

No Ka Pono ‘Ole O Ka Lehulehu:
The 1874 Election of Hawai‘i’s Mō‘ī
And The Kānaka Maoli Response

A Thesis Submitted To The Graduate Division Of The University Of Hawai‘i At
Mānoa In Partial Fulfillment Of The Requirements For The Degree Of

Master Of Arts

In

Hawaiian Studies

December 2013

By Puali‘ili‘imaikalani Rossi

Thesis Committee:

Jonathan Osorio, Chairperson
Lilikalā Kame‘eleihiwa
ku‘ualoha ho‘omanawanui

Dedication

He lei kēia no ko‘u makuakāne. This paper is dedicated to my father, Mark Rossi. Because of him, I learned to value and appreciate my Hawaiian culture and my kūpuna who came before me. He was there when I first checked out my Queen Emma book from Līhu‘e Library and he has been there ever since. Dad, thank you for your unending support. You made this possible.

Acknowledgements

Mahalo e Ke Akua, mahalo e nā kūpuna. This thesis could not have been possible without many people supporting me. I am so grateful to my parents, Mark and Haunani, for leading me to this path and for their constant support. My husband, Joshua Fukino, deserves many, many thanks for understanding how important this was for me and for always being someone to lean on when things got tough. So much thanks and gratitude goes to my committee. Kumu Jon, thank you very much for chairing my committee and for going the extra mile to see this through Your ‘ike is incomparable and I can only hope that one day I will live up to your potential. Kumu Lilikalā, I never would have imagined that you would one day be on my committee. You have been such an inspiration to me as a Kanaka Maoli woman. Kumu ku‘ualoha, when I heard you speak about our one hānau of Wailua and why it was important for Kānaka Maoli scholars to continue to research their histories, that was my hō‘ailona that this was the right path for me. I am so incredibly grateful that you agreed to sit on my committee, and I cannot thank you enough for all that you did to help me tell this story.

Many hands, many voices, and many generous hearts went into this thesis, including Peter Mills, Kale Langlas, Chancellor Helen Cox, Dennis Chun, Ka‘imi Summers, Jim McFarland, Victoria Holt Takamine, Puamōhala Kaholokula, Sabra Kauka, Māpuana Graham, Pō‘ai Galindo, Mauiola Cook, Wayne and Nani Fukino, Lovey and Bill DeRego, Regina Pfeiffer, Thia Rossi, Marisa Kamai Julian, Uluwehi Hopkins, Ka‘āhiki Solis, Lufi Luteru, the wonderful people at the Kaua‘i Historical Society, Hawai‘i State Archives, Bishop Museum Archives, the Hawaiian Historical

Society, the members of St. Michael's, all my Kumu both past and present, and my Kaua'i 'ohana and hoaaloha. My deepest appreciation also goes to my Rossi, Gonsalves, and Fukino 'ohana.

Though he is no longer with us, I am truly grateful for Kumu Kanalu Young. A few months before his passing, he agreed to be on my committee and then gave me some wonderful advice. He told me to visit the places where Emma and Kalākaua so that I may feel their presence and hear their voices. Kumu Kanalu, I listened and did just that. Thank you for guiding me there.

Another person who is no longer with me, but she always supported me, was my grandmother, Leatrice Reis Gonsalves. When I was a young girl, she bought me my first Hawaiian history book and encouraged me to learn more about my culture. I miss you so much, Grandma, but I felt you with me the entire way.

Last, but certainly not least, thank you to my haumāna. They did so much to make sure that I completed my graduate degree and to support me throughout this journey. I hope that I inspired you to move forward in your academic careers. You all certainly inspired me.

Abstract

On February 12, 1874, Ke Ali‘i David Kalākaua was elected Mō‘ī amid much protest by Kānaka Maoli who were in support of Kalākaua’s opponent, Mō‘īwahine Emma Kaleleonālani. Following the announcement of the new Mō‘ī, Kānaka Maoli reacted by rioting against the Legislature and the Hawaiian Representatives. This thesis examines the events surrounding Kalākaua’s election and why the ‘Ōiwi’s desire to see Emma wear the Crown went unheeded. In researching this topic, it became apparent that Kalākaua’s election was secured through manipulation on the part of the sugar plantation owners and businessmen in Hawai‘i who were aiming to control the Aupuni. Likewise, because it was significant that a Kamehameha continue to wear the Crown, the Kalākaua advocates disputed Emma’s claim that she was of Kamehameha descent creating a rift between the two Ali‘i families that never fully healed.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	3
Abstract.....	5
Introduction.....	8
Notes on the Text.....	14
 Mokuna ‘Ekahi: Nā Pua ‘Alua o Ke Aupuni Ke Ali‘i Kalākaua and Mō‘īwahine Emma.....	16
David La‘amea Kamanakapu‘u Mahinulani Nāloia‘ehuokalani Lumialani Kalākaua.....	16
Emma Kalanikaumakaamano Nā‘e‘a Rooke.....	22
 Mokuna ‘Elua: Ua Pau Nā Kamehameha The End of the Kamehameha Dynasty.....	29
Hawai‘i’s First Election.....	38
Upset At ‘Iolani Barracks.....	44
 Mokuna ‘Ekolu: Nā Kōlea Kā‘ili ‘Āina Missionaries, Sugar, and The Reciprocity Treaty.....	49
‘Āina, That Which Feeds.....	49
“Sweetening The Deal”: The Question of Pu‘uloa.....	54
Reciprocity Secured.....	64
 Mokuna ‘Ehā: Nā ‘Oi ‘Elua Na Ka Lāhui Who Shall Rule the Nation?	68
The Succession of Lunalilo.....	70
Campaigning For The Crown.....	80
 Mokuna ‘Elima: E Inu I Ka Wai ‘Awa‘awa! The Election and Riot of 1874.....	89
Casting The Ballot.....	90
Attacking The Representatives.....	96
Landing The Foreign Troops.....	100
The New Mō‘ī: Kalākaua.....	103
The Aftermath of the Riot: The Newspaper Response.....	107

Trial of the Queenites.....	111
Ka Lei Kaulana o Ke Kipi: Supporting Mō‘īwahine Emma.....	119
Mokuna ‘Eono: Nā Lei Hiwahiwa o Ke Aupuni Genealogy And The Crown.....	123
Early Debates on Emma’s Mo‘okū‘auhau.....	127
On Mō‘īwahine Emma’s Mo‘okū‘auhau.....	130
Genealogical Disputes in the Newspapers.....	135
Discussions Following the Election.....	144
Mokuna ‘Ehiku: He Wai ‘Ihi a He Mana Wahine The Blood Quantum and Gender in 1874.....	151
The “Non-Issue” of Emma’s Blood Quantum.....	151
Colonialism and The Issue of Gender.....	156
King or Queen?: The Traditional Role of Mana Wahine.....	161
Mokuna ‘Ewalu: E Welo Mau Ka Hae Hawai‘i Final Thoughts.....	169
The Kalākaua and The Kamehameha ‘Ohana.....	171
Ua Pau Ka Mo‘olelo: The End of This Story.....	174
Appendix A: S. M. Kamakau’s Mo‘okū‘auhau of Mō‘īwahine Emma.....	176
Appendix B: J. K. Unauna’s Mo‘okū‘auhau of Mō‘īwahine Emma.....	179
Appendix C: A Published List Of Names Of The Accused Rioters.....	180
Appendix D: List of Hawaiian Newspaper Articles Referenced In This Thesis..	181
Bibliography.....	184

Introduction

On a memorable day in February in the year 1874, several Kānaka Maoli stood waiting on the Waiānuenue Boat Landing in Hilo, Hawai‘i. They were not alone as many other people were anxiously waiting to hear who was elected the new Mō‘ī of the Aupuni. A few days before, the reigning Mō‘ī William Charles Lunalilo¹ had taken his last breath on O‘ahu. Failing to name a successor to the Crown, it was up to the Legislature to determine who would now rule over the Hawaiian kingdom. Would it be Prince David Kalākaua of the Keawe-a-Heulu family?² Or would it be the Mō‘īwahine Kānemake (Dowager Queen) Emma Kaleleonālani, the claimed descendent of Keli‘imaika‘i³ and widow of Kamehameha IV?

As the anticipation grew, an elderly man known for his claims of being a kuhikuhipu‘uone, one skilled in prophecies, approached them. He claimed that, like those young Kānaka Maoli, he also was a supporter of Mō‘īwahine Emma, but in speaking to them, he concluded with the following:

“But mark what I say. Kalakaua will be king, and his will be a troublesome reign.

The very name Kalakaua spells it.”⁴

¹ William Charles Lunalilo would rule as Mō‘ī from January 8, 1873, to February 3, 1874.

² McKinzie, 1983:20, 64. Keawe-a-Heulu was the child of Heulu and ‘Īkua‘ana and a descendant of ‘Umi-a-Līloa. Both Kalākaua and Lili‘uokalani would claim descent to Keawe-a-Heulu in their argument that they held the rank to rule over the Aupuni.

³ Keli‘imaika‘i is the younger brother of Kamehameha I and the ancestor used by Emma and her supporters to warrant her claim to the Crown. More on Keli‘imaika‘i will be discussed in Mokuna (Chapter) ‘Eono.

⁴ ‘Iaukea and Watson, 1988:23. The name Kalākaua literally translates to “The Day of War.” Pukui explains that a name was a personal possession that could take on a force of its own. The more the name was spoken, the more power the name could hold. Furthermore, a name could become a “living entity” that could influence the “health, happiness, and even life span” of a

The election of King Kalākaua in 1874 was one of the most calamitous events to happen to the Kingdom of Hawai‘i, as his reign paved the way for foreign takeover. His election removed the majority of Kānaka Maoli from the situation and resulted in a government controlled by po‘e haole (foreigners). Kānaka Maoli had already suffered through the abolishment of their traditional ‘Aikapu System, a dramatic population collapse, the conversion of commonly held ‘āina to real property, and the abundance of their ‘āina being abused for the wealth and profit of foreigners.⁵

Until 1874, the one area of Hawai‘i's Kingdom that had remained relatively secure was the sovereignty of their Mō‘ī. However, on January 3, 1874, the death of King Lunalilo thrust the Kānaka Maoli into a situation beyond their control. With the aforementioned population collapse, there were very few Ali‘i left who were considered qualified for the title of Mō‘ī: David Kalākaua and his ‘ohana,⁶ Mō‘īwahine Kānemake Emma and her ‘ohana,⁷ Bernice Pauahi Bishop and Ruth Ke‘elikōlani.⁸ No longer would the choice of Mō‘ī be determined by genealogical rank, nor was there an ‘Aha Ali‘i (Council of Chiefs) who analyzed and concluded the best choice for a ruler. The decision of who should rule the Kingdom was left up to forty-five men who made up the

person. Therefore, Kalākaua's name was viewed as a foretelling of his turbulent reign and its effect on the Kānaka Maoli. Pukui, et. al., 1972:94, 98.

⁵ Both Kame‘eleihiwa and Stannard discuss the population collapse of the Kānaka Maoli following Captain Cook's arrival in 1778. According to Kame‘eleihiwa, close to one million Native Hawaiians populated Hawai‘i. By 1874, this number dropped significantly. See Kame‘eleihiwa, 1992; Standdard, 1989.

⁶ “I Mau Ai Ke Kuokoa.” *Ka Nūhou Hawai‘i*. 3 February 1874. David Kalākaua's ‘ohana of eligible Ali‘i included his kaikaina (younger brother) William Pitt Leleiōhoku and his two kaikuāhine (sisters), Lydia Kamaka‘eha and Miram Likelike.

⁷ Ibid. Mō‘īwahine Emma's family of elligble Ali‘i included her two hoahānau (cousins), Albert Kūnuiākea and Elizabeth Keka‘anī‘au Pratt.

⁸ Ibid.

Legislative Assembly, some of whom had their own agenda and reasons for choosing a particular candidate. Following the death of Mō‘ī Lunalilo, two Ali‘i proclaimed their candidacy: David Kalākaua and Mō‘īwahine Emma. There would be a new Mō‘ī elected.⁹

This thesis examines the events leading up to and following the 1874 election between Ke Ali‘i David Kalākaua and Mō‘īwahine Kānemake Emma and the Kānaka Maoli’s riotous response to the results. While other historians have written about this significant event, many failed to look at the manipulative means used to secure Kalākaua’s victory and the reactions of the Kānaka Maoli. In their writings, other circumstances that surrounded the election, such as the issue a Reciprocity Treaty with the United States and the subsequent forced approval of the 1887 “Bayonet” Constitution, have overshadowed the repercussions of Kalākaua’s election to the throne.¹⁰ Most importantly, the po‘e haole behind the election silenced the anguish felt by the Kānaka Maoli.¹¹ Western historians who lacked the understanding of language later did the same.¹²

¹⁰ The Reciprocity Treaty will be discussed at length in Mokuna ‘Ekolu. The 1887 Constitution, commonly called the Bayonet Constitution, was forced upon Kalākaua during his reign. This constitution would strip away power from the Mō‘ī and put most of the kingdom’s authority into the hands of a small group of men who were looking to overthrow the kingdom and annex Hawai‘i to the United States. See Osorio, *Dismembering Lāhui* (2002), for a more detailed account of the events that led to the passing of this constitution.

¹¹ In Mokuna ‘Elima, I discuss how the newspapers used their influence to keep the Kānaka Maoli from expressing their frustration at Kalākaua’s election and the reason for their support of Mō‘īwahine Emma.

¹² Many Western historians of the past twentieth century would not use any of the Hawaiian-language newspapers as resources. These newspapers would uncover a significant archive of stories, political events, traditional customs, and historiographies from the Kānaka Maoli perspective. To exclude these writings is almost eliminating the Kānaka Maoli voice entirely.

Noenoe Silva explains that, following the outlaw of ‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i in public and private schools in 1896, English became the primary language used in both business and government affairs.¹³ With the exception of a few Kānaka Maoli, English was the accepted language of the pae ‘āina (Hawaiian archipelago), and it therefore became the primary language used to research and write Hawai‘i’s history.¹⁴ What Western historians often deem as being important in *our* history may not be what the Kānaka Maoli feel is significant. Linda Tuhiwai Smith points out that we “have often allowed our ‘histories’ to be told and then have become outsiders as we heard them being retold.”¹⁵ For example, Ralph S. Kuykendall, the noted who wrote an extensive three-volume history of Hawai‘i’s political history, significantly leaves out the reason behind the Kānaka Maoli outrage at Kalākaua’s election and instead defends the choice of the Legislature.¹⁶ The argument that Emma represented the Kamehameha ‘ohana and therefore deserved the right to rule the Aupuni is not even alluded to. Likewise, Gavan Daws, author of the Hawaiian history book *Shoal of Time* (1968), makes a brief mention of the genealogical factor in the election, but also fails to investigate why this was a significant factor to the ‘Ōiwi.¹⁷ A lack of research into the stories of our kūpuna through the medium of ‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i leaves us with critical gaps in the reconstruction of our past. It has now become, as it always has been, our kuleana, or responsibility, to share our version of Hawai‘i’s history and what we know is important for future generations to understand.

¹³ Silva, 2004:3.

¹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵ Tuhiwai Smith, 1999:33.

¹⁶ See Kuykendall, 1967.

¹⁷ Evidence for this statement can be Mokuna ‘Eono.

In response to these Western historiographies, later Kānaka Maoli historians, such as Lilikalā Kame‘eleihiwa (*Native Land and Foreign Desires*, 1992), Kanalu Young (*Rethinking the Native Hawaiian Past*, 1998), Haunani Kay Trask (*From a Native Daughter*, 1999), Jonathan Kamakawiwo‘ole Osorio (*Dismembering Lāhui*, 2002), and Noenoe Silva (*Aloha Betrayed*, 2004), have produced long-awaited discourses on Hawaiian history from the Hawaiian perspective. Both Osorio and Silva have discussed the election in their works and provided an excellent basis for this paper to elaborate upon.

In approaching this topic, I turned primarily to archival research and manuscript collections. Many of the po‘e haole who were present in Honolulu in 1874 recorded the event and thus made evident the means they went to guarantee Kalākaua’s victory. Almost all of these writings reaffirmed that Emma was the choice of the ‘Ōiwi. However, I wanted to hear what Kānaka Maoli had to say about the event and why they supported Emma. To do so, it was important to return to the Hawaiian-language newspapers.

The newspapers provided significant information on what was important to Kānaka Maoli during the later years of the nineteenth century. Within the newspapers, I discovered the sentiments of my kūpuna in regards to issues affecting the ‘Ōiwi and the Aupuni. Most importantly, the newspapers revealed to me that the issue of the 1874 election had less to do with politics and much more to do with whom was genealogically worthy of ruling the Aupuni. However, after the people rioted against the Legislature’s decision to elect Kalākaua, the Kānaka Maoli voice became noticeably silent. These are some of the issues that are discussed throughout this thesis.

My interest in this topic began during my childhood when I came across a biography of Mō‘īwahine Emma. Reading about a young girl who later became Mō‘īwahine captivated me, but it was learning about her struggles and loss that turned Emma into somewhat of a hero. Mō‘īwahine Emma was not only a woman who accomplished amazing things in her life, she persevered through the deaths of both a husband and child. Emma was a *Hawaiian* woman and someone that I, as a young Hawaiian girl, could look up to.

While attending the University of Hawai‘i at Hilo, my History of Hawai‘i course required that we research an event in Hawaiian history using only newspapers as our resources. Again, I turned to Mō‘īwahine Emma. However, this time I wanted to research the Election of 1874. It never failed to surprise me that she was not elected since, to me, it was evident that she was the choice of the Kānaka Maoli. If this was a *Hawaiian* Kingdom, why was their choice disregarded? What also surprised me was how many of my fellow Kānaka Maoli classmates did not know that Emma had even been a candidate.

My understanding of ‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i at that time was limited, so I turned to the English-language newspapers while attempting to understand what I could of the Hawaiian-language newspapers. In reading the English-language newspapers, I realized how far the influence of the po‘e haole in Hawai‘i reached. The newspapers were very one-sided and always weighed in favor of Kalākaua. They contradicted what I had felt to be true: that Mō‘īwahine Emma was the true choice of the Kānaka Maoli.

In 2008, I was privileged to sit in Kumu Jonathan Osorio’s Post-Contact Chiefs course at the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa. One of my classmates asked Kumu Jon a

question that I had never considered: If Mō‘īwahine Emma had won the election, would the overthrow have happened?¹⁸ The question was significant and deserved consideration. In researching this topic, I kept that particular question in mind, leading to the realization that the po‘e haole had greatly influenced the election of Kalākaua and completely rejected the voices of the Kānaka Maoli. It was time for their voices to be heard.

My thesis is not something that was chosen at random. It has been simmering under the surface from the moment that I, as that young girl, sat down with Mō‘īwahine Emma’s biography and learned about one of Hawai‘i most famous women of the nineteenth century. It grew the moment that I set aside my idolization of teen popstars, celebrities, and British Queens, and it flourished when I learned more about Mō‘ī Kalākaua’s election and how my kūpuna fiercely opposed the choice of a few influential men in the Kingdom. As Kumu ku‘ualoha ho‘omanawanui said to me while discussing my topic, we do not necessarily choose what to research when it comes to our history and culture.¹⁹ Rather, the subject selects who should tell its story. Therefore, it is a kuleana that we cannot, and should not, ignore.

Notes on the Text

As a Kānaka Maoli, I have never considered ‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i (Hawaiian language) to be a foreign language. It is the language of my kūpuna and therefore I have not italicized hua ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i (Hawaiian words) in this thesis because I do not consider them to be foreign words. Additionally, the use of the kahakō and ‘okina in quoted

¹⁸ This question was posed in Osorio’s HWST 342 course on March 20, 2008.

¹⁹ ho‘omanawanui, Personal communication. 8 July 2013.

Hawaiian-language newspaper articles will not be used out of respect for the writers, but they will be included in the publication names (e.g. *Ka Nūpepa Kū‘oko ‘a*).²⁰

Throughout this thesis, you will notice that the terms Aupuni (government, nation) and Representatives are capitalized; many of the Hawaiian-language newspaper articles I used in this thesis also followed the same format. Therefore, I chose to follow their example. Likewise, because this is a mo‘olelo that has “a very powerful need to give testimony to and restore a spirit”²¹ of my people, I chose to use and capitalize the terms Kānaka Maoli and ‘Ōiwi in referring to the indigenous people of Hawai‘i. These terms have a much deeper connotation because they emphasize the feeling of connectivity to our kulāiwi (native land).

Lastly, it was my intent to return to the Hawaiian-language newspapers to see how Kānaka Maoli were responding to the affairs of the Aupuni in 1874. Translating these texts can sometimes be problematic. As Larry Kimura accurately describes, when we translate ‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i into English, “the English words used add cultural connotations to the idea conveyed, while eliminating intended connotations and meanings of the original Hawaiian.”²² For that reason, I offer my sincerest of apologies if I have failed to accurately portray the voices of our kūpuna.

²⁰ I also consciously left out the diacritical markers in certain Hawaiian names where I saw more than one variation of spelling.

²¹ Tuhiwai Smith, 1999:28.

²² Kimura, 1983:181.

Mokuna ‘Ekahi: Nā Pua ‘Alua o Ke Aupuni Ke Ali‘i Kalākaua and Mō‘īwahine Emma

In order for us to understand the roles and significance that Kalākaua and Emma had in the Aupuni, we must first turn to their childhood. Unlike the Ali‘i before them, both Kalākaua and Emma were raised in a unique time where the traditions of the past were overshadowed by a foreign way of living. The influence of Westerners also created a system of governing the Aupuni that was unfamiliar to the ‘Ōiwi.

In addition, the Aupuni was now controlled by one Mō‘ī, which differed from traditional times where each moku-puni was controlled by one or more Ali‘i Nui. Therefore, as the ruling family, the Kamehamehas were set apart and held in higher prestige than other Ali‘i. As I will discuss in this chapter, this new era greatly influenced Kalākaua and Emma and their future positions in the Aupuni.

David La‘amea Kamanakapu‘u Mahinulani Nāloia‘ehuokalani Lumialani Kalākaua

On November 16, 1836, a night of flashing lightning and roaring thunder, a hō‘ailona (sign) that an Ali‘i was about to be born, Ali‘i Nui Wahine (high chiefess) Keohokālōle gave birth to her third son, David La‘amea Kamanakapu‘u Mahinulani Nāloia‘ehuokalani Lumialani Kalākaua. With her kāne, Kapa‘akea, Keohokālōle had mothered two sons and, after Kalākaua, she gave birth to six more children. Would either parent know that the child born to them on that stormy night would later become the Mō‘ī of the aupuni?

Many of Kapa‘akea and Keohokālōle’s children were given to other families as a keiki hānai, and Kalākaua was no exception.²³ He, too, left his birthplace to live with his hānai mother, the chiefess Ha‘aheo.²⁴ Ha‘aheo, however, passed away only a year after Kalākaua was born, leaving her husband, Keawemahi Kinimaka, to raise Kalākaua.

Kinimaka was a lesser-ranking chief,²⁵ and therefore did not have the same privileges afforded to Ha‘aheo.²⁶ Following the death of Ha‘aheo, Kalākaua lost his kahu (attendant) and he and Kinimaka had to move from the chief’s court in Lāhaina. Before Kalākaua was four years old, he lost his hānai mother and the lifestyle she was awarded. Kinimaka, also, took a new wife and start his own ‘ohana.²⁷ These changes brought a lot of turbulence at this early stage of his life. When his mother Keohokālōle requested that he attend the Chief’s Children’s School on O‘ahu, his life changed significantly once more.

²³ The traditional practice of hānai was a common one. The child would be taken from his or her biological parents (with their consent) and affectionately reared by their mākuā hānai (literally, “feeding parents”) because the keiki was seen as their own child. The biological parents of the keiki would not be concealed, and therefore the child was familiar with his biological family and could chose to have a relationship with both families. Handy and Pukui, 1972:71-72.

²⁴ Allen, 1995:5. I am unsure of Ha‘aheo’s familial relationship to Kalākaua’s ‘ohana. According to Allen, she was a lineal descendent of the Kamehameha ‘ohana, and was therefore allowed to live at Kauikeaouli’s court in Lāhaina.

²⁵ McKinzie, 1986:99. Kinimaka was the son of Kapiiwi, an ali‘i of Ka‘ū on the Island of Hawai‘i, and Kahikoloa, a chiefess from Maui.

²⁶ Allen, 1995: 5-6. Ha‘aheo would be allowed to live in Kauikeaouli’s court in Lāhaina.

²⁷ Kinimaka would marry Pai, a chiefess from Polapola (Borabora), with whom they would have three children: Ha‘aheo Kaniu (w), David Leleo (k), and Kaikala Kinimaka (k). McKinzie, 1986:99. According to Allen, Kinimaka’s new wife, Pai, would show aloha (affection) towards Kalākaua until she had her own child to attend to. See Allen, 1995:5-6.

It was at the Chief's Children's School²⁸ that Kalākaua saw the extent of how advantaged the Kamehamehas were. One more than one occasion, Kalākaua found himself on the receiving end of one of Mr. Cookes' severe methods of punishments of which the Kamehamehas were often exempt.²⁹ It would be surprising if Kalākaua did not feel a small bit of bitterness towards the elite Kamehamehas.

For example, a significant moment in Kalākaua's early life was the hanging of his grandfather, Kamanawa, in 1840.³⁰ It seems that Kamanawa was not yet accustomed to the new laws that forbade the traditional custom of "moe aku, moe mai"³¹ and had continued his extramarital affairs, much to the dismay of his Christian wife, Kamokuiki.³² Kamokuiki was granted her subsequent divorce request, and Kamanawa was prevented from marrying anyone unless Kamokuiki passed away.³³

²⁸ The Chief's Children's School (also known as the Royal School) was established in 1846 during the reign of Kauikeaouli and under control of Richard Armstrong, the Minister of Public Instruction. The institution would become a boarding school under Amos and Juliet Cooke where select children of Ali'i rank would be educated in Western knowledge. See Kuykendall, 1938:362.

²⁹ Allen, 1995:11. Amos Starr Cooke, who was angered that Mosese was out drinking with the sailors, decided to injure Kalākaua instead of Mosese. Mosese was Kīna'u and Kekūanaō'a's eldest surviving child and was next in line to become Mō'i after Alexander Liholiho. To hit the heir was unacceptable, therefore it was Kalākaua who was forced to deal with the repercussions of Cooke's anger.

³⁰ Kamanawa II was the father of Kapa'akea, the father of Kalākaua and his siblings. Kamanawa II takes his name from his illustrious uncle, Kamanawa, who was one of the "Kona Uncles" who helped Kamehameha I conquer the Aupuni. Kamanawa II's paternal grandfather was Kame'eiamoku, the twin brother of Kamanawa and another of Kamehameha's "Kona Uncles." See Lili'uokalani, Appendix F, 1898:407.

³¹ "Moe aku, moe mai," is a phrase that refers to being sexually intimate with different partners.

³² In addition to this peculiar event, Kamokuiki was also known for documenting one of the versions of the Kumulipo, of which Kalākaua would later use to proclaim his descent and worthiness to the Crown. See Beckwith, 1972:2.

³³ Gutmanis, 1974:143.

Within six weeks, Kamokuiki was dead, poisoned by Kamanawa and his friend, Lonoapuakau.³⁴ Kaomuiki's death occurred fourteen days after the signing of the Constitution that enacted the punishment of breaking the law, instigating the kingdom to act immediately by sentencing both Kamanawa and Lonoapuakau to death by hanging.³⁵

This incident must have had some impact on a young Kalākaua, who was also present at his grandfather's hanging. The young prince had been close to his grandfather, and he, along with his older brother James Kaliokalani, had been summoned to visit Kamanawa before his death. As both boys were attendees of the Chief's Children's School, they had been accompanied by the Cookes. It was not stated why a young Kalākaua was allowed to watch his grandfather's hanging, but some have speculated that the Cookes had little regard for the children of Kapa'akea simply because they were not part of the Kamehameha line.³⁶ It is unfortunate that we do not know the details of Kalākaua's last conversation with his grandfather; it would be surprising if it did not alter Kalākaua's feelings towards the "pious" missionaries.

³⁴ Lonoapuakau, who is also referred to as Lonopuakau, was a friend of Kamanawa and captain of the vessel *Ho'ōikaika*. Both Kamanawa and Lonoapuakau admitted to mixing a poison of 'ākia and 'auhuhu, two plants used to poison fish, mixed with 'awa. (See Gutmanis, 1974). In the year 1842, *Ka Nonanona* would publish a list of names of those whom the newspaper claimed died from or were guilty of intoxication of either 'awa or liquor. Following the list of names was a short query of why Kalākaua's grandmother, Kamokuiki, was not included in the list. "No ke aha ka pai ole ia ka inoa o Kamokuiki, me ka poe i make i ka awa?" (Why is Kamokuiki's name not published with those who have died from 'awa?) *Ka Nonanona*'s response was that Kamokuiki did not die from 'awa, but that her death was "he pepehi kanaka ia," a murder. However, because Kamanawa used 'apu'awa to kill Kamokuiki, *Ka Nonanona* did acknowledge that, had both ali'i stopped their continued consumption of 'awa and other intoxicants, Kamokuiki would not have taken the concoction made by her husband and would still be alive. "No ka Awa." *Ka Nonanona*. 3 August 1842.

³⁵ Keahiolalo-Karasuda, 2010:148.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 154.

Additionally, the incident may have aroused some hostility towards the Kamehameha family on the part of the Kalākaua ‘ohana. After all, it was the laws instigated by the ruling Kamehameha family that led to Kamanawa’s punishment. Kauikeaouli (Kamehameha III), the reigning Mō‘ī, was not without fault when it came to adultery. He had attempted to carry the traditional Ali‘i practice of *nī‘aupi‘o* with his sister, Nāhi‘ena‘ena,³⁷ even though she was later married off to ali‘i William Pitt Leleiohoku in 1835.³⁸ There were also rumors that Kauikeaouli, during his marriage to Mō‘īwahine Kalama, fathered Albert Kūnuiākea with Jane Lahilahi.³⁹ Perhaps Kalākaua and his family wondered why so little respect was shown to their family in regard to Kamanawa’s crime, when it appeared that the Kamehamehas were overlooked if they broke the new laws.⁴⁰

When Kalākaua left the Chief’s Children’s School in 1846, he then turned his attention to studying military tactics as well as legal matters. He studied under the Prussian Captain, Franz Funk, before serving as First Lieutenant of his father’s militia.⁴¹ At the age of seventeen, he studied law under Charles Coffin Harris,⁴² an American man

³⁷ Kame‘eleihiwa, 1992:165. According to Kame‘eleihiwa, their intimate affair went public in 1834, but that it had started at least five years prior.

³⁸ Daws, 1968:94; Kame‘eleihiwa, 1992:165.

³⁹ Jane Lahilahi was the daughter of John Young and Ka‘ō‘ana‘eha and therefore the maternal aunt of Mō‘īwahine Emma.

⁴⁰ Keahiolalo-Karasuda, 2010:154. The irony of this historical event was that Kamanawa was an Ali‘i. His sentence was a public declaration that no one was exempt from the law, not even the chiefs. Kamanawa was the grandson of Kame‘eiamoku, one of the five “Kona Uncles” who helped Kamehameha in his conquests, and he possibly assumed that his rank would have afforded him some leniency. Instead, his dishonorable execution was used as a lesson to the eight hundred *kānaka* who were coerced to witness what could happen if the laws were not abided.

⁴¹ Allen 1994:22-23.

⁴² Charles Coffin Harris first arrived in Hawai‘i in 1850 with the intention of practicing law. In 1851, he became the Police Magistrate under the reign of Kamehameha III, and continued to

who later supported his efforts to become Mō‘ī. When his school companion, Alexander Liholiho, became the King, Kalākaua gained political prestige by serving in the House of Nobles. From the years 1856 to 1874, Kalākaua served the kingdom in various capacities, taking very prestigious roles (serving as Lota’s Chamberlain) and also humble positions (working as Postmaster General). The many titles that he held gave Kalākaua good insight into the government and its inner workings; it also afforded him the opportunity to befriend some very influential men in the kingdom.

In the midst of all these kuleana, Kalākaua met the lovely Kapi‘olani, granddaughter of the Kaua‘i Ali‘i Nui, Kaumuali‘i. Kapi‘olani was the kahu of Alexander and Emma’s son, Albert, until the young prince died at the age of four in 1862. The two of them often came across one another, and on December 19, 1863, Kalākaua and Kapi‘olani secretly wed.⁴³ The wedding caused some bitter feelings between the Kamehamehas and the Kalākauas because Kalākaua married during the mourning period for Alexander Liholiho and suffered some verbal backlash.⁴⁴ It also did not help the situation that Kalākaua had once been engaged to Victoria Kamāmalu, sister of the Kamehamehas.

serve the kingdom in various capacities. He also served as Attorney General, Minister of Finance, Minister of Foreign Affairs, and was appointed by Kalākaua in 1874 to serve as Vice Chancellor and First Associate Justice of the Supreme Court. He is known for his contribution to the 1864 Constitution under Kamehameha V. C.C. Harris was born in 1822 in Portsmouth and died in Hawai‘i in 1881. See Day, 1984:50.

⁴² “The Riot.” *Hawaiian Gazette*. 18 February 1874.

⁴³ Allen, 1995:33. Allen writes that Kalākaua had explained to Lota Kapuāiwa in several letters that his marriage was meant to be a secret, and that even his own sister (Lili‘uokalani) was not informed of the nuptials. The original letter is located in the Kalākaua Collection at Hawai‘i Archives.

⁴⁴ Ibid.

Thus, we can argue that the tensions between both families were established long before Kalākaua ran for the honor of Mō‘ī. As a child, Kalākaua lived in the Lāhaina court of Kauikeaouli before he was forced to move with Kinimaka. When attending the Chief’s Children’s School, he took the blame for the transgressions of the Kamehameha children because they were destined to rule. He likewise witnessed the honor and privileges that were bestowed upon the Kamehamehas. As a young man, Kalākaua was betrothed to the sister of the Kamehamehas, Victoria Kamāmalu, but she broke off the engagement in a very humiliating way.⁴⁵ Yet, when Kalākaua took Kapi‘olani as his wife, he had to humbly apologize and explain why he had done so during the mourning period of Alexander Liholiho. Kalākaua, therefore, sought the same honor and greatness that other Mō‘ī had delighted in, giving him a purpose for running for the highest position of the Aupuni.

Emma Kalanikaumakaamano Nā‘e‘a Rooke

On January 2, 1836, Emma Kalanikaumakaamano Nā‘e‘a⁴⁶ was born on “the sands of Kākuhihewa”⁴⁷ to Fanny Kekelaokalani Young and George Nā‘e‘a. As was custom, Kekela’s younger sister, Grace Kama‘iku‘i, requested that Emma be her keiki

⁴⁵ A brief explanation of this engagement is referred to in Mokuna ‘Eono.

⁴⁶ The spelling of Nā‘e‘a varies. Nogelmeier uses Nā‘e‘a because that is the variant given to him by a lineage descendent; therefore I will use the same throughout this thesis. See Nogelmeier, 2001:175 n. 2.

⁴⁷ “Ke one o Kākuhihewa,” literally the sands of Kākuhihewa, refers to the Island of O‘ahu. Kanahele discusses the speculation surrounding Emma’s birthplace since others have noted that she was born at Kawaihae, Hawai‘i, at the home of her grandfather, John Young. See Kanahele, 1999:7.

hānai. Together, Grace and her husband, Doctor Thomas Charles Hyde Rooke, raised the young girl who eventually became Mō‘īwahine Emma Kaleleonālani.⁴⁸

Emma’s rearing was rather different than that of the other Ali‘i children. Both her mothers were of Ali‘i lineage, but they also were half-British by way of their father, John Young. Grace, in marrying British-born Dr. Rooke, provided Emma with a bilingual upbringing.⁴⁹ She spoke both the Hawaiian and English languages fluently, and developed an appreciation of both her Hawaiian and British heritages. One of her later tutors was a Mrs. Sarah Rhodes von Phister, who also hailed from England; she also influenced Emma’s Anglican faith.⁵⁰

Emma’s mother was the daughter of Ali‘i Nui Wahine Ka‘ō‘anā‘eha, the probable daughter of Kamehameha I’s full-brother, Keli‘imaika‘i.⁵¹ Her father was British-born John Young, one of Kamehameha I’s foreign advisors. Young, along with Isaac Davis, were the first two haole foreigners to call Hawai‘i home.⁵² Their skill and expertise in western weapons secured Kamehameha I’s successful conquest of the islands and later earn both Young and Davis places of honor in Kamehameha’s court.

Because of her mother’s high lineage, it was from an early age that Emma was given much respect from the people. Though death was no longer a threat for breaking

⁴⁸ Following the death of her son, Albert, in 1864, Alexander Liholiho would give Emma the name “Kaleleokalani.” Meaning the flight of the heavenly one, the name commemorated the death of their son. When her husband passed a year later, Emma would change the name to “Kaleleonālani,” which meant the flight of the heavenly *ones*. Restarick, n.d., Henry Bond Restarick Manuscript Collection, AH (Hawai‘i State Archives); Kanahale, 1999:177.

⁴⁹ Kanahale, 1999:17.

⁵⁰ Korn, 1958:299.

⁵¹ See Mokuna ‘Eono which discusses the genealogy of Emma.

⁵² I discuss both John Young and Isaac Davis in Mokuna ‘Ehiku.

particular kapu, the people still revered Emma by kneeling in her presence and by keeping a respectable distance from her.⁵³

Emma's relationship with her hānai father afforded her the opportunity to see firsthand the devastating effects that foreign disease had on her people. Dr. Rooke served as the kingdom's primary physician, even seeing to the birth of Kamehameha III's child with his sister, Nāhi'ena'ena, in 1836.⁵⁴ During Emma's childhood and adolescence, Rooke House served Kānaka Maoli patients who needed medical care.⁵⁵ Since she witnessed the sufferings of her people, many believe that it was through her hānai father's influence that Emma had such an invested interest in the establishment of a Kānaka hospital.⁵⁶

Like Kalākaua, Emma also attended the Chief's Children's School. Mrs. Cooke recorded that Emma arrived with her father on January 3, 1842, and became an official member of the family school on January 7.⁵⁷ Not much is written about during Emma's times at the Royal School, with a few exceptions. Judging from the Cooke's account, Emma was, at times, a child prone to disobedience. At one point, Mrs. Cooke writes that they had spoken to Dr. Rooke about Emma's behavior, but that "Mrs. Rooke takes Emma's part. A sure way to spoil her."⁵⁸

⁵³ Kanahēle, 1999:66.

⁵⁴ Kanahēle, 1999:18. The child of these two Ali'i would not live past a few hours.

⁵⁵ Ibid., 45. Because most of the kānaka maoli were unable to pay, Dr. Rooke did not charge for his services.

⁵⁶ Ibid.

⁵⁷ Richards, 1937:123.

⁵⁸ Ibid., 208.

Regardless of Emma's behavior as a child, she grew up to be a beautiful and educated woman. It did not take long for others to notice as well, and Emma had several suitors attempt to capture her attention.⁵⁹ It was Alexander Liholiho, however, who eventually won the hand of Emma. Lady Franklin, a Britishwoman who came to Hawai'i in 1861,⁶⁰ wrote, "The King was a long time courting Emma. He had shewn great signs of admiring her but had not made any proposals..."⁶¹

As I discuss in Mokuna 'Eono, Alexander Liholiho's decision to marry Emma did not come without a few oppositions, the loudest of which came from the Kalākaua 'ohana who felt that she was not genealogically worthy. In 1883, several newspaper articles that were defending Mō'īwahine Emma's genealogy explained that it was Kauikeaouli who determined that Alexander Liholiho should marry Emma.⁶² Because Kauikeaouli regarded Emma's rank to be of similar status to that of his heir, the writer explained that Emma and Alexander Liholiho were betrothed when Emma was born.⁶³

On June 19, 1856, King Kamehameha IV took the beautiful Emma Rooke as his wife. The wedding, which was held at Kawaiaha'o Church, made evident their admiration for British customs; they chose to have an Anglican ceremony for their wedding.

⁵⁹ Kanahele, *Emma*, 57-58.

⁶⁰ Korn, 1958:3.

⁶¹ Ibid., 128.

⁶² Alexander Liholiho was Kauikeaouli's keiki hānai and his heir to the throne.

⁶³ "Ka La 12 o Feberuari." *Kō Hawai'i Pae 'Āina*. 23 June 1883. "... ua naue mua ia ka mookuauhau o ko Emma aoao, a ua hoomaopopo ia kona kulana alii kiekie a pela i manao ai o Kauikeaouli, ua kulike kana keiki me keia wahine, a i kona hanau ana, ua paa ka hoopalau a hiki i ka mare ana." (Emma's genealogy was moved forward, and her position as a high-ranking chief was understood, and thus thought Kauikeaouli that his child's [rank] resembled this woman's, and at her [Emma's] birth, their betrothal was in place up until their marriage.)

Life at court was rather different than Emma's upbringing. Her duties as Mō'īwahine took away some of the freedom she had had as a young girl, but she invested a lot of her time in areas that sparked her interest, such as music and dance. However, one area was very close to her heart and concerned her deeply, and that was the health and welfare of her people.

On August 1, 1859, they opened doors to the Hale Ma'i o ka Wahine Ali'i (Queen's Hospital). Within one month, over 100 patients took advantage of the hospital.⁶⁴ The establishment of the hospital earned both Alexander and Liholiho much respect from the people. They returned to the Kānaka what had been stolen from them: a new path to life. The hospital was one of Mō'īwahine Emma's greatest of legacies; it was a gift that would never be forgotten.

If the royal family's gift of a hospital were not enough, the two Ali'i gave the lāhui something else to celebrate. On May 20, 1858, Mō'īwahine Emma gave birth to Albert Edward Kauikeaouli Kaleiopapa-a-Kamehameha. He was the first keiki and heir born to a ruling ali'i since Kamehameha I; unfortunately, he would also be the last.⁶⁵

⁶⁴ Greer, 1969:119.

⁶⁵ Kamehameha I had several children in the span of his life, two of which became his heirs in the years 1819-1824 (Kamehameha II) and 1825-1854 (Kamehameha III). One of his daughters, Kīna'u, birthed two reigning Mō'ī (Kamehameha IV and Kamehameha V). I have not come across any record of Liholiho having legitimate children. As for Kauikeaouli, his relationship with his sister, Nāhi'ena'ena, would give him one child. His wife, Mō'īwahine Kalama, gave birth to two children, neither of whom survived. There were rumors that Albert Kūnuiākea, the son of Jane Lahilahi and first cousin of Mō'īwahine Emma, was the son of Kauikeaouli. However, since Mō'ī Kauikeaouli was married at the time of the affair, the child was not legitimately recognized as Kauikeaouli's.

At the age of four, young Prince Albert became severely ill. The keiki had been suffering for several days, indicating pain in his abdomen.⁶⁶ Though both parents did all they could to save their child, on August 23, 1862, Emma watched her son take his last breath. His father, Mō‘ī Alexander Liholiho, followed suit, dying only one year later at the young age of twenty-nine.⁶⁷ Before the age of thirty, Mō‘īwahine Emma lost her son, her husband, and her position as Hawai‘i’s official Mō‘īwahine.

In the years following, Emma held a less active role in politics, instead choosing to focus more on her religious commitments. She continued to attend the Anglican Church, dutifully attending the Hawaiian services at 9:30 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. Her Anglican faith became a huge motivator in many of the things that Emma would do following her husband’s death. She was present when Lota laid the cornerstone for St. Andrew’s Cathedral in 1867. Mō‘īwahine Emma also played a pivotal role in the establishment and expansion of the all-girls’ school known today as St. Andrew’s Priory. During the reigns of Lota Kapuāiwa (1863-1872) and William Charles Lunalilo (1873-1874), she continued her role as the Mō‘īwahine Kānemake and accompanied both of them when a queen was needed. When Lunalilo fell ill, she was a constant companion for the last few months of his life.

Unlike Kalākaua, Mō‘īwahine Emma led a very privileged life. Her makuakāne hānai, as the primary physician of the Aupuni, held a lot of prestige in the eyes of both Kānaka Maoli and the po‘e haole. That respect would undeniably spill over to both Emma and her makuahine hānai, Grace Kama‘iku‘i. When she married Alexander

⁶⁶ Kanahale, 1999:137-140.

⁶⁷ Ibid. 172-173.

Liholiho, she became Mō‘īwahine Emma, a position that held a lot of kuleana, but also came with many advantages. After her husband died, Emma was still honored as the Mō‘īwahine Kānemake by both Lota Kapuāiwa and William Charles Lunalilo. She understood what it meant to be Mō‘īwahine and she understood and accepted the kuleana of that position.

The irony of the 1874 election is that neither Kalākaua nor Emma held the same rank and lineage of previous Mō‘ī. Kanalu Young wrote that their parentage made them kaukau ali‘i, or lesser ranking chiefs.⁶⁸ In the pre-contact era, it was extremely rare for someone of Kalākaua and Emma’s status to become an Ali‘i Nui. However, as I discuss in the following chapters, the population collapse of the Kānaka Maoli would force the lāhui to readjust the qualifications of who should rule over the Aupuni.

⁶⁸ Young, 114.

Mokuna ‘Elua: Ua Pau Nā Kamehameha The End of the Kamehameha Dynasty

In order for us to fully understand the motivation behind Kalākaua’s questionable means for securing the election, we must first return to the final days of Lota Kapuāiwa (Kamehameha V). It was during this time that the division between the Kalākaua ‘ohana and Mō‘īwahine Emma became significantly evident since both Ali‘i were named as possible heirs to Lota. However, since Lunalilo became Kalākaua’s competition for the Crown, this period in history shows the contention between these two candidates and how Kalākaua used all of his influence to succeed Lota, although his endeavours initially failed.

Kalākaua’s public quest for the throne began only a year prior following the death of Lota Kapuāiwa. The Mō‘ī had been sick for some time. Weighing over 400 pounds and suffering from other ailments, he became increasingly ill and was often confined to his home in Waikīkī or stayed in Moloka‘i. He continued his duties as Mō‘ī, trying his best to keep his condition hidden from the public.

As Lota’s forty-second birthday approached, it became more and more apparent that he was in a grave state. While the kingdom began its celebration of the Mō‘ī’s birthday, those close to the King were solemnly gathered together to say their goodbyes. Even Lota himself knew that death was imminent, acknowledging the irony of dying on his birthday “but God’s will be done.”⁶⁹

⁶⁹ Lyman, 1896:19. These words were spoken by Lota Kapuāiwa on the day of his death.

Doctor Trousseau,⁷⁰ one of the physicians present, told Lota that it was becoming necessary for him to make his final wishes known. The Mō‘ī, having neither a wife nor children of his own, had failed to produce a will. He also was the last remaining child of Kīna‘u,⁷¹ and was therefore considered the final heir of the Kamehameha line.

Those surrounding Lota’s deathbed began pleading with him to declare a next in line, but the Mō‘ī became exasperated by the others’ appeals. He finally agreed to draw up a will, to which John Dominis hastily transcribed, but his final decrees did not include the naming of a successor.⁷² At one point the King claimed that he needed to rest, but the Attorney General, Stephen Phillips,⁷³ asked Lota once more to name a successor. To this, Lota strongly replied that “he wanted time to consider so important a subject” and that he “was naturally nervous and under a great state of excitement.”⁷⁴

Lota then turned to Bernice Pauahi Bishop and asked that she succeed him as the next Mō‘ī. She refused his offer, saying instead to look at the other Ali‘i who were there and find an appropriate choice amongst them. Lota then spoke to Governor Nāhaolelua, asking him in ‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i that of the four present - Bernice Pauahi, Mō‘īwahine Emma, Ruth Ke‘elikōlani, and Lunalilo - who should succeed him.⁷⁵ Interestingly, as

⁷⁰ Day, 1984:122. Doctor George Trousseau was chosen by Lunalilo to serve on the kingdom’s Board of Health after he arrived here from arrived in the islands in 1872. He would additionally become Lunalilo’s physician after the Mō‘ī had fallen ill.

⁷¹ Kīna‘u was the daughter of Kamehameha I and Kaheheimālie. Through her marriage to Kekūanā‘o, they would have six children: Davida Kamehameha, Mosese Kekuāiwa, Lota Kapuāiwa, Alexander Liholiho, and Victoria Kamāmalu.

⁷² Alexander. Ed. 1898:11-16. Dominis expresses his exasperation at the Mō‘ī’s final bequests, which focused primarily on his property and material items.

⁷³ Stephen Phillips served as Attorney General from 1866 to 1873. See the *State Archives Digital Collections*, State of Hawai‘i.

⁷⁴ Alexander. Ed. 1898:11-16.

⁷⁵ Lyman, 1896:19.

Nāhaolelua was a close friend of Mō‘īwahine Emma and an advocate of hers for a number of years, most present assumed that he would, without hesitation, tell Lota to proclaim her as heir. According to ‘Iaukea’s memoirs, a later discussion with Elizabeth Keka‘anī‘au Pratt⁷⁶ showed that it had been a natural assumption that Nāhaolelua would have spoken Emma’s name. Had Nāhaolelua named Emma in response to Lota’s question, there was little doubt that Lota would have agreed and named her his successor.⁷⁷ Yet, instead of suggesting her, he responded with the words “He mau Alii wale no lakou a pau,” meaning that they were all his Ali‘i and was therefore unable to chose.”⁷⁸

Perhaps Nāhaolelua had too much respect for the other Ali‘i present. We must remember that it was not so long ago that such a decision would not necessarily be left to someone of lesser rank as Nāhaolelua was. The lāhui had not ventured that far from their traditional beliefs; such a choice as to who should be the Mō‘ī was not left to one person. To quote Osorio, “it would have been inconceivable that Ali‘i could be elected by human

⁷⁶ Elizabeth Keka‘anī‘auokalani Pratt was the daughter of the Ali‘i La‘anui and the Ali‘i Wahine ‘Ōwana. Keka‘anī‘au had an indirect claim to the Kamehameha family as her father’s great-grandfather was Keōua, the father of Kamehameha. (McKinzie, 1983:70.) Keōua, prior to his relationship with Keku‘iapoīwa, would ho‘āo (marry) Kahikikala, a High Chiefess of Hāna, Maui. (Pratt, 1920:14). Like Kalākaua and Emma, she also attended the Chief’s Children’s School. As an adult, she would continue her close relationship with Queen Emma, attending to her wedding as a bridesmaid and then serving as one of Emma’s ladies-in-waiting. See Kanahele, 1999:68.

⁷⁷ ‘Iaukea and Watson, 1988:22.

⁷⁸ Ibid. The conversation between Lota Kapuāiwa and Nāhaolelua was done in ‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i and then later translated. An oft-cited translation comes from John Dominis’ letter to Charles Bishop. Although Dominis acknowledges that the conversation was done in hushed tones, he was able to hear what the two were saying. There may have been more to this conversation between the Mō‘ī and the governor of Maui, but it must be remembered that Dominis’ account of the event was heavily biased against Queen Emma.

beings. As descendents of chiefly families whose rank equated them with akua, and as akua themselves, they surely were not chosen by the people to represent them.”⁷⁹

Osorio’s statement was in reference to the Bayonet Constitution, and the fact that the forced constitution had defined who was qualified to vote in the happenings of the kingdom.⁸⁰ In writing this, Osorio also explains that fifty years prior to the Bayonet Constitution of 1887, Kānaka Maoli would have found it inconceivable that they should be allowed to choose who was considered an Ali‘i. No one was able to “define someone’s chiefly lineage,”⁸¹ and while things certainly had changed in terms of Hawai‘i’s kingdom now being a constitutional one, the reverence that the people had for their Ali‘i had not wavered. Therefore, Nāhaolelua, who certainly wanted his beloved Emma to wear the Crown, possibly did not feel that he should define who was worthy of being the Mō‘ī.

In a letter written by John Dominis, the author presents a slightly different account in which Nāhaolelua was appealed to first before Lota spoke to Pauahi. In Dominis’ letter, Pauahi’s response was that the Mō‘ī should choose his sister, Ke‘elikōlani, as “it is hers by right. Instead, the Mō‘ī responded that Ke‘elikōlani was not “fitted for the position.” After some urging by Pauahi that went unheeded by Lota, she then proposed Mō‘īwahine Emma, saying “[that] she has been a queen once, and is

⁷⁹ Osorio, 2002:2.

⁸⁰ Osorio 2002. In 1887, a group called the Hawaiian League drew up a constitution and forced Kalākaua to sign. Lorrin Thurston, one of the main writers of the constitution, had changed many of the voting qualifications to exclude the kānaka maoli from being able to vote. This constitution also changed the power of the Mō‘ī, and made it so that Kalākaua was merely a figurehead who had to answer to his cabinet members. The 1887 Constitution has been called the Bayonet Constitution because Kalākaua was coerced to sign due to the fact that members of the Honolulu Rifles surrounded his home and office with bayonets.

⁸¹ Ibid., 2002:2.

therefore fitted for the position.” Lota surprisingly denied this and responded that Mō‘īwahine Emma “was merely queen by courtesy, having been the wife of a king.”⁸²

George Kanahele, who recounts this event in his biography on Mō‘īwahine Emma, questioned why the Mō‘ī would make such statement in regards to Emma.⁸³ It was well known that Lota had deep affection for his sister-in-law, and that there had been a strong relationship between these two Ali‘i. In fact, Kuykendall writes that, according to Minister Varigny, the latter had heard from Lota himself that he had been in love with his sister-in-law.⁸⁴ Lota’s hesitation to ask for her hand stemmed from his understanding of her sense of duty to the Anglican Church, as well as her deep love for her deceased husband.

Would Lota really have said such insensitive words in regards to the Mō‘īwahine? Perhaps so, but it seems rather doubtful. Kanahele does make reference to the bitterness between Emma and the Kalākauas, a family to which John Dominis was included. As Dominis is the source of that particular statement, he could very well have misquoted Lota Kapuāiwa. In fact, Dominis writes that, although “the queen” was present, she did not hear Lota’s words.⁸⁵

Another thing that needs mentioning is the omission of Lunalilo as a possible candidate. As the last remaining male member of the Kamehameha family, it’s somewhat surprising that Lunalilo wasn’t included in Pauahi’s list of befitting possibilities. Even

⁸² Alexander. Ed. A Letter By The Late Gov. J. O. Dominis, January 7, 1873.” *Sixth Annual Report of the Hawaiian Historical Society for the year 1898*, 11-16.

⁸³ Kanahele, 1999:266.

⁸⁴ Kuykendall, 1953:240.

⁸⁵ Alexander. Ed. 1898:11-16. Most likely, Dominis’ mention of “the queen” refers to Mō‘īwahine Emma.

Lota Kapuāiwa could not deny Lunalilo's heritage when he said that: "[Lunalilo] represents the old line, and, as such, commands their [the Kānaka Maoli] suffrage."⁸⁶ Instead, Pauahi names the two women of the Kamehameha lineage - Ke'elikōlani and Emma - as worthy candidates. Even the Mō'ī had a wahine (Pauahi) in mind. This is important because, upon Mō'īwahine Emma's announcement of candidacy for the throne, she was met with some opposition regarding her gender from the haole. To the Kānaka Maoli and to the Ali'i, gender seemed less significant than the ability to be a good Ali'i for the people.

Therefore, we may ask the question again as to why Lunalilo was not asked to succeed Lota Kapuāiwa. Granted, he was not as close to the Kamehameha lineage as Ruta Ke'elikōlani, nor did he have as much experience in kingdom matters as Mō'īwahine Emma. However, since the three wāhine had already denied or were denied the throne, it is interesting that they neglected to consider Lunalilo.

In Allen's book about Kalākaua, she makes mention that the relationship between Lota Kapuāiwa and William Lunalilo was somewhat strained, and perhaps not as amicable as the one between Kapuāiwa and Kalākaua. In fact, in the year 1861, Lota Kapuāiwa and Kalākaua made for San Francisco and Victoria, B.C. for the purpose of obtaining weapons to help build up military defense.⁸⁷ Unlike Kamehameha IV, Lota and Kalākaua did not have a problem upsetting the status quo. Both of them saw the advantages of building a military presence in Hawai'i should the situation call for it. The threat of annexation had been hovering over the kingdom since the reign of Kauikeaouli,

⁸⁶ Stokes, 1935:23.

⁸⁷ Allen, 1995:28-29.

but Alexander Liholiho was more concerned about the prosperity of the kingdom and the well-being of his people. Therefore, using the pretense of Lota's health as a reason for this trip, they instead went for the future purpose of protecting Hawai'i.

The relationship between Lunalilo and Lota, however, was somewhat different. Allen again makes mention that their blood descent had something to do with it, but does not go into detail.⁸⁸ It seems that the strain between the two Ali'i started early in their years at the Chief's Children's School. Allen writes that Lunalilo's mother often spoiled him, and when he did not get his way, he became disruptive. Lunalilo also had a fondness for liquor and gambling that did not please the Kamehamehas. At one point, Kana'ina put Lunalilo's inheritance under the guardianship of Charles Reed Bishop,⁸⁹ the husband of Ke Ali'i Bernice Pauahi.⁹⁰ Lunalilo was never given any political responsibilities under his cousins' reigns, and, unlike Kalākaua, was never appointed to serve in the House of Nobles until 1864.⁹¹ Also, there was an issue with Lota's younger sister, Victoria, and her

⁸⁸ Ibid. In another one of Allen's book, *The Betrayal of Lili'uokalani* (1982) she does make reference to the fact that Lunalilo, while a student at the Chief's Children's School, was often excluded from the older boys' activities. She states that this neglect from the older boys, which included Lota Kapuāiwa and Alexander Liholiho, had a lot to do with the fact that he was the only child whose mother was allowed to visit. Allen, 1982:51.

⁸⁹ Charles Reed Bishop was born in New York on January 25, 1822 and arrived in Honolulu in 1846. He remained in Hawai'i for close to fifty years and, within that time, married a Kamehameha descendent (Bernice Pauahi), served in the House of Nobles and Privy Council, contributed to the establishment of the Royal Hawaiian Agricultural Society, and opened Hawai'i's first bank. During the reign of William Charles Lunalilo, Bishop strongly supported a treaty of reciprocity with the United States and even joined Major General Schofield and Brevet Brigadier General Alexander as they surveyed defense capabilities of Hawaiian ports. When Kalākaua campaigned for the Crown in 1874, Bishop would support his efforts to win the election. See Kent, 1965:4, 14, 17, 60-62, 69.

⁹⁰ Allen, 1982:89.

⁹¹ Lydecker, 1918:103.

supposed engagement to Lunalilo that dissolved in a way that brought embarrassment to the royal family.⁹²

The British and American Commissioners living in Hawai‘i at the time showed a great interest in the events that were unfolding from when it became evident that Lota was not going to survive much longer. The next in line would certainly affect the relationships between Hawai‘i and the outside powers, and the fact that no successor had been named was troublesome in their minds. British Commissioner Wodehouse, in a letter written to the British government, wrote that he had privately met with the King to

⁹² Emerson, 1965:109-110. There is a lot of contradicting information in regards to Victoria Kamāmalu and her engagements. Some sources state that she was betrothed to Lunalilo, and others say it was to Kalākaua. Some sources say she was betrothed to both.

One of the best sources of Hawaiian history and traditions come from looking at the Hawaiian mele. According to Emerson’s *Unwritten Literature*, the author, whom it must be said was often incorrect in his statements regarding mele and hula, discusses the famous mele ‘Alekoki. ‘Alekoki, which most suppose was composed by Lunalilo (though it has been speculated that Kalākaua was the author), speaks of someone waiting in vain for their lover by the pool of ‘Alekoki in Nu‘uanu. The area is known for being rainy and cold, and the author uses those images to allude to the feelings he experienced while waiting for the lover who never showed. Many believe that Lunalilo wrote this to Victoria Kamāmalu to whom he was betrothed from a young age, as was custom of the royal families. Should Victoria and Lunalilo marry, their children would have had higher rank than her brothers Liholiho and Kapuāiwa. This, according to Emerson, sparked resentment in the two brothers who forbade her to marry Lunalilo. The young chief Lunalilo never forgave Victoria, or her brothers, for the broken engagement.

A more interesting version of this story comes from Victoria’s relationship with Kalākaua. Because Lota was unhappy with Lunalilo as Victoria’s suitor, he persuaded Kalākaua to marry his sister. Lili‘uokalani writes that Kalākaua sent her a letter while she was in Lāhaina telling her of his engagement to Victoria. However, when the announcement was to formally be made at a ball given by Lota, Victoria chose to intertwine her arm with Lunalilo’s and declare that they were betrothed. This announcement must have hurt Lili‘uokalani, as she claimed that she and Lunalilo had a mutual attraction to each other that led to an engagement. This probably did not help any possible animosity between the Kamehamehas and Kalākauas.

Reading between the lines of Lili‘uokalani’s memoirs paints the picture that some competition must have affected the relationship between Lili‘uokalani and Victoria Kamāmalu. Lili‘uokalani writes that, upon infancy, it was said that she “might be her [Kīna‘u] child’s rival, yet whatever would belong to Victoria should be [Lili‘uokalani’s].” (Lili‘uokalani, 1898:7.) It did not help that, after the broken engagement between Victoria and Lunalilo, Lili‘uokalani also replaced Victoria as choir leader at Kawaiaha‘o Church and in the royal court. Lili‘uokalani would later break her engagement to Lunalilo. See also Allen, 1982:89.

urge him to appoint a successor. According to Wodehouse, Lota expressed that his selection “would naturally fall on his sister-in-law Queen Emma,” and that his cousin Lunalilo was “unworthy” even though he had the higher rank.⁹³ However, Lota did not name Emma when he had the chance; nor did it seem that he wanted Ke‘elikōlani or Lunalilo to succeed him. No acknowledgement was made towards Kalākaua, which may not come as a surprise considering Kalākaua was not a Kamehameha. Lota wanted Pauahi, and perhaps by not making a choice, he was hoping that it would coerce her to take the kuleana.

Kuykendall wrote that it was the belief of some that the Lota’s superstitious nature held off on making his choice because he wanted to avoid death. Lunalilo would have certainly agreed to the Mō‘ī’s request, and perhaps Lota feared that death would be imminent once the heir was proclaimed. However, Kuykendall disregards this as falsehood, showing the indifference that early historians had on the Hawaiian respect for foresight.⁹⁴ That Lota would have felt that way is certainly plausible.

Regardless of how Lota felt, however, he took his last breath without leaving behind a successor. Had this happened only a few decades prior, there would have been a significant pool of Ali‘i to chose from. However, this was a time when disease was snatching the lives of the royal families; the remaining Ali‘i who were qualified to be Lota’s successor were of just a few.

⁹³ Kuykendall, 1953:240-242.

⁹⁴ Ibid. Kuykendall explains that it was perhaps Lota’s own reluctance to appoint Lunalilo, who should have been the natural choice as the oldest male member of the Kamehameha family, which kept him from naming Lunalilo as heir.

The following day of Lota's passing, the Ministers of the Cabinet called a meeting of the Legislative members to address the election of a new sovereign. In the Constitution of 1864, Article 22 stipulated that the direct heirs of the Kamehameha line should remain on the throne.⁹⁵ In the event that an Ali'i would pass on without leaving any heirs, then the next in line would be Victoria Kamāmalu and her descendents. Unfortunately, Lota Kapuāiwa had no children, and his sister had passed on in 1866 without leaving any heirs. Therefore, the decision was left to the Legislature.⁹⁶

Hawai'i's First Election

On January 8, 1872, discussion on the possible candidates commenced. Of the remaining Ali'i, William Charles Lunalilo, David Kalākaua, Mō'īwahine Emma, Ruth Ke'elikōlani and Bernice Pauahi Bishop appeared the most qualified. However, none of the wāhine mentioned showed any public desire to run for the title of Mō'ī; only Lunalilo and Kalākaua threw their names into the running.

It did not take long for the announcement of the two candidates to spread. Within days of Lota's passing, the campaign had begun and broadsides were distributed around the kingdom. Both candidates saw that they had two classes, for lack of a better word, to appeal to: the Kānaka Maoli and the po'e haole.

⁹⁵ Silva, ed., 2003:24-27.

⁹⁶ Osorio, 2002:147.

Lunalilo's popularity was immediately apparent. For his people, Lunalilo represented the Kamehameha lineage that was, at the time, rapidly disappearing. On his announcement, he made the following introduction:

William C. Lunalilo, son of Kekauluohi, the daughter of Kamehameha I., to the Hawaiian people, greeting.

Notwithstanding that according to the law of inheritance, I am the rightful heir to the Throne.⁹⁷

In the passage above, Lunalilo clearly states that he is the grandson of Kamehameha 'Ekahi by direct descent and through this family he has a legitimate claim to the throne. His broadside then concludes with: If he was indeed the grandson of Kamehameha 'Ekahi, Lunalilo was correct in saying that he the rightful heir to the throne. Even Mō'īwahine Emma openly supported Lunalilo; she had known him since their childhood days at the Chief's Children's School, and he also was part of the Kamehameha family. Should he be elected, he promised that he would reinstate the Constitution of 1852, which most likely satisfied the influential haole living in the islands.⁹⁸

⁹⁷ Dole, 1893:34.

⁹⁸ The Constitution of 1852 was ratified during the reign of Kamehameha III. Upon Lota Kapuāiwa's succession to the throne, he refused to take the Oath of Loyalty to the Constitution because he felt that necessary amendments needed to be made. His constitution, the 1864 Constitution, was somewhat troublesome to the po'e haole because it gave the Mō'ī more power. See Kuykendall, 1953:125-127; Osorio, 2002:110.

Kalākaua and his supporters, seeing that his opponent was the more popular choice, especially because of his ties to the Kamehameha family, immediately published a paper that challenged the legitimacy of Lunalilo's genealogy. This document, signed "By The Skillful Genealogists" attempted to disqualify Lunalilo's claim to the throne.⁹⁹ While it is not factually known if Kalākaua was one of writers who discredited the accuracy of Lunalilo's descent, it was common knowledge that Kalākaua prided himself at being a proficient genealogist.

The document stated that Lunalilo's mother, Kekāuluohi, was in fact *not* the daughter of Kamehameha 'Ekahi. Instead, the document claimed that Kekāuluohi was the daughter of Kaleimamahū and Kaheiheimālie. Kaleimamahū, according to the document, was the son of Keōua, who was the father of Kamehameha 'Ekahi, and Kamakaheikuli. Therefore, Lunalilo was not a direct descendent of the Kamehameha lineage. Rather, his mother was the daughter of Kamehameha's half-brother, and not the true daughter of the late chief.¹⁰⁰

Whether or not Kalākaua was one of the writers of this particular genealogy, it is hard to ignore the fact that prior to this publication, around the year 1865, Kalākaua had written a document entitled "Kalākaua's Order of Chiefly Procedure."¹⁰¹ In this document, Kalākaua claimed that Keōua and Kamakaheikuli were the parents of Kaleimamahū, who then resided with Hoapiliwahine.¹⁰² From this union came Kekāuluohi. Kekāuluohi then gave birth to Lunalilo after residing with Kana'ina. With

⁹⁹ Ibid., 36.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid., 17.

¹⁰¹ This document is located in the Bishop Museum Archives.

¹⁰² Hoapiliwahine is the name that Kaheiheimālie took later in life.

the exception of Kaheiheimālie's name being Hoapiliwahine in the earlier document, both genealogies are identical.¹⁰³

It seems, though, that Kalākaua's attempts to discredit Lunalilo's claim that he was a direct descendent of the Kamehameha line had backfired. After the paper was distributed, Lunalilo's supporters became even more spirited in their campaign. Additionally, those who were unsure of whom to endorse threw their support to Lunalilo in response to the genealogical slander.

Kalākaua's actions are significant to this thesis because it shows, again, that the significance of who should be Mō'i had less to do with political experience and more to do with genealogical inheritance. Kalākaua was undoubtedly more qualified in the area of politics than Lunalilo. However, Lunalilo was considered the more superior choice because of his connection to the Kamehamehas. Therefore, Kalākaua saw that his strongest weapon against Lunalilo was to disprove the latter's claim to that 'ohana.

Despite the fact that the decision of who would succeed Kamehameha V was up to the Legislature, Lunalilo saw it important that the people have a say. After all, this was a kingdom supported by and for the people; therefore he argued that they should have a

¹⁰³ Osorio, 2002:148. Kamakau gives us a similar genealogy in which Kekāuluohi is the daughter of Kaleimamahū, and the hiapo, or firstborn child, of Kaheiheimālie. Kaheiheimālie is then taken from Kaleimamahū by Kamehameha. With Kamehameha, Kaheiheimālie has Kīna'u, the mother of Lota Kapuāiwa and Alexander Liholiho. In following the Hawaiian traditions of marriage and children, Kamehameha and Kaleimamahū are, in essence, punalua to each other. Punalua, or literally "two springs," is the relationship between two people who share the same spouse. The child of one also becomes the child of the other. If the ancient custom of marriage was still recognized by the Ali'i in the 1800s, then Lunalilo's claim that he was a grandson of Kamehameha would be justified. Kame'eleihiwa, 1992:43-44. Kamakau writes that, in the later years of his life, Kamehameha took two more wāhine as his wives, one of whom was Kekāuluohi. (See Kamakau, 1991:208.) She later became one of Liholiho's five wives until he gave her as a gift to Kana'ina on July 24, 1821. Unlike Kekāuluohi, Kana'ina was a kaukau ali'i, or lesser chief. Kamakau, 1991:252-253.

choice on who should be Mō‘ī. Following the request of Lunalilo, a Plebiscite was held on January 1, 1873. With only a 38 votes cast for other qualified candidates, the overwhelming majority was in favor of Lunalilo, who won over 11,000 of the votes.¹⁰⁴

Kalākaua, however, being politically minded, recognized that the real power lay in the hands of the Representatives. Though his attempts to disprove Lunalilo’s genealogy had not worked, even if the Kānaka Maoli wanted Lunalilo, the ultimate decision was not up to the people. Kalākaua wasted no time in gathering the members together for breakfast before the votes were to be cast at noon. His actions, though, were futile. On January 8, 1873, a special session of Legislative Assembly was called to decide who should fill the vacancy left by Lota, and Lunalilo was the unanimous choice.¹⁰⁵

This outcome of this election was certainly pleasing to the majority. Had Kalākaua been the victor, there was a definite possibility that a riot similar to that of 1874 would have occurred. Lunalilo, himself, ensured his election when he told Sanford B. Dole¹⁰⁶ that he was prepared to name himself King if he lost the election.¹⁰⁷ The whole situation was worrisome to many in the Aupuni, especially the haole. In fact, both Ministers Pierce and Theophilus Davies sent word to their respective governments to

¹⁰⁴ Judd, 1936:28.

¹⁰⁵ Judd, 1936:28

¹⁰⁶ Kuykendall, 1953:244. Sanford B. Dole is best known for being a part of the Committee of Safety that overthrew the Hawaiian Kingdom in 1893, and later became Hawai‘i’s first President under the Provisional Government. Dole was born in Hawai‘i in 1844 and served in various capacities in Hawai‘i’s government. See Day 1984:36.

¹⁰⁷ Henry Peirce came to Hawai‘i in 1849 and opened the firm of H. A. Peirce & Co. with William Little Lee and Charles Bishop. During the 1874 election, Peirce served as the American commissioner in Hawai‘i. Theophilus Davies came to Hawai‘i from Great Britain in 1856. Like Peirce, Davies was the acting British commission in Hawai‘i in 1874. The store he opened in 1868 later became part of the Theo H. Davies & Co., one of Hawai‘i’s “Big Five” sugar companies. Day 1984:31-32, 104.

have warships docked in Honolulu.¹⁰⁸ On January 3, 1873, the U.S.S. *Benicia* arrived; luckily her services were not needed.

When it came to appointing a successor, Osorio makes clear that the election of 1873 materialized the distinctive intent of the haole and the Kānaka Maoli in regards to the throne.¹⁰⁹ To the haole, it was well noted that Lunalilo lacked the political background that Kalākaua obviously had; yet his declaration to restore many of the conditions of the 1852 Constitution made him a more popular choice.¹¹⁰ Kalākaua, on the other hand, had been noted as being “tricky, shifty,” and “fond of making himself agreeable.”¹¹¹ Many of the haole were distrustful of his intent.

To the Kānaka Maoli, genealogy was one of, if not, the most important factor on who should be Mō‘ī. It was of no consequence to the Kānaka that Lunalilo was not as politically experienced as Kalākaua. What mattered was that he was a *Kamehameha*. Therefore, he was not only considered the unquestionable heir to the throne, he was also a symbol of a lineage that was precariously close to disappearing.¹¹² As long as a Kamehameha wore the crown, the Kānaka Maoli could hold on to the belief that the Aupuni was still theirs.

Lunalilo’s time as Mō‘ī was alarmingly short, and an unfortunate symbol of the severity of the health of Hawai‘i’s Ali‘i. His reign was too brief to warrant many

¹⁰⁸ Osorio, 2002:148.

¹⁰⁹ Hartwell, 1947:16.

¹¹⁰ The constitution that was in place in 1873 was the 1864 Constitution written and ratified by Lota Kapuāiwa. The 1864 Constitution gave the Mō‘ī more power as opposed to the previous constitution of 1852 that was written by the missionaries and did not seek approval by the people. See Lili‘uokalani, 1898.

¹¹¹ Osorio, 2002:148.

¹¹² Charles Judd was serving as adjunct general during this period.

distinctive changes in Hawai‘i’s political history, but that is not to say that it was uneventful. As identified by other writers of Hawaiian history, Lunalilo’s reign was marked by two important events: the mutiny at the barracks, and the Reciprocity Treaty.

Upset at the ‘Iolani Barracks

The mutiny at the barracks is important to mention in this paper because it became a much-discussed topic after the riot of 1874. The event occurred at the later part of Lunalilo’s reign, during a time that he had already fallen ill. On September 7, 1873, a disagreement arose between the Household Troops and their drillmaster, Captain Joseph Jajczay. Dissatisfaction and animosity on the side of the Native soldiers had been simmering under the surface for some time, and on a day that Capt. Jajczay’s endeavored to discipline them, they responded with aggression. Jajczay was knocked down, and the mutineers demanded that both he and his adjunct general be dismissed.¹¹³ Other members of the Household Troops sided with the mutineers, and the following evening, they brought two cannons to the barracks where they secured themselves for the next four nights.¹¹⁴

Lunalilo, who had been staying at Waikīkī for the benefit of his health, was informed of the conflict at the Palace. He then sent an appeal to the mutineers to give up their revolt. Although several of the men vacated the barracks, a good majority did not heed the King’s command.

¹¹³ Kuykendall, 1953:260. Alexander, 1899:299-300.

¹¹⁴ Kuykendall, 1953:260.

On Thursday, the King sent another message asking that they abandon their ammunition and their stations. Addressing the mutineers as “my loving people,” Lunalilo promised that no harm would come to them should they return home peacefully.¹¹⁵ The following day, the mutineers consented to the King’s appeal. Lunalilo disbanded the troops soon after; the kingdom was left with no recognized military force until the reign of Kalākaua.

The question has been asked as to why the soldiers felt compelled to physically attack their commanding officer, barricade themselves with weapons, and disregard the command of their Mō‘ī. For the most part, Kānaka Maoli had been relatively peaceful in the nineteenth century, so this public display of hostility was unusual. It could be said that it showed the obvious dissatisfaction that the Kānaka Maoli were having with the authoritative haole. Although the mutineers were but an extremely small percentage of the Kānaka Maoli living in Honolulu, it was noted that many sympathized with the mutineers since the changes occurring in the government no longer reflected the needs and desires of the people. As a consequence, the people were understandably at a point where their feelings of resentment and frustration were so close to the surface that it took very little to boil over.

Letters from Mō‘īwahine Emma to Peter Kā‘eo, as well as insights from other historians, give a slightly different answer as to why the revolt occurred that day. According to Emma, the entire time that Lunalilo was ill, he was never once visited by

¹¹⁵ Korn, 1976:102, n. 16.

Kalākaua. On the day that the mutiny broke out, Kalākaua ironically made his first visit to Lunalilo at Waikīkī.¹¹⁶

Emma writes that within the hour of Kalākaua's arrival, news of the uprising had reached the Mō'ī, and that Kalākaua "exhibited no surprise."¹¹⁷ She questioned the fact that the mutineers would listen to and heed John Dominis, who went at once to restore order. As the event unfolded over several days, she noted that the people would only listen if specific individuals - namely, Leleiōhoku and John Dominis - were reinstated in office.¹¹⁸ These incidents, along with her writing that she was told Kalākaua was instructing the mutineers and permitting them to take ammunition from the Palace,¹¹⁹ led Emma to believe that the entire uprising of the Household Troops was instigated by Kalākaua.

Alexander later wrote that the mutiny was indeed provoked by Kalākaua who was "smarting under his defeat in the election"¹²⁰ against Lunalilo. Kalākaua, joined by an affronted Walter Murray Gibson (who had been excluded from Lunalilo's new Cabinet), had often used opportunities to disparage Lunalilo's political decisions in his capacity as Mō'ī. In addition to rousing the mutineers, Kalākaua had also warned the people prior to election of 1873 to "beware of the Constitution of 1852" and that the foreigners would use Lunalilo, should he be elected, as a chance to overtake the government.¹²¹

¹¹⁶ Ibid., 99.

¹¹⁷ Ibid.

¹¹⁸ Ibid., 100.

¹¹⁹ Alexander, 1899:2.

¹²⁰ Ibid.

¹²¹ Brooks, 1941:353.

An ironic twist to the whole incident is that Kalākaua, whom most blamed as being the antagonist, was allegedly and perhaps unknowingly being used as a pawn by a handful of haole. Kalākaua had acquainted himself with quite a few adversaries of the kingdom, many of whom were annexation-hungry Americans attempting to “alarm” the United States of the well being of their countrymen in the Islands. Once the natives impaired their own commanding officer, a *foreigner*, these men seized an opportunity to amplify the severity of the situation. If foreign lives were in danger, then America would find it necessary to intercept.¹²² The injury of a rescinded reciprocity treaty still fresh, they would use any measure, no matter how desperate and underhanded, to secure annexation.

Although the focus of this thesis is the 1874 election, the circumstances surrounding Lota Kapuāiwa’s final days play a significant role in events leading up to the election. As I have already stated, the Kalākaua family challenged both Lunalilo and Emma’s right to rule over the Aupuni, even though the latter had not yet declared any intention of succeeding Kapuāiwa. Who indeed had the right to rule over the Aupuni was still determined by mo‘okū‘auhau and connection to the Kamehamehas. Even though Kalākaua had more political experience than Lunalilo, the Kānaka Maoli wanted Lunalilo because he was a Kamehameha. They desired Emma in 1874 for the same reason.

The candidacy and reign of Lunalilo additionally shows how much Kalākaua aspired to become Mō‘ī. He began to campaign for the position long before Lunalilo took his final breath, either through suspicious means (for example, the mutiny at the barracks)

¹²² Chapin, 1996:65.

or by simply requesting the help of influential po‘e haole. Following Lunalilo’s death, the po‘e haole took advantage of Kalākaua’s ambitious nature to secure their personal greed. In the next chapter, I will discuss how the po‘e haole manipulated the Mō‘ī to gain prosperity while disregarding the welfare of the Kānaka Maoli.

Mokuna ‘Ekolu: Nā Kōlea Kā‘ili ‘Āina Missionaries, Sugar, and The Reciprocity Treaty

In the previous chapter, I discussed how Kalākaua began his campaign for the Crown during the failing health of Lota Kapuāiwa and through the reign of William Charles Lunalilo. Even though Kalākaua attempted to discredit Lunalilo’s genealogical claim to the Kamehameha ‘ohana, Kalākaua still lost the election. Lunalilo was still a Kamehameha and was therefore the rightful candidate to the Crown. However, Kalākaua and his advocates continued their attempts to disturb Lunalilo’s reign.

It was during Lunalilo’s reign that a serious situation arose in the Aupuni, and that was the issue of a Reciprocity Treaty with the United States. With the treaty also came the possibility of ceding Pu‘uloa to the U.S. as a way to push for ratification. In this chapter, I discuss the events that led to the desire for a treaty by the influential po‘e haole in Hawai‘i and how Kānaka Maoli rightfully protested against it. This chapter is significant to the argument that these po‘e haole used any and all means to secure their own ambitions while disregarding the ‘Ōiwi appeals. Because the treaty became a critical matter during the election of 1874, a whole chapter is devoted to the Reciprocity Treaty and the roles that the Ali‘i, the ‘Ōiwi, and the po‘e haole played in this event.

‘Āina, That Which Feeds

Prior to Western contact, Hawai‘i’s economy was based primarily on subsistence in which the traditional method of “kō uka, kō kai” method of barter and trade was practiced. Trade was a common practice in traditional Hawai‘i, allowing for sharing and

gift giving within the ahupua‘a and contributing to the prosperity of the whole community.¹²³ Agriculture was intensively diversified and included vegetable crops such as kalo, ‘uala, ulu, and kō, while the Kānaka Maoli’s skill in fishing would provide the necessary protein. Their construction of Loko I‘a, or traditional fishponds, would also produce a sufficient supply of fish and would also raise “the natural food efficiency of protein production by 100 times.”¹²⁴

Trading continued when the first po‘e haole would arrive in 1778. The Kānaka Maoli would bestow gifts of pigs, kalo, ‘uala, and other items, while Captain Cook’s ship would provide cloth, iron, weapons, and other Western goods that were favored by the Ali‘i.¹²⁵ With more voyagers making their way across the Pacific, trade between the Kānaka and the po‘e haole would become a frequent occurrence.

The arrival of the po‘e haole would alter the relationship that the Kānaka Maoli had with their ‘āina. Kame‘eleihiwa explains that “it is the duty of all Hawaiians to Mālama ‘Āina, and, as a result of this proper behavior, the ‘Āina will mālama Hawaiians.”¹²⁶ Because the ‘āina was seen as the kua‘ana, or elder sibling, of the Kānaka Maoli, it was our kuleana to love and respect the ‘āina. In turn, the ‘āina feeds and sustains us in the same way that the kua‘ana (older sibling) will care for the kaikaina

¹²³ McGregor, 2007:17-18.

¹²⁴ Kelly, 82.

¹²⁵ Kamakau, 1991:95.

¹²⁶ Kame‘eleihiwa, 1992:25.

(younger sibling).¹²⁷ The practice of Mālama ‘Āina was superb in that it created a process of sustainability that supported a population of 800,000 or more Kānaka Maoli.¹²⁸

Yet, as mentioned, the arrival and residency of the po‘e haole in our islands shifted this reciprocal relationship. A student of Lāhainaluna would write in 1834: “O kela mau mea a‘u i ike ai i ko‘u wa opio ua nana wau i keia manawa aole, manao iho la au, he mea pau e kela mea,” meaning that what he had known before in his childhood was not so at this time. What came from the land and from the sea was all that was needed; that was the “waiwai” or wealth of the Kānaka Maoli.¹²⁹ Before foreigners, the term ‘āina, as Haunani-Kay Trask explained, would mean “that which feeds us;” it did not mean real estate.¹³⁰

In 1848, the catastrophic event known as the “Māhele” would change the traditional land tenure system into a system of land “ownership.”¹³¹ Allowing ‘āina to be purchased through monetary means would not only alienate the Kānaka Maoli from their land, they would lose their reciprocal relationship with their ‘āina. Foreigners, specifically the missionaries, who had the means to and understanding of private property

¹²⁷ Ibid. This relationship stems from the mo‘olelo (story) of Papa and Wākea, in which the union of the earth mother (Papa) with the sky father (Wākea) produces the islands from Hawai‘i to Ka‘ula. Also from this union comes a daughter, Ho‘ohōkūkālani, with whom Wākea mates. From this incestuous relationship, Ho‘ohōkūkālani becomes hāpai, or pregnant. The child is stillborn, and thus buried.

¹²⁸ Kame‘eleihiwa, 1992:20.

¹²⁹ “No Na Mea Kahiko.” *Ka Lama Hawai‘i*. 1 August 1834.

¹³⁰ In 2007, I was privileged to take Kumu Haunani-Kay Trask’s Hawaiian Studies 490 course. Kumu Haunani, in discussing some of the many issues plaguing Kānaka Maoli today, reminded us that the word ‘āina refers to that which feeds and sustains us. This is how ‘Ōiwi saw their land; they never viewed their ‘āina as real estate.

¹³¹ Kame‘eleihiwa, 1992:8-9.

would take full advantage of the Māhele and would purchase large tracts of Hawaiian ‘āina, many of which would become prominent sugar plantations.¹³²

It was during the reign of Kamehameha III (1819-1825) that Hawai‘i saw a major shift in its economy and agricultural cultivation. Sugar, coffee, and livestock were some of the major industries in the islands during the 1820s.¹³³ Under increasing western influence, kalo production and fisheries were slowly being abandoned in favor of new economies, as the haole planters and ranchers were using all their influence to grow wealthy off of Hawaiian ‘āina. By 1825, they had already achieved the land needed to develop their plantations, the labor to work the land, and the support of the kingdom.¹³⁴

In the 1830s, the sugar planters had found a new opportunity for obtaining even more wealth in the markets of California and Oregon.¹³⁵ The problem, however, was the burdensome tax imposed on shipping sugar to the United States. Hawai‘i was, after all, still its own independent nation. In order to overcome this obstacle, the businessmen saw two possible situations that would best benefit their interests: annexation or securing a reciprocity treaty with the U.S. If Hawai‘i were annexed to the United States, the islands would benefit from the same privileges granted to other U.S. territories. Annexation meant a free market to export goods to the U.S.

¹³² See Kame‘eleihiwa, 1992; Osorio, 2002:44-73.

¹³³ Kuykendall, 1938:314-319.

¹³⁴ Kuykendall 1954:37.

¹³⁵ Putney, 2010:79.

Discussion of both annexation and a reciprocity treaty began towards the end of Kāiulani's time as Mō'ī.¹³⁶ The threat of takeover by a foreign nation had plagued the reign of this Ali'i, intimidation pushing through from the three main powers of France, Great Britain, and America. In fact, for a brief, yet unforgettable, six months, Hawai'i had been annexed to Great Britain. In the 1850s, the haole sugar planters were seeking a treaty of annexation that would make Hawai'i a part of the United States, and therefore wiping out any foreign tax imposed on shipping sugar overseas. It proved difficult, however, to move forward considering Hawai'i's relations with the governments of Great Britain and France and their commercial interests in the islands. Kāiulani, also, was opposed to any sort of annexation treaty that would erase Hawai'i's independence.

When Kamehameha IV, Alexander Liholiho, succeeded his uncle, securing a treaty of annexation proved more difficult because the King was very distrustful of the Americans.¹³⁷ Because he and Mō'īwahine Emma were both supportive of the British in Hawai'i, the Mō'ī strengthened the relationship between Hawai'i and Great Britain.¹³⁸ However, Alexander Liholiho agreed to a compromise, reluctantly approving a treaty of reciprocity in lieu of annexation. When he died, his brother Lota Kapa'uiwa continued his predecessor's efforts.

¹³⁶ Kuykendall, 1938:331, The issue of a Reciprocity Treaty with the United States was first brought up in 1848. Annexation to the United States became an issue following Hawai'i's temporary cession to Great Britain in 1843. Osorio writes that in 1854, the "loud aggressiveness" of merchants coming from California would lead Kāiulani's annexation discussions with the United States. (Osorio, 2002:130-131).

¹³⁷ Liholiho, 1967:108. In 1850, Alexander Liholiho and Lota Kapa'uiwa would travel overseas to America and Europe. Upon return to the United States, Alexander was ill treated while riding the train to Philadelphia because of his darker skin. Alexander would write that he was "disappointed in the Americans. They have no manners, no politeness, not even common civilities, to a Stranger."

¹³⁸ "Ancient History To The Reciprocity Treaty." Native Hawaiian Commission Report, 163.

Achieving reciprocity during Lota's reign once again became a real possibility. Brought before Washington, the treaty was discussed and debated on from 1867 to 1870. One argument stated that, considering the influence of Americans in Hawai'i, rejection of the treaty might ultimately force annexation. Others opposed the treaty due to their concern about how it would infringe on the market of the Southern states that were, at the time, the main producers of sugar in the U.S. The question very often asked in Congress was what benefit would the United States obtain if they entered into a treaty of reciprocity with a "sparsely populated and unproductive" nation such as Hawai'i.¹³⁹ Since no appropriate answer could be given, Hawai'i received the news that the ratification had again failed.

"Sweetening The Deal": The Question of Pu'uloa

It was not until the reign of Lunalilo in 1873 that a new idea formed in the minds of the sugar planters, one that had potential to come to fruition. It was a way to sweeten the deal for the United States. In the U.S., the concept of "Manifest Destiny" was a popular doctrine amongst the influential Americans. Manifest destiny was the idea that the United States was "destined" to expand its territory and its influence across the continent and beyond. If Hawai'i had something to offer the United States to help achieve their mission, then the sugar planters were willing to use whatever leverage they could.

¹³⁹ "California Correspondence: The Reciprocity Treaty." *Hawaiian Gazette*. 26 August 1868.

In January of 1873, Henry Whitney¹⁴⁰ approached Lunalilo with the idea of leasing Pu‘uloa¹⁴¹ to the United States for fifty years in order to secure the treaty.

Whitney believed that an offer such as this would be enticing to the American government. By allowing the U.S. exclusive rights to Pu‘uloa for their ships-of-war, it would fit into the goal of expanding American influence, while giving the sugar planters in Hawai‘i open access to ship sugar duty free.

It was ironic that, during this time, two American military generals were in Hawai‘i under the pretense of a vacation for health reasons. Arriving aboard the steamship *California*, the true mission of Major General Schofield¹⁴² and Brevet Brigadier General Alexander¹⁴³ was to inspect the ports around the island and determine their “defensive capabilities”¹⁴⁴ and to “collect all information that would be of service to the country in the event of war with a powerful maritime nation.”¹⁴⁵

¹⁴⁰ Henry Whitney was born at Waimea, Kaua‘i in 1824 to missionary parents. In addition to organizing Hawai‘i’s first post office in 1850, he is best known for establishing the *Pacific Commercial Advertiser* in 1856 and *Ka Nūpepa Kū‘oko‘a* in 1860. He also purchased the *Hawaiian Gazette* in 1873. See Day, 1984:126.

¹⁴¹ Pu‘uloa is the correct name for the area now known as Pearl Harbor. In continuing my argument that the Kānaka Maoli voice should be at the forefront of Hawaiian historiographies, I will use their name for Pearl Harbor throughout this paper.

¹⁴² Smith, 1925:291. Major General John McAllister Schofield was born in New York in 1831. In 1849, he became a Cadet at West Point and would later earn the position of Secretary of War in 1868 during the presidency of Lyndon Johnson. Prior to his arrival in Hawai‘i, he had become the Major General in Regular Army, a title that would later change to Commander-in-Chief in 1888.

¹⁴³ Kelley, 1998:126-127. Brevet Brigadier General Barton S. Alexander was born in Kentucky in 1819. Trained at West Point, Alexander would be thrust into the war in Mexico to build fortifications. Alexander’s experience from the war in Mexico would secure for himself an engineer position during the Civil War, and later he would become chief engineer of defenses in Washington, D.C. Alexander would also serve in the planning and construction of defenses for harbors in the United States. Alexander became Brevet Brigadier General at the conclusion of the Civil War.

¹⁴⁴ Daws, 1968:191.

¹⁴⁵ Kuykendall, 1954:248.

Having been sent to Hawai‘i under “secret instructions” by the United States Secretary of War,¹⁴⁶ they made specific notes regarding Honolulu and Pu‘uloa harbors.¹⁴⁷ Both officers agreed that Pu‘uloa would make an exemplary harbor to defend against any naval attacks and that it could also be used for commercial purposes.¹⁴⁸ It was a perfect location for a country looking to expand its sphere of influence. As one writer stated, “the possession by the United States of the bay called Pearl River, would be equivalent and far better than our possession of the islands.”¹⁴⁹

Their arrival could not have come at a more auspicious time for the sugar planters. In Schofield’s report to Secretary Belknap, he writes “cession of Pearly River Harbor and of so much of the surrounding district as might be necessary for its defense... [it] would probably be freely given by the government of the Islands as a *quid pro quo* for a reciprocity treaty!”¹⁵⁰ Charles Bishop, who was elected to Lunalilo’s Cabinet as Minister of Foreign Affairs, seized the opportunity to renegotiate the treaty: would the United States be willing to readdress the stipulations of reciprocity, allowing sugar to enter U.S. territory duty-free in exchange for complete access to Pu‘uloa? It did not take long for reciprocity and cession of Pu‘uloa to be thought of as one and the same.

It also did not take long for the Kānaka Maoli to voice their opposition to any cession of ‘āina to a foreign country. Mass meetings were held throughout the islands, many of which conveyed the frustration felt by the Kānaka in regards to the whole ordeal.

¹⁴⁶ Very, 74.

¹⁴⁷ Ibid. Honolulu Harbor was seen as a good possibility for commercial interest, but disadvantageous for protection against naval attacks.

¹⁴⁸ Kuykendall, 1954:248.

¹⁴⁹ “Mr. Nordoff’s Views About Pearl Harbor.” *Ka Nūhou Hawai‘i*. 22 April 1873.

¹⁵⁰ Junius, 1897:18.

They were already distrustful of the sugar planters, suspicious of their true intentions at entering into negotiations with the United States. At one meeting in Waihe'e, Maui, the following statement was made: "Let the plantations go down if they will; they have been a curse to the country."¹⁵¹

These mass meetings allowed the Kānaka Maoli the opportunity to make their feelings about reciprocity and the cession of Pu'uloa known to the greater public. Because the newspapers printed the minutes of these meetings, anyone who had access to the newspapers could see that the Kānaka Maoli were very much opposed to offering Pu'uloa to the United States. They did not feel that the treaty was worth relinquishing any control of their 'āina.

Hooholoia. – Na Makaainana a pau o ka Apana o Lahaina, Maui. Ma o lakou iho a me ke Kanawai, ke hooholo nei, aole no e ae ia, e hoolilo ia ke awa o Puuloa, i mea e panai ai me ke Aupuni o Amerika Huipuia, malalo o ke Kuikahi Panailike, no ka mea, o ua Kuikahi la e koiia mai nei ia oe e ka Moi, aole ia he pono no ka Lahuikanaka, e noho ana malalo o Kou maluhia, aka, he pomaikai no ka poe uuku wale no, oia ka poe Kalepa a me ka poe Mahi Ko.¹⁵²

Resolved – All Maka'āinana of the district of Lāhaina, Maui. Through our [power] and through the law, we have decided not to agree to the cession of Pu'uloa harbor as a way to obtain reciprocity with the United States of America

¹⁵¹ *The Hawaiian Gazette*. 30 July 1873.

¹⁵² "Halawai Makaainana." *Kō Hawai'i Pono 'ī*. 6 August 1873.

under the Reciprocity Treaty, because this Treaty that is being demanded of you, our Mō‘ī, it is not beneficial for the people living under Your protection, but its prosperity is for just a few, that is the Merchants and the Plantation owners.¹⁵³

The Americans in Hawai‘i monopolized the sugar industry, leaving Kānaka Maoli on the “fringes of the impending economic boom.”¹⁵⁴ Though the Kānaka Maoli understood the benefits that reciprocity would bring, they knew that they would be excluded from the rewards. As one writer accurately wrote to *Ka Nūpepa Kū‘oko‘a*, “And what is the wealth and prosperity that our Nation will receive [from the Reciprocity Treaty]? It is wealth for the merchants [and] sugar planters; it is only for them.”¹⁵⁵

Because the men who owned the English-language newspapers had a vested interest in capitalism in Hawai‘i, they wasted no time in publicly supporting the treaty. From as early as the 1860s, the English-language newspapers made a point to be an advocate for reciprocity, proclaiming that it would benefit all of Hawai‘i, not just the sugar planters.¹⁵⁶ In Henry Whitney’s newspaper, for example, the following statement was made: “It seems that we should be willing to ‘concede anything reasonable’ to secure so great a national benefit as a Reciprocity Treaty promises to be to us, and to avert so

¹⁵³ Author’s translation will be used throughout this thesis unless otherwise noted.

¹⁵⁴ “Ancient History To The Reciprocity Treaty.” *Native Hawaiian Commission Report*, 164.

¹⁵⁵ “Ke kuikahi Panai like.” *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*. 1 March 1873. The query was translated from the following: “A heaha iho la ka waiwai a me ka pomaikai e loa‘na i ko kakou aupuni? He waiwai no ka poe kalepa, mahiko, no lakou wale no.”

¹⁵⁶ William Murray Gibson’s newspaper, *Nūhou*, was one of the few newspapers that did not support the inclusion of Pu‘uloa as part of the treaty.

great an evil as the want of it threatens. Pearl Harbor has but little value to us at present; to the United States and to the commerce of the world, it may become of great value.”¹⁵⁷

For the Kānaka Maoli, the people who had one time tended to and cared for every access acre of their ‘āina, such a statement was incredibly disrespectful. Pu‘uloa may have had little value to the po‘e haole understanding worth, meaning that its monetary value at the time may have seemed insignificant to them. To the Kānaka Maoli, however, Pu‘uloa held a wealth of cultural value. It was home to the shark goddess known as Ka‘ahupāhau, who protected the waters of Pu‘uloa.¹⁵⁸ It was where the famous Kaua‘i hero, Kawelo, found Kākuhihewa¹⁵⁹ to request a canoe to sail to Kaua‘i to battle the Ali‘i, ‘Aikanaka.¹⁶⁰ To such arrogant statements as the one found in the *Hawaiian Gazette*, the Kānaka Maoli made sure to respond.

“Mai hilina‘i mahope o ka haole i hoopuka manao ole ma kekahi mau nupepa no ka hoomoakaka ana i ka pono a me ka pono ole o ka haawi aina ia Puuloa a me ka imi ana i Kuikaha Panailike iloko iho nei o ka wa kupilikii.”¹⁶¹

Do not put your trust behind the haole who have not commented in some newspapers to explain the advantages and disadvantages of ceding Pu‘uloa and the seeking of a Reciprocity Treaty within this time of distress.

¹⁵⁷ “Reciprocity.” *Hawaiian Gazette*. 26 March 1873.

¹⁵⁸ Kamakau, S. M. “Ka Moolelo Hawaii.” *Ke Au ‘Oko ‘a*. 7 April 1870. ho‘omanawanui, 2010:29.

¹⁵⁹ Kākuhihewa was an Ali‘i Nui of O‘ahu.

¹⁶⁰ “Moolelo no Kawelo.” *Ka Hōkū O Ka Pākīpika*. 3 October 1861.

¹⁶¹ “Mai Hilina‘i.” *Ka Nūhou Hawai‘i*. 6 January 1874.

Mō‘īwahine Emma also expressed her disappointment that King Lunalilo could possibly succumb to his Cabinet’s demands, and she sympathized with the opposition. She encouraged those within her correspondence to support any and all opposition to the provisions of the treaty, writing that there was “a feeling of bitterness against these rude people [the sugar planters and businessmen] who dwell on our land and have high handed ideas of giving away somebody else’s property as if it was theirs.”¹⁶²

Before Pu‘uloa had been used as an incentive to the United States to secure reciprocity, the Kānaka Maoli already had their reservations about making any arrangements with foreign nations. The sugar planters had been pushing for annexation for years and the treaty was seen as a compromise to the planters’ ever-increasing demands on the kingdom. The Kānaka Maoli regarded it as the first step towards the sugar planter’s ultimate goal. They argued that: “He keehina mua keia no ka hoohui aina,” meaning that this would be the first step towards annexation.¹⁶³ Now, with the addition of America’s complete access and control of Pu‘uloa, the Kānaka Maoli saw the treaty as a total abomination against everything that they were trying to protect.

At this point in my thesis, it is significant to return to the importance of what the Kānaka Maoli were desperate to protect. The Māhele greatly affected the relationship that both Ali‘i and maka‘āinana had with their ‘āina. Kame‘eleihiwa’s accurate description of how the Māhele created a “stand alone” situation where each individual was able to purchase his or her own piece of Hawaiian ‘āina and then disregard how that ‘āina could

¹⁶² Letter from Emma to Keli‘imoewai. 20 August 1873, AH.

¹⁶³ “Halawai Makainana o Kaumakapili.” *Ka Nūpepa Kū‘oko‘a*. 5 July 1873.

benefit the community as a whole.¹⁶⁴ The maka‘āinana were especially alienated from their ‘āina and its abundance, while foreigners achieved both wealth and the advantages from their ownership of Hawaiian ‘āina.

Additionally, British Commissioner Davies was adverse to such an arrangement. Calling upon the help of other influential British comrades, they cautioned the ‘Ōiwi that entering into an agreement with the United States was “suicidal,” frightening them with stories of America’s formidable treatment of the Native Americans.¹⁶⁵ Of course, the British would fear such a treaty with the United States since the Americans in Hawai‘i were becoming more influential in the Aupuni.

Whatever hesitations Lunalilo might have had to Whitney’s proposal, his Cabinet members and closest advisors had a vested interest in the sugar economy. They encouraged Lunalilo to defend the provisions of the treaty, and to seek ratification with the United States. Any arguments made against the treaty were quickly deflected; other nations had gone into similar agreements without losing their sovereignty, and this would be the best way to ensure the welfare of Hawai‘i. If the people feared future takeover by the United States, passing of the treaty may extinguish the demands of the sugar planters for annexation.¹⁶⁶

Regardless of any defense towards the passing of the treaty, Kānaka Maoli still held firm in their opposition. The issue of surrendering Pu‘uloa was an alarming one, and the people were justifiably worried that would open the door to annexation; to them,

¹⁶⁴ Kame‘eleihiwa, 1992:10.

¹⁶⁵ Brooks, 1941:352.

¹⁶⁶ Parker, 1989:126.

Lunalilo's submission to the desires of the Americans in Hawai'i was parallel to selling the Crown. Any hostility that they people may have initially felt towards the sugar planters and businessmen was only further heightened, and there was no restraint in making these feelings public. As Mō'īwahine Emma wrote in one of her letters, "The natives are all awake now to the American intention of taking possession of these Islands for themselves, and they oppose them to their faces."¹⁶⁷

The formal protests of the Kānaka Maoli in regard to the inclusion of Pu'uloa in the new Reciprocity Treaty could not be ignored and Lunalilo, supported by his Cabinet, decided to abandon the treaty, much to the dismay of its advocates. So outraged were the sugar planters that they immediately demanded the resignation of the Cabinet members, a call that went unheeded. For the moment, however, Hawai'i was safe; the Kānaka Maoli voice had finally been heard.¹⁶⁸

Unfortunately, the issue of reciprocity was not a dead one since it would become an important determinant in the 1874 election. Many of the po'e haole were in support of reciprocity, with the exception of a few significant groups, the British being one of them. As a professed anglophile, Mō'īwahine Emma was in no way supportive of the Reciprocity Treaty. She had often stated in her personal letters that she was saddened and distressed by the whole ordeal, and likewise equated the cession of Pu'uloa as a step towards annexation. Mō'īwahine Emma would write, "Everyone in the city is saddened to hear that the Ministers are strongly urging the King to sign the Reciprocity Treaty

¹⁶⁷ Korn, 1976:58.

¹⁶⁸ Parker, 1989:127.

giving Puuloa to America. Only the haole Americans believe in this annexation.”¹⁶⁹ Since the Kānaka Maoli had also been vocal in their opposition to the treaty, it substantiated her campaign against reciprocity. Emma was, after all, their Mō‘īwahine and their advocate.

Reverend Henry Bond Restarick mentions that upon the Queen’s declaration of candidacy, she was met by American opposition due to her British ties. However, the American’s real contention came from her obvious opposition to the Reciprocity Treaty. As Restarick explains, “The question before the people was really not so much the choice of persons as a vote on the policy of a reciprocity treaty with the United States.”¹⁷⁰ It was believed that no such treaty would be allowed to pass should the Mō‘īwahine Kānemake be elected.

Kalākaua was a slightly different matter. Still affronted by his defeat to Lunalilo, he had wasted no time in disparaging Lunalilo’s decision to support the treaty. In 1872, he wrote that seeking a treaty of reciprocity would be imprudent.¹⁷¹ Asking for a reduction in the sugar tax, he continued, could possibly lead to American goods being shipped to Hawai‘i without charging a duty, and would be a significant loss to the kingdom.¹⁷² In 1873, he declared that he would not endorse the treaty, and opposed Lunalilo’s consideration of ceding Pu‘uloa in exchange for reciprocity.¹⁷³ However, after Lunalilo’s death, Kalākaua’s stance against reciprocity began to waver.¹⁷⁴ Since Emma

¹⁶⁹ Letter from Emma to Nāhaolelua, 1873, AH.

¹⁷⁰ Restarick, 1924:8.

¹⁷¹ Kalākaua. “My Dear Friend,” 28 September 1872.

¹⁷² Ibid.

¹⁷³ Osorio, 2002:167.

¹⁷⁴ Pletcher, 2001:53.

was vehemently opposed to the Reciprocity Treaty,¹⁷⁵ Kalākaua saw an opportunity to secure support from the haole sugar planters and businessmen who were pressuring for the treaty. Though still against the cession of Pu‘uloa, Kalākaua was prudent in his position to avoid alarming the influential haole.¹⁷⁶

Reciprocity Secured

Following the death of Lunalilo, Kalākaua issued a public statement in the *Hawaiian Gazette* in which he addressed the concern of the nation towards any interventions by or arrangements with the United States. Acknowledging that he *had not been* in favor of ceding Pu‘uloa to secure the treaty, also wrote that the “previous actions of the United States does not justify those fears [of annexation], for that government has always desired to see the Hawaiian Nation free and independent.”¹⁷⁷ Before concluding his letter in which he denied any malevolence on the part of the Kānaka Maoli, Kalākaua conciliated the Americans overseas by inviting them to come to the islands, and to “bring with them money and skill to develop the resources of the country.”¹⁷⁸

Kalākaua’s strategy proved successful, but it would ultimately dispossess him of any respect. His fervent desire to be Mō‘ī led the members of the Legislature, most of whom were pro-reciprocity, to believe that he would be easy to manipulate. If they

¹⁷⁵ Queen Emma was not supportive of the sugar planters’ goals, and had been extremely distrustful of their intent. She was not enthusiastic of the Reciprocity Treaty as a whole, but when the discussion of Pu‘uloa began, she became publicly vocal of her disapproval.

¹⁷⁶ Osorio, 2002:167.

¹⁷⁷ *Hawaiian Gazette*. 17 December 1872.

¹⁷⁸ Ibid.

promised to support and vote for Kalākaua, he would be indebted to their future wishes. Emma's ties to the British were too strong to be ignored, and she had made it publicly apparent that she would in no way support the treaty if she were elected. Therefore, it became prudent for those who wanted reciprocity to use any means necessary to secure Kalākaua's victory.

There would, of course, be a price for Kalākaua to pay for his decision to support the treaty. Not long after he attained his position as Mō'ī, Kalākaua was urged to pursue the reciprocity treaty and to travel to the United States to again seek ratification. Kalākaua made it known that he was not in favor of ceding Pu'uloa to secure the treaty and, for the moment, he could keep his promise. On April 8, 1875, Honolulu was given word that the treaty had been approved.¹⁷⁹

Although cession of Pu'uloa was not in the original treaty, the same year that Kalākaua was forced to sign the 1887 Bayonet Constitution, the matter of extending the Reciprocity Treaty was being discussed in the United States Senate. While the Hawaiian kingdom had not planned on including the Pu'uloa matter again, the Foreign Relations Committee advised that the Senate should ratify the Treaty with the inclusion of granting "to the Government of the United States the exclusive right to enter the harbor of Pearl River in the island of Oahu."¹⁸⁰

The new amendment brought to fruition what both Kalākaua and Emma had feared: it gave a foreign power a strong foothold in the Islands, and took away even more

¹⁷⁹ Kuykendall, 1967:26-27

¹⁸⁰ Kuykendall, 1967:387.

authority from an already weakened Mō‘ī.¹⁸¹ Joseph Nāwahī¹⁸² accurately predicted that this “nation-snatching treaty” would be the first step towards annexation.¹⁸³ The Reciprocity Treaty certified that the sugar planters could continue to enjoy both the luxuries of wealth and their dominance over the kingdom. Within five years, the number of sugar plantations in Hawai‘i would increase from twenty to sixty-three.¹⁸⁴ Along with an increase in wealth, the haole planters and businessmen in Hawai‘i would continue to seek paramount positions in the government, thereby assuring their control over the Kingdom and the Kānaka Maoli.

With the United States’ presence in Hawai‘i secured, it also assured that the affluent Americans in the islands were protected. It is no surprise that Junius made note in his observation of the United States’ annexation scheme that it “was the power of the Hawaiian ‘Sugar Trust’ in the garb of ‘reformers’ that defeated Queen Emma’s election and brought Kalakaua to the throne in 1874, in order to secure the ‘reciprocity’ treaty,”

¹⁸¹ Mō‘īwahine Emma had already passed before the extension of the Reciprocity Treaty was discussed and renegotiated. Although the Pu‘uloa issue had been dropped in the original approved treaty, she never surrendered in her opposition of the treaty.

¹⁸² Joseph Nāwahī was one of the most politically influential Kanaka ‘Ōiwi in the nineteenth century. Born at Kaimū, Hawai‘i in 1842, Nāwahī was educated in Hilo under Makua Laimana (Lorenzo Lyons), he later moved to Maui and entered into Lāhaināluna School at the age of fifteen. In addition to becoming both a teacher and principal at Hilo Boarding School, Nāwahī was also an artist, lawyer, and newspaper editor. In 1895, he started the newspaper *Ke Aloha ‘Āina*, a newspaper that was anti-annexation and pro-Kānaka Maoli.

Because of Nāwahī’s intellect and political shrewdness, he was chosen by the people of Puna to serve as their Representative in 1870. Throughout his lifetime, he continued to serve in various capacities in the Aupuni. In 1874, Nāwahī became a professed Queenite; he heavily opposed Kalākaua and the Reciprocity Treaty, and continued to challenge decisions that he felt were not in the best interests of his people. Following the overthrow in 1893, Nāwahī became president of Hui Aloha ‘Āina, a political group that opposed the annexation to the United States. See Sheldon, 1996.

¹⁸³ Sheldon, 1996:100. To see Nāwahī’s speech in its entirety, see pages 98-102.

¹⁸⁴ Van Dyke, 119.

and that those same “reformers” would “conspire against him, when the seven-year treaty of 1875-76 was about to lapse.”¹⁸⁵

Had Queen Emma won the election of 1874, it is doubtful that the treaty would have been further pursued. As previously discussed, Emma’s affinity for the British made her uneasy towards the Americans. Emma was equally mistrustful of the po‘e haole merchants and sugar planters and their intentions behind the Reciprocity Treaty. Like many of the Kānaka Maoli who opposed the treaty, Emma also saw the treaty as a means to achieving annexation with the U.S. Moreover, she greatly protested the relinquishment of any part of Hawai‘i’s ‘āina to a foreign power.

Though Kalākaua was also not an ardent endorser of reciprocity, he realized that supporting the treaty would provide a means to the Crown. The very men who desired reciprocity were undeniably influential in the Kingdom, and Kalākaua was correct in his assumption that securing their support would likewise secure his election. The unfortunate irony was that many of these same men would later “wrestle control of the government away from Kalākaua” when they coerced him to sign the 1887 “Bayonet” Constitution.¹⁸⁶

Regardless of his victory, Kalākaua’s position as Mō‘ī was still somewhat precarious. Emma may have lost the election, but she was still seen as the Mō‘īwahine in the eyes of the Kānaka, whereas Kalākaua often found himself as a point of contention amongst his own people. It is not surprising that he had found company with sycophantic types who were after lucrative positions in the kingdom at whatever cost.

¹⁸⁵ Junius, 1897:3.

¹⁸⁶ Silva, 2004:126.

Mokuna ‘Ehā: Nā ‘Oi ‘Elua Na Ka Lāhui Who Shall Rule the Nation?

There are several arguments within this thesis, one of which is to present evidence on how Kalākaua and his supporters used manipulative means to secure his election. This chapter focuses on the final days of Lunalilo and what would lead to an earnest campaign between Ke Ali‘i Kalākaua and Mō‘īwahine Emma. Memoirs of influential po‘e haole and the haole-run newspapers who were involved in the campaign demonstrate some especially questionable behavior on the part of the Kalākauas, thus proving the extreme measures used to prevent the election of Mō‘īwahine Emma. Moreover, this chapter pursues the evidence that Mō‘īwahine Emma was the true choice of the ‘Ōiwi.

The year 1873 was indeed an exceptional one. If the people had felt before felt that they were straddling a time between ancient customs and new changes, it was truly this year that the insecurities of what the future held became more prominent. The death of Lota Kapuāiwa made it apparent that the end of the Kamehameha lineage was a real possibility. No child had been born to that line of Ali‘i since the birth of Prince Albert, the son of Queen Emma and Alexander Liholiho.

Any whisper of a treaty between America and Hawai‘i now held tremendous possibility, and the Kānaka Maoli were legitimate in their suspicion of going into any such negotiation. The seams once holding a kingdom together were slowly tearing apart. Even Kānaka Maoli were now divided between those that supported the changes, and those who were adamantly opposed. Tensions, also, were running high. It took very little

to ignite the sparks of animosity that the Natives had towards the influential haole *and* influential ‘Ōiwi in government.

In the month of July of that same year, a newsworthy event took place in the harbors of Honolulu. The arrival of a large school of ‘alalauā in Hawaiian waters aroused the excitement of the Kānaka Maoli.¹⁸⁷ Hawaiian people held the superstition that the presence of a large school of ‘alalauā in our waters foretold a coming disaster, usually the death of an Ali‘i. The newspapers wrote that the “kanakas are a little excited over this marine stranger; and in talking about, they use the expression, *weliweli*, meaning fearful or startling.”¹⁸⁸

The arrival of such a large number of ‘alalauā was “spoke of with a great deal of earnestness, and even foreigners like to tell, as confirmatory of the native superstition, how this fish arrived when ‘the princess’ died, and on other occasions.”¹⁸⁹ As rumors swirled regarding the ill health of their Mō‘ī, it is no wonder that the arrival of the ‘alalauā sparked anxiety in the hearts of the people.

Whether or not anyone took seriousness of the superstition, the events that unfolded several months later showed that the Natives were perhaps justified in their concerns. On January 18, 1874, Lunalilo returned home to Ha‘imoeipo. It was evident to many that the King was very close to death, as he had been sick for some time. On the following day, members of the Cabinet pleaded with him to name a successor.¹⁹⁰

Already there were concerns about the possibility of an election - both Kalākaua and

¹⁸⁷ ‘Alalauā refer to the young ‘āweoweo fish.

¹⁸⁸ “Ke Alalauwa.” *Ka Nūhou Hawai‘i*. 12 August 1873.

¹⁸⁹ Ibid.

¹⁹⁰ Judd, 1936.

Mō‘īwahine Emma had made their intentions for the Crown known - and the haole members wanted to avoid any possible commotion.

The Succession of Lunalilo

The successorship of Lunalilo was a much-discussed topic during the year 1873. Even though Kalākaua would not win the title of Mō‘ī in 1873, he wasted no time in privately continuing his political endeavors. When he saw a possible opening on the bench of the Supreme Court, Kalākaua hurriedly sought the help of Judge A. S. Hartwell to secure the vacancy. By filling this position, Kalākaua wrote that it would “help him to be elected king.”¹⁹¹ Hartwell denied his request, and chided him for even having that particular ambition in mind.¹⁹²

In September of 1873, when Lunalilo’s health had taken a turn for the worse, Mō‘īwahine Emma makes note in her letter to Kā‘eo that a meeting had been called at Kaumakapili Church with the intention of appointing a successor.¹⁹³ *Nūhou* stated that the meeting was called by the natives, and that “resolutions were offered in respect to the Succession”¹⁹⁴ However, Kalākaua’s supporters turned the meeting into one of advocacy for their chosen candidate. These resolutions, Mō‘īwahine Emma points out, were

¹⁹¹ Hartwell, 1947:17.

¹⁹² Ibid. It is interesting to note that, following Kalākaua’s election, the *Pacific Commercial Advertiser* reported that the new Mō‘ī asked Hartwell to resign as judge of the Supreme Court. See “Meeting of the Bar,” *Pacific Commercial Advertiser*, 21 February 1874.

¹⁹³ Korn, 1976:103.

¹⁹⁴ “The Succession.” *Ka Nūhou Hawai‘i*. 9 September 1873.

prepared by Kalākaua, to which he named himself a “candidate to the throne.”¹⁹⁵ The meeting, however, ended without any decisions being made.

It is apparent that Kalākaua and his party had showed “excited high hopes” at the prospect of a vacant throne,¹⁹⁶ and was going through any means necessary to secure the Crown for himself. It must be noted, however, that a significant source for his deplorable acts comes from private correspondence between Emma and her companions.¹⁹⁷ Emma writes that Kalākaua met with several of his supporters where he promised, if he obtained the throne, that they would inherit significant properties in the Honolulu area.¹⁹⁸ As the Mō‘ī had not yet passed, Emma considered it improper for Kalākaua to be so presumptuous. In other letters, she makes mention that the Kalākaua family, as well as Pauahi Bishop, attempted to persuade Ke‘elikōlani to intervene. Should Ke‘elikōlani be named successor, the next in line would be her hānai son, Leleiōhoku, and “all of their (Kalākaua’s) family of course will rise to the first place now.”¹⁹⁹

Ke‘elikōlani, also, according to Emma, had attempted to persuade Lunalilo to grant the rights of the kingdom to Leleiōhoku, *their* child. When Lunalilo fiercely refused to acknowledge Leleiōhoku as his keiki, Ke‘elikōlani became angry. At the time that

¹⁹⁵ Korn, 1976:103.

¹⁹⁶ Letter from Charles Bishop to Elisha Allen. 21 January 1874. Published in “An Inside View of the Reign of Lunalilo.” 1941:24-25. *Forty-Ninth Annual Report of the Hawaiian Historical Society for the Year 1940*. Honolulu, 1941:13.

¹⁹⁷ Because Queen Emma and Kalākaua had the same goal in mind, the accuracy of Emma’s statements could be influenced by her contempt of Kalākaua.

¹⁹⁸ Korn, 1976:86. Korn, in his footnotes, says that the people mentioned in Emma’s letter were possibly William Ka and Bennet Kahananui, both 1st Lieutenants of the Rifle Company. Emma writes that they met at Abigail Makai’s home where Kalākaua promised the home of ‘Ihikapu to Ka, Kana‘ina’s home close to Pohukaina to Kahananui, and Kīna‘u Hale to his sister, Lydia (Lili‘uokalani). See Korn, 1976:89, n. 7-8.

¹⁹⁹ Korn, 1976:93.

Emma had written the letter, Keʻelikōlani had left the King's residence and returned inland.²⁰⁰

It was additionally hinted by Emma that the Kalākauas wanted her to marry Leleiōhoku, although I could find no other source of this rumor.²⁰¹ If this was Kalākaua's intent, however, to have Emma marry his kaikaina, several reasons come to mind. One possibility was that, should Emma obtain the throne, the Kalākaua family could then rightfully claim legitimacy to the Crown. As Leleiōhoku was significantly younger than Emma (he was 18 years her junior), Leleiōhoku could possibly claim inheritance if Emma died before him. Or, perhaps, the Kalākauas hoped that if Emma were named Mōʻīwahine of the Aupuni, she would step down and allow Leleiōhoku to rule. Another possibility was that they, meaning the Kalākauas, had hoped a child would be born from this union who would unite the two families. In giving Kalākaua the benefit of the doubt, he may have reminisced an occurrence of his own ancestors in which two warring Aliʻi families were united by the birth of a shared descendent.²⁰²

It is evident that Kalākaua and his supporters were prompt in their actions to ensure his victory in the election. Sanford B. Dole writes in his memoirs that the Americans in Hawaiʻi requested that the Legislative members meet together to discuss the upcoming election as hastily as possible.²⁰³ As for members on the other islands, S.G.

²⁰⁰ Letter from Emma to Nahaolelua. 21 January 1874, AH.

²⁰¹ Ibid.

²⁰² Beckwith, 1972:27. The Kumulipo, the genealogical chant that the Kalākauas tied themselves to, was written upon the birth of Kalaninuʻīʻamamao, son of Keaweikekahialiʻiokamoku (k) and Lonomaʻaʻīkanaka (w). Before his birth, the two families of this child - the Mahi of Kōhala and the ʻĪ of Hilo - were in constant battle for control over the Island of Hawaiʻi.

²⁰³ Dole, 1936.

Wilder sent his steamer, the *Kīlauea*, to quickly and quietly bring them to O‘ahu where they could meet in regards to the matters at hand.

The surreptitious method of meeting with the Legislative members made evident the manipulative nature of these particular Americans. They purposefully avoided contact between the Legislative members and the people they represented, thereby silencing any opinions or desires that the public may have had in terms of the election. The previous year, Lunalilo saw it pertinent that the people should have a voice in the election, even though the final decision was up to the Legislature. In this case, however, the Americans knew that the overwhelming majority would be for Emma. Therefore, they deemed it crucial to meet without the public knowing. If the people had a chance to make their choice known, the voting members could be directed in a different way.

On O‘ahu, however, government issues could not be hidden. Champions of Mō‘īwahine Emma did not waste time in calling her supporters together, holding large and dynamic meetings in favor of their candidate.²⁰⁴ That is not to say that other islands were completely unaware of the current politics; letters between Emma and Nahaolelua showed that petitions supportive of Emma were in circulation on the Island of Maui. The newspapers would report that the Kānaka Maoli in Lāhainā were in favor of Emma and petitioned their Lunamaka‘āinana to vote for her.²⁰⁵

²⁰⁴ Ibid.

²⁰⁵ Mamaki, D. “Halawai Makaainana.” *Ka Nūpepa Kū‘oko‘a*. 28 February 1874. Lāhaina’s Lunamaka‘āinana were Luther Aholo and G. W. Napaepae. After the election, the Kānaka Maoli of Lāhaina would ask their Lunamaka‘āinana whom they chose as Mō‘ī. Aholo would respond that although the burden was a heavy one, he had voted for Emma because she was the wish of the people he represented.

As Kalākaua used suspicious means to obtain the throne, especially in regards to defaming any actions done by Lunalilo and Emma, the Mō‘īwahine Kānemake made her attempts as part of Lunalilo’s circle of companions. As a close friend of Lunalilo, she would often accompany him on his travels and remained a fixture at his side when he fell ill. Letters between Emma, her ‘ohana, and her supporters show that some indeed desired her to marry Lunalilo and to hopefully conceive a child. Other correspondence had claimed that Lunalilo privately told Emma that she would be his successor.

Emma’s affectionate relationship with Lunalilo allowed the Mō‘īwahine an insider’s perspective on the affairs of the kingdom and the sentiments of the King. This friendship was most certainly unsettling for some of the other Ali‘i, as well as the some of the more influential haole, who worried that her constant presence would sway Lunalilo’s decision of who would succeed him. Bishop, for example, wrote that there were “strong objections” to Mō‘īwahine Emma, indirectly referencing her close ties to the British.²⁰⁶

Even Bernice Pauahi, who may have been influenced by her husband, or perhaps her hānai relationship to Lili‘uokalani, objected to Emma gaining the crown.²⁰⁷ Emma relates a story told to her by Simon Ka‘ai in which Pauahi made a special trip to see Ke‘elikōlani with the hopes that the latter could convince the Mō‘ī to choose either her or

²⁰⁶ Letter from Charles Bishop to Elisha Allen. 21 January 1874. Published in “An Inside View of the Reign of Lunalilo.” 1941:24-25. *Forty-Ninth Annual Report of the Hawaiian Historical Society for the Year 1940*. Honolulu, 1941:25.

²⁰⁷ Pauahi’s husband, Charles Bishop, was for the Reciprocity Treaty that Emma was against. See note 423 on Lili‘uokalani’s hānai relationship to Bernice Pauahi.

Pauahi to succeed him. Pauahi's reasoning was that "if [they] leave this matter entirely to the King's choice [sic], there isn't the least doubt he will appoint the Queen [Emma]." ²⁰⁸

Lili'uokalani's own memoirs, *Hawai'i's Story by Hawai'i's Queen*, makes no effort to hide her true feelings regarding Mō'īwahine Emma and the latter's quest for the throne: "It is a fact that Queen Emma ardently desired and hoped to succeed King Lunalilo, and that during the time that he lay unconscious, with life barely perceptible to those of us who stood nearest him, she was busily whispering among her friends the details of her plans." ²⁰⁹ This is an interesting statement coming from Mō'īwahine Lili'uokalani since her own brother, Kalākaua, was concurrently doing the same.

Although it had been mentioned that the haoles were distrustful of Kalākaua's intentions, quite a few of the influential Americans preferred him to Emma. Many of the Ministers did their best to convince Lunalilo to chose Kalākaua. ²¹⁰ However, when Kalākaua's name was brought up as a possible heir, Lunalilo "ground his teeth in rage." ²¹¹ Although he didn't publicly name Mō'īwahine Emma as his successor, Lunalilo absolutely refused to appoint Kalākaua.

During this time, Emma was told by a few po'e haoles to surrender her claims to the throne. When it became apparent that Lunalilo had no desire to see Kalākaua succeed

²⁰⁸ Korn, 1976:142.

²⁰⁹ Lili'uokalani, 1898.

²¹⁰ Letter from Charles Bishop to Elisha Allen. 21 January 1874. Published in "An Inside View of the Reign of Lunalilo." 1941:24-25. *Forty-Ninth Annual Report of the Hawaiian Historical Society for the Year 1940*. Honolulu, 1941.

²¹¹ Hartwell, 1947:16.

him, Mō‘īwahine Emma writes that she was visited by Wilimana²¹² and Kale Puluka²¹³ to present her with a compromise. That is, Emma should petition the House of Nobles to collectively agree to place her on the throne with the stipulation that she should, upon Lunalilo’s passing, immediately name her successor and proclaim him²¹⁴ as the sovereign. She, in turn, would step down. Failure to do so, she writes, would result in a riot and that she “would know trouble” for the rest of her life.²¹⁵

Curtis Pī‘ehu ‘Iaukea, who would serve as Chief Diplomat for both Kalākaua and Lili‘uokalani, explained that Emma’s decision to run for the Crown had less to do with her own personal ambitions and more to “please her people.”²¹⁶ Kalākaua as Mō‘ī was worrisome to the Kānaka Maoli because of his ties to the American businessmen, and his empathy towards their political and business endeavors. According to ‘Iaukea, Kānaka

²¹² Hermann A. Widemann was born in Germany before moving to Kaua‘i. While in Hawai‘i, Widemann helped establish several sugar plantations, including Grove Farm (Kaua‘i) and Sprekelsville (Maui). He served as Justice of the Supreme Court and Attorney General during Kalākaua’s reign. Goto, 1982:120.

²¹³ Kale Puluka was the Hawaiian name given to J. C. Pfluger, who arrived in Hawai‘i from Hamburg, Germany in 1849 with his sister and brother-in-law, Captain Henry Hackfeld. In 1853, Pfluger was named partner in Hackfeld’s firm, Hackfeld & Co. The firm financed and helped in the establishment of a number of sugar plantations in Hawai‘i, and therefore supported the move towards a reciprocity treaty with the United States. See Thrum, 1900:43-45, 51.

²¹⁴ As this is a citation from a translated letter, it is significant to make mention that Hawaiian language does not recognize gender in its pronouns. Therefore, the use of the word “him” may just be a translation mistake, and Emma’s choice of a successor could have gone to either a man or a woman.

²¹⁵ Letter from Queen Emma to Nahaolelua. 23 January 1874, AH.

²¹⁶ ‘Iaukea and Watson, 1988:22. ‘Iaukea had a special affinity for Mō‘īwahine Emma. He was a companion of Alexander Liholiho and Emma’s son, Albert. After Albert died in 1862, ‘Iaukea was still invited to join Albert’s other young companions for Sunday morning breakfast at Emma’s residence. When ‘Iaukea was nineteen years old, Kalākaua commanded that he return to Kalākaua’s Court and serve the Mō‘ī. See Iaukea and Watson, 1988:7, 25.

Maoli also felt “that his supporters were not conducting their part of the election honestly.”²¹⁷

With Lunalilo’s health becoming more severe, the newspapers made it a priority to keep the people informed of his well-being. It became a concern to many that the situation the kingdom experience a little over a year prior would recommence. This time, however, the possibility of disorder was even more prevalent. With the number of qualified Ali‘i significantly diminishing, it weighed heavily on many that a peaceful transition may not happen.

On January 28, 1874, the *Pacific Commercial Advertiser* made two small announcements regarding the Mō‘ī’s health, with the first coming from the Palace, communicating that his health had “continued to improve for several days past, affording some encouragement for his recovery.”²¹⁸ However, right below this announcement came another from his attending physicians, which stated that Lunalilo “is extremely weak and thin, and the symptoms about the lungs are not improved.”²¹⁹

Both Lunalilo and Lota Kapuāiwa had attempted to keep their failing health from becoming public knowledge, but it did not take long for the people to understand that their Mō‘ī was in a grave state. With Lunalilo having no children, it became increasingly necessary that he name an heir. In the same edition of the *Pacific Commercial Advertiser*, the following sentiment was conveyed:

²¹⁷ Ibid.

²¹⁸ “Announcement From the Palace.” *Pacific Commercial Advertiser*. 28 January 1874.

²¹⁹ “Announcement From G. Trousseau and R. Oliver (Attending Physicians).” *Pacific Commercial Advertiser*. 28 January 1874.

Beyond the expression of an earnest wish, which we have already made, the His Majesty may nominate a successor to the Throne, we do not intend to enter into a discussion of the merits of individual candidates. The choice, if any be made, rests solely with King and the Nobles; except in the event of the King's death, without such a choice, when the people become more directly interested in it. During the past week, however, various rumors have been afloat regarding the succession to the throne. Among others, it has been asserted that Mō'īwahine Emma has formally renounced all claim on her party. We are informed that this is entirely erroneous and without foundation. Her Majesty, in common with the rest of the community, desires than an election be avoided, if possible, and is ready to do anything proper for her to do, in order to avoid that contingency.²²⁰

Looking at the memoirs of those significantly involved with the affairs of the kingdom - mainly the haole - most knew that Kalākaua had an investment in obtaining the crown. Even the Ali'i knew that, should Lunalilo die without making a choice, Kalākaua would publicly declare his intentions.

Mō'īwahine Emma, who did not have much faith in Kalākaua, wanted to avoid this possibility at all costs. She had a close relationship to Lunalilo, and it was well know that "he was very fond of her, and so were the natives."²²¹ Many assumed that Lunalilo would appoint her since Kalākaua "offend[ed] him grievously" and he had "indicated a

²²⁰ "Announcement. *Pacific Commercial Advertiser*." 28 January 1874.

²²¹ Hartwell, 1947:16.

preference for Queen Emma,”²²² but there has been no record that he had ever formally declared her his heir.²²³ However, Mō‘īwahine Emma had more than once expressed that Lunalilo secretly told her that she would be the next Ali‘i to occupy the throne.²²⁴ Others, also, make mention that there had been rumors of Lunalilo’s desire for Emma to succeed him, but that he had never put this choice in writing.²²⁵

Towards the very end of Lunalilo’s life, Emma had turned to Albert Francis Judd²²⁶ and asked, “Why will you not help me?” in regards to the gaining the Crown. Although Judd was a supporter of the Mō‘īwahine, he refused to push Lunalilo any further; the King was too weak at that point.²²⁷

On February 3, 1874, just thirteen months after being elected, Mō‘ī William Charles Lunalilo took his last breath at Haimoeipo. With him was his father, Charles Kana‘ina, the attending physicians, Mō‘īwahine Emma, Bernice Pauahi Bishop, Ruth Ke‘elikōlani, and Robert Stirling.²²⁸ Like Lota Kapuāiwa, Lunalilo also did not name a successor.

²²² Letter from Charles Bishop to Elisha Allen. 21 January 1874. Published in “An Inside View of the Reign of Lunalilo.” 1941:24-25. *Forty-Ninth Annual Report of the Hawaiian Historical Society for the Year 1940*. Honolulu, 1941:24-25.

²²³ Korn, 1976:181, n. 9, n. 10. In the correspondence between Emma and Kā‘eo, the latter makes mention that Chief Justice Elisha Allen, returning from his trip overseas to discuss reciprocity, had Lunalilo’s will in his possession. The will supposedly stated that Lunalilo had named Emma his heir apparent; this, however, was untrue.

²²⁴ Letter from Emma to Lucy Peabody. 19 January 1874, AH.

²²⁵ Letter to *Ko Hawai‘i Pae ‘Āina*. 16 June 1883.

²²⁶ A. F. Judd was born in Honolulu in 1838 and served as Attorney General in 1873. Following Kalākaua’s election, Judd was appointed as a judge of the Supreme Court. See Day 1984:58.

²²⁷ Judd, 1936.

²²⁸ Robert Stirling served as Lunalilo’s Minister of Finance.

Campaigning For The Crown

Kalākaua's supporters would promptly declare him the rightful candidate to throne the following day, to which Kalākaua would accept the nomination. His own proclamation would request of the people to ask for their Representative's support and to select Kalākaua, "the eldest member of a family high in rank in the country."²²⁹ Mō'īwahine Emma would announce her candidacy the next day, declaring that she had been appointed by Lunalilo before his death.²³⁰ Mass meetings were held to endorse the popular candidate, most of which occurred on the Island of O'ahu where both Ali'i could be present to appeal to the people.

The influence of the wealthy and prosperous po'e haole was set in motion; any possibilities of Emma winning the election needed to be eliminated. Minutes of the Privy Council show that the Minister of Foreign Affairs (Bishop) made sure to address the question of whether Mō'ī Lunalilo proclaimed a successor.²³¹ Bishop was firm in his statement that Lunalilo gave no formal announcement that Emma should be his heir. He reassured that he and his colleagues had no opposition to the public knowing this as well. Bishop never brought up Emma by name, but the coincidence between his statement and Emma's claim that Lunalilo *did* choose her cannot be ignored.

While Bishop was attempting to secure Kalākaua's support in the Legislature, the newspapers would use their advantages to herald the candidate that they endorsed. Since

²²⁹ Thrum, 1874:6

²³⁰ "I Ka Lahui Hawaii. To The Hawaiian Nation!" 6 February 1874. Monarch Collection. MS MC Kamehameha IV Box 3.1 (electioneering). Bishop Museum Library and Archives.

²³¹ Minutes of the Privy Council, 1873-1875. *Ka Huli Ao Digital Archives*. William S. Richardson School of Law, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, 2009. Web. 17 July 2013.

the men who were seeking the advantages of reciprocity controlled most of Hawai‘i newspapers, even Emma would write that the newspapers would throw their support for Kalākaua. The only exception would be *Ka Nūpepa Kū‘oko‘a*, which would attempt some semblance of neutrality.

What would ignite were the initial flames that would lead to the riot on February 12, 1874, and the emergence of what seemed to be a significant political party. Mō‘īwahine Emma’s supporters would begin a fervent campaign to ensure their candidate’s election. Her genealogy and connection to the Kamehameha lineage was brought forth to the public, as was her beneficial establishments in the nation. Also discussed was her wealth and property and how she would have the financial benefits to bring the kingdom out of debt.²³²

Emma’s supporters would call themselves the Queenites, or Emmaites, after their adherence to the Mō‘īwahine. Their adversaries would later call them kipi, or rebels, a name that the Queenites would proudly inherit. They were indeed “kipi,” or revolutionists against the Kalākaua regime and its foreign advisors. The Queenites would have little respect for the new Mō‘ī, calling him an unrighteous King.²³³

Since the majority of newspapers were clearly in support of Kalākaua, the Kānaka Maoli took to their traditional method of honoring an Ali‘i by composing significant mele that celebrated Mō‘īwahine Emma. These mele, which would be written long after

²³² Thrum, 1874:7.

²³³ Nogelmeier, 2001:189. The following paukū, or section, of this mele shows the sentiments of the Queenites towards Kalākaua: ”Pono ‘ole ka hale o Keweiki; ‘A‘ohe heahea leo aku; A he kūnou haole ke aloha.” The house of David is not righteous; He never beckons one to him; His greeting nod is like that of a foreigners.

Kalākaua was named Mō‘ī, again exalted Emma’s genealogical ties to the Kamehamehas and venerated her kapu status. These mele would state that through her great-grandmother, Kalikookalani, she would inherit the prostrating kapu. Through Kahoāli‘i²³⁴ she would receive the fiery kapu of the Kamehamehas. Kalākaua, proclaimed one mele, was nothing but an ‘aukā.²³⁵ It would be the flag of Mō‘īwahine Emma that should fly over the nation.

Though it is clear by both the newspapers and personal recounts of the election that Emma was indeed the popular choice of the people, Kalākaua was not unanimously opposed. *Ko Hawai‘i Pono‘ī*, for example, would write that the Representatives from Hanalei, Kaua‘i, would endorse the people’s choice, which was Kalākaua.²³⁶ Kalākaua’s own champions would present reasonable arguments as to why he was a good choice, calling him a “true and enlightened patriot.”²³⁷ Like Emma, Kalākaua’s genealogy and rank was brought forth and celebrated. His illustrious ancestor, Keawe-a-Heulu, meant that he had a valid right to the throne. His legal expertise and experience in the Legislature meant that he had the proper background for politics.

Kalākaua’s loudest advocate was *Ka Nūhou Hawai‘i*, the newspaper managed by Gibson, which would routinely publicize its support for the Prince. Should Kalākaua’s name be spoken about in a less than favorable manner, *Nūhou* was quick to defend him.

²³⁴ Since Keli‘imaika‘i would serve as Kahoāli‘i for Kamehameha’s luakini heiau, Pu‘ukoholā, this is most likely a reference to him.

²³⁵ Nogelmeier, 2001:200. The mele would proclaim, “‘A‘ole i kini ia, i ‘aukā wale mai nō ē.” (This is not a king, but only a nugget, yes.) The use of the term ‘aukā is translated to mean “nugget,” but it can also be a derogatory statement since it can also mean “feces.”

²³⁶ “Halawai Makaainana o ka apana o Hanalei ma ka Luakini o Waioli, ma ka hora 9 A.M. o ka la 7 o Feb. A.D. 1874.” *Ko Hawai‘i Pono‘ī*. 11 February 1874.

²³⁷ Letter to the Legislative Assembly. “*Ka Nūhou Hawai‘i*. 10 February 1874.

Other newspapers, specifically the *Pacific Commercial Advertiser* and the *Hawaiian Gazette* would also stand behind Kalākaua. Accompanying any support for the Mō‘īwahine would lead to an immediate rebuttal by one or more of these publications.

Though some of Emma’s supporters were politically renowned, such as George Pilipō,²³⁸ Joseph Nāwahī, Samuel Kamakau, and Governor Paul Nāhaolelua, many of the Queenites were “humble commoners.”²³⁹ Kalākaua’s supporters, on the other hand, were much more influential in the government than the Queenites. These men included Charles Reed Bishop, Walter Murray Gibson, Charles Coffin Harris, and Albert Francis Judd. Surrounding Kalākaua was also his prominent ‘ohana, which included his siblings and his sisters’ prevalent husbands: John Dominis and Archibald Cleghorn.²⁴⁰ Emma’s family, though of Ali‘i status, were not as prominent as Kalākaua’s ‘ohana and would add little bearing to the Legislature’s decision. To add further insult, Bernice Pauahi and Ruth Ke‘elikōlani would also deny the Mō‘īwahine their endorsement.

Therefore, it was up to the Queenites to express their loyalty and backing for Mō‘īwahine Emma. Emma, likewise, would petition her people to do all that they could

²³⁸ Called “Ka Liona o Kona Akau” (The Lion of South Kona), George W. Pilipō was the Reverend of Kaumakapili Church and served as the Representative for South Kona. Like the other Queenites, Pilipō was heavily opposed to the Reciprocity Treaty and therefore supported Mō‘īwahine Emma’s campaign for the Crown. See “Ke Koa Kaulana O Kona Akau.” *Kō Hawai‘i Pae ‘Āina*, 16 April 1887.

²³⁹ Letter from Hulu to Queen Emma. n.d., AH.

²⁴⁰ John Dominis, husband of Lili‘uokalani, was part of the House of Nobles and served as Governor of O‘ahu during the election. Likelike’s husband, Archibald Cleghorn, would also be invited to the House of Nobles and succeeded Dominis as Governor of O‘ahu after Dominis’ death.

to garner the needed support.²⁴¹ Her people would unhesitatingly produce their own electioneering material that asked the Representatives to “koho pono,” or to choose appropriately.²⁴² They responded to statements made against or fears about Mō‘īwahine Emma, such as the claim that she would marry a foreigner upon taking the Crown,²⁴³ and ask that they remember the many good deeds she had done for her people. Another proclamation would come from a group of wāhine and would request the wives of the Representatives to place their vote for Emma.²⁴⁴

The Queenites, though it is never firmly stated, really became one of Hawai‘i’s first political parties. Since Lunalilo’s reign was unanimously supported, there was no need for a group of politically minded people to rise up and campaign in such a way as they did in 1874. When it came time to elect the Representatives for 1876, Mō‘īwahine Emma and her party took a special interest in the election. As most of the Queenites were animatedly opposed to the Reciprocity Treaty, it was crucial that they could sway the votes in the Legislative assembly.²⁴⁵

²⁴¹ Letter from Emma to Lucy Peabody. 19 January 1874, AH. Emma would request of Lucy to have people write letters to the newspaper to call for support since Kalākaua’s campaign had already begun.

²⁴² “He Leo Kahea.” 7 February 1874. Monarch Collection. MS MC Kamehameha IV Box 3.1 (electioneering). Bishop Museum Library & Archives.

²⁴³ “Imua o ka lehulehu!; To The Public.” 9 February 1874. Monarch Collection. MS MC Kamehameha IV Box 3.1 (electioneering). Bishop Museum Library & Archives.

²⁴⁴ “Huro! Huro! Emma Kaleleonalani, ke Alii Wahine Nani. Na Na Kaikamahine Kuipua o Maemae.” 1874. Monarchy Collection. MC Kamehameha IV Box 3.1. (electioneering). Bishop Museum Library & Archives. This proclamation would also address the fear that Emma would marry a foreigner. In the document, the women declared that if she were to marry, the child from the union would either be and Ali‘i or a maka‘āinana. The kānaka, therefore, would rather see their Queen marry someone of low rank than to marry a kāne haole.

²⁴⁵ The main concern of the Queen and the Queenites of the treaty was the inclusion of ceding Pu‘uloa to the United States. Following the election, three of Emma’s supporters would win seats for the Island of O‘ahu, with two in Hawai‘i Island and another on Kaua‘i. As gratifying as it was

Although there was no official name for the Kalākaua supporters, the Mō‘īwahine and her people would call them the D.K.’s after one of David Kalākaua’s nicknames. Since the Hawaiian people put a lot of emphasis on the importance of names, a label such as D. K. could be seen as offensive. Larry Kimura explains that personal names hold distinct references to a person’s family, homeland, or history.²⁴⁶ When a name is misunderstood or pronounced incorrectly, it weakens the power of that name. Additionally, an abbreviation of a name, such as “D.K.’s,” strips the dignity of the name and the person to whom the name belongs. A good case in point is the similar name given to the Provisional Government following the overthrow. Rather than acknowledging the new government and calling it by its formal name, the Kānaka Maoli shorted the name to Pīkī or P.G.s. To call David Kalākaua’s supporters “D.K.’s” shows the Queenites’ mockery to the new Mō‘ī and his advocates.

As I have shown, Kalākaua was cunning when it came to protecting his candidacy. Beyond influencing the Legislative members, the Prince began to visit the homes of influential foreigners to “associate with them.” It is not said who these foreigners were, but Kalākaua’s actions tell us that the real power of the Kingdom truly lay in the hands of

for Queen’s Emma’s party, they would still lose their voice in the Legislature and the Reciprocity Treaty was pushed forward. As Emma would write, though members of her party were skilled in politics and law, they would not win since they represented only 1/3 of the majority of the House. Samuel Kamakau and Kalaukoa would win two of the four seats for Honolulu, S. W. Mahelona for Wai‘anae, J. Kaua‘i for Kaua‘i, Joseph Nāwahī for Puna, and George Pilipō for Kona ‘Ākau (North Kona). See Kanahēle, 1999: 311; Korn, 1976:318.

²⁴⁶ Kimura, 1983:178-179.

outsiders.²⁴⁷ He needed not to visit the homes of his own people because, as we will see in the next chapter, their voice had little influence in the Legislature's final decision. For example, when the maka'āinana printed letters of support for the Mō'īwahine, *Nūhou* would brush these off as "*silly native compositions* unworthy of notice."²⁴⁸

Further evidence of Kalākaua's influencing the Legislative members comes from Albert Pierce Taylor who stated that Kalākaua's advocates were "secretly exploiting" those who would vote on February 12. Kalākaua's reign would not enjoy the celebration deserving of a Mō'ī as many believed the Crown was earned through manipulation.

Albert Taylor shared a story that was told to him by one of these aforementioned supporters of Kalākaua.²⁴⁹ The source bragged that he had helped secure Kalākaua's victory when the Legislative members were detained by Kalākaua's men. The Legislative members were taken to Archibald Cleghorn's store where each was given a gift of a free suit. As the men were being fitted, a Legislative member on the side of Mō'īwahine Emma approached the clerk to ask if he, too, was privilege to a gratuitous suit. His request was accommodated,²⁵⁰ but once the man's coat was removed, the clerk stole noticed and then stole documents from the coat's inside pocket.

²⁴⁷ Letter to Emma from Kekuiapoiwa. 4 January 1874, AH. Emma would mention that Pauahi was also doing the same as Kalākaua. The inclusion of Pauahi's visitations leads one to wonder if she were campaigning for Kalākaua or for some other reason. There were some speculations that she, too, was seeking the Crown. Emma would write in an earlier letter to Nāhaolelua that Pauahi was "conceited" in her belief that she should be ruler of the kingdom. Also see Letter from Emma to Nāhaolelua. 29 March 1873, AH.

²⁴⁸ "A Political Meeting." *Ka Nūhou Hawai'i*. 10 February 1874. Emphasis added.

²⁴⁹ Taylor, Albert Pierce. n.d. "The Reign of Kalākaua: Political." Lecture: University of Hawai'i. Albert P. Taylor Collection, No. 134. State Archives."

²⁵⁰ Taylor writes that the clerk thought that the gift could possibly influence the man's vote later that day.

The items in question were none other than letters for each member of the Legislature from Mō‘īwahine Emma; written on those letters was her own personal proclamation on why she should be elected. When Mō‘īwahine Emma’s advocate later arrived at the Legislative Assembly, he had nothing to present to the members on behalf of Emma.

It seems that Emma’s attempts at the Crown were futile; even she made reference to the fact that the Nobles were against her.²⁵¹ The fact that most of the Legislative members were influenced by or were a part of the sugar trust almost guaranteed Kalākau’s victory. However, there was still the question of the other Kānaka Maoli Representatives. Wilder’s hasty decision to send the steamer *Kīlauea* to fetch the voting members of the Legislative Assembly deprived the people from voicing their opinions to their Representatives. It is interesting that, outside from O‘ahu, the Kānaka Maoli of Maui were extremely vocal in their choice of Emma as Mō‘īwahine. Since the *Kīlauea* would first set sail from O‘ahu to Kaua‘i, then to Hawai‘i Island, and finally to Maui, it afforded the Kānaka Maoli of Maui a bit more time to meet with their Representatives.²⁵²

On O‘ahu, it was harder to conceal Emma’s popularity with the Kānaka Maoli. Therefore, Kalākau’s supporters continued in their efforts to secure Kalākau’s victory through bribery (as is exemplified in Cleghorn’s gift of a free suit) or by straight out deceit (the stealing of Emma’s letters to the Representatives). Kalākau and his supporters may have ensured his victory on February 12, 1874, but they could not guarantee the support of the Kānaka Maoli. The Queenites would continue their efforts to see Mō‘īwahine

²⁵¹ Letter from Emma to Nāhaolelua. 23 January 1874, AH.

²⁵² *Kō Hawai‘i Pono ‘Ī*. 11 February 1874.

Emma placed on the throne; to them, she was the legitimate heir as a Kamehameha and possible choice of Mō‘ī Lunalilo. The voices of the Queenites were loud and significant enough that, long after both Ali‘i had passed, the Kānaka Maoli would still glorify the name of Emma Kaleleonālani.

Mokuna ‘Elima: E Inu I Ka Wai ‘Awa‘awa! The Election and Riot of 1874

On the afternoon of February 2nd, the U.S.S. *Tuscarora*²⁵³ arrived in the waters of Honolulu, followed by the U.S.S. *Portsmouth*²⁵⁴ on February 3rd.²⁵⁵ Already present in Hawai‘i was the British ship *Tenedos*. Due to tensions resulting from the upcoming election, it seemed necessary to the men on ship that they remain in Honolulu. As mentioned, the interest of Americans was at stake, and therefore an American ship should be present.²⁵⁶

Upon Lunalilo’s last breath, 39-minute guns were fired from the *Tuscarora* and the *Portsmouth*. Soon after, the Ministry proclaimed that, on February 12th, they must “choose a person for *king*,” and that claims for the throne should be submitted immediately.²⁵⁷

Captain Henry remarked on the bitter feelings between supporters of the two candidates. On the eve of the election, “preparations were made on both the *Tuscarora* and *Portsmouth* to protect American residents,” as well as to help in aiding the Ministry should any commotion erupt. In addition, signal lanterns were sent to the homes of the

²⁵³ Cummings, 1874. The U.S.S. *Tuscarora* had been commissioned to measure the ocean’s depth between the United States and Japan for the purpose of laying a sub-marine cable on the ocean floor. The *Tuscarora* would leave from Maine in 1872 before landing in Hawai‘i in 1874. The *Tuscarora* would leave Honolulu Harbor on March 17, 1874.

²⁵⁴ Southerland, 1896:13. This would be the *Portsmouth*’s second trip to Hawai‘i. The ship would first arrive in Hawai‘i during the reign of Alexander Liholiho. In 1874, it was in Hawai‘i for the purpose of doing survey work in the Pacific.

²⁵⁵ Hoyt, 1983:74. In Hoyt’s biography of Theo H. Davies, the author states that the presence of the American warships was due to Minister Pierce’s lack of faith in Kalākaua and that Pierce believed that he (Kalākaua) was hostile towards foreigners. The men-of-war would be landed if Pierce felt it was necessary.

²⁵⁶ Cummings, 1874:36.

²⁵⁷ Ibid. Emphasis added.

American Minister and Consul as means of communication in case anything arose during the night.²⁵⁸ Although there was no cause to worry that night, it was on the day of the election that Captain Henry saw the full force of what was to transpire.

Casting The Ballot

It was at 12:00 in the afternoon that the members of the special Legislative assembly gathered together to conduct Hawai‘i’s second formal election of an Ali‘i. This election was different than the first because, this time, the people were not given a chance to cast an unofficial vote for their candidate.²⁵⁹ As the electoral votes were being cast by the Representatives, the taunting words of the outside public could clearly be heard. Threats of all sorts resonated throughout the Courthouse, challenging the Representatives if they voted in opposition of Mō‘īwahine Emma. The public stood outside of the building, their faces distorted in anger and their bodies quivering in rage. Regardless of the disturbance outside, each vote was determinedly dropped into the electoral urn.

S.G. Wilder²⁶⁰ and W.L. Moehonua²⁶¹ were appointed by Chair Nahaolelua to count and read aloud the election ballots.²⁶² As Wilder and Moehonua stood behind the

²⁵⁸ Ibid., 37.

²⁵⁹ In Mokuna ‘Elua, we saw that Lunalilo asked that the people had a chance to vote for their Mō‘ī. Even though the Legislature made the ultimate decision, the Representatives could not declare that they were uninformed of their people’s chosen candidate.

²⁶⁰ Samuel Gardner Wilder was born in Leominster, Massachusetts on June 20, 1831. After working in California for the Adams Express Company, a cargo transport company that was created by Alvin Adams in 1854, Wilder came to Hawai‘i in 1857 onboard the *White Swallow*. That same year, he married Elizabeth Kīna‘u Judd, the daughter of Gerrit Judd.

Wilder was involved in several businesses in the islands, including the establishment of sugar plantations in Makawao (Maui) and Kualoa (O‘ahu), guano shipping, and a lumber business owned by James Dowsett. In 1872, he purchased Dowsett’s shares of the lumber business, and then later evolved the company into a government shipping business under the

ballot box, each member was called forward by name to cast their vote and then return to their seats. The first to be called was Charles Kana‘ina, the grief-stricken father of Lunalilo, with the last being a voter from Kaua‘i who was “too drunk to know where to deposit his vote.”²⁶³

At 2:45, after all votes were deposited, S.G. Wilder opened the ballot box and read aloud the names on each ballot. Only six meager votes were cast for Mō‘īwahine Emma; Kalākaua’s name was read an overwhelming thirty-nine times.

name Wilder & Co. His control extended over the ships *Kīlauea*, *Kīna‘u*, *Mokoli‘i*, and *Lehua*. He is known for helping in the construction of roads, bridges, and railroads, included the building of the Kōhala Railroad in 1881.

Politically, Wilder was chosen by Lunalilo to serve in the House of Nobles and remained in that position until 1878. That same year, Kalākaua appointed him Minister of the Interior, and he served in that capacity until 1880. In 1887, he was elected President of the Legislature, but due to his travels for work, the members thought it best to elect a more permanent President. Upon his death in 1888, he had the honours of Knight Commander of the Royal Order of Kalākaua and Grand Officer of the Royal Crown of Hawai‘i. Information on Wilder can be found in “The Late Hon. S.G. Wilder.” *The Hawaiian Gazette*, July 31, 1888, 6; Day, 1984; “*The Adams Express Company, 150 Years.*” Baltimore, The Adams Express Company, 2004.

²⁶¹ William Luther Moehonua was a kanaka maoli born in Mokulē‘ia, O‘ahu on May 5, 1824. His mother was Nāpua, and his father was Keaweamahi, although some say that his true father was the chief ‘Aikanaka. ‘Aikanaka was Kalākaua’s maternal grandfather, which may have played in a part in Moehonua’s support of Kalākaua. In fact, Moehonua’s name is an inoa ho‘omana‘o, a commemorative name for ‘Aikanaka’s ascent of a particularly high cliff in Waiālua. Because ‘Aikanaka could not reach the top, he slept below the summit and returned home in time for Nāpua to give birth.

At the age of twenty-five, Moehonua married Kaunu‘ōhua, a chiefess and an attendant of Kamehameha IV. He was widowed twice, the second time from his marriage to Lucy Muolo. In 1875, he married Kapeka Kahele, who was his third and final wife. Moehonua had a strong political standing in the islands. In 1874, he was a member of the Privy Council, served as King Kalākaua’s Chamberlain, and was appointed Minister of the Interior until 1876. That same year, he served as the Governor of Maui, and then returned to the House of Nobles until his passing in 1878. See “Moehonua, William Luther office record” in the State Archives of Hawai‘i and McKinzie, 1986.

²⁶² “Opening of the Legislature. Special Session, Feb. 12th, 1874.” *Hawaiian Gazette*. 18 February 1874.

²⁶³ Lyons, 1874. Henry Bond Restarick Manuscript Collection, AH.

At three o'clock in the afternoon, one of the Representatives stepped out onto the balcony of the Courthouse and made the announcement to the awaiting crowd that by an undisputed majority, Kalākaua was now the new king of Hawai'i. Roars of outrage erupted, each voice weaving into the next, making it sound like one long wail. When Curtis Lyons,²⁶⁴ who was close the balcony, asked what was being said, Representative Kua responded: "Inu nā Luna Maka'āinana i ka wai 'awa'awa. The Representatives will drink of bitter waters."²⁶⁵

The obvious upset of the results manifested itself when members of the committee set to leave the Courthouse and inform Kalākaua that he had won.²⁶⁶ When the Vice President of the Assembly emerged to quiet the shouts of distress, they paid him no mind, instead aiming their anger towards the committee members sent to notify Kalākaua of his victory.

Several attempts were made by the audience to cheer [when Kalākaua's name was declared], but they were promptly suppressed by the police.

Some cheering was heard from the crowd outside, but it was mingled with yells and cries of rage from the mob of Queenites.²⁶⁷

²⁶⁴ Curtis Lyons was the son of missionary Lorenzo Lyons and a Mō'īwahine Emma supporter. Daws writes that Lyons angered the planters when he spoke out against contract labor for the sugar plantations. This may have contributed to his support of Emma. Daws, 1968:182.

²⁶⁵ Lyons, 1874. Henry Bond Restarick Manuscript Collection, AH.

²⁶⁶ "Opening of the Legislature. Special Session, Feb. 12th, 1874." *Hawaiian Gazette*. 18 February 1874. When the President assigned the responsibility of informing Kalākaua of his victory to Aholo, Kaiue, Kaukaha, Martin, and Moehonua.

²⁶⁷ "Riot of the Queenites." *Pacific Commercial Advertiser*. 28 February 1874.

As the Representative members made their way out of the building, they remarked that there was no one with weapons to protect them. “Are there no arms?” they asked, “Where is the force to protect us? The government has been negligent in not providing for the event, when they knew we would have trouble.”²⁶⁸ Only the Honorable Komoikehuehu had a single pistol, and when he later made his way through the crowd, he did so unharmed.²⁶⁹

When the Representatives tried to embark on their carriage, they were instantly surrounded by some of the spectators. Angered by Mō‘īwahine Emma’s defeat, anything that could count as a weapon, such as sticks and rocks, was used against the committee members. Two of the members were badly beaten before retreating back to the Courthouse; a British foreigner named John Foley became a casualty when he tried to help Moehonua, whom the newspaper commented that the mob was, for some reason, most angry with.²⁷⁰ Within moments, the Representatives’ carriage was completely dismantled and parts of the carriage were then used as additional weapons.

The Committee having got back inside the Court House, the mob now surged around to the front entrance, where with savage yells they demanded that the Representatives appear. Whenever one of these [Representatives] was seen at an

²⁶⁸ “The Riot at the Court House.” *Ka Nūhou Hawai‘i*. 17 February 1874.

²⁶⁹ Ibid. Komoikehuehu did not accompany the Representative members who were going to pay visit to Kalākaua. He left the Courthouse later after the building had already been invaded by the protestors.

²⁷⁰ “Riot of the Queenites.” *Pacific Commercial Advertiser*. 28 February 1874. John Foley was struck while trying to help Moehonua. Foley, in turn, struck several men surrounding him and was then hit on the back of his head. He fell from the blow, but British Commissioner Wodehouse hurried over to him and stood guard until Foley could be taken to safety.

upper window, fists and sticks would be shaken at him, and the shout went up, “Look out for yourself!” while the eyes of the upturned faces glared with demonical [sic] fury.²⁷¹

For about an hour, the angry crowd continued to make violent threats at the Representatives who were, at the moment, barricading themselves within the Courthouse. J.O. Carter, Marshal Parke, and Deputy David Dayton tried to calm them, but this would only fan the flames of their excitement. However, when the deputy, whom Dole wrote was respected by the Kānaka, made his way towards and encountered the protesters, they politely lifted him above their heads and carried him out of harm’s way.²⁷²

Back in the Courthouse, Judge Hartwell turned to the other members around him and asked, “Is there no one to speak to them?” referring to the rioters.²⁷³ Lyons stepped forward onto the balcony, followed by Hartwell and Nāhaolelua. A moment’s quiet came, but when Lyons opened his mouth to speak, he was immediately interrupted. “‘A‘ole makemake ka haole!” they shouted, “We do not want the foreigners!”²⁷⁴

The rioters demanded that the Kānaka Representatives should come out so that “they may wreak on them their vengeance for having voted against Queen Emma.”²⁷⁵ “Aila māhu,” they cried, “Bring kerosene - burn them out!”²⁷⁶ Words such as “pepehi,

²⁷¹ Ibid.

²⁷² Dole, 1936,

²⁷³ Dabagh, 1974:81.

²⁷⁴ Ibid.

²⁷⁵ “Riot of the Queenites.” *Pacific Commercial Advertiser*. 28 February 1874.

²⁷⁶ Dabagh, 1974:81.

hailuku, puhi i ka hale i ke ahi,”²⁷⁷ roared throughout the crowd, with the loudest voices coming predominantly by the women.²⁷⁸ One report states that the first stone cast was done so by a woman, and that it would have been in the best interest of all to have removed the women from the vicinity of the Courthouse prior to the election.²⁷⁹

As their rage increased, the mob rushed the Courthouse entrance, while those inside did their best to keep them from barging in. While the doors shook from their attacks, one could only imagine the fear felt by the anxious committee members waiting inside. Some of them were certainly afraid for their lives. A couple of them, however, became brazen. Charles Coffin Harris, for example, tossed his cap aside and “dared them to strike a blow,”²⁸⁰ as he guarded the front entrance.²⁸¹

Realizing that entrance through the front door was futile, about twenty-five men then made a rush for the side and rear doors. Grabbing a large piece of lumber, it took them about two blows for the doors to break.²⁸² The aggressors pushed through, using their newly acquired weapons and proceeded to demolish the inside of the Courthouse. Windows were broken, chairs were destroyed, and any and all items that could be handled were vigorously thrown out of the windows. Those that were in possession of

²⁷⁷ The words “pepehi, hailuku, puhi ka hale i ke ahi,” are translated as “kill, slaughter, burn down the house,” in *Ka Nūhou Hawai‘i*, 17 February 1874.

²⁷⁸ “The Riot at the Court House.” *Ka Nūhou Hawai‘i*. 17 February 1874.

²⁷⁹ Ibid. This statement about the wāhine being the loudest voices in the crowd was a definite hint that women should not be allowed in politics. I discuss this more at length in *Mokuna ‘Ehiku*.

²⁸⁰ “The Riot.” *Hawaiian Gazette*. 18 February 1874.

²⁸¹ The same article in the *Hawaiian Gazette* also makes mention that Sanford B. Dole and George Dole also helped C.C. Harris in his attempt to stop the mob from entering the Courthouse.

²⁸² “Riot of the Queenites.” *Pacific Commercial Advertiser*. 28 February 1874.

pocket knives used their resources to cut furniture legs to use as clubs.²⁸³ It was later said that smears of blood decorated the wall plastering and stained the floors of the building.

Attacking The Representatives

While the attack may have seemed impromptu to some, it appears the antagonists had some sort of unspoken agreement. Their mission was to simply go after the *Kānaka* Representatives who voted in favor of Kalākaua. Once discovered, that Representative would then be ruthlessly attacked. Samuel Kipi and Haupū, both of Hilo, and William L. Moehonua of Maui suffered some of the worst injuries.²⁸⁴ S. Kipi's trauma was so severe that "his scalp was literally cut and torn into strips,"²⁸⁵ and Moehonua fainted several times from a laceration on his head.²⁸⁶ Haupū was pushed backwards and fell onto some of the furniture; his injuries were mainly internal.²⁸⁷ A Hilo man, Palapala, was dropped from the Courthouse and fell into the mob.²⁸⁸ Other Representatives, such as Birch, Kaiuē, Kakani, Kapule, Koakanu, Kupihea, and Lonoaea were other Representatives who needed a significant amount of time to recover.²⁸⁹ By March 10, *Ka Nūhou Hawai'i* reported that Lonoaea met a fateful end from the wounds he endured during the attack.²⁹⁰ He was the only fatality from the riot.

²⁸³ "The Riot at the Court House." *Ka Nūhou Hawai'i*. 17 February 1874.

²⁸⁴ Dabagh, 1974:8.

²⁸⁵ "The Riot at the Court House." *Ka Nūhou Hawai'i*. 17 February 1874.

²⁸⁶ Ibid.

²⁸⁷ Dabagh, 1974:81.

²⁸⁸ "Ka Haunaele a Ka Poe Kipi." *Ka Nūhou Hawai'i*. 17 February 1874.

²⁸⁹ "The Riot." *Hawaiian Gazette*. 18 February 1874. "The Riot at the Court House." *Ka Nūhou Hawai'i*. 17 February 1874.

²⁹⁰ *Ka Nūhou Hawai'i*. 10 March 1874.

It is important to note that in addition to only attacking the Representatives who voted for Kalākaua, all members of the intentionally injured party were Kānaka Maoli; the haole Representatives were deliberately left out of the assault. Lyons was even able to leave Courthouse unscathed, writing that the Kānaka Maoli even told him that the foreigners were forbidden.²⁹¹

Before they invaded the Courthouse, some members of the mob announced that their anger had nothing to do with the foreigners.²⁹² In another article in the February 17 edition of *Ka Nūhou Hawai'i*, it was stated that this “proves one thing we have often asserted, that the native will not if provoked molest the foreigner.”²⁹³ Rather, they chose to focus their anger towards their own people. They also left the offices of the clerks and the library alone. Two policemen, along with Marshall Parke,²⁹⁴ E. Barnard (Clerk), and the sheriff, protected the records of the Court, and insisted that the rioters leave those items untouched. The members of the mob complied to their wishes.

While disorder continued to surround them, the anxious committee members began to wonder what would stop the violence. It looked as though it would continue well into the night and become far more severe than just destroying the Courthouse. It was noted that the policemen in attendance did nothing to stop the disorder. In fact, many of them stood by and watched with various degrees of interest; some even seemed to

²⁹¹ Dabagh, 1974:81. Lyons tells us that when he opened the front window to escape, the kānaka maoli told him that it was okay to come out. “Kapu ka haole,” they told him, which meant that the foreigners were taboo and not to be touched.

²⁹² “Riot of the Queenites.” *Pacific Commercial Advertiser*. 28 February 1874.

²⁹³ “Our Mob.” *Ka Nūhou Hawai'i*. 17 February 1874.

²⁹⁴ Day, 1984:102-103. Born in Portsmouth, New Hampshire in 1822, William Cooper Parke was appointed Marshal under Kamehameha III and continued his position until Kalākaua asked him to step down in 1884. He called Hawai'i his home from 1834 until his death in 1889.

approve. At one point, several police officers ripped off their badges, and proceeded to pick up sticks and rocks and joined the rioters.²⁹⁵

The *Pacific Commercial Advertiser* writes that, as the riot reached new heights of violence, a member of the House of Nobles was driven to Emma's home to seek the Queen's assistance. It was believed that one word from Mō'īwahine Emma would be enough to stop any further violence. However, it states that Emma seemed aloof to any possibility of bloodshed and instead sent a note to the rioters to perhaps hold off until the next day "when a new election for Sovereign could be had!"²⁹⁶

As the chaos ensued, Mō'īwahine Emma's absence became more glaringly apparent. By 4:00 p.m., several hours after the election results were announced, there was no dissipation of the crowd's anger. Their outrage at the election and the violence they showed seemed to have no end. Tormented by the thought that disorder would continue into the night, many of the Westerners began to fear for their, and possibly the new Mō'ī's, safety. Still, Mō'īwahine Emma remained silent at her home in Nu'uānu.

German architect and carpenter, Theodore Heuck, gives us a firsthand account of what occurred in a letter he wrote to his family back home.²⁹⁷ At the time of the election, Heuck considered himself a close acquaintance of the Mō'īwahine. As disorder continued around the Courthouse, Heuck volunteered himself to speak to the Mō'īwahine in hopes

²⁹⁵ Heuck, 1874, AH.

²⁹⁶ "Riot of the Queenites." *Pacific Commercial Advertiser*. 28 February 1874.

²⁹⁷ Heuck first arrived in Hawai'i in 1850 by way of Australia, and immediately found an "in" with the kingdom through his expertise. While in Hawai'i, Heuck took part in the construction of Mauna'ala, 'Iolani Barracks, and the Queen's Hospital.²⁹⁷ In 1863, he was elected into the Privy Council, and also served in the House of Representative from 1864 to 1867. A few months after witnessing the election, Heuck left Hawai'i and passed away three years later in Hamburg. See "Theodore Heuck office records" in the State of Hawai'i Archives.

that she could calm the restless Kānaka Maoli. With the blessing of Charles Bishop,²⁹⁸ Heuck hurried from Honolulu to Emma's home where he encountered a multitude of Queenites gathered on the lawn of her home. Pushing through the crowd, he entered into Emma's home to find Emma surrounded by her companions and her ladies-in-waiting. Once in her presence, Heuck implored Emma to come to the Courthouse. Only she, he argued, could "restore order".²⁹⁹

Although Mō'īwahine Emma knew of the disaster occurring at the hands of her people, she was hesitant to accompany Heuck. Again, he beseeched her saying that "what has happened is past but at this moment you can score a wonderful point for yourself; come and everything will be right, help to uphold the dear name of 'Queen Emma.'"³⁰⁰ With those words, the Mō'īwahine requested her carriage be brought to take her to the Courthouse.

Upon hearing her order, the companions immediately bemoaned her decision. Scared that she would be hurt, or even killed, her companions implored her to remain safely at her home. Insisting that she must go, Mō'īwahine Emma firmly ordered that her carriage be brought to her. Heuck writes that not a single person moved; no one would comply with her request. This must have shocked the Mō'īwahine, who most likely was accustomed to have her commands fulfilled.

²⁹⁸ Charles Bishop, on behalf of the Legislative Assembly, would also write a letter to Emma requesting her presence at the Courthouse. He, too, believed that she could stop the riot of the people. Letter to Emma from the Legislative Assembly. 12 February 1874, AH.

²⁹⁹ Heuck, 1874, AH.

³⁰⁰ Ibid.

With that, she turned to Heuck, squeezed his hand, and told him to go ahead; she would follow with Governor Nāhaolelua. Heuck mentions that he was apprehensive about leaving without her, as her companions were incredibly adamant that she remain in the safety of her home. However, Mō‘īwahine Emma readily assured him that she would leave immediately and follow him. Unfortunately, Heuck writes that she never arrived at the Courthouse despite her promise.³⁰¹

Had Mō‘īwahine Emma left the sanctity of her home and went to the Courthouse, it is doubtful that the riot would have persisted. In the minds of the rioters, she was the Mō‘īwahine, and would comply to her commands. Her decision to remain in her home allowed the chaos in Honolulu to continue. Kalākaua, also, was not present when the riot broke out. While the ballots were being cast, he had waited at the home of his wife³⁰² until Charles Bishop and John Dominis delivered the news that he had won.

Landing The Foreign Troops

Back at the Courthouse, the possibility of fatalities had become more of a reality; the new King was urged to seek outside help. Although Kalākaua had been hesitant to request the help of foreign powers, the situation had gone beyond his control. Finally, Charles Bishop, conceiving the severity of the event, made the request to land the troops.

³⁰¹ Ibid.

³⁰² Hartwell, 17. This contradicts another article written by Judge Hartwell who claims that, while the election occurred, Kalākaua was at the home of George Trousseau, a physician who served on the Board of Health. Hartwell also claims that Kalākaua, or “David,” was a “badly scared man” and that he “hid” in Trousseau’s home during the election.

It was not long before Minister Pierce and Minister Wodehouse sent for help from their countries' respective vessels.³⁰³

A little after five o'clock in the afternoon, the captains of the U.S.S. *Tuscarora* and *Portsmouth* were given the signal to land the marines. The men rowed from their ships and marched down Fort Street; it took less than fifteen minutes for one hundred and fifty officers to arrive at the scene and immediately take control of the building.³⁰⁴ Some of the rioters who saw the officers took no time in dropping their weapons and assimilating into a crowd of innocent observers. It was noted that the Kānaka Maoli reacted with little to no contention towards the officers.³⁰⁵

Seventy men³⁰⁶ from the *Tenedos* also arrived less than half an hour later.³⁰⁷ Some of the protesters began cheering; they assumed that the British had arrived in support of the Mō'īwahine. Their optimism was a bit premature, however, as the British marines joined the American troops and also began to seize some of the antagonists.³⁰⁸

When one of the leaders of the riot was identified, he was quickly surrounded and taken back into the Courthouse.³⁰⁹ Upon realizing that the marines were making arrests, other rioters ran out from the rear of the house towards Nu'uau. Shouting their hails of support to Mō'īwahine Emma as they ran, they congregated at her residence, applauding

³⁰³ Cummings, 1874:38.

³⁰⁴ Taylor, Albert Pierce . n.d. Taylor Manuscript Collection in the State of Hawai'i Archives.

³⁰⁵ Morgan Report, 781. Jewell, an officer of the *Tuscarora* who was present at the riot, stated in the Morgan Report that the kānaka maoli did not resist the officers at all, with the exception of one who "waved a club at a petty officer," but was immediately apprehended.

³⁰⁶ Long, 1988:388.

³⁰⁷ Cummings, 1874:38.

³⁰⁸ Dabagh, 1974:84.

³⁰⁹ Ibid.

her presence and even giving speeches in her honor.³¹⁰ The adulations continued well into the evening when officers from the *Tenedos* appeared to diffuse the situation and make several more arrests.

Back at the Courthouse, it took little time to tame the mob; although some rioters were armed, not one shot had been fired. However, due to the public disturbance, the men-of-war were requested to remain on land throughout the night. Under the command of Lt. Commodores Theodore F. Jewell (*Tuscarora*) and Lewis Clark (*Portsmouth*), the troops were stationed at the Courthouse, Treasury, Army and Prison.³¹¹ Even some of the British women and children were prepared to seek asylum onboard the *Tenedos* should any more disturbances arise.³¹² With the exception of a few hurled stones towards the *Portsmouth* sailors and a pistol shot being fired,³¹³ there wasn't much else to worry about that evening. At least twenty of the rioters had been arrested and no further incidents occurred. By 8:00 that night, the town was quiet.³¹⁴

On February 13, the extent of the crowd's anger from the day prior could fully be seen. While special Legislative assemblies could cost the kingdom around \$15,000, Heuck wrote that this particular session could cost upwards of \$25,000.³¹⁵ The Courthouse was completely decimated, the windows being smashed and the furniture demolished. Legal books and papers were strewn all over the building and even out on

³¹⁰ "Riot of the Queenites." *Pacific Commercial Advertiser*. 28 February 1874.

³¹¹ Cummings, 1874:39.

³¹² Heuck, 1874, AH.

³¹³ Morgan's Report 781.

³¹⁴ Dabagh, 1974:8.

³¹⁵ Heuck, 1874, AH.

the road. Some of the offices were so devastated that nothing was standing but the walls.³¹⁶ Only the records of the Supreme Court had been left alone.

There were still some interested parties mingling around the Courthouse, but because the marines were still present, no one attempted any disruption. The only bitterness displayed by the public was after Governor Dominis returned to the Courthouse to announce that Kalākaua had been coronated.³¹⁷

The New Mō‘ī: Kalākaua

It was at noon on February 13, 1874, that Kalākaua officially given the title of Mō‘ī. The Emma supporters had scorned the coronation, challenging its legitimacy. After all, they felt the election had not reflected the desires of the people. Rumors were circulating that another election should occur in which the Mō‘īwahine would emerge victorious. Therefore, some members of the Legislature deemed it important that Kalākaua be named Mō‘ī immediately as to quell any additional disruption in the kingdom.

Unlike his predecessors who enjoyed all the pomp and splendor that accompanied such an honor, Kalākaua’s coronation was almost a solemn event. There was no celebration and no rejoicing in his victory. Kalākaua had wanted the ceremony to be performed in Kawaiaha‘o Church, as was the custom.³¹⁸ Instead, the ceremony occurred

³¹⁶ Dabagh, 1974:81.

³¹⁷ Ibid.

³¹⁸ Allen’s biography on Kalākaua states differently. She writes that it was Kalākaua who chose to have his coronation at Ali‘iōlani Hale because he was not a member of Kawaiaha‘o Church, but rather a member of the Anglican Church established by Queen Emma and her husband.

at Kīna‘u Hale,³¹⁹ which was “the most convenient place obtainable.”³²⁰ His only witnesses were government officials, members of his family, and a few other spectators.

At 11:30 a.m., the inauguration quickly began. Joined by the Foreign Representatives, Kalākaua’s family,³²¹ and some of the dignitaries of the islands, Kalākaua recited the oath of support to the Constitution that was read by Judge Hartwell. After a prayer was offered by Reverend H.H. Parker, those who were in attendance cheered for their new Mō‘ī. The guns at Punchbowl fired salute and were answered by the firing of cannons from the *U.S.S. Tuscarora* and the *H.M.S. Tenedos*,³²² therefore recognizing Kalākaua’s legal right to the throne. With that, the inauguration of Hawai‘i’s new Mō‘ī was complete.

It is pertinent, at this point, to note the austerity of this inaugural event. When an Ali‘i Nui would pass on, the mourning period that followed was anything but reflective. The people grieved for their chiefs in the most brazen of ways. The “knocking out of front teeth and fashing the head and scarring the body”³²³ was a way in which someone would mourn the death of a beloved Ali‘i. They did not constrain their grief.

In similar fashion, the inauguration of a new Ali‘i Nui had its own celebrations and customs. After Hawai‘i became a constitutional government, it became the kuleana of the Mō‘ī to take the oath of allegiance to the kingdom and its constitution. The Kānaka

Kalākaua, it says, felt that it would be better to perform the ceremony in a neutral location. See Allen, 1995:56-57.

³¹⁹ Heuck, 1874, AH. According Heuck’s letter, Kalākaua was coronated on the steps of Colonel Prendergast’s home, which was located next to the Palace.

³²⁰ “The Inauguration,” *Hawaiian Gazette*. 18 February 1874.

³²¹ Kalākaua’s family included his wife, Kapi‘olani, his sisters, Lydia Kamaka‘eha and Likelike, and his brother, William Leleiohōkū.

³²² Ibid. Heuck, 1874, AH.

³²³ Handy and Pukui, 1972:156-157.

Maoli, who found every reason to celebrate, would surround Kawaiaha‘o Church, wanting to be a part of such a momentous occasion.

If you have ever walked through ‘Iolani Palace, it is very evident that Kalākaua was not a simple man. He desired grandeur, coveted the ostentatious, and enjoyed that privileges that came with being King. Such a simple coronation most likely seemed unacceptable and embarrassing. Also, he would later become tired of the constant reminders that he was a king by choice and not by birth. It is no wonder that within a decade’s time, he would design a coronation for himself that never had been seen before in our islands.³²⁴

In order to be sure that nothing would challenge nor abolish his legitimacy, Kalākaua immediately began his duties as Mō‘ī. Only four days after he was coronated, Kalākaua announced to his public that he had appointed his Cabinet members. This included Governor Paul Nāhaolelua as Minister of Finance, W.L. Green as Minister of Foreign Affairs, Judge A. S. Hartwell was appointed Attorney General, and the new Minister of the Interior was Judge Widemann. While it was stated that the chosen Cabinet came as somewhat of a surprise, more were shocked by Kalākaua’s choice of who would sit on the Bench of the Supreme Court. Those honors were given to Charles Coffin Harris and Albert Francis Judd; the public shock being mainly due to their inexperience at these positions.³²⁵

³²⁴ Silva presents a detailed account of Mō‘ī Kalākaua’s Poni Mō‘ī (coronation ceremony) and its impact on the Aupuni. See chapter three in Silva (2004).

³²⁵ *Pacific Commercial Advertiser*. 21 February 1874.

Another important task of Kalākaua's was to appoint an heir. Since the reign of Kamehameha III, who declared his hānai son as his heir apparent,³²⁶ the last three Mō'ī had not named a successor.³²⁷ Kalākaua saw it pertinent, especially with the unfortunate events that occurred on the day of his election, to proclaim his next in line. That honor came on February 16, 1874, when Kalākaua named his younger brother, William Pitt Leleiohōkū, the heir apparent to the kingdom.³²⁸

While the newspapers heralded Kalākaua's attempt to restore order and to strengthen the kingdom, it must be said that this was not his first act as Hawai'i's King. Kalākaua's first order as Mō'ī was allowing Bishop to request the help of the captains and officers of the war vessels. Although he was acting under influence of his ministers, Kalākaua immediately made his political weakness apparent by complying. He, as the Mō'ī, could not stop his own people from disorder and chaos. His unfortunate need of reinforcements from outside powers showed his people, and the outsiders, that he was powerless. In addition, Hawai'i was now indebted to the Captains and officers of the war vessels.³²⁹

Heuck also condemns the King's decision to seek assistance from the foreign ships. "Now hide your face, Goddess of Hawaii!" Heuck writes, "Your children, the King of your beautiful islands is *so weak* – that foreign marines must give you police

³²⁶ Alexander Liholiho, husband of Queen Emma, was the nephew of Kamehameha III. Because the latter did not have children, he followed the traditional custom of hānai, or adoption, and took his sister's son as his own.

³²⁷ Alexander Liholiho's son, Albert, would have been his successor had the young keiki not preceeded his father in death. After Albert's passing, Alexander Liholiho did not declare an heir.

³²⁸ Heuck, 1874, AH.

³²⁹ Thrum, 1874. In the *Pacific Commercial Advertiser*, they admitted that "these islands have been laid under deep and lasting obligations" to the men who contained the riot.

service!’”³³⁰ As stated before, never in Hawai‘i’s history had the kingdom needed the support of outsiders to control the people. In doing so, it would denote a sense of vulnerability from a kingdom that was, at the time, holding on to any shred of independence from foreign power.

The Aftermath of The Riot: The Newspaper Response

It is of no surprise that the Hawai‘i newspapers provided a significant amount of coverage on the election and the violent response of the Kānaka Maoli. The problem, however, was the one-sided perspective that was portrayed by the newspaper editors. Up until this point, the po‘e haole attempted to portray Kānaka Maoli as passive participants in the affairs of the Aupuni that needed governance by the astute foreigners.

Ma ko kakou Kumukanawai aole i oleloia na na Makaainana e Balota no ke koho ana i kekahi alii hanau e noho ma ka noho alii.³³¹

Our Constitution does not say that the maka‘āinana are the ones who cast the ballot to choose an Ali‘i to sit on the throne.

However, within one year, two disturbances occurred that the po‘e haole could not control.³³² Therefore, the newspapers had two goals in the early months of 1874. In

³³⁰ Heuck, 1874, AH.

³³¹ “Naaupo Maoli No!” *Nūhou*. 17 March 1874.

³³² These two disturbances that I am referring to are the 1873 mutiny at the barracks and the 1874 riot.

addition to covering the aftermath of the election and the riot, they also aimed to downplay the situation in Hawai‘i and to show that the ‘Ōiwi could be controlled.

In 1874, the newspapers sided with the Kalākaua advocates and chastised Mō‘īwahine Emma for her failure to respond to the riot. The *Hawaiian Gazette*, for example, believed it was her kuleana to restore order, and that her shortcomings forced the kingdom to call upon foreign troops for help.³³³ Additionally, anyone who was a Queenite in 1874 was considered not only a rebel and “made up of the lowest classes,” they were repeatedly called ignorant by the newspapers.³³⁴ *Kō Hawai‘i Pono ‘ī* called the actions of the rioters shameful and remarked that the first election in 1873 was a peaceful one, but this day in 1874 was a disgrace.³³⁵ *Nūhou* would write, “Ua hoomaka mai keia naaupo i ke au o Lunalilo,”³³⁶ that this ignorance began during the reign of Lunalilo.

English-language newspapers, such as the *Pacific Commercial Advertiser* and the *Hawaiian Gazette*, used their publications to reassure the foreign residents in Hawai‘i and give foreign nations a sense of security. The haole wanted to put Hawai‘i in the most positive light so that they could continue to foster relationships with foreign nations, particularly the United States, and the riot could have destroyed this endeavor. If foreign governments saw Hawai‘i as a nation whose people were prone to violent attacks, any treaties or possible unions would be threatened. Therefore, the haole-run newspapers used any chance to show that Kalākaua was truly supported by his people and was indeed doing his best to solidify his kingdom.

³³³ “Our Misfortune.” *Hawaiian Gazette*. 18 February 1874.

³³⁴ Thrum, 1874.

³³⁵ “Haunaele Weliweli!” *Kō Hawai‘i Pono ‘ī*. 18 February 1874.

³³⁶ “Naaupo Maoli No!” *Nūhou*. 17 March 1874.

The Hawaiian-language newspapers also made sure to convey to the public that the riot was an exclusive action done by a small circle of outcasts from O‘ahu; the other islands were in support of Kalākaua. However, *Ka Nūpepa Kū‘oko‘a*, originally a supporter of the Mō‘īwahine, published that the Lāhainā Representatives were met by angry Kānaka demanding to know who they voted for; a severe punishment would come follow if the answer was Kalākaua.³³⁷ Several days later, *Kū‘oko‘a* published another small piece that said a kähili bearer from Kona Hema (South Kona) was angered to learn of Kalākaua’s election and refused to continue his duties.³³⁸ *Kū‘oko‘a* called such people and their actions foolish, telling its readers to leave such ill thoughts aside and reminding the people of Kamehameha’s kāmāwai of Māmalahoa.³³⁹ Though the newspapers tried to show that Kalākaua was the favored choice of the people, these little snippets of news told its readers otherwise.³⁴⁰

In another attempt to downplay the influence of the Queenites, *Nūhou* wrote that those who still considered themselves Queenites were in hiding.³⁴¹ If discovered by the police, the Mō‘īwahine supporters would immediately respond that they were not a

³³⁷ “Nu Hou Kuloko.” *Ka Nūpepa Kū‘oko‘a*. 21 February 1874.

³³⁸ “Nu Hou Kuloko.” *Ka Nūpepa Kū‘oko‘a*. 24 February 1874.

³³⁹ “Nu Hou Kuloko.” *Ka Nūpepa Kū‘oko‘a*. 21 February 1874. Kamehameha’s kāmāwai, or law, of Māmalahoa was printed in the conclusion of this announcement: “[E] hele ka elemakule, ka luahine, a me kamalii, a moe i ke alanui.” This statement translates to mean: “Let old men and women and children be free to lay on the road.” Kamehameha’s original law was enforced to protect human lives in time of war and slaughter. Once this law was proclaimed, every man, woman, and child were safe from violence. See Kamakau, 1991:312.

³⁴⁰ There is a possibility that *Ka Nūpepa Kū‘oko‘a* published these small pieces for a reason because, as previously mentioned, *Kū‘oko‘a* had been supportive of Mō‘īwahine Emma. Perhaps this was a way of acknowledging that not all the Queenites were confined to O‘ahu.

³⁴¹ “Na Nune Olelo O Ke Kulanakauhale.” *Nūhou*. 17 February 1874.

Queenite and that they were for Kalākaua.³⁴² Those who were truly for Kalākaua, according to *Nūhou*, had it in their minds that those who had been involved in the riot would be punished, whether by hanging or killing (or possibly beating),³⁴³ or they would die in prison.³⁴⁴ *Nūhou* also that some of protesters involved in the riot had gathered together and were now claiming that, “yes, the action is done, we will descend to Pākākā³⁴⁵ with the probing sticks.”³⁴⁶ The article continued in saying that the loud voices of the protesters were silenced and that the mistreatment towards Kalākaua would no longer continue.³⁴⁷ Likewise, some of the rioters were seeking forgiveness from the Sheriff and the new Mō‘ī.

The statement that the protesters’ voices had been silenced strengthens the argument that Mō‘īwahine Emma’s supporters were not given the chance to express why they had reacted so violently to Kalākaua’s election, nor were they allowed to explain why they supported Mō‘īwahine Emma. In fact, the newspapers would not print anything that endorsed the Mō‘īwahine. J. W. Mikasobe, a Hawaiian printer³⁴⁸ and later editor of

³⁴² Ibid. The article stated that anyone who was captured would respond by saying, “aohe owau, aohe owau kekahi, no Kalakaua wau, aohe no Ema, aohe o makou kipi,” meaning “not I, likewise not I, I am for Kalākaua, there is [no one] for Emma, we are not rebels.”

³⁴³ Pepehi could mean to either beat or to kill. See Pūku‘i and Elbert, *Hawaiian Dictionary*, 1986.

³⁴⁴ “Na Nune Olelo O Ke Kulanakauhale.” *Nūhou*. 17 February 1874.

³⁴⁵ Pākākā refers to Honolulu Harbor.

³⁴⁶ “Na Nune Olelo O Ke Kulanakauhale.” *Nūhou*. 17 February 1874. The printed statement was, “ea, ua pau ka hana, a e iho kakou i Pakaka me na laau e ohikihihi ai.” The words “na laau e ohikihihi ai,” may possibly refer to the sticks used as weapons during the riots. The phrase itself could be interpreted as a play on words; lā‘au ‘ōhikihihi are sticks used to clean one’s teeth. *Nūhou* wrote that, upon hearing these words, the assembly erupted in laughter.

³⁴⁷ Ibid. To quote the article: “Ua paa ka waha o ua poe nei i keia wa,” meaning that the mouths of these people (the rioters) have now been silenced.

³⁴⁸ In 1905, Mikasobe wrote a letter to the sheriff that was printed in the *Hawaiian Gazette*. In a postscript, the *Gazette*’s editor remarked that Mikasobe was “an old Hawaiian printer.” See “The High Sheriff Gets Some Political Advice.” *Hawaiian Gazette*. 25 April 1905.

Ka Leo o ka Lāhui,³⁴⁹ would write to Emma: “All of the printing presses are united in opposing the Queen.”³⁵⁰ When one of the Queenites wrote to *Nūhou* with a list of reasons why Kānaka Maoli wanted Emma as their Mō‘ī, the letter went unpublished. Instead, as we will see in the next section, the haole-run newspapers turned a deaf ear to the voices of the Queenites and portrayed them as nothing more than a small group of insignificant rebels.

Trial of the Queenites

I have come across very few Western historiographies regarding the aftermath of the riot and what happened to the accused rebels. With the exception of Osorio’s *Dismembering Lāhui* and Kanahēle’s *Emma: Hawai‘i’s Remarkable Queen*, both of which provided some insight into what would later happen to the Queenites,³⁵¹ most historical accounts proceed directly from the riot to Kalākaua’s move towards securing reciprocity. Yet, the consequences of the riot was in no way insignificant to the Aupuni and the newspapers continued their coverage of the events that unfolded in the early part of 1874.

On Tuesday, February 17, 1874, investigation began against those accused of partaking in the riot. By the evening of Friday, February 20, 1874, seventy-four³⁵² of the rioters were interrogated, with fifty-five of them being sent to trial in April before the

³⁴⁹ In 1889, John Bush (the later editor of *Ka Leo o ka Lāhui*) acknowledged that J. W. Mikasobe was the editor of *Ka Leo o ka Lāhui* after Bush was accused of writing articles in *Ka ‘Oio ‘i‘o* and *Ka Leo o ka Lāhui* that slandered the Court. See “Bush Contempt Case.” *The Daily Bulletin*. 28 October 1889.

³⁵⁰ Letter to Emma from J. W. Mikasobe, n.d., AH.

³⁵¹ Both Osorio and Kanahēle discuss some of the more significant arrests of the Queenites, of which I also examine in this mokuna.

³⁵² The *Hawaiian Gazette* reported seventy-three as opposed to seventy-four were interrogated. See “The Rioters.” *Hawaiian Gazette*. 18 February 1874.

Supreme Court.³⁵³ Seven of those accused were deferred until another examination could be carried out, while fourteen were pardoned for lack of evidence. Although there were a few who were released on bail, the remaining accused had to spend the rest of their time in prison until the trial took place.³⁵⁴

Beginning in April 1874, the Supreme Court met with the accused from the February riot at the Courthouse. Sixty-six defendants stood before the native jury³⁵⁵ and were charged with taking part in the riot and destroying government property in the Courthouse, and for injuring the Representatives.³⁵⁶ When the accused were asked how they plead to the charges, only five of the sixty-six – Kahelemauna, Kihei, Kuaana, Kaailuwale, and Koalii – pleaded guilty.³⁵⁷

On April 15, 1874, forty-one people were convicted for taking part in the riot.³⁵⁸ Of those forty-one, thirteen were sentenced to imprisonment ranging from eighteen months to five years,³⁵⁹ while the remaining twenty-seven were required to pay fines ranging from one dollar to two hundred dollars. The *Hawaiian Gazette* reported that a Kanaka Maoli by the name of Hulu was accused of being the mob leader in the riot.³⁶⁰ It

³⁵³ “The Investigation.” *Pacific Commercial Advertiser*. 21 February 1874.

³⁵⁴ Ibid.

³⁵⁵ “The Rioters Sentenced.” *Pacific Commercial Advertiser*. 18 April 1874. Twenty-five of those arraigned were released due insufficient evidence. See the *Hawaiian Gazette*. 15 April 1874.

³⁵⁶ “Aha Hookolokolo Kiekie.” *Kō Hawai‘i Pono* 7. 3 April 1874.

³⁵⁷ Ibid.

³⁵⁸ Appendix C provides a newspaper articles from *Ka Nūhou Hawai‘i* with the names of the some of the accused rioters.

³⁵⁹ Four of the convicted were sentenced to five years, five were sentenced to three years, one person was sentenced to two years, and the remaining three were given eighteen months. “The Rioters Sentenced.” *Pacific Commercial Advertiser*. 18 April 1874.

³⁶⁰ *Hawaiian Gazette*. 15 April 1874.

was noted a month earlier by *Kō Hawai‘i Pae ‘Āina* that Hulu had been captured at Ka‘ū on the Island of Hawai‘i and was taken back to O‘ahu onboard the *Kīlauea*.³⁶¹

Brought before Judge Harris, Hulu was asked if he had anything to say in regards to the charges against him. Instead of pleading guilty, Hulu replied that he was merely acting on the orders of a committee of thirteen³⁶² who, three days prior to the election, had decided to take any means necessary to ensure the victory of Mō‘īwahine Emma. The men brought before trial, he continued, were merely pawns in their plans; none of the thirteen conspirators were brought to trial. Although it was known who these leaders were, since there was no evidence that they actually took part in the riot, it would be difficult to arraign them.³⁶³ Hulu, however, was found guilty for the charges against him; he was sentenced to three years of imprisonment.³⁶⁴

I have found very little information regarding Hulu and his relationship with Emma. It seems that he had been reaching out to Mō‘īwahine Emma prior to and following the election. In letters from Hulu, he had cautioned the Mō‘īwahine to “watch out” and to “keep away,” and that “we are giving our lives for your cause until victory is gained and our wish granted.”³⁶⁵ Plans had been made to “kau i ko hae o kou noho lanakila,”³⁶⁶ or to raise the flag of her victory, on April 30.³⁶⁷ However, the threat of

³⁶¹ “Nu Hou Kuloko.” *Kō Hawai‘i Pono ‘Ī*. 18 March 1874.

³⁶² The irony of this statement is that the Hawaiian League, a group made of up annexationists who later overthrew Mō‘ī Lili‘uokalani, was managed by a group or “Committee of Thirteen.” See Kuykendall, 1967:348.

³⁶³ “Nu Hou Kuloko.” *Kō Hawai‘i Pono ‘Ī*. 18 March 1874.

³⁶⁴ “Nu Hou Kuloko.” *Ka Nūpepa Kū‘oko‘a*. 18 April 1874.

³⁶⁵ Letter from Hulu to Queen Emma, n.d., AH. Hulu never makes mention of who was a part of this group. However, we can assume that it may be the members of the committee of thirteen that Hulu made reference to in his trial.

³⁶⁶ Letter to Queen Emma, signed by Hapa Kahumoku, Hulu, and Keakui. n.d., AH.

facing any consequences caused some of the Queenites to back away from any disorderly behavior.

After Hulu was sentenced, Mō‘īwahine Emma had received a letter from a David Eldredge³⁶⁸ who cautioned Emma on having any connection to Hulu.³⁶⁹ The way the letter is written suggests Hulu had visited the Mō‘īwahine *after* his sentencing, and Eldredge questions how the public can keep Hulu restrained if Emma was allowing his visits. The controversy of the election still had the people extremely suspicious of one another, even though Hulu had been an advocate of the Mō‘īwahine.

Whether or not Hulu truly was the leader of the mob on February 12, 1874, the newspapers had their own speculations. There were rumors still running rampant amongst the community, mainly that Mō‘īwahine Emma was still doing her best to gain access to the throne.³⁷⁰ Such rumors stated that Emma herself had encouraged the riot; she and her supporters were the main catalysts of the attack.³⁷¹ *Nūhou* also blamed “Wini” (Henry Whitney) for igniting the riot because of earlier articles published in the *Hawaiian Gazette* and *Ka Nūpepa Kū‘oko‘a* that supposedly supported Emma. Whitney’s newspapers had continuously praised Emma and therefore, *Nūhou* asserted, sparked the

³⁶⁷ Looking at the newspapers during this time, I found no incidents that occurred on April 30, 1874.

³⁶⁸ David Eldredge was born on O‘ahu in 1848 and served as a delegate in the Legislature from 1872 to 1874. The year that Kalākaua was elected, Lunalilo’s father, Kana‘ina, selected Eldredge to collect rental fees from Lunalilo’s lands. Eldredge later moved in Maui and continued to serve the government in various capacities before dying in 1900. See “Ka Weheia Ana O Ka Ahaolelo.” *Ka Nūpepa Kū‘oko‘a*. 4 May 1872; “Died Suddenly On Maui.” *The Hawaiian Star*, 7 November 1900.

³⁶⁹ Letter to Queen Emma from David Eldredge. 19 April 1874, AH.

³⁷⁰ *Pacific Commercial Advertiser*. 4 April 1874.

³⁷¹ Following the riot, *Nūhou* accused Mō‘īwahine Emma supporters Samuel Kamakau, George Pilipō, and Pahukula for being the antagonists of the mutineers. *Nūhou* stated that they hoped to see these men arrested. See “Ka Haunaele a Ka Poe Kipi.” *Ka Nūhou Hawai‘i*. 17 February 1874.

mob mentality.³⁷² Likewise, *Ka Nūpepa Kū'oko'a* offered the gift of a Mō'īwahine Emma Kaleleonālani portrait to those who subscribed to the paper.³⁷³

In an article published on April 4, 1874, the *Pacific Commercial Advertiser* stated that Emma was seeking support from Great Britain to gain the throne, having called upon her relationship with Queen Victoria to gain the country's advocacy.³⁷⁴ Several days later, *Kō Hawai'i Pono 'ī* would report the same.³⁷⁵ It did not help the situation that, after the election, some of the rioters were heard roaring: "Tomorrow we will have Queen Emma elected!"³⁷⁶ The *Pacific Commercial Advertiser* called these rumors ludicrous,³⁷⁷ but it gives insight into the unease still present in the community. The lingering question was whether a second riot would break out.

Mō'īwahine Emma had remained, as mentioned, noticeably absent during the riot. She did not, in good time, congratulate nor recognize Kalākaua as the victor, and the Kalākaua supporters wasted no time in using that against her. Sentiments were expressed

³⁷² "Owai Na Alakai Kipi?" *Nūhou*. 17 March 1874. "Ka Haunaele a Ka Poe Kipi." 17 February 1874. These two newspapers were often at battle with each other, so it is unsurprising that Gibson would attempt to blame Whitney.

³⁷³ From December 13, 1873 to January 31, 1874, *Ka Nūpepa Kū'oko'a* appealed to its readers to either subscribe or renew their subscription to the newspaper for the year 1874. In return, *Kū'oko'a* would gift their subscribers with a portrait of a Hawaiian-born Ali'i. On December 27, 1873, *Kū'oko'a* was specific that the portrait its subscribers would receive was of Mō'īwahine Emma Kaleleonālani. See *Ka Nūpepa Kū'oko'a*, December 13, 1873 to January 21, 1874.

³⁷⁴ *Pacific Commercial Advertiser*. 4 April 1874.

³⁷⁵ *Kō Hawai'i Pono 'ī*. 8 April 1874. The article stated "ua palapala aku ka i ka Moiwahine o Beretania a e kokua mai ana kela e lilo ia Ema ka noho Moi," meaning that the Mō'īwahine [Emma] wrote to Britain to seek help in Emma's becoming the reigning Mō'ī.

³⁷⁶ Ibid.

³⁷⁷ Ibid.

that Emma should be charged with the expenses made by the riot, and that her “saintly reputation” was nothing more than a ruse to gain sympathy and support.³⁷⁸

Kuykendall writes that Emma did acknowledge Kalākaua’s victory, but that she did so in a privately written letter sent on February 13, 1874.³⁷⁹ On February 15, Hueck and Judge Wodehouse made their way to Nu‘uanu to visit Emma and express to her the importance of officially and *publicly* recognizing Kalākaua as Mō‘ī.³⁸⁰ They also asked that she stress the importance of keeping order and following the laws of the kingdom. Though Emma eventually acknowledged the sovereignty of the new Mō‘ī,³⁸¹ she also requested that he forgive the Queenites for their wrongful actions at the Courthouse. Kalākaua, after expressing that he must abide by the laws of the kingdom, refused.³⁸²

The same month that Hulu was convicted, one more arrest was made of a Mō‘īwahine Emma supporter, although in a slightly different capacity. Refusing to accept that Kalākaua was the new Mō‘ī, some members of the Queenites had continued their vigil on the grounds of her Nu‘uanu residence. Worried, also, for the Queen’s safety, about fifty men and women³⁸³ camped out and kept watch over the Queen’s home.³⁸⁴

On Saturday, April 19, Daniel Kanuha found himself in a struggle close to the Queen’s residence. Kanuha was considered a Mō‘īwahine Emma supporter up until the riot broke out. It seems that he attempted to stop the riot and, in consequence, made a few

³⁷⁸ Dabagh, 1974:85.

³⁷⁹ Kuykendall, 1967:3, 11.

³⁸⁰ Heuck, 1874, AH.

³⁸¹ Allen writes that Queen Emma did so only after Kalākaua was formally recognized by the foreign dignitaries. See Allen, 1995:56.

³⁸² Kanahele, 1999:296.

³⁸³ The *Pacific Commercial Advertiser* said the number of people was around thirty or forty. See “Unnecessarily Scared.” *Pacific Commercial Advertiser*. 25 April 1874.

³⁸⁴ “Nu Hou Kuloko.” *Kō Hawai‘i Pono‘ī*. 22 April 1874.

enemies of the Queenites. When trying to pass the “guards” at Mō‘īwahine Emma’s home to see a friend, he was seized, threatened, and called a rebel.³⁸⁵ The police arrived shortly thereafter, questioning the Queenites who responded by saying “he poe kiai makou no ke ola o ka Moiwahine,” that they were guarding the life of the Mō‘īwahine.³⁸⁶

Even though Kanuha claimed he was there to visit an acquaintance, he was found concealing a pistol. Brought before the Police Court, he stated that he only had the weapon to protect himself from the enemies that he had made; he in no way wished the Mō‘īwahine harm. He was released and charged a fine of ten dollars.³⁸⁷ *Ka Nūpepa Kū‘oko‘a* later responded to the ordeal by chastising the Mō‘īwahine’s po‘e kiai for making inaccurate claims that Mō‘īwahine Emma’s life was in danger.³⁸⁸

Ke kukala aku nei makou, a ke hoike aku nei i ka poe naaupo, aole he kanaka Hawaii e ola nei e aa ana e kii aku i kona alii e pepehi, he ole loa no.³⁸⁹

We proclaim, and make known to the unenlightened, there is no living Hawaiian person who dares to seize and kill their ali‘i, not one indeed.

Several months later, the riot was still a sore point in the minds of the haole residents of Hawai‘i. In April of that year, the *Pacific Commercial Advertiser* again recalled the events of that day, stating that no matter who would have voted, the results

³⁸⁵ Ibid.

³⁸⁶ Ibid.

³⁸⁷ “Unnecessarily Scared.” *Pacific Commercial Advertiser*. 25 April 1874.

³⁸⁸ “Nu Hou Kuloko.” *Ka Nūpepa Kū‘oko‘a*. 25 April 1874.

³⁸⁹ Ibid.

would still have been in favor for Kalākaua.³⁹⁰ According to the article, the other Hawaiian Islands were almost all in support of Kalākaua; nothing that Mō‘īwahine Emma could have done would have swayed the votes.

In the face of threats and attempts at intimidation made by Emma’s friends, the Representatives voted according to the wishes of their constituents, and of themselves. If all the Oahu Representatives had voted for Emma, the result of the election would have remained the same. The other islands were almost unanimous for Kalakaua, and the fact that a party in Honolulu were for Emma could not affect the vote for King Kalakaua.³⁹¹

As the newspapers covered the investigations, many brought up the munity at the barracks that occurred in September 1873; it was still fresh in the minds of the community, especially since a violent eruption of that caliber was uncommon in the 1800s. The newspapers speculated that had the Aupuni been more severe in their punishment of the mutineers, perhaps the riot would not have occurred; some of the men in the 1874 riot were identified as also being a part of the attack at the barracks.³⁹² Kānaka Maoli would have understood the repercussions of violent acts had it been previously enforced. Therefore, with the current situation at hand, the court was prepared

³⁹⁰ *Pacific Commercial Advertiser*, 4 April 1874.

³⁹¹ Ibid.

³⁹² Thrum, 1874.

to hand down the strictest of punishments so that Hawai‘i should not see any further disruption by Kānaka Maoli.

Ka Lei Kaulana o Ke Kipi: Supporting Mō‘īwahine Emma

If the public thought that the tense situation of the election was now over, they were to be disappointed yet again. Later that summer, Zephyrin Kahoali‘i, better known as Kepelino³⁹³ was arrested for treason when it was found that he was petitioning the French commissioner to help in overthrowing Kalākaua. Kepelino was the private secretary of Mō‘īwahine Emma and was also a professed Queenite.³⁹⁴ He is best known for being one of Hawai‘i’s more significant writers, alongside of Samuel Kamakau and David Malo, who wrote about the the ancient customs and traditions of Hawai‘i.

Born around the year 1830 and part of Catholic family, Kepelino was a descendent of Pā‘ao through his father’s line. From his mother’s lineage, Kepelino was part of the Kamehameha line.³⁹⁵ His connection to these ali‘i allowed him an insider’s perspective of the culture prior to foreign arrival. During the election, he publicly threw his support to the side of Mō‘īwahine Emma, even writing letters to Queen Victoria of Great Britain and the King of Italy requesting their advocacy for Emma.³⁹⁶ In the same month of the election, Kepelino had written to Emma himself informing her of those who

³⁹³ Kepelino is the translation of Zephyrin, the name given to Kepelino upon his baptism in the Catholic Church.

³⁹⁴ Kanahele, 1999:302-305; Korn, 1976:229 n. 6.

³⁹⁵ Valeri, 1985.

³⁹⁶ Kirtley and Mo‘okini, Trans., 1858:39-40. Ironically, when Kepelino was sending these letters to the foreign sovereign, Kalākaua was serving as postmaster.

were advocating for Kalākaua,³⁹⁷ as well as stating that he had been ostracized from dining with the French Commissioner and Kalākaua's supporters because they were concerned he would "hear their secrets."³⁹⁸

Kepelino's fervid desire to see Mō'īwahine Emma on the throne had not been extinguished by the election. One way he expressed his support of Emma was through a petition to the French commissioner.³⁹⁹ Kepelino, along with other Kānaka Maoli, had gathered signatures from others who wanted to end Kalākau's reign. It also requested that the French warships help in this coup. The petition claimed that Kalākaua had used bribery to secure votes, that he was a "false king," and only Emma was the acknowledged heir to the kingdom.⁴⁰⁰

Although this request went unheeded by the French, Kepelino's attempted actions against the reigning Mō'ī were not overlooked. On October 17, 1874, he was found guilty of treason and spent two years in prison.⁴⁰¹ While this arrest, as stated by Osorio, "may have ended whatever conspiracy existed to overthrow Kalākaua" at the time, it "by no means ended the opposition."⁴⁰² Kalākaua legitimacy to the throne and his political

³⁹⁷ Letter to Queen Emma from J.P. Zephyrin Kahoali'i, 2 February 1874, AH. In this letter, Kepelino names the Ministers of Foreign Affairs and Interior, and the Governors of O'ahu and Kaua'i, as well as other unnamed foreigners.

³⁹⁸ Ibid.

³⁹⁹ Kirtley and Mo'okini, Trans., 1858:39-40. It is interesting that Kepelino sought help from the French government since Mō'īwahine Emma had support from the British. It is understandable that Kepelino would not seek assistance from the American government; they had already shown their advocacy for Kalākaua. Perhaps, since the French Government was not as involved in the events on election day as the British and American governments were, Kepelino thought that he could find another powerful advocate for the Queen.

⁴⁰⁰ Kanahele, 1999.

⁴⁰¹ Kirtley and Mo'okini, Trans., 1858:39-40. Kepelino's original sentence was death by hanging. That sentence would later change to serve time in prison.

⁴⁰² Osorio, 2002:161-162.

actions would continue to be challenged, both for his legitimacy to wear the Crown, yet in more public and appropriate means.

Why did the rioters only attack the Kānaka Maoli Representatives? Why did they leave the haole alone? Unless someone recorded the thoughts behind the riot, we may never know the answer. However, available evidence shows several possibilities. Perhaps Kānaka Maoli felt that if they attacked the haole Representatives, the repercussions would be more severe because foreign powers such as America and Britain would certainly become involved.

More likely, they felt the other Kānaka Maoli *should have known better*. This was an Aupuni supported by and for *their* people, not by the foreigners. The aupuni was founded by the Kamehamehas, and if there was no Kamehameha on the throne, then the Aupuni would fall apart. Kānaka Maoli knew that a haole-dominated kingdom would be the quickest route to foreign takeover, and by electing the foreign choice (Kalākaua) and not the *Kānaka* choice (Emma), the Kānaka Maoli Representatives were siding with the haole.

Once the Hawaiians Islands were unified, Kamehameha ‘Ekahi represented a prosperous and relatively peaceful time in Hawai‘i’s history. Kame‘eleihiwa argues that Ali‘i Nui who were pono followed certain responsibilities, and Kamehameha was no exception. He followed the custom of nī‘aupi‘o, or incestuous mating, taking his “niece”

Keōpūolani as his wife and producing keiki of the highest kapu.⁴⁰³ He preserved the ‘Aikapu, the system of laws that preventing men and women from eating together, as made sure to keep his Akua pleased. Most of all, Kamehameha understood the importance of Mālama ‘Āina, that is, caring for the land.

Therefore, Kānaka Maoli wanted to ensure that a Kamehameha continued the tradition of ruling over a united Aupuni. Mō‘īwahine Emma, as part of this lineage, was still a last hope in the hearts of the Kānaka Maoli. With the establishment of the hospital, he had proven herself as one who understood the needs of her people. And, at the time, she was the only Ali‘i who had given birth to a child, showing that she was capable of continuing the Kamehameha line. Therefore, Emma’s claim to the Kamehameha lineage posed a definite threat to Kalākaua’s quest for the Crown and it haunted his reign as Mō‘ī. As a result, the Kalākaua ‘ohana consistently disputed Emma’s mo‘okū‘auhau and her Kamehameha lineage. In the next chapter, I examine how the Kalākauas used the newspapers to deny Emma’s assertion that she was a descendent of the Kamehameha line and how Emma’s supporters attempted to prove these assertions as incorrect.

⁴⁰³ ‘Ī‘Ī, 1959:51. Kamehameha’s three children - Liholiho, Kauikeaouli, and Nāhi‘ena‘ena - all had the kapu moe, which was the strictest of kapu. With this kapu, their people would have to prostrate before them.

Mokuna ‘Ehiku: Na Lei Hiwahiwa o Ke Aupuni Genealogy, Kapu, and the Crown

To Kānaka Maoli, mo‘okū‘auhau (genealogies) are considered a significant and cherished possession. They provide the link to those who came before us, an acknowledgement of our kūpuna and a celebration of their names and achievements. Knowing your mo‘okū‘auhau connects you to their stories, their histories, and their homeland.

In the nineteenth century, mo‘okū‘auhau were used as political tools to affirm one’s place in society, acknowledging who of the remaining Kānaka were Ali‘i and were qualified to rule. In 1873 and 1874,⁴⁰⁴ Kānaka Maoli relied on the cultural tradition of using mo‘okū‘auhau to determine who was best qualified to be Mō‘ī. While po‘e haole considered the political issues of reciprocity and personal business interests to decide their candidate, Kānaka Maoli were more concerned with the lineage of the candidates. What followed in 1874 were dynamic exchanges between the supporters of Kalākaua and Emma who scrutinized and critiqued the lineage of each candidate. Mō‘īwahine Emma’s mo‘okū‘auhau was notably attacked, specifically because she claimed a connection to the Kamehameha lineage and therefore had a right to the throne.

The intent of this chapter is to discuss some of the debates that occurred in the Hawaiian-language newspapers and how Kānaka Maoli used the newspapers to assert Emma’s claim to the Crown. The issue of Mō‘īwahine Emma’s mo‘okū‘auhau is an exceptional one because it began years prior to the 1874 election and would continue

⁴⁰⁴ These two dates refer to the election of Lunalilo (1873) and the election of Kalākaua (1874).

long after she would die. The claim that Emma and her ‘ohana were tied to the Kamehamehas was often a central point of debate between those with a professed skill in mo‘okū‘auhau, consequently providing decades of material to examine.

Although the scope and span of these genealogical debates is too significant to be ignored, most accounts of the 1874 election have failed to recognize the importance and purpose behind them. Looking at the election from a western viewpoint provides a very superficial understanding of why this event was significant. These accounts will usually acknowledge that Kānaka Maoli wanted Emma while either minimizing or eliminating completely the reason that she was their choice. Gavan Daws, for example, gives only a single paragraph that speaks of rank as a factor in the election.⁴⁰⁵

Emma’s campaign was a clumsy one. She had pinned her hopes on rank, but very few Hawaiians of any standing responded to this appeal (though it is not clear whether they failed to do so because of their genealogical convictions or because Kalakaua paid for more support).⁴⁰⁶

The above paragraph is a small example of how the Kānaka Maoli voices are removed from foreign historiographies. Even Kuykendall’s account of the election leaves out the genealogical issue entirely.⁴⁰⁷ The Kānaka Maoli used her rank as the most critical point of their argument, arguing her case in the newspapers, in the distribution of

⁴⁰⁶ Daws, 1968:199.

⁴⁰⁷ Kuykendall, 1967.

handbills, in mass meetings, and in their composition of mele.⁴⁰⁸ Samuel Kamakau, for instance, began to promote Emma's genealogical rank as early as January of 1874. S. M. Kamakau had unquestionable standing in the Kingdom and was one of the most famous genealogists of the nineteenth century.

The ancestral lineage of both candidates, in addition to their stance on the Reciprocity Treaty, was an important determinant in who should wear the Crown in 1874. The mo'okū'auhau of both Kalākaua and Emma were discussed and debated at length in an effort to prove that one's mo'okū'auhau was of higher rank than the other and who specifically had the right to rule. Most significantly, it determined who was connected to the Kamehameha 'ohana.

Prior to Western contact in 1778, mo'okū'auhau was significant for Ali'i in their efforts to claim rights to rule, to use and/or control 'āina, and to noho or ho'āo (marry).⁴⁰⁹ One's mo'okū'auhau was sacred, and not something made public to those deemed unworthy of such knowledge; it was not something confessed to the maka'āinana unless they had Ali'i lineage.⁴¹⁰ In the nineteenth century, this would change in part because the

⁴⁰⁸ Mele Kālai'āina (political songs) and Mele Kū'auhau (genealogical songs) additionally supported Emma's genealogical rank, celebrating her ties to some of Hawai'i's most prestigious of ali'i, such as 'Umi-a-Liloa, Kalanikauleleaiwi, Kamalālāwalu, and Kākuhihewa.

⁴⁰⁹ Kame'eleihiwa, 1992:43. When it came to ho'āo, the context of marriage was different than our Western understanding of marriage. While Ali'i could choose to noho, or reside with, a person for the sake of love, what was important for the Ali'i was to have a high-ranking child. Therefore, ideally an Ali'i's firstborn child should be with someone of equal or higher rank.

⁴¹⁰ In 1842, Samuel Kamakau would publish several pages of genealogy beginning from Kumuhonua and his wahine, Halooho. Kamakau's reason for publishing the mo'okū'auhau was so that future generations will know the names of these kūpuna and their descendants.

A. Unauna responded to Kamakau's publication by stating that mo'okū'auhau were very sacred to the Ali'i and not something freely given to the maka'āinana. Unauna also questioned Kamakau's reason for publicizing such a sacred genealogy, asking if Kamakau's purpose was to make himself famous for his skill in genealogies.

pool of ranking Ali'i was decimated by foreign diseases and only a few families remained. To ensure a continuing lāhui of sacred chiefs meant that it was important to know who claimed high rank, and it was during this time that mo'okū'auhau became accessible to all.

When the first wave of American Calvinist missionaries arrived in Hawai'i in 1820, Ka Palapala (reading and writing) was introduced to Kānaka Maoli.⁴¹¹ The Ali'i understood the significance of Ka Palapala and, using their power as leaders of the maka'āinana, would encourage literacy and education.⁴¹² Kānaka Maoli became so prolific in this skill that, by 1853, close to three-fourths of Kānaka Maoli were literate in 'Ōlelo Hawai'i.⁴¹³ Their eagerness to learn naturally progressed into writing in 'Ōlelo Hawai'i, a skill that Kānaka Maoli mastered. The Hawaiian-language newspapers provided an opportunity for Kānaka Maoli to put their knowledge to print, in which they

Kamakau's reply was that if others who were ignorant of these genealogies wanted to know, for example, how many children 'Umi had, they would be able to recite both the children's names and the mothers of those children. His purpose for publishing the mo'okū'auhau were just as he had stated earlier; Kamakau wanted the keiki to know these Ali'i. Kamakau also retorted that other genealogists who have died would rejoice in seeing the kū'auhau because they would no longer be lost or forgotten.

What these early debates tell us is that, yes, Unauna was correct in his statement that mo'okū'auhau were known by the Ali'i and other skilled genealogists. It was not made public, especially to people who were maka'āinana or kua'āina (a person from the country) because that was not their kuleana. However, Kamakau's response shows us that there was a reason for these mo'okū'auhau to be published during the nineteenth century. With so many changes in the Aupuni, it was significant that such knowledge be available to all. If future generations were unfamiliar with these Ali'i Nui of the past, the Ali'i Nui may one day be forgotten.

For more information on this genealogical dispute, see Kamakau, S. M. "Ke kuauhau no na Kupuna kahiko loa mai o Hawaii nei, a hiki mai ia Wakea. Mai ia Wakea mai a hiki mai i keia manawa a kakou e noho nei, i mea e maopopo ai i keia hanauna; a ia hanauna aku ia hanauna aku." *Ka Nonanona*. 25 October 1842; Unauna, A. "No Ke Kuauhau." *Ka Nonanona*. 8 November 1842; and Kamakau, S. M. "Lahainaluna, Dek. 2, 1842." *Ka Nonanona*. 14 February 1843.

⁴¹¹ ho'omanawanui, 2010:29.

⁴¹² Nogelmeier, 2010:70-71.

⁴¹³ Lucas, 2000:2.

published traditional mo‘olelo, mo‘okū‘auhau, and mele.⁴¹⁴ The newspapers additionally allowed Kānaka Maoli to entertain in “vigorous debates,”⁴¹⁵ notably on the mo‘okū‘auhau of the Ali‘i families. One of these genealogists who entered into genealogical debates was Kamakau who became a champion on the side of Mō‘īwahine Emma. His regular opponent would be John Koi‘i Unauna, a genealogist on the side of Kalākaua. However, they were not the only genealogists to enter into the discussion. In fact, the genealogical debate would span over fifty years, beginning with Alexander Liholiho’s decision to marry the young Emma and ending around the publication of Mō‘īwahine Lili‘uokalani’s book, *Hawai‘i’s Story By Hawai‘i’s Queen* in 1898.

Early Debates on Emma’s Mo‘okū‘auhau

Kānaka maoli were skilled in oratory challenges, exciting one’s opponent to deny their discourse. Although Kānaka Maoli were not literate in the western context until after the arrival of the missionaries in 1820, it is near impossible to deny that we excelled in our command of language. When written language was introduced, newspapers opened a new avenue for our talents. As I discussed in the section above, genealogical discussions became a heated affair in many publications. The genealogical disputes between Kamakau and A. Unauna⁴¹⁶ are a good example of this, one of which sprung up years prior to the election. The irony of this dispute is that it focused on noneother than

⁴¹⁴ ho‘omanawanui, 2010:29.

⁴¹⁵ Ibid.

⁴¹⁶ A. Unauna was the father of the aforementioned J. K. Unauna. A. Unauna’s son would pick up the genealogical debate against Kamakau twenty years later.

Keli‘imaika‘i, the younger brother of Kamehameha I and the claimed ancestor of Emma’s ‘ohana.⁴¹⁷

Keli‘imaika‘i’s mo‘okū‘auhau was discussed again when Alexander Liholiho (Kamehameha IV) proclaimed his intent to marry Emma Nā‘ea Rooke in 1855. At this time, the soon-to-be Mō‘īwahine had overheard malicious chatter at her own engagement party in which the gossipers pointed out that the marriage would be inappropriate because of Emma’s haole lineage.⁴¹⁸ In her autobiography, Lili‘uokalani wrote that some of the older Ali‘i and those considered genealogists⁴¹⁹ were disappointed with his choice of suitor, sending him a message that “there is no other chief equal to you in birth and rank but the adopted daughter of Paki.”⁴²⁰

Despite the changes occurring in Hawai‘i, when it came to mo‘okū‘auhau, the Ali‘i still felt that it was extremely important to keep the lineage strong. Similar to the old

⁴¹⁷ In 1842, thirty-two years before the election, *Ka Nonanona* published an article by Kamakau, who presents a lengthy mo‘okū‘auhau for Kamehameha. Immediately following Kamehameha was the name Kepo‘okalani. By next issue, Unauna immediately questioned Kamakau’s placing of this name after Kamehameha’s and before Kamehameha’s children. Unauna declared Kamakau’s mo‘okū‘auhau incorrect, writing that Kepo‘okalani was not Kamehameha’s child; he was the child of Kame‘eiamoku and Kamakehikuli. In February of 1843, Kamakau finally responded to Unauna’s rebuttal by telling him to return to his kumu, ‘Auwae: “E Unauna e; E ninau hou aku oe ia Auwae? Malia paha o hai hou mai ia oe no Kepookalani, malie paha, ua pōina ia ia, aole paha i hai mai ia oe.” (Unauna, [perhaps] you should inquire again of ‘Auwae? Perhaps he will tell you again about Kepo‘okalani, perhaps he forgot and did not tell you.) Kamakau continued by telling Unauna that Kepo‘okalani was an older name of Keli‘imaika‘i, and that Keli‘imaika‘i was the name given to him by the people of Kīpahulu, Maui. Thus began the genealogical debate between Kamakau and the Unauna ‘ohana. See Kamakau, S. M. “Ke Kuauhau no na Kupuna kahiko loa mai o Hawaii nei, a hiki mai ia Wakea. Mai ia Wakea mai a hiki mai i keia manawa a kakou e noho nei, i mea e maopopo ai i keia hanauna; a ia hanauna aku ia hanauna aku” *Ka Nonanona*. 25 October 1842; Unauna, A. “No Ke Kuauhau.” *Ka Nonanona*. 8 November 1842; and Kamakau, S. M. “Lahainaluna, Dek. 2, 1842.” *Ka Nonanona*. 14 February 1843.

⁴¹⁸ Kanahale, 1999:60.

⁴¹⁹ Lili‘uokalani does not state who these ali‘i and genealogists were.

⁴²⁰ Lili‘uokalani, 1898:12.

Council of Chiefs who would meet to discuss all matters affecting the lāhui,⁴²¹ the old Ali'i gathered together to examine the upcoming nuptials.⁴²²

Lili'uokalani writes that her biological father, Kapa'akea, was extremely vocal in his disapproval of Liholiho's choice of wife. He argued that Lili'uokalani came from a high bloodline that stemmed from the Ali'i Nui Keawe-a-Heulu, and her hānai parents also contributed to her rank.⁴²³ Emma's lineage, he argued, was not as high ranking as Lili'uokalani's, especially since she also claimed British heritage from her grandfather, John Young.⁴²⁴

Alexander Liholiho, who inherited the fiery temper of the Kamehamehas when provoked, was not happy with their interference. However, a week after the

⁴²¹ The 'Aha Ali'i, or Council of Chiefs, was made up of the Ali'i Nui's counselors who advised on such things as political, financial, and religious matters. See Kamakau, 1991:300-305.

⁴²² Another factor that may have contributed to Emma's elevated status was her hānai relationship with Dr. Rooke. That Rooke was a doctor during a time when the people were dying at an alarming rate gave the man a certain prestige. He was a source of ola, of life, in that he saved and cured those who were ill or dying. In the past, the source of ola came from the Akua, from whom the kuleana was bestowed to the Ali'i and to the kāhuna lapa'au. Following the arrival of Cook in 1778, the influx of foreign disease caused the kānaka to question their personal failures, not the inadequacy of the Akua. Dr. Rooke, as someone who had the ability to heal the sick, presented one of the new (and foreign) foundations of ola.

As Rooke's primary patients were the Ali'i, it would make sense that he would be revered and respected by both the ali'i and the people. After all, it was through his care that the Ali'i could possibly continue to thrive. During Kamehameha I's reign, Rooke was noted as the Kahuna Lapa'au of the aupuni. Therefore, Emma was likely respected as the daughter of the man through whom ola could be restored. See "He poe luna o ke aupuni." Ka Nonanona. 6 August 1844.

⁴²³ Krout, 1908. Lili'uokalani was a keiki hānai, or adopted child, of Paki and Konia, the biological parents of Bernice Pauahi Bishop. Paki's father was Kalanihelemailuna, son of Kamehamehanui of the Maui lineage, and his mother was Kawao (also called Kūho'oheihēpahu and Kaho'oheihēpahu). Konia was the daughter of Kahailiopua and Pauli Kaoleioku, the son of Kānekapolei. (Fornander, 1878.) Kaoleioku's paternal lineage is rather inconclusive; he is said to be either the son of Kalani'ōpu'u or by Kamehameha I. Kānekapolei was the wife of Kalani'ōpu'u at the time of Kaoleioku's conception, but rumors circulated that she had been intimate with Kamehameha and that the latter was the child's true father. Kamehameha would later recognize Kaoleioku as his own.

⁴²⁴ Allen, 1982:82-83.

announcement, Maunaloa erupted on Hawai‘i Island. Kānaka Maoli saw the eruption as a hō‘ailona that Pele was unhappy with the arrangement. The wedding was postponed for several months as a result, making it evident that the traditional customs were still an integral part of the culture, but Alexander Liholiho finally made the choice to wed Emma.⁴²⁵

What occurred during this time was a genealogical debate between the two wāhine. Both Emma and Lili‘uokalani’s mo‘okū‘auhau were dissected and discussed. This was one of the earliest debates between these two families, but it would certainly not be the last.

On Mō‘īwahine Emma’s Mo‘okū‘auhau

Emma’s lineage was called to question in regards to the parentage of her maternal grandmother, Ka‘ō‘anā‘eha. Ka‘ō‘anā‘eha, according to the genealogists on the side of Emma, was the daughter of Keli‘imaika‘i and Kalikookalani. Kalikookalani was an Ali‘i Wahine of high rank, tracing her lineage through Kanīniu and Kekūnuialeimoku (Kekunuialaimoku).⁴²⁶ Kekūnuialeimoku was the son of the famous Kalaninui‘īamamao and his wife, Ahia, both of the ‘Ī family.⁴²⁷ Through his parentage, Kekūnuialeimoku was also the half-brother of Kalani‘ōpu‘u and Keōua, and he was chosen by Kalani‘ōpu‘u to

⁴²⁵ Ibid.

⁴²⁶ “Ka mookuahau Alii o ka Moiwahine Kaleleonalani e pili ana ia Kamehameha I.” *Ka Nūpepa Kū‘oko‘a*. 31 January 1874.

⁴²⁷ Fornander, 1878:129. Fornander tells us that this marriage between Kalaninui‘īamamao and Ahia was done by the former’s father, Keaweikekahiali‘iokamoku, to further sanctify the union of the ‘Ī family.

be the makua hānai (adopted parent) of Kamehameha after Kamehameha was taken and raised by Nae‘ole.⁴²⁸

It was Ka‘ō‘anā‘eha’s paternal lineage that was often challenged. Keli‘imaika‘i was the son of Keōua and Keku‘iapoīwa II, and was the kaikaina pono‘ī of Kamehameha ‘Ekahi. His name was Kalanimalokuloku, but was given the name Keli‘imaika‘i because of his respect for the maka‘āinana and their ‘āina during a time when the Hawai‘i chiefs were invading Maui.⁴²⁹ Keli‘imaika‘i was also the revered punahele (favorite) of his older brother. Upon Kamehameha’s decision to build his famous luakini heiau, Pu‘ukoholā.⁴³⁰ everyone was required to take part in its construction. Everyone, that is, except for Keli‘imaika‘i.

As the punahele of Kamehameha, Keli‘imaika‘i had been given the kuleana of Kahoāli‘i,⁴³¹ and serve as the impersonation of the Akua for the heiau. Therefore, he would have to observe the kapu and prepare the sacrifices and purification of those

⁴²⁸ Kamakau, S. M. “Ka Moololo o Kamehameha I.” *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*. 20 Okakopa 1866. In Kamakau’s *Ruling Chiefs* (1991), Nae‘ole was an Ali‘i from Kōhala who was given the responsibility of serving as Kamehameha’s kahu following the Conqueror’s birth. Nae‘ole would raise Kamehameha until he around five years of age and then return the child to the care of Alapa‘inui (Mō‘ī of Hawai‘i Island). See Kamakau, 1991:67-69.

⁴²⁹ Fornander, 1878:229.

⁴³⁰ Ibid., 395. Pu‘ukoholā is located on the Island of Hawai‘i in the district of Kawaihae. As Kamehameha made his advancement to conquer the archipelago, he was instructed by the famous Kaua‘i kāula (prophet), Kapoukahi, to rebuild Pu‘ukoholā. Should he successfully appease his war god, Kūka‘ilimoku, with the reconstruction of the heiau, he was told that he would be able to fulfill his dreams of conquest.

⁴³¹ Kahoāli‘i (also spelled as Kaho‘āli‘i and Kahoali‘i) was chosen as the human impersonation in dedicating the luakini heiau. Only those who were significant enough in the eyes of the Ali‘i Nui were bestowed this honor. See ‘Ī‘ī, 1959:41.

involved in the building of the heiau.⁴³² ‘Ī‘Ī discusses how the sanctity of this chief was held in such high esteem that a place would become “very kapu” after he had consecrated it.⁴³³

Being Kamehameha’s kaikaina, Keli‘imaika‘i’s descendants would also be honored as members of the Kamehameha family. Emma, therefore, would not only be able to tie her lineage to the famous Conqueror, she could claim the same lineage to Keōua and Keku‘iapoīwa II as could the former reigning Kamehamehas. However, those who disputed the Mō‘īwahine’s right to the Crown often stated that her great-grandfather was *not* Keli‘imaika‘i, and that Kalikookalani had been with three additional men at the time of her daughter’s conception.⁴³⁴ Furthermore, the Kalākaua family argued that Keli‘imaika‘i never had children.⁴³⁵

This statement is rather suspicious since Keli‘imaika‘i was known to have been the father of Kekuaokalani.⁴³⁶ Kekuaokalani plays a rather prominent role in Hawaiian history as the benefactor of Kamehameha’s war god, Kūka‘ilimoku. Prior to the Conqueror’s death, Kamehameha had decreed that his kapu son, Liholiho, should inherit

⁴³² Ibid., 328. Fornander writes that on one occasion, Keli‘imaika‘i went to lift a stone for the heiau. Kamehameha immediately reprimanded his younger brother for taking part in the job as he was supposed to be held sacred, and had the pōhaku tossed into the ocean depths.

⁴³³ ‘Ī‘Ī, 1959:59. Keli‘imaika‘i had sanctified two bathing pools on Hawai‘i Island that ‘Ī‘Ī uses as evidence of Keli‘imaika‘i’s kapu. One of these bathing pools, called Keliialalahoolāawai, or “the chief who roused to dedicate the water” after Keli‘imaika‘i, was so sacred that no man could bathe there without first stripping off their malo.

⁴³⁴ Kalākaua’s Order of Chiefly Procedure. The document drawn up by Kalākaua has a column that includes the genealogy of Queen Emma. The accuracy of this column is challenged by Kalākaua who adds that Keli‘imaika‘i denied that he fathered Ka‘ōanē‘eha, which Kalākaua claimed was supported by Kīna‘u and Kekau‘ōnohi. Kalikookalani was not only tied to Keli‘imaika‘i and Kaleipaihala, she was also married to Palea and Keaka, making Ka‘ō‘anā‘eha’s true paternal lineage hard to determine.

⁴³⁵ See Lili‘uokalani’s note in Appendix F in *Hawai‘i’s Story by Hawai‘i’s Queen* (1898).

⁴³⁶ ‘Ī‘Ī, 1959:92, 124, 139.

the right to rule the aupuni, and that his nephew had care of the war god.⁴³⁷ Upon Liholiho's contemplation of whether or not to eat with his mothers and siblings and ultimately end the 'Aikapu system, Kekuaokalani urged him to not heed Ka'ahumanu's demands. When Liholiho succumbed, it was Kekuaokalani who revolted in a battle known as Kuamo'o,⁴³⁸ in which the latter met his death.⁴³⁹

Yet, in her book, Lili'uokalani made note in the presented mo'okū'auhau that Keli'imaika'i had "no issue" and that his wife, Ki'ilaweau, was actually a kāne and an uncle of Kalani'ōpu'u.⁴⁴⁰ There has been mention of a kāne Ki'ilaweau, who may have been the father of Kekūanaō'a.⁴⁴¹ However, others have noted that Keli'imaika'i did have a wife of the same name,⁴⁴² and that she was the mother of Kekuaokalani.

One response in *Kō Hawai'i Pae 'Āina* less than politely accuses the other (*Ka 'Elele*) of their so-called genealogical knowledge, stating that the sacred pahu drums of Keli'imaika'i resonated upon the birth of Ka'ō'anā'eha, and that only she and her daughter were allowed into the Hale o Keli'imaika'i (House of Keli'imaika'i) while he

⁴³⁷ Kamakau, 1991: 224.

⁴³⁸ Kanahale would mention that when Ka'ō'anā'eha would pass away, she was not granted the royal ceremony for her funeral. Kanahale writes that she would lose the respect of other Ali'i when she failed to conform to the new religion. Following her brother's death, Ka'ō'anā'eha would take the name Mele Kuamo'o after the battle in which Kekuaokalani was killed. Kanahale, 1999:45-46.

⁴³⁹ Kamakau, 1991:225-227.

⁴⁴⁰ See Appendix F in *Hawai'i's Story by Hawai'i's Queen*.

⁴⁴¹ "Estate of Charles Kanaina," 1893. In a dispute regarding the estate of Charles Kana'ina, Ki'ilaweau is said to have been the father of Kekūanaō'a. Kekūanaō'a, however, is often recognized as the son of Nāhi'ole'a.

⁴⁴² A mention of Ki'ilaweau is found in the journal of Ebenezer Townsend, Jr., who visited Hawai'i in 1798. He referenced Keli'imaika'i as the brother of Kamehameha and the Ali'i of the Kōhala district of Hawai'i. Keli'imaika'i spent some time with Townsend, and on August 16, the ship where Townsend and Keli'imaika'i were staying was visited by Ki'ilaweau, whom Townsend referred to as Keli'imaika'i's wife. "The Diary of Ebenezer Townsend, Jr.," 1888.

was laying in state.⁴⁴³ The question asked was that if Emma was not the true great-granddaughter of Keli‘imaika‘i, then why did Kauikeaouli personally chose her as the wife to his heir?⁴⁴⁴ Therefore, the stating of otherwise was considered nonsense.⁴⁴⁵

Those who questioned Ka‘ō‘anā‘eha’s paternal lineage, namely those on the side of Kalākaua, argued that she was more likely the daughter of Kaleipaihala.⁴⁴⁶ Kaleipaihala, like Ka‘ōanā‘eha, had questionable parentage as he is most famously known as the son of Kalani‘ōpu‘u, the Ali‘i Nui of Hawai‘i Island and uncle of Kamehameha. Kamakau, however, also listed Keawemauhili as a possible father. Both Kalani‘ōpu‘u and Keawemauhili shared Kalaninui‘iamamao as their father, with Keawemauhili’s mother being Kekaulike, daughter of Keaweikekahiali‘iokamoku with his wife, Kauhiokaka.⁴⁴⁷ In either case, both fathers would make Kaleipaihala worthy of Ali‘i status, and still allow Emma to uphold her claim to the Kamehamehas, albeit indirectly.

If, at the time of Ka‘ō‘ana‘eha’s conception, Kalikookalani had intimate relationships with both Keli‘imaika‘i and Kaleipaihala, that would make Ka‘ō‘anā‘eha a po‘olua. As explained by Kame‘eleihiwa, a po‘olua meant that Ka‘ō‘ana‘eha could claim two paternal lineages, something that could benefit a child and increase their mana.⁴⁴⁸ And if Kalaniwahine‘uli had been with both Kalani‘ōpu‘u and Keawemauhili, like

⁴⁴³ “Ka La 12 o Feberuari.” *Kō Hawai‘i Pae ‘Āina*. 23 June 1883.

⁴⁴⁴ “Ka La 12 o Feberuari.” *Ko Hawaii Pae Aina*. 30 June 1883.

⁴⁴⁵ “Ka La 12 o Feberuari.” *Ko Hawaii Pae Aina*. 23 June 1883.

⁴⁴⁶ Kaleipaihala is also called Kalaipaihala in other accounts. For the purpose of clarity, he will be referred to in this paper as Kaleipaihala.

⁴⁴⁷ “Mookuauhau Alii.” *Ka Maka‘āinana*. 2 Nowemapa 1896; Fornander, 1878:130-131.

⁴⁴⁸ Kame‘eleihiwa, 1992:43.

Ka'ō'ana'eha, Kaleipaihala would also claim po'olua status. Ka'ō'anā'eha's descendants would, therefore, claim lineages to some of the most prominent Ali'i Nui of Kamehameha's time. Nonetheless, even though Kaleipaihala was not of insignificant rank, it was Keli'imaika'i's lineage that was the most desirable because of his connection to Kamehameha I.⁴⁴⁹

To warrant Emma's ties to the Crown, articles in the newspaper began to herald her kapu status and the rank to which she belonged. The disputes would emerge prior to Lunalilo's death, and though neither Kalākaua nor Emma had yet to proclaim their political intentions, they would find themselves the main focus of such discourse.

Genealogical Disputes in the Newspapers

With one's mo'okū'auhau also comes one's rank and the kapu attributed to that rank. In a time when someone of kaukau ali'i status could openly defy the Mō'i and foreigners were given the privilege of sitting alongside the highest of Ali'i, it is unsurprising that an Ali'i did not have to uphold the sanctity of one's kapu. The aupuni

⁴⁴⁹ McKinzie, 1983:39. This statement can be questioned as another genealogy pointed out that the kapu attributed to both Keli'imaika'i and Kaleipaihala were somewhat equivocal, but that Kaleipaihala's was perhaps greater because of his parentage. Keli'imaika'i's superiority was simply tied to his kaikaina status to Kamehameha.

It is important to note that Emma also held Ali'i status through her biological father, George Nā'ea. George Nā'ea was a descendent of Kalau'awa, a chief of Kaua'i. Through her father, Emma was given the kapu of Kuapala. Kuapala referred to a kapu chief who had the right to carry pala fern during ceremonies. Kanahele, additionally, writes that one could not walk directly behind a chief with the Kapu Kuapala because their back was taboo.⁴⁴⁹ (See Kanahele, 1993:195.) Also through her father came a kapu known as Kapu Po'o Ho'olewa I Ka Lā, a stringent kapu that made did not allow the shadow of another to fall upon it.⁴⁴⁹ (See "Na Iwikuamoo o Hawaii Nei Mai Kahiko Mai." *Ka Maka 'āinana*. 23 November 1896.)These Ali'i were made kapu from the moment the sun began to rise and when it was at its fullest; they were only allowed to travel at night.

was now one resting upon Christian values and the fear of death for breaking a kapu was no longer valid. Yet, kapu was still important and still held value in the eyes of the people.

It is significant to mention that Kalākaua's roots in mo'okū'auhau stemmed deep. His grandmother, Kamokuiki, had learned mo'okū'auhau under the tutelage of 'Auwae Ka'aloa. 'Auwae who, according to his obituary published in *The Missionary Herald*, was born on Hawai'i Island around 1770 and died in 1834 as a converted Christian.⁴⁵⁰ A chief of lower rank, his father had been one of the premier genealogists of both Kuakini's and Kamehameha's court.⁴⁵¹ 'Auwae would follow in his father's footsteps, later training others who were worthy to learn such wisdom. Along with Kamokuiki, David Malo and A. Unauna also received genealogical knowledge from 'Auwae; Unauna's son would later be a defender of the Kalākaua line and an antagonist against those who supported Emma's.

The Kalākaua family, in their efforts to tie themselves to the Kamehameha 'ohana, could claim a connection through the famed Keaweikekahiali'iokamoku. In a published mo'okū'auhau, which significantly impressed on the side of Kalākaua, the lineages of the two families were compared and evaluated. On the side of the Kamehamehas, it was said that Keaweikekahiali'iokamoku resided with his sister Kalanikauleleiaiwi, thus giving birth to Ke'eumokunui. Ke'eumokunui would be one of three men to reside with Kamaka'imoku, and from this union Keōua, father of

⁴⁵⁰ Green, *The Missionary Herald*, 1835:463.

⁴⁵¹ Chun, 1993:19.

Kamehameha, was born.⁴⁵² Keaweikekahiali‘iokamoku later resided with Lonomia‘īkanaka. With her, he would have the esteemed Kalaninui‘īamamao, for whom the Kumulipo was written and the ancestor of Kamanawa, the grandfather of the Kalākauas.⁴⁵³

This mo‘okū‘auhau of which I am referring was found in the newspaper *Nūhou* in 1873, several months prior to the election in February of the following year. This extensive mo‘okū‘auhau entitled “Ka Papa Alii O Hawaii I Hoonohonoho Pono Ia” was printed in three consecutive articles and connected Kalākaua’s mo‘okū‘auhau to the Kumulipo and compared it with that of Kauikeaouli. Holding its readers in high esteem, the author wrote that it was through them that the mo‘okū‘auhau of the living Ali‘i would survive. The author would then turn to the mo‘okū‘auhau published by Kamakau.

Stating that, although Kamakau’s mo‘okū‘auhau were indeed splendid, they did not clarify the rank of the living Ali‘i:

... aole he akaka i ka poe makaainana e noho mai nei owai la ke ‘lii a owai la na kanaka; owai la ka haku i koe o ka ohana alii e noho mai nei a lehulehu wale.⁴⁵⁴

⁴⁵² “Ka Papa Alii O Hawaii I Hoonohonoho Pono Ia.” *Ka Nūhou Hawai‘i*. 23 Kekemapa 1873.

⁴⁵³ Another shared ancestor of both the Kalākaua and Kamehameha families was Mahi family of Hilo. Mahi’s daughter would noho with Heulu and give birth to Keawe-a-Heulu. Keawe-a-Heulu would father Kepo‘okalani, cousin of Kamehameha I and grandfather of ‘Aikanaka. ‘Aikanaka was the father of Keohokālōle, the mother of Kalākaua.

⁴⁵⁴ “Ka Papa Alii O Hawaii I Hoonohonoho Pono Ia.” *Ka Nūhou Hawai‘i*. 23 Kekemapa 1873.

... it is not clear to the living populace who was the chief and who were the subjects; who indeed is the remaining sovereign of the family of chiefs still living in the population.

The writer then continued that he felt it was time to bring forth to the public and praise the mo‘okū‘auhau of Kalākaua.

The following year, on January 3, *Ka Nūpepa Kū‘oko‘a* responded to the mo‘okū‘auhau by publishing “He Hapai Memeue mai nei,” in which the author, Pa‘akū‘auhau, questioned *Nūhou*’s intentions of bringing forth the mo‘okū‘auhau of Kapa‘akea and Keohokālōle’s children, especially since the Aupuni had not questioned their lineage.

Heaha ke kumu o ka hoala ia ana o keia hana? Ua hoole anei ka lahui, aohe ala o na mamō a Kapaakea laua me Keohokalole? Aohe. Ke ike nei ka lahui mai o a o, he poe alii no lakou.⁴⁵⁵

What is the reason for stirring up this action? Did the people deny that the descendents of Kapa‘akea and Keohokālōle have no esteem? Not so. All of the nation knows that they are indeed chiefs.

The writer could only presume that *Nūhou* had the specific purpose in mind: to perhaps encourage the nation to choose a new sovereign in case the present Mō‘ī

⁴⁵⁵ Pa‘akū‘auhau. “Ke Hapai Memeue mai nei.” *Ka Nūpepa Kū‘oko‘a*. 3 January 1874.

(Lunalilo) should die or to tread upon the mo‘okū‘auhau of the Ali‘i who were still alive. Mainly, though, Pa‘akū‘auhau felt that *Nūhou*’s objective was to encourage the lāhui to choose Kalākaua. Pa‘akū‘auhau found it most curious that *Nūhou* would only bring up Kalākaua and leave out the other three children of Kapa‘akea and Keohokālōle.⁴⁵⁶

The mo‘okū‘auhau found in *Nūhou* was met with obvious derision, especially since, as Pa‘akū‘auhau pointed out, the current Mō‘ī was still very much alive. A publication such as *Nūhou*’s was considered an insult. Lunalilo, though ill, had not died, but *Nūhou*’s article weighed heavily upon a people whose traditions would take such a matter seriously.

Nūhou wasted little time in responding. On January 13, *Nūhou* published “Ke ‘Kuokoa’ Ohikau,” which disputed Pa‘akū‘auhau’s claims that *Nūhou* was manipulatively celebrating Kalākaua’s ancestry. Of Pa‘akū‘auhau’s accusations that the mo‘okū‘auhau was attempting to lead the nation to choose Kalākaua as Mō‘ī, *Nūhou* responded that the mo‘okū‘auhau was simply a publication of the truth.

Ua hooholo keia poe e make ka Moi,’ &c. Hele pela oe e Paakuauhau a me na koo o ke *Kuokoa* Poonalo. Ina o kou manao wale no ia, heaha iho la ka loa o kou hoopuka ana i kou manao ma ka nupepa. Piha maoli kou waha i ka lepo.⁴⁵⁷

⁴⁵⁶ Pa‘akū‘auhau. “Ke Hapai Memeue mai nei.” *Ka Nūpepa Kū‘oko‘a*. 3 January 1874. The other three children of Kapa‘akea and Keohokālōle that Pa‘akū‘auhau was referring to were William Pitt Leleiōhoku, Lydia Kamaka‘eha, and Miriam Likelike.

⁴⁵⁷ “Ke ‘Kuokoa’ Ohikau.” *Ka Nūhou Hawai‘i*. 13 January 1874.

These people have decided that the Mō‘ī is going to die,’ and so on. Be gone, Pa‘akū‘auhau and you supporters of *Kū‘oko‘a*. If that were your only argument, than why would you publish this idea in your newspaper? Your mouth is truly full of filth.

Nūhou continued by saying that these presumptuous ideas of Pa‘akū‘auhau, for example the allegation that *Nūhou*’s publication trampled over the other Ali‘i lineages, were simply disgraceful. *Nūhou* called *Kū‘oko‘a*’s author a ho‘opilimea‘ai, or one who “clings to the food” of the chief.⁴⁵⁸ *Nūhou*’s writer concluded by saying that perhaps Pa‘akū‘auhau and *Kū‘oko‘a*’s supporters were against Kalākau because of his opposition to the Reciprocity Treaty. How surprising, *Nūhou* continued, that Pa‘akū‘auhau stood behind the haole who applauded the treaty that would give away control of their ‘āina.⁴⁵⁹

The discussion between the newspapers was further stimulated when Kamakau published a mo‘okū‘auhau that would prove Emma’s connection to the Kamehamehas. This mo‘okū‘auhau needs particular attention because it provides further evidence of how significant it was to promote the Ali‘i’s lineages.

⁴⁵⁸ Ho‘opili mea‘ai can be used as a derogatory term used against “hangers-on,” or loafers of the chief.

⁴⁵⁹ “Ke ‘Kuokoa’ Ohikau.” *Ka Nūhou Hawai‘i*. 13 January 1874. On March 10, 1874, *Ka Nūhou Hawai‘i* would revisit Pa‘akū‘auhau’s argument, but this time *Nūhou* editor (Walter Murray Gibson) would accuse Pa‘akū‘auhau of doing what he had accused *Nūhou* of. *Nūhou* would blame Pa‘akū‘auhau for stirring up the mob mentality of the Queenites. See Gibson, Walter Murray. “E Nana Pono! Eia Iho!!” *Ka Nūhou Hawai‘i*. 10 March 1874.

Seven years before the 1874 election, Kamakau would publish “No ka Papa Alii Hawaii,” an article that listed the living Ali‘i of the land and their parentage.⁴⁶⁰ When it came to Emma’s mo‘okū‘auhau, Kamakau names both Keli‘imaika‘i and Kaleipaihala as the father of Ka‘ō‘ana‘eha.

Elua makuakane o Kaoanaeha i hookaulana ia, o Keliimaikai a me Kaleipaihala. O Kaleipaihala ke keiki a Keawemauhili, a laua pu no me Kalaniopuu, a he mau Moi nae laua a elua, a he mau alii kapu...⁴⁶¹

Ka‘ō‘anā‘eha is famous for having two fathers, Keli‘imaika‘i and Kaleipaihala. Kaleipaihala is the child of Keawemauhili, and also [shared paternity] with Kalani‘ōpu‘u, and the two of them were both Mō‘ī and Ali‘i Kapu...

On January 31, 1874, Kamakau would publish “Ka mookuauhau Alii o ka Moiwahine Kaleleonalani e pili ana ia Kamehameha I,” a mo‘okū‘auhau that would not only show Emma’s connection to Kamehameha, it would also affirm her kapu status. In this mo‘okū‘auhau, unlike the one above that was published in 1867, Kamakau did not include Kaleipaihala’s name.

It is unlikely that Kamakau simply forgot to include Kaleipaihala in the mo‘okū‘auhau. In 1874, Kamakau would need to assert Emma’s claim to the

⁴⁶⁰ The order of listed Ali‘i by Kamakau were the following: William Lunalilo, Ruth Ke‘elikōlani, Bernice Kalanipauahi, David Kalākaua (and his ‘ohana), and Emma Nā‘ea (and her ‘ohana). In this genealogy, both Kalākaua and Emma were the only two Ali‘i whose families were also included as other ranking Ali‘i.

⁴⁶¹ Kamakau, S. M. “No ka Papa Alii Hawaii.” *Ka Nūpepa Kū‘oko‘a*. 5 October 1867.

Kamehameha line and eliminate any question of her right to the throne. Leaving Kaleipaihala's name out of Emma's mo'okū'auhau was most likely Kamakau's intention.

At a time when genealogical accuracy was critical, Kamakau's omission would open him up to an attack. Within a few days, J. K. Unauna would use *Nūhou* to respond to Kamakau's publication. In Unauna's response, he makes it clear that Emma was in no way a descendant of Keli'imaika'i. Instead, Unauna claims that Ka'ō'anā'eha's father was an unknown Keaka (Jack).⁴⁶² Emma's ancestors were also not the ones claimed by Kamakau; she was not a descendent of Keaweikekahiali'iokamoku nor was she tied to Kalaninuikupuapaikalaninui.⁴⁶³ Rather, Emma's lineage was from Kumale [sic]⁴⁶⁴

The day after Unauna's response, *Kō Hawai'i Pono 'ī* contributed to the discussion by reprinting Kamakau's 1867 mo'okū'auhau that I discussed above.⁴⁶⁵ *Kō Hawai'i Pono 'ī* introduced the article by stating that Kamakau's 1867 mo'okū'auhau was uncontested for seven years, therefore *Kō Hawai'i Pono 'ī* agreed that this mo'okū'auhau was indeed accurate.⁴⁶⁶ In the republication of Emma's mo'okū'auhau, Kaleipaihala name remained as it was in the 1867 article.⁴⁶⁷

⁴⁶² More clarification of Keaka is found on page 145.

⁴⁶³ Kalaninuikupuapaikalaninui (Keōua) was the father of Kamehameha I.

⁴⁶⁴ Kumale refers to Kūmalae.

⁴⁶⁵ I am referring to Kamakau's publication entitled "No ka Papa Alii Hawaii," which was printed in *Ka Nūpepa Kū'oko'a* on October 5, 1867.

⁴⁶⁶ "Ma ka la 5 o Okatoba, 1867, i hoolaha ai o Mr. S. M. Kamakau, ka haku moolelo kaulana, maloko o ka nupepa *Kuokoa*, oia hoi keia papa Alii o ka Aina, me ko lakou mau kupuna malalo nei. Aole hookahi mea i kue mai i keia hoike ana a Mr. Kamakau no na makahiki ehiku i hala ae nei, a ke ae nei makou he oiaio maoli no keia hoike ana." "Ka Papa Alii Hawaii." *Kō Hawai'i Pono 'ī*. 18 February 1874.

⁴⁶⁷ The mo'okū'auhau presented by *Kō Hawai'i Pono 'ī* is identical to Kamakau's publication in *Ka Nūpepa Kū'oko'a* in 1867. The only differences between the two are the inclusion of *Kō Hawai'i Pono 'ī*'s statement that Kamakau's original article was uncontested and the removal of

The genealogical debate between the two royal families would continue years past the actual election. Emma never admitted to anything but her descent from Keli‘imaika‘i, and those who supported her claims were staunch in their rebuttals. Or, as was the case with Pilipō, some would weave in subtle statements that alluded to the ‘ohana of the Ali‘i. Pilipō who, in a speech printed by *Ka Lāhui Hawai‘i*, was confronting the atrocities of the Reciprocity Treaty and its advocates, added the following:

“The line of the Kamehamehas was finished by Kamehameha V. The line of Kaleimamahū, the younger sibling of Kamehameha I, that was finished by Lunalilo. The lineage of Keliimaikai, the true younger brother of Kamehameha I, is still thriving; and do we not have hope through this family? The family of Keaweheulu is still thriving; do we not have expectations through them that the lineage will grow and multiply on this land? Here is the King Kalākaua, he and his wife have no [children]; and his younger brother, what about him?”⁴⁶⁸

Pilipō did not state Emma by name, but at this time, she and Kūnuiākea were the only other Ali‘i line still in existence besides Kalākaua’s. His mention of “ka lalani o Keliimaikai” (Keli‘imaika‘i’s line) was his subtle acknowledgement that the Mō‘īwahine was Keli‘imaika‘i’s.⁴⁶⁹

six concluding paragraphs in which Kamakau discusses other Ali‘i ‘ohana and why the population of Ali‘i was diminishing.

⁴⁶⁸ “Haiolo A Ka Hon. G. W. Pilipo ma ka La Kuokoa, ma Holualoa, Kona Akau, Novemapa 28, 1876.” *Ka Lāhui Hawaii*. 25 January 1877.

⁴⁶⁹ Another interesting part of this article was Pilipō’s discussion of ho‘oulu lāhui, that is the increase of the Hawaiian people. He was concerned, and rightfully so, that the government was more concerned about the increase of money instead of the more pressing issue: the decline of the Hawaiian people and the Ali‘i. His argument continued that if the nation wanted to remain independent, they would need to take interest in multiplying the kānaka. In addition, he expressed his distress that the kingdom was not in unity, as made evident in the 1874 election. It was not

Discussions Following the Election

In 1883, the year in which Kalākaua held his Poni Mō‘ī, the people saw fit to once again validate Emma’s right to be Mō‘ī. The newspapers, again, hold a wealth of information regarding the people’s view of the politics and goings-on of the kingdom. The dispute mainly occurred in the Hawaiian-language newspapers: *Ka Nūpepa ‘Elele Po ‘akolu* and *Kō Hawai‘i Pae ‘Āina*.⁴⁷⁰ Another Hawaiian language newspaper being published at the time was *Ka Nūpepa Kuoko ‘a* that, for the most part, remained out of the controversy. When it chose to contribute, it often did so on the side of Emma.⁴⁷¹

The dispute was a long one, lasting for several months. What is unfortunate, however, is that many of the original newspapers, especially those from *Ka Nūpepa ‘Elele Po ‘akolu*, were not preserved. Therefore, it is difficult to see what sparked the debate in the first place; it is probable that Kalākaua’s Poni Mō‘ī awakened former animosity in those who felt he had no right to the crown, let alone a ceremony of such grandeur.

One response in *Ko Hawai‘i Pae ‘Āina* less than politely accuses the other (*Ka ‘Elele*) of their so-called genealogical knowledge, stating that the sacred pahu drums of Keli‘imaika‘i resonated upon the birth of Ka‘ō‘anā‘eha, and that only she and her

only the people who were divided; there was conflict in the Government and amongst the Legislative members.

⁴⁷⁰ Silva, 2004:111. The former publication was owned by Kalākaua-advocate, Walter Murray Gibson, and the latter was owned by Henry Whitney and edited by Joseph Kawainui.

⁴⁷¹ *Kū‘oko ‘a* published an article that discussed Queen Emma’s genealogy on May 5, 1883. This genealogy, which looked similar to those published by Kamakau in previous years, would focus on her chiefly kapu and the ancestors tied to those kapu. Though the article was dedicated to Emma’s genealogy, the writer would dedicate several sections to Kalākaua’s family. However, the author acknowledged that Kalākaua’s genealogy had been shortened. Beginning with ‘Umi-a-Līloa, the article continued to name Kalākaua’s ancestors, while leaving out any kapu attributed to the Kalākaua family. “No Ka Moiwahine Ema.” *Ka Nūpepa Kū‘oko ‘a*. 5 May 1883.

daughter were allowed into the Hale o Keli‘imaika‘i (House of Keli‘imaika‘i) while he was laying in state.⁴⁷² The question asked was that if Emma was not the true great-granddaughter of Keli‘imaika‘i, then why did Kauikeaouli personally chose her as the wife to his heir?⁴⁷³ Therefore, the stating of otherwise was considered nonsense.⁴⁷⁴

On May 13, 1898, the mo‘okū‘auhau of Mō‘īwahine Emma would again be defended. Ironically, the champion on the side of Emma’s was none other than Robert Kalanihiapo Wilcox. Wilcox is best known for his rebellion against the 1887 Bayonet Constitution in 1889 and his rebellion against the Provisional Government in 1895; he is also famous for serving as Hawai‘i’s first Delegate to Congress in 1900.⁴⁷⁵ Wilcox was family to the Kalākaua ‘ohana⁴⁷⁶ and initially supported Kalākaua early in Kalākaua’s reign. In 1880, Kalākaua sent Wilcox to Italy and supported his education overseas.⁴⁷⁷ However, when Wilcox returned to Hawai‘i, he found an unstable government where it was almost impossible for him to secure a position of any value.⁴⁷⁸ Though Kalākaua and Lili‘uokalani attempted to help Wilcox, his unpredictable personality damaged his

⁴⁷² “Ka La 12 o Feberuari.” *Ko Hawaii Pae Aina*. 23 June 1883.

⁴⁷³ “Ka La 12 o Feberuari.” *Ko Hawaii Pae Aina*. 30 June 1883.

⁴⁷⁴ “Ka La 12 o Feberuari.” *Ko Hawaii Pae Aina*. 23 June 1883.

⁴⁷⁵ Lili‘uokalani, 1898; Quigg, 1988:202.

⁴⁷⁶ Robert Kalanihiapo Wilcox was born at Honua‘ula on the Island of Maui in 1855. His father was born in America to British-born parents. Wilcox’s mother, Kalua, was Kanaka Maoli and a descendent of Keaweikekahiali‘iokamoku. Through this lineage, Wilcox claims a familial connection to the Kalākaua ‘ohana. See McKinzie, 1986:66-67.

⁴⁷⁷ Nakanaela, *Ka Buke Mo‘olelo o Hon. Robert William Wilikoki*, 10-12; Quigg, 1988:174.

⁴⁷⁸ Quigg, 1988:201-202. Quigg writes that when Wilcox returned, the people who controlled the Aupuni did not have “pro-Hawaiian sentiments” and that he was told by Lorrin Thurston that it would be better to return to Italy.

relationship with both members of the Kalākaua ‘ohana.⁴⁷⁹ This may have led to Wilcox’s later support of Mō‘īwahine Emma.

The irony of having Wilcox defend the mo‘okū‘auhau of Mō‘īwahine Emma comes from his previous argument that was published in *Hawai‘i Holomua*. In Wilcox’s letter to the newspaper, he confronts Albert Kūnuiākea’s⁴⁸⁰ use of the title “Prince.” Stating that his father, Kā‘eo, had no claim to any of the distinguish kapu (nī‘aupi‘o, naha, and wohi), Wilcox then investigates the mo‘okū‘auhau on Kūnuiākea’s mother’s side (which would be the same as Emma’s).⁴⁸¹

Wilcox claimed that, although Ka‘ō‘anā‘eha repeatedly claimed parentage from both Keli‘imaika‘i and Kaleipaihala, both kāne would never declare this to be true. Instead, Wilcox states that Ka‘ō‘anā‘eha’s father was really a “cast-off Tahitian chief” known as Keaka. Although the purpose behind Wilcox’s letter to *Hawai‘i Holomua* was to dispute that Kūnuiākea had any genealogical right to call himself a Prince, Wilcox consequently discredited Emma’s mo‘okū‘auhau.⁴⁸²

Returning to Wilcox’s later defense of Mō‘īwahine Emma’s lineage, over ten years had passed since she had died and it was during this same year that Hawai‘i had become illegally annexed to the United States. Regardless of the turmoil surrounding

⁴⁷⁹ Lili‘uokalani, 1898:193-194, 198-201, 228-229. Lili‘uokalani makes more than once reference to her distrust of Robert Wilcox and explains that his “disposition of disobedience” led to her refusal to appoint him as one of her ministers in 1891. See also Lili‘uokalani, Appendix B, 1898:378.

⁴⁸⁰ Albert Kūnuiākea was first cousin to Queen Emma.

⁴⁸¹ Wilcox, Robert. Correspondence in *Hawaiian Holomua*. 26 May 1894.

⁴⁸² Ibid.

Hawai‘i, Wilcox saw it pertinent to defend the late Mō‘īwahine’s honor, arguing that Emma had as “equal claim” to the throne as Kalākaua.⁴⁸³

Wilcox writes this purposefully in response to “undignified and uncalled for attacks” to Emma’s lineage, and while he says that he means no disrespect to those Ali‘i still living, he subtly reveals that the attacks were coming from Mō‘īwahine Lili‘uokalani. The challenges were unnecessary since, according to the mo‘okū‘auhau introduced by Wilcox for comparison, both opponents were closely related to Kamehameha I. Wilcox displays the mo‘okū‘auhau written by Kamakau for Emma and Unauna for Lili‘uokalani, showing that both families branch out from Keaweikekahiali‘iokamoku.⁴⁸⁴

If Ka‘ōana‘eha was not the daughter of Keli‘imaika‘i, to which Wilcox argues that this claim was declared false by Alexander Liholiho, and Ka‘ōana‘eha was the biological daughter of Kaleipaihala, Emma would still be a part of the House of Keōua.⁴⁸⁵ This would still connect Emma to the Kamehameha ‘ohana, and make her even closer to the Kalākaua family since the two possible fathers of Kaleipaihala (Kalani‘ōpu‘u and Keawemauhili) were the sons of Kalaninui‘iamamao.

By May 25, less than two weeks later, Wilcox published yet another article that challenged a particular mo‘okū‘auhau of Emma and other Ali‘i. Yet this time, Wilcox

⁴⁸³ Wilcox, Robert W. “Wilcox on Genealogy: Compare Rank of Queen Emma and the Ex-Queen.” *The Hawaiian Star*. 13 May 1898.

⁴⁸⁴ Wilcox’s argument would state that Keaweikekahiali‘iokamoku married his kaikuahine, Kalanikauleleiaiwi, who both ruled the island together. This union produced Ke‘eaumoku, the grandfather of Kamehameha I and Keli‘imaika‘i. Keaweikekahiali‘iokamoku also took Lonoma‘a‘īkanaka of the notorious ‘Ī family of Hilo, and thus gave birth to Kalaninui‘iamamao who would be the famous ancestor of Kalākaua.

⁴⁸⁵ Ibid.

had no misgivings to disclose that Lili‘uokalani’s book was the source of his contention. Dissecting several of Lili‘uokalani’s genealogical appendices,⁴⁸⁶ Wilcox argues the following:

“On Appendix F, the ex-Queen attempted to correct Alexander’s mo‘okū‘auhau, but here she made a gross mistake by denying that Keliimaikai had no issue, and that Kiilaweau was a man. Yes, there was a man by that name who was supposed to have been the father of M. Kekuanaoa instead of Nahiolea; but Kiilaweau, wife of Keliimaikai, was a daughter of Keoua and Manononui, as heretofore mentioned and who became the mother of the celebrated Kekuaokalani, husband of the valiant and faithful Manono II.

Manono II was daughter of Kalola-a-Kumukoa and Kekuamanohā, a half brother of Kahekili, King of Maui. Keliimaikai is supposed also as one of the fathers of Kaoanaeha grandmother of Queen Emma and Prince A. K. Kunuiakea.”⁴⁸⁷

Wilcox was not the only person who protested the former Queen’s publication. A month later, on June 1, 1898, a short passage was inserted in the missionary newspaxper, *The Friend*. Titled “Natives Angry with Ex-Queen,” the brief comment mentioned that

⁴⁸⁶ The Appendices I am referring to are Appendix E (Lili‘uokalani and her family), Appendix F (a reprint of W. D. Alexander’s genealogies of Kalani‘ōpu‘u, Keōua, Kamehameha, Kekaulike, and Lili‘uokalani’s family) and Appendix G (genealogies of Bernice Pauahi Bishop, Mō‘īwahine Emma, and Ruth Ke‘elikōlani). See Lili‘uokalani, 1898:399-409.

⁴⁸⁷ McKinzie, 1986:71.

her publication had “aroused among the natives much denunciation of her,” namely because of her slanderous remarks towards Mō‘īwahine Emma, and her changes to the Ali‘i genealogies to “prove herself of royal descent.”⁴⁸⁸

The considerable amount of mo‘okū‘auhau published before and after the 1874 election shows how especially important it was to the ‘Ōiwi that this information become public knowledge. It was significant for the lāhui to know and understand why Mō‘īwahine Emma was the superior choice for the position of Mō‘ī, not only because of her contributions to the establishment of a hospital and her obvious love for her people, but also because she was a living descendent of the Kamehameha ‘ohana. As a result, it was imperative that the Kalākauas prove that her claims were inaccurate. In response, Emma’s supporters challenged these accusations by the Kalākauas for many years.

In 1896, *Ka Maka ‘āinana* published an article that presented the mo‘okū‘auhau of some of the living descendents of Ali‘i families.⁴⁸⁹ Special attention was paid to Albert Kūnuiākea who, as mentioned, was the cousin of Mō‘īwahine Emma. At the conclusion of the article, the author returned to the issue of Ka‘ō‘anā‘eha’s parentage and the question of who her father was: Keli‘imaika‘i or Kaleipaihala.

The author explained that it did not matter who Ka‘ō‘ana‘eha’s father was. Both Ali‘i were kapu and therefore she was still a high-ranking Ali‘i. Likewise, her grandchildren were also kapu. However, there was an interesting addition to this article. The author continued to say that because Kaleipaihala was the son of Kalani‘ōpu‘u, a

⁴⁸⁸ “Natives Angry with Ex-Queen.” *The Friend*. 1 June 1898.

⁴⁸⁹ “Mookuahau Alii, Na Iwikuamoo o Hawaiia Nei Mai Kahiko Mai.” *Ka Maka ‘āinana*. 13 July 1896.

Mō'ī, whereas Keli'imaika'i was renowned for being Kamehameha's younger brother. In other words, although both Ali'i were kapu, it could be argued that Kaleipaihala's rank was *higher* than Keli'imaika'i because of who his father was.⁴⁹⁰

This article reconfirms what was already made evident in 1874; it did not matter whose rank was higher or who had more political power. In fact, your mo'okū'auhau was connected to how much political power one would have in the Aupuni; it determined your position and rank in the Aupuni. In 1874, what was most important was who could claim lineage to the Kamehamehas. Therefore, when attacking Mō'īwahine Emma's mo'okū'auhau proved futile, the Kalākaua endorsers would find other means to prove that he was the more worthy candidate. In the next chapter, we will see some of these methods used by those who protested Mō'īwahine Emma's campaign.

⁴⁹⁰ Ibid.

Mokuna ‘Ehiku: He Wai ‘Ihi a He Mana Wahine The Issue of Blood Quantum and Gender in 1874

Though Mō‘īwahine Emma was the choice of many Kānaka Maoli, the 1874 election revealed two circumstantial changes that the po‘e haole introduced to the Aupuni. In this chapter I focus primarily on Mō‘īwahine Emma because these circumstances that I describe below did not necessarily affect Kalākaua. However, these two issues need discussion because they affect us today as Kānaka Maoli seeking self-determination. The first of these is the matter of blood quantum and its insignificance to the Kānaka Maoli of the nineteenth century. Emma was not a “pure-blooded” Hawaiian because of her one-fourth Anglo-Saxon blood, but as I discuss in this chapter, that was inconsequential to the ‘Ōiwi. As we have seen in Mokuna ‘Eono, her mo‘okū‘auhau was the most significant factor to Kānaka Maoli, not her blood quantum.

The second part of this chapter examines Emma’s status as a wahine running for the highest position of the Aupuni in a time when wāhine roles would change dramatically. Like blood quantum, the understanding of gender roles in traditional Hawai‘i would shift due to the influence of the po‘e haole. As a lāhui who valued and elevated our wāhine, Emma’s gender should not have been a factor for her opposition, and yet it became a significant issue that needs discussion.

The “Non-Issue” of Emma’s Blood Quantum

As the direction of the kingdom began changing to reflect the influence of the po‘e haole, the “rank” of the lesser ali‘i were superseded by the western knowledge and

expertise held by the po‘e haole. The Ali‘i Nui began to lean heavily upon the advice of the foreigners on how to rule a constitutional kingdom and deal with the influx of other foreign powers coming to Hawai‘i. The relationships between Ali‘i Nui and po‘e haole go as far back as Kamehameha’s time when he sought the ability of John Young and Isaac Davis⁴⁹¹ to use foreign weapons to conquer the archipelago. Because foreign weapons became essential to increase Kamehameha’s realm of power over the islands, so too was the initial indispensability of Young and Davis.

Traditionally, the rank of Ali‘i Kapu could only be gained through birth. However, some exceptions occurred, one example being Emma’s grandfather, John Young. As one of Kamehameha’s personal advisors, he was given the title of Ali‘i Nui and the full name of ‘Olohana-i-ka‘iwi-i-Nohea Kānehoa-a-Keali‘i,⁴⁹² and was thus given the gifts of ‘āina⁴⁹³ and a high-ranking Ali‘i Wahine for a wife. The wahine Young was

⁴⁹¹ John Young and Isaac Davis arrived in Hawai‘i in 1790. The story behind their arrival is a fascinating one in that they are both associated with the event commonly known as the ‘Olowalu Massacre. John Young arrived in Hawai‘i onboard the *Eleanor*. Kamakau writes that Young left the ship to “see the country,” but Kamehameha would hold him back from returning to his ship. The *Eleanor* would leave Young behind. Isaac Davis would arrive on the *Eleanor*’s companion ship, *The Fair American*, which was taken captive by one of Kalākaua’s own ancestors, Kame‘eiamoku. The men onboard *The Fair American* were killed when Kame‘eiamoku sought revenge against one of the *Eleanor*’s men who struck Kame‘eiamoku. Kame‘eiamoku vowed to seek vengeance on the next foreign ship to arrive. Davis survived the attack, but was severely injured. Kamehameha took both Davis and Young as companions and as advisers in the use of the weapons that Kamehameha inherited along with *The Fair American*. (Kamakau, 1991:145-147.)

⁴⁹² This article states that the distinction of having Ali‘i Kapu status was granted to John Young and Isaac Davis by Kamehameha’s younger brother, Kalanimalokuloku-keli‘imaika‘i, who was the father of Young’s wife, Ka‘ō‘ana‘eha.

⁴⁹³ According to Kame‘eleihiwa, the gifts of ‘Āina followed the tradition of Kālai‘āina, meaning that upon ascension of a new Mō‘ī, all the lands of the previous Mō‘ī were acquired by the new Mō‘ī and then redistributed to other Ali‘i Nui who were a part of the new Mō‘ī’s chiefly court. The Mō‘ī would determine how the ‘Āina should be distributed based on the council of his Kālimoku (chiefly advisor). This act was strategic and political because its purpose was to the gain support of the Ali‘i who were given gifts of ‘Āina. See Kame‘eleihiwa, 1992: 51-52; 59.

given was Ka‘ō‘ana‘eha, the daughter of Kamehameha’s younger brother, Kalanimalokulokukeli‘imaika‘i. From his union with Ka‘ō‘ana‘eha, he fathered four children: Fanny Kekelaokalani (Emma’s mother), Grace Kama‘iku‘i, John Young Jr., and Jane Lahilahi.⁴⁹⁴ Thus, Young was grandfather to Mō‘īwahine Emma and her cousins, Peter Ka‘eo and Albert Kūnuiākea. Even though Young was not Kanaka ‘Ōiwi, he was still considered to be somewhat of a dignitary and was treated as such.⁴⁹⁵

Because the ‘Ōiwi were severely suffering from so many new diseases, the pool of high-ranking Ali‘i became increasingly small. Regardless, the divinity of the Ali‘i was still seen as important, so it was not acceptable to marry someone of commoner status. It was, however, more acceptable to marry either a kaukau ali‘i or a foreigner. As pointed out by historian Kanalu Young, the last five ruling chiefs were not of the same high rank as the first three Kamehameha, because all had kaukau ali‘i fathers.⁴⁹⁶ Possibly the highest ranking child born after the death of Kauikeaouli was Alexander Liholiho and Emma’s son Albert, as he was the only child of that generation of Ali‘i who could claim rank from both parents.

⁴⁹⁴ Stokes, 1938. Prior to his marriage to Ka‘ō‘ana‘eha in 1805, Young had been married to Nāmoku‘elua around 1795, and she bore him two sons known as Robert and James before dying in 1804.

⁴⁹⁵ Bishop, Rev. Artemas. “Journal Kept at Kairua, Hawaii.” *The Friend*. March 1892. John Young’s alliances with Kamehameha and his aid in the latter’s conquests gained a close relationship with Kamehameha, and some have stated that he was made “a chief,” and earning him ‘āina and Kamehameha’s “niece Kaoanaeha.”

In Lucy Goodale Thurston’s memoirs of her missionary work in Hawai‘i, she wrote that, at times, Young would make his separation from the other Ali‘i known. At the time of Kamehameha I’s death, he forbade his children to partake in the public mourning in which ‘Ai noa would commence. However, “By marriage, by deeds and by counsel, he [John Young] had justly risen to the eminence of becoming a peer with the first chiefs of the nation,” and was respected by the other Ali‘i as their equal. See Thurston, 1882:202.

⁴⁹⁶ Young, 1998:112-113.

That Mō‘īwahine Emma’s connection to John Young was rarely part of the arguments against Emma’s lineage needs attention because it shows that the importance of blood quantum is a foreign concept. It is important in part because, in today’s context, blood quantum plays a significant advantage to those who have “native Hawaiian” status (defined by U.S. federal and Hawai‘i state laws as having 50 percent or more blood quantum) versus those who have not (“part Hawaiians” with 49 percent or less).⁴⁹⁷

This distinction has been a source of contention between the Kānaka Maoli and the colonizers (the United States) because it determines who qualifies for federal and other “benefits” including Hawaiian Home Lands reserved for *Natives*. Unfortunately, Kānaka Maoli have also fallen into the trap of identifying someone as being more or less Hawaiian based on blood quantum, creating an invisible barrier between those considered Native and those considered non-Native. Putting a percentage on how “Hawaiian” a person is goes against what J. Kēhaulani Kauanui explains as the “indigenous Hawaiian epistemologies that define identity on the basis of one’s kinship and genealogy.”⁴⁹⁸ One did not measure your blood quantum to determine your place in Hawaiian society.

This issue is significant because, in the nineteenth century, Emma’s blood quantum was not necessarily the critical point of argument. That Emma was one-fourth haole did not wholly diminish her rank as an Ali‘i. That she was not full-blooded

⁴⁹⁷ This distinction arose when the Hawaiian Home Lands Commission Act was passed in 1921. Under the act, the 200,000 acres of land set aside for Hawaiian Home Lands is leased out to those with 50 percent or more Native Hawaiian blood. When Hawai‘i was admitted to the Union as a state of the U.S. in 1959, the Admission Act followed the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act in its definition of Native Hawaiians as those meeting the 50 percent or more blood quantum requirements. (See section 5(f) of the Admission Act.)

⁴⁹⁸ Kauanui, 2008:3.

Hawaiian was not consistently used as a means to argue against her lineage; her blood quantum was not important, rather it was the *rank* and *lineage* of that blood that was significant. One of the few times that Emma's Anglo-Saxon blood was used in opposition to the Ali'i Wahine was at her engagement party to Alexander Liholiho. She had apparently fled the party in tears after hearing gossip that the marriage was unsuitable because of her haole blood.⁴⁹⁹ Such gossip continued, but was it because they felt she was unfit to be Mō'īwahine, or because of petty jealousy?⁵⁰⁰

I would have to concur with the latter. It is doubtful that the Ali'i would concern themselves with blood quantum at a time when there were more significant issues to worry about. If blood quantum were indeed a reason against Emma's marriage to Alexander Liholiho, or a reason against her becoming Mō'īwahine of the Aupuni, it would have been recognized in the numerous publications of her mo'okū'auhau. Even the Kalākaua supporters rarely, if at all, entered into the discussion of Emma's Anglo-Saxon blood because that was not important to them. It was her claimed connection to the Kamehamehas and her mo'okū'auhau that mattered. At a time when we are forced to measure our "Hawaiian-ness" based on blood quantum, we should follow the example of our kūpuna who found such issues inconsequential.

⁴⁹⁹ Kanahele, 1999:60.

⁵⁰⁰ As discussed in Mokuna 'Ehiku, some of the Ali'i preferred Alexander Liholiho to marry Lydia Kamaka'eha (Lili'uokalani) rather than Emma Rooke.

Colonialism and The Issue of Gender

In addition to discrediting the importance of Kalākaua and Emma's genealogical disputes, western historians have failed to weigh in on the issue of Emma's gender. Indeed, in 1874, Emma's role as a wahine was unfortunately used as a means of opposition. Because foreign concepts began to weave itself into the Hawaiian society, it altered the way in which the 'Ōiwi viewed their cultural traditions and their roles as kāne and wāhine. The po'e haole began to dictate what was appropriate, causing our people to question and then sometimes adjust their way of life.

Miriam-Webster's dictionary would describe feminism as "organized activity on behalf of women's rights and interests."⁵⁰¹ In all of the Hawaiian-language dictionaries, there is no word for feminist or feminism because such a concept did not exist for us. We had no need to fight for our rights and interests as wāhine because our roles were understood, respected, and exalted. However, following the intrusion of po'e haole into our society, we would lose our place as mana wāhine.⁵⁰²

Mana wahine, which ho'omanawanui describes as being the implication of "female-based power, strength, and resilience,"⁵⁰³ is entrenched in our cultural traditions. The evidence of traditional female empowerment is found throughout our mo'okū'auhau and mo'olelo, and it is an important quality in the leadership of the lāhui. As Trask accurately demonstrates, "Our mother is our land, *Papa-hānau-moku* –she who births the

⁵⁰¹ Merriam-Webster's online dictionary (www.merriam-webster.com).

⁵⁰² I use the words "mana wāhine," as a plural form of women with power. The term "mana wahine" refers to the concept of female empowerment.

⁵⁰³ ho'omanawanui, 2010:27; Trask, 1993:122.

islands. This means that Hawaiian women leaders are genealogically empowered to lead the nation.”⁵⁰⁴

However, in 1874, Emma’s gender and her role as a *mana wahine* were used against her candidacy. Even after the election, *Ka Nūpepa Kū’oko’a* would report that both “na kanaka a me na haole” were grateful that a Mō’ī kāne was elected.⁵⁰⁵ Many of the po’e haole did not want a woman as Mō’īwahine of the Aupuni and used her gender against her. As I explained in the beginning of this chapter, this issue needs consideration because it reveals how far the po’e haole would go to keep their dominant positions in the Aupuni and how our people have continued to resist these intrusions. In seeking self-determination, we need to recognize our traditional roles and their validity to the Aupuni.

Colonialism would completely shift the roles of wāhine in post-contact Hawai’i; rank and political status had very little bearing in the eyes of the foreigners. Customarily, women’s roles in Hawai’i were not restrained within the confines of simple domesticity and were appreciated in a much different manner. Women were held in esteem; they were the creators of life, and therefore key in the continuation of the lāhui. In the study of Hawaiian mythology, for example, the origin of our ‘āina comes from the earth mother, Papahānaumoku.⁵⁰⁶ She is exalted as the mother of what has always sustained us and

⁵⁰⁴ Trask, 1993:121-122.

⁵⁰⁵ “Ko kakou kulana.” *Ka Nūpepa Kū’oko’a*. 28 February 1874. This article is questionable because it claimed that this announcement of appreciation at having a male Mō’ī came out of a Hālāwai Maka‘āinana held in Lāhainā, Maui. Perhaps the po’e haole were thankful for the election of a male Mō’ī, but I cited another article by D. Mamaki from this same issue of *Kū’oko’a* who wrote that Kānaka Maoli in Lāhainā were unhappy with the results because they supported Mō’īwahine Emma. See Mamaki, D. “Halawai Makaainana.” *Ka Nūpepa Kū’oko’a*. 28 February 1874.

⁵⁰⁶ Kamakau, *Tales and Traditions*, 125; and Kame‘eleihiwa, 1992:23-24.

given us life. Papa is not considered second to her sky father husband Wākea and, like him, her genealogy is venerated.

The discourse of past writers of Hawaiian history have often imitated the paternalistic nature of the missionaries, foreshadowing the importance of our Akua Wāhine and glossing over the political significance of our Ali‘i Wāhine. Trask explains that, “American culture, like Western civilization generally, is patriarchal,” and that male predominance over women is validated in American culture.⁵⁰⁷ As a consequence, the mana (power) of our wāhine were wrongly interpreted as being haumia, or defiling. However, scholars such as Lilikalā Kame‘eleihiwa, Haunani-Kay Trask, and ku‘ualoha ho‘omanawanui have changed our understanding of mana wahine, arguing that women were perceived as having powerful and consequential roles in traditional society and in literature.

While many of the Ali‘i Nui tended to be kāne, that in no way meant that the wāhine remained behind and simply took passive roles in society. They partook in politics, lending their mana‘o (opinions) when necessary, even joining in battles between warring Ali‘i. They asserted their right to achieve mana through Lono, taking husbands that would produce high-ranking keiki, and having the freedom to leave the kāne at will.⁵⁰⁸

⁵⁰⁷ Trask, 1993:92.

⁵⁰⁸ Kame‘eleihiwa explains the concept of ‘Imihaku, or seeking a lord. Ali‘i Nui believed that there were two ways of achieving mana, and that was through either Kū or through Lono. Through Kū, one could achieve mana through politics and warfare. Through Lono, one obtained mana through lineage or by producing high-ranking keiki. See Kame‘eleihiwa, 1992:44-47.

The drastic changing of women's roles in Hawai'i was primarily seen during the reign of Kamehameha II (1819-1824) when Hawai'i became a constitutional nation; however, changes began to occur upon the arrival of the missionaries. Their perspectives of our wāhine were not favorable. The missionaries grimaced at our lack of clothing and condemned the sexual freedom that was enjoyed by both genders. Their influence was such that the social structure of Hawaiian society was forced to adjust. A change of that caliber within a society is usually felt most by the women and Hawai'i was no exception.⁵⁰⁹

Trask states that one purpose of colonization is the "obliteration rather than the incorporation of indigenous peoples."⁵¹⁰ Foreigners would establish a division between themselves and the kānaka maoli, thereby forcing the kānaka into roles of subordination. Likewise, the new framework would also put the wāhine into submissive positions in comparison to their kāne, as was the case in other colonized nations.⁵¹¹

In pre-contact Hawai'i, wāhine were not only the reproducers that help to flourish the lāhui, they were the genealogical link between kāne and Papahānaumoku (or Mother Earth) from whose womb came the necessities to sustain them. We have seen that wāhine had mana and they had authority. Yet under the new regime, they were reduced to being simply wives and mothers; there was no place for them in government issues. The

⁵⁰⁹ Merry, 2000:260.

⁵¹⁰ Trask, 1993:26.

⁵¹¹ Mies, 1998:74.

colonized nation had no place for them outside of their domesticated duties. In other words, the women were situated “within a nationality, but not within agency.”⁵¹²

Indeed, Trask is correct in her explanation that in order to annihilate the indigenous people, the colonizers will prohibit them from the legal system.⁵¹³ In a situation such as Hawai‘i’s, where a monarchical system ruled, the foreigners would have to be shrewd in their attempts to eliminate the Kānaka Maoli voice in government. What better way than to start with the women? By prohibiting the wāhine from entering into politics and government affairs, the colonizers effectively erased the danger of wāhine supremacy. If the past is any indication of how powerful a Hawaiian woman could become, the foreigners had a reason to feel threatened.

Sally Merry describes how women’s rights changed in 1845 when marriage and the laws supporting it became clearly defined. In the missionary efforts to colonize the “pagans,” the path to achieving mana was snatched from the women’s grasps. Under the new religious and political structure, all women were constrained to a fully clothed life of domesticity. They were wives and mothers first and foremost.⁵¹⁴ Women who were married became the sole dependent of their husbands. Under the new law, all property and rights now belonged to the husband.⁵¹⁵ While divorce could be granted under specific circumstances, the consequences that befell on the guilty party were more severe for women.

⁵¹² Mohanram, 60. Mohanram explains that, upon colonization, the colonizers will define the nationality of the oppressed while concurrently excluding them from the government of that nation.

⁵¹³ Trask, 1993:26.

⁵¹⁴ Merry, 2000:261.

⁵¹⁵ Ibid., 96.

On the subject of politics, wāhine were further subordinated when the law forbade them to vote and to run for office. Hawai‘i’s constitution of 1852 reflected these changes as it allowed for universal manhood suffrage, meaning that any *male* from the age of twenty was able to vote. The constitution was a reflection of Western intrusion; voting was an alien concept, and so it follows that who would be able to vote would follow foreign interpretation. Although women were able to serve in the House of Nobles, that position was determined by one’s status, and not necessarily of gender. Yet, the Legislative roster tells us that only six served in the House of Nobles.⁵¹⁶

King or Queen?: The Traditional Role of Mana Wahine

In 1874, the changed perception of gender roles in Hawai‘i became more apparent. The traditional structure of following the Ali‘i hadn’t completely collapsed, but the Ali‘i had new advisors dictating what was pono. They became deceived into thinking that Western laws and Western beliefs were honorable. While the Ali‘i altered the meaning of pono, so too would change the kānaka maoli understanding of pono. As a consequence, wāhine began to “lose” the mana they once had in the eyes of the people.

During Mō‘īwahine Emma’s campaign for Mō‘ī, her gender would be a subject of question and a means for opposition. The *Hawaiian Gazette* would print the query “King or Queen?” in its newspaper, giving three reasons why Kalākaua was the obvious choice: that he was voted unanimously in mass-meetings; he would provide a *Prine* as an heir, and that a “King will be more acceptable and undoubtedly be able to give more

⁵¹⁶ See Lydecker, 1918.

satisfaction to his people in the administration of the Government than a Queen could possibly give.”⁵¹⁷ That statement shows how deep the influence of western thought had dug; how far had the lāhui strayed from their respect of their mana wahine?

A story was shared by Curtis Lyons who wrote that he had heard the Kānaka Maoli speaking “Mea hooino, hooilahila kela,” meaning that something was dishonorable and shameful. Upon coming closer to the crowd, Lyons saw that behind the window of the *Pacific Commercial Advertiser*, the Mō‘īwahine’s candidacy proclamation was displayed. Written upon this were the words “Aole makou makemake e ike ka palekoki e hookomo ana i ka lolewawae.” These words, which meant, “We do not wish to see the petticoat putting on breeches” incensed Lyons, an Emma supporter, to the point that he smashed the window and crossed out the derogatory statement.⁵¹⁸

Was gender that much of a determinant in the election? Would the ‘Ōiwi have preferred a King to a Queen? It is possible, but the Kānaka response to the remark of a “petticoat government” was more infuriated than indifferent. One Mō‘īwahine Emma supporter retorted that “[D. Kalākaua] will put on trousers and boots too, and give us all a kicking.”⁵¹⁹ It appears that Emma’s genealogical rank and her familial connection to the Kamehamehas overshadowed her sex. In fact, her gender may have been a reason for their support.

It is important to understand that, in the past, certain things were indeed kapu to women. They were not allowed to take part in the consecration of heiau (temples)

⁵¹⁷ Thrum, 1874:7.

⁵¹⁸ Dabagh 1974:78.

⁵¹⁹ Thrum, 1874:15.

dedicated to the war god Kū. Particular foods were also kapu to women because of its representation of the male form, as well as the fact that these foods were given as sacrifices to the Akua Kū.⁵²⁰

Women, likewise, were unable to cook because they could defile a man's mana when he ingested the prepared food. They would also stay in the Hale Pe'a⁵²¹ during times of menstruation. Because of this, later historians would come to assume that this meant women were deemed as less important than the kāne. However, Kame'eiehiwa tells us differently. She explains that these kapu did not make women subordinates to their kāne, but that it gave them a level of power that could be threatening.⁵²²

One of the most famous of politically adept wahine was Ka'ahumanu. A woman of shrewdness and intellect, she captured the attention of Kamehameha when she demanded of him that she care for the corpse of Kīwala'ō.⁵²³ In addition to being one of the favored wives of Kamehameha, Ka'ahumanu would present the pathways of both Kū and Lono. She would represent the balance to her husband's skill in battle. As a pu'uhona, Ka'ahumanu could save one's life, whereas Kamehameha dealt out death.⁵²⁴

Ka'ahumanu's political significance was such that she would replace her father after his passing in the 'Aha Ali'i (Council of Chiefs), being chosen over her own

⁵²⁰ Kame'eiehiwa tells us that the following foods were kapu to wāhine: pua'a (pig), niu (coconut), mai'a (banana), and i'a 'ula (red fish). The first three foods represent the ma'i, or genitalia, of Lono, Kū, and Kanaloa, respectively. The red fish is representative of Kū'ula, the Akua of deep-sea fishing, a kuleana allowed only to the kāne. Kame'eiehiwa, 1992:33-34.

⁵²¹ A Hale Pe'a was a woman's menstruation house.

⁵²² Kame'eiehiwa, 1992:35.

⁵²³ Kīwla'ō was 'ohana to Ka'ahumanu's mother. Therefore, Ka'ahumanu explained to Kamehameha that it was her kuleana to care for Kīwala'ō's bones. See Desha, 2000:138.

⁵²⁴ Kamakau, 318. A pu'uhonua was a place of refuge where a transgressor could escape death.

brothers.⁵²⁵ When Kamehameha died in 1819, Ka‘ahumanu would take the title of Kuhina Nui, or royal advisor, a position that would come to gain more authority in the following years. She convinced her keiki hānai, Liholiho, to abolish the ‘Aikapu system and that she would rule alongside him. The fact that one woman could change a traditional system of laws that been held in place for generations would leave no one to question her dominance.

When the first wave of missionaries arrived a year later, the mana and influence of Ka‘ahumanu was too significant to disregard.⁵²⁶ It was in their best interests to be in her company even though she was not the Mō‘ī.⁵²⁷ It may have been somewhat bewildering for them to see a woman with such assertion over a people. Yet, they congregated to her, using Ka‘ahumanu to favorably complete their mission. She, along with Keōpūolani,⁵²⁸ would successfully convince other Ali‘i to become disciples of the

⁵²⁵ Ibid., 313.

⁵²⁶ Hiram Bingham, who was in the first mission to arrive in Hawai‘i in 1820, understood that Ka‘ahumanu held more power to convert the Kānaka Maoli to Christianity than that of the reigning Mō‘ī (Liholiho). In his description of Ka‘ahumanu, Bingham would write that “This woman, with all her haughtiness and selfishness, possessed, perhaps, as true a regard for the safety of the state, as her late husband or his high chiefs, and with all her magisterial and consequential airs, had a degree of suavity and skill for managing the minds of others...” “... the high rank and magisterial authority of Kaahumanu supported by several chief women of noble blood, furnished the opportunity which had not occurred before, and which could hardly be expected to occur again, for a queen of such rank and power – such an extensive influence over the whole group, to assert the rights of woman, unrestrained by a lordly husband, and to protests against the unreasonable disabilities under which they had been placed.” See Bingham, 1981:78.

⁵²⁷ Kame‘eleihiwa, 2002:12. Kame‘eleihiwa explains that Ka‘ahumanu was concerned about the population decline of her people. She wanted the Kānaka Maoli to thrive, and since the foreigners flourished in Hawai‘i while her people suffered, Ka‘ahumanu assumed that they held the secret to life. Therefore, she considered it to be in the best interests of her people to follow the customs and religion of the foreigners.

⁵²⁸ Keōpūolani was a wife of Kamehameha and the mother of Liholiho (Kamehameha II), Kauieakouli (Kamehameha III), and Nāhi‘ena‘ena. Her kapu status made her one of the highest ranking women in Hawai‘i at the time.

new belief structure. With the exception of a few, Ka‘ahumanu and Keōpūolani faced little resistance from the men to convert to the new religion.

Few of the Ali‘i would protest Ka‘ahumanu’s power; many of the others would rally behind her. She knew how to be politically manipulative, and would use her control of ‘Āina to gain and keep her allies. During Kauikeaouli’s reign, Ka‘ahumanu would disallow him many of his rights as a Mō‘ī. Although he was the Mō‘ī, he would be continuously met with opposition when he attempted to enforce those rights, such as his right to nī‘aupi‘o with his sister, Nāhi‘ena‘ena.⁵²⁹ When Ka‘ahumanu made her legacy of her Kuhina Nui position one of inheritance,⁵³⁰ her heir Kīna‘u (Ka‘ahumanu II) would effortlessly emulate the same power held by her predecessor.

The ‘Ōiwi would not question the powerful nature of these aforementioned wāhine. They were Ali‘i and through them came life and supremacy. Constitutional law would later legitimize the position of Kuhina Nui under the new government, while also confining the authority of all other wāhine. Incestuously

Lota Kapuāiwa’s 1864 Constitution would eliminate the Kuhina Nui position entirely. Since the Kuhina Nui could veto any of the Mō‘ī’s decisions, Lota sought to secure his absolute power as the reigning King by abolishing the title. Prior to doing so, Lota removed his sister from the position and elected his father. Osorio speculates that,

⁵²⁹ It was the kuleana of Ali‘i Nui to noho nī‘aupi‘o, incestuously reside with, with their brother or sister so that they may produce a high-ranking keiki.

⁵³⁰ Ka‘ahumanu would turn the Kuhina Nui position into one that was held, for the most part, by wāhine. Following Ka‘ahumanu would be Kīna‘u (Ka‘ahumanu II), Kekāuluohi (Ka‘ahumanu III), Keoni Ana, Victoria Kamāmalu, and then finally Kekūanaō‘a. Keoni Ana would serve as Kuhina Nui at the request of Kauikeaouli because Kekāuluohi’s heir, Victoria Kamāmalu, was too young at the time.

since Victoria Kamāmalu was equal to Lota in power and rank, having a lower-ranking Ali‘i in the position (and one who did not have a body of adherents to support him like Victoria did) made it more possible to dissolve.⁵³¹

Since Lota was already facing opposition with his new constitution, he perhaps wanted to eliminate the threats from his own people. They would be less likely to stand for the removal of Victoria from office because it would be almost equivocal to asking the Mō‘ī to step down. However, without the government lacking a significant female position of authority, wāhine were further reduced to more submissive representations in their own home.

It could be argued that Mō‘īwahine Emma, while known for her gentle disposition, often took a more assertive role in her capacity as Mō‘īwahine. Like other powerful Ali‘i Wāhine before her, she inspired loyalty from her people. She would lead others to campaign for a kānaka hospital and take it upon herself to travel overseas to secure funds for the Cathedral and Priory. No other Ali‘i Wahine, with the exception of Mō‘īwahine Lili‘uokalani, would have as much of a public presence as would Emma. Her establishment of a church and hospital in Hawai‘i gave her people two things of utmost importance: pathways to mana and life.

In that regard, Emma possibly represented something that the po‘e haole had feared. She could command the respect of some of the government’s most powerful men and would have unquestionable support in her anti-Reciprocity stance. She was so beloved by the people that she could, as was seen on February 12, 1874, ignite the most

⁵³¹ Osorio, 2002:114-115.

passionate of displays. Her widowhood would further intensify her determination because she fell under no one's limitations, unlike Lili'uokalani and Pauahi who had married formidable *foreign* men. It's somewhat inconceivable that the Kānaka Maoli would judge her for her gender, but it perhaps portrays the extent of colonization.

The British in Hawai'i were of a different and interesting matter. Their support of the Mō'īwahine most likely had more to do with her Anglo-Saxon heritage and her affinity for her grandfather's homeland. That she contested the negotiations with the United States to secure reciprocity also weighed heavily in her favor. Even though history would show that British colonialism was extremely oppressive on women,⁵³² British countrymen were more accustomed to a monarchical system where a woman could rule. Emma supporters would appeal to these affections when they asked the people to think of the peaceful and prosperous reign of Queen Victoria.⁵³³

Colonization, as we have seen in the events of the nineteenth century, dramatically altered today's perception of what it means to be 'Ōiwi and what our roles are as wāhine. Blood quantum meant very little to Kānaka Maoli in regards to Emma's claim to the Crown, yet we focus so much on that issue today. Even the issue of gender

⁵³² Mies, 1998:90-91. An example is presented where, in the sugar plantation colonies of the Caribbean, slave women were prohibited to marry and to conceive children. The time needed during pregnancy and recovery would take away from labor, and the colonizers saw this as an unnecessary expense at their own account. Should a slave woman become pregnant, she would be severely abused. On the other hand, the British wives were reduced to domestic activities; they were not allowed to work outside of the home. Additionally, they were encouraged to procreate so that their legacy could continue.

⁵³³ E Ola Ka Moi Emma Kaleleonalani I ke Akua Mana Loa!! Monarchy Collection. MS MC Kamehameha IV Box 3.1 (electioneering). Bishop Museum Library & Archives. A mele written by an Emma supporter would proclaim "'Elua 'oi o ke ao nei kohukohu i ka noho kalaunu; Vitoria kō Lādana; ke Kuini 'Ema kō Hawai'i.'" (There are two foremost of the world fitting to be on the throne; Victoria is London's own and Hawai'i has Queen Emma.) See Nogelmeier, 2001:184.

has been brought to my attention on more than occasion by haumāna who believe that we, as wāhine, were indeed subordinate to kāne.

The 1874 election provides us with a unique situation where both matters can be evaluated and compared from the perspective of our Kānaka Maoli and from the po‘e haole of the nineteenth century. Hopefully, the understanding that our kūpuna were more concerned with who was best qualified to rule based on mo‘okū‘auhau and rank, as well as who would best protect the ‘Āina and the welfare of the lāhui, will teach us to fall victim to outsider perspectives of who qualifies as being “Hawaiian.” In our quest for self-determination, let us look at what is most significant and beneficial to the lāhui and not let such circumstances as blood quantum divide us.

Mokuna ‘Eiwa: E Welo Mau Ka Hae Hawai‘i Final Thoughts

The initial purpose of this thesis was to examine the election and the reason behind the ‘Ōiwi’s support of Mō‘īwahine Emma. What unfolded was a mo‘olelo of how particular po‘e haole disregarded the appeals of the ‘Ōiwi to elect Mō‘īwahine Emma and how they secured Kalākaua’s victory in order move forward with their personal endeavors. The haole businessmen and planters wanted to obtain the Reciprocity Treay and the likelihood that the Mō‘īwahine would support it was slim. Rather than risk such an opportunity, they threw their support towards a man who would never had been Mō‘ī had he not changed his stance on the treaty. For that reason, following Lunalilo’s passing, these men hastily sent out the *Kīlauea* from O‘ahu to the other islands to snatch the Representatives before the ‘Ōiwi had a chance to make their voices heard. It was a calculating move that worked in the favor of these influential haole men.⁵³⁴

As I explained in Mokuna ‘Ekoḷu, Kānaka Maoli were strongly opposed to the treaty because they understood that it would not benefit the Aupuni. It certainly would not benefit the Kānaka Maoli. For the most part, the treaty would advantage a small few, namely the sugar plantation owners who did not have the welfare of the ‘Ōiwi in mind. In fact, had Emma been elected Mō‘īwahine of the Aupuni on February 12, 1874, there is a strong possibility that the overthrow and subsequent annexation may not have occurred. Most likely, Emma would not have agreed to a Reciprocity Treaty that would lead to the wealth and prosperity of the po‘e haole on our soil. These same po‘e haole would

⁵³⁴ This action is discussed in Mokuna ‘Ehā.

eventually turn against Kalākaua and force him to sign the 1887 Bayonet Constitution that stripped his power as Mō‘ī.⁵³⁵

While the po‘e haole were protecting their own personal interests, Kānaka Maoli were not passive participants in the politics of their Aupuni. When it came time to elect a new Mō‘ī in 1874, the ‘Ōiwi heavily campaigned for their chosen candidate. However, when a strong majority threw their support for Mō‘īwahine Emma, several of the haole-run newspapers criticized any and all reasons that the ‘Ōiwi gave for endorsing the Mō‘īwahine. In the same way that Lunalilo helped to secure his victory by allowing the people to proclaim their choice, the po‘e haole knew that there was a strong possibility that Mō‘īwahine Emma could secure the victory if the ‘Ōiwi had their say.

In addition to silencing the voices of the Kānaka Maoli by not allowing them to voice their opinions to their Representatives, those against Mō‘īwahine Emma wanted to erase any possibility of her victory. They consistently contradicted her mo‘okū‘auhau, denied any of her claims to the Crown, and, as pointed out in Mokuna ‘Ehiku, they even attacked her gender. When Kānaka Maoli violently responded on February 12, 1874, they did so out of frustration that their pleas had been disregarded. Again, the po‘e haole sprung into action, using the newspapers to erase the image that Hawai‘i was not suitable to enter into negotiations with other foreign powers.⁵³⁶ This also led to heavy criticism towards the Queenites, disallowing them the opportunity to express why they were supporting the Mō‘īwahine. Likewise, Emma was seriously reprimanded because she did

⁵³⁵ Both Osorio (2002) and Silva (2004) analyze the situations that led up to and followed after Kalākaua’s forced acknowledgement of the 1887 Bayonet Constitution.

⁵³⁶ By this, I am referring again to the hope of the sugar planters and businessmen in Hawai‘i to enter into a treaty of reciprocity.

not stop the riot, something that Kalākaua *could not* do without the intervention of the foreign troops. These attacks on Mō‘īwahine Emma may have helped Kalākaua’s victory in 1874, but it certainly did not assist his reign.

Kalākaua, as a consequence, would become a pawn in the efforts of the po‘e haole to control the Aupuni. Kalākaua desired something greater than his humble beginnings, a way to elevate the descendants of Keawe-a-Heulu and emerge from the shadow of the Kamehamehas. Yet in doing so, he would bring trouble to the reign of Lunalilo and trample upon the genealogy of Emma. It is difficult to say how much of this was influenced by the sugar plantation owners and businessmen, but there is no doubt that they pulled the strings on more than one occasion.

The Kalākaua and The Kamehameha ‘Ohana

It is not hard to feel some compassion for Kalākaua. He was obviously quite insecure about his position as Mō‘ī, and went to great measures to prove his genealogical right to rule. Since his youth, Kalākaua and his ‘ohana had been overshadowed by the beloved Kamemehamehas. As the descendents of the famous conqueror, the Kamehameha family had been revered, respected, and beloved by the people. Since it was Kamehameha who unified the kingdom, “influence and power was defined by how close one was to that family.”⁵³⁷ When the Kamehameha lineage would increase, so would the mana. That honor was theirs alone. Although Kalākaua would be given many of the same opportunities that the Kamehameha children were given, for example a good

⁵³⁷ Young, 1998:125-126.

education and military training overseas, he would never secure the honor reserved for Alexander Liholiho, Lota Kapuāiwa, and other members of the Kamehameha family.

Proving himself worthy of the Crown had been a key motivator in Kalākaua's candidacy and warranted significant attention during his reign. His reign was a turbulent one; he was not the choice of his own people and therefore made tremendous efforts to justify his position in the Aupuni. However, Kalākaua was not a Kamehameha. Mokuna 'Eono makes evident that mo'okū'auhau was of incredible importance to Kānaka Maoli. Though mo'okū'auhau are considered sacred and weren't necessarily revealed to all, the death of so many Ali'i in the nineteenth century made it crucial that everyone should know who was qualified to reign as Mō'i. Mo'okū'auhau also identified who was part of the Kamehameha 'ohana; so long as a Kamehameha was alive, the 'Ōiwi felt that it was their kuleana to wear the Crown.

During the nineteenth century, genealogical qualification was still tied to the Kānaka Maoli understanding of who was also political adept to rule. Because of this, the Kalākaua 'ohana had to prove their ancestral qualifications to reign while also *disproving* Emma's claim to the Kamehamehas. What may have started out as a political race between two candidates later became a genealogical dispute between two families.

The Kalākauas would never acknowledge that Emma had a legitimate claim to the throne. They would always portray her as a descendent of Kaleipaihala; that Keli'imaika'i was her great-grandfather would never be accepted. If Emma were indeed a Kamehameha, the Kānaka Maoli, the people for whom the Crown actually meant something, would always question the Kalākauas' right to the throne. Yet regardless of

her lineage, the Queenites would never fail in venerating her as a Kamehameha.

Following Emma's death in 1885 and Kalākaua's death in 1891, Mō'īwahine Lili'uokalani continued her brother's fight to justify her family's right to reign by aligning her family to the Kamehamehas and refuting Emma's connection.⁵³⁸

The Kalākaua family could ho'opili themselves to Kamehameha through Keawe-a-Heulu, an Ali'i of Hawai'i Island. In fact, Lili'uokalani did just that when asserting her validity to the Crown.⁵³⁹ Keawe-a-Heulu could claim a prominent lineage, as his father, Heulu, was the son of Kapahi-a-'Ahu-Kāne of the famed 'Ī family of Hilo. Keawe-a-Heulu, additionally, was the cousin of the Conqueror's father, Keōua. Heulu and Kamaka'imoku, the mother of both Keōua and Kalani'ōpu'u, shared the Mahi chiefess 'Umi'ula-a-ka'ahumanu as their mother.⁵⁴⁰ Keawe-a-Heulu, therefore, could tie himself to some of the highest-ranking Ali'i of that time. The relationship between Keawe-a-Heulu and Kamehameha's family was such that, upon the death of Kamehameha, the kuleana of who should hide his bones belonged to Keawe-a-Heulu's 'ohana.

Yet, preceding Kamehameha's death, the decision had been made to entrust Hoapili to hide his bones. According to Kamakau, Kamehameha lacked faith in Keawe-a-Heulu's ability to keep the location of his bones a secret. Kamakau states that the location of Keōua's bones had been revealed by the Heulu family, and so Kamehameha chose to give the kuleana to Hoapili.⁵⁴¹

⁵³⁸ See Appendix F in *Hawai'i's Story By Hawai'i's Queen*, 407.

⁵³⁹ Young, 1998:57.

⁵⁴⁰ Fornander, 1878:134-135.

⁵⁴¹ Kamakau, 1991:215.

Keawe-a-Heulu, although of high rank, was best known for being one of the “Kona Uncles” that helped and advised Kamehameha in achieving power.⁵⁴² Again returning to the importance of ho‘opili, Lili‘uokalani credits Keawe-a-Heulu as being a “founder of the dynasty of the Kamehamehas,”⁵⁴³ and that he had been Kamehameha’s chief counselor. She continues that, while Kamehameha was the patriarch of the nation, “he owed his selection for the monarch to the chiefs from whom the latest reigning family [Lili‘uokalani’s] descended.”⁵⁴⁴ No one would question that Keawe-a-Heulu was crucial to Kamehameha’s accomplishments, but the lāhui still belonged to the Conqueror.

Ua Pau Ka Mo‘olelo: The End of This Story

In writing this thesis, my intent was not to retell an already told story. It was to reclaim this mo‘olelo as our own and, as I pointed out in the introduction, to “give testimony to”⁵⁴⁵ the ‘Ōiwi whose story has been overshadowed by Western history for far too long. No one could deny that it was Emma who was the choice of the people; yet the voices of these people were suppressed. Their own Representatives did not heed their wishes, or they were uninformed of what the people had desired. Is it no wonder that the Kānaka reacted so violently to the results of the election? Their passionate display led to their persecution, and even those who were civil in their protests were ignored and called ignorant. To add further insult to injury, when the Queenites attempted to explain the

⁵⁴² Osorio, 2002:150.

⁵⁴³ Lili‘uokalani, 1898:1.

⁵⁴⁴ Ibid.

⁵⁴⁵ Tuhiwai Smith, 1999:28.

cause for their actions and why they opposed Kalākaua, their voices were suppressed.

Even the newspapers failed to publish any of their letters.

Though it would take over a hundred years, the voices of our kūpuna are being heard; their voices are being given spirit. Their experiences, their reactions, their *protests* of what had been done to *their* nation will no longer be censored. Native and non-Native historians are uncovering the gourd and letting their voices be carried out by our winds.

In 1874, our people refused to sit idly by while the wealthy few took control over the kingdom. We may still suffer the effects of the Legislature's decision and we are still fighting to regain our independence. It is unfortunate that we must find some way of living in a colonized society while asserting ourselves as Kānaka Maoli. Yet, we are making the necessary steps forward with the learning of our 'ōlelo makuahine, the studying and living of our culture, and the pride we feel in being Kānaka. And, most importantly, we refuse to let our voices be silenced.

Ua wehe 'ia ka 'umeke, ho 'ohāmau 'ole 'ia kō leo hanohano.

Appendix A

S. M. Kamakau's Mo'okū'auhau of Mō'īwahine Emma

Published in *Ka Nūpepa Kū'oko'a*, 31 January 1874

<u>Kāne</u>	<u>Wahine</u>	<u>Pua</u>
Keaweikekahiali'iokamoku	Kalanikauleleiaiwi	Keeeaumoku [sic]
Keeeaumoku	Kamakaimoku	Kalanikupuapaikalaninui
Kalanikupuapaikalaninui	Kekuiapoīwa	Kamehameha I
		Kalanimālokaloku-i-Kepooōkalani (Keliimaikai)
Keliimaikai	Kalikookalani	Kaoanaeha
John Young Olohana	Kaoanaeha	B. Kekelaokalani (mua)
		Kini Lahilahi (hope)
G. Naea	B. Kekelaokalani	Emma Kaleleonalani ka Moiwahine

Ko ka Moiwahine aoao kaupukea [kaupakuea], he puakoamakaia.

<u>Kāne</u>	<u>Wahine</u>	<u>Pua</u>
Keaweikekahiali'iokamoku	Lonomaaiakanaka	Kalaninuiiamamao
Kalaninuiiamamao	Ahia	Kekunuiāleimoku
Kekunuiāleimoku	Kaniniuokalani	Kalikookalani
Kalanimālokaloku	Kalikookalani	Kaoanaeha
John Young Olohani	Kaoanaeha	Fane Kekelaokalani
G. Naea	Fanny Kekelaokalani	Emma Kaleleonalani

Ko ka Moiwahine aoao niaupio.

<u>Kāne</u>	<u>Wahine</u>	<u>Pua</u>
Kalanikaumakaowakea	Kaneaumi	Piilaniwahine
Ahu-a-I	Piilaniwahine	Lonomaaikanaka
Keawe	Lonomaaikanaka	Kalaninuiiamamao
Kalaninuiiamamao	Ahia	Kekunuailemoku [sic]
Kekunuailemoku	Kaniniaokalani [sic]	Kalikookalani
Kalanimālokaloku	Kalikookalani	Kaoanaeha
John Young Olohani	Kaoanaeha	F. Kekelaokalani
G. Naea	F. Kekelaokalani	Emma Kaleleonalani

Ko ka Moiwahine aoao wohi

<u>Kāne</u>	<u>Wahine</u>	<u>Pua</u>
Kakuihewa	Kahaiao-nui-a-Kahuailana	Kanekapu-a-Kuihewa (mua) Kaihipapu-a-Kuihewa
Kaihipapu-a-Kuihewa	Ipuwaihoalani ⁵⁴⁶	Kauakahikuaanaauakane
Iwikauikaua	Kauakahikuaanaauakane	Kaneikauaiwilani
Kaneikauaiwilani	Keakealani	Kalanikauleleiaiwi
Keawe	Kalanikauleleiaiwi	Keeeaumoku
Keeeaumoku	Kamakaimoku	Kalanikupuapaikalaninui
Kalanikupuapaikalaninui	Kekuiapoīwa	Kamehameha I (mua) Kalanimālokaloku-i- Kepookalani
Kalanimālokaloku-i-Kepookalani	Kalikookalani	Kaoanaeha
John Young Olohani	Kaoanaeha	F. Kekelaokalani
G. Naea	F. Kekelaokalani	Emma Kaleleonalani

⁵⁴⁶ Ipuwai-a-Hoalani's name was illegible in *Kū'oko'a*'s publication. Reference to Fornander would show that she was the wife of Kaihipapu-a-Kakuihewa. See Fornander, 1878:286.

Ko ka Moiwahine aoao Mahana

<u>Kāne</u>	<u>Wahine</u>	<u>Pua</u>
Kamalalawalu	Piilaniwahine-a-Kaakaupea	Kauhikapu-a-Kama (mua) Kalaukauaehu-a-Kama
Kalakauaehu-a-Kama	Paakalani	Kaumahana
Kaumahana	Lonowahine	Kalaniulukaikahonua
Paukei	Kalaniulukaikahonua	Kepoomahana
Kauauanui-a-Mohiololi	Kapoomahana	Haae
Haae	Kekelaokalani	Kekuiapoīwa
Kalanikupuapaikalaninui	Kekuiapoīwa	Kamehameha (mua) Kalanimalokuloku-i-
Kepookalani		
Kalanimalokuloku-i-Kepookalani	Kalikookalani	Kaoanaeha
John Young Olohani	Kaoanaeha	B. Kekelaokalani
G. Naea	B. Kekelaokalani	Emma Kaleleolani [sic]

Ko ka Moiwahani [sic] makuakane

Kalauawa	Kuapuualokalani	Kukaeleiki
Kamaunu	Kukaeleiki	G. Naea
G. Naea	Kekelaokalani	Ema Kaleleonalani

Appendix B

J. K. Unauna's Mo'okū'auhau of Mō'īwahine Emma

(In Response to Kamakau's Mo'okū'auhau)

Published in *Ka Nūhou Hawai'i*, 3 February 1874

<u>Kāne</u>	<u>Wahine</u>	<u>Pua</u>
Kumale [sic]	Kunuunui puawalau	Makua
Makua	Kapohelemai	I
I	Kuwalu	Ahia I [sic Ahu-a-I]
Ahia I	Wao	Kamaalewa
		Ikukeleieiku
Ikukeleieiku	Ohua	Keakaohua
Lonoikahaupu	Keakaohua	Ninauaiwiakeakaohua
Ninauaiwiakeakaohua	Ahua I	Kuehu
Kuehu	Keliiokalani	Kaniniu
Kaniniu	Kekunui alaimoku	Kaliko
Kaliko	Keaka (Jack)	Kaoanaeha
<u>Kāne</u>	<u>Wahine</u>	<u>Pua</u>
Keaweikekahiali'iokamoku	Kalanikauleleiaiwi	Keeeaumoku [sic]
Keeeaumoku	Kamakaimoku	Kalanikupuapaikalaninui
Kalanikupuapaikalaninui	Kekuiapo iwa	Kamehameha I
		Kalanimālokaloku-i-Kepoookalani (Keliimaikai)
Keliimaikai	Kalikookalani	Kaoanaeha
John Young Olohana	Kaoanaeha	B. Kekelaokalani (mua)
		Kini Lahilahi (hope)
G. Naea	B. Kekelaokalani	Emma Kaleleonalani ka Moiwahine

Appendix C

A Published List Of Names Of The Accused Rioters

Eia iho malalo nei ka papa inoa o ka poe kipi nana i pepehi na Lunamakaaainana a wawahi i ka Hale Hookolokolo i ka Poaha, la 12, i wehe ai ka Ahaolelo no ke koho Moi ana; a ke paa nei i ka halewai—ekolu nae i kuuia :

Kanealii, Kealakua, Puweuweu, Paakaula, Keonelo, Kinilau, Kaiama, Kahelemauna, Kihei, Kuaana, Kaailuwale, Kekapa, Koalii, Kapilau, J. Kaulahea, Kameheu, Opiopio, David, Kealoha, Moke, (hookuuia) Paaōō, Moluhi, Maikai, Nao, Kalua, Kamakea, Kaailuhau, Kapule, Pa, Wm. Brown, Rev. G. W. Pilipo, (belaia) Moio, Alohihea, Geo. Bell, Kapau, Kalama, Kuaiwa, Keko, Kane-paiki, Mahoe, Mahi, Keeki, Mahoe, Kahele, Keikeikai, (kuuia no ka mai) Kamaalewa, Puhipaka, Kaluaioahu, Kailiuahea, Nailipe-lapela, Makaula, Keakui, Puhihale, Kalani, Koloa, Piko, Koa, W. S. Pahukula, Naholo-waa, Vitoa. (belaia)

O keia ka poe i hopuia mai ke ahiahi Po-aha a hiki i ke kakahiaka Poakahi. He nui aku koe, ke huliia nei no.

Ka Nūhou Hawai'i. 17 February 1874.

Appendix D

List of Hawaiian Newspaper Articles Referenced In This Thesis

Hawaiian Gazette

- “California Correspondence: The Reciprocity Treaty.” 26 August 1868.
17 December 1872.
“Reciprocity.” 26 March 1873.
30 July 1873.
“Opening of the Legislature. Special Session, Feb. 12th, 1874.” 18 February 1874.
“Our Misfortune.” 18 February 1874.
“The Inauguration.” 18 February 1874.
“The Riot.” 18 February 1874.
“The Rioters.” 18 February 1874.
“The Situation.” 25 February 1874.
15 April 1874.
24 June 1874.
“The Late Hon. S.G. Wilder.” 31 July 1888.
“The High Sheriff Gets Some Political Advice.” 25 April 1905.

Ka Hōkū o Ka Pākīpika

- “Moolelo no Kawelo.” 3 October 1861.

Ka Maka‘āinana

- “Mookuauhau Alii.” 13 July 1896.
“Mookuauhau Alii.” 2 Nowemapa 1896.
“Na Iwikuamoo o Hawaii Nei Mai Kahiko Mai.” 23 November 1896.

Ka Nonanona

- “No ka Awa.” 3 August 1842.
“He poe luna o ke aupuni.” 6 August 1844.

Ka Nūhou Hawai‘i

- “Mr. Nordoff’s Views About Pearl Harbor.” 22 April 1873.
“Ke Alalauwa.” 12 August 1873.
“The Succession.” 9 September 1873.
“Ka Papa Alii O Hawaii I Hoonohonoho Pono Ia.” 23 December 1873.
“Mai Hilinai.” 6 January 1874.
“Ke ‘Kuokoa’ Ohikau.” 13 January 1874.
“I Mau Ai Ke Kuokoa.” 3 February 1874.
“A Political Meeting.” 10 February 1874.
Letter to the Legislative Assembly. 10 February 1874.
“Na Nune Olelo O Ke Kulanakauhale.” 17 February 1874.

“Our Mob.” 17 February 1874.
 “The Riot at the Court House.” 17 February 1874.
 “Ka Haunaele A Ka Poe Kipi.” 17 Feb. 1874.
 “He Mele No Nuhou.” 24 February 1874.
 10 March 1874.
 “Naaupo Maoli No!” 17 March 1874.
 “Owai Na Alakai Kipi?” 17 March 1874.

Ka Nūpepa Kū‘oko‘a

“Ka Weheia Ana O Ka Ahaolelo.” 4 May 1872;
 “Ke kuikahi Panai like.” Ka Nupepa Kuokoa. 1 March 1873.
 “Halawai Makainana o Kaumakapili.” 5 July 1873.
 Ka mookuauhau Alii o ka Moiwahine Kaleleonalani e pili ana ia Kamehameha I.” 31 January 1874.
 “Nu Hou Kuloko.” 21 February 1874.
 “Pau Ole No Ka Kupanaha. Nu Hou Kuloko.” 21 February 1874.
 “Nu Hou Kuloko.” 24 February 1874.
 “Ko kakou kulana.” 28 February 1874.
 “Nu Hou Kuloko.” 18 April 1874.
 “Nu Hou Kuloko.” 25 April 1874.
 “No Ka Moiwahine Ema.” 5 May 1883.

Ka Lāhui Hawai‘i

“Haiolelo A Ka Hon. G. W. Pilipo ma ka La Kuokoa, ma Holualoa, Kona Akau, Novemapa 28, 1876.” 25 January 1877.

Ka Lama Hawai‘i

“No Na Mea Kahiko.” 1 August 1834.

Kō Hawai‘i Pae ‘Āina

“Ka La 12 o Feberuari.” 23 June 1883.
 “Ka La 12 o Feberuari.” 30 June 1883.
 “Ke Koa Kaulana O Kona Akau.” 16 April 1887.

Kō Hawai‘i Pono‘ī

“Halawai Makaainana.” 6 August 1873.
 “Halawai Makaainana o ka apana o Hanalei ma ka Luakini o Waioli, ma ka hora 9 A.M. o ka la 7 o Feb. A.D. 1874.” 11 February 1874.
 “Haunaele Weliweli!” 18 February 1874.
 “Ka Papa Alii Hawaii.” 18 February 1874
 “Nu Hou Kuloko.” 18 March 1874.
 “Aha Hookolokolo Kiekie.” 3 April 1874.
 8 April 1874.

“Nu Hou Kuloko.” 22 April 1874.

Pacific Commercial Advertiser

“Announcement From the Palace.” 28 January 1874.

“Announcement.” 28 January 1874.

“Announcement From G. Trousseau and R. Oliver (Attending Physicians).” 28 January 1874.

“Meeting of the Bar.” 21 February 1874.

“The Investigation.” 21 February 1874.

“Planned Beforehand.” 21 February 1874.

“The Investigation.” 21 February 1874.

“Riot of the Queenites.” 28 February 1874.

4 April 1874.

“Our Riot Abroad.” 11 April 1874.

“The Rioters Sentenced.” 18 April 1874.

“Unnecessarily Scared.” 25 April 1874.

The Daily Bulletin

“Bush Contempt Case.” 28 October 1889

The Friend

“Natives Angry with Ex-Queen.” 1 June 1898.

The Hawaiian Star

“Died Suddenly On Maui.” 7 November 1900.

Bibliography

Adams Express Company, Corporate Archives. *The Adams Express Company 150 Years*. Baltimore: Adams Express Company, 2004.

Alexander, William De Witt. *A Brief History of the Hawaiian People*. American Book Company, 1899.

---. Ed. A Letter By The Late Gov. J. O. Dominis, January 7, 1873." *Sixth Annual Report of the Hawaiian Historical Society for the year 1898*. Honolulu: Hawaiian Gazette Co., Ltd, 1890.

---. "Funeral Rites of Prince Kealiiahonui." *Thirteenth Annual Report of the Hawaiian Historical Society*. Honolulu: Hawaiian Gazette Co., Ltd, 1906.

Allen, Helena G. *The Betrayal of Lili 'uokalani: Last Queen of Hawai'i 1838-1917*. Honolulu: Mutual Publishing, 1982.

---. *Kalākaua: Renaissance King*. Honolulu: Mutual Publishing, 1995.

"An Inside View of the Reign of Lunalilo." 1941:24-25. *Forty-Ninth Annual Report of the Hawaiian Historical Society for the Year 1940*. Honolulu, 1941.

Beckwith, Martha. 1951. *The Kumulipo: A Hawaiian Creation Chant*. 2nd ed. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1972.

Bingham, Hiram A. M. 1847. *A Residence of Twenty-One Years in The Sandwich Islands*. Japan: Charles E. Tuttle Company, Inc., 1981.

Bishop, Rev. Artemas. "Journal Kept at Kairua, Hawaii." *The Friend*. March 1892.

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

Chapin, Helen G. *Shaping History: The Role of Newspapers in Hawai'i*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1996.

Chun, Malcolm Nāea. *Nā Kukui Pio 'Ole: The Inextinguishable Torches. The Biographies of Three Early Native Hawaiian Scholars Davida Malo, S.N. Hale'ole, and S. M. Kamakau*. Honolulu: First People's Productions, 1993.

Cummings, Henry. *A Synopsis of the Cruise of the U.S.S. "Tuscarora."* San Francisco: Cosmopolitan Steam Printing Company, 1874.

Dabagh, Jean. Ed. "King is Elected: One Hundred Years Ago". *Hawaiian Journal of History* 8 (1974).

Daws, Gavan. *Shoal of Time: A History of the Hawaiian Islands*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1968.

Day, A. Grove. *History Makers of Hawai'i*. Honolulu: Mutual Publishing, 1984.

Desha, Stephen L. *Kamehameha And His Warrior Kekūhaupi'o*. Trans. Frances N. Frazier. Honolulu: Kamehameha Schools Press, 2000.

Dole, Sanford B. "Thirty Days of Hawaiian History." *First Annual Report of the Hawaiian Historical Society*. Honolulu: The Hawaiian Gazette Company, 1893.

---. *Memoirs of the Hawaiian Revolution*. Honolulu: Pacific Commercial Advertiser, Inc, 1936.

Emerson, Nathaniel B. *Unwritten Literature of Hawai'i: The Sacred Songs of the Hula*. Rutland, Vermont & Tokyo, Japan: Charles E. Tuttle Company, 1965.

Emma, Queen. Letters and Other Correspondance. Emma Collection, M-45, Hawai'i State Archives.

"Estate of Charles Kanaina." Hawaii Reports: Cases Determined in the Supreme Court of the State of Hawai'i, Vol. 8 Hawai'i Supreme Court. Michigan: Valenti Brothers Graphics, 1893.

Fornander, Abraham. *An Account of the Polynesian Race: Its Origins and Migrations, and the Ancient History of the Hawaiian People to the Times of Kamehameha I*. London: Trubner & Co., 1878.

Green. "Decease and Character of a Head-Man." *The Missionary Herald* 31 (1835).

Greer, Richard A. "The Founding of the Queen's Hospital." *Hawaiian Journal of History* 3:11 (1969).

Gibson, Walter Murray. "E Nana Pono! Eia Iho!!" *Ka Nūhou Hawai'i*. 10 March 1874.

Goto, Baron. "Ethnic Groups And The Coffee Industry in Hawaii." *Hawaiian Journal of History* 16 (1982).

Gutmanis, June. "The Law... Shall Punish All Men Who Commit Crime... from the Constitution of 1840." *Hawaiian Journal of History* 8:143 (1974).

Handy, E. S. C. and Mary Kawena Pukui. *The Polynesian Family System in Ka‘u, Hawai‘i*. Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press, 1953/1972.

Hartwell, Judge Alfred Stedman. “Forty Years of Hawai‘i Nei.” *Fifty-Fourth Annual Report of the Hawaiian Historical Society For the Year 1945*. Honolulu: The Honolulu Star-Bulletin, Ltd, 1947.

Heuck, Theodore Christopher. Letter to George Heuck, 24 January 1874. M-61, T.C. Heuck Manuscript Collection, Hawai‘i State Archives.

---. Letter to Heuck’s Family, 12-22 February 1874. M-61, T.C. Heuck Manuscript Collection, Hawai‘i State Archives.

ho‘omanawanui, ku‘ualohaa. “Mana Wahine: Feminism and Nationalism in Hawaiian Literature.” *Anglistica* 14. 2 (2010).

---. Personal communication. 8 July 2013.

Houston, Victor S.K. *Election of Kalakaua, 1874-1954*. HI.H.59, Victor S.K. Houston Manuscript Collection, Bishop Museum Archives.

Hoyt, Edwin P. *Davies: The Inside Story of a British-American Family in the Pacific and Its Business Enterprises*. Honolulu: Topgallant Publishing Co., LTD, 1983.

‘Iaukea, Curtis Pī‘ehu and Lorna Kahilipuaokalani Iaukea Watson. *By Royal Command*. Hawai‘i: Hui Hanai, 1988.

‘Ī‘Ī, John Papa. *Fragments of Hawaiian History*. Ed. Dorothy B. Barrere. Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press, 1959.

Judd, A. Francis. “Lunalilo, The Sixth King of Hawai‘i.” *Forty-Fourth Annual Report of the Hawaiian Historical Society For the Year 1935*. Honolulu: The Printshop Co, 1936.

---. Letter, 9 June 1936. DU Historical Pamphlet 245, Bishop Museum Archives.

Junius. *The Hawaiian Annexation Scheme, (A Sugar Trust Plot.) Exposed by General Schofield*. New York, 1897. DU History Pamphlet #456 BPBM.

Kalākaua, King David. Letter from King Kalākaua to “My Dear Friend.” 28 September 1872. MS Kapi‘olani-Kalaniana‘ole Collection Kalakaua 1.3. Bishop Museum Archives.

---. Announcement to the People, 12 February 1874. M-61, T.C. Heuck Manuscript Collection, Hawai‘i State Archives.

---. Letter to W.C. Parke, 31 May 1877. M-117, William Cooper Parke Manuscript Collection, Hawai‘i State Archives.

---. Kalākaua’s Order of Chiefly Procedure. Kalākaua Collection, Bishop Museum Archives.

Kamakau, Samuel M. “Ke Kuauhau no na Kupuna kahiko loa mai o Hawaii nei, a hiki mai ia Wakea. Mai ia Wakea mai a hiki mai i keia manawa a kakou e noho nei, i mea e maopopo ai i keia hanauna; a ia hanauna aku ia hanauna aku” *Ka Nonanona*. 25 October 1842.

---. “Lahainaluna, Dek. 2, 1842.” *Ka Nonanona*. 14 February 1843.

---. “Ka Moolelo o Kamehameha I.” *Ka Nūpepa Kū‘oko‘a*. 20 Okakopa 1866.

---. “Ka Moolelo Hawaii.” *Ke Au ‘Oko‘a*. 7 April 1870.

---. *Ruling Chiefs of Hawaii*. Honolulu: The Kamehameha Schools Press, 1991.

Kame‘eleihiwa, Lilikalā. *Native Land and Foreign Desires: Pehea Lā E Pono Ai?* Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press, 1992.

---. *Nā Wāhine Kapu: Divine Hawaiian Women*. Honolulu: ‘Ai Pōhaku Press, 1999/2002.

Kanahele, George S. *Kū Kanaka, Stand Tall: A Search For Hawaiian Values*. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 1993.

---. *Emma: Hawai‘i’s Remarkable Queen*. Honolulu: The Queen Emma Foundation, 1999.

Kauanui, J. Kēhaulani. *Hawaiian Blood: Colonialism And The Politics Of Sovereignty And Identity*. Durham & London: Duke University Press, 2008.

Keahiolalo-Karasuda, RaeDeen. “The Genealogy of Punishment in Hawai‘i: The Public Hanging of Chief Kamanawa II.” *Hūlili: Multidisciplinary Research on Hawaiian Well-Being*, 6 :148 (2010).

Kelley, Robert Lloyd. *Battling the Inland Sea: Floods, Public Policy, and the Sacramento Valley*. California: University of California Press, 1998.

Kelly, Marion. “Dynamics of Production Intensification in Precontact Hawai‘i.” *What’s New? A Closer Look at the Process of Innovation*. Ed. Sander van der Leeuw and Robin Torrence. London: Unwin Hyman, 1989. 82-106.

Kent, Harold Winfield. *Charles Reed Bishop: Man of Hawaii*. Palo Alto, California: Pacific Books Publishers, 1965.

Kimura, Larry L. "Native Hawaiian Culture." In *Native Hawaiians Study Commission*, Vol. 1. *Report on the culture, needs and concerns of Native Hawaiians*. Pursuant to Public Law 96-565, Title III. 23 June 1983. Washington D.C.: The Commission, 1983.

Kingdom of Hawai'i. Foreign Office and Executive. *Privy Council Minutes*. 1859-1872.

---. Foreign Office and Executive. *Privy Council Minutes*. 1873-1875.

Kirtley, Bacil F. and Esther T. Mo'okini. Introduction. Hawaiian Hawaiian Collection: Hooiiliili Havaii, Pepa 1, 1858. By Kepelino. Honolulu: Paipalapala Katolika, 1858.

Korn, Alfons L. *The Victorian Visitors*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1958.

---. Ed. *News From Molokai: Letters between Peter Kaeo & Queen Emma 1873-1876*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1976.

Krout, Mary Hannah. *The Memoirs of Hon. Bernice Pauahi Bishop*. New York: The Knickerbocker Press, 1908.

Kuykendall, Ralph Simpson. *The Hawaiian Kingdom*. Vol. 1, 1778-1854: *Foundation and Transformation*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1938.

---. *The Hawaiian Kingdom*. Vol. 2, 1854-1874: *Twenty Critical Years*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1953.

---. *The Hawaiian Kingdom*. Vol. 3, 1874-1893: *The Kalakaua Dynasty*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1967.

Liholiho, Alexander. *The Journal of Prince Alexander Liholiho*. Ed. Jacob Adler. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press for The Hawaiian Historical Society, 1967.

Lili'uokalani. *Hawaii's Story by Hawaii's Queen*. Honolulu: Mutual Publishing, 1898.

Long, David F. *Gold Braid and Foreign Relations: Diplomatic Activities of U.S. Naval Officers, 1798-1883*. Maryland: U.S. Naval Institute, 1988.

Lucas, Paul F. Nahoā. "E Ola Mau Kākou I Ka 'Ōlelo Makuahine: Language Policy And The Courts." *The Hawaiian Journal of History* 34 (2000).

Lydecker, Robert C. *Roster Legislatures of Hawaii: 1841-1918*. Honolulu: The Hawaiian Gazette Co., Ltd, 1918.

Lyman, Rufus A. "Recollections of Kamehameha V." *Third Annual Report of the Hawaiian Historical Society for the Year 1895* 19 (1896).

Lyons, Curtis J. Letter to His Parents, 14 February 1874. Reprinted in the *Honolulu Advertiser*, 15 February 1925. M-212, Henry Bond Restarick Manuscript Collection, Hawai'i State Archives.

Malo, David, et al. Letter to W.C. Parke, 3 February 1873. M-117, William Cooper Parke Manuscript Collection, Hawai'i State Archives.

---. *Hawaiian Antiquities (Moolelo Hawaii)*. Translated by Dr. Nathaniel B. Emerson. Bernice P. Bishop Museum Special Publication 2, 2nd Ed. Honolulu, Hawai'i: Bernice Pauahi Bishop Museum, 1951.

Mamaki, D. "Halawai Makaainana." *Ka Nūpepa Kū'oko'a*. 28 February 1874.

Merry, Sally Engle. *Colonizing Hawai'i: The Cultural Power of Law*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2000.

McGregor, Davianna Pōmaika'i. *Nā Kua 'āina: Living Hawaiian Culture*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2007.

McKinzie, Edith Kawelohea. *Hawaiian Genealogies: Extracted from the Hawaiian Language Newspapers*, Vol. I. Ed. Ishmael W. Stagner, II. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1983.

---. *Hawaiian Genealogies: Extracted from the Hawaiian Language Newspapers*, Vol. II. Ed. Ishmael W. Stagner, II. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1986.

Mies, Maria. *Patriarchy & Accumulation on a World Scale: Women in the International Division of Labour*. London and New York: Zed Books Ltd, 1998.

Minutes of the Privy Council, 1873-1875. *Ka Huli Ao Digital Archives*. William S. Richardson School of Law, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, 2009. Web. 17 July 2013.

Nogelmeier, Puakea. *He Lei No 'Emalani*. Honolulu: Queen Emma Foundation, 2001.

---. *Mai Pa'a I Ka Leo: Historical Voice In Hawaiian Print Materials, Looking Forward And Listening Back*. Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press and Awaiaulu Press, 2010.

Osorio, Jonathan Kay Kamakawiwo'ole. *Dismembering Lāhui: A History of the Hawaiian Nation to 1887*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2002.

Pa'akū'auhau. "Ke Hapai Memeue mai nei." *Ka Nūpepa Kū'oko'a*. 3 January 1874.

Parker, Linda Sue. *Native American Estate: The Struggle Over Indian and Hawaiian Lands*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1989.

Pletcher, David M. *The Diplomacy of Involvement: American Economic Expansion Across the Pacific*. Columbia. Missouri: University of Missouri Press, 2001.

Pratt, Elizabeth Kekaaniauokalani Kalaninuiohilaukapu. *History of Keoua Kalanikupuapa-i-kalani-nui, Father of Hawaiian Kings, and His Descendants, with Notes on Kamehameha I, First King of All Hawaii*. Honolulu: T.H., 1920.

Pukui, Mary Kawena, et. al. *Nānā I Ke Kumu: Look to the Source*, Vol. I. Honolulu: Hui Hanai, Queen Lili'uokalani Children's Center, 1972.

Putney, Clifford. *Missionaries in Hawai'i: The Lives of Peter and Fanny Gulick, 1797-1883*. United States: University of Massachusetts Press, 2010.

Quigg, Agnes. "Kalākaua's Hawaiian Studies Abroad Program." *Hawaiian Journal of History* 22 (1988).

Restarick, Henry Bond. *Hawaii: 1778-1920 from the Viewpoint of a Bishop*. Honolulu: Paradise of the Pacific, 1924.

---. Papers on Notable Hawaiian Women. M-212, Henry Bond Restarick Manuscript Collection, Hawai'i State Archives.

Richards, Mary Atherton. *The Chief's Children's School: A Record Compiled From the Diary and Letters of Amos Starr Cooke and Juliette Montague Cooke*. Honolulu: Honolulu Star-Bulletin, Ltd, 1937.

Sheldon, J. G. M. *Ka Puke Mo'olelo o Hon. Iosepa K. Nāwahī*. Eds. Edward L. Like and John K. Prendergast. 1908. Hilo, Hawai'i: Hale Kuamo'o, 1996.

Silva, Kalena, ed. "Nā Kānāwai o ka Mō'i Kamehameha V." *Ka Ho'oilina: The Legacy. Journal of Hawaiian Language Sources* 2 (2003).

Silva, Noenoe K. *Aloha Betrayed: Native Hawaiian Resistance to American Colonialism*. Durham & London: Duke University Press, 2004.

Smith, William Henry. *History of the Cabinet of the United States of America, from President Washington to President Coolidge*. United States: The Industrial Printing Company, 1925.

Southerland, Admiral W. H. H. "Incidents Connected with the Election of King Kalakaua in February, 1874." *Fourth Annual Report of the Hawaiian Historical Society*. Honolulu: Robert Grieve, Electric Book and Job Printer, 1896.

Stannard, David E. *Before the Horror: The Population of Hawai'i on the Eve of Western Contact*. Honolulu, University of Hawai'i Press, 1989.

Stokes, John F. G. "Kaoleioku: Paternity and Biographical Sketch," *Forty-Third Annual Report of the Hawaiian Historical Society for the Year 1934* Honolulu, 1935.

---. "Nationality of John Young: A Chief of Hawaii." *Forty-Seventh Annual Report of the Hawaiian Historical Society*. Honolulu: The Pacific Herald Publishing Company, 1938.

Taylor, Albert Pierce. *The Reign of Kalākaua: Political*. Lecture at the University of Hawai'i. Albert P. Taylor Collection (No. 134). Hawai'i State Archives, Honolulu.

"The Diary of Ebenezer Townsend, Jr." *Papers of the New Haven Historical Society* New Haven 6 (1888).

Thrum, T. G. "The Second Interregnum: A complete Resume of Events from the Death to the Burial of His Late Majesty Lunalilo." Honolulu: Black & Auld, 1874.

---. *Hawaiian Almanac and Annual for 1900: A Handbook of Information and Statistics*. Honolulu: Hawaiian Gazette Co., 1900.

Thurston, Lucy G. *Life and Times of Mrs. Lucy G. Thurston*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: S. C. Andrews, 1882.

Trask, Haunani-Kay. *From a Native Daughter*. Monroe, Maine: Common Courage Press, 1993.

Tuhiwai Smith, Linda. *Decolonizing Methodologies*. London & New York: Zed Books, Ltd., 1999.

Unauna, A. "No Ke Kuauhau." *Ka Nonanona*. 8 November 1842.

U.S. Congress. *Senate Journal*. 53rd Cong., 2nd sess., no. 227, vol. 1 (1893). Morgan Report.

Valeri, Valerio. *Kingship and Sacrifice*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1985.

Van Dyke, Jon M. *Who Owns the Crown Lands of Hawai‘i?* Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 2008.

Very, Samuel W. “Pearl Harbor.” *Annual Report of the Honolulu Chamber of Commerce for the Year Ending August 18th, 1909*. Ed. H. P. Wood, Secretary. Honolulu: The Hawaiian Gazette Co., Ltd., 1909.

Wilcox, Robert. “Correspondence.” *Hawai‘i Holomua*. 26 May 1894.

---. “Wilcox on Genealogy: Compare Rank of Queen Emma and the Ex-Queen.” *The Hawaiian Star*. 13 May 1898.

Young, Kanalu G. Terry. *Rethinking the Native Hawaiian Past*. New York & London: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1998.

Electioneering Material

“I Ka Lahui Hawaii. To The Hawaiian Nation!” 6 February 1874. Monarch Collection. MS MC Kamehameha IV Box 3.1 (electioneering). Bishop Museum Library and Archives.

“He Leo Kahea.” 7 February 1874. Monarch Collection. MS MC Kamehameha IV Box 3.1 (electioneering). Bishop Museum Library & Archives.

“Imua o ka lehulehu!; To The Public.” 9 February 1874. Monarch Collection. MS MC Kamehameha IV Box 3.1 (electioneering). Bishop Museum Library & Archives.

“Huro! Huro! Emma Kaleleonalani, ke Alii Wahine Nani. Na Na Kaikamahine Kuipua o Maemae.” 1874. Monarchy Collection. MC Kamehameha IV Box 3.1. (electioneering). Bishop Museum Library & Archives.

Periodicals

Hawaiian Gazette

Ka Hōkū O Ka Pākīpika

Ka Maka‘āinana

Ka Nonanona

Ka Nūhou Hawai‘i

Ka Nūpepa Kū‘oko‘a

Ka Lāhui Hawai‘i

Ka Lama Hawai‘i

Kō Hawai‘i Pae ‘Āina

Kō Hawai‘i Pono‘ī

Pacific Commercial Advertiser

The Daily Bulletin

The Friend
The Hawaiian Star