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ABSTRACT

Defining this work can be best accomplished by starting with what it isn’t. This is not simply a work of revisionist history. It is not merely the “other side of the story.” Those things are merely answers; replies to certain histories that often devolve into “you say, I say” debates that seek to call forth choirs on each side eager to be preached to. It is not a “balancing of the scales,” a “righting of a wrong” or any other work dependant on the present master process. While it does critique the previously dominant way of presenting Hawaiian history, it is at its core an attempt to highlight Hawaiian voices that have been demanding to be heard. I believe that giving platform to the Hawaiian-language archive disables the exclusionary historiography that has demanded that we speak for those who have themselves already spoken. I do however question the dominant historiography; the foundation upon which these earlier histories are allowed to be produced. That platform is uneven, skewed. It is foundationally unsound and no amount of tinkering is going to set it right. It needs to be discarded.

The national narrative that is Hawai‘i has previously relied on haole sources while overtly excluding Native ones. For much of its production the lie was told that these Native sources just simply didn’t exist in significant number. When the existence of a vast collection of primary source material in the Indigenous language was highlighted, the exclusionary practice rested on a new principle; the Native was not competent to record her / his own history. Over the last three-plus decades, a growing number of Native Hawaiian scholars that includes Jonothan Kamakawiwo‘ole Osorio, Haunani-Kay Trask, Lilikalā Kame‘eleihiwa, Noenoe Silva, Carlos Andrade, Davianna McGregor and
many others have begun to change that dynamic by making their voices heard on a wide variety of topics including the history of their kūpuna. Students are graduating from Hawaiian Studies and Hawaiian-language programs in an ever-increasing number. The Kamakakūokalani Center for Hawaiian Studies has begun a Masters program in Hawaiian Studies and is looking ahead towards producing Ph.D. graduates. Just this recent school year the Hawaiian Studies, Hawaiian Language and Kānewai Lo‘i programs came together to create their own college, Hawai‘inuiākea School of Hawaiian Knowledge. There is much to be excited about.

The main focus of this thesis however, is not the producers of history but rather the process. Its focus is not historians but instead, historiography. I contend that a long developed historiography, based on English-language sources continues to be the foundation for much of what we are still using and producing. My 2003 undergraduate course entitled History of Hawai‘i was taught using Gawan Daws’ Shoal of Time (a problematic book critiqued later in this thesis) as its text. The course, History 284, is taught with this source today. The biographies of Hawaiian-historical figures that are the basis for student and community research are almost solely derived from English-language sources. These resources continue to form a significant portion of our new work.

This argument is furthered by the understanding that history is, by far, not only produced in the halls of academia. Consumers of history today get their product from magazine articles, television and film, museum and historical place tours, the internet and many other places. Very little of this history is sourced with a historiography that is inclusive of the vast archive that exists in Hawaiian language. This thesis seeks to make blatant the repercussions of ignoring that archive and ask why it is still allowed to
happen. It will show that within the prolific archive of Hawaiian-language material is testimony that contradicts long-held understandings of certain events. It will use two case studies. One of these describes an event from the late-nineteenth century and follows a trail of exclusion and preferred voice that results in a universally accepted false history of that event. A second modern example of exclusion details how the process that was built and supported in the past has given us a faulty historiography that continues to be used to produce exclusionary histories that very much affect our present.

Note on orthography: In this text I follow commonly accepted modern use of diacritical marks in Hawaiian words and names except in quoting original sources that did not contain them and in the case of showing respect to Mrs. Mary KawenaPukui who made known the preference that her name be written without them.

Note on translation: All translations within this thesis are mine except within the “Mele / Oli” section of the Survey of Archive where I have left intact the translations within the archive file; translator as noted.
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Hearing Voices: Long Ignored Indigenous-Language Testimony Challenges the Current Historiography of Hawai‘i Nei

“History, it is often suggested, is written by the winners. Yet losers also write history; they just don’t get translated.”

Yes, in a sense, all histories are exclusionary. The predominantly published and accessed discourses on history are the realm of victors, of colonizers. These histories are one of the spoils of power. Yet this quote speaks to a specific historiography; one created through the exclusion of Native language, Native voice. It is a history that calls on recollections of settler voices and foreign interpretations. These stories are pieces that come to form a narrative, a national history. The colonizer has been the narrator of the Native story, telling it how he will. As Edward Said has written, paraphrasing one critic, “nations themselves are narrations.” He continues, “the power to narrate, or to block other narratives from forming and emerging, is very important to culture and imperialism, and constitutes one of the main connections between them.” Often over time these histories are challenged and long-silenced voices are heard that give fuller, more rich and sometimes opposing stories. In Hawai‘i, this challenge is relatively recent.

---


This quote speaks directly to the existence of the excluded Native voice, and therefore historical record, that I am writing about. It however, mentions translation, which can also affect exclusion and has been written about in Marvin Puakea Nogelmeier’s dissertation, *Mai Pa‘a i ka Leo: Historical Voice in Hawaiian Primary Materials, Looking Forward and Listening Back*. I too argue strongly for accessing the primary source Hawaiian-language materials when seeking to include Native voice.

The history of Hawai‘i has been written largely excluding Native voice. The colonial experience of these islands has shaped a discourse on Hawaiian history that is most often exclusionary and one-sided. The colonizer simply removed Native voice from the historiographic process by suppressing the language and then passing laws to affect its demise. The more that the supplanting foreign language of English dominated and eventually nearly eliminated the indigenous Hawaiian language, the greater the disconnect between the recorders of history and the testimony of Native voices became.

Even with the foundational work of many scholars to organize and make available the vast collection of Hawaiian-language materials, these often-primary sources were largely ignored in the writing of history. As Edward Said writes,

> Without significant exception the universalizing discourses of modern Europe and the United States assume the silence, willing or otherwise, of the non-European world...there is only infrequently an acknowledgement that the colonized people should be heard from, their ideas known.

Another component of this exclusionary process is the fact that there is such a limited body of researchers and historians who are fluent Hawaiian-language speakers. There has been a slow but steady resurgence of Hawaiian-language learning. However, two of the aforementioned root causes of exclusion continue: the refusal to acknowledge Kānaka Maoli testimony and the neglect in including this testimony in the historiographic process.

This research seeks to illuminate these fundamental flaws and challenge modern-day historians to include the voluminous and powerful primary-source testimony from

---

3 Act of June 8, 1896, ch. 57, sec. 30 of the Republic of Hawai‘i, declared that English shall be the medium of instruction in all public and private schools.

4 Said, 50.
Kanaka Maoli that has long existed but been ignored. I will use the vast collection of Hawaiian-language newspapers and other Hawaiian-language documents to create two case studies, one a nineteenth-century event and one a modern day example. These will illuminate the historical, and perhaps more significantly, the ongoing effects of the exclusion of Hawaiian-language voice in the creation of history. This work will contrast previously documented historical events with newly presented, primary-source narration from the excluded voice. It will contain the description of significant events that have been portrayed and widely published as history that are directly contradicted by often several, and sometimes many, Hawaiian-language sources. I will highlight how these poorly sourced and one-sided accounts have not only been accepted as history, but also praised for their thoroughness. Noenoe Silva describes how the historiographic process has been molded so that,

By the mid-twentieth century, the idea that English was the language of Hawai‘i seemed natural, especially because, except by some persistent Kanaka, Hawai‘i was no longer regarded as a separate nation with its own people having their own history and language. When historians and others composed their narratives, they “naturally” conducted their research using only the English-language sources.\(^5\)

This normalization of research in Hawai‘i being done in the colonizers language also gains acceptance through the effects of what Ngũgĩ Wa Thiong'o has described as a “cultural bomb.” He writes that among other things, this cultural bomb makes a people

“...want to identify with that which is furthest removed from themselves; for instance, with other peoples’ languages rather than their own.”

Hawaiian-language scholars and students are changing this dynamic by researching primary accounts of Hawaiian history through the vast collection of Hawaiian-language material. I hope to contribute by giving voice to those Kānaka Maoli narrations long excluded from the writing of the history of their own lands. Kānaka Maoli wrote prolifically and powerfully about their lives, their land, and their Lāhui; it is long past time that we listened.

---

CHAPTER I
WHAT'S MISSING? SURVEY OF ARCHIVE

So what exactly has been excluded? Hawaiian-language “Native voice” is a general description that, unexamined, allows for questions of relevance, quality, and positioning. However, in critiquing the historiography of Hawai‘i with regards to the exclusion of Hawaiian-language sources, a close look at the scope and character of that archive reveals just how stunning this omission is. It not only illuminates much about what has been missing from the writing of Hawaiian history, but also magnifies the incompetence of a historiography that accepts the continued production of material that omits these vast primary sources. Upon close analysis it becomes apparent that this archive is foundational to any legitimate historiography of Hawai‘i.

As will be highlighted to follow, these primary sources are not only prolific, but also competent and extremely relevant. From Mō‘ī (monarchs) at ‘Iolani Palace to kalo farmers in Ke‘anae, Kanaka Maoli purposefully “spoke” on matters of life and living. Long passed should be the days when work assigning identity or motive to Kanaka Maoli action is filled with quotes from “an important officer aboard Cook’s ship” or “Rev. some or other.” Hawaiian voice on these subjects can be accessed. This archive speaks.

For the sake of this thesis I will categorize and describe, in relatively brief summary, much of what I have termed Hawaiian-language testimony, with attention to scope, content, and context. Specific examples follow in an appendix. These examples come from my own research within this field and are used so as to leave no question of the relevance and power of these resources. This is by no means a complete or even a very full survey. I have left out, for the sake of brevity, literally dozens of sources and
collections, and thousands of examples. My intention is to hopefully offer, by specific
instance, an enlightening glimpse at the Hawaiian-language sources that have been
excluded. I want to begin to build a feel, not only for the scope, but also for the character
of these sources.

KE ‘ANO O KA LEO (type of voice)

A. Nūpepa ‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i (Hawaiian-language newspapers)
   inclusive of:
   a1. Leka iā ka Luna ho‘oponopono (letter to the editor)
   a2. Mana‘o Luna ho‘oponopono (editorial)
   a3. Mo‘okūlauhau (genealogy)
   a4. Kanikau (funeral dirge)
   a5. Mo‘olelo Ka‘ao (legendary tale)

B. Leka ‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i (Hawaiian-language archival letters)
   b1. Personal letters
   b2. Institutional letters

C. Kīkā Kama‘ilio ma ka ‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i (Hawaiian-language interview audio-
   recordings)
   c1. Ethnographic and historical interview
   c2. Hawaiian-language radio
A. Niipepa 'Olelo Hawai'i (Hawaiian-language newspapers)

The archive of Hawaiian-language newspapers is quite simply the largest collection of Hawaiian writings in existence. It contains the equivalent of over one million letter-size pages of printed material in the indigenous language. It is unique in scope in Oceania, and its creation paralleled a passionate acquisition of literacy in nineteenth century Hawai'i that was to imbue this collection with broad authorship and readership. The character of the archive was shaped initially as a missionary produced and controlled press, but after a short period of mostly behind the scenes involvement in production, Kānaka Maoli took action to own and publish their own newspapers, successfully appropriating this new and powerful form of discourse. In doing so they produced a Hawaiian driven testimony that exploded in scope. This testimony, about Kānaka Maoli from Kānaka Maoli, that Noenoe Silva has called "one of the largest indigenous archives in the world," is epic in historical relevance.

From that truly transforming day, 16 May 1834, when the first issue of Ka Lama Hawaii (The Hawaiian Torch) was lifted from the presses of the seminary at Lāhaināluna

---


8 Silva, 11.
School through the birth of a Hawaiian nationalist press in 1861, and continuing on until
1941, the Hawaiian-language press recorded not only what Hawaiians did, but later, in
immense volume, what Kānaka Maoli thought. This was truly the creation of a national
narrative by an indigenous people. Its character leant itself to the inclusion of pertinent
historical materials.

Scope: As mentioned, the beginnings of the press in Hawai‘i were mission produced and
controlled. These efforts were also copious. By 1858, the mission print shops had
generated over one hundred million pages of bible translations, hymnals, inspirational
stories, textbooks, legal documents, tracts and newspapers in the Hawaiian language.⁹

The Hawaiian Kingdom of the first half of the nineteenth century was deluged with the
mana‘o (thought) of the haole (foreigner).

Another early player involved in this new mode of discourse was the government.
By the early 1840’s official papers of the government were being printed. Ho‘olaha or
announcements came from this arm as well as other publications relating to laws, court
decisions and addresses from the Mō‘ī. In June of 1845 a joint resolution was passed by
the Hawaiian legislature calling upon the Attorney General to set up a new structure of
government in Hawai‘i that created ministries and departments to carry out the
responsibilities of government. The laws that came out of this work would come to be
called the Organic Acts. In the formation of this structure, recognizing the power that
literacy and the press were creating in Hawai‘i, John Ricord, Attorney General for the

⁹ A. Grove Day and Albertine Loomis, *Ka Pa‘i Palapala: Early Printing in Hawai‘i* (Honolulu: Mission
Kingdom of Hawai‘i, set up a government arm of publishing named the Bureau of the Government Press.

Appropriation of the New Technology

The early presses and print shops incorporated Kānaka Maoli workers in the physical production of the papers. Hawaiians were hired on in many aspects of the business as translators, typesetters, printers and paperboys. Hawaiians learned and adopted this new physical technology as well as the skills of running a paper. Soon they would begin to open for themselves a new site of discourse produced and controlled by Kānaka Maoli. On 26 Sept. 1861, the first issue of Ka Hoku o ka Pakipika (The Star of the Pacific) was published. The paper was owned, edited and staffed by Kānaka Maoli. In less than three short decades, Hawaiians went from being observers of this new transformative technology, to prolific producers who would create a voluminous archive of Native expression. Helen Chapin has written that the origins of what she calls a “nationalist press” was “a striking illustration of literacy joined to a newspaper technology conferring empowerment.”

Now on the discursive landscape was the first Hawaiian-language newspaper produced and edited by Native Hawaiians. With this platform available, a flood soon began of Kānaka Maoli voice in their indigenous language that would fill dozens of different newspapers to come. Over the next few decades, Hawaiian speakers pervaded the written archive to the tune of nearly 100,000 pages.

Character: Mission control, and more specifically Calvinist control, of most Hawaiian-language printed matter for the first two decades meant that material was strongly proselytizing in nature. "Educational" materials nearly always contained references to classic analogies of darkness (evil, unenlightenment) and light (good, knowledge). Kānaka Maoli were spoken to and portrayed as newcomers to enlightenment. The early church-affiliated papers quickly blurred the lines between their religious missionary endeavors and matters of state by continuously publishing essays on what they saw as good government.

Calvinists produced by far the greatest amount of material, but theirs was not a complete monopoly on the production of Hawaiian-language materials. The Catholic Church produced material as early as 1831 and output increased in 1841 with an actual newspaper coming later in 1852. The Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints also produced a newspaper, Elele Evanelio (Evangelical Messenger) in 1891 and the Mormon Church in 1908 printed Ka Elele Oiaio (The Truthful Messenger).

The opening in 1856 of a more secular weekly Hawaiian-language paper, Ka Hae Hawaii (The Hawaiian Flag) was a central turn in encouraging Kānaka Maoli to take part in this forum. A new level of responsiveness from readers was seen as more traditional issues brought interest from a wide range of Kānaka Maoli. The inclusion of chants and dirges and more local material was to spur this interest. This meant not only the beginnings of a change in the producers of the some of the material, but also a significant change in the character of content. Newspaper editors began to be inundated with

---

11 Day and Loomis, 30.
material. An announcement in the newspaper *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa* (The Independent Newspaper) states;

\[
\text{He mau hanele ka nui o na Kanikau e waiho nei ma ko makou papakakau, a ua hiki ole ia makou ke pai ia mau mea a pan, no ka nele i kahi kaawale ole, ina paha he paumi ae ka nui o ka makou pepa.}^{12}
\]

There are hundreds of dirges left on our desk and because of the lack of available space we could not publish them all even if our paper were ten times its size.

Comments were also made about the personal nature of many of the letters such as when the editor of *Kuokoa*, writing in 1867, said that Kānaka Maoli letters were “me he mea la, ua kipa kino mai ma ko makou keena kakau, e kamailio ai” (written as though they dropped by the office for a chat).\(^{13}\)

Haole editors of this paper did allow for letter interaction but still controlled the discourse by imposing a tight reign on the choice of letters published. With Kānaka Maoli editorship and ownership of newspapers, the character and more importantly the control of newspapers began to change. Kānaka Maoli became a majority voice within the pages of the Hawaiian-language newspapers.

The publishing of *Ka Hoku o ka Pakipika* in September 1861 by Kānaka Maoli ranks as a transforming moment in the production of Native voice. This disruption in the continuum of growing foreign control of narrative in Hawai‘i can serve as an important

---


\(^{13}\) He Kamakamailio, ‘ao‘ao 2.
signal to understanding some of the character of this archive. Michel Foucault describes this type of resistance: “Beneath the great continuities of thought, beneath the solid, homogeneous manifestations of a single mind or collective mentality... one is now trying to detect the incidence of interruptions...”\(^{14}\) This very significant disruption in what had been a controlled and exclusive narrative meant the character and voice of this forum would become much more public.

One of the things the Hawaiian public was to do with this new found written voice was to express what was a century long concern over the loss of Hawaiian knowledge. Efforts to stem this tide of great loss generated a massive amount of written cultural material: genealogies, histories, legends, chants, riddles and extensive categorical listings. These listings that included such things as stars, plants, fish, sites, winds, rains, clouds, deities and innumerable other fields, filled the newspapers.\(^{15}\)

A Change in Representation

The power inherent in voice seemed to instill in many of the Kānaka Maoli who ran and contributed to the papers a sense of confidence that was seen in immediate challenges to “haole missionary” voices. While so much had dramatically changed over the last half-century, Kānaka Maoli continued to connect to an almost two millennium relationship to these islands and the genealogy of knowledge that comes with that relationship. Helen Chapin explains that the new Hawaiian based press,  


\(^{15}\) Efforts to index some of this material has resulted in the invaluable Hawaiian-language resource titled Hawaiian Ethnological Notes or H.E.N. that was compiled by Mrs. Mary Kawena Pukui and others during the mid-twentieth century.
...displayed a rich diversity in points of view. But they were united in sharing several basic themes that were markedly different from those of establishment papers: one, a conviction that Hawaiians knew what was best for themselves; two, an awareness that the decline of the Native population was a serious matter; three, an insistence that Hawai‘i remain an independent nation; four, a deep respect for the monarchy; and five, a great love for their land.\textsuperscript{16}

Alternate Hawaiian-Language View

Having mentioned the power and resistance issues involved in this production of Hawaiian-language newspapers, it is also very important to note that an argument for inclusion of these resources is not simply revisionist or resistant, but rather historiographical. Hawaiians, as any group, held diverse opinions on many subjects. Also, newspapers were produced in the Hawaiian language by haole. There were newspapers that were notably anti-royalist, pro-American and pro-annexation. Henry Martyn Whitney created and edited the largest and longest running of the papers, \textit{Ka Nupepa Kuokoa}, which was very supportive of aims at annexation and supported the Provisional Government. Also, in 1865, the paper ran a series heartily criticizing traditional Hawaiian medicine and attempting to prove to readers the uselessness of such ancient traditions. These excluded Hawaiian-language materials are, like their authors, a diverse entity.

Another important distinction of this archive is that the nineteenth-century newspapers were also very different from the newspapers we are familiar with today. They were a relatively instantaneous form of communication. Puakea Nogelmeier has referred to the papers as the Internet of the nineteenth century. For the great majority of

\textsuperscript{16} Chapin, 61.
readers, newspapers today are a one-way communication. Papers in this earlier period were much more familial and “interactive.” Families and groups of people would share the papers and discuss what had been written.

They were also the platform for world news of the day. Newspapers were received from the United States and Europe and most of the local papers commented on these happenings with lengthy foreign news columns that kept Kānaka Maoli abreast of world events. News from Europe would often reach the shores, and newspapers, of Hawai‘i before moving on to the western coast of the United States. News from the United States was also relatively quick in returning to Hawai‘i. An example of this is seen in a discussion within a column in the May 1894 issue of Nāpepa Ka ‘Oia‘i’o (Newspaper of the Truth). The editor writes of a collegiate debate over Hawaiian annexation that had taken place in the city of Washington [now known as Washington D.C.] only weeks prior and shares his spirited opinions.

Use: This new technology truly became a locus of discourse for Kānaka Maoli as the newspapers circulated among a nearly fully literate population. As early as 1825 Kauikeaouli, King Kamehameha III, had declared “O kou aupuni, he aupuni palapala ko‘u”17 (My kingdom is a kingdom of the written word). In 1839, a scant two decades after the formal introduction of training in the written word, missionary wife Laura Fish Judd wrote that she estimated the percentage of literacy among Hawaiians to be “greater than in any country in the world, except Scotland and New England.”18


Thus, the newspaper press was soon to become a locus of creation for a national narrative. This is an important distinction from most newspapers today as the writer of a modern day letter to the editor of the *Dallas Morning News* most likely has no expectation that his or her letter will be read that week in Oakland and vice-versa. Hawaiians wrote with the understanding of taking part in a national dialogue, and as Puakea Nogelmeier explains,

> The assumption of full literacy was general among Hawaiians and their foreign contemporaries. Thus, as Hawaiian writers took an active role in writing and publishing text for national distribution, they were aware that they were writing for, and reading along with, a fully literate populace. As the press became the locus of national dialogue, such a mindset would have many effects, including the care invested in writing and the importance placed on what was read. 19

Once Hawaiians controlled a press, the eager acceptance and use of the newspapers as a forum for interaction and discourse on a national scale was itself noted. *Ka Hae Hawai‘i* called Hawaiians “a people who crave the newspaper”20 and when that newspaper folded a kanikau or funeral dirge entitled “He kanikau aloha no ka Hae Hawaii”21 was written and sent in for the paper.

Even the mission press commented on Hawaiian-language newspapers. The January 1862 edition of *The Friend* said,

19 Nogelmeier, 102.

20 *Ka Hae Hawai‘i*, Nowemapa 16, 1861.

The Hawaiians are as much attached to newspapers as any newsmonger of old Athens was to the gossip of the Areopagus. Long since, the “Kumu,” “Nonanona,” and “Elele,” have passed away. Then followed the weekly “Hae” which was a great advance upon its predecessor.22

The interactive nature and widespread use of the newspapers gives great historic relevance to this forum. Within the contested space that was history, the newspapers were a valuable tool for those who could harness them. In the immediate days after the January 1893 Coup d’etat that resulted in the formation of a temporary government, the leaders of this group harassed and threatened several prominent editors of Hawaiian-language newspapers that had written material supportive of Queen Lili‘uokalani.23 Within two months the Provisional Government had established an Office of the Press and worked to enact laws that would tightly control dialog. This control of the press was a second transforming point that would begin to return Kānaka Maoli to the role of consumer of voice instead of producer. It would also provide a relatively consistent and hegemonic narrative that would be used within a historiography that relied on one language to help produce a faulty process that would continue to produce an exclusionary history.

Summary of Examples from the Hawaiian-Language Newspapers

The reach of this archival resource into the realm of topical studies is limitless. In nearly every research project that I have been involved with in my undergraduate and graduate studies, an inclusion of the Hawaiian-language newspapers as a source has had a

22 The Friend, January 1862.

23 See Jan. 1893 meeting minutes of the Provisional Government, Hawai‘i State Archives, Honolulu, HI.
demonstrably significant effect on my previous understanding of the topic. In some instances there was a direct contestation of the heretofore published, English-sourced material [see Case Study 1 in this thesis]. Almost universally, an inclusion of the Hawaiian-language newspaper sources leant powerful context and shading to an understanding of material that had previously been looked at through a more homogenous lens. Further, a growing familiarity with the archive lends inter-textual context to writings that can expand previously one-dimensional material. When one begins to understand the character and positioning of specific newspapers, authors and editors, the writings within those sources begin to acquire a distinct profundity.

This Hawaiian-language archive consists of material that stretches from the early 1830’s into the late 1940’s and was produced in quantities both large (several thousand copies per week in a case like *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*) and small. It was, during its tenure, both a discourse of proselitization and a national dialogue of resistance. It contained historic declarations from the supreme leaders of the kingdom, and local mana’o (thought) sent in from the most remote parts of the islands. An understanding of the impact and relevance of its inclusion in the writing of history in Hawai‘i will only continue to expand as we continue to open our previously exclusive discourse to these prolific voices.

Examples

I have included two [of many] specific examples of how the Hawaiian-language newspapers, as a historical resource, have affected research projects that I have worked
on. As both a producer and consumer of history in Hawai‘i, I believe this example to be very relevant. (See Appendixes A1 and A2).

*Note on other newspaper sourced materials: (original versions of translated works).

Another important part of the Hawaiian-language newspaper collection are transcriptions of text from the newspapers that later became edited published works. These works were often published later in translation. These translations, however, were heavily edited and beset with many of the problems inherent with translation. The text in the original language provides a distinctly more full and rich picture of the history that the author was trying to portray. The aforementioned Ph.D. dissertation of Puakea Nogelmeier more fully examines this issue.\(^{24}\)

**B. Leka ‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i (Letters in Hawaiian)**

While missionary correspondence has been repeatedly mined for insights into the Hawaiian mind, letters from Hawaiians themselves have been largely ignored in published histories. There are thousands of correspondences in ‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i that have long been publicly accessible at the libraries and archives throughout Hawai‘i. The range of content is enormous; these letters often included everything from overt political speech, everyday local events, important world matters and even subtle poetry. Letters from Kingdom of Hawai‘i rulers to immediate family members, correspondence from Kānaka Maoli to their leaders, and much more fill these archival repositories. These were people giving often-primary source accounts of what would later become prominent

\(^{24}\) Nogelmeier.
historical events. With summary and examples I attempt to highlight and describe a tiny portion of the hugely relevant yet excluded historical material.

Kapi'olani-Kalaniana'ole Collection
Manuscript Collection. Bernice Pauahi Bishop Museum Archives. MS KC

Summary: The Kapi'olani-Kalaniana'ole Collection contains a variety of manuscript materials and memorabilia apparently collected by King Kalākaua and later added to by Prince Jonah Kūhiō Kalaniana'ole and others within and around the Ali'i Nui families. The collection was donated to the museum in 1923 by his widow, Princess Elizabeth Kahanu Kalaniana'ole.

The collection consists of memorabilia of the Hawaiian monarchy, its officials, and subjects, including personal correspondence, papers and records. The material covers a time span of one hundred years, from 1822 to the death of Jonah Kūhiō Kalaniana'ole in 1922. The most complete papers are those of Alexander Liholiho (Kamehameha IV) and the last years of the reign of Kauikeaouli (Kamehameha III).

Hawaiian-Language Content: There are four (15.25" x 5" x 10.25") boxes containing several hundred letters written in Hawaiian language both to and from many of those within the royal family. These are some of the most significant historical figures within the Kingdom of Hawai‘i. Letters range from diplomatic entries during the reigns of Kauikeaouli, Lot Kapuaiwa, Kalākaua and Liliʻuokalani to personal letters within the family and letters from Kānaka Maoli to these Aliʻi Nui. These documents help lend powerful context to any study of these significant players in the history of these islands.
A British national historiography that excluded a large collection of personal and official correspondences from within the royal family would be unthinkable. The significance of this primary source material cannot be overestimated.

(Examples from the Kapiʻolani-Kalanianaʻole Collection are seen in Appendixes B1, B2 and B3).

**Henriques Collection:**
Manuscript Collection. Bernice Pauahi Bishop Museum Archives MS HC

Summary: (9 Hollinger Boxes. 4 linear feet) This manuscript collection contains materials collected and preserved by Edgar Henriques (1865-1931) until his death in 1931. Henriques was a real estate investor and trustee to several important estates in Hawaiʻi. He was married to Mrs. Peabody, whose aunt was Lucy K. Peabody, an important confidant and lady-in-waiting to Queen Emma. Mrs. Peabody was maid of honor at the marriage of Queen Emma and Kamehameha IV. Mrs. Peabody founded ‘Ahahui Kaʻahumanu on 4 June 1905. Mr. Henriques was known as a collector of Hawaiian historical materials and as such amasses a varied and important archive. The collection contains letters, memorabilia, and state papers primarily centered around Kamehameha IV and Emma but also including several other royal reigns.

Hawaiian-Language Content: The Hawaiian-language content within this collection is 2 linear feet containing approx. 100 letters and documents. There is one Hollinger box labeled “Letters in Hawaiian” Box 5, which contains the bulk of the Hawaiian-language material, but there are also letters in Hawaiian sprinkled throughout the other boxes.
There is a large group of letters from King Alexander Liholiho, several very significant documents from Kauikeaouli and much more.

(Examples from Henriques Collection can be seen in Appendixes B4 and B5).

**Lili‘uokalani Manuscript Collection:**

Manuscript Collection M-93. Hawaii State Archives

Summary: This collection contains correspondence between Lili‘uokalani and others, the Queen’s personal diaries, a large set of documents of state and other materials relating to Her Majesty’s reign and later life. One incredibly interesting set of documents in this collection is a group of over one-hundred pieces that were taken from Her Majesty Queen Lili‘uokalani’s personal safe in 1895 at the time of her arrest by representatives of the oligarchy which had overthrown her the year prior. Albert Francis Judd, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court for the Republic of Hawai‘i reviewed and cataloged these documents.

Another set of correspondence of particular note is a group of forty five letters written from Mrs. Emma ‘Aima Nāwahī to Queen Lili‘uokalani while the Queen was in Boston, New York and Washington making her case for recognition of her right to rule. These nearly weekly letters, most of which are eight to twelve pages, written from the one of the heads of Hui Aloha ‘Āina Honolulu to the Queen contain both personal and direct political matters. They are highly personal and at the same time are distinct tools used to inform the Queen of the actions of her enemies and her supporters. There is also talk of directions, both blatant and hidden, to be relayed to Her Majesty’s subjects
through Mrs. Nawahr. Mrs. Nawahr owned and ran the Hawaiian-language newspaper *Ke Aloha Aina* and would often print the more “open” of the Queen’s instructions.

Some other items within this collection including letters from supporters that detail some of the political and “military” maneuvers of her enemies. This is a hugely valuable archive collection that reveals so much about not only specific history but also assists in efforts to begin to understand how the varied subjects of the Kingdom of Hawai‘i viewed their monarch. They also give first person accounts of resistance by the people in many forms.

(Examples from Liliʻuokalani Collection can be seen in Appendixes B6 and B7).

*Leka ʻŌlelo Hawaiʻi mai nā Kāhuna Kalikiano* (Hawaiian-language letters from Christian Pastors)

“Judd Collection” MS Group 90 Bernice Pauahi Bishop Museum and Letter collections, Hawaiian Mission Children’s Society Library.

The relationships between Kānaka Maoli and the Christian mission, always complex, became more so as the church made much more blatant attacks on the Aliʻi Nui and Monarchy. This complexity might have reached its peak during the planning and aftermath of the overthrow of Queen Liliʻuokalani. Missionary leaders, seeking more influence and control over Kānaka parishioners, began to ordain more Hawaiian pastors. Following unsuccessful plans by the Provisional Government for immediate annexation to the United States, the situation became incredibly tenuous. Oligarchic and inter-depandant roles developed at the intersections of church and state in an attempt to maintain a fragile position of control. The leaders of the Hawaiian Evangelical
Association, many of whom held direct or supporting positions in the new government, prescribed sermons filled with degrading comments about the Queen and calls for support of the Provisional Government and annexation. A desire among many congregations for continued adherence to a new understanding of religious piety conflicted strongly with many Hawaiian’s intense regard and respect for the mother of their Lāhui, their beloved Queen. These conflicts emerged within communities, congregations and even within families. Letters from primary sources, such as the aforementioned Native pastors, their congregations, and the leaders of the organizations with which they interacted would again seem to be required reading for anyone doing a history of these topics.

(Example from Pastor Letters Collections can be seen in Appendix B8).

C. Kūkā Kama‘ilio ma ka ‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i (Hawaiian-language interview audiotapes)

An extensive collection of Hawaiian-language interview audiotapes exists which contain immeasurable insight into historically relevant material. Many of these interviews were conducted with subjects who were alive during the time periods under discussion and often had experience with these events. This is one of the largest archives of Kānaka Maoli narrative in existence.

Mary Kawena Pukui Audio Interview collection:

Bernice Pauahi Bishop Museum Archives Audio Collection:
Summary: The Bishop Museum Archives’ Audio collection is comprised of 1004 reels containing 500+ hours of oral interviews. These interviews were done over a 50-year period beginning in the early 1920’s. The collection offers a primary source knowledge base that describes pivotal pieces of data needed for the study and understanding of Hawaiian history, culture, and traditional cultural practices. Nowhere else in the world is there such a rich and vivid collection that embraces the Native Hawaiian identity in the nineteenth century. The informants are sources of a traditional cultural understanding. The interviews range over a plethora of topics and cover more than a century’s worth of oral traditions. The audio recordings offer renderings of the political history of Hawai‘i from the time prior to contact, through the great changes that arrived with new forms of government and law. They cover the 1893 Coup d’état, supposed American annexation of Hawai‘i, and continue on through the statehood process. These are often people who lived through many of these periods and the interview recordings are rich in valuable content.

The interview project was begun in 1959 by Mrs. Mary Abigail Kawena Pukui. Mrs. Kawena Pukui was recognized as the greatest living authority on Hawaiian culture and language and lent tremendous legitimacy to the enterprise. She personally knew many of the interview subjects and was thus able to imbue the process with an openness that enhanced the project. The interview subjects were diverse. In the first year of interviews, with the support of the University of Hawai‘i Committee, the Bernice Pauahi Bishop Museum produced 89 entries of recorded material. The number of interviews steadily increased each year for the next decade until Mrs. Pukui had amassed 740 contributions to
Hawaiian study and culture. Mrs. Pukui also left the museum a large collection of tapes preserving her knowledge of a wide assortment of Hawaiian cultural items at the Bishop Museum. A project is ongoing that seeks to transfer these invaluable audio-recordings to a digital format.

Hawaiian Language Content: The vast majority of the 1004 reels of interview tape are in Hawaiian language providing literally hundreds of hours of Hawaiian-language content. (English is used in some of the tapes and interviewees would sometimes switch into English at some points).

(Examples from this collection can be seen in Appendixes C1 and C2).

**Ka Leo Hawai‘i Radio Program:**
Audio-tape collection held at University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa Language Lab and also at U.H. Mānoa Hamilton Library. These reel to reel tapes were recently digitized and now are also available as MP3 digital files.

Summary: This collection consists of tape recordings of a sixteen-plus year Hawaiian-language radio program named Ka Leo Hawai‘i. The collection contains interviews with kūpuna, kumu and others centered on material relevant to Hawaiian culture and history. There is a tremendous variety of subject matter. These tapes start with the radio show of 22 February 1972, and continue until 11 December 1988. Most of the shows were ninety minutes in length; however the first thirty-six tapes are sixty minutes long, resulting in a collection of approximately four hundred and fifty hours. The tapes have recently been digitized and are accessible to download as digital files to a computer or music player.
Hawaiian-Language Content: As this was a Hawaiian-language radio show geared towards efforts aimed at assisting a resurgence of Hawaiian language, the collection is almost completely in Hawaiian.

(Example from this collection can be seen in Appendix C3).

D. Mele / Oli (songs / chants)

Written language as a common form of communication was developed around 1820 in Hawai‘i. For the nearly two millennia prior to that however, Kānaka Maoli passed history and knowledge orally. Much of this history was in the form of oli. Important mo‘okū‘auhau, place histories and even knowledge of medicine and arts were passed through oli or chants. Oli contained feelings regarding the people, places and governance of these islands. Much of the original history of Hawai‘i is contained in such a form. Mele was also used as a carrier of history. Collections of the lyrics, and in some cases actual audio-taped performances of this content are another extremely valuable historical resource.

The lyrics to these oli and mele are often complex and hold meaning for those that are in the conversation. Kānaka Maoli often used mele, and other forms such as poetry, to communicate with other supporters while seemingly not attacking the haole power elite. Dr. Noenoe Silva in speaking about the three hui that organized the anti-annexation petitions of 1898 writes,
The hui of 1889-1898 communicated with each other in their mother tongue. It was easier that way because it was harder for the oppressor to decipher. Songs, poems and stories with the potential for kaona, or “hidden meanings,” presented even greater opportunities to express anti-colonial sentiments.25

Although much kaona may be lost to time, without question much can be gained by incorporating these text into a broader understanding of the history of Hawai‘i.

Discussed briefly below are several collections of mele as well as individual mele within the collections at the institutions

**MS SC Roberts Collection**

_ Bernice Pauahi Bishop Museum Archives_

Summary: (1.8 c.; 4 Hollinger boxes, 1 half-size Hollinger Box) This collection contains materials collected by Helen H. Roberts, a trained musician and anthropologist, during her project to gather recordings of ancient Hawaiian chant. The project was funded by legislative act and carried out by Mrs. Roberts and an interpreter/assistant Thomas K. Maunupau. They traveled the islands and collected audio-recordings and lyrics to traditional mele. One of the projects main sources was Kuluwaimaka Palea, a court chanter for King David Kalākaua and one of the most respected chanters of the nineteenth-century. Kuluwaimaka provided Helen Roberts with hundreds of mele and oli to be recorded for her preservation fieldwork. At the completion of the project Mrs. Roberts’ report was edited and published as *Ancient Hawaiian Music* (Bishop Museum

---

25 Silva, 5.
Bulletin 29, Honolulu) in 1926. The collection contains nearly 700 mele, with about 200 separate songs.

Hawaiian-Language Content: The collection of 700 mele is transcribed in the original Hawaiian with some minor but important variances in many mele. The audio recordings are an important asset as traditional chanters familiar with subtleties of intonation and inflection preformed many.

(Examples from the MS SC Roberts Collection can be seen in Appendixes D1 and D2).

Theodore Kelsey Manuscript Collection
Bernice Pauahi Bishop Museum Archives

Summary: This collection consists of transcriptions and notes from Theodore Kelsey. Mr. Kelsey was a very significant historian, ethnographer, and translator who, like Mrs. Pukui, collected and preserved many of the important mele and oli that we are able to access today. He published with the Bishop Museum and did translation work also. This collection includes many mele hula. Mr. Kelsey’s notes contain sometimes very detailed analysis of mele with important cultural information and context. There are hula mano, hula pua‘a, hula ‘ilio and also name chants for Ka‘ahumanu, Prince Kalaniana‘ole, Nāhi‘ena‘ena and others. Mr. Kelsey often worked with other people who could impart cultural knowledge to create his notes.

Hawaiian-Language Content: This collection includes mele in Hawaiian not found in other collections as well as mele that contain important variances from their text found in other collections.

(An example from the Theodore Kelsey Collection can be seen in Appendix D3).
Songbooks of Lili‘uokalani, Kalākaua and other Ali‘i Nui

A large collection of significant mele is found within numerous other sources including the mele songbooks of David Kalākaua, Lili‘uokalani, and other Ali‘i Nui. These collections contain pertinent and often personal material. One example is: H.I.M.1. Commonplace Book 1887-1895; held at Bernice Pauahi Bishop Museum. This book contains 250 pages and was presented to Lili‘uokalani by William Auld. This book contains mele written by Lili‘uokalani during her imprisonment in ‘Iolani Palace. Also, much work has been done to compile databases of mele including the work of Amy Ku‘uleialoha Stillman which led to the creation of an index of Hawaiian chants and songs in published and recorded sources.
CHAPTER II
SELECTED VOICE

The Building Blocks of History: A Brief Look at Some of the Prominent Nineteenth Century, English-Language Source Components of an Exclusive Historiography

If, as Lawrence Levine has written, historiography is "narrative storytelling about those whose power, position, and influence was palpable,"26 then much of the historiography of late nineteenth-century Hawai‘i was, like the government, oligarchic. A small, inter-dependant group that included the businessmen, planters and church leaders that created, ran and supported the governmental entities (provisional government, republic, territory) of the time, produced the historic narrative of the era. Most of these players had fluid roles within these groups and worked in a number of different ways to produce, collect and control narrative.

Church leaders, predominately from the Protestant “Hawaiian Evangelical Association,” supported the government in a number of different ways, including the previously detailed production of pro-annexation and anti-monarchy rhetoric within the church and community. The Rev. Sereno Bishop, pastor, editor and church leader, created narratives about Hawai‘i and Kānaka Maoli within the church framework while simultaneously writing political columns for United States newspapers, and being a member of the “Annexation Club.” Church leaders such as O.P. Emerson strongly promoted the idea of Native pastors preaching to their congregations on the evils of monarchy and insisting that these church members support the new government and the

26 Lawrence W. Levine, Black Culture and Black Consciousness (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993).
idea of annexation. During the political strife of 1893, at the annual June gathering in Honolulu of the H.E.A., the idea of showing official support for the unstable Provisional Government was proposed:

In view of the confidence and regard we feel, be it resolved that we, the members of the Hawaiian Evangelical Association - clergymen, pastors, delegates, and corresponding members now in session in Honolulu, do call on Hon. S.B. Dole. President of the Provisional Government of these Islands, and upon his Cabinet.27

The motion passed, and the day after the annual conference ended, some forty plus H.E.A. members were welcomed by President Dole in a ceremony at the Executive Building.28

Often reciprocally, Government leaders were involved in the church. Albert Francis Judd, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, was a central member and supporter of the H.E.A. The justice was often turned to for counsel by the church and its leaders while concurrently he was deciding cases that affected these same people. Judge J.W. Kalua, an ardent supporter of annexation and one of the first to sign the oath of allegiance to the Provisional Government was also very involved with the H.E.A. He sat on a committee that re-instated the Rev. Adam Pali of Lāhainā to his pastorship after the congregation had ousted him because of his support for annexation.

Some of the preferred historians of the day were ardent advocates of particular positions on the issues of which they wrote. William DeWitt Alexander, one of the most

27 "Abstract of the minutes of the meeting of the HEA held June 6th-12th 1893, p11," Hawaiian Mission Children’s Museum, Honolulu, HI.

28 In a seemingly sardonic act, another motion was passed at the same meeting that declared, "That partisan politics should not be introduced into the pulpits of the land."
prominent, and published, historians of the period was intimately involved with Justice Judd, Rev. Bishop and many of the others within the government and church leadership. Besides writing books, newspaper columns and giving speeches about Hawaiian history, Alexander was also appointed as a member of the commission that organized, created and ran the Hawai‘i State Archives.

Histories are made not only at the moment of the event, but also in the later collection of sources. By necessity, all produced histories are inherently somewhat exclusive. A process that collected literally everything that happened, and everything that was observed around an event, would be unintelligible. Voices therefore, battle for inclusion on the discursive landscape. Choices are made about which sources to incorporate and which to leave behind. The players involved in these choices have a tremendous impact on the histories produced. Although later understandings and contextualization regarding sources may alter a historiography so as to appear more enlightened, oft-times the early decisions that preference specific sources set the character for a narrative process that remains tainted. What we know about Sereno Bishop today may, for some historians, greatly contextualize his “testimony,” but his part in the production of an exclusive narrative that displaced Hawaiian-language voice, helped create a process, a historiography that normalized the idea that Hawaiian history was sufficiently done with these English sources. We have not completely shaken that false assumption yet.

In nineteenth-century Hawai‘i, sources that were deemed authoritative on history were predominately white, western-educated and male. These participants were given “natural” slots in the discourse on Hawaiian history. A review of the common English-
language sources from this period strengthens the critique of them as the primary sources of historical knowledge. One oft-used source of historical accounts is the collection of English-language newspapers of the period. Very few modern day historical accounts of nineteenth-century Hawai‘i, this thesis included, are void of citations from the prominent newspapers of the day. These inclusions can vary in amount from several within the text, to as I will highlight later, instances of nearly entire books being written from this source. In very few cases is this source contextualized.

In the use of this source, an important understanding is often overlooked. There is a significant difference in the character of newspapers as media of the nineteenth century and their counterparts’ use today. While it could be argued that modern-day newspapers carry political leanings that affect their coverage of “news” hidden within their supposed unbiased columns, newspapers of nineteenth-century Hawai‘i most often made no attempt to claim impartiality, but rather trumpeted their political, or moral, position; often on the masthead. The Maui News began publication in 1900 with a title that proudly read “THE MAUl NEWS: A REPUBLICAN NEWSPAPER.” The paper covered political and social events such as the new Territorial Legislature and governmental elections with an active and strongly opinioned voice. Understanding this, and/or balancing one’s research with alternate papers would be a fundamental historiographical step.

The largest and most successful of the English-language newspapers of this time period was the Pacific Commercial Advertiser. This paper was started on 2 July 1856, by Henry Martyn Whitney. Henry was the son of Samuel and Mercy Whitney, members of the first company of missionaries to arrive in Hawai‘i. Whitney, as an editor, was fiercely pro-American and supported the dominance of American ways and ideals in Hawai‘i.
Throughout the organized calls for annexation by the United States he, and the paper, spoke strongly in favor of the plan. He wrote that the Advertiser was “an ardent advocate of annexation to the United States.”29 The paper was also open in its editorial-style reporting. It spoke openly about the supposed racial superiority of whites in the islands. Helen Chapin, author of Shaping History: The Role of Newspapers in Hawai‘i notes that later editor Walter Smith wrote of the Japanese, “The plantation coolie is the lowest type of the Japanese race...this should be a white man’s country.”30

The Advertiser was even heavily criticized by a very prominent member of Honolulu society and fellow supporter of annexation, Albert Francis Judd. A scathing critique of this paper as a “news source” comes from this missionary son and Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. An undated manuscript written by Judd that possibly became a speech, contains an essay in which he evaluates the newspapers; in particularly the most popular English-language paper, the Pacific Commercial Advertiser.31 Judd begins by explaining the Advertiser’s role, “The experiment of sustaining a newspaper which would represent the foreign community [emphasis added] of Honolulu, independent of Government patronage was never successful until the appearance of the “Advertiser.” Judd’s characterization of the paper as a representation of the foreign community seems lost on later historians who have mined its pages to gain an understanding of “Hawaiian” history. Use of its reporting as a source without accessing a alternate voice of the Native community is an obvious flaw in the historiography. But


30 Pacific Commercial Advertiser, July 26, 1904.

31 Albert Francis Judd, “The Newspapers,” MS Group 70 Box 29.3, B.P.B.M. Archives, Honolulu, HI.
Judd himself further damns this paper as a source. In the body of his essay he writes, "... a character as a truthful sheet it has failed to establish." Chief Justice Judd goes on to explain this characterization in detail by writing:

... glaring inaccuracies are quite as common as correct statements. Striving to be ahead of its neighbor of the "Terrafin Express," merely hearing a whisper of something that is said to have occurred, right or wrong, hit or miss, in it goes to the press; and if, in its pages, it has something in reference to an occurrence, even though every item be directly opposed to the real facts, it seems to be perfectly satisfied with its enterprise. Heresy, it clothes with all the dignity of impressive truth.

If a newspaper cannot give us the truth, unvarnished facts, without blundering and stupidity, then let it not attempt to instruct its readers. And if the information thence obtained cannot be relied on, better be without the newspaper; for while error is dangerous, truth will find for itself other means of publicity, and perfect silence is much preferable to distorted facts & falsehoods. 32

This resource has however, become a significant source of "documenting" history. These sources were, and are, not only commonly used, but in some cases dominated the narrative. In doing research for a 2007 university graduate seminar I came across a biography of the important Hawaiian politician and revolutionary Robert W. K. Wilcox by retired professor of history Ernest Andrade. 33 In reading this book, I was immediately struck by the inconsistencies between the tone, and sometimes factual consistency, of what I was reading and what I was familiar with in my research through the Hawaiian-language newspapers of the period. The answer for this blatant inconsistency lie in the author's notes. As I began to scan the endnotes, I noticed they

32 Albert Francis Judd, "The Newspapers."
were dominated by a specific source category, the English-language newspapers. This
dominance was so dramatic in fact, that I decided to physically count the number of times
Mr. Andrade’s source was one of these papers. The results were startling. The 254 page
biography of Robert Wilcox contains 515 citations from the English-language
newspapers. The previously mentioned Pacific Commercial Advertiser leads the
resources by far, with 361 specific citations as a source. The biography is nearly a
transcription of this newspaper. While this dedication to a specific source certainly
allowed the author to become intimately familiar with how the Advertiser of the 1890’s
saw Mr. Wilcox, I argue that this biography sorely lacks the breadth of view of this
important historical figure that would have come from also reading the prolific mentions
of Wilcox in the Hawaiian-language press. I could not find a Hawaiian-language source
within the endnotes. There are hundreds, and possibly thousands, of mentions of Mr.
Wilcox in the Hawaiian-language press. It seems essential to me that a biography of one
the important historical leaders of Hawai’i be inclusive of materials written by the great
number of his contemporaries who were writing in Hawaiian. Many of these important,
Hawaiian-language sourced biographies remain to be written.34

Again, the important argument of process needs to be fore-fronted. I have no idea
of the authors positioning. It is not an argument of intent, or authorship, but of
historiography. Mr. Andrade’s work is handicapped by his sourcing. He simply cannot
gain the understanding that would come from inclusion of prolific material that has been
written about his subject in the Hawaiian language.

34 A Hawaiian-language account of the life of Robert Wilcox entitled Ka Buke Moolelo o Robert William
Wilikoki was published in 1890 by Thomas K. Nakanela and republished in 1999 by Bishop Museum Press.
As mentioned, a small group of people, almost exclusively men, were often involved in the writing, publication and even the collecting of Hawaiian history in this period. One of the most prominent of these individuals was the historian William Dewitt (W.D.) Alexander. Mr. Alexander wrote on a vast array of topics covering social, political and scientific topics in Hawai‘i. He published a book on the history of the Hawaiian people for the Board of Education that was used in schools. He was also a frequent speaker at the first Hawaiian Historical Society presentations. He filled another historiographic role by being a collector of history. Alexander was one of the men chosen to create and run the Hawai‘i State Archives.

In October of 1894 an advertisement began to appear regularly in newspapers in Hawai‘i for the sale of a book on Hawaiian history that was to be something the author explained was “sorely needed.” In this contested political climate and partisan atmosphere, W.D. Alexander was in the process of writing a history of the “Hawaiian Revolution” that was, as touted by the advertisement, an “Unbiased” “Accurate” and “Impartial” source. The title of the book was History of later years of the Hawaiian monarchy and the revolution of 1893 by Prof. W. D. Alexander [See Figure 1 next page].

35 A search of the University of Hawai‘i library system turns up 48 titles for Alexander including the following: A Brief History of the Hawaiian People, History of later years of the Hawaiian monarchy and the revolution of 1893, Overthrow of the ancient tabu system in the Hawaiian Islands, Early trading in Hawaii.

36 Pacific Commercial Advertiser, Oct. 4, 1894 and daily for months prior to release.

Figure 1. Advertisement for W.D. Alexander’s history of the Hawaiian Revolution

In evidence of the normalization of these few historians and their sources as preferred authoritative sources, the author and his publisher see no irony in prominently displaying that this “ACCURATE” and “IMPARTIAL” history of this political event is “DEDICATED BY SPECIAL PERMISSION TO THE Provisional Government.”38 The publishers proceed to place this “history” in context in a summary within the advertisement that exclaims,

---

38 Pacific Commercial Advertiser, Oct. 4, 1894, Honolulu, HI.
The historians have commenced with the framework of the construction, setting forth the remote causes of events and the motives of human action... The foundation principals of government, the predominant sentiments swaying human minds at different epochs... have all been closely studied. Accuracy of statement, soundness of reasoning, clear presentation, and high literary merit will be the commanding aspect of this ambitious effort. 39

This editorial stance would continue with the announcement,

The publishers have the honor to announce that arrangements are being made for the insertion of the following bodies: The Committee of Safety, the Executive, the Officers of the original Annexation club, Officers and members of the National Guard, the fire Department, the 1st Advisory Committee, Members of the bar, the Counsels.

This theme carries on to the content. The author’s history would include the following material;

Chapter 1 - Prof. Alexander’s History of King Kalakaua’s Reign
Chapter 2 - Prof. Alexander’s History of Liliuokalani’s Reign
Chapter 3 - A Brief Account of the Revolution of 1893
Chapter 4 - A Brief Account of the Provisional Government to date
Chapter 5 - Minister Willis and Dole’s Correspondence
Chapter 6 - President Dole’s Reply
Chapter 7 - Willis and Dole’s Correspondence
Chapter 8 - Minister Thurston’s Protest issued at Washington
Chapter 9 - Minister Thurston’s Statement of the Hawaiian Case
Chapter 10 - President Dole’s Specifications
Chapter 11 - Morgan’s Report to the Senate
Chapter 12 - The Senate’s Action on Hawaiian Affairs

The content is void of many of the vital documents and testimony that speak to the Hawaiian Kingdom and its representative’s arguments about the illegality of much of what had happened. The Table of Contents begins this “impartial” history with a section

39 Pacific Commercial Advertiser, Oct. 4, 1894, Honolulu, HI.
described as, “Part I. The Decadence of Hawaiian Monarchy. It is true that the germs of many of the evils of Kalakaua’s reign may be traced to the reign of Kamehameha.”

The book was later aggressively marketed in advertisements in the Pacific Commercial Advertiser. Columns appeared like the following:

“The Hawaiian Revolution”

The work on the “The Hawaiian Revolution” is going ahead rapidly. The patron list is a strong one, headed by President Dole. It will contain, among other things, the following articles: Professor Alexander’s histories of the reigns of Kalakaua and Liliuokalani, brief histories of the Revolution of 1893 and the Provisional Government to date, the correspondence between President Dole and Minister Willis, Thurston’s protest in Washington and his statement of the Hawaiian case, President Dole’s specifications, Senator Morgan’s report, and the Senate’s action on the Hawaiian matter.40

The aforementioned inter-dependency of the small group of preferred sources is actually manifest conspicuously throughout this book. Alexander describes in his preface, “Much assistance has been derived from a paper by the Rev. S. E. Bishop covering the latter part of the period in question, and Chapter VI stands as he wrote it with some slight alterations.” The oligarchic triumvirate of the church, government and historical fields are all at work harmoniously in this text.

CONCLUSION

As the Haitian historian Michel-Rolph Trouilliot has written, silences are inherent in the chronicling of an event and even necessary. “If the account was indeed

40 Pacific Commercial Advertiser, Oct. 4, 1894.
fully comprehensive of all facts it would be incomprehensible." The archivist collects what they deem important and valid. As Trouillet continues,

Archives assemble. Their assembly work is not limited to a more or less passive act of collecting. Rather, it is an active act of production that prepares facts for historical intelligibility. Archives set up both the substantive and formal elements of the narrative. They are institutionalized sites of mediation between the sociohistorical process and the narrative about that process...they convey authority and set the rules for credibility and interdependence; they select the stories that matter.42

Simultaneously while the Pacific Commercial Advertiser and other English-language newspapers were published, there were dozens of Hawaiian-language papers being published. One collection has been heard from while the other for the most part ignored.43

---


42 Trouillot, 52.

43 This exclusion of Native-language testimony is even harder to fathom when one notes that newspapers like the Japanese-language Hochi Herald have very much been used historiographically to counter English-language press accounts of events. The importance of the process seems to be understood but not implemented when dealing with Hawaiian-language materials.
CHAPTER III - CASE STUDY I

Deafening Silences: *Long Ignored Voices Vigorously Challenge an “Understood” History*

(Waine‘e Church Fire of 1894)

He pu‘upa‘o wale no i ka leo.
*(An obstruction collapsing at the sound of the voice)*

Abstract

On 28 June 1894, amid great political turmoil and with a newly declared temporary government desperately seeking support, historic Waine‘e Church in Lāhainā, Māui burned to the ground. The way in which this event was eventually recorded and then printed as official history, brightly illuminates the ease with which much of Hawai‘i’s history has been created based on an incomplete, one sided discourse.

Numerous times, primary accounts of historical events were not accessed at all because these accounts were written in the Hawaiian language. Although different narratives were produced, often a single, sometimes misleading or inaccurate outsider account written in English, was used to document the story. Later repeated access of that narrative went on to produce what eventually would come to be seen as a broad survey of this event. Until recently the prominent discourses on Hawaiian history have taken part within the framework of the English language. Hawaiian-language scholars and students are changing this dynamic by researching primary accounts of Hawaiian history through the vast collection of Hawaiian-language newspapers and other Hawaiian language documents. In doing so they are often uncovering not only a different history, but also the
amazing ease with which colonization has created the poorly sourced and often false history that we all live with today.

Choosing History: The Building of an Exclusionary Narrative

An exclusionary history’s ability to persist as a dominant narrative lies not solely in its ability to sweep the discursive terrain free of competing voices, but rather, is also supported by tools that often exaggerate and magnify the problematic exclusion. One of these tools is the creation of what appears to be a broad and well-resourced history through the process of simply repeating, usually through publication, a singular, or few resource[s]. In this sense, history often has a way of being self-validating. A history, drawn from a single can evolve into a universally accepted account. If however, the history is examined, this historiographic construction is revealed as a proverbial house of cards.

A History Revealed

Lahaina, Maui.

On June 28, 1894, one of the first and most historic churches in Hawai‘i burned to the ground. The current-day history, universally accepted, tells of a protest torching of the church by supporters of Her Majesty Queen Lili‘uokalani, angry over the proposed annexation of Hawai‘i. The historiography that created this narrative excluded the
examination of available Hawaiian-language sources. An inclusive process would have revealed a completely different narrative.

Luakini Waine‘e (Waine‘e Church), today called Waiola, was first named “Ebenezer.” Keʻōpūolani, the sacred wife of Kamehameha, and members of the second company of missionaries founded the meetinghouse in 1823 as the first Christian church on Māui and one of the first churches in Hawai‘i. Aliʻi Nui and Governor of Māui, Ulumāhiʻehiʻe Hoapili, had a stone building erected at the site of the church meetings between 1828-1832. As the center of Christian life in Lāhiana, services at the church at one point grew to attract nearly three thousand Kānaka Maoli. This important site of conversion bordered the royal fishpond known as Mokuhinia, which held the sacred island of Moku‘ula. Moku‘ula was known to be a puʻuhonua (place of refuge) for Kauikeaouli in which he could escape the pressures of the haole (foreigners) and live as he wished. Moku‘ula and the surrounding area was the capital of the Hawaiian Kingdom until approximately 1845.

During its first few decades of existence, the church services held at Waine‘e included many of the highest ranking Aliʻi Nui. David Malo was the first Native pastor to give a sermon at Waine‘e and speeches by Mōʼiʻi Kawika Kalākaua and visits by Mōʻiwahine Liliʻuokalani are noted. A wooden pier existed at Moku‘ula from which Aliʻi Nui could be paddled straight from the sacred island, several hundred yards up to

---

44 Letter of missionary J.B. Spaulding, Oct.26, 1832, Mission Houses Museum Library, Honolulu HI.

45 Spaulding, Oct. 23, 1832.
the church for Christian services. The Waine'e Church cemetery held the burial remains of Keʻōpūolani, Nāhiʻenaʻena, Kaumualiʻi and many other Aliʻi Nui.

The story of this fascinating place of worship and the fire of 1894 that destroyed it is well known by the people of Lāhainā. For the visitor, tourist, or passerby, the story is shared by word of mouth, on “historic” walking tours, on county-generated pamphlets and at the church itself. For those whose interest is peaked in the story, the account can be found in several books, at historic societies, and in academic sources. All of these accounts carry the same, sparsely detailed history that portrays a gang of Royalist supporters of Queen Liliʻuokalani burning down the church in protest over the proposed annexation of Hawaiʻi. It makes for a stirring story. That is how I came to examine the story, fascinated by this explosive story of supposed Kānaka Maoli resistance. An initial examination of the story led to questions. A look at the historiography involved in the creation of the narrative led to the source of the current narrative. Furthering my research to include Hawaiian-language sources revealed alternate accounts of the event that were supported by several disparate voices. The new resulting narrative is about far more than a church fire; far more than a political event confined to the 1890’s. It is about a process. A long accepted process that through its exclusion of Hawaiian-language testimony has undoubtedly created vast amounts of “Church Fire” stories. The following uncovered facts about sources, context and exclusion demand a questioning of the full range of histories about Hawaiʻi that we are left with today.

46 The church does have an interesting history as a site of contestation. Other letters from Mr. Spaulding at the Mission Children’s Museum Archive record a dispute between the congregation and Prince Lot, whose property was crossed by the street heading into the church. Lot had the road closed. The congregation then gathered and signed a petition to the Prince asking him to open the road with a gate installed. He refused.
In this case study, I will begin by reviewing the current “known” history of the Waine’e Church Fire of June 28, 1894. I will follow the trail of source[s] back to the formation of the narrative. I will then examine the source[s] of the information and its character and positioning. Next I will give platform to the other available but ignored sources and speak to their positioning. Finally, I will place the event, and the creation of the accepted narrative, in its important historical context.

The Current Historiography and Resulting Narrative

I first experienced the church fire story as most will; through conversations, from stories, and eventually from a book. These interactions with history came as a general consumer of an uncomplicated narrative. The current history of the church fire has many published accounts, all in agreement as to fact and all straightforward about the cause of the fire. As these accounts are multi-present and all in agreement, they raise no immediate cause for doubt. The story, in its current narration, appears in “histories” on the Internet,47 which greatly expands the narrative’s reach, and breadth. I have included several of the publications here in descending chronological order so as to follow the story back to a source.


This book is part of a series of “Exploring Historic ...” books that are histories of noted areas throughout Hawai‘i. The author is a Native Hawaiian writer and educator and Richardson Law School graduate. The book presents many Lāhainā histories through photos with captions explaining the pictured material and its context. This book contains a photo from the Lahaina Restoration Foundation of the “new” church at Waine‘e and explains in unambiguous language that the old church

“was burned down by anti-annexation protestors in 1894.”

This Bishop Museum publication is a history of the wahi pana (sacred place) of Moku‘ula in Lāhainā that physically bordered Waine‘e Church. The book is academic in tone and style, well respected as a history, and contains voluminous citations. The book contains a picture of the area, which includes Waine‘e Church. The author cites a Community Planning Inc. report prepared for the Lahaina Restoration Foundation, which will be discussed to follow. The author writes,

“The structure in the background appears to be the ruins of Waine‘e Church, which was severely damaged by a monarchist insurrection in 1894.”

---


This book was published by the Lahaina Restoration Foundation from a portion of the historical survey done in 1961 that is discussed later. It explains that “Lahaina Restoration Foundation is a non-profit organization incorporated in the state of Hawaii for the purposes of educational and restoration and preservation work in the area of Lāhainā Māui.”

Source: Community Planning Inc. report.

**Historical Events of Lahaina 1736-1960 [timeline]**

“1894 Wainee Church was burned down by Royalists.”

**1964: Lahaina Historical Guide** by Maui Historical Society.

This publication, sponsored by the Maui Historical Society, is a free publication that is available at tourist resorts, government buildings and businesses throughout Māui. Its contents are also reproduced on tourism websites including “Historic Lahaina Walking Tour.” Republished in 1998, this historical guide is also the source of the Internet

---


51 Lahaina Restoration Foundation, 24.


“Wainee Church was burned by incendiary action on June 28, 1894, during the turmoil over the overthrow of the monarchy.”


This report came out of an effort by the Board of Supervisors and other agencies on Māui to identify the most prominent historical aspects of Lāhainā and have their “official” history recorded. The purpose was two-fold; to examine the best way to grow the town as a tourist destination and to preserve the important sites for history. Both the Lahaina Restoration Foundation and the Maui Historical Society were involved. The Board hired a private development company, Community Planning Inc., to produce the history and create a plan that would best meet these needs. The collection of notes and manuscripts from this project are held at the Lāhainā Restoration Foundation in Lāhainā and at the Mission Children’s Museum Archive in Honolulu.

Source: Dr. Baldwin of Lahaina.55

---


"1894 Wainee church was burned down by royalists"

And a further summary:

"Then on June 28, 1894, the church was burned down during a controversy over the abolition of the monarchy."56

1953: Dr. Baldwin of Lahaina.

This biography of Lāhainā pastor, Rev. Dwight Baldwin, was written by descendant, Mary Charlotte Alexander. Concerning the church fire, the author quotes from the 1897 afore-mentioned "letter" of Rev. Sereno Bishop.

This was the third destruction of Wainee church since Dr. Baldwin’s day. The first, in 1894, had been incendiary. The minister, Rev. A. Pali, had become obnoxious to the royalist members of his congregation because, disgusted with the heathenish tendencies of the court, he favored abolishing the monarchy. These royalist members burned the church, and the people were too divided and weak to rebuild it.57


The above-mentioned source letter, from which all of the accounts evolve, was in fact not really a letter. It was one of a long series of “editorial contributions” written under a pseudonym, by the Reverend Sereno Edwards Bishop of Honolulu. The Rev. had been hired as a “special correspondent” in Honolulu for the Washington newspaper, The Evening News. The reverend had taken on the mantle of United Press correspondent and was sending dispatches “covering” the Hawaiian situation for a United States audience.


57 Alexander, Dr. Baldwin of Lahaina (Berkeley: Stanford University Press, 1953), 345.
He wrote about the political situation in Hawai‘i in order to inform a United States audience and strongly argued racial, economic and spiritual reasons as why the white elite should run Hawai‘i and why the United States should annex the islands. It was agreed that it would be wise for the Reverend to take a pseudonym. Bishop’s participation in and later concern about his hidden identity columns will be discussed in more detail to follow in a look at his role as a source.

There was a double grand occasion at Lāhainā, a great Sunday school convention, and the dedication of a beautiful new church, presented to his father’s old parish by Henry P. Baldwin, at a cost to himself of about $12,000. The excellent pastor of this church, Reverend A. Pali, had become obnoxious to a majority of his people on account of politics. He had favored the abolition of monarchy, having become, like a majority of his colleagues in the pastorate, exceedingly disgusted with the increasing heathenish tendencies of the court. The dissension arising from Pali’s attitude had led to the burning of the fine old stone church by partisans of the Royalist side, and the people were too weak to rebuild...58

From current day web-references, down through the books by Kupau and Klieger, through historical guides and “official” histories prepared for the County of Māui, this story evolved from one source. What appeared to be a broadly sourced, harmonious, well researched history, was merely a personal narrative made to appear full through republication at different sites. Next would come an investigation of that single source.

Source Review

58 Sereno E. Bishop [under pseudonym] letter of April 22, 1897, The Evening Star.
An analysis of Sereno Edwards Bishop as a source is extremely relevant, as his contextual positioning and prevalent writings reveal. Sereno Bishop was a minister, newspaper editor, and educator. He was the son of Artemis Bishop and Elizabeth Edwards, who were among the second company of missionaries; arriving in Hawai‘i in 1822. As a young child Sereno, like most of the mission children, was sent away to school in the United States. The terrible ordeal of being separated from their children for much of the youngsters’ early years was over-ridden by the fear of their children being influenced by the heathen language and customs of the sinful Hawaiian children. Sereno, the son of a devout and stern pastor, developed a very severe attitude about Christianity that pushed the outer boundaries of even the very strict Calvinist religion from whence he emerged.

In September 1887 Sereno became the editor of the mission press publication entitled The Friend. Originally titled the Temperance Advocate and later the Temperance Advocate and Seaman’s Friend, this newspaper, started by the Rev. Samuel Chenery Damon, was the pronounced voice of the mission even as their influence in other papers was significant. Its original focus was on promoting temperance, proselytizing to seaman, reporting on the work of the mission and interesting happenings around the wharfs. In 1885 the paper changed hands and became more editorial regarding issues involving the political affairs of the tumultuous times. Two years later when Sereno became editor, the Rev. Bishop began a more than decade long critique of the Hawaiian monarchy and support for the governments that would replace it. This was Rev. Bishop’s first media pulpit and over time, and in many more newspapers and publications, he would become an adept player. His position as a minister granted him authority to the outside world. In
November 1888 Rev. Bishop gave an address to the Honolulu Social Science Association entitled *Why Are the Hawaiians Dying Out?* which was later printed as a small book.\(^{59}\)

The speech centered on the heathen influences of traditional Hawaiian society as a main cause for the rapid deaths of the people. He explained,

> Both [hula dancing and the influence of kahuna] are purely heathen institutions of the most pronounced and detestable type and are totally incompatible with any true and wholesome civilization. They should both be hunted down and exterminated like the venomous reptiles that they are, poisoning and slaying to the people.\(^{60}\)

Even as the paper sometimes advocated keeping religious and political realms separate, its columns were filling with anti-monarchical tirades and pro-American stylings. *The Friend*, under Rev. Bishop, would come to be one of the primary advocates of annexation and anti-Monarchy voices.

Ralph Kuykendall has written that, “Sereno E. Bishop was one of the most prolific and most controversial commentators on political, social, and religious conditions and developments, in Hawaii...”\(^{61}\) In the hugely contested events surrounding the January 1893 Coup d’êtat and later formation of a supposed Republic of Hawai‘i, Rev. Bishop had a very decided, and prolifically articulated stand. Sereno had long advocated “white rule” in Hawai‘i as a matter of logical Caucasian superiority. He attacked Hawaiian

---


60 Bishop, *Why are the Hawaiians dying out?*

tradition, thought, and competence in the pages of newspapers both locally and in the 
United States. In his position as editor of The Friend, he declared in one column that the 
Hawaiians' "wise and benevolent white advisors" had lifted the common Hawaiian out of 
political slavery and that "Only the alert and capable white man can rule here..." Bishop 
got on in this column to praise the hard work of the American teachers spanning nearly 
eighty years and closed with the stirring declaration, "Human history records no more 
beneficent or honorable achievement for the welfare of a weak and needy race." In a 
letter to a Washington D.C. newspaper Sereno wrote "in no state where a majority of the 
people are childish or base minded can free government exist on a purely democratic 
basis." His private correspondence was often only slightly more venomous. 

In the days leading to the overthrow of Queen Liliʻuokalani, Bishop wrote in a 
letter to friend Gorham Gilman, "We shall now be delivered from that incubus of the 
palace, poisonous to the natives and a perpetual threat and hindrance to white 
civilization." He was to later continue this theme when the idea to determine the fate of 
the nation through a national elections in Hawaiʻi was proposed. In a rebuttal to calls for 
democratic elections Sereno was to insist that "with the very weak character of the mass 
of Natives, universal suffrage would simply throw the government into the hands of the 
worst class of demagogues," and further "What an idiotic thing for Congress to take the 
power from our noble body of whites, + give it to the incompetent natives!" Bishop's

---


63 Rev. Sereno E. Bishop, [under papydum], Column in Evening Star, Jan. 15, 1896.

64 Bishop, Letter to Gilman, Jan. 13, 1893, Hawaiian Mission Children’s Society Archive.

65 Bishop, Letter to Gilman, June 22, 1900.
theories on racial superiority and calls for removing Kānaka Maoli from power are well
documented throughout his long career as an editor and also in his voluminous
contributions to many newspapers.

The reverend's racism however, was not always so general. In one of his most
disturbing attacks, Bishop set his sights on Her Majesty Queen Liliʻuokalani, a woman
well-respected by both the Kānaka Maoli and foreign communities alike as an intelligent,
graceful and adept sovereign. In an April 1896 letter to Gilman, Sereno discusses the
Queen's efforts in New York and Washington D.C. to present Her nation's case for the
restoration of recognition.

My sister in N.Y. sends me a story clipping of a most sickening laudation
of Liliʻuokalani. What Lit calls the “downfall” of her nation” due to the missionaries is really a redeeming movement for them.
They have been doing much better under the Republic, and now we are
striving to lift them up into a noble promotion to U.S. citizenship. But for
the missionaries L. herself would have rotted away early as a common low
creature...[emphasis added] 67

But this assault on the Queen from Rev. Bishop appears to be as much motivated
by the political contestations of 1894 as it is by race; for in September of 1891, when the
white-led mission party held the monarchy thoroughly in check through the Bayonet
Constitution, Sereno gave a vastly contradictory review of this “incubus of the palace” to

66 This reference to the Queen as “Lili” was a well-known disparagement. To Kānaka Maoli, names carried
not only moʻokūlauhau (genealogies) but also mana and the vocalization of them had important
significance.

United States readers. In a September 1891 story in *The Review of Reviews*, Bishop wrote of the Queen,

She has a perfect use of English, a good literary, and an especially sound musical culture. The Queen’s manner is peculiarly winning, her bearing noble and becoming, the latter a character of Hawaiian Royalty. The Queen gives evidence of having deeply at heart the moral welfare of her people.68

For the audience back home in Hawai‘i, Bishop described “Our good Queen Lili‘uokalani,” in the pages of *The Friend*:

She enjoys in a high degree the affection of her Hawaiian subjects, and their confidence in her attachment to their welfare. Her gentle and gracious demeanor, her good sense and her fine culture have also commanded the high regard of the foreign community.69

**Political Positioning of Source**

Not only is Sereno Bishop’s persistent racism relevant to his quality as a source considering that issues of race permeated the events that occurred, but perhaps even more germane is his avowed political position relative to those whom he has accused. His active and aggressive voice in the contested terrain gives important context to his testimony. Bishop was a member of the Hawaiian League that had in 1887 implemented the “Bayonet Constitution” by force in order to greatly reduce the power of the monarchy


and later joined the "Annexation Club."70 Historian Ralph Kuykendall describes Bishop’s massive production of written material and names him as “certainly the most prolific writer of things Hawaiian.”71 In his letters Bishop refers to the Royalist supporters of the Queen as “my enemies.”72 Concerning these enemies, he warns in a letter that the Provisional Government must not allow the Royalists a say in the formation of a government, lest they restore monarchy by their vote.

Self-preservation, + the cause of decent gov + liberty necessitates our keeping them outside until a constitution is established. We are in a revolution and cannot pursue ordering Republican forms in preliminary work.73

Bishop’s “testimony” on Hawaiian matters was being given a prominent and pervasive position in the media. Besides his editorship of The Friend, Sereno also regularly wrote to and was published by other local papers on political topics. Besides these forums, the Reverend sought space for his voice on politics in the arena where the final decision on these matters would be delivered, the United States. He wrote columns for several United States newspapers and eventually parlayed his strong views and pro-white voice into a position as a United Press correspondent in Hawai’i.

During the decade of the 1890’s Bishop wrote many columns that were published by a variety of U.S. newspapers such as the New York Tribune, New York Independent.

70 Bishop, Letter to Gilman, Feb. 8, 1894.


72 Bishop, Letter to Gilman, Jan. 12, 1894.

73 Bishop, Letter to Gilman, Feb. 8, 1894.
Washington Evening News and others. In discussing his “correspondent” career later with another pro-annexation author and friend in Boston, Gorham D. Gilman, Bishop writes that he is amazed at earning “$30 - $40 a week” writing political columns. Back home in Hawai‘i his position as writer for American papers was noted in an April 11, 1900 three-quarter page article in the Pacific Commercial Advertiser that was titled “Dr. Bishop on Hawaii: Distinguished writer Expresses His Views in an Article in the New York Independent.” In the article Bishop writes that in Hawai‘i since annexation “about twenty-five million dollars was added to the corporate stock of the plantations,” and goes on to praise U.S. Senator John Tyler Morgan’s recommendation of limiting suffrage. He frets over the U.S. Congress’ idea to throw this limited suffrage clause out. He explains “Hawaiian elements could out-vote the combined English-speaking elements if the suffrage is unrestricted, and Americanism would be crushed.” If this was to happen and universal suffrage were allowed, Bishop warns “the larger debased elements of population will convert Honolulu into a worse pest-hole than the plague could possibly make of it.” And in a classic call echoing the burden of the white man, Bishop finishes by saying,

I will merely advert to the fatal demoralization which that ascendancy of the evil elements is sure to inflict upon the weak Hawaiians. We witnessed much of such evil effects from the debaucheries of Kalakaua, who was a destroyer of his own race. Every true lover of the natives must pray that the party of purity and morality may prevail. America is entering upon a new experience in governing and educating undeveloped and weak races, lifting them to higher things...It seems incredible that she should begin

---

with the idiotic blunder of treating these feeble and childish souls as grown and strong men...  

From this voice comes our source document for the current day Waine'e Church fire history.

Sereno was prodded to write material for U.S. newspapers by former U.S. Minister John Stevens and members of the Republic of Hawai‘i government. Stevens was the U.S. Representative who had helped plot the coup and assisted the Provisional Government. The Reverend Bishop’s personal correspondences describe a meeting with a gentleman at the Hawaiian Hotel sometime prior to March of 1894 where it was agreed that he would write columns on “the Hawaiian situation,” as a “special Honolulu correspondent.” It was also apparently decided that it would be better if he did not reveal his true identity, as Bishop wrote the columns under a pseudonym.

In maybe one of the most impertinent decisions of this unseemly writing career, the Reverend Bishop wrote a profusion of his most adamant columns, attacking the competence and moral character of Native Hawaiians and supporting annexation, under the name “Kamehameha.” In a series of over one hundred columns, the Reverend Sereno Bishop updated an American audience to the affairs in Hawai‘i as the Honolulu United Press correspondent, “Kamehameha.” Titles of these columns ranged from

---

75 Bishop, “Dr. Bishop on Hawaii:... Pacific Commercial Advertiser, April 11, 1900.

76 Bishop, Letter to Gilman, Dec 4, 1897.

77 Several of the final “Kamehameha” columns bear the heading “From our Honolulu correspondent Sereno E. Bishop who had formerly written this column under the pseudenum “Kamehameha.” Dozens of these articles that appeared in the Evening Star "signed" Kamehameha are are cut out and pasted in an album that was donated to the Hawaiian Mission Children’s Museum Library in Honolulu. On the cover of the album is written Letters from “Kamehameha.”
“Affairs in Hawaii” to “Race Supremacy” to “Immediate Necessity for the Annexation of Hawaii” and “The Government controlled only by the Intelligent Class / No natives, Japanese or Chinese.” In this particular column Bishop writes,

> The commercial progress of these islands and their immense development in all of the appendages of civilization have long since become incompatible with any administration of government by men of Polynesian decent, except as assistant and subordinate to able white men.\(^7\)

Sereno was often writing in an attempt to effect specific political events. In 1897, when arguments over ownership of the crown lands were being raised, Sereno wrote to Gilman,

> Doubt if we have heard the last of Lil at Washington. She is quite cunning + possesses considerable powers of fascination, to enable her to impress her views more or less upon people. I will try to write about the Crown lands, but my next letter cannot reach Washington before March 9.\(^7\)

Sereno also saw his writings used to specifically counter pro-monarchy, anti-annexation voice. One such voice was Julius Palmer who had come to Hawai‘i as a newspaper correspondent to investigate and write about the political situation for the paper. When Palmer’s findings were published, the paper inserted competing editorials from Bishop along with the column. In one personal correspondence, Bishop crows to his friend Gilman that Palmer’s complaints were being ruined by the inclusion of Bishop’s work.\(^8\)

---


\(^8\) Bishop, Letter to Gilman, Feb. 10, 1897.
It seems though that even Rev. Bishop had second thoughts about this work, as he wrote in a personal correspondence, “I do not reckon the Kam. Letters as a work in which I shall peculiarly rejoice in the future life...”81

The Rev. Sereno Bishop was not viewed as a maniacal side-voice to the discussion but rather was central to the debate about the Hawaiian political situation. He was a “player” in the exclusive realm of “valid” Hawaiian discourse. He was intimately involved in the political efforts of the new government, was friends with Supreme Court Justice A.F. Judd and others, and was very much, one of the governments voices. In a letter of Oct. 1900 to Gorham Gillman, Sereno, never one for modesty, reveals that “Emmeleuth,” [one of the original Committee of 13], had allowed him private access to most acts of the Government Council so as to gather thought to write his United Press dispatches.82

Placing this source for the current narrative concerning the Waine’e Church Fire in this context does much to draw into question the validity of this story. Even more problematic however, is the fact that other testimonies exist that were not accessed. Sereno’s letter, written two years after the fire, was not, by far, the only account of the event. At the time of the fire, in June of 1894, there were nine different Hawaiian-language newspapers being published.

81 Bishop, Letter to Gilman, Dec. 4, 1897.

82 Bishop, Letter to Gilman, Oct. 20, 1900.
Native-Language Testimony

1894 Hawaiian-language Newspapers

*Ka Makaainana* 1887-1899
*Ka Hoku o Ka Pakipika* 1861-1863
*Ka Leo o ka Lahui* 1889-1896
*Ka Nupepa Kuokoa* 1861-1927
*Ka Oiaio* 1889-1896
*Ka Malamalama* 1892-1898
*Hawaii Holomua* 1894
*Ka Nupepa Aloha Aina* 1894-1895
*Nupepa Ka Oiaio* 1894-1896

What these newspapers have held are accounts from the community, previously ignored, from the time of the fire and the days immediately after. This testimony tells a different story of the church fire than that of Rev. Bishop’s editorial recorded more than two tears later. An inclusion of this Native-language testimony by researchers along the way would have created a different history.

Mai nā Nūpepa ‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i: (From the Hawaiian-Language Newspapers)

1894 June 29. *Ka Leo o Ka Lahui*

In the pages of this Hawaiian-language newspaper, from the day after the fire, came this simple note.
Aloha Ka Luakini o Wainee

Ua pau i kea ahi ka Luakini o Wainee ma Lahaina Maui, ma ka auina o ka la 28 nei Poaha. Aole i ike ia ke kumu o ke ahi i pau ai. Aloha ka Hale o ke Akua.83

Aloha, Church of Waine'e

Waine'e Church in Lāhainā, Maui was destroyed in a fire the afternoon of this Thursday the 28th. The source of the fire is not known. Aloha House of God.

Reading this account, printed in the newspaper the day after the fire, immediately challenged the previously understood narrative. Bishop’s account had angry Royalists burning down the church in a protest. The Waine'e Church of 1894 sat near the harbor, at the heart, both physically and socially, of Lāhainā Town. This article tells of an afternoon fire, the cause of which is not known. One immediate question to this narrative was how an afternoon protest burning of the main church in the center of Lāhainā Town produced no witnesses. No persons were arrested. I wondered why, if it was a protest, none took credit to further their cause. How did Bishop come to know it was a Royalist protest yet that did not appear in not the newspaper? All of these questions and more prompted further investigation.

1894 July 2 [4 days after fire] Ka Makaainana

83 “Aloha ka Luakini o Wainee.” Ka Leo o Ka Lahui, June 29, 1984, 2.
There is more news of the fire in an article published four days later in the popular Hawaiian-language newspaper *Ka Makaainana*. This account is in direct opposition to the later narrative of Sereno Bishop.

Pau o Wainee i ke Ahi

Mahope iho o ka hora 1 o ka auwina la Poaha iho la, ma Lahaina, Maui, ua pau aku ka luakini o Wainee i ke ahi, a o na paia pohaku wale no ia e ku la. Aole i maopopo ke kumu o ke ahi, koe wale no paha ilaila ka o Kaiwikaola, ka mea ia ia ka malama ana o ka luakini, a ua puhipuhia aha opala, a ua manao ia ua lele aku paha kekahi momoku ahi a luna o kaupaku a hoomaka ai ka a ana o ke ahi. He baibala, he elua kiaha dala inu waina a he ogana ka i pakele mai. Elima poe i hiki mua aku ilaila, aka, ua emoole ka holapu ana a ke ahi, me he puhiohio la ia o ka laau, a ku olohelohe iho la iho la na paia pohaku. Ke manaoia nei no ka hana hou aku, oiai, he oia mau no ka maikai o na paia pohaku. He lapuwale nane hoia na oele ana na kahi poe manaoino i ka Rev. A. Pali i puhi i ke ahi.84

Waine‘e is Destroyed in a Fire

After the hour of one in the afternoon of the Thursday passed, in Lahainā, Māui, Waine‘e Church was destroyed in a fire, and the stone walls are the only thing left standing. The source of the fire is not clear, except perhaps to Kaiwikaola, the caretaker of the church, who burned rubbish, and it is thought that a piece of smoldering twig perhaps flew up and alighted on the thatched roof and started the fire. A bible, two silver wine pitchers and an organ escaped the fire. Five people arrived there first but the spreading of the fire was not delayed, because of a strong whirlwind blowing without end. The site was laid barren except for the stone walls. The gossip by the evil people that are saying that the fire was started because of Rev. Pali is ridiculous.

This account of the fire has several important pieces of content that contradict the history that was created. *The Makaainana* column agrees with the other Hawaiian-

84 “Pau o Wainee i ke Ahi,” *Ka Makaainana*, Iulai 2, 1894, 5.
language accounts as to the time of the fire. Again this event is mentioned as an afternoon fire. This account also repeats the earlier mentioned source that the reason for the fire is not known. This article goes on to mention that it is thought that perhaps the caretaker of the church who burned rubbish and cleaned up had accidentally started the fire through a spark that alighted on the thatched roof. It mentions that five people arrived soon after but that they were unable to stop the fire. With Kaiwikaola there from the start, and five others arriving soon afterwards, why was no-one [the angry Royalist mob] seen? Importantly, this account also mentions that certain people have started gossip that the fire was intentionally set by those opposed to the pastor. It calls that evil thought.

1894 June 29. *Nupepa Kuokoa*, Letter to the editor by Daniel Kahaulelio.

The day of the fire, respected Lahainā resident Judge Daniel Kahaulelio wrote of the event to the largest newspaper of the day. It was published on June 29th, the day after. This resident’s account, if accessed, would have given direct contradiction to Sereno’s narrative.

**NA LETA**
Ka Pauana o Wainee I ke Ahi

E Ka Nupepa Kuokoa,
Aloha oe——

Ua pau ka luakini o Wainee I kea ahi ma ka hora 1:30 o keia 28 o lune, a ma ka puoakahi i kau ai ka bele, malaila kahi o ka a mua ana o ke ahi ulia puhipuhipala a ka mea hookani bele D. Kaiwikaola i ka mahi ai a pulumi a hoomaema e ka po. Aole no oia I ho-a wahi ahi no na opala e like me ka mea mau, aole no I komo iki iloko o ka luakini, mahope o kea hora 12 awakea, ua hoi oia ma ka aoao makai o ka luakini e hoomaha ai, a he poha ana kana I lohe, I alawa ae ola
iluna e puka ana ke ahi iluna o ka puoa o ka halepule, a he Manawa ole ua holo awiwi ae ia ke ahi maloko o ka pale o luna o ka luakini. Ma ia Manawa I hiki mai ai o R.P. Hose ka makai o ka —— a hooikaika lakou I na ipukukui huihui me na kukui kau aoao me na pono ahaaina a ka Haku, na pika dala me kiaha a me na baibala a pakele ia mau mea, a [holapu] kea ahi I na wahi a pau. Ma ka hora 3:30, ua pau loa na wahi a pau o ka luakini, koe na kua a me na kikina puka e a ia ana, a haalele aku me ka naau i piha i ke aloha a me ka luuluu, me ka minamina nui.

Me ke aloha no,
D. Kahaulelio
Lahaina, June 28, 1894

LETTERS
Waine‘e Destroyed by Fire

E Nūpepa Kuokoa,
Aloha to you—

Waine‘e Church was destroyed in a fire at 1:30 this 28th of June. The steeple which held the bell, was the place that the accidental rubbish fire started. The bell ringer, D. Kaiwikaola is the one who grows food and sweeps, and cleans up at night. He hadn’t started a rubbish fire as usual and hadn’t entered the church. After the hour of 12 in the afternoon he had gone to the makai side of the church to rest and he heard a crackling sound when he glanced up the fire came into sight on the steeple of the church, and in no time the fire had quickly spread over the church. At this time the sheriff, R.P. Hose arrived and they exerted themselves to gather the collection of candlesticks, candleholders and the things for used for the Lord’s Supper, the silver pitcher with cups, bibles and other things to save before the fire spread everywhere. By the hour 3:30 the church was destroyed, only the back wall and doorframe remain and are burning. It leaves the soul with a feeling of deep aloha and grief.

With aloha,
D. Kahaulelio
Lāhainā, June 28, 1894

85 D. Kahaulelio, letter to the editor, Ka Nūpepa Kuokoa, June 28, 1894, [published July 7, 1894].
This account mirrors the other Hawaiian-language accounts as to the time of the fire. It re-iterates the thoughts of an accidental fire started by the caretaker Kaiwikaola. It, as the other, mentions that the fire started in the steeple of the church, not the ground. The steeple is at a great height from the ground. Kaiwikaola apparently heard the beginnings of the fire and rushed to the side of the church. Again there is no mention of anyone else seen or in the vicinity. The sheriff arrived in time to help save some items and also saw no one. This also seems to be a near eyewitness account as the event wound down.

Kahaulelio lived within blocks of the church and in speaking of the remains of the “a” (fire) uses the particle “ana,” indicating that the walls are still burning. His letter is dated the day of the fire. He was apparently writing this account as the fire still smoldered.

Also a very pertinent aspect of this letter is the context of the source. The author of this letter D. Kahaulelio, was a member of the Hawaiian Evangelical Association, an annexationist, and supporter of the Provisional Government. He was directly involved in the troubles surrounding this specific church which will be discussed later. The newspaper that the letter appears in is *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa* which was avowedly pro-American, pro-annexation and also supportive of the P.G. If there was any thought or evidence that Royalists had burned the church in protest, Kahaulelio and this newspaper would have been the first to say so, but this letter, the first account found, actually refutes that. It is only later that this gossip about an intentional fire begins.
1894 July 6 [six days after the fire] Nupepa Ka Oiaio

KE KAPILIPILI NEI

Ke hoaö nei na poe hooihui-aina, e kapilipili nei aku, na poe Aloha Alii i puhi i ka Halepule o Waine'e i ke ahi. He nele loa ka loaa ana he holike, e hiki ai ke loaa ia manaö i hakuia. Eia ka mea i maopopo loa: Aia ke ki o ka halepule ma ka lima o ka mea malama halepule o ka aoao ekaelesia Hooihui-aina. Nana e wehe a e pani i ka puka, aole loa na kekahì mea o ka Aoao Aloha Alii. O ka mea i hoomaopopoia; aia no keia kanaka malama halepule e purumi ana mawaho iho o ka hale, a oia kona wa i ike aku ai i ke ahi e a ana iluna o ka hale bele. O ka ninau; Nohea ke ahi i hoa ia ai ma ka hale bele iluna loa, he aneane 70 kapuai ke kiekie? Ke pane nei na poe hooihui aina; Na ka poe enemi, oia no na poe aloha aina?

Ke haanū nei o Iosepa me Manase, na na enemi aloha aina i hana ia mea. Lapuwale ka manaö o ka poe hooihui aina.86

ATTACHING BLAME

The annexationists are trying to attach blame for the fire that burned Waine'e Church to the Royalists. They are destitute of any evidence to show this thought that they arrived at. Here is what is understood: The key to the church was in the hands of the caretaker who is an annexationist. When he opened the door, he didn't see any Royalists. Things that are clear: There was this caretaker of the church sweeping outside and when he looked up he saw a fire burning in the bell tower. A question? From where came a fire that started in the bell tower nearly seventy feet up? The annexationists are replying; the enemies, yes that so, the people who love the land? Iosepa and Manase are gloating, the enemies of the Aloha 'Āina are the ones who have done this [spread false rumors]. This thinking of the annexationists is foolish.

This article in the Hawaiian-language newspaper Nupepa Ka Oiaio goes straight to the happenings going on around the fire by saying that those who support annexation are

---

86 "Ke Kapilipili Nei," Nupepa Ka Oiaio, July 6, 1894.
trying to blame their enemies, the people who love the ali‘i, for the church fire. It mentions that the caretaker [Kaiwikaola] did not claim to see anyone, and that the fire started in the bell tower, seventy feet above the ground. It mentions “Iosepa and Manase,” Māui pastors who were very involved in the troubles around the church and who were supporters of annexation.

Note: Waine‘e church was to burn again on Oct. 21, 1947. The front page of the next day’s Maui News was to explain, “Cause of the fire, according to Lieut. Samuel K. Makekau of the Lahaina Fire Department, was the sparks from the rubbish burning in the church yard (emphasis added).” This interesting event lends credence to the idea that a rubbish fire could burn the church and speaks to the topic of political contextualization of the time being relevant to the resulting narratives.

These multiple, timely and local accounts of the fire agree on important aspects of the fire that strongly call into question Sereno Bishop’s narrative that became what is today the history of the church fire. They also discuss the fact that those who oppose the Queen and her supporters were starting rumors that linked the fire to that group. A more in-depth look at the political climate that surrounded the church fire adds very important context and speaks to motive of Sereno, the church [specifically the H.E.A.], and the annexationists to create their narrative.

A War of Words for Hearts and Minds: Contested Space / Context / Motive

As Sally Engle Merry has written, “stories make history, but historical circumstances also make stories.” This story has important political and social contexts, some of which are briefly mentioned prior.

The church fire at Waine‘e on June 28, 1894, was a mere six days prior to the declaration of the Republic of Hawai‘i. The severely unstable temporary government that had overthrown the Queen was desperately seeking broader backing and greatly desired a way to stem the strong support of their Royalist counterparts.

The minority Provisional Government originally had no intention of running a country but instead merely planned to hand over the reins of government to the United States. After reeling from an unsuccessful attempt at immediate annexation, and having to face the devastating July 1893 conclusions of the Blount report, they were now dealing with continued reports that the United States was planning to re-instate the Queen to power. Reports of planned Kānaka Maoli uprisings were also rampant. In the months prior to the church fire, letters swirled back and forth between the members of the ruling oligarchy and their supporters trying to gauge if the United States minister, who had made known his desire to see the Queen restored to her throne, had been given the power


89 Included among the many written accounts of this fear is the record of minutes from the P.G. Council of Dec. 14, 1893, which states “The Attorney General also stated that a report had been received by Colonel Soper [Commander of military forces for the Provisional Government] from Major McLeod, purporting to come from a naval officer, that the U.S, forces were to land for the purpose of restoring the ex-queen this afternoon.”
to use force against the Provisional Government. One correspondence, speaking of the political climate of early 1894 relays,

This has been a tremendous week, like that in January. The tension was unendurable, + Dole wrote Willis to know if he was really communicating with the Queen. He [Minister Willis] called for a formal interview at 1:30 pm on the 19th, he made formal request for the P.G. to retire + let the Queen resume her Gov't.90

In early 1894, talk within the Annexation Club began to coalesce around the idea that annexation might not happen soon and that there might be a need to form a more permanent government.91 While some at the meeting warned that it was too volatile a time to implement such a thing, on March 15, 1894, the Provisional Government took the first step towards such an action by forming a commission that would work toward a new constitution. These things meant that at the time of our June 1894 church fire there was a figurative, if not yet a literal, war going on in the islands. This battle for support pervaded down through communities, parishes, and even sometimes families. Sereno Bishop himself, our source for the examined history, wrote in February 1894, “we are in a revolution.”92

In this “war,” there was a strong battle going on over hearts and minds. Efforts were made by the Provisional Government to control the press through intimidation and fear. The P.G. had quickly formed a “Printing Committee” that watched over the press

90 Bishop, Letter to Gilman, Feb.12, 1894.

91 Bishop, Letter to Gilman, Feb. 8, 1894.

92 Bishop, Feb. 8, 1894.
and acted with immediate response to any criticism. The Feb. 15, 1893, minutes of the meeting of the Provisional Government Council read;

At this point Mr. Sheldon entered in charge of the Marshall. The Attorney General read the following charge against him, the original of same now being placed on file: Provisional Government of the Hawaiian Islands. J.G.M. Sheldon is charged with disrespect to the Executive and Advisory Counsels of this government by disorderly and contentious behavior in publishing in the Daily Hawaiian Holomua, a newspaper published in Honolulu on the 14th day of February A.D. 1893, certain disrespectful, contemptuous, and insulting comments...

Council Chamber, Honolulu, Feb. 15, 1893. W.O. Smith, Attorney General.93

Libel charges were laid against editors and several were called before the P.G. council to answer about specific columns that were unflattering to the government. Efforts were constantly being made to sully the reputation of the “Royalists.” One method used by the P.G. exploited a long ago developed plan of the Christian mission. Ever since their arrival in Hawai‘i, the church had made effort to use Native pastors to lead their fellow people from the evils of traditional life. A Native pastor might hold more sway in matters not only of religion, but increasingly of politics. Some of these pastors were now employed with the task of turning their parishioners from their steadfast support of their beloved Queen.

While some pastors followed the admonitions of their leaders, others defied their superiors by resisting. At first, the H.E.A.’s sights were set on those Kānaka Maoli who

93 Minutes of the meetings, Provisional Government, p. 117, Hawai‘i State Archives, Honolulu, HI.
continued traditional practices. At the annual meeting of the Hawaii Evangelical Association in June of 1892, mission leaders pointed out this problem:

The Hawaiian mind acts slowly, and it has been only by the most persistent and outspoken exposure of these evils that the best of the people are beginning to realize their enormity. We owe much to the labors of Mr. Bicknell in this direction, and to the studies and writings of such men as Prof. W.D. Alexander, Mr. J.S. Emerson and the Rev S. E. Bishop, and we think it the most hopeful thing we have to report that while some of our Christian leaders among the natives are guiltily secretive......And we bring no unprovable charge against some of our Hawaiian brother-clergymen and pastors in the field when we say, that they have refused to look at these faults of their people; that they have refused to have them discussed and exposed.94

After the Coup d’etat of 1893, strongly pro-annexation leaders within the church, such as the Rev. Sereno Bishop and O.P. Emerson, set their sights on the Queen and the Royalist faction. They urged Native pastors within the H.E.A. to help move the people from their unenlightened support of a debauched and wrecked government to support for the wise haole. This discourse caused much consternation within the churches and created havoc in certain congregations. Attacking what many saw as “sinful” practices had been one thing; asking Kānaka Maoli to openly take sides against their Queen was another.

One sight that was particularly tumultuous was Lāhainā. Three months after the coup, in April of 1893, the pastor at Waine’e church, Rev. Adam Pali sent an anxious correspondence to officials at the H.E.A.

Lahaina, Aper. 10, 1893.
Rev. O.P. Emerson

Reverend Pali was one of the missions strongest Native voices for annexation. As he made his admonitions in church more vocal, the congregation in-turn made their feelings more apparent. By early May of 1893 leaders within the congregation had called for a meeting to discuss the removal of Pali as pastor and on May 16 a church board voted to do just that. Alarm went out throughout not only the church community but also other areas of support for the Provisional Government.

The Hawaiian-language newspapers also were reporting on these events as seen in a copy of *Ka Leo o Ka Lahui* from May 19, 1893.

---

**KIPAKU O REV. A. PALI**

*Ua hoike ia mai ia makou ua hoholo ka hapanui loa o na hoahanau o ka ekalesia o Lahaina e kipaku ia o Rev. Pali, mai ka noho kahu ana no lakou, malalo o ke kumu, aole he pono i na kahu ekalesia e komo pu e hooikaika ma ka hana hoohuī aina. Nolaila ua kipaku ia o Rev. A. Pali.*96

---


REV. PALI EXPELLED

We saw the decision of the majority of the brethren of the church at Lāhainā to expel Rev. Pali, from the pastorship. The reason given was that it is not right for pastors of churches to support annexation. Therefore Rev. A. Pali was expelled.

The church hierarchy took this matter very seriously. The H.E.A. was scheduled to have their annual meeting in mid-June and just prior to the meeting, the Rev. Bishop, as editor of The Friend reported on what he ironically called the dangerous trend of letting politics invade religion:

Hence, while thus the greatest majority of our best and ablest pastors are annexationists..., a majority of their church members are apt to be found in sympathy with that court [Queen Liliʻuokalani] and its corruptions. Next week occurs the annual meeting of our Evangelical Association, or Synod. It will be remarkable if some of the bitter political strife which has been raging, does not appear there. Indeed, some protests seem unavoidable against the shameful charges of treachery and hypocrisy poured by the royalists upon the highest and best of our native pastors.97

When the pastors did gather for the Thirtieth Annual Meeting, they enacted new by-laws to deal with the spreading problems. They explained that only they [the central church organization] could remove a pastor, not the congregations themselves. They not only reinstated Rev. Pali, but called for disciplinary proceedings against those who had opposed the reverend.

97 "Politics in Religion," The Friend, June 1893.
In view of the fact that there are troubles in some of the Churches, and that certain pastors are opposed by a factious element which they can neither reform nor discipline, owing to their being in the minority, Therefore, it is the advice of this body that such pastors take occasion to call a special session (if need be) of their island association, and lay before that body charges against the guilty such as shall aim to secure discipline.  

Everyone from the Lāhainā congregation who had signed the original petition supporting Pali’s removal, and the five members of the congregations board who had voted to expel Pali, were themselves suspended from the church. The historic church at Waine‘e immediately went from a congregation of 93 members, to 17. The H.E.A. body would paradoxically go on to write, “It was also resolved that partisan politics should not be introduced into the pulpits of the land.”

Considering these extreme political contestations of the day, it is understandable that a story blaming the enemy for the burning of a church could be created. The problem lies in the understanding that this faulty and unsupported narrative was for so long accepted by historians.

CONCLUSION

On the afternoon of June 28, 1894, a fire began that ended up destroying Waine‘e Church in Lāhainā. On that day, and for several days afterwards, Kānaka Maoli from

---

98 “Abstract of the minutes of the Meeting of the H.E.A. held June 6th-12th 1893”, 11.

Lāhainā wrote about the event, leaving an important record of this happening in their lives. These accounts were ignored in the historiography that created the narrative that we have today. Instead, a letter written more than two years later and placed in a newspaper nearly five thousand miles away became our source for this history. The letter was written under a pseudonym, by a hate-filled racist who was in the middle of a battle for control over the country in which he lived. He, not the Kānaka Maoli, was accepted as a preferred source for a valid history. The few Hawaiian-language voices that have been given platform here are speaking back and claiming a right to tell their own history. There are a myriad of other voices, ready to be heard on a myriad of other histories.
CHAPTER IV - CASE STUDY II

Inventing Authority: *Modern Continuation of an Exclusionary Historiography*

*(Honolulu magazine article)*

Abstract

"Everyone thinks the word ‘ohana expresses an ancient Hawaiian value. Not so. It turns out we made it up."\(^{100}\)

These powerful words come from the writer Scott Whitney and were published in the September 2001 issue of the prominent magazine *Honolulu*. The article, along with an accompanying illustration, addresses what is considered a foundational concept in Hawaiian culture. The words introduce an article in which the writer seeks to weigh in on earlier contentious cultural interpretation debates by claiming that the term ‘ohana and its associated connotations are relatively recent creations of Hawaiian activists. The words, and the accompanying research, seem to enlighten a naive public to the political motivations that seek to create a new history and lead them astray. The words are also a lie. They continue a long historical discourse of “enlightened” settlers explaining to a naive Native culture who they themselves are. They come from an author, unfamiliar with the Hawaiian language, who seeks to educate Hawaiians and others on the “truth” of their linguistic past. This case study is a look at how, with relative ease, such poorly researched discourses on Hawaiian history can continue to be published; it looks at how providential narratives have contributed to handing an exclusive position in Hawaiian historiography to those with the least knowledge of Hawaiian epistemologies. It is a

---

questioning of why the basic standards of journalism and historiography, long applied to research about European and North American histories, are often disregarded in settler/indigenous writings; how egotism begets reluctance to seek out Kānaka Maoli discourses and how a lack of familiarity with the Hawaiian language creates such major gaffes.

"Inventing 'Ohana"

The aforementioned problems of exclusion that were so existent in writings on Hawaiian history in the early and mid-twentieth century, did not end with greater knowledge of and access to Hawaiian-language materials or the emergence of Native-language speakers and scholars. Earlier non-inclusive writings worked to build a canon of Hawaiian history that has not been easy to dislodge or penetrate.\(^{101}\) Perhaps more importantly, these earlier writings worked to build a process, a historiography, which normalized the idea that research in Hawai‘i was done through the medium of the English language. Power and history relationships long-nurtured, still frame much of the modern-day public discourse on Hawaiian history. Noenoe Silva speaks to this practice in her 2004 book *Aloha Betrayed: Native Hawaiian Resistance to American Colonialism*:

"By the mid-twentieth century, the idea that English was the language of Hawai‘i seemed natural, especially because, except by some persistent Kānaka, Hawai‘i was no longer regarded as a separate nation with its own people having their own history and language.\(^{102}\)

\(^{101}\) Works, noted in this thesis' bibliography, however by authors such as Puakea Nogelmeier, Noenoe Silva, Jonathan K. Osorio, Kanalu Young, Lilikala Kame‘eleihiwa, John Charlot and others within the last two decades that have called upon Hawaiian-language sources are actively and powerfully challenging this historiography.

\(^{102}\) Silva, 3.
This normalization, later faced with what Michel Foucault has termed, “an insurrection of subjugated knowledges,” was certainly forced to recognize the existence and new accessibility of Kānaka Maoli voices, but often continued to preference non-Native ones. This active attempt to silence these resistant kānaka voices manifests itself in several ways. One tool used to sustain the hegemony of this historiography was to merely “make present” a plethora of competing voices and then privilege those desired sources. This privileging can take place not only at the site of the writing of history but also at the place of collecting, preserving and transcribing testimony of events. In the collecting and archiving process, non-Native voices were granted a much more significant place, and therefore historiographical weight, relative to their actual position in events. This is true of the past and the present. This shaping of a historical archive is very much an active process, or as Michel-Rolph Trouillot explains,

Thus the presences and absences embodied in sources (artifacts and bodies that turn an event into fact) or archives (facts collected, thematized, and processed as documents and monuments) are neither neutral or natural. They are created. As such, they are not mere presences and absences, but mentions or silences of various kinds and degrees. By silence, I mean an active and transitive process: one “silences” a fact or an individual as a silencer silences a gun. One engages in the practice of silencing. Mentions and silences are thus active, dialectical counterparts of which history is the synthesis.¹⁰⁴


In effect, "As sources fill the historical landscape with their facts, they reduce the room available to other facts."\(^\text{105}\)

Trouillot lays out an example of this active silencing in his description of the late nineteenth-century efforts to create a biographical narrative of Christopher Columbus that would in effect, crowd out more controversial aspects of later Spanish incursions in Latin America and henceforth create fertile ground for later political efforts. He explains that "International fairs that attracted millions of visitors...academic conferences...and official commemorations...taught the new masses who they were, in part by telling them who they were not."\(^\text{106}\) Spain sought to create a new and encompassing narrative through celebrations of Columbus' life that would produce "testimony" with which to fill historical space.

A yearlong series of events led to grandiose ceremonies in October and November of 1892 that involved the Spanish royal family and many foreign dignitaries. The commemoration became a powerful tool with which the politician-historian and his quadricentennial junta of academics and bureaucrats wrote a narrative of The Discovery with Spain as the main character.

Trouillot continues,

The junta created at least one serious academic journal, influenced others, dealt with learned societies, and commissioned research that still inspires European and American studies.

Many titles show the role of the quadricentennial in shaping the categories and themes under which the conquest of America is still discussed. These activities not only influenced participating academic, they also shaped the

\(^{105}\) Trouillot, 49.

\(^{106}\) Trouillot, 124.
The writer then follows the effects of that 1892 Spanish quadricentennial narration on the next year’s 1893 United States celebration in Chicago, named the World’s Columbian Exposition of Chicago:

...Columbus gained a lot from Chicago. Commemorations feed on numbers and the 1893 quadricentennial was a display of the U.S. appetite for size: more participating countries, more acreage, more exhibits, more money than any fair the world had known.

To be sure, Columbus’s metamorphosis into a Yankee hero, the lone ranger of the western seas, looked somewhat banal outside Chicago. Still, viewed from the far south, the fair belonged to a political and economic series from which it drew its symbolism. The Columbus story written in Chicago overlapped with the ongoing narrative of conquest that U.S. power was busily writing in the lands of this hemisphere. What was said to have happened in 1492 legitimized what was actually happening in the early 1890’s. 108

These creations of enormous characters and the active highlighting of their effects on other peoples, work to crowd out the Native in their own story.

Likewise, histories of Hawai‘i have inevitably begun in the eighteenth century with “The Discoverer,” Captain James Cook and highlighted the arrival of the missionaries and their gift of civilization. 109 Missionary “civilizing” of Natives in Hawai‘i

107 Trouillot, 124.

108 Trouillot, 129.

109 Cultural history tours of the hugely significant town of Lahaina by historical societies tell of the two hundred year history of this town as a whaling port and the contestations between those whalers and the arriving missionaries from 1820 onward. This of course is a tiny fraction of the area’s history. This land has a nearly two-thousand year history that involves generations of Mo‘o, ali‘i nui, and their interaction with
has been a starting point for discussion on group history that evolves into a national history. Many of the problematic issues of identity grow out of this interaction and the way it has been portrayed. These portrayals once again reference the accumulated archive of missionary letters, business transactions, and nearly every shipman’s diary that can be examined; the whole time not granting space to the first-person voice of the Native. Dealing with contemporary issues and identities in Hawai‘i today, often meant using supposedly improving templates that were laid down by the described outcomes of the interaction of these past peoples. Outcomes were assessed with these shaped materials. These histories from, and analysis by, haole (foreigners) in Hawai‘i are prolific. Hawai‘i’s cup of historical knowledge figuratively runneth over with haole wisdom.¹¹⁰

In Hawai‘i, long existent but newly accessed or highlighted voices must compete to displace this already created archive. As late as the 1990’s a cannon of the history of Hawai‘i would have been fore-fronted by books with very little or no primary source Kānaka Maoli voice, but instead only scant interpretation of the actions of these supposedly acted upon peoples. Even so, such influential histories as Ralph Kuykendall’s The Hawaiian Kingdom¹¹¹ were reviewed and praised as thorough and comprehensive. Reviewer S.K. Stevens of the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission calls Kuykendall’s work “a remarkably thorough” study and writes that it provides for the state this sacred area prior to the arrival of haole. This historical slight is changing through the creation of Hawaiian based historic tours by groups like the Friends of Moku‘ula.

¹¹⁰ In the recent article Kuleana: Towards a Historiography of Hawaiian National Consciousness, 1780-2001, Native Hawaiian scholar Kanalu Young has written about a new blueprint for a more inclusive historiography that can be used to better understand Hawaiian nationality. He writes that it is “imperative” that we include “ancient institutions, values, and knowledge systems,” in our attempts to comprehend identity.

of Hawai‘i “one of the most comprehensive and excellent background historical
narratives possessed by any of our American states.”\textsuperscript{112} Stevens “strongly advises”
students of history to study this work “as detailed so thoroughly in this volume.”\textsuperscript{113} Those
familiar with this archive will no doubt question how a history that excludes such a vast
collection of Native voice can be considered “thorough.” These statements completely
ignore the presence of the massive archive of Hawaiian-language historical material.
Despite modern critiques of this work and others, created exclusively from the English-
language archive, they remain, for many classrooms and research projects, the central
text from which histories of Hawai‘i are sourced.\textsuperscript{114}

More recent resistant histories that include Native voice have appeared;
challenging for historical space. This contested space within the historiographical process
is where another instrument of silencing is brought to bear upon ongoing efforts of
inclusion. Attempts to discredit the introduced Native voice become the new weapon of
hegemony, or as Trouillot writes, “Since some traces [historical documentation] could
not be erased, their historical significance had to be reduced.”\textsuperscript{115} Now undeniably present
Native voices become inconsequential, insignificant, or incapable of truly recording
history. A competent recorder of history is now on the scene and history begins with this
recording. The time, and therefore the voices of the period before such a significant event

\textsuperscript{112} S.K. Stevens, “Review of The Hawaiian Kingdom, 1854-1874: Twenty Critical Years, by Ralph S.

\textsuperscript{113} Stevens, 592-593.

\textsuperscript{114} As mentioned, this author’s “Hawaiian History” course, taken in pursuit of a B.A. in Hawaiian Studies at
the University of Hawai‘i: Maui Community College used Gavan Daws’, \textit{Shoal of Time} as the course
textbook.

\textsuperscript{115} Trouillot, 130.
is merely preparatory to the wondrous advancement brought by this new force. In
Trouillot's case, the first 280 years of Euro-American history were merely preparation for
the rise of the glorious United States. Similarly, in the case of narrated Hawai'i, pre-
contact times were merely the preparation for a tremendous wave of enlightenment and
economic advancement brought on by the shift in power to those who understood these
situations and how to record them. Pre-contact voices were assigned the role of carrier of
myth and legend, and even Kānaka Maoli who were present post-contact were seemingly
only along for the ride of great white advancement and were not reliable sources to be
accessed for histories.

Nineteenth-century missionary discourse on the barbarism and intellectual
shortcomings of Kānaka Maoli, while now widely accepted as racist and incorrect,
worked to taint Native sources from that time period. Civilization and intellect were
things that Hawaiians could only hope to slowly aspire to. Even today, Hawaiians are
often seen as only recent beneficiaries of western academic enlightenment. The extensive
and scholarly writings of Kānaka Maoli like Iosepa Kaho'olulu Nāwahi, Joseph
Mokuohai Poepeo, Moses Kuaea Nākuina, Moke Manu and many others were
casualties of Ngāti Wa Thing'o's "cultural bomb" in which a people lose belief "...in
their capacities." He continues, "It makes them see their past as one big wasteland of

116 An example is Nāwahi's 1878 address opening the Kingdom legislature. His oratory included an
analogy comparing the Treaty of Reciprocity being debated in the assembly with the story of the Trojan
Horse as told in Virgil's epic Latin poem *The Aeneid*.

117 A brilliant Kingdom of Hawai'i attorney, newspaper and book publisher and political activist.

118 A Hawaiian novelist, prolific writer and publisher of materials on a variety of topics including Native
Hawaiian education.

119 A Hawaiian historian, writer and cultural expert whose work made later translators like Thomas Thrum
popular.
Only recently are these voices being extensively documented and written about. Ground-breaking work like the ongoing research of Noenoe Silva to highlight “Hawaiian intellectuals” of the nineteenth century is much in need and will not only add content, but even more importantly, adjustments to the framework with which scholars in the future can understand Native writings.

With the begrudging acceptance of the work of Native scholars and research, another method of negation filled the colonizer’s toolbox. The commonly imposed label laid upon modern day Native voice is the automatic disclaimer that they are inherently political, “emotional” and therefore biased. Kānaka Maoli cannot simply do analysis, but rather are burdened by inherent political passions. This belief often meant that to learn, research or simply live one’s culture was a political act and therefore biased. Roger Keesing and Jocelyn Linnekin made a version of this “politicization” argument in the 1980’s in referring to cultural concepts like Mālama ‘Āina and this dismissal continues into the twenty-first century. This “Invention of Tradition” claim was debated by several others. Native scholar Haunani-Kay Trask challenged these characterizations of Native Hawaiian voice and made evident the irony in this accusation by pointing out that this politicization of discourse emanated from the overthrow of the Hawaiian Kingdom.

---

120 Ngātir Wa Thiong’o, 3.

121 In a 2007 conversation with a prominent producer of Hawaiian history, this writer was told to be careful about using the Hawaiian-language newspapers as a source as Hawaiians tended to “get worked up, emotional and agitated” when they spoke.

Kānaka Maoli asserting the right to self-identity is only political in a situation of their loss of nationhood.

A Flawed Historiography

This silencing of Native voice through the production of alternate, privileged voices in the contested space and the further discrediting of any accepted Native voice is very much ongoing. In September 2001, associate editor of Honolulu magazine, Scott Whitney, published an article in the above-mentioned publication, highly critical of the widespread and ongoing efforts by Native Hawaiians to work towards defining for themselves who they are. The magazine cover grabbed viewers with a sexy cover [unrelated to this article] and the powerful title, “the Myth of ‘Ohana”[123] [see figure next page].

Figure 2: “the Myth of ‘Ohana” Cover of Honolulu Magazine, Sept. 2001.
The caption inside the cover reads, “Kama‘aina routinely use the word ‘ohana without ever knowing where it came from or what it really means. Prepare to have your cultural preconceptions shaken.”

The offensive illustration that accompanies the article depicts a supposed family of Native Hawaiians dressed in ti-leaf skirts and malo. All of the figures are missing faces; as if to imply that these Kānaka Maoli have no identity [see illustration below].

Figure 3: “‘Ohana” Article Illustration, Honolulu Sept.2001.

---

The editors display an all too familiar paternalistic role of intellectual savior, enlightening the “other” about themselves. This direct challenge to “kama‘aina” about what they think they know of their own culture places the article inside a powerful discourse on foundational cultural knowledge.

For the article, Whitney developed a thesis about these efforts and then searched for evidence that supported his critical view. The opening highlighted line of his article would make the very significant claim “Everyone thinks the word ‘Ohana expresses an ancient Hawaiian value. Not So. It turns out we [emphasis added] made it up.” These words, and the seemingly damning evidence that followed, addressed what is considered a foundational concept in Hawaiian culture. All who read them, along with those who were told about them by the original readers, were called once again to question the voices of Kānaka Maoli who sought to interpret for themselves who they were, and face “evidence” of this mistake. Are these words from Mr. Whitney a breakthrough in understanding; a well-researched discovery about a people? No, they are quite simply a lie; what the writer would later call a “mistake.” They are an untruth that once published goes on to pervade and often dominate discussion about a people. These words are able to enter the discourse because of the dominant and privileged power position of the narrator and their forum. This article is a powerful example of a privileged narrator, his ability to widely exclude Native voice and the different standards with which these narrations are

125 The author uses the term “kama‘aina” towards the readership of the magazine, invoking further issues of contested identity.

126 Again the author seems to attempt to erase any designation of Kānaka Maoli, haole or settler.

held too. Many privileged positions within the published discourse that are the preferred components of today’s historiography in Hawai‘i, are most often inhabited by those lacking either the tools necessary to access Hawaiian-language materials or the inclination to do so. While there continues to be a dearth of Kānaka Maoli writers in positions within the major media outlets in Hawai‘i, the lack of desire to access available testimony or knowledge is perhaps just as telling.

Analysis of a “Mistake”

Whitney states that the word ‘ohana does not come from “Old Hawai‘i”. Examinations of the two main pieces of “evidence” on which he bases his claim, and his research methods, or lack of them, are illuminating.

Evidence I: Paragraph 2 of the article

“Look in one of the original Hawaiian language dictionaries, Lorrin Andrews’ 1865 tome with the snappy title: A Dictionary of the Hawaiian Language to which Is Appended an English-Hawaiian Vocabulary and a Chronological Table of Remarkable Events. You will not find a listing for the word ‘ohana.”128

For those who thought they knew the origins of this word, this is pretty stunning evidence. If the word does not exist in the dictionary from 1865, that would begin to cast doubt on the widespread use of the term and the existence of this so-called ancient

128 Whitney, 42.
cultural concept. The problem is, it is in that exact dictionary. Page 91 of the book lists the term.

O-HA-NA, s. A family. 2 Sam. 9:1. A brood of birds. Kanl. 22:6. A litter, as of puppies or pigs; an offspring; a tribe. los. 14:1 2, 3. All the young of one animal; ka ohana moa, ka ohana ilio, &c.; ohana uuku, an endearing appellation for little children; ohana hipa, a flock of sheep.

O-HA-NA, adj. Of or relating to a family; he mohai ohana, a family sacrifice. 1 Sam. 20:29.

O-HA-NA, s. A family of parents, children and servants living together; o ke kakae no ia o ka lepo o Lahainaluna me he ohana moa ia.129

How was this simple fact overlooked? How was such a foundational part of this thesis made in error? A look at Mr. Whitney’s method of researching this significant cultural claim is revealing. The writer’s own later words would reveal the lack of scholarly method that caused this oversight. Whitney writes that:

In researching the original article, I phoned the Hawai‘i State Library’s Hawai‘i-Pacific collection and asked the librarian to look up ‘ohana for me in the 1865 Andrews dictionary. He looked, and told me over the phone that the word was not there. “There’s not even any o’s in here,” he said under his breath. I should have stopped right there to follow up, but I was so happy to be proved right that I hung up and went on with my writing.130


130 Whitney, 22.
Whitney was “so happy” to find what he thought was evidence to prove his thesis, he chose, while writing an article attacking a foundational principal of Hawaiian culture, to ignore basic journalistic research methods and simply telephone a secondary source, gain information, then publish that as evidence of his theory. This comfort with doing such surface research while “correcting” the Native about their own culture, speaks strongly to the perceived inherency of Indigenous inferiority. His failure to follow what would be considered a rudimentary step in the process of gaining evidence for a story speaks to his drive to publish what were simply his own biases. Remarkably, he writes that the librarian he spoke with mentioned that there are “no o’s” at all in the dictionary. This stunning anomaly of there being no “o’s” in the dictionary does not slow down the writer or call to him for further review. He himself describes where he began to stumble with a statement that “Albert Einstein once complained about scientists whose theories determined their observations. That’s partly what happened here.”

Evidence II: Paragraph one of the article

Mr. Whitney’s other piece of supposed evidence to prove his thesis of the non-existence of the word ‘ohana in “Old Hawai‘i” is possibly even more lax. He conducts an online search using one specific tool. He instructs the reader of his article, “Go to the University of Hawai‘i’s Hawaiian Pacific Journals Database, and look for uses of the word [ohana] between the years 1889 and 1949 you will not find a single entry.” There are several

131 Whitney, 22.
132 Whitney, 42.
glaring problems with this methodology. If the writer were searching for evidence of the
use of a specific word in ancient Hawai‘i, he possibly could not have used a less helpful
database. The University’s own description of this index says: “HPJI is an index to
magazines and journals published in or about Hawai‘i and the Pacific…”133 The search of
an online English-language magazine and journal index with the parameters of 1889-
1949 [a vast majority of the titles in the index are post 1965] would hardly give someone
insight into the customs and practices of “old Hawaii.” Hawaiian Collection Curator Joan
Hori explained “this is not a keyword search index but rather a title search index. Unless
the word appeared in the title or first sentence of the article that type of search would be
nearly useless.”134 Bernice Pauahi Bishop Museum librarian B. J. Short seconded the
analysis of using that source by saying that this was a title search index.135 Available,
actual nineteenth-century writings on cultural concepts would have been much more
fruitful and instantly required that the writer withdraw his primary thesis.

A brief search by this writer turned up hundreds of citations, in more than a dozen
resources, of the word ‘ohana prior to the 1890’s in sources that were available to Mr.
Whitney at the time that he wrote this article in September of 2001. I have highlighted a
few below:


134 Personal communication of September 12, 2006.

135 Personal communication of October 6, 2007.
RESOURCE a1: Hawaiian-Language Newspaper Collection

Availability: Microfilm collection at University of Hawai'i, Mānoa Hamilton Library

Sample Listing: “Ua launa mai na 'ili, a me na kanaka o keia ohana [emphasis added]; a ua oluolu.”136

Notes: My personal brief, [two afternoon] search of this collection turned up twenty-two examples of the use of the word 'ohana in the newspapers prior to the year 1865. There are however, more than 6,000 uses documented so far in this corpus137, each of which would have caused the researcher to re-asses his thesis.

RESOURCE a2: Writings of Samuel Mānaiakalani Kamakau

Availability: Published Texts

Ke Kumu Aupuni: Ka Mo'olelo Hawai'i no Kamehameha Ka Na'i Aupuni a me Kāna Aupuni i Ho'okumu ai. Honolulu: Ke Kumu Lama, 'Ahahui 'Ōlelo Hawai'i, 1996.

Ke Aupuni Mō'ti: Ka Mo'olelo Hawai'i no Kauikeaouli Keiki Ho'oilina a Kamehameha a me Ke Aupuni āna i Noho Mō't ai. Honolulu: Kamehameha Schools Press, 2001.

Sample Listing: “...hānau 'o Kūmākaha, noho iā Moemoeāauli'i (ma loko o kēia wahine ka 'ohana e loa'a aku ai 'o Kāmapua'a a me kālāua; 'ohana 'o Pele [emphasis added])”138


137 A typed entry of the word 'ohana in the Hawaiian-language newspaper website ulukau returns 6,067 examples of the use of the word 'ohana in the newspapers from the first newspaper in 1834 until the early twentieth century. While admittedly, this particular on-line resource was not available to Mr. Whitney at the time of his article, it does point to the fact that the word was indeed listed prolifically throughout the papers and a physical examination such as the one I have done would have undoubtedly turned up citations.

138 Samuel M. Kamakau, Ke Aupuni Mō'ti: Ka Mo'olelo Hawai'i no Kauikeaouli Keiki Ho'oilina a Kamehameha a me Ke Aupuni āna i Noho Mō't ai. (Honolulu: Kamehameha Schools Press 2001), 4.
Notes: This use of the word ‘ohana is found in Kamakau’s description of a genealogy in which he refers to the families or clans of Kamapua’a and Pele. The word appears throughout these published texts.

RESOURCE a3: Ka Puke Mo‘olelo O Hon. Iosepa K. Nāwahī

Availability: Published Text


Sample Listing: “I ka hiki ‘ana aku i ka ilina e piha mai ana a e olowalu ana nā leo kūmākena o ka lehulehu me kahi mau ‘ohana [emphasis added] pono‘i ona mai Puna mai e hea mai ana i kekahi mau mele inoa i haku ‘ia nona i kona mau là kama iki e hi‘ialo ‘ia ana e kona mau māku.”139

Notes: This widely available 1996 book, originally published in 1908, has well over one hundred uses of the word ‘ohana in the text.

RESOURCE a4: Hawaiian Ethnological Notes

Availability: Index and complete records available to the public at the Bernice Pauahi Bishop Museum Archives

Sample Listing: “Ohana Kahuna Lapaau [emphasis added]”140

Notes: This resource speaks not only to the writer’s statement that the word did not exist, but also to his critique of the use of the word. Here, clearly the word is referring to ‘ohana as something broader than merely blood relationship.

140 Hawaiian Ethnological Notes Index, Bernice Pauahi Bishop Museum Archives.
RESOURCE a5: Hawaiian Bible

Availability: Ka Baibala Hemolele o ke Kauoha Kahiko a me ke Kauoha Hou; i unuhiia mailoko mai o na olelo kahiko, a ua hooponopono hou ia. Nu Yoka: Ua piaia no ko Amerika Poe Hoolaha Baibala, 1868.

Sample Listing: E hoopomaikai aku hoi au i ka poe hoomaikai ia oe, a e hoino aku au i ka mea hoino ia oe, a ia oe e pomaikai ai na ohana [emphasis added] a pau o ka honua.

Notes: This 1868 resource has over 700 examples of the use of the word ‘ohana.

And if the writer was so very intent on not leaving his office to do this research he could still have easily accessed;

RESOURCE b1: Bernice Pauahi Bishop Museum Archives On-Line Catalog

Availability: On-line access

Sample Listing: “Kuu nani ohana [emphasis added]”

Notes: This archive contains resources from 1839 onward including the beautiful mele composed by King David Kalākaua listed above.

RESOURCE b2: University of Hawai‘i Library Voyager Catalog

Availability: On-line access

---

141 [http://bishopmuseumarc.lib.hawaii.edu/cgi-bin/Pwebrecon.cgi?v=1&t=7&ti=1.7&Search%5FArg=ohana&Search%5FCode=CMD&CNT=15&PID=mugg0MTlxq_koB-t_-mU9uNcksb&SEQ=20080107035951&SID=1] accessed March 11, 2008.
Sample Listing: “Na himeni hoolea. He mau mele ma ka uhane, e hoolea ai na kanaka, na keiki, na ohana [emphasis added], na ekalesia, ia lehova, ke Akua e ola‘i.”

Notes: This was a popular 1864 hymnal published by Henry M. Whitney.

RESOURCE b3: Bernice Pauahi Bishop Museum Library On-Line Catalog

Availability: On-line access

Sample Listing: Ka Ayer buke paalima: e wehewehe ana i ke ano o ka lawelawe ana o na laau lapaaau ohana [emphasis added]; a Kauka Ayer: a e kubukuhi ana i ka mea pono e hana ia i ka manawa e loaa ai na ulia poino, a e hoihe ana i kekahai mau mea waiwai nui e ae.

Notes: An interesting 1891 medicinal catalog with a mention of the members of the medical profession as “laau lapaaau ohana.” This reference speaks not only to the early existence of the word but also directly to Whitney’s further argument that “groups” have so bastardized the meaning by incorporating the term into “groups of non-blood related people” Here we have an 1891 “Kanaka Maoli Laau Lapaaau Ohana” or native medicine ‘ohana or organization.

142 http://uhmanoa.lib.hawaii.edu/cgi-bin/Pwebrecon.cgi?v=1&t=1.3&Search%5FArg=na%20himeni%20hoolea&Search%5FCode=GKEY%5FE&CNT=25&PID=wRSrvHU88_HU2TwP8yD4fEA9%&SEQ=20080107040648&SID=1 accessed March 11, 2008.

143 http://bishopmuseumlib.lib.hawaii.edu/cgi-bin/Pwebrecon.cgi?SAB1=1891&BOOL1=all+of+these&FLD1=Keyword+Anywhere+%28GKEY%29&GRP1=AND+with+next+set&SAB2=laau&BOOL2=all+of+these&FLD2=Keyword+Anywhere+%28GKEY%29&GRP2=AND+with+next+set&SAB3=&BOOL3=all+of+these&FLD3=Keyword+Anywhere+%28GKEY%29&PID=kMTic9Rd0HsYc1W8XGBP6ormfu&SEQ=20080107041449&CNT=15&HIST=1 accessed March 11, 2008.
But for some reason none of these Hawaiian-language sources, or the many others not listed here, were considered when researching ancient Hawaiian culture.

Later in the article, the writer begins to reveal motive. His earlier mentioned rush to be “proved right” in his thesis, validated his desire to enlighten a wondering public and set the record straight about the “other.” In his re-emphasizing of the statements about the modern creation of this word and its related concepts, Whitney lumps this with other “pious cultural explanations” and says that we have merely “bought the myth.”\(^\text{144}\) The sellers of this distorted myth listed by Whitney are Native Hawaiian cultural practitioners, like Mrs. Mary Kawena Pukui, George Helm, Walter Ritte and Emmett Aluli. In reminding us that ‘ohana is a modern creation, Whitney says that, “The word ‘ohana was thrust into the public sphere as late as 1976 by the original organizers of the Protect Kaho‘olawe ‘Ohana.”\(^\text{145}\) Whitney’s thesis continues that these Hawaiian leaders “...had to learn how to be Hawaiian”\(^\text{146}\) and did so by reading the work of Mrs. Pukui, which led them astray.

Whitney writes also about the political and academic discourse on culture from Kānaka Maoli that he has now proven false. His efforts here to correct the errant teachings emanating from Native Hawaiian scholars and leaders, works to taint everything further that comes from these sources. If what the public has long believed to be true is just a politically motivated fabrication of Native Hawaiian practitioners and

\(^{144}\) Whitney, 43.

\(^{145}\) His thesis seems borrowed from the 1983 book “Defining Tradition” by Jocelyn Linnekin in which she argues that the among other “invented” cultural aspects is the assigning of sacredness to the island of Kaho‘olawe.

\(^{146}\) Whitney, 44.
scholars, then all of their histories are questionable. These questions are to be sorted out by un-biased educators and researchers who can look in from the outside.  

Through this work, Native voice is once again deterred from entering the discourse on equal footing through questions of competence.

Whether intentional or not, this tainted discourse plays on a long-fed disjuncture between what Native peoples have heard from their own kūpuna and what is now published, with accompanying “evidence” in these preferred arenas. This attempted separation of a colonized people from their own understandings of who they are has a long and devastating history in Hawai‘i. Noenoe Silva has asked, “How do a people come to know who they are? How do a people recover from the violence done to their past by the linguicide that accompanies colonialism?” With Indigenous efforts to de-colonize history and include Native voice have come these new efforts at silencing through discrediting. This is a strategy often employed by those who support the exclusionary historiography as resistance to the demands for voice by Native peoples rises and begins to gain its place. These efforts at discrediting are undoubtedly a direct reaction to the promising and powerful effects of the growth of institutions like Hawai‘inui‘alea School of Hawaiian Knowledge at the University of Hawai‘i, Mānoa, Ka Haka ‘Ula O Ke‘elikōlani College of Hawaiian Language U.H. Hilo and others who are actively giving

---

147 Although I do not wish to lump together an entire field, one of my favorite analogies by Dr. Trask comes from a classroom discussion of Oct. 2001, that arose from a published article by her on Anthropology. She mentioned first that an Anthropologist without Natives is like a Entomologist without bugs and then went on to explain that Anthropologists can be so intent on process, that if they found a bug that talked, they would analyze how it talked, what places it talked in, what they believed it represented when it talked and whether it bowed its head when it talked...instead of listening to what the damn bug had to say!

148 Silva, 3.
platform to Kānaka Maoli voices of the past and present, and are now able to reach
several thousand university students each semester.

Dr. Haunani-Kay Trask wrote in response to an earlier attack on Indigenous
attempts at self-identity that Keesing and others seemed to be claiming “Natives are so
colonized so why bother reading them.”

Ironically, once the Native starts to de-
colonize and rely on Indigenous voices they are criticized as being political and merely
re-acting to colonization. It is a box that one can never climb out of. The admonition to
fore-go “politicized” voices is ultimately ironic considering the actively exclusive
historiography that has ruled the writing of history in Hawai‘i until recently. Missionary
accounts of events in which they had a very specific desired outcome were and still are
often used to speak about and even for Kānaka Maoli.

Some modern day historians seem eagerly at ease with speaking for long passed
Kānaka Maoli through extrapolation and reach. Often without source, emotions and
motivations are assigned to Hawaiians.

In Gavan Daws’ 2007 book on the history of Honolulu, he writes about the 1836
passing of the sacred chiefess Nāhi‘ena‘ena. There was much contestation between the
missionaries and traditional chiefs for the soul of this very important woman and she
seemed to move back and forth between the two camps. Being of extremely high
genealogy, and sister to the reigning monarch Kauikeaouli, she would be an extremely
prized convert for the mission and example to other Kānaka Maoli. Daws writes of her
passing; “She died late in 1836, obese, debauched, diseased and guilt-stricken [emphasis

---

(1991), 111-117.
added]... He allows himself, without any diary, note, letter or other primary source material from the woman herself to write of supposed feelings that this princess of nearly two hundred years ago held. There exists unpublished Hawaiian-language mele by and about the princess. More generally, scholars are spending time in the Hawaiian-language archives reading the materials, gaining important contextual understandings of the time period. These materials may help lend critical insights to the related undertakings of the people and also the latent kaona (hidden meaning) of some of these materials. Neither these materials, nor the researchers working in this important Hawaiian-language archive are consulted, but rather very involved haole missionary voices are unquestioningly accepted for historiographical purposes. Daws gives Nāhiʻenaʻena’s inner feelings voice based solely on the writings of her missionary teachers and supporters. These same teachers, in an effort to spur conversions, did in fact later write about her death by proposing to use the tragic event, as a warning sign to other Hawaiians. As the King and the nation mourned the tragic early death of this sacred princess, Gerrit P. Judd wrote of her death “all who imitate her example whether in the church or out ought to know that it will prepare them for eternal burnings.”151 Although the mission had excommunicated the princess, and she had blatantly and powerfully defied her new teachers by joining in a sacred nāʻauipo union with her brother [seeking to find a traditional answer to the devastating problems that were facing the kingdom], she is portrayed by the mission, and later Daws, as wracked by guilt for her actions. These “true” feelings of Nāhiʻenaʻena are

---


used in presentations, museum interpretations, books and other historiographic forums. Such words, and other similar outsider testimony, are used as the primary resources in reconstructing the lives of earlier Kānaka Maoli, while the Hawaiian-language materials, chants and other writings from Hawaiians, that do exist, have been mostly ignored.

Daws wrote the most widely read history of Hawai‘i today, Shoal of Time, and holds an even greater power of acceptance because of his seemingly “unbiased” research. He not only writes of what he sees as Kānaka Maoli mistakes, but also often harshly criticizes missionary endeavors. His readiness to attack haole power grants him credibility. In a review of Daws’ history, Native scholar Jonathan Osorio explains that while he seemed sympathetic to Native culture, Daws lacked the ability to understand this same culture.\textsuperscript{152} I agree and argue that a significance is that his failure to understand, greatly stems from his lack of ability to access Hawaiian-language testimony. This deficiency demands that he rely on a past process that often assigned meaning and representation from an outsider epistemology that was in many ways fundamentally different than the Kānaka Maoli culture that it sought to analyze. As David Hanlon writes in discussing attempts by historian James Davidson to create a more inclusive Pacific Islands history,

The emergence of Pacific or Pacific Islands history as a specialty of academic historical discourse evidenced the limits of liberalism in a post-World War II climate. Despite its humanistic inclinations, Pacific Islander history as it evolved from Davidson through his students at the Australian National University remained largely the province of Europeans writing about and for Islanders. The paternalistic bias of doing a history of others or helping them to do a history of themselves seemed not to matter. Davidson’s brand of Pacific history thus retained a

colonizing quality about it; its liberal gesture was to include Oceanic peoples in a form of historical expression that continued to render island pasts in terms of the conventions and values of European history. Replacing overtly imperial or colonial history with a more liberally inclined history that still relied heavily on alien forms and criteria to order the past remained, in a sense, no less colonialist.\textsuperscript{153}

Daws' and other historians on Hawai‘i, who continue to write histories of this place that ignore the voice of a people written in their Native tongue are no doubt, whether well-intentioned or not, still relying heavily on "alien forms and criteria to order the past." While Daws' writing could be seen as an attempt to "personalize" and open up a past imperial historiography that dealt with Native Hawaiians, \textit{Shoal of Time} and \textit{Honolulu} continued the exclusionary historiography through a flawed and paternalistic methodology. As this paper argues, the question is not of what is written but rather of how. It is a question of historiography, of process. First English-language sources are preferred by writers like Daws, and then writers like Daws are preferred over "tainted" Native writers.

\section*{History and Power: A Chosen Narrator}

Why characterize Whitney’s article as privileged voice? What does the contested historiographical terrain look like? A broad look at not only the construction, but more decidedly the consumption of historical narrative in Hawai‘i reveals a very concentrated but sometimes excluded Kānaka Maoli presence. The place of consumption of historical

\textsuperscript{153} David Hanlon, "Beyond the English Method of Tatooing": Decentering the Practise of History in Oceania," \textit{The Contemporary Pacific} 15, no. 1 (Spring 2003): 23.
material for the average person is a television newscast, films, a newspaper column, a magazine article or often a guided tour with some bit of cultural history included. As pointed out, material like Honolulu magazine can be very much considered archived history. These points of person / history interaction have often been undervalued as mere “pop culture history.” Academia has sometimes been satisfied with “knowing the truth” and having the capacity to deliver it to those who “really care about knowing.” We in academia are however, in a unique position. The great majority of the public has not read the latest published research on Kānaka Maoli resistance or an analysis of Hawaiian-language materials. Nor, to be honest, does the majority of the public read what we publish in the form of books or journal articles.

One of the reasons why Whitney’s article is an example of privileged position is because of the composition of audience. The general public, often lacking the time or even desire to research broad ranges of issues, rely on selected “authorities” to deliver to them seemingly unbiased histories. The aforementioned attacks on Native histories, popular and academic, as “emotional,” “political,” or “incompetent,” work to leave the discursive landscape open to those with the supposed competence to evaluate history. Writers like Whitney, who holds a Masters degree from the University of Hawai‘i in Pacific Island Studies, and Daws, who was granted the first Ph.D. in Pacific History from the same institution, possess the same academic credentials as the Kānaka Maoli scholars but seemingly lack the bias supposedly inherent in kānaka writings.

Forums like Honolulu magazine further this façade of competent yet unbiased writing through the marketing of their work. The magazine places itself in a strata defined by its readership, saying that it writes for “Hawai‘i’s best educated and most
affluent residents, as well as its most sophisticated visitors.” The magazine goes on to say “Each month the magazine takes an unblinking look at contemporary issues. Honolulu writes stories that matter - and stories that celebrate the unique culture, heritage and lifestyle of the Islands. It’s the only magazine in Hawai‘i that does both.”

Despite these assertions, some in the academic world view these “popular histories” as a separate realm that does not often warrant their attention. It is a mistake of academia to under-estimate power, lifespan, and resiliency of what is often thought of as popular writing. The work of the magazine, and others like it however, is important to not only examine but to engage. The work of these publications, already spoken of as more popular, perpetuates a historiographical model that has denied the existence of and then diminished the validity of an archive of Hawaiian-language Kānaka Maoli voice.

Academia has most often valued and focused on the production side of historical material without a true analysis of the inter-dependant consumption side. Consumption of historical product, and even many times production, is often much more widespread outside of typical academia. A “popular” history of Hawai‘i found in such diverse places as in-flight airline magazines, museum tour pamphlets, weekly local newspapers, television newscasts and Hollywood feature films is much more “consumed” than the academic work that may more prolifically contain Native voices. As Michel-Rolph Trouillet mentions, “...a tourist guide, a museum tour...can perform as much an archival role as the Library of Congress.” He further mentions that academic historians are necessarily trained to neglect the very actor that text like magazine and newspapers are


155 Trouillet.
concerned with, the public. This speaks to the idea of a separation between academic research and public knowledge. That space of separation is where Honolulu magazine and other media can work to maintain dominance of the widespread discourse on certain issues. Where each is placed within that space can be relative to its acceptance in the discourse. U.H. Mānoa Media Ethics professor and Chairman of the Academy for Creative Media, Tom Brislin, has mentioned this particular magazine’s attempts to position itself as more academic and influential in the field of local magazines.

Honolulu magazine was originally Paradise of the Pacific, which was a magazine commissioned by King David Kalākaua in 1888 to be “Hawai‘i’s ambassador to the outside world.” In 1966 this magazine became Honolulu and changed focus to being a magazine “by and for the people of the islands.” This inclusive mantra would be rather ironic considering its efforts to woo the aforementioned “best educated and most affluent residents.”

The magazine seeks to position itself as an “intellectual” or “educated” look at issues in Hawai‘i rather than a simple entertainment magazine, thus becoming a preferred voice in the writing of history. A March 2006 blurb about the magazine from its parent company PacificBasin Communications describes it readership as “educated” and “affluent.” Its call to advertisers states,

HONOLULU is an award-winning, elegant, four-color, monthly magazine that reaches Hawai‘i’s savvy, affluent residents in their homes, as well as its most sophisticated visitors at select Waikiki Hotels. With more paid subscribers than any other magazine in the state with a paid circulation of more than 30,000 and a statewide readership of over 126,000, our readers

represent some of Hawaii's most active consumers.\textsuperscript{157}

These consumers of not only advertisements, but also historical voice, are described in the parent company's Subscriber Profile section. As of 2008, a full 56\% of its subscribers had a household income of greater than $100,000 a year and the average net worth was $1,105,400; more than 70\% were college graduates and nearly 35\% were members of a company's board of directors.\textsuperscript{158} This audience consists of many of the decision makers that affect not only the dissemination of discourse, but also the effects of that discourse from boardrooms to publishing houses to state legislatures. The magazine finishes by describing how this crowd has come to appreciate its "authoritative voice."

This claim to authority has been seconded by the industry within which the magazine operates. The magazine has received dozens of H.P.A. awards. These awards are described as "honoring outstanding achievements in Hawaii publications," and interestingly "...an independent panel of mainland publishing experts judge the contest."\textsuperscript{159} "Authoritative" voice seems to have migrated further and further from the subject source. More specifically, the writer of the "Inventing 'Ohana" article himself has been rewarded for his excellence in writing on Hawai'i. Just seven months after the article and retraction appeared, Mr. Whitney was promoted, and named editor of Pacific Magazine in April 2002. An April 1, 2002 news release described the move.


PacificBasin Communications, publisher of *Pacific* magazine, has named Scott Whitney as the magazine's editor. This is a new position, based in Honolulu, Hawaii. Whitney is a veteran writer and editor who most recently was associate editor of *Honolulu* magazine, another PacificBasin Communications monthly title. Floyd K. Takeuchi, President of Pacific Basin communications, said “Scott’s appointment is a major boost for *Pacific* Magazine. His in-depth writing in *Honolulu* magazine on the Bishop Museum and Native Hawaiian issues, among others, have had a huge impact in Hawaii [emphasis added]. He will bring that same discerning eye, along with his knowledge of the Pacific Islands, to his new role as editor of *Pacific* magazine.”

---

Back the Future: The Life of a “Mistake”

The aforementioned context of consumption speaks of more than 126,000 educated, affluent, active kama'āina readers. Added to this number are non-subscribers that purchased this issue at a newsstand, bookstore or other outlet. This larger group then undoubtedly spoke of such a controversial article to family, friends and at the proverbial company water cooler the next day. This crowd spoke to others and so on. Even though a retraction, much smaller in scope, was published in a later issue, Whitney’s opening of this Pandora’s box cannot be undone. Of the hundreds of thousands of readers of the article, how many also read the later retraction and made the connection? Of those that did, how many completely erased the thesis proposed from their understanding of the contested issue? Did all of the people who referenced the article when talking at work, at dinner or on the phone then go forward and find all the people that they had spoken to, gather them, and tell them that a mistake had been made and the revelatory truth they mentioned last month was actually backed up by now disproven facts? Tellingly, now

---

more than six years after the 2001 article and subsequent retraction, the untruth lives on
with new life. A January 2008 Google search for the term "word ohana" turns up as its
first listed find, a web-site, created by Kenneth Conklin, formatted to look like the on-line
encyclopedia, Wikipedia with a complete reproduction of the article, a discussion and a
re-iteration of the claims, minus mention or reproduction of the later printed retraction.

The web-site again claims,

The word "ohana" is only about 50 years old. The cultural concept it
names has been cobbled together from ancient customs that varied widely
from place to place. Today's concept was invented for political purposes.
"Ohana" is a buzzword, neither historically authentic nor descriptive of
current practices. An article published in Honolulu Magazine in 2001
shows that a very important word in modern Hawaiian language did not
exist until 1950 at the earliest, and became popular only in the 1970s. The
word "ohana" is today regarded as a core concept in Hawaiian culture.
But it is actually an example of cultural invention, or revisionism,
associated with the political movement that seeks to construct a Hawaiian
identity essentially from scratch, and quite different from ancient
practices.161

This 2008 article of nearly 5000 words not only reprints the disproven article,
sans mention of the retraction, but pontificates further on cultural issues ranging from
Hawaiian language to religion to politics. The site contains dozens of links to a massive
archive of writings from the author. While initial "academic" reactions to the site might
include a dismissal of the work, it is important to recognize its effect on popular histories

161 "The Word 'Ohana is a Modern Invention,"

The site does include a 2 line, incomplete note, recognizing that one person has found evidence of the word
'ohana in old Hawaiian-language newspapers. The note incorrectly proposes, as shown in this thesis, that
is was "quite possible" that the information was unavailable to the original writer. The note again ignores
the prolific and easily accessible information that any researcher would be able to find within minutes,
much less the responsibility of a magazine editor writing a critique of cultural issues outside of his own.
and understandings. As mentioned, the site is the absolute first link that appears when a search is done for material on the term “word ohana.” With the growing prevalence of internet-based research within not only popular realms but also academic sites, this material at the very least, represents a false argument. With the 2001 issues of Honolulu magazine not available on-line, Whitney’s retraction in relative effect, begins to fade with the disappearance of the hard-copy magazine while the original false article lives on and is accessed. I have personally experienced this process. As an instructor of Hawaiian Studies 107 at the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa, I have received, from undergraduate students, two separate research papers that sourced this specific article in papers dealing with Hawaiian language.

This is a story of power within discourse. A writer situated within the space that has been created to allow for “authoritative” voice was able to build from his own thesis and create an extremely poorly researched article that excluded a plethora of available Native-language sources. This false thesis was then published as important enlightenment to a naive public. The writer’s unfamiliarity with and reluctance to use the Hawaiian-language resource materials greatly contributed to his false thesis. This speaks to the current ease with which readily available Native sources can be excluded and ignored, and how that narrative can become accepted; its ripples continuing to reverberate around the lake that is our understanding of this place and its people.

Scott Whitney’s hypothesis, claimed as fact yet easily proven incorrect, admittedly so by him, was thrown into a popular and influential magazine with incredibly poor journalistic research. He neither fulfilled the most basic requirements of journalistic research, nor accessed the plethora of available knowledge and thought at hand not only...
in Hawaiian-language documents but among Hawaiian scholars within and without academia. But this "mistake" begs the further question asked by David Stannard in his discussion of the colonizer's poorly researched writings on Hawaiian issues, "...why is it so common for such work to be published enthusiastically by the most prestigious scholarly journals and presses so long as the people being described are not white?"

Why did the publishers of one of the most widely read magazines in Hawai‘i, with a readership in the hundreds of thousands, so easily overlook such poor journalistic research and publish an article of this type? A historiography, long tainted by early racist and imperial motivations, has yet to rid itself of its crippling past.

This example of recent historiography in Hawai‘i speaks to the earlier mentioned idea of nations as narrations. A people become understood through what is written about them. Its hegemonic power lies not necessarily in the character of the author, but more importantly in the framework he provides. The key aspect of the criticism is not so much personal, but rather structural. Terrance Wesley-Smith takes this idea further by writing; "The colonial nature of Pacific history lies not so much in the ethnicity of its authors or the particular emphases they impose, as in the larger narratives that frame and inform their work." Mr. Whitney's narrative is one built on a past historiography. It continues the colonial beliefs that look at Native histories as undoubtedly unsatisfactory, unacademic, and inherently political. The Native, taking charge of defining who she/he is, must be political as it threatens the colonizers ability to define. Mr. Whitney has brazenly

162 Several attempts to contact the author and his publisher for comment were unsuccessful.


stepped up to a pulpit kept warm by the ghosts of mid nineteenth-century missionaries. He has the audacity to attempt an analysis for the Native, many of them fluent speakers, of the cultural aspects of a language that he doesn't speak!

This process is built on supposedly long dead assumptions of inherent western intellectual superiority. There seems to be no ground immune from the blessings of analysis and interpretation by outsider enlightenment. Whitney seems to seek to fill any possible silent spaces in the discourse that might allow Native voices to be heard, for indigenous research and investigation can be very disruptive to colonial hegemonic discourses. If the Native is left to find for themselves who or what they are, the academic discussions might start to build bridges to long told oral stories concerning identity.
CHAPTER V

Other Voices: More Work Ahead

I have examined two stories, one nineteenth century and one modern day. But this work is not about a church fire, nor a lazily written false analysis of language. It is about the absurd implication that we are writing competently about a past while excluding the voices of that past’s central characters. Before, after and all around these two stories are a cacophony of voices that we haven’t listened to. This is the work that has yet to be done.

I want to just briefly open up a few of these stories here. So as to release a few more voices that might haunt others, like those that I’ve examined have haunted me.

Do Primary Sources Matter?

On January 14, 1893, Her Majesty Queen Lili‘uokalani was ready to promulgate a new constitution that had been demanded by her people. Members of foreign diplomatic corps, officers of the Kingdom Government, the justices of the Supreme Court and a committee from the patriotic group Hui Kalaiaina were in attendance. When most of the Queen’s cabinet ministers [under outside pressure] backed out of the plan to sign the new constitution, she was left unable to fulfill this desire. There was a crowd of thousands of her subjects on the lawn of the palace eagerly awaiting her declaration. The Queen went to the second floor veranda of ‘Iolani Palace and delivered a speech. She spoke to her people in their Native tongue, ‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i. A commonly known record of her speech, delivered that morning of the 14th, appeared in the January 16th newspapers the Pacific
Commercial Advertiser and the Daily Bulletin. Her speech was on a Saturday, not a publication day, thus the two-day delay. What these publications printed however, was only an English translation of parts of her original speech. Ralph Kuykendall notes in Hawaiian Kingdom that

The queen spoke in Hawaiian. Chief Justice Judd heard her remarks in the Throne Room, and that evening wrote out from memory what she said, translated it into English, and this version of her speech was printed in the Pacific Commercial Advertiser, Jan 16, 1893, and with two deletions in the Daily Bulletin the same day. 165

So, what we know as Her Majesty’s speech of that morning is actually a “remembrance” of the speech by A.F. Judd, then partially translated. Significantly though, Kuykendall continues;

An extra issued by Ka Leo o ka Lahui the same day gave in Hawaiian what purported to be the text of the Queen’s speech to the people outside the palace...

John E. Bush, editor of the newspaper Ka Leo o ka Lahui had printed the Queen’s speech as an extra that was passed around to the crown as a bulletin. Since it was not part of the normal published Monday Jan. 16 paper, it is not found in the archived microfilm collection of Hawaiian-language newspapers. I have also unsuccessfully searched the collections of original papers held at the different archives on O‘ahu. Although I, and others, have been unable to locate this document, my research of Kuykendall’s notes held

165 Judd corroborates this story in his testimony at the hearings that are contained in the “Morgan Report.” 53rd U.S. Congress, Senate Report 227, 444.
at the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa’s Hamilton Library turned up information that led to an interesting mention of the document at the second U.S. investigation into events of the overthrow over annexation titled, *Hawaiian Islands: Report of the Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate, with Accompanying Testimony, and Executive Documents Transmitted to Congress from January 1, 1893, to March 10, 1894*; commonly referred to as the Morgan Report.

At these hearings the Rev. Roswell Randall Hoes, chaplain in the U.S. Navy, testifies that he has a document that is the Queen’s speech printed by *Ka Leo o ka Lahui* from January 16, 1893. When the chairman of the hearing asks if the document is in Hawaiian or English, Rev. Hoes replies “Hawaiian” and there is no further mention at this time. One of the men who has been noted as working closely with Senator Morgan during these hearings is present though, Lorrin Thurston. Thurston, the man who led the overthrow of the Queen in which the committee is investigating, provides a translation of the Queen’s speech for the official record.

An appendix of the report reads,

**Appendix:**

The following is the translation of the original poster referred to by Mr. Hoes in his statement. “I hereby certify that the foregoing is a correct translation of the accompanying extra issued by the *Ka Leo o ka Lahui*, a Honolulu newspaper, published in Honolulu, in the Hawaiian language, on Jan. 16, 1893.

Lorrin G. Thurston

---

This left historians with an official record of the Queen’s speech that was a translation done for the U.S. Congress by Lorrin Thurston, the leader of the oligarchy that had overthrown her. The other sources were the English-language press, which carried a remembrance from Albert F. Judd that had been translated. The Honolulu Advertiser and the Daily Bulletin actually carried slightly different “versions” of the speech. The Daily Bulletin of January 17th itself mentions discrepancies in the two newspaper versions by saying, “...her Royal organ prints an extra with her speech with more bitter [“less bitter” Ed. Bulletin] language than in the Advertiser.”

This story became a revealing example for me as I searched for the original Hawaiian-language text. Upon consulting a very prominent writer and publisher of material on Hawaiian history about this case, I was told that Lorrin Thurston was a respected lawyer and member of the community and that his translation would assuredly be correct. When I asked further whether as a historian writing about the event, this person would not be interested in seeing the primary source, I was told to be careful about going off on any wild conspiracy theories.

For me, that conversation solidified much of what this thesis is about. The fact that a long followed historiography that has ignored and excluded primary testimony in Hawaiian-language still clings to prominence even in the light of modern day awareness of the existence a massive Hawaiian-language archive. It is not a matter of whether there is discrepancy in the text but that as a historian in Hawai‘i you might not “bother” to even compare the two. To read what

---

Hawaiians had to say about their own history, in their own language, is today considered by some prominent people in our field to be chasing wild conspiracy theories.

Speaking in Tongues

This period provided yet another historical discrepancy based in language. Immediately following the Queen’s speech of Jan. 14, 1893 it is reported by the English-language press that William White, a Hawaiian legislator and supporter of the Queen, angry over the loss of the new constitution, demands that the crowd “go in and kill and bury them” referring to the Queen’s cabinet ministers. They had withdrawn their support for the new constitution and White was supposedly so angry that he uttered this murderous command. Lorrin Thurston however, reported that White demanded that the crowd “go in and kill and bury her” referring to the Queen herself. Did White, who spoke in Hawaiian, say “lakou” (them) or “iāia” (her), or neither (White said he was going to sue the papers for libel although I found no such court case). William White himself is portrayed throughout the published histories today as a conniving, unscrupulous character, although it is known that he was awarded the Knights Order of Kalākaua by Her Majesty Queen Liliʻuokalani for his work along with Joseph Nāwahī on the new constitution that she sought to promulgate. He was a very popular leader among Kanaka Maoli in Lāhainā and was writing to the Queen and others about covert issues surrounding her possible re-instatement. Would a review of Hawaiian-language material give an entirely new picture of this man in Hawaiian history? I believe strongly that we
have barely begun to gain a real picture of so many events in this narrative because we have barely begun to listen.
CHAPTER VI:
CONCLUSION

In their introduction to the recent review of Pacific histories entitled *Texts and Contexts*, Brij Lal and Doug Munro deliver a necessary admonition to eager historians of this generation by reminding us that, "no one methodology or theory holds the key to the riddle that is history. Older perspectives can still be useful, and today’s historical work will, in time, be displaced by others, even derided as the misguided expressions of a bygone era." They continue more specifically, "Still, it sometimes takes an effort to appreciate that the authors of our foundational texts worked in a world that thought and acted differently from the one in which we live today." Their reminder of the need for humility and context is heard and appreciated.

Yet history is far from being created in a vacuum. It is and has always been a tool both of colonization and de-colonization. In this struggle that is power and history, often these foundational texts built not only a corpus but a historiography that excluded native voice. An English-centered historiography, created in the past, has been carried forward by new preferred narrators. This continuation of a colonial historiography legitimately remains in the sites of many current day academics. Understanding and patience are often called for but how patient must the Indigenous "receiver" of history be? How understanding? How much time must pass in "process" until its o.k. to demand to hear Native voice? How contextual are false histories that work to displace Native rights and

---

maintain the occupation of a nation by denying recognition of Native sovereignty, identity and history? How understandable is it for historians of the 21st century to continue to define 19th century Kānaka thought through haole voices of that period?

This demand to hear Native voice is not a blanket indictment or erasure of past work. In the same book as Lal and Munro, Jonathan Osorio, in critiquing some of these earlier flawed histories, explains his admiration for the task to which some previous historians had committed themselves but continues that "I too refuse to depend on the histories as dependable interpretations of culture."169 I agree; the problem however is that many narrators do still depend on these text. Although Native voices are recently ascendant, it is still vital to critique the older historiography and demand change. The long-maintained exclusionary process contains inherent and self-sustaining deterrents to change that dismiss and trivialize alternate narratives. Understanding power/history relationships in an occupied country such as Hawai‘i, means that a challenge to an understood history, or more powerfully a historiography, is a challenge to power within the disputed territory. As Noenoe Silva writes, "...historiography is one of the most powerful discourses that justifies the continued occupation of Hawai‘i by the United States today."170 A long followed historiography that has ignored and excluded primary testimony in Hawaiian-language still clings to usage, even as awareness of the existence and pertinence of the material comes to light. While numerous academics are currently writing from and about the Hawaiian-language archive, the current day continued

---


170 Silva, 9.
ignorance\textsuperscript{171} and dismissal\textsuperscript{172} of the archive, along with ongoing power/history discourse issues, means that there is much to be done.

I am reminded of Linda Tuhiwai Smith's account of yet another historical conference laden with the reassuring talk of post-colonialism and its effects on the field. She quotes Aborigine Activist Bobbi Sykes, who dared to ask, "What? Post-colonialism? Have they left?"\textsuperscript{173} Although I assume his question to be possibly literal, mine is more metaphoric. Has this type of history been removed? Have these colonial discourses left? Have writers stopped their inherent preferencing of haole voices over Native? Have we arrived at a time when a call for more Hawaiian voices in publishing, writing and teaching is seen as historiographic and not merely unabashed political activism? The "colonizer," embodied in a historians toolbox void of Indigenous methodologies and languages, still remains prevalent.

I believe this "colonial" historiography to be very existent in modern day academia and prevalent in sites of popular history. I also believe it is a mistake of academia to dismiss the latter field. Much has been written about modern "sites of historical production" and any academic who begins to fall prey to an over-inflated sense of place, need merely check the latest amazon.com sales figures of her/his book against those from the numerous popular histories published by "the less qualified." Yet, I do very much see academic writing as a central tool to unlocking the gates of exclusionary

\textsuperscript{171} In a recent [Sept. 2007] presentation to a group of college-bound students on O'ahu, when asked who had heard of the existence of the Hawaiian-language newspaper archive, 4 of the 37 students claimed they had.

\textsuperscript{172} The author has experienced several conversations with colleagues, some within related fields where the relevance of the newspaper archive has been diminished or dismissed.

work. But I call on the field to also engage more with those that write the magazine articles, the pamphlets, the museum tours and the movie scripts; answer back to those that give problematic museum tours and tourism hikes. There is a problem within academia if we believe that it is enough that “we now know the truth”. I was oft reminded in my studies at the Kamakakūokalani Center for Hawaiian Studies that knowledge given is a gift that carries much kuleana. It is not something intended only to develop an individual, but instead is a tool to enrich a Nation.

In Hawai‘i, for the nearly two thousand years of the ‘Ōiwi wale,174 Kānaka Maoli passed histories. Others came and claimed the right to tell the stories, name the wahi pana, and interpret events. They claimed that they were more equipped to do these things and that therefore their narratives were true. But Kānaka Maoli never quit telling stories. When a new and powerful form of storytelling arrived, literacy, they mastered that. When newspaper technology appeared and was a proficient way of getting stories heard, they started their own papers, and they told their stories. When their Native language was removed from the school system, Kānaka Maoli would later write their stories in English.

Ngūgĩ Wa Thiongo has described the removal of a people from their Native language as the first and most important step in colonization. The break from Hawaiian language meant that later historians, unable to speak Hawaiian, would leave this tremendous archive of Kānaka Maoli storytelling behind. In speaking of earlier published songs, poems and stories within the Hawaiian-language newspapers, Noenoe Silva writes, “People made use of these forms, and they created and maintained their national
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174 I borrow this term, coined by Kānaka Maoli scholar and historian Kanalu Young, to signify the era in Hawai‘i prior to contact in which there was an exclusively indigenous influence. Young explains that this term highlights the existence of thought and epistomologies prior to Capt. Cook and does not privilege the point of contact.
solidarity through publication of these and more overtly political essays in newspapers. 

There is no access to this body of thought except through the Hawaiian language

[emphasis added]."175 But this didn’t seem to be a problem for those who now were writing history. When later historians documented Hawai‘i through haole voices, they were lauded as “thorough” and “expert” and were named things like “the world’s foremost authority on Hawaiian History.”176

But Kānaka Maoli never “lost” their history. There was no wasteland of missing history, no empty archive. It was where it was supposed to be, it was in the past, I ka wā mamua, ka wā mahope. Knowledge was not as Gavan Daws has written, “intractable.”177 The kūpuna left us one of the most amazing records of knowledge I have ever seen.

Maybe we just weren’t ready. Maybe we weren’t smart enough. My “Aunty” from Moloka‘i reminds me often when I’m in the thick of my research, “Things will come to you when there supposed to.” Maybe that’s what’s happening. Maybe they’re speaking now. People like Ester Mo‘okini, Helen Chapin and others laid the groundwork. The authors previously mentioned in this work along with others such as Leilani Basham, Noelani Arista, Laiana Wong, Kekeha Solis, Sam Warner, Amy Stillman, Ku‘ualoha Ho‘omanawanui, Joan Hori and many others are all giving platform to what the kūpuna wrote, the stories they are still telling. Speaking for myself, its not “my work,” its a passive process. I’m anxious to hear what’s coming. I’m excited when I see an entire K-

175 Silva, 9.

176 On the dust jacket of Ralph S. Kuykendall and A. Grove Day’s 1948 book Hawai‘i a History, Kuykendall is referred to as “the world’s foremost authority on Hawaiian history.”

177 Pu‘akea Nogelmeier calls Daws to task on his defense of his omission of Hawaiian-language sources when Daws claimed “...sources on the life of the native community are all but intractable. The Hawaiians were not in the habit of explaining themselves in written form (this despite widespread literacy and the existence of a native-press)”. Nogelmeier, 73.
12 school, filled with Hawaiian-language speakers when I think of the voices, the stories they will bring us. There’s a crack in the dam wall, soon the floodgates will open. I can’t even imagine.
APPENDIX A1:

Newspaper article describing the first royal funeral for Princess Nāhi‘ena‘ena in *Ke Kumu Hawai‘i*, February 15, 1837.

**KE KUMU HAWAII**  
Wednesday, February 15, 1837.

**NO KA HOOLEWA ANA.**

Ua hoolewa o Harieta Nahienaena i ka la o 4 o Feb. i ka makahiki oka Haku 1837. Mai uka mai o ka hale Uluhe a hiki i ka Luakini. Ua hoonohoia na mea a pau i hele pu i ua huakahi hoolewa la.178

**THE HAWAIIAN TEACHER**  
Wednesday, February 15, 1837.

**THE FUNERAL PROCESSION.**

The funeral procession for Harieta Nāhi‘ena‘ena was on the fourth of February in the year of our Lord 1837. It traveled from Hale Uluhe [house of Kauikeaouli] to the Church [Kawaiaha‘o]. Everything for the procession had been arranged ahead of time.

This 1837 announcement of the funeral for the sacred princess and sister to the Mō‘ī, Nāhi‘ena‘ena not only provides vital historic information about a little known first funeral for the princess (she was later famously buried at Moku‘ula in Lāhainā), but it also contradicts an account in a popular English-language newspaper on the procession order of the funeral. The English-language *Sandwich Island Gazette* contained a diagram with missionaries leading the funeral procession and kāhuna nowhere amongst those

---
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involved. The diagram in Ke Kumu Hawaii however, specifically has the missionaries as third in the procession, fronted by “na Kahuna Lapauu” (priests/healers), and “kekahi poe Koa” (warriors). A look at only the English-language source would omit an important variant account.

Fig. 4 Ke Kumu Feb. 1837

Fig. 5 Hawaiian Gazette Feb. 1837
APPENDIX A2:

Newspaper article describing an inter-collegiate debate in the United States with the topic being the proposed United States annexation of Hawai‘i in Nupepa Ka ‘Ola’i‘o Mei 18, 1894.

Nupepa Ka Ola‘io.
Poalima, Mei 18, 1894.

AOLE HOOHUI IA HAWAII
Ka Paio Lanakila a ke Kulanui o Georgetown Maluna o ke Kulanui o Columbia.

KE KUMU PAIO
"E hooholola. E hoohuila ke Aupuni o Amerika me na Paemoku o Hawaii."

HE HOAILONA KEIA
E ka labui Hawaii; ke olelo nei makou; e like me ka hana ana a na kula o Kaleponi i pono ai no keia ninau o Hawaii, a hoole lakou mamua; ma hope mai koho ka Ahaoelelo Makaainana o Amerika e apo no ana i ko Cleveland hoole i ke kuikahi hooi aina; pela no ke koho ana ma keia ninau ma ka Aha Senate maho o ka apono ia ana o ke kula o Georgetown.179

Newspaper of the Truth.
Friday, May 18, 1894.

NO TO ANNEXATION OF HAWAII
The Debate Victory of the University of Georgetown over the college of Columbia.

THE DEBATE TOPIC
"Resolved. That the Islands of Hawaii shall be annexed by the United States."

THIS IS A SIGN
To you Hawaiian Nation, We are saying this; like the decision of the Colleges of California that debated this question of Hawaii, and denied it first; after the choice of the House of Representatives of America to embrace Cleveland’s denial of the annexation; That’s the choice that the

Senate should make following after the correct decision of the University of Georgetown.

This article in the Hawaiian-language newspaper *Ka ‘Oia‘i‘o* alerted readers to collegiate debates that were taking place in America over the proposed annexation of Hawai‘i to the United States. This article is an example of the access to current news that these papers offered. It offers historians a glimpse at the fact that the question of annexation was being fiercely debated at colleges in the United States and also leads researchers to what were some of the best-developed academic arguments for and against annexation at the time.
APPENDIX B1:

Letter from Ka‘ahumanu IV (Victoria Kamāmalu) to ‘Iolani (Kamehameha IV).
MS KC Letters in Hawaiian 152 B.P.B.M.

Honolulu
13th January 1855

I Ka Moi
Kamehameha IV

Aloha oe

Ua loa mai iau kau palapala, e hai mai ana, ua koho mai oe iau e noho ma Ke Ano, a e hana hoi i ka hana a kou Kuhina Nui- E kauoha mai ana hoi iau e [ ] koke au i mau kanaka kupono, e noho i mau kūlina nou. Elike me kau kaauoha; ke hoopuka aku nei au ia oe i ka inoa o kaʻu mau kanaka i manaʻo ai he kupono e noho i mau kuhina nou. penei-

Keoni Ana i Kuhina Kalaiaina
R.C. Wyllie i Kuhina o Ko na Ania E
E.H. Allen i Kuhina Waiwai
R. Armstrong i Kuhina Ao palapala

Owau no me ka Mahalo
Kaahumanu

To the King
Kamehameha IV

Aloha to you

I received your document, declaring your choice of me as the one to do the work as your Kūhina Nui-You have instructed me to choose the correct men to sit in these other positions. As per your order to me, I am putting down the names for you of those people that are the right ones I think to be ministers. Thus-

Keoni Ana at Minister of Interior
R.C. Wyllie at Minister of Foreign Affairs
E.H. Allen at Minister of Finance
R. Armstrong at Minister of Education

---

180 Kaahumanu IV to Kamehameha IV, Januari 13, 1855, Kapi‘olani-Kalanianaʻole Collection, MSKC Letters in Hawaiian 152, B.P.B.M. Archives, Honolulu, HI.
This letter of Ka'ahumanu IV to Alexander Liholiho, reveals her role as Kūhina Nui at the time and the role of that position in the choosing of other ministers. It reveals her use of the positional name Ka'ahumanu and speaks to her role as a woman. It is historically significant to several related fields.
APPENDIX B2:

Letter from Charles Kana‘ina to King Kamehameha III and Kuhina Nui Keoni Ana. MS KC 4.58 B.P.B.M.

Na
H.H.M. Kamehameha III
Aloha oe
A me ka Mea Kiekie
Keoni Ana
Ke Kuhina Nui

Aloha maikai olua
Owau o C. Kanaina ka hoolina o ka poe i halau e aku. 1. Nahienaena 2. Hoapilikane. 3. Hoapiliwahine. 4. Kekauluohi. Owau ka 5 o ka hoolina iloko o keia waiwai. Ke hoopii aku nei au ia olua, no ka hooko ana o na Luna Hoona ou, ma ko [i]lannahina aoao, no kekahi pahale i pilili ko‘u mau elua mai.181

For
H.H.M. [His Hawaiian Majesty] Kamehameha III
Aloha to you
And the High
Keoni Ana
Kūhina Nui

Aloha to the two of you,

I am Charles Kana‘ina the heir of the people who have passed 1. Nāhī‘ena‘ena. 2. Hoapilikane. 3. Hoapiliwahine. 4. Kekauluohi. I am the fifth of the heirs to this resource. I am bringing this suit to you two, as you are the one to fulfill these rights, and the familiarity of you two to these things.

[this letter continues over four pages]
In this letter, written on paper that included the Royal Stamp, Charles Kana‘ina, father to William Charles Lunalilo, writes to King Kamehameha III and the Kūhina Nui, Keoni Ana, in regards to a land dispute. He opens with the declaration that he is the descending rights holder to the place of four incredibly important people and landholders in the kingdom. He continues with the explanation that while his parents did indeed “give” the land to this other person, it was given with the understanding that it was his to use as long as he did not welcome haole to the land. He did so and the land was taken from him.

This letter spells out important claims by a central figure in Hawaiian history and also sets the stage for a discussion of several incredibly important issues. The author writes regarding land rights, genealogy, Kingdom law and others important issues that have been written about by modern-day historians. This letter also brings to the front important issues surrounding language. What did it mean in this case at this time to “give” land. It spotlights issues of resistance to haole ownership of land. This primary source document, like so many of the others in the collection, is an important “voice” on these issues.
APPENDIX B3:

Letter of petition to the Mo‘i Alexander Liholiho (Kamehameha IV) from men who have been arrested for selling alcohol and are currently in prison.
MS KC Letters in Hawaiian. 2.6 B.P.B.M.

I ka Moi Lokomaikai Nui
Kamehameha
A ke Akua i hoonoho ai i Alii no ko Hawaii Paeaina iloko o kona Ahakuka Malu.
E mau loa
O na mea nona na inoa malalo, ke noi haahaa aku nei me ka hoike aku imua ou ka Moi Nui a ke Akua i hoonoho mai ai no kona lahuikanaka, no na mea e pili ana i kekahai o kou mau makaainana e noho ana iloko o ka Halepaahao o kou Aupuni, no ka haki ana i kekahai o kou mau Kanawai e pili ana i ka hoomahlu ana i na hewa, i mea e hookuuia mai ai lakou no na hoopai ana no ia hewa, ina nae he pono ia i ko ke Alii manao ana.

I ka malama o Julai M.H. 1861, Ua hoopiia o Malaihi, Kalaaaukane, a me Elia, no ke kuai Rama me ka palapala ae ole, mamuli o ka Pauku 10, Haawina II, Mokuna II, Apana I, o ke "Kanawai hoonohonoho i na hana i haawiia i na Kuhina o ko Hawaii Paeaina” ma ka aoa a 269 o na Kanawai Kivila, a na hookolokolo imua o kou Aha hookolokolo Kiekie ma Ka Banco, a na hooholo ua Aha la, e uku lakou pakahi i Elima Haneri Dala a me na Kolma he Umi Dala a keu aku, a i ole ke dala, e hana ma ka haina [oulea] a pau ka uku hoopai i oleloia.

...No keia hewa, ua hookomoia lakou iloko o ka Halepaahao e hana ma ka hana oolea, a ke hana nei lakou kokoke ewalu malama hana a hiki i keia la me ka manaio e hana a pau na makahiki i oleloia, ke ole ka Moi e hookuia ia lakou no keia hoopai ana no keia hewa ma kona noonoo maikai ana, a me kona Ahakuka Malu pu. Nolaila, ina ua manao ka Moi, ua maalii kona kanawai no na malama hema i hala ac nei, alaila, e hookuuia mai keia pae kanaka nona na inoa maluma.
E ola loa ka Moi i ke Akua!
Aia kakauia i keia la 25 o Aperila M.H. 1862

J.W. Aumai
Jno. L. Nailili
J.B. Kelikanakaole
G. Pasa

W.K. Kamakau
J. Kahai
T. Kamaka
S.R. Kaheelani\textsuperscript{182}

\textsuperscript{182} J.W. Aumai \textit{et al.} to Kamehameha, Aperila 25, 1862, Kap‘olani-Kalaniana‘ole Collection, MS KC Letters in Hawaiian 2.6. B.P.B.M. Archives, Honolulu, HI.
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To the Most Benevolent King

Kamehameha

He who reigns by the power of God in the highest court
Long life to you
The names below, humbly request to exhibit before the most high King
whom God has placed to reign over his people, the things pertaining to a
certain of your people that reside in the jail of your government, for
breaking certain of your laws about protecting us from wrongs, if perhaps
it is for you to decide if this is a just thing in your thinking.
In the month of July in the year 1861, Malaihi, Kalaaukane and Elia were
convicted of selling Rum without a license, according to section 10,
article II, Chapter II Part I of the “Arranged laws given by the Kūhina of
the Hawaiian Islands” on page 269 of the civil code, to be tried in court
before the Supreme Court en banc, to each pay five hundred dollars and
extra fines of ten dollars, and if they don't have the money they all can
work to pay off the fine.
...for this crime, they must enter prison and work at hard labor for six
years, and they have been working eight months till now with the thought
of completing all the years declared. The King may decrease the amount
of time for these men as he sees fit.
Therefore, if the King thinks, the law will be eased to help the passing of
this and support these men named below.
Long live the King through God!

Written this day 25 April 1862.

J.W. Aurnai        W.K. Kamakau
Jno. L. Nailili     J. Kahai
J.B. Keliikanakaole T. Kamaka
G. Pasa            S.R. Kaheelani

This letter is a primary source document whose topic is the morality laws that were
proliferating in the Kingdom and their affect on Kānaka Maoli. These men who have
been convicted of selling rum without a license and are unable to pay the severe fine, are
serving six years at hard labor in prison. They are petitioning against this punishment.
They address the Moʻī himself in their plea as he has the power to adjust the sentence.
This letter, and many others in the collection, speak to very relevant topics of historical
importance.
APPENDIX B4:

Letter from Mary Kainaloa to Mrs. Jane Clark with included list of new member of Hui Aloha ‘Āina o Na Wahine o Hilo. MS HC 3.5 Letters in Hawaiian. B.P.B.M.

Mrs. Jane Clark
Hope Kakauolelo i ka Hui A.A. o ka A.H.K. o na Wahine o Honolulu Oahu-

Aloha oe;
UA loaa mai iau ka hauoli nui ma ke kauoha a ka makou halawai Hui A.A. a na Wahine o Hilo nei e hoouma ku ia oe i na inoa o keia poe hou i kona pu mai me kaku i loko o ka pulli aloha ana no ka Aina hanau no ka Lahui Aloha a me ke Aupuni Kumu o na Kupuna Alii o Kakou i hala. Me ka manaolana ahonuij e hoiihou hou ia mai ana no i ko ke Akua ma hou. Eia na inoa hou i komo mai i Mau lala no ka H.A.A. o na Wahine o Hilo nei.

Waiakea
Miss Kaleimomi Kealoha
Awapuhi
Kalepolepo
Mrs. Kahani Hulihee
Kukuau
Miss Lilia West
Annie Aluna
Ponahawai
Mrs. Grace Kalili
Miss Emeline Brown
Helen Kaina
Punahou
Miss Emma Akamu

Hannah
Mrs. Malo
Pueo
Mrs. Hoopii Poo
Becky
Haaheo
Mrs. Mohihio
Kamalau
Miss Kalua Lalakea
Kini
Loke
Maria
Mrs. Moses Lalakea

Mrs. Jane Clark
Assistant Secretary Hui Aloha ‘Āina of Honolulu, O‘ahu Women

Aloha to you,

183 Mary Kainaloa to Mrs. Jane Clark, undated, Henriques Collection, MS HC Letters in Hawaiian 3.5, B.P.B.M. Archives, Honolulu HI.
It is with great joy I send to you from the Women's Hui Aloha ʻĀina of Hilo meeting the names of the new people who have entered with us into the group that loves the land of our birth and the beloved Nation and the government founded by the kūpuna who have passed. With the wishes to return again by the grace of God. Here are the new names that entered the branch of Hui Aloha ʻĀina Women of Hilo.

This very important historical document lists the names of women joining one of the most significant political organizations in Hawaiian history. The letter deals with the patriotic association, Hui Aloha ʻĀina, their organizing efforts and membership. This collection possesses important information on how the groups and individuals interacted, rare Hawaiian-language terms, and again, contextual details that help give insight to the archive and its authors.
APPENDIX B5:
Letter from G.W. Pilipo to Her Highness Kaleleonalani (Queen Emma) MS HC Box 3.5.40 B.P.B.M.

Kawaihae Kohala Hema
Sept 28, 1883

I ka Hiwahiwa a Hawaii
Kaleleonalani

Aloha nui
Inehinei no ka'u hiki ana mai a i keia kakahiaka au e hele ai no ka'u
huakai i Hamakua. Ke lohe nei au ia John S. eia i uka i Waimea ke ili
Kukailimoku i J Paka ma, a e hui aku ana paha me ia ilaila. Piha olelo
hoihoi o John S. lana me Wahine nui no na hoopaapaa Kuanhau Alii
ma na Nupepa...
Aloha, Kau kauwa [hooloho]
G.W. Pilipo¹⁸⁴

Kawaihae South Kohala
Sept. 28, 1883

To the Beloved one of Hawaii
Kaleleonalani

Much Aloha
Yesterday upon my arriving in the morning I went on my journey to
Hamakua. I was listening to John S. and at this place, upland of Waimea
we met up with John Parker guys. Very interesting the talk of John S. and
his wahine about the ali'i genealogies that had been published in the
newspapers...
Aloha, Your servant
G.W. Pilipo

G.W. Pilipo, a Hawaiian-language newspaper editor, is writing in this letter to
Queen Emma and speaking of the arguments and “mistakes” made over her genealogy by

¹⁸⁴ G.W. Pilipo to Kaleleonalani, Sepa 28, 1883, Henriques Collection MS HC Box 3.5.40 B.P.B.M.
Archives, Honolulu, HI.
some in the papers. This was a crucial issue that affected not only the social and political events of the day but also would be pertinent to issues of land cases and inheritance.
APPENDIX B6:


Kapalama January 23, 1897

Aloha oe a nui loa; -
Ua loaa mai kau leta iho i ka maikai o ko kalani ola kino, o ka mea nui noia a ka leo pule o ke kanaka e uono mau aku nei i ka paepae kapu o ka mea mana loa. A he mea hoohauoli mau ia i ka mana o kou Lahui holoookoa e noho aku neime ke Aloha oiaio iloko o ko lakou puuwaai e hoona ku wale ana no ka loaa mau mai ona lono no ko Kalani ola kino, a me kana huakai. Ike ihola i ka mea nui a ka Haku e kakali hoomanawanui maila i ka annanu Bosetonia. He oia mau ke onipaa o ka Lahui mai ka Keli‘i haalele ana iho, a ke kau moa aku nei ko lakou mau tini ano nui a pau maluna o ka “Huakal Alii”. Oiaia, ua hawawa loa ka poe nana e paa maila ke Aupuni. A noila ila, ke hopu mai nei I ka ia he Alamihi. E pono e hopuhopu hou ia na poe Aloha Aina, malaila ua ike no kahi o lakou ina mea pili I ke kumuhana a ka Moiwahine e hele ala. O Dole a me Kinney na mea kue loa...A ma na lono oiaio loa I loaa mai ia‘u eia ke ake loa mai nei. a ke hoao nei lakou e hana I kekahi mau hana malu loa e hoowalewale ai i kahi Alakai o ka Lahui e punihei aku I ka lakou mau hana pahele. Mea mai nei o Kaulia, ua hele ka kekahi poe e ninau ia Kaaka noia mea, Aeia oleloia mai ka e ia, Hiki no ke hana ia ina ua Makemake oukou e hana pela, Aole nae nonei Manawa oia a hiki mai I ko Makinole Manawa. Pakiki nonae kekahi poe e hana koke ia no I nei wa.185

[aole pau]

Kapalama January 23rd, 1897

Much Aloha to you
I received the letter concerning your Majesty’s good health. This is the main thing that the people call out in prayer for at the sacred places. This is a thing that brings constant joy to the hearts of your entire Nation, their regular hearing of Her Majesty’s well health on the journey. It is understood how important this thing is that is the reason Your Majesty waits in the cold of Boston. The people [your Nation] have remained

185 Emma Nāwahī to Her Majesty Queen Lili‘uokalani, January 23, 1897, Lili‘uokalani Manuscript Collection, M-93, Hawai‘i State Archives.
steadfast since Your Majesty has left and all of their unceasing desires are placed upon the “Royal Journey.”
The people who are strong with the government are very foolish. Therefore, the sea creatures that are mostly being caught are Alamihi.
It will come to pass that they again arrest the Aloha ‘Āina people because perhaps they think these people might know the doings of Her Majesty on the trip. Dole and Kinney were very opposed. According to the truthful sayings I’ve heard, their desire is to enact some secret plans to lead astray many of the leaders of the people and catch them in their traps.
According to Kaulia certain people went to Ka’aka to ask him about this matter. He said it could be done at this time, if you all wish it can be delayed until the time of McKinnley. Some people are difficult and want to act now.

[Not completed here. This letter is twelve pages long and continues to discuss, both openly and in many cases with much discretion, many of the people involved in the political maneuvers going on while the Queen was away. She mentions secret plans and gives the Queen names of people who are acting for and against her.]

This is one of forty-five letters written by Mrs. Emma ‘Aima Nawahī to her beloved Queen, Lili‘uokalani. Mrs. Nawahī was a close personal friend of the Queen and during this time period, 1897-1901, served as both an informant for the Queen, keeping her appraised of political maneuverings back at home, and also as a liaison between the Queen and her people. This entire series of letters is filled with material, often couched in metaphor and hidden meaning. The letters also reveal much about how Mrs. Nawahī and others like her felt about their sovereign. She opens most of the letters with praise, love and admiration for the Queen. This resource strongly speaks back to a plethora of English-language newspaper stories that were inaccurately portraying the Hawaiian people’s relationship to their monarch.
APPENDIX B7:

Letter from Lieut. William Haskins Kealakai to Hon. Sam Nowlein (Captain of the Queen’s Royal Guard). Jan. 11, 1894. M-93

note: This document is contained in a portion of the Lili‘uokalani Collection, held at the Hawai‘i State Archives, that contains materials that were seized from the personal safe of Her Majesty Queen Lili‘uokalani just after her arrest in January of 1895 by so-called “Republic of Hawai‘i.”

Ia Hon. Sam Nowlein
Aloha oe:
E oluolu oe nana mai i ko makou mau kumu nui i waiho ai i ka hana, me kou makou pala inoa ka poe i waiho i ka Oihana Makai, a na kou hanohano ia e ahewa a pono paha. A ma ka oluolu pu o kou hanohano e waiho ae imua o ke Alii ka Moiwahine Liliuokalani ka makua o ka lehulehu.
['aʻole piha pono]
Mamua ae o ka hookahuli ia ana o kou noho aliʻi a me ke Aupuni, Aole loa makou i kuemi hope, a hohe wale, hopohopo hoī, a ma kaʻu wale; ua aa makou e hele imua a make a ola nou ko makou Moiwahine i aloha nui ia; ke aloha i ka aina a ko kakou ma kupuna i eha ai ka ili; a hiki i ka wa i loa mai ai he lono; ua oluolu i ka Moiwahine Liliuokalani ka waiho ana mai i ke Aupuni ma ka lima o ke aupuni P.G. me na kumu kue pu. Me ka mokumokuahua o ko makou mau puuwai i ke aloha i waiho aku ai makou i na mea kaua ma ka lima o ka poe o ke Aupuni P.G. Nolaila, aia maluna ou ko makou nana. Ina o ka pae mai o kou leo Aliʻi E hooko no makou.
Kakau inoa ia e makou,

Kealakai, W.H. Lieut. of 1st Iwaho
Kelliaa, D.H.
Kekipi, John Eli
Palau, John
Puakalehua, Jeo.
Peka, G.
Kalaukoa, J.H.
Pomaikai, Jno.
Kaliikane, M.K.
Kauahi, H.M.
Paakai, P.
Paia, John
Kaulukau, H. Alias Brow

Kahemalani
Keawehawail, John
Damian, Daniel
Moanaliha
Pahu, George Washington
Haluapo, Sam
Kahaleaahu, David
Leialoha
Kahoino, Sam K.
Mokuahi, Sam
Kaliikohe, John
C.K. Pa
Hiapo, Solomon K.
Me ka oiaio. Kau kauwa,
William Haskins Kealakai Jr. mau

To the Hon. Sam Nowlein  Jan. 11 1894
Aloha to you:
Please look at our reasons for this important thing placed before you with our list of names of the people who are Police Officers, and it is for your honor to decide if this is correct or not. And please your Honor place this before Queen Lili‘uokalani, the mother of the masses.

[a five-page letter follows which details the fact that these men have committed to refusing to work for the Republic, resigning their jobs and supporting the Queen.]

In the face of the overthrow of our ali‘i and the government we didn’t fall back or act cowardly, be worried and scared. We were brave enough to stand forward and were willing to lay down our lives for our beloved Queen whom we love so much. We loved the land of our ancestors. Until the time we got the news that Queen Lili‘uokalani had placed the government in the hands of the P.G. under protest. With great grief in our hearts we placed our weapons in the hands of the Provisional Government. Therefore, we are looking to you now. At the sound of your voice, we will do as you say.
Written by us,

[26 names as above]

Truthfully, Your servant,
William Haskins Kalahari Jr. mau

This incredible letter details to the Queen, through the Captain of her Royal Guard, how the twenty-six under-signed police officers have remained loyal to her by refusing to serve under the Provisional Government, and are giving up their jobs. This letter does much in terms of documenting resistance and is yet another piece of evidence that speaks back against a master narrative that had historically portrayed Kānaka Maoli as a weak

186 William Haskins Kealakai Jr. to Sam Nowlein, Jan. 11, 1894, Lili‘uokalani Manuscript Collection M-93, Hawaii State Archives, Honolulu, HI.
and "passive" people that had accepted their fate without a fight. The letter also gives insight into many other aspects of the period and its list of names would be an incredible source for anyone doing a history of the resistance of this period.
APPENDIX B8:

Letter from Rev. H. Manase (pastor in Wailuku, Maui) to Albert Francis Judd (Chief Justice of the Supreme Court)

May 18, 1893

I ka makamaka,
A.F. Judd.

Aloha oe.

O ka nubou mai Lahaina mai, ua kipaku ka Ekalesia o Lahaina no ka hui aina me America ma ka leta o Rev. A. Pali iau. aole paha e lohi na la, a lohe a ku oe, ma kipaku keia Ekalesia...

H. Manase 187

May 18, 1893

To my dear friend
A.F. Judd

The news from Lāhainā, the church of Lāhainā has expelled Rev. Pali over his support of annexation in the letter to you. Not long perhaps are the days until you hear of this church rising up and expelling me...

H. Manase

This letter, one of dozens within this category, between members and leadership of the H.E.A., speaks to the problems that the church was facing in Lāhainā, and the worries that this resistance would spread. This topic of resistance within churches is an under-developed research area and work on this important topic would require the reading of these direct Hawaiian-language correspondences between the major players involved.

187 H. Manase to A.F. Judd, May 18, 1893, “Judd Collection” MS Group 70, Box 23.2 B.P.B.M. Archives, Honolulu, HI.
APPENDIX C1:

Interview with Ku‘umi Kin In, Alfred Kalama Kahakua, and Mary Kawena Pukui. HAW 105.5.2 B.P.B.M. Archives

This interview, recorded in Hawaiian language in the basement of Na‘alehu School in Ka‘ū, Hawai‘i Island on 18 August 1960, contains discussions among these kūpuna about the reading of Hawaiian-language newspaper among Ka‘ū people in the late-nineteenth century. It also speaks of codes used within the Hawaiian language, Kumauna stone rituals, Kawa Iki and Kawa Nui, kōnane boards and going fishing. There are references throughout to legal, cultural and historic issues.

188 Kuumi Kin In, Alfred Kalama Kahakua, and Mary Kawena Pukui, interview by Mary Pukui, Ka‘u, Hawai‘i, August 18, 1960.
APPENDIX C2:

Interview with Jennie Kapahukulaokamamalu and Joann Kealiinohomoku. HAW 59.11.1-59.11.2-59.12.1-59.12.2 B.P.B.M. Archives

Jenny Wilson was a hula dancer who danced regularly for King David Kalākaua and these tapes contain discussions about various aspects of hula including body movements and public performances. They also include a discussion of the 50th birthday party for Kalākaua and the hula that was performed for this event. These tapes provide an incredible glimpse into a very historic and contested narrative. Much has been written about the resistance shown by King Kalākaua and that resistance has been interpreted in a number of different ways. These tapes are Native voice, in ‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i, speaking about these issues. They add much to the important research into these topics. The tapes were recorded in July of 1962 at Maluhia Hospital, Honolulu, HI.

---

189 Jennie Kapahukulaokamamalu and Joann Kealiinohomoku, interview by Mary Pukui, Honolulu, HI, July 1962.
APPENDIX C3:


On this tape of the show for 5 May 1972, Mr. Kimura talks with Abigail Kaleiheana about many historical topics. Mrs. Kalaiheana discusses her contacts with Kalākaua, the Kalaniana‘ole family, Prince Jonah Kūhiō and other ali‘i. The tape reveals much about ‘Iolani Palace and what it meant to serve the Royal Family. Many things such as place names, alternate names for ali‘i and other historical information can be gained from this tape.

APPENDIX C4:

Discussion between host Larry Kimura and Mrs. Mary Kaleikoa HV 24.17 11-28-1972. 63 minutes.

On this tape of the show for 11 November 1972, Mr. Kimura and Mrs. Kaleikoa discuss the Hawaiian monarchy, including events occurring during different periods of history and also the role of the monarchy in Hawaiian life. Mrs. Kaleikoa gives historic insight about significant aspects of Kalākaua’s reign. Geography of the Palace grounds along with the relationships between the families and friends that lived in the area are discussed.

190 Abigail Kaleiheana, interview by Larry Kimura, May 5, 1974. HV24.65a, Ka Leo Hawai‘i Radio Program Collection, U.H. Mānoa Audio Lab, Honolulu, HI.

191 Mary Kaleikoa, interview by Larry Kimura, November 11, 1972, HV24.17, Ka Leo Hawai‘i Radio Program Collection, U.H. Mānoa Audio Lab, Honolulu, HI.
APPENDIX D1:

[Mele no Nāhi‘ena’ena] Ho‘i au e pili me Kauiki, uoki e nanahe upalu no ko laila kini, uoki e.

Recorded at Hanalei, Kaua‘i 1923. Performed by Lucy Kapohaiali Kaili. Translation by Mary Kawena Pukui. Provenience of mele; Māui. MS SC Roberts 5.2 ref. 20.

Ho‘i au e pili me Kauiki, uoki e
He nanahe upalu no ko laila kini, uoki e
E aka hele mai oe Makana ia kaua, uoki e
A uoki e

He aha ka hana a kau Ka‘opua, uoki e
Pahe‘e. pakika kaua i ka welowelo, uoki e
Ilaila ho‘ohehi ka mana‘o, uoki e
Hoeu na hono a o Pi‘ilani, uoki e
A uoki e

I go to be close to Kauiki; leave it alone
Gentle and mild are its inhabitants; leave it alone
Be careful how you treat us; leave it alone
Leave it alone

What did Ka‘opua do? Leave it alone,
We slip and slide all the way; leave it alone
There the mind becomes entranced; leave it alone,
It stirs the land of Pi‘ilani; leave it alone
Leave it alone.

This mele, written for Princess Nāhi‘ena’ena was passed to Mrs. Kaili and predates her generation. The mele speaks of a relationship with the sacred Princess and of places on

192 “Ho‘i au e pili me Kauiki, uoki e / He nanahe upalu no ko laila kini,” MS SC Roberts 5.2 ref. 20, B.P.B.M. Archives, Honolulu, HI.

193 Translator unknown
Māui. There is much to be learned from an examination of this and other mele by those competent to access this material.
APPENDIX D2:

He Lei no Emma MS SC Roberts 2.1 B.P.B.M. Archives. Performed for recording by Moha. Born circa 1863. Recorded at Kekaha, Kaua‘i.

He lei keia no Emma

Ko lei taulana i ke tipi
Ua kau ko lei i ka waha
I ka lehelehe o ka loko lono
Tueka‘a pau ia mai
Na kui na oi o loko
He kolea kau ahua
Noi no i ohana aupuni
I ka hana loko mai‘a‘i ia
E ka na‘au lani ha‘aha‘a
Ua pono no oe ke lino
Ua lohe na kupa o Kahiti
Elua o i ka ao nei
Witolia ko Lakana
O Kuini Emma ko Hawai‘i
Kohukohu i ka noho kalaunu
Haina ia mai ka puana
Kaleleonalani he inoa194

This is a lei chant for Emma
A lei chant for you, who are known as a rebel
Your name is mentioned everywhere
By the lips of heartless people
Everything rolls out
Like nails and sharp things within
They are but mound perching plovers
Who seek to hold government offices
Though they have been kindly treated
by the gracious hearted chiefs
You have something to boast of
For it is heard in foreign lands
That there are but two great women
Victoria of London
And Queen Emma of Hawaii
These two are fit to occupy thrones

194 Moha, “He Lei no Emma”, MS SC Roberts 2.1 p.74-77, B.P.B.M. Archives, Honolulu, HI.
This mele was composed after the tumult that followed the defeat of Queen Emma in the fiercely-contested election of 1874. It speaks frankly about those who surround this event. This was a very important event in Hawaiian history and this mele and many others like it help lend a contextual understanding to the period.
He Inoa No Nahienaena

A ka luna o Wahine-kapu  
Ho‘i ka ‘ena a ka makani  
Ho‘i ka ‘ena a ka makani  
Noho ka la‘i i ka malino  
   Makani ua Haao e  
   Ko‘ ke au i Hala’e’  
   Wai ola na ke kupua  
   a ka ‘ilio nana  
   Hae! nanahu i ke kal!

Ehu kai nalo ka pua o ka iliau  
O ka ‘ohai mahapepe  
O ke ku moena weuweu  
I ulana ‘ia e Kea’eloa  
Hea o Ku’iliialoa “Nawai e ke kapu?”  
Na Kalanimalokuloku  
   Rau! Rau! Rau!195

A name-song for the Princess of the Fiery Tabus
At the top of Wahine-kapu
Her tabus, like heat blown by the wind, are laid aside for sport
Calm hovers over the still waters
Descends the rain-sweeping wind of Ka’u
The current draws to Gone-Before
Water of life of the demi-god
Of the savage dog
Bow-wow! He bites the sea
The sea foams. Hidden is the flower of the iliau
The short growing ‘ohai
The pile of sleeping mats with grass padding between
Woven by The One from distance
Ku the dog of Loa calls (who controls this place?)

195 Theodore Kelsey, He Inoa No Nahienaena, H.I.M.40. ref. 1, B.P.B.M. Archives, Honolulu, HI.
The dare-devil who barks at the tabus
Rau! Rau! Rau!196

This mele, chanted in the olioli style, is adapted as a hula ‘īlio or dog hula. This collection has prolific ethnographic notes relating to the mele. Mr. Kelsey’s extensive notes and comments on translations and the kaona within this and other mele are especially interesting and undoubtedly an incredible source from which to begin research into this collection.

196 Translation by Theodore Kelsey
APPENDIX E:


Note to Appendix E: My inclusion of this lengthy letter as an appendix borders on self-indulgence but was a sincere effort by the author to convey in a very small way a fraction of the beauty and the spiritual content that made up a large part of this thesis work. A belief that all things are animate alongside a sometimes overwhelming feeling of mana inherent in many of these “voices” of the past led me to attempt in some way, however feeble, to bring that to the written page. I appreciate the reader’s patience.
Kapalama, January 23rd, 1897

Aloha e a oiu loa;

Na loa mai,

Iwa o ka la 29 o December i ka la aha
ike iba i ka Maih kai o ko Kalani ka
kino, o ka manaia nein a ka leo
pule o Ke Hanaka e pele a a man
aka nei i ka papea kapu a ko
Kea Mana loa, a ke hanu ho hanu
Mania i ka Hanano o koa Lahiini
holo kon e jembo a keu kei me ke
Aloha oiai e ia ko ko laka pumvai
i hooma kea wale ana wa o ko loa
Man Mai na lo Wo de Ke Kalani ko
King, ana kama hanakai, kala i
i ka manaia a ka Haku e Kakali
hoomana wanui daila i ka mundo Bole,
Aloha wale ke Kakali ana daila e
Kau o mai ai ke a maka aloha o Kolu
nana, kea kana ke kane kaia, ke kana
i e kana, e ke haka e, e kane
i e kana, kei e ke kana, kei kei,
e ke kana, kei kei, kei kei.
ei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei,
ei kei kei kei, kei kei kei kei kei,
ei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei,
ei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei,
ei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei,
ei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei,
ei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei,
ei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei,
ei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei,
ei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei,
ei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei,
ei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei,
ei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei,
ei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei,
ei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei,
ei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei,
ei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei,
ei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei,
ei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei,
ei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei,
ei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei,
ei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei,
ei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei,
ei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei,
ei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei,
ei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei,
ei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei,
ei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei,
ei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei,
ei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei,
ei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei,
ei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei,
ei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei,
ei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei,
ei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei,
ei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei,
ei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei,
ei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei,
ei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei,
ei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei,
ei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei,
ei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei,
ei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei,
ei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei,
ei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei,
ei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei,
ei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei,
ei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei,
ei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei,
ei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei,
ei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei,
ei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei,
ei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei,
ei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei,
ei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei,
ei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei,
ei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei,
ei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei,
ei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei,
ei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei,
ei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei kei,
ahākuka nei a lakou. Eipo'a e hopuhopu hou ia ma poe Aloha, o mea pili i ke kumu kaha a ke Moiwhine e hele ala. Alaila manuia ia mana ake ia lakou a puka de ai Kahi mana a hiki ai ia haka ke ike e i nei ara.
O Oke ake Kinney ma mana kana loa a pula i kaule iia mana mana kapuaihe Kahi poe o lakou. O kaaloa ko mokolo, o ke Haole ki aia e koikaike mai nei i ka koalalo kea ka lauwai koohinaia a lakou kekahi pono ane ka pono kea i ko Hawai'i ke aie i ka koohinaia. Ama kea kono viaio loa i kea mai iai gia ke ake kono mai kei, a ke kono kei loa o Kahi e Laka. Laka e koohualale aie i Kahi Ala maka o ke Laka e koohualale.
ia puhi ana a kei nei iia lakon
Hoakulei kei nei na poke kei e a kei a a
Kauhionoa hou io kei ka lakoni
foi mai kei o Kaulia a hui iai i
Kauhionoa manua aku o Makemi
Moai Mea, iaka au, aole au e a
aku ana e hana ia ia hana i wena
o ka lakoni i poi a a. Mea mai kei o
Kaulia, na lelei ka Kukahi poke i weni
ia Hanaka Moai Mea, Ana oleloa
mai ka o ia. Hekili kei hana ia
ina pa Makemake ou kon e hana
foale, aole kei koonei manawa aia
a liki mai i ke Makemake Manua
lakiiki. Hanu Kukahi poke i hana
foale ia nei nei a a. Mea a kaula au
ia Kaulia, Cce Ka mana hohe hou e
a akei ai o keina Keina. Nalaila a
Hanakaia ae. Cce o Keina Manua ia
Hanu ia akei e Kukahi Manuhalua
mei, ke iau hana loo lakiiki.
Taulia me ke Kakawelo u. E. Johnn
Aloa ola e ae aku ikaia hana e
Saipai ia mai, a maia mana aku ola
Nau ka hoko lo Dramp o anu aia aku
Ruka o ka Fui aloa aina, Kia, a ohui
E huki na poulima loa no haka e maka
Makapo mai nei. Me ka ike he i ka
Hana e Hana ia iho nei no ka pono o
Ka lahui, ao Rakon o ka wahi ikaa i
Loa na Kealohilani noa ike, e
Ho'omana'awii no Rakon o ka
Matua aku ma maka i aina, O ka ola
Hana pono wale no e hora man ola
E Kealohilani i ka po'upuha ina man ola
E Manoa ia Haua. Noho i aku ika no
Haumakaha a na o Hoka e nohi hoku
Balua, a o Huka Haumakaha a ka ko ha
Mano a hele mana a nei e hooaulua
Hana in Taulia. O ka Rakau inoa hou
O ka lahui, ke ke laka hooaulua
Aotea as he makemake o Kaulia o ia.
Jan. 23, 1873

E no e kau'i ikaika aku nei iaia
mai ae aku i ka ia kanaka, i akamani
ike olua wai a ae ai e hana ia ia hana
wakine nei a papa ikaika i ka lahui
Hokule'a o He'e Nafpepa nei, Ada e hoolele
i ka olua alakai ana. Haila, ke hana
kau'i kahuna, ko lai ka ina'ea hana ai, ko
ka olua manu Kulana hikina i nā.
Ke hana maikai o ka ina'ea e hana ai, e ha
ae o ike hana ai. ka ikaika, ko
'oe kaukakake o ka hoolele i kekahi
ale o Kalani e hele kumaka a i nui i ka pono
a ka Lahui, a i ala i manu kama ko ni
ni i kekahi nei. E ka omanikomina ai
i ka mana, ake. ahe de i mana a i mana.

P. M. Viva'i, President o ka Hui a ma Puka
Kekahi i ke ikaika ma'i i Kauiia e ku'
au aku ka pua Aloha ala o Ke Lahui
a o wehe ia i "Maeke Meeting" ko Ke'ea
koa e mana akua i ke'ea na ke mau i o na
'oe Kupuna. E ke kau'i o Kauiia a hai ia i
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