiological features, with a similar but lengthier piece being presented further into the text. This is a

⁸⁹ "Ka Hoku O Ka Pakipika," *Ka Hoku o ka Pakipika*, October 3, 1861; P. Kahuhu, "Halawai Hookeai," *Ka Hoku o ka Pakipika*, October 10, 1861.

major change from the original English-language Woodbridge, at least in the 1828 edition, which buried the illustrated race piece on page 165.⁹⁰

The short piece in the beginning also includes images of each race. Simple line drawings depicting the head and shoulders portray the “Malay,” “Asiatic,” and “African” races, with exaggerated features to emphasize their supposed physiological differences. These are taken directly from the original Woodbridge. The “[Native] American” and “European,” races, however, contain more detailed engravings incorporating landscapes and artifacts. The “American” appears in buckskin dress, clutching a bow in a forest, while others row a canoe in the background. The “European” wears tights, boots, and a long-tailed jacket, holding a top hat next to a large vase on a small, decorated column, while a horseman rides across the manicured field behind him. Perhaps the line drawings in the original, where the “American” looks “European” and the “European” wears a turban, did not show enough physiological or material difference to suit the taste of whatever party made the changes. Without access to all editions of the original Channing, however, it is hard to say if the missionaries changed their version to fit changes in later versions of Channing or of their own volition. They did make numerous other changes to the text, including an enlarged discussion of the Hawaiian Islands. Regardless, the inclusion and highlighting of this discussion on racial types, as well as their suspicious choice/approval of the illustrations, indicates that the ABCFM missionaries were not just conscious of racial discourse but actively promoted certain aspects of it as part of their basic teaching.

Yet the missionaries also promoted a Christian discourse of human brotherhood, noting at the end of the interior section on race that all men descended from the line of

⁹⁰ Whitney, *He Hoikehonua*, vi-vii; William Channing Woodbridge, *Rudiments of Geography: On a New Plan, Designed to Assist the Memory by Comparison and Classification: With Numerous Engravings of Manners, Customs, & Curiosities*, Ninth ed. (Hartford, CT: Oliver D. Cooke & Co., 1828), 165-7.

Adam and Noah. In addition, the concept of equality before God played an important part in ABCFM doctrine in Hawai'i, with the missionaries often using it to decry the power of the *ali'i* in Hawaii. Furthermore, some of the ABCFM missionaries, with their links to abolitionist movements, subscribed to relatively radical ideas about racial equality, albeit within a strictly racialized American understanding of humanity. The conflict between a social and cultural acceptance of race as a key difference between men and the theological belief in the equality of men characterized much of the racial tension between the ABCFM missionaries and Native Hawaiians.⁹¹

Nineteenth-century Hawaiians, however, rarely employed the “Five Races of Man” form of racial discourse, usually relying on a Hawaiian discourse that revolved around the terms *'ili'ula'ula* and *'ilikeokeo*, the red/brown-skinned and the white-skinned respectively. For the most part Hawaiians used *'ilikeokeo* as a substitute for white or Caucasian. *Haole* also served to denote whiteness on occasion, but into at least the 1850s it still technically referred to foreigners rather than a single racial group. In 1856, for instance, missionary Samuel Kamakahiki wrote a letter detailing the actions of a “godless haole” on Ponape, noting later that the “godless haole” was a “negro.” Hawaiians rarely clarified race when referring to Caucasian *haole*, however, so clearly by this time they already considered *'ilikeokeo* to be the default type of *haole*. Newspapers of the day occasionally used the term *'ili'ele'ele*, black-skinned, which seemed to refer specifically to people of Sub-Saharan African descent, though they did so far less than they used *'ilikeokeo* and *'ili'ula'ula*.⁹²

While whiteness was not a prerequisite of conversion in Congregationalism, many ABCFM missionaries seemed to feel that it was a prerequisite towards full acceptance as

⁹¹ Whitney, *He Hoikehonua*, 38.

⁹² Samuel Kamakahiki, February 7, 1856, Kamakahiki to Unknown, HMCS-Micronesia; “Ke Au O Kakou,” *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*, April 27, 1865.

either a minister or a missionary. During the second half of the nineteenth century, as members of the ABCFM raised in an era of more-developed racial power-structures came to work in the same mission fields as Hawaiian missionaries, racial tensions often came to a head. While the Native Hawaiian missionaries accepted a certain amount of race-based discrimination on the part of white Americans as normal, their own faith in Christian discourses of equality allowed them a broadly-recognized platform to condemn such discrimination. When confronted directly with racism, they often turned to their status as missionaries and as members of a *lāhui na'auao* to counter this racism.

Racism on the part of *haole* in the Pacific was such a normative part of late-nineteenth-century life that Hawaiians were as likely to comment on its absence as its presence. Aboard a mission ship in 1858, Isaiah Kaiwi commented on what he perceived to be an amazing lack of racism on the part of the ship's captain and crew, noting:

The Lord is planting seeds of love in the *poe keokeo* [white people]. Normally the *iliulaula* and the *haole* do not mix. They greatly despise the *iliulaula*, but the work of the Lord is entirely different, here there is gathering together, socializing together, sitting together, eating together.

Hawaiians of Kaiwi's time apparently had little experience with white men who did not "despise" them, including Hawaiians who had long experiences with the ABCFM. Like Kaiwi, Robert Maka also saw his equal treatment during a trip in 1865 as worthy of mention, noting in a letter, "The captain took good care of us aboard the ship just like he cared for the white people."⁹³

While Kaiwi and Maka may have marveled at the courtesy and treatment they received at the hands of their captains, such treatment was far from guaranteed. The

⁹³ Isaiah Kaiwi to Smith, February 19, 1858, HMCS-Marquesas; Robert Maka to Parker, August 14, 1865, HMCS-Micronesia.

injustice of the generally poor treatment of the Hawaiians during his 1877 trip to Micronesia led Samuel Nawaa to write the following:

The main point of this letter is that we were not well treated by the captain of the ship. Our food was like the sailors'. We had to associate with smokers—the ship's officers—and the tobacco smoke was awful when we were lying down. Is it right to put workers in distress? Is this a proper thing for you white people? Are the Hawaiian missionaries dogs? Shall they eat the crumbs of the white people?

Father, without hypocrisy and fear I declare that the captain of the Morning Star hates us Hawaiians evilly, but wants you white people.

Let us Christians consider this carefully as we are of one blood, have one spirit and one God who made us.⁹⁴

Nawaa's statement not only described what he considered racial discrimination on the part of the captain, but also the expectation of more equal treatment on account of being a missionary. His comments also indirectly criticized the HBCFM for allowing such practices and for not treating the Hawaiians and *haole* in the same manner. By the time of Nawaa's voyage, Native Hawaiian missionaries expectations regarding their relationships to the *haole* had changed. The treatment that surprised Maka and Kaiwi in 1865, Nawaa demanded outright in 1877.

Ten years after Nawaa's voyage, the HBCFM still supported segregated accommodations aboard the mission ships. Though the Hawaiians had stopped complaining about the conditions in their official reports, they still expressed their anger with such conditions through quiet protests aboard ship, including snubbing the ABCFM missionaries who failed to support their fellow servants of Christ. Rev. Albert Walkup, a somewhat notorious racist, mockingly reported on the Hawaiians' protests on the way to Kiribati, "they feel aggrieved at not having the same accommodations and fare as the

⁹⁴ Samuel Nawaa to Bingham, October 26, 1877, HMCS-Micronesia.

white people did. A certain degree of civilization puffeth up!” His statement, made in an official report in an official report, implies that he saw such racist thinking as normative and that he expected the Hawaiian Board to be sympathetic to his perspective. While the HBCFM missionaries clearly hoped that the Board and the *haole* missionaries would treat them with the equality they felt they deserved as Christians, their lack of official protest showed that they had begun to understand the racial limits of Christian brotherhood in the Pacific better than that. Native missionaries continued to face racial segregation and unequal treatment aboard ABCFM mission ships into the 1890’s, when Rev. W.N. Lono returned to Hawaii after twenty-two years as a missionary.⁹⁵

Conclusion

In many ways the religious worldview of mid-to-late-nineteenth-century Native Hawaiian Congregationalism remained strikingly similar to that of the New England missionaries who arrived in 1821. The stress on public worship, the mental and academic work of conversion, and the belief in a world constantly torn between the forces of Satan and Christ all arrived in Hawai‘i as the product of centuries-old theological debates in American and Europe. Yet Native Congregationalists viewed these imported ideas through Native Hawaiian lenses and understood them in large part through the meanings already attached to Christianized concepts like *mālamalama*, *kapu*, and *pō*. They also inherited ideas about the need to persistently work for the advancement of God’s Kingdom in one’s soul and in the world, a need fueled by a deep fear of collective and individual backsliding. Such ideas held even greater importance for Native Hawaiians because of their collective anxiety over the tentatively Christian status of the *lāhui* as a whole.

⁹⁵ Alfred Walkup, Annual Report, Gilbert Islands 1886-7. HMCS-Micronesia. Lono, “Lono, W.N. Journal.”

In the 1850s and 1860s, the period in which most of the Native missionaries were trained and left for the mission field, Native Hawaiian Congregationalists retained a level of collective anxiety beyond the high levels typical of their religion. The relative recentness of the *lāhui*'s conversion, the constant reminders of remaining *na'auāpō* in Hawaii, and the paternalistic actions and words of their mission *mākua* left them unsure if the *lāhui* would remain *pa'a* in Christ's kingdom or fall back into the *pōuli*. For the next half-century mission work provided a productive outlet for this anxiety, a chance to prove that the *lāhui* as a whole were committed to the *na'auao* of Christ and qualified to spread that *na'auao* to other parts of the Pacific. In a similar manner the missions also served as an important rhetorical weapon to fight against the racist paternalism of the ABCFM and HBCFM, elevating the *lāhui* to a level of spiritual equality with America and the other "Christian lands."

CHAPTER 3.
AMONG THE WILD DOGS:
NATIVE HAWAIIAN MISSIONARIES IN THE PACIFIC, 1853-1908

Aneane kanakolu na makahiki o W.N. Lono i keia wa a ke hoouna nei ka Haku ia ia i waena o na ilio hihii o ka moana Pakipika.

W.N. Lono was nearly 30 when he was sent among the wild dogs of the Pacific.

-Rev. William Lono, regarding his mission work among the Kiribati

Like many of nineteenth-century Hawai‘i’s Native ministers, William Nehemiah Lono grew up in adverse economic conditions. His academic acumen and the willingness of his parents to sacrifice for his schooling allowed him to gain what, in those times, counted as a very substantial education. Aside from a year of private English-language schooling in Kona, he also attended the Hilo Boarding School and received further education at the Lahaianaluna College on Maui. All three schools were founded and run by ABCFM missionaries, who gave him not just a quality education, but also an immersion in the Congregationalist worldview described in the previous chapter. Soon after his graduation from Lahainaluna, Lono pledged himself to foreign mission work, completing his training at the Wailuku seminary.¹

In 1871 Lono took over the HBCFM mission station on Maiana. Though he returned to Hawai‘i for a three-year period to recuperate and to minister to the immigrant

¹ Lono, “Lono, W. N., Journal.”

Kiribati population on Kaua'i, Lono spent the majority of next twenty-two years on Maiana. He returned to Hawai'i for good in 1894. Upon his return he tended to a number of small congregations around Kalihi and Moanalua before becoming the co-minister at Kaumakapili church in 1901, remaining in that post until his death in 1911. At some point during those years he also wrote a short autobiography, the original manuscript of which eventually found its way into the Hawai'i Mission Children's Society archive.²

Though his mission work occupied a significant portion of his life, it occupies a curiously small place in his autobiography. His travels in Hawai'i, both as a youth and during his brief return home in the 1880's, occupy more of his manuscript than his travels to Kiribati, and are far more personal as well. The descriptions of his domestic journeys display a Hawaiian style of travelogue, which relied heavily on poetic allusions to the famous sights and places of his journey and the experiences a traveler expected at each. Describing his first journey from Hilo to Kona, he wrote:

I drank the bubbling water of Kawa, got wet from the famous rain of Kau called Haao. I climbed the famous *pali* of Moilele...From Honomalino, I could see Manuahi, the *kapu* hills of Keoua facing me and beckoning the wanderer to return. Then appears the swirling sea of my land. *O Kona kai opua i ka lai, pua Hinano.*³

At times his Native sense of the poetic overtook the sheer hatred for traditional polytheism typically expressed by his fellow missionaries and ministers, be they Native or *haole*. He referred, for instance, to the lava flowing into the sea at Kiholo by saying, "E auau kai ana ua wahine noho mauna la ia makahiki," The lady of the mountains swam in the ocean this year, a clear allusion to the goddess Pele.

While still using a certain amount of poetic license in his descriptions of Kiribati, he did so with noticeably less affection than he showed for Hawai'i. He described Maiana

² Ibid; W.B. Oleson, "W.N. Lono," *The Friend*, October 1911, p.7.

³ *O Kona kai opua i ka lai, pua Hinano*: Kona, where the clouds rest in the calm, blossom of the Hinano.

as choked with weeds, both literal weeds such as *akolea*, *uluhi*, and *puakala*, and moral weeds like, “the desire for pleasure, *hula*, greed, begging, theft, drinking, assault, the drinking of kawa, worshiping idols, and so forth.” He described the people of Maiana as “the wild dogs of the Pacific,” hardly an endearing description. Wars and other dangerous situations dominated his account of Kiribati, including an incident when a man named Teru Tokintikai threatened him with an ax in a property dispute. Despite these tribulations he and his wife both proclaimed a deep *aloha* for the people of Maiana, particularly the young students who lived with them and an chiefly convert named Tom Beru.⁴

This chapter expands upon the argument that Native Hawaiian Congregationalists’ anxiety over the *lāhui*’s perceived proximity to the *na‘aupō* inspired them to undertake mission work. It argues that this anxiety not only encouraged Hawaiians to undertake mission work, but it also encouraged them to do so in a manner that rhetorically and conceptually distanced them from the Islanders who they traveled thousands of miles to work among. This distancing took the form of a discourse of superiority, in which Hawaiian missionaries like Lono portrayed themselves as beacons of Christianity and *na‘auao* among the “wild dogs.” By developing and promoting a discourse of separation from the *na‘aupō* abroad, they sought to disperse the anxiety caused by fears of the *na‘aupō* at home and pull them closer to the other Christian peoples of the world.

The Defilement and the Ignorance: A Discourse of Superiority

In their various writings the HBCFM missionaries employed a variety of insults and negative descriptions to dehumanize their hosts, or at least undermine their humanity. They used terms like *hūpō*, ignorance, *na‘aupō*, and *hihiu*, wild or untamed, to devalue

⁴ Lono, “Lono, W.N. Journal.”

these other *lāhui* based on presumed levels of intelligence, education, and “civilization.” Other terms, like variations of the word *‘ino*, meaning cruel or malicious, further dehumanized their hosts by questioning their capabilities for civility and kindness. In addition to dehumanizing their hosts, these terms effectively elevated the missionaries along the same lines. By decrying Marquesans as *na‘aupō* or *hihiu* the Hawaiians implicitly claimed themselves to be *na‘auao*, by calling the Micronesians *‘ino*, the Hawaiians claimed themselves to be full of the *aloha* for the Lord and for their fellow man.

As discussed earlier, Native Congregationalists packed the term *na‘aupō* with considerable weight, using it to denote not just a lack of education, but also a lack of civilization and salvation. Their frequent use of the term to describe their hosts showed not just any distinction between they and their hosts, but the most important distinction, the one between the *ao* and the *pō*. In an early report on the people of Fatuhiva, Kekela wrote, “These people appear to be kind and very generous. They are, however, *naaupo*, continuing to care for their ancient gods.” While Kekela acknowledged their virtues in terms of Hawaiian/Polynesian culture, their kindness and generosity, he negates this by calling them *na‘aupō*, specifying that they remain polytheists. In 1858 Samuel Kekuewa, taken aback by how the people of Mile preferred foreign tobacco to foreign religion, wrote in exasperation, “Oh, the defilement and *pouli* of the *naaupo*.” Like Kekela, Kekuewa defined his hosts through their otherness, specifically their extensive darkness and vileness.⁵

Similar to *na‘aupō*, the term *hupo* can be translated as ignorance, but the two words have different connotations. *Na‘aupō* implies a lack of spiritual and cultural enlightenment, in addition to a lack of education. On the other hand, *hūpō*, literally the

⁵ James Kekela to Clark, September 3, 1853, Awaiaulu; Samuel Kekuewa to Pogue, November 18, 1873, HMCS-Micronesia.

rising darkness, typically denoted something closer to stupidity, a lack of intelligence. Thus while the *na‘aupō* may not have been exposed to the *mālamalama* or choose to ignore it, the *hūpō* were unable to even understand it without significant aid. Often Hawaiian missionaries used the term *hūpō* as a blanket statement denouncing the perceived ignorance of their hosts. Kekela did so in 1857, writing, “And do pray often to the Lord on our behalf, that our lives be maintained among these *hupo* people.”⁶

Often the missionaries described their hosts as *hūpō* to deflect criticisms of themselves. During a feud between ABCFM missionary Rev. Emerson and HBCFM missionary Kaukau, Emerson told the HBCFM board that Kaukau and his wife had been excessively cruel to a Marquesan woman. Kaukau dismissed the incident, saying that the woman was *hūpō* and due to her stupidity misunderstood a harmless comment made by his wife. Similarly, after making a review of schools in different part of Kiribati, Kanoa reported that the lack of educational progress was due to the stupidity and ignorance of the students, “therefore, we should not think ill of our teachers that were sent among these *hupo* people.” In both cases it is the *hupo*, the stupidity and slow wittedness of others, that results in misunderstandings or the lack of progress. Furthermore, in Kanoa’s case it is the people as a whole who are *hupo*, unable to benefit from the teachings of the Hawaiians.⁷

Like *hūpō* and *na‘aupō*, the term *hihiu* implies an uncivilized nature, but rather than describing a low level of education or intelligence, *hihiu* describes wildness, or even savagery, *hihiu loa*. Used in much the same way that Americans and Europeans used the term savage to dehumanize Hawaiians and other peoples, Hawaiian missionaries frequently used *hihiu* to dehumanize their hosts. Lono did this in his autobiography,

⁶ James Kekela to Smith, August 25, 1857, HMCS-Micronesia.

⁷ J.W. Kanoa to Pogue, December 20, 1871, HMCS-Micronesia; Alexander Kaukau to Bishop, Clark, and Smith, Sept 13, 1858, HMCS-Marquesas.

describing the Kiribati as “the *ilio hihiu* [wild dogs] of the Pacific,” doubling up on the dehumanization by referring to them as ‘*ilio*. At times, however, the missionaries used *hihiu* to generate a more specific sense of the spiritual, cultural, and physical danger the missionaries imagined themselves to be in. While Kekela was abandoning the Oomoa station due to conflicts with the chief Matuunui, he, his colleagues, and their converts hurried to transport his goods before Matuunui’s allies could seize them. That night he wrote, “Because our work yesterday on this ship was not finished, we slept this night on board the ship; our wives slept ashore, along with our children, among the *poe kanaka hihiu* of this archipelago.” While the threat comes from a specific group with specific grievances, Kekela choose not to fear for his wife’s safety among his enemies, but rather her safety among a savage people, elements of which had spent the day helping save his belongings.⁸

The terms *hūpō*, *na ‘aupō*, and *hihiu* all described a perceived lack of social or cultural training. The term ‘*ino*, however, added a sense of cruelty, wickedness, or viciousness. Again the missionaries sometimes used this as a blanket denunciation. In a short, undated, unaddressed note, Kekela wrote a New Years greeting. Without the time, space, or desire to list his standard grievances about the Marquesans, Kekela simply wrote, “Boundless is the grace of the Lord in his ministering to his worthless subjects during their stay in this *pouli, naaupo, lokoino* [evil-gut] land.”⁹ At other times the missionaries used the term ‘*ino* to categorize more concrete examples of malicious behavior, behaviors understood to be purposefully harmful to others. In March 1862 *Ka Hoku Loa* printed a letter from Kauwealoha in Hivaoa. Saddened and pained, “from hearing and seeing the *ino* and the blasphemy,” of his hosts, he wrote, “in my humble opinion, my people do not do great *ino* like this pagan people,” listing cannibalism, war,

⁸ James Kekela to Smith, February 19, 1858, Awaiaulu; Lono, “Lono, W.N. Journal.”

⁹ James Kekela, *Eia Ka Makahiki Hou*.

sorcery, plundering, adultery, and theft. Worse than the theft of belongings, however, was their theft of “the wealth of the *ao*,” teaching *malihini*, outsiders, “*hula*, tattooing...the worship of feeble gods, theft, adultery, warfare, cannibalism, gossiping, and *opuino* [evil-guts].” As with the darkness of the *na‘aupō*, the missionaries perceived and portrayed the ‘*ino* of their hosts as not just a communal failing, but as a collective contagion that could easily spread to the unwary.¹⁰

These broad descriptions of the *na‘aupō*, *hūpō*, and *loko‘ino* nature of their hosts effectively painted these other Islanders as inferior and as an other, but provided little detail. For this the missionaries turned to a classical form of othering, ethnography, which they used to highlight the differences between themselves and their hosts and to support their assumptions of cultural superiority. At times the missionaries wrote these ethnographies as stand-alone pieces or as ethnographic travelogues. Kekela’s narration of the inaugural Micronesian voyage, for instance, describes the islanders in detail, focusing particularly on the depth of their *na‘aupō*, the more titillating of their cultural practices, and the material culture of the Micronesians. After the death of Rev. Kahelemuna, Mary Kaaila Kahelemauna, his wife, wrote a serial column for the newspaper *Ka Lāhui Hawai‘i*. The piece described her time on Mili, including brief ethnographic observations of her hosts and other Micronesians. For the most part, however, the missionaries simply included their ethnographic notes and commentary within their official reports.¹¹

The focus of these ethnographies was typically on the *hewa* nature of their hosts. In 1858, for instance, Isaiah Kaiwi summed up the obstacles presented to his work in Fatuhiva by simply saying, “Great is the *hana lealea*,” which his audience understood as a grave obstacle to the *na‘auao*. The *hana le‘ale‘a*, after all, pulled students away from the

¹⁰ Samuel Kauwealoha, “No Hivaoa,” *Ka Hoku Loa*, March 1862.

¹¹ Mary Ka‘ai Kahelemauna, “Reminiscence of Her Life on Milli(Mulgrave) Written in 1877 after Her Husband Simeon Died, Manuscript Translation of Articles in *Ka Lahui Hawaii* Feb 18-May 24, 1877, 1877,” HMCS-Micronesia; Kekela to Alexander, November 26, 1852.

schools, worshippers away the pews, and hearts away from Christ. As noted in the previous chapter, *hana le‘ale‘a* remained a persistent threat to Hawaiian congregations, where decades of mission teachings and official censures of various kinds failed to completely cleanse the *lāhui* of their heathenish love for enjoying themselves. Thus reports of the widespread and unchecked *le‘ale‘a* of the Marquesans and Micronesians served to remind parishioners to be wary of the pockets of *na‘aupō* around them. They also conceptually separated them from lands inundated by the *na‘aupō*, where the people publicly pursued the *le‘ale‘a* without the interference of church or state.¹²

The blanket term *hana le‘ale‘a* covered a number of different activities that the HBCFM missionaries and their ABCFM forefathers saw as sinfully pleasurable. Sports and games, for instance, were clear signs of Satan undermining the *na‘auao*. The tendency of Pacific Islanders to dedicate entire seasons to their pastimes especially vexed the missionaries. Such seasons not only preoccupied the people, they sometimes resulted in temporary population shifts that disturbed schools and meetings. In 1876, for instance, Lono wrote that the population of Maiana had recently devoted themselves to canoe racing. For several months the entire population seemed to move to the part of the island best suited for the sport. Several members and prospective members abandoned the mission station, schools, and meetings to follow the races. The 1870-71 report for Abaiang reported a general season of *hana le‘ale‘a* also led to backsliding:

In the third week of April 1871 sports were awakened in every place throughout the land. Here are the recreations: the *hula*, flying kites, swinging, baseball, canoe racing, attracting the old men and old women, young men and young women, and small children. They gave up working in their taro patches and were devoted to laziness. So some seekers gave up their support of Jesus’ Kingdom, returning to darkness, forsaking good

¹² Kaiwi to Smith February 19, 1858.

works, attending the *hula* and many sporting events, indulging in adultery, giving up education.¹³

While the missionaries distrusted all forms of *hana le‘ale‘a*, they expressed the most concern over *hula*.¹⁴ *Hula* drew missionary contempt not just for being one of the most popular and persistent forms of *hana le‘ale‘a* in both Hawai‘i and the mission field, but also for its religious and sexual connotations. In their descriptions of *hula* in the mission field, the HBCFM missionaries worked hard to maintain that cultural stigma. In 1882, complaining about the continued success of *hula* instructors while his own school struggled to find students, Lono wrote, “in the school house is my student, in the *hula* house, the student of Satan.” In 1862 Hapuku equated *hula* and polytheism with murder and cannibalism, describing the people of Hiva Oa as “A people who greatly desire the spirits of their ancestors, *hula*, unjustified plundering, cannibalism, and all the evil customs.”¹⁵

The connections between Native power structures and *hula* played a major role in its persistence across the Pacific and thus it was a significant item of contest between chiefs and the missionaries. On Mile in 1871, Simeon Kahelemauna reported that a local chief was *pa‘akiki*, stubborn, and would not convert because he was lost in the desire for *hula* and continued to promote it. In many cases the chiefs’ support of *hula* directly affected the success of the mission among the rest of the population, usually by drawing

¹³ William Lono to Pogue, February 25, 1876, HMCS-Micronesia; Joel Mahoe, “Apaiang Parish Report, 1870-71,” HMCS-Micronesia.

¹⁴ In reality the many different forms of Native dance described here as *hula* cover a broad array of forms, functions, and meanings that fall beyond the definition of *hula*, a term for a specific range of Hawaiian dances. The missionaries used the term *hula* to denote, and decry, all forms of Native dance. Seeing all Native dance as evil and a sign of the *na‘aupō*, they saw little difference to distinguish different forms. Because this chapter is primarily concerned with how these missionaries saw and shaped their relationship with other islanders, I have followed their thinking and also used *hula* to denote all Native dance the missionaries encountered.

¹⁵ Zakaria Hapuku to Clark, March 13, 1862, HMCS-Marquesas; William Lono to Emerson, December 30, 1889, HMCS-Micronesia.

away their students. Robert Maka wrote from Butaritari that the chiefs had declared a season of *hula* and banned the people from working. His students soon abandoned the schools for the festivities, which included a great deal of feasting, making it an even bigger draw. On Ebon Kanoa reported that a chief had beaten some of his students for not participating in the *hula* and threatened to beat the missionaries for keeping students from the *hula*.¹⁶

A major part of missionary discontent with *hula* and *hana le‘ale‘a* in general, is that these activities promoted the body as a source of pleasure, connecting them to sex and sensuality. Indeed the term *le‘ale‘a* can be used to infer sex when more direct terms are not desired. In adapting New England religion, Native Hawaiian Protestants also absorbed some of New England’s puritanical thinking on “proper” sexual behavior. While certainly less interested in and preoccupied with the sex lives of their flocks than New Englanders, they still felt the need to investigate and report on the sexual depravities of their hosts. In 1862 Kauwealoha reported to *Ka Hoku Loa*, “They sleep around, even the old and mature, living together etc, raising children and grandchildren, they go to one another like animals. One woman, four or five men, one man, several women. When ships come, the women go out and the men help them.” The allusions to multiple partners, “even among the old and mature,” maritime prostitution, and non-nuclear families assured the readers that this was clearly a practice of a very different type of people than the modern Hawaiian Congregationalist, perhaps even the behaviors of “animals.”¹⁷

Reports equating changes in sexual behavior with conversion also provided the missionaries and their readers with proof of the moral superiority inherent in

¹⁶ Simeon Kahelemauna to Pogue, November 3, 1871, HMCS-Micronesia; J.W. Kanoa to Wilcox, August 10, 1886, 1866, HMCS-Micronesia; Robert Maka, “Church Report, Butaritari 1870-71, 1871,” HMCS-Micronesia.

¹⁷ Kauwealoha, “No Hivaoa.”

Christendom, while also reassuring them that their commitment to Christ might ease their own sexual desires. Surely the *hoahānau* would be safe if sexual adventures occurred only among the unsaved, such as one of the chiefs J.D. Ahia described on Apaiang: “he is the younger brother of the deceased king...he has pulled a part of the town to the hula and the assembling at night of men and women for fornication.” Reinforcing the equation between salvation and an end to sexual impropriety, Ahia added that, “the sister of R. Kaiea has turned to righteousness. She was utterly devoted to pleasure formerly with young men to indulge in sensuality at night. This woman dragged in young girls to engage in fornication with young boys. And God turned her into a religious woman to do his will.”¹⁸

At every mission station the missionaries also cited the consumption of alcohol as another major obstacle to their work. While the ABCFM’s close ties to early temperance and teetotaler movements played a role in creating the HBCFM missionaries’ stances on alcohol, the physical and societal effects of alcoholism and alcohol consumption among their prospective flocks also worried the missionaries a great deal. Foreign liquor was bad enough, but the rapid spread of simple, homemade, coconut “toddy” throughout the south Pacific exacerbated existing problems with alcohol. It also encouraged other forms of *hewa* like the *hula*. Levi Kaiwi reported that, “the students attend sometimes, but not at others due to laziness, and being given over to hula and drinking,” blaming these complimentary forms of *hewa* for drawing the youth of Tahuata from the *na'auao*.¹⁹

What worried the missionaries more, however, were the potentially violent consequences of alcohol consumption. The underlying issues behind both alcohol consumption and socially disruptive violence, like cultural disruption, massive population loss, and the resulting communal depression, meant little to the missionaries. They

¹⁸ J.D. Ahia to Forbes, April 20, 1871, HMCS-Micronesia.

¹⁹ Levi Kaiwi to Smith, November 3, 1859, HMCS-Marquesas.

viewed alcohol abuse and violence only as symptoms of a strong Satanic presence. With the amount of alcoholism and violence they reported, it must have seemed that Satan had an incredibly firm grasp upon their hosts. In 1881 Kanoa described Butaritari as superior to all others in “drinking rum, hanging oneself and shooting in the belly.” The Abaiang mission report of 1872-73 described a war spurred entirely by the consumption of alcohol, at least in the minds of the missionaries. In 1862, Kekela combined the view of alcohol as a catalyst for violence and the view of alcohol as a catalyst for *le‘ale‘a*, recording a beating at a large *hula* gathering, reporting:

They had drunk coconut liquor and were drunk, and when they’d gotten quite drunk, uttered obscenities, so one man fetched a gun and because those men were so drunk, this man shot the gun at one, and he died, and thrashed another with the gun, hitting his head, not killing him, and then shot him with the gun.²⁰

Even without the anti-social lubricant provided by alcohol, warfare and violence occurred frequently in the Marquesas and Micronesia, particularly Kiribati. At times the missionaries’ letters report years of prolonged warfare and violence. William Lono on Maiana reported several major wars in his reports, including: a war on Tarawa in 1871, a vague reference to fighting and preparations for a war of retaliation against Abemama in 1876, and a civil war related to the Abemama war that lasted intermittently from 1876 until 1878. The missionaries reported some major form of warfare on Tarawa, Abaiang, Butaritari, Tabiteuea, Fatuhiva, and Hiva Oa. The missionaries rarely discussed the underlying causes of these wars, however, typically blaming them on Satan or single

²⁰ J.W. Kanoa, “He Wahi Moolelo No Ke Kihapai O Butaritari, 1881,” HMCS-Micronesia; James Kekela to Smith, August 25, 1857, Awaiaulu; Mahoe, “Apaiang Church Report 1872-73.”

incidents, like Abemama’s king slaying people of Maiana, or just on the consumption of alcohol.²¹

At other times, especially in the Marquesas, the missionaries blamed warfare on the very nature of the people. In 1854 Kauwealoha and Kekela both wrote letters naming the love or preoccupation with war as one of the major characteristics of the Fatuhiva people. Kauwealoha simply called them, “*He poe kanaka puni kaua,*” a war-loving people. Kekela elaborated, “the people's existence in this land is not good, nor is it protected – an ignorant race – *he poe puni kaua.* They war back and forth against each other.” The idea of an individual or people who *puni kaua* appears frequently in 19th-century Hawaiian historical writing, often associated with *ali‘i nui* like Kalaniopu‘u.²²

For the Native Hawaiians congregations, the missionaries’ descriptions of warfare and persistent unchecked violence marked a clear difference between the contemporary *na‘auao* of the *lāhui* and the *na‘aupō* of the Marquesans and Micronesians. After Kamehameha’s wars of unification, the *lāhui* participated in no major wars and minimal acts of organized fighting until WWI. Few Hawaiians remained alive during the mission period who had participated in or remembered even the small battles surrounding Ka‘ahumanu and Liholiho’s promotion of the ‘*ai noa* or the brief rebellion by Henry ‘Ōpūkaha‘ia’s former New England classmate George Humeume on Kauai. Similarly, the sheer volume of reported murders and other unorganized acts of violence must have seemed foreign to Hawaiians. Due to Kamehameha’s promulgation of the Mamalahoa Law in 1797 and his unification of the islands, mid-nineteenth-century Hawaiians had

²¹ George Haina, “Parish Report of Tarawa, 1878-79, 1879,” HMCS-Micronesia; Paulo Kapohaku to Smith, September 18, 1859, HMCS-Marquesas; James Kekela to Clark, December 29, 1854, Awaiaulu; William Lono to Pogue, October 17, 1871, HMCS-Micronesia; William Lono to Pogue, July 19, 1876, HMCS-Micronesia; William Lono to Pogue, February 9, 1877, HMCS-Micronesia; William Nehemiah Lono to Pogue, July 17, 1878, HMCS-Micronesia; Nalimu, “Tapiteauea Church Repot, 1878-1879,” HMCS-Micronesia.

²² Samuel Kauwealoha to Baldwin, February 4, 1854, HMCS-Marquesas; James Kekela to Hunnewell, April 2, 1854, Awaiaulu.

never witnessed the social instability and relatively commonplace violence that the missionaries described in both the Marquesas and parts of Kiribati. These references to violence broadened the rhetorical gulf between the peaceful Hawaiian *lāhui* and the *poe puni kaua*, a difference many Hawaiian Congregationalists had been trained to explain as a result of Christianity and the *na‘auao*.²³

The missionaries also focused on a final form of *hana ‘ino*, theft, which violated the tenth commandment *and* endangered the capitalist understanding of property that underpinned so much of what the ABCFM missionaries had once taught them. The missionaries listed theft in general as one of the many evils of their hosts, yet like the ABCFM missionaries in Hawaii and other *malihini*, outsiders, throughout the Pacific the HBCFM missionaries were most concerned about the theft of their own belongings. On Jeluij, for instance, the only specific theft Rev. Kapali mentioned were the theft of their crops. Kekela described the situation in the Marquesas as far more dire, writing:

Only with constant vigilance night and day do we save the clothes, the adzes, digging sticks, kettles, knives and everything else. Things of ours that are lost to thievery are completely lost, never to be gotten again if we go to find them. They are not embarrassed when wearing in our presence things that they’ve stolen.²⁴

Since Magellan, *malihini* have characterized Pacific Islanders as thieves, often amazed that those who had seemed genuinely friendly would also take things from them openly and boldly. Often such “thefts” resulted in violent efforts to “teach” the Native about Euro/American concepts of ownership. Cook’s encounters with Hawaiians, for instance, began and ended in deaths over theft. During their first meeting with Hawaiians on Kauai, Cook’s men shot a Hawaiian for attempting to “steal” a piece of iron from the *HMS Resolution*. In his final “encounter” in Hawai‘i, or anywhere, Cook and a number

²³ Kamakau, *Ruling Chiefs*, 227-228, 267-269; Silva, *Aloha Betrayed*, 138-9.

²⁴ David Kapali to Pogue, June 28, 1877, HMCS-Micronesia.

of Hawaiians died in a bloody battle following the theft of a boat.²⁵ While *malihini* saw simple theft, a sin as well as a violation of their person through their property, Islanders often perceived their actions as correcting imbalances of one sort or another. Thus the Marquesans and Micronesians may have targeted the HBCFM missionaries so often because the HBCFM missionaries failed to act according to the expectations of their hosts.

Kekela seems to have understood this, even though his training recoiled at the implications. He noted of the Fatuhiva people, “they are pleasant when paid, and that is what is right when we spend what we have, that it be in trade or for work. If their goods come to us through sale without them being pleased, there is then grumbling, and they’ll just come and steal.” The Fatuhiva people used “theft” to even out perceived bad-faith dealings, the *pono* of the exchange being more important than the terms of the agreement. The Fatuhiva people Kekela mentioned may have considered the missionaries to be somewhat selfish in their dealings, and indeed Matuunui’s biggest complaint with them seems to be that they gave him no cloth though he provided them with land, supplies, and safe haven. Most Pacific Islanders saw stinginess as a major character flaw, as well as a threat to the social order. Even the Hawaiian missionaries frequently used the specter of stinginess to motivate donations at home. In a letter to a Hawaiian newspaper, Kekela pointedly noted that the Americans and English were more generous to their missionaries than the Hawaiians were. On the other hand, during a brief respite in Tahiti, Kekela just as pointedly noted the stinginess of Tahitian Christians as compared to the generosity of the Hawaiian community in Tahiti. Despite this understanding of the importance of generosity in Pacific Island cultures, the missionaries’ capitalist training and the resulting fetish for private property turned them into stingy *malihini* in the mission field, whose wealth and lack of generosity made theft a viable option in easing the social disruptions

²⁵ Kuykendall, *The Hawaiian Kingdom*, Vol. I, 14, 18-19.

they caused. On occasion, however, their hosts simply used theft to let the missionaries know their welcome had worn thin, as when the Hanaipa people bluntly told Alexander Kaukau, “When you go, our thieving will come to an end.”²⁶

Following the examples set by their ABCFM *mākuā*, the Hawaiian missionaries often exploited gendered practices to exemplify the otherness and *na’aupō* of their hosts. In Tarawa, Haina claimed that the women were nothing but *kauwā*, slaves, for the men, who held absolutely no *aloha* for the women. In the Marquesas, gendered *kapu* resembling those Ka’ahumanu had overthrown presented the missionaries with easy targets. Despite the presence of powerful female chiefs, including some who either patronized or antagonized the missionaries, the missionaries clung to gendered *kapu* as evidence of feminine oppression. They frequently cited various forms of ‘*ai kapu*, gendered eating *kapu*, as evidence of the *na’aupō*. They also noted that women, “are not to sail on their canoes...it is entirely forbidden; and here is the reason for the restriction, ‘Lest their husbands go completely blind from the women getting up on something the husband made.’” Practices that considered women to be sacred met with equal derision, like the reported practice of praying to pregnant women on Marakei.²⁷

Like other ethnographers, the Hawaiian missionaries often included details of the macabre and “bizarre” to tantalize their audience and accentuate the otherness of their hosts. In Kiribati, funerary practices provided the Hawaiian missionaries with a textbook example of the macabre other. Henry Nalimu described these practices in 1872, “If a corpse is well beloved by his people, he is not buried in the earth. He is placed above to

²⁶ Zakaria Hapuku to Clark, February 25, 1864, HMCS-Marquesas; Kekela to Clark, September 3, 1853; James Kekela to Clark, January 19, 1856, Awaiaulu.

²⁷ George Haina to Clark, June 1, 1861, HMCS-Micronesia; David Kanoho, “Church Report, Marakei, 1877-1878,” HMCS-Micronesia; Paulo Kapohaku to Smith, August 12, 1859, HMCS-Micronesia; James Kekela to Clark, December 29, 1854, Awaiaulu; James Kekela to Clark, January 19, 1856, Awaiaulu; James Kekela, “J. Kekela’s Farewell Letter to All of the Church Members Here in Hawaii Pt 5 (Awaiaulu Translation),” original in: *Ka Hae Hawaii*, February 23 1859.

become putrid then taken outside to be rubbed with coconut oil to become shiny. The persons whose deeds were regarded as evil were buried below.” In the Marquesas, the missionaries frequently conjured up another form of macabre *hana ‘ino*, the specter of *‘ai kanaka*, cannibalism. In addition to simply othering their hosts, the missionaries used these practices to dehumanize them as well. For the failure to show the “proper” blend of disgust and respect for corpses, the missionaries considered their hosts themselves to be disgusting and unworthy of respect.²⁸

In reporting on this broad range of *na ‘aupō* behaviors, the missionaries provided a rhetorical means for separating themselves and their *lāhui* from the *na ‘aupō* of the south and to further condemn any remnants of such behaviors in contemporary Hawai‘i. As noted above, in the cases of widespread violence, warfare, and the “bizarre,” only the former applied as these practices had either never existed in or vanished from Hawaii. Like most places in the Pacific, however, Hawaiians still had its fair share of dancing, inebriation, adultery, polytheism, and *hana le ‘ale ‘a*. In defining their hosts through these behaviors, however, the missionaries left room for the Hawaiians to still claim moral superiority. In Hawai‘i these behaviors were exceptions and outrages rather than the norm. In the minds of the sober Hawaiian Congregationalists, for instance, reports of widespread alcoholism solidified the *na ‘aupō* of the Marquesans and their inferiority to the mostly sober Hawaiian *lāhui*. At the same time, it gave an extra deterrent to church people who might be inclined to partake in a drink now and then or those who excused or condoned the drinking of others. To do so would lower oneself to the level of the *na ‘aupō*, *hihiu*, and *hūpō* islanders of the south.

Finally, no ethnography would be complete without some form of comment on material culture, and the Hawaiian missionaries writings do not disappoint. Mary

²⁸ James Kekela to Smith, April 5, 1862, Awaiaulu; James Kekela to unknown, July 10, 1862, Awaiaulu; Henry Nalimu to Pogue, July 26, 1872.

Kahelemauna's article about life on Mille and Kekela's descriptions of the inaugural voyage to Micronesia, for instance, both contained detailed descriptions of material culture. Some items, like the swift canoes of the low islands and the massive meeting houses of Makin, earned praise from Kekela, but for the most part the Micronesians lack of western goods, particularly western clothing, validated the missionaries' sense of their superior material *na'auao*. Even the Tahitians, who Kekela visited when originally heading to Fatuhiva, received some derision for their poverty of western goods. Kekela, angered at their lack of hospitality, noted sneeringly that even Pomare, their deposed queen, lacked anything more than the simplest of dresses, and none of the men wore hats.²⁹

Kekela also collected material goods in the Marquesas and Micronesia in order to display the material "otherness" of those peoples. He displayed the Micronesian items, mostly war implements, before the crowds that gathered to hear him when he returned from Micronesia, presenting them with physical representations of the *na'aupō*. His letters also record two incidents where he collected Marquesan goods as presents or favors for *haole*. In the 1860's, Kekela helped save the life of an American whaler, Jonathon Whalon, for which the Lincoln administration presented him with a gold watch. In response Kekela sent Lincoln a Marquesan war club, meant to illustrate, perhaps, the type of implement that would have been used to dispatch Whalon. In 1892 Kekela prepared an entire shipment of goods for the nascent Bishop Museum, participating in the early proto-colonial collecting of that institution by procuring various articles, especially different types of *lei* and clothing that the Marquesans placed great value in.³⁰

²⁹ Kahelemauna, "Reminiscence of Her Life on Milli (Mulgrave) Written in 1877 after Her Husband Simeon Died, Manuscript Translation of Articles in *Ka Lahui Hawaii* Feb 18-May 24, 1877," HMCS-Micronesia; Kamakau, *Ruling Chiefs*, 244; Kekela to Alexander, November 26, 1852.

³⁰ ABCFM, *The Missionary Herald*, Volume 49, 365; James Kekela to Unknown, March 29, 1865, Awaiaulu; James Kekela to Hyde, December 16, 1892, Bishop-Hyde Papers.

In their representations of the Micronesians and Marquesans they worked among, the Hawaiian missionaries created a caricature of a *hihiu*, *na‘aupō*, and *hūpō* other, who they and the rest of the Hawaiian *lāhui* could pity and despise, using them as a point of contrast to the *na‘auao* of Hawai‘i. While conjuring up the traces of the *na‘aupō* Hawaiian past, these descriptions also helped to ease the anxiety caused by that past by showing how far the Hawaiians had advanced out of the *na‘aupō*. While traces and pockets of the *na‘aupō* remained in Hawai‘i, the HBCFM missionaries described a land completely submerged in the *na‘aupō*. In comparison, Hawai‘i could be seen as being clearly on the side of the *na‘auao*. Even when discussing *hewa* still found in Hawai‘i, such as drinking and *hula*, the missionaries made it clear that such *hewa* were far more prevalent among their hosts, defining the norm rather than being an exception to it. Even their material culture provided proof of their inferiority, their lack of stone houses, clothes, and hats marking them as decades, if not generations, behind the Hawaiian people. The missionaries did far more than simply make rhetorical claims to superiority, however, they also acted off of and sought to reinforce these claims in their daily efforts to replace Marquesan and Micronesian culture with idealized versions of Hawaiian Protestantism.

Acting the Part

James Kekela summed up the essence of Hawaiian mission work during a speech before a mixed Hawaiian and *haole* crowd in 1852:

What then is more reasonable than that we Hawaiians should extend to other nations in this ocean, the blessings of the gospel? Those tribes are now what we were a short time ago, degraded, wretched, idolaters. Shall we not have pity on them, as the people of God in the Untied States had pity on us?³¹

³¹ “Remarks of Rev. Mr. Kekela.”

In short, the Hawaiian people, once the object of pity, had now advanced enough to pity someone else. One could argue that mission work, like pity, required a deep belief in one's own superiority. From such a perspective, the very act of taking on mission work depended on the willingness to not just believe in one's superiority, but to act upon it. Yet the chauvinism inherent in mission work also expressed itself in the everyday acts of the HBCFM missionaries, as well as in the occasionally spectacular actions they undertook among their hosts.

Which is not to say that chauvinism was the only thing that guided the actions of the HBCFM missionaries. Inherent in most Christian mission work is a belief in sacrificing one's earthly success for the progression of God's word and for the sake of the souls of the host societies. In their minds, the HBCFM missionaries were making a great sacrifice for their hosts and expressing their *aloha* for these other islanders in their work. When asking for more missionaries in 1878, for instance, Samuel Kekuewa framed his request to the *hoahānau* by asking, "where are the people who *aloha* this Pagan people?" In part due to this *aloha*, the missionaries were willing to sacrifice enormous chunks of their lives to "save" their hosts, indeed Kekela and Kauwealoha spent a half-century performing mission work in the Marquesas. They continued through hunger, poverty, the threat of violence, and often actual violence in the belief that the souls of those around them were worth saving. Many formed a close attachment to their flocks, transforming the theological and theoretical *aloha* they held for the pagan into a personal and pragmatic *aloha* for those they lived and worked amongst on a daily basis. As noted in the beginning of this chapter, for instance, Lono and his wife expressed a great deal of sorrow in leaving their flock on Maiana in order to recover their health in Hawai'i, writing of their deep *aloha* for the people there.³²

³² Samuel Kekuewa to Bingham, January 14, 1878, HMCS-Micronesia; Lono, "Lono, W.N. Journal."

As another expression of their *aloha* many of the missionaries also worked on behalf of their hosts in more worldly situations. Lono, for instance, helped the converts of Maiana combat the intrigues of a *haole* trader, who tried to demand lands from islanders who owed him various debts. For this act, he wrote, “their love clung tightly to me.” Robert Maka, who also worked with the Kiribati in Hawai‘i, listened to and reported on their complaints regarding conditions on the plantations, as well as working to better their conditions through pressure from the HBCFM. With one or two significant exceptions, which will be covered below, the missionaries also attempted to act as peacemakers during local conflicts although such actions often put them at physical risk.³³

While there is no reason to doubt the *aloha* of the missionaries for their hosts, the missionaries often expressed this *aloha* through a strongly paternalistic filter. Following their descriptions of the ABCFM missionaries as their *mākuā*, they in turn styled themselves as the *mākuā* of their hosts. After the death of Naomi Kekela, James’ partner in life and work for more than a half-century, Kauwealoha sought to comfort him by recounting what she achieved as a missionary. “Kaumaha no ke kaawale ana aku o kekahi makuahine o keia lahui kanaka,” he wrote, heavy/sorrowful is the separation of the mother of this people. As carriers of the *mālamalama* into the *pō*, they no doubt felt they had earned the right to consider themselves *mākuā*, and to act as *mākuā* do, loving their children but also acting in the belief that they inherently know what is best for them. Far too often this paternalism and the sense of superiority it stemmed from displayed itself in ways that left little room for a more understanding and accepting form of *aloha*.³⁴

Like the Sandwich Islands Mission and other “civilizing” projects, the HBCFM missions focused a significant amount of their efforts and resources in separating Native

³³ George Haina, “Gilbert Islands Report, 1878-1879,” HMCS-Micronesia; Lono, “Lono, W.N. Journal;” Robert Maka, “Maka’s Report: Gilbert Islanders in Hawaii, 1880,” Micro-Coll.

³⁴ Samuel Kauwealoha to Kekela, October, 1903, HMCS-Marquesas.

children from *na‘aupō* influences, such as their families and communities. While day schools gave them access to the still malleable minds of the children, or at least the few that attended, the child still returned home to the *na‘aupō* and *hihiu* of the Native home. Something had to be done. Once the missions established a level of permanence and support in a region, they typically attempted to establish a centralized *kula hānai*, or boarding school, to take on the older students. In Hawaiian *hānai* means to raise or to adopt, and the schools did exactly that, removing the students to a location where missionary surveillance could assure their separation from the *hula*, alcohol, tobacco, and *hana le‘ale‘a* that affected attendance among the day schools. Like in Hawai‘i, the missionaries created separate boarding schools for boys and girls. Not only did this cut down on the likelihood of sexual activities among the students, or at least heterosexual activities, it also allowed the students to better develop “proper” gender roles. As in Hawai‘i, the missionaries developed the girls’ schools to develop good Christians, but also to develop good westernized “helpers” for the graduates of the boys’ schools. Maka’s 1870 report on the Kiribati girls’ school, for instance, emphasized sewing, weaving hats, washing, ironing, cooking, and sweeping in his discussion of the curriculum.³⁵

Often the missionaries spent years attempting to establish boarding schools. In the Marquesas Kekela, Hapuku, and Kauwealoha tried repeatedly to create boarding schools between 1867 and the 1880’s. The three alternated the boys and girls schools between them on a somewhat regular basis, trying to find the right combination for success. In addition to the lack of funds from the HBCFM or from the local community, many students and parents also refused to commit to schools located not just in another valley or on another island, but often in places associated with recent or current enemies. By

³⁵ Robert Maka, “Annual Report of the Girls’ School 1870-1871,” HMCS-Micronesia; S.K. Maunaloa to Forbes, July 28, 1881, HMCS-Micronesia.

1875 the boy's school, then under Hapuku with Kekela's occasional assistance, had only six pupils. Kauwealoha's girls' school had only three. In 1877 Kauwealoha seriously considered closing the girls' school for good due to lack of interest and funds. The schools eventually succeeded thanks to persistence, hard work, and a pair of French invasions that resulted in a mandatory-schooling law. In 1882 the mission finally reported some success with a Protestant French-language boarding school, now for both boys and girls since they only had a single French-language instructor. They also reported some success with an English-language school run by Kauwealoha's son.³⁶

With the boarding schools the missionaries sought a pristine environment in which to indoctrinate their students in Hawaiian/New England Congregationalism, a total removal from the *na'aupō*. In many cases missionaries also adopted or boarded local students outside of formal boarding schools, either as a substitute or precursor of the *hānai kula*. In 1874 Robert Maka reported three girls living with he and his wife in Kuma. While they considered such arrangements better than having the girls live with their own families, the missionaries still considered them less than optimal, as the mission stations were not isolated enough to remove the threat of the *na'aupō*. In 1867, while preparing for the formal creation of a boarding school, Kekela began taking in female students, reporting, "I urged the parents about having some of their daughters staying with us. (For the boarding school.) Three are living with us from here in Puamau; there are a great many children here, I am nevertheless fearful, lest they run away, due to the proximity of their homes." The missionaries sometimes went to extremes in their attempts to isolate their students from the *na'aupō* of their *lāhui*. Kauwealoha, for instance, founded his school in an uninhabited valley on Uapou where access came strictly from the sea.

³⁶ Samuel Kauwealoha to the Mission Children Living in Hawaii, May 14, 1877, HMCS-Marquesas; Samuel Kauwealoha to Hall, February 22, 1882, HMCS-Marquesas; James Kekela to Gulick, May 16, 1867, Awaiaulu; James Kekela to Pogue, February 27, 1875, Awaiaulu.

Despite consistent problems with supplying the school, Kauwealoha refused to give up the site, whose remoteness allowed him to isolate and train the students in Hawaiian Christian living.³⁷

The threat of the *na‘aupō* infecting children weighed so heavily on the minds of the missionaries that the majority of the long-term HBCFM missionaries sent their own children away, not just for schooling, but to free them of the evil influences of their host *lāhui*. As Nancy Morris has found in her work on the HBCFM missions, many of the Hawaiian missionaries suffered mentally from their separation from their children, yet most saw their children’s chances of remaining within the *mālamalama* to be far greater at home, especially if they found housing and an education at either a Christian boarding school or with a *haole* or Hawaiian minister. Kekela even sent one daughter to Tahiti to be educated when sending her home proved prohibitively expensive. Once again the HBCFM missionaries continued a trend set by the ABCFM missionaries and other *haole* in Honolulu, who sent their young children back to America for their upbringing and education. While educational quality was a concern in both cases, HBCFM and ABCFM missionaries alike displayed a clear fear of cultural, and even linguistic, contagion from the Native people whom they sought to save. Hezekiah Aea, for instance, wrote of his concerns that his son Lowell was spending much of his time with Kiribati, and that all of his children spoke Hawaiian poorly, pronouncing their words with a Kiribati accent.³⁸

While removing their own children from the infectious *na‘aupō* of their hosts, and attempting to do the same with their hosts’ children, signified a definite sense of superiority and disrespect for their hosts, it was in the destruction and defilement of

³⁷ Samuel Kauwealoha to Gulick, July 8, 1868, HMCS-Marquesas; James Kekela to Gulick, August 7, 1867, Awaiaulu; Robert Maka to Chamberlain, December 30, 1874, HMCS-Micronesia.

³⁸ Hezekiah Aea to Gulick, November 7, 1864, HMCS-Micronesia; Hezekiah Aea to Gulick, August 6, 1866, HMCS-Micronesia; Kuykendall, *The Hawaiian Kingdom, Vol. I*, 366-367; Morris, *Hawaiian Missionaries Abroad*, 231-232.

sacred places and artifacts that the Hawaiians showed their greatest disrespect. At its very essence, of course, mission work attempts to raze existing conceptions of the sacred in order to replace them with new ones. While this occurred on a daily basis through sermons, lessons, and discussions in which the missionaries declared the beliefs of their hosts to be *na‘aupō*, *loko‘ino* and *hūpō*, in some cases the missionaries took more spectacular and aggressive courses of action. In the Marquesas the missionaries mostly participated in such desecrations vicariously, watching with approval as the French imprisoned and defiled the *kāula*, or prophets, and forced the people to destroy their gods and defile their sacred places.³⁹ In Micronesia, however, missionaries participated in such acts much more directly.

When told that the area around the graves of chiefs were *kapu*, Mary Kahelemauna decided to purposefully violate the *kapu* and prove the falseness of her hosts’ religion. The people cried out, “do not go there lest you die,” yet, she wrote, “I went right on, entered the graveyard and stood at the head of the grave of the son of that chief. At this time the chief himself called to me: ‘Oh woman do not go there lest you die.’” When she did not die, Kahelemauna declared the incident a success for the side of God, disproving the superstitions of the heathens. Another reading of the incident, however, was that she purposefully desecrated a gravesite and avoided the very real and worldly punishments for such violations because the people of Mili knew the consequences of attacking missionaries. During the Kahelemaunas’ first year on Mili, the USS *Jamestown* sailed to Kiribati to deal with the destruction of HBCFM mission property on Abaiang. It then “visited” the Marshalls and other areas of Micronesia, including Mili, making sure that local leaders understood that the lives and property of the Hawaiian and American missionaries were under American naval protection. Mr. Kahelemauna reported that he and the chief they lived under, Drime, met with Captain

³⁹ Samuel Kauwealoha to Forbes, July 28, 1881, HMCS-Marquesas.

Truxton of the *Jamestown*, who made Drime sign a promise of good conduct, guaranteeing the missionaries' safety. As this occurred before Mrs. Kahelemauna defiled the gravesite, it may partly explain Mrs. Kahelemauna's willingness to perform such a provocative act as the desecration of a chief's grave in front of his father.⁴⁰

Rev. Kapu on Tabiteuea participated in and guided much broader and more destructive acts of desecration with some frequency. Kapu's enthusiastic preaching style earned him a massive following by 1868, when his converts on the north side of the island destroyed their religious artifacts and began publicly gathering on formerly forbidden sites. Though no doubt inspired by Kapu, his converts carried out this iconoclasm themselves, and the items destroyed seemed to be their own sacred items in which they, or at least a vocal majority, had ceased to believe. The arrival of Nalimu to administer to the southern regions of the island in 1870 further bolstered the Tabiteuea Congregationalist community.⁴¹

In southern Tabiteuea, however, the majority of the people practiced the Tioba (Jehovah) religion, a proselytizing, indigenous version of Christianity. The Tioba followers had little love or patience for the HBCFM missionaries, and the feeling was mutual. Kapu and Nalimu referred to the Tioba followers as *hulumanu*, bird feathers, in derision of the feathered cross which the Tioba people carried. They were likely also referencing the Hulumanu of Kamehameha III, his followers and companions during his anti-mission "revolt" some 40 years earlier. In 1879 Kapu and Nalimu went south with 2000 of their own flock following behind. After trying to force their way into a Tioba meetinghouse to preach, the two were ejected. In retaliation they and their followers returned north, destroying every symbol of the Tioba they found along the way. This

⁴⁰ Kahelemauna, "Reminiscence of Her Life on Milli"; Simeon Kahelemauna to Pogue, June 1, 1870, HMCS-Micronesia.

⁴¹ ABCFM, *The Missionary Herald*, Vol. 66, (Cambridge, MA: The Riverside Press, 1870), 197-198.

desecration, as expected, goaded the Tioba folk into battle, a battle the northerners won decisively by violating traditional rules of engagement. This led to another iconoclasm, in which the northerners under Nalimu and Kapu destroyed more old gods and symbols of Tioba religion.⁴²

Unsatisfied with the destruction of Tioba artifacts, however, Kapu and Nalimu soon set in motion a string of events intended to bring about the destruction of either the Tioba religion or the people who followed it. Despite a public meeting at the end of the year, during which Kapu and Nalimu preached peace and ordered all weapons destroyed, they soon returned to preaching war against the south. In 1880 they went to try to preach in the Tioba areas three times and were consistently ejected. Their third effort led the southerners to again gird up for battle, but the northerners, prepared for such an eventuality and with newly made spears and newly purchased guns, ambushed the Tioba people at dawn, slaughtering more than 600 of them, including men, women, children, the wounded, the fleeing, and those who threw down their weapons. Many of the bodies were piled on the battlefield and burned in an enormous pyre, denying them any form of funerary rites and denying their families the chance to view and mourn over their fallen relatives.⁴³

After an examination of the historical evidence, H.E. and H.C. Maude determined it quite likely that Kapu and Nalimu bore heavy responsibility for the massacre. Clearly, in both confrontations the Tioba people were the first to begin outright preparations for war, and in neither did Kapu or Nalimu personally participate in the battle, yet they were clearly responsible for instigating the battles and for the unusually deadly results. First,

⁴² W.B. Kapu to Bingham, October 30, 1879, HMCS-Micronesia; H.E. Maude, "Tioba and the Tabiteuean Religious Wars," *The Journal of the Polynesian Society* 90, no. 3 (1981): 317-18; Nalimu, "Tapiteauea Church Report, 1877-1878," HMCS-Micronesia; Henry Nalimu to Bingham, November 10, 1879, HMCS-Micronesia; Nalimu, "Tapiteauea Church Report, 1878-1879."

⁴³ Maude, "Tioba and the Tabiteuean Religious Wars," 323-4.

both battles occurred after Kapu and Nalimu antagonized the southerners with their unwelcome preaching and the destruction of sacred Tioba objects. Second, Kapu and Nalimu preached extensively on the evils of the southerners in the period before the second battle, whipping their congregations into a fervor of religious militancy. Finally both battles differed significantly from tradition, both in style and deadliness. The Maudes determined Kapu to be the architect of the battle plan for the massacre. Furthermore, the pursuit and slaying of fleeing enemies in both battles was highly unusual. Witnesses claimed that Nalimu encouraged them to massacre the enemy, as they were enemies of God.⁴⁴

When the HBCFM demanded Kapu and Nalimu return to Hawai'i for a hearing, they removed Nalimu from the mission but merely chastised Kapu and returned him to his post. After the battle, and even after his formal resignation from the mission in the 1880s, Kapu remained one of the foremost power brokers on the island. He was remembered as “the Law-bringer,” for his creation of a legal code based largely on Congregationalist morality and his strict enforcement of it. Anger over his role in the battle, specifically in areas once associated with the Tioba religion, led to a high numbers of Catholic conversions in those areas after the arrival of a French-backed Catholic mission in 1888. In 1892 it was these Catholic converts who convinced the British to remove Kapu, citing both his incitement to warfare and his oppressive influence. Memories of the battle and of the Hawaiians role in it retained a definite place in the Tabiteuean mind into the twentieth century. In the late 1940's Katharine Luomala recorded an oral history as told by Moaua, a Protestant leader from the village of Te Wai, where the battle took place. In a detailed account Moaua named Kapu and Nalimu as instigators and leaders of the massacre, which was known as “the second war,” within

⁴⁴ Ibid.: 318-24.

Tabiteuean history, “the first war,” having occurred more than a century and a half earlier.⁴⁵

Though far more spectacular than the missionaries’ everyday work, Mrs. Kahelemauna’s actions on Mili and Kapu and Nalimu’s on Tabiteuea illustrate the clear sense of supremacy, as Christians and as members of a *lāhui na‘auao*, that Native Hawaiian mission work depended upon. This is what led Mrs. Kahelemauna to believe that she had not only the right, but also the duty to defile graves on Mile. This same sense of absolute superiority led Kapu and Nalimu to instigate the slaughter of their enemies, destroying and defiling their bodies when destroying and defiling their symbols failed to crush their faith. Furthermore, the results of both of these incidents, namely Mrs. Kahelemauna not suffering any repercussions and Kapu and Nalimu’s extension of control to the southern areas of Tabiteuea, only served to strengthen their belief in their own superiority.

The missionaries had only slightly more respect for the *na‘auao* and moral strength of their converts, who in many cases made up a tiny fraction of their host *lāhui*. While converts could be equals in Christ, they would never be equal in the *na‘auao*. The HBCFM missionaries, as noted earlier, took to styling themselves as the *mākua* of their flocks, just as the ABCFM missionaries had in Hawai‘i. More importantly, the Hawaiian missionaries maintained a very tight grip on the membership rolls of their congregations, the earthly boundaries of the Kingdom of God. As in Hawai‘i, long probationary periods and constant expulsions of those who *ho‘i hope* kept the parishioners on their toes and kept the missionaries in firm control.⁴⁶

⁴⁵ Katharine Luomala, “A Gilbertese Tradition of a Religious Massacre,” *Sixty-Second Annual Report of the Hawaiian Historical Society* (1953): 19-22.

⁴⁶ “He Ahaolelo Misionari Ma Ko Nuuhiva Pae Aina (Marquesas Mission General Meeting) 1868,” HMCS-Marquesas; Kauwealoha to Kekela, October 1903; James Kekela to Emerson, September 22, 1895, Awaiaulu.

Part of this may have been driven by a desire to assure the ABCFM missionaries that they were upholding the same standards that their *mākuā* had. In some cases the general thinking about protecting the exclusivity of membership resulted in Native Hawaiian missionaries seeming almost apologetic when their labors began to bear fruit. In 1871 James Kanoa included the following lines in his report to the HBCFM:

Your idea that arrived on the "Morning Star" is good, saying, "Be cautious in bringing in people into church membership, for they are backsliders." But some have already entered into the church, for they have been known by us as chosen of God, in prayer, in repentance for sins, attending services regularly and making regular contributions to the new-monthly offerings...but in the future we shall be careful.⁴⁷

Rev. Kekela sounded a similar note regarding several converts on Nukuhiva in the 1860's. He reported on the joy they felt at the progress of several students who lived with them, but added, "nevertheless [we] were not quick to admit them into the church, we waited and watched, lest God's house be filled only with *opala* [rubbish]." Kekela's fear, that they might fill God's house with *opala*, was a theologically meaningful one for the ABCFM and HBCFM. A congregation weakened by backsliders, false converts, and other "*opala*" would injure all the members, possibly contaminating them and causing their downfall. The congregation might also fear losing the favor of the Lord, who might punish them collectively for their aggregate sins. Some Native missionaries who studied under Coan, however, like the energetic, animated preacher Rev. Kapu on Tabiteuea, expressed far less reluctance to admit massive numbers of converts.⁴⁸

Yet the administration of such tough standards to gain and maintain membership also strengthened the personal and collective power of the missionaries, just as it had in Hawai'i. Even with their most devout members, such as Natua, an *ali'i* of Oomoa, the

⁴⁷ J.W. Kanoa to Pogue, September 29, 1871, HMCS-Micronesia.

⁴⁸ James Kekela to Gulick, January 16, 1865, Awaiaulu.

missionaries feared any straying from the mission's direct control. When Bicknell proposed taking Natua to Hawai'i, Kekela objected quite forcefully, writing:

And it is the main reason for my flat refusal of A. Natua, he does not need to sail to Hawaii; lest great wealth be accumulated to him, and this and that provision, and return; forsake us, the mind leaning toward the people who gave him the free bundles. Here is another, lest he be quickly lost to the temptation of sin, there is a great number of people who have strayed in Hawaii, the chiefs, the foreigners, some of the church brethren. Look at Hopu, Wiliama, Kanui, Kaumuali'i, the people that sailed together with Bingham in 1820. They fell quickly astray, ask your father, about said people, I have heard, and it is truly so.

Ironically, after years of telling the Marquesan people that Hawai'i was *na'auao* and more advanced than the Marquesas, Kekela changed his tune, arguing that Hawai'i was too sinful for a delicate soul like Natua.⁴⁹

Silence and Purge

In order to maintain their claims of moral superiority, the Hawaiian missionaries needed strategies to deal with any facts or events that challenged their claims. Many of these challenges could be dealt with by simply ignoring them. Thus the silences found in the missionaries' writings can point out what the missionaries may have seen as challenges to their claims of superiority. At times, however, the challenges came from the actions of the mission community itself. Sometimes the missionaries felt that the failings of their brethren were small enough and private enough to deal with quietly. At other times these failings forced the missionaries to purge themselves of the offenders to retain the illusion of moral purity that their superiority hung from.

Considering how hard they worked to portray themselves as superior, it should come as no surprise that the HBCFM missionaries carefully avoided discussions of

⁴⁹ James Kekela to Gulick, March 28, 1865, Awaiaulu.

positive similarities between their host *lāhui* and the *na‘auao* of Hawai‘i. On occasion the missionaries did argue for similarities between their own past and the contemporary status of their hosts. Such statements, however, were clearly grounded in a perception of the Hawaiian past as *pōuli*, and therefore distant from the modern Hawaiian *na‘auao*, rather than in any sort of claims to contemporary closeness or kinship. The first time Hezekiah Aea preached on Ebon in 1861, his sermon addressed “The nature of the lives of the natives of Hawaii in former times.” Similarly, Kaaikaula wrote in 1856 that in the few opportunities Rev. Sturges gave him to give talks among the people of Ponape, he focused most on, “the characterizations of our life in Hawaii, about idolatry and diversions in older times until the missionaries came with the power of God, then all the evils of our land were overturned and perhaps also [those] on Ponape.” In arguing against Bicknell’s plan to take Marquesans to Hawai‘i for medical treatment, Kekela claimed that if something went wrong the Hawaiian missionaries would pay the price. As evidence, he cites that in “*ka wa na‘aupō*,” medical failures by the ABCFM missionaries led not just to a loss of the Hawaiians trust, but also to nearly fatal consequences for some of the missionaries. In all these cases the missionaries’ remarks about similarities between the Native Hawaiian past and the contemporary cultures of their hosts acted to create a rhetorical distance between contemporary Hawaiian *na‘auao* and the *na‘aupō* of both the Hawaiian past and the Micronesian/Marquesan present.⁵⁰

They also mentioned a few negative contemporary similarities, particularly in comparing the remaining *na‘aupō* of Hawai‘i to the *na‘aupō* masses among their hosts. The missionaries recognized drinking and *hula*, for instance, as issues at home and abroad, but as mentioned earlier, they treated these activities as deviances from the norm in Hawai‘i while they *were* the norm among their hosts. Thus they made these

⁵⁰ Hezekiah Aea to Clark, June 8 1861, HMCS-Micronesia; Berita Kaaikaula to Clark, February 6, 1856, HMCS-Micronesia; Kekela to Gulick, March 28, 1865.

comparisons in order to shame the *na‘aupō* in Hawai‘i for their similarities with a backwards people, not to make any claims for equality or similarities between the two groups as a whole. Kekela used this trick in 1859, for instance, when he called those individuals who practice *hula* in Hawai‘i far worse than the masses who practiced it in Fatuhiva, for the Hawaiians lived in a land that knew the light, while the Marquesans did not.⁵¹

Even in the Marquesas, now considered one of the most likely sites of origin for the Hawaiian people, the missionaries reported on no contemporary cultural ties. Hawaiian and Marquesan culture had admittedly evolved along separate courses since they had lost contact centuries earlier. In light of the similarities found between Hawaiians and other Polynesian peoples in the present day, however, it is hard to imagine that nothing about the Marquesan people struck the Hawaiians as familiar. It seems much more likely that such similarities would have struck the Hawaiians as too uncomfortable to address. Modern similarities would serve to question their superiority and thus the very basis of their missions.

The one major exception, however, follows the tired cliché of proving the rule rather than breaking. In 1890 Samuela Kaaia claimed that the largely Christianized people of Tabiteuea “have an *oluolu* demeanor, like the Hawaiian people.” This characterization of the people as ‘*olu‘olu*, pleasant/comforting, said much for the people in a Native Hawaiian cultural context though it had little bearing on either the salvation or *na‘auao* of the Tabiteuea people. He never said the people there “have an *oluolu* demeanor, like a Christian people,” or “like a *lāhui na‘auao*.” The Hawaiian missionaries knew that gaining the *na‘auao* did not necessarily require ‘*olu‘olu*. Many of the ABCFM missionaries, Reverends Emerson and Walkup for example, would be damned to the

⁵¹ Kekela, “J. Kekela's Farewell Letter to All of the Church Members Here in Hawaii Pt 1(Awaiulu Translation).”

depths of Hell if that were the case. Kaukau noted that Emerson had achieved a reputation for rudeness among Hawaiian congregations. Rev. Walkup's open hostility for the Hawaiian missionaries in Kiribati earned him a similar reputation there. But no one claimed these two were not *na'auao*, only that they were not *'olu'olu*. So while Kaaia certainly made a positive comparison, the comparison played no role in the *na'auao/na'aupō* dichotomy that Hawaiian claims of superiority rested upon, thus Kaaia and his fellow missionaries would find it acceptable.⁵²

The Hawaiian missionaries also avoided any mention of significant knowledge that could be gained from their hosts. While the missions needed to learn basic practical knowledge from their hosts, such as who ran what valley or atoll, what plants were edible, and what the going price for a hog was, they reported no knowledge of any use or interest outside of such basic practicalities. The only exceptions come in moments of extreme desperation. George Leleo searched for an indigenous cure for his wife's leprosy among the people of Nonouti, hoping to avoid being recalled and his wife's inevitable internment at the leprosy colony at Kalaupapa. Hapuku's use of a local seer to deal with his daughter's possession represented another case, one that was far more unsettling to his fellow missionaries. In both cases these desperate turns to Native knowledge resulted in disciplinary actions from the HBCFM, who valued such knowledge even less than the Hawaiian missionaries did.⁵³

The greatest challenges to the missionaries' illusion of Christian superiority came not from signs of knowledge among their host *lāhui* or from positive similarities to the Hawaiian *lāhui*, but from the occasional backsliding of one of their own. These individual *ho'i hope* became particularly damaging when knowledge of them spread among their

⁵² Alexander Kaukau to Smith, April 27, 1858, HMCS-Marquesas; Kekela, Kekela to Smith, August 25, 1857; William Lono to Emerson, January 1, 1892, HMCS-Micronesia.

⁵³ Zakaria Hapuku to Emerson, September 5, 1893, HMCS-Micronesia; George Leleo to Pogue, April 24, 1876, HMCS-Micronesia; Morris, *Hawaiian Missionaries Abroad*, 368-9.

hosts, their home congregations, and the HBCFM. In addition to the incident involving Hapuku's daughter, there were numerous other times when the missionaries failed to live up to the high standards they set for themselves and their flocks. At different times Hawaiian missionaries committed or were accused of adultery, trading for profit, particularly in alcohol and tobacco, and involvement in different forms of violence, from wife beating to the slaughter on Tabiteuea. Typically the missionaries attempted to deal with these issues quietly and amongst themselves, effectively silencing them. In some cases, however, when personal disputes came into play or when other missionaries deemed the fall to be too serious or too public, they turned on one another to purge the fallen from their midst and minimize contamination to their collective souls and reputations.

In several cases the missionaries' falls came in the form of public displays of violence. When the ABCFM supply ship *Morning Star* failed to provide Timoteo Kaehuaea with goods needed to pay off some workers, Kaehuaea got pushed into a physical confrontation during which he seriously injured one man with a knife. David Kapali was dismissed after reports claimed that he offered to fight a *haole* trader in the middle of an intense argument. Samuela Kamakahiki and Samuel Nawaa both engaged in physical disputes with their wives in front of members of the congregation, in Nawaa's case, apparently beating her quite violently. The most well-known and horrific incident, however, was Nalimu and Kapu's participation in the massacre at Tabiteuea.⁵⁴

Moekolohe, adultery, was another significant issue. In the Marquesas Ruta Kaihe'ekai, the wife of Alexander Kaukau, and Luisa Kapuana, the wife of Levi Kaiwi, both left their husbands for other lovers. Kapuana left her husband for only a short time,

⁵⁴ HBCFM, "Report of Committee on Gilbert Islands on the Tabiteuea Massacre, 1881," HMCS-Micronesia; Robert Maka, "Minutes of General Meeting of the Gilbert Islands Mission, 1873," HMCS-Micronesia; Morris, *Hawaiian Missionaries Abroad*, 307, 326, 412.

temporarily living with her Hawaiian expatriate lover before returning to Hawai'i with her husband. After several months of clandestine affairs with a pair of chiefly Marquesan brothers, Kaihe'ekai left Kaukau and the couple's children to live with the two. Despite repeated pleas by Kaukau and other HBCFM representatives, she refused to return to either Hawai'i or Kaukau. In 1899 the board expelled Zadaio Paaluhi over his molestation of a 13 year-old female neighbor, seemingly more concerned with his adultery than with the age of his victim or the issue of consent.⁵⁵

ABCFM missionary Rev. Snow also forced Mary Kahelemauna to confess to *moekolohe* in a bizarre incident in 1874. Mary, bed-ridden by illness while her husband was visiting a distant church, asked a "keiki," either a young man or a boy, for a massage. He then attempted to rape her during the massage. Mary grabbed him by the genitals and managed to push him off, but did not have the energy to remove him from the house, where he stayed overnight. Though the HBCFM missionaries tried to simply ignore the incident, ABCFM missionary Snow soon found out and felt the need to intervene. Though Snow was sympathetic to her plight, in his eyes Mary had fallen since she allowed the young man to massage her, despite this being a standard Pacific Islander medical practice. Furthermore, she failed to eject him from the house, despite being bedridden. After interviewing her, Snow temporarily ejected her from the congregation, demanded she not participate in the next communion, and proceeded to "help" her write a confession, which he read to the congregation while Mary stood on mute display. He then welcomed a properly humiliated Mary back into the congregation.⁵⁶

⁵⁵ HEA, "Report of the Committee on Foreign Missions on the Case of Rev. Z.S.K. Paaluhi, June 1899," HMCS-HEA; Alexander Kaukau to the Editor of the *Kuokoa*, April 3, 1866, HMCS- Marquesas; Kekela to Smith February 24, 1862.

⁵⁶ Simeon Kahelemauna to Pogue, August 24, 1874, HMCS-Micronesia; Benjamin Snow to Pogue, December 28, 1874, HMCS-Micronesia.

Numerous missionaries also engaged in some form of trading, usually to supplement their meager incomes. Official censures usually put a stop to this practice when *haole* traders complained the Hawaiians were encroaching into their territory. One missionary, Laioha, found himself in trouble with the HBCFM for moving around too often, though by the time they asked him to return to Hawai'i he had finally established a stable and growing flock. He compounded his sins, however, when he refused to leave and informed the HBCFM that the Catholics had expressed some interest in his teaching in their schools. Another missionary, J.D. Ahia, fell into a deep depression after the death of his wife and begun using alcohol and tobacco as well as distributing it among the people.⁵⁷

These incidents challenged the missionaries' veneer of Christian superiority in a number of ways and for a number of audiences. The main concern was the impact of the events on their host *lāhui*, including both converts and "pagans." Seeing their teachers fall could weaken both the will of converts and the authority of the missionaries. According to Kekela, Kaihe'ekai's adultery and her refusal to repent had a direct impact on his congregation at Puamau, writing, "And at the time that Kaiheekai wandered, from there they began to dwindle, and some people say outright, 'Ha! We thought Kaiheekai was truly a pious woman, come to find out, it was just deceit.' It is something that is a great obstacle to the work of God."⁵⁸

In addition to church members, however, the unconverted of their host *lāhui* stayed keenly interested in the failings of the missionaries and any signs of hypocrisy. After Kaihe'ekai left Kaukau, Kekela wrote:

⁵⁷ Samuel Kauwealoha to the Members of the Board, April 16, 1872, HMCS-Marquesas; G.W. Laioha to Gulick, May 7, 1868, HMCS-Marquesas; Maka, "Minutes of General Meeting of the Gilbert Islands Mission; J.F. Pogue, "Report of Rev. Pogue as Delegate of the Hawaiian Board to the Marquesas Mission, 1869," HMCS-Marquesas.

⁵⁸ James Kekela to Gulick, October 17, 1866; Snow, Snow to Pogue, December 28, 1874.

The natives of the land are stabbing, and hurting, and mocking us with different words indeed in our presence. ‘Ha! There are so many deceitful ones amongst you! You teach us, adultery is evil. There now is Kaiheekai; lost to adultery, the second of you that committed adultery, [Ka]Pauana was the first, and Kaiheekai was the second.’

In reporting on Hapuku’s turn to “witchcraft,” Kauwealoha and Kekela explained that through these events “the Kingdom of Satan has been planted and made to grow,” for news of it had gleefully spread around the island. In a letter to Hapuku, Kauwealoha told him that it was a great shame for the mission, and that even the Tahiti papers carried news of his follies.⁵⁹

To avoid the loss of faith among members and the public derision of the unconverted, their fellow missionaries or the HBCFM purged most missionaries who had been publicly compromised, hoping that such measures might recuperate the cracked façade of their superiority. Even Kaukau and Kaiwi were sent home, as they had become liabilities, tainted by the fall of their wives and a constant reminder of the fallibility of the missionaries. When faced with less public or less spectacular failings among their fellow workers, however, the Hawaiian missionaries often closed ranks, pursuing quiet agreements amongst themselves to help recuperate a fallen member without the interference of the HBCFM or local ABCFM missionaries. In cases such as John Nua’s grief-driven temporary insanity after his wife’s death the missionaries favored minor, private reprisals rather than the ejections and public humiliations favored by the *haole*. Nancy Morris argues that this reflected the practice of *ho‘oponopono*, the communal discussion of issues to restore and maintain balance. The Hawaiians sought to restore the balance within the missionary community while the *haole* sought to “ride herd” on the Hawaiians they perceived as less stable and inferior Christians. This led to a second

⁵⁹ James Kekela and Samuel Kauwealoha to Ka Papa Hawai‘i, December 22, 1892, HMCS-Marquesas; Kauwealoha to Hapuku, December 8, 1892; James Kekela to Gulick, November 22, 1865, Awaiaulu.

reason the Hawaiians may have felt it important to handle things quietly and internally, the fear of interference from the *haole* from the ABCFM or HBCFM. Snow's public humiliation of Mary Kahelemauna provided a perfect example of what could happen in such a situation, turning Kahelemauna's near-rape into a public spectacle that lowered the Hawaiian missionaries in the eyes of all involved. Such incidents also provided the *haole* with a chance to buttress their own claims of superiority over the Hawaiians.⁶⁰

When personalities clashed the HBCFM missionaries were more than willing to hang their brethren out to dry. For a few years after Nalimu joined Kapu on Tabiteuea, the two failed to get along and accused each other of numerous *hewa*. According to his 1872 report, Kapu claimed that Nalimu was spreading rumors that Kapu promoted idolatry, *hula*, and false teachings regarding the proper starting time for the Sabbath. In response, Kapu directly accused Nalimu of encouraging drinking and false teaching regarding the Sabbath. Later that year he again accused Nalimu of telling the people that drinking was acceptable and clarified that Nalimu taught that fishing, farming, and the lighting of cooking fires were all permissible on the Sabbath. In a letter from July of the same year, Nalimu accused Kapu of a range of crimes, from selling tobacco and letting his female domestics gossip, to threatening Nalimu with a stick, threatening the people with a warship, and telling people Nalimu had killed his dog. In 1874 the feud continued. Kapu accused Nalimu of striking his wife, claiming that only the presence of the local people, who pulled Nalimu off and threw him in a spring, prevented a severe beating.⁶¹

By the end of the decade, however, the two had clearly patched up their differences enough to cooperate in the events leading up to the massacre of the Tioba. The sheer scope of the Tabiteuea massacre was too large for the Kiribati mission to

⁶⁰ Morris, *Hawaiian Missionaries Abroad*, 194-5; Snow to Pogue, December 28, 1874.

⁶¹ Kapu to Pogue, July 15, 1872; W.B. Kapu, "Parish Report, Tapiteauea 1872," HMCS-Micronesia; W.B. Kapu to Pogue, July 31, 1874, HMCS-Micronesia; Nalimu, Nalimu to Pogue, July 26, 1872.

sweep it under the rug, even if they had wanted too. The HBCFM sent out their own investigators and recalled Nalimu and Kapu to Honolulu for a hearing in 1882. Although Tabiteuean oral histories named Rev. Kapu as the instigator and planner of the massacre, the less experienced and unordained Nalimu received the bulk of the board's wrath and he was removed from mission work. Kapu received a lecture and was sent back to Kiribati. After the death of his wife in 1886, however, Kapu's behavior become increasingly erratic, including making claims that he remained in communication with her spirit. Unlike promoting the slaughter of Islander heretics, this sort of sin could not be overlooked by the Board or Kapu's fellow HBCFM missionaries, who expelled him from the mission. He remained on Tabiteuea as a trader and power broker until the British finally removed him in 1892.⁶²

An even more vicious feud pitched Hapuku against Kekela and Kauwealoha, despite the trio having working together for decades and the marriage between Kekela's son and Hapuku's daughter. According to an October 1893 letter from Kekela, after he and Kauwealoha investigated the incident involving Hapuku's daughter's *ma'i daimonio*, they ordered Hapuku to return to Hawai'i. Hapuku refused, blaming Kekela for his daughter's possession in the first place, Kekela being unwilling to return the horse the *daimonio* had demanded. He also sent a letter to the board that claimed that his "enemies," Kauwealoha and Kekela, were jealous of his family because the Hapukus were popular with the people and the *haole*. Furthermore they looked down on him because he was not a Lahainaluna graduate like they were. Furthermore, Kekela and Kauwealoha both committed *moe kolohe*, Kekela with Tahitians and Kauwealoha with his *hānai* Marquesan daughters. In an 1894 letter he claimed that Kauwealoha was in trouble with traders and opium sellers, while Kekela was "*mai ma ka poo*," sick in the head. In 1895, upset that Hapuku had yet to repent and had not visited him during a long

⁶² Luomala, "A Gilbertese Tradition of a Religious Massacre," 21.

illness, Kekela called Hapuku and his wife stubborn and foolish, comparing them to Ahab and Jezebel. He also equated Hapuku with Lili‘uokalani, following the official post-overthrow HBCFM/HEA party line accusing the devout Congregationalist monarch of being a polytheist. He argued that she and Hapuku were the same in their giving of animals to demons and the *akua*.⁶³

Like all such claims, the HBCFM’s discourses of Hawaiian superiority contained numerous weaknesses. Many of these weaknesses could be silenced simply by ignoring them, which the missionaries frequently did. They carefully ignored, for instance, any signs of contemporary similarities between the Hawaiian *lāhui* and their host *lāhui*. The only Hawaiians admitted to be similar to the Marquesans and Micronesians were those Hawaiians of *ka wa na‘aupō* and the few stragglers lost to Satan in the present. They also acted to silence any signs of their own moral failings while in the mission field, whenever such a course was possible. When it was not, the missionaries sought to purge their rolls of the offenders, distancing themselves from the *na‘aupō* among themselves in the fear that the fallen among their number would cause their hosts, their American *mākuā*, and the Hawaiian *lāhui* to question their carefully constructed discourses of Hawaiian superiority.

Mission and Empire

The Hawaiian missionaries’ frequent collaborations with and support of Euro/American imperial projects in the mission field provides further evidence of both their identification of themselves as part of God’s earthly and predominantly-Euro/American Kingdom and their belief in and promotion of discourses of their own superiority over non-Protestant Islanders. The widespread belief that its status as both a

⁶³ Hapuku, Hapuku to Emerson September 5, 1893; Hapuku, Hapuku to Emerson, September 5, 1893 (2); Hapuku to Emerson, Feb 26, 1894, HMCS-Micronesia; Kekela to Emerson, October 19, 1893; Kekela to Emerson September 22, 1895.

treaty nation and a *lāhui na‘auao* protected the Kingdom from foreign aggression left the Hawaiian missionaries, and much of the *lāhui*, feeling relatively secure. Between this and the implicitly and explicitly pro-Imperial views they inherited from the ABCFM missionaries, the HBCFM missionaries had little interest in pushing back against the various imperial projects they interacted with. Indeed they often supported such projects, viewing them as a boon for the general spread of the *na‘auao*. As a *lāhui na‘auao* they felt that Hawai‘i deserved to remain independent. Their *na‘aupō* hosts, however, had persistently proven their inability to govern themselves. If they needed to be colonized for the *na‘auao* to spread, than so let it be done.

Because the Hawaiian *aupuni* had gained international recognition as a sovereign nation during the reign of Kamehameha III, few Native Hawaiian Congregationalists from the 1850’s through the 1870’s feared that they would become the targets of aggressive foreign empires. Indeed Hawai‘i’s status as an internationally recognized state was an essential part of the Hawaiian national identity, providing not just a guarantee of independence but also a legal anchor for Hawaiian claims of possessing greater *na‘auao* than other Pacific Islanders. In the 1860’s Reverend Charles Kalu gave a sermon on Moloka‘i at a feast on *La Kuokoa*, the annual November 28th holiday that celebrated the signing of treaties of recognition with France and England. Kalu pronounced that these agreements assured Hawaiian independence while the rest of the Pacific was swept up in various imperial nets. While many Hawaiians feared the undue influence of America in Hawai‘i, formal empire seemed to carry little threat under an internationally recognized *aupuni*. For the HBCFM missionaries, however, with their close ties of allegiance to the

mission-dominated American faction, both formal and informal empire seemed of little concern.⁶⁴

Indeed the New England heritage of the HBCFM/HEA led most of the Hawaiian missionaries to lean towards a general support of Euro/American imperial projects. In the seventeenth century both the Pilgrims and the Puritans took advantage of British imperial claims in North America to settle there, using bibles and bullets to “civilize” Native peoples out of their lands whenever they felt the need to expand. Their theological descendants in the ABCFM understood mission work within a broader belief in the God-given duty of expansion and paternal domination over North America, what would later be called Manifest Destiny. Yale President Timothy Dwight, who was a major influence on the ABCFM, promoted the underlying ideology of westward expansion as early as 1785 in *The Conquest of Canaan: A Poem in Eleven Books*. This epic poem uses the Israelite conquest of Canaan as a metaphor to argue that God had given the continent to the Americans and thus it was their duty to conquer it. Some ABCFM missionaries and administrators did oppose elements of American expansion and the associated loss of Native sovereignty, such as Jeremiah Evarts, who was one of the most active white opponents of Cherokee removal. It should be of little surprise, however, that most of the ABCFM missionaries were still quite comfortable with American expansion into the Pacific. Indeed they and their families were its main proponents in Hawai'i from the time of Kamehameha III until the end of the century. Their students, the HBCFM missionaries, inherited much of their pro-colonial attitude.⁶⁵

⁶⁴ “Editorial,” *Ka Hoku o ka Pakipika*, November 28 1861; Charles Kalu, “Ka Haiolelo O Hon. Cha. Kalu Imua Ona Kanaka O Molokai Ma Ka La 28 O Novemaba Iho Nei Maloko O Ka Halepule O Kaluaaha. , n.d.,” HMCS.

⁶⁵ John A. Andrew, *From Revivals to Removal: Jeremiah Evarts, the Cherokee Nation, and the Search for the Soul of America* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1992); Paul Boyer, *When Time Shall Be No More: Prophecy and Belief in Modern American Culture* (Cambridge, MA:Harvard University Press:

The French had already laid claim to the Marquesas by the time the HBCFM missionaries arrived there. Considering it a Roman Catholic Empire, the missionaries distrusted the French, but were encouraged by the French administrator in Tahiti who warmly welcomed them and granted permission to establish a mission in the Marquesas. He also sent a French warship to accompany them to Fatuhiva. A few days later, another French warship arrived with a Catholic mission and the HBCFM's distrust of the French returned in force. Over the next 22 years the HBCFM missionaries' views of the French followed this pattern, alternating between cooperation and a spirit of distrust and contempt of French Catholicism.⁶⁶

In 1875, however, when French warships arrived in Hivaoa to avenge the killing of one of their officials, the Hawaiian mission by and large turned to supporting the French Empire. Zachariah Hapuku celebrated the French soldiers coming to "teach" the Marquesans, and reported approvingly of the French willingness to shoot those who do not obey their "teachings." He then argued for more Hawaiians to come to the Marquesas, as now there was less to fear from the Natives since the French would protect them. In 1880 he further celebrated the French occupation. New laws forced children into the schools, punished and returned any student that ran from them, and forced adults to fund them. This was a definite boon for the mission schools, which had minimal success attracting or retaining students until the French occupation. The Lord had finally seen fit to fill their schools, albeit at the point of a Catholic bayonet. Kekela was particularly encouraged by a second French invasion in 1880, which resulted in the destruction of numerous Marquesan religious shrines and temples on the orders of the French admirals. He noted approvingly that the French also forced the Marquesans to build roads around

1992), 74 Op Cited; Timothy Dwight, *The Conquest of Canaan: A Poem in Eleven Books* (Hartford, CT: Elisha Babcock, 1785); Osorio, *Dismembering Lāhui*, 130-1, 224-5.

⁶⁶ Kekela to Clark, September 3, 1853.

the island, “as they do in *naauao* nations.” The fact that the people of Hivaoa were literally whipped into performing this work did not seem to bother any of the HBCFM missionaries. The presence of roads and churches was the mark of an enlightened land, and the HBCFM missionaries welcomed any progress towards ending the *na‘aupō*, even if it cost the Marquesans their freedom and the skin of their backs.⁶⁷

Samuel Kauwealoha had cooperated with the more established French presence on Uapou since 1865, where he doggedly attempted to build a flourishing school. He even held a *hō‘ike* for the French Governor’s visit in 1869, though a student “accidentally” burned the school down the next day. The peculiar timing of this accident seems to indicate that his students may not have felt as eager to please the French as Kauwealoha was. Kauwealoha also wrote approvingly of the occupation of Hiva Oa, noting that in addition to overturning the old *kapu* and destroying the *kapu* places, the French captured the two most prominent *kāula*, prophets. Imprisoning them in a pit and “encouraging” women to walk over their heads, the French effectively stripped them of their sacredness and of their utility as foci for resistance. The result of much this action, Kauwealoha reported happily, was that many chiefs now came to beg the HBCFM missionaries for teachers and a mission station, much as Matuunui had done thirty years prior.⁶⁸

As the French empire maintained their occupation following the 1880 action, the mission continued to collaborate with them on the “teaching” of the Marquesans. The schools remained the key point of interaction. Things were complicated, however, by an 1881 decree that all schools had to be taught in French. The French were slow to enforce this law, allowing the Hawaiians a few years to obtain a French Protestant teacher, Rev.

⁶⁷ Zakaria Hapuku to Clark, June 27, 1875, HMCS-Marquesas; Zakaria Hapuku to Bingham, October 9, 1880, HMCS-Marquesas; James Kekela to the Hawaiian Board, March 1881, Awaiaulu.

⁶⁸ Samuel Kauwealoha to Gulick, July 4, 1865, HMCS-Marquesas; Samuel Kauwealoha to Chamberlain, July 20, 1869, HMCS-Marquesas; Kauwealoha to Forbes July 28, 1881.

Sarran, from Tahiti. Kauwealoha, who had a long relationship with the French on Uapou, continued to praise them into the nineties. As far as his letters to the HBCFM show, he never really criticized them. Neither did Hapuku.⁶⁹

Rev. Kekela, on the other hand, soured on the French in the 1890s. In 1892, Kekela accused the French authorities of being law-breakers and scoundrels. His anger at the French seems to have stemmed from a French administrator who gave the Tahitian churches credit for the success of the Protestant schools. In 1895, while staying at the home of a French administrator, who, “[was] a kind man, and he hosts me and my daughter well,” Kekela universally condemned the French administration as “arrogant and law-breaking.” In 1898 Kekela denounced the French as second-rate colonizers, arguing that the British or Americans should have taken over, as they had in “Australia, New Zealand, Fiji, Samoa and Hawai’i, the ‘Paradise’ of the Pacific,” where colonization had brought true progress. Furthermore, the French were racists, as “they look to their own kind [of people], not to the *ili ulaula*.”⁷⁰

The relationship between Hawaiian missionaries and the British in Kiribati was somewhat different. To start with, the British were not Catholics, and many of the British missions in the Pacific were not just Protestant, but also connected of the London Mission Society, an ally of and inspiration for the ABCFM. In addition, formal occupation and administration only occurred in 1892, when the HBCFM as a whole was in its last gasps. Yet the islands fell under informal British authority for the entire span of the Kiribati mission. This led to frequent interactions with British Naval authority, which claimed the right to enforce sanctions in those islands as they saw fit. In nearly every case, the missionaries and the British saw and treated one another as allies.

⁶⁹ Samuel Kauwealoha to Forbes, March 23, 1881, HMCS-Marquesas.

⁷⁰ Kauwealoha to Hall, February 22, 1882; Samuel Kauwealoha to Emerson, January 26, 1892, HMCS-Marquesas; Kekela to Hyde, December 16, 1892; Kekela to Emerson, September 22, 1895; Kekela to Emerson, September 12, 1898; James Kekela to Emerson, June 31, 1898, Awaiaulu.

Holding the island of Abaiang captive in order to flush out the killer of a British citizen, the captain of one British warship captain advised ABCFM missionary Rev. Taylor and HBCFM missionaries Leleo and Haina that in the likely event that they bombarded the island, the missionaries would first be offered refuge aboard the ship. Later, upon hearing of the eventual capture and execution of the murderer from Leleo, Lono equated his teachings and the “teachings” of British Naval justice, “he obtained the last of the disobedience of the instructions of the missionaries. To disobey is death, to listen is life.” Robert Maka also happily reported on an 1887 law forbidding the selling of alcohol to the Kiribati, a touch of helpful providence through the hands of the British Empire. Though the establishment of formal British authority in 1892 resulted in the forcible removal of former missionary W.N. Kapu from the islands, many of Kapu’s former colleagues supported his removal, particularly Peter Kaaia, who accused him of trading and going over to the Catholics.⁷¹

The attempted murder of Joel Mahoe and the destruction of the ABCFM/HBCFM Abaiang mission station also brought the American Naval power into the picture in 1870. In response to an outcry by ABCFM supporters on the East Coast, the Navy ordered the USS *Jamestown* to visit the region and protect American interests, which apparently included the HBCFM missionaries. Through displays of overwhelming firepower and a thinly veiled desire to use it on Native homes and bodies, the captain of the *Jamestown* managed to get compensation for the damages to the mission as well as guarantees for the safety of future American and Hawaiian missionaries. Though he intended to hunt down Mahoe’s assailants, the Abaiang people told the disappointed American that the two had been killed earlier that year. The *Jamestown* then visited various islands and atolls

⁷¹ Samuela Ka’ai, “Na Mea Hoike No Ke Kipakuia O Kapu Mai Tabiteuea, 1892,” HMCS-Micronesia; Leleo to Pogue, April 24, 1876; Lono to Pogue, July 19, 1876; Robert Maka Forbes, August 31, 1887, HMCS-Micronesia.

throughout Micronesia, meeting with missionaries and local leaders to assure the safety of the missionaries and otherwise support American interests.⁷²

Seeing the concrete ways that the power and influence of empire benefited mission work, the HBCFM missionaries' greatest complaint about empire seemed to be that they lacked one themselves. In particular they lacked warships. In 1861 Kaukau reported that the valley Kauwealoha lived in had been overtaken by another valley, whose chiefs threatened to kill the Hawaiians since they had no warships. George Leleo witnessed the execution of the murder suspect mentioned earlier, who was tied to the cannon of a British warship and then fired through in the manner made famous after the Sepoy Mutiny. Leleo's only regret was not the brutality of the spectacle but that the king of Butaritari who had murdered three Hawaiians still walked free. The unstated implication being if the Hawaiians had a warship he would be similarly punished and the Hawaiians would receive the same respect as the British.⁷³

While they lacked warships, the Hawaiian missionaries did not lack for imperial ambition. During the Kalākaua era, when both Hawaiian nationalism and the King's foreign policy ambitions peaked, several of the missionaries tried to promote the creation or at least the illusion of a Hawaiian empire in order to strengthen their efforts. On Butaritari Kanoa and Robert Maka encouraged their chiefly patron, Nanteitei, to request a Hawaiian protectorate over the island in 1882. Remarkably similar petitions from Tabiteuea in 1878 and Abaiang in 1882 also hint at missionary inspiration, as these were among the most successful of the Kiribati stations.⁷⁴

⁷² Hawaiian Mission Children's Society (HMCS), *Annual Report of the Hawaiian Mission Children's Society, 1880* (San Francisco: C.W. Gordon Steam Printer, 1880), 42; Kahelemauna to Pogue, June 1, 1870; Morris, *Hawaiian Missionaries Abroad*, 141.

⁷³ Alexander Kaukau to Smith, January 3, 1861, HMCS-Marquesas; Leleo to Pogue, April 24, 1876.

⁷⁴ Kuykendall, *The Hawaiian Kingdom*, Vol. I, 313-314.

Though the Kingdom never actually declared any such protectorates, George Haina acted as if one actually existed on Abaiang when trying to arbitrate a peace between warring factions in 1878 and 1879. In a letter to Bingham Jr., he reported telling the chiefs, “You are friends of Kalakaua because your names are written in his book. His thoughts are *ao* and he commands us to talk to you folks, to live peacefully together, among one another.” According to Haina, one of the chiefs then responded, “‘We don’t want war,’ because he respected the enlightening words of Kalakaua.” In another account of his attempts to broker a peace treaty, Haina claims to have told them, “You are friends of Kalakaua, for you are living under the Hawaiian flag.” Like Haina on Abaiang, Nalimu on Tabiteuea favored a Hawaiian protectorate and sought to convince both the local chiefs and the Hawaiian government of the benefits of one. In a letter on the subject, he wrote, “this will be a good thing in our opinion if the government of Hawaii should regulate the evil deeds of these islands. This would speed up the advancement of the work of God in the Gilberts.”⁷⁵

While the *mō‘ī*, as the head of the Hawaiian *lāhui* and the *aupuni*, remained secure within the Hawaiian missionaries’ hearts and minds through the 1880’s, the 1893 overthrow forced them to pick sides between the *mō‘ī* and the ABCFM/HEA theocracy. From the official record kept by the HBCFM, it appears that the missionaries remaining in the field chose to put their support behind the “missionary party.” Based on the HBCFM records, Samuel Kaaia was the first of the missionaries to voice any opinion on the political happenings at home, stating his support for the new republic on November 9, 1894. “A republic for us [inclusive] at this time. Perhaps this is the Lord guiding us to the place that is needed for the *lāhui*. For Jehovah to care for Hawai’i, like his Republic that

⁷⁵ George Haina to Bingham, November 27, 1878, HMCS-Micronesia; Haina, “Parish Report of Tarawa, 1878-79”; Henry Nalimu to Bingham, February 4, 1879, HMCS-Micronesia.

will emerge in the end.” Noticeably, Kaaia referred to God’s former “Kingdom” as his Republic, neatly converting to the new party line while retaining the old millennialism.⁷⁶

After the Wilcox Rebellion of 1895, Kekela began to denounce Lili‘uokalani and the deceased Kalākaua. Lili‘uokalani received the worst of his bile, despite being only one of two *mō‘ī* to remain in the Congregational church since Kamehameha III’s death in 1853. On May 15, 1895 he wrote:

Great is God’s benevolence in sparing the Hawaiian Islands from the hands of the rebels, via Liliuokalani, the blood-thirsty Queen, of last January 1895. The two of them, Kalakaua and Liliuokalani are unfit rulers. They are chiefs who desire bad things. And God’s termination of the two of them from the Hawaiian throne is just. The time has come for *naauao* to rule over *naaupo*. "*Naauao* is far more lofty than *naaupo*." It is good if the Hawaiian Islands join with America.

Kekela continued his diatribe in another letter that September, stating, “The Kingdom of Jesus will be victorious, nothing can deny that, if we work for Jesus Christ...The overthrow of Liliuokalani was excellent. God ejected her from ruling over Hawaii.” In both letters, Kekela made it clear that he saw the overthrow and Wilcox’s defeat as the will of God. Kaaia displayed his loyalty to the mission party, and ostensibly to Jesus, by simply embracing the Republic. Kekela, however, went the extra mile, returning to the form of renunciation he learned a half-century earlier at Lahainaluna. Where once he renounced the Hawaiian past, he now renounced the Hawaiian monarchy. Decades later he still sought to distance himself from anything the American *mākuā* declared to be *na‘aupō*.⁷⁷

With news of annexation came another change in *aupuni*, now to the American government. Hapuku and Kekela received the news joyously, noting that the loss of the

⁷⁶ Samuela Ka‘ai to Emerson, November 9, 1894, HMCS-Micronesia.

⁷⁷ James Kekela to Emerson, May 15, 1895, Awaiaulu; Kekela to Emerson, September 22, 1895.

aupuni would be a benefit for the *lāhui*. As early as 1895, Kekela had written, “It is good if the Hawaiian Islands join with America.” When news of an annexation deal reached him in November of 1898, he stated with some pride, “I am an American now.” Hapuku voiced similar sentiments in 1899, stating, “Our joining with America is exceedingly correct, It is the one that will bring peace to the Hawaiian *lahui* ...The Hawaiian *lahui* owes a great debt to the children of the [ABCFM] missionaries.”⁷⁸

With few exceptions cooperation and mutual support typified Hawaiian missionary interactions with the representatives of imperial powers in the field. After all, the missions and the empires ran on similar logics, namely the right and responsibility of the *na‘auao* to teach and dominate the *na‘aupō*, of the superior to control the inferior. Since Christianity and “civilization” were seen as mutually inclusive, empires and missions saw each other as natural allies. Missionaries saw the “civilizing” influence of empires as a necessary component for the Christianization of the world. Empires perceived and supported missions as a relatively cheap tool for pacifying and indoctrinating Native peoples. This proved just as true when the missionaries themselves were Natives as when they were white. This was certainly the case with the HBCFM missionaries, who—despite relatively minor disputes with Catholic French authorities in the Marquesas—largely supported and were supported by Euro/American empires. In the end their largest complaint about empire seemed to be that they lacked the power and prestige that being part of an empire would have brought them. When their mission *mākua* forced them to choose between American empire and Hawaiian sovereignty, however, the few elderly missionaries remaining in the field finally gained that authority.

⁷⁸ Zakaria Hapuku to Emerson, March 9, 1898, HMCS-Micronesia; Kekela to Emerson September 12, 1898.

Host Perceptions

As with many other missionaries in the Pacific, Native or *haole*, the perception that the host Islanders had of the missions is difficult to discern through the words of the missionaries themselves. A proper examination of the topic would require not just a great deal of further research in different archives and different type of knowledge repositories, but also an in-depth understanding and knowledge of the societies, cultures, and histories of each of the host cultures that is outside the scope of this project. A certain amount, however, can be gleaned from the HBCFM records and secondary sources, particularly in the varying treatment the Hawaiians received from their hosts.

The actions of the Hawaiian missionaries and their clear belief in their own superiority often created a noticeable tension between them and their hosts. In most cases the Hawaiians initially received a cordial welcome, and at the very least their hosts usually tolerated their existence. In some cases, as with their initial stay with Matuunui in the Marquesas, their hosts often gave them land and resources in the hopes of seeing some sort of benefit from having foreigners living under them, a longstanding Pacific convention. Often they also received additional grants of land and other favors from local chiefs, as Kaaikaula did on Pohnpei. Their behavior, however, often resulted in a quick loss of welcome. Their perceived lack of generosity led to thefts and confrontations across the Marquesas and to the initial fallout between the mission and Matuunui, their original patron. It also led to a Tarawa chief killing three Hawaiian sailors in front of Maka, the chief being angered that the mission ship brought a year's worth of supplies to Maka yet brought him nothing.⁷⁹

Other acts show that their hosts often became unhappy with the actions of the missionaries and sought to vent this anger in some form. Some Marquesans, clearly annoyed by the moralizing of the Hawaiians, were quick to mock the missionaries

⁷⁹ Kaaikaula to Clark, January 31, 1854; Robert Maka to Parker, July 31, 1861, HMCS-Micronesia.

regarding the *moekolohe* of Kaihe'ekai and Kapauana, telling Kekela, "Ha! There are so many deceitful ones amongst you! You teach us, adultery is evil. There now is Kaiheekai; lost to adultery, the second of you that committed adultery." The Tiobans on Tabiteuea clearly resented the attempts of Kapu and Nalimu to preach in their meeting houses and the destruction of their holy objects, allowing themselves to be goaded into open warfare. Memory of the massacre and Kapu's actions after the incident also led the Catholic/former Tioba factions to push for the removal of Kapu. The "accidental" burning of Kauwealoha's school the day after the French Governor visited also seems suspiciously like an act of politically-motivated arson. Indeed, on several other occasions the Marquesans used fire to send a message to the missionaries. In 1866 the Kekela family awoke to a fire in their own home, which destroyed it. Everyone escaped, though the nearly blind Rev. Kapohaku nearly did not. Rev. Kapohaku and his family had already worn out their welcome with the chiefess who had initially welcomed him at Hekani. After chasing him out three times she burned down his home and stole his tools. Of all the Hawaiian missionaries and their families, however, only Mahoe on Abaiang received any serious intentional injury from their hosts, being stabbed during the sacking of the mission station in the 1860s.⁸⁰

The successes and failures of the missionaries might also have a lot to do with the way that their hosts perceived them. The success of Kapu's enthusiastic preaching on Tabiteuea indicates that though he was certainly hated by many in the south, he was much respected in the north. Despite rocky starts on Tarawa and elsewhere, the Kiribati missions met with a relatively high level of success, indicating that what the Hawaiians offered their hosts appealed to many within those communities. The enormous political influence of the Hawaiian missionaries in Kiribati, which peaked around efforts to cede

⁸⁰ Kaukau to Smith January 3, 1861; Kekela to Gulick November 22, 1865; Kekela to Gulick October 17, 1866; Maude, "Tioba and the Tabiteuean Religious Wars," 330-331.

some degree of sovereignty to the Kalākaua administration, also indicates that their hosts placed a high level of trust in the Hawaiians. Despite early provocations such as Mrs. Kahelemauna's grave desecration on Mili, the Marshall Islands' missions also met with some success. The ill regard most Marquesans had for the Hawaiian missionaries also corresponds with an extremely low success rate, on both the religious and educational fronts. Even there, however, some of their hosts did convert, indicating that for at least a few, the relationship with the Hawaiian missionaries may have been closer to how Lono described the situation on Maiana, "*Ua pili ko lakou aloha me au,*" their *aloha* clung tightly to me.⁸¹

Conclusion

In 1909, the last of the Hawaiian missionaries, Samuel Kauwealoha, died in the field after more than a half-century in the Marquesas. The last of the missionaries in Micronesia, Daniel Mahihila, had returned to Hawai'i five years earlier. Though the HBCFM had continued to reinforce the Micronesia mission into the 1890's, they had been trying to starve out the Marquesan mission since the 1860's. Any reinforcements there came from within the Hapuku, Kauwealoha, and Kekela families, elements of which remained active in the Marquesan church long after 1909. Numerous causes led to the eventual end of the missions. The extension of formal empires into Hawai'i as well as Micronesia led to diplomatic complications that hindered further work. Furthermore, cultural liberalization in Hawai'i and in the United States dulled the Puritan edge of the church, easing the insecurity that had driven Protestant mission work throughout the nineteenth century. Finally, by 1900 the end of the *haole* stranglehold on ministerial positions, which had been slowly weakening since the late sixties, allowed promising

⁸¹ Lono, "Lono, W.N. Journal."

young Hawaiian Protestants greater access to higher positions within the Hawaiian church hierarchy, taking some of the luster away from mission work.

The missionaries could certainly claim some successes in their half-century in the field. In the Marshalls, Kiribati, and the Marquesas, the Hawaiians left a lasting impact on the religious lives of their host *lāhui* through the Hawaiian/New England-accented congregations they left behind. In some cases these congregations were small enough to be almost negligible, but in others, such as parts of the Marshall Islands, many Protestants still trace their religious heritage back to Hawaii. Even among those who did not convert to Protestant Christianity, the Hawaiians and their defilement, desecration, and destruction left a significant negative impact on traditional religious, political, and cultural practices. Like the American missionaries, they also helped soften their hosts for eventual colonization.

The missions also fulfilled their purpose at home. They gave the Hawaiian churches a communal focus for fifty years, allowing church members to strengthen the *mālamalama* by extending it south. It also helped to shake some of the Hawaiian anxiety regarding their own Christianity, indeed it gave Hawaiian Protestants a point of pride that remained for decades after Kauwealoha's death. In the 1960's Mary Kawena Pukui, the renowned translator, anthropologist, and cultural icon, pointed to the Hawaiian missionaries as a badge of pride for herself and other Hawaiian Protestants, proof of their inherent religiosity and quick absorption of Christianity. Even for those commonly viewed as opponents of the ABCFM mission, such as the 'ahahui behind *KHOKP*, the HBCFM missionaries provided a concrete example of Hawaiian progress to challenge *haole* depictions of Hawaiians as half-educated, immature, and unsteady in all forms of the *na'auao*.⁸²

⁸² Mary Kawena Pukui; W.F. Jones' Rev E Kaupu; H Neuman, *Haw 108.11.1: Interview with Mary Kawena Pukui, W.F. Jones, Rev E Kaupu, and H Neuman* (Bishop Museum Archive), Audiotape.

Finally, in the relationships between the Hawaiians and other *lāhui* of the Pacific, the missionaries established concrete relationships and precedents for other forms of interaction. The petitions that Tan Teitei and others sent to Kalākaua, for instance, fueled Kalākaua's interest in a broader role for the Kingdom in Pacific affairs, which will be examined in the next chapter. The missionaries also laid the groundwork for attempts to bring in Kiribati people as immigrants, though they never played a major role in restoring the Kingdom's population as Kalākaua hoped, or in providing stable and cheap labor as the plantations intended. Furthermore, the missionaries established a precedent for Hawaiian relationships with other islanders in which Hawaiians sought to strengthen perceived alliances with the Euro/American empires by developing and acting upon a belief in their superiority in the *na'auao*.

CHAPTER 4: THE MŌ‘Ī, THE KINGDOM, AND THE WORLD: 1880-1887

On January 19th, 1881, King David Kalākaua began his historic voyage around the world with the most common of travel experiences: waiting for a delayed transport. The steamer *Australia*, which operated a passenger and mail route between Australia and San Francisco, had yet to come into port. Being the *mō‘ī*, however, Kalākaua’s waiting experience was far different than that of most travelers. He remained at the palace, a few short blocks from the harbor, and was being sent off by a massive collection of chanters, singers, dancers, and the Royal Hawaiian Band. Following Native protocol his well-wishers maintained a constant stream of music until the king left the shore, which did not happen until after the *Australia* finally steamed into Honolulu Harbor the next morning.

While waiting the king had ample opportunity to reflect on the present and future state of the Kingdom. In many ways the trip signaled the high hopes he had for the future of the Kingdom. His success convincing the United States Congress to sign a reciprocity treaty had proven a boom for the Kingdom’s economy. This, in turn, promised to provide the government with considerable income for internal improvements and other initiatives. The Kingdom’s diplomatic recognition had served him well in Washington, and in all likelihood it would continue to aid his efforts on his voyage as well. The king hoped the trip would further elevate the status of the Kingdom in the international community, strengthening its ties to the “Great Powers” as well as to other nations and peoples, particularly in Asia. The Kingdom had tremendous potential and Kalākaua relished the opportunities Hawai‘i’s future might present.

Yet the king also knew that recent international and domestic trends threatened the very existence of the Kingdom. Of key concern was the acceleration of worldwide trends of imperial aggression, the effects of which he would see on his journey. In recent decades Euro/American powers had increased both the rate and intensity of imperial land grabs and military actions. The pro-imperial worldview behind such aggression had also made its way to Hawai‘i, where many in the *haole* community had come to think that they, not a Native monarch or a largely Native electorate, had the right to rule over the islands. Foremost among this group were the American mission families, the “missionary party,” who saw the Kingdom as their birthright rather than that of the *lāhui*. Following in the footsteps of their parents, many persistently attacked Native ways and Native leaders as incompatible with self-governance, arguing loudly and persistently that the Kingdom required firm *haole* “guidance.”

The voyage would later prove to be one of a handful of pivotal moments during Kalākaua’s reign that shaped his understanding of the Kingdom’s present and future place in the world. The voyage pushed Kalākaua to greatly accelerate and enlarge his domestic and foreign agenda, focusing on increasing the strength and prosperity of the Kingdom and the *lāhui* while combating the menace of formal and informal empire. This chapter examines these elements of Kalākaua’s agenda during the middle period of his reign, between 1880 and 1887, when the coup that brought about the proclamation of the Bayonet Constitution effectively brought an end to Kalākaua’s ambitious domestic and foreign policy agenda. It argues that the king based many of his initiatives on a Hawaiian national culture that positioned the Kingdom as an heir to the cultural and political traditions of both Polynesia and Europe. At the center of this culture sat the monarchy, with the king/*mō‘ī* as the embodiment of both traditions.

As an heir to Euro/American political and social norms the Kingdom could make claims for the continued recognition of its independence by the Euro/American powers

and for its right, as part of the international community of nations, to participate in global politics. Contrary to the arguments of the mission-scions and their ilk, however, the Kingdom did not and would not make such claims by renouncing its Native past. Instead it embraced its Native heritage, promoting it as part of the national identity and arguing that it was what made the Kingdom special and distinct. By no coincidence this also made the implicit claim that Natives, and the Native monarchy in particular, had the right and the ability to effectively run such a Kingdom, while foreign governments or power-hungry settlers did not. The chapter ends with an examination of the king's plans for a Polynesian confederacy and argues that this was the logical outgrowth of his vision of Hawai'i as an explicitly Native independent state within the Euro/American-dominated community of nations.

Cultural and Political Contestation, 1819-1872

By the time Kalākaua came to the throne in 1874, various factions had been openly contesting for the right to shape Hawaiian national culture for nearly half a century. After the official cessation of Kaua'i in 1810, the Kingdom entered a period of cultural, social, and political stability that remained in place until the death of Kamehameha I in 1819. Underneath the surface, however, massive population loss, Kamehameha's own governmental reforms, and experiences with foreign customs resulted in significant changes within the Kingdom. Kamehameha's death signaled the beginning of a long period of conflict, including limited armed conflict, over the social, political, and cultural future of the Kingdom. Though it began with Ka'ahumanu's dismantling of the *kapu* system in 1819, the arrival of the ABCFM mission greatly accelerated the rate of change.¹

¹ Kame'eiehiwa, *Native Lands*, 81-82.

As noted in the first chapter, the mission depended heavily on Euro/American discourses of “progress” to support claims of superiority. They also promoted the idea that only those who had developed according to their standards could claim themselves worthy of self-governance. Indeed the mission went so far as to argue that Native culture and society doomed Native peoples, pointing to the massive deaths from Euro/American diseases as proof of the *na‘aupō* of Native culture. Following similar logics but different agendas, the imperial powers made several direct threats to Hawaiian independence that supported the mission’s arguments. The temporary British seizure of the islands in 1843, the French extortion of 1839, the landing of French troops in 1849, and even American threats regarding private debts in the 1820’s encouraged Kamehameha III to push through significant social and political changes. These changes, such as the Great Mahele, the decision to allow foreigners to become citizens, the decision to allow non-citizens to purchase land, and the constitutions of 1840 and 1852, brought the Kingdom closer in line with Euro/American norms. By no coincidence these actions all received the strong support of the ABCFM and other Euro/American settlers and helped to increase their power and influence.²

Even with these policy changes and international recognition of Hawai‘i’s independence, many Euro/Americans in Hawai‘i continued to argue that Native Hawaiians lacked the necessary pre-requisites for self-governance on the basis of their retention of Native Hawaiian culture. The ABCFM missionaries, as seen in the last chapter, declared all aspects of Native Hawaiian culture to be *na‘aupō*. While such arguments often had implicit racial foundations, by the 1850’s *haole* in Hawai‘i added an explicitly racial element to these arguments, claiming that Hawaiians, like all non-whites, were inherently unsuited for self-governance. The Committee of Thirteen, a group of

² Kuykendall, *The Hawaiian Kingdom*, Vol. I, 91-2, 165-6, 213-6; Osorio, *Dismembering Lāhui*, 44-6, 50-3, 85-9, 28-30.

haole agitators during the last years of Kamehameha III's reign, sought a white-led republic. At the heart of their agitation lay American racial discourses developed to protect the institution of slavery, which the Committee saw as a blueprint to rule over what their leader, George Lathrop, gleefully and publicly referred to as "niggers." Often *haole* with deeper roots in Hawai'i pursued "softer," more paternalistic strains of racism. Walter Murray Gibson, Kalākaua's right hand man and the main *haole* proponent of "Hawaii for Hawaiians," once commented:

I am a South Carolinian and believe somewhat in the subordination of races, and yet feel strong attachments to brown and black people. To these young men educated under Puritan congregational philanthropy the kanaka is a digger[sic], a darkey, while I view him as an interesting yet feeble younger brother.³

By the mid 1880's racism was so ingrained into the *haole* community that the *Pacific Commercial Advertiser*, both under Gibson's control and later as the main English mouthpiece for the missionary party, regularly ran racist "humor" pieces on the front page, usually pulled from mainland papers. In one such piece after Gibson's tenure, a political boss tells an Omaha museum man he will give him 5\$ for the votes of the museum's "freaks and curiosities from the Cannibal Islands and such places, half idiots most of them." Finding himself still short a few voters, the political boss then asks the museum man, "What's them freemen locked up in that there cage for?" The museum man replies, "they're Ourangoutangs [sic]," to which the boss replies, "they'll do." The multiple layers of racism in the joke apparently made for multiple layers of hilarity for the multiple layers of racists in the English-speaking community.⁴ Pro-imperial *haole* on the mainland and in Hawai'i would later employ such global discourses to promote the

³ Daws, *Shoal of Time*, 147-53; Osorio, *Dismembering Lāhui*, 199.

⁴ "Civilities of the Sarvice[Sic]," *Pacific Commercial Advertiser*, June 22 1889; "The Happy [III]," *Pacific Commercial Advertiser*, June 22 1889; B. Zim, "An Old Fable Retold," *Pacific Commercial Advertiser*, January 18 1884.

1887 coup, the 1893 overthrow, and the 1898 annexation. The mainland press, for instance, often portrayed Queen Lili‘uokalani in cartoons employing a variety of racial caricatures that borrowed liberally from stereotypical images of Africans, African Americans, and other non-whites. Written editorials portrayed her as a barely-civilized heathen thirsting for the blood of white men. The collective effect was to portray her as racially unable to rule herself or her people, let alone the white citizens and foreigners of her mixed-race Kingdom.⁵

Similar claims, in either its explicitly or implicitly racialized versions, supported Euro/American imperial and colonial projects around the globe. Indeed the discourse in Hawai‘i, as seen in Lathrop’s comments and the images of Lili‘uokalani, owed a large part of its heritage to these global discourses, particularly those involving African Americans in the United States. Such claims allowed, and still allow, its proponents to use virtually any aspect of Native culture to claim Native unsuitability for self-governance and thus justifying their own power grabs. As was the case in Hawai‘i, the indoctrination of such discourses of Native inferiority from the pulpit and the blackboard created a strong demoralizing effect, as well as a tendency to grant Euro/Americans political and cultural power at the expense of Native elites. It also established a set of requirements for self-governance so strict that only those who by definition fell within those requirements, Euro-Americans, had a reasonable chance to meet them. In the eyes of those same Euro/Americans, Natives who attempted to assimilate to Euro/American standards lost their traditions and the knowledge and value those traditions contained, but rarely, if ever, achieved acceptance as equals.

The relative wealth and power of Euro/American empires and persistent population decline among the *lāhui* seemed to support such claims, leading many Native Hawaiians to internalize some claims of Euro/American superiority. Indeed enough

⁵ Noenoe K. Silva, *Aloha Betrayed*, 173-180.

accepted it during the 1830s and 1840s that Euro/Americans, and the ABCFM/HEA in particular, quickly developed enormous power and influence in Hawai'i. In the latter years of his reign Kamehameha III did little to limit the power of the increasingly aggressive *haole* community. Indeed by 1854, the final months of his reign, the Kingdom's future independence seemed to be at stake. Lathrop and his gang openly preached rebellion and a racially stratified white man's paradise, while the American consul, backed in part by the ABCFM missionaries, sought to negotiate American annexation with the dying king.⁶

With the death of Kamehameha III, Alexander Liholiho came to the throne and quickly put to rest any and all plans to seize or annex the islands. Between 1854 and 1874 he and his brother, Lot Kapuāiwa, later Kamehameha V, acted to recover the political power of the *mō'ī*, renew the value of Native culture, and strengthen the independence of the *lāhui*. In order to do this they needed to weaken the power of the *haole* establishment, particularly the missionaries. As discussed in Chapter 2, the two encouraged a number of cultural and societal changes meant to counter the cultural power of the ABCFM missionaries and their allies. Certainly the most spectacular expression of this came during the reign of Alexander Liholiho, who oversaw the introduction of an Episcopalian mission and the departure of the royal family and much of the *ali'i nui* from the HEA flock. The Episcopalians offered a number of benefits to the *mō'ī*. They allowed the royals to break free from the religious control of the ABCFM/HEA without converting to Catholicism or refuting Christianity completely, either of which would have been a political disaster. It also created stronger ties to England, partially offsetting the American influence of the ABCFM/HEA. Finally, the ritual-oriented, conservative Episcopalianism they introduced was far more liberal than Congregationalism when it

⁶ Daws, *Shoal of Time*, 129-31, 147-53; Osorio, *Dismembering Lāhui*, 27-9, 91-2.

came to the practice of Native culture, providing a powerful Christian defender against the cultural attacks of the ABCFM/HEA.⁷

As would be the case during Kalākaua's reign, the last two Kamehamehas used their authority to shape a national culture that promoted the simultaneous embrace of Native Hawaiian and Euro/American culture. Their implicit and explicit promotion of certain elements Native Hawaiian culture acted as a counterweight to the actions of the ABCFM/HEA and their more dogmatic Native supporters, like Kekela. As the denunciation of practices associated with the Hawaiian past composed a major part of the ABCFM's efforts to retain cultural power in Hawai'i, the royal brothers' efforts weakened the ABCFM's cultural position and strengthened that of Native Hawaiian cultural practitioners. This fell in line with more direct efforts to limit the ABCFM/HEA's cultural power, like removing them from control of the government schools and replacing them with men like Episcopalian Bishop Staley and Abraham Fornander, a Swede known for his deep love and knowledge of Hawaiian culture.⁸

Between the two of them the brothers also oversaw an increase in the presence of Native culture in official life, particularly through the reintroduction of *hula* and chanting during state funerals. Kapuāiwa also worked to create a system of official licensure for the practice of traditional medicine, *lā'au lapa'au*, both under his brother's administration and during his own. The two also played a role in watering down attempts to ban *hula* performances, which the missionaries and planters saw as taking Hawaiians away from Christ and their "proper" role as agricultural servants. Though not the same as an open and explicit embrace of *hula*, the actions of the brothers clearly represented a implicit approval of *hula* and other "heathen" elements of Native culture, which *haole* and

⁷ Daws, *Shoal of Time*, 158-9; Kuykendall, *The Hawaiian Kingdom*, Volume II, 87-97.

⁸ HEA, "Sandwich Islands," *The Missionary Herald*, Vol. 61(1865): 364; Kuykendall, *The Hawaiian Kingdom*, Volume II, 108.

Hawaiian alike could and did recognize. As Colette Akana has found, this resulted in a cautious but increased sense of intellectual freedom during the brothers' reigns not found during most of the Kamehameha III era.⁹

Both kings, but Alexander Liholiho in particular, also established a reputation for the embrace of certain aspects of Euro/American cosmopolitan culture, including: introduction of the Anglican Church, the Victorian style of the court, and their patronage of the Euro/American arts. The two, along with fellow future king William Lunalilo, even participated in a rendition of *Lady of the Lake* in 1853 when all three were still princes. In that time *haole* of all stripes used possession of Euro/American culture to make claims of superiority over Native Hawaiians, who were assumed to lack the capability for such "refinement." The mission-educated, world-traveling Kamehameha brothers, however, made it clear that their own courts possessed such Euro/American-dominated cosmopolitan culture and the power associated with it.¹⁰

Not coincidentally these cultural maneuvers came at a time that many Native Hawaiians, similarly concerned about the growing power of the *haole*, were embracing Native nationalist discourses. Prominent intellectuals like Samuel Kamakau worked to shape a nationalist historical narrative through the Hawaiian-language press and other media. Much of this rested on two specific elements of Hawaiian history, one that celebrated the explicitly Native origins of the Kingdom and the other that celebrated the entrance of the Kingdom into the community of recognized nations. As one might predict the origin story of the Hawaiian Kingdom, particularly the conquests of Kamehameha the Great, played a prominent role in the new nationalism. Kamakau wrote a series of articles on the life of Kamehameha for *Nupepa Kuokoa* in the late 1860s, much of which was

⁹ Collette Leimomi Akana, "Kahuna Ho'opunipuni Letters of 1863," *The Hawaiian Journal of History* 36, (2002): 33; Silva, "He Kānāwai E Ho'opau I Na Hula Kuolo Hawaii" 40, 43, 45-6.

¹⁰ Daws, *Shoal of Time*; Royal Hawaiian Theatre, "Lady of the Lake (Program), 1853," HSA M-485.

later translated and published by Bishop Museum. In addition to strengthening a generic nationalism, this also helped to strengthen a specific Native nationalism that privileged powerful genealogies and a strong Native leadership. The focus on Kamehameha I also strengthened the position of his grandsons, Kamehameha IV and V.¹¹

Another focus of nationalist history was November 28, 1843, the date France and the United Kingdom recognized Hawai‘i’s status as an independent nation. As noted in Chapter 2, November 28th, *Lā Kuokoa*, was a national holiday in Hawai‘i from 1844 until the Republic period, when the mission/planter oligarchy replaced it with Thanksgiving. Since at least the reign of Kamehameha IV, late November included some tensions between the *lāhui*’s celebration of *Lā Kuokoa* and the ABCFM-promoted celebration of Thanksgiving, often associated with a remembrance of the ABCFM’s arrival in Hawai‘i. A *KHOKP* article that appeared on *Lā Kuokoa* 1861 acknowledges a certain degree of thankfulness for the missionaries but directly argued that *Lā Kuokoa* was of far more importance to the Kingdom and the *lāhui* than the mission’s arrival. Rev. Charles Kalu’s *Lā Kuokoa* sermon from later in the decade focused primarily on Kamehameha I and the events of 1843. Even among the *hoahānau*, it seems, *La Kuokoa* and the memory of 1843 trumped Thanksgiving and the memory of the ABCFM missionaries, neither of which found their way into Kalu’s speech.¹²

As an *ali‘i nui* and a member of Alexander Liholiho’s and Lot Kapuāiwa’s courts, Prince David Kalākaua was certainly aware of their efforts to shape Hawaiian national culture, weaken the cultural power of the ABCFM, and strengthen the cultural position of Native Hawaiians. Like them he embraced Native culture and foreign culture alike, seeing mastery of the two as the best rebuttal of mission-led anti-Native discourses. Yet his personal life also reflects an embrace of both as an integral part of his identity and his

¹¹ Nogelmeier, “Mai Pa‘a”, 152.

¹² “Editorial.”; Kalu, “Ka Haiolelo O Hon. Cha. Kalu”

lifestyle. His scrapbooks and journals from the time include a number of *mele* and *mo'olelo*, many of his own composition, as well as clippings from British and American scientific and technical journals, numerous Euro/American technical sketches, and diagrams of his own inventions.¹³

Kalākaua was also a key member of the *'ahahui* behind the newspaper *Ka Hoku o ka Pakipika*. Noenoe Silva has identified Kalākaua as an editor of the paper and Helen Chapin has identified him as one of its prime benefactors, as well as being the main support behind the later daily *Ka Manawa* and the literary journal *Ka Hoku o ke Kai*. In an undated note residing in the Hawaiian Mission Children's Society archive, Kalākaua denied that he had edited *KHOKP* but claimed to have contributed numerous articles for publication. Whatever his exact role was, it is clear that Kalākaua participated heavily in the creation and publishing of *KHOKP*, which was explicitly created to not just destroy the mission monopoly on print journalism but to give the Hawaiian readership forms of Native and foreign knowledge they felt the missionaries wrongfully withheld. J.H. Kanepu'u, one of the founding members, argued that the most important of these were *mele*, *mo'olelo*, and "news of foreign lands," the same sort of mix of foreign and Native knowledge that would later become the hallmark of Kalākaua's reign.¹⁴

The publication and content of *KHOKP* also mirrored the cultural efforts that Alexander Liholiho and Kapuāiwa undertook as *mō'ī* and there were also some indications that Liholiho might have quietly supported the paper. In a letter to the king, Abraham Fornander gleefully discussed the potential backlash against the ABCFM/HEA,

¹³ David Kalākaua, "Scrapbook 6.1, Typed Manuscript," Bishop-Monarchy; David Kalākaua, "Scrapbook 6.2, Typed Manuscript," Bishop-Monarchy; David Kalākaua, "Scrapbook 6.3, Typed Manuscript," Bishop-Monarchy; David Kalākaua, "Scrapbook M-14," Bishop-Monarchy; David Kalākaua, "Lawyer's Common Place Book, 1869," HSA-Kalaniana'ole Coll.

¹⁴ Helen Gracimos Chapin, *Shaping History: The Role of Newspapers in Hawai'i* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii, 1996), 59-61; David Kalākaua to (Damon?), N.D., HMCS-HEA; J.H. Kanepu'u, "Ka Hookumu Ana O Ka Hoku Pakipika: Helu 3.," *Ka Hoku o ka Pakipika* November 28, 1861; Silva, *Aloha Betrayed*, 63-64, 79.

who were attempting to kill the paper. “Their unceasing interference,” he wrote, “will be severely rebuked this time, not by ‘licentious and malignant foreigners’ but by their own well sheared lambs.” The tone of the letter certainly indicated that Fornander understood the king as a supporter of the paper. The government’s agreement to print *KHOKP* on the government press also indicated a certain level of royal support, as did the administration’s decision to lease the press to the anti-mission Fornander at around the same time.¹⁵

The very act of publishing an unambiguously pro-Native culture and pro-Native knowledge newspaper affirmed a new and more inclusive understanding of *na‘auao*. Furthermore, returning to the passage quoted in Chapter 2, the *‘ahahui* explicitly stated their acts to be those of the *na‘auao*, comparing their independent actions to the independent actions of the Hawaiian missionaries, “If the opposition conceals the *naauao* of the Hawaiian people, [by opposing independent newspapers] they might as well stop sending the missionaries to Fatuhiva.”¹⁶ The *‘ahahui*, implicitly through the act of printing and explicitly in the words they printed, claimed the mantle of the *na‘auao* for themselves and the *lāhui*. Furthermore they did so not because they turned away from all things that were Hawaiian, but rather because they had mastered the knowledge of the foreigners while retaining their own.

Around the World with the *Mō‘ī*

Unlike the Kamehamehas, Kalākaua rose to the throne not as the heir of the previous *mō‘ī*, but through a constitutionally mandated election. When Kamehameha V died he left behind no heir. According to the Kingdom’s constitution, this left the legislature to elect the new *mō‘ī* from the genealogically qualified candidates. Kalākaua

¹⁵ Abraham Fornander to Kamehameha IV, September 17, 1861, Bishop-Davis/Fornander Collection. Honolulu; Silva, *Aloha Betrayed*, 68, 71.

¹⁶ “Ka Hoku O Ka Pakipika,” 1861.

lost his first bid for election to William Lunalilo in 1873, whose higher genealogy and personality made him far more popular among both the *lāhui* and the legislators. When Lunalilo died in 1874, Kalākaua ran again, this time against Queen Emma, the beloved widow of Kamehameha IV and an *ali‘i nui* in her own right. As voting day grew nearer the election promised to be a close one and proved to be a nasty one. Kalākaua garnered the support of the English- and Hawaiian-language press while the Queen’s supporters promoted her through pamphlets, flyers, and speeches. In the closing days of the election Kalākaua switched his position on the issue of reciprocity with the United States, which he had previously opposed. This earned him the tenuous support of the American community and likely swayed the election in his favor. Upon hearing the election results, the crowd of Emma partisans waiting outside the legislature rioted and assaulted the Kalākaua electors. The new king had to call on British and American troops to quell the disturbance. The new *mō‘ī* thus started his reign on a rather unstable footing, hated by Emma’s supporters and in a mutually wary partnership with the American faction.¹⁷

Because of his precarious position in the early years of his reign, Kalākaua spent little of his limited political capital on cultural matters. Until 1880 his cultural position largely mirrored that of Liholiho and Kapuāiwa, permitting Native Hawaiian culture more than promoting it. Around 1878, however, this changed as the king found the needed political alliances and stability to undertake a public and ambitious series of projects to reshape Native Hawaiian culture. As art historian Stacy Kamehiro has argued, at this point Kalākaua began investing, economically and politically, in creating a legacy of nationalist art, celebrating the history and future of the Kingdom. This included the Kamehameha statue, which Kalākaua’s legislative leader Walter Murray Gibson proposed in the 1878, the construction of the current ‘Iolani palace between 1879 and

¹⁷ Osorio, *Dismembering Lāhui*, 150-5.

1882, a new Hawaiian coinage, and a new national anthem, *Hawai‘i Pono‘ī*, penned by the king himself.¹⁸

Two significant events in 1880 provided a catalyst that further accelerated the king’s nationalist agenda. The first occurred after the arrival of Italian “adventurer” Celso Moreno, a fast-talking schemer with connections, albeit strained connections, to powerful figures in Europe, the United States, and China. Seeing a fellow dreamer in the charming and well-traveled Moreno, as well as a potentially powerful tool to use against the missionary party, the king introduced a new cabinet featuring Moreno and cadre of the king’s Native supporters. A threatened revolt by the *haole* establishment and news that Moreno’s actions in Washington had turned many of his powerful friends into powerful enemies led the king to ask for Moreno’s resignation. He then appointed a conservative cabinet more inline with the *haole* establishment’s wishes. By no coincidence, this was also the first all-*haole* cabinet of Kalākaua’s reign. Despite this setback the Moreno incident marked the first clear indication that the king planned a political break with the missionary party.¹⁹

The second major event of 1880 came when the king, still dealing with the Moreno fallout, revealed plans to circumnavigate the world. While the trip served certain explicit foreign policy aims, specifically in encouraging immigration from Japan and India, the journey played a more significant role in informing Kalākaua’s foreign and domestic policy decisions in the ensuing years of his rule. Other *mō‘ī* had traveled abroad before and such travels often left a clear impact on their domestic and political agendas. Kamehameha II had traveled to Britain early in his reign, hoping to find a British counterweight to Ka‘ahumanu’s ABCFM allies. He succumbed to measles soon after

¹⁸ Stacy Kamehiro, *The Arts of Kingship: Hawaiian Art and National Culture of the Kalākaua Era* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2009), 55, 82, 85-6.

¹⁹ Kuykendall, *Hawaiian Kingdom*, Vol. III, 207-224.

arrival in England. In 1849 Alexander Liholiho and Lot Kapuāiwa, then princes, accompanied Dr. Gerrit Judd on a trip to the United States, Britain, and Paris, hoping to gain some form of indemnity for the French seizure of the Royal Yacht *Kamehameha* and destruction of the harbor fort in Honolulu. Their warm welcome in England and experiences with racism in America contributed to the Kingdom's shift towards England during their reign. Kalākaua had traveled to Washington DC earlier in his reign, where he helped persuade the Congress to accept a reciprocity treaty. His plan for a circumnavigation of the world, however, surpassed any other journey taken by a Hawaiian monarch in terms of ambition and length. Indeed it was the first circumnavigation of the world undertaken by any sitting head of state.²⁰

The King's Reception Abroad

Kalākaua started his journey with a short trip to San Francisco, whose Chinese and American residents welcomed him with banquets and toasts. He then traveled to Japan, where the Emperor hosted him with full honors. He made several stops in China, including Hong Kong, before heading to the Indian sub-continent by way of South East Asia. After several stops in India he headed north through the Red Sea and the Suez Canal before entering the Mediterranean. He stayed briefly in Egypt and Italy, meeting with the Khedive and the Pope and checking in on several Native Hawaiian students he had sent to Europe under the care of Moreno. He stayed in Western Europe for the majority of the social season, where he made a small but noticeable splash among the European elite, particularly in England. He then returned to the United States, landing in New York then traveling by rail to San Francisco for the voyage home.²¹

²⁰ Kuykendall, *The Hawaiian Kingdom*, Vol. I, 77-9; Kuykendall, *Hawaiian Kingdom*, Vol. III, 23-5; Alexander Liholiho, *The Journal of Prince Alexander Liholiho, the Voyages Made to the United States, England, and France in 1849-50* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1967), ix, 108-109.

²¹ Kuykendall, *Hawaiian Kingdom*, Vol. III, 228-35.

The trip reinforced Kalākaua’s trust in the diplomatic and political capitol available to the Kingdom, and to himself, due to Hawai‘i’s treaty status and international recognition. In military and economic strength, of course, the United States, France, Germany, and the United Kingdom dwarfed Hawai‘i, but in the legal and ritual world of international diplomacy Hawai‘i retained a technical equality. In addition, through his own charm, the good treatment of the citizens of other countries in Hawai‘i, and the exotic lens through which many Euro/Americans viewed the Pacific, the king also experienced a general good will beyond that demanded by international etiquette. This came as a great surprise to his mission-scion escorts, who the “missionary party” had foisted upon him at the start of his voyage.

After the Moreno affair the king made a number of concessions to gain the support of the missionary party for his trip and Lili‘uokalani’s regency during his absence. He wished to travel as a reigning monarch, with the trappings that would entail. The missionary party, fearing the expense of such an undertaking and expecting foreign powers to give the king as little respect and credit as they did, convinced him to travel “incognito” as “Prince Kalākaua.” Of course such a pretense was laughably thin and nearly everywhere he went Kalākaua was received as the sovereign of an independent people. The king also selected a Hawaiian, John Kapena, and an Englishman, George McFarland as his traveling companions. The missionary party, however, insisted that two of their own accompany the king, Attorney General William Armstrong and the king’s Chamberlain, C.H. Judd, both of whom had been schoolmates of the king’s some thirty years earlier. Armstrong had gone to college on the mainland and served briefly in the American diplomatic corps before returning to Hawai‘i a few short weeks before the tour.²²

²² William N. Armstrong, *Around the World with a King* (New York, F.A. Stokes Company, 1904), 9-10; Terence Barrow, “Introduction to the New Edition,” in William N. Armstrong *Around the World with a*

Like many other mission scions, Armstrong thought of the tour as a chance to humble the king. He received quite a surprise, however, when the king received a warm welcome across the globe, often from individuals of great wealth and power. Even Kalākaua himself seemed slightly taken aback by his reception, though from the start he had more confidence than his escorts in how a largely imperial world would receive a Native king. Though supposedly traveling “incognito,” the king had little desire to appear as “Prince Kalākaua” and had secretly packed the royal standard. As the *City of Sidney* entered San Francisco, the ship’s captain gave Kalākaua what little encouragement he needed to drop the farce and unfurl the royal standard. Armstrong and Judd favored a quieter entrance, perhaps a completely silent one, as “a modest introduction to San Francisco would befit the entrance of the monarch of a midget kingdom into the domain of a great republic.” The king, however, had been received warmly in San Francisco during his previous trip and many of the city’s residents had previously received the king’s hospitality in the islands, leading to a royal welcome.²³

Part of Armstrong’s expectations stemmed from a belief that the citizens of the city would not welcome a “coloured” man, regardless of his royal status. Though 1880 white Americans had a clear pre-disposition to virulent racism, Armstrong might have simply been projecting his own particularly strong anti-Polynesian biases. Implicitly referencing rumors swirling in the *haole* community, namely a rumor that the king’s “true” father was an African American blacksmith, Armstrong noted that the king was “unusually dark for a Polynesian, and several of his features suggested negro inheritance. But [in San Francisco] the generous citizens of both sexes smothered antipathies, if they had any, and, rising to the occasion, cordially declared that black was white.” Race

King, (Rutland, VT: Charles E. Tuttle Company, 1977), xix. (All citations from the text of Armstrong come from the 1904 version)

²³ Armstrong, *Around the World with a King*, 13-15.

played such a significant role in how Armstrong understood the world, including his relationship with his ruler and childhood playmate, that he was shocked to witness a “coloured” king embraced by white Americans.²⁴

As in San Francisco, the king unfurled the standard in Tokyo Harbor, again with the encouragement of the ship’s captain and other passengers. The Japanese, who had been alerted by their contacts in San Francisco, spared little expense in welcoming the king. The Russian, French, British, and Japanese warships in the harbor all saluted the king. Being the first sitting head of state to visit Japan, the people of Tokyo celebrated Kalākaua’s arrival in the streets while the Emperor welcomed the king and his party with the highest levels of formal protocol. The welcome crushed Armstrong and Judd’s hopes that the voyage would humble the king, while bringing into reality their fears that international recognition of a “midget kingdom” might elevate the king’s ambitions.²⁵

The Japanese leg of the voyage clearly strengthened Kalākaua’s belief in the importance of the Kingdom’s diplomatic status and his desire to use that recognition to forward his agenda. The rapid industrialization and reorganization of Japanese society amazed the king and his party, who noted that the Japanese were quickly catching up to the European nations in knowledge and technology. Despite this, they still suffered under the unequal treaties that the United States and the other powers had forced on them decades earlier. Due to Europe and America’s recognition of Hawai’i as an independent and technically equal member of the international community, Hawai’i enjoyed diplomatic privileges that Japan lacked. Indeed Hawai’i even held unequal though largely symbolic treaties with Japan, having ridden in on the coattails of the Americans. Seeing the chance to improve Hawaiian relations with a rising non-Euro/American power, which was as opposed to further Euro/American imperial growth as Hawai’i was, Kalākaua

²⁴ Ibid.

²⁵ Ibid., 27-45.

pledged that Hawai'i's treaties with Japan would be amended to recognize equal relations between the two. Hawai'i's changes to the treaties would present a crack that the Japanese could exploit to break the diplomatic fetters the great powers had imposed on them. Pressure exerted by European and American diplomats, however, later killed Hawai'i's plans to alter the treaties, much to the disappointment of Kalākaua and the Japanese.²⁶

After Japan the king largely dropped any pretense of traveling incognito and traveled openly as a monarch for most of the journey. He received warm and official welcomes from leaders across the globe, aided in no small part by his status as the sovereign of an independent nation. Even in China, where the king's desire to meet the Emperor were rebuffed, Viceroy Li Hang Chang provided the party with accommodations and received them at an official dinner. Typical of any long voyage of the late-nineteenth century, the king was frequently in or near the British Empire. Being the sovereign of an independent nation with friendly relations with the United Kingdom, Kalākaua received particularly grand welcomes from British administrators from Hong Kong to Calcutta, who were often as starved for social novelty as they were overwhelmed with their own wealth and power. This occasionally took the king by surprise. In Hong Kong the British Governor met his ship in the bay, demanding the king stay as his guest throughout the visit. He also threw several massive and opulent state functions in the king's honor. Even in countries that had no diplomatic relations with Hawai'i, local dignitaries rolled out the red carpet. In Bangkok King Chulalongkorn, having obtained the king's travel plans from his representatives in Hong Kong, sent officials to offer the king an official greeting and the full hospitality of the palace. A similar incident occurred in Cairo, where the party unexpectedly found themselves the unexpected guests of the

²⁶ Ibid., 48-51.

Khedive. Hearing of the reception Kalākaua had received in Asia, the Khedive felt the need to prove that Egypt was no less welcoming a place than Siam or Japan.²⁷

While the king's welcome stemmed from his position, his popularity among his hosts was aided by his own familiarity with elite Euro/American cosmopolitan culture. This familiarity granted him a social common ground that he shared with heads of Empire like Queen Victoria, Western-influenced heads of the few remaining independent Asian states, like Mutsuhito and Chulalongkorn, and the various local elites and imperial functionaries he encountered. Kalākaua's embrace of and fluency within this elite culture allowed him to make the most of the opportunities his status granted. The male aristocrat's love of horses, for instance, formed a common bond between Kalākaua and the Khedive in Cairo. Indeed the Khedive was so impressed by the king's knowledge of horse breeding that he offered the king one of the prized horses in his stable. In San Francisco General Emory Upton, the author of the influential text *The Military Policy of the United States*, spent a great deal of time with the king discussing military strategy and history, commenting that the king's knowledge of maneuvers and strategy surpassed that of most officers then serving in the US military. He would know, having trained many of them as commandant of the United States Military Academy.²⁸

In Japan Kalākaua began participating in another martial element of elite "cosmopolitan" culture, the ritualistic exchange of medals and honors. While the exchange of such honors had a particular appeal to the Japanese, they were an established element of cosmopolitan elite culture, one which Kalākaua himself took full advantage of. After Japan Kalākaua became an enthusiastic collector and presenter of such honors. By the end of his journey medals from across the world covered Kalākaua's chest and

²⁷ Ibid., 91-6, 104, 118, 158.

²⁸ Ibid., 15, 191.

members of the Orders of Kalākaua and Kamehameha were scattered from Tokyo to Wales.²⁹

In Europe, particularly England, the king's charm and grasp of Euro/American culture allowed him to become something of a minor celebrity. The newspapers tracked his moves, listing his itinerary alongside those of the British royals, who he was often in the company of. To be sure, some of this was a result of a certain level of "exotic" appeal that the king held for London's elite. Dark-skinned and standing over six feet tall, the king made an impressive visual statement at most functions, usually clad in a self-designed military uniform, chest covered with the ribbons and medals. Armstrong noted the excited whispers of many English elites, who did not know that Armstrong was part of the king's entourage, wondering if the rumors were true that the king had thirty wives and his grandfather was a cannibal. At the same time, however, the king's British-accented English and social graces also endeared him to the British elite, who saw him as an exotic racial other, but still a comfortably British-mannered other.³⁰

While his status as a monarch and his personal graces allowed the king access to and opportunities for social success among Euro/Americans, he also had the advantage of previous connections to elite cosmopolitan social and cultural circles. Throughout California, for instance, the king's hospitality earned him many elite friends who had partaken of his generosity in the islands. The king's high standing within the Freemasons granted him further access, as in Cairo where he gave a speech for local masons, mostly French and British citizens. The success of that speech impressed the attending masons a great deal, increasing the king's European reputation for intelligence and charm.³¹

²⁹ Ibid; Richard A. Greer, "The Royal Tourist—Kalākaua's Letters Home from Tokio to London," *The Hawaiian Journal of History* 5 (1971): 76-7, 83-4, 99-100.

³⁰ Armstrong, *Around the World with a King*, 216, 217, 225, 230-231.

³¹ Ibid., 15, 196-7.

In England the king also tapped into a long history of elite connections between the British and Hawaiian royalty. Kamehameha the Great, for instance, had unsuccessfully sought such connections through emissaries during his reign and Kamehameha II attempted to create them personally, though he lacked the social, cultural, and diplomatic connections Kalākaua would later take advantage of. Kamehameha IV and V, as noted earlier, had notably warm feelings for the British and had met the queen and other members of the Royal family in the late 1840s. Liholiho and Queen Emma even named their son Albert in honor of Queen Victoria's consort. Queen Victoria and Queen Emma, whose grandfather was British, developed a friendship through the post. In 1865, still grieving over the deaths of her son and husband, Emma traveled to England as a guest of her sister queen. This particular relationship formed Queen Victoria's primary association with Hawai'i, a particularly happy one that she cited as part of her enthusiasm for Kalākaua's visit. The king, understandably, did not see fit to explain the political tensions between himself and Emma.³²

While all of these contributed to the British royals' warmness for Kalākaua, none of them carried as much weight as Kalākaua's efforts to host Victoria's son, Prince Albert, the Duke of Edinburgh, more than a decade earlier in Hawai'i. Albert had visited the islands during the reign of Kamehameha V and received the full hospitality of the Hawaiian elite. Kalākaua, who always had a touch for entertaining, threw his fellow prince a lavish Hawaiian style *lā'au*, featuring Native foods, *mele*, *'oli*, and *hula* in the peaceful surroundings of one of the valleys behind Honolulu. The event left a major impression on the duke, who reported on the affair to the royal family. During the king's visit the British royals recalled Kalākaua's hospitality. Unable to meet Kalākaua in person, being deployed in the Baltic at the time, Albert sent the king his greetings and asked his brother Edward, the Prince of Wales to see to the king's every need. Edward,

³² Ibid., 225.

however, needed relatively little urging, having been interested in Hawai‘i and Kalākaua since his brother’s return from the islands.³³

Empires and Natives

Until his voyage the king had little direct experience with the operation of formal empire or with other peoples targeted by empire. He had been to the United States, but like many settler states the Americans made significant efforts to erase both Natives and their imperial nature. He also frequently dealt with the representatives of empire in official and unofficial settings, but he did so as the sovereign of a recognized nation within that nation’s borders. On his voyage, however, he witnessed firsthand the operation of formal and informal empire, particularly within the British Empire, allowing him the opportunity to observe and meditate on empire in both the abstract and the concrete. The voyage forced him to put further thought into where Hawai‘i stood in a world increasingly split between those who possessed empires and those possessed by them, and what he could do to retain Hawai‘i’s independence.

As Armstrong’s memoirs of the voyage are the most complete record remaining, much of the king’s reaction to empire has to be drawn from those writings. The glory of empire and what Kipling would later call “the white man’s burden” had a deep hold on Armstrong’s soul, as it did for many of the second and third generation “Hawaiians” descended from the mission. As Armstrong took it upon himself to “educate” the king on the ways of the world during his trip, usually by trying to convince him to follow the missionary party’s wishes at home, he occasionally attempted to engage the king on the topic of empire. In India, for instance, Armstrong fawningly described the ability of a relative handful of British to rule over a land many times larger and more populous than England. He sympathized with the “brave” bureaucrats, writing that they faced something

³³ Ibid., 215.

far worse than the “negro problem” in the United States, as at least the “the eight millions of American negroes speak the English language, outwardly conform to Christian doctrine, and have the habit of subservience to the stronger race.” When Armstrong began fawning over the brave British and their troubles in India, Kalākaua, despite his Anglophile tendencies, expressed little sympathy for them. “The British,” the king replied, “had foolishly gotten into a scrape and would have to get out of it the best way they could; they had...meddled in other people’s affairs, and their fingers were burned.”³⁴

A similar situation occurred in London, where Armstrong again attempted to engage the king in the celebration of empire. Though he admitted that the British had mercilessly bombarded cities and massacred men, women and children, Armstrong listed the many “good” deeds of the empire. They had established “law and order,” across a quarter of the globe and guaranteed safe trade throughout their territory, not just for themselves but for “the Frenchman, the German, the Russian, and the American on the same footing as the Briton.” The king, taking his morning tea in an elegant London Hotel, asked of Armstrong, “What is there in all of this for me?” Despite his infatuation with the British Empire, Armstrong had to admit the king’s point, for those at risk of falling prey to empire its supposed benefits to other Euro/Americans were beyond meaningless, they were an insult.³⁵

During the trip Kalākaua frequently engaged in and encountered indirect critiques of the supposed cultural superiority of Europe and America. In part this came from discussions with others like him, Native elites, educated and experienced in Euro/American politics and culture, but still loyal to the independence and ways of their own people. In Egypt the king and his entourage expressed some interest in the former Khedive’s harem, which the monogamous current Khedive continued to maintain. “Sami-

³⁴ Ibid., 160-170.

³⁵ Ibid., 219.

Pasha,” the official assigned as their guide and escort, explained that the harem’s occupants would likely express more than a little discontent with the boundaries of their life if they had experienced the freedom of European women. On the whole, however, he felt that Egyptian women lead happier lives than European women, particularly among the poor. Christendom had much to boast of, but in their debauchery and treatment of women it had much to atone for as well. Of course care must be taken with the word of elite male nationalists regarding their treatment of women. As Euro/American empires frequently used both real and imagined ill treatment of women among other peoples to validate their own claims of superiority, such a counter claim contained an anti-colonial critique that would have appealed to the king.³⁶

The king also took a clear joy in swiping at certain aspects of Euro/American culture, particularly its sacred cows. In Egypt, during one of his frequent bouts of imperial reflection, Armstrong waxed poetically about being in a place so rich in history, specifically Shakespearian-derived Roman history. The shared British and American obsession with Rome, their collective view of themselves as the heirs of Rome, and their dedication to spreading their supposedly Roman-derived civilization elevated Romanophilia to a near religion in both empires. In Egypt, Armstrong swooned at the thought of standing on the same ground where Caesar received Pompey’s head, where he fell in love with Cleopatra, and where Mark Anthony died as a result of his love for the same woman. The king cut Armstrong off, stating simply, “Those Romans you are talking about only made asses of themselves for a woman.” In addition to winding up Armstrong, which the king seemed to take great pleasure from, the king also expressed an implicit disregard for the Roman-philia of the British and Americans, as well as their imperial inheritance.³⁷

³⁶ Ibid., 185-6.

³⁷ Ibid., 194.

As the royal party left San Francisco for Honolulu, the last leg of the journey, Armstrong asked the king what lessons he had learned from the voyage. The king surprised Armstrong by stating that the clearest lesson he had learned from his voyage was that his people, “were already better off than the majority of the people in the many lands we had visited; they had enough to eat and wear, and they were certainly happier than any people he had seen.” Armstrong replied that the king’s people were dying. The king admitted this was true, but then reminded Armstrong that that death came from abroad, and from Euro/Americans in particular. Even conceding that the missionaries had done some good, the king stated that for every one of them that did good, a hundred of their countrymen arrived who negated them. In the end the voyage confirmed what the king had believed all along, that his people were better off living as an independent Native people. Neither imperial rule nor efforts to dispose of their own culture and emulate those of Europe and America would bring them greater happiness. The king’s statements rebuffed Armstrong’s assumptions of innate Euro/American superiority, which Armstrong had hoped the voyage had impressed upon the king. Instead the king rejected the worth of empire on the lives of its subjects in both the metropole and in the colonies, as well as explicitly portraying Euro/American ways and actions, not Native ones, as the cause of Hawaiian distress.³⁸

Despite his somewhat flippant reply to Armstrong, the king did take away a number of lessons from the journey, particularly regarding potential futures for Natives and Native states. While the journey gave the king a firsthand view of the octopus-like grip of empire upon the world, it also gave him a chance to reflect on the diversity and value of ideas found among non-Euro/American peoples, including Native Hawaiians.

³⁸ Ibid., 277.

On the very first leg of the journey, from Honolulu to San Francisco,³⁹ Kalākaua spent much of his time discussing the Hawaiian system of astronomy with, “a well-known Englishman, a lecturer on astronomy, returning from Australia.” While Armstrong dismissed these “semi-scientific conversations,” they provided Kalākaua with further proof that Hawaiian knowledge could be of value not just to Hawaiians, but to outsiders as well.⁴⁰

In Japan Kalākaua also noted that the retention of older traditions could offset or even preempt claims of Western exclusivity to the creation of intellectual and scientific knowledge. At a Buddhist temple with a statue of a monkey, Kalākaua asked a young priest about its significance. Among other factors the priest mentioned was a story that one of the Chinese monks who brought Buddhism to Japan had promoted a belief that men had descended from monkeys. This potential non-western parallel to evolution excited Kalākaua, as it denied Europe as the sole creator of useful knowledge. Kalākaua also looked for religious parallels between Buddhism and Christianity, hoping to locate an Asian origin for European religion. He wrote of a Buddhist ceremony in Japan, “one is struck with comparative likeness of the devotional services of the Roman and Greek Catholic churches which is nothing else than a copy of the Buddhist ritual service throughout.” Kalākaua also noted, somewhat incorrectly, the similarities between, “the godhead of Christian religion as well as his human attributes, with that of the Buddhist which existence was long anterior to the Christian date.” Again the concept of non-western knowledge preceding, and even creating, western knowledge and practices interested Kalākaua. In another example of valuing Native knowledge over that of the Euro/Americans, and also foreshadowing the post-colonial linguistic trends of the

³⁹ Because of the lack of reliable service from Honolulu to Japan, the king needed to travel east to San Francisco before heading west to Japan.

⁴⁰ Ibid., 13.

twentieth century, the king wrote that he supported ending the usage of the western term Japan in favor of Nippon, which the Japanese used in formal situations.⁴¹

The Japanese also strengthened Kalākaua's belief that a Native state could adapt foreign technology and culture to their own needs while still retaining their own identity and national culture. The Japanese, for instance, printed their own money, created an Imperial college for engineering, modernized their army, and had sent a number of students to the United States and Europe. Yet while the Japanese still employed numerous foreign advisors, they replaced these advisors as soon as a suitable Japanese replacement had been trained. This was far different from Hawai'i, where *haole* "advisors" often justified their continued employment by arguing Native Hawaiians lacked the necessary requirements or initiative to even receive training.⁴²

Despite the rapid "modernization" of the Meiji period, the Japanese still retained their cultural distinctiveness, just as Kalākaua felt his own people must do. Western-style diplomatic affairs alternated with tea ceremonies, visits to imperial colleges and printing presses alternated with visits to temples and shrines. Japanese Zen Buddhism particularly attracted the king's interest, to the point that he even suggested introducing it among his subjects. Even in the largely westernized setting of the court, Kalākaua noted, "politically the old style grandeur of its rulers, their Antique chivalry with its state ceremonial costumes have only assumed a new form." Kalākaua presented Japanese selective retention and adaptation in a most favorable light, noting that in some ways it allowed the Japanese to surpass the West. On the subject of military training he wrote, "the manner of fencing or handling of the Japanese double-handed sword is a wonderful thing and might be introduced to all naval and military schools." He also expressed a preference for the

⁴¹ Greer, "The Royal Tourist—Kalākaua's Letters Home from Tokio to London," 90; David Kalākaua, "Transcript of: Voyage around World, Especially Japan, 1881," p. 20, 33, 97, Bishop-Monarchy.

⁴² Kalākaua, "Transcript of: Voyage around World, Especially Japan," p. 10, 17, 95.

character of the Japanese court, noting of a meeting with the emperor, “stately as all the surroundings appeared still there was an air of cordiality and natural freedoms assumed during the whole of the interview which made it a contrast to the stiffness of European courts, especially England.”⁴³

The king’s experiences eventually renewed and strengthened his embrace of Native culture at home, but they also made clear the importance of performing and embracing a specifically Native Hawaiian identity abroad. From the start of the voyage the king had attempted to gain a certain amount of recognition as a distinctively Native Hawaiian monarch, particularly among other non-Euro/American rulers. To accomplish this he took with him one of the feather capes of Kamehameha, a royal treasure composed of hundreds of thousands of yellow and red feathers. The king intended to display the cape on formal occasions but the massive and heavy cape conflicted with his western-style uniform. Furthermore, anyone wearing both sets of royal garments would find the weight and heat stifling in all but the coolest weather. The king transferred the duty of wearing and displaying the cape to Robert, a disgraced European aristocrat and habitual drunk who served as his valet. In Japan and in Jahore, where the king displayed the cloak aboard his walking mannequin, the arrangement caused numerous misunderstandings as the king’s confused hosts asked why a cloak meant for Hawaiian royalty adorned the shoulders of a European servant. By the time the king reached Europe he gave up on the idea of using Robert to display the cloak. In a letter to his sister, however, he noted that the Hawaiian uniforms resembled those of the Europeans too closely and that he had added a few Hawaiian flourishes to distinguish himself and his party.⁴⁴

⁴³ Armstrong, *Around the World with a King*, 84; Kalākaua, “Transcript of: Voyage around World, Especially Japan,” p. 4, 13.

⁴⁴ Armstrong, *Around the World with a King*, 41-2, 143; Greer, “The Royal Tourist—Kalākaua's Letters Home from Tokio to London,” 101.

The king's cloak and uniform, however, did less to promote him as a distinct and proud Native sovereign than the makeup of his entourage served to call that status into question. As noted earlier the king accepted Armstrong and Judd in order to placate the mission faction. On several occasions the lack of Native Hawaiians in the king's entourage led his hosts to question whether or not the king himself remained an independent sovereign or if his Kingdom had already fallen under informal American rule. Several Japanese bureaucrats, two Siamese princes, the Khedive, and the Pope all brought up the question at one time or another, though the Japanese, always conscious of royal dignity, brought the question up to Armstrong and Judd rather than the king himself. After returning home, the king made certain that Native Hawaiians formed the core of all diplomatic efforts to other non-Euro/American states and peoples.⁴⁵

In part the king sought to portray himself as an explicitly Native monarch, not just to show that he, and by extension the Native Hawaiian people, remained in power, but also in the hopes of creating stronger ties to other Native peoples. In Jahore Kalākaua reveled in the exploration of ties between the Hawaiian and Malay people when he met with the Maharajah, Sultan Abu Bakar Ibin Daing Ibrahim. Kalākaua informed the Maharajah that prominent theories about the origins of the Hawaiian people traced them to the Malay people, after which the two spent hours probing for linguistic and cultural similarities. Part of this seemed to have been inspired by the Maharajah's physical resemblance to a deceased *ali'i nui*, as he noted in a letter to Lili'uokalani, "he is a fine looking man and resembles the first Leleiohoku very much. If he could have spoken our language I would take him to be one of our people."⁴⁶

The king also sought to establish religious ties between Hawai'i and Asia. In Japan the king expressed a desire to introduce Japanese-style Buddhism to Hawai'i,

⁴⁵ Armstrong, *Around the World with a King*, 47, 126, 187, 208.

⁴⁶ Ibid; Greer, "The Royal Tourist—Kalākaua's Letters Home from Tokio to London."

noting that perhaps it would provide a better fit with Native culture than Christianity. The king's interest in Buddhism continued in India, where he obtained a carved image of Buddha, "for the purpose, [Armstrong] afterwards learned, of showing to his own people that nations with some high civilization used a variety of idols as well as the Hawaiians. His people, he said, were not the beastly pagans that the travelers and missionaries had represented them to be."⁴⁷ Clearly part of the king's interest in Buddhism stemmed from his domestic agenda. In addition to validating Native Hawaiian practices around *ki'i* by associating them with Buddhism and the cultures of Asia, he likely saw the promotion of Buddhism as a way of tweaking the missionary party's nose, as well as those of his mission-descended escorts. In terms of foreign policy, however, such a connection would also help develop a stronger cultural alliance between Hawai'i and Buddhist-dominated states and peoples, a cultural alliance that the king hoped might be extended into the political arena.⁴⁸

As noted earlier, his time in Japan impressed the king a great deal, so much so that he also initiated several attempts to ally with the Japanese. Some were cultural measures, such as his interest in introducing Buddhism to Hawai'i, others were of a more explicitly political nature. After leaving Armstrong and Judd behind in their quarters, the king met privately with Emperor Mutsuhito to discuss increased connections between the two nations. First Kalākaua proposed to marry one of the Japanese princes to Kalākaua's niece, the Princess Kaiulani. Mutsuhito agreed to consider the proposal, though he warned Kalākaua that such an arrangement would be against Japanese customs and therefore unlikely. Kalākaua also proposed a, "Union and Federation of Asiatic nations and sovereigns," led by the Japanese. The emperor later agreed that "our Eastern Nations ought to fortify themselves within the walls of such Union and Federation, and by uniting

⁴⁷ Armstrong, *Around the World with a King*, 159-161, 169-170.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 84, 169.

their power to endeavor to maintain their footing against those powerful nations of Europe and America, and to establish their independence and integrity in the future.” He feared, however, that the timing was not right for such a confederation, as Japan lacked the strength to confront the great powers. He eventually turned down both propositions. Kalākaua’s proposals, both made when he had safely abandoned his escorts, clearly showed a desire to create bonds with rising non-Euro/American states in an attempt to fight against further Euro/American colonization throughout the Asia Pacific region. The king might have been laying some of the groundwork for such a confederacy when talking to the Maharajah in Jahore as well, as he commented to a mystified but bemused Armstrong, “That his own people were Asiatics, and he hoped the Asiatic nations would become powerful and stand by one another.”⁴⁹

During his travels the king sought ties and alliances with other non-Euro/American peoples and polities, learned from their indigenous or traditional knowledge base, and examined their attempts to close the perceived development gaps between themselves and Europe. But he did so very selectively. The non-Euro/American people and leaders he was most taken with were those that were the most westernized, like Emperor Mutsuhito, the Maharajah, and the Khedive. While interested in knowledge from non-Euro/American cultures, he also seemed mostly interested in those that were recognized as ancient civilizations in the Euro/American imagination, such as the Japanese, Chinese, and Indians, the same peoples the missionaries had once explained to be partially *na‘auao* in the *Hoikehonua*. Though he circumnavigated the globe, he by no means covered the entire world, indeed he took the shortest route possible from Japan to Europe with only short stops at the major ports of call in between the two. He expressed no interest, or at least very little interest, in visiting Africa or South America, and perhaps most tellingly, no interest in visiting Hawai‘i’s closest neighbors, the peoples of the south

⁴⁹ Ibid., 62-3, 146; Kuykendall, *Hawaiian Kingdom*, Vol. III, 229-231.

Pacific. While the king displayed an eagerness to question the Euro/American monopoly on knowledge production and “progress,” he seems to have felt that only those places that had progressed along the Euro/American model were worth visiting and learning from.

~~~~~

When the king announced his plans for his world tour at the end of 1880, the missionary party, including Armstrong and Judd, hoped the experience would humble him. They believed that the king, traveling among lands and people with far greater wealth and power than the Hawaiian Kingdom could ever hope for, would develop the sort of low opinion of himself and his people that was a core component of the missionary party philosophy. Yet the king learned, and likely suspected from the start, that the Kingdom’s lack of wealth and power did not negate the symbolic or diplomatic worth of Hawai‘i’s status as a sovereign nation, nor the social and cultural capital that the king could tap into as its “westernized” monarch. While the missionary party argued that Kalākaua, as a Native monarch, lacked the judgment and background to rule, the elite of other countries, including monarchs of the great empires, welcomed him as an equal, at least in certain social and diplomatic contexts. Similarly he saw how the creation and maintenance of social bonds among such elites could reap benefits down the road, just as his hosting of the Duke of Edinburgh so many years prior had reaped major benefits for the king in England. The king’s reception abroad certainly caused a much-needed moral boast. More importantly it inspired him to use the diplomatic and social capital he had discovered and developed to promote Hawaiian interests. The problem, however, came in judging exactly how much this diplomatic and social capital mattered in the realpolitik of international relations.

At the same time the experience, with its multitude of imperial encounters, presented the king with first hand knowledge of global political trends. In Japan, China, Siam, Jahore, India, and Egypt he witnessed the continued assault of empire on Native



peoples and of the repercussions of such imperial aggressions. He witnessed, for instance, the direct imperial control of the British throughout Asia, criticizing their presence at the same time that he took comfort in their hospitality. The trip also provided the king with evidence of the success of independent Native peoples, particularly the Japanese mix of western industry, traditional culture, modern military technology, and indigenous/indigenized religion. Finally the trip showed the king that just as colonization was working on a global scale, anti-colonial efforts needed to be coordinated beyond the limits of national boundaries. This would require an explicit embrace of ties, real and imagined, historical or contemporary, between different peoples targeted by empire.

### **The *Mō‘ī* and Hawaiian National Culture**

After returning to Hawai‘i Kalākaua placed a renewed energy behind his efforts to develop a pro-Native national culture, specifically one rooted in the historical and cultural authority of the *mō‘ī*. This worked in Kalākaua’s favor in a number of ways. Domestically it strengthened his personal claim to the throne within the Hawaiian community, to weaken the opposition left over from his disputed election. In promoting the idea that the authority of the monarchy was rooted in the Hawaiian past he also argued for a nationalist culture that empowered and united all those who shared and understood that past, specifically Native Hawaiians. It also excluded and disempowered those who built up their own cultural status by actively working to dismiss or demonize Native Hawaiian history and culture, namely the missionary party and their allies. Similarly, through his embrace of the symbols and technologies of power typically associated with *haole* empires and nation-states, the king refuted those who claimed such powers to be the exclusive province of *haole*.

The king’s cultural agenda was also closely tied to the ongoing battle for the legislature. In 1882 the king’s Native and *haole* legislative supporters gave him the

leeway and funding to initiate a number of pro-Native cultural projects, despite the protests of former Emmaites and the missionary/planter faction. The king also replaced the all-*haole* cabinet foisted upon him after the Moreno affair with a mixed-*haole*/Native cabinet more in line with his own agenda. In the following years the pro-Native, pro-*mō‘ī*, nationalist culture that Kalākaua promoted helped to stir up the electorate in his favor. As part of this effort, he even adopted the former Emmaite slogan, “Hawai‘i no Hawai‘i,” Hawai‘i for Hawaiians. The king’s contemporary and later detractors have often decried this as racist. Since the small *haole* minority in Hawai‘i actively sought to disempower Native voters and leadership through explicit and implicit racial discourses, however, the “Hawai‘i no Hawai‘i” campaign can be more truthfully seen as a response to racism than a cause of it.

In 1884 the king’s *haole* opponents in the mission/planter community combined with elements of the Emmaite opposition to create the Independent Party. Though not organized into a formal party, the king’s supporters managed to retain a slight advantage in the legislature, which granted him the power to enact his agenda. In 1886 the king’s party dominated the missionary faction of the Independents, who had largely abandoned the façade of power sharing with the Emmaites. These three cycles of electoral victories gave the king the leeway to embark upon his new domestic and foreign agendas, as well as signaling the popularity of such initiatives among the electorate.<sup>50</sup>

The most spectacular embodiments of the king’s cultural agenda came in the form of two prolonged and widely attended public celebrations, the 1883 coronation and the 1886 Royal Jubilee. As Silva, Kamehiro, and others have shown, these events marked the beginning of a marked upturn in the visibility and public status of Native Hawaiian culture. Both events created an atmosphere of public celebration that revolved around the monarchy, specifically the house of Kalākaua, and merged Native and Euro/American

---

<sup>50</sup> Osorio, *Dismembering Lāhui*, 200-209.

cultural forms and symbols of power. What has gathered the most attention about the two events, particularly considering Kalākaua's importance to modern practitioners, is that the events marked the triumphant public return of *hula* and *oli*<sup>51</sup> to the forefront of official Native cultural expression.<sup>52</sup> Of the two, the coronation is best remembered for its promotion of a Native cultural revival, featuring days of *hula*, feasting, and other celebrations. Despite missionary teachings *hula* never died, as Kekela noted with much disgust during his trip home. Kalākaua's public farewell before the world tour also featured *hula*, *mele*, and *oli*.<sup>53</sup> The coronation, however, was a more spectacular affair than any seen for a generation, and *hula* was at the center of it all.

The theme of combining Native and foreign elements into a contemporary Hawaiian national culture also ran through both events. Both featured formal balls and the Royal Hawaiian Band alongside the *hula*, formal dinners alongside massive public feasts. Much of the *hula* featured a blend of Native and introduced features. Amy Stillman has found that much of the popular *hula* after the 1860's was *hula 'auana*, wandering *hula*, which was free from many of the sacred meanings and restrictions of older forms. One of the main streams of *'auana* was the *hula ku'i*, which borrowed heavily from foreign accompanists, melodies, and even choreography. Much of the *hula* performed at the coronation was *hula ku'i*, often with accompaniment and choreography developed specifically for the event. The Jubilee also featured a great deal of *hula* and *oli*, following the precedent established by the coronation.<sup>54</sup>

But *hula* composed only a single facet of the celebrations. The Jubilee planners included a American-style parade whose floats represented various Native *mo'olelo* and

---

<sup>51</sup> *Oli*: chant

<sup>52</sup> Kamehiro, *The Arts of Kingship*, 26-54, 87-122; Silva, *Aloha Betrayed*, 108-112

<sup>53</sup> Armstrong, *Around the World with a King*, 9; Silva, *Aloha Betrayed*, 108.

<sup>54</sup> Amy Stillman, "Of the People Who Love the Land: Vernacular History in the Poetry of Modern Hula," *Amerasia Journal* 28, no. 3 (2002): 88-90.

historical figures, and a “Historical Tableaux,” which presented Hawaiian history through various forms, including *hula*, and Hawaiian puppetry. Finally, the material trappings of kingship and *mō‘ī*-ship Kalākaua used in the coronation and his court blended Hawaiian and European symbols on multiple levels. He displayed a number of cherished Native artifacts, such as the feather cloak of Kamehameha, to show the *mana* he wielded as the heir to the Kamehamehas. Yet he also prominently featured European symbols of power made specifically for the event, such as his crown and scepter. The crown included distinctively Hawaiian symbols, such as the *kalo* plant, the older sibling of the Hawaiian people and a significant metaphor for the ties between Hawaiians and the land. Some “traditional” symbols, like the *puloulou*, or “*kapu* stick,” followed traditional forms and carried traditional meanings, such as the sole right of the *mō‘ī* to occupy certain spaces of power, yet were made from distinctively foreign materials. Rather than the traditional *kapa*-ball-topped *puloulou*, the king used a narwhal-horn shaft topped with a golden ball. The message of the king’s accoutrements of power was as clear as that of the ceremonies and festivities as a whole, this was a king who brought together Native and Euro/American technologies of power and based his rule in the mastery of both.<sup>55</sup>

As could be expected, the missionary party recognized that these sorts of pro-Native, pro-*mō‘ī* celebrations were intended to, and succeeded in, weakening their own cultural power. As in the battle over *KHOKP* and the negotiations over the king’s world tour, they attempted to control the damage, attacking the events, and by extension the king. In the wake of the coronation they arranged to have the publishers of the coronation programs brought up on obscenity charges, not knowing that the pamphlets were published on the press of the pro-missionary party *Gazette*. While the publishers were eventually found guilty, this and other attempts to demonize the proceedings had little

---

<sup>55</sup> Kamehiro, *The Arts of Kingship*, 37-53; Silva, *Aloha Betrayed*, 112-9, 101; Stillman, “Of the People Who Love the Land: Vernacular History in the Poetry of Modern Hula,” 88-89.

effect in stemming the revival of Native public culture. By the time of the Jubilee the missionary party, as represented by their newspapers, seem to have accepted their losses and no longer railed quite so strongly against the *hula*. They did, however, continue to argue that the events proved that Hawaiians lacked the necessary requirements for self-governance since they celebrated rather than degraded their heathenish pasts. While the effect of such arguments was clearly waning among Native Hawaiians, future events would show that it retained its ability to rile up and energize power-hungry elements of the *haole* community.<sup>56</sup>

Overall, the combined events of the Jubilee and the coronation promoted an image of a contemporary Hawaiian national culture centered around complex, cosmopolitan Natives, proud of bare-chested ancestors who had wielded spears at the side of the conqueror, yet still quite comfortable waltzing across a ballroom in glove and tails. For the *lāhui* it signaled that the *mō‘ī* and the *aupuni* valued their exclusive cultural and genealogical bonds, but believed that they were still fully capable, as a *lāhui*, of mastering the supposedly superior Western culture. To the *haole* community and visiting dignitaries, the *mō‘ī* sent a similar message. While Hawaiians, especially among the elite, belonged to the global cosmopolitan culture of the period, they did so in a manner that maintained their cultural distinctiveness. But the most important message, one the king hoped to transmit to all, was that only a individual who met the requirements needed to be both a *mō‘ī* and a king could rule the Hawaiian people, and the embodiment of that was the man at the center of both celebrations, David Kalākaua.

### *Hale Nauā*

While not as public as the two celebrations described above, or as longstanding as ‘Iolani Palace or the Kamehameha statue, Kalākaua’s Hale Nauā society represents the

---

<sup>56</sup> Silva, *Aloha Betrayed*, 108-109, 114-120.

most fully developed project in the king's cultural agenda. As a result, the Hale Nauā frustrates simple characterization. For all practical purposes it began as a governmental agency, the Board of Genealogy, yet during its time as a private institution it took the form of a locally developed secret society, which Kalākaua, an avid Mason, structured largely along Masonic lines. It was also a re-imagining of an ancient Native organization found in various *mo'olelo*, which operated as a mechanism for validating and proving genealogical and other claims. It operated as a royal think tank for developing and putting into motion the king's cultural agenda. It used *mo'olelo* and traditional knowledge to comment upon contemporary scientific debate in the realms of geology, medicine, and anthropology, and in doing so used scientific theory to validate the importance of such knowledge. It promoted Native Hawaiians as both masters of their own culture and participants in the international movement to further scientific inquiry.

In 1880 the legislature approved a measure to create the Papakū'auhau, the Board of Genealogy of the Hawaiian Chiefs, whose explicit purpose was to collect, unravel, and preserve the genealogies of the *ali'i nui* in order to verify chiefly lineages. While these genealogies remained the board's primary focus, by employing a broadly inclusive Polynesian definition of genealogy the board soon became the official locus for gathering, examining, and preserving all manner of Hawaiian knowledge. The board continued operating until 1887 when the post-Bayonet government ended its funding. Another group, however, the Hale Nauā "secret society," stood ready to take up much of the Papakū'auhau's work. In terms of personnel, the transition was an easy one, as many of the members of the Board of Genealogy were also members of Hale Nauā. The president of the Board, for instance, Princess Po'omaikelani, the sister of Queen

Kapiolani, was also the highest-ranking member of Hale Nauā after her sister and royal brother-in-law.<sup>57</sup>

While the board performed a significant amount of work in what Euro/Americans considered genealogy, the Hawaiian understanding of *kū‘auhau* and the inquiries of the board occupied a space far beyond limited Euro/American conceptions of “genealogy.” Genealogical epics formed the backbone of Native Hawaiian and many other Polynesian cultures, acting as the primary means of producing, storing, and perpetuating cultural knowledge and values.<sup>58</sup> The importance of *kū‘auhau* stretched far beyond the tracing of lineages needed for maintaining an aristocracy, though that was an important function. *Kū‘auhau* contained the histories of the *‘āina* and the *lāhui*, and of the connections between the two. The prime example for this is the *Kumulipo*, an epic *kū‘auhau* that the board obtained in their early years and which Kalākaua published in 1889. The *Kumulipo* contains everything from relatively recent chiefly dynasties of Hawai‘i Island to the Native vision of the birth of life itself from deep within the *pō*. From the darkness came the invertebrates, the corals, the plants, and the *akua*. From two of these *akua*, Papa and Ho‘ohokulani came Hāloa, who was stillborn, buried, and transformed into the first *kalo*, the Hawaiian staple food. Their later children were the first *ali‘i* and the first *maka‘āinana*. This familial relationship between the *akua*, the *‘āina*, the *ali‘i*, and the *maka‘āinana* formed the basis of Native Hawaiian culture, defining the responsibilities of each based on the existence of such genealogical ties and the specific details of these relationships.<sup>59</sup>

Thus the board argued in 1884 that, though restricted by law to research only *kū‘auhau* and *mele*, the broad definition of *kū‘auhau* included a vast number of sub-

---

<sup>57</sup> Ibid., 94-107.

<sup>58</sup> Much of the practical knowledge of Hawaiian culture, however, was preserved within the practices and rituals of the various *kāhuna*.

<sup>59</sup> Kame‘eleihiwa, *Native Lands*, 19-23; Silva, *Aloha Betrayed*, 26-54.

disciplines, including: “Physiology, Psychology, Philology, Paleontology, Zoology, Botany, Ornithology, and Choncolgy[the study of mollusks], and other scientific subjects pertaining to the Hawaiian Islands, without which the work of the board would be incomplete.” Minutes from a meeting in 1882 also show that the board was interested in locating *ku‘ula*, images dedicated-to/inhabited-by the god of fishing, as well as war hills and coral heads that had special cultural significance. The board also had a heavy interest in the sociological and historical anthropology of the islands. In preserving and collecting such data the board made it available not just for antiquarian and material purposes, but also for the benefit of strengthening the existing cultural foundation that Kalākaua’s pro-Native nationalism could root itself in. The Hale Nauā, though not limited in its studies by law, continued to use the broad Polynesian understanding of genealogy to structure its work.<sup>60</sup>

Through the Papakū‘auhau and the Hale Nauā, Kalakaua obtained think tanks for both the preservation of Hawaiian knowledge and the creation of a new form of knowledge production based in Native and foreign sources and technologies. Both organizations, for instanced, relied heavily on *kū‘auhau*, *mele*, and other Hawaiian intellectual traditions, as well as on contemporary European and American works and theories regarding anthropology, linguistics, medicine, and paleo-geology. Both organizations, for instance, used a combination of *kū‘auhau*, linguistics, and geological theories similar to plate tectonics to examine the origins of the Polynesian people, something of a mystery *du jour* among the nineteenth-century amateur anthropologist set. In 1888 and 1889, Antone Rosa, a Native member of the Hale Nauā and former Attorney General, read the society’s annual address, presenting excerpts from their ongoing work

---

<sup>60</sup> BOG, “Minutes of the Board of Genealogy, 1882,” Bishop; BOG, “Report of the Board of Genealogy, 1884,” Bishop.



using the *Kumulipo* as a metaphor/source for paleo-geology and as a critique of self-serving Western historiography.<sup>61</sup>

The Hale Nauā was also interested in various other projects associated with the social and hard sciences. Kalākaua’s personal Hale Nauā notebooks, for instance, included a chart attempting to trace the spread of Indo-European languages in relation to the migrations tracked in the *Kumulipo*, affected no doubt by contemporary theories espoused by Abraham Fornander and others that Polynesians were descended from the Aryans. The Hale Nauā also dedicated a portion of its resources to the search for a leprosy cure. Leprosy, or at least the fear of leprosy, had torn apart the social fabric of Hawai’i since 1864, when the kingdom gave in to *haole* pressure and began to exile lepers to isolated Kalawao on Molokai. During the reign of Lunalilo, leprosy surveillance and banishments increased. Kalākaua’s administration, aware of the deep unpopularity of the banishments among Hawaiians, relaxed enforcement, but was still deeply concerned with the problem leprosy posed to the Hawaiian population. Throughout his reign Kalākaua promoted different projects to *Ho‘oulu Lāhui*, or increase/grow the *lāhui*, the main focus of which was to end the demographic decline and the high prevalence of disease among Native Hawaiians. The few surviving Hale Nauā records include fragments of their efforts to seek out potential cures, including reports of lepers cured in Kohala and a letter to the Prince of Wales inquiring into British efforts to find a cure.<sup>62</sup>

Tied into these efforts around leprosy were broader efforts to grant Native Hawaiians more choice in health care. The 1886 legislature passed a law that extended the licensure of *kāhuna lā‘au lapa‘au* beyond the levels taken by Kamehameha V. The

---

<sup>61</sup> BOG, “Minutes of the Board of Genealogy”; BOG, “Report of the Board of Genealogy”; BOG, “Report of the Board of Genealogy to W.M. Gibson, Minister of Foreign Affairs, ca. 1882.” Bishop; Hale Naua, “Hale Naua, 1889,” HSA-Hale Naua File; David Kalākaua, “Kalākaua’s Medicine Book,” HSA-Kalanianaʻole Collection; Antone Rosa, “Annual Address, 1888,” HSA-Hale Naua File; Silva, *Aloha Betrayed*, 104-107.

<sup>62</sup> Hale Naua, “Notes and Reference Data,” HSA-Hale Naua File.

“Kahuna Law,” which was decried by the missionary party and targeted for reversal after Bayonet, allowed Hawaiians open access to *kāhuna* for medical maladies, which the handful of western-style physicians in the state had failed to provide much relief for. Hale Nauā members, as experts on traditional practices, were appointed to the licensing board for *kāhuna*. The king even kept his own “kahuna book,” with a list of plants, their medical uses, Hawaiian names, English names, and scientific names. Though by no means opposed to the practice of western medicine, Kalākaua and the Hale Nauā did not see the validity of Hawaiian medicine and Western medicine as mutually exclusive, rather they perceived a place for each within contemporary Hawaiian society.<sup>63</sup>

Finally, the Hale Nauā took on the public role of promoting the new pro-Native national culture, particularly the concept of Native-oriented scientific inquiry that they themselves were helping to develop. The annual address, during which their work was displayed and papers read, was a major social event, attended in 1889 by visiting dignitaries like Robert Louis Stevenson as well as prominent Native Hawaiians and resident foreigners. The society also corresponded with other scientific societies in Europe and America, exchanging ideas and theories and promoting Hawai‘i as part of the scientific community. Finally they served as cultural spokesmen for the *lāhui* after the Bayonet constitution, collecting and displaying feather cloaks and other sacred and everyday items for special events and planning for the 1893 Columbian Exposition. The society’s plans for a delegation to the exhibition included a mix of European, American, and Hawaiian displays of sport and art. The planners included nine *kinipopo*, ball players, likely baseball players, who they planned to put up against local teams at the exhibition and at events on the way to the exhibition. They also included nine paddlers and a canoe to display their prowess in America’s rivers and lakes. The party also included several

---

<sup>63</sup> Kalākaua, “Kalākaua’s Medicine Book”; Esther T. Mookini, “The Hale Naua of David Kalākaua,” (Honolulu: University of Hawaii, 1970), 18.

sharpshooters, who, like the *kinipopo*, would challenge locals along the route to the exhibition and at the exhibition itself.<sup>64</sup>

Hale Nauā also expected to take forty surfers and “poe lele kawa,” or high divers as well as twenty-two opera singers and thirty woodwind musicians. The planned schedule for the exhibition included ball sports three times a week, paddling competitions for two days, high diving and surfing for three days, exhibition of cloaks and capes six days a week, opera three nights, musical concerts three days. The message the Hale Nauā intended to send was clear; Hawai‘i, while proudly retaining an explicitly Native culture, was still proficient in the cultural forms of Europe and America. Furthermore, the competitive elements of the party, specifically in sharp shooting and baseball, placed Hawaiians in a position to show not just proficiency in American sport, but to actually surpass Americans in those sports. Due to the king’s death and the overthrow, however, the Hale Nauā’s delegation never made it to the Columbian exhibition. The Republic instead sent Lorrin B. Thurston and his America-friendly presentation of Hawai‘i as a land of natural beauty and untapped resources.<sup>65</sup>

Between 1880 and his death in 1891, the Hale Nauā acted as Kalākaua’s cultural and scientific think tank, as well as a means for promoting his cultural agenda. It promoted Native Hawaiian knowledge production as a valid and important national resource. They also promoted the value of participating in scientific inquiry, both in the hard and soft sciences. More importantly, however, they merged both sets of projects into one, shaping them into a new vision for Native Hawaiian knowledge and cultural production. In using Native knowledge as a foundation for scientific inquiry and

---

<sup>64</sup> Lili‘uokalani, *Hawaii’s Story by Hawaii’s Queen* (Boston: Lothrop, Lee, and Shepard Co., 1898), 115; Hale Naua, “Hale Naua Society, 1886-1891: Translation of Documents at the Hawaii State Archives and Hawaiian Mission Children’s Society Library,” HSA-Hale Naua Files; BOG, “Minutes of the Board of Genealogy,” May 22, 1890.

<sup>65</sup> BOG, “Minutes of the Board of Genealogy,” May 22, 1890.

employing textual methodologies for researching, preserving, and promoting Native Hawaiian culture, the Papakū‘auhau and Hale Nauā established a precedent for the future of Native Hawaiian knowledge creation. As with Kalākaua’s other efforts to merge Native and cosmopolitan culture, this allowed Native Hawaiians to embrace a pro-Native national culture without forfeiting either the ability to reshape their own culture or the ability to reshape Euro/American culture to their own needs. Furthermore, through its elite social appeal and its public displays, publications, communications with other scientific societies, and the aborted exhibit at the Columbian exposition, the Hale Nauā also played an important role in promoting this vision to Native and foreigner alike.

### **Foreign Policy**

After returning from his voyage, Kalākaua also signaled a new direction for the Kingdom’s foreign policy. Some of this had no immediate effect in Hawai‘i, though it did affect how other nations viewed the Kingdom. The king continued, for instance, to build upon the social/diplomatic connections he had established during his voyage. Through official correspondence he kept in touch with the various leaders he had met, typically congratulations for important events and milestones and condolences for deaths within royal families. His correspondence grew to include prominent individuals he had not met, however, including the Shah of Persia. The king also sent a formal invitation for the coronation to his friend the Maharajah of Jahore, as well as official notifications to all the nations he had visited. In 1884 he also sent Curtis P. ‘Iaukea, a charming and intelligent young Native politician, on his own circumnavigation. In addition to representing the Kingdom at the coronation of Alexander III in Russia, ‘Iaukea also extended Kalākaua’s frenzy of decoration exchanges with foreign heads of state and official. In 1887, seeking to further develop the connection between the Hawaiian and British royal families, he

sent Lili‘uokalani, Queen Kapiolani, and ‘Iaukea to represent Hawai‘i at Queen Victoria’s Jubilee.<sup>66</sup>

Other elements of his foreign policy had greater immediate effects in Hawai‘i. Since the reign of Kamehameha V one of the Kingdom’s prime foreign policy issues had been the promotion of immigration. In part this was an outgrowth of the sugar industry, as Hawai‘i had plenty of land and water but few laborers. The declining population among the *lāhui* resulted in a very small labor pool available during the sugar boom of the 1860’s, and many in that pool refused to work under the horrid conditions insisted upon by the plantations. In addition to the needs of the sugar industry, however, many in Hawai‘i worried about the cultural, political, and social effects of population loss and the possibility that one day the *lāhui* might disappear completely. Kamehameha V, Lunalilo, and Kalākaua both looked for ways increasing the Native population within the islands, including the creation of the Queen’s Hospital, the Board of Health, searches for leprosy cures, the exiling of lepers, and the licensing of *kāhuna*, but none of these did more than slow the loss of population. Thus they turned to immigration for a way of boosting the citizenship.<sup>67</sup>

Often the goals of the plantations matched those of the *mō‘ī*, in part because they looked to similar sources to meet their goals. The monarchs often looked for people that seemed to be similar to Hawaiians, either by race, culture, or geography, what they often termed “cognate races,” believing that these people would easily assimilate into the population. The planters looked for poor non-white people, and on occasion poor marginally white people like the Portuguese, who they believed would be cheap and obedient labor. During Kamehameha V’s reign small numbers of laborers arrived from

---

<sup>66</sup> Kuykendall, *Hawaiian Kingdom*, Vol. III, 132, 341. For Correspondence see: HSA-Executive Correspondence.

<sup>67</sup> Kuykendall, *The Hawaiian Kingdom*, Vol. II, 68-79; Mo‘okini, “The Hale Naua of David Kalākaua,” 17-19.

Japan and Micronesia while a much larger number from China. In 1868, Gibson, then still in the private sector, pushed for Malay immigrants, arguing that though they were unlikely to work on sugar plantations, they were of a cognate race and would make good citizens. The Dutch government, however, would not permit such immigration and the pro-planter Board of Immigration saw little reason to push the issue, being primarily interested in labor, not citizens. Kalākaua, who sat on the Board during Kamehameha V's reign, continued the immigration of Chinese laborers but was constantly looking for new sources of immigration. One of the stated reasons for his trip abroad was to investigate other sources, including Japan, India, and Malaysia. Many of the *haole* planters, merchants, and mechanics of Hawai'i no longer desired Chinese immigrants, as few remained on the plantations after their contracts and they began to compete with the *haole* merchant class. Some Native Hawaiians, particularly Native men, also disagreed with further Chinese immigration, arguing that they wanted men, women, and children of a cognate race to immigrate, rather than the all-male labor migrations of the Chinese.<sup>68</sup>

Kalākaua and the planters both viewed the Japanese as excellent immigrants, though for different reasons. Though not opposed to Japanese contract labor, the king primarily viewed the Japanese as his first choice for prospective citizens. As of his world tour, at least, the king remained of the opinion that the Chinese, despite *haole* and Native Hawaiian complaints, would continue to provide all the labor the Kingdom needed. In a notation added to his account of the visit to Japan he wrote:

My observation has been that our islands could be repopulated from India, Malay and Japan. We need no further recruiting from China for she has already learnt the security of life and property of her subjects and are now

---

<sup>68</sup> Board of Immigration, "Immigration-Minutes of the Meetings of the Board Of, 1868-1882," HSA-Interior Department; Kuykendall, *The Hawaiian Kingdom*, Vol. II, 69-72, 177-185; Kuykendall, *Hawaiian Kingdom*: Vol. III, 116-118, 144-145.

migrating in numbers that will furnish all the labor necessary. The important question is then repopulation.

With the English and Dutch prohibiting South Asian and Malay immigration and the king already pursuing stronger relations with Japan for other reasons, the choice for new citizen immigrants was clear.<sup>69</sup>

At first the Japanese government refused to allow working-class immigration, preferring to keep such laborers at home where they could aid internal development. The king's time in Japan and later communications with the Japanese, however, led him to believe they were open to negotiation. In 1882 he sent a young Hawaiian politician named John Kapena to discuss the immigration issue with the Japanese. Though he failed to get a treaty signed, Kapena did impress upon the Japanese Kalākaua's continued belief that Hawaiians and Japanese shared a common bond in both being "Asiatic" peoples and that because of that bond Japanese immigration would reinvigorate the Hawaiian race. Kapena's trip impressed the Japanese enough for them to send an Envoy, Sugi Magoshichiro, to attend Kalākaua's coronation and continue the discussions. Finally, in 1884 'Iaukea stopped in Tokyo on his way to the Russian coronation, completing negotiations on the immigration treaty on April 23, 1884.<sup>70</sup>

Previous efforts by countries hoping to obtain large numbers of immigrants from Japan had failed for decades, and indeed the Japanese cited their unwillingness to agree to previous treaties of immigration as a precedent for denying early Hawaiian requests. According to an account in his obituary, Native Hawaiian politician and diplomat John E. Bush later told an American diplomat that the secret to Hawai'i's success had been convincing the Japanese that Hawaii sought citizens, not laborers. Bush, then Minister of Interior, had been a key proponent of sending Native Hawaiians like Kapena and 'Iaukea

---

<sup>69</sup> Kalākaua, "Transcript of: Voyage around World, Especially Japan," p. 90.

<sup>70</sup> Kuykendall, *Hawaiian Kingdom*: Vol. III, 155-168.

to Japan, arguing that were they to send Gibson's pick, S.T. Alexander, the Japanese would have rejected the treaty as an attempt by white planters to find cheap, exploitable labor. By sending Native Hawaiians they would better curry the Emperor's favor, as it would seem more believable when they requested immigrants to help repopulate the *lāhui* and the land. Kalākaua likely approved of Bush's plan over Gibson's, who was the king's right-hand-man, because of his own experiences during the world tour and the Japanese questioning of his "choice" of escorts.<sup>71</sup>

### *The Polynesian Confederacy*

The king's foreign policy ambitions, however, extended far beyond maintaining diplomatic/social ties with Europe or obtaining immigrants from Japan. Like many observers at the time, the king realized that the increased pace of the Euro/American race for empire spelled disaster for small, Native states, regardless of their diplomatic status. Even before the Berlin Conference, for instance, the great powers engaged in a systematic destruction of Native autonomy in Africa, which only increased after the conference. In Asia, Euro/American empires had gobbled up most of the continent over the centuries, though a weakened China and a few states like Japan and Siam remained independent but afflicted by unequal treaties. In the Pacific only three major island groups remained free after the British took control of Fiji in 1874, Tonga, Hawai'i, and Sāmoa. Despite the independence of these groups, the Euro/American powers had already unofficially divided them into spheres of imperial interest. The Americans staked a claim on having a specific interest in Hawai'i, the British in Tonga, and the Germans, British, and Americans all claiming a right to determine the future of Sāmoa.

Kalākaua and his advisors understood that inaction would allow for a gradual erosion of Hawaiian independence and quite possibly American annexation. As noted

---

<sup>71</sup> "John E. Bush Passes Off," *Pacific Commercial Advertiser*, June 29 1906.



above, the king worked to strengthen the Kingdom's diplomatic and social ties to Europe, particularly England, hoping to offset American influence in the islands. Such efforts had limited effect. The Kingdom needed a more proactive position, actively removing itself from the threat of imperial control or hegemony. The king and Gibson developed a plan to strengthen the independence and status of the Kingdom by uniting the remaining independent Polynesian groups in an explicitly anti-colonial confederacy based upon their shared cultural/ethnic heritage.

Such plans emerged in the late 1870s. Ralph Kuykendall has identified several editorials from 1877 and 1878 that supported outright Hawaiian annexation of Sāmoa. By 1880, possibly as a result of conversations with the big-dreaming, fast-talking Celso Moreno, Kalākaua himself expressed an interest in such a plan. Talk of a Hawaiian-led Pacific followed him to California, where he attended a dinner in his honor attended by prominent Californians, including members of the legislature. Armstrong later wrote that the king:

Heard the 'thrilling eloquence' of several American orators. Among these was one who in fervid eloquence described the importance of the Hawaiian kingdom in the rising commerce of the Pacific Ocean, and predicted the final union of the inhabitants of all Oceania and Polynesia under one rule, and, he shouted, 'it will be that of king Kalakaua, the Colossus of the Pacific.'

Several weeks later Kalākaua proposed an Asia-Pacific confederacy to Emperor Mutsuhito. In early 1882, however, he received word from the Emperor that the Japanese were not yet willing to promote such an agenda.<sup>72</sup>

In 1883 the king began laying some of the groundwork for developing a smaller Polynesian confederacy. He appointed A.N. Tripp to be Royal Hawaiian commissioner to the States and Peoples of Polynesia, which the administration defined broadly enough to

---

<sup>72</sup> Armstrong, *Around the World with a King*, 15; Kuykendall, *Hawaiian Kingdom*: Vol. III, 311-12.

include much of Micronesia. Tripp, as captain of the labor recruiter *Julia*, was already headed to Micronesia and Fiji. He presented various chiefs with the goodwill of the Hawaiian people and received letters from several chiefs, particularly in missionary-laden Kiribati, expressing their desire for various forms of official relations with Hawai'i, including protectorates. Little came of the voyage except the wreck of the *Julia*. That year Gibson also wrote a diplomatic protest that the legislature officially approved, condemning the predatory behavior of the Euro/American powers in the Pacific. The protest evoked the goals of the confederacy and justified Hawai'i's right to lodge such a protest based on its dual status as both an independent Polynesian state and a recognized member of the community of nations.<sup>73</sup>

Of the great powers, only the United States sent an official reply, which was nothing more than a politely worded brush off. In 1885 the administration sent their senior diplomat, H.A.P. Carter, to Washington, London, and Berlin, where he lobbied for Hawai'i's right to participate in any major talks regarding the future of the Pacific. Despite the Kingdom's diplomatic recognition, Kalākaua's social connections, and Carter's long list of powerful contacts, the effort was doomed from the start. When such a conference occurred, the powers intended Pacific Island states and peoples to be on the table, not sitting around it. In December of 1886, with no progress being made in the capitols of the Great Powers, Kalākaua and Gibson appointed former secretary of Foreign Affairs, John E. Bush, to be the kingdom's Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to the Chiefs and States of Polynesia. According to their orders, Bush and his party would travel to Sāmoa, Tonga, and wherever else in the Pacific they felt necessary, examining the situation on the ground, offering the chiefs and kings of those

---

<sup>73</sup> *Pacific Commercial Advertiser*, July 30 1880; *Nupepa Elele*, January 15 1887; Immigration, "Immigration: Minutes of the Meeting of the Board, 1868-1882"; Walter Murray Gibson, *Report of the Minister of Foreign Affairs, 1884*. HSA-FO&EX, Appendix C.

lands the goodwill and friendship of the Hawaiian Kingdom. If the opportunity arose, they were to discretely inquire into local feelings regarding a confederation with Hawai‘i. Though Bush succeeded in convincing the Samoan “king,” Malietoa Laupepa, to join the confederacy in 1887, the coup preceding the declaration of the Bayonet Constitution brought an end to not only plans for the Confederacy, but the vast majority of Kalākaua’s other domestic and foreign policy initiatives as well.<sup>74</sup>

In the remaining documentation there is no explicit blueprint as to what this confederacy might have become had Kalākaua succeeded in forming it. Enough survived, however, to flesh out the principles behind its formation. First and foremost, the Kalākaua administration imagined the confederacy as a matter of national security. The king realized that Hawai‘i’s international guarantees of independence would only hold off the imperial tide for so long if the rest of the Pacific fell to the Great Powers. The king had been mulling over the issue since at least the time of his world tour, when he and the emperor discussed at some length the broader threat of empire in Asia and the Pacific. The 1883 protest voiced this fear quite explicitly, arguing that the Hawaiian people, “cannot be silent about or indifferent to acts of intervention in contiguous and kindred groups which menace their own situation.”<sup>75</sup> The king believed that the simplest way for small independent states to “eradicate” the threats from Euro/American empires was through unity, as a collection of such states would be more costly to annex than a series of them. Kalākaua and Mutsuhito came to such a conclusion in their discussions in 1881, focusing largely on the inability of Asian nations to fight off the Euro/American advance separately. The emperor agreed with Kalākaua about the importance of unification, this time among East Asian peoples, writing, “to do this is a pressing necessity for the Eastern

---

<sup>74</sup> Kuykendall, *Hawaiian Kingdom*: VOL. III, 317-325.

<sup>75</sup> Gibson, *Report of the Minister of Foreign Affairs*, cxi-cxli; Kalākaua, “Transcript of: Voyage around World, Especially Japan, p. 89.

Kingdoms, and in so doing depend their lives.” The same was true for the pared-down version of this grand plan, Kalākaua’s Polynesian confederacy, which at its heart was an attempt to preserve Hawaiian independence by stifling Euro/American empire elsewhere in the Pacific.<sup>76</sup>

In conjunction with being explicitly against Euro/American empire, the king also envisioned the confederacy as explicitly Native/Polynesian. Indeed he based the legitimacy of the confederacy on a shared Polynesian identity. The British, as Kalākaua had mentioned on his world tour, had deserved to have “their fingers burned” in India for having “meddled in other people's affairs.” Kalākaua saw the confederacy not as a matter of meddling in the affairs of others, but rather as developing stronger bonds based on either genealogical or racial relationships, depending on if one privileged the Polynesian or Euro/American perspective.<sup>77</sup> Polynesians did not seem to have had an equivalent concept to “Polynesians,” before contact with Euro/Americans. Most, however, did place a heavy emphasis on genealogy as the fundamental form of Native knowledge/knowledge production.<sup>78</sup> As noted earlier, epic *kū‘auhau* like the Kumulipo provide a means of understanding and communicating the history, the ethos, and the mythos of not just the *ali‘i* who can directly trace their lineage through such works, but of the *lāhui* as a whole. Such an embrace of genealogy was and continues to be a common feature of Polynesian cultures.<sup>79</sup>

---

<sup>76</sup> Kuykendall, *Hawaiian Kingdom*: Vol. III, 229.

<sup>77</sup> Armstrong, *Around the World with a King*, 170.

<sup>78</sup> It should be noted that the phrase “Genealogy” in this usage refers not to the European concept of genealogy, but rather to the much broader but related Polynesian concept of genealogy, what the Hawaiians referred to as *kū‘auhau*. In this context, which relates to Polynesian ideas about genealogy rather than Hawaiian specific ones, I use the term genealogy in order to signal a broader application than just the Hawaiian one.

<sup>79</sup> Angela Ballara, *Iwi: The Dynamics of Maori Tribal Organization From. 1769 to C. 1945* (Wellington, NZ: Victoria University Press, 1998), 50; Denning, *Islands and Beaches: Discourse on a Silent Land : Marquesas, 1774-1880*, 34, 74; R.P. Gilson, *Samoa 1830 to 1900: The Politics of a Multi-Cultural Community* (Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1970), 30.

As shown by the newspaper debates over genealogies that Hawaiians engaged in during Kalākaua’s time, the value of *kū‘auhau* had not diminished during the nineteenth century. Kalākaua himself showed a deep interest in *kū‘auhau*, and it was through his Papakū‘auhau and Hale Nauā that the Kumulipo and other epic *kū‘auhau* have been retained to this day. Within these *kū‘auhau* and in the *mo‘olelo* and *mele* connected to or contained within them, Hawaiians retained a strong cultural memory of their general migration from the south, often referred to generically as “Kahiki.” They also retained accounts of specific individuals from Kahiki who came on later voyages, many of whom became ruling chiefs or even *akua*. Such traditions had a strong effect on Kalākaua, who in 1879 designed the front entrance of the new ‘Iolani Palace to face Kahiki, the ancestral homeland, specifically southwest towards Sāmoa.<sup>80</sup> Kalākaua also featured several *mo‘olelo* about Hawai‘i and Kahiki in his *Legends of Myths of Hawai‘i* (1888). Indeed he set much of the book against the backdrop of a secondary wave of migrations from the south, which over several generations resulted in a merging of “Native” and southern lines within the ranks of the ruling *ali‘i*.<sup>81</sup>

Obviously Kalākaua had an agenda when choosing and collecting these particular *mo‘olelo* for publication, especially since the collecting and composing of the book occurred while he was also working on the confederation. Indeed his specific promotion of Sāmoa, rather than Tahiti or the generic Kahiki, as the homeland of the *akua* Pele and the southern adventurer/Big Island *ali‘i* ‘*ai moku* Pili, were clearly meant to emphasize the historical connections between Hawai‘i and its future confederate. Kalākaua believed such genealogical connections between Polynesian peoples, particularly Polynesian *ali‘i*, provided an important foundation for future political alliance. While such genealogy did not guarantee alliances in Native Hawaiian culture, they did provide a claim through

---

<sup>80</sup> At least symbolically. Technically the palace faces due southwest, while Sāmoa is more south-southwest.

<sup>81</sup> Kalākaua, *The Legends and Myths of Hawaii*, 69-71, 14-142, 154; Kamehiro, *The Arts of Kingship*, 68.

which other relationships could be forged. Alapa‘i, for instance, an ancestor of Kamehameha, descendant of Pili, and *ali‘i ‘ai moku* of Hawai‘i Island, once fought a great battle on Oahu against Peleioholani, the *ali‘i ‘ai moku* of Kauai. After a few days the battle was at a standstill, resulting in nothing but death on both sides. Neither chief seeing a benefit in continuing the war, they called for a genealogist, Naili. Naili then related to each their genealogical ties and set up a meeting between the two to find an honorable end to the dispute based on their “newfound” family connection. Kamakau identified this as a somewhat common solution in such situations.<sup>82</sup>

Beyond a Polynesian emphasis on genealogy, Kalākaua also tapped into Euro/American discourses of national racial/ethnic unity to promote the confederacy. Italian and German nationalists had used such discourses to great effect in efforts to unify those countries, both of which came into existence during Kalākaua’s lifetime. Other nations like England, Japan, and the United States also employed racial discourses to shape their national culture. As mentioned earlier in the chapter, the various Euro/American empires also employed racial discourses to understand and shape their imperial power structures, both in the colonies and in the metropolises.

These late-nineteenth century racial discourses, both of the nationalist and colonial/imperial sort, found support in an international effort to “scientifically” determine the racial origins of various groups through cultural and linguistic anthropology. Tony Ballantyne has argued that ethnographic and linguistic research into the racial origins of colonized peoples, specifically Māori and South Asians, provided the British with the discourse of Aryanism that later allowed them to understand and validate their imperial and national identity. Native Hawaiian nationalists turned to the same race-oriented anthropology that nationalists and colonials across the world were employing. The Hale Nauā, Papakū‘auhau, Abraham Fornander, and Kalākaua all participated in

---

<sup>82</sup> Kalākaua, *The Legends and Myths of Hawaii*; Kamakau, *Ruling Chiefs*, 88-9, 72.

social-science-based efforts to define Polynesian origins, an international effort driven largely by British/New Zealanders. Thus when Gibson argued in the 1883 Protest that Hawaii stood against Euro/American empire out of interest for their “kindred groups” and “sister islands,” he was speaking through an international, “scientific,” racial/ethnic discourse of political unity. Such discourses supported the creation of a Polynesian confederacy from a Euro/American understanding of race as much as Polynesian discourses supported such a confederacy based on their understanding of genealogy.<sup>83</sup>

As noted earlier, such nineteenth-century nationalist discourses of race operated alongside, and often in conjunction with, colonial discourses about the racial inferiority of non-white peoples. One of the key tenets of such racial discourses was the inability of non-whites to fully participate in self-rule. It was these sorts of white-supremacist arguments that Kalākaua sought to destabilize through his domestic policies and through international projects such as the confederation. Just as his explicitly pro-Native policies in Hawai‘i acted to counter the anti-Native racial discourses of the *haole* community, his attempts to create an explicitly pro-Polynesian confederacy acted to counter the broader imperial discourse that Polynesians as a whole were incapable of self-rule. The idea of the confederacy argued that Polynesians were capable of self-rule and that the Hawaiian *lāhui*, as the most developed of the Polynesian peoples, had the *kuleana* to nurture the proper environment for it.

While Kalākaua envisioned the character of the confederacy around a shared Polynesian identity and anti-colonial sentiment, he imagined the form and structure based on Euro/American political science and diplomatic culture. As mentioned above, Hawaiians understood the importance of international recognition in not only shielding

---

<sup>83</sup> Tony Ballantyne, *Orientalism and Race: Aryanism in the British Empire*, Cambridge Imperial and Post-Colonial Studies Series (Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire ; New York: Palgrave, 2002), 189-191; Abraham Fornander, *An Account of the Polynesian Race, It's Origins, and Migrations* Vol. I (London: Trubner & co., 1878); Gibson, *Report of the Minister of Foreign Affairs*, cxi-cxli.

Hawai‘i from blatant imperial aggression, but also in granting the Kingdom a place and a voice in the international community. None understood the opportunities this presented more than Kalākaua, particularly after the world tour. Thus he took most of the preliminary steps to creating the confederacy through the channels and forms of Euro/American diplomacy: the 1883 Protest, the Carter mission of 1885, and sending an “Envoy Extraordinaire and Minister Plenipotentiary” to the south. With such a title Bush would have full diplomatic privileges, and not coincidentally, would outrank the consuls of the great powers in Sāmoa and Tonga according to the standards of Euro/American diplomacy.<sup>84</sup> Hawaiian recognition, the king hoped, would provide the diplomatic structure and channels needed to establish the confederacy and earn its acceptance by the Euro/American powers.

Furthermore many Hawaiians saw their own internal efforts to organize a government compatible with Euro/American norms as the key to obtaining such guarantees. Without some of the changes made by Kamehameha III, like a law code and constitution, Hawai‘i may not have obtained such guarantees at all. Other Polynesian groups saw this and attempted to emulate the Hawaiian success. In the 1870’s and 1880’s king George Tupou I of Tonga constructed similar institutions, partly on the advice of Charles St Julian, a former representative of the Hawaiian Kingdom. Though the Tongans did not receive the same sort of recognition that Hawaii did, they certainly laid the necessary groundwork. Different Samoan factions had attempted similar efforts, but none of these projects succeeded due to a combination of internal and external factors.<sup>85</sup>

---

<sup>84</sup> George Webb, June 21, 1887, Dispatch 5, Hawaii State Archives FO & Ex.

<sup>85</sup> Kalu, “Ka Haiolelo O Hon. Cha. Kalu”; Malama Meleisea, *The Making of Modern Samoa: Traditional Authority and Colonial Administration in the History of Western Samoa* (Suva: Institute of Pacific Studies of the University of the South Pacific, 1987), 36-9; Noel Rutherford, *Shirley Baker and the King of Tonga* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1996), 27-28.



As envisioned by Kalākaua, the confederacy's first step would be to shield Sāmoa and Tonga under Hawai'i's diplomatic recognition. This would grant Sāmoa at least some time to develop and/or strengthen new political structures without the interference of the Great Powers and give Tonga a diplomatic pathway to gaining recognition. Kalākaua and Gibson also saw this as an opportunity to hold the Great Powers to their claims of wanting Sāmoa and Tonga to become self-governing by creating a blueprint by which they could do so under Hawaiian guidance. In the protest Gibson made a point of this, writing:

HIS MAJESTY'S GOVERNMENT, speaking for the Hawaiian people, so happily progressing through national independence, makes earnest appeal to the Governments of great and enlightened States, that they will recognize the inalienable rights of the several native communities of Polynesia to enjoy opportunities for progress and self-government, and will guarantee to them the same favorable opportunities which have made Hawai'i prosperous and happy,

Such rhetoric had been used to develop empires for decades, but the Hawaiians hoped by calling the Great Powers' bluff, they might be able to use this same rhetoric to stop empire building, just as it had in Hawai'i a generation earlier.<sup>86</sup>

At its core, regardless of whatever else it might be, the confederacy was a nationalist project. First and foremost, the core reason for the confederacy came from the most basic nationalist desire of all, the desire to retain the independence of the country. In At the same time, the features of the confederacy discussed above: anti-imperialism, an explicit Polynesian identity, and the emphasis on Euro/American diplomatic and political norms, all reflected the specific brand of nationalism promoted by the Kalākaua administration. In essence he sought to remake the rest of independent Polynesia in the image of Hawai'i, just as he sought to remake Hawai'i according to his own ideals.

---

<sup>86</sup> Gibson, *Report of the Minister of Foreign Affairs*, cxi-cxli.

Spreading such a vision across the Pacific would also validate and strengthen Kalākaua's agenda at home. Finally, the confederacy would elevate Hawai'i's status internationally. While recognition gave Hawai'i a place and voice in international politics, it gave it very little power and influence. Being the head of a confederacy, however small, would increase Hawai'i's influence in international affairs, both among the Euro/American powers and among other Native states.

The confederacy also reflected the chauvinist side of nationalism, specifically the belief in the superiority of the *lāhui* over other Polynesians. As with the HBCFM missionaries, this sense of superiority was based on the belief in a superior Hawaiian grasp of the *na'auao*, though this time a *na'auao* based on Euro/American political structures. Indeed the very concept of the confederacy hinged on the belief that Hawai'i had the greatest *na'auao* of the Polynesian peoples and thus was the natural choice to create and lead such an organization. Again the 1883 protest reflects such a belief, referring to imperial aggression against other Islanders as “unjust to a simple and ignorant people.”<sup>87</sup>

The ties to nationalist chauvinism and the belief that Hawai'i had the *kuleana* to create and lead the confederacy both raise the question, was the confederacy itself a plan for a Hawaiian Empire? The Polynesian Confederacy certainly had the stink of empire upon it, but so did nearly everything in the nineteenth-century Pacific. Granted, Kalākaua proposed the confederacy primarily as a bulwark against Euro/American imperial aggression, but this alone does not mean the confederacy would not develop into an empire. The Japanese in the 1830s and 1840s promoted their own imperial aggressions under the anti-imperial vision of a “Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere.” This question will be picked up again at the end of the next chapter, which takes a more in

---

<sup>87</sup> Ibid.

depth look at the 1887 legation to Sāmoa and what that project can tell us about the likely nature of the Confederacy.

### **Conclusion**

In the middle years of his reign, 1880-1887, Kalākaua pushed a domestic agenda intended to strengthen nationalist sentiment around Native traditions, Hawaiian mastery of Euro/American *na‘auao*, and the person and office of the *mō‘ī*. Hawaiians, including then Prince Kalākaua, had been developing this particular type of Native nationalism since the reign of Kamehameha IV. This Hawaiian nationalism sought not just to restore Native confidence in their own culture, but also to reign in the disproportionate strength of the missionary party and other pro-imperial *haole*. But Kalākaua was the first *mō‘ī* to put the full strength and prestige of the government into such a cultural agenda. Drawing upon his Native and *haole* supporters alike, Kalākaua built nationalist monuments, threw lavish celebrations, and created think tanks to strengthen the *lāhui’s* pride in their Kingdom, their heritage, and their *mō‘ī*. While disparaged by the briefly sidelined *haole* power brokers, the majority of the Native community rallied around such efforts, providing Kalākaua with the popular and legislative support needed to move forward.

In a similar manner, the king’s foreign policy worked to create an international understanding of Hawai‘i as being equal parts Native and cosmopolitan, a member of the community of nations yet still culturally distinctive from the Euro/American powers then engaged in the race for empire. During his trip abroad the king saw how useful Hawai‘i’s status as a recognized nation could be, but also witnessed firsthand the march of empire and the need for the targets of empire to band together and oppose further imperial aggression. Failing to obtain Japanese support for an “Asiatic” confederation, the king turned to a smaller Polynesian confederation based in Hawai‘i, Tonga, and Sāmoa. Hoping to use the Hawaiian model to “develop” the *na‘auao* of Sāmoa and Tonga, and

thus help them gain the same recognized status as Hawai'i, the king believed he could stymie further imperial aggression in Polynesia as a whole.

The king's hopes that his domestic and foreign policies might hold off both the local *haole* and foreign aggression proved unfounded. His attempts at creating a pro-Native nationalism proved to be too successful for *haole* liking, threatening the idea of global white superiority and the cult of American empire at the very moment that those ideas were enflaming the *haole* consciousness in Hawai'i and America. Rising on this tide the American-dominated *haole* community usurped the political rights of the Hawaiian people through threats of violence backed implicitly by American military might, creating a racially-stratified political system enshrined in the undemocratic Bayonet Constitution of 1887.

Kalākaua's vision of Hawaiian national culture, however, lived on as a cornerstone of Hawaiian identity long after Bayonet, persisting even after the development of formal American empire in 1900. In celebrating, studying, and promoting *hula*, *oli*, *mele*, and other forms of Native culture, Kalākaua, his allies in the Hale Nauā, and similar-minded individuals rejuvenated Hawaiian culture and knowledge, allowing it to remain strong even after the end of the Kingdom that spawned it. Much of the Hawaiian Renaissance of the twentieth century, for instance, rooted itself in Kalākaua-era cultural efforts, including the direct cultural work of the *mō'ī* himself, as a composer, publisher, and author. 'Iolani Palace, the Kamehameha Statue, and many of the artifacts saved and preserved by Kalākaua and the Hale Nauā/Papakū'auhau, also remain important symbols of the Native Hawaiian past and future. Though Kalākaua failed to stop the global onslaught of imperial aggression, he managed to create a cultural safe haven for the *lāhui* that remains central to its identity today.

## CHAPTER 5 MŌ'Ī AND TAMA'ĀIGA

This chapter examines the efforts of the Hawaiian legation to Samoa in 1887. In particular it looks at how the Hawaiian representatives imagined, promoted, and developed the relationship between the Hawaiian and Samoan peoples and states. It argues that two central discourses guided Hawaiian attempts to shape relations with the Samoans: a Polynesian genealogical discourse that promoted an innate sameness and unity between the two peoples and an Euro/American-derived discourse of progress that promoted Hawaiians as developmentally superior in the *na'auao*. In addition to providing mutually intelligible appeals for the new confederacy, these discourses also shaped Native Hawaiian understandings of the Samoans, the relations between the legation and their Samoan hosts, and the likely relationship between the two peoples under the confederacy. While the idea of Hawaiian superiority drove the Hawaiian desire to remake Samoa in its own image, the mutual privileging of genealogy served as much to control the scope and tenor of Hawaiian actions as it did to negotiate Samoan consent for Hawaiian intervention.

### **Diplomats, Kings, and Treaties**

The legation landed in Apia on January 3rd, 1887. In addition to Envoy Extraordinaire and Minister Plenipotentiary John E. Bush, the party included the legation's secretary Henry F. Poor, Bush's wife Mary Julia, his daughter Mollie, the government photographer, Joseph Strong, and the legation's staff, D. Moehonua, Hiram Kaumiali'i, and a third individual named Kane. One account also listed two unnamed

Samoans among the party, and there is a chance Kane was one of these two men. Bush's orders instructed him to examine the situation on the ground, establish ties with the nominal king, Malietoa Laupepa, work towards a resolution of hostilities between Malietoa and the "rebel" Tupua Tamasese, and, if the situation on the ground warranted it, to discreetly inquire into Samoan sentiments regarding a possible alliance with Hawai'i. If Bush found them interested, he was to help the Samoans develop a proposal and forward it to Honolulu.<sup>1</sup>

The choice of Bush and Poor as the senior members of the legation embodied the Hawaiian nationalism that Kalākaua sought to develop, one that brought together a Native Hawaiian nationalist identity and the cosmopolitan *na'auao* of Europe and America. Both men were Native Hawaiians, but to be more precise they were *hapa-haole*, Native Hawaiians with some *haole* ancestry, and thus genealogically representative of the cultural mix of *haole* and Native that was contemporary Hawai'i. As *hapa-haole* they still maintained what both the Hawaiians and Samoans would argue was a genealogical connection to the Samoans, they could speak to the Samoans about "our" connections rather than more abstract connections between Native Hawaiians and Samoans. This also followed the policy that Kalākaua initiated after his world tour, staffing his diplomatic missions to other non-European peoples with Native Hawaiians. Bush also promoted this policy during his time in the cabinet, sending John Kapena to Japan rather than Gibson's *haole* candidates. At the same time their *haole* descent likely presented them with greater access among the *palagi*, as it did among the *haole* of Honolulu.<sup>2</sup>

Both men were also quite accomplished in the sort of Euro/American-style enterprises that marked Hawaiian *na'auao*. After the death of his father, Bush worked as a

---

<sup>1</sup> "Ko Samoa Pae Aina," *Ko Hawaii Pae Aina*, December 25 1886; Kuykendall, *Hawaiian Kingdom* Vol. III, 317-319, 325; Henry Poor and John E. Bush, "Journal of the Embassy to Samoa, 1887," Bishop.

<sup>2</sup> "Death of H.F. Poor," *Pacific Commercial Advertiser* 1899; "John E. Bush Passes Off."

teenage apprentice in the printing shop of the *Gazette*, eventually working his way to foreman before becoming editor of the Hawaiian-language paper *Ke Au Okoa* sometime in the 1870's. By 1880 Bush moved to a career in politics and the civil service, serving as the Governor of Kauai island, twice as Minister of the Interior, and once each as the Minister of Foreign Affairs and Minister of Finance. He had also been among the planners of the king's Jubilee, the massive two-week long celebration of Kalākaua as both Hawaiian *mō'ī* and cosmopolitan king. When he returned to Hawai'i after the 1887 coup, he also returned to journalism, becoming editor and publisher of *Ka Oiaio*. His editorials and the direction of the paper made him one of the few individuals as hated by Lili'uokalani as he was by the missionary party. He also served as member of the House of Representatives from Ko'olau in 1890. After the overthrow, he and his writing talents returned to the royalist fold, where he and Joseph Nawahi were among the top targets of the oppressive Republic government. The two were arrested together in 1894, jailed, and treated in an inhumane manner. The government's abuse of the prisoners broke Nawahi's health. He died several months after his release. Bush's health survived his time in prison, but the experience still effectively ended his career as a prominent voice for the Hawaiian people.<sup>3</sup>

Though less prominent a figure than Bush, Poor was by no means unaccomplished. After a brief period at Oahu College,<sup>4</sup> Poor began work as a Bishop & Co. clerk when his father died at 15, later moving to Castle & Cooke. In his mid-twenties the government selected him as the secretary for Curtis P. 'Iaukea's follow-up to Kalākaua's world tour, attending the coronation of Czar Alexander III, meeting Queen Victoria, and participating in 'Iaukea's push for immigration treaties in Japan and India.

---

<sup>3</sup> Daws, *Shoal of Time*, 282; Abraham Fornander to Katy, September 23, 1886, Bishop-Davis/Fornander Collection; "John E. Bush Passes Off."

<sup>4</sup> Later renamed Punahou School.

Like the king before him, Poor returned with his chest covered in foreign decorations, which he would put on full display in Sāmoa. Upon his return he clerked for the Supreme Court before transferring to the Postal Savings Bank, where he was responsible for modernizing their bookkeeping system. By sending Bush and Poor as the heads of the legation, the Kalākaua administration sent the Samoans two examples of not just the *na‘auao* attained by Native Hawaiians, but also the *na‘auao* available to Samoans under Hawaiian guidance.<sup>5</sup>

The legation’s junior staff also displayed Native Hawaiian “development” along two very different Euro/American cultural trajectories. Due to the uncommonness of his surname, David Moehonua was likely a relative of former government minister and Maui governor William Moehonua, an uncle of Kalākaua’s. David attended Oahu College between 1884 and 1885 and appears to have acquired a reputation for embracing Euro/American popular cultural. The only specific references in the mission’s files refer to him as the legation’s resident “Baseball dude” and as a guitar player. Hiram Kaumiali‘i, on the other hand, was one of the Native Hawaiians rising up in Hawaiian Evangelical Association, as evidenced by his selection as a lay representative to the HEA annual conference in 1886. From Moehonua’s time at Oahu College and Kaumiali‘i’s place in the HEA, both men can be assumed to have been educated in English and Hawaiian.<sup>6</sup>

Upon arriving in Sāmoa on January 3<sup>rd</sup>, the legation made it a top priority to develop contacts with the Malietoa administration. On the fifth Bush and Poor attended

---

<sup>5</sup> “Death of H.F. Poor.”

<sup>6</sup> William De Witt Alexander, *Oahu College List of Trustees, Presidents, Instructors, Matrons, Librarians, Superintendents of Grounds, and Students* (Honolulu: Hawaiian Gazette Co. LTD, 1907), 66; HEA, *Twenty Third Annual Report of the Hawaiian Evangelical Association* (Honolulu: The Hawaiian Board, 1886), 5; Joyce Linnekin, *Sacred Queens and Women of Consequence: Rank, Gender, and Colonialism in the Hawaiian Islands* (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 1990), 104; Henry Poor to Webb, March 12, 1887.



what Poor referred to as “a ball,” thrown for them at the Fale Malo Sāmoa, the Government House, hosted by Selu, Malietoa’s Secretary of State. There they met Malietoa’s cabinet, “or rather those [who] are at present in Apia,” including Secretary of State Selu, Secretary of Interior Le Mamea, Secretary of Treasury Lapolu, Registrar Fomata, and Under Secretary of Foreign Affairs William Coe. The *hapa* son of American businessman and diplomat Jonas Coe, William also acted as a translator for the legation during most of their early meetings with the Malietoa government. Though few other details remain of the event, Poor did note that the Hawaiians were presented with a piece of *kapa* as a token of esteem and welcome. During this visit the legation requested a meeting with Malietoa, which was arranged for the 7<sup>th</sup>.<sup>7</sup>

The meeting on the 7<sup>th</sup> was a ritual affair that brought together Western and Polynesian customs. Despite the heat, which Bush estimated to be about 100 degrees, the Hawaiian party arrived in full diplomatic costume, their chests jingling with foreign and domestic decorations. Upon being introduced Bush presented Malietoa with a letter of introduction and greetings from Kalākaua. He then gave a short speech in Hawaiian, in which he relayed the King’s “deep interest...in the welfare of yourself and the people of Samoa.” He then presented Malietoa with the Grand Cross of his Royal Order of the Star of Oceania, an order Kalākaua specifically instituted to decorate “the Kings and Chiefs of Polynesia and those who contribute to the welfare and advancement of Polynesian communities.” Malietoa responded with a speech of his own, acknowledging and reciprocating the friendship of Kalākaua. Malietoa then entered into conversation with the Hawaiians while *kawa* was prepared. After everyone had been offered and drank a cup, the meeting dissolved.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> Poor, “Journal of the Embassy to Samoa.”

<sup>8</sup> John E. Bush, “Address Read to His Majesty Malietoa: January 7, 1887 (Translation),” Carter Collection, Honolulu; John E. Bush to Kalākaua, January 27, 1887, HSA-FO&EX.

A few days later Malietoa's cabinet traveled to Bush's quarters to informally discuss the mission's agenda. The meeting went long into the night, setting something of a precedent for the legation. At that meeting the Samoan chiefs voiced a favorable opinion of a possible confederacy, though no commitments were made on either side. The meeting clearly encouraged Bush, who wrote to Kalākaua, "during the evening's conversation I felt convinced that the King and the Samoan Government were favorable to our visit and the object of my mission. They seem to feel the necessity of being under some power, and that power the Hawaiian Government."<sup>9</sup>

On January 15<sup>th</sup> the Hawaiian delegation entertained Malietoa and a number of his chiefs to a lavish Hawaiian-style celebration, exchanging toasts and speeches with their hosts. In the legation's official dispatch, Bush wrote:

Some [chiefs] spoke in the strongest terms of their desire for an alliance or confederation with Hawai'i. Subsequent to this a great number of powerful and influential chiefs have called on me and voluntarily expressed their earnest support of an alliance recognizing our superiority as a state, our advanced condition, and the friendly relations of America and European countries.

In a private letter to Kalākaua, he added, "The satisfaction and general good feeling evinced by his Majesty and Government led me to believe that I could, by a little diplomacy, bring about an understanding mutually beneficial to our countries." Bush then set about finding an unofficial channel through which to reach Malietoa for a private interview. Their landlord, the chief Folau, just happened to be a "*makuakane*," a father or uncle, of Malietoa, and by various friendly gestures Bush convinced Folau and Malietoa's brother, Moli, to secure the desired interview.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> Bush to Kalākaua, January 27, 1887.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid; John E. Bush, "Dispatch #2," February 2, 1887, FO and EX, Honolulu.

On January 20<sup>th</sup>, Malietoa, Coe, Folau, and several members of Malietoa's family arrived at the legation's quarters to discuss matters. Malietoa explained that all those present were, "family," and could be trusted with whatever the Hawaiians had to tell him. In the legation's journal, Poor recounted:

Bush then stated about the substance of [our] mission, the interest of Kalākaua in the Polynesian States and his desire to aid and assist them, if possible to form a confederacy, that is if it pleased Malietoa to consider such a plan and retain his sovereignty under Kalākaua's direction that [Bush] thought the Hawaiian Government would allow him \$5000 or 6000 a year, [to allow him to] maintain the dignity of his office as King.

Furthermore Bush convinced Malietoa that, "such a course would soon make his Government permanent." Bush felt he was on the verge of success, writing:

Everything I said took the King and his advisors very favorably, one of the Taimuas (Nobles) present, advocating the immediate consideration of the matter, and an answer given as soon as possible. The King's answer was as follows: 'I am satisfied with everything you have said this evening as being the best and happiest way for us to overcome our present difficulties and pave the way for our future prosperity...This evening I cannot positively give you my answer, until I present the matter before the Taimuas and Faipules (Nobles and Representatives), but I can say to you, and you may rely upon that assurance, your answer will be favorable.'<sup>11</sup>

Malietoa visited Bush once more on the 27<sup>th</sup>. He informed Bush that he was leaving for Afega, the seat of the Ta'imua and Faipule. He would send his barge for Bush and Poor on the following Friday. He made it clear that they should appear in full diplomatic uniform, which "would make a deep and substantial impression." Around this time Bush also suggested that Malietoa allow A.O. Carter, Hawai'i's representative in Washington, to represent Malietoa's government as well. On January 31<sup>st</sup> Malietoa

---

<sup>11</sup> Poor, "Journal of the Embassy to Samoa"; Bush to Kalākaua, January 27, 1887.

signed an assortment of letters to Kalākaua, Carter, and President Cleveland, requesting that each allow Carter to act as his representative.<sup>12</sup>

On February 2<sup>nd</sup>, Bush and Poor met with the assembled Ta‘imua and Faipule to propose and negotiate the agreement of confederation. Bush made a speech to the chiefs and orators, outlining the arguments for confederation, but for the most part Malietoa had already gained their support before Bush’s arrival in Afega. The majority favored an alliance and agreed to empower Malietoa with the right to draft and sign a treaty of confederation. Some of the assembly, however, put little value in the words of Bush, Malietoa, or Kalākaua; they wanted to see a Hawaiian warship before any decisions were made. When the various speeches and negotiations were completed, a ceremony was held, raising the flags of the two states side by side, followed by more ‘awa and yet another feast. After some negotiations about the details of the agreement, Malietoa and representatives from the Ta‘imua and Faipule signed a document of confederation on February 17<sup>th</sup> and sent it to Honolulu for approval. Kaumiali‘i included a triumphant note in the next mail, “All have succeeded, Samoa and Hawai‘i, we are one in this time. The Samoan flag and the Hawaiian are together in one *pahu*<sup>13</sup>. We have found a home for Hawaii, here in Samoa.” Within less than a month after arriving in Sāmoa, Bush and company had completed the first major step in creating Kalākaua’s Polynesian confederacy.<sup>14</sup>

### *Sāmoa and the Powers: Realpolitik in the Pacific*

When news of the signing reached Hawai‘i, it took most of the government by surprise. They had not expected an agreement so soon, and many seemed puzzled that

---

<sup>12</sup> Poor, “Journal of the Embassy to Samoa”; Bush to Kalākaua, January 27, 1887; John E. Bush, “Dispatch #7, February 2, 1887,” HSA-FO&EX.

<sup>13</sup> *Pahu*: container, drum,

<sup>14</sup> Bush to Kalākaua, January 27, 1887; John E. Bush, “Dispatch #11,” March 7, 1887, HSA-FO&EX; Hiram Kaumiali‘i, “Leta Mai Samoa Mai,” *Nupepa Kuokoa*, March 19 1887.

Malietao had agreed with so little negotiation. Yet the circumstances were such that Malietao may have felt that he had few other alternatives if he wanted to remain even nominally in control of the Samoan government. Between the 1840s and 1860s, Sāmoa repeatedly found itself the victim of the typical settler-oriented gunboat diplomacy of the era, not unlike Hawai'i's experiences between the 1820s and 1850s. In 1841, for instance, Royal Navy Captain William Hudson attempted to kidnap several high profile Samoan chiefs to force the surrender of the chief Popotunu, who was allegedly responsible for a fatal attack on a whaling crew in 1834. Failing at that he turned to another favorite tactic of naval justice when he bombarded and burned several villages. In 1851 American Captain G.A. Magruder kidnapped Malietao Moli and several other chiefs in order to obtain a Tongan sailor who had killed an American sailor in a fight in Apia then fled to Savai'i. Malietao and the other chiefs tried to explain to Magruder that they did not have any authority over Savai'i or the Tongans in Sāmoa, but their pleas fell largely on deaf ears.<sup>15</sup>

Foreign gun running and a rush of questionable land sales during a conflict in the late 1860s led to a much more prominent role for settlers in Samoan politics. At this point the general trend of foreign "interventions" transitioned from naval "justice" to direct attempts to control the direction of Samoan politics. In 1875 the American Albert Steinberger became Premier with broad Samoan support and promises of an American protectorate. Malietao Laupepa, meanwhile, held the office of Tupu, a recently created position often translated as "king." Though he had previously supported Steinberger, the foreign community convinced him to fire the American, leading the Ta'imua and Faipule to depose Malietao. Royal Navy Captain G.E. Stevens, who coordinated the campaign against Steinberger, landed marines in a failed attempt to put Laupepa back in power, resulting in a skirmish with supporters of the Ta'imua and Faipule. The Ta'imua and

---

<sup>15</sup> Gilson, *Samoa 1830 to 1900*, 152-5, 212.

Faipule then led the government at Mulinu'u for a period, but lost popular support over perceived weakness in disputes over foreign land claims.<sup>16</sup>

After a series of conflicts between Malietoa Laupepa and Tupua Tamasese Titimea, the two became “co-kings” in 1881. In 1884 the government requested that Queen Victoria declare Sāmoa a protectorate of the British Empire in order to deal with increasingly aggressive German actions, particularly those surrounding land claims. In response the German firm claimed the land on Mulinu'u that the government occupied and evicted them. Tamasese, angered over the weakness of the government and chafing in his position as co-ruler, abandoned the government. He returned to Leulumoega, where he had strong support, and established a rival government with German assistance. In 1886 the Germans stepped up their support of Tamasese by sending their new consul with instructions to officially recognize both governments. They also sent Eugen Brandeis, an employee of Godeffroy, the German trading firm, to be Tamasese's premier and military advisor.<sup>17</sup>

During this later period, between 1870 and 1887, Samoans employed two main diplomatic strategies in dealing with foreigners: attempts to create a central government and efforts to find a friendly power to protect Samoa from outside aggression. While the various incidents of “Naval Justice” angered many Samoans, the scope of the questionable land sales made between 1869 and 1872 and the ensuing speculation among the *palagi* created a much more pressing problem. During the 1870s and 1880s some Samoans saw the creation of a central government as a means of processing and untangling such claims while also serving as a buffer between the Euro/American powers and the Samoan people. Malietoa Laupepa was intimately involved in two major attempts to do so, including the governments of 1873 and 1881, both of which featured some sort

---

<sup>16</sup> Ibid., 329-331; Meleisea, *The Making of Modern Samoa*, 33-38.

<sup>17</sup> Meleisea, *The Making of Modern Samoa*, 38-39; Poor, “Journal of the Embassy to Samoa.”

of power sharing with a representative of Sā Tupua. In both cases he lost support from powerful Samoan interests after perceived weakness in the face of Euro/American demands, specifically asking for Steinberger's resignation and allowing the Mulinu'u government to be evicted. The Ta'imua and Faipule, which took control from Malietoa in 1876, also lost support among the Samoan people in 1878 because of their inability to withstand settler pressure over land claims.<sup>18</sup>

Another Samoan strategy was to develop stronger relations with one of the powers in the hopes of using that relationship to avoid the aggression of the others. With the Germans as the clearest aggressors, this typically meant appealing to the United States or the British. In 1875 the government formed under Malietoa Laupepa developed a new constitution and appointed Steinberger Premier in the hopes of creating a stronger relationship with the United States, then perceived as the least aggressive of the three powers. Steinberger encouraged the belief that Washington was interested in a protectorate and used this to consolidate Samoan support. Many held out the belief that Steinberger had either succeeded or could succeed in getting the United States to declare a protectorate up until 1878. In 1884 the Malietoa/Tamasese joint regime also sent two petitions to Queen Victoria asking for a protectorate, which led to increased hostility from the Germans. Tamasese, meanwhile, twice looked to the Germans to protect and help develop governments at Leulumoega.<sup>19</sup>

In terms of realpolitik, Hawai'i offered Malietoa two things, the diplomatic infrastructure and recognition needed to negotiate with the Powers and the experience and knowledge needed to help create a stable, centralized Polynesian polity recognized by the Euro/American powers. As noted above, Malietoa had been at the center of efforts to create such a government and to develop either a British or American shield over

---

<sup>18</sup> Meleisea, *The Making of Modern Samoa*, 36-40.

<sup>19</sup> Gilson, *Samoa 1830 to 1900*, 39; Meleisea, *The Making of Modern Samoa*, 353.

Sāmoa. The Hawaiians, though far weaker than either of those two, had close relations with both, perhaps close enough to shield Hawai‘i and Sāmoa from the Germans. With little or no other aid on the horizon, the Hawaiians were Malietoa’s best hope.

*Building Support: February through July*

Having obtained a treaty from Malietoa, Bush and Poor felt that the most significant portion of their work had been completed and turned towards less pressing but still important tasks. As late as March 29<sup>th</sup> Bush wrote that upon the arrival of the *Kaimiloa*, the refurbished Hawaiian naval “training vessel,” he would head immediately to Tonga. The longer they remained in Sāmoa, however, the more the Hawaiians realized that the situation was not as they had imagined it, and they would need to take a far more active role to truly secure both the confederacy and the Malietoa government.<sup>20</sup> Throughout the period from the signing in February until the legation’s recall in July, the bulk of the legation’s work split into three overlapping categories: information gathering, developing the infrastructure and connections needed for the confederacy, and strengthening Malietoa’s administration. While a certain amount of this work could be carried out in Apia, as time went on Bush and Poor realized that the dispersed nature of power in Sāmoa necessitated a great deal of travel within Sāmoa. They were aided in this by the arrival of the *Kaimiloa* on June 15<sup>th</sup>, which served both as transport and as an important symbol of Hawai‘i’s technological and economic development.

The most pressing problem of the mission stemmed from the weak position of the Malietoa government, particularly the continued existence of Tamasese’s “rebel” government at Leulumoega. The legation took a direct role in helping Malietoa gather support for a stronger central government as well as bringing the dispute with Tamasese to a peaceful end. The legation spent a considerable amount of time and resources trying

---

<sup>20</sup> Bush, “Dispatch #2”; John E. Bush, “Dispatch #13,” HSA-FO&EX.



to draw away Tamasese's supporters. They had considerable success in doing so, attracting major figures within Tamasese's government like Patioli, a former member of Tamasese's cabinet, and prominent members of Sā Tupua, Tamasese's extended family, like Mata'afa Iosefo. The legation managed to arrange a meeting with Tamasese and several members of his government who had signaled their willingness to suspend their efforts under certain conditions. When Poor and Coe attempted to visit Leulumoega, Tamasese's German advisors placed Tamasese under armed guard and arrested Coe, Poor, and several of Tamasese's cabinet, thus preventing any discussion from taking place.<sup>21</sup>

In the time after the signing of the treaty, Poor, often accompanied by Strong and Coe, began traveling through different parts of Sāmoa with the primary purpose of developing a general Hawaiian knowledge base about Sāmoa. As noted earlier, the Kalākaua administration and the vast majority of the Hawaiian public had a very limited understanding of Sāmoa, a problem the legation was tasked with ameliorating. Poor compiled several reports for the legation, including an account of the recent political history of Sāmoa, a report on general conditions, copies of various official documents pertinent to the confederacy, and a brief genealogy of the Malietoa title. During these visits Poor and Coe also promoted the confederacy among Samoans outside of Apia, as well as acting to quell the more militant sentiments among Malietoa's supporters and seeking a peaceful end to the dispute with Tamasese.

Bush, meanwhile, focused his efforts largely on continuing to develop the Hawaiian diplomatic presence in Sāmoa. He made developing the kingdom's physical infrastructure in Sāmoa a high priority, obtaining property for a permanent legation and

---

<sup>21</sup> John E. Bush, "Dispatch #19," May 23, 1887, HSA-FO&EX; Poor to Webb, March 12, 1887; Robert Louis Stevenson, *A Footnote to History: Eight Years of Trouble in Samoa* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1900), 61.

constructing a legation building. As the senior Hawaiian diplomat he spent a great deal of time visiting with and entertaining numerous Samoan elites and met with various legations from outside Apia. He made two trips to visit Mata'afa, the second time aboard the *Kaimiloa*, hoping to cement Mata'afa's support for the confederacy and his promise to continue to deny resources to Tamasese. He also took the *Kaimiloa* on a visit to Itu-o-tane, Savai'i hoping to drum up support in that region.<sup>22</sup>

While the legation continued making steady progress in building broader Samoan support for both the confederacy and the Malietoa government, they were unaware that they themselves were drastically losing support at home. Hawaiian- and English-language newspapers in Hawai'i had begun publishing anonymous letters disparaging the mission as early as March 19<sup>th</sup>, when *Ko Hawai'i Pae Aina* published an excerpt from such a letter written by an anonymous *palagi* in Sāmoa. On April 9<sup>th</sup> the *Kuokoa* published an excerpt from another letter, written sometime in February, decrying the Hawaiians for alcoholic excesses during the party on February 17<sup>th</sup>. Rumors about the legation swirled around Honolulu, particularly among the *haole* establishment, then in the process of escalating their smear campaigns against the Kalākaua administration. In response to these rumors, Gibson and Kalākaua sent George Webb, a member of Gibson's staff and a friend of Poor's, to Sāmoa with orders to investigate the state of legation, particularly Bush.<sup>23</sup>

Sometime after the *Kaimiloa* left Honolulu, Kalākaua received a letter from William Coe, Malietoa's translator and another friend of Poor's. Coe attacked Bush as a drunkard and a miscreant, writing "He is the most dissipated man who has held a high

---

<sup>22</sup> John E. Bush, "Dispatch #12," March 29, 1887, HSA-FO&EX; John E. Bush, "Dispatch #22," June 21, 1887, HSA-FO&EX; Lt. Samuel Maikai, "Lt Maikai's Logbook (Bishop Copy), 1887," Bishop-Monarchy; Frank Waiiau, "Lt Waiiau's Logbook (Bishop Copy), 1887," Bishop-Monarchy.

<sup>23</sup> "Mai Samoa Mai," *Nupepa Kuokoa*, April 9 1887; "Samoa a Me Hawaii," *Ko Hawaii Pae Aina*, March 19 1887.

position at this place for many years. His associates here are mostly of the lowest kind of half castes and whites.” Coe also forwarded an English translation of a letter purportedly from Malietoa, promising to send the autograph copy in Samoan by next mailing. Like Coe’s letter, the “Malietoa” letter proclaimed Bush a drunkard and demanded he be recalled. Despite the peculiarities of the situation, particularly the lack of an autographed copy from Malietoa, Gibson and Kalākaua ordered Bush recalled on June 10th, frightened that he would bring the entire mission down through his supposed debauchery and apparent disregard for his hosts.<sup>24</sup>

Because of the irregularity of the mail system news of the recall did not arrive in Sāmoa until July 17<sup>th</sup>. Bush was on Savai’i at the time, and would not return for several more days. Following the orders sent to him with Bush’s recall, Poor took over the mission. The next day a second dispatch from Hawaii arrived, informing them of the political unrest in Hawai’i. On July 8, a mass meeting of *haole* residents, emotion whipped up by months of bombastic columns in the English-language press and feverish rumor-mongering, threatened the king with open revolt if he did not concede to a new constitution that effectively surrendered power to the *haole* establishment. The new constitution, often referred to as the Bayonet Constitution, gave non-citizen *haole* the right to vote, restricted the Native Hawaiian electorate through property and income restrictions, and banned Asians from voting entirely, be they citizens or aliens. It also required voters to swear an oath to the new constitution, which many Native Hawaiians found abhorrent. Furthermore it stripped the king of much of his power, particularly the right to appoint and dismiss ministers at will, and forced upon him a cabinet of their own

---

<sup>24</sup> Walter Murray Gibson, June 10, 1877, Gibson to Webb, HSA-FO&EX; Jeremy Horn, “Primacy of the Pacific under the Hawaiian Kingdom” (Thesis, University of Hawai’i at Manoa, 1951), 147-153; “Mai Samoa Mai”; “Samoa a Me Hawaii”; George Webb, “Dispatch 5,” June 21, 1887, HSA-FO&EX.

choice. In essence they initiated a bloodless coup, seizing power while retaining the king in a much-weakened position.<sup>25</sup>

In the years leading up to the Bayonet revolt the *haole* establishment had often railed against the king's projects, attacking them as wasteful, harmful, and even satanic. While Christian conservatism and economic conservatism played a role in these attacks, the true root of *haole* anger during this period came from the realization that Native Hawaiians, particularly the *mō'ī*, no longer felt a need to ensure them a privileged place in Hawaiian society. The defeat of their candidates in three successive elections, the king's refusal to favor them with appointed positions after his return from the world tour, and resurgent Native national culture all threatened their assumed superiority, and for many this also questioned their very understanding of themselves. It should come as no surprise then, that once empowered politically, the mission/planter oligarchy turned their fury on Kalākaua's cultural and foreign agendas, which they labeled wasteful, heathenish, and damaging to the national image.<sup>26</sup>

The confederacy and the *Kaimiloa* were particularly offensive to many of them, as it questioned not just the place of *haole* in Hawai'i, but the right of Euro/Americans to rule the Pacific as a whole. The new government immediately recalled the entire legation. By the time Bush returned to Apia, Gibson's order recalling Bush and the new government's orders recalling the legation had both become public. Bush immediately visited Malietoa to learn the authenticity of Coe's letters, which Malietoa denied having any knowledge of. Malietoa then fired Coe and asked Bush to stay on as part of his administration, which Bush agreed to, moving his family out of the Hawaiian legation he

---

<sup>25</sup> Osorio, *Dismembering Lāhui*, 240-244.

<sup>26</sup> Kuykendall, *Hawaiian Kingdom*: Vol. III, 336; Osorio, *Dismembering Lāhui*, 233-238.

had so recently built. Bush then accused Poor, among other things, of having conspired with Coe to have him removed.<sup>27</sup>

After this Malietoa essentially snubbed the official legation, siding with Bush and only agreeing to meet with Poor and Webb for the departure of the *Kaimiloa* on August 6<sup>th</sup>. According to Bush, Malietoa spoke to Poor only briefly at the event, stating, “I understand that you and Mr. Coe have been the means of Mr. Bush’s recall and the withdrawal of the Hawaiian Legation.” He then turned his back on the party, until the Hawaiian officers of the *Kaimiloa* came forward, at which point, “The King felt sorry for the young officers, and as they were about to leave, he tendered them through an *aloha* as he said for Your Majesty, the usual token of friendship, only for them, but not for [Poor], nor Mr. Webb.” Malietoa refused to communicate any further with the official members of the legation, who left Sāmoa on August 18<sup>th</sup>. Thus the Polynesian Confederacy came to its anticlimactic end.<sup>28</sup>

### **Genealogy, Race, and Kinship**

While the coup cut short the legation’s time in Sāmoa, as well as the kingdom’s brief foray into trans-Polynesian alliances, the legation’s activities in Sāmoa were substantial enough to get a clear sense of how they and the Kalākaua administration understood and promoted their relationship with Sāmoa. Throughout the legation’s accounts, the Hawaiians constantly employed a discourse of genealogy and kinship in order to secure Samoan support. As discussed in the last chapter, most Polynesian cultures place genealogy at the center of their historical and contemporary understanding of the world. Thus it should come as no surprise that the Hawaiians rooted their political appeals for closer ties in the present within genealogical claims of closer ties in the past.

---

<sup>27</sup> John E. Bush to Kalākaua, August 15, 1887, Hawaii State Archive. Honolulu; Henry Poor to Brown, August 23, 1887, HSA-FO&EX.

<sup>28</sup> John E. Bush to Kalākaua, August 15, 1887, HSA-FO&EX; Henry Poor to Brown, August 23, 1887 HSA-FO&EX.

Copies of Kalākaua’s letter to Malietoa, which played a prominent role in the period before the signing of the treaty, have vanished from the various archives in Hawai‘i. A transcript of Kalākaua’s letter to King George Tupou of Tonga, however, signed and dated on December 23<sup>rd</sup> and sent with the legation, remains in the Hawai‘i State Archive. In that letter Kalākaua emphasizes the kinship between Hawai‘i and Tonga, highlighting “the friendship we have always entertained towards your majesty and the Tongan people, a race so closely allied by blood to the Hawaiians.” While Euro/American racial discourses influenced the king’s language, the appeal was clearly one of kinship, a powerful appeal within Polynesian cultures. Following Kalākaua’s lead, Malietoa and Bush both made similar appeals regarding the relationship between the Hawaiians and Samoans after Bush presented Kalākaua’s letter to Malietoa. Despite Hawaii and Sāmoa having relatively little contact for decades and lacking any communication for centuries before that, the Hawaiians and the Samoans both understood the symbolic contact represented by genealogy as an important foundation for their new relationship.<sup>29</sup>

During the various meetings that took place between the Hawaiians and the Samoans before the signing of the treaty, the issue of a common origin remained on everyone’s tongues. After the first informal meeting with Malietoa’s cabinet at the legation’s quarters, Bush wrote “they appear perfectly satisfied that Hawaiians and Samoans are relatives, and that a closer alliance than is accorded to other nations would be proper. This feeling permeates all, the Chiefs and the people.” Bush made a speech at the January 15<sup>th</sup> entertainments, during which he, “dwelt forcibly on the strong resemblance of the two races, and from the similarity of the names of the chiefs [in the genealogies], of their relationship.” The January 15<sup>th</sup> feast, which the legation planned as

---

<sup>29</sup> Bush to Kalākaua, January 27, 1887; David Kalākaua to George, King of the Tonga Islands, December 23, 1886, HSA-FO&EX.

a Hawaiian-style event, was itself an expression of kinship with the Samoans, highlighting shared Polynesian feasting traditions as “refined” by the Kalākaua court. At the meeting with the Ta‘imua and Faipule, Bush prefaced his remarks by alluding to their Polynesian connections, stating:

I come among you not exactly as a stranger but representing a King and a people closely allied to you by blood, by language, and by similar traditions. Many generations ago the chiefs and people of Hawai‘i and Samoa visited each other in their great canoes. Some of your chiefs became Kings in Hawai‘i and our traditions say that our chiefs even were received in Samoa, where a number of them went to seek brides of suitable rank. For many years we have had no communication with you and now we come to renew old friendships and seek new ties among a kindred people.<sup>30</sup>

The power of genealogy in Polynesia comes in large part from the Polynesian emphasis on the value placed on family, *‘ohana* in Hawai‘i, *‘āiga* in Sāmoa, and conversely the importance of genealogical knowledge helped to maintain those familial bonds. In Polynesian cultures familial connections brought a host of advantages and responsibilities. Family connections played an essential role in maintaining safety and security in everyday life, allowing one access to food, shelter, land, and hospitality in good times and bad. In order to maintain this access, however, one had to fulfill certain responsibilities to the family. This extended far beyond the household, indeed an important part of the security of this system came from the ability to call upon resources from geographically and genealogically distant parts of the family in times of trouble. War, drought, natural disaster, or wanderlust could force or encourage people to temporarily or permanently abandon their home areas. In these cases a well-dispersed extended family provided the most secure hospitality. In Sāmoa, broadly distributed families also continued to provide a certain degree of protection in wartime, with family

---

<sup>30</sup> Bush to Kalākaua, January 27, 1887; John E. Bush, “Bush to Taimua and Faipule,” FO & EX, Honolulu.

on the winning side looking out for the interest of family members on the losing side. As shown in the example of Peleioholani and Alapa‘i given in the previous chapter, Hawaiian genealogical appeals also had a historical precedent for ending wars even when the genealogical connection was a relatively distant one that needed a specialized genealogist to invoke it.<sup>31</sup>

While Polynesians placed a high value on kinship, by no means did it guarantee harmony between kin. Indeed the importance of genealogy in determining chiefly *mana* meant that many wars and conflicts occurred between close relatives. Kamehameha, for instance, took control over Kona by slaying his cousin Kiwala‘o, who had a more prominent inheritance but less powerful supporters. The longstanding conflict between Malietoa Laupepa and his uncle Malietoa Talavou occurred in part because both possessed a valid genealogical claim to the Malietoa title. Among the powerful, kinship was not a guarantee of alliance, rather it was an important value and a resource that could be appealed to in order to create, strengthen, or validate relationships in both mundane and unusual circumstances.

This understanding of genealogy as a resource can be seen in the kinship claims of the Hawaiians and the Samoans, where the situational context turned distant ties into close ones. Thus while the genealogical appeals on both sides reflected a genuine feeling of connection and *aloha* between the two peoples as distant relatives, it also represented a conscious attempt to create contemporary connections desired on both sides for practical political reasons. The shared genealogical connections between the Hawaiians and Samoans did not create the need or impetus for the Confederation, or else it would have been attempted generations earlier. Rather it created a way to justify and rationalize the fast tracking of an alliance that both sides desired for political reasons. Furthermore, if

---

<sup>31</sup> Meleisea, *The Making of Modern Samoa*, 28; Mary Kawena; Hand Pukui, E.S. Craighill, *The Polynesian Family System in Ka'u, Hawai'i* (Honolulu: Mutual Publishing, 1998).



they actually succeeded in creating a fully realized confederacy it would also give them a foundation for future mediation within the confederacy.

According to the ideals of Hawaiians and most other Polynesian peoples, the connections and responsibilities between family members were not to be understood just in terms of resources and responsibilities, but ideally should be offered freely as an expression of *aloha/alofa/aroa*. A lack of *aloha* for one's *'ohana* threatened the harmony and thus the wellbeing of the entire *'ohana*. Following Polynesian value systems, the Hawaiian legation actively promoted the legation and the confederacy as an act of *aloha* between the two peoples. As most of the legation's remaining records are in English, including many of the original documents, it is hard to say how directly the Hawaiians actually used the term *aloha* in reference to the Hawaiian/Samoan relationship. Kalākaua's letter to King George references feelings of "friendship" he and the Hawaiian people had for the Tongans, as did Bush's original speech to Malietoa. Yet *aloha* and friendship are interwoven in Hawaiian thought. The most pervasive translations of "friendship" are *pilialoha* and *hoaloha*, literally clinging/adhered with love and companion in love. Furthermore, when summarizing the Samoan response to the letter, Bush explicitly refers to it as "the letter of sympathy and love which Your Majesty wrote." The letter may not have contained the actual word, but Bush clearly understood it as an expression of *aloha*.<sup>32</sup>

On at least two occasions the Samoans, or at least Malietoa, affirmed the idea that the relationship between the two kings, and their respective governments, was rooted in *aloha/alofa*. In one translated letter he refers to Kalākaua's December 1886 letter as an acknowledgement that Kalākaua's "love for us is unchanged in the way you remembered me." In another letter he wrote of his great joy at Bush's presence, and how the envoy continued to "help and maintain the love between the two Governments." In this letter,

---

<sup>32</sup> Bush to Kalākaua, January 27, 1887; Kalākaua to George, King of the Tonga Islands.

the only of these four examples in which a Samoan or Hawaiian version has survived, Malietoa used the word *alofa* in the original.<sup>33</sup>

As mentioned in the last chapter, Hawaiian appeals to Polynesian kinship and unity clearly contained traces of European and American racial ideologies. For some of the *haole* involved in the mission, like George Webb of the Foreign Office, there was little or no difference between the confederacy and the racial nationalism then prominent in Europe. In a somewhat naïve manner, he expressed some surprise at German resistance to Hawaiian unification with Sāmoa, as it was motivated by “the same race sentiment that had so recently united Germany.”<sup>34</sup> Webb apparently failed to realize that that same German racial sentiment had also helped fuel their quest for empire. The legation and the Samoans also employed the language of race, particularly when using the English language. They often fell back on blood metaphors, for instance, which stemmed directly from Euro/American racial discourses. Bush explained Kalākaua’s interest in Samoan welfare in part through his recognition, “in them of a people of a kindred race closely allied to the Hawaiians by blood, by language, and by historical traditions.” Malietoa echoed these sentiments in his response, which Coe translated into English as, “It is true that the Hawaiians and Samoans are related by blood and other ties. I have in my possession genealogical records which prove that your kings and people and myself are related.” He sounded a similar sentiment in his first letter to Kalākaua on January 18<sup>th</sup>, writing, “By traditions we have learned the truth that your people are of one blood with

---

<sup>33</sup> Malietoa Laupepa to Kalākaua, January 18, 1887, HSA-Carter Collection; Malietoa Laupepa to Kalākaua, April 20, 1887,” HSA-Carter Collection, Honolulu.

<sup>34</sup> George Webb, “Dispatch 1,” June 21, 1887, HSA-FO&EX.

us.” While neither Bush nor Malietoa/Coe relied entirely on “blood” imagery, their words clearly show the influence of Euro/American racial discourses.<sup>35</sup>

Kēhaulani Kauanui has discussed how the blood-based metaphor for race and kinship was imported into Hawai'i in the nineteenth century, and how such an understanding of kinship-as-race is based on a much different conception of kinship than the Polynesian genealogical model. Furthermore, Hawaiian bodily metaphors and terms for close kin usually reference other body parts such as the *piko*, bellybutton. Since only the English translations of these speeches and letters are available, however, it is hard to say at what point the term blood entered into the picture. Such slippage into racial discourses when using English must have seemed quite natural in the late-nineteenth century. Globally, nineteenth-century English cannot be separated from the United States and other parts or former parts of the British Empire, where race was the default understanding of how different peoples were connected to or separated from each other. Even if this discussion of “blood” only appears as a result of needing English as a common language between the Hawaiian representatives, the Samoan chiefs, and the *haole* among the foreign affairs staff in Honolulu, it still presents clear evidence that European and American racial ideologies had some role in shaping how the Hawaiians and Samoans saw their connections.<sup>36</sup>

Though carrying a very different set of connotations and baggage, racial discourses, like genealogy, still spoke to ways of categorizing peoples as innately tied to or separated from one another. Thus these appeals to race still portrayed Hawaiians and Samoans as intrinsically connected to one another by bonds beyond temporary political necessity. By employing the racial discourses of the time in their bid for an anti-imperial

---

<sup>35</sup> Bush, “Address Read to His Majesty Malietoa: January 7, 1887 (Translation)”; Bush to Kalākaua, January 27, 1887; Kalākaua to George, King of the Tonga Islands; Malietoa Laupepa, “Remarks of King Malietoa in Response To an Address of His Excellency Jno. E. Bush, 1887,” HSA-Carter Collection.

<sup>36</sup> Kauanui, *Hawaiian Blood: Colonialism and the Politics of Sovereignty and Indigeneity*, 49-52.

alliance, the Hawaiians and Samoans were also challenging dominant elements of English-language discourses on race in which only “white” races were capable of self-governance let alone international alliances. In light of Fornander’s Aryan thesis, perhaps the use of English-language racial discourses even marked a claim for whiteness.

*Aloha Among Confederates, Diplomacy within the ‘Ohana/‘Āiga*

In keeping with the rhetoric of genealogy and kinship that proved so powerful in their discussions with Malietoa, the Hawaiians also sought to act in accordance with Polynesian understandings of relations within families, particularly the emphasis on generosity. There are several notes from Bush to other members of the legation and the *Kaimiloa*’s crew, requesting that the bearer of the note receive certain items from the ship’s stores, such as cash, “A felt hat, a good one,” bread, and syrup. There is also a note from Coe to Bush, explaining that Malietoa needed \$100 and that the queen would be by to pick it up. The cursory nature of the note seems to imply that the issue would not be disputed and that Hawaiian compliance with such a request would be almost reflexive.<sup>37</sup>

Though technically the guests of the Samoans the Hawaiians still displayed their generosity and *aloha* through an emphasis on hospitality. As noted above, the Hawaiians hosted the Malietoa government to a rather extravagant Hawaiian-style feast during their earliest days in Apia, a conventional Polynesian display of *aloha* and wealth. Bush, however, felt the building they were renting as the legation lacked the space and ambiance for further entertaining, and built the new legation in large part to improve their ability to provide hospitality. Once completed, the legation building became something of a social center where the Hawaiians hosted various prominent Samoans. Visiting delegations wishing to speak with the Hawaiians could expect Hawaiian hospitality in Apia, such as a delegation from Manono, Tutuila, and Savai‘i that came to discuss the

---

<sup>37</sup> William Coe to Poor, April 6, 1887, HHS-Poor Papers; Kingdom of Hawaii, *Incoming Letters, Kaimiloa* 1887.

confederacy in May. Some prominent Samoans living in Apia were frequent visitors to the legation, like the orator Patioli, who acquired a place near the legation in Apia and spent much of his time enjoying the mission's hospitality.<sup>38</sup>

These expressions of generosity and hospitality, of course, were not without political motivation. In loaning or giving money to Malietoa, the legation clearly meant not just to show general Hawaiian generosity, or even Hawaiian generosity to Samoans, but specifically Hawaiian generosity to King Malietoa. The same can be said of the hospitality shown towards the delegation from Manono, Tutuila, and Savai'i, a collection of chiefs and orators who represented a wide and powerful swath of Malietoa's allies from across Sāmoa. The legation also focused their hospitality at potential defectors from the Tamasese faction. Patioli, also known as Lauafi or Maia, had been Tamasese's Chief of State until quite recently. He and his daughter, who Poor claimed had been Tamasese's wife, abandoned Tamasese and moved to Apia in large part due to the presence of the Hawaiian legation. While Patioli had left Tamasese's party, he could not officially come out in favor of Malietoa, as "he was indebted to Weber by mortgage on lands. If clear of Weber he would not hesitate to pronounce in favor of Malietoa." In the meantime, however, the legation provided him with hospitality and a space to unofficially signal his support for Malietoa.<sup>39</sup>

As noted above, Bush also made several trips out of Apia. He visited Mata'afa in Atua twice, once before the *Kaimiloa* arrived and once with the ship. He also took the *Kaimiloa* to the Gaga'emauga and Gaga'ifomauga districts on Savai'i, collectively known as the Itu-o-Tane, where Bush visited with the local dignitaries from July 11<sup>th</sup> until the 18<sup>th</sup>. In large part these trips signaled that Bush had finally recognized the need to appeal for support for the confederacy at the level of the districts and villages. By

---

<sup>38</sup> Bush, "Dispatch #12"; Bush, "Dispatch #22"; Poor to Webb, March 12, 1887.

<sup>39</sup> Poor to Webb, March 12, 1887.

traveling out to meet and visit with the various chiefs and orators of these districts, Bush displayed Hawaiian respect for these polities or sub-polities and showed that they valued them as allies. Due to the zealousness with which such polities guarded their reputations and independence, such signs of respect were essential for broader support for the confederacy. Indeed part of Bush's anger at being recalled in July was that the chiefs and orators of the areas he had not yet visited would be offended and perhaps turn their backs on the confederacy. Yet these trips also presented Bush the opportunity to further display Hawaiian generosity and affection, allowing these politically motivated trips to be also understood as a show of *aloha*.<sup>40</sup>

During his second visit to Mata'afa and his trip to the Itu-o-Tane aboard the *Kaimiloa*, Bush had three new tools at his disposal to display the Hawaiians' *aloha* and generosity: the ship's stores, the ship's band, and the *Kaimiloa* itself. Though disparaged in Hawai'i and woefully under-gunned compared to the vessels of the Great Powers, the Samoans still admired the *Kaimiloa*. In his June Dispatch, Bush wrote:

The *Kaimiloa* arrived here on the morning of the 15h...Her appearance has excited none but favorable comment in Apia, and she and her officers and boy crew have excited special interest among the Samoans, and the native chiefs seem to take a personal pride and interest in her and extend a hearty welcome to her officers. Her appearance has certainly strengthened the position of Hawai'i in Samoa and will I think bring the whole of Samoa to our side in peace.

Like the Samoans of Apia, Mata'afa also seemed to take a personal pride in the *Kaimiloa* when it arrived in Atua, at a place the Hawaiians first identified as "Wainau Bay." Upon

---

<sup>40</sup> Bush to Kalākaua, August 15, 1887; Waiiau, "Lt Waiiau's Logbook (Bishop Copy); Frank Waiiau, "Lt Waiiau's Logbook (Grove Copy), 1887," HSA-FO&EX; George Webb, "Dispatch #6," July 18, 1887, HSA-FO&EX.

coming aboard the ship Mata‘afa declared that he would rename the bay in their honor, and that it would be thereafter known as “Kaimiloa Bay.”<sup>41</sup>

The Samoans could clearly see the clear difference in size and power between the *Kaimiloa* and the warships of the Great Powers. The German *Adler*, which shadowed the *Kaimiloa* during its time in Sāmoa, was a new, wood-and-steel, composite-hulled vessel that displaced some 1040 tons. The *Kaimiloa*, meanwhile, was a 171-ton guano trader converted into a gunship in four months. Its crew, meanwhile, included a large number of reform school boys sent aboard to learn a trade and to perform as the ship’s band. Yet the *Kaimiloa* was still a gunship, and a gunship owned and operated by Polynesians. Indeed even the ship’s reform school band, which *haole* portrayed as a sign of Hawaiian ineptitude, proved a major draw for the *Kaimiloa* in Apia and in other parts of Sāmoa. In Apia, Atua, and at Itu-o-Tane, the band was constantly going between the ship and shore, providing both entertainment and proof of the Hawaiian *aloha*.<sup>42</sup>

The ship’s stores also allowed Bush further opportunity to display Hawaiian generosity, presenting his hosts with presents as well as helping supply the festivities ashore. While Bush displayed a relatively open hand with the ship’s stores in general, he was particularly generous with the ship’s supply of gin. Indeed throughout their stay the Hawaiians were free with their liquor, including at the feast thrown for Malietoa in January and with their other daily visitors at the legation. Poor noted somewhat pointedly, for instance, that Patioli took a particularly strong liking to the legation’s open bar. Bush’s liberality with the Hawaiian liquor caused a great deal of concern, particularly among his detractors. Webb, who Gibson sent to spy on Bush and who distrusted him from the start, was disturbed by the sheer volume of gin Bush distributed, complaining that, “Of fourteen cases of gin purchased for the [trip], seven remained on

---

<sup>41</sup> Bush, “Dispatch #22; Waiiau, “Lt Waiiau’s Logbook (Bishop Copy).

<sup>42</sup> Bush, “Dispatch #22; Kuykendall, *Hawaiian Kingdom*: Vol. III, p. 334.

the ship.” Webb, however, felt that Bush’s trips in general were a waste, nothing more than an attempt to “gratify the several chiefs visited by a sight of the ship, and having the band sent ashore to entertain their people.”<sup>43</sup>

The long and global history of traders, merchants, and other outsiders using alcohol to inebriate and exploit Native peoples brings into question the intent and wisdom of Bush’s generosity with his gin. At the same time, however, it should be noted that Kalākaua promoted his own efforts to end prohibition in Hawai‘i largely by arguing that the Kingdom’s liquor policies, which only barred Natives from purchasing and selling liquor, were discriminatory throwbacks. Bush’s liberality with his liquor, which violated similar laws in Sāmoa, seemed to strike a similar chord among many of the prominent Samoans who either hosted or were hosted by the legation, considering the speed with which the booze disappeared.<sup>44</sup>

Bush’s efforts to display Hawaiian *aloha* and respect become more significant when viewed in contrast with the behavior of the Germans in Sāmoa. While the representatives of both the United States and Great Britain had done their share of exploiting and exasperating the turmoil in Sāmoa, the Germans had the most to gain from and the most interest in weakening Samoan independence. Their eviction of the government at Mulinu‘u provided just one of a number of examples of the way that the Godeffroy company, backed by the German Navy, routinely antagonized the Samoan people and mocked the very concept of Samoan independence. Appalled, Poor described the Germans associated with the main German Company, J.C. Godeffroy and Sons, as “more like the ancient Goths and vandals from which they sprung than like modern

---

<sup>43</sup> Bush to Kalākaua, January 27, 1887; Poor to Webb, March 12, 1887; George Webb, “Dispatch 7,” July 19, 1887, HSA-FO&EX; George Webb to Brown, August 27, 1887.

<sup>44</sup> Kuykendall, *Hawaiian Kingdom*: Vol. III, 257.



Christian Gentlemen,” an amusing play on Euro/American claims of Polynesian historical and contemporary savagery.<sup>45</sup>

While the Hawaiian legation and their allies in the Malietoa government were certainly biased against the Germans, they witnessed enough German malfeasance to justify such a bias. Poor reported a crowd of drunken Germans who, after failing to goad the legation into a fight in a hotel restaurant, literally marched into the streets of Apia in a drunken attempt at a military formation and began randomly assaulting Samoans. On March 22<sup>nd</sup>, the Kaiser’s birthday, Poor reported that the Germans and their Samoan employees had rampaged in the streets of Apia before being driven back by a large number of Samoans residing in Apia. Such behavior did little to ingratiate the Germans to the Samoan public, especially around Apia. Bush noted as much in a February dispatch:

Their arbitrary, arrogant, and aggressive methods have made them disliked by almost the entire native population as well as by a great majority of foreigners resident here. The native chiefs and people would bitterly deplore German rule and would never be content or prosperous under it but would rapidly be ‘civilized off the face of the earth.’<sup>46</sup>

German disregard for the Samoans even extended to their allies in Tamasese’s camp, which led to a significant erosion of support for the German-backed Leulumoega government during the legation’s stay. On March 12<sup>th</sup> Poor reported that he had heard a number of Tamasese’s supporters were already losing faith in their German allies after:

[Weber] made a speech to the Tamasese Government giving them every encouragement and making vague promises and undoing it by informing them that \$1700 was due his firm for arms and ammunition and a speedy settlement was desirable: that the balance in the treasury (which was in Weber’s hands) was already exhausted by previous purchases of arms:

---

<sup>45</sup> Henry Poor to Webb, January 31, 1887.

<sup>46</sup> John E. Bush, “Dispatch #8,” February 22, 1887, HSA-FO&EX; Poor to Webb, January 31, 1887; Henry Poor to Webb, March 23, 1887.

advised them all to sell their lands to him (at 25 [cents] per acre) that they might obtain more arms.

Those misguided people are beginning to think that as a man Weber is not all their fancy painted him.

Poor then noted that Brandeis, the former Godeffroy clerk who Weber sent to “advise” Tamasese, was ready to file a complaint with the German consulate when the Tamasese Government decided to only pay him a third of the \$150 per month that Weber had negotiated for him. He gleefully added, “the Tamasese Government evidently do not appreciate his services for the think \$50 per month is sufficient for a man who was too incompetent to fill a position [at Godeffroy].”<sup>47</sup>

May proved to be particularly disastrous for the Germans. In the beginning of the month Tamasese’s German advisors physically refrained Tamasese and briefly imprisoned Poor, Coe, and several of Tamasese’s *ali’i* and *tulafale* to prevent meetings between the Tamasese government and the Hawaiians, much to the disgust of Tamasese’s supporters. Later that month, with the Hawaiians stripping away supporters and morale lagging, the Germans initiated a disastrous public relations campaign. On the 28<sup>th</sup> they presented Tamasese with a new flag at Leulumoega and, according to Bush, convinced one of the orators there to bestow upon him the title Tui Atua. On the 30<sup>th</sup> they took the provocative step of bringing Tamasese and his chiefs to Apia, where they entertained them aboard the German warship *Adler* under the new flag. While the event clearly showed the Germans’ contempt of Malietoa and recognition of Tamasese, it failed in its intended goal of raising morale among Tamasese’s supporters. Bush reported:

The visitors expected a salute of cannon for themselves and the new flag, but as the ship has not a saluting battery they became suspicious and disappointed. Tamasese and a few others returned home that morning but

---

<sup>47</sup> Poor to Webb, March 12, 1887.

the majority staid [sic] on Mulinuu Point where they got into a general quarrel among themselves.

The majority objected to the new flag as being too close a resemblance to the German and were mad that no salute had been fired, and begun to doubt the good faith of the Germans.<sup>48</sup>

The incident served as a catalyst for further discontent. The next day a large faction of Tamasese's supporters from Atua left. They cited among their chief complaints the improper protocols under which Tamasese had received the Tui Atua title over Mata'afa, who had designs on the Tui Atua title and considerably stronger support within the district itself. A number of warriors from Itu-o-Tane also left, disgruntled with the entire situation. Tamasese then set out for Falefa in Atua to hold *fono*, make explanations, and try to induce his former adherents to return. On the 10<sup>th</sup> of June the German vice-consul went down to join Tamasese and assist him in recalling the disaffected warriors, but they both returned on the night of the 11<sup>th</sup> having failed in their mission.<sup>49</sup>

It is no coincidence that Bush's first stops on the *Kaimiloa* were at Atua and Itu-o-Tane, regions discontented with Tamasese and his German hosts. While the Hawaiians continued to woo Mata'afa in Atua, the Germans continued to push him farther away with their ham-fisted efforts, particularly regarding the questionable bestowal of the Tui Atua title on Tamasese. If Mata'afa needed further contrast between the German and Hawaiian views of their Samoan hosts it came during Bush's visit aboard the *Kaimiloa*. The Hawaiians welcomed Mata'afa aboard the ship, toasted him, and impressed him with their generosity and *aloha*. As soon as Mata'afa returned to land the captain of the *Adler*, which followed the Hawaiians into "Kaimiloa Bay," ordered him onboard, interrogated him about the Hawaiian visit, and tried to bully him into supporting Tamasese. Similarly,

---

<sup>48</sup> Bush, "Dispatch #22."

<sup>49</sup> Ibid.

while the Germans' behavior had upset the Itu-o-Tane warriors in May, the Hawaiians voyaged out to their district in June, wined them (or at least ginned them), displayed the *Kaimiloa*, and presented them with entertainment in the form of the Reform School/Navy band. The Hawaiians could not match the Germans in terms of military or economic strength, and the Samoans recognized this. But they clearly outmatched the Germans in terms of *aloha*, respect, and generosity.<sup>50</sup>

This was the key to the Hawaiian vision of the confederacy and the way the Hawaiians believed they could secure influence in Sāmoa. Unlike the various empires in the Pacific that could rely on their ability to coerce Native polities and colonized peoples through force of arms, the Hawaiians had to rely largely on Samoan trust. The basis of this trust came in proving that the Hawaiians thought of themselves and the Samoans as belonging to one another through genealogical and kinship-oriented logics. As Bush put it:

From all my observation and experience here and the messages and assurances I have received from the chiefs of different districts, I am convinced that the Hawaiians would, better than a foreign nation, have the confidence of the Samoans and succeed in raising order out of chaos: build up a stable government on the ruins of anarchy: unite the country in peace and start it on a career of prosperity, for which its fertile lands and its excellent harbors will be a guarantee.<sup>51</sup>

Bush's use of "foreign" in this statement is rather telling. On the one hand "foreign" was a common translation for "*haole*," and Bush may have simply meant that as a non-*haole* state the Hawaiians had a better relationship with the Samoans. At the same time, however, the exclusion of Hawaiians from the category "foreign," may also indicate

---

<sup>50</sup> Stevenson, *A Footnote to History*, 61; Waiiau, "Lt Waiiau's Logbook (Bishop Copy).

<sup>51</sup> Bush, "Dispatch #8."

Bush's own strong beliefs in the importance of Hawaiian and Samoan kinship. The Hawaiians were not foreign; they were *'ohana*.

Throughout their time in Sāmoa the Hawaiian legation sought to define the relationship between Hawai'i and Sāmoa as one between two peoples, and two monarchs, inherently tied to one another by their genealogical connections. In the direct appeals they made to the Malietoa government, they did so explicitly, as did Malietoa and his cabinet, creating a mutually understood foundation for their negotiations regarding the confederacy. Even after the signing of the treaty of confederacy the legation continued to act according to Polynesian expectations of behavior among kin, particularly in their displays of generosity and hospitality. They did not perform such displays without political motivation, of course, as they directed them primarily at allies and prospective allies among the Samoan elite. These displays further developed the idea of a political confederacy around the values of kinship and *aloha*, and the expectation that such values would mediate the future relationship between the Hawaiians and Samoans under the confederacy. While by no means a new idea within Polynesian polities and societies, this represented a new type of political relationship between Polynesian polities that challenged the Euro/American vision of a colonial Pacific.

#### **“Very Few Live with *Na'auao* Like Ours”: A Hawaiian Discourse of Progress**

Polynesian discourses of kinship argue for inherent ties and mutuality, but this should not be confused with an argument for equality, indeed families are the most consistently unequal social structures within Polynesia. From the start the legation sought to define the relationship between the two peoples as intimate, but with the Hawaiians clearly in a position of influence and power over the Samoans based on their *na'auao*, specifically their “progress” along towards Euro/American political, cultural, and economic norms. Unlike the inherent and permanent ties of kinship, however, the

Hawaiians displayed and promoted their superiority with the explicit promise that they could help their Samoan kin achieve the same level of progress and development, that the Samoan inferiority would eventually be developed away. Regardless, the Hawaiian belief in their own progress led, as such beliefs usually do, to assumptions of Samoan primitiveness in both their internal discussions and their planning for the future of Sāmoa under the confederacy.

From the start the legation proudly maintained a belief in their collective Hawaiian superiority. While impressed by the properly subdued behavior of Samoan churchgoers, Kaumiali'i noted pointedly that they lacked hats, even the preachers, and that, "their living is a little *hemahema* [awkward/deficient]. They have no bowls or calabashes, to place the meat and food, they put all the food together in a coconut basket." Bush expressed similar sentiments to Kalākaua, writing of the Samoans, "very few live with *naauao* like ours. To me their mode of living is like ours when there was no *kapu*, and are somewhat wild, and their minds are not like that of the Hawaiian nation...I can truthfully say: 'Hawaii no ka oi.'"<sup>52</sup> Bush also wrote of the effort to find affordable medium-term lodging until appropriations for a permanent legation could be built, complaining that:

There was not a vacant or habitable dwelling to be obtained in Apia. The Government people offered us native houses, but this we could not accept, as the natives here are very curious and do not hesitate or think it rude to come in to your dwelling. Your bedroom is not even sacred to them.

---

<sup>52</sup> John E. Bush to Kalākaua, January 3, 1887, HSA-FO&EX; Hiram Kaumiali'i, "He Leta Mai Samoa Mai," *Nupepa Kuokoa*, February 19 1887. The originals of both these letters are in Hawaiian. A translated version of the Bush letter is available in HSA-FO&EX, but the translation presented here is my own, retaining the Hawaiian terms when significant.

The assumptions in the statement are clear, Native houses were not habitable, in large part because of the presence of Natives.<sup>53</sup>

The Hawaiians remained relatively consistent in their belief in their own superiority, yet from the beginning a split seemed to appear between Bush and Poor in the value associated with this superiority relative to the value of their kinship. The two differed, for instance, in their descriptions of their speeches on January 15<sup>th</sup>. In a letter to Kalākaua, Bush recounted giving a speech that placed a heavy emphasis on the kinship between the Hawaiians and Samoans. In a letter to Webb, Poor summarized his own series of toasts and short speeches by writing, “I think you would have been amused at the paternal way in which I addressed these people, but they seemed to like it.” The two also differed in their descriptions of Malietoa’s attire. In a letter to Kalākaua, Bush described Malietoa’s appearance during their first meeting within a highly complimentary paragraph regarding Malietoa’s demeanor and dignity, likening it to Kalākaua’s. He then added, “Although he wore but a linen shirt without even a color on, and a siapo or pau around his waist, his feet without shoes, he still appeared distinguished under such adverse circumstances.” Poor, meanwhile, described Malietoa and his cabinet arriving for the feast on the 15<sup>th</sup> in a mocking tone, referring to their, “Full Samoan costume, i.e. a coarse linen shirt without collar, and a siapo or length of Kapa cloth wound about the loins and hanging about as low as the knee, and bare-footed.”<sup>54</sup>

The differing tones in Bush and Poor’s descriptions of their speeches and Malietoa’s attire highlight a divergence in how the two envisioned their relationships with the Samoans. While both seemed to have a certain investment in genealogical/racial connections with the Samoans and the discourse of Hawaiian developmental superiority,

---

<sup>53</sup> Bush to Kalākaua, January 3, 1887; Bush, Bush to Kalākaua, January 27, 1887; Kaumiali’i, “He Leta Mai Samoa Mai.”

<sup>54</sup> Bush, Bush to Kalākaua, January 27, 1887; Poor to Webb, January 31, 1887.

Bush on the whole seemed much more invested in the former and Poor in the latter. Bush, for instance, was more inclined to comment on observations like his first-hand recognition of Samoan as a linguistic cousin of Hawaiian, noting that he could understand many words and the general gist of conversations after just a few days. Poor, meanwhile, complained that it was so hot he rarely put on his suit, and that if he stayed in Sāmoa too long he would “degenerate into a Happy ‘faa Samoa.’” These differences would also have repercussions in the way the two men imagined and began to develop plans for relations between the Hawaiians and Samoans under the confederacy.<sup>55</sup>

The Hawaiians did not relegate their explicit promotion of their own superiority to their internal writings, however, indeed their claims to superiority were as significant to their overall appeals for a confederacy as were their claims of kinship. Bush’s speeches, given to a Samoan audience, frequently stated that he, and by proxy Kalākaua, saw the Samoans as undeveloped versions of themselves. In his speech on the 15<sup>th</sup>, Bush recalled telling his audience that:

Their condition today was very much like ours, in many respects, some thirty or forty years ago, and that with forty years the start of them in Christianity and civilization, they could well look to us for friendly advice and advanced ideas in the construction and formation of a stable and liberal government.

He later expressed similar ideas to the Ta‘imua and Faipule, telling them:

We have been more fortunate than you in our progress in [ill.] civilization and taking an advanced stand among the civilized nations of the world, and now come to you to extend a helping hand if you desire it...My advice to you is to remain firm and strong and seek to have your country governed by the advanced principles of Modern Civilization and truth and justice will prevail in your favor...My country has fortunately been the exception

---

<sup>55</sup> Bush to Kalākaua, January 27, 1887; Poor to Webb, January 31, 1887.



[among Polynesian countries] and is established and recognized and has become wealthy and prosperous.<sup>56</sup>

The Hawaiians also utilized cultural representations of their assumed superiority, particularly the trappings and formalities of European diplomacy, which they displayed frequently to impress the Samoans with their grasp of that world. They began this from the initial meeting, for instance, where Bush, in full diplomatic costume, chest covered in the various ribbons and medals, formally presented Kalākaua's letter. Kalākaua, like most royals of his era, had been fond of such decorations and pomp before his world tour, but his voyage had shown him how important such decorations had become within the social norms of global diplomacy. He even created a new order specifically for the confederacy, the Royal Order of the Star of Oceania, awarding Bush the Grand Cross and authorizing him to bestow a similar honor upon Malietoa. The appointment of Bush as Envoy Extraordinaire and Minister Plenipotentiary provided yet another sign of Hawai'i's diplomatic savvy, as Bush technically outranked all of the other foreign representatives in Apia at the time, none of whom ranked higher than consul. Thus, despite the fact the consuls had larger staff, more influence, and more sheer power than Bush, he still received a degree of social and professional deference from the American and British consuls that the Malietoa government surely appreciated. The Germans, however, soon proved so hostile to the Hawaiians that they preferred to insult the British by not attending a dinner celebrating Victoria's birthday because of the presence of Envoy Bush, who was given a seat of honor at the festivities.<sup>57</sup>

Furthermore, by offering to have Carter represent Malietoa in Washington and Europe, the Hawaiians gave Malietoa a taste of what Hawai'i had and what Sāmoa could access through the confederacy. The legation also promised that under Hawaiian tutelage

---

<sup>56</sup> Bush to Kalākaua, January 27, 1887; Bush, "Bush to Taimua and Faipule."

<sup>57</sup> Greer, "The Royal Tourist—Kalākaua's Letters Home from Tokio to London"; Webb, Dispatch 1.

the Samoans could one day possess the same international recognition as the Hawaiians. Furthermore, the diplomatic trappings and offer of Carter's representation also displayed Hawaiian respect, courtesy and friendship, particularly in comparison to the discourteous nature of the Germans.<sup>58</sup>

The high value placed on Euro/American development and the equation of development with superiority provided the Hawaiians with a readily accessible discourse of power because after a century of contact with Euro/Americans both parties understood such discourses quite well. In addition, even before the legation arrived, Hawai'i already possessed a favorable reputation among Pacific Islanders for their "progress" and "civilization." According to Robert Louis Stevenson, who visited Hawai'i, Sāmoa, and other parts of the Pacific several years later:

In the eyes of Polynesians the little kingdom occupies a place apart. It is there alone that men of their race enjoy most of the advantages and all the pomp of independence; news of Hawaii and descriptions of Honolulu are grateful topics in all parts of the South Seas; and there is no better introduction than a photograph in which the bearer shall be represented in company with Kalakaua.<sup>59</sup>

Thus even before the arrival of the legation, the Hawaiians, Samoans, and some *palagi/haole* already believed the Hawaiians had something the Samoans did not.

Malietoa recognized the Hawaiians willingness to ally themselves with him as a means to access things otherwise unavailable to him. He expressed his joy at Hawaiian "advancement," on several occasions, as well as his desire to accomplish what the Hawaiians had. Bush informed Kalākaua, for instance, that during their first meeting Malietoa expressed, "his great pleasure and gratification to hear and to know from our appearance of the high culture and advanced civilization of Your Majesty and people and

---

<sup>58</sup> Bush to Kalākaua, January 27, 1887.

<sup>59</sup> Stevenson, *A Footnote to History*, 59.

of our country.” He voiced similar sentiments in a toast during the entertainments on January 15<sup>th</sup>, saying:

I am satisfied from what I have heard, that your King, my Brother, is enlightened and a highly civilized monarch, and very much esteemed and respected by the monarchs of the world, and that your country, which is so far advanced of ours, that I deem myself fortunate that your King has been considerate in sending to my court a mission with the highest diplomatic honors.<sup>60</sup>

Later that month Malietoa informed Bush, “I shall hereafter ask you to direct us in our affairs and difficulties, and hope you will not hesitate to give us good and paternal advice. We rely on our Brother, your King, for he is our elder in enlightenment and in knowledge, though we may be his *Matua* [fathers] in relations.” On one level, Malietoa expressed his belief that the Hawaiians were better equipped to deal with the foreign community and the development of a modern government due to their “advanced” enlightenment and knowledge. At the same time, however, he reminded Bush not only of the kinship bond that required a certain level of fidelity to the Samoans, but of the Samoans’ superior genealogical claims, being of the elder line. Thus the Hawaiians not only had a responsibility to assist the Samoans, but also owed them a certain amount of deference. In declaring Kalākaua his elder in knowledge, Malietoa temporarily waved these claims of precedence to a degree, but reminded the Hawaiians of their existence.<sup>61</sup>

Once he had decided to ally himself with the Hawaiians, Malietoa immediately began co-opting Hawaiian development in his appeals to other Samoans. When meeting with Bush in late January, he asked him to make sure when he appeared before the Ta‘imua and Faipule he did so in full diplomatic garb. As Malietoa had by that time voiced to the Ta‘imua and Faipule his own support for the confederacy, Bush now

---

<sup>60</sup> Bush to Kalākaua, January 27, 1887.

<sup>61</sup> Ibid.

represented Malietoa's views as well as those of Kalākaua. Thus in this particular meeting of the Ta'imua and Faipule, Malietoa also displayed his access to the symbolic power of European diplomacy and material displays through the Hawaiians, in the same way he might later do in dealing with the various foreign governments.<sup>62</sup>

The Hawaiians continued to promote their development in their post-signing efforts. Indeed it was essential during their efforts to display their generosity and hospitality. The arrival of the *Kaimiloa*, for instance, allowed them to impress the Samoans with Hawaiian progress. Before its arrival the only significant opposition from the Ta'imua and Faipule came from the argument that the Hawaiians, for all their finery and diplomatic recognition, lacked a gunboat. The gunboat was the most important symbol of European and American "progress" in the Pacific, and had been for generations. As Bush put it, "the islanders of the South Pacific have learned to have the greatest awe and respect for a war-vessel and [the *Kaimiloa*] will impress them with an idea of the power and ability of the Hawaiian Government to carry out its plans to assist and protect them." In Sāmoa, as elsewhere in the Pacific, the threat of regularly visiting warships underwrote the position and influence of the Euro/American planters, merchants, and missionaries. The ever-present German warships allowed the German consul and the local Germans the freedom to disregard and harass the Malietoa government and the Samoan people. The *Kaimiloa*, despite its many faults, symbolized a developmental distance between the Hawaiians and the Samoans that the Samoans deeply desired to overcome.<sup>63</sup>

### *Hawaiian Assumptions*

As seen in the preceding sections, the Hawaiian use of genealogical and developmental discourses had a great deal of purchase among their hosts and were

---

<sup>62</sup> Ibid.

<sup>63</sup> Ibid; John E. Bush, "Dispatch #10," February 10, 1887," HSA-FO&EX.

essential elements in convincing Malietoa and other Samoans to accept the idea of a confederacy. Yet their reliance on these discourses also guided the Hawaiian understanding of Sāmoa and in many cases resulted in a fundamental misreading of contemporary Samoan politics and *fa'a Sāmoa*. By imagining the Samoans as primitive Hawaiians, they interpreted the Samoan political situation through the lens of nineteenth-century Hawaiian politics, envisioning Malietoa as a nascent Hawaiian-style *mō'ī* rather than as one of several powerful Samoan *Tama'aīga*. At the same time Hawaiian beliefs in their own developmental superiority led them to interpret Samoan life through the cloud of biases associated with Euro/American “progress,” leading to a belief that the Samoans were a simplistic and lazy people in desperate need of Hawaiian guidance. Both of these sets of assumptions would feed into later Hawaiian plans to remake Sāmoa in the Hawaiian image.

For centuries Samoan political and social culture followed a principle that Malama Meleisea has termed a “unitary system of dispersed power.” On a very fundamental level Samoans understood themselves as united through *fa'a Sāmoa*, the cultural and social norms that identified them as a people. Indeed *fa'a Sāmoa* can be understood as an indigenous form of conscious “nationalism” that predated the very creation of the nation state, let alone the introduction of the nation state into the Pacific. Yet at its very core *fa'a Sāmoa* promoted a diffusion of political power, the opposite of the hierarchal culture of political obedience that the Euro/American nation state was founded upon. By dispersing power among different networks of villages, families, districts, and temporary factions, *fa'a Sāmoa* guaranteed Samoans a great deal of autonomy and independence at these levels. Large-scale projects or decisions required

input from all the interested parties, with decisions being made by the assembled chiefs and orators representing those parties.<sup>64</sup>

The Samoan tendency towards diffusing power and their pride in independence, however, should not be mistaken for a lack of hierarchies, which were also enshrined within *fa'a Sāmoa*. Indeed Samoan society revolved around a series of hierarchal relationships, between individuals, families, sections of families, villages, and districts guided by genealogy and historical precedent. Samoans, particularly Samoan men, negotiated these hierarchies through the pursuit of *matai*, titled offices, and through the assumption of the various rights and responsibilities accorded by those titles. *Matai* titles included *ali'i*, chiefs, and *tulāfale*, orators. In general *ali'i* had more *mana*, more spiritual status/power, and the *tulāfale* technically served the *ali'i*. Yet, as typical of *fa'a Sāmoa*, the individual *ali'i* and *tulāfale* depended upon one another for their authority, and the collected *ali'i* and *tulāfale* of an area worked together in the administration of their respective areas of authority. This ability to participate in communal decision making as the representative and head of an *'āiga*, or family, composed a key part of the identity of a *matai*. A specific *'āiga* associated the right to communally grant each title. While obtaining a title required a genealogical tie to the associated *'āiga*, genealogy was not the only factor taken into consideration, as typically multiple individuals had some genealogical claim on the title.<sup>65</sup>

Within *fa'a Sāmoa* the most widely recognized source of accomplishment came from the pursuit of more prestigious titles. Though all titles marked one's movement into the decision-making community, certain titles marked higher status and influence within that group. The two most powerful of the extended *'āiga*, Sā Malietoa and Sā Tupua, held the four most desirable of descent-based titles, the *Tama'āiga*, with Sā Malietoa

---

<sup>64</sup> Meleisea, *The Making of Modern Samoa*, 1-2. 5-6.

<sup>65</sup> Gilson, *Samoa 1830 to 1900*, 23-25; Meleisea, *The Making of Modern Samoa*, 7-8.

controlling the Malietoa title and Sā Tupua controlling the Tupua, Mata‘afa, and Tuimaleali‘ifano titles. Genealogical connections to past holders and claims of belonging to the senior lineages of their respective family lines remained an integral part of obtaining such titles, but by the 1880s *Tama‘āiga* titles were not automatically inherited according to any rigid genealogical rule. Rather claims to assume the title needed to be contested among the qualified applicants, decided by the various *nu‘u* and *fono*, councils, who possessed the right to do so, and approved by those who possessed that particular right. The politician and historian Tuiatua Tupua Tamasese,<sup>66</sup> has asserted that before the 19<sup>th</sup>-century guidelines for the succession to these titles dictated a relatively clear inheritance pattern. In the nineteenth century and after, however, the bestowment of titles has regularly been disputed, as different branches or factions within the ‘*āiga* sought to have one of their own appointed to the title.<sup>67</sup>

The *Tama‘āiga* were the most prestigious of titles associated with specific ‘*āiga*, though the Samoan elite also contested for another set of four titles which represented an even higher level of achievement. Known individually as *papa* or collectively as *Tafa‘ifā*, these four titles, Tui Atua, Tui A‘ana, Gatoa‘itele and Tamasoali‘i, symbolized that the holder had the support of the various polities and councils associated with each title. Though technically each title was associated with a specific district of Upolu, because of the political networks between Upolu, Savai‘i, and Manono, obtaining all four titles signaled that one had the support of all three islands and had reached the pinnacle of achievement. Yet this achievement did not come with any sort of executive authority. Even Malietoa Vai‘inupō, who held the *Tafa‘ifā* in the 1830’s, expressed neither the

---

<sup>66</sup> Not to be confused with Malietoa’s rival Tupua Tamasese Titimea, who also had a disputed claim to the Tui Atua title

<sup>67</sup> Meleisea, *The Making of Modern Samoa*, 33; Tuiatua Tupua Tamasese, “The Riddle in Samoan History: The Relevance of Language, Names, Honorifics, Genealogy, Ritual and Chant to Historical Analysis,” *The Journal of Pacific History* 29, no. 1 (1994): 67-8.

desire nor the means to develop a centralized rule. As the leader of the *mālō*, the victorious side in the series of wars that brought him to prominence, he had a certain amount of control over the vanquished. This, however, could not be considered “rule” over such districts as much as the ability to intimidate them into making certain decisions, particularly regarding titles, ritual, and ceremony.<sup>68</sup>

The pursuit of both the *Tama‘āiga* and *pāpā* titles dominated Samoan politics and warfare in the period up to and before the 1870’s and continues to be a significant issue into contemporary times. A lack of understanding with regards to *fa‘a Sāmoa* led many outsiders to believe that such wars, particularly the conflicts between different factions of *Sā Malietoa* over the Malietoa title, were actually wars over the right to “rule” Sāmoa. This is especially true of the 1868-1872 conflict between Malietoa Laupepa and his uncle Malietoa Talavou, which triggered the deluge of controversial land sales that would later prove so problematic. In the mid 1870’s these conflicts merged with efforts to form a centralized government and warfare over the right to do so. The main figures in such efforts, of course, were also *Tama‘āiga*, the only ones with the influence and prestige to head a potential government, and the acquisition of *pāpā* continued to be a central part of their efforts to strengthen their positions.<sup>69</sup>

The Hawaiian *ali‘i*, meanwhile, had spent generations before European contact centralizing power through a class-based hierarchy coherent through the entire archipelago.<sup>70</sup> Before the 1820s genealogy alone determined if an individual was part of the *ali‘i* as a class, and depending on genealogy and individual circumstances one might also be born with or granted certain *kapu* that further set one apart from the *maka‘ainana*. This was especially true among the *ali‘i nui*, the chiefs of high lineage. Politically the

---

<sup>68</sup> Gilson, *Samoa 1830 to 1900*, 58-62.

<sup>69</sup> Meleisea, *The Making of Modern Samoa*, 27-36.

<sup>70</sup> Hawai‘i Island chiefs, from whom the Kamehameha and Kalākaua dynasties sprung, were noted as particularly interested in centralizing power.



*ali'i* had far greater authority than in Sāmoa, with power flowing in a more centralized and hierarchical manner within the various small “kingdoms” spread across the chain. In the period immediately before and during Kamehameha’s conquests, human political authority started with the *ali'i 'ai moku*, the ruler, who typically ruled over a single island or a portion of an island. The *kalai'āina*, the official distribution of lands, was the ultimate symbol of the *ali'i 'ai moku*’s power, representing their control over the lower *ali'i* who depended on them for their lands. Inheritance of political authority followed relatively strict inheritance patterns based on genealogy. Less genealogically qualified *ali'i nui*, however, often those of a junior line, frequently overthrew unpopular or ineffective *ali'i 'ai moku*.<sup>71</sup>

During the kingdom era the role of the *ali'i* changed considerably as Hawai'i underwent massive changes due to horrific population decline and the introduction and adaptation of many Euro/American political, cultural, and economic structures. Many *ali'i* , particularly *ali'i nui*, managed to transform their connections and status into appointed or elected positions within the government or commercial and professional success. Many also retained informal but significant cultural and social influence. Yet by Kalākaua’s reign the *ali'i* as a class had lost their traditional political role. The major exception, however, were the heirs of Kamehameha the Great, who through conquest and treaty became the *ali'i 'ai moku* over all the islands but Kaua'i and Ni'ihau, where he was only a nominal sovereign. Ka'ahumanu, however, eventually brought Kaua'i into the Kingdom's control. During the reign of Kamehameha III, his administration began to refashion his reign, transforming him from an *ali'i 'ai moku*, a ruling chief, to a constitutional monarch, a *mō'i*. From Kamehameha III onwards, the various *mō'i* developed this office into both a strong, European-style, monarchy and a symbol for the collective *mana* of the Hawaiian people, past and present. As seen in the previous

---

<sup>71</sup> Kame'eiehiwa, *Native Lands*, 36-38, 51-52, 53.

chapter, Kalākaua continued their work, further developing the idea that the *mō‘ī* was the center of Native Hawaiian identity as well as the government’s highest authority.<sup>72</sup>

When they arrived in Sāmoa, the Hawaiian legation interpreted the political landscape according to their own understanding of Polynesian politics, which they drew almost entirely from their experiences in the post-Kamehameha III Hawaiian kingdom. Building upon common *palagi* misconceptions of Samoan politics, and perhaps the willingness of Malietoa to represent himself as a ruling monarch, the legation imagined Malietoa as an underdeveloped *mō‘ī*. In the first letter from Bush to Kalākaua, the only one written entirely in Hawaiian, Bush refers to Malietoa as “Ka Moi Malietoa.” He also refers to Tamasese as a *mō‘ī* in that first letter, though in future English references he refers to Tamasese as either, “the rebel chief” or just a “chief.” Malietoa remained a “king.” Based on their vision of the centrality of the *mō‘ī*, they aimed their early appeals entirely at Malietoa and his advisors. Even their efforts among the Ta‘imua and Faipule came at Malietoa’s initiative, not their own.<sup>73</sup>

While the Hawaiians (mis)understood Samoan politics by viewing it through the lens of Hawaiian political conventions, they did recognize some incongruities between their vision of Malietoa as *mō‘ī* and the realities of dispersed power in Sāmoa. On February 22<sup>nd</sup>, just a few days after the signing of the Confederacy agreement, Bush wrote:

Samoa will be more difficult to govern than Hawai'i for feudal customs and rights still exist with traditional jealousies and discords in different provinces. Samoa is divided into nine districts or provinces...Each province has its own feudal chief or governor selected by their own people and he alone they obey: but if he does not suit them they turn him out and put

---

<sup>72</sup> Osorio, *Dismembering Lāhui*, 2.

<sup>73</sup> Bush to Kalākaua, January 3, 1887; Bush to Kalākaua, January 27, 1887.

another in. From way back those districts have joined in various combinations against each other.<sup>74</sup>

Though the statement, particularly the allusions to Samoan feudalism, reflect further Hawaiian misunderstandings of Samoan politics and society, it also makes clear that the Hawaiians understood the existence of a disconnect between their imagined version of the Samoan political landscape and what they observed firsthand. Rather than reassessing their interpretation of Sāmoa, however, the Hawaiians instead sought to alter Samoan society to fit the Hawaiian model, a process covered in the next section.

While the Hawaiian belief in Hawaiian and Samoan kinship led them to imagine Malietoa as a weak *mō'i*, their belief in their own superior development also led to a gross misunderstanding and mischaracterization of the daily lives and values of the Samoan people. This becomes particularly clear through a review of the legation's information gathering efforts. Despite the rhetoric of kinship and Polynesian unity that facilitated Hawaiian promotion of the confederacy, in reality the Hawaiian people and the Kalākaua administration knew relatively little about Sāmoa or its recent history until the legation arrived. There were, to be certain, Samoans in Hawai'i, and as *Ko Hawai'i Pae Aina* reported, two unnamed Samoans accompanied the legation on the trip from Hawai'i. Counter to what that same *KHPA* article reported, there were also a number of Hawaiians living in Sāmoa, several of whom later attached themselves to the mission, as well as numerous Hawaiian sailors that touched at Sāmoa at in their travels. Between these sorts of informal contacts and the international newspapers that the Hawaiian and *haole* elite read, there may have been some general understanding of Sāmoa as a southern Polynesian area with a great deal of internal and external turmoil, but details were sorely lacking.<sup>75</sup>

---

<sup>74</sup> Bush, "Dispatch #8."

<sup>75</sup> "Ko Samoa Pae Aina."

Out of necessity the Hawaiians went to work establishing a basic understanding of the Samoan political situation, resulting in a transcription of the Malietoa genealogy, Poor's historical synopsis, and other ethnographic and political notes sprinkled throughout their reports and correspondences. Once they had established some basic political knowledge, Poor set about creating the centerpiece of the legation's knowledge production campaign, a forty-page document entitled "The Samoan Islands-A Sketch by Henry Poor." Poor's sketch followed the basic format of an encyclopedia article, covering, in-order: Location, Geography, Population, "National Features, Soil [and] Climate," Products, Forests, Industries and Commerce, Lands, Currency, Harbors and Roadsteads, Foreign Communications, The People, Political Divisions, History, Language, Religion and Education, and Government.<sup>76</sup>

Strong's sketch reveals a clear plantation-capitalist mindset, focusing largely on the exploitable resources of Sāmoa from pages three through twenty-eight. While an appreciation and understanding of resources are far from exclusive to the plantation mindset, Poor placed a definite emphasis on what could be done to maximize profits around steady, industrially-organized exports, not much different from how the Germans viewed Sāmoa. Indeed he even used the German plantations to illustrate what Sāmoa could become with proper management. It is not entirely clear if he intended this description only to describe what the Samoans might be able to exploit under Hawaiian "guidance" or if he intended to show what Hawai'i could gain by being the ones to exploit Sāmoa's resources. What is clear is that he saw Sāmoa in the same way many Euro/Americans saw much of the "undeveloped" world, as a potential source of wealth that could only be properly developed through foreign initiative.<sup>77</sup>

---

<sup>76</sup> Henry Poor, "The Samoan Islands-a Sketch by Henry Poor, 1887," HSA-FO&EX.

<sup>77</sup> Ibid.

Two recurring themes appear throughout Poor's sketch: the high fertility of the Samoan soil and the corresponding laziness of the Samoan people. Following one of the oldest of European tropes about Native peoples, Poor wrote:

The profuseness of nature in supplying their food and their wants being simple, [Samoan] industries are not many or general, and such of her products as are prepared for trade or personal use amount to but a small percentage of what is possible the whole population engaged in some industry, to say nothing of the extensive production possible on the great areas of fertile and untilled land.

The logical extension of this argument, and the one that European and American colonizers have used throughout the Pacific, is that it was their duty and their right to make sure that the land reached its full "potential," since the Natives could/would not. The laziness of the Samoans, of course, meant that they would not work on foreign-owned plantations, leading Poor to add, "it is necessary for the plantations to import labor." Poor added that Sāmoa only exported 1/3 the copra that it should with just their existing trees, "owing to the reckless consumption by the natives at their homes and at their feasts; the considerable amount used to make oil for their bodies and their hair; the reckless feeding to pigs and chickens, and the thousands that rot away from sheer indolence to utilize them." With absolutely no irony, Poor then expresses the wonders of copra in the European market, where it was manufactured into soaps, candles, and hair oils, while the "refuse" became stock feed or fertilizer.

After finishing his section on Samoan industry, or lack of industry, Poor turned to the Samoan people themselves, starting with a page and a half on their physical appearance. In a striking effort, he goes on to include nearly every possible stereotype about Pacific Islanders as well as a few other disparaging remarks:

Darwinian theorists may find some argument in the following characteristics: They pick up things with their toes, squat when they meet to

talk, and pick out lice from each others head and eat them. In personal character they are far beneath the Hawaiian and lack many of the moral principles. Their greatest failing is petty thieving and deceit. Love, affection, gratitude, morals and justice are but weakly developed in their organization and they are excessively lazy spending most of their time in sleep or play as food is so abundant they have no need to work for it, and each village is a commune where idlers or traders may eat or sleep from house to house.

They live only in the present, the past and future concern them not, and with their simple habits are a happy and contented race of people. With civilization, education, and law, with their social benefits, it is possible for them to develop a higher type of character and industry and rival their more enlightened brethren in Hawai'i.

After this list of old colonial favorites, Poor invoked the image of both the slavishly devoted Native convert before lamenting the Native's lack of true Christianity, adding, "after observation I fear that genuine Christian principles are not very deeply rooted in them as yet." He then returned to the spiritual devotion of Samoan Christians, which he juxtaposed with their irreligiosity under their old religion, a "mild" heathenism with "no structure or monuments," of which, "there is now hardly any trace of their previous heathenish beliefs."<sup>78</sup>

To compliment their textual knowledge production, the Hawaiians also collected artifacts of Samoan material culture for Kalākaua's Hawaiian National Museum. The artifacts included a number of common items similar to those found in Hawai'i a few generations before, such as bone fishhooks, fish spears, tapa making items, kava bowls and strainers, necklaces, and tattoo instruments. The vast majority, however, were instruments of warfare from Sāmoa, Niue, and elsewhere, including spears, clubs, armor, and bows. While the items promoted a view of Samoans as warlike and materially "primitive," they also create a certain sense of sameness with the Hawaiians, as many of

---

<sup>78</sup> Ibid.

the artifacts were variations of generic Polynesian artifacts, the Hawaiian versions of which the museum had already collected as part of shaping a national historical narrative through its material culture.<sup>79</sup>

Poor's work and the collection of artifacts shows the Hawaiian legation as actively engaged in the production of knowledge about the Samoans which emphasized Samoan "primitiveness" and contrasting it with Hawaiian "progress." Typical of the model set by imperial knowledge-production efforts, the legation started with an assumption of Hawaiian superiority and then purposefully created knowledge that supported their assumptions. This not only justified their own sense of superiority, but also whatever actions they took or planned to take by wrapping it in the illusion of the civilizing mission.

One could argue that Poor's work represented his personal views not those of the legation as a whole. As mentioned earlier, Poor was notably more critical of the Samoan lack of "progress" than Bush was. He was also uncomfortable with any hints that Hawaiians might slip back into the *na'aupō*, as noted on his response to Princess Likelike's death. During the trip rumors reached Poor, likely through Webb, that the Princess had died of fright in the belief that a *kahuna* was praying for her death. Poor responded:

If it is true as reported that Likelike died of superstitious fear it is still more sad: To think that around such an intelligent mind should still linger any of the heathenish and unreasonable superstitions of the dark ages of Hawaiian life. Will the light of progress, civilization, science and the proud triumphs of the mind over matter never drive away these ghoulish, uncanny and degrading superstitions from the Hawaiian mind?<sup>80</sup>

---

<sup>79</sup> Kamehiro, *The Arts of Kingship*, 100-126; Henry Poor, "Inventory of Items Purchased by H.F. Poor for the Hawaiian Museum, 1887," HSA-FO&EX.

<sup>80</sup> In 1952 Jennie (Kini) Wilson, wife of former Honolulu Mayor John Wilson, wrote a letter to Eugene Burns regarding his book on Kalākaua. She refuted Burns claims that such rumors were pervasive, arguing

While Poor certainly applied his personal biases in his work, to dismiss his colonial attitudes as entirely non-representative of the legation or of the administration would be misleading. As seen in his speeches and displays, Bush also clearly believed in Hawai‘i’s superiority, or as he put it, “Hawaii no ka oi.” Furthermore, Bush, then one of Kalākaua’s favorites, was the head of the mission, with the power to approve or disapprove of Poor’s work. With his background in publishing, it seems unlikely that he feared pushing revisions and edits on an underling. Finally, Poor represented a Hawaiian perspective on Sāmoa by the simple fact that he was a Hawaiian. And a Hawaiian nationalist for that matter, who despite his many ties to the *haole* community still proved to be an ardent Royalist in the post-overthrow era. Nor was Poor the only Hawaiian of his time to express discomfort over the supposed darkness of the Hawaiian/Polynesian past, as noted in Chapters One and Two. From Bush’s and Poor’s accounts of their Samoan hosts, a clear difference existed within the legation with regards to the relationship between Hawaiians and Samoans. The difference, however, between Bush’s desire to raise up his fellow Polynesians and Poor’s fear of degenerating into a Samoan was largely one of sentiment rather than substance, both depending heavily on a discourse of a superior Hawaiian grasp of the *na‘auao*.<sup>81</sup>

### **Hawaiian Sāmoa**

As stated earlier, no one in Hawai‘i expected the Malietoa government to be so eager to sign a confederacy agreement. The signing of the confederacy caught Kalākaua, Gibson, and perhaps even Bush by surprise. No one had any concrete plans in place as to what exactly the confederacy would look like or what Hawai‘i’s role in Sāmoa would be

---

that she was raised around the Royal Family and never heard such rumors. As Burns sources and Poor’s likely came from the *haole* community, which never missed a chance to gossip about the royalty, it seems likely that the rumors did exist, but may have been restricted to certain groups. Jenni Wilson to Burns, November 26, 1952, Bishop-Misc. Letters.

<sup>81</sup> “Death of H.F. Poor”; Poor to Webb, January 31, 1887; Poor to Webb, March 12, 1887.



once the confederacy was established. With a concrete agreement but no concrete plans, Gibson tasked Bush and Poor, now the kingdom's Sāmoa experts, to come up with a preliminary plan for reorganizing Malietoa's government and for the relationship between that new government and Hawai'i. Based on their assumptions of Hawaiian superiority and their vision of Malietoa as a nascent *mō'i*, the legation began laying plans for a deeply Hawaiianized Sāmoa.

The Hawaiians believed that no Samoan progress, and no hope of preventing German takeover, could occur without the creation of a strong central government recognized by the populace and supported by a nationalist sentiment. From their experiences at home, they believed both of these could be accomplished through the Hawaiian model and a focus on the *mō'i*. Despite the lack of any known Samoan precedent and the likelihood of German interference, Bush felt confident that the Hawaiians could accomplish the task given both their status as an advanced nation and their cultural and genealogical ties to the Samoans. With Bush embedded as a trusted advisor of the Malietoa administration, the legation began preliminary planning in conjunction with the Malietoa government for organizing the new government.<sup>82</sup>

The act of creating a government for a sovereign state they did not belong to held a definite imperial quality to it, which at first seemed to concern Bush. Throughout the early meetings with the Malietoa government, he carefully avoided the appearance of annexation or the surrender of Samoan sovereignty. When the Ta'imua and Faipule flew the Hawaiian and Samoan flags together, Bush reported that several members suggested that they fly only the Hawaiian flag, as it was the prettier of the two. The suggestion, which certainly had a much deeper significance, either as a test or as a bid for an all out protectorate, took Bush by surprise, and he insisted that the two flags remain flying together, equals. In terms of the actual planning for Sāmoa's future, however, the legation

---

<sup>82</sup> Bush, "Dispatch #8."

proved far more inclined to treat Sāmoa as a client state than as an equal. The Malietoa government encouraged such an attitude. Bush informed Gibson that the Malietoa government had indicated repeatedly that they would follow Hawai'i's lead on the government reorganization and the confederacy agreement. Poor put it more bluntly, "In fact if Hawai'i is to be allowed [by the Powers] to control here—you can have everything your own way. The King and his govt. are so simple and have so little knowledge of govt. that they are willing to accept and adopt any and every plan proposed by the Hawaiian Govt."<sup>83</sup>

After "repeated interviews with the Samoan government and foreigners of long residence," Bush presented Gibson with a preliminary scheme for the creation of a centralized Samoan government. The plan included several influential positions to be appointed by the Hawaiian government, which Bush indicated the Malietoa Government had requested of their own volition. This included an ill-defined position of "Director General," appointed by Kalākaua, "with prescribed powers of inspection and direction." It also called for Kalākaua to appoint the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court and the Minister of Finance.<sup>84</sup>

The legation's plan called for a relatively limited central government, with Bush arguing that the Samoans could not be forced into adapting a more complicated and centralized government without widespread dissent and confusion. It kept numerous features from previous governments, retaining: Malietoa as the head of state, a cabinet of his selection, the Ta'imua and Faipule as a combination legislature/national *fono*, and district "governors" appointed through the customs of each district. Furthermore,

---

<sup>83</sup> Bush, "Dispatch #11"; John E. Bush, "Dispatch #14," April 26, 1887, HSA-FO&EX; Henry Poor to Webb, March 20, 1887, HSA-FO&EX; Henry Poor to Webb, May 7, 1887, HSA-FO&EX.

<sup>84</sup> Bush, "Dispatch #22"; John E. Bush, "Dispatch #23," June 23, 1887, HSA-FO&EX.

Malietao would have a personal body guard of some 100 troops, “properly officered, uniformed, and drilled, for general purpose and for emergency.”<sup>85</sup>

The major changes came in plans to develop the infrastructure needed to make such a government effective, specifically the creation of a new national law code, a Supreme Court, and a system of nationally appointed magistrates, tax collectors and police who would fall under the immediate command of the district governors. The scheme also included a land commission to look into the problem of land sales of the past two decades. It would consist of two Samoans and one foreigner, “all familiar with Samoan land customs...to investigate and pass upon titles. There should be land laws similar to those of New Zealand compelling the registry of all titles, and all original sales must be through the commission.” It is unclear whether Bush was unaware of the problems such plans had caused in New Zealand or if he felt that Samoan control of the membership would allow the commission to avoid the pitfalls of the Native Land Court in New Zealand.<sup>86</sup>

The postal system, then a private venture, would be nationalized with the postmaster falling under the direction of the Honolulu postmaster. This likely came from Poor’s own experiences in the postal service. He likely recognized the important role that such a system can play in aiding centralization and nationalism, both in its primary role and through secondary functions like postal roads or a postal savings bank. The plan also called for a collector general of customs, a registrar of conveyances, a notary, and a harbormaster to facilitate imports, exports, and businesses as well as to collect revenue. Finally it called for a number of civil structures to be built, including: a palace for the

---

<sup>85</sup> Bush, “Dispatch #23.”

<sup>86</sup> Ibid.

head of state, a Government House, a jail, and regional government buildings in each district.<sup>87</sup>

The plan was an expensive one, and Bush admitted that the first step for the new government would have to be securing a loan of \$100,000 to pay for the estimated \$22,600 in building costs and \$62,650 for the first year's salaries. Poor estimated in his sketch that total imports were approximately \$400,000 a year, perhaps a third of which was re-exported to other islands, while exports topped out at about \$250,000 a year. This meant that Sāmoa would have to seriously accelerate its cash flow, necessitating major agricultural development, likely following the same plantation model the Germans were pursuing in Sāmoa and various factions were pursuing in Hawai'i.<sup>88</sup>

#### *Securing the Mō'ī*

Any centralized government relies on the ability of those in power to either train, earn, or coerce the obedience and loyalty of its citizens or subjects. As noted earlier, Samoans were unified under *fa'a Sāmoa*, but this unity did not necessitate such loyalty or obedience. This nationalist obedience needed to be purposefully created if the Hawaiians' plan had any hopes of succeeding, and due to their own biases the Hawaiians believed that such sentiment among Polynesians should be centered around the person of the *mō'ī*, namely Malietoa. As Malietoa was not actually a *mō'ī* in any way, shape, or form, the legation needed to create a narrative understandable along Polynesian and Euro/American logics that promoted Malietoa as the legitimate authority of the future government.<sup>89</sup>

---

<sup>87</sup> Ibid.

<sup>88</sup> Ibid; Poor, "The Samoan Islands."

<sup>89</sup> Bush's role in promoting a strong Samoan monarchy are but a single moment in his relatively complicated relationship with monarchical government. Though a member of several Kalākaua cabinets, he was vehemently opposed to Lili'uokalani, and promoted the creation of a Native-led republican government during her reign. Immediately after the overthrow, however, he agitated for a restoration of the monarchy and was a major opponent of the oligarchy's Republic.

In order to assure themselves and the Hawaiian government of Malietoa's legitimacy, they turned first to his genealogy. Though it took some time, they eventually acquired a genealogy of the Malietoa title, which they sent to Gibson on April 26<sup>th</sup>. Rather than an epic genealogy, such as the *Kumulipo*, what they sent was a brief accounting of Sā Malietoa and the Malietoa title. They obtained this from four councils of orators recognized as the keepers of Sā Malietoa's genealogy, who Bush identified as "Lealataua, Leleituau, Salemuliaga, and Taafafalealii-ina." The Hawaiians interpreted the Malietoa genealogy through the lens of late-nineteenth century Hawaiians politics, where, as noted earlier, the prime consideration for ascendancy to the throne was genealogy. Following Hawaiian logic, Bush argued that Malietoa's genealogy would, "establish Malietoa's right to the satisfaction of the civilized powers." Bush was mistaken on two major counts. First, by no means was Laupepa the only candidate for the title, indeed his hold of the tile had already been disputed once before. Second, the Malietoa genealogy was just that, the genealogy of the head of Sā Malietoa. Conflating this title with the right of Malietoa to rule over Sāmoa as *mō'ī* represented a fundamental inability or unwillingness to see other Polynesian political structures as anything but a variation of those of late nineteenth-century Hawai'i.<sup>90</sup>

The legation also attempted to portray Malietoa as having a "legal" right to rule through an examination of the recent political history of Sāmoa. Having lived under constitutional monarchies for half a century, Hawaiians were quite familiar and comfortable with the idea of contractual mechanisms for the transfer of authority, having elected several generations of legislators and two *mō'ī*. Coming from such a background, the legation sought to understand political legitimacy in Sāmoa in part through such mechanisms. In a short "Historical Synopsis," Poor summarized the recent political disputes and foreign interventions that had occurred in Sāmoa. His synopsis started in the

---

<sup>90</sup> John E. Bush, "Dispatch #17," April 26, 1887," HSA-FO&EX; Bush, "Dispatch #19."

1870's, covered the first major attempts to create a centralized government, and traced the various shifts in legal authority through which Malietoa and the Ta'imua and Faipule claimed their status as the official government. Like the genealogy, Poor's synopsis laid out a case for Malietoa's right to rule, but it did so not on the basis of descent and Hawaiian understandings of the *mō'ī*, but on the basis of legal agreements and previous Samoan constitutions.<sup>91</sup>

Hawaiian efforts to prove Malietoa's right to rule, however, faced some major obstacles. In addition to using a model largely foreign to Sāmoa, they also had to account for and defuse the threat of the rival Tamasese government at Leulumoega. If the Malietoa government should fall to either the Tamasese faction or the Germans, so would the confederacy and plans for a Hawaiian-style Samoan state. Understanding this the legation sought not just to establish a case for Malietoa's legitimacy in their dispatches home, as discussed in a previous section, but also to actively work to end the threats to Malietoa's government. The heart of this was finding a peaceful end to the dispute between Malietoa and Tamasese.

In part the embassy sought to deal with Tamasese by discrediting him as both a rebel and a tool of the Germans. Bush did so, for instance, by claiming that, "the rebellion in Aana is not an organization of the natives but is directed and supported by the German Consulate and the German firm." The use of the term rebellion, which the legation consistently employed to discredit Tamasese and his government, was a clear attempt to delegitimize them according to the values of the nation-state. Bush also attempted to support such arguments by asserting the genealogical primacy of Sā Malietoa based primarily on the genealogy provided by Sā Malietoa. This genealogy claimed Tupua Tamasese and Sā Tupua to be vassals of Sā Malietoa, leading Bush to claim that their, "rank...as high chiefs is undisputed but [their] pretensions to equality with the Malietoa's

---

<sup>91</sup> Henry Poor, "Draft-Historical Synopsis," HHS-Henry Poor Papers.

is absurd and unwarranted.”<sup>92</sup> While this characterization fit into the narrative of Tamasese as a rebel against traditional and legal authority, it relied on either a gross misunderstanding or misrepresentation of *fa’ a Sāmoa* or the relationship between the two families.<sup>93</sup>

At the same time the legation also challenged the authenticity of the “rebellion” as a Native project. The legation vigorously documented German involvement in the Tamasese government in the misguided hope that Carter could shame the Germans into abiding by earlier promises to support the government at Afega. Yet in doing so they also sought to further delegitimize Tamasese as inauthentic and a tool of empire. For the Hawaiian government, which was staking its own alliance on the Samoans on the basis of explicitly Polynesian, anti-imperial discourses and sentiment, such characterizations served as an outright condemnation of the Tamasese government. Tamasese, of course, drew his support from a relatively broad geographic range within Sāmoa. Yet by tying together the German’s deep entanglements within the Tamasese government, their role in destabilizing previous governments, and their, “arrogant, unprincipled, and ungentlemanly” behavior, the legation essentially dismissed Tamasese as a cog within the German imperial machine. Ironically such a view of Tamasese likely matched how the Germans perceived him more than how most Samoans did.<sup>94</sup>

The Hawaiian reports worked fine for discrediting the Tamasese government in the legations’ minds and those of their superiors, but this did little to end the actual threat of the “revolt.” While their allies among the Malietoa faction pushed for a joint military

---

<sup>92</sup> While seeking a closer alliance with Mata’afa, Bush also sought to cut off any future threat from Mata’afa’s status as a holder of a *pāpā* title by dismissing the Tui Atua title as “a principality or Dukedom, subject to higher authority and that authority has always been with the Malietoa’s.” He failed to mention that as Tui Atua, as Mata’afa, and as a potential claimant for the title of Malietoa, Mata’afa, who was descended from both Sā Tupua and Sā Malietoa, had as strong a claim as Malietoa or Tamasese to the right to create a government. Bush to Kalākaua, August 15, 1887.

<sup>93</sup> Bush, “Dispatch #19.”

<sup>94</sup> Bush, “Dispatch #2”; Bush, “Dispatch #14”; Poor to Webb, January 31, 1887.

effort to wipe out Tamasese's forces, the Hawaiians shied away from any actual fighting. In part the desire to do so came from Gibson and Kalākaua's orders to find a peaceful end to the dispute, but it also signaled a recognition of the German desire to turn their financial and advisory support of Tamasese into direct military intervention. The Germans claimed that since they had diplomatic relations with the Tamasese government, and that Tamasese and Malietoa had agreed to share the government in prior years, any action taken by Malietoa or his supporters would be grounds for action by the foreign powers, namely the Germans. The de facto leader of the Germans in Sāmoa, Godeffroy agent Theodor Weber, laid out this argument in a letter to Mata'afa, as did Tamasese in a letter to the three consuls in May.<sup>95</sup>

Since news of the confederacy had first broken, the Germans pursued a course of action clearly intended to incite Malietoa's supporters into armed aggression. In May, for instance, the Germans brought Tamasese and his supporters into Apia, entertained Tamasese aboard the *Adler*, and raised a new Samoan flag based largely on a German design. In bringing Tamasese and his warriors into Apia, the backyard of Malietoa's Afega government, the Germans clearly intended to provoke Malietoa. Knowing he could not retaliate against them directly, they hoped he or his followers would retaliate against the Tamasese government. Poor and Coe also claimed to uncover another German effort to incite war in Fa'asaleleaga:

An agent of Mr. Weber's had recently been through the district and sold great numbers of firearms, some in exchange for lands but mostly on credit to be paid for in future with copra on lands. The natives becoming excited by the possession of arms, thirsted for war and were preparing in large numbers to sail over to Upolu and engage the Tamasese party in a fight.<sup>96</sup>

---

<sup>95</sup> Tupua Tamasese Titimea to Consuls, April 29, 1887, HSA-FO&EX; Theodor Weber to Mata'afa, April 28, 1887, HSA-FO&EX.

<sup>96</sup> Bush, "Dispatch #14"; Bush, "Dispatch #22."



Other than finding a way to profit from both sides of the conflict, Weber was none too subtly setting up a conflict by arming strong Malietoa supporters who resided just across Apolima Strait from Leulumoega, at the same time the German warship *Adler* was waiting in port at Apia for an excuse to begin action. Combined with other German actions, particularly their continued selling of arms, Bush came to the only reasonable conclusion in his April letter to Kalākaua. In it he condemned, “the actions of the German Consul here, who openly allows its subjects to sell firearms and to drill and assist the insurrectionary party...and thus keep up a state of irritation, which they hope will lead to an open rupture, whereby they may lead to an excuse of forcibly seizing the Group.”<sup>97</sup>

The German plans were far from unfeasible, as many of Malietoa’s supporters saw little reason to refrain from attacking the Tamasese government. Due to events of the previous year Tamasese’s military capabilities were at a low during most of the legation’s stay. The Germans, meanwhile, continued to flaunt their backing of Tamasese’s “rebellion” while snubbing the Malietoa party. Poor wrote that many in Sā Malietoa saw the opportunity and need to obtain the upper hand over Sā Tupua in general, setting up long-term dominance over them. This assumed, of course, that Mata’afa continued to sit out the dispute.<sup>98</sup>

Even if the Germans had been pushing the matter through their gun sales, they had to do relatively little to find eager buyers. During Poor and Coe’s visit to Fa’asaleleaga, they found widespread desire for martial action against Leulumoega. Upon gauging the warlike atmosphere of the district, Poor and Coe moved to block off the hostilities. Bush reported to Gibson that the war-hawks’, “crazy purpose was only checked by the active exertions of Mr. Coe who sought out their leaders and by arguments and wise councils changed their purpose.” Bush also noted that Coe’s

---

<sup>97</sup> John E. Bush to Kalākaua, April 24, 1887, HSA-FO&EX.

<sup>98</sup> Henry Poor, “Extracts from Poor to Webb, April 10, 1887,” Carter Collection, Honolulu.

promises of a Hawaiian warship to aid Malietoa helped to convince the more militant voices to at least postpone their aggression, if not quite to put it aside forever. In his letter to Kalākaua on the 24<sup>th</sup>, he reported that Poor had led a more significant role in the negotiations than the official dispatch had let on, and emphasized that the war leaders had agreed to “await the mediation and influence of the Hawaiian government.”<sup>99</sup>

Neither Bush nor Poor mentioned if their efforts to rouse support for Malietoa and the confederacy had anything to do with the heightened desire for war, though the legation’s promise that a Hawaiian warship would soon arrive clearly played a part in both the increased tensions and the agreement of the Malietoa forces to refrain from action. Bush held onto the belief that the arrival of the *Kaimiloa* would help end the “rebellion,” noting in February that news of the Hawaiian warship, “spread fear in the rebel camp and decided several wavering chiefs to join Malietoa, and I think the moral influence of her presence will assist in inducing the rebels to peacefully renew their allegiance to the government.” Yet the threat of a stronger Malietoa faction, theoretically backed by the Hawaiian gunship, allowed Tamasese and the Germans to boost their own recruitment among those wary of Sā Malietoa’s possible dominance.<sup>100</sup>

In early May, when the delegation of chiefs from Manono, Tutuila, and Savai’i visited Bush in Apia, they asked, among other things, his opinion about attacking the Tamasese forces. According to Bush, “They said they were well prepared to fight and desired to restore peace and the dignity of Malietoa by crushing out the Aana rebels...I persuaded them to return and keep the peace.” Though it never went beyond the initial stages, this desire for war on the part of these chiefs and their meetings with the Hawaiians worried the Tamasese party even more than the Fa‘asaleleaga incident. Manono, a relatively small island within the Apolima Strait, had long played a

---

<sup>99</sup> Bush to Kalākaua, April 24, 1887; Bush, “Dispatch #14.”

<sup>100</sup> Bush, “Dispatch #10.”

disproportionately important role within Samoan politics as a naval power. As a result it was the center of the powerful 'Āiga-i-le-Tai war confederation, and shared with Safotulafai the right of conferral for the Malietoa title. Manono's history of attacks on A'ana made it especially dangerous to the Tamasese government, which sat just a few miles by sea from Manono. Indeed Manono's navy had trapped many of Tamasese's fighters on land in a major battle the previous year, allowing the Malietoa land forces to overwhelm them. Furthermore, the geographic range of Malietoa support the group represented, from Tutuila in the east to Savai'i in the west, signaled a very broad and immediate threat to Tamasese. In response to this legation a number of warriors flocked to Tamasese's side, including the large parties from Atua and Itu-o-Tane that would eventually abandon Tamasese in late May.<sup>101</sup>

Despite the various factors that seemed to be pushing Malietoa's and Tamasese's supporters towards war, the Hawaiian delegation succeed in preventing any open conflict during their stay there, in large part by promising to find a peaceful end to the standoff. But simply avoiding armed conflict was only a temporary measure, for as long as Tamasese remained at Leulumoega under German protection, he remained a threat to the Malietoa government and thus the confederacy. As seen in previous sections, the legation planned to draw support away from Tamasese by appealing to disgruntled supporters and potential supporters, like Patioli, Mata'afa, and the Itu-o-Tane district. They also sought out Tamasese himself, although his German "advisors" forcibly prevented the meeting from taking place.

### *Law, Education, and Nationalism*

In addition to crafting a narrative to legitimize Malietoa as a *mō'ī*-like monarch, the Hawaiians also began planning an organizational means of centralizing power in

---

<sup>101</sup> Ibid; Bush, "Dispatch #22"; Poor, "Draft-Historical Synopsis."

Sāmoa and developing a monarch-based nationalism. As part of transforming Sāmoa into a nation state, the Hawaiians sought to develop a western-style legal system with a written code of laws, police, and magistrates. Sāmoa had various legal codes dating back for decades but none of them ever amounted to much. The various foreign intermediaries and limited governments who promoted such codes lacked any means of enforcing or popularizing them. Like tax collection and the post, the only other national systems Bush proposed, a working legal code would do more than just provide a systematic tool for dispensing justice. It would also provide a regular interface between the central government and the population, shifting the government from an abstract concept to an everyday reality that Samoans had to think about and interact. Along these same lines the Hawaiian legation planned to develop a system of police and judges to enforce the new legal code, physical infrastructure, including jails and courts, and a improved national secular education, all of which would create regular and tangible connections between the Samoan people and the law code.<sup>102</sup>

The legal system would also bring Sāmoa in line with European, American, and, Hawaiian expectations of how a nation state disciplined its citizens. Indeed such systems had become so central to how Hawaiians understood a properly managed nation that upon landing in Apia, Poor, finding no functioning system, immediately sent home for a copy of Hawai‘i’s penal and legal codes. The Hawaiians had begun incorporating Euro/American legal culture since the 1820’s, weaving jury trials and written laws into the Hawaiian consciousness and replacing the already dismantled *kapu* system and the hierarchal legal pronouncements of the *ali‘i*. By the 1880’s Hawaiians broadly recognized the courts as the legitimate path for dealing with civil and criminal complaints. Many educated Hawaiians, including Kalākaua, studied and/or practiced law, though they were still grossly underrepresented among the judiciary, particularly at the highest levels. The

---

<sup>102</sup> Bush, “Dispatch #23.”

Hawaiians hoped to reproduce their own legal history in Sāmoa, but in order to do so they would need to convince Samoans to either abandon their own system of conflict resolution or alter it sufficiently to accommodate and privilege the new system.<sup>103</sup>

For the most part Samoans perceived anti-social actions, like assaults, insult, vandalism, murder, and theft, within the framework of family, village, and district relationships. These groups were communally affected by and responsible for such actions, thus the group responsible for anti-social action needed to find a way to make amends to the offended group or risk repercussions. Should the new law system be based on Euro/American understandings of criminal justice as a matter solely between either individuals and the state or individuals connected through contract, a certain amount of conflict with traditional systems was inevitable. When Euro/Americans tried to impose their legal thinking in a Samoan context, it often had disastrous consequences. The standard historiographic illustration of this phenomenon is the case of William Fox, an English trader living in Salailua, who was killed by a young man of high rank from Sagone. Sagone, made an *ifoga*, a traditional offering of repentance, to Salailua. Salailua rejected the offer, and instead ambushed and killed a chief of Sagone. When the British demanded Fox's killer, his district refused, seeing the matter to have been handled. The British, however, expected the Samoans to hand over the actual killer to be processed, tried, and likely executed as an individual under Western conceptions of law. At the same time they still held the Samoans collectively responsible for killing Fox, as they proved by bombarding Sagone and fining Malietoa Moli for something that occurred outside of his area of authority.<sup>104</sup>

---

<sup>103</sup> Sarah Engle Merry, *Colonizing Hawaii: The Cultural Power of Law* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000), 35-62; Henry Poor to Webb, January 3, 1887.

<sup>104</sup> Kuykendall, *The Hawaiian Kingdom*, Vol. I, 126-131; Meleisea, *The Making of Modern Samoa*, 32.

There were clear benefits to adopting a legal system based on Euro/American concepts of justice, at least in the Hawaiians eyes. In addition to providing Samoans with a supposedly fair system for their own use, it would theoretically prevent incidents like the bombardment of Sagone. The code would also serve as a means to discipline “rebellious” districts or factions, like Tamasese’s. Even in the case of an armed revolt that the government might not have the forces to put down, this would allow the government to condemn such actions as illegal and thus find international support for ending such “disturbances,” just as Kalākaua had found British and American aid to end the rioting after his election. Assuming the Powers eventually surrendered the right of extraterritoriality, the law system would also provide a means to punish foreigners who violated Samoan laws, including aiding “rebels” or selling arms, without risking more bombardments or attacks. Many of the early Hawaiian court cases had involved foreigners, and indeed the laws were passed in large part to control the violent and frequently inebriated *haole* community.<sup>105</sup> Whatever benefits the Hawaiians and Samoans perceived under such a system, however, the Hawaiian plan did not detail, and likely had yet to account for, a means of reconciling it with *fa’a Sāmoa*.

As part of their Hawaiianization effort, the legation believed that Samoans would need to surrender the right of violence into the sole possession of the government. As seen in the Fox incident, the belief in the legitimacy of violence on the district, village, family, and individual level was key to Samoan attempts to preserve their autonomy at those levels. Insults or injuries not satisfied by *ifoga* or mediated by a larger collectivity could be legitimately settled by personal or collective violence. Under a centralized government the Samoans would be asked, and eventually forced, to cede the right of violence to the state, diminishing the influence of warriors and elevating the influence of lawyers. Samoans, who were by no means unfamiliar with powerful orators, would need

---

<sup>105</sup> Kuykendall, *The Hawaiian Kingdom*, Vol. I, 126-131.

to learn a whole new set of ground rules to deal with one another under the law, likely falling under the influence of *palagi* and possibly Hawaiian lawyers for some time before fully engaging the practice of law.

The same went for the international stage. While the threat of gunships prevented Samoans from responding violently to the numerous foreign aggressions committed on its shores, its various unequal treaties had done just as much damage to Samoan sovereignty as musket balls and grapeshot. As Bush informed Kalākaua, this left them “more afraid of the pen than the sword,” though he assured the king that he could, “convince them that Hawai’i is strong today from the use of the pen, [rather] than from the power of the sword.” Following the Hawaiian plan to turn warriors into lawyers, the legation also hoped to turn Samoans and other Polynesians into diplomats that could manipulate international law in their favor instead of being continuously manipulated by it.<sup>106</sup>

In order to become a nation of lawyers and diplomats the legation felt the Samoans would need schools. In his report on Sāmoa, Poor noted few Samoan children received any education beyond basic training in reading, writing, and the Bible. The only significant exceptions were the wealthier part-Europeans and the students of the religious schools. While he reported rather positively on the Catholic girls’ school, he critiqued the LMS school in Malua, which averaged about a hundred male students, noting in particular that only 1/8<sup>th</sup> of the curriculum focused on secular learning. As this school produced the vast majority of Sāmoa’s village teachers, their poor preparation helped perpetuate the low state of the village schools. The plan to remedy this situation included the extension of the Hawaiian school system into Sāmoa, which Kalākaua proposed in February. In March Bush informed Gibson that the Samoans welcomed the Hawaiian school he had proposed and to begin processing the request. In May Gibson informed

---

<sup>106</sup> Bush to Kalākaua, January 27, 1887.

Bush that two Hawaiian teachers would be coming to Sāmoa in June, though there is no record of their arrival in Sāmoa.<sup>107</sup>

In addition to improving the state of secular education in Sāmoa, the importation of the Hawaiian school system would likely help provide a nationalist education and further indoctrination into accepting a centralized state. Alexander Liholiho, Lot Kapuāiwa, and Kalākaua all actively engaged in the struggle to wrest control of the school system from the ABCFM/HEA and put them under greater governmental control, in large part because they understood the power of education as a tool of indoctrination, either for or against the *mō‘ī*. With limited modifications the Hawaiian school system would instill future generations of Samoan students with their own monarch-centered nationalist education. Furthermore such schools would likely portray the confederacy and the Hawaiian Kingdom in a beneficial light. A Hawaiian church, which the Kalākaua administration also offered to start in Sāmoa, would offer similar benefits with regards to developing a pro-Hawaiian sentiment and a monarchy-based nationalism.

Seeing their own “progress” to be largely an affect of the agricultural industrialization of Hawai‘i, the Hawaiians also intended to increase commercial development in Samoan agriculture and turn Sāmoa towards a cash economy. Poor’s decrying of Samoan “laziness” and the wasted potential of agriculture in Sāmoa stemmed in large part from a desire to develop Sāmoa along the Hawaiian plantation model. Bush’s plans for taxation on a village level and his assumption that within a few years Sāmoa could afford its \$62,000 a year government also show a Hawaiian desire to push Sāmoa further into a cash economy. Poor’s support for immigrant labor and Bush’s proposal for buying out the German land holdings and running them as a Hawaiian company also reflect the Hawaiian economy, where outsiders controlled the economy and

---

<sup>107</sup> Bush, “Dispatch #13”; Horn, “Primacy of the Pacific under the Hawaiian Kingdom,” 148-9; Poor, “The Samoan Islands.”



provided a large chunk of the tax base. While this had boosted both the overall Hawaiian economy and the government coffers, the problems this type of foreign investment already caused in Hawai'i and Sāmoa should have given Poor and Bush some pause. Apparently it did not. In addition to providing cash for the government, and for Hawaiian and other foreign investors, this industrialization and the push towards a cash economy would again emphasize the importance of the centralized government. The government would be the supreme arbiter for the various disputes within the system, the authority under which laborers would be introduced, and the developer of the infrastructure such industry would need.<sup>108</sup>

The Hawaiian plans also provide greater insight into how the legation perceived the future relationship between confederates. Overall the efforts to reshape Sāmoa show a clear belief that Hawai'i would dominate the relationship, both in terms of relations between the two and the internal management of Sāmoa. The high cost of the government and Hawaiian privileging of their own generosity indicate that the Hawaiians envisioned a certain amount of cash dependency on the part of the Samoans, at least in the early years. From Bush and Poor's plans for Hawaiian agricultural investments, however, it seems that the Hawaiians would try to find ways to make up such early losses through other means.<sup>109</sup>

As noted above the Hawaiians also planned to have a formal role in the administration of the Samoan government. Yet the appointment of Hawaiians or by Hawaiians for key positions in the Samoan government might have seemed beneficial to Malietoa as well. In general such positions guaranteed a Hawaiian investment in the government and signaled Hawaiian interest in making sure the government succeeded. The head of the Supreme Court would be a position of significant power, but also of

---

<sup>108</sup> Bush, "Dispatch #8"; Bush, "Dispatch #23"; Poor, "The Samoan Islands-a Sketch by Henry Poor."

<sup>109</sup> Bush, "Dispatch #8"; Bush, "Dispatch #23"; Poor, "The Samoan Islands-a Sketch by Henry Poor."

potential controversy if held by a Samoan, as that individual would be beholden to various familial and political factions. A Hawaiian would be free, at least, from some of these entanglements, though still carrying their fair share of other biases and entanglements. The Minister of Finance would effectively hold the purse strings for the government. Again the advantage of having a Hawaiian in such a position came from their perceived lack of bias. In addition, since the Hawaiians would be providing financial backing to the new government, a Hawaiian in such a position would give the Hawaiian government certain reassurances as to the spending of their money. Though Bush claimed that the inclusion of such appointments came at the behest of Malietoa, of course, it certainly behooved the Hawaiians to hold the purse strings and head the judiciary in a government they were risking so much of their own political and economic capital in creating. But in comparison to the overall Hawaiian attempt to reshape Sāmoa in its own image, the Hawaiian appointments were a relatively minor attempt to shape the future of Sāmoa.<sup>110</sup>

There are few clues as to what other sort of social and cultural agendas Kalākaua may have had for the confederacy. In addition to the indoctrination and education they provided, Hawaiian schools and church would likely play a role in creating cultural exchanges as well as a favorable association between the Hawaiians and Samoans. It seems quite likely that Kalākaua and the other members of Hale Nauā would express an interest in incorporating other Polynesian knowledge into their work. Internal records of their artifacts included references to Samoan material culture, such as a description of a ‘awa bowl as “somewhat like those of the Samoans,” indicating such work had already begun. Kalākaua originally intended the legation’s artifacts to end up in the National Museum, an institution closely affiliated with Hale Nauā. With increased contact the likelihood of cultural influences flowing freely between Hawai‘i, Sāmoa, and Tonga

---

<sup>110</sup> Bush, “Dispatch #23.”

seems rather likely as well. Even without the confederacy, Hawaiian *hula* during and after that period influenced and was influenced by the dance styles of other Islanders, such as the incorporation of Kiribati-style grass skirts. Considering Kalākaua’s personal and political interests, it seems very likely that he himself would encourage increased cultural exchange, and perhaps the beginnings of a unified Polynesian cultural movement. All of this is largely speculation, however, as the legation and the administration concerned themselves primarily with reinventing Samoan politics and society rather than its culture.<sup>111</sup>

Such changes would come at a cost for the Samoans, as it had for the Hawaiians, whose “modernization” led to a rupturing of traditional ties, an unhealthy reliance on foreign advisors, and widespread economic disruption. As John Osorio, Lilikala Kame‘eleihiwa, and Sarah Merry have noted with regards to politics, land tenure/culture, and law respectively, the adoption of Euro/American norms often created a space for Euro/American encroachment into Hawaiian sovereignty, in part by devaluing Hawaiian culture and society. By the 1880s Native Hawaiians had begun to “catch up” in terms of politics and the public sphere. In terms of land ownership and control of their daily economic status, however, Hawaiians were actually far worse off than the Samoans, with nearly the entire economy and the great majority of private arable lands in the hands of *haole*. In promoting Euro/American development among the Samoans the Hawaiians risked acting as a Trojan horse for the same sort of Euro/American “progress” that had led to such disastrous consequences at home. Their internalization of discourses of Euro/American *na‘auao*, however, blinded them to such possibilities.<sup>112</sup>

---

<sup>111</sup> Hale Naua, “List of Items, Hale Naua,” HSA-Hale Naua Files; Poor, “Inventory of Items Purchased by H.F. Poor for the Hawaiian Museum.”

<sup>112</sup> Kame‘eleihiwa, *Native Lands*; Merry, *Colonizing Hawaii*; Osorio, *Dismembering Lāhui*.

What the Hawaiians believed, perhaps incorrectly, was that the benefits of such measures, particularly in terms of retaining their independence, outweighed the costs. This would be called into question by the series of events that crippled Hawaiian independence: the Bayonet Constitution, the overthrow, and annexation. In all three events it was armed *haole*, empowered by the Kingdom's pro-plantation economic policies and reliance on the rule of law rather than the state's ability to coerce through force, who dismantled the Kingdom's sovereignty. Yet the motivation for such events came not from Hawaiian "progress," but from a global culture of Euro/American imperial aggression and greed, which slaughtered, enslaved, and colonized non-Euro/American peoples regardless of their levels of "progress." Considering the important role of Native nationalism, peaceful protests, legal battles, and diplomatic appeals later played in various twentieth-century de-colonial efforts, however, the Hawaiians' efforts to control and steer their own "development" and that of the Samoans may not have been entirely misguided.

Either way, the Hawaiian legation's belief in the superiority of Euro/American political, cultural, and social structures and norms eclipsed alternative possibilities for more Polynesian-centered polities. Had the Hawaiians shown more interest in a mutual exchange of ideas between themselves, the Samoans, and eventually the Tongans, rather than just Hawaiianizing Polynesia, they might have collectively recognized the flaws in their push for "progress" and developed political, economic, and social structures better suited to their situations and their peoples. Had the legation been able to look past their own biases, they might have realized the confederacy need not promote the Euro/American-tinged Hawaiianization of Sāmoa and Tonga, but could also promote the creation of a new type of political structure for all three based on shared Polynesian values and better suited towards Native self-governance than for colonial exploitation. It is possible, of course, that after diplomatic matters had been settled the confederacy

might have been headed in such a direction anyway, particularly with greater input from Kalākaua. His domestic cultural and social efforts hint that such a turn of events was not entirely outside of the realm of possibility. Indeed the confederacy could have provided a proving ground for the sort of ideas being developed by the Hale Nauā. But the early trajectory the legation set the confederacy upon and the general Hawaiian fetishization of “development” would have created considerable resistance to such a plan.

## Conclusion

When trying to understand the Hawaiian legation to Sāmoa and how the Hawaiians involved imagined and shaped their relationship with the Samoans, it may be useful to reflect upon the same question dealt with at the end of the previous chapter: What was the confederacy? As noted there, from its very conception the confederacy had the stink of empire upon it, but it also contained a distinct and explicit core of anti-imperial, pro-Native sentiment. It combined European/Polynesian discourses of race/kinship, European/Hawaiian discourses of progress/*na ‘auao*, and the realpolitik of empire in the late-nineteenth-century Pacific. But what did any of this mean for the actual ties developed by the legation and the future relationships they and their Samoan allies imagined?

The Hawaiian use of discourses of Hawaiian superiority and Polynesian kinship would likely have continued shaping the course of relations between Hawai‘i and Sāmoa. While the abrupt end to the confederacy disallows any concrete declarations of how the relationship between the two peoples would have eventually developed, the legation reveals enough to make a few educated guesses. The lack of coercive ability ruled out any sort of formal Hawaiian Empire. Instead the Hawaiians would need to depend on persuasion and trust from within the familiar confines of an extended *‘āiga/‘ohana*, albeit a very extended *‘āiga/‘ohana*. As Glenn Petersen has argued with regards to the extended

polities of Yap and Tonga, such negotiated, hierarchal, inter-*lāhui* polities can be understood as empires, just not empires following the nineteenth-century Euro/American model. Thus any analysis of the confederacy as empire could not rely on understandings of empire based on the Euro/American model. Categorizing the confederacy as such an empire would do more to expose the limits of our current understandings of empires than to help us understand the confederacy.<sup>113</sup>

Both sides clearly imagined the relationship as an unequal one, the sort of imbalance that categorized empires far more than it did simple allies. What this meant for the future relationship between Hawai‘i and Sāmoa depended largely on how serious the Hawaiians were about their kinship with the Samoans. Poor’s attitude towards the Samoans indicates a willingness to view such rhetoric as politically expedient talk, easily put aside in the real business of developing and exploiting the Samoans. If the Hawaiian government gravitated towards such an attitude, they risked offending the Samoans and losing their support. If the relationship continued after this point, the confederacy likely would have begun to resemble the hegemony of aid-based neo-colonialism of the post-WWII era, where the promise of aid money allowed richer, more-developed states the opportunity to exploit poorer states through cycles of corruption, debt, and dependency.

By putting greater reliance on their superiority over the Samoans rather than their kinship with the Samoans, the Hawaiians would likely find it in their interest to prevent Samoans from questioning that superiority. As with development regimes and other forms of colonialism and neo-colonialism, this would likely result in deliberate efforts to under-develop Sāmoa and to perpetuate a discourse of Samoan inferiority through various measures. As seen in Chapter 3, Hawaiians were adroit students of such measures under their ABCFM teachers. Under such a path the confederacy, while exploitative and likely oppressive, would represent a clear break from trends of the nineteenth-century

---

<sup>113</sup> Petersen, “Indigenous Island Empires: Yap and Tonga Considered.”

Pacific, but only because it would be one Polynesian people structurally exploiting another rather than Euro/Americans doing it. In all likelihood, however, the *haole* and *palagi* establishments would derive the greatest benefit from such a situation, particularly considering the established *haole* dominance of the Hawaiian economy.

If the attitude of the Hawaiian government followed that of Bush and Kalākaua, however, the genealogical connection to the Samoans and the rights and responsibilities associated with such a connection might have been taken more seriously. While at worst the confederacy would simply be a different form of exploitation, if it were to live up to its full potential, the confederacy would be a radical departure from political trends not just in the Pacific, but worldwide. If the confederacy succeeded in stopping Euro/American takeovers in Hawai‘i, Sāmoa, and Tonga, and eventually reached a state of equilibrium between its members, it would have made a major statement to the world about the validity of Native-polities. At the same time it would have called into question the assumed future hegemony of Euro/Americans and their empires. This would be particularly radical if the confederacy allowed a space for the creation of Polynesian polities guided by the needs and values of Polynesian states rather than upon Euro/American discourses of progress and development. As Euro/American empires continued to consume non-Euro/American peoples, cultures, and lands across the globe, such a confederacy could have provided an alternative model, and possibly even a home, for other independent, non-Euro/American peoples and for independence-minded, colonized peoples of the Pacific and elsewhere.

But in the end the confederacy was not allowed to become any of these things, brought to an early end by the 1887 coup. That coup set the stage for the divisiveness of the Lili‘uokalani years and a second coup in 1893, which took rule out of the hands of the Hawaiian people for good. Over the next seven years the *lāhui* struggled against the rule of a handful of mission scions and planters at home while petitioning and campaigning

against annexation in Washington. In 1898, with the Spanish American War increasing America's Pacific empire and a Republican administration back in the White House, the long fight against annexation came to an end. Hawai'i fell under direct imperial rule. In 1899 the United States and Germany split Sāmoa amongst themselves, creating a political separation that persists into the present day.

Though it died an early death, the confederacy did, in fact, have concrete and positive results, at least for one small group of Samoans and Hawaiians. In 1962, a University of Hawai'i anthropology student, William Pila Kikuchi, traveled to the island of Aunu'u. Upon learning that Kikuchi was from Hawai'i, the chief, Salauve'a, informed him that two of the *Kaimiloa's* men, Aniani and Mahelona, had fled the ship after the legation's recall and taken refuge on Aunu'u. Later, when asylum seekers from Tutuila, being pursued by their enemies, asked for shelter on Aunu'u, the local people offered their aid. Setting up a kill zone in a pass in the coral reef the pursuers needed to pass through, the Aunu'u people defeated the pursuers in such a devastating manner that Aunu'u was never threatened again. The Hawaiian sailors and a Hawaiian storekeeper named Manoa planned the ambush, set up the kill zones, and manned the cannons. Kikuchi found that the people of Aunu'u still remembered them for their contributions, and their descendants still lived on Aunu'u. While having nowhere near the political or rhetorical impact Kalākaua had hoped for, for the people of Aunu'u, at least, the alliance had proven a most satisfactory arrangement.<sup>114</sup>

---

<sup>114</sup> William Pila Kikuchi, "A Legend of Kaimiloa Hawaiians in American Samoa," *Hawaiian Historical Society Review* (1864).



## CHAPTER 6 THE *LĀHUI* BESIEGED

During the period between annexation in 1898 and the First World War, the focus of the *lāhui* changed from collective resistance, which categorized the period between the overthrow and annexation, to the development of strategies to secure their collective and individual interests under a hostile colonial regime. The *lāhui* could no longer rely on the old institutions that had framed Native Hawaiian life. The Kingdom, which had been the institutional and conceptual foundation of the nineteenth-century *lāhui*, was now just a memory. The Native Congregational church, already weakened by defections to other Christian sects, was further weakened by its connections to the overthrow. Though many Hawaiians remained in the church, it had lost the capability to serve as a focus for the interests of the *lāhui*.

Furthermore, the *lāhui* was under siege by a variety of forces, which had been either developed under or strengthened by American rule. Politically the *lāhui* was largely at the mercy of the United States, who not only had exclusive control of the appointed executive branch, but who also exercised an inordinate amount of power through congressional oversight. Furthermore, the oligarchs who had controlled the islands after the overthrow remained entrenched in the executive branch through their connections in Washington. Meanwhile powerful and wealthy agri-businesses, primarily the sugar interests, increased their control over Hawai‘i’s economy and its arable lands.

Demographic trends also threatened the interests and collective strength of the *lāhui*. The continued decrease of the Native Hawaiian population and the massive post-

Bayonet boom in immigration from the continental US, Europe, and especially Asia, made Native Hawaiians a minority in their own lands. Furthermore, Americanization projects, particularly in the school system, threatened the cultural cohesion of the *lāhui*. On all fronts, Native Hawaiians faced life within an American colonial system that privileged Euro-American individuals while being openly antagonistic to the very existence of Native collectivities.

Facing this hostile environment without the institutions that had once represented and unified them, most Native Hawaiians saw little choice but to engage with the Territory's economic and political life. This engagement required negotiating with many of the forces aligned against their interests, leading to conflicts over the correct mix of collaboration and confrontation to best further their collective interests. Even as they dedicated themselves to the process of engagement, many Native Hawaiians questioned whether the limited benefits they were reaping from collaboration were worth its high costs. Collaboration and engagement rarely succeeded in protecting the interests of the *lāhui*, typically working to provide only a few remedial concessions while conceding on broader systematic issues. The actions of the various forces aligned against them, the effects of collaboration, and the tensions caused by disagreements over how to move forward all further weakened the cultural cohesion of the *lāhui*, and thus its very existence. Aware of this threat many Native Hawaiians explicitly worked to emphasize and develop the cultural and social bonds that remained, hoping at the very least to keep the *lāhui* intact.

### **The Lāhui Unified**

The years following the Bayonet Constitution were an unquestioned disaster for the political interests and independence of the *lāhui*. Kalākaua's death in 1891, the overthrow of Lili'uokalani's government in 1893, and life under an oppressive oligarchy

all proved particularly painful. Yet the pain of the overthrow, the overwhelming sense of injustice, and the recognition of the threat that possible annexation represented to their future united and energized the *lāhui* in a way it had not been since Kalākaua's election. The lingering resentments of the Emmaites, the anti-Kalākaua furor of the HEA and the missionary party, and legitimate political disagreement with Kalākaua's administration and agenda combined to create a substantial anti-Kalākaua minority among Native Hawaiians. Lili'uokalani inherited many of her brother's foes, as well as facing Native Hawaiians radicalized by the injustices of the Bayonet Constitution. Foremost among these were former Envoy Bush and Robert Wilcox, a *hapa* politician, newspaperman, and the avowed opponent of every administration between 1888 and his death in 1902.

The overthrow changed all that. Despite claims by the future oligarchs that they acted in the interests of all Hawai'i, the vast majority of the population, including Natives, *haole*, and Asians, recognized the coup as a power grab by American settlers. Even the Native opposition quickly rallied around the queen, though Wilcox flirted with the coup leaders in the early days after the overthrow. This unity, which was expressed through political organizing, the production of certain cultural artifacts, public protests, and even armed revolt, continued until annexation. The *lāhui* focused on two main strategies for restoring the government. The first was to use the Kingdom's treaty status, the un-democratic nature of the overthrow, and appeals to American ideals to encourage the United States government to restore the Kingdom. The second was to avoid participation in the new government, preventing it from making any kind of justifiable claim of being a legitimate and representative government.

The Oligarchs formed an ad-hoc government officially called the Provisional Government, which most Hawaiians referred to as the *Piki*. The government had little legal standing and was envisioned as only a temporary measure, as they expected rapid approval of annexation from the United States. The previous year, members of

Republican President Benjamin Harrison's administration had already informed coup leader Lorrin Thurston of the president's approval of a potential coup, as well as his desire to annex Hawai'i should such an event occur. The coup leaders, however, had moved too slowly. Their coup occurred in January 1893, several months after the Republicans had lost the Presidential election to Grover Cleveland. Lame-duck Harrison submitted an annexation treaty to the Senate, but it failed to move fast enough and was withdrawn by his successor. Cleveland supported Lili'uokalani and stymied any attempts to annex Hawai'i, but he lacked the political clout in either Washington or Hawai'i to force the restoration of the monarchy, leaving the *haole* Oligarchy in control of the islands indefinitely.<sup>1</sup>

The failure of annexation surprised the mission-scions at the center of the coup. Until a more favorable administration came into power in Washington they found themselves ruling over a still independent nation with a population deeply opposed to their rule. Seeking to establish a façade of democracy, the Oligarchy abandoned the Provisional Government and declared themselves the Republic of Hawai'i in 1894. They continued, however, to exclude most Native Hawaiians and all Asians from voting, as well as initiating widespread abuse of the legal system to silence their political foes, Native Hawaiian and *haole* alike. Despite their frenzied allegations of wanton spending, corruption, and unchecked executive power under Kalākaua, the Oligarchs ran up massive public debts and developed a culture of corruption, inefficiency, and abuse of power that would take generations to untangle.<sup>2</sup>

Those who fought against the hated *Piki* and the Republic became heroes in Hawai'i. Native politicians and newspapermen John E. Bush and Joseph Nawahi, for

---

<sup>1</sup> Kuykendall, *Hawaiian Kingdom*, Vol. III, 534-536; Silva, *Aloha Betrayed*, 169-170.

<sup>2</sup> Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico (CPIPR), *Hawaiian Investigation: Report on General Conditions*, 1902, p.10, 150, 117-124, 172-3; Daws, *Shoal of Time: A History of the Hawaiian Islands*, 282.

instance, gained immense popularity for their stands against the Oligarchy. On Kaua‘i, a *paniolo*<sup>3</sup> named Ko‘olau became a popular outlaw figure when he and his family resisted *Piki* attempts to send him to the leper colony on Moloka‘i without allowing his wife as a *kuleana*, or helper. When Deputy Sheriff Louis Stolza attempted to shoot a relative who was helping hide the family, Kaimonakamakeloa, Ko‘olau’s favorite rifle, lived up to its name, Death-that-Winks-From-Afar. The *Piki* sent a regiment of troops to capture Ko‘olau. They burned the homes of his relatives and neighbors, then hounded Ko‘olau, his wife, and their child into the mountains.<sup>4</sup>

The *Piki* troops, who were mostly foreign-born *haole*, attempted to ambush Ko‘olau in the forests, forests that Ko‘olau had spent his lifetime hunting, gathering, and herding in. In the ensuing skirmishes Ko‘olau skillfully evaded their ambushes while setting his own, killing several *Piki* troops. Falling back, the government forces decided to shell the cave Ko‘olau and his family were thought to be living in and bury them in the rubble. Ko‘olau and his family had left the cave, however, and watched the bombardment from a distance. The *Piki* troops decided not to search too carefully for bodies, declaring victory and sailing back to O‘ahu. Ko‘olau and his family remained in hiding for several more years, his wife Pi‘ilani emerging from the forest only after her husband and son had been claimed by leprosy.<sup>5</sup>

In 1895 a group of Hawaiian citizens, primarily Native Hawaiians, sought to reestablish the monarchy through armed revolt. Coordination issues, the unavailability of guns, and a lack of training doomed the effort, and after a few days of skirmishing the Oligarchy took most of the “rebels” into custody. They also took the opportunity to arrest numerous political opponents who had not participated in the revolt, including

---

<sup>3</sup> *Paniolo*: cowboy

<sup>4</sup> Pi‘ilani Ko‘olau, “The True Story of Kaluaiko‘olau, or Ko‘olau the Leper “ *The Hawaiian Journal of History* 21 (1987).

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*

Lili‘uokalani. A series of show trials convicted many prominent rebels, such as Princes David La‘amea Kawānanakoa and Jonah Kūhiō Kalaniana‘ole, as well as some of the political prisoners, including Lili‘uokalani. In a show of “liberality” the Republic agreed not to carry out any death sentences, though such a course of action would almost certainly have led to a general revolt and condemnation from the international community. The imprisonment of Lili‘uokalani and the rebels served to further establish them as heroes among the *lāhui*, as well as further entrenching the oligarchy in the role of the villains. When it became known that the prisoners, including the princes, were forced to wear stripes, young women in Honolulu began wearing striped dresses as a sign of solidarity. Songs were composed for the prisoners celebrating them as warriors and heroes of the *lāhui*.<sup>6</sup>

Hawaiians also sought to thwart the Oligarchy’s plans through less-spectacular but better coordinated political efforts. Anti-Republic and anti-annexation groups like the ‘Ahahui Kalai‘āina and ‘Ahahui Aloha ‘Āina organized public protests, marches, speeches, and petitions. Both the oligarchy and the opposition recognized that the key battle would be the fight for annexation. If the Native Hawaiian populace could thwart annexation long enough the Republic would likely collapse under the weight of its own unpopularity and incompetence. On the other hand, once annexation occurred hopes for a restoration of Hawaiian independence would be effectively crushed. Furthermore, many Native Hawaiians feared that annexation would result in the sort of brutal occupation that other Native peoples had experienced under the American empire. Professor Benjamin Cluff, then President of Brigham Young University and a proponent of annexation, toured the islands and found that many rural Hawaiians feared:

---

<sup>6</sup> Bernice Pi‘ilani Irwin, *I Knew Queen Lili‘uokalani* (Honolulu: Bernice Pi‘ilani Irwin, 1960), 53; Amy Stillman, “History Reinterpreted in Song: The Case of the Hawaiian Counterrevolution,” *Hawaiian Journal of History* 23, (1989): 3-13.

[They] would be driven to the mountains, and be treated like the Indians of the west, or rather as they have heard the Indians are treated; that their lands would be taken from them and their property confiscated; that they would be ostracized from society...some even think they would be enslaved like the negroes of the South.

While Cluff dismissed such fears in 1897, the recentness of the 1890 massacre at Wounded Knee, the continued whittling away of Native lands and rights in places like Utah, and the conditions in the Jim Crow South only served to heighten and justify Hawaiian fears.<sup>7</sup>

Despite protests and other evidence that the population stood solidly against annexation, the United States Senate approved the Newlands Resolution to annex Hawai'i in 1898. With the onset of the Spanish American War enflaming American imperial desires, the only major objections in the American press and Washington came not over the trampling of the principle of self-determination, but over fears that the Asian and Native Hawaiian population would taint the whiteness of the American citizenry. When news of annexation reached Hawai'i, the *haole* community largely celebrated while the vast majority of Native Hawaiians wept. For many the only positive aspect of annexation was the end to the hated Republic. The Oligarchy, however, maintained absolute rule until Congress passed the Hawaiian Organic Act in 1900, restoring limited self-governance to Native Hawaiians as citizens of a United States Territory.<sup>8</sup>

### **Oligarchs, Party Politics, and Territorial “Democracy”**

In a statement he submitted to a United States Senate commission in 1902, *ali'i nui*, former planter, and royalist stalwart John A. Cummins voiced the sentiments of many Native Hawaiians regarding participation in Territorial politics. He wrote:

---

<sup>7</sup> Benjamin Cluff, “The Hawaiian Islands and Annexation,” *Improvement Era* 1, no. 1 (1897): 436; Silva, *Aloha Betrayed*, 130-134.

<sup>8</sup> Daws, *Shoal of Time*, 286-291; Irwin, *I Knew Queen Lili'uokalani*, 64.

The action of the Congress of the United States in annexing the islands is not and never will be approved by the Hawaiian people in general. Our people have submitted, and will continue to submit, to the authority of the United States, but only upon the grounds of necessity, knowing that they are unable to change the course of [history] or to break or cut the bond which has been fastened upon them without their consent...You have made us American citizens against our will; we now propose to make the best of the situation.<sup>9</sup>

With annexation a reality and hopes of restoration shelved for the indefinite future, Native Hawaiians faced the unhappy but necessary adjustment to life as citizens/subjects of the American empire, hoping “to make the best of the situation.” They still faced numerous obstacles. The American empire had not slaughtered Native Hawaiians, run them into the hills, or placed them in reservations as they had done to Native Americans and were currently doing to the Filipinos. But it seemingly placed the final nail in the coffin of the Kingdom, which had been the most powerful institution for safeguarding Native Hawaiian interests in the nineteenth century. They had also forced Native Hawaiians to live under the colonial rule of the American territorial system; as colonial “citizens,” Native Hawaiians fell under the indirect rule of the US Congress and the direct rule of a powerful Territorial Governor appointed from Washington. In addition to veto power, control of the Territorial executive branch, and the control of a powerful patronage machine, the Governor’s office also had near complete discretion with regards to the management of Territorial lands, with no system of review, approval, or appeal except in US Congress. The wealth of the missionary party and the plantations, their connections in Washington, and American racial/imperial ideologies kept the executive branch in the hands of pro-plantation, anti-*lāhui haole* for the entirety of the early Territorial period.

---

<sup>9</sup> Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico (CPIPR), *Hawaiian Investigation: Pt 3, Exhibits, Memorials, Petitions, and Letters*, 1902, p.114-115.



During both Democratic and Republican administrations, Washington reserved the appointment of governors and other high-level federal positions for the group often referred to as the Oligarchy. A pro-imperial mix of mission-scions and large agri-business concerns, the Oligarchy held absolute power between the overthrow and the organization of the Territory. They then controlled the unelected executive until 1918. Though there was some overlap, in membership, ideologies, and interests, between the missionary party and the agri-business factions of the Oligarchy, the two were somewhat distinct groups. As the name suggests, mission sons and grandsons formed the core of the missionary party, who focused primarily on obtaining and exercising political power over the islands. They had been the key agitators against both Kalākaua and Ka‘ahumanu, as well as the drive for annexation. The Agri-business faction, primarily the plantations and the “Big Five” sugar firms,<sup>10</sup> were interested primarily in the acquisition of wealth, and tended to be more interested in politics as a means of keeping the sugar and cash flowing than in political power itself.

The missionary party included numerous key players in the overthrow, the Republic, and the push for annexation who had only indirect interests in the plantations, men like mission-scions Lorrin Thurston, Sanford Dole, and W.O. Smith. Dole was best known as a judge, though his cousin James did start the pineapple plantation that today bears the Dole name. Thurston was a newspaperman and early tourism promoter. Smith was a lawyer. Yet there was also significant overlap. William Castle, like Thurston, Dole, and Smith, descended from a mission family and helped plan the overthrow and annexation. Yet he was also the son of the co-founder of the Castle and Cooke firm and was closely tied to the other Big Five companies. His brothers, who ran the firm, had

---

<sup>10</sup> Alexander & Baldwin, Castle & Cooke, H. Hackfield and Company (later American Factors), Theo H. Davies & Company, C. Brewer & Company.

only supporting roles in the overthrow and the Provisional Government, though they, like most of the sugar community, backed both.<sup>11</sup>

More importantly, the goals of the two groups nearly always overlapped with regards to maintaining power over both the Native Hawaiian and Asian populations. With passage of the Organic Act in 1900, Native Hawaiians regained a limited franchise, being able to vote for a bicameral Territorial legislature and a non-voting delegate to the US House of Representatives. Because of American race baiting over the “Oriental menace,” the organic treaty denied citizenship and the right to vote to the vast majority of the Asian population. With the *haole* population still in the minority, Native Hawaiians dominated the electorate, as well as many of the elected offices during the 1900 elections.<sup>12</sup> Many Hawaiians hoped to retain the unity they had during the post-Overthrow era, hoping to use their electoral dominance to regain some measure of power. Lili‘uokalani, for instance, had been pushing such unity since annexation. In an address in 1898, just months after the annexation passed the US Senate, she spoke of the need for Native Hawaiians to organize an “Ahahui nui Kalaiaina,” an umbrella political party, to represent the concerns of the *lāhui* to the Organic Commission.<sup>13</sup> She then forwarded a set of names of “*kanaka Hawaii naauao*” to represent the *lāhui* during the Organic Commission’s inquiries and beyond. Among numerous other prominent Native Hawaiians like Antone Rosa, John Baker, and Robert Hoapili Baker, the list included the Queen’s former opponent Robert Wilcox.<sup>14</sup>

In the period before the first Territorial election in 1900, it was Wilcox who proved most capable of tapping into this Native Hawaiian desire for unity. That year he

---

<sup>11</sup> Daws, *Shoal of Time*, 311; Kuykendall, *Hawaiian Kingdom: Vol. 3*, 587.

<sup>12</sup> Ernest Andrade, *Unconquerable Rebel: Robert W. Wilcox and Hawaiian Politics, 1880-1903*(Niwot, Colorado: University Press of Colorado, 1996), 189-190.

<sup>13</sup> The Ahahui Aloha ‘Āina, like the Ahahui Kalai‘āina, were predominantly Native Hawaiian patriotic groups formed to protest the Bayonet Constitution and later the overthrow and annexation.

<sup>14</sup> “Ka Haiolelo a Ka Moiwahine Liliuokalani,” *Ka Lei Rose o Hawaii*, August 1 1898.

created the Home Rule Party, which he promoted as a continuation of the various anti-annexation ‘*ahahui* that had been so popular in the post-overthrow era. With the *lāhui* largely united behind them, the Home Rule Party crushed the Republicans and Democrats. Much to the dismay of the Oligarchy, Native Hawaiians voted Robert Wilcox to be Hawai‘i’s first delegate to Congress. The election also gave the party control of the legislature, with which the party vowed to beat back the Oligarchy and protect the interests of the *lāhui*.<sup>15</sup>

Between his accented English, racism on the part of American congressmen, a lack of allies in the two-party system, and his somewhat abrasive personality, Wilcox had little success in Washington. In addition, the Home Rule legislature faced total obstruction from Governor Dole, who stonewalled and vetoed the legislature into irrelevance while the Oligarchy-aligned press gleefully attacked them for their supposed incompetence. Wilcox’s personality and Home Rule impotence in Washington and Honolulu fed dissent within the party. During the 1902 convention Prince Jonah Kūhiō and other Home Rulers drafted a new party platform, which Wilcox saw as an effort to undercut him. He threw up numerous procedural hurdles to block Kūhiō’s platform, leading Kūhiō and about half the delegates to walk out of the convention. Kūhiō was enormously popular among Native Hawaiians, perhaps even more so than his brother Prince David Kawānanakoa. Upon hearing of Kūhiō leaving the Home Rule Party, several prominent Republicans went directly to Kūhiō’s house, woke him up, and convinced him to run for delegate on the Republican ticket. Kūhiō agreed, taking a massive number of former Home Rule voters with him. Between Kūhiō’s popularity among Native Hawaiians and Republican control of the plantations and ranches, the 1902 election initiated decades of Republican control of territorial politics.<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> Andrade, *Unconquerable Rebel*, 124-127, 198.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, 236-243.

Despite the Home Rule party's early dominance, its quick demise showed it to be fundamentally unsuitable for inclusion in American politics. First the lack of affiliation with either major party weakened the ability of both Wilcox and the legislature to influence federal policies affecting Hawai'i. If anything the lack of party affiliation marked Wilcox as the enemy of both the Republicans and Democrats, meaning that requests from the Home Rule Legislature and Delegate faced animosity from both parties in Washington. Furthermore they had no hope of landing allies in even the lowest of the federally appointed or executive-appointed positions, as these were in the hands of whatever party held the White House. Finally, the unity of the Home Rule party was largely based on the momentum of the anti-oligarchy, pro-monarchy groups 'Ahahui Aloha 'Āina and 'Ahahui Kalai'āina. During their height in the late 1890's these groups brought together a broad spectrum of Native Hawaiian political viewpoints united behind their opposition to the Republic and annexation. Though the lingering spirit of anti-annexation solidarity catapulted the Home Rulers to victories in the 1900 election, it could no longer hold together the diverse views of the *lāhui* on how to move forward now that annexation was a reality. Open to personal, political, and ideological divisions like the split between Wilcox and Kūhiō, and unable to move forward any legislation in Washington or at home, the Home Rule party quickly lost its influence and power.<sup>17</sup>

The new political system also worked to divide the *lāhui* in another way when it restored the right of Native Hawaiian men to vote but continued denying the vote Native Hawaiian women. While pre-contact Native Hawaiian culture maintained clear gendered inequalities, it lacked the sort of masculine monopoly on the public sphere and politics that characterized Euro/American politics during much of the ironically named Victorian period. Through the adaptation of Euro/American political institutions, Hawai'i also adapted some bias against the inclusion of women from the realm of politics. From the

---

<sup>17</sup> Ibid., 190, 227-8.

earliest days of Hawaiian elections, women were excluded from the electorate. *Ali'i nui* women, however, remained a strong political force, including Queen Emma, Princess Ruth, and Queen Lili'uokalani. No Hawaiian would have considered dismissing Ka'ahumanu for her gender, and many Hawaiians supported Queen Emma's right to rule while amazed *haole* papers sought to point out her unsuitability for rule based on her gender. A handful of Native Hawaiians also used her gender to attack her campaign. Kalākaua supporter John A. Cummins even defaced some of her posters with the claim "We do not want to see the petticoat putting on breeches." Similarly, during Lili'uokalani's reign several prominent Native Hawaiians, including Wilcox, attacked her as unsuitable for the manly world of politics.<sup>18</sup> During the Provisional Government and Republic era, however, with most Hawaiian men similarly disenfranchised, Native Hawaiian women participated *en masse* in the anti-annexation and anti-oligarchy protests. Some even argued that Native Hawaiian women, if anything, were stronger and more active supporters of the anti-annexation campaign than the men were. With the return of universal suffrage for male citizens under the Territory, however, women were again edged out of the political picture.<sup>19</sup>

The Home Rule victories of 1900 represented the last gasp of the political unity that had sustained the *lāhui* through the tough times after the overthrow. Under the Territory Native Hawaiians, or at least Native Hawaiian men, regained the vote, but in their forced inclusion into American Two-Party politics, they lost that unity. This lack of unity was just one of many political obstacles faced by the *lāhui* during the early Territorial period. As a Territory, Hawai'i had no vote in the US Senate, House or Electoral College, yet were under the indirect control of the US Congress and the direct

---

<sup>18</sup> George S. Kanahale, *Emma: Hawaii's Remarkable Queen* (Honolulu: The Queen Emma Foundation, 1999), 307; Kuykendall, *Hawaiian Kingdom*, Vol. III, 528.

<sup>19</sup> Cluff, "The Hawaiian Islands and Annexation," 436; Bob Krauss, *Johnny Wilson: First Hawaiian Democrat* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1994), 85.

control of a federally appointed governor. The missionary/planter Oligarchy, however, had the ear of both the Congressmen and the Presidents of both parties, allowing them more than a decade of absolute control of the federally appointed Territorial administration.

### *Ho‘oulu Lāhui*

Despite such obstacles, Native Hawaiians did attempt to use electoral politics to forward the interests of the *lāhui* in the ways they could, even though such efforts were often put aside for the interests of the party. Even with the lack of solidarity within the *lāhui*, Native Hawaiians made up such a massive majority of the electorate that Native Hawaiian politicians numerically dominated both parties. Even with strong *haole* dominance of the Republican Party’s funding and leadership, the Native electorate and strong Native leadership under Kūhiō and others meant that the party consistently put a number of Native Hawaiians on their legislative tickets. Although the Territorial senate trended more *haole* than the House, Native Hawaiians still had a prominent place in that body. In 1907, for instance, the Senate included Native Republicans John C. Lane, one of the Lane brothers made famous by their roles in the 1895 Rebellion, Senate Vice-President Samuel E. Kalama, and W.C. Achi.<sup>20</sup>

The Democratic Party also featured prominent Native Hawaiian politicians. Though Hawai‘i’s Democratic Party is commonly portrayed as an Asian-American phenomenon because of the 1954 Democratic Revolution, throughout the Territorial period it relied on a strong urban Native Hawaiian base for its votes and its officials. Prince David, for instance, was one of the founders of the Hawai‘i Democratic Party. Like Prince Kūhiō, Prince David saw the importance of affiliating with the two-party system as long as Hawai‘i was under control of the federal government. Unlike his

---

<sup>20</sup> Robert Colfax Lydecker, *Roster, Legislatures of Hawaii, 1841-1918* (Honolulu: Hawaiian Gazette Company, 1918), 275.

brother, however, he felt little desire to ally himself with the plantation interests within the Republican Party, preferring the pro-small-farmer and pro-laborer ideology of the Democratic Party. Other founding members of the Democratic Party included John E. Bush and future Honolulu Mayor Johnny Wilson, who had become interested in the national party during his time at Stanford, citing the party's affiliation with the "common man," and Jeffersonian ideals.<sup>21</sup>

In some districts, particularly in the urban areas of Honolulu, the diversity of the economy and the active political culture of the city allowed Democrats a strength they lacked in many of the plantation-dominated rural areas. Native Hawaiian politician Joseph Fern proved this in 1907 by being elected to the Honolulu Board of Supervisors and again in 1909 when he became Honolulu's first mayor. Many expected his opponent, Senator Lane, to sweep him in the polls, based on his name recognition, political experience, and the support of the Republican machine. Despite being outspent \$785 to \$125, Fern defeated Senator Lane in a tight race. Fern polled strongest in predominantly Native precincts like Kaka'ako, Pauoa, and Palama, former strongholds of the now waning Home Rule party. Despite the Republican-dominated Board of Supervisors' efforts to negate the election by simply ignoring him, Fern became a major force in Honolulu politics over the next decade, remaining mayor until 1920 with the exception of one term between 1915 and 1917.<sup>22</sup>

Though hampered by Oligarchy-controlled Territorial administrations and the limited colonial democracy of the Territory, Native Hawaiians still sought to pursue the interests of the *lāhui* through electoral politics. The clearest examples of this occurred during the so-called Lady Dog legislature of 1901. Ridiculed by the *haole* press and

---

<sup>21</sup> Krauss, *Johnny Wilson*, 38-75.

<sup>22</sup> Donald D. Johnson, "Joseph James Fern, Honolulu's First Mayor," *Hawaiian Journal of History* 9, (1975): 75-6.

essentially hamstrung by the veto power of Governor Dole, the Home Rule legislature's lack of successes proved to be a major point of contention during the 1902 split in the party between the Wilcox and Kūhiō factions. Yet the legislature's actions, like passing a county bill, carrying out discussions in English and Hawaiian despite an Organic act ban on Hawaiian in official business, and a condemnation of the Dole administration for corruption, were all clear efforts to reestablish Native dominance over the government after a decade in the wilderness.

One of the main *haole* attacks came from a successful bill that altered a Republic-era tax on female dogs. The *haole* press stood by and mocked the “incompetence” of the Native legislators, who altered the law in such a way that made the tax uncollectible. What they did not say was that in effectively ending this tax the “Lady Dog” legislature was acting in the interest of the Native Hawaiian community, who owned most of the dogs. Native Hawaiians and *haole* both understood that the Republic-era bill as a measure to tax and control Native Hawaiians.<sup>23</sup> In effectively ending the Republic-era dog tax, the Home Rulers were simultaneously acting in the economic interests of Native Hawaiians and making a statement challenging *haole* control of Territorial politics.<sup>24</sup>

After the downfall of the Home Rule Party, Native Democrats and Republicans continued to act in the interests of the *lāhui*, albeit not nearly as strongly or as regularly as the Home Rulers had. One of the most significant and successful political efforts of the early Territorial period was the effort to create county and municipal governments, a move resisted by the Oligarchy and Republican governors between 1898 and 1912. The

---

<sup>23</sup> Indeed such taxes had long been an issue for Native Hawaiian voters. After the first Kingdom-era legislature one Kauai district refused to send another delegate during the next legislature. Instead they sent a message that explaining they wanted no more representatives, since the last time they sent one he returned with nothing but a tax on their dogs. Osorio, *Dismembering Lāhui*, 66

<sup>24</sup> Andrade, *Unconquerable Rebel*, 202-3, 209. Iokepa Salazar at the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa is working on a much more in depth examination of the 1901 legislature and its treatment in the Hawaiian and English newspapers.



idea of county governments was first promoted during the 1898 Organic Commission hearings, and the Territorial Legislature was given the right to grant county charters in the Organic Act. For almost all Hawai'i residents the county acts promised greater local control over resources, as well as greater access to both the operation and services of government. Many transactions required paperwork to be filed in Honolulu, for instance, which under a county system could be taken care of locally. The Oligarchy opposed the idea for the same reason that many Native Hawaiians supported it. County governments would weaken the power of the federally appointed executive tremendously, transferring numerous functions, duties, and Territorial land to democratically elected county governments. For Native Hawaiians, who dominated the electorate in every proposed county, the county acts promised more power and influence, as well as refutation of the old *haole* narrative of Native unsuitability for self-governance.<sup>25</sup>

The 1901 legislature passed an immensely popular county bill that Governor Dole then vetoed, claiming technical irregularities in the bill. The Oligarchy's primary public argument against the bill, however, was that the Native Hawaiian population lacked the ability to govern themselves, echoing the patriarchal racism that underwrote their 1887 and 1893 power grabs. The Oligarchy and their supporters argued that counties would simply allow for greater inefficiency and corruption by limiting the influence of the respectable, federally appointed, and predominantly-*haole* Territorial executive. Dole argued that elected local roads boards, which had been created under the Bayonet Constitution and voted for under a limited franchise, had proved to be wildly inefficient and corrupt. Therefore he argued, all positions except the Legislature should be appointed by Washington or the governor. The people, by whom he meant Native Hawaiians, were simply not ready for more responsibility.<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup> CPIPR, *Hawaiian Investigation: Report on General Conditions*, p.13-16.

<sup>26</sup> CPIPR, *Hawaiian Investigation: Pt 2, Testimony*, 1902, p.434-7.

Pro-county advocates, particularly Native Hawaiian ones, responded by pointing to widespread incompetence and corruption in the respectable, federally appointed, and predominantly-*haole* Territorial government. In a statement before the 1902 Mitchell Commission, Curtis ‘Iaukea described how the Territorial government drained funds from the rural areas and provided next to nothing in local services, spending most of its money on salaries for people who never left urban Honolulu. He continued:

As I have already publicly expressed my opinions on city and county government in answer to the opponents of the measure charging the native electorate with incompetenc[e] and irresponsibility, I will not take up the time of your committee by reiterating them here. Suffice it to say that, whatever the system, surely none can be found or devised that will equal the present one in extravagance.<sup>27</sup>

Armed with evidence provided by Native Hawaiian and *haole* alike, the Mitchell commission found that in addition to extravagance, the Territorial government was also incredibly inept and corrupt, noting that, “in a space of less than six months, seven of the Territorial officials in Hawaii defaulted and were arraigned on criminal charges for embezzling public funds.” Not only were the seven officials appointees, but the Territorial administration allowed them to hold massive amounts of public funds without posting the bonds required by Territorial law. The Secretary of the Territory, a federal appointee, was directly responsible for removing some \$161,000 from the government depository and placing them in the direct control of another appointee, William Wright, who absconded with some \$17,000 of it to Mexico.<sup>28</sup>

Despite overwhelming popular support for county governments, repeated efforts in the legislature, and pressure from Congress, the Oligarchy staved off the creation of counties during the 1903 and 1905 legislatures through executive and judicial roadblocks.

---

<sup>27</sup> CPIPR, *Hawaiian Investigation: Report on General Conditions*, p.14-15

<sup>28</sup> Ibid.

In 1907, however, the Territory finally recognized the county charters and county governments, though the Oligarchy continued its attempts to restore centralized power through the judiciary. Though many anti-Oligarch *haole* in Hawai‘i also supported the creation of counties, the strength behind the movement came from Native Hawaiians. Native politicians in the legislature pushed the bills through and prominent Native Hawaiians like ‘Iaukea, who the Mitchell Commission called, “one of the most intelligent, thoroughly educated, and enterprising citizens of the island,” succeeded in rebutting accusations of Native incompetence and revealing the inefficiency, inadequacies, and corruption of the Territorial government. Without their leadership the counties would never have come into being.<sup>29</sup>

During the 1911 legislature the Oligarchy and Republican Governor Walter Frear made one final push to cripple the nascent county governments. Though accepting the reality of county governments Frear and his allies sought to push through bills that would end the position of Mayor in Honolulu, restrict the number of elected administrative positions, privatize Honolulu’s water system, and remove management and construction of roads from county control. The heavily Republican, but also heavily Native, legislature defeated all the bills and Kūhiō, the leader of the Native Republicans, blasted Frear for working against the clear will of the people. In the end, however, the Oligarchy accepted the reality of county governments and turned instead to controlling the nascent county governments through their dominance of the plantation economy.<sup>30</sup>

*The Limits of Collaboration: Homesteading, Plantations, and the Republican Kalai‘āina*<sup>31</sup>

The push for county governments, however, was one of the few substantial victories the *lāhui* had over the Oligarchy. In most cases the Oligarchy’s economic and

---

<sup>29</sup> Ibid., 13; Johnson, “Joseph James Fern, Honolulu's First Mayor,” 78.

<sup>30</sup> Johnson, “Joseph James Fern, Honolulu's First Mayor,” 82.

<sup>31</sup> *Kalai‘āina*- Lit. Carving of the lands. Political, politics, the ancient practice of redistributing lands as a demonstration of *mana* and strength when a new *ali‘i* took power.

electoral power allowed them to brush aside the concerns of Native Hawaiians from either party. The difference between the interests of the Oligarchy and those of the Native Hawaiians expressed itself most clearly with regards to land questions. By their very nature plantations are land-hungry operations, and by the time of annexation they had consumed most of the arable land in the islands. The *haole* elements of the Republican Party and a handful of wealthier Native Republicans like Sam Parker supported land policies that allowed men like themselves to acquire, control, and exploit greater and greater swaths of land. Most Native Hawaiians and other residents, however, desired that the limited arable lands be subdivided and opened for homesteading. As a way of drawing in American and European immigrants, the Republic had established relatively liberal homesteading laws. Yet these homesteading laws represented more of a public relations gimmick than an actual attempt to reverse or even slow the trend of land centralization, as the Oligarchy essentially negated such laws through selective administration. These laws carried over into the early Territorial period, as did absolute control of the public lands by the Oligarchy.<sup>32</sup>

Under the Organic Act control of government lands rested exclusively in the hands of the US Congress, who in turn entrusted their management to the appointed executive. While Native Hawaiians dominated the Republican Party's voting rolls and elected positions, the federally appointed positions remained the domain of the Oligarchy. Whenever the interests of potential homesteaders or minor landowners came against those of the planters, ranchers, or corporations, the *haole* Republicans persistently sided against the homesteader. Indeed in cases like a proposed homesteading organization on the scrublands at Maili, the Republican administration expressed disdain and hostility towards Native homesteaders not even competing for lands desired by the plantations or

---

<sup>32</sup> Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico (CPIPR), *Territory of Hawaii: Statements before the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico*, 1908, p.4.

other major landholders. This should come as no surprise since the very idea of homesteading was inimical to their pro-plantation worldview.<sup>33</sup>

Most Native Hawaiians, however, strongly supported the concept of homesteading. For one thing it appealed to the basic Native Hawaiian concept of closeness to the land, *aloha ʻāina*, which gained even greater cultural resonance during the protests of the *Piki* and Republic era. It was also a familiar system of land acquisition reminiscent of the Great Mahele, a system itself modeled after the Jeffersonian small-farmer doctrines that drove homesteading in the United States. Homesteading also provided an important fall back position during hard times, an issue that would become increasingly important during the 1910s.<sup>34</sup> Most importantly, homesteading in both Hawaiʻi and the continental United States promised a degree of isolation and independence from the large landowners and corporations that dominated both economies. While still tied to the plantation economy in many ways, prospective Native homesteaders hoped to obtain a degree of self-sufficiency that would allow them to survive or even thrive, while also minimizing the plantations' ability to control and manipulate their public and private lives. Politically, for instance, there were no Democrats working on the plantations, or at least not for very long. If there were no other jobs than those available on or associated with the plantations, this also meant there were simply no political opposition.

Despite his professional reputation for efficiency and quality, for instance, road builder and future mayor Johnny Wilson's political activities created significant problems for his business, often leaving him reliant on his wife Kini and her agricultural labor on the couple's property. Kini's agricultural work on the family's farm on Moloka'i not only

---

<sup>33</sup> CPIPR, *Hawaiian Investigation: Pt 3*, 171-2; CPIPR, *Territory of Hawaii: Statements before the Committee*, p.9.

<sup>34</sup> Kameʻeleihiwa, *Native Lands*, 25; Krauss, *Johnny Wilson*, 85; Silva, *Aloha Betrayed*, 141-2.

kept the two fed, but they also allowed Johnnie the room and independence to pursue an anti-plantation agenda through the Democratic party. What homesteading offered Native Hawaiians and other Hawai'i residents was just this sort of ability to survive in a plantation economy without being entirely dependent upon, and subservient to, the wills and dictates of the planters and other major landowners.<sup>35</sup>

With control of the public lands, the plantation wing of the Republican Party effectively prevented the expansion of independence based on smallholder land ownership while funneling public lands into the hands of their allies. Numerous Native Hawaiians testified before the Mitchell Commission in 1902 that the Oligarchy abused their control of the public lands and violated the Territory's land laws to prevent more homesteading. Wilcox, for instance, testified that the Governor and his cronies often used "land swaps" to transfer government lands into the hands of the plantations and other large landowners. One case that came up repeatedly involved lands near Punchbowl, an area known as Auwaiolimu, where Portuguese homesteaders had sublet government land originally leased to the Kapiolani Estate. The commission focused primarily on the fate of the Portuguese once the original lease ran out in 1912. Several Native Hawaiians, however, had already been evicted from nearby government lands so that they could be swapped for other Kapiolani Estate lands desired by the Honolulu Rapid Transit Company. Four Native Hawaiians filed a petition arguing that they had lived on those lands for thirty years, made multiple improvements, and were evicted without notice and against the terms of their existing leases. One of the four was a leader of the Home Rule Party, Senator David Kalauokalani, who was likely targeted specifically by the Governor's office as an act of political retribution and intimidation. The incident also

---

<sup>35</sup> Krauss, *Johnny Wilson*, 90-93.

showed the limits of electoral politics as a means of assuring Native interests in an American colony.<sup>36</sup>

In addition to seizures and evictions, Native Hawaiians and *haole* testified that the homesteading policies of the Territory were a farce, especially with regards to the requests of Native homesteaders. As another prominent Native Hawaiian, Frederick W. Beckley, told the commission, “Wherever there is a favorable opening to make a self-supporting homestead the native Hawaiian need not apply.” At the request of some other Native residents of Waianae, Beckley presented the commission with the case of the prospective homesteaders who sought to raise pigs and goats off of *kiawe* pods at Maili. The land was, and continues to be, of poor quality for agriculture and almost absolutely no use to the plantations. The Waianae plantation had previously held the lease to the area yet never cultivated it. They chose to only renew the lease on the more fertile upland areas of Waianae when the original lease expired.<sup>37</sup> The Government bundled the lands desired by the plantation together in a new lease, essentially setting them aside for the plantation as small growers and homesteaders could not afford such a large area. It then rejected the proposal for homestead lots in the dry lowlands. Despite the lack of interest on the part of other buyers the Government claimed that the lands might one day provide a suitable location for a “fashionable” housing area. Native pig farmers, they argued, would make the area undesirable.<sup>38</sup>

Native and *haole* homesteading supporters argued that as long as Hawai‘i’s land remained under the control of the Oligarchy, homesteading would continue to be a sham. They requested that Congress remove the governor’s control over the lands, seeking in particular that the Territory’s laws be replaced with the far more homesteader-friendly

---

<sup>36</sup> CPIPR, *Hawaiian Investigation: Pt 3*, p.166-169; CPIPR, *Hawaiian Investigation: Pt 2*, p.528-529.

<sup>37</sup> CPIPR, *Hawaiian Investigation: Pt 3*, p.170-2; CPIPR, *Hawaiian Investigation: Report on General Conditions*, p.38-43.

<sup>38</sup> CPIPR, *Hawaiian Investigation: Pt 3*, p.170-172.

policies of the continental US. Echoing a common sentiment throughout the 1902 testimonies, one petition from the Home Rule Party stated, “[we] feel it to be but just that [we] should receive the same encouragement of opportunity as is given to the citizens of the other Territories.” To defend themselves, Dole and supporters of the administration routinely argued that all they were trying to do was prevent speculation by false homesteaders, and that in not releasing lands to such spectators they were actually protecting the real homesteaders. It was not their fault, Dole argued, that there were simply no real homesteaders to be found.<sup>39</sup>

All of these incidents happened before Kūhiō and his supporters went over to the Republican ticket, a period when the Republicans had little chance of capturing the legislature or the delegate position and saw little chance of success among Native Hawaiian voters. After Kūhiō’s defection, however, the Republican Party had a number of Native Hawaiian voters and officials who supported homesteading, and thus more political impetus to get behind it. The elected Native Republicans, however, had little ability to force the hand of the appointed Republicans who controlled the lands, and whatever sort of influence they *did* have in the smoky back rooms of the Republican Party seemed to have little effect. The Republican Territorial Senate passed a resolution in 1907 to demand answers from the Commissioner of Public Lands about some specific incidents and properties related to homesteading, but like all such resolutions they had no bite. Furthermore the resolution’s sponsor was R.H. Makekai, one of the Senate’s few Democrats.<sup>40</sup>

The Native Republicans could do little to stop the various shifty land deals being carried out by their party leadership. One of the more egregious incidents of the period

---

<sup>39</sup> Ibid., 597; CPIPR, *Hawaiian Investigation: Pt 2*, p.437-438.

<sup>40</sup> Hawaii Territorial Legislature, *The Fourth Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii: Journal of the Senate*, 1907. p.949.



occurred when Governor George Carter transferred 40,000 acres of government agricultural lands on Lana‘i to Charles Gay in 1907, swapping it for 293 acres of forest preserve on O‘ahu. The deal caused a great deal of controversy in the islands, eventually going to the Republican-appointed territorial Supreme Court. They, unsurprisingly, found in favor of Gay and the Carter administration. Such land swaps and the court’s endorsement allowed the plantations and the Republican administration to essentially disregard the Territory’s ban on the sale of large areas of public lands, funneling favorable sales and leases to their supporters. At the same time Carter refused to recognize the homesteading applications of 100 Native Hawaiians on Lana‘i, many of whom had lived their entire lives on the lands they applied for and had ancestral ties to the island. The land swap and the refusal to allow homesteading claims essentially gave Gay and later owners absolute control over Lana‘i, minus a few small *kuleana* lands homesteaded under the monarchy, and thus absolute Republican control of Lana‘i’s votes. While Gay allowed Native Hawaiians to remain on the land as tenants and employees, homesteading was not part of his vision for a solid Republican Lana‘i.<sup>41</sup>

Carter’s successor, Governor Frear, continued to play lip service to the idea of homesteading while effectively preventing any real progress. In 1908 he testified before the Senate Committee on “Pacific Islands and Porto[sic] Rico,” presenting homesteading in Hawai‘i as an ongoing and regular concern, though little to no new homesteading was actually occurring. When asked if the Territory might not be better served by allowing the Territorial legislature to decide land policy, Frear replied that Hawaiian lands were of national rather than local interests, referencing the American fear of increased land ownership among Asian immigrants. Furthermore he claimed the electorate was “not quite ready for that authority.” In a textbook example of doublespeak he argued that

---

<sup>41</sup> Jon Van Dyke, *Who Owns the Crown Lands of Hawai‘i?* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2008), 623; Krauss, *Johnny Wilson: First Hawaiian Democrat*, 86-7.

giving them that authority would allow the “corporations” to acquire the lands, failing to add that corporations had proven perfectly capable of acquiring vast tracts of land under his and previous administrations. His real fear was that such a move would almost certainly result in expansive homesteading. The legislature may have been reliably Republican, and would continue to be so until the 1950’s, but it was also reliably Native Hawaiian, and the last thing the Oligarchy/plantation faction wanted was to hand control of the public land policy over to their Native allies.<sup>42</sup>

During both the committee hearing and his 1909 address to the legislature, Frear attempted to sidestep criticisms of his administration’s handling of homesteading with the familiar argument of the planter/Oligarch faction. The laws, he argued, promoted speculation rather than homesteading, and in not allowing more homesteading all he was really doing was protecting still-hypothetical “real” homesteaders. In his address to the Senate he also argued that the lack of homesteading came from a lack of demand rather than a lack of supply, urging the legislature to expend more funds on developing roads through potential homesteading areas. This would make them both more accessible and desirable, though by no coincidence this also made them more attractive to the wealthy agriculturalists and investors who inevitably ended up with the lands.<sup>43</sup>

The Frear administration continued to stonewall homesteading into the 1910s. For the most part Native Republicans tried to work within the Republican Party organization, but by 1912 Prince Kūhiō decided he had had enough. In January 1912 he forwarded a set of charges against Frear to the White House, hoping to prevent Frear’s reappointment. He also published the charges in the *Pacific Commercial Advertiser*, accusing Frear of not placing a single family on a homestead during his entire administration. He then

---

<sup>42</sup> CPIPR, *Territory of Hawaii: Statements before the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico*. 7-10.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*, 34; Hawaii Territorial Legislature, *Journal of the Senate of the Fifth Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii: Regular Session, 1909*, p. 28-9.

detailed numerous incidents where Frear and his predecessors had violated Territorial policy by ignoring applications for homesteading, primarily from Native Hawaiians. He also provided numerous examples of Frear employing various measures to hand land over to the plantations and other corporations in violation of the spirit and letter of Hawai‘i’s land laws. In one case Kūhiō claimed a member of a homesteading *hui*<sup>44</sup> was forcibly detained by the owner of the plantation he worked at in order to get him to withdraw his application. The superintendent of schools then threatened three other members of the *hui*, all government schoolteachers, arguing that they had “placed themselves in opposition to the Government.” He also accused the Frear administration of allowing planters and corporations to usurp the water rights of Native farmers and of potential homesteaders and then stonewalling investigations of these incidents.<sup>45</sup>

Frear replied with a 98-page pamphlet in which he attempted a point-by-point rebuttal of Kūhiō’s claims. He claimed to be a progressive whose strongest support came from “ardent workers for genuine homesteading.” Kūhiō replied with his own point-by-point response. He mocked Frear’s claims of homesteader support, pointing out that everyone knew that Frear’s strongest support came from the sugar interests. He noted that some planters had come out in support of homesteading since his original charges against Frear, but the homesteading they proposed was a false one, featuring small lots on third-rate lands, lands suitable for living on top of but not living off. As he put it, these were

---

<sup>44</sup> *Hui*: Group or organization, similar to *Ahahui* though typically smaller. Sometimes used for corporations, often with regards to small, incorporated groups seeking to pool money to purchase real estate.

<sup>45</sup> Lori Kamae, *The Empty Throne: A Biography of Hawaii’s Prince Cupid* (Honolulu: Top Gallant Publishing Company Ltd., 1980), 232-3, 234-5, 236, 241-2. In her appendix Kamae reprinted the entirety of Kūhiō’s charges, as printed in the Pacific Commercial Advertiser in January 1912, as well as his response to Frear’s rebuttal.

“laborers’ homesteads not farmers’ homesteads,” and no real supporter of homesteading would ever approve of such.<sup>46</sup>

Kūhiō’s rift with Frear ended after the election of Woodrow Wilson and the appointment of a nominally Democratic Governor, Lucious Pinkham. Much to the disgust of Hawai‘i’s Democrats and many Native Republicans, Pinkham was yet another old ally of the Oligarchy and showed about as much interest in promoting homesteading as Frear had. He also expressed as little interest in the opinions of Native Democrats as Frear had of Native Republicans. At this point much of the agitation for homesteading fell into the hands of private *‘ahahui*, including several connected to or organized by Kūhiō. The onset of World War I brought with it an increased motivation for homesteading as war activity drove the price of food exponentially higher. Efforts by the legislature and the counties to create price limits failed when the US Supreme Court ruled such powers were limited to the US Congress, who had better things to do than make sure their colonial subjects could afford to eat. Native Hawaiians began to see homesteads, often promoted under the banner of “rehabilitating” the indigent Native Hawaiian, as a solution to the now prevalent problems of poverty and hunger. In his charges against Frear, Kūhiō had begun with the failed attempt of schoolteachers to obtain homesteads, which would allow such educated professionals a measure of independence from the plantations and the Oligarchy. In the 1910s the focus turned from helping such educated professionals to succeed to allowing the Native poor to simply survive.<sup>47</sup>

Giving up on finding support from the entrenched interests within the Territorial administration, Kūhiō and the various Native *‘ahahui* began pressuring for passage of a

---

<sup>46</sup> Walter F. Frear, *The Reply of Hon. Walter F. Frear, Governor of Hawaii, to the Complaint of Hon. Jonah Kuhio Kalanianaʻole, Delegate in Congress from Hawai‘i* (Honolulu: Gazette Publishing Company, 1912), 4; Kamae, *The Empty Throne*, 316-7.

<sup>47</sup> Davianna McGregor, “‘Āina Ho‘opulapula: Hawaiian Homesteading,” *Hawaiian Journal of History* 24, no. (1990), 4.

Native Hawaiian Rehabilitation bill in the United States Congress, a bill focused primarily around homesteading. Kūhiō, however, still needed to negotiate with both the planter faction of the Hawai‘i Republican party and the various Republican and Democratic factions within Congress. At the same time the planters had become increasingly concerned about the series of leases given during the Post-Bayonet Era and the Provisional Government, many of which were set to expire in the near future. This would open up massive tracts of first-rate agricultural lands. The current laws, even though the planters had managed to ignore or manipulate them for so long, were still too great a threat to remain intact. Though still opposed to homesteading, they saw the Native Rehabilitation bill as a vehicle to secure their own interests.<sup>48</sup>

For years the planters had used their wealth and power to undercut Kūhiō, sending their own delegations to Washington to lobby for their interests. Now they pushed for their own vision of the bill among the Republican-dominated House and the slim Republican majority in the Senate. A 1919 Territorial House Resolution, HR 28, also hindered Kūhiō by pointing out the cash value of the prime agricultural lands under consideration, a move that effectively handicapped any efforts to put such lands up for homesteading in the pro-corporate Republican Congress. This prevented Kūhiō from delivering the sort of comprehensive homesteading package he and most Hawai‘i residents desired, leaving him scrambling to salvage whatever he could of the original bill. Furthermore Kūhiō had to deal with a complicated hierarchy of racial politics in Washington, eventually promoting the bill as an expression of both white paternalism regarding Native peoples and anti-Asian bigotry. The Oligarchy and the Congress, meanwhile, pushed a 50% Native Hawaiian blood quantum for participation in homesteading.<sup>49</sup>

---

<sup>48</sup> Dyke, *Who Owns the Crown Lands of Hawai‘i?*, 246.

<sup>49</sup> Ibid., 247; McGregor, “‘Āina Ho‘opulapula: Hawaiian Homesteading,” 13-14, 17, 24.

The various political contortions Kūhiō needed to perform to get the bill through his own party, both in Hawai‘i and in Congress, effectively neutered the very concept of homesteading. What Native Hawaiians and many other Hawai‘i residents wanted was a comprehensive reform of the homesteading system that would allow individuals, the *lāhui*, and the population in general to loosen the iron grip of the plantations. They wanted the first-rate agricultural lands freed from the control of the plantations, and they wanted the chance to help steer the future of Hawaiian agriculture, and thus Hawaiian society. What they got under the Hawaiian Homesteading Act of 1920 were sections of second and third-rate lands too small, too dry, and too isolated to support a family above the poverty line. In essence Congress created the sort of system of “laborers’ homesteads” Kūhiō had dismissed a decade earlier. The plantations, meanwhile, were given longer leases and more secure holds on prime agricultural lands. Furthermore, by focusing on the need to “rehabilitate” Native Hawaiians rather than fixing a broken land policy, Congress created a blood-quantum requirement that only allowed “full” to “half-blooded” Natives access to the homesteads. This allowed the plantations to avoid greater competition from white settlers and helped to keep the Asian population dependent on the plantations. It also created a legal precedent for an understanding of Native Hawaiians intended to eventually define them into oblivion.<sup>50</sup>

Kūhiō returned home to promote the new act, convinced that he had done his best to work within the system and gotten Native Hawaiians the best they would be able to get. If his charges against Frear represented his idealistic view of how things should be done, his promotion of the new bill when he returned to Hawai‘i represented the bitter compromises required of Native Republicans. For newly elected Mayor Wilson and a large number of Native Hawaiians, Portuguese, and *haole*, the bill represented an almost complete capitulation to the planter interests. Wilson pointed out that the Moloka‘i lands

---

<sup>50</sup> Dyke, *Who Owns the Crown Lands of Hawai‘i?*, 247-8.

chosen for the first homesteads were dry, rocky, and barren. Furthermore, there was no market for goods on Moloka'i and no steamer service for small farmers except the small one he himself ran at a loss for his *'ohana* and other residents of Pelekunu and neighboring valleys. If Hawaiians struggled to survive in lush valleys like Pelekunu, what hope did they have on the castaway lands given to them by the new act? The plantations had taken Kūhiō for a ride, Wilson argued, and now Kūhiō sought to bring the rest of the *lāhui* with him.<sup>51</sup>

The battle over homesteading illustrates the complexity of Native Hawaiian interactions with the plantation economy and Republican hegemony. Kūhiō's effort to pursue Native interests from within the Republican Party allowed him to obtain a homesteading bill, but only after two decades of being stonewalled by his supposed allies. Even then, he only managed to get the sort of homesteading he had mocked Frear for promoting in 1912. Overall he and Native Republican voters seemed to do much more for the plantations than his Oligarch allies were willing to do for the *lāhui*. In the eyes of Kūhiō and his supporters though, the prince may have only gotten the Native Hawaiians scrublands, but at least he got them that. Without his presence, they argued, things may have been worse. Either way, the fight over homesteading illustrated, and continues to illustrate, the limits of electoral politics as a means of forwarding the interests of a Native people living under colonial rule.

### **Plantation Economics and the Independence of *Lāhui***

The decades long battle over homesteading not only illustrates the limits of political collaboration with the Oligarchy, but also the economic issues facing Native Hawaiians during the Territorial period. While the plantations created a number of economic opportunities, their domination of the economy and the social changes they

---

<sup>51</sup> Krauss, *Johnny Wilson*, 175-176.

brought about created further threats to the interests of the *lāhui*. Their control of land and water, for instance, limited the possibilities for other forms of agriculture in many areas, while their willingness to use their dominance to suppress dissent limited the ability and willingness of many Native Hawaiians to act against the interests of the plantations. More fundamentally, however, the plantations and inclusion into the American capitalist system threatened to fundamentally reshape how members of the *lāhui* understood their relationships to one another and the land.

As the driving economic engine of the Islands since the 1860s, the sugar plantations, and to a lesser degree the major ranches and other large agri-business concerns, certainly created a number of economic opportunities for Native Hawaiians. The bulk of such opportunities, however, came in the form of wage labor. For the most part Native Hawaiians turned to field labor on the plantations in only the most desperate of situations, as did most immigrant laborers once their initial contracts were up. Long hours, brutal conditions, hard work, and the systematic abuse of workers made such jobs the least desirable in Hawai‘i, one of the reasons that labor immigration was a constant concern.

This is not to say that Native Hawaiians did not view the plantations as sources of work. In rural areas Native Hawaiians contested with *haole* craftsmen for skilled labor on the plantations, though *haole* still dominated such positions. Native Hawaiians also found work as *luna*, essentially work gang supervisors. There were also jobs filled almost exclusively by Native Hawaiians, like the limited *paniolo* and teamster work. The plantations also opened up other avenues for Native Hawaiians, including trades that were almost exclusively Native. Dock work was so predominantly understood as a Native Hawaiian institution that the Hui Po‘ola, the Honolulu stevedore’s organization, formed a central role in Royal funerals, marching before the hearse while a chosen group pulled it by hand through the streets. Native Hawaiians, including many *hapa-haole*, made up a



large proportion of the *paniolo* at the major ranches, like the Big Island's Parker Ranch, itself owned by the part-Hawaiian Parker family. The plantation economy also provided a limited amount of work for Native Hawaiian professionals, particularly lawyers and clerks, as well as a being a source of wealth for the small percentage of Native Hawaiians with investments in the plantations. Because of the variety of economic opportunities presented by the plantations, a number of prominent Native Hawaiians argued for continued Chinese immigration in 1902 to keep the plantations going strong, claiming that in keeping a fresh flow of Chinese labor in the fields, the plantations were generating positions higher up the ladder for Native Hawaiians, on and off the plantation.<sup>52</sup>

The early Territorial years also saw a continued expansion of a Native middle-class based around the professions, an expansion made possible in part by the plantation economy. Native Hawaiians retained a presence in education, particularly at the lower levels. Native lawyers, clerks, and judges played a major role in the lower and middle levels of the justice system since the later years of the Kingdom, and a small number of Native Hawaiians held white-collar positions in the sugar, baking, and trading firms in Honolulu. For the most part, however, such occupations remained predominantly *haole*. In the later years of the Kingdom and during the Republic, Native Hawaiians also moved into some of the more coveted positions in the Congregational Church, a trend that continued into the early Territorial period. The Reverends Poepoe and Lono, for instance, not only ministered to the historic Kaumakapili church in Honolulu in the early 1900's, but were also in charge of its rebuilding after the Chinatown fires. By the 1920s a Native Hawaiian stood at the pulpit of Kawaihao as well. Some of these professionals came from

---

<sup>52</sup> CPIPR, *Hawaiian Investigation: Pt 3*, p.134-7; Billy Bergin, *Loyal to the Land: The Legendary Parker Ranch, 750-1950* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2004), 43-95; Irwin, *I Knew Queen Lili'uokalani*, 108; Kamae, *The Empty Throne*, 18-19; Krauss, *Johnny Wilson*, 113; Carol Maclennan, "Kilauea Sugar Plantation in 1912: A Snapshot," *Hawaiian Journal of History* 41 (2007): 26-27.

the comfortable backgrounds and elite private schools like Punahou and ‘Iolani, while others worked their way into the professions through the public education system.<sup>53</sup>

But in many other ways plantation dominance also limited the economic possibilities for the *lāhui* and for the Territory as a whole. The plantations, and to a lesser degree the ranches, controlled the vast majority of the arable lands of the Territory. They also held the rights to a fair chunk of Hawai‘i’s fresh water, diverting flow from the streams that once sustained small-scale farms as well as a variety of the eco-systems Native Hawaiians traditionally gathered resources from. The plantations’ dominance of the economy and the executive branch also allowed them to intimidate and silence many of their opponents. For Native Hawaiians, or any resident of Hawai‘i, to stand against the plantations’ interests required independent wealth or a source of income independent of the plantation’s direct or indirect control. And these jobs were increasingly few during the early Territorial period.

The demographic changes the plantations brought to Hawai‘i, including the large number of Chinese and Japanese immigrants, also created massive economic competition for rural and urban Native Hawaiians. A large part of this came from fundamental differences in how Native Hawaiians understood economic desire in contrast to the *haole*, Chinese, and Japanese. Before the gradual transition into a cash economy between the reigns of Kamehameha III and Kalākaua, the primary means of support for Native Hawaiians came from harvesting ocean products and small-plot farming, usually worked as part of a small family-based collective. Even in 1900 these remained a small but diminishing percentage of Native Hawaiian primary-occupations. Furthermore, many Native Hawaiians farmed or fished as a supplement to their income and/or food supply.

---

<sup>53</sup> Mary Dillingham Frear, “A Brief History of Kaumakapili Church,” *Forty-Sixth Annual Report of the Hawaiian Historical Society* 46 (1938): 19; Kalākaua, “Lawyer’s Common Place Book”; Lono, “Lono, W.N. Journal.”

While Native Hawaiians outnumbered the Japanese 3:1 in the fishing industry in 1900, by 1930 the Japanese essentially controlled the entire industry. Part of the Japanese success came from the importation and production of sampan-style boats, which allowed them to dominate the deep-sea fishing industry. More importantly, however, Native Hawaiians tended to fish only in limited amounts, eschewing the industrial-level fishing of the Japanese. Thus they could not compete in volume or in price, nor did they move offshore when the inshore fisheries were depleted.<sup>54</sup>

By 1900, small plot agriculture, traditionally the basis of the Native Hawaiian economy, remained the dominant occupation in only a few remote areas. One of the main problems was the loss of available land and water rights to the plantations and ranches. In some remote areas, like Pelekunu valley on Moloka'i, arable land and abundant water remained available. Yet the remoteness and isolation that kept such areas free from plantations and ranches also hindered efforts to obtain cash and goods in exchange for produce. Even in better-connected rural areas, like Waipi'o Valley on Hawai'i Island, Native Hawaiian taro farmers were leaving or being evicted from their leased fields while Chinese farmers replaced them as tenant farmers.<sup>55</sup>

The fundamental difference between the fishermen and small planters from Asian immigrant and Native Hawaiian populations was their understanding of the connections between land, work, and money. Despite the presence of a cash economy for several generations, many Native Hawaiian fishermen and farmers still understood their livelihoods on a predominantly subsistence-plus basis. The land and the ocean provided enough through small-scale production to provide most basic needs and a surplus that could be used for taxes, barter, and a small amount of consumable goods needed or

---

<sup>54</sup> McGregor, “‘Āina Ho‘opulapula: Hawaiian Homesteading,” 8; Donald Schug, “Hawai'i's Commercial Fishing Industry: 1820—1945” *Hawaiian Journal of History* 35, (2001): 17-19.

<sup>55</sup> Krauss, *Johnny Wilson*, 175.

desired. Accumulation of resources beyond that was unnecessary, and a likely sign of greed as well, a deep moral failing in Polynesian culture. The Japanese and Chinese, however, were moving from one cash economy to another. They came from and lived in cultures that encouraged rather than discouraged small-scale industrial fishing and farming. Moreover, they lacked the legal protections and (limited) opportunities for skilled labor and other sources of income that many Native Hawaiians could turn to. Their only power and protections in the Territory came from their ability to generate wealth, and often that meant competing with Native Hawaiians for the limited number of occupations the *haole* had little control over or interest in. This included fishing and farming, two things most of the immigrants were already familiar with. If Native Hawaiians hoped to compete, they needed to follow the same sort of backbreaking industrial levels of production, ignore their cultural predisposition against greed, and turn the earth and sea into agricultural factories rather than cherished cultural and practical resources.

*Americanization, Individual Success, and the Future of Native Hawaiian Culture*

The early Territorial period also witnessed a considerable amount of tension between Americanization and the fear of losing connections to the Native Hawaiian past. On one hand the vague cultural process of Americanization offered practical benefits for success in an economic and political environment largely dictated by American norms and American capital. Internalizing American cultural practices and values, particularly regarding capitalism and the promotion of individual wealth accumulation, would allow individual Native Hawaiians greater economic resources and independence with which to further the interests of the *lāhui* as a whole. In theory, at least, it would allow Native Hawaiians to move higher up the economic ladder while the immigrant population provided the manual labor those jobs depended on. On the other hand the full

assimilation model promoted by the *haole* in Hawai'i and America would lead to the absolute destruction of the cultural practices and values that tied the *lāhui* together. Recognizing this tension, Native Hawaiians sought to control the process of Americanization in order to retain their cohesion as a *lāhui*. Though the dominant trend of the era was to favor the process of Americanization, Native Hawaiians made a clear and conscious effort to preserve cultural practices, values, and connections to the Native Hawaiian past.

For many Native Hawaiians, Americanization was a process they were targeted by rather than one that they choose to embrace. Much has been written, for instance, about the Americanization/indoctrination efforts of the Provisional Government, Territorial, and State schools, which banned the Hawaiian language from the classroom, pushed a pro-American, pro-capitalist, pro-consumption curriculum, and denigrated Native Hawaiian ways as archaic and savage. At Kamehameha Schools, the private school funded through the trust of *ali'i nui* Bernice Pauahi Bishop, the *haole*, Republican trustees developed a curriculum and philosophy similar to those of the infamous Carlyle Indian schools, privileging military discipline and manual education for the boys, domestic skills for the girls, and strict pro-Americanization policies for all. A prime target was again the Hawaiian language, the use of which earned students various punishments. Henry Robinson, a 1906 graduate, later recalled being forced to march in circles when being caught using a single Hawaiian word.<sup>56</sup>

While Native Hawaiians did not drive the efforts to weaken the Hawaiian language and culture in the schools and elsewhere, many did participate in and perpetuate it in an attempt to better their own and their children's prospects under American rule.

---

<sup>56</sup> Maenette Kape'ahiokalani Padeken Benham, "The Voice "Less" Hawaiian: An Analysis of Educational Policymaking, 1820-1960" *Hawaiian Journal of History* 32 (1998): 130; "Founders Day Marked," *Ka Mō'ī*, 1969.

When a group of Kamehameha School graduates began to protest the school's curriculum in 1916, they did so not in protest of the indoctrination, but rather with regards to the school's overwhelming emphasis on manual education and assumptions of Native intellectual inferiority. Robinson, like many of his peers, refused to speak Hawaiian at home in his adulthood, and neither his children nor grandchildren learned Hawaiian at home. Several of his descendents, ironically, later learnt to speak Hawaiian at Kamehameha. Even David Kanuha, a tailoring instructor at the school who had participated in the 1895 rebellion, enforced an English-only policy at home and in the classroom. Furthermore many Native elites continued sending their children to Punahou and 'Iolani, where English had always been the language of instruction. While Hawaiian remained the primary language of most adult Native Hawaiians, and was still used extensively in everyday situations, music, political campaigning, and newspapers, the percentage of Native youth learning and using the language dropped dramatically. Within a generation English had replaced Hawaiian in formal settings and among Native elites while plantation pidgin replaced it among the working class.<sup>57</sup>

Yet while many Native Hawaiians embraced different forms of Americanization, typically they did so with a mind towards controlling the potential loss of Native culture. The goal was to create a Native Hawaiian culture that fit well within the larger American culture and society rather than ending Native culture altogether. Some did so more forcefully than others. Wilcox's Home Rulers, for instance, insisted on conducting business in Hawaiian, much to the disgust of *haole* inside and outside of the legislature.

---

<sup>57</sup> Samuel King and Randall Roth, *Broken Trust: Greed, Mismanagement, & Political Corruption at America's Largest Charitable Trust* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2006), 40-41, 45-46. Information on Robinson's family has come from my own family history, he was my own great-grandfather.

Later Prince Kūhiō petitioned to change the Organic act to allow Hawaiian in official business.<sup>58</sup>

Falling back on a technique used since the 1860's, some Native Hawaiians turned to the newspapers as a means of preserving and dispensing traditional knowledge. Judge Daniel Kahā'ulelio, for instance, wrote a series of articles on fishing for the *Kuokoa* in 1902 and 1903. The articles covered a wide variety of disappearing Native fishing techniques learned from his father and grandfather. In part the series was a clear attempt to promote Native Hawaiian participation in the fishing industry: the paper's editor, D. Kanewanui, introduced the series with an explicit plea for Native Hawaiians to return to the fishing trade instead of abandoning it to the Japanese. In his own introduction however, Kahā'ulelio also made clear he saw the articles as a means of preserving a Hawaiian tradition that extended from "the time of Kumuhonua on through Papa and Wakea," linking it to the genealogy, history, and culture of the *lāhui*.<sup>59</sup>

Others preserved Native Hawaiian traditions in less public ways. Kini Wilson had learned hula as part of Kalākaua's *halau* and remained dedicated to the art throughout her life. This created something of a tension in the family because of Johnnie's political career. Being married to a former *hula* dancer remained a political liability during the early Territorial years, when some elements of the *haole* and Native community still viewed it as belonging to *ka wa na'aupō*. It should be noted, however, that *hula* dancers, as well as Hawaiian music, remained popular draws at campaign rallies, including the 1909 rallies that helped elect Joe Fern as Honolulu's mayor. While she no longer danced publicly, Kini still taught hula to friends and neighbors, including members of the famous Beamer clan, who achieved fame as some of the most prominent singers, musicians,

---

<sup>58</sup> Andrade, *Unconquerable Rebel, 1880-1903*, 200, 243.

<sup>59</sup> Daniel Kahā'ulelio, *Ka 'Ōihana Lawai'a: Hawaiian Fishing Traditions*, trans., Mary Kawena Pukui (Honolulu: Bishop Museum, 2006), xv, xvii.

*kumu hula*, and dancers of the twentieth century. She also served as an unaccredited source for Nathaniel Emerson's *Unwritten Literature of Hawai'i*. In doing so Kini tapped into a tradition of using the cultural resources of *haole* authors to preserve Native knowledge, echoing Kalākaua's collaboration with Fornander.<sup>60</sup>

Other Native Hawaiians preserved their culture through the simple activity of continuing to practice it for their own enjoyment. This included sports like canoe paddling and surfing, which *haole* in Hawai'i also began to participate in. Lei making remained a favorite past time among Native Hawaiians, from the pampered children of the elite to the rugged *paniolo* of North Kohala, who sometimes covered themselves and their horses in fern and flower leis when they went to town. Native Hawaiians continued to cherish Hawaiian music, both in traditional forms and with new innovations like steel guitar and slack key. Public performances and *kani ka pila*, "jam sessions," remained a prominent part of Hawaiian life for professional and amateur musicians alike. Long after his death, Hilo residents still remembered the eminent Native capitalist John Tamatoa Baker's love for breaking into impromptu song and chant, often carrying his *ukulele* in case he felt the need for accompaniment.<sup>61</sup>

The popularity of Tin Pan Alley's faux-Hawaiian hits also began to creep into Hawaiian popular music. This, understandably, caused a great degree of angst among some lovers of Hawaiian music. When the Royal Hawaiian Band began playing such tunes in 1920, then Mayor Wilson brought back his childhood friend Mekia Kealakai to lead the band, pleading with him to return and save the "old Hawaiian Music" of their youth. While that "old Hawaiian Music" incorporated a great deal of American and European inspiration from the era, as well as instruments like the banjo, guitar, and

---

<sup>60</sup> Johnson, "Joseph James Fern, Honolulu's First Mayor," 3; Krauss, *Johnny Wilson*, 99, 198-9.

<sup>61</sup> Clarice B. Taylor, "Little Tales About Hawaii: J.T. Baker, Model for Kamehameha Statue Pt. 9," *Honolulu Star Bulletin*, September 19 1951; Isaiah Helekunihi Walker, "Hui Nalu, Beachboys, and the Surfing Boarder-Lands of Hawai'i" *The Contemporary Pacific* 20, no. 1 (2008): 93-97.



ukulele, at least its incorporation into Hawaiian music came largely at the hands of Native Hawaiians. It was also done tastefully and with an understanding of the traditional themes of nuances of Native culture. The same could not be said of much of the output from Tin Pan Alley.”<sup>62</sup>

In addition to preserving Native culture at home, Native Hawaiians were also active in promoting it in America. Duke Kahanamoku, for instance, when not dominating international swimming competitions, was also promoting the sport of surfing across the world. Hula dancers performed across the United States and Europe during this time, sometimes treated as a sideshow and sometimes as legitimate artists. Kini Wilson earned some fame as a hula dancer in the mainland and Europe before the turn of the century, which also earned her infamy among more prudish Native Hawaiians like Johnny’s mother. Johnnie Wilson’s brief time as a concert promoter for former members of the Royal Hawaiian Band marked the start of long-running and successful mainland and European careers for some of those musicians. From the vaudeville circuit to headline acts in New York, Native Hawaiian entertainers built their careers off of the musical traditions of the Kalākaua-era. Wilson’s friend, Mekia Kealakai, was leading a successful Hawaiian troupe in London when Wilson brought him back to lead the Royal Hawaiian Band.<sup>63</sup>

The *ali‘i nui*, and particularly the royal family, remained an important focal point for Native Hawaiian culture. The death of an *ali‘i nui* was a tragic event for Native Hawaiians, and the occasion of intense grief, particularly as the number of *ali‘i nui* continued to dwindle rapidly. Yet funerals of the *ali‘i nui* also served as public expressions of Native Hawaiian culture and unity, driven by the great *aloha* between the *lāhui* and the *ali‘i*. John Cummins’ funeral in 1913, for instance, included numerous *mele*

---

<sup>62</sup> Krauss, *Johnny Wilson*, 176.

<sup>63</sup> *Ibid.*, 44, 176.

and *oli* interspersed with Christian hymns. His *aumakua*, a white stone he had cared for since childhood, stood guard in front of his home, bedecked in leis. So was his coffin inside the house, which was crowded with the feather *kahili* and *pūlo‘ulo‘u*, marking the presence of an *ali‘i nui*. Lili‘uokalani’s funeral in 1917 was an even grander event, marked by days of grieving, wailing, and chanting by Native Hawaiians, the display of royal *kahili* dating back to the early-kingdom era and a massive funeral procession during which the Hui Po‘ola pulled her hearse through the crowded streets of Honolulu. Though tragic, such events served as a reminder to Native Hawaiians and other Hawaiian residents of the cultural ties that bound the *lāhui* together and the deep meaning and value that Native customs still held.<sup>64</sup>

Native Hawaiians placed a particularly high value in maintaining and celebrating the memory of the monarchy as a focus for imagining and uniting *lāhui*. The prominent space Lili‘uokalani occupied in Native Hawaiian hearts and minds made her wellbeing a matter of collective and symbolic importance. The queen had a number of dependents and had expended considerable sums in battling against the Provisional Government and annexation. She had also lost considerable income as the result of the Provisional Government’s seizure of the Crown Lands, lands set aside for the exclusive use and maintenance of the *mō‘ī*. Native Hawaiians of all stations demanded that the US government or the Territory either restore the crown lands or grant the queen a lump sum or annuity for her upkeep. The 1902 Senate commission investigated the issue and found overwhelming support among Native Hawaiians. Sam Parker testified that restitution to the queen had been in the 1900 party platforms of all three parties. John Lane, Native Hawaiian hero of 1895 and later Republican Mayor of Honolulu, testified that the issue was so important to Native Hawaiians that, “if the Queen is paid I think the Hawaiians

---

<sup>64</sup> Irwin, *I Knew Queen Lili‘uokalani*, 107-110; Rianna M. Williams, “John Adams Cummins: Prince of Entertainers,” *Hawaiian Journal of History* 30 (1996): 165-166.

will unite with the people of the United States. Without that they are against the Americans.” Even Sanford Dole, one of the leaders of the Oligarchy, testified that restitution to the queen was an essential element in healing the rifts between the *lāhui* and the United States. In part, however, it seems Dole also testified in the hopes that the Federal government, rather than the Territorial government, would assume the expenses of restitution. In the end the United States government refused to act. Despite repeated efforts the Territorial legislature was only able to pass legislation to provide the queen with an annuity of \$12,000 a year in 1912, just five years before her death.<sup>65</sup>

Nothing symbolized the efforts to negotiate the process of Americanization better than the various Native Hawaiian civic and social organizations of the Territorial period. These organizations, like kingdom era groups such as Kalākaua’s ‘Ahahui Ho‘oulu a Ho‘ōla Lāhui, served as benevolent societies and lobbied for the interests of Native Hawaiians, particularly poor and working-class Native Hawaiians. Some of these groups, like the Order of Kamehameha and the Ka‘ahumanu society were remnants of the Kingdom era, though their purposes and role in the community had evolved since the overthrow. Others, like the Hawaiian Civic Club and the Hale o Na Ali‘i emerged only in the 1910s. All shared a basic commitment to the Native Hawaiian people, as well as an overlapping membership, coming mostly from the middle-to-upper classes of Native Hawaiian society. Prince Kūhiō, for instance, was a member of the Order of Kamehameha, which he helped to restore in 1902, as well as a founder of the Hawaiian Civic Club and the ‘Ahahui Pu‘uhonua o Nā Hawai‘i (APH), the Hawaiian Protective

---

<sup>65</sup> Dyke, *Who Owns the Crown Lands of Hawai‘i?*, 236; CPIPR, *Hawaiian Investigation: Pt 2*, p.456-7, 479.

Society, as part of the homesteading fight. Other founders of the APH included John Lane and the Reverends Akaiko Akana and John Wise, all prominent Native Hawaiians.<sup>66</sup>

Most of the clubs had multiple purposes, serving, for instance, as elite social groups similar to the fraternal organizations of the Kalākaua era. They also served as lobbying and organizing centers for various efforts, including the creation of price limits on food during WWI, homesteading, and improving the state of Native Hawaiian health. Kūhiō created the Hawaiian Civic Club, for instance, explicitly for these purposes. These groups, especially the APH, also placed a heavy focus on “rehabilitating” the *lāhui* along educated, middle-class, American standards, particularly the poorer, urban members of the *lāhui*. They promoted sanitation and “moral” hygiene along largely American middle-class norms, as well as thrift, sobriety, education, and the moral and physical dangers of city life. In these ways they were not terribly dissimilar to other late-Victorian, middle-class progressives, like the “settlement house” movement, temperance associations, the YMCA or the NAACP. While well intended, the APH tended to not just aid the process of Americanization, but also followed a logic of “uplift” that assumed a certain degree of incompetence and lack of direction among those they sought to help.<sup>67</sup>

Yet significant differences did exist between the Native Hawaiian groups and similar groups on the mainland and in England. For one thing, within Native culture the *lāhui* had an expectation of protection and guidance from the *aliʻi*, and many of the groups’ members were actual *aliʻi*, often *aliʻi nui*. Prince Kūhiō founded both the Hawaiian Civic Club and the APH. Princess Abigail, Prince David’s widow and a significant leader of the *lāhui* in her own right, founded the Hale o Nā Aliʻi. Where

---

<sup>66</sup> Richard A. Hawkins, “Princess Abigail Kawananakoa: The Forgotten Territorial Native Hawaiian Leader,” *Hawaiian Journal of History* 37 (2003), 10; Kamae, *The Empty Throne*, 208-9; McGregor, “‘Āina Hoʻopulapula: Hawaiian Homesteading,” 1, 5.

<sup>67</sup> McGregor, “‘Āina Hoʻopulapula: Hawaiian Homesteading,” 1, 5; Warren Nishimoto, “The Progressive Era and Hawaiʻi: The Early History of Palama Settlement, 1896-1929” *Hawaiian Journal of History* 34, (2000), 11.

settlement houses and other progressive benevolent societies often claimed the right to speak for and guide those they worked among from a position of authority based on an assumed superiority, the Native Hawaiian groups felt the need to speak for and shape the *lāhui* based on the claims the *lāhui* could make on the them as *ali'i*. If the *ali'i* believed these sorts of efforts were needed to assure the preservation of the *lāhui*, then it was their *kuleana* and could not be shirked. The continued success of Kūhiō's political career and of projects like the Hawaiian Civic Clubs provide some evidence that many Native Hawaiians still approved of such a relationship, at least informally.

These groups also served as Native cultural institutions. The Hale o Na Ali'i served in part to direct proper burials for the *ali'i*, a similar responsibility to one taken on by the Hale Nauā a generation earlier. The Order of Kamehameha and the Ka'ahumanu Society also had cultural functions, though representing different elements of Native tradition. The Ka'ahumanu club represented Native Christian culture and the Order of Kamehameha represented the monarch-oriented Native nationalism of the Kalākaua period. One of the founding purposes of the Hawaiian Civic Club, alongside pushing for "rehabilitation," was to preserve Native Hawaiian culture, language, and history. Even the APH, which maintained the strongest pro-Americanization stances, did so couched within the rhetoric of a return to Native values of integrity, co-operative work, and responsibility to one another based on the *lāhui's* cultural and historical bonds. They also promoted the connection of the people and the land, *aloha 'āina*, as the foundation of their support for homesteading and their attacks on the "slum" dwelling of poor and working-class urban Natives.<sup>68</sup>

In the minds of many Native Hawaiians of the early territorial period, the need for both individual Native Hawaiians and the *lāhui* to succeed under American rule necessitated a certain degree of Americanization. Most understood that this would result

---

<sup>68</sup> Kamae, *The Empty Throne*, 207-8; McGregor, "'Āina Ho'opulapula: Hawaiian Homesteading," 5.

in losses to Native culture. The Hawaiian language, for instance, was often the first to go, pushed both by the educational decrees of the oligarchy and by the internalization of the equation between success and the English language. At the same time, however, many Native Hawaiians sought to mitigate the cultural dangers of Americanization to Native Hawaiian culture. In particular they sought to protect elements of Native culture that would preserve their ties to one another, their ties to the monarchy, and the memory and history of the Hawaiian kingdom. In doing so they hoped to remain identifiable to one another as members of the same *lāhui* even under the thick cultural baggage of Americanization.

*Ali'i Old and New: The Limits of Patronage*

While Native Hawaiians sought to develop the tools that would aid them in finding economic success in the plantation economy, the experiences of some economically successful Native Hawaiians show the limitations of individual success as a means of furthering the interests of the *lāhui* as a whole. A handful of Native Hawaiians inherited great wealth, particularly in the form of land, and translated that into significant commercial success. Samuel Parker, a co-heir of the Big Island's Parker Ranch, sought to increase his wealth through investments like the Kohala ditch, which brought year-round water to the seasonally dry Hamakua plain. John A. Cummins, another son of a *haole* rancher and an *ali'i wahine*, also inherited a great deal of land. From these lands in Waimanalo he developed the Waimanalo Sugar Company, which he later sold, though he remained the plantation's manager. Both Parker and Cummins were supporters of Lili'uokalani and traveled to Washington at her request to push for the restoration of the monarchy immediately after the overthrow. Though both men were wealthy and

educated, neither made much headroom in Washington against the wealthier, better connected, and more Caucasian representatives of the Oligarchy.<sup>69</sup>

Others, however, achieved commercial success based more upon their connections, capabilities, and capitalist mindset than on inheritance. Two such men were John Tamatoa Baker, the focus of the following chapter, and Mayor Johnny Wilson. The two had much in common, though separated by a generation. Baker had been active in the Kalākaua administration at the same time as Wilson's father, Marshall Charles B. Wilson. Both were Tahitian, Caucasian, and Native Hawaiian, and both were as involved in politics as they were in commerce. Both also profited strongly through the connections of their family members to the Kalākaua dynasty. Baker gained access to the court through his half-brother, Robert Hoapili Baker, who was a prominent supporter of Kalākaua's, and from his wife, Ululani, a descendant of Kaua'i royalty. This access provided Baker, a recent Lahainaluna grad, with appointed positions under Kalākaua as well as the resources to make several successful runs for the legislature. He also served briefly as the Governor of Hawai'i Island, a position Ululani held immediately before him. For their service and to help provide financial support, Kalākaua leased the Bakers a large section of land in Hilo known as Pi'ihonua for a nominal rent.<sup>70</sup>

After the overthrow Baker continued to carry out political projects for the Queen and the anti-annexation movement, even traveling to Washington to lobby against annexation. For his own support, however, he turned to the private sector. By subletting his Pi'ihonua land, especially a large section let out to a group of independent Portuguese

---

<sup>69</sup> Bergin, *Loyal to the Land: The Legendary Parker Ranch, 750-1950*, 162-164, 261-264; Williams, "John Adams Cummins: Prince of Entertainers," 154-155.

<sup>70</sup> Hawaii Territorial Legislature, *Journal of the House of Representatives of the Seventh Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii: Regular Session*, 1913, p.839; Clarice B. Taylor, "Little Tales About Hawaii: J.T. Baker, Model for Kamehameha Statue Pt. 4," *Honolulu Star Bulletin*, September 13, 1951; Clarice B. Taylor, "Little Tales About Hawaii: J.T. Baker, Model for Kamehameha Statue Pt. 5," *Honolulu Star Bulletin*, September 14, 1951; Clarice B. Taylor, "Little Tales About Hawaii: J.T. Baker, Model for Kamehameha Statue Pt. 6," *Honolulu Star Bulletin*, September 15, 1951.

sugar planters, Baker established a steady flow of income as well as capital for later ventures. Baker also established some renown as a rancher in Hamakua and Kohala. During the early territorial years he was constantly in search of new opportunities. He obtained the gas production monopoly in Hilo in 1917, and developed plans for a creamery in Hilo after viewing such operations on the mainland. He also attempted to develop smallholder pineapple planting in Kohala based, it seems, on encouraging homesteaders to do the planting and finding California capital to build the canneries. Unfavorable results from more extensive soil testing and the inability to secure homesteads sunk the plan. He peppered his account of his tour through Polynesia, which is covered in the next chapter, with ideas about how to diversify the Hawaiian economy and economic opportunities for Hawaiians in the South Pacific.<sup>71</sup>

While Johnnie Wilson was a generation too late to receive the sort of royal patronage that gave Baker his start, his father's positions under Kalākaua and Lili'uokalani allowed Johnny to attend 'Iolani and Stanford. While in California his father relied on Claus Spreckles, the sugar magnate, to look in on Johnny and manage his finances. In 1894 Wilson left Stanford, in part as a result of the overthrow and his father's loss of income. Wilson went to Spreckles looking for an engineering job and instead ended up in charge of former members of the Royal Hawaiian Band, who had left Hawai'i after the overthrow and were meeting with Spreckles hoping to arrange work. Wilson managed them on a cross-country tour, though success and debates over finances eventually caused the band and their manager to split ways. Wilson returned to Hawai'i in 1897, finding work surveying for Oahu Railroad and then for the Republic. Soon bidding

---

<sup>71</sup> Hawaii, *Laws of the Territory of Hawaii Passed by the Legislature* (Honolulu: Honolulu Star-Bulletin LMTD, 1913), 265; "Hilo May Have a Creamery Plant," *The Hawaiian Gazette*, October 20, 1911; Legislature, *Journal of the Senate of the Fifth Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii: Regular Session*, p. 303; Clarice B. Taylor, "Little Tales About Hawaii: J.T. Baker, Model for Kamehameha Statue Pt. 8," *Honolulu Star Bulletin*, September 18, 1951.



opened up to construct the Pali road from Honolulu to Kailua, and Wilson submitted a bid for \$37,500, some \$23,000 less than most Honolulu engineers assumed the road would cost. When the road opened on time and on budget, Wilson's star was on the rise. He continued to underbid and out-engineer the competition on a number of other projects, including the extension of the Oahu Railroad at Ka'ena point and sections of the Hana road on Maui.<sup>72</sup>

Wilson also began leasing a sixty-foot steamer named the *Iwa*, which allowed him to save money on transporting workers and materials as well as making money transporting cargo during down time. This led him to examine the potential for regular steam service to the remote rural areas where many Native Hawaiians still lived. After months of studying the profitability of such a line, he decided that there was substantial money to be made by transporting rice and taro to Honolulu and manufactured goods from Honolulu to the rural areas. He soon began arranging for his new local steamship line with the backing of Honolulu's Chinese merchants. As an offshoot of this business, he also opened a *poi* shop in Honolulu. Noting the success of his 1894 tour and the success of Kini, his future wife, as a *hula* dancer on the mainland, he also launched several entertainment ventures, taking Hawaiian acts to the mainland during various expositions and other events.<sup>73</sup>

A number of events in 1899, however, broke Wilson's streak of successes. One of his two new steamers, *La Ninfa*, sunk off Kaua'i, and a fire swept through Chinatown during a "controlled burn" during a bubonic plague outbreak. Wilson was among the many Hawai'i residents the fires ruined financially by the Chinatown fires. Most of his laborers on a major construction job at Pearl Harbor were Japanese and Chinese immigrants who lived in Chinatown. After the fire they were restricted to

---

<sup>72</sup> Krauss, *Johnny Wilson*, 22, 34, 47, 57.

<sup>73</sup> *Ibid.*, 64-66.

quarantine/detention centers, and Wilson was left with no workers to complete the job. Furthermore his Chinese backers for the steamship line were wiped out, leaving Baker with no source of current or future income except for the small family farm kept by Kini, his fiancé, on Pelekunu, Moloka'i.<sup>74</sup>

Personal desires for wealth, comfort, stability, power, and influence certainly played a major role in the efforts of Native Hawaiians to obtain wealth and political office. At the same time, however, in achieving and maintaining wealth and political power Native Hawaiians also put themselves in a position to aid other individuals within the *lāhui*. In part this reflected the old relationship between the *ali'i* and the *maka'āinana*, particularly with regards to remaining *ali'i nui*. It proved both the *mana* of the *ali'i* in the ability to provide for others, and the *pono* of their rule in their willingness to do so. This tradition remained live and well into the Territorial period, and was especially strong among the remaining *ali'i nui*. The 1902 Senate investigation of Hawai'i investigated the question of allowing Lili'uokalani either a one-time payment or an annuity as a sign of American good will. When discussing her economic status, several prominent Native Hawaiians, including Parker, testified that the queen supported a number of Native Hawaiians, young and old. When asked to clarify, John Hopkins, a Native Hawaiian and a "commissioner of education," testified, "She has [dependents], as all Hawaiians who are chiefs. They have a great many retainers and servants under them, and aged people that they support, and the Queen is one of these."<sup>75</sup>

Other Hawaiians of wealth and status were also expected to help those around them. John Baker, for instance, was not an *ali'i* by birth, but he married a high-ranking *ali'i wahine* and was both the last governor of Hawai'i Island and a wealthy man. Thus he became something of a contemporary *ali'i* himself. Like an *ali'i* Baker was willing to use

---

<sup>74</sup> Ibid., 63, 72-74.

<sup>75</sup> Rico, *Hawaiian Investigation: Pt 2*, p.456-7, 474.

his wealth to help the less wealthy and powerful around him. A 1913 report on Baker's land holdings in Hilo and his willingness to give up some of his Pi'ihonua lease for homesteading indicates another way Baker helped to support what he called, "the people." Baker indicated that he was willing only to end his lease on two distinct categories of land: lands he currently was not leasing out and the land "occupied by the people." In doing so he seemed to be making a clear distinction between the lands he was leasing for profit and those "occupied by the people," which he agreed to release for homesteading. He demanded, however, that those lands be appraised before any turnover and that "the people" could have a chance to purchase the lands they occupied and improved at a fair price rather allowing them to be out-bid by the planters.<sup>76</sup> In seeking to care for the interests of his tenants, Baker was fulfilling the traditional role of an *ali'i* as the elder sibling of the *maka'āinana*, as well as of a modern Native Hawaiian seeking to support other members of the *lāhui* through his influence, wealth, and position.

Wilson also tried to aid other Native Hawaiians, particularly small farmers in the countryside. Wilson's plans for a steamer route to remote taro- and rice-producing areas was inspired in large part by seeing a need for such a service on the part of the *kua'āina*, the backcountry Natives. When his plans for a commercial line fell through Wilson convinced the Republican administration to place a post office in Pelekunu, guaranteeing regular steamer visits. Later, when the Pelekunu postmistress, Wilson's wife Kini, refused to live in the valley any longer, no one could be found to fill the post and the post office closed. Baker took it upon himself to make regular visits on the steamers he used for his construction business, transporting goods back and forth from Pelekunu to support the valley's residents. His visits were not regular enough, however, and his relatives and

---

<sup>76</sup> Legislature, *Journal of the House of Representatives of the Seventh Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii: Regular Session*, p.839.

others abandoned Pelekunu valley, deeming it as too isolated to remain viable in a cash economy.<sup>77</sup>

Another form of assistance to the *lāhui* came in the form of political patronage, reflecting both American and Hawaiian political culture. The most sought-after patronage jobs remained almost entirely outside of local control, like the governorship and other federally appointed positions. A certain amount of influence could be exerted by the local elements of whatever party held the Presidency, especially for lower-prestige jobs such as the numerous postmaster/postmistress positions. These lower-status but more numerous jobs were the media that patronage politics were crafted from, and a key part of Native Hawaiian conversion to the two-party system. County jobs were entirely at local discretion and used to great advantage as patronage positions. Being the first mayor and overseeing the early development of the city and county government, Joe Fern became a master of patronage, employing numerous local Democrats, many of whom were Native Hawaiians. Against significant Republican opposition he appointed Wilson to the post of Superintendent of Roads. As a result Wilson was in charge of a staff of some 200 workers and engineers, and thus a dispenser of patronage in his own right. The disbursement of patronage jobs not only served to keep the rank-and-file party members happy, but also served as a way to keep the *lāhui* employed and in positions of influence in the community. If Native Hawaiians did not seek and obtain elected office, however, they would not be in a position to assure that the *lāhui* got its share of the political spoils.<sup>78</sup>

Yet such patronage, political or otherwise, could only have a limited effect. Patronage certainly provided a level of aid to the *lāhui*, but it did so on a small-scale, aggregate level. The *ali'i* of old had a number of tools available to them to assure the

---

<sup>77</sup> Krauss, *Johnny Wilson*, 64-66, 99, 174-5.

<sup>78</sup> *Ibid.*, 101-120.

security of those under them. While patronage was a visible one, it was a relatively minor one. In the plantation economy patronage could help individuals, but absent of other supporting types of power and influence it could do very little when the interests of the *lāhui* and those of the Oligarchy came into conflict. Even the handful of wealthy Native landowners like Sam Parker lacked the sort of wealth needed to truly oppose the Oligarchy, had they even chosen to do so. Parker, it should be noted, was the Republicans most prominent Native Hawaiian supporter before Kūhiō's defection.

Johnny Wilson's politically influenced economic problems illustrate the limitations of wealthy or simply well off Native Hawaiians to combat the Oligarchy. Wilson studied engineering at Stanford, built the Pali road, some of the most challenging sections of the Hana road, and would eventually become the mayor of Honolulu. Despite these accomplishments, between 1900 and 1915 his economic ventures were severely hindered by his work for the Democratic Party, work he undertook to support the interests of the *lāhui* against the interests of the plantations. In 1905 Wailuku plantation refused to award him a job after he outbid the nearest competitor by \$22,000. The plantation, however, turned to a contractor who had not bid and negotiated a new price based on Wilson's quote rather than allow the upstart young Democrat to do the work. In 1906, an election year, the Territorial administration put out a call for bids on improvements to the Pali road, which Wilson had built faster, cheaper, and better than anyone had thought possible. With Wilson safely away on Kaua'i they allowed an unprecedentedly short 48 hours for bids, guaranteeing Wilson would not get a job he was probably the best suited in the islands to take on.<sup>79</sup>

On Kaua'i, meanwhile, plantation-affiliated Republican officials ran Wilson into bankruptcy by refusing to follow the standard practice of paying him piecemeal for roadwork. This put Wilson in debt for expense incurred building the road, debt the county

---

<sup>79</sup> Ibid., 91, 92.

quickly purchased from his private backers. They then filed suit for payment of the debt, forcing him into bankruptcy. As a result the county got the roadwork he had done for a fraction of the cost, were able to cash in Wilson's bond, and as an added benefit, they humiliated a prominent Democrat and ruined his reputation as a businessman. When Joe Fern appointed Wilson to be Honolulu's Road Supervisor in 1909, the Republican administration and County Board of Supervisors spent two years fighting against his appointment. After leaving the City and County of Honolulu in 1912, Wilson had to take the Territory to court to be awarded another road contract he had won a bid for. They refused to give him the contract, citing the Kaua'i incident as proof of incompetence. Wilson won the decision, preserving his reputation in court with a string of character and professional witnesses.<sup>80</sup>

As noted briefly in the previous section, part of the reason Native Hawaiians were so heavily invested in homesteading was that they perceived the ability to fall back on small-scale agriculture as the key to remaining independent, or at least somewhat independent, of the plantations and other large landholders. Johnny and Kini provide the textbook example of this. When Wilson's political efforts on behalf of the *lāhui* resulted in economic attacks by the Oligarchy, it was Kini's agricultural labor on both the family farm in Pelekunu valley and their small farm in Kaimuki that kept the couple fed. This sort of supplemental agricultural labor allowed Native Hawaiians and others with access to farmlands a modicum of economic independence, which was one of the reasons the Oligarchy was so dead set against homesteading, even in the scrublands.<sup>81</sup>

Furthermore, the path to wealth often required one to sacrifice certain elements of Native Hawaiian culture in order to even be in a position to help others. In Baker's case his role as a pseudo-*ali'i* meant that other Native Hawaiians had certain expectations of

---

<sup>80</sup> Ibid., 93,103-107, 109-111

<sup>81</sup> Ibid., 85.

him, particularly regarding his generosity. The openhanded generosity of the *ali'i* however, conflicted with the attitude required to develop wealth in a capitalist society. To maintain his status, Baker often had to favor the preservation of his capital over Native Hawaiian expectations of generosity. Years later he was remembered in part as a “stingy alii,” by some of his relatives and others. When asked for aid Baker agreed by giving them low-level jobs and telling them to work their way up, which was seen as bad form for an *ali'i*. Baker, however, embraced his reputation for “stinginess,” which he cited as the secret to his success.<sup>82</sup>

In Wilson’s case, he often had to work against the interests of other Native Hawaiians in order to succeed as a contractor. Part of the reason he was able to consistently bid so low was the availability of cheap Chinese and Japanese immigrant labor, which he and other contractors made frequent use of. If he raised his wages to prices Native Hawaiians would agree to work at, which were considerably higher, he would have lost his bids. When the Democratic party began making an issue of “citizen labor” during the 1904 campaign, specifically hoping to attract more Native Hawaiian voters, Wilson followed the party line and swore to only use citizen labor on a job near Hana. He found it very difficult, however, to find Native Hawaiians or other citizens willing to work for the low wages he normally paid non-citizens. After the election, he returned to his reliance on immigrant labor on his other jobsites.<sup>83</sup>

In a somewhat related manner, Wilson’s *poi* shop may have succeeded because he was not under some of the cultural obligations other prospective Native Hawaiian shopkeepers would be. Unlike the Chinese, Japanese, and *haole*, Native Hawaiians tended to stay away from mercantile operations, in part because of the lack of capital and

---

<sup>82</sup> John Tamatoa Baker, “Mai Ka Ano Mamao Mai (15),” *Ke Aloha Aina*, November 31 1907; Clarice B. Taylor, “Little Tales About Hawaii: J.T. Baker, Model for Kamehameha Statue Pt. 10,” *Honolulu Star Bulletin*, September 20 1951.

<sup>83</sup> Krauss, *Johnny Wilson*, 89, 92.

in part because of a lack of interest in shop keeping, which had connotations of stinginess about it. Native shopkeepers were often in a difficult position when relatives or friends requested one's stock without the means or desire to purchase them. Perhaps part of the reason Wilson's *poi* shop managed to survive was that most of his mother's family lived on Moloka'i and his father's family in Tahiti.

Throughout the territorial period, many wealthy and powerful Native Hawaiians sought to use their power to assist other Native Hawaiians, thus helping the *lāhui* as a whole. In doing so they partially filled some of the functions once assumed by the *ali'i*, even if they themselves were not always *ali'i*. Such patronage certainly helped individual members of the *lāhui*, but such aggregate actions had only limited effects in furthering the interests of the *lāhui* as a whole. Such actions could do little, for instance, to ease Native Hawaiian dependence on the plantation economy, raise wages, or outspend the plantations for votes, power, and influence in Hawai'i and Washington. Furthermore, as seen with Wilson and Baker, the ability to acquire the wealth that would position one to help others required an embrace of capitalist values that acted in opposition to Native Hawaiian cultural values and sometimes in direct economic opposition to the interests of the *lāhui* as a whole.

## **Conclusion**

In the years between annexation and World War I, Native Hawaiians faced the unsettling prospect of adjusting to life under formal imperial rule. The Kingdom, the institution that had largely defined the *lāhui* for the better part of a century, was no more. Culturally, politically, and economically, the new order stripped the *lāhui* of the protections, benefits, and direction the Kingdom had once offered it. The American colonial government that replaced the Kingdom remained under the control of the plantation/missionary Oligarchy, whose interests were often directly in opposition to the



interests of the *lāhui*. Economically the plantations controlled most of Hawai‘i’s resources, leaving little room for economic success independent of their influence. Culturally, the *lāhui* faced the threat of Americanization, which eroded at the fundamental qualities of the *lāhui*, including the very basis on which they understood their relationships with one another. In nearly every aspect of life, the onset of American empire brought the *lāhui* under siege.

For many within the *lāhui*, the situation required a tightrope walk between collaboration with the new order and contesting the control of the Oligarchy. In politics especially, Native Hawaiians were split regarding how closely to ally themselves with the plantations, which were both the most powerful economic and political force in the islands and the greatest threat to Native Hawaiian interests. A second tension arose between Americanization, both coerced and consensual, and the fear of losing Native Hawaiian culture. Native Hawaiians participated in the process of Americanization, sometimes grudgingly, but always with a mind to control the process and retain what they considered to be key elements of Native culture. Both types of efforts, however, were of limited benefit. The eventual “victory” of Hawaiian homesteading, for instance, was so watered down by collaboration with the Oligarchy that it had a negligible positive effect on the independence and well being of the *lāhui* while ensnaring Native Hawaiians within an American racial discourse of blood intended to define them into non-existence.

Many Native Hawaiians saw the *lāhui*’s future in economic advancement, hoping to create opportunities for Native Hawaiians to succeed economically and thus be able to aid the *lāhui* as a whole, perhaps even competing with the wealth-driven power of the Oligarchy. The actual benefits of such a plan, however, proved as limited as the benefits of political collaboration. Successful Native Hawaiians like Johnnie Wilson could aid other individual members of the *lāhui*, but when they tried to use that wealth to forward the interests of the *lāhui* against those of the Oligarchy, the Oligarchy’s control of the

colonial government and the economy could easily crush them. Furthermore, the steps they needed to take in order to gain wealth, particularly the assumption of a capitalist mentality, served to weaken the cultural values that united the *lāhui* and caused these wealthy few to look after their personal economic interests over those of the *lāhui*. As with the political situation, the only solutions available for the *lāhui*'s economic problems were of limited use and created new problems for a *lāhui*.

In 1907, halfway between annexation and World War I, John T. Baker left Hawai'i to tour Polynesia. In some ways he journeyed as a tourist, a comfortably well-off businessman and landowner with a love of travel. Yet he also voyaged as a member of a Native Hawaiian elite who was deeply concerned with the future of the *lāhui*. He was concerned by the weakness of a *lāhui* divided by colonial politics, the wellbeing and status of Native Hawaiians in a plantation economy, and the ability of the *lāhui* to retain the cultural ties that bound them together in an American imperial culture hostile to the very existence of Natives. The voyage allowed Baker to put these issues into a much broader context. Struck by the numerous similarities between Native Hawaiians and other Polynesian peoples, and between the Territory and other Euro/American colonies. By began to form and promote an understanding of the *lāhui*'s future within the context of a much larger Polynesian *lāhui*, connected and validated by shared culture, values, colonial contexts, and relationships to the land.

**CHAPTER 7**  
**“AOHE NŌ HE WEHENA MAI KAKOU”:  
NO DIFFERENT FROM US**

In 1907, entrepreneur, politician, and rancher John Tamatoa Baker left Hawai‘i for a seven-month tour of Polynesia, the Philippines, and Japan. Though a *malihini*, a stranger, to all the places he visited, Baker’s gentle demeanor, musical talents, and standing as the former royal governor of Hawai‘i Island earned him a warm welcome in Tahiti, Fiji, Rarotonga, Aotearoa, Sāmoa, and Tonga. He dined with high chiefs and colonial governors in Tahiti, reunited with his grandfather’s family in Borabora, befriended core members of the Young Māori Party in Wellington, entertained the queen in Rarotonga, and connected with a string of Hawaiians who had decided in previous years to make their homes in the south. He visited the thermal attractions of Rotorua and viewed the lava spilling down the slopes of Savai‘i and into the sea. He also wrote a string of letters to the Hawaiian-language newspaper *Ke Aloha Aina*, which published them as a serial starting in August of 1907.

While primarily personal in nature, Baker’s journey and writings reflected the effort of Native Hawaiians to retain their unity and significance as a *lāhui* under the rapidly expanding American empire. Unlike the HBCFM missions and the Sāmoa Embassy, projects explicitly developed to reshape other parts of the Pacific, Baker had little intention of reshaping other Islanders in the Native Hawaiian mold. Rather his intention was to use his experiences among other Polynesians to better understand the situation of the *lāhui* at home. Through his writing, which can be understood as a form of travel literature, he also sought to alter how his Native Hawaiian audience thought of

themselves and their relationship to the rest of the Pacific. Like most travel literature of the time, Baker's intent was not just to inform his audience about foreign lands, but also to force an examination of their relationship to empire. Euro/American travel writing, however, is largely written from imperial standpoints, often as a validation of Empire. It allows the reader to gaze upon the empire, future sites of empire, or the empires of others, and thus better understand their expected role as part of the Imperial metropole. Like other colonial projects that speak directly to the metropole, travel literature trains the audience to examine, understand, and feel about empire in a certain way, typically by educating them in the correct mindset of an imperial elite.<sup>1</sup> In the case of Baker's writings, however, the connection between the writer and the audience come not from their shared perspective as the possessors of empire but from their shared status as the subjects of empire and shared concerns about their futures under empire. As a result his encounters with and descriptions of other islanders, while displaying a certain amount of ethnocentrism or nationalist chauvinism, focus heavily on a recognition of their shared status as Polynesians and colonized peoples, as well as their shared struggle in navigating life under various Euro/American empires.

By placing contemporary Native Hawaiian problems in a broader geographical and cultural context, the voyage helped shape Baker's understanding of how the *lāhui* fit into both the Native and imperial Pacific. This chapter argues that in response to fears regarding the *lāhui's* future under American rule, Baker promoted and developed a vision of the *lāhui* as intimately connected to other Polynesians, validating its values and attitudes as normative by Polynesian standards in opposition to *haole* depictions of Native Hawaiians as lacking in the training or capability for civilization under Euro/American standards. Furthermore he used this cultural solidarity to critique Euro/American empires and their proponents, marking *them* as morally and ethically deviant for their deep

---

<sup>1</sup> Thomas, *Colonialism's Culture*, 105-107, 125-142, .

inadequacies under Polynesian social and cultural standards. At the same time Baker promoted an agenda of increased Polynesian economic initiative and support for Westernized leaders as the best available path for maintaining the strength of the various *lāhui* under imperial rule. When promoting these agendas, however, Baker did not use other Polynesians as a foil to promote the idea of Hawaiian superiority, the way the HBCFM missionaries and the 1887 legation had. He instead used Native Hawaiian connections and similarities to other Polynesians to understand such agendas in a broader context, even rethinking and reframing them based on Polynesian-derived critiques.

### **John Tamatoa Baker: Native Hawaiian Capitalist, Politician, and Traveler**

Baker's journey to the south came partly from his desire to visit the land of his ancestors. While all Native Hawaiians traced their distant ancestry south to Kahiki, Baker's family had a much more recent tie to the south. His maternal grandfather, a Tahitian named Pupuhi, came to Hawai'i in the early 1800's. According to the descendants of his brother, Edward Adam Baker, Pupuhi escorted Rev. William Ellis to Hawai'i in the 1820s and remained there when Ellis returned.<sup>2</sup> He married a Native Hawaiian woman and had several children, including Baker's mother Luka. Baker's father, Adam Baker, an English ship's captain, came to Hawai'i around mid-century. He had two sons with Luka, John and Edward, and another son, Robert Hoapili Baker, with the *ali'i wahine* Malie Napu'upahoe. While his sons were still in their youths, Captain Baker "disappeared" at sea. He returned a few years later with an English bride and a desire to take John and Edward to England for an education. Luka promptly told him

---

<sup>2</sup> There is some confusion as to the identity of Luka's parents. Some sources site her as the sister of Malie Napu'upahoe, who was also named Luka and later became Mrs. Mark Previer. Yet this would rule out her parentage by the Tahitian Pupuhi. Furthermore, most sources have Baker's mother dying in the 1870's, Luka Previer died in 1895 *The Independent*, November 05, 1895.

what he and his new wife could do with a proper English education and sent her sons to Lahainaluna.<sup>3</sup>

John graduated from Lahainaluna in the mid 1870s, where he developed a reputation for his hard work, intelligence, charm, and physical beauty. At sometime following his graduation Baker, his charms attracted the *ali'i wahine* Ululani Lewai, the daughter of Noah Peleioholani. A fixture in the courts of the later Kamehamehas, Noah Pele'ioholani descended on his father's side not only from his namesake, Pele'ioholani, the famous O'ahu and Kaua'i *mō'i*, but also from the Maui *mō'i* Kamehamehanui, the predecessor of Kahekili. His mother's father was George Cox Ke'eumoku, the son of Kamehameha's chief advisor, Ke'eumoku Pāpa'iahiahi. The two married soon after John's graduation.<sup>4</sup>

Despite Noah's rank and influence, he had little to offer the young couple in terms of economic support and they struggled financially. When Ululani found herself pregnant, Baker "shipped" on a three-year contract with John Cummins in Waimanalo to provide for Ululani and their child. Ululani, meanwhile, sailed to Maui to give birth among her relatives on her mother's side. The baby, like so many in those times, died weeks after its birth, filling both Ululani and John with great sorrow. It would be the only child the two ever had. Meanwhile, Ululani's half-brother, Solomon, who Kamehameha IV had sent abroad for an education some 20 years earlier, returned to the islands after Kalākaua cut his government support. When offered a position in the court, he refused, allying himself with the Emmaite faction, and pledging only to serve only under a Kamehameha. His father, now a supporter of Kalākaua, chastised him for his stance,

---

<sup>3</sup> Rebecca Copp Raymond, "The Baker Clan," (Santa Rosa, CA: Cleek/Print), 2-5; Clarice B. Taylor, "Little Tales About Hawaii: J.T. Baker, Model for Kamehameha Statue Pt. 2," *Honolulu Star Bulletin*, September 11 1951; Clarice B. Taylor, "Little Tales About Hawaii: J.T. Baker, Model for Kamehameha Statue Pt. 3," *Honolulu Star Bulletin*, September 12 1951.

<sup>4</sup> Taylor, "Little Tales About Hawaii: J.T. Baker, Model for Kamehameha Statue Pt. 4."

leading Solomon to go to Maui, fetch the still grieving Ululani, and deposit her at Kalākaua's court as his proxy. Kalākaua took a liking to Ululani, and in 1878 he bought out John's contract and awarded him a place in the household guard, then under the command of Baker's half-brother Robert. By 1879 Baker had developed a close personal tie to the *mō'ī*. Kalākaua asked Baker, who was noted in the court for his physique and handsome face, to pose for photographs in the sacred *malo* of Liloa and Kamehameha's feather cape. Those photos were then sent to Italy to become the basis for the famous Kamehameha statue. John and Ululani were also among the founding members of the Hale Nauā.<sup>5</sup>

In 1884 Baker moved into electoral politics on the "Government" ticket, running for one of the four Honolulu seats in the House of Representatives. Though he did not take a leadership role in the election, he did make a name as a public speaker in the later days of the campaign. On February 3<sup>rd</sup>, he and the other pro-Kalākaua candidates spoke at the Roman Catholic Churchyard in Honolulu, where an unnamed speaker declared that all Catholic voters should support them against the Congregationalist-dominated independents.<sup>6</sup> On the fifth, the day before the election, the Independent Party held a rally at the wharf. Unable to speak Hawaiian, J.O. Carter, the Independent Party's lead candidate in Honolulu, depended entirely on the Reverend Stephen Desha to speak for him. Desha was able to hold the crowd's interest until torrential downpours began and the crowd abandoned Desha for the drier areas of the wharf. As the other Independent candidates attempted to herd the crowd back in, Baker stood up on a pile of boxes and began an impromptu speech that stole the crowd from the Independents. According to the

---

<sup>5</sup> Frank Karpel, "Notes and Queries," *Hawaiian Journal of History* 33, (1999): 208-209; Taylor, "Little Tales About Hawaii: J.T. Baker, Model for Kamehameha Statue Pt. 4"; Taylor, "Little Tales About Hawaii: J.T. Baker, Model for Kamehameha Statue Pt. 5"; Taylor, "Little Tales About Hawaii: J.T. Baker, Model for Kamehameha Statue Pt. 6."

<sup>6</sup> Though only some of the pro-Kalākaua candidates were Roman Catholic, the anti-Catholic bias of the Independents made the Roman Catholic population a base of pro-Kalākaua support.

PCA, “It was evident that he is a favorite with Hawaiians, and for half an hour he kept his audience smiling and applauding.” When a member of the Independent Party, Mr. Kunuiakea, tried to follow up on Baker’s speech, the crowd dispersed. Baker and the pro-Kalākaua candidates swept Honolulu the next day. They also swept the city in the 1886 election, with Baker again gaining notice for his oration, particularly his attacks on the Independent Party’s Sanford Dole.<sup>7</sup>

Baker continued serving in appointed and elected positions throughout the Kalākaua dynasty. The turmoil, vote suppression, and suffrage restrictions following the Bayonet constitution weakened the Native Hawaiian vote and kept Baker and many other pro-Kalākaua legislators out of office in 1887 and 1888. In 1890, however, Baker managed to return to the legislature. During the Kalākaua and Lili‘uokalani years Baker also served in a number of appointed positions. In 1884, after his election, Kalākaua appointed Baker to Captain in the Household Guard, and Major in the King’s Guard in 1886. Kalākaua also appointed him Sheriff of Hawai‘i Island in congruence with Ululani’s appointment to the Governorship of Hawai‘i Island in 1887, and in 1892 Lili‘uokalani appointed him to replace Ululani as Royal governor. He also served on Kalākaua’s Privy Council from 1884 until 1891.<sup>8</sup>

Though not as prominent in the post-overthrow political battles as Bush, Wilcox, or Nawahi, the Bakers were major Royalist supporters and leaders of the movement in Hilo.<sup>9</sup> Professor Benjamin Cluff, then President of Brigham Young Academy in Provo,

---

<sup>7</sup> “Independent Ticket Meetings,” *Pacific Commercial Advertiser*, February 6, 1884; “Local and General,” *Pacific Commercial Advertiser*, February 6, 1884; “Political Gatherings on Saturday and Sunday- the Government Endorsed,” *Pacific Commercial Advertiser*, January 18, 1886.

<sup>8</sup> Karpel, “Notes and Queries,” 208-9; Lydecker, *Roster, Legislatures of Hawaii, 1841-1918*, 178; Taylor, “Little Tales About Hawaii: J.T. Baker, Model for Kamehameha Statue Pt. 8”; Taylor, “Little Tales About Hawaii: J.T. Baker, Model for Kamehameha Statue Pt. 9”; Taylor, “Little Tales About Hawaii: J.T. Baker, Model for Kamehameha Statue Pt. 10.”

<sup>9</sup> In 1895, *Ka Makaainana*, Bush’s paper, reported that “Keone Beka,” a political prisoner, had been released from jail, probably following the “Republic’s” massive roundup of Royalists in response to



visited the islands in 1897 after McKinley's election led to a renewed push for annexation. He described his efforts to promote annexation in an article for the YMCA's *Improvement Age*. The piece, which Cluff wrote in part to promote annexation, listed Baker as one of the leaders of the Hilo Royalists. Specifically he described Baker as, "the most intelligent Royalist I met outside of Honolulu." He then discredited Baker's allegiances by insinuating Baker was only a royalist out of fear that Kalākaua's ghost would "look down upon him disapprovingly," should he turn against the Queen.<sup>10</sup>

As noted in the last chapter, Baker not only managed to endure the political turmoil of the Republic and early Territorial years, he prospered, both economically and socially. His leased lands, ranching, and other business concerns made him comfortably wealthy if not quite as rich as the planters. Popular with the *haole* and Hawaiian community in Hilo, the Baker's were a major fixture the town's social circuit and leaders of the Native Hawaiian community. The couple also fell in love with traveling during this period. After participating in the lobbying effort against annexation in Washington DC, they toured the mainland and Western Europe in 1899, enjoying the experiences available to well-off and well-connected tourists. Though times were tough for the *lāhui*, the Bakers' were more than content with their personal lives. In October of 1902, however, tragedy struck, and Ululani passed away at the age of 55. Even five years later her death still deeply affected John, and it was in part to escape the memories of her in Hilo and Hamakua that he left for the South Pacific.<sup>11</sup>

---

Wilcox's rebellion, the same roundup that sent Bush and Nawahi to jail for several months, causing Nawahi's death. I still have not discovered if this is the same John Baker or more likely his nephew and namesake, John Baker Jr.

<sup>10</sup> Cluff, "The Hawaiian Islands and Annexation," 445; "Ke Kiaaina Mrs. Ululani Baker Ua Hala, Aloha No.," *Ke Aloha Aina*, October 11, 1902.

<sup>11</sup> "Ke Kiaaina Mrs. Ululani Baker Ua Hala, Aloha No."

## **He Leta Mai ka 'Āina Mamao Mai, A Letter from a Distant Land**

Baker stopped first in Tahiti, the homeland of his maternal grandfather. Though based primarily in Pape'ete, Baker traveled widely around Tahiti and Mo'orea. He alternated between touring, searching for his family, and visiting with various local residents. He swam off Venus point, dined with the French Governor at a public feast, and was a frequent guest of the prominent British/Tahitian Salmon family, as well as of the various Hawaiian expatriates living in the area. He also succeeded in locating his grandfather's family, though only after extensive searching and multiple disappointments. When he did find his family, however, he was not only welcomed, but became the subject of some dispute between two different female relatives over the right to host him. He also witnessed the raucous Tahitian celebration of Bastille Day, and even became involved in the celebration himself, playing his ukulele and singing various Hawaiian tunes.<sup>12</sup>

He left Tahiti for Raiatea on the nineteenth, spending a day touring the island in the company of a Tahitian and her brother who managed government affairs for the French. He then headed for "Lorotona," or Rarotonga in the Cook Islands, where he caught guppies in a stream in the same manner he had learned as a youth in Hawai'i. He met with a Hawaiian named Alakai, who lived there with a woman from Manihiki and had taught the Hawaiian *hula* to her relatives. He also met with Queen Makea,

---

<sup>12</sup> John Tamatoa Baker, "Mai Ka Ano Mamao Mai (1)," *Ke Aloha Aina*, August 10, 1907; John Tamatoa Baker, "Mai Ka Ano Mamao Mai (2)," *Ke Aloha Aina*, August 17, 1907; John Tamatoa Baker, "Mai Ka Ano Mamao Mai (3)," *Ke Aloha Aina*, August 24, 1907; John Tamatoa Baker, "Mai Ka Ano Mamao Mai (4)," *Ke Aloha Aina*, August 31, 1907; John Tamatoa Baker, "Mai Ka Ano Mamao Mai (5)," *Ke Aloha Aina*, September 7, 1907; John Tamatoa Baker, "Mai Ka Ano Mamao Mai (6)," *Ke Aloha Aina*, September 14 1907; John Tamatoa Baker, "Mai Ka Ano Mamao Mai (7)," *Ke Aloha Aina*, September 21, 1907; John Tamatoa Baker, "Mai Ka Ano Mamao Mai (8)," *Ke Aloha Aina*, September 28, 1907.

entertaining her with the latest Hawaiian songs and music. After a short stay he began the voyage to New Zealand, landing in Auckland on August second.<sup>13</sup>

Baker's stay in Auckland never made it to publication. His letters pick up again on the eighth, in a train car leaving Auckland, with Baker chatting and bonding with number of Māori aboard the train. He disembarked at Rotorua, a well-known tourist destination, then took a carriage to nearby Whakarewarewa to witness a Māori dance performance. A conversation with the dancers and a display of the Hawaiian style of hula led to Baker's celebrity among the local Māori during the three days he remained there.<sup>14</sup> He then headed to Wellington by skiff, foot, and train. He remained there for some time, befriending various individuals including James Carroll and Dr. Maui Pomare, two prominent leaders of the nascent Young Māori Party. He and Pomare got along particularly well, leading to Pomare's introducing him to a broad swath of Wellington's Māori and Pākeha elite.<sup>15</sup>

Soon after this Baker headed to Hokianga river area with a friend, leaving a party of tourists he had been traveling with after being badgered by a pair of particularly *niele*, or nosy, fellow travelers. On September 4<sup>th</sup> they headed to a nearby sawmill to take a look at the operation and a crowd soon gathered, saying that they had come to meet with, "A Hawaiian, from the land of the ancestors." Baker fielded their questions about Hawai'i and the Hawaiians *ano o ka noho ana*, or way of life, as well as of his travels. A well-off Māori in the crowd, Tuwake, asked Baker to visit him at his place which Baker called "Waharapa." Baker stayed with Tuwake for several days, becoming quite close in their brief time together. Baker then headed to Parengarenga, where he was the guest of Mrs.

---

<sup>13</sup> Baker, "Mai Ka Ano Mamao Mai (7)."

<sup>14</sup> John Tamatoa Baker, "Mai Ka Ano Mamao Mai (9)," *Ke Aloha Aina*, October 19, 1907; John Tamatoa Baker, "Mai Ka Ano Mamao Mai (10)," *Ke Aloha Aina*, October 26 1907.

<sup>15</sup> John Tamatoa Baker, "Mai Ka Ano Mamao Mai (11)," *Ke Aloha Aina*, November 2, 1907; John Tamatoa Baker, "Mai Ka Ano Mamao Mai (12)," *Ke Aloha Aina*, November 9 1907; "Colonel Baker's Grand Time in the South Seas," *Hawaiian Gazette*, January 31, 1908.

Ngawini Yates, the daughter of a prominent chief, and celebrated a mass wedding with the local Māori community.<sup>16</sup>

At some point during the trip Baker went to Gisborne, where he gave an interview to one of the Māori newspapers. The paper reported that he had come specifically to see the Māori people, and was disappointed that he arrived in the wrong season to travel inland on overland routes, as he believed that the Māori lived better lives away from the towns and cities. He did, however, enjoy meeting the men at the college at Te Rau, an Anglican seminary, happy to see the youth upholding the faith, particularly the *hapa-haole*. In Hawai'i, he regretfully informed them, only one *hapa-haole* had chosen the ministry as his profession. In parting Baker left them with a number of Hawaiian songs that spoke of the Hawaiian connection to Kahiki, which were published in Hawaiian and Māori.<sup>17</sup>

While reluctant to leave New Zealand, Baker put himself on a ship headed for Tonga and Sāmoa on the September 17th, landing at Nuku'alofa on the 22nd. There he had a falling out with his fellow tourists, all *haole*, over their attitudes towards their Tongan hosts. He also arranged a brief social meeting with the Tongan king, George Tupou II.<sup>18</sup> On the 23<sup>rd</sup> Baker left Nuku'alofa, reaching Ha'apai on the 24<sup>th</sup>, where he saw the smoke rising from the "sacred place," the volcano on Tofua. That evening Baker threw an impromptu concert aboard the ship, which he would do with increased frequency as the monotony of life aboard ship grew heavier. They arrived in Sāmoa on the morning of the 26<sup>th</sup>, landing first in Apia then heading north to Savai'i.

In Sāmoa, Baker visited Taga and Apia and ran into several former Hawai'i residents. Off the coast of Savai'i he witnessed the lava flows headed down to the ocean,

---

<sup>16</sup> Baker, "Mai Ka Ano Mamao Mai (15)"; John Tamatoa Baker, "Mai Ka Ano Mamao Mai (16)," *Ke Aloha Aina*, December 7, 1907.

<sup>17</sup> "He Manuhiri No Hawaii," *Te Pipiwharauoa*, October, 1907.

<sup>18</sup> John Tamatoa Baker, "Mai Ka Ano Mamao Mai (13)," *Ke Aloha Aina*, November 16, 1907.

and headed ashore to look at the flows piling into the sea. He noted that he had missed the phenomenon when it happened within a day's journey of his home but saw it now in a distant land. Though only in Sāmoa briefly Baker visited several villages, where he found the Samoans as curious about Hawaiian ways as he was about theirs.<sup>19</sup> From Sāmoa Baker went to Fiji. Baker spent several days in and around Suva, but by the seventh of October he was headed for Australia.<sup>20</sup>

On several evenings, at the requests of the other passengers, Baker played concerts aboard the ship, easing the monotony of the voyage. In Australia he visited the mountains of New South Wales and the sheep auctions of Sydney. Little of Australia seemed to leave much of an impression on Baker except the chaotic masses of Sydney's dock area and the beauties of the city parks and of Mount Victoria. He noted that such parks attracted many tourists and commented, somewhat prophetically, that similar parks in Hawai'i would be a welcome vacation area for locals and tourists alike as well as a source of income. On November 6<sup>th</sup> he went by sea to Brisbane, but from there his trail goes cold. Because a number of issues of *Ke Aloha Aina* are missing or severely damaged, few details of the rest of Baker's journey remain. On January 14<sup>th</sup> the Gazette reported that Baker had returned to the islands. According to that article he visited Manila, Hong Kong, and Japan, where he remained for an entire month, reflecting, perhaps, the Kalākaua era ties between Hawai'i and Japan.<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup> Ibid; John Tamatoa Baker, "Mai Ka Ano Mamao Mai (14)," *Ke Aloha Aina*, November 24, 1907.

<sup>20</sup> John Tamatoa Baker, "Mai Ka Ano Mamao Mai (17)," *Ke Aloha Aina*, December 14, 1907.

<sup>21</sup> Ibid; "Col. Baker Met Prince Salmon," *Hawaiian Gazette*, January 14, 1908. The available copies of *Ke Aloha Aina* end on January 11, 1908 with a partially destroyed copy of Baker's letter from a ship headed towards the Philippines dated November 19, 1907. I could not determine if Baker wrote further letters during his time in the Philippines and Japan or if such letters were printed.

## Tahiti: Networks and Connections

Throughout his journey Baker placed a heavy emphasis on the connections and ties between Polynesian peoples, though nowhere was this more important to him or his narrative than in Tahiti. Upon his arrival Baker found comfort in two very different social circles, both connected to migratory networks between Hawai'i and Tahiti. The first was the circle of *ari'i* within and connected to the Salmon clan. One of the family, Ninito Salmon, had traveled to Hawai'i in the 1850s, remaining there until her death in the 1890s. Ninito established a strong social connection between the Hawaiian and Tahitian elite, which resulted in a number of Salmons visiting Hawai'i and joining the Honolulu social scene either temporarily or permanently. During the same time as Baker's journey, another member of the Salmon clan, Ari'i Pa'ea, was making quite a stir in Honolulu due to his long-distance wooing of the much-older Queen Lili'uokalani, including a disastrous attempt to woo her in person.<sup>22</sup>

Baker's entry to the Tahitian elite, however, came largely from yet another Salmon, who Baker identifies only as the *keiki mu'umu'u*, or maimed child. Several years earlier the anonymous *keiki* had come to Hawai'i, and apparently the two had met. Kimo Poe, a friend of Baker's who was more familiar with the Salmons, wrote Baker a letter of introduction and sent it by mail ahead of Baker's trip. The *keiki*, however, recognized Baker's name upon his arrival and there was no need for the letter. The *keiki* welcomed him as he got off the ship and introduced Baker to Tati Salmon, the clan's British-educated patriarch and a high *ari'i* of Papara. Baker spent the day with the Salmons, watching a Catholic procession and sharing several meals with the family.<sup>23</sup>

That evening he entertained them Hawaiian style, *kani ka pila*, playing his *ukulele* and singing various Hawaiian *mele*, including Kalākaua dynasty songs such as “Hawai'i

---

<sup>22</sup> “Col. Baker Met Prince Salmon.”

<sup>23</sup> Baker, “Mai Ka Ano Mamao Mai (1).”

Pono‘ī” and “Aloha ‘Oe.” He also sang several songs connecting Hawai‘i and Tahiti, noting that, “it was appropriate to release the wind gourd of Laamaomao.”<sup>24</sup> The Tahitians, Baker reported, were enthralled with his singing, but even more so with his instrument. As noted above, Tati’s youngest sister, Alexandrina Manihinihi Salmon, who Baker identified as Teri‘i Manihinihi, also entertained Baker with a *luau*, after some awkwardness getting in touch with each other and confusion over Baker’s letter of introduction from Kimo Poe. Baker finally made contact with her through her husband, resulting in her sending for Baker and demanding that he come and see “Aunty Alii.”<sup>25</sup>

The Salmons would host Baker once more on the 14<sup>th</sup> of July, where he was one of only two non-family attendees at a birthday party thrown for one of Tati’s children. His companion at this event was Pa‘ea, the Salmon who was then attempting to woo Lili‘uokalani, and Baker described him as a tall handsome man. In a later interview he reported that Pa‘ea had asked him many questions about Lili‘uokalani, namely whether or not she was rich and had a lot of property, as well as how old she was. Baker found the questions odd, but not as odd as Salmon’s claims that he intended to marry her. He did not feel it was his place to write to Hawai‘i with his impressions of the man until he was in Japan and heard of Pa‘ea’s somewhat disgraceful behavior in San Francisco and Hawai‘i. He assured his interviewer that the Salmon’s themselves were a very respectable family, adding, “I suppose in every family there is one to make a fool of himself.”<sup>26</sup>

Baker also tapped into another social network in Tahiti, one much farther down the social ladder, but of no less importance to Baker. Like Baker’s grandfather, Ninito Salmon, and other Tahitian immigrants, a number of Hawaiians had found the closeness

---

<sup>24</sup> As noted in the introduction, La‘ama‘oma‘o was a Raiatean who possessed a sacred wind gourd that he and his descendants would open to let out the winds, aiding their journeys or sinking the fleets of their enemies. He accompanied the Hawaiian chief Moikeha on the latter’s return to Hawai‘i.

<sup>25</sup> Ibid; Baker, “Mai Ka Ano Mamao Mai (4)”;

<sup>26</sup> Baker, “Mai Ka Ano Mamao Mai (7)”;

of Hawaiian and Tahitian life made immigration a relatively easy project. Within days of arriving Baker met up with Mokuahi, a native of Kohala, then living on Moorea. Though he had lived in Tahiti so long that he forgot much of the Hawaiian language, he still remembered his education in Hilo under the ABCFM missionary Rev. Lyman. Mokuahi introduced Baker to Liwai, whose mother's family was from Hilo and whose relatives still resided there. Like Mokuahi he had lived in Tahiti for decades, having left Hawai'i at the death of Kamehameha III (1854), and had become *hemahema*, awkward, in his native tongue.

After an evening spent reminiscing together about people they knew and singing the songs of the places they knew, Liwai invited Baker, and his ukulele, to his home. There Liwai's Maohi friends and family hosted Baker, plying him with food and asking him questions about Hawai'i. Baker again turned to his ukulele and Hawaiian repertoire to add to the celebrations, much to the joy of his audience, who claimed they had never heard such music before. His Maohi hosts sang Baker "an old Polapola song," a bawdy song similar to the *kolohe* music Hawaiians often sang amongst themselves, leading Baker to comment, "They really believe that I am a Polapola and this is my birthplace."<sup>27</sup>

The welcomes that Baker received from these two very different groups of Maohi, the Salmon clan and the relations of Hawaiian immigrants, help illustrate one of the major themes of Baker's work, the existing networks of connections between Hawai'i and other Islanders. Their cultural and geographic closeness allowed for the development of a longstanding tradition of immigration between Hawai'i and the Society Islands. This immigration and associated travel between the islands, like that of the *keiki mu'umu'u*, Baker, or his mother a generation earlier, created various personal networks between the

---

<sup>27</sup> Baker, "Mai Ka Ano Mamao Mai (1)"; Baker, "Mai Ka Ano Mamao Mai (2)." Following more recent conventions this paper will refer to Society Islanders by the broad term Maohi, rather than by their island of origin. Baker follows a Hawaiian convention of the time, recognizing the Islands by their names but refers to most Maohi people and traits as "Polapola," or Boraboran, after the island of Borabora.



two groups. The existence of such networks and Baker's discussions of them humanized the connections between Hawai'i and Tahiti. The idea of a community of Hawaiians living in Tahiti, particularly Hawaiians with ties to Hawai'i Island, brought the two lands closer together in the minds of Baker's Hawai'i Island readers. Rather than presenting Tahiti as a far off land or a strange land, Baker presented it as the land Kailianu's son Liwai lives in. The incorporation of those Hawaiians into Maohi society and the creation of large Maohi/Hawaiian families brought the two even closer together, calling upon the importance of extended relations in the Hawaiian consciousness. The same can be said for Baker's accounts of searching out his own Tahitian relatives, particularly his emotional retelling of finally finding his family and being presented with mats and other household goods, proof of their acceptance of his claims to kinship and the right to reside among them as family.

Though Hawai'i had a much longer history of immigration to Tahiti, Baker ran into Hawaiians in other places as well. In addition to meeting Alapai in Rarotonga, Baker also learned from Queen Makea that many Hawaiians had visited or immigrated to Rarotonga in the past, and that the voices of part-Hawaiians echoed throughout her land. In Sāmoa he met a former Hilo resident named Coaster and a *kanaka* of Ni'ihau named Kaomea. Even in New Zealand, where far fewer Hawaiians had ever visited, let alone immigrated, he found connections to Hawai'i, including an elderly *pākeha* woman in search of news of her family in Hilo. When Maui Pomare discussed visiting Hawai'i some time earlier, he and Baker found that the two had several mutual acquaintances in Honolulu. In Gisborne, his interviewer also asked Baker about Prince Kūhiō, who had visited a few years earlier. In each case the personal networks and connections not only

eased Baker's transition into the place he visited, but strengthened and humanized the mental connections he was creating for his readership.<sup>28</sup>

Baker's welcome in Tahiti also illustrates the importance Baker placed on the cultural similarities between Hawaiians and other islanders as a basis for some form of solidarity. Baker made his strongest and most persistent arguments for cultural similarities with regards to Polynesian conceptions of hospitality and generosity. As a traveler it should be no surprise that Baker placed a high value on generosity and hospitality, but his articles make it clear that he valued them as explicitly Polynesian values which Native Hawaiians shared with the Māori, Maohi, Samoans, Tongans, and Fijians. In Tahiti, for instance, when feasted by Liwai's Maohi neighbors and family, he commented:

These are a good people, like us Hawaiians, an open bowl and an open gourd....Much like our parties/meals, standing and offering the bottle before eating, saying, here is the food, it has been prepared...eat and drink without unease, and talk together with our happiness on meeting together...[they are] no different from us.

Being a nationalist, however, and writing to a nationalist audience, he felt the need to add, "still the saying of Kapu [remains], Maui no ka oi, and of [Kalākaua], Hawaii no ka oi."<sup>29</sup>

Baker's emphasis on Polynesian hospitality remained prominent in his visits to other lands as well. When discussing the Māori he had met in and leaving Auckland, Baker commented on their similarities to Native Hawaiians:

---

<sup>28</sup> Baker, "Mai Ka Ano Mamao Mai (7)"; Baker, "Mai Ka Ano Mamao Mai (8)"; Baker, "Mai Ka Ano Mamao Mai (12)"; Baker, "Mai Ka Ano Mamao Mai (13)"; "He Manuhiri No Hawaii."

<sup>29</sup> "Maui nō ka 'oi," is a famous saying of the Maui people, Maui excels[over all]. Kalākaua, being a descendent of Hawai'i Island *ali'i* and *Mō'i* of the Hawaiian Kingdom, instead proclaimed "Hawai'i nō ka 'oi." Baker, "Mai Ka Ano Mamao Mai (1)"; Baker, "Mai Ka Ano Mamao Mai (2)."

A pleasant people, full of aloha...[they are] no different from us, the generosity, the dissoluteness, the hospitality, the care of some people, and the reckless spending of some, these complain and sit collected in one place to chat day and night, some are well supplied and really well off, and some are destitute and some people are drunks, men and women.

While obviously some of the things Baker found familiar about the Māori were negatives often associated with colonized peoples, the dissoluteness and drinking, for instance, he again emphasized hospitality and generosity as shared features of Native Hawaiians and other islanders.<sup>30</sup>

The Māori also presented Baker with gifts nearly everywhere he went, which Baker took care to point out in his letters. The Māori at Rotorua gave him numerous gifts and the sister of Maui Pomare presented him with a watch chain made of gold and *pounamu*, greenstone. Tuwake of Hokianga presented him with a *pounamu* ornament of his ancestors and members of his family even offered Baker land if he wished to settle among them. Ngawini Yates not only presented Baker with gifts, including a *pounamu* carved by her ancestors, but also instructed other members of the community to do so as well. In an interview Baker gave upon returning to Hilo, Baker also noted the number of other Māori had given him gifts in Wellington. He told the interviewer:

It was embarrassing on one occasion, for I was presented with three beautiful pieces of New Zealand greenstone. They were family heirlooms and were of unknown age. I refused to take them saying that it was too much but they insisted, saying that I was the first man from the old home of their ancestors that they had ever seen and that I must take the stones.<sup>31</sup>

Though Baker spent very little time in Tonga, and noted little about the Tongan people themselves other than their physical beauty and a general disregard for headwear,

---

<sup>30</sup> Baker, “Mai Ka Ano Mamao Mai (7).”

<sup>31</sup> Baker, “Mai Ka Ano Mamao Mai (10)”; Baker, “Mai Ka Ano Mamao Mai (12)”; Baker, “Mai Ka Ano Mamao Mai (16)”; “He Manuhiri No Hawaii.”

he presented the King's willingness to meet with him as another example of the hospitality of the southern islanders. Among the Samoans, he noted several differences between them and the Hawaiians, but noted that in their pleasantness and generosity they were much alike. As with the Tongans, this was one of the few things he had to say about the Samoans. He had even less to say about the Fijians, though he noted that they were also a pleasant people, contrasting them directly with the "unfriendliness" of the Indians, further promoting openness and generosity as explicitly Polynesian traits.<sup>32</sup>

Baker's emphasis on hospitality and friendliness among the people he met came not only from his desire to portray these as core Polynesian values, but more specifically as values that separated them from the *haole*. Among the Tahitians of Parawao, Baker proclaimed their cultural ties to the Hawaiians by saying, "You are truly good and thus so are we, we are one people, in our talking, in the way of eating, the living, the actions, all the things I have seen in the style of hosting, there is no separation between us, our way is this, a heart like yours is full of love." He then repeated a common Native Hawaiian complaint about *haole* failures to return Native hospitality, "many are the *haole* that come to us when destitute, cared for by the *kanaka*. Eat together, sleep together, and after these *haole* get rich, these *haole* are never seen again." By directly contrasting the generosity of the Hawaiians, and by extension the Maohi, with the greed and ingratitude of the *haole*, he presents the *haole* as possessing a horribly misguided value system and as deviants according to the norms of Polynesian civilization.<sup>33</sup>

Finally Baker received and reported on a heightened level of generosity, hospitality, and *aloha* between Polynesians, where the *malihini* quickly became 'ohana. Liwai's Maohi relations, for instance, embraced him so whole-heartedly because they

---

<sup>32</sup> Baker, "Mai Ka Ano Mamao Mai (13)."; Baker, "Mai Ka Ano Mamao Mai (15)."; Baker, "Mai Ka Ano Mamao Mai (17)."

<sup>33</sup> Baker, "Mai Ka Ano Mamao Mai (3)"; Baker, "Mai Ka Ano Mamao Mai (4)."

thought of him as one of their own, perhaps for his Tahitian blood, but also perhaps as a Native Hawaiian. Thus they shared the *kolohe* music with him, which was normally reserved for their own ears. The Māori embraced him as not just as a visitor, or even as kin, but according to a specific belief that Hawai'i was the Hawaiki that they originated from. They embraced him as the *iwi*<sup>34</sup> of their ancestors, and thus deserving of an especially warm welcome.<sup>35</sup>

This idea of a greater expectation of hospitality between Polynesians emerged again in Tonga, when Baker sought to meet with King George Tupou II. Baker overheard some *haole* from the ship referring to the Tongans as a lazy people, “and because of this talk I was hurt,” as he understood their comments about Tongans to be an insult to a kindred people and thus to himself. In addition to providing another example of *haole* disregard for those who provided them with hospitality, the incident also inspired Baker to seek out some Polynesian solidarity, and if possible to show up his fellow travelers. He declared that would seek an audience with the king, Tupou II, leading them to mock him, saying that even though he was a prominent individual, the king would not see him, as they had been informed he did not see tourists. Baker replied, “In your going to see [him], [the desire is based] not in the *aloha*, but, to sightsee and spectate, [but] mine is in the *aloha*, my skin and blood he will see as my calling card, for they are close to his.” The King did indeed meet with Baker, presenting him with an autographed picture and the grounds for silencing the *haole* visitors. Baker attributed his meeting with the Tongan King not to his status as a former member of Kalākaua’s court, though this likely helped, but as a Polynesian, bonded to the Tongans by kinship and history.<sup>36</sup>

---

<sup>34</sup> *Iwi*: bones, the most cherished part of the body, where the *mana* resided. In Maori it is also a word for clan/“tribe.”

<sup>35</sup> Baker, “Mai Ka Ano Mamao Mai (2)”;

<sup>36</sup> Baker, “Mai Ka Ano Mamao Mai (13).”

## Savai'i and Hawai'i: Land Claims

In addition to the people of Polynesia, Baker also developed a strong connection to the actual lands of Polynesia based on their similarities to Hawai'i. Off the coast of Savai'i Baker witnessed the eruption of Matavanu, a volcano in the Itu-o-tane districts Bush had visited some twenty years earlier. Watching the lava trailing down to the ocean and pouring over the cliffs and into the sea, he noted, "This is a worthwhile name for this island, Savaii-Hawai'i. Tears come to my eyes as a I looked out, it was like looking at Hilo, the hill Halai stands there, like the fiery veil on top of Mokuaweoweo and Kilauea, this is how the fire burns here." The reminder of Hawai'i Island brought back a flood of memories and loneliness to Baker, which in Tahiti and New Zealand he had escaped by the company of the Maohi and Māori. Aboard the ship, looking out at the lava flows, however, Baker began to reminisce:

[I am] reminded of Waimea, and I thought of the two of us covered in the fog and on top of that seeing the forests of Mahiki...to deposit the bones of the one I love...and I begin to sing, softly, with a sleeping spirit, with loving tears:

How will this cold end, that we two meet and pulse inside of,  
Oh you and I, oh the embrace of the cold,  
Oh to see these things that I see.

I unfastened my watch with the image [of Ululani] and searched the uplands. I know some stupid things I have done, oh the love, forgetting the good thoughts. I looked to the mountains and the fog was done, and the banks of clouds were bunching below the forest like the uplands of Kapaukea and Kukuikomo. I thought of the places I went with this most loving and beloved woman.<sup>37</sup>

In addition to providing a focus for his grief, Baker's equating of Savai'i and Hawai'i was also a descriptive and rhetorical trick he frequently employed. Baker often

---

<sup>37</sup> Baker, "Mai Ka Ano Mamao Mai (14)."

described the lands he visited by equating them with areas in Hawai'i. In his initial description of Papeete, for instance, he told his readers "If you think of the view from Hakalau to Papeekeo [on the Hamakua coast], then it is like the island of Hawai'i, progressing through the districts until you arrive at Hilo Bay. There is a lagoon to the south like Keahua...It is hot like Kawaihae, if not Kona perhaps, and the living is like Lahaina in all ways." The isthmus of Parawao, he compared to "Kamaomao, broad, desolate [of people], and green with growth." Tonga had "the placing of Niihau, spread out." The island of "Nuapou," likely Niuafo'ou, the northernmost island of the Kingdom of Tonga, he described as being like Kaho'olawe, a small island isolated from the sea by cliffs, but like Puna on top, "the coconuts and the hills, at one place it is like going to Makuu, at another Kamalii and the trip on the smooth lava of Malama." The Fijian archipelago he described as, "Mountainous lands, like Keanae on Maui." In some cases he used Hawaiian places to help his reader understand the cultural significance rather than physical features of a place. "Waharapa," for instance, he described as a meeting place for Māori chiefs, equating it with Kualoa, then telling a tale that reinforced the cultural significance of Kualoa.<sup>38</sup>

The use of Hawaiian lands to describe other Polynesian lands worked to connect Baker and his readers to those lands and their peoples on several levels. In part it was a simple descriptive shortcut, allowing him to use known locations to paint a picture for his readership without describing either location in detail. Yet this also presented his audience with a sense of comfort and familiarity with those lands, merging them with the lands they grew up in. Had Baker described them in opposition to Hawai'i, highlighting only the geographic differences between Hawai'i and the rest of Polynesia, the effect would have been far different, creating mental barriers for his readers rather than bridges.

---

<sup>38</sup> Baker, "Mai Ka Ano Mamao Mai (1)"; Baker, "Mai Ka Ano Mamao Mai (3)"; Baker, "Mai Ka Ano Mamao Mai (14)"; Baker, "Mai Ka Ano Mamao Mai (15)."

Yet this rhetorical equating of lands also had a more specific Polynesian context to it. In connecting the lands he visited to the lands of Hawai‘i, Baker called upon *aloha ‘āina*, the spiritual and symbolic connection Native Hawaiians had to the lands of Hawai‘i, as well as the specific emotional and cultural connotations associated with specific places. In Polynesian societies, the continuity provided by the *‘āina* in stories such as the one he retold about Kualoa served to connect the present and the past through the continuity of the land; as long as the land was there, the history of the *lāhui* remained vital and relevant. At the same time that history reiterated the deep spiritual and cultural connections between the land and the *lāhui*; as long as the *lāhui* remembered their history, their *aloha ‘āina* would remain vital and relevant as well. In using Hawaiian lands as a rhetorical stand in for other Polynesian lands Baker transferred some of this *aloha ‘āina* to those other lands, making them more “real” in the hearts of he and his readers just as the physical descriptions made them more real in their minds. Nowhere is this truer than in his tearful equation of Savai‘i with Hawai‘i, and the transference of his emotional bonds from that land to its Samoan counterpart.

### **The Haka Meets the Hula at Lake Rotorua**

In what still proves to be a common theme among Polynesians today, Baker also used the exchange of dance and music to cement bonds with his hosts and to illustrate those bonds to his readers. Nowhere did this prove truer than among the Māori at Rotorua. After arriving in Auckland, Baker headed for Rotorua, a North Island city on the lake of the same name. Rotorua hosted a number of tourist attractions centered on the area’s geothermal activity, including geysers, hot springs, and mud pools. Even the 1886 eruption of Tarawera, a nearby volcano, which killed 150 people and destroyed a number of homes and attractions, did little to interrupt the tourist trade over the long term. Baker wrote that he and about 15 others went to the nearby village of Whakarewarewa



specifically to see “the hula of the Māori people,” already an established art of the region’s tourist attractions. There he described a “Hula Poe,” the women’s dance performed with *poi*, small lightweight bags twirled in dance and struck as percussive accompaniment, a style that some Hawaiian hula dancers would incorporate later in the twentieth century. Though he enjoyed their hula, he noted with a mix of cultural bias and the critical eye of a fellow practitioner, “They have not caught Hawai’i in the excellence, they are in the middle, they are not like, perhaps, the *niniu* [dizzy spinning] Molokai or the *poahi* [spinning] Lanai.”<sup>39</sup>

While Baker was walking around Whakarewarewa, the Māori dancers began to speak to him in Māori, and they reacted with some great surprise when he replied that he was not a Māori but a Hawaiian. They greeted him with great *aloha*, for as they told him, “From Hawai’i are the bones of the ancestors.” Following on this idea of kinship and similarity, Baker reported that:

Their faces are like ours, the face is heavy, and thus are theirs, and when a song sung to them in the aloha, then they are crying the tears of the old people, man and woman, the posture of the body is like ours...In the bearing of the bodies and the faces we are very alike. There is no little thing that one fails to recognize.

The dancers then insisted that he dance and sing for them in the Hawaiian style, a task he was always eager to undertake.<sup>40</sup>

The next day Baker went to nearby Rotomahana, another lake, and spent the day witnessing more geothermal wonders, before returning to the hotel around 5:30. While he was gone, news of the Hawaiian visitor traveled through the Māori community around Rotorua. No sooner had he returned to his hotel when a messenger fetched him and took him to a structure on the lakeside, which he described as an *aupuni*-built community

---

<sup>39</sup> Baker, “Mai Ka Ano Mamao Mai (9).”

<sup>40</sup> Ibid.

center covered in carvings of “men and women with their tongues hanging out.” He noted that the Māori were fond of wood carving, putting him in mind of a famous *ali‘i*, Lualī‘i, who was known for his obsession with carving images into all manner of wooden implements. “They are not satisfied without engraving the face from the forehead and the cheeks, to the lips and the nose,” he wrote, “It is truly ugly for us to look at, to them [the images] are pretty.”<sup>41</sup>

As with the evening before at Whakarewarewa, the Māori women performed the “Hula Poe,” though this time the men also danced what Baker described as the “Hula Hakalewalewa [Whakarewarewa], a hula for rising the anger and preparing for war...a way of instilling fear, unleashing the tongue of this one and that one, and flaring the eyes.” After the hula the Māori told him of their happiness in meeting with, “the *alii* of the bones of their *kupuna*, [stating] that we are the same, them and the people of the Hawaiian Islands, and to come and see them and so forth.” They then requested that Baker show them, “the Hawaiian ways,” and he in return danced and sang for them, answering their questions about Hawai‘i and returning their aloha. He did not return to the hotel until midnight.<sup>42</sup>

As the next day was a Sunday, Baker went down to the shore to pray before breakfasting with the local Māori on foods cooked with geothermal heat, including fresh water shrimp similar to the Hawaiian *‘ōpae ‘oeha‘a*, which the Māori call *koura*. While breakfasting he heard the popular story of Hinemoa and Tutanekai, noting its close resemblance to the *mo‘olelo* of Ka‘ililauokekoa, both featuring lovers separated by their families but united through the sound of the flute. He then attended an Anglican service before going to the compound of “Laniwili,” an elderly *ariki*, which soon crowded over with people. A Māori woman welcomed Baker with a chant, likely a *karanga*, a

---

<sup>41</sup> Baker, “Mai Ka Ano Mamao Mai (10).”

<sup>42</sup> Ibid.

summoning or welcome chant to bring visitors into a *marae*. Baker could not understand the words, but understood the meaning and intent, describing the chant as being, “like what we were accustomed to when the rulers traveled around the island, and in the places they visited the people crowded and called their name.” Remembering his beloved patron Kalākaua, Baker began to tear up somewhat, though he remained still until the chanting was completed, then moved forward and greeted each of the sixty or so people there before entering Laniwale’s home.<sup>43</sup>

Baker identified the house as being “of the old style...73 years old, clean and pretty inside.” He described the various carvings, noting again the Māori love for woodcarving, but this time adding, “I think in the old times, in our buildings, the *ea* [air/sovereignty/life] was sweet, and that is how it is here.” For the third night in a row, *hula* and *haka* were exchanged. Different groups of Māori danced, with the women performing a dance Baker described as having, “nothing fun or pretty about it, flaring the eyes and sticking out the tongue.” Though not entirely in agreement with Māori performance aesthetics, Baker understood the importance of showing his appreciation for the dancing, writing, “the good and *pono* [balanced/correct] thing to do is clap and cry out applause, with many pleasant words, because [if one lets out] a laugh, these people are listening.” More men’s and women’s dances followed, the women with tattooed lips Baker described as “deep blue, a thing of beauty.”<sup>44</sup>

During speeches by Laniwili, his sister, and his grandson, Māori again stated their happiness at meeting with a Hawaiian, and a prominent Hawaiian at that, declaring their love for their ancestors and the land they had come from. Baker then spoke, accepting their hospitality and thanking them for it, both sides affirming it as “a gift given completely, with no thought of tomorrow.” As everyone sat down for the feast that had

---

<sup>43</sup> Ibid.

<sup>44</sup> Ibid.

been prepared, the Māori again insisted on seeing and hearing the music and hula of Hawai'i, which Baker gladly obliged to, recalling that his audience "all died in the happiness and fun." The sister of Laniwili presented Baker with her *pa'u*, or wrap, stating, "you are one of our people, what are you to me? You are a brother of mine." She then presented him with a *taro* and a *kumara*, the taro and the sweet potato, and asked him to send back a Hawaiian *kalo* slip and a '*uala*<sup>45</sup> when he returned home.<sup>46</sup>

As mentioned above one of the major themes of Baker's writing were the ties between Polynesian peoples, a multitude of which he described at Rotorua, including hospitality, physical similarities, similar *mo'olelo*, and similar mannerisms. His experience at Rotorua, however, also highlighted the important role of cultural exchanges in strengthening and validating these bonds. On the first day Baker witnessed the Māori dance as what seemed to be a form of tourist spectacle, though he does not specify if the audience was made up of *pākeha*, Māori, or both. Due to the nature of the tourist industry, which Rotorua and Whakarewarewa were early sites for, and the lack of any response by Māori tourists to the Hawaiian in their midst, the dance was likely offered as a form of exotic spectacle for *pākeha*. The emphasis on the relatively gentle, feminine poi-ball dancing also hints at a *pākeha* tourist crowd.<sup>47</sup>

Baker's description, however, is not really one of a spectator witnessing an exotic event, rather he describes the "hula" of the Māori as a critic and practitioner witnessing a new form of his own art. His descriptions of the Māori dancing focused specifically on details that differentiated Māori and Hawaiian dance, from the flaring of the eyes and unleashing of the tongues, to the way that the women's arms moved during the dance. He

---

<sup>45</sup> '*Uala*: The Hawaiian pronunciation of *kumara*.

<sup>46</sup> Baker, "Mai Ka Ano Mamao Mai (10)." There is no record of whether or not Baker ever sent such gifts back, though Baker in general was known for his honesty and of being a man of his word. It also seems out of character for him to would violate the *aloha* and generosity of his hosts by not returning the gifts.

<sup>47</sup> Baker, "Mai Ka Ano Mamao Mai (2)"; Baker, "Mai Ka Ano Mamao Mai (10)."

also noted the existence of parting chant and dance, as in Hawai'i. Similarly, upon learning that Baker was a Hawaiian, the Māori performers were not just excited to meet him, but also wished to see and hear Hawaiian dance and music. Like Baker they were interested in witnessing a new form of a shared art, turning the event from a tourist spectacle to an exchange between practitioners.<sup>48</sup> It is not known, however, if like Baker, they secretly assured themselves of the superiority of their own styles, and thus the superiority of their own culture within the broader family of Polynesian cultures.<sup>49</sup>

But the *hula* and *haka* were not just variations of a shared art form, they were variations of an art that had deep cultural significance for both Hawaiians and Māori. Hawaiians traditionally used *hula* to celebrate and honor gods, *ali'i*, heroes, places, and events. It provided entertainment, but also preserved knowledge, helped mark and maintain regional, familial, and factional identities, and created, maintained, and sometimes bridged the boundaries between the sacred and the profane. For generations *hula* provided a cultural standard of beauty and elegance, of artistic and physical perfection. As noted in previous chapters, after the overthrow of the *kapu* system and the ascension of *hula*-hating neo-Calvinist theology, Hawaiians also used *hula* to mark their independence from the missionaries, particularly in the courts of Boki, Liliha, and the young Kamehameha III. The tradition continued in the “private” funerary performances of the later Kamehameha’s and the full-scale revival under Kalākaua and Lili‘uokalani. Though commonly thought of as war dances by non-Māori, *haka* played a similarly diverse role in Māori culture, welcoming guests to *marae*, preserving cultural knowledge and values, and marking shared ancestral identities.

---

<sup>48</sup> Later exchanges around Polynesian dance led to innovation in dance around the Pacific. Other Hawaiians, for instance, later picked up Māori poi balls and Kiribati grass skirts as props for *hula*, while Hawaiian gestures and music have had an impact on dance styles around the Pacific.

<sup>49</sup> Baker, “Mai Ka Ano Mamao Mai (10).”

Thus the exchange of *hula* and *haka* were not just exchanges between artists, but also exchanges between cultural practitioners, who expected one another to be able to read some of the significance between the exchanges. Through their dances they were telling each other who they were and who their people were, but more importantly, they were signaling who they were in relation to each other. While the dances of the Hawaiians and the Māori were clearly different styles, they shared enough, in significance, form, and intent, to help cement the bonds between the two peoples. They brought Baker closer to his Māori hosts, providing a medium to act upon pre-existing expectations of Polynesian kinship, as well as providing each side with an entertaining and novel version of a deeply valued art. In addition, in both Hawai'i and Aotearoa the Native people and their respective *haole* or *pākeha* guests, settlers, and occupiers, used Native participation and commitment to Polynesian dance to define the line between Native and foreigner. The embrace of one another's dances as part of the same cultural family united Māori and Hawaiian in a way that by long historical precedent also separated them from the *haole* and *pākeha*.

Similar incidents of dance-and-music-based cultural exchange also occurred in Tahiti and Rarotonga. Baker described the Tahitian dancing he witnessed, specifically at the Salmon's and the celebration at Liwai's house, as different than the Hawaiian. He wrote:

They release till all fuel is consumed and Kanualewa [the oscillating multitude] is reached and they are like the dog, free of the earth, and then rise and shake the dust from them, a shaking of the body, a wink of the eyes is our parting gesture, they do not do a parting chant here.

The Maohi, he wrote, were clever in their dancing, but still not the equal of Maui's similarly energetic dancers. Like the Māori, the Maohi also encouraged him to dance and sing, asking him if the Hawaiian hula was the same as theirs, and if not, what was the

Hawaiian style. Once again Baker's performance and their interest in Hawaiian style and forms transformed the event into a cultural exchange, pulling the two peoples closer together despite the significant differences in their performances.<sup>50</sup>

Music and song, sometimes as an accompaniment to dance and sometimes not, provided a similar medium or cultural exchange. In Tahiti Baker relied heavily on his *ukulele* to provide accompaniment for his contemporary renditions of Hawaiian music. In some cases his hosts returned the sentiment with their own music, including the bawdy Boraboran song in Tahiti. Thus this music, like the hula, was not only an expression of Baker's own love for Hawaiian music, but an attempt to use that music to connect to other islanders, to create cultural bonds that built upon the shared values of hospitality, generosity, and *le'ale'a*, pleasure seeking. This included learning their own songs, including the Borabora song and at least one *Māori* song that he played a number of times, though he wished he had the opportunity to learn more.<sup>51</sup>

Baker's time in Rotorua also illustrates another feature of both pan-Pacific connections and Baker's trip, which is the importance of specific historical connections between island groups in establishing contemporary ones. Just as Kalākaua and Bush had once emphasized specific ties between Hawai'i and Sāmoa, namely genealogies and oral histories, the Māori found Baker's presence especially gratifying not just as he was a Polynesian, but because they believed Hawai'i to be Hawaiki, the homeland of the Māori people. The number of carved *pounamu* various Māori presented him with, often pieces handed down from their ancestors, also spoke in several ways to the importance of Hawaiki in the Māori cultural geography. Not only were such items among the most revered and valuable items in Māori culture, but they also had a specific tie to Hawaiki.

---

<sup>50</sup> Baker, "Mai Ka Ano Mamao Mai (2)."

<sup>51</sup> Baker, "Mai Ka Ano Mamao Mai (1)"; Baker, "Mai Ka Ano Mamao Mai (2)"; "Colonel Baker's Grand Time in the South Seas."

According to some traditions, a man from Hawaiki, Ngahue, went to Aotearoa, where he found *pounamu*. Taking a large chunk back with him he fashioned axes with which he built one of the fleets of canoes that brought the Māori to Aotearoa. Thus they were not only giving him items of value, but giving him items associated with visitors from Hawaiki and known to establish a bond between those lands and Aotearoa.<sup>52</sup>

Though in his Gisborne interview Baker argued that Hawaiians and Māori likely had shared roots in the central Pacific, Baker was still willing to let Hawai'i's place in the Māori worldview smooth his passage into the Māori community, just as the contemporary history of connections between Tahiti and Hawai'i had done earlier in the trip. Thus while some connections could be made between any island group and Hawai'i, the specifics of those connections and how they were viewed by the local people also determined the tenor of the initial welcome Baker received.<sup>53</sup>

Once his status as a Hawaiki, or just as a Hawaiian elsewhere in the Pacific, had established his welcome, of course, Baker's charm and *'olu'olu* demeanor typically helped secure his continued welcome. No less important, however, was that Baker conducted himself in a way that was *pono*, allowing other Polynesians to recognize him as a variation of themselves at the same time he was recognizing them as a variation of himself. Though unfamiliar with local customs and languages, he was familiar enough with Polynesian ideas of propriety and respect to comprehend the general mood and improvise his specific actions, recognizing and honoring elders and persons of *mana*, when to laugh, when to cry out, and when to remain silent and respectful. He was generous with his time, his person, and his *aloha*, even if "stingy" with his money at home. But, perhaps most importantly he was generous with his expansive historical

---

<sup>52</sup> Maui John; Mitchell Mitchell, Hillary, *Te Tau Ihu O Te Waka: A History of Maori of Nelson and Marlborough* (Wellington: Huia Publishers, 2004), 22.

<sup>53</sup> "He Manuhiri No Hawaii."



knowledge, song, *hula*, and genealogy and was thus a person of importance in Polynesian culture as a producer and holder of knowledge.

### **Poroi's Complaint: Greed and Sufficiency**

Beyond cultural exchanges and hospitality, Baker also attempted to delve deeper into how other Polynesians understood and navigated life under empire, an examination informed and driven by the personal and collective struggles of the *lāhui* at home. One of the biggest issues for many Native Hawaiians, as discussed in the previous chapter, was their economic future. Baker, both as a businessman and a concerned Hawaiian, believed in the importance of increasing Native economic initiative in preserving the future of the *lāhui*. Thus on his voyage he searched constantly for economic opportunities and lessons that could enrich himself and the *lāhui* while weakening the stranglehold the plantations held on Hawai'i's land, politics, and economy. Yet the experience of living under American occupation, the loss of Native Hawaiian sovereignty, and the effort to seek out, develop, and promote ties between Native Hawaiians and other Polynesians made Baker far more receptive to critiques of capitalism based on Polynesian cultural norms and history. While he continued to promote Native capitalist initiative, his experiences while traveling forced him to reevaluate economic "development," promoting it as a necessary but dangerous tool under colonization rather than as an inherently positive agenda in and of itself. He also took such critiques and applied them to a broader critique of colonization, empire, and land dispossession as signs of *haole* moral and cultural deviancy under Polynesian norms rather than Polynesian economic and political incompetence under Euro/American ones.

The time Baker spent in the Parawao region of Tahiti proved particularly important in bringing him to question some of his underlying economic beliefs, both regarding the situation in Hawai'i and about the Pacific in general. Baker spent several

days there with Poroi, a French/Maohi *ari'i* whose family came from Borabora, but who had close ties to and lands in the area. A low broad plane, Parawao lay between Tahiti's two mountainous regions, with rich soil, the tropical sun, and more than sufficient rainfall, it was lush and green even by Tahitian standards. Baker noted its lushness and expressed surprise at the lack of agricultural development. There was some commercial development, namely a few minor coconut plantations under *haole* direction, but for the most part the Maohi stuck with a subsistence plus agricultural model. They grew traditional and imported food crops to survive and depended on small cash crops, mostly vanilla and a bit of copra, to provide any wants or needs beyond what they could grow themselves.<sup>54</sup>

The raising of vanilla piqued Baker's interest, as it seemed to contrast both with the traditional Maohi agriculture, and the developed plantation economy of Hawai'i. Baker often investigated different kinds of land use, such as sheepherding in Australia, flax production in Rotorua, and copra throughout the Pacific, all of which he was interested in as alternative agricultural exports for Hawai'i. In addition to hoping to diversify Hawai'i's agriculture, Baker also felt, with great justification, that sugar left little room for small farmers and planters, and indeed provided far too much risk. By its nature sugar was a capital-intensive crop. Comparing it to vanilla, Baker argued that sugar required massive amounts of start-up capital for the cuttings, planting, pulling, milling, and refining before any profit could be realized. Small farmers had to borrow money to plant cane, putting their land up for collateral, and living a bad crop or two away from losing their land to one of the large plantations with the money to weather the volatile market. Living in Hilo, Baker had seen this cycle repeating itself over and over again, and considered it a trap for the small landowner.<sup>55</sup>

---

<sup>54</sup> Baker, "Mai Ka Ano Mamao Mai (3)."

<sup>55</sup> Ibid.

In Baker's mind vanilla, as grown in Parawao, held far more promise for small-scale Native farmers. Though labor intensive, it required minimal financial investment, needing only forestlands, knowledge, and cuttings, which could be had cheap, unlike cane cuttings. As with copra, Tahitians could grow small quantities of vanilla and exchange the dried beans for cash or goods from local stores and traders, who collected and resold them in bulk. Few if any Maohi in Parawao produced enough copra or vanilla to live off of, but it provided enough of a supplement to their food crops to furnish them with a limited number of needed or desired consumer goods without placing the ownership of their lands at risk. By keeping their demands minimal they lived alongside the cash economy rather than under it.<sup>56</sup>

This subsistence-plus agriculture, as well as any other agriculture, required some form of control over the land. In Hawai'i the sugar economy promoted the centralization of land in the hands of large plantation owners, often with heavy financial backing from the mainland. In Tahiti, Baker claimed, competing land claims and French colonial policies created a less-friendly environment for such large acquisitions and the accompanying removal of land from Native peoples. Judging by the very existence of massive undeveloped stretches of arable land, which were no longer available in Hawai'i, there seems to be some truth in Baker's statement. Baker wrote, "their lands, none of them sell, but they rent. They can not sell, because it is not administered, you sell to someone and someone else does not agree, you are headed towards a fight." More importantly, however, he noted that the people of Parawao, and many Maohi in general, had little interest in expanding their entanglements with the market economy, either as planters or as labor. He wrote of them:

---

<sup>56</sup> Ibid.

They do not have a great desire for the dollar and they will not work for wages...The foundation of the *kamaaina* is not to labor [for others], because they are the land, the land is theirs to work, to plant, and to take for sale for a few dimes and please the body. They are sufficient in things to eat.<sup>57</sup>

Despite seeing, quite clearly, that the people of Parawao were content with a subsistence-plus lifestyle, Baker, the Lahainaluna graduate and businessman, could not understand why they did not pursue more development, why they lacked the Hawaiians *akenui*, great desire, for money and development. He asked Poroi, “Why do you not *akenui* the dollar to get all manner of goods?” Poroi laughed and replied:

You [Hawaiians] have many dollars and progress...and are you not slaves and servants for the dollars? Perhaps you do not rest, perhaps your lands go to the haole in the *akenui* of yours for the dollar...For us here, ours is a life of comfort.

God provided us and perhaps you also, the banana, growing and flowering, and thus goes the year, the taro growing for you to fetch as you can, here is the yam, and there is the breadfruit, three different types, and all these types of plants mature sometime. Therefore, why overburden and ruin your body for the dollar, for what reason? It is *lawa* [sufficient/satisfactory] to have some convenient money.<sup>58</sup>

Poroi then told Baker a local parable. A man of Parawao lived in a large barrel, which he always kept turned towards the sun. Word of the curious man spread through Parawao until it reached the *ari'i*. Concerned and perhaps a little embarrassed that a man might be living under such conditions in his domain, the *ari'i* went to investigate. Upon seeing the man lying in his barrel, he approached, called out a greeting, and asked “What can I do for you? I will hire you to work for me.” The man replied, “Greetings to the *alii*, May you live long. All that I want to ask from you, the *alii*, is that you remove yourself

---

<sup>57</sup> Ibid.

<sup>58</sup> Ibid.

from the mouth of my barrel, because you are blocking the radiance of the sun, and that is my desire.” Poroi continued by saying:

This is how you folks are, you have seen the power of the dollar to block the glory of relaxing and seeing the Lord, and you are in the darkness, the worship of this other god, the dollar, your god, that is where all your thought is. But perhaps this way is coming to us here, only God knows, this is his role.<sup>59</sup>

Baker, though chastised, was rarely one to be at a loss for words. He thanked Poroi for his wisdom and agreed with his analysis, then repeated the standard Hawaiian line about the rest of the Pacific, that the Maohi were what the Hawaiians had once been forty-five years earlier. This time, however, he framed Hawaiian “progress” the same way Poroi did, arguing that Hawaiians had wrongly abandoned “the *lawa* living of [our] grandparents, living free and being a truly religious people.” Continuing the religious tone of the conversation he told of a prayer his grandmother would say over him every night, asking that he would not grow up to be so poor as to be a beggar or a thief, but not so wealthy that he would forget the Lord. He continued by saying that the problem was that the Hawaiians had been led astray by their teachers, the missionaries, who then abused Native trust for their own profit. It was they who told the Hawaiians to stop burying their wealth in the land, then seized the lands and the wealth inside of it. It was also they who told the Hawaiians to stop caring for their weapons of war, then snatched the islands by arms after the Hawaiians who knew the ways of war had all expired. He expressed the anger and sense of betrayal that many Hawaiians felt at having supported and aided *haole* who came to Hawai'i destitute and poor, only to be turned out once those *haole* achieved success. Still he felt that this generosity, which had been so often

---

<sup>59</sup> Ibid.

betrayed, was an essential and meaningful part of the Hawaiian character, ending by saying simply, “Auwe, that is how we are.”<sup>60</sup>

The incident at Parawao illustrated an issue that Baker and other many other Hawaiians seemed genuinely conflicted about, the cultural valuation of economic desire. Many perceived of (at least) two separate visions of economic desire and wealth acquisition competing for dominance in the Pacific. In the capitalist vision, which Baker associated with the *haole*, the acquisition and hoarding of wealth was a virtue in itself. In this way of seeing the world, the *haole* in Hawai'i and the Pacific were doing the correct thing in making the Pacific “productive,” mainly through plantations. The common *haole* extension of this argument was that Native peoples were simply too lazy or feeble to take such steps, necessitating *haole* intervention. In the vision promoted by Poroi and Baker's grandmother, the acquisition of wealth beyond the physical and social needs of the family or community was a wasteful pursuit that placed unneeded stress and dangers on the individual and the group. It was based not on need, or even on *ake*, desire or longing, but on *akenui*, great longing, something that dominated the mind and blocked other thoughts and emotions from coming to the surface. The proper way to live was to produce enough to ensure that one was secure and a bit of surplus to acquire a few necessary or desired goods that it was not feasible to produce by one's self. Thus the *akenui* of the *haole* for wealth was disruptive and *hewa*, a threat to themselves and those around them.

Contrary to *haole* opinion of the time, Polynesians in general and Native Hawaiians specifically had no cultural aversion to work. Before and after contact with Europe and America, Native Hawaiians valued the willingness to labor for the needs of one's self, family, community, or patron. The idle and lazy, those who would not work to provide for themselves and those around them were the subject of cultural derision. But the Hawaiian lifestyle was a labor intensive one as is. Once a person worked enough to

---

<sup>60</sup> Ibid; Baker, “Mai Ka Ano Mamao Mai (4).”

be well supplied, then it was thought that they should be satisfied, or *lawa*, with what they had. This is part of the reason few Native Hawaiians saw much benefit in adding to their workload in order to satisfy artificial material desires introduced by the *haole*, or at least until the missionaries and traders began to develop such desire as proper and *na'auao*. Baker, whose home and attire were among the most fashionable in Hilo, proved the success of such campaigns. Even after a century of exposure to capitalism, however, Native Hawaiians still maintained a strong cultural aversion to greed, of the accumulation of wealth as an end in and of itself. Such desire invited stinginess, which conflicted with the ideals of hospitality and generosity that Baker celebrated so thoroughly, of having an open bowl and an open table. Thus in rhetorically redefining Baker's desire for commercial development as greed, Poro'i called into question the viability of maintaining these deep-rooted cultural values in a cash-based agricultural economy.

Furthermore Poro'i clearly struck home with his comments on the loss of freedom resulting from greed, of Hawaiians becoming "servants and slaves" in their own land. While Baker also argued that *haole* failure to understand sufficiency led to their desire to seize or acquire Islander lands on the macro and micro scale, Poro'i also made a very significant point about the role of Polynesian greed, and thus losing their understanding of sufficiency, in developing their ill fortunes. The Hawaiians, he argued, had learned to desire the dollar, and thus they sold or abandoned their lands and went to work as laborers for the *haole*. Without lands and dependent on others for their livelihood, they had become servants and slaves. This hit the very source of Native Hawaiian insecurity regarding the future of the *lāhui*, the very issue that consumed so much of Native Hawaiian energy at home.

The Parawao incident appeared to have a significant impact on Baker, as it was one of the few he reported in his interview in Hilo after he returned home. Both times he reported on the incident to his Hawaiian audience, in the letters and in the interview, he

portrayed Poroi's arguments as the clearly superior ones to his own pro-capitalist ones. He also recounted his grandma's prayers to the Māori newspaper in Gisborne, after saying that the Maohi were somewhat lazy, but that they were well supplied in terms of land and resources and thus could perhaps afford to be lazy. As his memories of his grandma and the writings of other Hawaiians of the time illustrate, the portrayal of capitalism as socially destructive greed was surely something that Baker had experienced before, and likely had some sympathy for despite his capitalist behavior and attitude. Yet something about Poroi's presentation of the issue stuck in Baker's mind and heart. Perhaps it was the power of his arguments, or simply witnessing first hand that such a cultural economic system could still work, or having heard the argument in the homeland of his grandfather, but for some reason it was Poroi that made him question his absolute dedication to capitalist ideals.<sup>61</sup>

Baker, as noted above, was a noted capitalist who lived an exceedingly "comfortable" life, and for the most part had few qualms with his personal desire for wealth. In his Gisborne interview Baker argued that his success came from two things, "plugging the holes in his pockets" and being constantly on the lookout for new economic opportunities, clearly following an ethos of economic desire closer to the capitalism of the missionaries than to that of the Maohi of Parawao. As noted in the last chapter, he even acquired something of a reputation as a "stingy alii" among other Hawaiians, including his relatives. To a point he even embraced his reputation for stinginess, playing upon it by writing of his friend Tuwake, "He was a rich and well situated man, like John Baker a man who takes care [of his wealth] and is even firmer in his stinginess than I am, and he lived well supplied. His wealth is from his stinginess." Furthermore, like many other prominent Native Hawaiians, Baker seemed to hold the

---

<sup>61</sup> Baker, "Mai Ka Ano Mamao Mai (3)"; Baker, "Mai Ka Ano Mamao Mai (4)"; "Colonel Baker's Grand Time in the South Seas."



opinion that under Hawai'i's current social and political regimes, individual economic success was the only route to the survival of the *lāhui*.<sup>62</sup>

Thus it should come as no surprise that throughout the rest of his trip Baker frequently reverted to seeing other Polynesians through western, capitalist lenses. Even after agreeing with Poroi at Parawao, he still frequently pointed out what he believed to be the laziness of Polynesians and their failures to seize economic opportunities. Before he left Tahiti he made several pointed comments to Tati Salmon about the lack of agricultural development in Tahiti, arguing that an enterprising Hawaiian could make a very comfortable life for himself by initiating projects the Maohi were too lazy to consider. He described the people of Rarotonga with the Hawaiian saying, "The husband is Sleepy-head, the woman is Gaze-about," denoting laziness and uselessness.

Even in these cases, however, he did so not as a way of propping up Native Hawaiian's as superior capitalists, but rather addressing what he saw as a shared need to take greater economic initiatives before their lands were bought out from under them. At the sawmill on the Hokianga he spoke to the crowd of Māori who gathered to hear him speak about a number of issues, but the only one he felt the need to report back to Hawai'i was their collective Polynesian laziness and lack of initiative. "If a land is farmed and cleared," he told the crowd, "it is a *haole*'s, and if it is cultivated in pieces, with chunks of forest remaining, then it is a Maori's. That is how we are in Hawai'i....And what is the reason we don't farm our lands?" The Māori replied that it was for lack of funds. "Then you wait to get the money then farm?" he asked, "from where is the dollar coming?" The Māori acknowledged they did not know where to raise such funds, to which Baker replied that they must put their shoulder to the grindstone, working whenever they had time off from their paid labor to clear such properties until they could live off their land

---

<sup>62</sup> Baker, "Mai Ka Ano Mamao Mai (15)"; Taylor, "Little Tales About Hawaii: J.T. Baker, Model for Kamehameha Statue Pt. 10."

(again) instead of living off the wages paid by the *pākeha*. While acknowledging the legitimacy and cultural validity of Poroi's points while in Parawao, he still felt that the threat of empire and especially settler colonialism required far more rigorous Native economic initiative in order for the various *lāhui* to survive in their own lands.<sup>63</sup>

Baker, however, limited his preaching about economic initiative largely to Native audiences. When speaking to *haole* he typically employed Poroi's critiques to fend off accusations of Polynesian laziness, even though they often mirrored his own language when talking to a Polynesian audience. When he overheard his fellow tourists comment about the supposed laziness of the Tongan people, Baker wrote that he was hurt by such talk, and responded by channeling his experience at Parawao, stating to them:

Between all the red skinned people I have gone among, the *haole* always say these are a lazy people, as with us [Hawaiians], and they are all similar in all the ways of living, we are a loving, welcoming, and friendly people, and we know this *lawa* and restful living, but, for our failure to pursue after your crazy ideas and chase the dollar until we lie down with this greed and no longer think of resting, and you call us a lazy people, but, still you do not meet with a red-skinned man begging for food like the lazy white man, why is that?<sup>64</sup>

In Fiji Baker found himself in a similar conversation with Humphrey Berkley, an Englishman who had obtained an island from the British and who fancied himself a student of Pacific peoples. Berkley began to argue for the superiority of the *haole* way of living over Polynesian ways. Baker replied by again arguing that the issue was not an imbalance between white initiative and Polynesian laziness, but between a Polynesian understanding of satisfaction and *haole* avarice. This time, however, he extended the

---

<sup>63</sup> Baker, "Mai Ka Ano Mamao Mai (15)"; Taylor, "Little Tales About Hawaii: J.T. Baker, Model for Kamehameha Statue Pt. 10."

<sup>64</sup> Baker, "Mai Ka Ano Mamao Mai (13)."

argument about *haole* avarice from the behavior of individuals to the systematic colonization of the Pacific, writing:

Here the limits of eating are to go until you are satisfied, it is enough, finish and rest, and there, a boundary to the meal, and there is a the boundary for all things...For our way of living one is satisfied, then stop and rest, I think we are a *lahui naauao*, to love, to share with the ones you have, to be pleasant, not greedy. If one sees a little dog with the bones and a big dog with a piece of beef, that [large] one is not satisfied, but, it will fetch the bone of the little dog, this is how it unfairly looks at all things, no love inside of that one. This is how I see the *lahui keokeo* [White peoples/nations]... If you and I look at [Hawaii], and at [Fiji], there are no small [nations] like [Fiji] and [Hawai'i] that have been freed [from empire], Hawai'i is in America, Tahiti in France, Rarotonga, Fiji, New Zealand, and Tonga and so forth to Britain, Sāmoa is in Germany, and many others.<sup>65</sup>

In both cases Baker followed Poroi in arguing for a culturally imposed upper barrier for the accumulation of wealth, *lawa*, the point where one's needs and the requirement for effort were met. Recognition of this point kept one from becoming blind to the needs of others in the desire to obtain more wealth, from becoming the big dog stealing the bone of the small dog. Thus colonization was not the fault of Polynesians being delinquent in their lack of desire for wealth and "progress," but a result of *haole* inability to recognize reasonable and ethical limits to their desires. Baker applied this analysis to the macro and micro scale, blaming the *haole* idealization of greed for the desire of foreign governments to take over the Pacific and for the greed of individual settlers in obtaining Native lands through various means.

Despite the appearance of contradiction in Baker's positions, the underlying reasoning and objectives remained consistent. In both his efforts to promote Polynesian economic initiative and his Polynesian critique of greed, Baker aimed primarily to promote Polynesian economic stability free from the direct control of the *haole*. In the

---

<sup>65</sup> Baker, "Mai Ka Ano Mamao Mai (17)."

case of Polynesians already trapped in a market economy, particularly a settler and/or plantation economy, Baker saw no possibilities other than playing by the rules of the dominant ideology, namely capitalism. As economic success and political power went hand in hand in such cases, the various *lāhui* needed to better adjust to market ideologies in order to remain politically, socially, and culturally significant, and thus independent of the direct control of wealthy settlers and planters. This political and economic stability would create the needed resources to maintain the cultural values like hospitality and generosity that sustained and united Hawaiians and other Polynesian cultures. For other Islanders, like the Maohi of Parawao, their partial-isolation from the market allowed them even greater independence, though with less of a chance of retaining any political and social significance should large plantation economies take hold nearby.

Yet achieving wealth and economic stability in order to elevate the *lāhui* and offset the strength of the plantations still fell under the category of properly limited economic desire, since the end goal was the preservation of the *lāhui*. Greed, however, the desire for individual wealth for its own sake, posed a clear threat to the stability and independence of the *lāhui*. Those thinking only of their personal success and wealth would likely ignore the concerns of the *lāhui*, providing little or no benefit regardless of whatever wealth they obtained. By experience Native Hawaiians knew that the single-minded pursuit of wealth often resulted in individual and collective losses for the *lāhui*, as reflected in Poroi's painfully accurate claims of Native Hawaiians becoming slaves and servants in the pursuit of the dollar. Those who chased the dollar above all else lost sight of the other things that strengthened and defined the *lāhui*. And nothing defined the *lāhui* the way the land did.

Regardless of whom he was speaking to or what specific vision of the Polynesian economic future he was addressing, nothing concerned Baker or imperiled the various occupied *lāhui* as much as the loss of Native lands. As noted in the last chapter, in the

early years of the territorial period most Native Hawaiians acknowledged land dispossession as one of the greatest, if not the greatest, threat to the *lāhui*. When speaking to some traveling companions in New Zealand, Baker discussed his own personal land policies. While he had other investments and sources of income, he wrote that it was his income from rentals that allowed him the liberty to live freely and travel, saying:

That is the fruit supporting me for these six months, that is the fruit I harvest, with moderate consumption. I have been asked to cut the tree and harvest the fruit, but I do not think that is right...If I sell this land and the rental [contracts], and earn a hundred dollars, for what? Here at most, probably just to end one source of rot [to deal with a debt], but this is a waste...Leave the fruit till it is mature. I pick [only] the fruit that are mature, and thus I measure consumption, and this is [all] I eat...I eat the fruit and the seed I plant again, I start the fruit again, and eat the ones I grew as seedlings from the earlier plants.<sup>66</sup>

Falling in line with Baker's vision of self-reliant Native agriculture, this metaphor emphasized living within one's means, avoiding debt, and the relationship between Polynesians and the land, each sustaining and caring for the other. His measured consumption of "fruit" allowed him to avoid the "rot" of debt, which could force him to sell the fruits that sustained him. Cutting the trees would provide short-term profit, but would also end the long-term security possession of the land ensured. Furthermore, his measured consumption allowed him to save up for future investment, to "plant the seeds" for future consumption. It should be noted, however, that being a landlord did not entirely live up to Baker's promotion of smallholder agriculture.

Beyond economics, the connection to the land and the use of the land transcended simple resource management and was an essential part of Polynesian identities and spirituality. As Baker put it, "The foundation of the *kamaaina*<sup>67</sup> is not to labor [for wages],

---

<sup>66</sup>Baker, "Mai Ka Ano Mamao Mai (15)."

<sup>67</sup> *Kama'āina*: Lit. Child of the land. Native born, one connected to the land. In modern usage: resident.

because they are the land, the land is theirs to work.” He made a similar point in his conversation with Berkley, arguing that the Lord had set aside the land, “for the *kanaka*, and what can break the *kuleana* of the land that the Lord has given to every *lāhui*, but, here come the people of the big government to scoop up the land of the little people.” This argument for a cultural/spiritual connection to the land buttressed the more practical arguments for retaining control over the land. It also worked as another level of critique regarding the deviance of colonial dispossession and as a cultural deterrent to further land sales among his Hawaiian audience.<sup>68</sup>

### *Old Time Religion*

The incident at Parawao also illustrates how Baker understood the relationship between Polynesians, spirituality, and empire in the Pacific, namely his desire to link Polynesians through Christianity rather than separating them with it as the HBCFM missionaries had. Baker himself was a fairly devout man, though hardly a fundamentalist like Kekela. The role of his highly religious grandmother in his upbringing, the likely possibility that his grandfather had come to Hawai'i as a Tahitian mission worker, and his time at Lahainaluna certainly left an impact on his spiritual outlook regarding the *pono* and *na'auao* of Christianity. Like several other high-profile Lahainaluna graduates, however, such as Samuel Kamakau, Baker's devotion to Christianity was not the same as devotion to Congregationalism or the Mission party.

Indeed the Christianity he practiced, a distinctly personalized and Hawaiian version of Christian Science, would have appalled the early ABCFM missionaries who founded Lahainaluna. In addition to following the general teachings of Christian Science founder Mary Baker Eddy, John Baker also referred to and worshipped Jehovah through the guise of Kane-i-ka-wai-ola, Ku, and Hina, a variation of the holy trinity based upon

---

<sup>68</sup> Baker, “Mai Ka Ano Mamao Mai (3)”; Baker, “Mai Ka Ano Mamao Mai (17).”

retrofitted Hawaiian deities. When asked by a *pākeha* whether he attended church frequently, Baker replied only when he felt the need. This angered this particular *pākeha*, who considered regular church attendance important for maintaining one's standing in the community. Baker replied by saying that many are those who sit in church and pray, "Look at Matthew 7:21 and you will have a laugh over the proper people."<sup>69</sup> He preferred to rely on bible study and healthy living as a better sign of Christian devotion, commenting, "there is no work like learning from the book." In addition, his fondness for hula and the distinctly non-monotheistic connotations of traditional and contemporary Hawaiian music would have sent both Kekela and Bingham into fits, as would the bawdy "Borabora" tune he sent home to be published in *Ke Aloha Aina*.<sup>70</sup>

Baker also did not understand Christianity as foreign to Polynesian culture the way many *haole* did. His writings portray Christianity as a matter of tradition as well as religious belief, and devotion to Christ as a matter of upholding the ways of his ancestors, or at least of his grandparent's generation. At Parawao the story of his grandmother's devotion, which he also retold in Gisborne, clearly showed Baker and his different Polynesian audiences understood Christianity not as a new phenomenon, a recent import from the West, but as a matter of Polynesian culture stretching back several generations. Nor was this the only occasion where he promoted Christianity as such. In describing the family of an elderly Hawaiian transplant, Kamaka of Kapalama, he remarked, "these old men and women are like ours, vigilant in going to pray since the time they were young." In Gisborne he complained of the lack of young Hawaiians, particularly *hapa-haole*, who went into the ministry, noting that, "none of the youth of my country wish to believe. They only think of all the things of this world." Portraying such secular desires as a

---

<sup>69</sup> "Not everyone who says to me "Lord, Lord," will enter the Kingdom of Heaven, but only he who does the will of my Father who is in Heaven."

<sup>70</sup> Baker, "Mai Ka Ano Mamao Mai (15)"; Baker, "Mai Ka Ano Mamao Mai (16)."

strictly contemporary trend among Polynesians only made sense if he and the audience understood past generations as more religious.<sup>71</sup>

Baker also met any insinuation that the Hawaiian people were not fully Christianized with marked hostility. In one incident in New Zealand, Baker got extremely agitated when his traveling companions began inquiring into Native Hawaiian religious practices in a manner that seemed to assume their lack of Christianity. When asked what religion Hawaiians practiced, he responded that Hawaiians have all the religions they did in New Zealand, referring to the various Christian sects. They pressed further, asking what the *original* Hawaiian religion was. Baker replied, “I do not know the religion from the beginning, but, the religion of this time, is a religion like yours in all ways.” The women continued to prod him, “You do not worship images?” Baker responded, “NO! We worship the God,” before explaining his own Hawaiian/Christian Science understanding of the Trinity.<sup>72</sup>

Baker, it seems, was playing coy with both his interrogators and his audience, however. He and his wife were among the founding members of Hale Nauā, so he surely knew more than he let on. The blend of Hawaiian polytheism and Christian Science in his version of the holy trinity also implies a bit more familiarity with various *akua*. He did not, however, care to discuss such matters with anyone who might cast aspersions about his Christianity or Hawaiian Christianity in general, and who would use it to cast aspersions on the *na'auao* of the Hawaiians. As seen in the secret status of the Hale Nauā, Native Hawaiians typically held such discussions and knowledge behind closed doors and among other Native Hawaiians only. Public discussion of them provided too much grist for the *haole* rumor mills. They also inadvertently supported the positions of the

---

<sup>71</sup> Baker, “Mai Ka Ano Mamao Mai (5)” ; “He Manuhiri No Hawaii.”

<sup>72</sup> Baker, “Mai Ka Ano Mamao Mai (15).”



missionaries and their descendants, in which the normal state of the Polynesian was *na‘aupō*, which could only be pushed back by diligent *haole* control.

In Baker’s view the Hawaiian past was *na‘auao*, as represented by his grandmother and the old people, and only the contagious greed of the *haole*, particularly the missionaries and their children, threatened to drag the Hawaiian youth into the darkness. Baker’s discussion with Poroi did more than just promote Christianity as a Hawaiian/Polynesian tradition and reinforce their claims to religious *na‘auao*. He and Poroi both used Christianity to validate Hawaiian/Polynesian assumptions about proper economic desire and their connections to the land, as well as using it to critique imperial land dispossession, capitalism, the missionaries, and other settlers. Poroi’s barrel parable, for instance, made the point that *akenui* of the dollar, the economic initiative Europeans and Americans had so long celebrated as a sign of their superiority over lazy Natives, was in opposition to the proper worship of God. This not just reinforced an existing anti-greed message featured throughout the New Testament, but brought the *na‘auao* in line with Polynesian cultural values. The ABCFM and many of their literal and spiritual descendants had long pilloried Polynesians for not being proper capitalists, and thus not proper Victorian Protestants. Poroi and Baker turned the tables on them, criticizing the *haole* for not being proper Christians in their greed, and furthermore, of hindering the Christianity of their devout Polynesian students. Furthermore, by separating Polynesians from the lands that God granted them as their *kuleana*, the *haole* were endangering both God’s plan and the livelihoods of the Polynesians.

### **Pomare, Carroll, and Baker: *Kanaka Na‘auao*, Westernization, and Political Unity**

In addition to adopting Euro/American attitudes towards economic initiative, albeit with proper Polynesian limits on economic desire, Baker also promoted political unity behind westernized Polynesian leaders as an important step in securing Polynesian

futures under empire. Such attitudes reflected both the contemporary political battles at home and his time in the heavily westernized Kalākaua court and administration. Yet instead of rhetorically inflating Native Hawaiian westernization by emphasizing the differences between Native Hawaiians and other Polynesians as the Kalākaua administration had, Baker instead focused more on the presence of westernized elites and leaders elsewhere in the Pacific and the services such individuals could and did provide for their respective *lāhui*, particularly among the Māori. At times Baker expressed a certain degree of nationalist chauvinism regarding other Polynesians lack of westernization, particularly the acquisition of Euro/American material culture, but such incidents were frequently offered in passing rather than as a topic of significance. Furthermore, as a result of his reevaluation of proper economic desire and his discussions with other Polynesians, Baker occasionally admitted such biases to be a product of colonization.

In Wellington, New Zealand's capital, Baker made a point of visiting Parliament, where he met with James Carroll, the Māori-Irish Member of Parliament and Minister from Waiapu. Carroll had held the seat since 1893, as well as being the Native Minister since 1899. Baker described Carroll as a pleasant and well-educated man, like Keoni Kamakani and Simon Ka'ai, two educated young Hawaiians. Baker reported that he was one of four Māori MPs, "working for the strengthening of the righteousness of their *lāhui*." "If it was this way for us," he asked his readers, "would not things perhaps be different?" He then bemoaned the state of Hawaiian politics, where American party politics split the Native vote and allowed the rise of "the people who talk sinfully, like the people who have the election *mana* without any substance. We're lost in the cunning speeches of honey, the righteous people are not seen."<sup>73</sup>

---

<sup>73</sup> Baker, "Mai Ka Ano Mamao Mai (12)."

The next day Baker met another rising *Māori* politician, this time quite by accident. While walking somewhere on the outskirts of Wellington he noticed a well-dressed young Māori walking in the same direction, and the two greeted each other. The Māori greeted Baker with “Aroha,” to which Baker replied, “Aloha.” Taken aback by Baker’s seeming mispronunciation, the man asked if Baker was a Māori, to which Baker said, much to the other’s delight, that he was a Hawaiian. The young man, who introduced himself as Maui Pomare, stated that he had some time earlier visited Hawai’i and knew some men whom Baker was acquainted with. Furthermore he had heard of Baker’s visit from the captain of the steamship *Hauroto*, though he thought Baker was still in “Okalana.”<sup>74</sup>

The two headed to Pomare’s office where Baker learned that Pomare, though only 32, was the head of the Māori Board of Health and had some 37 doctors working under him, including two other Māori. Educated in Michigan, Pomare had returned with the explicit purpose of using his knowledge to better the medical condition of his *lāhui*. As Pomare explained it, the board focused on “the reorganization of domestic life and the care of the ones who are living,” claiming credit for an increase of 5000 individuals among the Māori population. With a still dwindling Native Hawaiian population at home, such a claim clearly interested Baker, buoying his hopes for his own *lāhui* as well as for Pomare’s. Pomare later revealed that a key part of his plans included the suppression of alcohol, much to the teetotaler Baker’s approval. They also discussed Pomare’s work to suppress medical *tohunga*, Māori versions of the *kahuna lā‘au lapa‘au*. This conversation may have proven particularly interesting considering Baker’s participation in the Hale Nauā, which had been involved in efforts to vet and license qualified *kahuna*, and

---

<sup>74</sup> Ibid.

Pomare's own opinion of contemporary *tohunga* as charlatans in comparison to the *tohunga* of old.<sup>75</sup>

Baker visited Pomare's home that night, noting that it was a large and beautiful house, with a *haole* groomsmen and a *haole* woman as the cook, the only time he commented on any servants during his voyage. Pomare's wife and children were off on a vacation, but his sister acted as the hostess. Pomare took Baker to view the weapons of one of his ancestors, a war-loving chief who had once ruled a small island. According to Baker's account, this ancestor had visited England twice, both times receiving gifts from prominent individuals, including the queen. He immediately sold these items in exchange for European weaponry. Upon returning home he seized a ship and used it to attack and conquer another island, which was still controlled by his descendants. Baker, ever fond of word play and puns, told Pomare that he and his forefather were the same, one with their war against men, one with his war against disease, a sentiment Pomare deeply appreciated.<sup>76</sup>

Following Victorian custom the two retired to the homo-social space of the smoking room after dinner, though neither man smoke or drank. The two got along quite well, and finding they had much in common, spent the evening deep in conversation. Baker was impressed by Pomare's commitment to his *lāhui*, noting, "The righteousness and the *aloha* are the main things," and that Pomare "Showed me [his] aloha in [his] uplifting work." As Baker left Pomare's sister presented him with a watch chain of gold and greenstone, and Pomare promised to visit him during an up-coming trip to Hawai'i. Though Baker wrote no more of Pomare in the newspapers, in his interview in Hilo he

---

<sup>75</sup> Ibid; Derek A. Dow, "'Pruned of Its Dangers': The Tohunga Suppression Act of 1907," *Health and History* 3, no. (2001): 51; Mookini, "The Hale Naua of David Kalākaua," 18.

<sup>76</sup> Baker, "Mai Ka Ano Mamao Mai (12)." It is possible that the ancestor described in Hongi Hika, though I can find no traces of Pomare's relation to Hongi Hika. The story, does fit, although one of Hongi Hika's journeys was to Australia rather than England, and he met with King George IV rather than Queen Victoria.

revealed that the two had stayed in touch while Baker was in Wellington and that Pomare had introduced him to many other prominent Māori and Pākeha.<sup>77</sup>

Through his interactions with Pomare and Carroll, Baker expressed a vision of what sort of leadership Hawaiian, Māori, and other Polynesian peoples would need to flourish under colonial rule. The first and foremost quality of such a leadership was clearly a dedication to the *lāhui* as a whole rather than to the goals of a single party or faction, and he explicitly described each man as working specifically for the betterment of the Māori people. He then contrasted this commitment to the people with the divisiveness of Hawaiian politics. Similarly, in the Gisborne interview, he argued that it was the divisiveness within the Hawaiian community, such as Bush and Wilcox's anti-Lili'uokalani campaigns, which allowed the *haole* to overthrow the monarchy. Furthermore he argued that this divisiveness continued to strangle the progress of the *lāhui*, or as he put it in the Gisborne interview:

We have lost our [true] mana. We say it is because we were not of one mind, some succumbed to cajolery, and others were bought off. If we could be of one mind, the Native Hawaiians would be running the [legislature]. The Americans knew the Native Hawaiians were looking to unite but divided them so that would not happen.<sup>78</sup>

While Baker, who had largely removed himself from politics since the overthrow, implied that commitment to the *lāhui* was inherently opposed to factionalism, his experience in politics should have made it clear to him that even a shared commitment to the *lāhui* is not the same as a shared belief in the proper path for the *lāhui*. The split between the Kūhiō Republicans and the Wilson/Fern Democrats illustrated that abundantly. Furthermore, a more informed assessment of Carroll and Pomare, who already formed part of the core group of what would become the Young Māori Party,

---

<sup>77</sup> Ibid; "Colonel Baker's Grand Time in the South Seas."

<sup>78</sup> "He Manuhiri No Hawaii."

would have to conclude that they too were involved in factionalism, and sometimes bitter factionalism, among the Māori. However, they still acted, like Kūhiō, Wilson, and Fern, in what they believed to be the interests of the *lāhui* as a whole.

Baker also promoted a vision of leadership that was not just capable in the western intellectual and political traditions, but who had mastered them in some form. Pomare's American medical education, for instance, impressed Baker as a mark of leadership capabilities, as did the more generic western education of Carroll and the George Tupou II. He also was pleased to see the many young Māori "that study in general and that study the law, and the many who are lawyers." Living under the *haole/pākeha* laws and governments, Hawaiians, Māori, and other Polynesians needed leadership that understood not just the laws, but also the processes, the ritual, and the protocols of *haole* power and government. Only those who could navigate such seas could properly advocate for the various *lāhui* in the halls of *haole* power, as well as guide the rest of their *lāhui* to paths that would benefit the collective. Furthermore, the authority gained through recognizably western education and socialization also led to a certain *haole/pākeha* acceptance of Native authority, Pomare's staff of 37 doctors, for instance, displayed the potential results of western education. As Baker knew, with the late Victorian fascination with professionalization, the failure of Polynesians to gain such schooling would put them at the mercy of *haole* "experts" who rarely, if ever, put the needs of the Native *lāhui* above the needs of their own.<sup>79</sup>

In former times leadership came from genealogy, traditional knowledge, and the approval of the gods. Under colonization or occupation, however, early-twentieth-century Polynesians largely lost executive powers, as well as the ability to set the agendas and protocols of the various types of legislatures and advisory bodies that governed their lands. Thus to the thinking of Baker and some other Hawaiians and Polynesians, the

---

<sup>79</sup> Baker, "Mai Ka Ano Mamao Mai (12)."

ability to work *under* the various colonial regimes now overrode the need for traditionally defined and vetted leaders and/or strong executive leadership as would be needed in an independent state. It may be no coincidence that Baker heaped praise upon Pomare and Carroll yet did not visit with or mention Mahuta Tāwhiao Potatau Te Wherowhero, the Māori King. Though still a prominent a figure in New Zealand politics and among the Māori, Mahuta lacked much of the formal education and ease with Euro/American social and political custom that Baker saw and admired in Carroll and Pomare. At the same time, however, Baker also noted in his Gisborne article that he had wished to travel deeper into the countryside, away from the ports and railroads, where he felt the Māori people lived better lives than in the town areas. He could not, however, because the rainy season had severely diminished the quality of the rural roads. It is quite possible he was referring to the “King Country,” which was a primarily rural area with minimal rail-access that he had traveled along the edges of at several points during his trip.<sup>80</sup>

While clearly influenced by a desire to see the *lāhui* succeed under the constraints of empire, Baker’s exclusive promotion of leaders like Carroll and Pomare also came from his own pro-westernization myopia. By promoting this sort of westernization as the *sole* path to leadership Baker failed to see how other forms of traditional leadership allowed alternative means of organizing the various *lāhui*, retaining cohesiveness and knowledge, and challenging the narratives and systems that colonial and imperial regimes constructed to validate their positions. In portraying Euro/American training as the *only* route to Native leadership, men like Baker, Kūhiō, Pomare, and Carroll helped to further enshrine and validate colonial and imperial power structures even as they forced or negotiated concessions from those structures. Simply because the *lāhui* needed individuals capable of working within the system, by no means did they need to surrender all means of working outside of it as well.

---

<sup>80</sup> “He Manuhiri No Hawaii.”

Baker, like many Polynesians and foreigners alike, also viewed the possession of western material goods and compliance with western material standards as a marker of the individual and communal skills needed for leadership. Baker was a man who valued his appearance, and dressed as he felt a man of his status should, fully outfitted in European and American fashion. He occasionally, and with some derision, commented upon the less “complete” attire of other islanders, as Bush and Poor had in Sāmoa. When arriving in Papeete, for instance, he was somewhat scandalized by the men walking in the street with little more than a *malo* around their waists. In Tonga he wrote that the manner of living was like that of Puna, though the men went around with a cloth wrapped around their waists instead of pants, thus Puna was superior. In Fiji after being pressed by Humphrey on if he thought Hawaiians were superior other Polynesians, he replied that they were superior “In the *Naauao*, their quickness, [and] no one goes around without clothes, without hats.”<sup>81</sup>

Yet there were also several incidents where the arguments of the local people put a pause to Baker’s equating western material standards with superiority. In Tonga he was surprised that the women lacked hats, only to be rebutted by a Tongan woman. She responded that God had already given each Tongan a full head of hair to guard their heads from the sun, so “why should we chase after [the fashion of] some *haole* woman?” The woman’s logic appealed to Baker, forcing him to reconsider the virtues of Tongan hatless-ness. In a similar manner Baker’s discussion with Poroi forced him to question his privileging of western fashion, however temporarily. At the end of his stay at Parawao he described the clothing of the local Maohi as follows, “the men wear white clothes, white coat, no shirt, and an undershirt...The women pretty clothes but no shoes. These islands

---

<sup>81</sup> Baker, “Mai Ka Ano Mamao Mai (1)”; Baker, “Mai Ka Ano Mamao Mai (16).”



are pleasant and calm. We really are slaves and servants to the dollar of the *haole* and the toil of work.”<sup>82</sup>

While Baker did make the occasional pointed comment on the lack of westernization among some Polynesians, such comments were typically made in passing and in some cases rebutted by Baker or the even by the targets of his comments. Instead of elevating and promoting Native Hawaiian westernization by separating them from other islanders in this way, however, Baker choose instead to promote material westernization by praising the leadership capabilities of other Polynesians who mastered the material wealth of their colonizers and occupiers as well as their education and training. Pomare’s residence, for instance, impressed him because it was a large, well-furnished, western-style structure. Baker also made special note of Pomare’s *haole* servants, the reverse of what he typically saw in Hawai‘i and elsewhere, Polynesian and other non-white servants for white employers. White servants likely being harder to find and more expensive, Baker seemed impressed by both the economic and social statements such an arrangement made. Baker also praised the “stinginess” of Tuwake, his large and well-furnished home, and his leadership within his large extended family before making allusions to Tuwake’s lands as traditionally important for the region’s *ariki*.<sup>83</sup>

Displays of wealth and the ability to use that wealth to support one’s causes and retainers had long been a marker of leadership among Polynesians and many other peoples across the globe. This was no less true under colonial regimes than it had been under native states, and Baker, Pomare, Carroll, and many other Polynesians of the time recognized this. In addition, as with western education and socialization, wealth and westernized material trappings also granted Polynesians a greater access and acceptance

---

<sup>82</sup> Baker, “Mai Ka Ano Mamao Mai (4)”; Baker, “Mai Ka Ano Mamao Mai (13)”; Baker, “Mai Ka Ano Mamao Mai (17).”

<sup>83</sup> Baker, “Mai Ka Ano Mamao Mai (16).”

among *haole/Pākeha*, who saw these as badges of power and station within their own ranks. Baker, for instance, took advantage of this phenomenon in Tahiti, when he donned formal late-Victorian attire, including tails and gloves, when meeting with the French governor in the stifling equatorial heat. He wrote that the manners and costume were sure to impress, as they were the same he used when received by President McKinley in Washington. His patron Kalākaua had also understood the role of western costume in his own court and travels, and had been known as quite a fashionable gentleman at home and abroad.<sup>84</sup>

Besides these practical reasons for supporting a leadership with a certain mastery of the *haole* trappings, protocols, and technologies of power, Baker may have also supported such things in part through an internalization of the ideas that some *haole* ways were simply superior to Hawaiian and Polynesian ways. His time at both Lahaianaluna and the Kalākaua court would have reinforced such ideas and promoted assimilation to differing brands of western influence. As noted above, Baker frequently made arguments for Hawai'i's superiority based on a greater compliance with certain western values, most typically with regards to material possessions like hats, pants, mattresses, and western-style homes. While Baker clearly supported a certain level of cultural retention and differentiation between Polynesian and Euro/American *lāhui*, he whole-heartedly endorsed the material superiority of western *ano o ka noho ana*, standard of living.

As noted in the last chapter, Baker himself had once been named as one of Hawai'i's western-educated and loyal men in a plea put forward by Queen Lili'uokalani. In 1898, when America was forming the organic commission on Hawai'i, the queen had put forward a plea for all Hawaiians to unite behind the *na'auao*, loyal men of the kingdom who could best represent them in front of the commission. Hawaiians, she argued, must put aside factionalism in an effort to support those who would think not of

---

<sup>84</sup> Baker, "Mai Ka Ano Mamao Mai (7)"; Baker, "Mai Ka Ano Mamao Mai (8)."

themselves, but of the *lāhui*. John Baker was one of the names she put forward as an example. Reading Baker's views on Polynesian leadership one gets a sense that when meeting men like Pomare and Carroll, he felt rejuvenated, brought back to his own time in politics as part of a similar cadre of young Hawaiians. Perhaps what Baker considered to be the best sort of Polynesian leaders were simply younger versions of what he saw every morning in the mirror.<sup>85</sup>

Thus he might have also been simply more comfortable with westernized forms of leadership and *ano o ka noho ana* because those were the forms he had the most experience with, both as an urban Native and as a Native Hawaiian elite. While promoting Polynesian solidarity throughout his trip, Baker certainly gravitated more towards similarly urban and westernized Polynesians. His deepest friendships seemed to have been established either with other Native Hawaiians or with other westernized Polynesian elites such as Pomare, Carroll, and Tuwake. He also lingered far longer in more "developed" parts of Polynesia. Indeed his stays and his descriptions of his stay in Sāmoa, Tonga, and Fiji all border on perfunctory in comparison to his time in Papeete, Wellington, and even Rotorua.

In part this came from the greater similarities between Tahiti, New Zealand, and Hawai'i in terms of pre-contact language and culture, where the three had far more in common with each other, than with Sāmoa, Tonga, and Fiji. Yet the three of them were also the most commercially developed, had far more in the way of established tourist attractions and accommodations, and had trended more towards westernization, which likely impacted the length of Baker's stay as well. The three also had the longest histories of sustained engagements with Euro/American empires, Tahiti and New Zealand as colonies, Hawai'i as an independent state. As a result the three also had the most developed settler populations in Polynesia, which would have led to the development of

---

<sup>85</sup> "Ka Haiolelo a Ka Moiwahine Liliuokalani."

similar types of regional culture and amenities that Baker would find the most comfortable, as well as the sort of colonial problems and tensions he would have considered the most immediately relevant. Since he seems to have set out specifically to look for ties and connections between Native Hawaiians and other Polynesians, both of these arguments also feed into the possibility that on some level he sought and privileged situations where he felt the ties and similarities between Native Hawaiians and other Polynesians would be more prominent than the differences. While theoretically committed to the idea of creating and promoting ties between all Polynesians, he seemed more interested in forming relationships with some Polynesians more than others, specifically those he felt to be most like the Hawaiians.

### **Conclusion**

In many ways John Baker's trip and writings mirror those created by countless Euro/Americans before, during, and after his time. Like them he accessed relatively well-traveled, tourist-friendly networks and journeyed to distant lands on the far reaches of Euro/American empires. Like them he captured his experiences in writing, granting his readers access to those same destinations while also helping them to better understand their relationship with the colonized and soon to be colonized lands and peoples targeted by the great empires. Yet Baker's trip and his writings differed significantly from those of Euro/American travel writers because he and his audience understood themselves not in opposition to the colonized subjects of his travelogue, but as connected to them by their Polynesian heritage and by their shared predicaments under various empires.

Throughout his journey the similarities between Hawai'i and the rest of Polynesia struck Baker, at times bringing him to tears, at other times bringing him great joy. In his reporting he sought to make these connections real for his readers as well. To describe the mannerisms and faces of the people he evoked the mannerisms and faces of the *lāhui*, to

describe their cliffs and their mountains, he evoked the *pali* and the *mauna* of Hawai'i. In addition to making his voyage more “real” to his readers, this also developed the idea of kinship and connections to the rest of Polynesia, making Hawaiians more aware that they were part of a greater whole beyond their undesired political annexation into the American Empire.

Thus when describing these similarities Baker not only worked to connect Hawai'i to other Polynesians, but also to validate their culture and history as part of a wide-spread Polynesian culture, as distinct from their colonizers as they were similar to other Polynesians. His discussions and displays of *hula* and *haka*, for instance, positioned Hawaiians within a larger collection of people with a shared appreciation and understanding of a distinctively Polynesian art form. They understood and valued *hula* because they were Polynesians, as opposed to the *haole* who saw it as heathen practice or exotic spectacle. At times his discussion of this shared Polynesian culture included references to the superiority of Polynesian culture. In discussing the shared style and values around hospitality, for instance, Baker not only validated this as part of a broad Polynesian identity, but as distinct and superior to the ingratitude of the *haole*.

Like many other Polynesians, and many *haole*, Baker also focused on differing understandings of the proper role of material desire to critique the colonization and occupation of Polynesia. Though somewhat conflicted about how to define the proper level of economic desire, Baker argued that *haole* culture lacked a conception of *lawa*, sufficiency, and thus had no means to satisfy their desires, allowing them to fester into greed. This greed, he argued, drove the *haole* colonization of the Pacific on the macro and micro level, and infected many islanders, causing them to lose sight of their own values. In an interesting turnabout from the times of Kekela, Baker also used the concept of *haole* greed to invert the argument made by the ABCFM, the HBCFM, and likeminded individuals about the compatibility of Hawaiian and Polynesian tradition with

Christianity. Where the missionaries, their supporters, and many of their converts saw Hawaiian/Polynesian tradition and Christianity as inherently oppositional, Baker and Poroi argued that Christianity was an inherent part of the Hawaiian/Polynesian past. Furthermore, the greatest opposition to Christianity in the Pacific came not from indigenous traditions, but from western culture, with its emphasis on personal gain and the acquisition of wealth. He even argued that the missionaries, rather than being the font of the *na'auao*, were the source of the anti-Christian contagion known as greed.

The trip also allowed him a chance to reflect upon the future of Hawai'i and the rest of Polynesia under imperial control and propose his own vision of how the various *lāhui* might survive and even thrive under empire. Reflecting trends in Hawai'i and his economic success, he envisioned the future of the *lāhui* to be intimately tied into the prosperity and economic independence of the individual *kanaka* who made up the *lāhui*. He further argued that possession of and working the 'āina anchored any hope for economic, cultural, and political success for the various Polynesian *lāhui*. Without possession of the land, which granted the *kanaka* the means of production in both cash-crop and subsistence-plus agriculture, the various Polynesian *lāhui* were doomed to fail, being composed of “servants and slaves” working for the prosperity of their *haole* employers.

He also looked to mastery of the material, educational, and political cultures of the *haole* as the necessary characteristics of the new leadership Native Hawaiians and Polynesians would need to succeed under *haole* regimes. Seeing in the Young Māori Party, for instance, echoes of himself and his former cohort of young Native Hawaiian politicians, he envisioned a future in which the western-educated and somewhat western-assimilated elite would lead Polynesian peoples to survival and even success under the constraints of Imperial control. Tempered by proper Polynesian/Hawaiian cultural values and a legitimate desire to promote the good of the *lāhui*, Baker argued that such

leadership could guide the *lāhui* as a whole to success. Provided, of course, that the various *lāhui* could unite behind their respective leaders instead of being split into factions by external or internal tensions. Baker's vision remained rooted in *aloha* for the *lāhui*, a desire to see it prosper, and the seeming lack of viable alternatives.

To a certain degree Baker sought to distance the Hawaiian *lāhui* from other Polynesians, but most often he did so only in terms of degree rather than essential differences. Baker often argued that the Hawaiian people were more beautiful, their *hula* more elegant, and their grasp of the *na'auao* and material wealth superior, for instance, though these were often passing remarks to appeal to the pride of his readers. In the vast majority of instances, however, he focused on the ties and similarities between islanders, on cultural exchange, and on developing a sense of belonging to a larger collective Polynesian identity to offset the collapse of the political and social structures that Native Hawaiians had developed around the Kingdom in the nineteenth century. Where it mattered most they were, "*Aohe no he wehena mai kakou ae,*" No different from us.

## CONCLUSION

In the fifty-five years between the start of Native Hawaiian foreign mission work and the start of John Baker's voyage, the *lāhui* experienced a host of drastic changes. In 1850 it was a sovereign kingdom, looking ahead to a long future as such under its various treaties and friendly diplomatic relations with Europe and America. By 1907 it had experienced 14 years under some form of *haole* colonial rule and 8 years within the American empire. In 1850s Hawai'i's economy was based primarily on a mix of subsistence-plus agriculture and a seasonal provisioning trade tied to whaling. By 1907 *haole*-dominated sugar firms controlled the lion's share of the land, water, and economy of the islands. In 1853, the *lāhui* was still some 71,000 strong. Though far fewer in number than it had been just a few decades earlier, Native Hawaiians were still the clear numerical majority in the Kingdom. By 1907 the population of the *lāhui* had dropped to nearly 40,000, now only 25% of the Island's population.<sup>1</sup>

Native Hawaiians also experienced a drastic change in their understanding of their relationship to other Pacific Islanders, a change closely connected to how they envisioned their relationship to Euro/American empires active in the Pacific. The more they viewed the empires as sympathetic to the interests of the *lāhui*, the more likely they were to

---

<sup>1</sup> OHA, "Table 1.1 The Population of the Hawaiian Islands: 1778-1896.," Native Hawaiian Data Book, [http://www.oha.org/databook/databook1996\\_1998/tab1-01.98.html](http://www.oha.org/databook/databook1996_1998/tab1-01.98.html) (accessed October 26, 2010); OHA, "Table 1.2 The Population of the Territory and State of Hawai'i: 1900-1990.," Native Hawaiian Data Book, [http://www.oha.org/databook/databook1996\\_1998/tab1-02.98.html](http://www.oha.org/databook/databook1996_1998/tab1-02.98.html) (accessed October 26, 2010). Second number includes *hapa* and "full-blooded" Hawaiians.



picture other Islanders as the imperial states did, typically as culturally inferior heathens in need of being led to the *na‘auao*. Native Hawaiian missionaries, for instance, imagined the *lāhui* in a Christian alliance with the imperial powers, as potentially equal participants in the expansion of Christ’s Kingdom. Seeking to strengthen this alliance by separating themselves from the *na‘aupō*, they distanced themselves from the islanders they worked among, promoting a Euro/American-originated—but still localized Hawaiian—discourse of Christian superiority.

Yet many Native Hawaiians also viewed the empires as a direct threat to their continued existence, often at the same time that they were seeking stronger ties with the empires. The shared threat of imperial “intervention” led Native Hawaiians to look for ways of connecting themselves more closely to other Islanders, with the hope to find strength in such alliances. By 1907, the overthrow, annexation, and seven years of U.S. colonial rule made it clear to Native Hawaiians that the Euro/American empires, and the American empire in particular, were a clear threat to the interests of the *lāhui*. The *lāhui* under colonial rule was a *lāhui* besieged. When former governor John Tamatoa Baker traveled south in 1907, he quickly began drawing parallels between the Hawaiian situation and that of other Polynesians under colonial rule. He developed and promoted an understanding of Native Hawaiians as part of a much larger Polynesian whole, validating their past, their culture, and their continued existence.

At times these two trends overlapped. Feeding off international recognition of the Kingdom’s sovereignty, Kalākaua believed that by expanding Hawai‘i’s international presence Hawai‘i could gain a greater say in imperial discussions about the future of the Pacific. At the same time, however, he feared that the failure to gain this seat at the table would inevitably result in Hawai‘i appearing on the table with the remaining independent parts of the Pacific. He looked to the cultural and genealogical ties between Native Hawaiians and other Polynesians as a means of pulling together an explicitly anti-

colonial confederacy under the Hawaiians. Reflecting the King's own split view of other Polynesians, the King's representatives attempted to develop a relationship with the Samoans based on inherent ties and mutual responsibilities to one another, while still promoting the Hawaiians as more developed and thus superior to (and entitled to a position of leadership) over their southern kin.

Tracing these three different projects through the period in question, an argument for change over time emerges. In general, the evidence suggests a gradual transition from the missionaries' embrace of empire and rejection of Pacific Islander cultures to Baker's rejection of an imperial Pacific and embrace of Polynesian solidarity. Due to the diversity of opinions in the *lāhui* and the complex relationships between Natives and empires in general, not all Native Hawaiians of the period would fit into such a narrative. Kekela, for instance, continued to condemn Native culture and embrace empires until his death in 1904. For the most part, however, the argument for a shift in Native Hawaiian opinion from one extreme in 1850 to the other in 1907 holds true. Extending the trend line past that date, however, would be ill advised.

In addition, while consistently valuing the *na'auao* that could be gained by engaging with the Euro/American empires, Native Hawaiians between 1850 and 1907 increasingly questioned the Euro/American ownership of that *na'auao*. Even the HBCFM missionaries, who saw the Euro/American empires as a source of not just secular *na'auao*, but of salvation as well, consistently challenged the legitimacy Euro/American claims to dominion over that *na'auao*, including claims made by their American missionary *mākuā*. Kalākaua pushed this trend further, arguing that Native and Euro/American *na'auao* could and should be equally valued, thus challenging the previously assumed right of Euro/Americans to define the *na'auao*. Baker took this even further, using Polynesian *na'auao* to challenge the foundations of Euro/American

capitalist *na‘auao*, finding it, and by extension the empires that represented it, fundamentally flawed.

~~~~~

Within the strict national/island-group focus of most Pacific histories, the Native has typically been cast not only as caught in time, but as a geographically static figure, trapped within boundaries they themselves did not recognize nor obey. By expanding the examination of Native Hawaiian understandings of themselves and their collective place in the world beyond the traditional empire/Native axis, we are allowed to see the Native at different angles, complicating and enriching our understanding. By looking at Natives along the multiple axes that they understood themselves, we can uncover entire dimensions of the Native past previously ignored by or invisible to the historian. In this particular case, by examining how, when, and why Native Hawaiians developed and reshaped their relationships with other Pacific Islanders, we also gain insight into the *lāhui*'s critical and changing articulations of their place in the period's complex web of regional and global networks. Somewhat ironically, by adjusting the focus away from the empire/Native encounter, we can also gain a clearer picture of how Natives understood, collaborated with, and combated both Euro/American empires and specific colonial projects, including mission work, diplomatic regimes, and tourism/travel-literature.

Work on how Native Hawaiians and other Pacific Islanders saw other regions of the globe and the peoples of Asia, Africa, Europe, and the Americas could similarly work to broaden our inquiries and our understandings of both Natives and Empire. In some cases these subjects call for far greater attention than has been granted them. The history of the relationships Native Hawaiians and the Hawaiian kingdom developed with Asians and Asia, for instance, is an absolutely central element of Hawaiian history, yet it is almost entirely unexamined. Native Hawaiian histories look at the ties and conflicts between Hawaiians and *haole*. Asian-focused histories of Hawai'i focus on the ties

between Asians and *haole*. *Haole* histories of Hawai'i focus largely on *haole* relationships with other *haole* against a backdrop of Asians and Hawaiians. The lack of Asian/Native Hawaiian histories is both astounding—considering the importance of those relationships—yet unsurprising. The plantation-era *status quo* is still a significant part of identity making and power negotiations among local Asians, Native Hawaiians, and *haole* alike.²

Such work on Pacific-Islander-to-Pacific-Islander connections, or more generally Native-to-Native connections, can also be of aid in bringing contemporary relationships, or the lack of contemporary relationships, into context. This dissertation's arguments on how and why Native Hawaiians developed relationships with other islanders, for instance, certainly cast a light on modern relationships amongst Pacific Islanders as well. Indeed both ways of envisioning Native Hawaiian connections to other Islanders— as protégés in need of Hawaiian tutelage or as kin with a common shared past —are alive and well in the present period, as are both ways of understanding relationships between Native Hawaiians and the American empire.

² See: Smith, Andrea. "Heteropatriarchy and the Three Pillars of White Supremacy: Rethinking Women of Color Organizing," in: *Color of Violence: The Incite! Anthology*. Ed. INCITE! Women of Color Against Violence. (Cambridge: South End Press, 2006).

APPENDIX: A NOTE ON TRANSLATIONS AND SOURCES

Translations

All translations from the Hawaiian language newspapers, including Baker's letters, and from other published Hawaiian-language sources (*Ka Wehewehe*, etc.) are mine. When a translation was not available for HBCFM missionary records, the translations are mine as well, specifically in the cases of: Samuel Kaaia's letters, Simeon Kahelemauna's letters, Samuel Kekuewa's letters, David Kanoa's letters after 1880, and Robert Maka's letters from 1887 and 1888. When using the available translations for the other letters, I backtracked at relevant places to verify the original language when important and to seek some of the detail lost in translation. William Lono's journal was partially translated by his daughter and I used her translations as a general guide, but verified or did my own translations of relevant parts. Translations taken from the Samoan-language documents in the fourth chapter were all taken from official translations or staff translations available in the same collections.

In some cases the specific Hawaiian-language words or phrases used in the original are significant to the arguments of the paper. In such cases I have left the word or phrase in Hawaiian but provided the rest of the quotation in English. At times this has meant editing the translations of others by searching out and restoring some of the original wording.

Sources

The three specific projects covered in this dissertation all generated sizeable written records. The Native Hawaiian missionaries produced thousands of pages worth of

reports, letters, and accounts that are now held in the Hawai‘i Mission Children’s Society Archives. Originally written in Hawaiian, most were translated some time ago by a descendant of the missionary Judd family, though a sizeable fraction are still only available in Hawaiian. Both the translations and the Hawaiian originals are available on microfilm through the Pacific Manuscript Bureau. Awaiaulu.org has compiled and translated the letters of one prominent missionary, Rev. John Kekela, as well as several articles he wrote. Awaiaulu’s Dr. Puakea Nogelmeier was kind enough to lend me an electronic, and thus searchable, copy of the unpublished compilation. This proved very useful during the development of the first two chapters.

Due to the turmoil of the 1887 Bayonet Constitution, the overthrow, and the Republic Era, the various records of the Samoan Legation are scattered in different locations in Hawai‘i. A sizeable portion of the Legation’s records have been lost, destroyed, or never placed in the archive, such as Kalākaua’s letters to Bush. The majority, however, can be found in the A.C. Carter collection and the Foreign and Executive Office files at the Hawai‘i State Archive. Smaller portions of the Legation’s documentation can be found at the Bishop Museum and the Henry Poor papers at the Hawaiian Historical Society.

Baker recorded his trip in a series of letters he wrote to the Hilo Newspaper *Ke Aloha Aina*, which were then published as a serial between 1907 and 1908. These are available digitally on the website Nupepa.org. After a badly damaged January 11, 1908 issue, the available copies of *Ke Aloha Aina* run out until October of that year. Except for a brief portion of Baker’s account of Hong Kong, nothing else is available from his time in Asia. If any future reader knows of further copies of *Ke Aloha Aina*, or has other access to Baker’s letters, please let me know. Baker’s impressions of Asia, particularly his month-long stay in Japan, would be useful for examining Native Hawaiian understandings of Asia. The Māori scholar Paul Meredith has also provided a

transcription and translation of an article about and an interview with Baker from the September 1907 issue of the Māori newspaper *Te Pipiwharauoa*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Primary Sources

i. Unpublished

Hawai'i State Archive-

A.C. Carter Collection
FO&EX
Interior Department
Kalaniana'ole Collection

Bishop Museum Archive-

Monarchy Collection
Miscellaneous Letters

Hawaiian Mission Children's Society Archive-

HEA Collection
Micronesia Collection
Marquesan Collection

Hawaiian Historical Society-

Henry Poor's Papers

Awaiulu.org-

Reverend James Kekela: Correspondence & Articles, 1852-1902

ii. Published

a. Government Publications

i. Kingdom, Territory, or State of Hawai'i

- Gibson, Walter Murray. Report of the Minister of Foreign Affairs, 1884.
- Hawai'i, Territory of. *Laws of the Territory of Hawaii Passed by the Legislature*. Honolulu: Honolulu Star-Bulletin LMTD., 1913.
- Legislature, Hawaii Territorial. *The Fourth Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii: Journal of the Senate*, 1907.
- _____. *Journal of the Senate of the Fifth Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii: Regular Session*, 1909.
- _____. *Journal of the House of Representatives of the Seventh Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii: Regular Session*, 1913.
- OHA. "Table 1.1 The Population of the Hawaiian Islands: 1778-1896." Native Hawaiian Data Book. http://www.oha.org/databook/databook1996_1998/tab1-01.98.html (accessed October 26, 2010).
- OHA. "Table 1.2 The Population of the Territory and State of Hawai'i: 1900-1990." Native Hawaiian Data Book. http://www.oha.org/databook/databook1996_1998/tab1-02.98.html (accessed October 26, 2010).

ii. United States

- Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico. *Hawaiian Investigation: Pt 3, Exhibits, Memorials, Petitions, and Letters.*, 1902.
- _____. *Hawaiian Investigation: Report on General Conditions*, 1902.
- _____. *Hawaiian Investigation: Pt 2, Testimony*, 1902.
- _____. *Territory of Hawaii: Statements before the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico*, 1908.

b. Periodicals

Alaula
Annual Report of the Hawaiian Evangelical Association
Annual Report of the Hawaiian Mission Children's Society
Hawaiian Gazette
Honolulu Star-Bulletin

Improvement Era
Ka Hae Hawai'i
Ka Hoku Loa
Ka Hoku o ka Pakipika
Ka Lahui Hawai'i
Ka Lama Hawaii
Ka Lei Rose of Hawaii
Ka Mō'i
Ka Nonanona
Ke Aloha Aina
Ko Hawai'i Pae Aina
Missionary Herald
Nupepa Elele
Nupepa Kuokoa
Pacific Commercial Advertiser
Report of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Mission
Te Pipiwharauoa (Māori translations by Paul Meredith)
The Evangelical Magazine and Missionary Chronicle

c. Books and Pamphlets

- Alexander, William De Witt. *Oahu College List of Trustees, Presidents, Instructors, Matrons, Librarians, Superintendents of Grounds, and Students*. Honolulu: Hawaiian Gazette Co. LTD, 1907.
- Armstrong, William N. *Around the World with a King*. Rutland, Vermont; Tokyo, Japan: Charles E. Tuttle Company, 1977.
- Bingham, Hiram. *A Residence of Twenty-One Years in the Sandwich Islands*. Canandaigua, NY: H.D. Goodwin, 1855.
- _____. *Selected Writings of Hiram Bingham 1814-1869: Missionary to the Hawaiian Islands to Raise the Lord's Banner Studies in American Religion*; V. 31. Lewiston, New York, USA E. Mellen Press, 1988.
- Bennet, George and Tyerman, Daniel. *Journal of Voyages and Travels by the Rev. Daniel Tyerman and George Bennet, Esq.: Deputed from the London Missionary Society, to Visit Their Various Stations in the South Sea Islands, China, India, &C. Between the Years 1821 and 1829*. London: Crocker and Brewster, 1832.
- Dibble, Richard Armstrong and Sheldon. *Ka Wehewehela, Oia Hoi Ka Hulikanaka*. Oahu: Mea pai palapala a na misionari, 1847.

- Dibble, Sheldon. *He Hoikeholoholona Na Na Kamalii*. Lahainaluna: Mea Pai Palapala no ke Kula Nui, 1835.
- Dwight, Edwin W. *Memoir of Henry Obookiah: A Native of the Sandwich Islands, Who Died at Cornwall, Connecticut, February 17, 1818, Aged 26*: American Sunday School Union, 1830.
- Dwight, Timothy. *The Conquest of Canaan: A Poem in Eleven Books*. Hartford, CT: Elisha Babcock, 1785.
- Ellis, Rev. William. *Narrative of a Tour through Hawaii, or Owhyhee; with Remarks on the History, Traditions, Manners, Customs, and Language of the Inhabitants of the Sandwich Island*. London: H. Fisher, Son, and P. Jackson, 1826
- Fornander, Abraham. *An Account of the Polynesian Race, Its Origins, and Migrations* Vol. I. London: Trubner & co., 1878.
- _____. *An Account of the Polynesian Race, Its Origin and Migrations, and the Ancient History of the Hawaiian Peoples to the Times of Kamehameha I*. Vol. II. London: Trubner & Co., 1880.
- Frear, Walter F. *The Reply of Hon. Walter F. Frear, Governor of Hawaii, to the Complaint of Hon. Jonah Kuhio Kalaniana'ole, Delegate in Congress from Hawaii*. Honolulu: Gazette Publishing Company, 1912.
- Greer, Richard A. "The Royal Tourist—Kalakaua's Letters Home from Tokio to London." *The Hawaiian Journal of History* V (1971): 75-109.
- Irwin, Bernice Pi'ilani. *I Knew Queen Lili'uokalani*. Honolulu: Bernice Pi'ilani Irwin, 1960.
- Kahā'ulelio, Daniel. *Ka 'Ōihana Lawai'a: Hawaiian Fishing Traditions*. Translated by Mary Kawena Pukui. Honolulu: Bishop Museum, 2006.
- Kalākaua, King David. *The Legends and Myths of Hawaii*. Honolulu: Mutual Publishing, 1990.
- Kamakau, Samuel. *Tales and Traditions of the People of Old*. Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press, 1991.
- _____. *Ruling Chiefs of Hawaii*. Honolulu: Kamehameha Schools Press, 1992.
- Ko'olau, Pi'ilani. "The True Story of Kaluaiko'olau, or Ko'olau the Leper" *The Hawaiian Journal of History* 21 (1987): 45.
- Liholiho, Alexander. *The Journal of Prince Alexander Liholiho, the Voyages Made to the United States, England, and France in 1849-50*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1967.
- Lili'uokalani. *Hawaii's Story by Hawaii's Queen*. Boston: Lothrop, Lee, and Shepard Co., 1898.
- Lydecker, Robert Colfax. *Roster, Legislatures of Hawaii, 1841-1918*. Honolulu: Hawaiian Gazette Company, 1918

- Neuman, H., Mary Kawena Pukui, W.F. Jones, and Rev E. Kaupu. *Haw 108.11.1: Interview with Mary Kawena Pukui, W.F. Jones, Rev E. Kaupu, and H. Neuman*. Audiotape. Bishop Museum Archive, 1961.
- Stevenson, Robert Louis. *A Footnote to History: Eight Years of Trouble in Samoa*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1900.
- Stewart, Charles Samuel. *Journal of a Residence in the Sandwich Islands: During the Years 1823, 1824, and 1825*. New York: John P. Haven, 1828.
- Whitney, S. and William Channing Woodbridge. *He Hoikehonua, He Mea Ia E Hoakakaí I Ke Ano O Ka Honua Nei, a Me Na Mea Maluna Iho*. Oahu: Mea Pai Palapala A Na Misionari, 1845.
- Woodbridge, William Channing. *Rudiments of Geography: On a New Plan, Designed to Assist the Memory by Comparison and Classification: With Numerous Engravings of Manners, Customs, & Curiosities*. Ninth ed. Hartford, CT: Oliver D. Cooke & Co., 1828.

2. Secondary Sources

i. Articles and Books

- Akana, Collette Leimomi. "Kahuna Ho'opunipuni Letters of 1863." *The Hawaiian Journal of History* 36 (2002): 39.
- _____. "Kahuna Ho'opunipuni Letters of 1863." *Hawaiian Journal of History* 36 (2002).
- Andrade, Ernest. *Unconquerable Rebel: Robert W. Wilcox and Hawaiian Politics, 1880-1903*. Niwot, Colorado: University Press of Colorado, 1996.
- Andrew, John A. *From Revivals to Removal: Jeremiah Evarts, the Cherokee Nation, and the Search for the Soul of America*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1992.
- Arista, Noelani. "Foreward." In *Kepelino's Traditions of Hawaii*, edited by Martha Warren Beckwith. Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press, 2007.
- Ballantyne, Tony. *Orientalism and Race: Aryanism in the British Empire* Cambridge Imperial and Post-Colonial Studies Series. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire ; New York: Palgrave, 2002.
- Ballara, Angela. *Iwi: The Dynamics of Maori Tribal Organization From c. 1769 to C. 1945*. Wellington, NZ: Victoria University Press, 1998.
- Barman, Jean, and Bruce McIntyre Watson. *Leaving Paradise: Indigenous Hawaiians in the Pacific Northwest, 1787-1898*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2006.
- Barrow, Terence. "Introduction to the New Edition." In *Around the World with a King*, edited by William N. Armstrong. Rutland, VT: Charles E. Tuttle Company, 1977.

- Belich, James. *Making Peoples: A History of New Zealanders, from Polynesian Settlement to the End of the Nineteenth Century*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2001.
- Benham, Maenette Kape‘ahiokalani Padeken. “The Voice “Less” Hawaiian: An Analysis of Educational Policymaking, 1820—1960 “ *Hawaiian Journal of History* 32 (1998): 20.
- Bergin, Billy. *Loyal to the Land: The Legendary Parker Ranch, 750-1950*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2004.
- Boyer, Paul. *When Time Shall Be No More: Prophecy and Belief in Modern American Culture*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1992.
- Brooks, Jean Ingram. *International Rivalry in the Pacific Islands, 1800-1875*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1941.
- Campbell, I. C. “Imperialism, Dynasticism, and Conversion: Tongan Designs on Uvea (Wallis Island), 1835-52.” *The Journal of the Polynesian Society* 92, no. 2 (1983): 155-167.
- _____. *Island Kingdom: Tonga Ancient and Modern*. 2nd. rev. ed. Christchurch, N.Z.: Canterbury University Press, 2001.
- _____. *Worlds Apart: A History of the Pacific Islands*. Rev. ed. Christchurch, N.Z.: Canterbury University Press, 2003.
- Chapin, Helen Gracimos. *Shaping History: The Role of Newspapers in Hawaii*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii, 1996.
- Clifford, James. “Indigenous Articulations.” *The Contemporary Pacific* 13 (2001): 22.
- Crocombe, R.G. and Marjorie Crocombe, ed. *Polynesian Missions in Melanesia: From Samoa, Cook Islands, and Tonga to Papua New Guinea and New Caledonia*. Suva: Institute of Pacific Studies, 1983.
- Davidson, J.W. *Samoa Mo Samoa: The Emergence of the Independent State of Western Samoa*. Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1967.
- _____. “Problems of Pacific History.” *Journal of Pacific History* 1 (1966): 5-21.
- Daws, Gavan. *Shoal of Time: A History of the Hawaiian Islands*. Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii, 1968
- Deloria, Philip Joseph. *Indians in Unexpected Places*. Lawrence, Kan.: University Press of Kansas, 2004.
- Dening, Greg. *Islands and Beaches: Discourse on a Silent Land: Marquesas, 1774-1880*. Chicago, Ill.: Dorsey Press, 1988.
- Diaz, Vicente. “Fight Boys, Till the Last:’ American Football and the Remasculinization of Indigeneity in Guam.” In *Pacific Diaspora*, edited by Paul R. Spickard. Honolulu: University of Hawaii, 2002.

- _____. *Repositioning the Missionary: Rewriting the Histories of Colonialism, Native Catholicism, and Indigeneity in Guam*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2010.
- Dow, Derek A. "Pruned of Its Dangers': The Tohunga Suppression Act of 1907." *Health and History* 3 (2001): 23.
- Duffy, Eamon. *The Striping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England 1400-1580*. Second ed. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2005.
- Dyke, Jon Van. *Who Owns the Crown Lands of Hawai'i?* Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2008.
- Frear, Mary Dillingham. "A Brief History of Kaumakapili Church." *Forty-Sixth Annual Report of the Hawaiian Historical Society* 46 (1938): 13.
- Garrett, John. *To Live among the Stars: Christian Origins in Oceania*. Geneva; Suva, Fiji: World Council of Churches, in association with the Institute of Pacific Studies, University of the South Pacific, 1982.
- Garrett, John. *Footsteps in the Sea: Christianity in Oceania to World War II*. Suva, Fiji: Institute of Pacific Studies, University of the South Pacific, in association with World Council of Churches, 1992.
- _____. *Where Nets Were Cast: Christianity in Oceania since World War II*. Suva: Institute of Pacific Studies in association with World Council of Churches, 1997.
- Gilson, R.P. *Samoa 1830 to 1900: The Politics of a Multi-Cultural Community*. Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1970.
- Gunson, Niel. *Messengers of Grace: Evangelical Missionaries in the South Seas 1797-1860*. Melbourne ; New York: Oxford University Press, 1978.
- _____. "The Tonga-Samoa Connection 1777-1845." *The Journal of Pacific History* 25, no. 2 (1990): 176-187.
- Hau'ofa, Epeli. "Our Sea of Islands." *The Contemporary Pacific* 6 (1994): 148-161.
- Hawkins, Richard A. "Princess Abigail Kawananakoa: The Forgotten Territorial Native Hawaiian Leader." *Hawaiian Journal of History* 37 (2003): 16.
- Howe, K. R. *Where the Waves Fall: A New South Sea Islands History from First Settlement to Colonial Rule*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 1984.
- Johnson, Donald D. "Joseph James Fern, Honolulu's First Mayor." *Hawaiian Journal of History* 9 (1975): 26.
- Kamae, Lori. *The Empty Throne: A Biography of Hawaii's Prince Cupid*. Honolulu: Top Gallant Publishing Company Ltd., 1980.
- Kame'eleihiwa, Lilikala. *Native Lands and Foreign Desires: Pehea La E Pono Ai*. Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press, 1992.
- Kamehiro, Stacy. *The Arts of Kingship: Hawaiian Art and National Culture of the Kalakaua Era*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2009.

- Kanahele, George S. *Emma: Hawaii's Remarkable Queen*. Honolulu: The Queen Emma Foundation, 1999.
- Karpiel, Frank. "Notes and Queries." *Hawaiian Journal of History* 33 (1999): 203-212.
- Kauanui, Kēhaulani. *Hawaiian Blood: Colonialism and the Politics of Sovereignty and Indigeneity*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2008.
- Kellaway, William. "The Indian Library." In *The New England Company 1649-1776* edited by William Kellaway, 122-65. London: Longmans, 1961.
- Kikuchi, William Pila. "A Legend of *Kaimiloa* Hawaiians in American Samoa." *Hawaiian Historical Society Review* (1864): 268-269.
- King, Samuel, and Randall Roth. *Broken Trust: Greed, Mismanagement, & Political Corruption at America's Largest Charitable Trust*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2006.
- Koppel, Tom. *Kanaka: The Untold Story of Hawaiian Pioneers in British Columbia and the Pacific Northwest*. Vancouver: Whitecap Books, 1995.
- Krauss, Bob. *Johnny Wilson: First Hawaiian Democrat*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1994.
- Kuykendall, Ralph. *The Hawaiian Kingdom, Volume II, 1854-1874, Twenty Critical Years*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1966.
- _____. *The Hawaiian Kingdom, Volume III, 1874-1893, the Kalakaua Dynasty*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1967.
- _____. *The Hawaiian Kingdom, Volume I, 1778-1854, Foundation and Transformation*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1968.
- Kuykendall, Ralph S., and A. Grove Day. *Hawaii: A History, from Polynesian Kingdom to American Commonwealth*. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1948.
- Linnekin, Joyce. *Sacred Queens and Women of Consequence: Rank, Gender, and Colonialism in the Hawaiian Islands*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 1990.
- Luomala, Katharine. "A Gilbertese Tradition of a Religious Massacre." *Sixty-Second Annual Report of the Hawaiian Historical Society* (1953): 6.
- Mackrell, Brian. *Hariru Wikitoria!: An Illustrated History of the Maori Tour of England, 1863*. Auckland; New York: Oxford University Press, 1985.
- MacIennan, Carol. "Kilauea Sugar Plantation in 1912: A Snapshot." *Hawaiian Journal of History* 41 (2007): 34.
- Maude, H.E. "Tioba and the Tabiteuean Religious Wars." *The Journal of the Polynesian Society* 90, no. 3 (1981): 307-336.
- McGregor, Davianna. "'Āina Ho'opulapula: Hawaiian Homesteading." *Hawaiian Journal of History* 24 (1990): 38.

- Meleisea, Malama. *The Making of Modern Samoa: Traditional Authority and Colonial Administration in the History of Western Samoa*. Suva: Institute of Pacific Studies of the University of the South Pacific, 1987.
- Merry, Sarah Engle. *Colonizing Hawaii: The Cultural Power of Law*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000.
- Mitchell, Maui John and Hillary Mitchell. *Te Tau Ihu O Te Waka: A History of Maori of Nelson and Marlborough*. Wellington: Huia Publishers, 2004.
- Munro, Doug, and Andrew Thornley. *The Covenant Makers: Islander Missionaries in the Pacific*. Suva, Fiji: Pacific Theological College and The Institute of Pacific Studies at the University of the South Pacific, 1996.
- Nishimoto, Warren. "The Progressive Era and Hawai'i: The Early History of Palama Settlement, 1896—1929" *Hawaiian Journal of History* 34 (2000): 16.
- Osorio, Jon Kamakawiwo'ole. *Dismembering Lahui: A History of the Hawaiian Nation to 1887*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2002.
- Petersen, Glenn. "Indigenous Island Empires: Yap and Tonga Considered." *The Journal of Pacific History* 35, no. 1 (2000): 6-27.
- Pukui, Mary Kawena. *Nana I Ke Kumu Vol. I*. Honolulu: Hui Hanai, 1972.
- Pukui, Mary Kawena and E.S. Craighill Hand. *The Polynesian Family System in Kau, Hawaii*. Honolulu: Mutual Publishing, 1998.
- Pukui, Mary Kawena and Samuel Elbert. *Hawaiian Dictionary, Revised and Enlarged Edition*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1986.
- Raymond, Rebecca Copp. "The Baker Clan." Santa Rosa, CA: Cleek/Print.
- Rutherford, Noel. *Shirley Baker and the King of Tonga*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1996.
- Sahlins, Marshall David. *Islands of History*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985.
- Salesa, Damon. "'Travel-Happy' Samoa: Colonialism, Samoan Migration, and a 'Brown Pacific'." *The New Zealand Journal of History* 37, no. 2 (2003): 171-188.
- Schug, Donald. "Hawai'i's Commercial Fishing Industry: 1820—1945" *Hawaiian Journal of History* 35 (2001).
- Silva, Noenoe. "He Kānāwai E Ho'opau I Na Hula Kuolo Hawai'i: The Political Economy of Banning the Hula." *Hawaiian Journal of History* 34 (2000): 29-49.
 _____. *Aloha Betrayed: Native Hawaiian Resistance to American Colonialism*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2004.
- Smith, Andrea. "Heteropatriarchy and the Three Pillars of White Supremacy: Rethinking Women of Color Organizing." In *Color of Violence: The Incite! Anthology*. Ed. INCITE! Women of Color Against Violence. Cambridge: South End Press, 2006.
- Spickard, Paul R., ed. *Pacific Diaspora: Island Peoples in the United States*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2002.

- Spurway, John. "Hiki Mo E Faliki: Why Ma'afu Brought His Floor Mats to Fiji in 1847." *The Journal of Pacific History* 37, no. 1 (2002): 5-23.
- Stillman, Amy. "'Aloha Aina': New Perspectives On 'Kaulana Nā Pua'." *Hawaiian Journal of History* 23 (1989): 30.
- _____. "History Reinterpreted in Song: The Case of the Hawaiian Counterrevolution." *Hawaiian Journal of History* 23 (1989): 30.
- _____. "Of the People Who Love the Land: Vernacular History in the Poetry of Modern Hula." *Amerasia Journal* 28, no. 3 (2002): 85-108.
- Stoler, Ann Laura. *Race and the Education of Desire: Foucault's History of Sexuality and the Colonial Order of Things*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1995.
- Tamasese, Tuiatua Tupua. "The Riddle in Samoan History: The Relevance of Language, Names, Honorifics, Genealogy, Ritual and Chant to Historical Analysis." *The Journal of Pacific History* 29, no. 1 (1994): 66-79.
- Teaiwa, Teresia. "Lo(O)Sing the Edge." *The Contemporary Pacific* 13, no. 2 (2001): 14.
- _____. "Militarism, Tourism and the Native: Articulations in Oceania." University of California, Santa Cruz, 2001.
- Thomas, Nicholas. *Colonialism's Culture: Anthropology, Travel, and Government*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1994.
- _____. *In Oceania: Visions, Artifacts, Histories*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1997.
- Trask, Haunani-Kay. *From a Native Daughter: Colonialism and Sovereignty in Hawai'i*. Monroe, Me.: Common Courage Press, 1993.
- _____. *From a Native Daughter: Colonialism and Sovereignty in Hawai'i*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1999.
- Tuimaleali'ifano, Morgan A. *Samoans in Fiji*. Suva: Institute of Pacific Studies, University of the South Pacific, 1990.
- Valeri, Valerio. *Kingship and Sacrifice: Ritual and Society in Ancient Hawaii*. Translated by Paula Wissing. Chicago: University of Chicago press, 1985.
- Wagner-Wright, Sandra. *The Structure of the Missionary Call to the Sandwich Islands, 1790-1830: Sojourners among Strangers*. San Francisco: Mellen Research University Press, 1990.
- Walker, Isaiah Helekunihi. "Hui Nalu, Beach boys, and the Surfing Boarder-Lands of Hawai'i." *The Contemporary Pacific* 20, no. 1 (2008): 24.
- Warrior, Robert Allen. *The People and the Word: Reading Native Nonfiction Indigenous Americas*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2005.
- Williams, Rianna M. "John Adams Cummins: Prince of Entertainers." *Hawaiian Journal of History* 30 (1996): 15.

ii. Unpublished Dissertations and Papers

- Beamer, Kamana. "Na Wai Ka Mana." PhD Dissertation, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, 2008.
- Diaz, Vicente. "Moving Islands: Towards an Indigenous Tectonics of Historiography in Guam." Unpublished Paper, University of Michigan, 2005.
- Horn, Jeremy. "Primacy of the Pacific under the Hawaiian Kingdom." M.A. Thesis, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, 1951.
- Mookini, Esther T. "The Hale Naua of David Kalakaua." Unpublished Paper, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, 1970.
- Morris, Nancy Jane. "Hawaiian Missionaries Abroad, 1852-1909," PhD Dissertation, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, 1987.
- Nogelmeier, Marvin Puakea. "Mai Pa'a I Ka Leo: Historical Voice in Hawaiian Primary Materials, Looking Forward and Listening Back." PhD Dissertation, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, 2003.
- Salesa, Damon. "Race Mixing: A Victorian Problem in Britain and New Zealand." Dphil Thesis, University of Oxford, 2000.
- Somerville, Alice Te Punga. "Nau Te Rourou, Nau Te Rakau: The Oceanic, Indigenous, Postcolonial and New Zealand Comparative Contexts of Maori Writing in English." PhD Dissertation, Cornell University, 2006.