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Introduction

My research focuses on the period of 1820 to 1832, a time in which Hawaiians as a society learned the new Western technology of literacy and, according to my research of missionary accounts, appears to have achieved a minimum of ninety-one percent literacy rate in just thirteen years—an achievement that is unparalleled in the world.\(^1\) Hence, the methodologies used to achieve this high rate of literacy in such a short space of time are unique and invaluable to educational institutions and communities that struggle with illiteracy today.

Strangely, the phenomenal literary achievement of Hawaiians has remained in relative obscurity. One explanation for this oversight may have been that historians knew that the methodologies brought by the missionaries were not unique. The printing press, Watt’s catechism; Webster’s spelling book, the Bible and the Euro/American classroom methodology for teaching were methodologies and technologies that were employed in many other countries all over the world—and did not achieve the phenomenal success experienced in Hawai‘i.

Accordingly, a unique phenomenal achievement, logically, requires a unique methodology or technology. Unfortunately, the technologies and methodologies brought by the missionaries could not and cannot explain how or why Hawaiians, as a society was able to achieve a phenomenally high rate of literacy in such a short period. Even today, these same technologies and methodologies brought by the missionaries have been greatly improved; yet, many communities and nations around the world continue to struggle with illiteracy.

My research documents this literacy achievement by drawing on primary source materials from people who lived in Hawai‘i in the early nineteenth century and recorded what

\(^1\) See addendum 1
they witnessed. These sources include personal journals, letters, reports, and business records of missionaries, traders, Hawaiians and others who had a close-up view of the literacy achievement period. It was also important to analyze the eyewitnesses, their perspective, motives and worldview. To date, what has been written comes from largely one viewpoint—the viewpoint of the non-Hawaiian. The Hawaiian viewpoint and analysis remains largely undocumented, unnoticed or ignored.

Lingering evidences of this phenomenal literacy achievement include the enormous amount of material printed from 1820 to 1832: approximately twenty-four million pages of text in the Hawaiian language were printed by the missionary presses. More than 70 different Hawaiian language newspapers would follow. Today, about one million pages from those Hawaiian language newspapers have survived, creating one of the largest resources of a native language in the entire Pacific.

Sadly, the role Hawaiians played in their own rapid ascension to literacy remains relatively unknown—surreptitiously omitted from our history books and tacitly ignored by our public educational institutions. Consequently, this literacy achievement also implies that Hawaiian society did not have an aversion to Western educational subjects, Western methodology or Western technology. The fact that Hawaiian society eagerly embraced literacy suggests that as a society they were, intelligent, unbiased, disciplined and cohesively understood that literacy was a valuable tool that could be used to their advantage and benefit. Therefore, how did Hawaiian government/society successfully incorporate a foreign technology into their society and distribute it to their citizens with unmatched speed and extraordinary efficiency?

The answer to this question requires a broad, holistic, interdisciplinary approach to our research and analysis. I will attempt to analyze how Hawaiian society functioned at the ground

2 ABCFM Annual Reports, 1833, p. 82.
level, structure of leadership, organization and function from a native perspective. The unique Hawaiian methodologies that engineered the literacy effort were missed by non-native historians most likely because these historians viewed Hawaiians, their history, government and society from a western lens that was focused with different value systems.

I divided my research into two parts; in the first part, I will look at the actual literacy development by assembling those events and information to identify the key players, their roles and the chronological context. In the second part, I will analyze Hawaiian society just prior to the literacy phenomenon through key moʻolelo that were written by native Hawaiians and translated by myself, a native Hawaiian, so that a Hawaiian perspective can be presented.

I have discarded English terms such as king returning to the Hawaiian term of Mōʻī, Aliʻi instead of chief, and Makaʻāinana instead of commoner because of the additional baggage that these terms carry from their foreign cultural origins. Such comparisons infers equivalence, I argue that they are not. In fact, it is the continued use of these archaic misrepresentations, which continues to mask Hawaiian society achievements, especially Hawaiians phenomenal rise to literacy.

Hawaiian society was far different than the feudalistic frame that it has been long incarcerated in. One unique feature of Hawaiian society that I found which evidences an advanced society was the presence of a highly efficient two-tier governance system, the Aliʻi and the Makaʻāinana. This two-tier governance system is being studied as the new alternative to the archaic Anglo-Saxon single-tier corporate governance system. I will argue that while the Aliʻi and the Makaʻāinana shared genealogies, religious and moral beliefs, the society of the Makaʻāinana though subordinate to the society of the Aliʻi, were fundamentally separate entities with their own governance and succession systems. In other words, the Aliʻi formed a
supervisory tier, a role that oversaw the various districts but refrained from the direct management of the Makaʻāinana. The Makaʻāinana formed the actual operation and production tier, managed by a governance system that was headed by a konohiki whose selection, training and authority originate from the Makaʻāinana. The presence of a two-tier governance system now provides a plausible explanation for Hawaiians phenomenal rise to literacy. Therefore, understanding how Hawaiian society truly functioned is necessary to understand how they achieved their rapid rise to literacy. Nonetheless, my attempt to understand or fully explain early nineteenth century Hawaiian society or any society, let alone one that has had a unique phenomenal literacy achievement is daunting and cannot hope to be fully explained in a single work.
Chapter 1

EIA NŌ KEKAHUA
(The Foundation is Still Here)

Literacy in Hawaiʻi, 1820–1834

In 1937 at the age of eleven my father, his mother, sister, and five brothers left crowded Honolulu for the island of Hawaiʻi to live in Nīnole, Kaʻū the ancestral home of his parents. They moved in with their kupunakāne (grandfather), who lived next to an ice cold brackish water pond that was a favorite swimming spot for those who lived in Kaʻū. The pond was the home of the ʻanae, a mullet so large that its tail stuck out of a 50 lb. rice bag. Above the pond was an “aʿā” lava field, and through that lava field ran the old government road which was built during ka wā kahiko (the time of old), which was known as the alanui o Mōʻī, a.k.a. the King's Road. This road facilitated travel through the hot, jagged, unforgiving, treacherous aʻā lava field which connected Nīnole and Honuapu directly along the coast. Next to the alanui o Mōʻī and above the pond in Nīnole is an old rock wall enclosure; it is the last remnant of an old schoolhouse.

The schoolhouse was situated at the edge of a small cliff giving it an unobstructed view of the whole ahupuaʻa of Nīnole, Wailau, Hilea and the beach at Punaluʻu where canoes sat in quiet readiness under the protection of their canoe shelters waiting for the time to holoholo. For my father the schoolhouse was a place where he would spend nights lying down inside its protective walls, soaking in the peaceful quiet solitude, eyes fixed on the majestic star canopy

---

3 Note: If a Hawaiian was going fishing and he someone asked him where he was going he would say, “Oh I just going to holoholo”, which literally meant I am not sure where, I’m just wandering. To tell someone that you were going fishing would warn the fish because the fish have ears and you would not catch any fish that day. So fishermen would use the term “holoholo” instead of fishing.
above allowing him to dream into the future. The remnant schoolhouse was for my father—a place of refuge—a personal sanctuary.

The school house was built during the time of Kauikeouli Kamehameha III, more than 170 years ago. It was where Kupuna Kaiako, my dad’s kupunakāne went to school. He was taught in his native Hawaiian language. Kupuna Kaiako was only eighteen at the time of the illegal US-backed coup d’état of the de jure constitutional government of Hawai‘i in 1893. The schoolhouse was forced to close when the new haole regime opened their English-medium school at Pāhala for the children of the plantation workers. According to Kupuna Kaiako, those teachers who taught in that schoolhouse at Nīnole were the last of the holdouts; those who had refused to follow the new regime’s governmental order of 1896, which mandated that only English could be used to teach in both public and private schools. The penalty for continuing to teach in Hawaiian was that the school would not be accredited, and if it were a government school such as the school in Nīnole, the teacher would not be paid. By 1902 the intent and goal of that governmental mandate was achieved; the number of schools teaching in the Hawaiian language—zero.

Today, the rock wall is all that is left of the old schoolhouse. The wooden rafters, posts, and roof are gone. The rock wall of the schoolhouse provided the kahua (foundation) upon which the rest of the schoolhouse was built. The rock wall was constructed using an old Hawaiian method of stacking called “hoʻoniho” which used readily available pōhaku (rocks/stones) from the surrounding area, stacking them one on top of the other without the use of mortar or cement. As a result, of not using cement or mortar the wall was somewhat flexible and forgiving, Hawaiians did not worry about their wall being damaged from an earthquake or ground tremor. However, if the wall was damaged, it was easily repaired. The wall was versatile; it could be
enlarged, reconfigured, dismantled, and recycled into a new wall or a new location without major demolition or waste.

The western term for this traditional Hawaiian method of stone wall building is called “dry stacking” and appears to have been practiced by natives on the North American continent as well. The pōhaku are arranged and placed in such way that they interlock and support each other in a cooperative, natural, synergistic way that creates a strong, practical, fully functional, durable, low-cost, recyclable wall. To learn how they constructed the wall requires a close examination of each pōhaku. Studying how and why each pōhaku was placed in a particular position will reveal the principles of dry stacking. Then we will know how the pōhaku synergistically interlocked and unified with the other pōhaku to produce a strong, functional wall.

**Early Literacy Rates**

The rock wall of the schoolhouse in Nīnole was built during the time when literacy was sweeping Hawaiʻi at a phenomenal rate, from 1820 to 1834. By 1831, in just eleven years 1,103 schoolhouses were built, covering every district throughout all the eight major islands that the missionaries estimated were serving at least 52,882 students. This massive educational network of schoolhouses provided the infrastructure that would transport the Hawaiian population from a near zero literacy rate in 1820 to a conservative estimate of 91 percent literacy and perhaps as high as 95 percent by 1834. By 1832, Hawaiians had surpassed the current literacy rate in the United States, which at the time was barely 78 percent. Comparatively, during the same period of 1820-1824 literacy in the United States grew by only 6 percent, while Hawaiʻi experienced a

---

5 (see addendum 1 Literacy chart)
6 Federal Reserve Bank Report, June 2000,
phenomenal 91-plus percent increase. In fact, the literacy rate in the United States would not break the 90 percent level until 1902—68 years later, three hundred years after the first settlers landed in Jamestown.

In Europe, the overall literacy rates were much lower. While the literacy rates varied across Europe, by 1850 it had not risen very much above 50 percent. However, there was one exception, Sweden, where a 90 percent literacy rate was achieved in 1720. It was achieved after a concerted effort by the church in 1660 to bring literacy to the entire population for the purpose of, being able to read the Bible and sing church hymns. That concerted effort took sixty years; however, for most of Europe especially in the rural areas; illiteracy was very high even up until the beginning of the twentieth century.

The level of literacy prior to the twentieth century in the United States and Europe by today’s standard would be considered rudimentary at best; additionally, there were no records kept regarding any literacy tests or general examinations from which researchers could determine nineteenth century literacy. Instead the criterion researchers used to calculate both American and European literacy was the signature. If a person could sign their name, then that person was counted as being literate. Therefore voting records, land records where people signed their names no matter how crude their signature other than using an “X” were included in the total of those who were literate. Whether a signature truly signifies literacy is of course highly debatable; nevertheless having no other method or data to determine literacy, this method remains and continues to be the standard method used by researchers today. As a result, this method, by default, overstates the literacy rate for European and American populations.

Public Examinations

However, this was not the case for determining literacy in Hawai‘i. As early as September 1820, just six months after the missionaries first landed in the Hawaiian Islands, the first public quarterly examination for literacy took place and these examinations went far beyond the ability to just sign one’s name.  

Missionary Hiram Bingham reported to the ABCFM on October 12, 1822 that they had their ninth quarterly examination the previous month. Working backwards nine quarters brings us to September 1820 which means that these examinations began six months after the missionaries arrived, indicating that the first Hawaiian pupils, after only six months of instruction were able to read and write.

These quarterly public examinations were rigorous, usually lasting for two days, in which students were tested in reading, writing, composition and oratory. Incredibly, these public examinations in due course became enormously popular events that were attended by thousands of Hawaiian scholars. In one such event, missionary Levi Chamberlain wrote on April 19, 1826: 

The exhibition of improvement, and the evidence of advancement in civilization, were highly gratifying to the missionaries, and excited the surprise of foreign visitants. Most of two successive days were employed in the examination, and though we were obliged to conduct it in the open air, yet none appeared weary, or dissatisfied. The number of schools and classes examined, amounted to 69, comprising 2,409 scholars, under the direction of 66 native teachers. Between 500 and 600 scholars belonged to the neighboring districts. Some schools came the distance of 12 to 14 miles.

Less than one year later, on January 19, 1827, Bingham reports that more than six thousand scholars had attended the quarterly public examination. In a quarterly examination

---

held on January 1831, attendance reached an astounding 10,336 pupils.\textsuperscript{17} The Reverend Rubin Tinker describes one of these unique “Hawaiian-ized” public quarterly examinations that he witnessed on July 19, 20, 1831, he wrote;

The shell horn blowing early for examination of the schools, in the meeting house. About 2000 scholars present, some wrapped in large quantity of native cloth, with wreaths of evergreen about their head and ganging toward their feet—others dressed in calico and silk with large necklaces of braided hair and wreaths of red and yellow and green feathers very beautiful and expensive. It was a pleasant occasion, in which they seemed interested and happy.

…The King and chiefs were present, and examined among the rest. They read in various books, and 450 in 4 rows wrote the same sentence at the same time on slates. They perform with some ceremony. In this exercise, one of the teachers cried out with as much importance as an orderly serjeant [sic]…and immediately the whole company began to sit up straight. At the next order, they stood on their feet. At the resting on the left arm as a musician would place his fiddle. At the next order, they brought their pencils to bear upon the broadsides of their slates ready for action. Mr. Bingham then put into the crier’s ear the sentence to be written, which he proclaimed with all his might and a movement of 450 pencils commenced which from their creaking was like the music of machinery lacking oil. Their sentences were then examined and found generally correct…Eight of the Islanders delivered orations which they had written and committed to memory. Gov. Adams (Kuakini) was among the speakers.\textsuperscript{18}

What was unique and unusual about these Hawaiian public examinations was its very public nature. Missing was the heavy foreboding ominous cloud that usually attends modern-day examinations. Today, in stark contrast, examinations are generally closed, private and secret; public examinations in typical Western educational institutions are unheard of.

For Hawaiians, these examination days were both serious and festive events, drawing thousands from far distances who appeared to be looking forward to these examinations with anxious anticipation, instead of apprehensive dread. All came to this event to celebrate accomplishment in learning and mastery, rather than impending failure.

**Contrasting Methodology**

These examinations were lengthy (lasting two days), disciplined (requiring cooperative silence, order and unison performance) and rigorous (impromptu writing and reading). And in spite of this rigor,

---

\textsuperscript{17} Missionaries Letters (Unpublished), vol. 4, p. 1066.

these quarterly examinations appear to emulate the excitement of a modern-day hula exhibition or competition; apparently while these examinations were serious, they were also—fun. Those who were to be examined dressed in maile lei, western cloth, long lengths of kapa, beautiful ʻahuʻula (feather cloaks) as if they were going to a celebratory event. In Hilo, a missionary wrote:

The day that was fixed upon for the general examinations of the schools of Hilo & Puna was ushered in by the sounding of about 40 conch shells which made the air ring. The teachers & scholars anticipate, & enjoy examination with equal pleasure to children & youths of our own country. The number of scholars has greatly increased since the last examination 6 months previous, being an increase of more than one thousand scholars.¹⁹

By simply embedding the learning of the palapala²⁰ into their own time-tested, generation-honed methodology for teaching and passing on knowledge to the next generation, Hawaiians made the learning of a foreign knowledge/technology—fun. We see this kind of methodology in traditional Hula Hālau schools of dance, in which students are expected to be very serious in their memorizing chants and choreography for a very precise performance. Today, public and private educational institutions that have incorporated fun into the learning environment are considered to be on the leading edge of education.

Hawaiians from earliest times held knowledge sacred, living on an island with finite resources made the lack of specific intimate accumulated knowledge precarious, even dangerous with dire consequences. Therefore, they would have naturally developed and employed highly efficient methods for preserving and teaching accumulated knowledge to each succeeding generation. The preserving of knowledge would have been a necessary component to their continued survival as a people, on an island with limited natural resources. Hawaiians’ millennium longevity evidences that the methods they employed were highly successful.

²⁰ Note: Learning to read and write was often referred to as “the palapala.”
In contrast, some of the educational methodologies being employed in the United States during this same period were quite archaic, medieval and painful. The practice of corporal punishment in the educational process was widespread and customary; “Most district and old-field schoolteachers as well as their urban counterparts used and defended physical punishments to keep order.” In 1819, six-year-old James Sims was sent to a boarding school in South Carolina where new boys were always flogged, usually “until the youngster vomited or wet his breeches.” This marriage of corporal punishment and education in the nineteenth century American educational institutions was prevalent, pervasive and accepted; and despite significant evidence of its detrimental effects to a productive learning environment, corporal punishment in US public education still has its supporters to this day.

In the United States, the US Supreme court took the view in *Ingraham v. Wright* that school corporal punishment does not constitute cruel and unusual punishment under the Eighth Amendment and as a result there is still no federal prohibition on the use of physical discipline against children in public school. Ironically and quite bizarre is the fact that federal courts have simultaneously banned the use of corporal punishment in juvenile detention centers, ruling that corporal punishment in these institutions do indeed violate the Eighth Amendment of the United States Constitution which bans “cruel and unusual punishment.” The fact that this double-standard exists today and that the US Congress has been unwilling to legislate against corporal punishment in the schools is difficult to explain, except that it demonstrates how punishment of children in an American educational setting is deeply ingrained in American culture.

---

24 House Education and Labor Subcommittee on Health Families and Communities, “*Corporal Punishment in Schools.*”
The Missionaries

The Arrival of the Missionaries

When the missionaries arrived at Kailua, Hawai‘i in March 30, 1820, Liholiho, Kamehameha’s highest ranking son and heir to the government had just recently become Mō‘ī upon his father’s death in May 1819. Liholiho immediately convened his Ali‘i council to decide whether permission should be given to allow the missionaries to take up residence in Hawai‘i.25 The issue was discussed among the Ali‘i for thirteen days, and even after a consensus appeared to have been reached, Liholiho continued to delay his decision until he had a chance to confer with Ka‘ahumanu, who was the “Kuhina Nui” and who had been absent when the Ali‘i council was first convened.

The thirteen days was considered extremely long, especially by the American ship captain who was anxious to sail on. The unusual length of time it took to decide whether to let the missionaries stay indicates the seriousness of the discussion among the Ali‘i, who appear to have had strong concerns regarding the introduction of a new foreign religion, and more specifically Christianity. Apparently, the Ali‘i were well-informed of the dangers and tragic consequences resulting from allowing Christian missionaries into a country. However, what appears to have tipped the decision in favor of the American missionaries was that they had brought with them two important bargaining chips; a printing press and a promise to teach the “palapala” to the people. Had they not brought the printing press, the promise to teach the “palapala” and possibly their wives, permission for the missionaries to set up residence in Hawai‘i most likely would have been denied.

Incidentally, these bargaining chips would have been meaningless if some of the Ali‘i and Liholiho did not first, understand the value of the palapala, which apparently they did. Samuel Mānaiakalani Kamakau nineteenth century Hawaiian historian had noted that reading and writing was known to Hawaiians at least eight years before the coming of the missionaries;

Before the coming of the missionaries some of our people had gone to foreign lands and to Tahiti and learned to read and write and to speak in English. Such women as ‘Umi-o-kalani and Ponunu came home with a knowledge of writing. Some of our boys learned English in America. Here in Hawaii some chiefs had been taught English and could speak and read it. Ke-aka-kilohi, the son of Ka-lolo-ahi-lani and Ke‘e-au-moku, was one; others were Kahekili Ke‘e-au-moku, Ka-lua-i-Kona-hale Kuakini and Ka-umu-ali‘i, the ruling chief of Kauai, and his son Ka-mahole-lani. Of Ke-aka-kilohi who died in 1812 it is said that he was a learned chief with a good command of language, knew several secret languages, and could speak in riddles so that few could understand him.²⁶

Kaluai Konahale Kuakini and Kahekili Ke‘eaumoku was Ka‘ahumanu’s brothers and uncles to Liholiho. Thus, the art of writing had been known however, it had remained in the language of the foreigner.

**Liholiho’s Three Conditions**

Liholiho was well aware of the value of the palapala because he had already acquired the alphabet before the arrival of the missionaries from Jean Rives and therefore he understood the potential of the printing press and their offer to teach the palapala to the people.²⁷

The process that Liholiho goes through to gain the mana‘o (thoughts) of the Ali‘i and the Kuhina Nui is quite interesting. Liholiho was the Mō‘ī, the supreme authority in the Islands and since he was obviously in favor of allowing the missionaries to land, one would think that as the supreme authority he would have automatically, and singularly, granted permission; instead he delays his decision and immediately convenes a council of Ali‘i. After he gained their mana‘o he further delays his decision until he can counsel with the Kuhina Nui Ka‘ahumanu, to get her

---

Once the manaʻo of the Kuhina Nui and the council of Aliʻi were received, Liholiho makes his decision and gives permission to the missionaries to stay, only if they agree to three of his conditions. Interestingly, Liholiho’s deliberate and lengthy decision making process of seeking out counsel before making a decision challenges the characterization by westerners that Hawaiian leadership was feudalistic, despotic, repressive, or autocratic.

Liholiho’s first condition was that the doctor would have to stay with him in Kailua, Hawai‘i. The second was that the missionaries would be given one-year probation, during which if they behaved themselves and did not cause any trouble (such as sedition), then their stay would be extended. The third condition was that they would teach the Aliʻi first. However, it was the first condition that created the most anxiety for the missionaries, because when they left Boston, they had assumed that they would all be living together in the same location for protection; thus they were fearful of being split up. Lucia Holman wrote;

The King gives orders that Dr. H. and our teacher must land at Kiarooah—the village where he now resides, and the rest of the family may go to Oahhoo, or Wahhoo. We plead earnestly that we might all go to Oahhoo.  

Sybil Bingham also recorded in her journal;

The important decision is made. We are to proceed to Hoahoo to make the principal establishment, leaving two of our brethren and sisters in this place. The separation is painful….Our physician is the other to be left….The King insists upon his remaining on account of his art.

All the women of the missionary company were against staying in Kailua; more specifically they all wanted to go to Oʻahu. But Dr. Holman felt that it was in the best interest of the Mission that he stay in Kailua with Liholiho, promising the others that if things didn’t work out he would eventually join them on Oʻahu. It was at that point that it was also decided that one of the
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preachers either Bingham or Thurston should stay with the Holmans but both desired to go to Oʻahu; the decision was finally reached by casting lots.  

On April 12, Mrs. Holman wrote:

> We, with our belongings, were today set on the shores of the heathen, our friends sailing the same evening for Oahu. I need not tell you that the separation, altho a temporary one, was trying to our feelings, but our path appeared to be made plain and it was our duty to submit.

The second condition gives us a clue to what was most likely the major concern among the Aliʻi regarding the intentions of the missionaries. It had been reported to them that the missionaries were after their lands and that they were sent here to foster discord and rebellion among the people. It was also reported that in other countries where the missionaries were allowed to settle, foreigners eventually displaced the natives from the land. Reverend William Ellis wrote in 1823;

> They said they had heard that in several countries where foreigners had intermingled with the original natives, the latter had soon disappeared; and should the missionaries come to live at Waiakea, perhaps the land would ultimately become theirs, and kanakas maore [sic] (aborigines) cease to be its occupiers.

The natives of Waiakea asked the Rev. William Ellis who visited Waiakea (Hilo, Hawaiʻi Island) in 1823; if such a thing did happen in some other countries. He told them that it indeed did but reassured them that precautions had been taken to prevent such a thing from happening in Hawaiʻi. He does not mention specifically what those precautions were. However, Ellis further notes that many of the natives of Waiakea were already acquainted with the leading facts of the history of South America and the West Indies and thus, were concerned. Thus, Liholiho sent a message to Boki the Kiaʻāina (Governor) of Oʻahu;

> By his fast-sailing vessel, the Neo, the king had sent a message to Governor Boki: “This is my command. Furnish the haoles with land and houses and with provisions. Let them dwell in Honolulu for one year, if they do not make any trouble.”

---
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33 Waiakea, Hilo, Hawaiʻi, 1823.
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The third condition signifies the importance that Liholiho placed on the palapala. As mentioned earlier, Liholiho had learned the alphabet from Jean Rives a Frenchman, who had been living with him and had been holding classes to teach the palapala prior to the arrival of the missionaries.\textsuperscript{38} Unfortunately, a dispute arose between Liholiho and Rives and the classes were ended. Nevertheless, Liholiho had learned enough to scribble notes to ship Captains and would have most certainly recognized the opportunity for his people to learn the palapala (reading and writing) that was being offered by the missionaries.\textsuperscript{39}

Additionally, this third condition also suggests that Liholiho may have been anticipating a potentially massive logistical problem if all the people desired to learn the palapala; and he appeared confident that all the people would have the desire if given the opportunity. Thus, Liholiho knew that a proper order and organization needed to be established or the few missionaries would soon be over-whelmed. Prudently and sensibly, he decides to restrict the initial learning of the palapala. This decision conformed to traditional customary practice that provided an order which had been long established in Hawaiian society. This order prescribed that the leadership, the Aliʻi, should be taught first, then everyone else would follow in their proper sequence. The missionaries could not have known or expected the enormous interest the people would have in learning the palapala, and when it did happen they were dumbfounded, unable to understand it or explain why it was happening. On the contrary, Liholiho was not surprised at all, since he had properly and correctly prepared for it.

The king orders were that none should be taught to read but those of rank, those whom he gave permission, and the wives and children of white men.\textsuperscript{40}

\textsuperscript{38} John Papa ʻIʻi, \textit{Fragments of Hawaiian History}, Bishop Museum Press, p. 86.
\textsuperscript{39} ʻIʻi, \textit{Fragments of Hawaiian History}, p. 86.
\textsuperscript{40} Tomlinson, p. 42.
Liholiho’s restriction to “teach only the Ali‘i” had produced an involuntary twitch in the missionaries; triggering a dark recollection of their own past feudal experience, one that was replete with repression, oppression and privilege. This recollection coupled with their lack of the vernacular experience of Hawaiian society caused the missionaries to patently misread Liholiho’s third condition as being feudal, despotic, autocratic and oppressive. It was a misjudgment that not only the missionaries were guilty, but also many modern-day historians who continued to make the same erroneous assumption/comparison by tagging Hawaiian society with an experience from their own past;41 a past they once coined—the dark ages.

In contrast, Liholiho’s decision making process and protocol demonstrates a discipline of inclusiveness rather than autocratic; quite unlike the decision making processes practiced by the feudal lords and kings of Europe. Hawaiian genealogy had been carefully preserved and provided the foundational knowledge that reminded the people including the Ali‘i and the Mō‘ī that they were all related—that they were essentially one family. Liholiho’s purpose was clear, he wanted his leadership taught first so that they could then disseminate it to the people through their millennia long-established social organization, which would allow the literacy effort to easily expand along a natural course—a proven time-honored course conceived for the purpose of preserving and teaching valuable knowledge to future generations.

The Missionaries Delay Learning the Language

Henry Ōpūkaha‘ia had been instrumental in generating the interest necessary to send American missionaries to the Sandwich Isles. Unfortunately his untimely death on February 17, 1818, almost a year and a half before the American missionaries sailed to Hawai‘i on the brig Thaddeus prevented him from seeing his dream become a reality. Ōpūkaha‘ia in anticipation of

his return to Hawai‘i and looking towards the establishment of a Sandwich Islands mission, had translated the book of Genesis into Hawaiian and had been working on a Hawaiian grammar, dictionary and spelling book. Yet oddly, the missionaries apparently did not bring this important work with them.

Since there were no books or texts available in the Hawaiian language when the missionaries arrived, we can only conclude that those Hawaiians who were first taught the palapala, were being taught in English using Hawaiian interpreters. These first Hawaiian pupils were learning to read and write—in English. Bingham confirms when he states that it was sometime later when they determined to learn the “vernacular tongue.” How much later we are not exactly sure but it raises an important question, why did the missionaries delay learning the language when it should have been an obvious conclusion?

The passage to Hawai‘i took one hundred and sixty-four days, giving the missionaries ample opportunity to learn the language from the four Hawaiians who were traveling with them, and yet none of the missionary journals indicates that a serious study of the Hawaiian language had been conducted. The reason for this decision may have been the uncertainty of receiving permission to land in Hawai‘i and had prepared to sail to the Society Islands in the event permission was not granted. However, even after they received permission to land they continued to teach the palapala in English and did not make an earnest attempt to learn Hawaiian.

To sum it up, the missionaries did not bring Ōpūkaha‘ia’s translations with them, there is little evidence that they made a serious attempt to learn the Hawaiian language while in route to
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42 Gavan Daws, *Shoal of Time*, 1968, University of Hawai‘i Press, p. 61. Note: While this book has come under heavy criticism for its weakness in its citations, I have chosen to include it because other researchers have confirmed to me that Ōpūkaha‘ia did indeed translate the book of Genesis which will be included in their work.
Hawai‘i and after settling in Hawai‘i they continued to teach in English using their Hawaiian interpreters. These inexplicable decisions strongly suggest that there must have been other factors preventing the missionaries from embracing the obvious. Thus, we must take into account the social cultural context of the missionaries in order to understand the reasons for their delay in learning the language of their host culture and potential converts.

First and foremost, the missionaries were motivated by a sincere desire to serve their God, to willingly and bravely separate themselves from their families, friends and loved ones and embark on a mission to save “heathen” souls. From their cultural perspective, such actions which they believed also placed their lives at some risk were irrefutable evidence of pious devotion to their God. Therefore, their intent to do good—is foundational.

Correspondingly, the missionaries were also a product of an American culture imbued in capitalism, ethnocentrism and racism; ideologies naturally embraced in varying degrees as cultural members and reflected in their journals, letters and reports. As a result, their personal writing has framed them in the social context as ethnocentric and/or racist. This however, provide us with an interesting paradox, that apparently, racist ethnocentric people at great personal sacrifice, placed their lives at risk to save the dark heathen savages. While their some of their comments are associated with racism their initial actions appear to contradict the categorization. It is a common malady of simple categorizations and narrow definitions, which suggests that further exploration of the definition of racism needs to be addressed.

Although, the missionary may have represented the liberal side of their early nineteenth century society they were still bound by the social cultural taboos and ethnocentric beliefs which had achieved normalcy and pseudo-scientific fact in their society. Today, the flaws of such coarse beliefs (racism and ethnocentrism) are obvious, but for the missionaries of 1820, they
were held as truth and fact. Thus, making it highly inappropriate for a group of white New England Christian Missionaries—in the presence of their wives and other white crewmen—to be publicly instructed by dark savage native boys, regardless of their being baptized, Christianized or educated. Their good intent and liberalism curtailed by social order, proper behavior and cultural beliefs. Therefore, the propriety of learning the language in route to Hawai‘i from the four native Hawaiian young men traveling with them had already been foreclosed by social context.

Even after travelling half-way around the world, social context, cultural prohibitions, *haole* taboos of nineteenth century white society are not easily detached or left behind. These flawed cultural beliefs formed the basis of how their society distinguished the civilized from the savage and would provide the missionaries with a constant source of personal challenges, dilemmas and obstacles in the prosecution of their goal—to save heathen souls.44

Furthermore, while the missionaries most likely represented the liberal faction of early nineteenth century American white society, they were also financially dependent upon it and thus entangled in its mainstream cultural context. They may have believed that they had solved their dilemma of learning Hawaiian from the dark natives because; the three Hawaiians who accompanied them could interpret for them. This provision would have allowed them to learn the Hawaiian language at their leisure and more importantly avoid being subjected to—native teacher instruction.

What the missionaries could not have foreseen was the latent and inherent desire of Hawaiians’ quest for knowledge; more specifically the knowledge of the *palapala* (learning to read and write) which would eventually cause the missionaries to reconsider their original
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strategy—and concede, that they must learn the language. Interestingly, Bingham felt it was necessary to defend this decision in his report to the ABCFM;

“That the sudden introduction of the Hawaiian nation in its unconverted state, to general English or French literature, would have been safe and salutary, is extremely problematical.”

The fact that Bingham felt it necessary to defend their decision to learn the language, a decision that should have been naturally obvious, confirms the general ethnocentric and racial bias of the time which the missionaries were culturally obliged to follow. Unfortunately, it is not entirely clear as to what Bingham means by “extremely problematical.” However, it is clear that teaching English or French, instead of Hawaiian, was a part of the pre-planning before they sailed on the Thaddeus. Thus, teaching in English or French would have made the previous work of the translation of the book of Genesis into Hawaiian by native Hawaiian scholar Henry Ōpūkahaʻia or the need to learn the language while on board the Thaddeus—unnecessary.

**Missionaries Struggle Learning the Language**

Neither Bingham nor any of the other missionaries provided any details of the manner in which they studied the language. What could they be studying when there were no books in the Hawaiian language to study? By 1821, the missionaries write desperately to the ABCFM for books on orthography, lexicons, Tahitian language, but noticeably absent from their letters and correspondences are the names of Hawaiians who must have instructed them regarding proper pronunciation, idioms, grammar, dialect, usage and/or terminologies.

Essentially, there were only two groups of people who could help them; the dark native Hawaiians or the white foreigners who could speak Hawaiian. At first, the missionaries naturally gravitated to the white foreigners who appeared to have acquired the language, with the thought
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45 Bingham, *A Residence of Twenty-one Years in the Sandwich Islands*, p. 103.
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of learning the language from them. However, they soon complain, that often the pronunciations or interpretations that they received were incorrect or not reliable, which they contend, contributed greatly to their delay in acquiring of the language.\footnote{Bingham, p. 153.} If the missionaries obeyed their social cultural constraints and refrained from being instructed by a native; then the only avenue left for learning the language was to be self-taught and without the aid of any written text in Hawaiian. Though this idea appears extraordinarily absurd, it does proffer a plausible explanation as to why the first company of missionaries took so long to learn the language.

Whether the first company of missionaries used native instructors as their teachers in learning the language during their first year and a half in the islands, their personal journals do not record it. We can then speculate that they may have restrained themselves from seeking regular native instruction and only sought out clarification on specific points. Thereby, technically circumventing the definition of “being taught by;” thus faithfully observing their social cultural taboo and inadvertently impeding their learning the Hawaiian language.

Two and a half years after their arrival, the missionaries were still using an interpreter when preaching their sermons. In a letter sent October 20, 1822 Lucia Thurston wrote to her husband, the Rev. Asa Thurston:

> I truly rejoice in the prospect of your contemplated short excursion, viewing it as placing you in a situation to facilitate your gathering up, and becoming master of this unwritten language. I hope you will be unwearied in your daily efforts to become thoroughly acquainted with the language, and that you will not too long delay addressing the people, independently of an interpreter, though with a stammering tongue. \footnote{Lucy Goodale Thurston, \textit{Life and Times of Mrs. Lucy G. Thurston}, Wife of Rev. Asa Thurston, Pioneer Missionaries to the Sandwich Islands, S.C. Andrews Ann Arbor Maine, p. 70.}

Was Asa Thurston a slow learner? Asa Thurston was a Yale college graduate. He had two and a half years of being surrounded and immersed in the Hawaiian language and was still unable to
preach in Hawaiian. Hence, his delay in acquiring the language cannot be explained without applying the issue of cultural context.

Interestingly, the Reverend William Ellis, a London Missionary Society (LMS) missionary, who had spent six years in the Society Islands (Tahiti) and had arrived in Hawai‘i on March 28, 1822; in just a little more than a month later, he would become the first foreigner to preach a sermon in the Hawaiian language.\(^{50}\) The American missionaries immediately saw Ellis as a solution to their dilemma in acquiring the language. Ellis had easily transitioned his knowledge of the Tahitian language to Hawaiian, nationalistic boundaries were quickly put aside and they promptly solicited Ellis to join them in their missionary efforts in Hawai‘i. With Ellis (even though he was British) they could be instructed in the language without violating their social cultural prohibition or personal approbation. Bingham then makes an impassioned appeal to the ABCFM to accept this London Missionary Society missionary into their fold.

After giving the subject a prayerful consideration all were united in the opinion, that Mr. Ellis was particularly needed here, at the present conjuncture. The reasons of this determination are briefly these viz. His knowledge of the language, which differs little from that of the Society Islands, gives him great advantages toward preaching the Gospel to the natives speedily and extensively;\(^{51}\)

The words, “speedily and extensively” confirm that the American missionaries recognized the extreme length of time that it was taking them to learn the language. In truth, Ellis is not a native Hawaiian language speaker but a Tahitian speaker who converted his Tahitian to Hawaiian. Though the languages may be somewhat similar, there are differences which would have made Ellis’s Hawaiian language skills decidedly inferior to those native Hawaiians such as Thomas Hopu and others, whom the missionaries had long depended upon to translate and interpret their

\(^{50}\) Kuykendall, *The Hawaiian Kingdom*, vol. 1, p. 103.

\(^{51}\) Annual Reports of the ABCFM, vol. 1, p. 108.
sermons and discourses. Obviously, Ellis’s selection and appeal was assessed more upon cultural bias context than on his proficiencies in the Hawaiian language.

For the second company of missionaries who arrived in 1823, the cultural bias context regarding learning the language was less of a problem because they could now be instructed by those of the first company. However, for the newly arrived missionaries William Richards and Charles Stewart who were assigned to Lahaina where there was no white person to instruct them the old cultural prohibition dilemma once again prevailed. Richards wrote on January 31, 1825 one year and nine months after their arrival in Hawai‘i regarding the dilemma of learning the language that he was under:

My ability has lain in my ignorance of the language. This barrier to usefulness is now in part removed & I converse with the people with some degree of ease. For the last five months I have been more systematic in my attention to the language than formerly, and while I have been thus attending to the language I have been accomplishing another very desirable object. I mean a translation of the gospel of Matthew. The course I pursue is this. In the morning I take Knapp’s Testament, Schleumen’s Lexicon, Dodnedge’s exposition and a few other helps and strictly examine the passage I design to translate. In the afternoon, Maro my teacher comes, and Taua the Tahitian. I give the passage to Maro according to the best knowledge I have of the language. Then Taua gives it to him from the Tahitian translation, then Maro puts it into pure Hawaiian & I write it down.52

For Richards, trying to learn a native language and obeying their ethnocentric social taboos proved frustrating, wearisome and unintelligible. Perhaps out of this frustration, he blatantly and publicly decides to ignore the unwritten haole taboo and boldly identifies as his teacher—a native Hawaiian, he is the first missionary to do so.

Unlike other Western recorders, historians, ethnographers, scientists, researchers who bury the identities of their native sources under the faceless title of “native informant” or “native assistant;” Richards boldly names a native as his teacher and he names another native as his equal in translation. Whether Richards would have been equal to Taua in translation is somewhat doubtful. However, Richards appears to have come to the conclusion, after struggling

52 Missionary Letters (Unpublished), vol. 2, p. 723a. Note: Maro = Malo or David Malo. [January 31,1825]
for fifteen months, that learning the language and translating the Bible expeditiously, was far more important than submitting to an unwritten nonsensical haole taboo, which under the present circumstances was entirely useless, a great impediment to the work and in spreading the gospel—which he is unashamed to put to print. Interestingly, it took the first company of missionaries twenty-two months, almost two years, before they were able to overcome their cultural bias context regarding being instructed by natives. Sybil Bingham wrote on February 12, 1823;

Mr. B has gone with Mr. E. to spend the evening, according to engagement with Krimoku and the King, as pupils, to be instructed in the Hawaii language.

Loomis had also been going to Kalanimoku for instruction of the language, which had been noted by second company missionary Levi Chamberlain.53 While Bingham, Ellis and Loomis demonstrated that it was possible to reset their cultural bias context, I have been unable to find in any of their personal writings, an admission that they had received native instruction in the language. Flawed social cultural context is extremely complex, multi-faceted and not easily erased or modified, especially when it concerns “taboo subjects” such as ethnocentrism or what we call racism today—the modifying or elimination of such beliefs, education, experience and desire.

---

Chapter 2

Hawaiians Engage the *Palapala*

Liholiho’s Experiment with the *Palapala*

While the missionaries struggled learning the Hawaiian language this was not the case with two early Hawaiian scholars learning the English language. Soon after, the Thurstons settled in Kailua, Liholiho placed two of his attendants, John Papa ‘I‘i and James Kahuhu with them to be instructed in reading. Liholiho told the Thurstons, “Teach these, my favorites, ‘I‘i and Kahuhu. It will be the same as teaching me.”

54 Lucy Goodale Thurston, p. 42-43.

55 Lucy Goodale Thurston, p. 42-43.

After some months he returned to hear how well they could read; He was delighted with their improvement, and shook Mr. Thurston most cordially by the hand—pressed it between both his own—then kissed it.

Liholiho appears to be very pleased with their progress. John Papa ‘I‘i and James Kahuhu were perfect pupils for Liholiho’s experiment in the learning of the *palapala*. They were selected to be Liholiho’s attendants because of their genealogy (*being closely related*), their keen intellect (*the ability to learn quickly*) and their attention to detail in following the instructions of their parents.

For Hawaiians, memory held all knowledge, therefore training to memorize important protocol, *oli* (*chants*), *pule* (*prayer*), *mo‘okū‘auhau* (*genealogy*) and *mo‘olelo* (*stories*), all of which was necessary to properly serve the *Ali‘i*, began at a very young age and was practiced by all Hawaiians from time immemorial. This practice created an inherent ability in Hawaiians to memorize quickly, accurately and copiously. The *Kumulipo* an ancient Hawaiian creation chant of 2,000 plus lines long was one of thousands of *oli* that were passed down through the 800
generations. This inherent ability to memorize made the learning of a new language and the technology of literacy, hikiwale (easy thing to do), uncomplicated, straightforward and simple.

Lucy Thurston gives an account of Hawaiians remarkable ability to memorize. Each Friday she held a Bible reading class for Hawaiian women in which she would read to them from the Bible. After one of those meetings she wrote of a visit by two Hawaiian women.

Two women of cultivated tenacious memories, came up to our house after meeting and wished me to read that chapter again. After I did so they assisted each other and began by repeating the line of names from Abram to David, to the captivity, to Jesus. They went through successfully, only asking aid in recalling two names.56

And soon after the missionaries arrived in Honolulu, a Hawaiian mother Pulunu and her two daughters approached them and asked to be instructed. The missionaries were eager to begin their work and were surprised at her quick progress.

We readily consented; and both mother and daughters became interesting members of the school. In a few weeks the mother conquered the main difficulty in acquiring an ability to read and write, and the others before many months. On the 1st of August, the slate was introduced, and by the 4th, Pulunu wrote on her slate, from a Sabbath School card, the following sentence in English; “I cannot see God, but God can see me.”57

Another young boy was taken in and schooled and made rapid improvement, “so that in a few months, he could read intelligibly several portions of the English Bible.”58 We should keep in mind that Pulunu and all the pupils who attended the public quarterly examinations prior to 1822 were tested to see if they could read and write not in Hawaiian, but in the foreign language of English, which is quite remarkable.

Just one year after the arrival of the missionaries, James Kahu, John ‘I‘i, Ha‘alilo and Kauikeouli were among the first pupils selected to be teachers. They are the first native Hawaiian teachers mentioned by the missionaries who are now teaching Hawaiians how to read and write in—English.

56 Lucia Goodale Thurston, p. 90.
57 Bingham, Residence of Twenty-one years in the Sandwich Isles, p. 106.
58 Bingham, p. 107.
The fact that ‘I‘i and Kahuhu were able to learn to read and write in the foreign language of English in a matter of months, demonstrated to Liholiho that this foreign technology of literacy could be learned quickly. Liholiho then moves forward with his plans for bringing literacy to all of his people by arranging for a special visit to the Thurston. Lucy Thurston wrote that Liholiho had arrived in full western dress: ruffled shirt, silk vest, pantaloons and coat. He then inspected their house and cellar and complimented everything that they did.\[^{59}\]

Liholiho’s arrival in western dress and his formal inspection of their house indicates that his visit was pre-determined, deliberate and for a specific purpose:

He [Liholiho] expressed his wish to have the missionaries learn all the Hawaiian sound—he would assist them then books and prayers in the native language could be printed. He criticized the pronunciation of some dozen words. He wished to know how far his favorite young men under Mr. Thurston had proceeded in their spelling books and Testaments. When he was shown, and had looked at their writing books, he three times expressed how very sorry he was that he had left off learning; felt vexed with himself for so doing…In giving his aloha, his parting address was; “Don’t pray for rain today, because we are going to have a grand dance.”\[^{61}\] [underline added.]

It is inconceivable, that Liholiho was not aware that his two attendants could read and write at the time of his visit; they were his closest attendants and would have kept him well-informed on their progress. Hence, Liholiho’s request served to demonstrate to Thurston that since it was easy for his two attendants to learn how to read and write in English, then it should be just as easy for the missionaries to learn Hawaiian and to produce “books and prayers in the native language”—which was the real purpose of his visit.

Liholiho’s gesture to “assist them” indicates that he knew that the learning of the Hawaiian language by the missionaries had not yet begun. Liholiho makes a personal commitment to assist them reinforcing the importance and priority he placed on their learning the language as soon as possible and without any further delay. Regardless, of why the missionaries
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had put off learning the language or why they had reasoned that teaching the *palapala* in English should be their first option, at that instant it was irrelevant. To the missionaries this direct request by Liholiho carried the weight of a royal command. Clearly, Liholiho had tactfully and unmistakably made his point—he wanted the gate—wide open.

Liholiho saw that literacy was possible for all his people, not just literacy in English but literacy in the Hawaiian language. What was needed was for all the Hawaiian sounds to be properly attached to the corresponding alphabet(s). Delighted with the early results of his literacy experiment and now with the missionaries committed to learning the language, he was excited about literacy’s future prospects and he was ready to celebrate with a “grand dance.”

**Hawaiians Begin Learning the *Palapala***

January 7, 1822, twenty-one months after the arrival of the missionaries, the first eight pages of the *pīʻāpā* (Hawaiian spelling book or elementary lessons)\(^{62}\) that Liholiho mentioned he would “assist in preparing” was printed.\(^{63}\) Anxious to begin and not waiting for the second eight pages of the *pīʻāpā* to be completed, approximately seventy Hawaiians began studying the new alphabet; they found the lessons easy and soon mastered them.\(^{64}\) Later in February, the last eight pages were printed and the first *pīʻāpā* with its sixteen pages was completed. On February 1, 1822 the missionaries reported to the ABCFM;

> Our pupils will devour books in this language as fast as we can make them.\(^{65}\)

> Fast as impressions are given to paper, the scholars seize their language with much avidity & delight.\(^{66}\)

Lucy Thurston wrote on January 31, 1822:

---

\(^{62}\) Note: This book which contained the Hawaiian alphabet was called the spelling book, elementary lessons and the *pīʻāpā* or *biaba*.

\(^{63}\) Missionary Letters (Unpublished), vol. 1, p. 140.

\(^{64}\) Bingham, *Residence of Twenty-one Years*, p.160.

\(^{65}\) Missionary Letters (Unpublished), vol. 1, p. 16.

\(^{66}\) Missionary Letters (Unpublished), vol. 1, p. 94.
The youngest boy, of six years old, has his daily lessons in the English and Owhyhian spellings, the English language & the testament, and the rapid improvement he is making is surpassed by few American pupils of a corresponding age.\(^{67}\)

Sybil Bingham wrote on August 9, 1822;

Tuesday Cox [Kahekili-Ke‘eaumoku] who has always appeared friendly, came publicly forth and declared his intention of having himself and his people become regular pupils sent immediately for books and a teacher and with a request that a religious meeting be held at his house in the evening….Krimokoo[Kalanimoku] declared his intention of having all about him furnished with books.\(^{68}\)

In total, five hundred pī‘āpā were printed in that first edition which was soon exhausted and which prompted a printing of a second edition of 2,000 copies, only six months later in September.\(^{69}\) However, the second printing only fueled the fire for more books, which the missionaries on Kaua‘i described soon after receiving their newly printed allotment of spelling books:

For several days our house was thronged with natives pleading for books. We were unable to gratify but a small part of them. Since, we have received a supply, and there are now probably not less than three hundred, who attend more or less to learning. Several of our former scholars have become teachers.\(^{70}\)

The pī‘āpā and its instruction is an instant hit, as Liholiho had envisioned. The demand begins to increase exponentially. Even the elderly are seek the palapala; Kakupuoki, sister of Naihe, who was one of the wives of Kalani‘ōpu‘u, now age 80, and who claimed to have had no less than forty husbands during her lifetime, had a fervent desire to learn the palapala;\(^{71}\)

Soon after the establishing of a school in this place, she came with several of her people as one of our pupils. But being old, and slow of apprehension, she appeared the most unpromising scholar that we ever had. It was with the utmost difficulty and after a long time that she was able to remember her alphabet. We often advised her to give up the thought of learning to read the word of God, that she persevered. She chose one of her female attendants who had become an expert
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in reading to be her teacher. Her book was her daily companion at home and abroad, and at length after 2 or 3 years and is now able to read a chapter with tolerable facility.\textsuperscript{72}

For the missionaries, it was difficult to understand why an 80 year-old Aliʻi woman, would want to go through the toil and stress of learning the palapala, and evidently as Kamakau explains Kakupuoki was not the exception.

Before the end of the year [1823] the old people over eighty and ninety years old were reading the Bible. Ke-kupu-ohi, Ka-ʻele-o-Waipiʻo, Kamakau, and their families all learned to read and write.\textsuperscript{73}

The innate desire for knowledge that Kakupuoki, Kekupuohi, Kaʻeleowaiʻo, Kamakau and other elderly denotes the high value Hawaiians placed on knowledge, regardless of their age.

The 2,000 copies of the pīʻāpā were speedily distributed and more editions were printed; however, the missionaries soon realized that they could not keep up with the demand. From the island of Hawaiʻi the missionaries wrote:

> The general cry on this island is for books and teachers. From Waipio on the north, to Puna on the south-east, the cry comes up to us. Kamakau tells us he wants four thousand books to send to Kau, where Naihe and Kapiolani are sojourning. Gov. Adams wants a kini, forty thousand books for his and Kaahumanu's people. \textit{But we have not one on hand!}\textsuperscript{74}

From Oʻahu Bingham wrote:

> Do send us paper and other articles of stationery. You cannot send too much nor too soon. You will excuse our importunity on this subject – the cry rings in our ears continually – “give us the palapala”, “give us the slates”, -- “give us the pencils”, “give us ink” – “make haste and give us the biber.\textsuperscript{[sic]}\textsuperscript{75}

Missionary Elijah Loomis wrote;

> In one place was found 16 or 18 persons able to read, all of whom learned from one Spelling-Book.\textsuperscript{76}

By August 30, 1825, 16,000 copies of spelling books, 4,000 copies of a small scripture tract and 4,000 copies of a catechism had been printed and distributed.\textsuperscript{77} On October 8, 1829, missionary

\textsuperscript{72} Missionary Letters (Unpublished), vol. 3, p. 1014-1015.
\textsuperscript{73} Kamakau, \textit{Ruling Chiefs}, p. 249.
\textsuperscript{74} Bingham, p. 257.
\textsuperscript{75} Missionary Letters (Unpublished), vol. 2, p. 304.
\textsuperscript{76} Missionary Letters (Unpublished), vol. 1, p. 147.
Stephen Sheppard reported to the ABCFM that 140,000 spelling books had been printed; 120,000 were printed in Hawai‘i [sic] and 20,000 were printed in Utica.\(^7\) It is an incredible number when compared to the estimated population, which the missionaries estimated to be about 150,000—160,000; which meant that possibly 90 percent of the population was in possession of a spelling book.

The overwhelming demands for the pī‘āpā and for its instruction dumbfounded the missionaries; while they are extremely happy with its acceptance they are unable to explain it. They could not explain why a people would want to learn how to read and write in their own language especially when there were no books in their language for them to read. And as far as the missionaries could determine, there was no additional financial or material benefit for the people, especially the Maka‘ainana. Thus, some missionaries reasoned that the people learned the palapala for…reflection; while other missionaries believed it was…providence.\(^7\)

**The First Spelling Book**

Who actually created the first elementary spelling book is not entirely clear. Although Bingham and Ellis have generally been given credit for its creation, there are problems with this assumption.\(^8\) First, we know that Ellis did not arrive in Hawai‘i until March 28, 1822, almost two months after the first spelling book was printed.\(^9\) Therefore, it was impossible for Ellis to have helped in the preparation of the first spelling book and yet Bingham insists that Ellis was instrumental in their acquiring the language. The problem appears to stem from a partial letter published in the Missionary Herald in 1825 which stated;

\(^7\) Missionary Letters (Unpublished), vol. 2, p. 316.

\(^8\) Missionary Letters (Unpublished), vol. 3, p. 822. Note: Bingham claims that most of the presswork was done by Hawaiians. Letter dated February 22, 1827 missionaries letters vol. 2, p. 484.

\(^9\) Missionary Letters (Unpublished), vol. 3, p. 812


April 13. Mr. Loomis has to day finished printing an edition of 3,000 copies of the elementary lessons for schools prepared jointly by Messers, Bingham and Ellis. It contains the alphabet, Arabic figures, and a specimen of Roman numerals, and exercises in spelling from monosyllables to words of ten syllables, with a due proportion of exercises in reading.\footnote{Missionary Herald, XXI, p. 210.}

The assumption by later writers and historians, that came out of this letter, was that the elementary lessons which Bingham and Ellis prepared was the same elementary spelling book that was first printed on January 7, 1822; clearly, it is not.\footnote{Note: Ellis did not arrive in Hawai‘i until March 1822 two months after the first spelling book was printed.}

On August 22, 1822, just five months after his arrival, Ellis leaves Hawai‘i for Tahiti to retrieve his family; he returns the following year on February 5, 1823. The date of the above letter is April 13, 1824 more than two years after the printing of the first elementary book and a year after Ellis returned to Hawai‘i. According to the 1832 Annual Report of the ABCFM there were three elementary books printed (probably different versions), the first book had four editions printed, the second, two editions and the third, three editions.\footnote{Annual Report of the A.B.C.F.M., vol. 1, 24th meeting, 1832, p. 78.} The report also mentioned that a spelling book was then printed, only once and without any further editions.\footnote{Note: There are no dates supplied with the printing of each version or editions except that each project appears to be listed in a chronological order that they were produced.}

Therefore, it appears that Bingham and Ellis may have prepared a revision of the elementary lessons or they prepared the Spelling book that was printed only once.\footnote{Note: In 1826 the missionaries voted to remove the “r” and “i” from the Hawaiian alphabet, Bingham and Ellis were for keeping it therefore their spelling book would have become obsolete after 1826 and not requiring further editions. Furthermore the first spelling book of 1822 or pīʻāʻpā had several editions printed due to its enormous demand.}

However, there are fundamental problems with the idea that the missionaries were capable of producing the first spelling book. The missionaries clearly were struggling with the language due to their obeisance to their social cultural ethnocentric context. After Ellis arrives they immediately make an impassioned plea to the ABCFM in behalf of Mr. Ellis for permission to allow him to join their mission as a London missionary. The first and foremost reason that
they give is that he was able to make the adjustment from Tahitian to Hawaiian with relative ease and had begun preaching in the Hawaiian language, something that the American missionaries were incapable of performing but desperately in need of, they wrote;

The following considerations influenced our minds to come to this decision: Your missionaries were laboring under great difficulties in acquiring the language of this people: difficulties, which, we perceived, would not be surmounted for a considerable period. Mr. Ellis being intimately acquainted with the Tahitian language, which is radically the same with this, we were convinced that he would render essential service to your missionaries in this particularly; and thus accelerate the period, when they will be able to declare to these islanders, in their own tongue, the wonderful works of God.87

This letter could have only been composed at the earliest, after Ellis’s arrival to Hawai‘i which would have been April 1822, four months after the printing of the first spelling book. In retrospect, Ellis’s arrival in Hawai‘i was quite propitious for the missionaries. Almost a year earlier they had seriously contemplated a trip down to the Society Islands during the summer of 1821 to interview with the missionaries at Otaheite (Tahiti), for the purpose of obtaining books of the Tahitian alphabet and help in learning the language.88 Unfortunately, Kaumuali‘i who was going to provide a ship to take the missionaries to Tahiti was dissuaded by the foreign traders, to which Bingham was clearly upset as he wrote to the ABCFM of his great disappointment which he blamed on the designs of wicked men (foreigners/traders) and the evil forces of the adversary.89 Incidentally, Bingham would not give his first public address in Hawaiian until August 4, 182290 and we know that Asa Thurston was still using an interpreter as late as October 1822.

What is also peculiarly absent is that none of the missionaries, not even Bingham or Ellis, has made a direct claim regarding the authorship of the first spelling book or participating in its construction in any of their letters to the ABCFM or in any of their writings. Furthermore, the

87 Annual Report of the ABCFM, vol. 1, p. 188.
88 Missionary Letters (Unpublished), vol. 1, p. 6.
89 Missionary Letters (Unpublished), vol. 1, p. 11.
90Bingham, p. 162.
missionary reports to the ABCFM are void of any specific details as to how they determined the alphabet, the foreign sounds or orthography. In contrast, the details of their reasoning, debate and arguments for revising the Hawaiian alphabet which eliminated certain consonants in 1826 were quite lengthy and meticulous.

More importantly, we must ask the question, would the missionaries have been proficient and knowledgeable enough to know all the Hawaiian sounds prior to January 1822? Would they have been competent enough to select the right consonants/vowels or vowels/vowels combinations necessary to reproduce all the Hawaiian sounds properly?91 By their own admission they were still struggling with the language at least three months after the spelling book had been printed and consequently could not have known nor could have been proficient in pronouncing all the Hawaiian sounds. Therefore, it is highly unlikely that they were capable of producing the first spelling book—especially without a lot of native help.

In order to convert the Hawaiian language to the alphabet someone was needed who would have known all the Hawaiian sounds, proper pronunciation and who understood how the alphabet functioned to reproduce the correct sound. The prime candidates would have been Thomas Hopu and John Honoliʻi young Hawaiian men who were fluent in Hawaiian and schooled at the Foreign Mission School at Cornwall, Connecticut. Other candidates were John Papa ʻIʻi and James Kahuhu attendants of Liholiho, the first pupils of the Thurston who learned to read and write in English within several months. Kuakini, Kiaʻāina (Governor) of Hawaiʻi Island and brother of Kaʻahumanu was already fluent in English before the missionaries arrived;92 so was Kahekili Keʻeaumoku Hoapili Kiaʻāina (Governor) of Maui.93 John Young,

91 Note: Bingham writes in his book, “A Residence of Twenty-one Years in the Sandwich Islands” a detailed account of how they determined the orthography, however his consonants that he claims was determined in 1822 had already eliminated the b, r, t, and the v which did not occur until 1826.
92 Missionaries Letters (Unpublished), vol. 1, p. 60; Kamakau, Ruling Chiefs, p. 244-245.
trusted haole advisor to Kamehameha I could have helped. They all might have helped. And of course Liholiho who was committed to producing “books and prayers in the native language” and whom the missionaries reported could read intelligibly from the New Testament as early as July 1820 just three months after their arrival.\(^\text{94}\)

However, of the possible candidates, Thomas Hopu working jointly with John Papa ‘I‘i and James Kahuhu, may have been the most likely people to have succeeded in producing the original pī‘āpā, along with Liholiho who would have been carefully following their progress. Thomas Hopu had left Hawai‘i with Ōpūkaha‘ia on the same ship. Later, he and Ōpūkaha‘ia attended Cornwall together. It was while Ōpūkaha‘ia was at Cornwall that he completed his translation of the book of Genesis.\(^\text{95}\) Therefore, Thomas Hopu would have been privy to how Ōpūkaha‘ia had worked out his alphabet. Interestingly, on December 26, 1821, just twelve days before the first copy of the spelling book was printed Sybil Bingham recorded in her journal;

> The Russians appear interested in him [Thomas]—have had him on board several days to assist them in forming a vocabulary of this language. It is through their influence that he is now attendant upon the queen.\(^\text{96}\)

However, Thomas Hopu left Hawai‘i when he was a boy, his knowledge of all the Hawaiian sounds or words would not have been thorough or complete, this is where John Papa ‘I‘i and James Kahuhu would have been able to fill in, especially after the two had learned to read and write the English alphabet.

**Palapala ka Mea Maika‘i: “The Good Thing”**

The literacy effort was progressing so well that Liholiho refused to take the customary harbor-fees of those ships that brought more teachers.\(^\text{97}\) In a letter to Capt. Clasby he wrote;

\(^{93}\) Missionaries Letters (Unpublished), vol. 1, p. 9.  
\(^{94}\) Missionaries Letters (Unpublished), vol. 1, p. 98. (Letter dated: July 20, 1820.)  
\(^{95}\) Daws, *Shoal of Time*, p. 61.  
Aroha oe. Eia kau wahi olelo ia oe. Maitai no oe i kou haavi ana mai i ka kumu hou. Aore oe e uku i ke ava---aore akahi. Aroha ino oe. RihoRiho Iolani.  

Love to you. This is my communication to you. You have done well in bringing hither the new teachers. You shall pay nothing on account of the harbour---no, nothing at all. Grateful affection to you. Riho-Riho Iolani.

These harbor fees amounted to £160 which would be equivalent to $20,462.45 today. It underscores the desire and commitment Liholiho had for the palapala and his goal to teach it to all of his people.

The force behind the literacy effort is undoubtedly Liholiho, which is further evidenced by the fact that the missionaries become known to the people as the “the king’s curiosities.”

The following year on November 27, 1823, Liholiho departed on his fateful voyage to England, however, before he left, he gave instructions to his people to learn the palapala. As a result, his literacy campaign continued to grow as it entered into the conduits of Hawaiian society and its organizational structure for disseminating knowledge. A month after Liholiho sailed for England, missionary Elijah Loomis wrote on December 31, 1823:

Probably nearly 2,000 of the natives are now able to read, and a considerable write, so as to hold correspondence with each other. A few have commenced the study of arithmetic. Such is the desire of the natives for instruction and such the facility with which they learn that it would seem that the whole population would become able to read, if they had the books put into their hands, without further effort on our part.

Amazed at the progress, Hawaiians were making towards literacy in such a short period, Loomis identifies two key reasons that he believes is the cause of this unexpected literacy explosion;

First, the general desire of Hawaiians to learn and; Second, their facility to learn. This general

---

98 Stewart, *Journal of a Residence in the Sandwich Islands*, 1826, p. 108
102 Missionary Letters (Unpublished), p. 146-147. [December 31, 1823]
103 Missionary Letters (Unpublished), vol. 1, p. 147.
desire to learn is evident as it attracted even those Hawaiians who were out of the immediate purview of the missionaries or the schools, and who learned the palapala on their own initiative. Due to the enormous demand the spelling books became a scarce commodity. Judiciously, the missionaries refused to sell books to those whom they did not know or who did not learn from a teacher that they knew. However, one group whom the missionaries did not know insisted that they sell books to them. Richards wrote of their encounter;

We would buy, but you will not sell to us. You have now obtained some books and give them to many lazy persons who will not learn them, but here we are intent on learning, but your own teachers will let us have no books. Think again, is this proper? We queried with them saying, perhaps you are not more industrious than others to whom we give books. They answered, ‘yes we are, you have seen none like us in Lahaina. We have had no books, you have not taught us at all, we have had nothing to learn with except this stone board. (holding up a slate) and still we can write’. We said to them, “let us see”. They each took the slate & wrote, ‘Ke noi aku nei au ia oe i wahi biaba”. My entreaty of you is a spelling book. By this powerful argument we were convinced that we ought to give them books.104

Again, while it was clear to the missionaries that Hawaiians possessed a strong desire to learn the palapala they were puzzled as to why. What the missionaries did not know was that Hawaiian traditions valued knowledge and held it sacred; and because Hawaiians held knowledge sacred, the desire to learn was always a constant.

One young man asked me for a book yesterday, & I inquired of him who his teacher was He replied, “My desire to learn, my ear, to hear, my eye, to see, my hands, to handle, for, from the sole of my foot to the crown of my head I love the “palapala.”105

This young man’s response exhibits Hawaiian oratory eloquence, sophistication and desire. However, desire alone does not always generate phenomenal results. Loomis recognized that the facility to learn was a key element as to why he believed literacy was being acquired so quickly by the Hawaiians.

Two or three instances when they have learned the alphabet the first day; in a word they are lovely youth.106 [punctuation added]

105 Missionary Letters (Unpublished), vol. 1, p. 82.
106 Missionary Letters (Unpublished), vol. 1, p. 117.
At Waimanu, a youth, Wahapuu, being taught by Lima, was found to have learned to spell and read well, or to have mastered his spelling book, in the short space of five days.\textsuperscript{107}

As an oral society who valued knowledge, they were duty-bound to train their minds from an early age, to be able to memorize and maintain vast amounts of accumulated knowledge. The longer a society matures, greater are the amount of accumulated knowledge that must be passed on. Ingeniously, Hawaiians specifically selected gifted children with keen intellects, at an early age, to be their depositories of treasured and important knowledge; knowing that these children would eventually become the future leaders or trusted advisors. This selection rewarded those who were gifted with the best foods and with special care, thus naturally prolonging their lives and increasing their chance to pass their knowledge and their genes on to future generations. Thus, with each succeeding generation the treasured abilities, in this case the ability to memorize quickly and copiously, would over time, naturally increase and propagate throughout the general population.

It is gratifying to add that most of the schools have not only learned to read, but have already committed to memory most of the tracts which the mission has printed.\textsuperscript{108}

They are nearly all adults. They read the scriptures & recite portions of them from memory. 30 verses is a common lesson. One female, apparently near 60 years of age, & obliged to use spectacles, recited 37. A middle aged woman repeated 62. These lessons I understood were committed in one week.\textsuperscript{109}

On June 22, 1824, Kaʻahumanu and Kalanimoku gave the literacy effort a calculated boost by making a proclamation, “when schools are established, all the people shall learn the palapala.”\textsuperscript{110} The fact that the proclamation was made while Liholiho was on a trip to England demonstrates that initiative and leadership continued even after he was gone and that the Aliʻi were actively involved and in agreement with the single belief that the palapala was a “good

\textsuperscript{107} Bingham, \textit{Twenty-one Years in the Sandwich Islands}, p. 297.
\textsuperscript{108} Missionary Letters (Unpublished), vol. 3, p. 975.
\textsuperscript{109} Missionary Letters (Unpublished), vol. 3, p. 815.
\textsuperscript{110} \textit{The Missionary Herald} XXII, p. 240.
thing.” Clearly, the Aliʻi were not the consummate bureaucrats, and it appears that their system of government did not support it.

Once the proclamation was made; that everyone should learn the *palapala*, it now took on the mantle of *kuleana* (responsibility). Learning the *palapala* became the *kuleana* of the people. *Kuleana* is a Hawaiian concept that evokes obedience through moral responsibility and proper behavior, which is quite different from Western law which demands obedience to the letter of the law, by ultimatum and penalty. The literacy proclamation was not a “do this or else” kind of law and interestingly the Aliʻi did not feel a need to add an “or else” clause to the proclamation. Thus, there was no penalty for those who choose not to learn the *palapala*. This proclamation simply conveyed to the people that the *palapala* was good, and their leaders recommended learning it. That simple recommendation was enough to encourage the people to begin learning the *palapala* en masse; indicating the existence of a high level of trust between the Aliʻi and the Makaʻāinana; between the people and their leadership, a level of trust which does not appear to exist in most modern governments today.

In fact the common people neither have (n)or desire to have any opinion or will independent of their Chief’s to whom they pay the most implicit deference, and consider as incapable of a wrong action.

It is for this reason that we pay a particular attention to the instruction of the Chiefs, that through them we may obtain access to the people. And if this course were not pursued, our labor would be in vain, in attempting to arrest the attention of the common people.\textsuperscript{111}

It is true, also, that it is almost impossible for the chiefs to give their subjects what may properly be termed *advice*. Their *wishes*, when once known to the people, are in effect as absolute as their *will*, and their *advice* has all the force of *command*.\textsuperscript{112}

In a collision of cultures, the missionaries could not understand the motivation behind the *Makaʻāinana* consistent and almost universal loyalty to their *Aliʻi*. The missionary’s historical experience with their own leadership, especially those who once held absolute power was grim;

\textsuperscript{111} Missionary Letters (Unpublished), vol. 1, p. 178.
\textsuperscript{112} Annual Report of the ABCFM, 24\textsuperscript{th} annual meeting, p. 76.
their recollections mired in oppression, despotism, poverty, ignorance and disease. Obviously, the peasants of Europe viewed their lords in a much different light than the Makaʻāinana viewed their Aliʻi. The level of devotion that both the Aliʻi and the Makaʻāinana exhibited towards each other is quite remarkable and may in part; explain how compliance or conformance was achieved in the absence of a large police force—indicating that a different societal order and governance system other than feudal must have been in place in order to produce such a high level of trust.

One fundamental belief that all Hawaiians, Makaʻāinana and Aliʻi shared was the belief in a common ancestor which identified the Aliʻi as their elder sibling which meant that a familial order had long been established and preserved. The kaikaina (younger sibling) serves and respects the kaikuaʻana (elder sibling) and it was the responsibility of the kaikuaʻana to malama (protect and care) their kaikaina.113 This principle had been incorporated into all facets of Hawaiian life that included the land, plants, animals and the cosmos.114 The missionaries were unable to understand it because they had nothing in their history that was equivalent, therefore in their ethnocentric rationale, they determined that such loyalty, trust and devotion between leadership and the people was due the peoples’ long oppression.

However, research on oral cultures may help to complete our understanding of how voluntary compliance was achieved. One researcher asked a man from an oral culture (a culture that did not know literacy) what sort of person he was, the man responded with, “What can I say about my own heart? How can I talk about my character? Ask others; they can tell you about me. I myself can’t say anything.”115 Judgment bears in on the individual from the outside, not from within.116 The Aliʻi possessed the supreme authority but could only gain the support of the

113 Lilikalā Kameʻelehiwa, Native Lands and Foreign Desires, p. 16.
114 Lilikalā Kameʻelehiwa, p. 16, 22-25.
116 Ong, p. 54.
Makaʻāinana if the Makaʻāinana viewed their Aliʻi as pono (behaving properly). The trust that the Makaʻāinana exhibited to the Aliʻi evidences that a long consistent history of proper behavior had been shown by the Aliʻi; which resulted in a high level of trust equity from the Makaʻāinana that was naturally reciprocated. Thus, together the Aliʻi and the Makaʻāinana were able to engineer a national phenomenal rise to literacy quite easily. Unmistakably, it began with their leadership—the Aliʻi.

Since the visit made us by Kaahumanu, in Sept. last, anew and accelerated impulse has been given to the erection of schools in all the principal villages in this part of the island. There are now nearly forty schools in successful operation on this island, and many villages are waiting for teachers and books. The only difficulty that we meet with, in extending schools, is the want of a sufficient supply of elementary books, and teachers qualified to instruct in a proper manner. 117

The literacy effort was going so well that missionary Elijah Loomis believed that the whole population would not only be able to read, but they would also be able to learn to read without any further help from the missionaries. In other words, he was indicating that the literacy effort was now well into the Hawaiian societal organizational structure which distributed and disseminated new knowledge and technology to the entire population. In essence, Loomis recognized that the rapid rise to literacy for the Hawaiian people as a population was now under its own power and no longer solely dependent on missionary support.

Logistical Hurdles

Without question the logistical hurdles required to bring a nation from primary orality to literacy is an enormous undertaking. The success of such a project would depend largely upon the successful partnering of the Hawaiian people who supported it, their Aliʻi who organized and managed it…and the missionaries who initiated it.

The Pīʻāpā

Foreigners had been living in Hawaiʻi for quite some time before the missionaries arrived. Kamehameha’s foreign advisors John Young and Issac Davis were literate and communicated in writing to other foreigners. Thus, the existence of the alphabet was well-known; however, it remained in the domain of the foreign languages of the foreigners. That all changed when the alphabet had finally been applied to the Hawaiian language—the demand for learning the palapala became prolific.

Many amusing anecdotes might be related of persons applying for books, serving to show the eagerness with which these means of instruction are sought. At different times in the course of a season you would see natives of every age, from childhood to grey-hairs, bringing every kind of product of the earth, or of their labor, they might have at command or to spare soliciting a palapala. You would see one with a melon, another with a bunch of bananas, a sugar cane, a bundle of ohia; (the apple of the Sandwich Islands) you would see some with potatoes and taro, others with eggs, a fowl, a kid, a bundle of sticks for firewood, a ball of native cord, another begging for some kind of work that he might earn a spelling book.¹¹⁸

Within a short period the second edition of 2,000 spelling books, printed in September 1822, were all distributed. The demand for books continued unabated, as it became clear that the supply of books would soon be depleted a third printing was needed, except paper was in short supply.¹¹⁹

There is a great call for books, but our supply of paper is altogether inadequate to meet the demand. All the paper we have on hand will be needed Mr. Bingham thinks before the close of the year for a new edition of the hymns.¹²⁰

Why Bingham felt that hymn books needed to be printed at a time when spelling books were in high demand is somewhat of a mystery, considering that literacy was still in its infancy.

Perhaps, Bingham was concerned that the press needed to print more religious material and had scheduled the printing of the hymns because he expected that the supply of spelling books would hold up till the next shipment of paper was received. It was a huge miscalculation: the avid and

enthusiastic desire for instruction by the people created an extraordinary demand for spelling books and the shortage of paper became acute when the missionary’s expected shipment of paper did not arrive as scheduled. 121

Two facts soon became clear to Bingham; one, that current paper supplies would be depleted long before the delayed shipment of paper would arrive; and two, that even when that shipment did arrive it would fall far short of filling the ever-growing demand for spelling books. However, there was other paper available in Hawai‘i but it was held by the foreign traders whom the missionaries were often at odds with. Bingham was now forced to solicit paper from the traders who he may have felt might either refuse to sell to them or they might sell the paper to them but at a much higher price, hence Bingham asks the Ali‘i for help. 122

The Ali‘i quickly decipher the situation, intercede, and take decisive action by purchasing all the available paper from the foreign traders and ship captains and then place it with the missionaries—free of charge. 123 The missionaries reported to the ABCFM;

Karraimoku has recently encouraged the printing of a new spelling book or a new set of elementary lessons consisting of 8 pages, which is to go to press this week and of which we shall now print 10,000 copies. 124

The hymn books, the enormous demand for spelling books and the additional supply of paper by the Ali‘i drove the printing press to be in daily operation.

The press is now daily employed in printing elementary lessons which are distributed as fast as they are printed. About 16000 copies have been distributed since April last—something near this we supposed to be the present number of those among the nation who are attending to instruction. 125

121 Missionaries Letters (Unpublished), vol. 2, p. 550. Note: For some reason unexplained the missionaries do not received and paper from America for several years.
122 Missionary Letters (Unpublished), vol. 2, p. 316, 469.
125 Missionary Letters (Unpublished), vol. 2, p. 319. [October 18, 1825]
The speed, efficiency and positive actions with which the Hawaiian government and their leadership responded to their potential literacy crisis, is noteworthy especially when you compare it to the responsiveness of modern governments today. Kalanimoku, Kaʻahumanu as well as other Aliʻi were quick to join in and are able to move concertedly without being bogged down by bureaucracy. The speed of the response, also suggests that literacy, the palapala, held a high priority among the Aliʻi. Without the additional 13,500 books it would have been extremely difficult to maintain the rapidly expanding literacy effort, therefore, the Aliʻi recognizing the problem immediately began to contribute money and paper to the missionaries so that the flow of books for their people could continue without delay.

According to Chamberlain, the missionaries did not receive any shipments of paper from the US during the years 1823 or 1824, and yet 13,500 copies of the spelling book were printed which would have required 50 reams of paper which could have only been supplied by the Aliʻi.126

### Teachers

Simple logistics would suggest that there were too few missionaries to teach the 182,000 people who lived in 1,100 districts that were spread out among eight major islands. Moreover, Hawaiians did not typically live in urban centers or villages, but were spread out over the land in what could be termed hamlets.127 Districts and villages waited patiently for their native teachers, who as soon as they were qualified, were sent out.

The demand for teachers was great. In December 1822, just two years after the arrival of the missionaries, they reported that Thomas Hopu and James Kahuhu were already engaged in

---

126 Missionary Letters (Unpublished), vol. 1, p. 147; vol. 2, p. 550; Note: Loomis says that 40 reams can produce 12,800 copies therefore 12,800 copies/40 reams =320 copies per ream; 16,000 copies / 320 copies = 50 reams.
127 Luciano Minerbi, course on urban planning models of ancient Hawaiians, University of Hawaiʻi, Fall 2009.
teaching their own schools and that Thomas was being sent to take over a school started in Kailua, Hawai‘i by Loomis while Thomas’s school on O‘ahu would be turned over to Kanaa.  With the printing of the second and third editions of the pīʻāpā, schools began to be expanded at a lively pace. Native Hawaiian pupils who learned the palapala became teachers and the missionaries became the principle examiners of the students. The explosion of schools and the rapid expansion of the literacy movement were noted on all major islands.

On Kaua‘i the missionaries reported;

Great numbers of those who were first instructed have gone to different parts of the Islands and are now employed in teaching others.

On O‘ahu;

Three chiefs of magnificent stature and lofty bearing came to the mission house for a teacher. All were already employed, down to George, six years old, a native child that had been given to me. He possessed a good mind, was an English scholar, had been thoroughly instructed, and was perfect in his Hawaiians lessons. One of the chiefs placed the little fellow on his shoulder, and bore him away in triumph, saying, “This is my teacher.” He proved to be efficient, and manfully, with much pleasure, continued to repair twice to their place daily.

Little William B., cleanly dressed, goes regularly, twice a day at the request of Kaahoomanoo, and Tomoree to remain by them two or three hours at a time to assist them to read when they feel disposed. When he reaches the door, they often say, well our little kumu (teacher) is come. There is great demand for every scholar that has been under instruction.

In Hilo, Hawaiʻi;

Schools are rapidly increasing in all the eastern [sic] half of this island and all that seems to be wanting, is books and teachers. I am unable to supply only twentieth part of the calls for books. Some have already left the school, commenced by us about ten months since and have gone out to teach others; and many other teachers are immediately wanted.

In Kaʻawaloa, Hawaiʻi;

All the people of Kaawaloa and many in the neighboring villages are engage in the palapala. The great cry is for books and teachers. Those, who were once stubbornly opposed, are now soliciting books and instruction.

---

129 Missionary Letters (Unpublished), vol. 1, p. 147.
130 Lucy Goodale Thurston, p. 66.
131 Sybil, Bingham, Journal of Sybil Bingham, p. 78. Kaahoomanoo is Kaʻahumanu, Tomoree is Kaumualiʻi.
132 The Missionary Herald, vol. XXII, p. 278
In Maui,

A goodly number of chiefs were there, many of whom were lying on the mat learning to spell or read, and some to write.

Thus we see that once spelling books were available, Hawaiians promptly began their study of the *palapala*, such was their desire for learning.

The *Aliʻi*, who were instructed previously, began to contribute to the literacy effort by becoming teachers themselves and/or supporting the establishment of schools, supplies or the native teachers assigned to those schools. Some of the *Aliʻi* who became teachers were Kuakini, Laanui, Opiia, Kaikioewa and his wife Amelia, Deborah Kapule, Hoapili, Wahine-pio, Kealiʻiahonui and many others.

Although Hawaiians appear to harbor a natural innate desire for knowledge, it does not fully explain the sense of urgency that appears to be pushing Hawaiians to acquire the *palapala* rapidly. In 1824, a visiting committee was approved by the Kiaʻāina (Governor) of Oʻahu for the purpose, of visiting the schools to conduct examinations and encourage the study of the *palapala*.\(^{134}\) Rather than have the people travel all the way to Honolulu, where housing and food was limited they decided to visit the schools in their districts, something that the *Aliʻi* had been doing for countless generations.

On their first tour of the island, missionary Levi Chamberlain entered an area where the land for several miles had the appearance of having once been under cultivation but now was in a neglected state, he inquired of the natives of the area as to why this was so and was told;\(^{135}\)

There have been two seasons of destructive sickness, both within the period of thirty years, by which, according to the account of the natives, more than one half of the population of the island

---

\(^{133}\) Missionary Letters (Unpublished), vol. 2, p. 673.
\(^{134}\) Missionary Letters (Unpublished), vol. 2. p. 520.
\(^{135}\) Missionary Letters (Unpublished), vol. 2, p. 521. [March 1824]
was swept away. The united testimony of all, of whom I have ever made any inquiry respecting
the sickness, has been that “Greater was the number dead than of the living.”\textsuperscript{136}

Accordingly, Chamberlain learned that in a period of thirty years more than half the population
died, which Chamberlain was convinced did indeed take place. Kaʻahumanu while visiting
Kailua, Hawaiʻi confirms the massive depopulation prior to the arrival of the missionaries as she
related it to missionary Artemis Bishop;

She also corroborated in the most striking manner by a simple description of the former numerous
inhabitants of these shores, a part of which we have long been convinced, that the present
population of this island has diminished at least three fourths since Capt. Cook first landed
here.\textsuperscript{137} [underline added for emphasis]

Never before had Hawaiians witnessed such death and devastation that left entire communities
and their complexes empty. To which Ellis attests in his tour through Hawaiʻi in 1823;

The number of heiau, and depositories of the dead, which we passed convinced us that this part of
the island must have formerly been populous.”\textsuperscript{138}

The swiftness and indiscriminate nature of the foreign disease that swept through the islands, left
those who survived disconcerted, unsettled, anxious, alone and helpless while death hovered
over them like a dark cloud—as they awaited the next wave of sickness. It is hard for us to
imagine the stress and anxiety that such experiences generate; however, in order to truly
understand the Hawaiian mindset at the time of the literacy phenomenon, the distress of
depopulation, of mass indiscriminate death due to foreign disease must be factored in.

Incredibly, while under this enormous stress, the literacy effort proceeded at a break-neck
speed; schools were being built and teachers were trained at an unbelievable pace. With the death
of three-quarters of the population, it also meant that three-quarters of those who were the
keepers of knowledge, the living walking depositories of two thousand years of accumulated
knowledge had also died. Almost equally serious, three-quarters of those who were being taught

\textsuperscript{136} Missionary Letters (Unpublished), vol. 2, p. 521. [March 1824]
\textsuperscript{137} Missionary Letters (Unpublished), vol. 2, p. 625. [Nov. 30, 1826]
or had been taught from the age of four, and who was expected to carry on the knowledge to the next generation had died. Those keepers’ of knowledge who survived yet lost their apprentice faced a forbidding dilemma; either, start all over training another child or start training an older person. Clearly, they knew that time was not on their side; all could be lost—forever. Perhaps this may in part explain why so many adults attended the schools in the first twelve years of the literacy effort. The palapala may have been seen as a solution—a way to preserve precious knowledge.

By 1826, just four years after the printing of the pīʿāpā, the literacy project began to hit full stride. As soon as books were printed and teachers trained—schoolhouses were built. The magnitude of the expansion both pleased and worried the missionaries, in the minutes of the general meeting held in Kailua they wrote;

> From what have been registered, and from the number of books distributed where a register has not yet been made, we estimate that the present number belonging to the schools at about 25,000. For the instruction of these not less than 400 native teachers are employed, who, being able to read and write themselves, and apparently well disposed, are thought to be in no small degree useful to those under their charge. Probably not less than one hundred other, who call themselves teachers, but ill deserve the name, have without consulting us been employed by petty chiefs and land-holders to teach their people.¹³⁹

Four hundred native teachers were being employed to help satisfy the demand for instruction, and at least one-fourth of those teachers did not go through a school taught by or under the direct supervision of the missionaries. These new teachers were most likely the second generation of teachers who had gone out to teach their own schools and were supported by the Aliʻi through the Konohiki.

The teachers are generally supported from the lands of the chiefs. The districts, being divided among the chiefs, are each given in charge to certain men called Konohiki, whose business it is to let out the separate plantations to tenants, and superintend the business of the chiefs in several districts over which they preside. The Konohiki are directed by their several chiefs to support the

teachers which are sent them. Where schools are established on separate plantations, the man who superintends the plantation is directed to support the teacher.\textsuperscript{140}

Evidently, the engine that was now driving the literacy campaign was the Hawaiians themselves and—to the consternation of the missionaries. The phrase, “have without consulting us” appears to underline a growing uneasiness among the missionaries; that they were losing their monopoly on the production of native teachers and eventually their influence over the schools. In response, the missionaries decided to implement a “teacher certification” program which would require “that every native teacher must be examined by the missionaries.”\textsuperscript{141} On its face, this new teacher certification program appears to be more inclined to protect an interest than to promote the proliferation of literacy among the masses. One thousand certificates were ordered and printed.\textsuperscript{142} However, the certification scheme failed to gain support from the Aliʻi or Hawaiians in general who evidently must have seen it as nothing more than a bottleneck, as they continued with their rapid expansion of the schools unabated.

In an effort to salvage some type of control on the Hawaiian literacy movement, the missionaries retreated to a more exclusive alternative and embarked on building a station school at Lahaina in 1828, which they initially promoted as teacher training schools for native teachers. The Aliʻi donated the land for the school. The Hawaiian students who were enrolled in the Lahaina School were adults with families. They move onto the land and immediately begin to contribute their labor towards the construction of the school. The Hawaiian students and their families also cultivate the land both for the support of the school and their families. They do not receive any financial support from the ABCFM or the missionaries.

\textsuperscript{140} The Missionary Herald, vol. XXV, p. 55.
\textsuperscript{141} Sandwich Islands Mission, Unpublished minutes of the Prudential Meetings of the Mission, September 23, - October 20, 1826, . p. 23.
\textsuperscript{142} Missionary Letters (Unpublished), vol. 2, p. 322-323.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waikiki</td>
<td>Kalauao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikiki</td>
<td>Ohemua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikiki</td>
<td>Kawaakahi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikiki</td>
<td>Kulauka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikiki</td>
<td>Moku &amp; Kauhane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikiki</td>
<td>Paniolo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikiki</td>
<td>Kamahoula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikiki</td>
<td>Kamaukoli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikiki</td>
<td>Kapule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waialae</td>
<td>Ohao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilupe</td>
<td>Napunawai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niu</td>
<td>Hapauea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wamanalo</td>
<td>Puwahiki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaelepu</td>
<td>Kauwa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaelepu</td>
<td>Kuahiioinui</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kailua</td>
<td>Kamakani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaneohe</td>
<td>Nuuhewa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kikiwelawela</td>
<td>Mahe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heeia</td>
<td>Kaai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waihee</td>
<td>Kahiemoe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kulaa</td>
<td>Momona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaawa</td>
<td>Mahu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makaua</td>
<td>Koala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kahana</td>
<td>Ola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punalu &amp; Waiono</td>
<td>Kalakoa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puheemiki</td>
<td>Makole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaluamui</td>
<td>Lauiki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atakao</td>
<td>Kalua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hauula</td>
<td>Kukuhi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laiewai</td>
<td>Kealoha-aukai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaikahana</td>
<td>Kalami-wahimoku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kahuku</td>
<td>Kalawaianui</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waialae</td>
<td>Holi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waialua</td>
<td>Kahalau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waialua</td>
<td>Maiu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waialua</td>
<td>Kaika-kawaha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waialua</td>
<td>Kahele</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waialua</td>
<td>Kamai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waialua</td>
<td>Naukana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waialua</td>
<td>Kapela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waialua</td>
<td>Kapuaa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mokuleia</td>
<td>Oo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kawaihapai</td>
<td>Wainulani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaena</td>
<td>Makaliili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makua</td>
<td>Kaululena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makaha</td>
<td>Kani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waianae</td>
<td>Kahoa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honouliuli</td>
<td>Neau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikle</td>
<td>Kalaikoa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikle</td>
<td>Moo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waipio</td>
<td>Kekaha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiaawa</td>
<td>Kuhiahu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiaawa</td>
<td>Kapioho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalauao</td>
<td>Kaiwi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moanalua</td>
<td>Kapapoko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalihi</td>
<td>Kokokua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palama</td>
<td>Hoaliku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palama</td>
<td>Kaunoho</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1 Schedule of Schools Examined on O'ahu in February 1828 by Levi Chamberlain
Schools

The building of the schools for literacy, initiated one of the most prolific building programs that built schools in every district on all the islands, which the missionaries reported to the ABCFM;

Schools have been established in every district throughout the whole group of islands, and so rapid has been the increase of the number of schools, and of learners, that we have not been able to keep an exact register of them all. 143

On Maui and Lanai schools were established:

Schools have been established on every part of Maui—and the constant cry from that quarter is “give us books.” Schools are also established on the island of Ranai, and will soon, we hope, be established on Morokai 144

On Hawai‘i;

Gov. Adams has given orders for the establishment of schools from Waipio on the N.E. to the Division of Kau on the south a distance embracing nearly 2/3 of the sea-board of Hawaii. 145

In Waimea, Kauai a missionary wrote:

But the most interesting object which came under my view, was the school house. There is at least one in every considerable village. They are generally built with care, & large enough to afford a commodious place of worship for the inhabitants in their respective vicinities. 146

The straightforwardness, promptness and apparent ease which the Hawaiian economy handled this logistical hurdle is a unique model that showcases a society not bogged down in bureaucracy, limited in resources or despair.

Those who desired to learn the palapala were also those who attended the church service on the Sabbath. Thus, the missionary effort was directly tied to the success of the schools, while those who did not regard the palapala did not usually attend.

Indeed were it not for our schools we should witness but few to attend the church on Sabbath. The scholars & their connections form the principal part of the regular attendants upon our religious meetings. The sentiment has gone forth and is prevalent both here & in the other

144 Missionary Letters (Unpublished), vol. 2, p. 434. [January 1825]
145 Missionary Letters (Unpublished), vol. 2, p. 430 [November 14, 1827]
islands, that they who do not attend to the palapala (schools) have no interest in the new religion, but are exempted from any of its moral instructions or penal sanctions. ¹⁴⁷

What is interesting is the aspect of tolerance and the respect for the individual to decide whether to learn the palapala or not. This exemption suggests that the move to literacy while supported and promoted by the Ali‘i, was still a personal choice.

The decision to construct a school house seems to depend upon the Konohiki of a district. Chamberlain, on his tour of the schools on Oʻahu, also found that the decision to build a schoolhouse largely depended on the Konohiki. If the Konohiki believed that palapala was good then a school house was constructed, Chamberlain mentioned one such district they visited that did not have a school house because the Konohiki did not care for the palapala.

Of the total amount of money spent by the ABCFM in the first 12 years of the mission, most of it was spent on direct expenses incurred for the missionary’s own support. The missionary annual expenses report contained no category for expenses that could be charged to the support or building of the 1,103 schools. Thus, it appears that the Hawaiian government in twelve years had financed the entire infrastructure build-up of the 1,103 schools and supported the employment of the 1,103 teachers who taught in those schools.¹⁴⁸ The people paid nothing to attend the schools; many purchased their own spelling books and slates. Incredibly, the Hawaiian government had in essence provided to their people “free public education,” a public service that would not arrive on the American topography for another thirty years.¹⁴⁹

While Liholiho and the Ali‘i viewed literacy as a good thing for the people, in many European countries literacy for the masses was strongly opposed. For example, in England, during same period of time there was major opposition towards education of the masses for two

¹⁴⁸ Missionary Letters (Unpublished), vol. 2, p. 599. [June 1, 1825]
¹⁴⁹ note: In 1852 Horace Mann adopted the Prussian educational system in Massachusetts.
basic reasons: 1) the belief that every step in the scale of society was full, and; 2) that the temporal condition of the lower orders cannot be exalted but at the expense of the higher. The English upper classes argued that mass education would lead to disorder. They were fearful of educating the lower classes because the lower classes would leave their employ. Then, where would they get their cheap labor?

This was in stark contrast to Hawaiian society which embraced the Hawaiian metaphor of malama ʻāina from time immemorial. This Hawaiian metaphor malama ʻāina imprinted the concept of ʻohana (family) into Hawaiian society and extended it beyond the immediate family to include their leadership, the land and their gods. This meant that Mōʻī was not a king in the European sense but a Mōʻī whose responsibilities included that of an older sibling whose kuleana was to protect and care for their kaikaina (younger sibling), the Makaʻāinana; and in return the Makaʻāinana would respect and support their kaikuaʻana (older sibling). Thus a familial relationship encompassed both Aliʻi and Makaʻāinana; this familial relationship did not allow Hawaiian leadership to exploit their kaikaina, instead it encouraged the Aliʻi to care for their kaikaina (younger siblings), the Makaʻāinana.

Hawaiian governance and government was based on the concept of pono (proper behavior) which according to anthropologist Stanley Diamond would be what he called a “moral order” which applied to all members of the society, including their leadership. Therefore, once the Aliʻi determined the palapala was a good thing, it was then their kuleana to encourage the people to learn it also.

---

150 Kaestle, Pillars of the Republic, p. 33.
Kaahumanu who at the examination, appeared only as a pupil, now appeared as an authorized teacher and ruler of the people. As such she recommended to them, to cast off all their old and evil practices and go in the new and right way, attend diligently to instruction, and observe the law of God. That she might not seem to be enforcing this without their consent, she, in a very proper manner, demanded of them whether they were willing to engage in this work of reformation; to which they replied “Ae”\(^\text{154}\)

Kaʻahumanu who was the *Kuhina Nui* and the most powerful woman in the Hawaiian government did some remarkable things in this short account. First, she led by example and in this case Kaʻahumanu humbly took her place as a pupil at a public examination along with the other pupils. Second, she chose persuasion instead of command, seeking consensus as she encouraged the people to learn the *palapala*.

In the United States “the people” were generally opposed to free public education because they were fearful that it would bring new forms of taxation by the state.\(^\text{155}\) They were also fearful they would lose local control and individual choice; thus they were generally satisfied with the existing educational arrangements, which did not include “free” public education.\(^\text{156}\) However, in 1795, Connecticut became the first state with a semblance of a government-sponsored, partially funded public education system.\(^\text{157}\) It came about as a result, of a government land sale in which a permanent school fund was set up and the interest from that fund was distributed to the counties to be used for teacher salaries with no strings attached.\(^\text{158}\) As a result, by 1820 it had developed into one of the best common schools in the country.\(^\text{159}\)


\(^{157}\) Kaestle, *Pillars of the Republic*, p. 11.

\(^{158}\) Kaestle, *Pillars of the Republic*, p. 11.

\(^{159}\) Kaestle, *Pillars of the Republic*, p. 12.
Chapter 3

A Collision of Cultures

The missionaries came from a capitalistic society that esteemed the accumulation of material things by individuals. On the opposite end of the spectrum Hawaiian society was formed around a community non-monetary based society based on sharing and proper behavior, which frowned on unnecessary accumulation. Hawaiians called the practice of unnecessary accumulation pī or ‘au’a (stingy behavior) which provided the backdrop for a collision of cultures.

Hawaiian Cooperative Efficiency versus Western Capitalistic Society

Western historians and academics routinely describe the ancient Hawaiian economy as a “subsistence economy.” It is a term that often implies scarcity and low production; production that is based for consumption rather than exchange, thus, producing little surplus beyond meeting the daily necessities of life.\(^\text{160}\)

However, Hawaiian economy was quite the opposite, for centuries Hawaiian lands were in a high state of cultivation and producing large amounts of surplus beyond meeting the daily necessities of life. Early explorers reported vast plantations which stretched out for miles, food was abundant, and the people were healthy. In 1794, Achibald Menzies, a naturalist on the HMS Discovery, made this observation of the plantations he witnessed in Hawai‘i while strolling from Waikiki beach to Mānoa valley O‘ahu;

As we advanced beyond the bread-fruit plantations, the country became more and more fertile, being in a high state of cultivation. For several miles round us there was not a spot that would admit of it but what was with great labor and industry cleared of loose stones and planted with esculent roots or some useful vegetables or other. In clearing he grounds, the stones are heaped

up in ridges between the little fields and planted on each side, either with a row of sugar cane or the sweet root of these islands where they afterwards continue to grow in a wild state, so that even these stony, uncultivated banks are by this means made useful to the proprietors, as well as ornamental to the fields they intersect. (Menzies 1920:75)

In 1823, Ellis confirms a high state of cultivation on Oʻahu when he wrote:

The level land of the whole district, for about three miles, is one continued garden, laid out in beds of taro, potatoes, yams, sugarcane, or cloth plant.\textsuperscript{161}

The mouth of the valley, which open immediately behind the town of Honruru [Honolulu], is a complete garden, carefully kept by its respective proprietors in a state of high cultivation; and the ground being irrigated by water from a river that winds rapidly down the valley is remarkably productive. ... After walking about three miles through one unbroken series of plantations, the valley becomes gradually narrower, and the mountains rise more steep on either side.

Food was found to be in abundance by whalers on their way to the whaling grounds of Japan. As a result, Hawaiʻi soon became an important stop for American whaling ships and other merchant vessels. During the years 1824 to 1827; 104 ships per year stopped at the islands; and at the height of the whaling boom from 1828 to 1833; 172 ships per year stopped in Hawaiʻi to trade for fresh provisions.\textsuperscript{162} In Waimea, April 27, 1829 missionary Gulick wrote:

I can scarcely believe that our Western states which are so much praised, exceed, either in beauty or fertility, some large tracts (through which I passed) including many thousand acres on this island.\textsuperscript{163}

With abundant resources, the building of 1,100 hundred schools was a simple matter; supporting 1,100 teachers with food, kapa and a house was also a simple matter. Hawaiian surplus production also supplied the missionaries with houses and land upon which to farm for their support.

The expense of making our first establishment was not great. Our two principal houses at this place were built by government, and for many months our table was almost wholly supplied by the liberality of natives and foreigners. The station at Kisu (kairua) cost nothing. At Tauvae almost the whole expense of the first establishment was defrayed by the government.\textsuperscript{164}

In regards to generosity of Kalanimoku, the missionaries wrote:

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{Ellis, Journal of William Ellis, \textit{A Narrative of an 1823 Tour Through Hawaiʻi}, p. 60.}
\footnote{Ralph Kuykendall, \textit{The Hawaiian Kingdom vol. 1}, p. 307.}
\footnote{Missionary Letters (Unpublished), vol. 3, p. 809.}
\footnote{Missionary Letters (Unpublished), vol. 1, p. 141.}
\end{footnotes}
He presented to the missionaries at Oahu a piece of land, and another to the missionaries at Maui. He always refused to trade with the missionaries. He said if he had anything the missionaries wanted, they should have it without expense.\textsuperscript{165}

Kalanimoku and the Aliʻi generosity went beyond just providing the missionaries with food and shelter, they also built meeting houses so that church services could be held and schools taught all at no cost to the missionaries.

Karaimoku has just commenced in earnest the building of a large stone church. He will send to America for some of the materials and would cheerfully appropriate 800 or 1000 dollars for a bell of 4 or 500 pound, and a town clock.\textsuperscript{166}

These meeting houses required enormous amounts of manual labor to build which the people did so willingly and without delay. One that was being built in Hilo in 1826 was described by missionary Goodrich;

The people of Hilo & Puna are now busily employed in cutting & drawing down timber for a new meeting house the largest & longest sticks of timber require about 80 men to draw them down a distance of about 5 miles. The longest sticks are 70 feet the busy natives hewing and drawing timber is not unlike the sounding of tools in ship yards in our native land.\textsuperscript{167}

Due to the overflowing congregations which began to attend religious services at Kailua, Hawaiʻi, the missionaries requested that Kuakini build a new “capacious house” for worship. These meeting houses required enormous amounts of labor from the people in the collection of the materials, the transportation of the materials to the building site and finally the construction of the building; all of which was donated by people and their government. Oct. 23, 1826 the missionaries describe the meeting house that was built in Kailua;

We therefore suggested to Gov. Adams about 10 months ago and he immediately assented to the proposal. Accordingly, about beginning of February of the present years, every man in the district was called out to get timber in the mountains. Some were appointed to cut, and others to drag it down, and in this manner, not less than 400 sticks of from 40 to 60 feet in length were collected upon the spot in a few weeks. An open space upon the rocks and partly enclosed by a grove of coconut and Kou trees was selected as the site. In about 5 months the ground was prepared, the timber hewn and the frame erected. The posts, 51 on each side, were firmly set into

\textsuperscript{165} Missionary Letters (Unpublished), vol. 3, p. 845.  
\textsuperscript{166} Missionary Letters (Unpublished) vol. 2, p. 317.  
\textsuperscript{167} Missionary Letters (Unpublished), vol. 2, p. 704a.
the rock blasted out for the purpose, and an area of stones was then built upon the side 3 feet above the former level firmly enclosing the posts on every side. Early in July the people were again called out to thatch the building when about 4000 came bringing with them the materials. In little more than a month the thatching was completed and by the first of September the house was finished and ready for use. Its whole length is 180 feet. Its width 78. It is built of the firmest and most durable materials that the islands afford, and is pronounced good judges to be the largest and most elegant native building every erected, and will remain good 20 years. The floor is overspread with a thick layer of rushes and covered with mats. It has a good pulpit painted and furnished with cushions & hangings.\textsuperscript{168}

Other buildings were also completed; one in 1829 was described;

The large new meeting house built by order of Government was opened for public worship and solemnly dedicated to God. It is in several respects the best of the kind in the islands. 196 feet long and 61 broad completely floored with rush mats and furnished with a pulpit that very highly ornaments the house and which no clergyman would be ashamed to ascend were it in any of the most favored cities of Eng. or America.\textsuperscript{169}

What was remarkable was the ability of Hawaiians, as a society, to come together by the thousands to complete these public works projects, without the enticement of pay or immediate reward. These projects involved thousands of people who contributed tens of thousands of labor hours to complete them, which also suggests that Hawaiians must have possessed copious amounts of leisure time.\textsuperscript{170} Loomis confirmed; “It is not customary for any native to work all day long, unless on very special occasions.”\textsuperscript{171} These structures provides evidence of community in agreement and committment; a community that was disciplined, efficient, and ordered; a community where sense of familial obligation to each other, reinforced with reciprocity and \textit{aloha} extended from the highest \textit{Aliʻi} to the humblest \textit{Makaʻāinana}; a community operating at a very high level of cooperative efficiency—a necessary component when living on islands of limited resources.

\textsuperscript{168} Missionary Letters (Unpublished), vol. 3, p. 951.
\textsuperscript{169} Missionary Letters (Unpublished), vol. 2, p. 576.
\textsuperscript{170} Note: Leisure time is time not spent on farming, gathering or hunting for food or producing the necessities of life, thus, if Hawaiians were constantly searching for the necessities only, they would not have time to contribute to these huge public works projects.
\textsuperscript{171} Missionary Letters (Unpublished), vol. 3, p. 833.
Unfortunately, those raised with a continental experience of unlimited resources are ill-prepared for collective and conservative use of natural resources, especially fresh water resources. Lucia Holman wife of Dr. Holman and member of the original company while living in Kailua, Hawai‘i wrote;

But I have now said all in favor of this place as there is neither wood, water or earth within 3 or 4 miles of this village except the sand upon the seashore. We are obliged to employ 2 kahnakas (men) to fetch water. I attend the house and stove, and when we can obtain water enough, which is seldom we employ 2 men to wash for us—besides doing the greatest part of it ourselves—or else have it half done. Two men in Owhyhee will accomplish as much work in 2 days as 1 good man in America will do in 2 hours. We have this advantage, however, it costs us nothing to keep them. Their food is all they require (as they were no clothing) and this is furnished by the king. We may have as many men and women servants as we please, and it will cost us nothing but vexation of having them about, which is more than I can endure.\footnote{Tomlinson, \textit{The Journal of Lucia Ruggles Holman}, p. 32.}

Eight months later as a direct result of their continental mindset and practices, Liholiho reluctantly decides to remove his Ali‘i from Kailua, due to an unexpected shortage of water. Lucia Holmans wrote in her journal;

The king thought he could furnish one family with water, but 2, he could not, as \textit{we} required more than he had expected.\footnote{Tomlinson, p. 34.} \footnote{Tomlinson, p. 21.} [boldface underline added for emphasis]

How could two missionary families (just four people) cause a depletion of water resources that had been adequate for Liholiho’s 300 to 400 Ali‘i? Granted that the washing of clothes with fresh drinking water could have contributed to the depletion of water but it cannot be solely responsible. An earlier description of the water situation by Lucia provides us with an additional explanation;

All fresh water used by the natives is brought from the mountains 5 miles distant from the village. This is all brought on the kahnahka’s (men) shoulders in calabashes. The \textit{natives} use fresh water \textit{only} to drink; \textit{they} bathe in the sea.\footnote{Tomlinson, p. 21.} [emphasis added]

Lucia’s letter infers that they (the missionaries) did not use fresh water “only” to drink; and while the natives bathed in the sea, they did not. So, what water did they use to bathe in?
The missionaries imprinted with a continental mindset and its vast and unlimited resources, where their individual actions regarding resources did not necessarily threaten the larger community were unprepared and apparently, unable to recognize the limitations of the natural resources with regards to island environments and the greater community. Ignorance and perhaps ethnocentric attitudes blinded the missionaries to the consequences of continuing their continental habits and consequently—depleted the fresh water drinking resources of Kailua, the abode of the Liholiho and his Alīʻi.

After four years of living in Hawai‘i the missionaries make an impassioned plea to the ABCFM to satisfy some of their wants which apparently the Alīʻi did not supply them with;

They give us land sufficient to supply us with poi; and they make us presents of as many fresh fish as we need. Beside these things, they sometimes send us a pig, a goat, a few potatoes, and a few bananas, a melon, and the like. But American may easily see, that these things do not support us. Shall we have no bread; no meat, but once or twice a month; no flour; no clothing, but tapa; no beds, except mats; no windows, but open holes through the houses; no medicine, when we are sick; and none of the other comforts, which have enjoyed in our native land? I do not mention these things, because we do not enjoy most of them; for we have them generally in our possession. But they are expensive; and they are the very things not provided for us by the chiefs.175

In June 1824, with the specter of death claiming the lives of many people, those who survived naturally tried to determine, who or what the cause of the dying; even the missionaries came under suspicion. Taua, one of the Tahitian missionaries, became seriously ill; the people began to suspect that perhaps it was because of the learning of the palapala; or maybe it was the missionaries themselves? Richards perturbed by such superstitious and ridiculous assertions decided to take action by visiting Taua at his home to determine the real cause of his illness.

Richards wrote:

As soon as I became satisfied what his disease was I bled him profusely & applied a large blister to his breast, which became very painful & did not heal at all for a number of days. The people reported that I cut holes in his arms with a sharp pointed knife, let all his blood run out, and then made a boil on him so large as to cover his whole chest, so that he was already like a dead man.

175 Annual Reports of the ABCFM, vol. 1, 15<sup>th</sup> annual meeting 1824, p.106.
It was but a few days however, before greatly to the disappointment & sorrow of the people, Tauwa [sic], was perfectly recovered. Some said that his restoration was in consequence of my exertions, but others said that it was in consequence of some native medicine which he took at the first of his sickness, which was so powerful that though I tried, I could not kill him.  

Obviously, American medical practices also had their superstitious unscientific beliefs and practices. In this account Richards is honest almost to a fault, however, it speaks well for his character. Such honest intimate accounts give us a clearer window in which to understand what is happening and what they are thinking. It allows us the opportunity to make better assessments; and hopefully, leave us with valuable lessons from their encounters.

At the same instance, we see Hawaiians responding with their herbal medicines to treat the illnesses that had descended upon them. Those illnesses that Hawaiians were familiar with they could treat, but the new diseases brought in by the foreigners were still beyond their experience and understanding. As desperate survivors, having witnessed more than three quarters of their population die from a strange new disease, some Hawaiians were desperate enough to try almost anything, even profuse bleeding and chest-sized blisters.

For the missionaries, their understanding regarding the sense of community was rather underdeveloped. Their social cultural context encrusted in ethnocentrism and their understanding and appreciation of the land—crude. Their knowledge of efficient resource conservation practices—embryonic.

**The Line Between Secular and Non-secular Begins to Blur**

The great desire and tremendous demand for the *palapala* by Hawaiians, was mirrored in their generous support of the missionaries. On July 27, 1826 Loomis wrote;

> We have every facility that can be given by the natives for the prosecution of our work. The chiefs are kind and furnish us with much of the fresh provisions we have occasion to use; and besides, at most of the stations, the members have excellent pieces of land on which much can be

---

raised with little or no expense to the Mission. There was never more eagerness manifested by
the natives for instruction.\textsuperscript{177}

One of the concerns of the missionaries was the dogma of maintaining a pious
appearance which among other things included an avoidance of secular activities, such as trading
or selling for profit. However, refraining from engaging in secular activities began to become
more and more difficult as the number and needs of the missionaries began to exceed the
financial capacity of the ABCFM. The pressing demand for books, or more specifically paper
had caught the missionaries and the ABCFM by surprise; it was clear that the demand was far
above the ability of the ABCFM to support it, causing Bingham to ask the \textit{Ali‘i} for assistance in
supplying additional paper. The \textit{Ali‘i} acted promptly by purchasing a large supply and placing it
with missionaries.

Previously, the missionaries gave away their books, free of charge perhaps in
reciprocation for the food, houses, meeting houses and land which were given them free of
charge by the \textit{Ali‘i}. Nevertheless, as the demand for more spelling books, hymns and other
religious tracts continued to increase, the practice of giving books away gratuitously came to an
end;

\begin{quote}
Examination going on to a great extent. Natives say Bingham told them before; they would give
them books if they would go to school, but now they want fowls; goats & pigs—Mr. Richards
asks four Stones for a book of 8 octa [sic] pages, & eight for a Hymn book!!\textsuperscript{178}
\end{quote}

Due to the high demand, this new policy provided the missionaries with an abundance of
products of every kind; however, it also began to lure the missionaries into a more secular role as
they found that Hawaiians’ great desire for books fueled generous offers of trade for books.

Richards wrote on December 10, 1825;

\begin{quote}
The chiefs here at Lahina, and Kaavaroa are very kind in making presents; and we are getting into
the way of selling books to good advantage, for vegetables, fruit, wood &c. in consequence of
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{177} Missionary Letters (Unpublished), vol. 3, p. 834.
\textsuperscript{178} Reynolds, 1989, p. 144.
which we shall need fewer articles of trade. Every ream of paper sent out from America will be worth to us, in the way of support, more than cost and charges.\textsuperscript{179}

Furnishing us with stationary and materials for printing is by no means increasing the expenses of the mission, for books are now far the best articles with which to procure our supplies. I have no doubt but I could build a comfortable house, with the material I could obtain with 100 native bibles.\textsuperscript{180}

The spelling books made an excellent item for trade, it was compact, non-perishable and in high demand. One practice that the missionaries resisted was the selling of books for money, which they considered well within the realm of secular activity. However, the demand for books which translated into a demand for more paper, created a quandary for the missionaries. The supply of paper coming from America in the early years was neither consistent nor adequate. The traders who had paper and the means to get more paper, demanded cash or goods that could be sold easily for cash. Oahu, June 18, 1825 Chamberlain wrote:

> We need slates for the learners. Those sent out in the Amira would have been all taken up in a fortnight in this station, if we would have disposed of them.—Some were almost angry with us, that we had no more to dispose of. We sold them for vegetable & other supplies at three or four time the cost of them in America.\textsuperscript{181}

However, just four months later missionary James Ely member of the second company wrote a letter that had noticeably different perspective and undertone;

> Whole gospels & hymns be printed by the Board for these Islands, I think that 20,000 would be a fair number for Hawaii. They will be the best article of trade to supply the stations that can be procured; and the sale will be sure. They ought to be put at a reasonable price, and with the sale of them we can build houses & fences, purchase our meat, fowls, vegetables, water, wood & hire any labor performed that we should need.\textsuperscript{182}

By April 3, 1829 missionary Chamberlain details how best to dispose of their books to the best advantage;

> There is a kind of cloth called mamake made on Hawaii, which may be disposed of to any amount for cash, if it can be obtained. The brethren at Hawaii have received considerable of this...
article in exchange for books; and we hope the natives will manufacture it in larger quantities, than they ever have before, for the express purpose of supplying themselves with books.  

As to all the mamake kapa they can obtain, it can very readily be disposed of for cash, or turned towards paying for printing materials, when they can be procured at the islands.

The missionaries appear to use a large portion of the money they collected from the sale of their books for the purchasing of more paper. In 1825, the missionaries purchased 14 reams of paper while receiving only 13 from America; in 1826, they purchase more than ten times the amount that they did the previous year totaling 157 reams while only receiving 40 from America; in 1828 that number doubles to 301 reams purchased while receiving only 40. In total the missionaries report purchasing 476 reams of paper in the islands, while receiving only 83 reams; they had purchased almost four times the amount of paper that had been sent out from America. So, where did they get the money to purchase the 476 reams of paper? The missionaries had only two other ways to raise money to buy paper, from the Aliʻi or from the people through trade or sale of their books. Kalanimoku, who worked closely with the missionaries in securing paper from the foreign merchant traders and in building several meeting houses at Kawaiahao, had suggested to the missionaries the possibility of ordering a ton of paper from Canton on the next ship heading to China.

The missionaries, worried about engaging in what appeared to be clearly a secular activity, presented the problem to their superiors the ABCFM who then provided guidance in solving their dilemma which cleared the way in which books could be sold for money.

---

187 Note: The Aliʻi were interested in providing paper for the “elementary books” which they were demanding in large quantities, while the missionaries wanted to print hymns, catechisms, and the four gospels. Therefore the missionaries needed the additional paper to do so.
You will say and every one of us will repeat it, if the printing department will maintain itself and aid in the support of the mission, extend its operations to the utmost demand of the nation for books.\textsuperscript{190}

This meant that as long as it was used to support the printing operations, aid in the spreading of the gospel and fulfill the nation’s demand for books, the selling of books was justified.\textsuperscript{191} For the missionaries it was clear that the advantages and benefits far outweighed the need to preserve the image of pious appearance by avoiding secular activity entirely. Thus, the missionaries began to be engage in a quasi-secular activity.

In the end, this decision proved to be hugely successful; as money was collected, it was used to buy more paper for printing that went far beyond what the ABCFM could have ever supported. By 1832, 24,065,800 pages were printed;\textsuperscript{192} a mind-boggling number; and according to Bingham almost all the press work for printing was done by the natives.\textsuperscript{193}

However, once one proceeds down the path of secular activity, it can be dangerous and slippery as the line between secular and non-secular begins to blur. For example, while charging money for performing a Christian marriage ceremony was a customary practice in America, American trader Stephen Reynolds questioned the amount that as charged, on August 1, 1826, he wrote;

Couple he married he charged TEN Dollars if they had money; if not he received it in hogs, fowls, or anything they had to give!! Mr. R. Charlton said Mr. Bingham’s marriages were not binding on English subjects!!\textsuperscript{194}

Reynolds was an American trader who naturally respected a fair profit, but even he thought that the ten dollar marriage fee was a bit extreme. To better understand Reynolds’ reaction and to bring the ten dollar marriage fee into perspective, we will look at the worth of a picul of

\textsuperscript{190} Missionary Letters (Unpublished), vol. 2, p. 555.  
\textsuperscript{191} Missionary Letters (Unpublished), vol. 2, p. 555. [January 2, 1829]  
\textsuperscript{192} Annual Report of the ABCFM, vol. 1, 1833, p. 82.  
\textsuperscript{193} Missionary Letters (Unpublished), vol. 2, p. 484.[February 22, 1827]  
\textsuperscript{194} Reynolds, p. 146.
sandalwood. A picul of sandalwood was worth eight dollars; half a picul of sandalwood or four dollars would settle a man’s entire tax obligation to the government for the year. The labor required to gather a half picul of sandalwood was not easy, the sandalwood had to be found, cut to a certain size, carried out on a man’s shoulder and then delivered to the konohiki, which might have taken a whole day or two. On the other hand, a marriage ceremony could not have been more than fifteen minutes and possibly shorter if you are doing ninety-eight marriages in one day.

Adding to the clarification and perspective, Ellis had suggested that the missionaries could hire a laboring man and his wife to do their domestic chores for about $100 dollars a year; Brother E said to me that we should need a laboring man besides the two boys. The expense for the board of a laboring man and his wife who might expect to be fed, would probably be not less than 100 doll. a year. -- Allow this to each of our families and the expense is not less 1000 doll a year, not including Mr. W’s family where two men are constantly employed & their families supported from the land.

This meant that a charge of $10.00 for a marriage ceremony represented ten percent of a man and wife’s annual salary for domestic work. While Reynolds, a seasoned capitalist, may have found the amount unreasonable, the charge of ten dollars was most likely reasonable according to New England standards where a money economy was long practiced.

**E Ola Pono (To Live Uprightly/Virtuous)**

Hawaiians often gave without expecting something in return, a practice Hawaiians call kahiau, and an ideal that conflicted innately with the capitalistic inclinations of foreigners. Dr. Lilikalā Kameʻeleihiwa further explains the Hawaiian worldview:

---

195 Reynolds, p. 169.
In the Hawaiian world, the hallmark of civilization was, and still is, generosity; that is, the willingness to share one’s waiwai (accumulated wealth). Hawaiian generosity was thus diametrically opposed to their basic tenets of capitalism, which Hawaiians found repugnant by their own standards of humanity.199

This idea of generosity and sharing is key to understanding the Hawaiian concept of *E Ola Pono* (to live uprightly/virtuous), regardless of your station or rank in society the principles of sharing and generosity governed. Samuel M. Kamakau, a noted Hawaiian historian during the 1860s confirms:

> It is generally said that the Hawaiians are a religious people, kind, humble, merciful, freely giving away eatables and raiment; they welcome strangers, or call the strangers to sleep in their house, and partake of the food and fish without pay, and wear apparel without compensation. These people are ashamed of giving away things for the sake of gain.200

While John Young and Issac Davis conducted themselves auspiciously, most other foreigners did not. Hawaiians noticed almost immediately that the missionaries on the other hand, were different from the foreigners who resided in Honolulu, many of whom were rowdy, reckless, uncouth, unscrupulous and ill-mannered. Initially, the missionaries were viewed with suspicion. However, as the missionaries began to speak out against intoxication, a known foreign introduction, it must have surprised the Hawaiians because they were well aware of the large profits made by the foreigners who plied the liquor trade.

Hawaiians must have been further surprised by the missionary’s code of conduct which barred missionaries from engaging in the secular activity or the business of profit.201 Their pious behavior and call to repentance angered, and alienated their fellow foreign colleagues, while at the same time caused the Ali‘i to reevaluate their opinion of the general character of all foreigners. In 1826, Kalanimoku, remarked, “I have watched them with a careful eye from the
time of their arrival to the present moment, and I have found no fault in them." 202 This is an important statement by Kalanimoku. It is recognition and a recommendation from a high-ranking Aliʻi nui that the missionaries, at least those of the first and second companies had behaved in a proper manner and in his opinion, the missionaries’ behavior that he had observed was at the level that would contribute positively to their cooperative efficiency of Hawaiian society. This did not mean that they were flawless, but it assured other Aliʻi, Konohiki and Makaʻāinana that the missionaries could be trusted to act properly in preserving and possibly improve on the cooperative efficiency of their society.203

This was not the case when they first arrived. Thomas Hopu had been ridiculed when they first arrived and told the missionaries that, “Most of my countrymen are violently opposed to Christianity; but my hope is in God.” The thirteen days of deliberation regarding allowing the first company to land most likely centered around the potential disturbance of their cooperative efficiency by a foreign religion and explains why certain conditions had to be imposed by Liholiho in order to gain the consensus of the council of Aliʻi. Having proven that they were not disturbers or disrupters of the Hawaiians’ cooperative efficiency, the missionaries began to gain the trust of the cooperative, and the people naturally became more open to their religious ideas and concepts.

By 1831, there were 1,103 schools with an estimated 52,000 pupils and most likely represented the nearing of the climax of the literacy phenomenon.204 In 1832, Kaʻahumanu died. She was unceasing in her support for literacy for her people and her death may have been a contributing factor to the decline in attendance at the schools. However, there were other

202 Missionary Letters (Unpublished), vol. 3, p. 843. [September 7, 1826]
203 Note: The missionaries of the subsequent companies do not all make the adjustments and many continue to hold on to their social/context and ethnocentric beliefs.
compelling and pragmatic reasons. The curriculum of the schools had advanced very little beyond reading and writing, therefore once the art of reading and writing was achieved, interest in attending school naturally waned. In addition, the missionaries began to notice that the make-up of pupils attending school was changing. The schools whose pupils in the past were mostly adults, now began to be filled with mostly children; possibly indicating that the majority of adults had already learned the palapala and that the next group (the children) in the order of Hawaiian society was taking their turn.

One of the leading questions regarding Hawaiians phenomenal rise to literacy and one that the missionaries could not produce a reasonable answer for, was the question of why did Hawaiians want to learn the palapala in the first place? For the Aliʻi, the ability to write and communicate with other Aliʻi especially those under their charge was practical. Their written requests insured the exactness of their words. However, the Makaʻāinana had nothing to gain from the exercise or effort of learning the palapala, there were no other books written in Hawaiian in which they could use their newly acquired skill. What was their motivation? The missionaries largely determined that, “It was providence” or in other words…it was a miracle. Their social cultural context and history blocking the logical conclusion; that perhaps these dark heathen primitive Hawaiian people were not so primitive, but decidedly intelligent, superbly organized, evidently gifted with the predilection for memorization and an inherent desire for knowledge.

For the missionaries the realization of this fact presented a paradox. Their employer, the ABCFM, which was supported through donations from New England Calvinist congregations, who had invested in a crusade to the Sandwich Isles in order to save a race of starving, hungry, savage, heathen, barbaric, destitute, primitive, ignorant people. Therefore, their continued
financial support for the Sandwich Island mission rested upon the reports of the missionaries that was sent to their employer the ABCFM; who in turn reported to their Calvinist congregations through the Missionary Herald. Thus, the missionary reports needed to reinforce two major themes to insure continued support; 1) the preservation and confirmation of the presupposed images of destitution, impoverishment, ignorance, heathenism, barbarism; and 2) that their work to save the heathen was meeting with some success. Therefore, the missionaries and the ABCFM were predisposed to describe Hawaiians and Hawaiian society in terms that were once considered normal and benign for their time, but are somewhat offensive and even racist today.

This cultural filter was propagated and institutionalized in the annual reports of the ABCFM and by the Missionaries Herald. However, this was not the end of the filtering process, modern writers, historians and anthropologists have continued to marginalize and ignore Hawaiian achievement almost within the same social cultural framework of the missionaries. This framed the discourse that Hawaiians were primitive, and by default were incapable of participating and/or contributing to their rapid ascension to literacy or any other achievements that exceeded western achievements. Thus, in the case of the phenomenal rise to literacy of Hawaiians, which had been widely documented, it remained unexplainable, an abnormality, a “miracle” in order not to disturb the discourse of Hawaiian primitiveness and western superiority.

**Cooperative Efficiency Model**

A cooperative occurs when two or more individuals or groups voluntarily decide to work together and when the parties of the cooperative perceive that it is better to cooperate together rather than individually, then they would have achieved a level of “cooperative efficiency.” In the absence of a perceived cooperative efficiency for one or both parties, the participants
eventually will abandon the cooperative. In other words, a marginalized person or a person who perceives no increased value from their cooperation has no incentive to continue in the cooperative voluntarily and perceives the cooperative as inefficient. However, when a high level of “cooperative efficiency” is achieved, production and trust increases, further raising the “cooperative efficiency” of the group. This is achieved because each participant is, and is seen as a contributor to the “cooperative efficiency.” High levels of cooperative efficiencies create long memories that generate “trust equity” for the participants in the cooperative; and as the “trust equity” increases, the willingness to help each other when difficulties arise also increases even when a member of the cooperative is unable to contribute to the “cooperative efficiency.”

The “cooperative efficiency” operates much like a savings account in a bank, more deposits makes for larger resources and a stronger bank allowing the bank to extend surplus resources to those in need of it. However, unlike a bank once a deposit is made individual ownership is surrendered to the cooperative and becomes a part of the “cooperative efficiency.” Hawaiians as a society invested heavily into this “cooperative efficiency” which is major distinction between western and native Hawaiian society.

Key to achieving and maintaining a high level of cooperative efficiency resides in the leadership and in the perception of the participants. Good leadership maintains and improves the cooperative efficiency; bad leadership causes the efficiency to decline. As participants begin to lose confidence in their leadership because of the perceived decline in cooperative efficiency, they eventually leave the cooperative.

However, high levels of cooperative efficiency, sustained over a long periods will almost always lead to high levels of achievement, production and general happiness in the group. Highly functional families are primary examples of high levels of cooperative efficiency; the
difficulty arises in extending those same principles to the larger community and beyond. Hawaiians, to that end Hawaiians were very successful and were able to extend the cooperative efficiency found in functional families outward to the inclusion of all those who lived in their the ahupua’a (land district), their moku (island) and their pae ‘āina o Hawai‘i āpau (all the Hawaiian Islands). The phenomenal rise of Hawaiians to literacy is evidence that a high level of “cooperative efficiency” did exist in Hawaiian society. Hawaiians’ literacy achievement also demonstrated the flexibility and adaptability of the cooperative, by incorporating Hawaiian methodology, technology, societal values into logical systematic efficient process for distributing the knowledge of the palapala to all the people.

There was no miracle in Hawaiians phenomenal rise to literacy. However, if there was a miracle it would have to be the missionaries themselves and their employer the ABCFM. Two entities deeply embedded in an ethnocentric cultural paradigm that should have prevented their participation in the Hawaiian phenomenal rise to literacy, instead and in direct contradiction initiate, support, and assist Hawaiians in the literacy movement.

The ABCFM purchased the printing press, paid for the passage of the missionaries and the four Hawaiian young men who travelled to Hawai‘i with the first company, and they continued to raise funds to continue in their missionary effort. The missionaries traveled half way around the world; provided the labor equity and the willingness to teach the palapala to the Hawaiian people. The Ali‘i through the konohiki built the schools, employed the teachers. They provided the leadership that directed the Maka‘āina and the missionaries that resulted in a highly successful partnership that brought literacy to the Hawaiian people with phenomenal swiftness. Although this partnership was not always perfect, it demonstrated that a level of cooperative efficiency had been attained.
The Aliʻi and the Makaʻāinana had already achieved a high level of cooperative efficiency as they were able to produce food productions systems that were highly efficient and productive. The inclusion of the missionaries into their cooperative arrangement gives evidence that the system was very tolerant, generous, open and inclusive. It also suggests that the missionaries had adjusted their cultural bias, which allowed them to participate in the cooperative and though they were still haole, they had apparently made significant adaptations/adjustments away from their cultural taboos that it began to distinguish them from their newly arrived brethren.

Unfortunately, the ethnocentric discourse and racist dialogue found in many missionary journals and missionary publications perpetuate the idea that the missionaries did not adapt or make necessary adjustments. Yet, as I read the missionary letters of the first company of missionaries, I began to notice that the ethnocentric racist comments began to be less racist and less ethnocentric, even vanishing from their personal correspondence. However, as new missionaries arrived “fresh off the boat” still enshrouded by their cultural bias, they continued the racist ethnocentric commentary, which unfortunately has framed the all missionaries. Even though they may have changed their initial attitudes later, their written discourses have branded them.

This distinction between the veteran and the newly arrived is evident today as we categorize and distinguish those haoles recently arrived from the continent from those haoles who have maturated here. Those who have lived here for a while or who grew up in the islands are held to higher standard of behavior than those who are malahini (new visitors). For example,  

Note: Bingham’s book, A Residence of Twenty-one Years in the Sandwich Islands may challenge this presumption since his book is full of ethnocentric and racist statements, however his book was a result of an editorial process which above all was meant to make a profit and to do that they needed to sell books, books that met the stereotypical image of missionaries/savage heathen success story. After reading Bingham’s letters chronologically it is obvious that he had modified many of his ethnocentric social cultural beliefs that do not agree with the tone and tenor of his book, which can only be attributed to editorializing.
in local conversations when the poor behavior of a stranger is questioned, the local will ask, “Whea he from?” The respondent answering, “Oh he from da continent!” The one who asked the question then replying, “Oh dats why!, okay.” Immediately the standard of behavior was lowered to accommodate the malahini (newly arrived visitor) indicating that a higher level of tolerance was being extended. However, if the person grew up in Hawai‘i or local, then the response would be decidedly different, “What! He from hea! Den whats da matta with him?”

A key difference between a Hawaiian cooperative efficiency and a western cooperative efficiency is that the motivation to contribute stem from a sense of “kuleana” rather than from an expectation of an immediate reward, payment, trade or gratuity. This kuleana creates a space for the malahini to sample the cooperative efficiency without being judged too harshly if they fail to reciprocate and/or contribute immediately to the cooperative efficiency. This space allows the malahini time to decide if they want to be a part of this cooperative efficiency and to learn it. If they chose not to make the adjustments or reciprocate they are simply tolerated and categorized; treated civilly but kept on the outside and out of the cooperative efficiency. A judgment rendered by the consensus of the cooperative that their participation would result in an unbalanced flow of benefits from of the cooperative, thus disrupting the flow of reciprocity and lowering the cooperative efficiency of the group. However, if they chose to be a part of this cooperative they simply reciprocate; attitudes, beliefs and behavior acclimate and align as a natural result. Kalanimoku gives us a good example of this process with the missionaries;

He presented to the missionaries at Oahu a piece of land, and another to the missionaries at Maui. He always refused to trade with the missionaries. He said if he had anything the missionaries wanted, they should have it without expense.206

Here Kalanimoku gives the missionaries the opportunity to experience the benefits of the cooperative efficiency of Hawaiian society.

He felt a freedom to call upon the missionaries for any little article he might need, without expecting to pay for it. If he wished a file, a hammer, or such like things, he would send a man to us saying he wished for it, and we in every case felt a pleasure in supplying him where we could do it without much inconvenience. His calls on us, however, for articles of property were always for some small article of little value, not amounting to the hundredth part of what we every year received from him, while he dwelt at Oahu.\textsuperscript{207}

Kalanimoku had offered to pay 800 to 1000 dollars for a 500 pound bell and a town clock for a church building that he was constructing, therefore he possessed the resources to buy his own file or hammer from the traders, but his purpose was to teach the missionaries and at the same time test them.\textsuperscript{208} Borrowing small items from the missionaries now and then gave them the opportunity to reciprocate, to experience giving without necessarily receiving a payment or even a promise to be paid. The test was—would they do it; would they decide to make an adjustment in their ways of dealing with others that markedly different from western prescriptions yet vital to successfully participating in the cooperative efficiency of Hawaiian society. The missionaries understood that the risk of losing a file or hammer was small compared to the amount they had already received gratuitously and what they might receive in the future making it an easier decision for them to participate. If they reciprocated they obviously made an adjustment in their perspectives if they did not reciprocate then they chose to remain as they had come. Clearly, the missionaries of the first and second company had made certain adjustments to their social cultural paradigm—some more than others.

As new companies of missionaries arrived, quite literally “FOB” (fresh off the boat) with their American social cultural patterns fully intact, discord between those newly arrived and those who had matured began to surface. The successes and accomplishments of the early missionaries and the present conditions were challenged by the newly arrived, to the point that
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the Missionary Herald began to publish both accounts in order to give congregations a chance to form their own opinions.

*Kūkulu I ka Pā Pōhaku (Rebuilding the Stonewall)*

The insights we have gained tells us that the Hawaiian government was considerably more than a monarchy of the European model. The *Mōi* possessed supreme power but did not operate autocratically, instead was subject to consensus of his council of *Aliʻi* and the consensus of the *Makaʻāinana*, exhibiting characteristics of a democracy which anthropologist Stanley Diamond, confirms that “indigenous societies are democratic, though they are not reductively ‘equalitarian’.” The lack of a large police force indicates voluntary compliance and agreement founded on a moral order.

The *Aliʻi* led rather than ruled in the western sense, and they led with an inherited confidence that was supported by general agreement to customary practices that had a long been established. Their confidence in leadership was grounded in proper behavior rather than the accumulation of material wealth; believing that wealth was the consequence of being a *pono* leader. As Hawaiian leadership recognized the possibility of literacy in Hawaiian for all their people, they made it happen without long drawn-out debate but with quick decisive action. This concept of cooperative efficiency allowed the *Aliʻi* to participate directly in the literacy movement as students without reservation to their status or class because the activity was perceived as *pono*; good for everyone in the cooperative.

The missionary accounts have provided invaluable information regarding Hawaiian involvement in their phenomenal literacy achievement; and it has given us hints of the uniqueness of Hawaiian governance. However, we still do not understand the structure or the

---

functions of Hawaiian governance systems in terms that clearly explain how Hawaiian society achieved literacy at such a phenomenal rate. Therefore, we need to re-examine the events leading up to 1820 and the underlying customary practices that prevailed, by applying the same principles used to analyze the missionary accounts. Gaining a Hawaiian perspective requires using primary sources from native Hawaiian authors and re-translating from original Hawaiian text. Those Hawaiian perspectives are embedded in our moʻolelo, oli, mele, and hula; and like the pōhaku of the dry-stacked rock wall of the schoolhouse in Nīnole—all we need to do is to put it in its proper place.

When I was a young boy, my grandfather taught me that if you want to learn how to build or repair something just take it apart piece by piece, several pieces at a time. Then stop and rebuild it to its former state. Once you have replaced the pieces in their proper place, and then repeat the whole process removing a few more pieces than you previously did, eventually rebuilding it to its former state. You continue this process until you have the whole project disassembled and reassembled. When you are finished, you will know how to rebuild it.

Before we can build the schoolhouse, we need to know how the rock wall was constructed; we need to understand how the wall was put together and the function of each pōhaku. Today, our Hawaiian society is but a remnant of its former self, huge portions of the wall is missing or fallen down, but the pōhaku are still here, hidden in the grass or covered with sand, preserved in our moʻolelo, our hula, our oli, our mele, our traditional practices and in our genealogy. EIA NŌ KE KAHUA.
Chapter 4

EIA NĀ PŌHAKU

The rock wall of the schoolhouse in Nīnole used many pōhaku to synergistically form the physical structure of the wall without the use of mortar or cement. The use of mortar and cement in modern stonewalls serves to forcibly hold a stone in place, allowing the builder to position pōhaku in locations or positions that would otherwise be unstable if left to its own accord. In a Hawaiian stone wall, the placement and location of each individual pōhaku were natural, determined by its inherent natural characteristics of size, shape and weight. Thus, the stability of a traditional Hawaiian stone wall depended upon the proper, natural positioning of the pōhaku, which interlocked synergistically with the community of pōhaku in the wall. The skillful and proper placement of the pōhaku determined the wall’s height, durability and stability. The rock wall of the schoolhouse in Nīnole has stood for almost 190 years with little to no maintenance and confirms its resilience, efficient design and skillful construction.

To the unskilled and casual observer all pōhaku looks the same, and should such persons attempt to build a traditional Hawaiian stone wall, the resulting effort would most likely end up resembling a pile of stones rather than a wall. They are unable to distinguish the unique and useful features of each individual pōhaku, because they simply do not recognize its purpose; and it is difficult to understand the purpose if you don’t understand the context or the moʻolelo (story) of the wall. Therefore, in order to build a traditional Hawaiian stone wall, you need to know the moʻolelo, which begins to describe and detail the characteristics of each pōhaku so that its purpose, function and how each pōhaku fits into the society of the wall.
It is evidently clear that Hawai‘i’s phenomenal rise to literacy was founded upon the vitality and organization of its traditional Hawaiian Society; in other words no traditional Hawaiian society—no phenomenal rise to literacy. Therefore, I will examine the two different kinds of pōhaku in the wall of the traditional Hawaiian society namely, the Ali‘i and the Maka‘āinana. Understandably, it is impossible to look at and analyze all the pōhaku in the wall or to cover every minute detail of Hawaiian society within the confines of this single paper. I will begin with my re-translations of key moʻolelo so that a proper foundation can be established in order to better understand the leading events, institutions and decisions that contributed to the literacy phenomenon.

**Complexities of a Social World**

All societies are complex and the older a society becomes the more complex its social world becomes. It is difficult for those not of the society to accurately describe it or to correctly explain how and why the society functions in a certain way simply because they lack the vernacular, the day to day experience which grounds, defines and preserves the principles and social morays by which the society operates. An outsider trying to understand the inner workings of a society has an inherent handicap of not knowing the “full story.” Their experience in the observed society is largely out of context, like jumping into the middle of a conversation without hearing what was spoken previously. Therefore, their interpretations are suspect, which is further compromised by their own societal/cultural experience. For example, in one of their early meetings with Liholiho the missionaries wrote his name on a paper, showed it to him saying this is you. Liholiho responded, “It doesn’t look anything like me.” The missionaries concluded that Liholiho was truly a noble but ignorant savage. Their experience

---

was out of context, they did not know that Liholiho had already acquired the alphabet before their arrival. The truth was that Liholiho was making a joke, which apparently the missionaries missed entirely because they did not know the whole story; their interpretation was flawed due to their predetermined assumptions of Hawaiians.

Even though the missionaries learned afterwards that Liholiho actually did understand the alphabet, they had already recorded the encounter and put it to print. Unfortunately, the flawed uncorrected account had been picked up and regurgitated by a modern historian who failed to include the fact that Liholiho had previously acquired the alphabet. This kind of faulty scholarship continues to perpetuate the idea of pre-contact, pre-missionary native Hawaiian ignorance. These inaccurate personally derived conclusions founded on the social cultural experience of the “outsider” historian are common and numerous; and continue to detour our understanding of the Hawaiian social world.

Consequently, to understand the social world of any society requires primary knowledge from the people who are from that society; and while this is easily understood it is typically not followed in practice. Many “outsider” scholars study a society for one to five years and become the world’s leading authority of that society—while those from the society who disagree are ignored.

Hawaiian society of the early 1800’s had been tagged by the missionaries, and chorused by western academics as being a feudal society, and yet Hawai‘i’s literacy achievement directly challenges the comparison. If the comparison were true we might ask, where is Europe’s phenomenal rise to literacy? The absence of a phenomenal literacy achievement suggests that European society was less developed socially and/or more primitive; and conversely, we can

---
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conclude that Hawaiian society must have been more socially developed, more sophisticated, more intelligent and decidedly more efficient than their feudal European counterparts.

As we examine Hawaiian society through Hawaiian moʻolelo we must remember moʻolelo are designed specifically to teach future leaders of their society what is proper behavior or what Hawaiians call pono behavior. Consequently, a moʻolelo goes beyond the confines and boundaries of the academic box that frame our western perspective today. A moʻolelo challenges us to explore philosophies free of categories, departments, compartments, judgments and/or bias in order to understand how those unique differences contribute and unite to form the synergy of the society.

A social world must be seen as a unit of social organization which is diffuse and amorphous in character. Generally larger than groups or organizations, social worlds are not necessarily defined by formal boundaries, membership lists, or spatial territory. A social world must be seen as an internally recognizable constellation of actors, organizations, events, and practices which have coalesced into a perceived sphere of interest and involvement for participants. Characteristically, a social world lacks a powerful centralized authority structure and is delimited by...effective communication and not territory nor formal group membership.212

Therefore the idea that a specific methodology can be singled out as the reason for the literacy phenomenon is absurd, we must look at all methodologies as it interfaces and intersects with the Hawaiian social world.

Unfortunately, the stone wall constructed by non-Hawaiian historians and anthropologists regarding Hawaiian society have left us with a heap of stones instead of a wall. Their descriptions of a “primitive” Hawaiian society fail to explain how this primitive Hawaiian society could have engineered their phenomenal rise to literacy.

The moʻolelo I will be using are from native Hawaiian scholars that were recorded in the Hawaiian language by their own pen. Their work had been translated into English;

unfortunately, a large part of their work was translated into English by non-Hawaiians—outsiders who lacked the day to day experience of living as a Hawaiian.

Even the missionaries who spent their remaining years in the islands preferred to keep their children distanced from Hawaiian children and sent them to schools on the American continent or to the missionary schools such as Punahou. These missionary children schooled in American society and culture later returned to Hawai‘i and became involved in the translations of Hawaiian text written by Hawaiian writers. Though some were able to speak the language they lacked the experience of living as a Hawaiian; and thus their translations were handicapped. In addition, their translations are by default fused and tainted with the Euro-American perspective, culture, ethnocentric biases which appear in their commentary, misrepresentations and judgments. The result is a translation infected by a western context and bias; giving us a somewhat distorted historical account and leaving few clues that Hawaiians were even capable of engineering their own rapid rise to literacy.

The translations by non-Hawaiians leave us with a history that selectively omitted and/or dulled almost all the unique and remarkable Hawaiian achievements while at the same time promoting and preserving the myth of a primitive backward feudal Hawaiian society. Unfortunately, these translations formed the bulk of the Hawaiian history that is being taught in the schools today.

As a native Hawaiian, I have retranslated each of the mo‘olelo used directly from the Hawaiian text in “Ke Kumu Aupuni” authored by native Hawaiian historian scholar Samuel Mānaiakalani Kamakau, who began recording these mo‘olelo in the early 1800s; and unless otherwise noted all translations are my own. I found many nuances that were either ignored or misinterpreted. The correct interpretation of these nuances is extremely important because they
reveal character, underlying motivations, attitude that are needed to establish the proper context. As these nuances were reintroduced into the translation a new perspective and viewpoint began to emerge that added additional depth and understanding to the event and the individuals involved. It began to bring the pieces of the puzzle together—it began to make perfect sense.

In my retranslations, I was surprised to find obvious discrepancies where the Hawaiian text was entirely omitted from the English translation. I also found a studious, persistent, even oppressive effort to convert Hawaiian grammar to conform to what was once termed “Standard English.” I have included direct quotes and translations as well as summaries in which the original Hawaiian text was closely adhered to.

The replacement of Hawaiian grammar with so-called Standard English grammar creates significant problems with context. This would be similar to watching a Chinese kung-fu movie where the director replaced the dialogue of the Chinese actors with dubbed-in English that contained a southern draw or New Jersey twang—besides sounding strange, weird, and ridiculous; it distracts, erodes and distances the essence of the story; we may get the gist but miss the important tasty morsels. Today, movie directors prefer to use English subtitles or dialogue which attempts to incorporates the grammar patterns of the language being translated rather than dubbing over with “standard” English voice-over. In my retranslations I have attempted to preserve the Hawaiian grammar pattern as much as possible in the direct Hawaiian to English translations which I quote particular sections verbatim. Consequently, I have found a significant difference in the overall tone, tenor, cadence and context; that begins to reduce the underlying western milieu.

Note: An Englishman must find this American claim amusing, since Americans do not speak English like an Englishman and therefore the English that Americans do speak cannot be “Standard English” but only a bastardized or creole form of English.
As mentioned earlier, I have discarded English terms such as king and chief, the use of these terms mires the translation poetry/artistry making it difficult to uncover the *kaona* (hidden/additional meanings) that the original Hawaiian term represents. Therefore, I use Hawaiian terms to the greatest extent possible, including those instances where linguistic differences occur no matter how slight or insignificant it may appear.

Hawaiians have a long history of great orators who used sophisticated language that was constructed very skillfully, subtle and powerful. These subtleties of language and dual meanings, allowed the skilled native Hawaiian orator/author to speak/write of intimate subjects that were understandable to the Hawaiian but deftly disguised to not offend the sensitivities of the missionaries.

My analysis will focus on those key individuals involved in each *moʻolelo* such as Kalaniʻōpuʻu, Kīwalaʻō, Kamehameha, Liholiho, Kaʻahumanu, Keōpūolani and others; in an attempt to try to understand their mindset and the reasons behind their actions and decisions. To date, the only analyses of these key individuals have been made largely by non-Hawaiians who have applied western assumptions founded upon a pro-western paradigm. The evidence of their flawed assumptions is that it does not explain Hawaiian technological achievements nor Hawaiians phenomenal rise to literacy. Therefore, as a native Hawaiian, my analysis from a native Hawaiian perspective is critical. As a result, of these steps taken, the individual characteristics of each *pōhaku*, as well as its contextual position, began to reveal itself—and the heap of stones began to take on the form of a traditional Hawaiian stone wall.

As I mentioned earlier, I will argue that the governance systems of the *Aliʻi* and the *Makaʻāinana* operated as two separate governance systems that were connected by genealogy, methodologies and perspective beliefs. The perspective beliefs imbued in the metaphors of
ʻOhana, Kaikuaʻana/Kaikaina and Malama ʻāina, established the principles for proper behavior in the context of kuleana that governed their interactions with each other. Kuleana is both a driving force, as well, as a guiding force in these two societies, which is unique and innovative when compared to modern societies.
The Society of the Aliʻi

The moʻolelo of the kalaiʻāina is the focal point of the consolidation, redistribution and realignment of land that establishes the realignment of political power for a new Mōʻi. These moʻolelo are recounted and retold to ingrain haʻawina (life lessons) for future Aliʻi, regarding the principles for proper behavior and leadership. Thus, the moʻolelo of the kalaiʻāina of Kīwalaʻō establishes the political foundational from which we can begin to understand the political and administrative process of the society of the Aliʻi that led to Hawaiʻi’s literacy phenomenon. It will give us a snap-shot of the political landscape of each new Mōʻi that is fundamental in understanding the society of the Aliʻi prior to 1820.

The kalaiʻāina is a methodology that was first instituted by ʻUmi-a-Līloa and it will be the first kalaiʻāina that I will look at. Next, we will examine the moʻolelo of the kalaiʻāina of Kīwalaʻō which is made up of several moʻolelo beginning with the moʻolelo of Nuʻuanupāʻahu and ‘Imakakoloa which laid the ground work for the kalaiʻāina of Kīwalaʻō which was unsuccessful and allowed Kamehameha to rise to Mōʻi. These moʻolelo are necessary to understanding the actions and motivations of the key players in the society of the Aliʻi. They allow us to see how traditional belief, customary practice, genealogy, expected pono behavior and religion integrate in the decision making processes that presides in the society of the Aliʻi. Next, I will examine the moʻolelo of Liholiho and his kalaiʻāina, which ushers in his reign and sets the political landscape that brings us to the door step of Hawaiʻi’s phenomenal rise to literacy. These moʻolelo are very important as it introduces a new era called ‘ai noa (free eating) which abolished the old ‘ai kapu (literally translated as sacred eating) religion just six months before the arrival of the missionaries and which had been practiced for more than a millennia. These are Aliʻi moʻolelo, which carries the Aliʻi perspective, focusing on the political aspect of
Hawaiian society’s leadership or upper management. It does not necessarily reflect the *Maka‘āinana* perspective.

**The Kalai‘āina: Mō‘ī as Source of ʻĀina Defines the Political Landscape**

In a *kalai‘āina*, those *Ali‘i Nui* (the highest *Ali‘i*) who received lands from the *Mō‘ī* in the initial division, then have the right to divide it further within their own administrative network, assigning land divisions to their own cadre of junior lineage *Ali‘i* supporters and relations who manage the smaller divisions. This process is repeated until it reaches the smallest land divisions. In this way, past loyalty is rewarded, which in turns promotes continued support, creating a network in an almost perfect hierarchy all the way to the *Mō‘ī*. However, this simple process is further augmented by customary and traditional practice, protocol, genealogy and political ties. It requires much skill on the part of the *Mō‘ī* to execute a successful *kalai‘āina*. Each *kalai‘āina*, in spite of following traditional and customary practice, has its own special circumstances which gives each *kalai‘āina* a distinct signature, as it conforms to the political environment of that time.

The *kalai‘āina* was a crucial event for Hawaiian leadership, the *Ali‘i*, and most especially for the *Mō‘ī*, because it would set the tone and tenor which would underpin the operational and political culture of the government, if it were successful. The *kalai‘āina* of Kīwala‘ō in particular is important, because it has been fairly well documented by native Hawaiian historians. It gives us an inside perspective that identifies the underlying political currents and possible clues that will help us to understand Hawaiian society and how Hawaiians engineered their own literacy achievement.

**The Fundamental Elements of a Kalai‘āina and the Moʻolelo of ʻUmi-a-Līloa**

When a *Mō‘ī* died, all lands under his authority are inherited by the new *Mō‘ī*, who then redistributes the land in what is called the *kalai‘āina*. It is a very deliberate process, that will
either give the Mōʻī loyal supporters to bolster his rule, or it will make him enemies who may threaten it. According to Kameʻeleihiwa, Liloa was the Mōʻī who instituted the practice of dividing the ruling power:

“Liloa instituted this new practice of dividing the ruling power in two – creating government and military—with each to serve as a check upon the other, and it is likely that he hoped the two brothers would work together rather than become rivals. ‘Umi, however, was clearly meant to be the kanaka (servant) of his elder brother Hākau.”  

The Moʻolelo of ‘Umi-a-Liloa (‘Umi-the son of-Liloa)

According to the moʻolelo, ‘Umi distinguished himself in sports and other Aliʻi contests to the chagrin of Hākau. ‘Umi was popular, intelligent and superior to Hākau in every aspect except in genealogy; he would have made an excellent heir to the government if it were not for his lower birth. Liloa gives the government to Hākau his highest ranking son and to his son ‘Umi he gives Kūkāʻilimoku, the god. There is no mention of ‘Umi receiving an equal share of lands or any lands for that matter and for good reason. If Liloa had given ‘Umi an equal share of land, ‘Umi would be more than just a check on the Mōʻī Hākau. With an equal share of the lands ‘Umi would have become a serious rival who would then have the means and resources to rebel against the rule of his brother Hākau, the new Mōʻī. Thus any policy that would give the keeper of the god substantial lands would have undermined the purpose of the checking mechanism of the god Kūkāʻilimoku. Malo confirms, “The largest districts were not generally assigned to the highest chiefs lest they might be enabled to rebel against the government.”

Without major lands, ‘Umi would not have the means to overthrow Hākau, at least at the beginning of his reign. However, over time if Hākau continued to do hewa, did not show proper respect to the gods, the people or behave in a pono manner, eventually the people, the Aliʻi and the religious leaders would become discontented and fearful of the future consequences for
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incurring the displeasure of the gods. Thus, though a natural quiet democratic process people would begin to switch their loyalty and support from the Mōʻī Hākau to ‘Umi.

With this checking mechanism or arrangement in place there are essentially only four scenarios or outcomes. One scenario could be that the Mōʻī is pono and the keeper of the god is pono, in this scenario there would be no reason to change the Mōʻī. Second scenario, if the Mōʻī is pono and the keeper of the god is not pono; a change would not occur because the keeper of the god would not be able to win the support of the people and unable to carry out a forcible change of leadership. Third scenario, if the Mōʻī is not pono and the Keeper of the god is not pono, a change would not occur, because it makes no sense to change one bad leader for another. Fourth scenario, if the Mōʻī is not pono and the keeper of the god is pono, a change would most likely occur because of the dissatisfaction of the people with the Mōʻī. The Keeper of the god would have the right to “snatch the government away” from the Mōʻī as long as he has the general support of the people to do it.

This “check mechanism” provided the process for change only when the worst case scenario exists. It naturally realigns people, religious leadership and Aliʻi, minimizing pretentious politics, superfluous charismatic leadership while encouraging and promoting pono behavior. The mechanism discouraged despotic behavior, provided for change through consensus, and provided an environment in which good leadership could rise to the top. It is remarkably simple and ingenious. Order is maintained by a code of conduct preserved in moʻolelo, hula and oli which is enforced through “public opinion.” Thus order in Hawaiian social world appears to have been achieved though the cultivation of a proper mindset regarding proper behavior which was enforced through “the opinion of advisors, councilors and the general populace.” In contrast, modern societies maintain order through rule of written law which
requires a huge and expensive judicial enforcement apparatus. Unfortunately, this also produces a population that has only minimal behavior compliance.

Rules, language and treatise do not guide conduct. Rather entering the state of mind generates the proper practice. Thus a written code cannot guide proper action because it fails to produce the necessary state of mind. The Hawaiian oral tradition was a purposeful way of creating necessary impact, in terms of sounds, the beat, and the dance, to place the audience in the proper trance-like state of right practice.\(^\text{216}\)

In the Western world the rule of law creates a minimum behavior standard. This encourages mediocrity, low achievement and the propensity to circumvent the law, which then requires a large police force and judicial system to insure compliance. As a result, we find ourselves in a highly litigious society where lawyers are hired to win with little regard to the morality of right or wrong behavior.

Unfortunately, in the case of Kīwalaʻō who was born nine generations after ʻUmi-a-Līloa, his kalaiʻāina was not successful as it ignited the battle of Mokuʻōhai and his defeat. Historically, the battle has overshadowed the kalaiʻāina of Kīwalaʻō because it is the battle in which Kamehameha will eventually become Mōʻī and which will place him on the path to uniting all the Hawaiian Islands. Nevertheless, the kalaiʻāina instigates the battle. Thus the moʻolelo of the kalaiʻāina of Kīwalaʻō helps us to understand the political tensions that led to the battle of Mokuʻōhai and how the “check mechanism” was triggered even before Kamehameha’s ascension to Mōʻī. This kalaiʻāina will show how customary and traditional practices, religious beliefs, protocols, genealogies, personal ambition, political attachments and obligations impacted the decision making process. It gives us a window into the political heart of the society of the Aliʻi just one generation prior to the phenomenal literacy achievement providing a foundation upon which to build an understanding of how Hawaiian society functioned. Thirty-seven years

later the residue from this *kalaiʻāina* provides the political backdrop for Kamehameha’s successor, Liholiho, the arrival of the missionaries and the unprecedented rise to literacy.

**Moʻolelo of the Kalaiʻāina of Kīwalaʻō**

About 1780, Kalaniʻōpuʻu moved his court to Kohala and it was there that Kamakau tells us that the *Aliʻi* agreed that Kīwalaʻō would be the heir to the government and that Kamehameha was to be given the war god Kūkāʻilimoku and to serve under Kīwalaʻō. Just prior to moving his large retinue of *Aliʻi*, attendants, warriors, to Kohala, Kalaniʻōpuʻu began to entertain an excessive lifestyle of *leʻaleʻa* (fun, good time) and waste which placed unreasonable wasteful burdens on the *Makaʻāinana*.

The *moʻolelo* explains that Kalaniʻōpuʻu had become senile. This *leʻaleʻa* life style began to cause discontent as Kalaniʻōpuʻu began to demand more support for his retinue and his *Aliʻi* began to rob the *Makaʻāinana* of their property. The excesses of Kalaniʻōpuʻu caused a severe strain on the resources of Kona, which is probably the reason he removed his retinue to Kohala.

This excessive lifestyle had also placed a strain on the resources of Puna creating severe hardships for the people. ʻĪmakakoloa, the *Aliʻi* of Puna, had decided to stop sending supplies to Kalaniʻōpuʻu. It was an act of rebellion. However, before Kalaniʻōpuʻu could deal with ʻĪmakakoloa there was another *Aliʻi* at Kohala who presented a more pressing concern. It was a concern that Kalaniʻōpuʻu decided he needed to deal with before he could move against the *Aliʻi* of Puna, ʻĪmakakoloa.
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The *Moʻolelo of Nuʻuanupāʻahu*\(^{220}\)

With Kalaniʻōpuʻu in Kohala was Nuʻuanupāʻahu, an *Aliʻi* of Kaʻū, who was also his relative and whom Kalaniʻōpuʻu suspected was involved with ʻĪmakakoloa in a plot to rebel against the future rule of his son Kīwalaʻō. Interestingly, Kalaniʻōpuʻu declined to take direct action against Nuʻuanupāʻahu and instead asked his *kahuna waha heʻe* (deceitful priests) to figure out a way to have Nuʻuanupāʻahu killed without any evidence pointing back to Kalaniʻōpuʻu. The *kahuna waha heʻe* of Kalaniʻōpuʻu possessed the art and skills of *ʻanāʻanā* (praying someone to death). However, they could not employ their *ʻanāʻanā* skills directly because they knew that the *kahuna* (priests) of Nuʻuanupāʻahu could perform the “*kuni*” ceremony by securing a piece of hair, fingernail or something of the victim and burning it; they would learn the identity of those responsible and return the *ʻanāʻanā* to the perpetrators.

Therefore the *kahuna waha heʻe* of Kalaniʻōpuʻu told him:

“E make ‘o Nuʻuanupāʻahu i ka waha o ka manō e pono ai, i nele kāna mau kāhuna i ke kuleana ‘ole e kuni ai.”\(^{221}\)

*Nuʻuanupāʻahu will die in the mouth of a shark will be proper, then his kahuna(s) will lack the means to discover who is responsible through the use of the kuni ceremony.*\(^{222}\)

Kalaniʻōpuʻu approved the plan and the *manō* were made ready.\(^{223}\) Nuʻuanupāʻahu was not only a seasoned warrior but he was also skilled in the sport of surfing. After the arrival of the *Aliʻi* at Kohala, they immediately commenced building their *kauhale* at Halaʻula. Then, after they finished the building of their *kauhale* they went to Kauhola to surf. However, to the disappointment of the nā *kahuna waha heʻe* of Kalaniʻōpuʻu, Nuʻuanupāʻahu did not join in the surfing. Instead he sat on shore watching everyone surf. A few days passed before the waves at
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\(^{220}\) Note: The moʻolelo Nuʻuanupāʻahu comes from Samuel Kamakau, *Ke kumu Aupuni*, p. 58–59. The translation is the authors, the narrative has been paraphrased and made more understandable to English readers but represents as closely as possible a direct translation of the *moʻolelo*.

\(^{221}\) Kamakau, *Ke Kumu Aupuni*, p. 58.

\(^{222}\) Note: As noted earlier all translations are my own unless otherwise stated.

\(^{223}\) The moʻolelo does not tell us how the sharks were made ready but it certainly leaves room for more research.
Maliu and Kapaelauhala became *haki maikaʻi* (excellent breaking waves), Nuʻuanupāʻahu grabbed his *papa alaila* (surfboard) and leaped into the water, paddling his way outside of Kapaelauhala to catch the big, waves.

He caught his first wave and rode it expertly all the way to shore. The people who had been long waiting to watch this expert surfer from Naʻalehu cheered. Nuʻuanupāʻahu paddled back out and mounted his second wave, but in the wave a huge *manō* appeared that lurched at him like a *mālōlō* (flying fish) with its mouth wide open, water dripping from its teeth and *halo*. It was a *ʻahi kananā* (a fierce shark) of the ocean deep measuring approximately “six anana.” The people were terrified and immediately flee from the water. However, the *ʻahi kananā* failed to seize Nuʻuanupāʻahu, the child who broke the branches of the *māmane* at Kapāpala and the branches of ʻŌhaikea. When Nuʻuanupāʻahu saw the *manō* he redirected his board to the *ʻako o ka nalu* (crest of the wave) of the wave; the *manō* seeing Nuʻuanupāʻahu at the *ʻako o ka nalu* pursued him above. Then using all his skill, Nuʻuanupāʻahu sent his *papa alaia* down the wave flying like an arrow and passed over the *manō* below. The *manō* reacted quickly jerking its body around opening its jaws wide to bite Nuʻuanupāʻahu who punches the *maka* (eye) of the *manō* with his fists causing it to plunge back into the sea. Nuʻuanupāʻahu then steered his board into the *puka o ka nalu halehale* (the pocket of the huge wave) while he watched the *manō* below him.

Again the *manō* tried to bite him but Nuʻuanupāʻahu sped his board past the *manō*; the *manō* again reacting by jerking its body around to bite Nuʻuanupāʻahu. This time Nuʻuanupāʻahu’s plunged his hand into the *pihapīha* (gills) of the *manō*, and clawed the *pihapīha* securing a piece in his hands, then ripped it out. The *manō* rears away in pain and

---

224 Def. fin between the gill and ventral fin.
225 Note: one anana is about one fathom or six feet, therefore six anana is approximately 36 feet in length.
disappears into the sea, the people on shore cheer for this Aliʻi from Naʻalehu. However, as Nuʻuanupāʻahu neared the shore another manō near the rocks, launches a second attack with its mouth wide open, again Nuʻuanupāʻahu s able to beat it off with his fists but not before the unsociable ‘ahi kananā takes a sizable bite from his buttock and thigh. Nevertheless, Nuʻuanupāʻahu rides his board all the way to the shore, standing briefly in triumph, then collapsing to the sand.

ʻUā aʻela nā aliʻi me nā makaʻāinana; he ikaika aku he ikaika mai, he ola aku, he ola mai; olo aʻela ka pihe uē. 226

The Aliʻi and the Makaʻāinana cry out; incomparable strength and power; incomparable escape from certain death; for a long time they cry out wailing.

People rushed to his aid while his kahuna(s) retrieve the pihapiha that was still clenched in his fist and immediately begin to pray the two manō to death. So powerful were their prayers that the leaves of nearby trees turn brown and dry up. The next day one manō washed up on the shore in Naʻohaku and the other at Hapuʻu and sadly, several days later, Nuʻuanupāʻahu dies from the wounds he suffered in the attack. 227

Hawaiian moʻolelo are grounded in real events, however the focus of the moʻolelo is seldom about the technicalities of the event but more about the people and their behavior. Thus, in the moʻolelo of Nuʻuanupāʻahu, the behavior of Kalaniʻōpuʻu, Nuʻuanupāʻahu, ‘Imakakoloa, the Aliʻi and the Makaʻāinana and the kahuna are the focus. If we look at this story from a western perspective, the “good guy” or hero of this story is killed by the villain. Even those associated with Kalaniʻōpuʻu exhibit poor behavior; the people suffer without receiving any justice. From a western framework this story makes no sense, why tell it at all? It is like a Greek tragedy; it is a story without a “happily ever after” ending. However, these stories leave a

226 Kamakau, Ke Kumu Aupuni, p. 58.
somber impression with the listener, one that the listener is not likely to forget—especially an Aliʻi. It taught future Aliʻi what constituted pono behavior and what did not.

This moʻolelo criticizes the behavior of the former Mōʻī. Leʻaleʻa (having a party) was not something that was automatically frowned upon by the Makaʻāinana except when it went to excess, and in the opinion of some Aliʻi and the Makaʻāinana, Kalaniʻōpuʻu had exceeded those limits. The moʻolelo recounted that Kalaniʻōpuʻu was senile which also infers that if he were in his right mind he would have never acquiesced to such wasteful conduct and excessive behavior, because the limits of leʻaleʻa were known, and those who transgressed beyond that was considered—wasteful, even if he was the Mōʻī. Therefore the Mōʻī was voluntarily compelled to pono behavior, though he also held the prerogative to ignore it he was certainly not above it.

Additionally, there was no “check mechanism” on Kalaniʻōpuʻu because he had fought his way to power to gain the aupuni (government) which is why he possessed both the government and the god Kūkāʻilimoku. Those who would oppose him would have to wait until after his death when the government and the god Kūkāʻilimoku would once again be rightfully divided, thus, reestablishing the “check mechanism” on the new Mōʻī.

In this moʻolelo of Nuʻuanupāʻahu, we are also given a glimpse of the power, stature and purpose of the kahuna and how they factored into the government. How someone could gain the control of the two manō and use them for their own purposes or destruction is beyond our understanding and knowledge today. However, it created a real need for each Aliʻi to have their own kahuna as close advisors and spiritual guardians, a role that the missionaries would eventually fill.
The Moʻolelo of ʻĪmakakoloa and the Incident at Pakini Heiau

After Kalaniʻōpuʻu dealt with Nuʻuanupāʻahu, he gathered his armies and went to Hilo to deal with the Aliʻi of Puna, ʻĪmakakoloa. The war was hard fought and eventually Kalaniʻōpuʻu’s forces prevailed. However, the Makaʻāinana of Puna loved their Aliʻi and hid him for almost a year before he was captured. ʻĪmakakoloa was known for his long braided hair, which reached down to his ankles and had decided to have his hair cut, when he was recognized and captured.

During the year that it took to find ʻĪmakakoloa, Kalaniʻōpuʻu built a heiau near Kamaʻoa called Pakini where he planned to have Kīwalaʻō offer the dead body of ʻĪmakakoloa as a sacrifice. If performed correctly, the offering and prayers would authenticate Kīwalaʻō’s right to rule over the island of Hawaiʻi. In this ceremony the puaʻa (pig), the maia (banana) and the body of ʻĪmakakoloa were to be offered, and in that specific order. The most important part of the ceremony was the offering of ʻĪmakakoloa, which would complete the ceremony, free the kapu and garner the support of the gods for the establishment of Kīwalaʻō’s right to rule. Kīwalaʻō performed the entire ceremony perfectly; however, when he brought the body of ʻĪmakakoloa to the ʻahu with the manaikalani (fishhook), Kamehameha stepped forward, grabbed the “alleged” corpse, of ʻĪmakakoloa and placed it on the ʻahu.

While Kīwalaʻō may have seen it only as a gesture of assistance, some of the Aliʻi saw Kamehameha’s act as an usurpation of Kīwalaʻō’s future right to rule; a premonition that

---

228 Note: These human sacrifices are not to be confused with the sacrifices of other cultures which required the life and blood to be spilled at the altar, instead they were offerings required bodies that were dead. Fallen warriors, kapu breakers, and kauwa who were killed prior to their being brought to the heiau.

229 Ceremonial sacrificial hook used to drag the dead body for the human sacrifice to the altar.

230 Kamakau, Ruling Chiefs, p. 109. Footnote in Ruling Chiefs: In Kaʻū an old Hawaiian told Pukui that ʻImakakoloa was brought to be sacrificed an old kau of his who pitted him shouted out to the chiefs, “That is not ʻI (makakoloa) the chief, that is I his servant; I can point out to you ʻI the chief!” So a young kau, a relative who resembled him, was sacrificed in his place. Their descendants in Kaʻū still bear the name of ʻI-kauwā, (I-the-servant) and ʻI-pa‘a-puka (I who-closed-the-door [of death]).
Kamehameha would one day rule the entire island. Some of the Aliʻi began to conspire to take his life, thus ending the possibility that Kamehameha would one day become Mōʻī and a ruler over them. Eventually this rumor reached the ears of Kalaniʻōpuʻu who upon hearing it, spoke secretly to Kamehameha and told him to go back to Kohala, to take his wife and the god Kūkāʻilimoku where he would be safe.

My dear child, I hear the conspiring of the Aliʻi, and the rumors that they will kill you; perhaps they are afraid of me while I am alive, if perhaps I die, they will truly go after and kill you, but here is my thought to you; you will return to Kohala, and you have at your command, the god; there is your wealth.

Kamehameha left the retinue of Kalaniʻōpuʻu and remained at Kohala until Kalaniʻōpuʻu’s death in 1782, when he was summoned by Kekūhaupiʻo to go to Kailua to pay his respect to the dead and await the kalaiʻāina.

According to the moʻolelo it was an Aliʻi of Kona, who secretly told Kamehameha what to do during the ceremony at Pakini, though the Aliʻi is not named. This anonymous Aliʻi of Kona told Kamehameha that if he did not want to be destitute, he must take the body of ʻĪmakakoloa and place it on the ʻahu himself instead of allowing Kīwalaʻō to do it. This was the final step of the ceremony and the one who placed the sacrifice on the ʻahu would be the one to receive the approval and support of the gods to preside as Mōʻī. Whether Kalaniʻōpuʻu knew of the conspiracy of the Aliʻi of Kona to encourage Kamehameha to place the body of ʻĪmakakoloa on the ʻahu, or whether he saw it as an innocent attempt by Kamehameha to help

---

his son Kīwalaʻō, this event revealed the potential problem posed by the Aliʿi of Kona to the future reign of his son Kīwalaʻō.

The heiau at Pakini was specifically built for the purpose of the ceremony. Obviously, the Hawaiian government, unlike Western governments today, did not believe in a separation of church and state. Religion was tightly intertwined into their government and no major decisions would have been contemplated without consulting their religious advisors first. Hawaiians were pious to their gods, disciplined and accustomed to long prayers and ceremonies. All who attended participated through their strict silence, which added sanctity to the ceremony and encouraged a successful outcome. The disturbance of the silence diminished the sanctity and rendered the ceremony useless. These ceremonies demanded precise recitation of each prayer and each step had to be done with exactness. Those who attended were required to remain attentive and silent throughout the whole ceremonial process until the final act which freed the kapu. These ceremonies trained Hawaiians to be more disciplined, orderly, focused and attentive especially in large groups for long amounts of time without any breaks. We see this discipline displayed in the public examinations that lasted for two days and would have been an essential component for large groups to learn the palapala and then tested. This behavior amazed the missionaries and foreigners alike because they had never witnessed mass discipline of this level in their own societies.

Kīwalaʻō and Kamehameha Meet Before the Kalaiʻāina Begins

Kīwalaʻō was well aware of the consequences should Kamehameha not receive any lands in the kalaiʻāina. Kamehameha would be left destitute and forced to go to war. The day before Kīwalaʻō made the official announcement, he learned that Kamehameha had just recently arrived at Kaʻawaloa, and so he went to meet with him. Upon his arrival, Kamehameha extended all the
protocols and respect to Kīwalaʻō as required because of his high rank. They both wailed over the death of Kalaniʻōpuʻu, their father.\textsuperscript{233} Kīwalaʻō then spoke candidly to Kamehameha.

ʻAuhea ʻoe, e make ana paha kāua lā, eia nō makua kāne o kāua ke puʻe mai nei nō e kaua kākou; ʻelua wale nō paha auaneʻi kāua e make. Aloha ʻino kāua.\textsuperscript{234}

Listen, perhaps we will die, here our father (their uncle Keawemaʻuhili) of ours is urging us to war; perhaps only just the two of us will die. How lamentable for us!

Why did Kīwalaʻō go to see Kamehameha? He already knew the kauoha (the will) of his father Kalaniʻōpuʻu, which would not allow him to give Kamehameha any districts (lands)—at least not directly. Perhaps the reason for the meeting was that Kīwalaʻō wanted his kaikaina, Kamehameha, to know that he was not in favor with leaving him destitute of lands and that their Uncle Keawemaʻuhili, was the one who was adamant that Kamehameha receive no districts in the kalaiʻāina. Kīwalaʻō’s suggestion “that perhaps just the two of them will die,” indicates that he knew that they were on a collision path and were reluctant participants caught between two powerful groups of Nā Aliʻi. The Aliʻi of Kona are demanding an equal share of districts and the Aliʻi of Hilo and Kaʻū were holding to tradition that the keeper of the god should not receive any lands. Kīwalaʻō’s words indirectly informs Kamehameha that he is attempting to find a solution to this dilemma, but needed Kamehameha to be patient, which Kamehameha appeared willing to do.

The Kalaiʻāina of Kīwalaʻō Begins

In the kauoha (will) of Kalaniʻōpuʻu, Kīwalaʻō, the highest ranking son of Kalaniʻōpuʻu, was given the government or the right to govern as Mōʻī, while Kamehameha was given the God Kūkāʻilimoku. After Kalaniʻōpuʻu died and his bones were placed at Hale ʻo Keawe, at Honaunau, Hawaiʻi, Kīwalaʻō made the proclamation that began the process of the kalaiʻāina:

\textsuperscript{233} The use of “father” is in the Hawaiian context and not in the Western context of a biological father.
\textsuperscript{234} Kamakau, Ke Kumu Aupuni, p. 70.
ʻAuhea oukou, e nā Aliʻi a me nā makaʻāinana, ʻelua māua i kauoha ʻia ke kupapaʻu, ʻo wau a me kuʻu kaikaina. ʻO ke kauoha o kuʻu kaikaina (Kamehameha), ʻo ke akua o māua (Kūkāʻilimoku), ʻo kona kauoha ia; a ʻo ka ʻāina i loa a iā ia mai ka makua kāne mai o māua, ʻo kona ʻāina nō ia. ʻO koʻu kauoha, ʻo ke aupuni, ʻo wau ke aliʻi ma luna o ke aupuni. ʻAʻole e hiki iaʻu ke kiʻi i ko ia ala kauoha; ʻaʻole hoʻi e hiki iaʻu ke 'aʻe i koʻu haʻawina. ʻO ia ke kauoha a ke kupapaʻu.‖

Attention all, Aliʻi and Makaʻāinana! The two of us were commanded by the dead, I and my dear younger brother [Kamehameha]. The inheritance of my younger brother [Kamehameha], the god of ours (Kūkāʻilimoku), it is his, the lands he acquired by him from the father of ours, to be his own lands. I inherit the rule of government; I am the Aliʻi over the government. I will not be able to take what he has inherited; he will not be able to trample my assignment. It is the will of the deceased.

Hawaiians considered all those of their parents’ generation to be their mākua or parents, similarly, all those of the children’s generation were considered brothers and sisters. Hence, even though Kamehameha and Kīwalaʻō were cousins in the Western sense, they were brothers in the Hawaiian social world. The same held true with regards to Kalaniʻōpuʻu, who was a father to Kamehameha in the Hawaiian social world, but an uncle in the Western world.

For the most part the proclamation by Kīwalaʻō was more of a formality. The Aliʻi of Kona were waiting to hear whether Kamehameha would be given any of the six districts of the island of Hawaiʻi. The division of the six districts was the main concern for the Aliʻi of Kona. If Kamehameha received some of the districts then their concerns would be alleviated because Kamehameha was aligned with them, which meant that they would share in the control of the resources and the surplus production of those districts. If Kamehameha did not get some of the districts, they all would become destitute. From an Aliʻi perspective the word destitute did not mean abject poverty; the highest ranking Aliʻi possessed hereditary lands from which they could always draw their support for their personal needs.

Ua maʻa nō hoʻi mai ka wā kahiko mai ma nā maʻolelo, ʻo ka noho aupuni wale nō ko ka mōʻi, a ʻo ka mea i moʻa i nā aliʻi, ʻo ia kānea e ʻai ai. ʻO ka hapa nui o ka ʻāina, no nā aliʻi nō ia a me nā makaʻāinana. Ua loaʻa alodio mai i kekahi poʻe aliʻi kekahi poʻe ʻāina mai nā kupuna mai.236

235 Kamakau, Ke Kumu Aupuni, p. 70.
236 Kamakau, Ke Kumu Aupuni, p. 199.
Indeed from ancient times it was practiced throughout history, the Mōʻī’s only ruled, and of the things cooked for the aliʻi, namely his food to eat. Majority of the lands were for the Aliʻi and the Makaʻainana. Some Aliʻi people obtained allodial right to lands from Aliʻi from generations.

This tells us that traditionally the Mōʻī did not own the lands upon which he ruled—“he only ruled,” which suggests that a Mōʻī operated in much of the same fashion as do most presidents, prime ministers, heads of states do today. They do not “own” all the land even though they represent the supreme authority. Therefore the idea that the Mōʻī owns all the lands is a European introduction patterned after the primitive European feudal land tenure system and a precursor to private property ownership. The concept that the king owned all the land was a necessary component for the successful introduction of private property ownership in Hawaiʻi as it established original title of land. Once original title of ownership is established land could now be bought and sold.

The Aliʻi maintained a large retinue of attendants, priests, warriors, skilled craftsmen and others whom they fed and clothed, which was more than their personal lands could support; thus, they were dependent upon the surplus production of the Makaʻainana who lived in those districts. Without this additional support an Aliʻi knew that eventually he would not be able to continue to feed and clothe those in his retinue and they would eventually leave, seeking another Aliʻi to serve. Thus, as their retinue grew smaller so did their number of warriors, attendants, skilled craftsmen, skilled advisors, counselors and their mana. An Aliʻi without a retinue was in the eyes of other Aliʻi—destitute.

The proclamation made public the kauoha of Kalaniʻōpuʻu. Kamehameha was to receive the god Kūkāʻilimoku and the personal lands that were given to him by Kalaniʻōpuʻu. Kamehameha specifically, was not to receive any of the six districts in regards to the kauoha of Kalaniʻōpuʻu. However, Kīwalaʻō was now the Mōʻī, the supreme authority of the island of Hawaiʻi and as the new supreme authority, why didn’t Kīwalaʻō simply avoid war and give
Kamehameha some of the districts? Was Kīwalaʻō bound by customary practice and protocol? Was he powerless to change the circumstances even though the current situation pointed to war? The answer is yes and no. Even though Kīwalaʻō was bound by protocol and customary practice, as the Mōʻī he could depart from it, if he so chose since he was the supreme authority. However, to go against customary practice would open himself to critical review by the Aliʻi which might have triggered the “checking mechanism” that begins to switch loyalties of the Aliʻi. Unlike his father, Kīwalaʻō did not possess the god Kūkāʻilimoku, the checking mechanism was in place and active. As the Mōʻī loses the support of his Aliʻi, the keeper of the god Kūkāʻilimoku, almost by default gains it. Then, all the keeper of the god has to do is to conduct his behavior in a pono manner. This is a real problem for Kīwalaʻō, who inherited his position as Mōʻī rather than through military victory; he is therefore dependent on the military muscle of those who support him largely because of their loyalty to his father Kalaniʻōpuʻu, and not necessarily to him. Kīwalaʻō is therefore unable and/or unwilling to depart from protocol or customary practice. After the proclamation is made the Aliʻi of Kona departed in disgust.

I ka lohe ʻana o nā aliʻi o Kona, ʻōhumu iho lākou me ka ʻōlelo ʻana, “Kāhāhā! Kāhāhā!! Kainoa e māhele ka ‟āina, i ʻekolu moku o kekahī, a i ʻekolu hoʻi o kekahī; ‟o ia ka pono, waiwai like; ‟aʻole kā! ʻIlihune loa kākou! ʻO ko Hilo poʻe aliʻi a me ko Kaʻū ke waiwai, no ka mea, na lākou kēlā aliʻi. E aho ke kaua! E aho ke kaua!!”

When the Aliʻi of Kona heard, they grumbled to themselves with the words, “How surprising! How very surprising indeed! We thought they would divide three districts to one and three districts to the other; it is proper, equal wealth but no! We are impoverished! The benefits belong to the Hilo Aliʻi and Kaʻū because they are their Aliʻi. Better to fight! Indeed it is better to fight!!

The Aliʻi of Kona, as expected, are not happy; nor are they surprised that Kamehameha did not receive any districts; they infer that Kamehameha should have received three and Kīwalaʻō three, both sharing equally in the benefits.

237 Kamakau, Ke Kumu Aupuni, p. 70.
When they hear that all six districts went to Kīwalaʻō, the Aliʻi of Kona declare to themselves, Kāhāhā! Kāhāhā!! Which had been previously translated as, Unjust! Unjust!! This translation infers that the Aliʻi of Kona were surprised at the announcement. However, we know that Liloa had not divided the lands equally between the keeper of the god and the Mōʻī which Malo confirmed, “the largest districts were not generally assigned to the highest chiefs lest they might be enabled to rebel against the government.” The Aliʻi of Kona had come to Kailua with the expectation of war and had thus prepared themselves with weapons, cloaks, helmets and then strategically locating their encampment near grounds that would give them the best advantage to conduct a battle. Obviously, they had come expecting a war, they knew that it was not a customary practice to give Kamehameha half of the districts.

According to an earlier version of the Hawaiian Dictionary, kāhāhā also means, surprised, astonished, disappointed...knows not how to account for. Therefore the Aliʻi of Kona were not surprised—they were simply being sarcastic. To have cried out, Unjust! Unjust! Would have been an open declaration of rebellion which they were not planning to do until it was clear that Kamehameha would not be receiving any districts; and there was one more opportunity for Kīwalaʻō to do so.

The Aliʻi of Kona declared to each other, “Ilīhune loa kākou” (We are all destitute!) Again they were not technically or immediately destitute, but would soon be if nothing was done. They left the proclamation perhaps to evaluate and discuss what their next step should be and perhaps to lobby for more support and consensus among the Aliʻi of Kona that war may be preferable. Although the Aliʻi of Kona see war as inevitable it is important to note that they did not begin immediate preparations for war after the proclamation. Instead, the Aliʻi of Kona went

---

surfing and was content to wait for the next phase of the kalaiʻāina to be completed.

Kamehameha was giving Kīwalaʻō time to find a solution. It appears that time was on the side of the Aliʻi of Kona, rather than the Aliʻi of Hilo and Kaʻū who were far from their lands and resources, each day that passed consumed more of the limited resources that they had brought with them, which meant fewer resources to sustain a prolonged conflict. Therefore, if a challenge were going to be made, the Aliʻi of Hilo and Kaʻū would have preferred that it begin as soon as possible.

Since all the districts went to Kīwalaʻō, his second in command Keawemaʻuhili would now be the one to divide the districts further. Keawemaʻuhili was an Aliʻi of Hilo—Kalaniʻōpuʻu and Kīwalaʻō were Aliʻi of Kaʻū—they were directly related though the ʻĪ and Keawe genealogical lines. Therefore, when the Aliʻi of Kona declared after the proclamation that the Aliʻi of Hilo and Kaʻū would get all the lands, they already knew who would now be dividing the districts. This suggests that thus far, nothing in this kalaiʻāina had surprised them—in fact, it appears they understood the process very well.

The Hale Mua Incident

Immediately after the proclamation, Kamehameha wanted to go with the rest of the Aliʻi of Kona, but Kekūhaupiʻo restrained him and suggested that they go to his home in Keʻei.

Kekūhaupiʻo then told Kamehameha:

E noho kāua i ʻaneʻi, a ahiahi aku, hoʻi hou kāua i kō kaikuaʻana lā i kēia pō.240
We will stay here, until evening, then we will return again to your older brother tonight.

An ʻaha ʻawa (awa gathering) was to be held at the hale mua (men’s house) of the Mōʻī Kīwalaʻō that evening. Kekūhaupiʻo wanted to make sure that Kamehameha attended the gathering with him. It is clear that Kekūhaupiʻo had a purpose for going to the hale mua which

---

240 Kamakau, Ke Kumu Aupuni, p. 71.
appears he did not share with Kamehameha. Kekūhaupiʻo was a famous and skilled warrior for his time and he was a kahuna; a warrior/priest and kahu (teacher) to Kamehameha. When the time arrives, they go the hale mua, where Kekūhaupiʻo converses with Kīwalaʻō;  

Hō mai kou ʻawa na ia nei e mama (na Kamehameha), ʻÓlelo maila hoʻi ka mōʻī, “He aha hoʻi kā ia ala mea e mama ai?” Pane aku hoʻi ʻo Kekūhaupiʻo, “ʻO ia kauoha ia a nā mākuʻa o ʻolua, e noho kanaka aku kekahī keiki o ʻolua ma lalo o kekahī keiki o ʻolua, ke kū kekahī keiki o ʻolua i ka moku.”  

Bring here your ʻawa, it is he (Kamehameha) who will chew it, The Mōʻī asked, “What will he chew? Kekūhaupiʻo answered, It was willed of the fathers of you two, that one child of you two will serve under one child of two of you, one of the two of you to rule the island.

Kekūhaupiʻo request and answer relied upon protocol and customary practices, to which Kīwalaʻō could not object. Hawaiians delighted in the ʻawa, perhaps because it freed them from normal inhibitions and stress. However, for Kekūhaupiʻo who was a skilled warrior and kahuna, ʻawa use was both purposeful and symbolic that had been embedded in protocol. Much like the offering of ʻĪmakakoloa at Pakini; the proper performance of the ceremony revealed the sincerity, commitment and pono of the individual. With war imminent it was important for Kekūhaupiʻo to know the real intentions of Kīwalaʻō towards his haumana (student) Kamehameha to determine if the Mōʻī would be pono in his conduct regarding Kamehameha.

Even though the event is non-official, Kamehameha understands his duty and proceeded to chew the ʻawa, mixed it with water then poured it into a cup which he handed to Kīwalaʻō according to proper practice. It is an intimate gesture of humility and submission, Kamehameha displayed his kaikaina ranking to Kīwalaʻō by preforming his task perfectly and therefore he deserved the respect and malama from his kaikuaʻana Kīwalaʻō. Kīwalaʻō forgot himself, grabbed the first cup and without thinking gave it to his aikāne punahele (intimate associate).  

It was a serious mistake that revealed that Kīwalaʻō had little respect or aloha for his kaikaina

---

241 Kamakau, Ke Kumu Aupuni, p.71.  
242 Kamakau, Ke Kumu Aupuni, p.71.
Kamehameha. His careless act would be similar to receiving a gift and then in the presence of the gift-giver, give it to someone else. Kekūhaupiʻo saw that Kamehameha would not be respected by Kīwalaʻō, he struck the cup from the hand of the aikāne punahele of Kīwalaʻō and sent it flying.

“The Hewa ke aliʻi, ʻaʻole paha i mama kō kaikaina i ka ʻawa---ē no ke kanaka, nou, no ke aliʻi.” Peku akula nō ʻo Kekūhaupiʻo iā Kamehameha me ka ī aku, “Hoʻi aku kāua a kau i luna o ka waʻa” Hoʻi akula nō hoʻi lāua a pae i Keʻei; hewa aku hewa mai--- ʻo ʻoe ka hewa, ʻo ke aliʻi i ka hewa.”

The Aliʻi is wrong, his younger brother perhaps did not chew the ʻawa for the kanaka of yours, [but] for you the Aliʻi. Kekūhaupiʻo kicked Kamehameha and said, “Let us return on board of the canoe.” They left and landed at Keʻei; fault is there and here---are you at fault? Is the Aliʻi (Mōʻī) at fault?

Did Kekūhaupiʻo go to the hale mua with the intent to find fault with the Mōʻī as a pretext for war? Quite possibly, however, if Kekūhaupiʻo was simply searching for a pretext to go to war, it would seem to be a lot of effort that only a few Aliʻi would witness. Kīwalaʻō had shown both friendship and respect to Kamehameha in public, but the real question was, would Kīwalaʻō maintain that respect. Drinking ʻawa can bring on a relaxed state which may remove inhibitions and allow a person to act more freely, revealing their true feelings. Kekūhaupiʻo purpose for going to the hale mua was to test the Mōʻī in a private and relaxed setting, to see if he truly respected Kamehameha. If Kīwalaʻō truly held Kamehameha in proper respect he would not forget the proper protocols, it is the classic case of, “actions speak louder than words.” By offering the first ʻawa cup to his aikāne punahele it proved to Kekūhaupiʻo that Kīwalaʻōʼs aikāne punahele was held in higher regard than Kamehameha, which also meant—Kamehameha would not be respected and no lands would be given to Kamehameha.

Kamehameha and Kekūhaupiʻo returned to Keʻei in which Kekūhaupiʻo lamented the situation; in his mind war was inevitable. He knew that he would be fighting against the son of

---

243 Kamakau, Ke Kumu Aupuni, p. 71.
Kalaniʻōpuʻu, which almost equated to fighting against Kalaniʻōpuʻu, with whom he had fought valiantly and loyally for much of his adult life. Who was right and who was wrong? The gods would decide. “*Hewa aku hewa mai*” the state of wrong exists there and it exists here, between the keeper of the god Kūkāʻilimoku and the Mōʻī; between the Aliʻi of Hilo and Kaʻū and the Aliʻi of Kona; between Kalaniʻōpuʻu’s time and Kīwalaʻō. There are many faults on both sides; only the death of one will decide who is largely at fault. Kekūhaupiʻo asked Kamehameha, “Are you at fault or is it the Mōʻī? You must be sure, because the one who is hewa will lose his life.”

The *hale mua* incident is important because we see Kamehameha very humbly conforming to *pono* behavior by serving his kaikuaʻana (older brother), Kīwalaʻō. Kīwalaʻō however, forgot himself and disrespected his kaikaina (younger brother) Kamehameha by giving away something that had been prepared especially for him. From our modern perspectives such a breach of etiquette is not that big of a deal; however, in the Hawaiian social world this was a serious oversight by Kīwalaʻō.

*Pono* behavior was not a one-sided proposition but carried a theme of reciprocity; there was a *pono/proper* behavior for the kaikaina and equally important there was a *pono/proper* behavior for the kaikuaʻana. Kīwalaʻō had failed to reciprocate the respectful behavior being offered to him. For Kekūhaupiʻo it spoke volumes regarding the mindset of Kīwalaʻō towards his kaikaina, Kamehameha. Though Kīwalaʻō had manifested a public regard and aloha for Kamehameha, this careless slip, revealed to Kekūhaupiʻo that he had more regard for his *aikāne punahele* which told him that Kamehameha would not be respected.

---
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The question that must be asked is, did Kekūhaupiʻo go to the Hale mua to pick a fight. It does not appear so, it’s most likely that Kekūhaupiʻo went in search of answers not necessarily to pick a fight. He knew that war was imminent, but as a warrior/priest who had served Kalaniʻōpuʻu faithfully he needed reassurance that his decision to support Kamehameha was pono—Kīwalaʻō’s misstep confirmed that decision. Kekūhaupiʻo knew as a kahuna (priest), that proper behavior was far more important than land and wealth. He also knew as a famous experienced warrior, that those who would stand with Kamehameha would be significantly outnumbered by those who stood with Kīwalaʻō. For people like Kekūhaupiʻo, war is serious business and the reasons for risking one’s life must be understood in terms of being pono, rather than in its spoils.

This kaikuaʻana/kaikaina familial relationship forms the spine of the Hawaiian social world. The Aliʻi who are directly related to the Mōʻī but not of the senior line are kaikaina younger siblings and would become the ‘iwikuamoʻo (backbone), ilamoku (executive officers) and kuhina (ministers of the government).245 The junior lines must serve the senior lines because it is the proper order, a discipline garnered from their navigating descendants who practiced the law of the sea, in which there must be an established order and discipline. It is not a model of democracy but rather a model of efficiency. The captain of a ship must be obeyed especially in times of distress or emergency. We see this order and discipline transferred into the political structure of the Aliʻi and the Makaʻāinana. However, the absolute rule of the Mōʻī was tempered with a code of pono behavior which included among other things the kaikuaʻana/kaikaina relationship.
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Keawemaʻuhili Makes the Division

The kauoha of Kalaniʻōpuʻu virtually left Kīwalaʻō with almost no options. Therefore, did Kalaniʻōpuʻu knowingly set the stage for war with the Aliʻi of Kona, or was Kalaniʻōpuʻu also following a customary practice? Before we can answer those questions we must first learn more about Keawemaʻuhili, Kīwalaʻō’s second in command.

Keawemaʻuhili was a half-brother of Kalaniʻōpuʻu, a grandson of Keawe and a descendant of the ‘Ī, the Mahi and Ahu Aliʻi, whose kapu was wili lua (doubly twisted), meaning he was of very high rank on both sides of his parents. Keawemaʻuhili was also a warrior who had fought with Alapaʻi and Kalaniʻōpuʻu, therefore he was a seasoned warrior and the highest ranking Aliʻi next to Kīwalaʻō, making him the logical candidate for the second in command. Did Kalaniʻōpuʻu know that Keawemaʻuhili would become his son’s second in command? The answer is definitely, yes. Kalaniʻōpuʻu went to great lengths to remove potential threats to his son’s future rule such as Nuʻuanupāʻahu and ʻĪmakakoloa; and would have chosen carefully his son’s future second in command. Furthermore, as the highest ranking Aliʻi after Kīwalaʻō it would have almost been Keawemaʻuhili’s right.

From the moʻolelo of Nuʻuanupāʻahu, we know that Keawemaʻuhili was most likely present in Kohala when it was arranged that Kīwalaʻō would be the new Mōʻī after the death of his father Kalaniʻōpuʻu. Keawemaʻuhili was also present when Kalaniʻōpuʻu gave his kauoha. Therefore, Keawemaʻuhili would have known for quite a while that he would be the one to eventually divide the six districts in the kalaiʻāina after the initial division was conducted by Kīwalaʻō. Keawemaʻuhili’s only constraint was waiting for Kīwalaʻō to make the kauoha.
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official by public announcement which would then authorize him to begin the division of the
districts.

I kekahī lā aʻe, koi mai ʻo Keawemaʻuhili i ka Mōʻi Kīwalaʻō a me nā aliʻi, e ʻokiʻoki i ka ʻāina o Hawaiʻi. ʻE ʻokiʻoki i ka ʻāina, a no kuʻu kaikaina kekahī ʻāina, no Kamehameha” wahi a ka Mōʻi. Hōʻole maila ʻo Keawemaʻuhili, me ka i ʻana aku, “ʻAʻole pēlā ke kauoha a kō makua kāne. Ua kaʻawale nō kona kauoha, ʻo ke akua, a ʻo kona ʻāina kahiko nō, ʻo kona nō ʻia i kauoha ʻia ai. ʻO ʻoe nō ke Aliʻi o ke aupuni, ʻo wau aku nō ma lalo ou, a ʻo nā aliʻi mai ma lalo o kākou, Pēlā ke kauoha a ke kupapaʻu.”

The next day, Keawemaʻuhili urged the Mōʻi Kīwalaʻō and the Aliʻi to divide the lands of Hawaiʻi. “Divide the lands, some lands for my dear younger brother, who is Kamehameha” said the Mōʻi. Keawemaʻuhili refused and saying, “This was not the will of your father. His will cannot be ignored, the god, and his hereditary lands, is bequeathed to him. You are the Aliʻi of the government, I am under you, and the Aliʻi under us, that was will of the dead.

Kīwalaʻō attempts to exert his position over Keawemaʻuhili as Mōʻi by insisting that some lands be given to his dear kaikaina, Kamehameha. Keawemaʻuhili is not impressed nor moved, he almost rudely reminds Kīwalaʻō of the command of his father Kalaniʻōpuʻu and the protocol of the kalaiʻāina. Kīwalaʻō has no option but to accept the rebuff, he is powerless to do anything else. Kīwalaʻō had inherited his position. He did not earn it through conquest and was therefore untested, lacking in confidence and beholding to the loyal support of his uncle Keawemaʻuhili. Then, without hesitation Keawemaʻuhili, brazenly takes the largest and best ʻāina for himself, leaving his two nephews Kīwalaʻō and Keōuakūʻahuʻula (Aliʻi of Kaʻū) without any districts.

After Keawemaʻuhili makes the divisions, Keōuakūʻahuʻula immediately meets with his half-brother Kīwalaʻō to find out if he still holds the lands he previously held under Kalaniʻōpuʻu. He is informed by Kīwalaʻō,

“ʻO ko kāua mau wahi ʻāina kahiko nō, ʻo kou nō ia.”248

We are both left without lands of this division, our uncle of ours has taken all the lands. Our hereditary lands you have received.
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Keōuakūʻahuʻula must have suspected that he would lose some of his lands that he held under Kalaniʻōpuʻu which is why he met quickly with Kīwalaʻō after Keawemaʻuhili made the division. This tells us that either he knew his uncle was “alunu” (greedy) or that there may have been other issues between him and his uncle. Was Keawemaʻuhili indeed alunu? If Keawemaʻuhili was alunu, wouldn’t Kalaniʻōpuʻu have known it? And if he did, why would he put someone who he knew was alunu as second in command to his son Kīwalaʻō?

Kalaniʻōpuʻu was an Aliʻi of Kaʻū and so was his son Kīwalaʻō. ‘Īmakakoloa was the Aliʻi of Puna who rebelled against Kalaniʻōpuʻu. Puna borders Kaʻū. Nuʻuanupāʻahu was also an Aliʻi of Kaʻū who was suspected by Kalaniʻōpuʻu of plotting to rebel against the rule of his son Kīwalaʻō. Keōuakūʻahuʻula was also an Aliʻi of Kaʻū. Therefore, Keōuakūʻahuʻula may have also been a suspect for rebellion. It does not seem reasonable that Nuʻuanupāʻahu would have entertained the idea of a rebellion without the support of Keōuakūʻahuʻula his relative, which may explain why Keōuakūʻahuʻula had all his lands taken from him—he was becoming too strong.

Keawemaʻuhili appears to be following the customary practice of not giving the highest chiefs great portions of lands to prevent rebellion. He makes the division so quickly that it has the appearance of being preplanned perhaps by Kalaniʻōpuʻu. Keawemaʻuhili knew that by depriving Keōuakūʻahuʻula of his previously held lands Keōuakūʻahuʻula would have only two choices, accept destitution and begin disbanding his retinue of warriors or start a war and win lands by conquest.

Since destitution is not an option for an Aliʻi, Keōuakūʻahuʻula has no choice but to go to war, but whom will he fight. Upon first glance, he should have attacked Keawemaʻuhili, since Keawemaʻuhili was the one who set the stage for Keōuakūʻahuʻula’s impoverishment. However,
he did not attack Keawemaʻuhili, instead he picked a fight with some of Kamehameha’s people, caused their death and then sent their bodies to Kīwalaʻō who immediately offered the bodies as sacrifice.

There are several reasons why Keōuakūʻahuʻula may have decided to pick a fight with Kamehameha: 1) Keōuakūʻahuʻula was an Aliʻi of Kaʻū and half-brother of Kīwalaʻō, attacking Keawemaʻuhili also meant attacking the Mōʻī Kīwalaʻō, his half-brother; 2) Genealogy; Keōuakūʻahuʻula was closely related to Keawemaʻuhili and Kīwalaʻō; 3) If he fought against Keawemaʻuhili there was no assurance that the Aliʻi of Kona would join him, in fact they might fight against him to share in the division of his lands in Kaʻū. Therefore, his only course to avoid impoverishment was to go to war against Kamehameha and the Aliʻi of Kona. However, Keōuakūʻahuʻula was not strong enough to take on the Aliʻi of Kona all by himself and needed the assurance that Keawemaʻuhili would join him. The only way to guarantee that to happen was to have Kīwalaʻō offer the bodies provided by Keōuakūʻahuʻula as a sacrifice. This would force Keawemaʻuhili, Kīwalaʻō’s second in command to commit to the ensuing battle to protect Kīwalaʻō. When the bodies of those killed by Keōuakūʻahuʻula’s men were brought to Kīwalaʻō, he immediately offered the bodies as sacrifice without any discussion with Keawemaʻuhili or his council of Aliʻi. It appears that Kīwalaʻō and Keōuakūʻahuʻula may have entered into a prior agreement after realizing they had been left destitute of lands.

Keōuakūʻahuʻula was a warrior; he was intelligent, proud, and somewhat impulsive, made decisions quickly and was unafraid of war. Keawemaʻuhili actions had guaranteed that a war would take place immediately. Perhaps Keawemaʻuhili knew that Keōuakūʻahuʻula would never side with the Aliʻi of Kona because of his close ties to Kīwalaʻō and genealogy. Strategically and logistically time was not on the side of the Keawemaʻuhili because they were
far from Hilo and their resources, therefore it would have been better if the war started as soon as possible giving the Aliʻi of Kona little time for preparation and giving Keawemaʻuhili the ability to conduct a war while he still had sufficient provisions to do so. This scenario suggests preplanning, and which Kalaniʻōpuʻu would have had opportunity to participate in. If Kalaniʻōpuʻu was aware of the bold actions of the Aliʻi of Kona carried out at Pakini heiau he may have conspired with Keawemaʻuhili in bringing about the war immediately after the kalaiʻāina in order to deal with the Aliʻi of Kona and protect the future rule of his son Kīwalaʻō. Keōuakūʻahuʻula was impulsive and a possible suspect for rebellion, who would have wasted no time in starting the war, and at the same time keep him dependent on Keawemaʻuhili. The plan would have been very simple, all it required was for someone to keep Kīwalaʻō from giving the Aliʻi of Kona lands, then strip Keōuakūʻahuʻula of lands held previously to get him to start a war; which is exactly what Keawemaʻuhili did.

Results of the Kalaiʻāina of Kīwalaʻō

After Keōuakūʻahuʻula received the disappointing details of the kalaiʻāina he left Kīwalaʻō and immediately met with his own Aliʻi, to inform them of the results of the kalaiʻāina leaving them only two choices, accept destitution or fight. They chose to fight, immediately donning their war regalia and went down to Kailua under the pretense of cliff diving. They then initiated the conflict by cutting down several coconut trees. It is a serious offense, only an Aliʻi of Nīaupiʻo rank is allowed to cut down a coconut tree. Some of Kamehameha’s men intervened and a fight ensued resulting in the death of several of Kamehameha’s people. Keōuakūʻahuʻula then sends the bodies to Kīwalaʻō who immediately offered the bodies as sacrifice to his gods.

The prospects for defeating the Aliʻi of Kona were actually very good. The superior force and the numerical advantage lay with the Keawemaʻuhili and those who supported Kīwalaʻō.
This notion is supported by the defections of some of the Aliʻi of Kona from Kamehameha to Kīwalaʻō; even Kanekoa the Aliʻi of Waimea and who was a favorite of Kamehameha had defected. Hauiki was chosen to conduct the battle because of the gulches in Keʻei and the rough lava at Honaunau removed some of the advantage of a larger fighting force over a smaller force. If the forces were evenly matched the battleground chosen would have been an open plain where different strategies could be deployed. Incredibly and against superior numbers Kīwalaʻō is killed, causing the forces of Kīwalaʻō to scatter—Kīwalaʻō’s death signaled that the gods had chose Kamehameha to rule and the incident at the heiau at Pakini fulfilled what was feared by the Aliʻi of Hilo and Kaʻū.

The Battle of Mokuʻōhai

The battle of Mokuʻōhai incorporated military strategy, boldness and skill as well as prophetic predictions by their skilled kaula (prophets/prophetess). The Aliʻi depended upon the skill of their warriors, the strategy of their military kahuna, and the prophetic warnings of their kaula. The Mōʻī who listened to his advisors usually prospered, those who were ignored their advisors usually ended in misfortune. Hawaiians were famous for their kaula (prophets). On the fifth day the major battle took place. Kīwalaʻō was warned by his kaula, Kalaikuʻiʻaha;

"ʻO kēia lā, he au i luna, pā iā ʻoe i ka ʻehu kakahiaka, i ke awakea, hoʻi ke au i lalo, pā i kēlā ʻaoʻao i ka ʻehu ahiahi, no laila, e hoʻomoe ke kaua ʻapōpō."249

This day, the current will be above you in the morning dawn, until noon, then the current will return below, to that (the other) side in the eventide, therefore, put the war to rest until tomorrow.

The Aliʻi of the Mōʻī Kīwalaʻō did not want to hear the prophecy of Kalaikuʻiʻaha because they wanted a quick defeat of the Aliʻi of Kona confidence in their superior numbers and having won all earlier skirmishes, had blinded their judgment as they failed to take into account the toll of their long march from Honaunau to Keʻei had on their warriors. Therefore, they
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ignored the advice of their *kaula*, Kalaikuʻiʻaha. However, Keōuakūʻahuʻula perhaps out of concern that the advice of the *kaula* was not being followed, then gave the orders to have his canoes readied and waiting just in case Kamehameha’s side somehow found victory.

Kamehameha was also delayed in reaching the battle by his own *kaula* Holoʻae and Pine (prophetess), who used the *ipu kuaʻaha* to determine the outcome of the battle, in which they told Kamehameha;

> He lā pilikia kēia, e make ana nā ʻaoʻao ʻelua, a e make ana kekahī aliʻi o ʻoukou; akā, i hoʻololi ke akua i ka make ma kēlā ʻaoʻao, a laila, e make ana ke aliʻi nui, akā, eia nō ke au i luna, a ʻaui aʻe ka lā, na kēia ʻaoʻao ka heʻe.\(^{250}\)

This is a day of trouble, with death on both sides, and one *Aliʻi* of yours will die; but the god changed the death to the other side, then, the *Aliʻi nui* [*Mōʻī*] will be killed but now the current is above, and when the sun declines, then this side will flee.

What is interesting is that the *kaula* from both Kīwalaʻō and Kamehameha predicted the same outcome. Kalaikuʻiʻaha tried to change the outcome by telling Kīwalaʻō to hold off the battle until the next day hoping that given a new day a different outcome could be wrought, unfortunately for Kīwalaʻō the warning was not heeded. Kīwalaʻō was killed in battle in the late part of the day as predicted; Keawemaʻuhili was captured and imprisoned, while Keōuakūʻahuʻula escaped back to his home district in Kaʻū. Once Kīwalaʻō was killed it was a *hoʻailona* (a sign from the gods) to all *Aliʻi* that the god Kūkāʻilimoku was with Kamehameha, the death of Kīwalaʻō declared victory for Kamehameha and confirmed that Kamehameha was—*pono*; Kīwalaʻō apparently not; thus justifying the snatching of the government from Kīwalaʻō by Kamehameha.

Kamehameha would go on to unite all the Hawaiian Islands by honoring his god Kūkāʻilimoku, building the heiau at Puʻu Koholā and demonstrating *pono* behavior. The next *Kalaiʻāina* would occur upon the death of Kamehameha thirty-seven years later. During this

---
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time Kamehameha eventually instituted the office of *Kiaʻaina* (Governor) to replace the *Mōʻi* of each island as each *Mōʻi* was defeated.

**Ka Wā ʻo Liholiho (The Time of Liholiho)**

The next Kalaiʻāina would occur upon the death of Kamehameha thirty-seven years later on May 8, 1819. Kamehameha, who had snatched the government from Kīwalaʻō and went on to unite the islands under his rule for twenty-three years; dies at the age of eighty-three. During his rule, Kamehameha had sought to insure that the government he left behind would be a peaceful government for his heir Liholiho. Following the traditional practice, Kamehameha gave his son Liholiho the government and he gave his god Kūkāʻilimoku to his nephew Kaʻoākekuaokalani who was the son of his younger brother Keliʻimaikaʻi. At the time of his death Liholiho was twenty-two years of age, Keōpūolani mother of Liholiho and the most sacred *Aliʻi kapu* was forty; Kaʻahumanu favorite wife of Kamehameha and *hānai* mother of Liholiho was forty-six.

> In days of Kamehameha when dimness did not overcome his eyes, no prolonged ringing in his ears, during his days of earthly life, his proclamation was broadly proclaimed before the *Aliʻi* and the *Makaʻāinana*, in telling them, that Kalanikualiholiho the heir of the government on the time of Kamehameha death, the news to be proclaimed that Liholiho would preside over the consecrated days of the sacred gods of the temple. And by his indisputable will, the government would come into the possession of Liholiho, at the death of Kamehameha.

> *A ʻo ka lua o kāna kauoha, ʻo ke akua ʻo Kūkāʻilimoku, a ua lilo ia kauoha iā Kaʻoākekuaokalani. ʻO ke aupuni a me ke akua ua like pū ko lāua mau ʻano, a he mau haʻawina kiʻekiʻe loa ia i ka wā kahi kō. Pēlā nō ka wā o Līloa, ua kauoha ʻo ia i kēia mau haʻawina ʻelua, no kana mau keiki ʻelua. ʻO ke aupuni, ʻo ia kāna kauoha iā Hākau, a ʻo ke akua hoʻi, ʻo*

---

And the second of his will, the god Kūkāʻilimoku, that was to go into the possession of Kaʻoākekuaokalani. The government and the god, they were equal in nature, and were the highest honor in ancient times. It was like this in the time of Līloa, when he bequeathed these two gifts, for his two children. The government, thus he willed to Hākau, and the god Kūkāʻilimoku as follows willed to ‘Umi, but the deeds done by the child who ruled the government was wrong, and the government passed into the possession of the child whom he gave the god.

Kamehameha was a pious Mōʻī. He had respected the gods and adhered to the ancient practices of the ‘ai kapu which forbade women and men from eating together as well as other restrictions. He had built the heiau at Puʻu Koholā at Kawaihae because he was told that if he did so he would unite all the islands under his rule without suffering a scratch to his skin. This came to pass. Of those Mōʻī whom he defeated, he immediately secured the possession of their gods and continued to respect them.

The day after the death of Kamehameha, Keōpūolani his most sacred wife, daughter of Kīwalaʻō and who possessed the highest kapu of all Aliʻi, appeared to have also come to the conclusion that it was time to end the practice of the ‘ai kapu (sacred eating) as she joined with those who begin practicing ‘ai noa (free eating).

ʻO ka haʻalele ʻana o Keōpūolani, ke aliʻi hoʻokahi i koe nona ke kapu, me ke kōkua like ʻana o nā aliʻi a pau.253

When Keōpūolani abandoned [her kapu], the Aliʻi with the single highest kapu remaining, which indeed had caused the kapu to fall, with the support of all the Aliʻi.

Abandoning her kapu meant that she would be giving up her own sacred kapu which distinguished her from the Aliʻi and the people. This abandonment caused all other Aliʻi who held a sacred kapu, to abandon theirs as well initiating the end of the ‘ai kapu practice.

---
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The most important question that must be considered at this point is why did Keōpūolani voluntarily give up her sacred *kapu* by supporting the abolishment of the ‘ai kapu? Keōpūolani was the highest ranking *Aliʻi* and who held the most sacred *kapu*, in essence she was the closest human relative to the *akua* (god) and because of her *nīaupiʻo* birth; she was considered an *akua* who walked on the earth—by ending the ‘ai kapu her own personal distinction and political importance would be greatly diminished.

The ‘ai kapu was like a covenant between Hawaiians and their gods. It would be similar to the Jewish covenant of not eating pork, Seventh-day Adventist, Latter-day Saints (Mormon) food restrictions; piety and devotion became symbolized through abstinence of certain foods that demonstrated obedience, voluntary submission, to their god(s) in return for blessings of protection, guidance and abundance. These abstinence practices are based on a belief of reciprocation between worshippers and their god(s). The Israelites learned that when they failed to keep the covenants that they made with their god—destruction came upon them. When they were obedient to their covenants, Jehovah protected and cared for them. Hawaiians were under similar reciprocal arrangements; the embodiment of this reciprocal relationship rooted in the Hawaiian metaphor of *malama* ‘āina.254

A *pono* Mōʻī is the *kaikuaʻana* (older sibling) of the people and must *malama* (protect and care) them, failing to *malama* the people would cause support for the Mōʻī to shift elsewhere and eventually the Mōʻī could be replaced. The Mōʻī was also *kaikaina* (younger sibling) to the *akua* (gods), therefore as the *kaikaina* he needed to respect, serve and support the *akua*. Failing to fulfill his role as a *kaikaina* could not only bring serious consequences upon the Mōʻī but the people also. Therefore, the *pono* behavior of the Mōʻī was seen as an important precursor to prevent natural disasters or calamites from occurring which were in realm and power of a

---

displeased akua. Equally, if the akua did not malama (protect) the people, like the Mōʻī, the akua could be disregarded or replaced. This concept of malama ʻāina extended from the akua, to the land, to the Mōʻī, to the Aliʻi and to the Makaʻāinana, laying down the order of respect in Hawaiian society.

During Kamehameha’s time, he employed as many as forty to fifty foreigners who built, repaired and sailed his western ships. They openly ate in the company of women, most were not religious, and many ignored the other sacred kapus without suffering any personal tragic calamity or retribution from the Hawaiian gods. More importantly, Hawaiians observed that these foreigners were not affected by the sicknesses that swept the land since the arrival of Cook and that had claimed the lives of three-quarters of the population. For some, the gods that Kamehameha served piously were either unable or unwilling to save them.

Therefore, if the akua failed to malama the people, Keōpūolani as an akua who walked the earth, had two concerns; first, was her behavior pono; if it wasn’t then she might be removed, exiled or killed. If her behavior had been pono than it could only mean the gods were unable or powerless to save the people from the new diseases. Therefore, when the sicknesses came and people died by the hundreds of thousands, perhaps, their reason to worship those gods may have died. For Keōpūolani, she had to make sure that her behavior was exemplary to escape any blame for all the sickness and death.

Obviously, Keōpūolani could not have decided to do away with two thousand year old practice without first gaining the support of the council of Aliʻi and specifically Kaʻahumanu. This meant that the decision to do away with the ʻai kapu was made before the death of Kamehameha. Kamakau confirms when he quotes Keōpūolani as saying;

\[ Ua \ make \ akula \ nō \ ka \ mea \ nāna \ e \ mālama \ ke \ akua, \ a \ ua \ pono \ nō \ ko \ kākou \ ʻai \ noa \ ʻana. \]

\[ \text{Kamakau, Ke Kumu Aupuni, p. 209.} \]
Because for him whom the god protected is dead, our free eating is right.

We know that Kaʻahumanu, Liholiho’s hānai mother, supported the abolishment of the ʻai kapu because she sends for him to join her and the Aliʻi at Kailua for the purpose of being proclaimed Mōʻi, and to participate in the “free eating,” (men and women eating together) that was being practiced there. Liholiho at the time was with his cousin Kaʻoākekuaokalani who was the keeper of the god Kūkāʻilimoku. They had attempted to perform the ʻaha ceremony but were unsuccessful in obtaining the ʻaha, Liholiho then decided to join his mother Keōpūolani, Kaʻahumanu and those Aliʻi who supported the abolishment of the ʻai kapu. It was at that ceremony which proclaimed Liholiho as Mōʻi, that Kaʻahumanu declared the kauoha of Kamehameha that she would be regent and co-rule with Liholiho.

When the Mōʻi Liholiho entered inside of the assembly of people and the Aliʻi council, he meeting with Kaʻahumanu whom she answered in these government inheriting words, “Oh Heavenly one, I tell the last words of the command of your grandfather: Here are the Aliʻi, there are your people of your grandfather, and there are your guns and here your lands. But, we will rule in the land. Liholiho readily agreed and he ruled as Aliʻi in the government.

This is a major departure from the process of the traditional kalaiʻāina and we are without collaborating testimony to confirm that Kamehameha did give a final kauoha that Kaʻahumanu would be regent and co-rule with his son Liholiho. However, if Kamehameha did give the command for Kaʻahumanu to share power with Liholiho then it might have meant that Kamehameha had recognized the strength of Kaʻahumanu and her relatives; and thus, relinquished or negotiated co-rule rather than complete rule for his son Liholiho. However, if

---

256 Kamakau, Ke Kumu Aupuni, p. 199.
Kamehameha did not give the *kauoha*, then Kaʻahumanu was, without question, the most politically powerful *Aliʻi wahine* at the time.

Either scenario tells us that Kaʻahumanu was politically powerful, so why does she agree to co-rule? Why not complete rule? There are at least two possible explanations; one is that she loved her *hānai* son Liholiho, who appeared to be a good boy who was compassionate and respectful and would make a *pono Mōʻī*. Another reason may have been that she did not have the support of all the *Aliʻi*…just a majority of them; if she took all the power it would have been viewed as a direct usurpation of Liholiho’s inherited right. In Hawaiian society women participated at the highest levels of government, it was not the sole province of men.

Emancipation of women had already occurred in Hawaiian society; it would take another 200 years before women in the United States would be allowed the right to vote.

**Kuhina Nui ʻo Kaʻahumanu**

In 1801, Keʻeaumoku father of Kaʻahumanu and Kamehameha’s most trusted advisor was dying, and in the last moments of his life Kamehameha asked him which of his *Aliʻi* did he need to fear, who would rebel and try to take his government from him, Keʻeaumoku answered;

“ʻAʻohe aliʻi e kipi i kō aupuni; hoʻokahi nō naʻe kipi nui o kō aupuni, ʻo kō wāhine nō (Kaʻahumanu); a nui kō mālama, ʻaʻole e kipi ʻia kō aupuni.”

None of the *Aliʻi* have the power to rebel against your government; but there is only one who has enough power to overthrow your government, your wife (Kaʻahumanu); be sure to care for her greatly, then there will be no rebellion against your government.

*A lohe ʻo Kamehameha i nā ʻōlelo kaouha a Keʻeaumoku, a laila, kūkāla ʻia akula ka ʻōlelo paʻa a me ke kānāwai. ʻO ke aliʻi a me ke kanaka e moe kolohe iā Kaʻahumanu, ʻo ka make ka uku hoʻopaʻi. ʻAʻole nō kona mālama ʻi o i lilo ʻo Kaʻahumanu i wahine hoʻokahi nāna wale nō, akā hoʻi, ua makaʻu ʻo ia o lilo ʻo Kaʻahumanu i wahine hoʻokahi nāna wale nō, akā hoʻi, ua makaʻu ʻo ia o lilo ke aloha o Kaʻahumanu i ke kāne ʻē, a kipi mai hoʻi i ke aupuni; no ka mea, ʻo ka hapa nui o nā aliʻi, he poʻe mākua kāne a mau kaikunāne hoʻi no Kaʻahumanu.*

---


When Kamehameha heard the advice of Keʻeaumoku, then a proclamation was prepared and the law. The Aliʻi and the men cannot sleep with Kaʻahumanu, the penalty will be death. His caring really was not genuine, Kaʻahumanu had become his one only wife, but he feared Kaʻahumanu would become attached to another man, who would rebel against the government; because, most of the Aliʻi, were fathers and brothers and sisters of Kaʻahumanu.

As early as 1801, Kamehameha was aware of the potential danger posed by his wife Kaʻahumanu because of her many relatives whom she was connected to. In 1809, Kaʻahumanu was strong enough to make plans for rebellion especially after the death of Kanihonui.259

Kalanimoku was confident enough that he approached Liholiho directly,

“What do you think? Shall we wrest the [government] kingdom from your father, make you [Mōʻī] king and put him to death? Liholiho bowed his head and answered, “I don’t want my father to die.”260

Kalanimoku had boldly posed the question directly to Liholiho indicating that they had already consolidated enough power and were prepared to forcibly remove his father Kamehameha from the government if Liholiho agreed. They had offered to make Liholiho the Mōʻī, instead of accepting he turns down the offer, revealing his desire to save his father. His answer is pono, as it comes from the heart. It is so pono that the insurrection is put on hold—touched by the words of the young Aliʻi Liholiho; the conspirators relent and allow his father, Kamehameha, to live out his life peacefully.261 The fact that Kaʻahumanu included Liholiho in their plans indicates that she may have recognized his Akua rank; his right to rule and/or was affectionately attached to her hānai son. Apparently, honest moral conduct mattered in Hawaiian society and was respected by those at the highest levels. Interestingly, the conspirators appear to be acting out of a sincere concern for the well-being of the lāhui (nation), rather than political ambition or power.

259 Note: In 1809, Kanihonui had been put to death and sacrificed because he had slept with Kaʻahumanu. Kanihonui was a very handsome nineteen year-old and a nephew of Kamehameha. However he was not put to death because Kamehameha was jealous or because Kanihonui had committed the Christian concept of adultery; Kanihonui was put to death because he had broken kapu Kamehameha had placed on the body of Kaʻahumanu.

260 ʻIʻi, Fragments of Hawaiian History, p. 50-51.

261 ʻIʻi, Fragments of Hawaiian History, p. 50-51.
After witnessing three-fourths of the Hawaiian population die from strange new diseases, while Kamehameha remained in pious devotion to his gods, most likely convinced Kaʻahumanu and Keōpūolani that the gods which he worshipped were powerless to save the people. They also saw that the *haole* who did not obey the “sacred eating,” was unaffected. In, their minds, gods who could not save their people were useless—hence, the abandonment of the ‘ai kapu and the embracement of the ‘ai noa. This decision demonstrates that while Hawaiians as a society were often pious in their religious beliefs and worship, they were also pragmatic.

Clearly, the society of the *Aliʻi* operated on principles that were substantially different from the ruling classes of Europe. The power of the *Mōʻī* and the *Aliʻi* though absolute, operated out of consensus and was bound by *pono* behavior; this was a form of governance that the missionaries had no personal experience or knowledge. Thus, the missionaries were often puzzled by the voluntary obedience and compliance of the people to the wishes of their leadership; and from their own experiences could not understand such devotion. The society of the *Aliʻi* led rather than ruled. They respected the people as their *kaikaina* to be protected and cared for, not to be exploited. This perspective reveals that Hawaiian leadership was unique, and thus, supplies a logical explanation for Hawaiians phenomenal rise to literacy—or at least a partial explanation.
Chapter 5

The Society of the Makaʻāinana

Who were the Makaʻāinana?

Inherently, traditionally and genealogically the Makaʻāinana and the Aliʻi had always enjoyed the right of freedom of movement or the right to travel. They were a moana (ocean) people, a race of seafarers with the innate desire to travel encoded in their DNA. Therefore, those Makaʻāinana and Aliʻi who felt that they were not appreciated or taken care of properly would have embarked on a “ʻimi haku” (search for a lord).

The relationship between Makaʻāinana and Aliʻi was distinctly different from relationship between the European aristocracy, and their peasants, serfs or fiefs. The Makaʻāinana were free to move to a different ahupuaʻa, district or island if they choose to, especially if they were not satisfied with the Aliʻi in the district in which they lived. This freedom to relocate naturally placed a check on the Aliʻi. If the Aliʻi were too harsh, too demanding or mistreated the Makaʻāinana, the Makaʻāinana could simply leave the district. As the Makaʻāinana abandoned the district, the production of surplus goods would drop; and a drop in production of surplus goods to the Mōʻī would have caused an immediate inquiry. Therefore, to keep the Makaʻāinana from leaving the district the Aliʻi had to make sure that the Makaʻāinana were treated fairly according to customary practice. In other words, the Aliʻi, in the eyes of the Makaʻāinana, must be pono.

This qualification required skillful managers who could balance productivity and happiness. A level of “cooperative efficiency” had to be maintained to prevent people from leaving. This fundamental “freedom of movement” rewarded the pono Aliʻi directly and
punished the not *pono* or *hewa* *Aliʻi* indirectly. It was a natural process, which encourages and rewards good leadership while exposing the bad.

On the opposite end, if you were unproductive or lazy, the *Aliʻi* had very little incentive to encourage you to stay and in the interest of preserving the cooperative efficiency might give your land to someone else who would make it productive. This balance would keep the land in a high state of production by rewarding those who worked, with land; and weeding out those who choose not to work, with dispossession of land.

An early definition of the *Makaʻāinana* was; “being of the land or one belonging to the land.” Translated literally it translates as “the eyes of the land.” The *Makaʻāinana* have long been equated to a commoner, and though they were the cultivators of the land; the *Makaʻāinana* were much more than the commoner of Europe. They were the ones who spent the long tedious hours, days, months, and years observing, learning and accumulating knowledge specific to their *ʻoihana* (principal work), whether it was as a farmer, fisherman or craftsman. Therefore, they would also be the ones who would have had the knowledge to design, engineer and build the extensive *ʻauwai* (irrigation systems); delineate the different vegetation growing zones, as found in Kona, Hawaiʻi, that matched plant and elevation/climate for maximum growing efficiency. They would have been the ones who would have experimented with growing kalo in cold water instead of dry land which resulted in the design and engineering of the *loʻi* (irrigated *kalo* gardens) which increased *kalo* production fivefold. The *Makaʻāinana* would been the ones who would have accumulated all the knowledge needed to build a successful *loko iʻa* (fish ponds) which created a protected estuary for the *ʻamaʻama* and other fish species; and the *koʻa* (open

---

ocean fish farming) which trained the *opelu* to return to specific breeding grounds to be harvested seasonally.

In 1903, sixty-seven fish ponds on Oʻahu delivered to market 578,292 pounds of fish.²⁶³ It was estimated that prior to Cook’s arrival there were approximately 400+ fishponds in productive use, applying the 1903 average pond production numbers to the 400+ fishponds gives us a 3.5 million pounds of fish harvested each year—all without launching a single canoe. Careful and consistent observations of fish, learning what fish ate, what kinds of fish ate algae, what kinds of algae that certain fish preferred and what were the premier conditions that promoted the proper algae to grow, was knowledge that would have been required before a pond could have been successfully constructed. Hawaiians knew that planting taro in water produced five times the yield of the same taro planted on dry land; the only requirement was that water temperature needed to be cold enough to keep the taro from rotting. All this engineering could not have come from a top down management system—instead, it strongly suggests that it had to have come from the ground up. This kind of knowledge could have only come from those who planted and fished daily; and who observed, studied fish and plants daily, monthly, seasonally, yearly and generational. These kinds of advanced technological achievements could only have been developed by those who were on the land; whose eyes were of the land—the *Makaʻāinana*. The time that it took to bring these technological achievements to their present state of perfection strongly suggests that it most likely spanned several generations; surviving intact up until the arrival of the missionaries. The longevity and continued uninterrupted operation of these achievements, challenges the assumption made by Western historians and academics that Hawaiians warfare was similar to European warfare. In Europe, because the people were forced

into military service of their lord or king, these nationalistic European wars devastated the population and the lands upon which they fought. Nationalistic wars that involved their citizenry typically resulted in stealing, pillaging, looting and/or destruction of the technological achievements of their enemies. In contrast, Hawaiian technological achievements remained intact and untouched—which was evidenced after Kamehameha conquered Maui, Molokaʻi, Lānaʻi and Oʻahu.

**The Moʻolelo of Kalanimālōkūkuikepoʻookalani (Keliʻimaikaʻi)**

The *moʻolelo* of Kalanimālōkūkuikepoʻookalani younger brother of Kamehameha gives us some insight into this relationship between *Aliʻi* and *Makaʻāinana*. During the battle of Kaʻahuʻula on Maui, the forces of Kalanimālōkūkuikepoʻookalani invaded Maui at Kīpahulu. Upon landing at Kīpahulu, Kalanimālōkūkuikepoʻookalani immediately gave the command to his warriors that no one should touch the property of the *Makaʻāinana* and in this case the property of the *Makaʻāinana* of Maui. Therefore the crops of the *Makaʻāinana* of Maui were not despoiled and for this act the *Makaʻāinana* of Maui called the younger brother of Kamehameha, “Keliʻimaikaʻi “the good Aliʻi”, a name by which Kalanimālōkūkuikepoʻookalani would eventually adopt and by which he is commonly known today.

When the Maui forces are finally collected and sent to repel the invading forces of Keliʻimaikaʻi they successfully drive the forces of Keliʻimaikaʻi back. The Hawaiʻi forces are driven back so quickly that Keliʻimaikaʻi is almost surrounded by Maui warriors. The *kahū* of Keliʻimaikaʻi, Muliheʻe, saw that Keliʻimaikaʻi was in danger and launched himself into the heat of the battle temporarily scattering the Maui warriors. The Maui warriors pull back to regroup.

---

and Muliheʻe decides to hide the young chief in a “thick growth of kaeʻe vine and tī plants.”

The Makaʻāinana of Maui had seen where the chief was hidden but did not reveal his location to the Maui warriors who defeated the Hawaiʻi warriors who were searching for him. Later that night, Keliʻimaikaʻi escaped back to Hawaiʻi and went to his older brother Kamehameha I.

There was a tearful reunion and Keliʻimaikaʻi recounted the courage of his kahu Muliheʻe.

Kamehameha then told Keliʻimaikaʻi that if he had been killed he (Kamehameha); would have brought great slaughter upon the people, killing men, women, and children. Keliʻimaikaʻi then told his brother, that it was because of the kindness of the Makaʻāinana of Maui that his life was spared. To which Kamehameha then replied, “Then we will carry on the war on Maui against the sons of Kahekili.”

The Makaʻāinana Civilian/Non-combatants

When Kalanimālokulokuikepoʻookalani younger brother of Kamehameha and a Hawaiʻi island Aliʻi invaded Maui, his conduct towards the Makaʻāinana of Maui gives us an insight to a traditional and customary relationship that existed between Aliʻi and Makaʻāinana when the Aliʻi were pono.

I ko lākou noho ʻana ma Kīpahulu a me Hāna, ʻaʻole naʻe i hina ka pū kō, ʻaʻole hoʻi i ʻeli ʻia ka puʻe ʻuala, ʻaʻole i ʻai ʻia ka maiʻa palakū, ʻaʻole nō hoʻi i kālua ʻia ka puaʻa, akā, ua malu like nō nā waivai a pau o nā makaʻāinana, no laila, ua kapa ʻia kona inoa ʻo Kealiʻimaikaʻi, no kona mahalo ʻia no ke Aliʻi hana maikaʻi.

When they [Kalanimālokulokuikepoʻookalani and his warriors] occupied Kīpahulu and Hāna, the sugar cane clumps were not toppled, the sweet potato hills were not dug up, the ripened banana on the tree were not eaten, indeed no pigs were baked, but all the properties of the Makaʻāinana were protected, therefore he was named, “The good Aliʻi.”, in gratitude for the Aliʻi’s [Kalanimālokulokuikepoʻookalani] righteous behavior.

265 Kamakau, Ke Kumu Aupuni, p. 96.
266 Kamakau, Ke Kumu Aupuni, p. 96.
267 Kamakau, Ke Kumu Aupuni, p. 96.
268 Note: Spelling of Kalanimālokulokuikepoʻookalani comes from the Ke Kumu Aupuni, Kūʻkokaʻa April 6, 1867.
269 Kamakau, Ke Kumu Aupuni, p.95.
While the Aliʻi did not always conform to pono behavior when conducting their campaigns of expansion, this moʻolelo identifies what may have been customary and consequently pono behavior for the Aliʻi in regards to their treatment of the Makaʻāinana. The warriors of Keliʻimaikaʻi who are occupying Hāna and Kīpahulu, are dutifully following the command of their Aliʻi to protect the properties of the Makaʻāinana of Maui without complaint or murmurings, which implies that it may have indeed been a customary practice to leave the lands and properties of the Makaʻāinana unspoiled and untouched. The reaction of the Makaʻāinana of Maui however, leads us to believe that this customary practice may not have been faithfully respected by the Aliʻi at all times.

Thus if the property of the Makaʻāinana were customarily protected irrespective of the island upon which they lived, then the Makaʻāinana could not have been viewed by the Aliʻi and even an invading Aliʻi as “the enemy.” The opposite would also be true, the Aliʻi regardless of what island they originated from were not viewed as “the enemy” by the Makaʻāinana. This kind of warfare is unlike many of our modern nationalistic and often genocidal wars of today, these wars were not between islands and their people, the Makaʻāinana; they were wars between the Aliʻi.

The Aliʻi have in essence made the Makaʻāinana non-combatants or civilians, in their wars of expansion and control. This policy makes sense as it softens the negative impacts of war by preserving the island’s finite resources. In this way, the Aliʻi could conduct their wars of expansion without disrupting the production of food and other resources which the Makaʻāinana had brought to a high degree of production. In fact, the surplus food production of the Makaʻāinana—became the prize. The Makaʻāinana worked the land, managed the resources and produced the food and other necessities which the Aliʻi needed to supplement their retinue of
warriors, advisors, attendants and skilled craftsmen. Island resources which included the Maka‘āinana were extremely sensitive and fragile; to have the Maka‘āinana participate in the Ali‘i’s wars of expansion would have disrupted food production and the maintenance of those systems, which could precipitate food shortages, famine and/or starvation. Disastrous consequences would follow if these wars were prolonged, numerous and destructive; crops would be neglected or worse destroyed.

The Maka‘āinana who were the farmers, fishermen and land managers and NOT skilled in warfare would most likely be the first ones killed in battle. Thereby any war that put the Maka‘āinana on the battlefield would produce an empty victory for the victor, who would acquire new lands that would most likely be damaged with no one to cultivate it or who knew how to maintain the complex productions systems that were in a particular location or place.

The Ali‘i viewed the Maka‘āinana as much a part of the land as the plants that grew on it, therefore the Maka‘āinana were logically and customarily excluded from their geographical disputes—as long as they did not take an active part in the campaign for either side.

The Maka‘āinana of Maui are appreciative of Keli‘imaika‘i for respecting the customary practice and reciprocated by sending their surplus food to the invading Ali‘i of Hawai‘i. The Ali‘i of Maui do not consider the supplying of food to the Hawai‘i island invaders by the Maka‘āinana of Maui as being complicit, collaboration or traitorous; it is viewed as customary and proper for the Maka‘āinana to do so. What had happened in Kīpahulu and Hāna was simply a change in management—a result of a hostile takeover by another competing managing entity while the day-to-day operations continued without interruption.

Kamehameha’s first reaction to his younger brother’s defeat and narrow escape in Maui was rage because he thought that the Maka‘āinana of Maui had directly participated and
contributed to Keli‘imaika‘i’s defeat and supposed death. Keli‘imaika‘i quickly informs his brother that the Maka‘āinana of Maui had acted properly and had in fact saved his life by not revealing to Ali‘i of Maui where he was hidden which allowed for his escape. Kamehameha responded;

*Inā e make ‘oe, ‘o ka‘u ‘āina luku nui ‘o Kīpahulu, a e pā‘ia wale ‘ia ke po‘o o nā kāne, nā wāhine a me nā kamali‘i.*\(^{270}\)

If you were killed, my destruction would be great upon Kīpahulu, and the heads of the men, the women and the children would be struck.

Kamehameha’s comment suggest that if the Maka‘āinana of Maui had actively participated in Keli‘imaika‘i’s defeat, it would have been a serious violation of a long-held understanding and customary practice, that would have justified Kamehameha in bringing war upon all of Maui including the Maka‘āinana of Maui. However, upon learning that the Maka‘āinana of Maui had respected the customary practice, Kamehameha concludes with;

*E aho aia ke kaua ma Maui me nā keiki a Kahekili.*\(^{271}\)

It is good, we will war on Maui against the children (Maui Ali‘i) of Kahekili.

The Maka‘āinana of Maui had acted appropriately and had not taken sides but sought to preserve life. For this reason Kamehameha reaffirmed the customary practice by proclaiming that his war was with the children of Kahekili, the Ali‘i of Maui and not with the Maka‘āinana of Maui.

Today, it is difficult to separate non-combatants because the entire citizenry participates directly either through forced conscription or voluntary nationalism. Incredibly, Hawaiians achieved a milestone in civilized society which delineated a civilian population apart from those who favored war for the purpose of expansion. In essence, the Ali‘i fought the wars for territorial expansion and the prize being the surplus production of the Maka‘āinana. This

---

\(^{270}\) Kamakau, *Ke Kumu Aupuni*, p. 96.
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development of a non-nationalistic civilian population protected the Makaʻāinana from the
destruction of nationalistic wars and allowed them to concentrate their efforts on food production
intensification.

These food production intensification systems, implies that the Makaʻāinana had also
developed an apparently highly efficient methodology for the preserving and passing on complex
sophisticated knowledge to the next generation without the aid of literacy. This methodology for
passing knowledge to the next generation combined with the separation of the Makaʻāinana
from the wars of the Aliʻi, indicates that the Makaʻāinana must have had their own separate
management organization or governance system. A subordinate, yet separate governance system
had to have been in place to continue the operations, development and maintenance of their
technologies while the Aliʻi were at war with each other. How were the Makaʻāinana organized,
what was the structure of their organization, how was their leadership determined and how did it
interface with the Aliʻi are important questions as we try to understand Hawaiian society and its
phenomenal rise to literacy.

Makaʻāinana Leadership “The Punahahele”

The following story was told to me by Emil Wolfram which gives us an idea of how the
Makaʻāinana might have been organized. In 1971, Emil was working for the Department of
Education as a science teacher at Honokaʻa High School. Shortly after arriving at Honokaʻa,
Emil was called to be a Bishop of the Honokaʻa Ward of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day
Saints (Mormon) and was assigned to visit John Thomas, a member of his ward (congregation).
During his monthly visits, he learned that John was born and raised in Waipiʻo valley, his house sat at the top of the road that led down into valley.\textsuperscript{272}

John was in his eighties and was born before the coup dʻétat of the constitutional Hawaiian Government in 1893. He was fluent in Hawaiian and possessed extensive and intimate details of Waipiʻo valley that prompted Emil to ask John about what he knew about the \textit{wahi pana} (sacred places) in the valley—especially those that related to Liloa and ‘Umi-a-Liloa. Emil soon realized that John was well acquainted with all the traditional Hawaiian practices, Hawaiian \textit{moʻolelo} and especially those \textit{moʻolelo} particular to Waipiʻo. Having read the story of ‘Umi-a-Liloa, Emil asked John if he would draw a map of Waipiʻo valley and locate all the \textit{wahi pana} that he could remember. John agreed and several months later presented Emil with a hand-drawn map of Waipiʻo, that located Pakaʻalana, the location of the residence of Liloa, his heiau, the \textit{puka} that ‘Umi used to enter into the residence of Liloa, which formed a compound that John identified as the \textit{Honuaʻula} (see Figure 1). Many other details convinced Emil that John Thomas’s knowledge far exceeded what was commonly known. Emil then asked John how he had acquired all this detailed knowledge. John told him;

\begin{quote}
“I am the last of the seven punaheles of Waipiʻo, at a very young age I was one of seven children selected to be a punahele. Only the brightest were selected and they were instructed in all aspects of protocol, \textit{moʻolelo} and \textit{oli}. We were sent to live with each of the fourteen families who lived in Waipiʻo to learn their genealogies, \textit{moʻolelo} and their ʻoihana (occupation). We were trained from the time we were little, in all aspects of the community. It was from this group that a konohiki would eventually be selected for the valley.”\textsuperscript{273}
\end{quote}

John Thomas died a few years later. However, his story helps us understand how leadership was selected, trained and transitioned in Waipiʻo. Whether this system was used

\textsuperscript{272} Note: In the spring of 2009, while working on a funding project with Emil Wolfgram he shared with me an experience that he had back in 1971 when he was living in Honokaʻa working as a high school science teacher. At the time Emil was a Bishop of the Honokaʻa Ward of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints and was assigned to visit John Thomas as his home teacher whom he made regular monthly visits.

\textsuperscript{273} Emil Wolfgram, personal conversation October 2009.
elsewhere we can only speculate at this point but it does give us insight into how the Makaʻāinana of Waipiʻo was organized and how they chose their leadership.

Figure 2 Hand drawing of Waipi'o Valley, Hawai'i island
This system began with the training of specially selected children at a very young age, to be the keepers of intimate and accumulated knowledge for their community in all of its aspects by having them live with each of the fourteen major families of Waipiʻo. This methodology is ingeniously simple; selecting children at a young age to become the living walking depositories of all accumulated knowledge of Waipiʻo valley. They would in the natural course of their development and growth, accumulate intimate details necessary for understanding the independent and complex interdependent functions of each person in their community and how they contributed to the “cooperative efficiency” of Waipiʻo. This intimate knowledge allowed the punahele who was finally selected to be the Konohiki, to make pono decisions that would preserve or enhance the “cooperative efficiency” of the community. The concept of the punahele is further explained by Mary Kawena Pukui;

> In the ‘ohana or family of old Hawai‘i, one or more children might be designated as the punahele. Usually this favorite child was the hiapo or first born. This child was, by tradition, given (hana‘id) to the grandparents, there to be reared for future responsibilities as a family senior. A non-hiapo child might also be earmarked for punahele status because of special talents or because of some sign or portent before or at his birth.

There appears to be a dual purpose to the giving of the hiapo to the grandparents; First, it would have assured the grandparents that they would have someone young to take care of the menial chores that was better suited to a young person; Second, the accumulated knowledge of the family or district could be passed on to the next generation by the hiapo who would eventually become the family senior. The child being taught and prepared from a young age (four years) would have received years of training by the time most children would have gone to grade school.

The derivation of the word makes it clear that the punahele was not just the “favorite child” as we know favoritism today. The punahele as the “spring or source that continues” was destined to learn the family traditions, genealogy and general lore-of-living so he could in turn pass them on.

---

to future generations. He would hold in trust and strengthen the “sense of family” that binds Hawaiian relatives so closely. As an adult he would be the senior member who would guide, counsel and make decisions that would affect family welfare. It was a responsible role. To prepare for it, the punahele memorized the family chants, listened to and absorbed the advice of elders, and spent most of his time in sort of “apprentice for seniority” training course.  

According to Pukui, the hiapo was a “living history book,” who spent most of their time in the company of their grandparents learning the genealogical chants, customary and traditional practices, specialized skills and knowledge with little time to play. As a punahele herself Pukui gives us first-hand knowledge of what the life of a punahele was for her and which may have been the same for John Thomas of Waipiʻo;  

As her grandmother’s tag-along companion, Mrs. Pukui stored up knowledge. What she learned spanned her grandmother’s pre-missionaries era past, and the turn-of-the-century years before her own birth. Sometimes she was given specific assignments: “Grandmother made me memorize all the relatives, both the living ones and the family auumākua (ancestor gods). “She taught me etiquette and family customs...the traditions of the land ownership...how to sit down quietly and talk to people in trouble...when I should call for hoʻoponopono.” More often she learned by watching and listening: “I used to wake up at night, and hear Grandmother chanting. And so I memorized the chants.” (Prayers, legends and genealogy were all handed down in oli or chants.)  

This punahele methodology was not only practiced by the Makaʻāinana but also by the Aliʻi. However, the focus of the Aliʻi was different from the Makaʻāinana in which genealogy was paramount in Aliʻi circles as it determined right to rule and established a proper order. At the age of four, Aliʻi children were customarily taken to the heiau to learn their own moʻokūʻauhau (genealogies) and the moʻokūʻauhau of all other Aliʻi even those who lived on different islands. It was through the chanting of their moʻokūʻauhau as they met other Aliʻi whom they did not know personally that they identified themselves to other Aliʻi.

---

275 Pukui, Nana I Ke Kumu, p. 189-190.  
276 Pukui, Nana I Ke Kumu, p. 52.  
Abraham Piʻianāiʻa Aliʻi Descendant and a Twentieth Century Punahelo

In 1970, Abraham Piʻianāiʻa became the first director of the Hawaiian Studies Program at the University of Hawaiʻi, a program that he and many other faculty members had fought long and hard for. The University had approved the establishment of the Hawaiian Studies program yet failed to provide any funding for the director position or a physical office for this brand-new program. Abraham Piʻianāiʻa accepted the position without pay, and as an instructor in the geography department, he secured an office in the geography department as the new home for the Hawaiian Studies Program. Eventually, the University approved funding for half-time directorship position for the program, a position that Piʻianāiʻa held until he retired from the university ten years later. Abraham Piʻianāiʻa was an Aliʻi descendant, sixth generation from Keliʻimaikaʻiʻi, the younger brother of Kamehameha I, who honored the rights of the Makaʻāinana of Maui.

Abraham’s grandfather and namesake the first Abraham St. Chad Piʻianāiʻa had hānai Abraham when he was a young boy. Abraham was taught all of the genealogies of all the Aliʻi as well as the protocols. Dr. Kiyoshi Ikeda, a colleague at the University of Hawaiʻi and avowed “konohiki” of Abraham, confirmed that “Papa” knew all the Aliʻi and their genealogies. He had witnessed on several occasions that whenever Papa encountered an Aliʻi descendant he would spontaneously chant their genealogy—on the spot. Dr. Ikeda also added that in chanting their genealogy he would of course leave out the “not so nice things” about their lineage.

Piʻianāiʻa, a Hawaiian traditionalist, was a punahelo schooled by his grandfather. He was a living history book, who visited his birthstone at Waikahalulu every year on his birthday, pounded his own poi and ate Hawaiian food every single night. He was fluent in Hawaiian, a

---

278 Kiyoshi Ikeda, personal conversation December 17, 2009.
279 Ikeda, personal conversation December 17, 2009.
first language speaker who had envisioned a Hawaiian Studies program that would teach Hawaiian Studies in the Hawaiian language. His 1979 syllabus for his Hawaiian Studies course “Perspectives in Hawaiian Studies” was written in Hawaiian and he had required those Hawaiian Studies students in his geography class to write their final papers in the Hawaiian language. He was an elder, a *kupuna*—a *kaikua’ana*.

Outwardly, Abraham Pi’ianai’a wore a suit and tie, spoke “good” English and for all intents and purposes appeared to be as American as one can get without a white skin. Prior to 1986, the year that he retired from the university, there had been a growing number of younger

---

280 Kiyoshi Ikeda, personal conversation December 17, 2009.
Hawaiian faculty who were more vocal, more assertive, and more demanding that the university should do more for Hawaiians. In Piʻianāʻaʻa’s mind, he saw that this was the next generation who would take Hawaiian Studies to its next level, inwardly, he welcomed their arrival.

When Haunani-kay Trask was hired by the university, Gordon remembers his father telling him, “Haunani is a smart, intelligent, articulate young Hawaiian—and they (the university) are scared of her. And when Haunani was up for tenure, my father, made sure that he was there early to vote for her, because he was fearful that there were those (even some Hawaiian faculty) who might vote against her and he wanted to make sure they didn’t.”

However, these were the, “behind the scenes” stuff, that most people do not see; nor did the new younger Hawaiian faculty. These kaikaina were schooled in an American educational system that promoted individualism, utilized racism, and ignored Hawaiian metaphors such malama ʻāina. The energy, enthusiasm and idealism of youth incorporated into their approach the American cinematic cliché of “Damn the torpedoes full speed ahead!” It was a path, that Piʻianāʻa respected but one he could not take. During his thirty plus years at the university Piʻianāʻa had accumulated support from non-Hawaiian faculty, to bring about a separate Hawaiian Studies program. In the process, he had built bridges and friendships which his early training had taught him to respect and therefore could not sever or betray. However, after ten years of half-pay and being housed in an office in the geography department he was also convinced that it was time for a change of strategy, the time for the next generation of Hawaiian scholars—the time for the kaikaina had arrived. He had done his job, he had laid down the foundation, Abraham St. Chad Kikiakoi Kalilioku Piʻianāʻa had built the platform in the crowd, the platform that would allow his kaikaina to stand on and shout.

281 Gordon Piʻianāʻa, personal conversation. Dec.3, 2009. Note: This may not have been the process by which tenure for a Professor is decided, however, this is what Gordon remembers his father telling him,

282 Kameʻeleihiwa, Native Lands Foreign Desires, p.51-55.
One of Piʻianāiʻa’a’s duties as a punahele of his grandfather was, to prepare the ʻawa for special guests, remain quietly seated in the room and simply observe. He was not to speak, but was to remain seated for as long as they visited. He was to be seen but not heard, it was his opportunity to listen and to accumulate knowledge; it was his training for future leadership. His grandfather’s visitors were some of the most knowledgeable and respected Hawaiian scholars of their time. It was a simple methodology and similar in theory to the one used in Waipiʻo and Kaʻū by the Makaʻāinana—and why not, it was a highly efficient and an effective way for passing knowledge to the next generations.

The discipline and training that Abraham received from his grandfather served him well. When he attended Kamehameha Schools as a boarder he had his first experience using silverware; however, this lack of tableware experience did not appear to be a handicap, as he excelled in his studies and was the top student in class, for all four of his high school years.

When World War II broke out he joined the US Naval Merchant Marines where he rose to Ship Master in just eighteen months; a position equivalent to a Ship Captain. As a Ship Master, he was part of select group of people who was licensed to sail any weight vessel in any ocean of the world; and he was only 28 at the time.

In 1950, he became a Police Detective in the Honolulu Police Department, and at the same time was pursuing a Bachelor’s degree at the University of Hawaiʻi in Government and Public Administration. He graduated with honors in 1953, at the age of 37. Piʻianāiʻa pursued his graduate studies and completed his work for his Master’s degree in Geography. The very next year after he graduated, Piʻianāiʻa began teaching a course in Navigation at the University

---

283 Kiyoshi, Ikeda, January 4, 2010 email: The Line Islands work was written up for Abraham’s Master's but was not awarded because it was still under tight war-time security control. The Chair of his degree work passed away, but no other person could replace his chair because they did not oversee the rewriting and they did not work on the Line Island work. The Department treated Abe as a degree work person even if the University could not proceed to award him his Master's degree.
of Hawai‘i. This course was later broken into two landmark geography courses, the “Geography of Hawai‘i” and the “Geography of Honolulu.” The two courses enrolled more than 1,000 students a year.\textsuperscript{284} Brian Murton professor of geography at the University of Hawai‘i writes,

“In 1969 Abe was Director of Hawaiian Homes department, yet he still taught the course (Geography of Hawai‘i) at 7:30 am, MWF, to 300 to 400 students!!! Honolulu is an early town, but to get students to register, and turn up for, a 7:30 am class is saying something.”\textsuperscript{285}

The reason Abraham taught at 7:30 in morning was because he had to rush off to go to work at his full-time job with State of Hawai‘i. This was his daily schedule for sixteen years until he retired from the state in 1970.

The mo‘olelo of Abraham Pi‘ianā‘a establishes that the Ali‘i had also used the punahele methodology in their Ali‘i society. Whether it originated from the Maka‘āinana or from the Ali‘i is not important for our purpose, and in fact may have been an organic methodology among the earliest Hawaiians. However, what is important is that it was practiced by both societies the Ali‘i and the Maka‘āinana for preserving and passing on important knowledge; and for the training of future leadership.

**Benefits of Punahele Leadership**

The training of selected children from each generation to be a repository of acquired knowledge, hana no‘eau (skilled experts) mo‘okū‘auhau (genealogies), mo‘olelo (story-telling), oli (chant), wahi pana (the celebrated and sacred places) insured that the next generation would have all the tools and knowledge of the previous generations to build upon. In Waipi‘o, the physical placement of a punahele with each of the fourteen families insured that a future konohiki had an intimate knowledge of each family’s role and their function in the community.

\textsuperscript{284} Kiyoshi Ikeda, For Posthumous Regents’ Medal of Distinction (Executive Policy E5.206 revised.) p.3
\textsuperscript{285} Brian Murton, Letter to David McClain, President University of Hawai‘i, 20 April 2005.
which contributed greatly to the maintenance of the cooperative efficiency of the ahupuaʻa of Waipiʻo.

This leadership training methodology not only prepared those who would eventually lead but at the same time it prepared those who would be led. As the children matured, the people would have the chance to watch them closely, to determine if they were pono or not; if they were capable or not; and if they could lead or not. This lengthy period, allowed the people to judge the character of the punahele, to determine for themselves if the behavior of the punahele was pono. If the behavior of the punahele had been pono by the time a new Konohiki was needed, the decision to promote the punahele to Konohiki would have been a mere formality. There would have been little drama, no political jousting, no posturing or behind the scenes maneuvering; instead the transition of leadership would have been smooth, seamless and consistent. The punahele and the people were not strangers, outsiders or mere acquaintances but ʻohana to each other in a very real sense and obviously would not have needed a media campaign to sell an image to the community because the community already knew who he or she was.

It appears that in Waipiʻo, a failsafe mechanism was also a part of this system, should a punahele reveal a serious character flaw while growing up, the punahele could just as easily be unselected by the current leadership, which may explain why Waipiʻo chose seven punahele instead of just one. In addition, having seven punahele insured that customary and traditional practices; important genealogies, past accumulated knowledge was accurately preserved; each punahele being a check and a back-up for the other.

Thus, among the Makaʻāinana transition of leadership was uneventful, natural and lacking the drama associated with modern political campaigns and a model of efficiency. For the
Aliʻi, transition of leadership was well established but could be challenged. Such challenges were deadly serious and each side had to weigh carefully the consequence of failing to come to an agreement.

However, for the Makaʻāinana, the punahele system insured that the best and brightest of each generation were properly trained for future leadership roles while the final selection as konohiki depended upon individual performance over a thirty-to-forty years or more period. This training and selection period would have allowed copious amounts of intimate generational accumulated knowledge to be passed on to the next generation in a natural, efficient, and positive manner that placed kuleana at its center. The methodology insured the community of a continued supply of good leaders who were knowledgeable and extremely skillful in managing the affairs of the district which was necessary to maintain or improve on the cooperative efficiency of the community. This high level of cooperative efficiency appears to have been the driving force that inspired and drove Hawaiians to phenomenal technological achievements in food production and in their phenomenal rise to literacy.
Chapter 6

E Kūkulu i ke Kahua
Building the Foundation

Pōhaku of the Hawaiian Governance System

Having examined the society of the Aliʻi and the Makaʻāinana, I will now examine some of the pōhaku (components) this governance system and how they may have functioned together based on the findings of this research. I also recognize that more than likely, there were other components of the Hawaiian governance system that was not covered in my research which may have also been an important component in how the whole governance system functioned. However, I believe that those I will address qualify as unique and present a compelling argument as to the uniqueness, advance, efficient and democratic functions which these components individually and synergistically generate that begins to explain Hawaiian governance which produced the phenomenal Hawaiian achievements.

Relationship of Trust

Unmistakably, the Makaʻāinana were subordinate to the Aliʻi, however, they did not view their leadership, the Aliʻi, as oppressive or despotic; but quite the opposite.

The genius of the people is of such a character that if their leaders go forward, they will follow, or if they recede, they will go after them.286

It is true, also, that it is almost impossible for the chiefs to give their subjects what may properly be termed advice. Their wishes, when once known to the people, are in effect as absolute as their will, and their advice has all the force of command.287

Obviously, the regard that the Makaʻāinana exhibited towards their leadership was quite different from how Europeans and Americans related to theirs. The relationship of the

---

287 Annual Report of the ABCFM, 24th annual meeting, p. 76.
Makaʻāiinana with their leadership was firmly embedded in a familial context and anchored by genealogy. The missionary’s recollection of oppressive kings and lords soured their assessments of any governance system that did not sponsor elected leadership. Thus, with no equivalent example from their historical memory, the missionaries erroneously concluded that the peculiar behavior of the Makaʻāiinana towards the Aliʻi must be a consequence of their long oppression.

They couldn’t have been more wrong. The Makaʻāiinana revered their leadership because their relationship had a long history of proper behavior and the high levels of “cooperative efficiency” produced even higher levels of trust. Instances of oppression or tyranny by a Mōʻi or Aliʻi were rare. The Makaʻāiinana and the Aliʻi had long possessed the right to freedom of movement; they were not bound to the land as the peasants of Europe had been. They could, and did leave an oppressive or unjust Aliʻi whenever they chose to. The freedom of movement insured that a balanced was maintained; thus, oppression was highly unlikely. Instead, what the missionaries had witnessed was evidence of a high level of cooperative efficiency that had been established between the Aliʻi and the Makaʻāiinana.

Consensus, Dissent and Mutual Agreement

Liholiho’s three conditions imposed upon the missionaries after meeting with his council of Aliʻi and the Kuhina Nui demonstrated a decision-making protocol that required discussion, deliberation and consensus. This decision-making process demonstrated that though the power of Liholiho was supreme and absolute, it was regulated by pono behavior, and decisions were embedded in a process that necessitated consensus. This is exemplified when Kaʻahumanu addressed the people after a public examination, in which she participated as a student, sought the consent of the people to encourage the learning of the palapala.
That she [Kaʻahumanu] might not seem to be enforcing this without their consent, she, in a very proper manner, demanded of them whether they were willing to engage in this work of reformation; to which they replied “Ae”\textsuperscript{288}

This of course does not infer that consensus or mutual agreement was always easily obtained. On the contrary, it took thirteen days for the council of Aliʻi to reach a mutual agreement to allow the missionaries to land.

The length of time that it took to reach a mutual agreement suggests that there was substantial disagreement; further revealing, that the Aliʻi possessed both the freedom and confidence to voice dissent in the council—while in the presence of the Mōʻī. It appears that being able to present dissenting arguments in the council were expected, natural and normal. Dissenting arguments had their place and forum in the Hawaiian decision-making protocol and was not discouraged or ignored. Dissenting arguments were openly addressed and freely discussed; which is necessary if mutual agreement/consensus is the goal; and the arrival at a pono decision. Thus, Hawaiian governance displayed a high degree for tolerance, acknowledgment and regard for the dissenting voice, which is a necessary component for all democratic societies.

**Jurisdictional Responsibility and Freedom**

Another feature of Hawaiian governance was the division of responsibilities and jurisdictions. The Rev. William Richards once asked Kaʻahumanu to intervene in a local annoyance regarding the habit of some of the people who assembled every night in the meeting house next to their home and whose loud laughing and incessant chatter late into the night disturbed their rest. Kaʻahumanu responded to Richards;

“\textquote{I am not the acting governor of this place and it is proper for me only to give advice. I exceedingly regret the practice, will speak to the other chiefs on the subject and will give positive orders to my own people.}\textquote{,\textsuperscript{289}}

\textsuperscript{288} The Missionary Herald, XXI, p. 212. Note: ‘Ae in Hawaiian means to consent, agree, approve.
Kaʻahumanu’s response demonstrated the existence of proper protocol regarding jurisdiction and authority in the Hawaiian governance system; and even though she was the Kuhina Nui she could not intervene directly in a decidedly local matter. The Hawaiian governance system appears to be built upon foundations of trust, order, respect and reciprocity—solidified by mutual agreement that nurtures high levels of cooperative efficiency, discourages micromanagement and inefficient bureaucracy.

**Hawaiian Two-tier Governance System v. Western Business Models**

The separate governance systems of the Aliʻi and the Makaʻāinana, indicates that a two-tiered governance system was employed. In feudal Europe, a single-tiered governance system was in place however, it proved highly problematic. The single-tiered governance systems are efficient models in arriving at decisions because decision making power resided in one person. However, the downside to single-tier governance systems was its tendency to collapse into oppression, despotism and tyranny. As a result, European single-tiered governance systems evolved into a two and three-tiered governance systems, that provided the necessary “checks and balance” on the governing powers to prevent back-sliding towards oppression. While these new systems were a great improvement over the primitive single-tier model in preventing oppression and tyranny; they were inherently inefficient, bureaucratic, political and substantially more expensive.

While the two-tiered and three-tiered governance systems have been adopted by most Western nations; Western businesses have held on to the single-tiered governance system for their businesses and corporations. Nearly, all American corporations and the majority of

---

European corporations continue to employ the primitive Anglo-Saxon single-tier corporate governance system.

However, recent corporate fraud scandals such as WorldCom, Tyco, BCCI, Adelphia, Vivendi, Enron, Arthur Anderson and many others (the list continues to grow); have cost consumers, investors and employees billions of dollars and indicates that something is horribly wrong. Consequently, in an effort to stem corporate fraud, corruption and collusion, Germany and the Netherlands have enacted legislation requiring corporations to organize under a two-tier corporate governance system.

The movement away from the primitive single-tier system is due largely to the ineffectiveness and inefficiencies of the board of directors in a single-tier system. While the debate is still being conducted on which system is better single-tier or two-tier they do agree on an underlying principle; that there must be complete separation between the supervisory board and the management group while simultaneously keeping the supervisory board focused on the performance of the management.

In Japan, after the war, corporations were reorganized according to American single-tiered corporate governance systems; however, a two-tier system was long suspected. Japan’s major corporations, Mitsubishi, Sumitomo (Mazda, Asahi Breweries) Dai’Ichi Kanyo (Hitachi, Isuzu), Tokai (Toyota Group) , Fuyo (Yamaha, Nissan) the largest and most successful Japanese corporations was long suspected to have been operating in a secretive two-tier system from their earliest formations in what is called a keiretsu.290 However, it was not until 1998 that empirical proof was finally provided, that proved that these Japanese corporations were operating under a two-tier governance system. Kenneth A. Kim and Piman Limpaphayom explained how the

*keiretsu* operated in their paper, “A Test of the Two-tier Corporate Governance Structure: The Case of the Japanese Keiretsu;

In a financial or horizontal keiretsu, corporations are linked together through an extensive network of corporate cross-shareholdings. Moreover, corporate members have close ties to a main bank, which not only provides member firms with debt financing, but also owns a substantial amount of each firm’s equity.\(^{291}\)

Because financial institutions within these keiretsu networks are both creditors and equity holders, they have strong incentives to monitor their member firms carefully. However, Aoki (1990) and Aoki, Patrick, and Sheard (1994) state that financial institutions only take on an active monitoring role when member firms become financially distressed. Bergløf and Perotti (1994) also show theoretically that within a financial keiretsu, it is efficient to allow corporate cross shareholders to mutually monitor each other. The main bank assumes responsibility for the survival of the distressed firm when financial distress becomes a real threat. Thus, Aoki (1990), Aoki, Parick, and Sheard (1994), and Bergløf and Perotti (1994) suggest a two-tier monitoring system. In the first stage, corporate cross shareholders serve as the monitors. In the second stage, the financial institutions take on an active intervention role.\(^{292}\)

Aoki (1990) and Aoki, Patrick, and Sheard (1994) suggest that the main bank acts as a passive participant until a firm becomes financially distressed.\(^{293}\)

This two-tier system operated under the radar in Japan and was hard to detect because it involved connections that transcended capitalist paper trails, with family connections and traditional practices; which, did not show up in the financial statements of the corporations involved. However, as these Japanese corporations emerged from post-war occupation after having western capitalistic models impressed upon them; the so-called, “Japanese miracle” was unexplainable as they exceeded all expectations and rose to world economic prominence.

In Hawaiian society, the *Aliʻi* formed what constituted a supervisory board, similar to the supervisory role of the banks in the Japanese *keiretsu*. The *Makaʻāinana* were organized into *ahupuaʻa* which was managed by the *Konohiki* who managed the day to day operations. However, the difference between today’s two-tier governance systems and the two-tier governance system of the Hawaiian society was the focus of the governance system.

\(^{291}\) Kim and Limpaphayom, p. 37-38.
\(^{292}\) Kim and Limpaphayom, p. 38.
\(^{293}\) Kim and Limpaphayom, p. 39.
Corporate governance is geared towards profit to benefit its owners, while Hawaiian two-tier governance or the Ali‘i/Konohiki system was geared towards successful production of food and resources to the benefit of the people, the community and its leaders. So, as long as the Maka‘āinana kept their lands productive, the Ali‘i could not ask for more. Intervention would be pointless, intrusive and most likely counterproductive. However, if serious problems developed within an ahupua‘a it would indicate that something was amiss in the governance of the ahupua‘a. If the people were unable to resolve the problem, then the Ali‘i would then be expected to intervene and bring about a change.

In a way, the Ali‘i acted as a checking mechanism for the Maka‘āinana leadership. If the behavior of the konohiki were not pono, the loyalty and cooperation of the people would naturally wane, thus allowing the Ali‘i to intervene, without incurring much objection from the people. If the behavior of the konohiki were pono, removal by an Ali‘i could be perceived by the people as a hewa action by the Ali‘i which may cause people to leave the district or redirect their support.

The Ali‘i may have also provided an insurance policy for an ahupua‘a. Since, the Ali‘i presided over the whole island, if an ahupua‘a were hit hard by a natural disaster or other calamity, they could turn to their Ali‘i, their kaikua‘ana and ask for assistance. The Ali‘i could then ask other Ali‘i for necessary resources from other ahupua‘a to help those who were in need; thus, providing a safety net for communities of Maka‘āinana. The principle of ‘ohana framed the constitution of Hawaiian governance while providing a simple, easily understood metaphor for proper relationships through all aspects of their governance system.

The concept of pono behavior applied to both groups, Ali‘i and Maka‘āinana, and provided the “moral order” which was necessary to achieve a high level cooperative efficiency.
This pono behavior or “moral order” is described by banker Erik Belfrage of Sweden’s SEB Bank regarding corporate governance success in which he stated that “doing good” is not separate from “being good.” Belfrage further explained, that Corporate governance today must include corporate social responsibilities, which he agrees is not easy thing to do; his company took nearly three years in deciding what those values were, but now everyone in the bank can say; “Yes, I share those values; We are living them.”

The Hawaiian traditional system of governance was, in the sense as anthropologist Diamond noted—democratic, although it was not equalitarian. The Aliʻi supervised and intervened when needed, collected the surplus production, fought their own wars of expansion and otherwise left the Makaʻāinana to “do their own thing.” Genealogy, Hawaiian metaphors of ohana, kaikuaʻana/kaikaina and malama ʻāina united the two groups in a unique way that allowed efficiency and innovation to flourish. This environment produced high levels of cooperative efficiency, which is evidenced by Hawaiian technological advances in food production intensification and by Hawaiians phenomenal rise to literacy.

---

295 Interview Belfrage.
296 Diamond, In Search of the Primitive, p. 136. Note: Diamond uses the term “primitive societies” are democratic” referring to indigenous societies.
Epilogue

Tragic Consequences “Change in Management”

Today, test scores of Hawaiian children lag behind statewide averages by approximately ten percentile points in reading and math; in addition, the achievement gap widens as students progress to higher grades.297 Today, Hawaiian students have the lowest timely graduation of all major ethnic groups in the State; and the three-year average graduation rate for Hawaiian students was 69.4 percent, compared with 76.6 percent statewide.298 Inexplicably, the rate that Hawaiian students are referred for special education is higher than any other major ethnic group in Hawai‘i.299 Almost one in five Hawaiian students is identified for special education services, compared with roughly one in ten for non-Hawaiians.300 In fact today, Hawaiian students have one of the highest excessive absenteeism rate of any ethnic group, 17.3 percent compared to 9.8 percent.301

In light of past phenomenal Hawaiian educational achievement in literacy, these statistics are both appalling and unexplainable. Why are Hawaiian students doing so poorly in our educational system today? The Department of Education (DOE) has entertained and funded alternative programs which appear to address the problem of the academic deficiency of Hawaiian students. However, majority of these programs are based on the premise that Hawaiians “learn differently” and are not suited for the western classroom style of instruction but are more adept to “hands on” type of instruction. The phenomenal rise to literacy tells us that

298 Ka Huaka‘i 2005.
299 Ka Huaka‘i 2005.
300 Ka Huaka‘i 2005. (18.5 percent referral rate for Hawaiian students and a 10.9 per cent for non-Hawaiian.)
301 Ka Huaka‘i 2005.
this is not true. Hawaiians can and have learned in the classroom setting and have done extremely well learning western technology.

These DOE solutions are based on the assumption that all Hawaiian students are being treated fairly by their teachers and their school administrators; and the possibility of racism which would also explain the poor academic performance is neither explored nor investigated. However, Hawaiians have responded to the racism issue by lobbying for Hawaiian immersion and charter schools which are having enormous success with Hawaiian students. With most of their student body comprised mainly of Hawaiian students as well as being staffed by Hawaiian administrators and teachers, student attendance and graduation are at the highest levels.

Nawahīokalaniʻōpuʻu language immersion program in Hilo reported;

Perhaps most significant is the fact that all five members of Nawahiokalaniʻōpuʻu’s first senior class were also admitted as concurrently enrolled high school students at the University of Hawai`i at Hilo; only one other student from Hilo High School was allowed to attend university classes while still in high school that year. By their junior year of high school, the entire class had completed all but two courses needed to graduate under the Department of Education regulations.

…all five of the initial seniors passed the university’s English composition assessment examination. This same examination often presents considerable difficulty to graduates of Hawai`i’s English medium public high schools, especially Hawaiian students. 302

Furthermore, Dr. Ku Kahakalau, the principal at Kanu o ka ‘Aina, a Big Island charter school, noted that a study last year paid for by the state Office of Hawaiian Affairs found that Native Hawaiian students in charter schools did better than Native Hawaiian students in traditional [DOE] schools. 303 Kamehameha School’s Ka Huaka’i report also confirms the success of cultural based charter schools in academic achievement for Native Hawaiian students.

Native Hawaiians in start-up charter schools score higher in math and as well or better on reading tests compared; they also experienced a lower excessive absenteeism rate than their

counterparts in regular DOE public schools. This is significant; Hawaiian students who largely failed in the general school populations of “regular” DOE schools—now outperform them. The results of native Hawaiian students in culture based and Hawaiian language schools contradict the notion that native Hawaiian students are the problem. Instead, the results indicate that it is the public school system that is the problem—not the native Hawaiian students.

These outcomes are not unique. Native American Indians students in both Canada and the United States, the Maori’s of Aotearoa (New Zealand) and other native indigenous peoples have had similar experiences. They all experienced low achievement in the dominant foreign/colonial educational school systems and then miraculously attain high achievement in a cultural-based or language based alternative school system. In truth, there was no miracle, racism and forced assimilation was replaced with equality and identity.

However, the tremendous success of these immersion and charter schools have failed to generate any enthusiasm from the DOE to support their programs as they continue to deny these successful schools equitable funding and support that other “regular” DOE schools enjoy. These Hawaiian culture based schools have solved the problem of native Hawaiian student success and still the DOE treats these schools as if it were an illegitimate child. This illogical behavior by the DOE is difficult to comprehend outside of the context of institutional racism.

In 1893 a change of management occurred, American businessmen colluded with the American ambassador John L. Stevens to land American soldiers on Hawaiian soil, to support their coup d’état of the constitutional government of Hawai‘i. The subsequent US congressional investigation by US senator James Blount documented the unwillingness and fear of the haole usurpers who now controlled the government, to allow Hawaiians the right to vote. They told the Senator from Georgia, if Hawaiians were allowed to vote they would be voted out at the first

304 Ka Huaka‘i, p. 12
opportunity. Therefore, various schemes were enacted to give the appearance of a democracy, yet, specifically targeted Hawaiians with the intent to marginalize or assimilate them.

Soon after, Hawaiian educational institutions began to be restructured and refocused. For example, prior to the overthrow, 91 Hawaiian and Part-Hawaiian teachers taught in the public school system, comprising 41.1% of the total number of teachers. By 1895, two years after the overthrow, the number of Hawaiian and Part-Hawaiian teachers remained the same while the number of American teachers began to escalate. A recruitment program for more American teachers from the continent was begun and by 1897, just four years after the change in management, Hawaiian and Part-Hawaiian teachers drop from 41.1% to 32.5% while the percentages of American teachers increased from 34.8% to 44.9%. This meant that seventy-seven new American teachers had been hired that began to change the complexion of Hawai‘i’s educational face. This discriminatory policy continues to this day, having achieved normalcy and institutional status. The result of this policy is locally born and educated teachers in the islands face layers of interviews and a rigorous application process while, those recruited on the continent are fast-tracked with just one interview and then hired; which unbelievably is not with the principal of the school that they will be working in.

On June 8, 1896, three years after the illegal overthrow the new haole-run government, operating under the facade of the Republic of Hawai‘i, enacted the Act of June 8, 1896, Ch. 57, Sec. 30 which stated:

The English language shall be the medium and basis of instruction in all public and private schools . . . . Any schools that shall not conform to the provisions of this section shall not be recognized by the Department.

---
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While the damaging effect of this ban was that it institutionalized the discriminatory ban, barring Hawaiians in the future from creating Hawaiian language programs in the DOE system. It would not be until 1987 that the ban on the Hawaiian language would be officially removed from its books.

Kaʻanoʻi Walk, a 2008 law J.D. graduate, William S. Richardson School of Law, University of Hawaiʻi, Mānoa, commented on the Act of 1896 that essentially banned Hawaiian language from the public school system of Hawaiʻi;

According to the 1896 act, the schools in Hawaiʻi had a choice to use English or not; however, a choice contrary to the law meant forfeiture of government funding. As a result of this English preference law, the number of ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi schools dropped greatly “from a high of 150 in 1880 down to zero in 1902.” On the contrary, “the number of English-medium schools significantly rose from 60 in 1880 to 203 in 1902.” The Republic’s report of 1896 remarked that “[t]he gradual extinction of a Polynesian dialect may be regretted for sentimental reasons, but it is certainly for the interest of the [Hawaiʻi ʻōiwi] themselves.”

In 1897, the lack of school funding or the intent of the Act appears to have a direct correlation to their salaries; 26 Hawaiian and 16 Part-Hawaiian teachers, which constituted 89% of the total number of teachers on the Island of Oʻahu were paid less than $360 a year, while all 37 American teachers received an annual salary of $1000. In total, 41 teachers were paid an annual salary of at least $1,000, of that group there were two Hawaiian and two Part-Hawaiian teachers and the highest paid teacher in the government in 1897—was an American earning $2,700 annually. The average annual salary for all 42 Hawaiian and Part-Hawaiian teachers averaged only $220; while the average annual salary for the American teachers was almost five times more, at $1,045. These kinds of discriminatory acts appear to have begun in earnest immediately after the illegal overthrow in 1893.

---
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“In 1893 the white people controlled the Government. What did they do? They fired every Hawaiian from office who did not hold the same political opinions as they did themselves.”

According to Franz Fannon, “there are cultures with racism and cultures without;”

American culture is—a culture with racism; a social cultural context that has never been a part of the discussion when addressing Hawaiians’ current educational challenges.

Figure 4  Timeline of Hawaiian Educational Achievement and its Decline 1833 to 2003

Therefore, the current low test scores, low timely graduation rates, high absenteeism and the high referral rates of native Hawaiian students for special education, when placed within light of the Hawaiian’s prior phenomenal rise to literacy, exposes the façade of American system of equality and justice for all, while providing evidence that native Hawaiians have been and continue to be…victims of American racism.

Addendum 1

The methodology for determining the literacy rate for the population would normally be a simple matter if the enrollment of pupils in schools had been faithfully recorded. However, the unexpected phenomenal growth of literacy in Hawai‘i, created unique problems with logistics and record keeping. The rapid expansion of the schools, which the missionaries did not control, caught the missionaries ill-equipped and unprepared to keep up with demand for spelling books, let alone keeping track of the numbers of pupils enrolled in the schools. Therefore, we have an incomplete record; enrollment figures are only reported for the years 1821, 1822, 1823, 1825, 1828, and 1832. The enrollment for these years shows a steady and consistent upward trend that sky-rocks once the spelling books are printed in larger numbers. This steep jump in the curve is further supported by the public quarterly examinations which progressed quickly to couple thousand, reaching a high of ten thousand scholars at one quarterly examination. However like the attendance enrollment, these quarterly examinations are recorded sporadically.

The other difficulty in determining the literacy rate is the inconsistency of the population estimates made by the missionaries which varied from 200,000 to 130,000 during this period, as reported by different missionaries. I have decided to use the missionary’s highest population estimate of 200,000 to give us the most conservative literacy rate estimate. We should also keep in mind that the population continued declined which was further reduced by the influenza epidemic of 1826, and the whooping cough epidemic in 1832. Dr. David Stannard’s work on the estimated population of Hawai‘i when Cook arrived placed the Hawaiian population at 800,000 to 1,000,000. This appears to be consistent with missionary estimates and corroborates
Kaʻahumanu’s statement to Artemas Bishop that three-fourths of the people had died prior to the arrival of the missionaries in 1820.\textsuperscript{313}

Therefore, by plotting the known enrollment figures in their respective years and essentially connecting the dots we can estimate what enrollment numbers would have been during the unrecorded years. Thus, the estimated enrollment from the following graph is based on the premise that enrollment naturally continued to rise until it hit its peak in 1832 of 52,000 pupils. This premise is further supported by the employment of teachers and the construction of schools which indicate that the community took the long term approach to their learning of the \textit{palapala}.

The other assumption that is made is that these pupils did not take more than a year to learn their sixteen page spelling book primer. Missionary records recount that some students learned to read and write in a couple of months—and one bright young lad in five days. Therefore, by adding the total number of pupils enrolled for each year and factoring in a one year learning curve an estimated number of pupils who could read and write is arrived at and by dividing that figure by the total population an estimated literacy rate is achieved under the above assumptions.

Before 1834, the missionaries reported that the majority of the students were adults. After 1834, they reported that the majority of their students are now children, suggesting that by 1834 most of the adult population was literate.

1820 The missionaries arrive
1821 They begin their school with 40 pupils.\textsuperscript{314}
1822 2,500 spelling books are printed and distributed, suggesting at least 2,500 people were receiving instruction. However, we also know that many Hawaiians shared their spelling book, as in one area 18 people learned to read and write off of one spelling book.\textsuperscript{315}
1825 The missionaries print and distribute 16,000 spelling books and declare that as many are under instruction.\textsuperscript{316}
1828 25,000 pupils\textsuperscript{317}
1832 52,000 pupils, 1103 schools.\textsuperscript{318}

\textbf{Estimated People Under Instruction}

\begin{tabular}{ll}
1821 & 200 \\
1822 & 500 \\
1823 & 2500 \\
1824 & 9,000 \\
1825 & 16,000 \\
1826 & 19,000 \\
1827 & 22,000 \\
1828 & 25,000 \\
1829 & 36,000 \\
1830 & 39,000 \\
1831 & 45,000 \\
1832 & 52,000 \\
\hline
\textbf{Total} (est. Pupils who are literate) & \textbf{266,200} \\
\end{tabular}

The estimated population of Hawai‘i at 1832 was 182,000.\textsuperscript{319} A 91% literacy rate represents a literate population of at least 1. Subtracting 165,620 from 266,200 gives us a surplus of 100,580 buffer to cover any overestimate per year; those who died; and those who took longer than a year to learn an 16 page spelling book. Thus, it appears that 91 percent literacy rate would be extremely conservative. Furthermore if the population was lower than 185,000 by 1832, which is very possible than again our figures would be understated.

### Addendum 2

**Timeline of Calvinist Missionary Interaction with Hawaiians**

**1820 to 1832**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>March 30</strong></td>
<td>Mauna Kea is sighted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>April 4</strong></td>
<td>Missionaries anchor at Kailua, Hawaii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rev. Hiram Bingham and his wife Sybil Moseley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rev. Asa Thurston and his wife Lucy Goodale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Thomas Holman and his wife Lucia Ruggles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daniel Chamberlain and wife Jerusha Burnap and their five children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elisha Loomis and his wife Theresa Sartwel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Samuel Ruggles and his wife Nancy Wells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Samuel Whitney and his wife Mercy Partridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas Hopu Hawaiian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William Kanui Hawaiian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Honolii Hawaiian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thurston, Holman, Hopu, Kanui and Humehume remain at Kailua.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Humehume marries Becky Davis a daughter of Issac Davis sails the next day to Oʻahu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elisha Loomis goes to Kawaiahae where he begins to instruct Kalanimoku and his family.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>April 19</strong></td>
<td>Missionaries arrive on Oʻahu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>May 2</strong></td>
<td>Whitney, Ruggles and Humehume leave Honolulu for Kauaʻi to visit and return to Oahu leaving Humehume on Kauai with his father.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>July 2</strong></td>
<td>Whitney sails for Hawaiʻi to visit Thurston and Holman.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>July 20</strong></td>
<td>Whitney reports that: Liholiho has learned to alphabet prior to their arrival and begins to ready the New Testament as well as four others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>July 20</strong></td>
<td>Elisha Loomis is sent to Kawaihae, Hawaiʻi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>July 25</strong></td>
<td>Whitney arrives in Kauai.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>July 30</strong></td>
<td>Dr. Thomas Holman and wife leave Hawaiʻi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>October 14</strong></td>
<td>Report to Board: 40 students being taught in Kauaʻi Still trying to learn the language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>November</strong></td>
<td>Liholiho moves his government to Honolulu and Loomis returns to Honolulu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>November 11</strong></td>
<td>Report to Board: Several of former students have become teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>December 21</strong></td>
<td>Thurston arrives in Honolulu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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1821

January 31  Dr. Holman excommunicated from the Church.\(^{329}\)
March 21  Daniel Chamberlain and family returns to the United States.
February 22  Child of Kalanimoku born, five days later it dies on February 27\(^{th}\).\(^{330}\)
April 21  Kaʻahumanu arrives in Honolulu.\(^{331}\)
July 8  Bingham, Ruggles, Kalakua sail to Kauai\(^{332}\).
July 21  Liholiho visits Kauaʻi.
September 5  First Annual Examination on Kauai.\(^{333}\)
          Public examination is also held on Oahu.
October 5  Kaumualiiʻi arrives in Honolulu.\(^{334}\)
October 9  Kaʻahumanu marries Kaumualiiʻi.\(^{335}\)
December 5  Russian ships of discovery entered port, Capt. Schischamroff calls on mission informing them that Commodore will arrive shortly.\(^{336}\)
December 15  Kaʻahumanu is sick. On the 16\(^{th}\) she is visited by Bingham and his wife.

1822

Jan 7  The first printing done in the Chamberlains thatched home.\(^{337}\)
March 16  Bingham arrvies in Kauai.\(^{338}\)
March 28  Rev. Ellis Arrives in Honolulu, with seven Tahitians.\(^{339}\)
          (Another date given in the Missionary Album states his arrival on April 22, 1822)\(^{340}\)
          (Bingham gives March 29\(^{th}\) as the date of their arrival at Hawaiʻi and April 15\(^{th}\) in Honolulu.)\(^{341}\)
August 11  Thomas Hopu is married to Delia by Bingham.\(^{342}\)
August 22  Rev. Ellis Leaves Honolulu for Tahiti.\(^{343}\)
          Kaahumanu is learning to read; They had their 9\(^{th}\) Quarterly Examination
          on the 14\(^{th}\) on last month, not less than 500 students are tested.\(^{344}\)
          2,000 copies of the spelling book struck a second edition.\(^{345}\)
          Bingham begins to preach in the language.\(^{346}\)

---

\(^{330}\) Sybil Bingham, Journal of Sybil Moseley Bingham, p. 54e.
\(^{331}\) Hiram Bingham, Twenty-one years in the Sandwich Isles, p.132.
\(^{332}\) Hiram Bingham, Twenty-one years in the Sandwich Isles p.135.
\(^{333}\) Hiram Bingham, Twenty-one years in the Sandwich Isles p. 145.
\(^{334}\) Bingham, p. 148.
\(^{335}\) Ralph Kuykendall, The Hawaiian Kingdom, vol. 1, p.75.
\(^{336}\) Sybil Bingham, Journal of Sybil Moseley Bingham, p. 55. [Com. Vassilief]
\(^{337}\) Missionary Album, p. 140.
\(^{339}\) William Ellis, A Narrative of an 1823 Tour Though Hawaiʻi, Mutual publishing, p. XV.  Note: According to Missionary Album he arrived on April 16, 1822.
\(^{340}\) Missionary Letters (Unpublished), Vol. 1, p. 21  Note: If they had their 9\(^{th}\) quarterly examination the previous month then working backwards, quarterly examinations would have begun as early as September 18, 1820.
\(^{341}\) Bingham, p. 161; Sybil Bingham, Journal of Sybil Moseley Bingham, p. 79.
\(^{342}\) Bingham, p.167.
\(^{343}\) Missionary Album, p. 88
\(^{344}\) Missionary Letters (Unpublished), vol. 1, p.21.
\(^{345}\) Missionary Letters (Unpublished), vol. 1, p.59.
\(^{346}\) Missionary Letters (Unpublished), vol.1, p. 59.
October 20  Letter from Lucy Thurston to Asa Thurston noting that one day he will not need at interpreter to preach. Honolulu.

November 18 Report to ABCFM: John Adams (aka Kuakini, brother of Kaʻahumanu) can speak English very well. Loomis visits Kailua and establishes a school which Kuakini teaches at.347

December 28 Report to ABCFM; Thomas Hopu, Kanaa, James Kahuulu are teaching schools of 50 pupils. Hopu is sent to teach a school on Hawaiʻi island that was opened by Loomis348.

1823

January 11 Report to ABCFM:
Liholiho send’s a written communication by his own hand to missionaries encouraging all chiefs to listen to the words of the Preachers.349 Wahine-nui is superintendent of school of 50 pupils in Kauai. Honoliʻi, Auna the Tahitian, James Kahulu, Kanae, & Tumi are heads of schools which were meeting for the examination.350

February 5 Rev. Ellis returns from Tahiti with two Tahitian teachers
   Taua and family
   Taa Motu a female

April 27 Second Company arrives
   Rev. Artemas Bishop and his wife Elizabeth Edwards
   Rev. William Richards and his wife Clarissa Lyman
   Rev. Charles Stewart and his wife Harriet Bradford Tiffany
   Dr. Blatchely and his wife Jemima Marvin
   Levi Chamberlain
   James Ely and his wife Louisa Everest
   Joseph Goodrich and his wife Martha Barnes
   Betsy Stockton
   Stephen Popohe, Tahitian
   William Kamouula, Hawaiian
   Richard Kalaioulu, Hawaiian
   Kupelii, Hawaiian

1824

January 1 Chiefs are beginning to acquire the art of arithmetic.351

March Report to Board: Thomas Hopu’s father dies. An edition of 2000 copies of “the Hawaiian Hymn Joy to Jehovah, the true God” is completed, which is 60 pages.352

347 Missionary Letters (Unpublished), vol.1, p. 60.
348 Missionary Letters (Unpublished), vol.1, p.24
349 Missionary Letters (Unpublished), vol. 1, p.27
350 Missionary Letters (Unpublished), vol. 1, p. 28
351 Missionary Letters (Unpublished), vol. 1, p. 82.
March 14  New Spelling to be printed 8 pages, 10,000 copies; 7000 printed previously were all distributed.\textsuperscript{353}
March 22  Kahekili Keʻeaumoku dies.\textsuperscript{354}
April 8  Bishops arrive at Kaawaloa where Kapiolani and Naihe convince him to set up residence.\textsuperscript{355}
May 26  Kaumualiʻi dies.\textsuperscript{356}
June 22  Kaahumanu issues the law that all the people should learn the \textit{palapala}.
July 8  Kamamalu dies in England.
July 14  Liholiho dies in England.
August 8  George Kaumualiʻi rebels in Kauai.\textsuperscript{357}
September 18  Rev. Ellis returns with family to England.\textsuperscript{358}

1825

March 9  News arrives in Honolulu of the death of Liholiho and Kamamalu.
May 6  The Blonde arrives with Lord Bryon and the bodies of Liholiho and Kamamalu.\textsuperscript{359}
April 14  Kalanimoku and Kaʻahumanu proclaim that all should learn the \textit{palapala}.\textsuperscript{360}
October 7  Problems with English sailors from the ship Daniel in Lahaina. They want the kapu on women lifted and came to Richard’s home to threaten him.
October 17  Samuel Stewart returns to United States
December  Kaʻahumanu, Kalanimoku, were admitted to membership in the church at Honolulu.

1826

Feb. 7  Influenza
Feb. 26  The schooner \textit{Dolphin} with Captain Percival arrives in the islands.
Assault by \textit{Dolphin} crewmen on Missionaries due to ban on allowing women on to ships.\textsuperscript{361}
June 19  Report to the Board that 41,000 copies of the spelling book has been printed and nearly all distributed.\textsuperscript{362}
July 26  Missionary reject the letter b,d,t, v from the Hawaiian alphabet.\textsuperscript{363}
September 27  Kuakini completes a huge meeting house, 180’ x 78’, covering 14,040 square feet capable of holding 4,800 hearers, taking seven months to complete.\textsuperscript{364}

\textsuperscript{352} Missionary Letters (Unpublished), vol. 2, p. 303.
\textsuperscript{353} Missionary Letters (Unpublished), vol. 2, p. 313.
\textsuperscript{355} Missionary Letters (Unpublished), vol. 2, p. 666.
\textsuperscript{357} Kuykendall, vol. 1, p.118.
\textsuperscript{358} Kuykendall, vol. 1, p.119.
\textsuperscript{362} Missionary Letters (Unpublished), vol. 2, p. 466.
\textsuperscript{363} Missionary Letters (Unpublished), vol. 2, p. 469.
October 26 American Warship the Peacock arrives with Captain Catesby Jones.

November 3 Bingham is at Kailua, Hawai‘i working with Bishop revising the Gospel of Matthew for the press.\textsuperscript{365}

November 20 The Hawaiian alphabet is reduced to 5 vowels and 7 consonants.\textsuperscript{366}

December Sandalwood and tapa tax law enacted.

1827

January 6, Elisha Loomis and family returns to the United States
February 8 Kalanimoku dies\textsuperscript{367}
February 13 The sound of hula is beginning to rend the air.\textsuperscript{368}
February 22 Report to Board; Most of the people in the mountains cutting sandalwood.
July 7 Roman Catholic priests arrive from France arrive. Rejected by Ka‘ahumanu the captain sails off leaving them in the islands.\textsuperscript{369}
May 26 Dr. Blactchely and wife returns to the United States
Maria Whitney young daughter of Rev. Samuel Whitney returns with the Blactchelys
Nov Captain Wm. Buckle incident with William Richards

1828

February First tour around the island of Oahu taken by committee to examine the schools; which takes 13 days.\textsuperscript{370}
February 21 Elizabeth Edwards Bishop, wife of Artemas Bishop, dies at Kailua.
March 12 Goodrich moves from Hilo to Oahu to supervise the printing.\textsuperscript{371}
March 30 Third Company arrives
Rev. Lorrin Andrews and his wife Mary Ann Wilson
Rev. Ephraim W. Clark and his wife Mary Kittredge
Rev. Jonathan S. Green and his wife Theodotia Arnold
Rev. Peter J. Gulick and his wife Fanny Hinckley Thomas
Dr. Gerrit P. Judd and his wife Laura Fish
Stephen Shepard and his wife Margaret Caroline Slow
Maria Ogden
Maria Patton (later marries Levi Chamberlain)
Delia Stone (later marries Artemas Bishop)
Mary Ward (later Mrs. Edmund H. Rogers)
Henry Tahiti Tahitian
George Tyler (Kielaal Hawaiian) a shoemaker
Samuel J. Mills (Paloo) Hawaiian a teacher
John E. Phelps (Kalaaauluna) Hawaiian assistant to Dr. Judd
This company brings a second printing press\textsuperscript{372}

\textsuperscript{364} Bingham, \textit{A Residency of Twenty-one Years}, p. 298.
\textsuperscript{365} Missionary Letters (Unpublished), vol. 2, p. 618.
\textsuperscript{366} Missionary Letters (Unpublished), vol. 2, p. 621.
\textsuperscript{367} Missionary Letters (Unpublished), vol. 2, p. 481.
\textsuperscript{368} Missionary Letters (Unpublished), vol. 2, p. 477.
\textsuperscript{369} Kuykendall, \textit{The Hawaiian Kingdom}, vol. 1, p. 140; Bingham, \textit{A Residence}, p. 311-313.
\textsuperscript{370} Missionary Letters (Unpublished), vol. 2, p. 545.
\textsuperscript{371} Missionary Letters (Unpublished), vol. 2, p. 697.
June 12  Goodrich is reassigned back to Hilo.  
July 19  Bingham reports the arrival of the Catholics  
August 18  Richards, Andrews and Green tour Oahu to examine the schools and numbering the inhabitants and making surveys; they are accompanied by Nahienaena.  
October 15  James Ely and family with eldest daughter of Hiram Bingham leave Hawaii for United States.  
December  Artemis Bishop marries Delia Stone.  

1830
June 14  Bingham relocates to Waimea, Hawaiʻi, letters vol.4 1063  
December 28  Fourth Company of Missionaries arrive  
  Rev. Dwight Baldwin and his wife Charlotte Fowler Baldwin  
  Rev. Sheldon Dibble and his wife Maria M. Tomlinson  
  Rev. Ruben Tinker and his wife Mary Throop Wood  
  Andrew Johnstone and his wife Lois S. Hoyt Johnson  

1831
March 12  Bingham and family returns to Honolulu.  Letters vol.4 1067  
May 17  Fifth Company of Missionaries  
  Rev. William Alexander and his wife Mary Ann McKinney  
  Rev. Richard Armstrong and his wife Clarissa Chapman  
  Rev. John S. Emerson and his wife Ursula Sophia Newell  
  Rev. Forbes and his wife Rebecca Duncan Smith  
  Rev. Harvey R. Hitchcock and his wife Rebecca Howard  
  Rev. David B. Lyman and his wife Sarah Joiner  
  Rev. Lorenzo Lyons and his wife Betsy Curtis  
  Rev. Ephraim Spaulding and his wife Julia Brooks  
  Dr. Alonzo Chapin and his wife Chapin  
  Edmund H. Rogers  
September  Lahaina School commenced.  

1832
June 5  Whooping Cough Epidemic  
  Kaʻahumanu dies.  

372 Missionary Album, p. 8.  
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