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The original question this study posed was, “How do contemporary Christian Hawaiians identify themselves between being Hawaiian and being Christian?” This hypothetical question is fundamentally oriented in the present. In order to find better answers to the question, however, a broader historical framework is indispensable. Therefore, the dissertation is composed of two focuses: the past and the present of Hawaiian Christianity — mainly in the Congregationalist tradition. They are separated not only by time and target of investigation but also in the analytical methods used for approaching targets. However, I attempt to present them in such a manner as to make interpretation of the past and the present resonate.

In the historical study of this dissertation, I investigate how Hawaiians incorporated Christianity in the latter half of the 19th century and how Hawaiian culture functioned in the process of incorporation. By locating two dissident Hawaiian Christian movements within a broader social context of the colonial condition, I aim to describe how Hawaiians were dealing with Christianity. Although their results were different, leaders of the two movements attempted to seize the initiative and establish sovereignty in the church. They wanted to establish a real church for Hawaiians.

In the study of contemporary Hawaiian Christianity, I investigate how Christian Hawaiians are constructing their identity and faith. Through examining their narratives on how they deal with Hawaiian traditions and Christianity, I show how their identity and faith are diversely constructed but loosely unified under the problem that originally brings about diversity. I also point out that Christian Hawaiians are facing difficulty in the process of establishing Hawaiian Christianity because of the post-colonial condition, in which Hawaiian-ness (a symbolic complex of Hawaiian history, culture and identity) is competitively represented and has never had a fixed unitary meaning.
By juxtaposing the past and present of Hawaiian Christianity, I argue that Hawaiian-ness can serve not only as a problem but also as a catalyst when constructing Hawaiian Christian faith in the present. As a post-colonial problem, the relation between culture and faith becomes a significant issue for Christian Hawaiians, who desire to make Christianity Hawaiian.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Initial Questions

The Pacific Islands are one of the areas in which Western missionaries achieved the greatest success in converting the indigenous people to Christianity and Hawaii\textsuperscript{[1]} is no exception to this. Since the arrival of the American Protestant missionaries in 1820, Hawaiian culture has suffered drastic changes not only in its socio-economic system but also in its ideological and symbolic system. Although all the cultural changes that Hawaiians have experienced cannot be solely attributed to Christianity, it definitely had a major impact on the ideological and symbolic domain of Hawaiian culture and its influence still lingers upon certain sections of contemporary Hawaiian society. In this backdrop, how do present Hawaiians who follow Christian faith identify themselves in terms of spirituality? What is the relationship between being Hawaiian and being Christian in their perception of cultural identity? Do they incorporate Christian ideology in order to recreate or revitalize their own culture and cultural identity? Do they appropriate Hawaiian traditions, some of which are somewhat detached from a daily experience and perceived in the politics of representation, in order to localize Christian faith? My research starts from these questions concerning the current condition of Christian Hawaiians, with the presupposition that there is, at least, a latent tension between being Hawaiian and being Christian, whether it is premised logically or perceived as a legacy of the 19th century missionary discourse.

The ethnographic present of this study is from 1994 to 1996, when I conducted questionnaire surveys among local Hawaiian students, historical research on Christianity in the archives, sporadic participant observation and interviews among independent Hawaiian churches, and more or less formalized but open-ended ethnographic interviews
with Hawaiian ministers, Hawaiian lay people and non-Hawaiian ministers serving for Hawaiian churches. The sovereignty movement and cultural revival are significant factors to be considered when investigating the current socio-cultural condition of Hawaiians. The sovereignty movement gained momentum from the late 1970s to the 1980s, while the cultural revival first germinated as the "Hawaiian Renaissance" in the late 1960s and the 1970s and led to a flourishing of Hawaiian tradition — language, music and dance — in and after the 1980s. I conducted my research at a time when the Hawaiian sovereignty movement and cultural revival reached a climax and were moving toward the next stage of development. In this social and political situation in which "who and what is Hawaiian" becomes a critical issue, the aforementioned logical tension can become externalized in some form or other among many Christian Hawaiians. For example, we can inquire into how "pro-sovereignty" Christian Hawaiians feel when they see a Hawaiian traditional ritual performed during a political rally and gathering, or what Congregational Hawaiian ministers thought when the President of the United Church of Christ made an official apology to the native Hawaiian people for the overthrow of the Hawaiian monarchy. It is a productive attempt for the study of cultural identity to investigate how Christian Hawaiians articulate their position in this highly political atmosphere.

The Construction of Hawaiian Christianity

The main issue of this study is the construction of Hawaiian Christianity, mainly in the Congregationalist tradition. Because an understanding of Hawaiian Christianity in a broader historical context is required in order to comprehend the current condition of Christian Hawaiians deeply, I investigate the main issue — the construction of Hawaiian Christianity — both in the past and the present. However, the meaning of "construction" is slightly different between the past and the present. In the ethnographic study of Hawaiian Christianity in the past, I aim to consider how Hawaiians incorporated
Christianity and how Hawaiian traditional culture functioned in the process of incorporation. In order to do so, I investigate two dissident Hawaiian Christian movements in the latter half of the 19th century in detail, by locating them in a broader social context that I describe by using various historical materials. In this framework, "construction" signifies what Wagner (1981) calls "invention," which is in a dialectic relationship with "convention" in order to produce culture. On the supposition that Hawaiian Christianity is a kind of culture that is constructed and reconstructed in the process of social changes, I analyze the construction of Hawaiian Christianity in the past, by focusing on it as culture at the macro-level.

On the other hand, in the ethnographic study of present Hawaiian Christianity, I aim to interpret how the current Christian Hawaiians construct their cultural identity of being Hawaiian and being Christian, by investigating their narratives of how they utilize Hawaiian traditions that were once negated by the 19th century missionaries as well as how they establish Christian faith in a Hawaiian way. In this perspective, what I mean by the "construction" of Hawaiian Christianity is a discursive composition of Hawaiian Christian faith and Christian Hawaiian identity, which is not exactly equivalent to Hawaiian Christianity as culture, but constitutes its significant part. The discursive composition of Hawaiian Christianity becomes more significant in the present post-colonial condition surrounding Christian Hawaiians, which gives rise to the politics of culture in which everything — including culture, tradition, history, identity and faith — becomes a target of competitive representation. In this dissertation, the theoretical perspective of the historical study of Hawaiian Christianity belongs to the orthodox framework that investigates how culture is constructed; that is, produced in the dynamic relation between convention and invention. Concerning the ethnographic study of present Hawaiian Christianity, the theoretical orientation is cultural constructionism developed in the postmodern and post-colonial study of cultural identity (cf. Hall and du Gay 1996;
Stewart and Strathern 2000). Because I utilize an ethnographic interview method in order to approach the discursive construction of Hawaiian Christianity, I interpret the subject at the micro-level, through which I aim at describing the present condition of Hawaiian Christianity as a whole.

A reason why there is a difference between the past and the present concerning the "construction" of Hawaiian Christianity may be partly technical, i.e., the limited availability of useful data. It is nearly impossible to find historical documents — such as a memorandum or memoirs — written by a Christian Hawaiian in the late 19th century, which narrate his or her thoughts on Christian faith that satisfy the demand of my inquiry. In addition, Hawaiian Christianity at present has become relatively secularized and less influential in a community so that it cannot provide rich material for investigation at the macro-level. It is, of course, possible to focus on a specific Hawaiian Christian church as the subject of investigation in order to describe Hawaiian Christianity as a (small) whole. In fact, I once attempted to do so in my research. However, I found it difficult after receiving both direct and indirect rejections from several churches and hearing that even an important church member was finding it difficult to write a church history by gleaning fragmentary information in daily conversation with elderly ministers of the church.

Another reason why there is a slightly different meaning of "construction" between the past and the present is the problem of identity. I roughly surmise that the 19th century Christian Hawaiians did not need to struggle over the problem of Hawaiian identity — "What does it mean to be Hawaiian?" — when they were striving to make Christianity their own. Although it is difficult to verify this assumption, it may be said that the concept of Hawaiian identity or Hawaiian-ness did not become a problem for Christian Hawaiians in the same sense of the present; they simply wanted to be "real" Christians, not "Hawaiian" Christians. Because it is difficult to uncover cogent evidence that indicates that individual Christian Hawaiians considered the problem of Hawaiian
identity in the process of conversion, the study cannot help focusing on the construction
of Hawaiian Christianity as culture at the macro-level; that is, investigating how
Hawaiian society responded to and incorporated the missionaries' Christianity in what
social circumstances, by interpreting the historical materials. On the other hand, the
problem of Hawaiian identity is the most important issue for the current Christian
Hawaiians when they try to establish their Christian faith. What they want to become is
not simply Christians, but, rather, "Hawaiian" Christians. Therefore, the construction of
Christian Hawaiian identity comes to the fore as a research subject in the study of
Hawaiian Christianity at present.

To summarize, the slightly different meanings of "construction" in the past and
the present originate in the following two factors. First, the social condition surrounding
Hawaiian Christianity has changed from the latter half of the 19th century, when
Hawaiian Christianity still had a great influence in Hawaiian society and was able to
present rich historical material for investigation, to the late 20th century, when
Christianity was no longer a dominant power prevailing in the Hawaiian community.
Secondly, the paradigm of Christianity shifted from the past, when the concept of
Hawaiian identity did not come into sight for a large majority of Christian Hawaiians, to
the present, in which it is the most significant issue for those who are establishing
Hawaiian Christian faith.

Previous Studies of Hawaiian Christianity

There are several historical studies that focus on the specific topic of Christianity
in Hawaii (cf. Grimshaw 1989; Gallagher 1983), but most of these studies focus not on
Christian Hawaiians, but, rather, American missionaries and their activities. Even though
Morris (1987) studies Christian Hawaiians in the late 19th century, her subject is
Hawaiian missionaries who went to other Pacific Islands. As far as I can ascertain, in the
field of ethnographic study, there are only four works — in the form of dissertations or
theses — that study Hawaiian Christianity as the main subject. Aiona (1959), for example, investigates whether or not an offshoot church separated from Hoomana O Ke Akua Ola [Ho’omana O Ke Akua Ola: Church of the Living God] is a religious movement in which followers search for their identity in a drastic social change. By doing fieldwork in a branch church of Hoomana O Ke Akua Ola, Peterson (1975) describes the church life and attempts to explain how the church members seek leadership. Silva (1989) compares Hawaiian hymnody between two different Hawaiian Christian denominations in his ethnomusicological study. Paleka (1995) examines how Hawaiian traditional religion is incorporated into Hawaiian Christianity by studying another offshoot church of Hoomana O Ke Akua Ola.

With few exceptions, Hawaiian Christianity has never been the main focus in either historical or anthropological studies. There are a few reasons for this. First, compared with the other Pacific Islands — such as Fiji and New Zealand — in which conspicuous socio-political movements inspired by Christianity emerged under the colonial suppression, there was not a large-scale native Christian movement in Hawaii after the late 19th century (cf. Henderson 1972; Kaplan 1995; Kasuga 2001). Second, unlike other Pacific Islands such as Samoa and Tonga, in which Christianity now permeates into all aspects of the island society, Christianity is not necessarily the driving force of the current Hawaiian community. Third, the multi-ethnic condition of Hawaiians makes it difficult to extract or focus on Christian Hawaiians as a single independent group. For example, Filipino Hawaiians who are Catholic and Chinese Hawaiians who are affiliated with the United Church of Christ cannot be grouped under the same category of Hawaiian Christians. The complexity of being Christian Hawaiian becomes an obstacle for the study that concentrates on the relation between Christianity and Hawaiians in a simple dualistic framework.
Turning from Hawaii to the Pacific Islands in general, a certain tendency can be clearly detected in the study of Christianity. In this field of study, historical or ethnohistorical studies predominate. These studies cover various topics, such as the missionaries' activities on the island, the cultural contact and interaction between missionaries and islanders, and the influence of Christianization on the island society. There are several significant works conducted as a comprehensive survey, although some of them focus on a specific era and particular denominations (cf. Forman 1982; Garrett 1982, 1992, 1997; Gunson 1978). There are also many case studies of Christianity in the Pacific region, but, again, most are ethnohistorical works that investigate the early period of cultural contact (cf. Adams 1984; Langmore 1989; Laracy 1976). Among the ethnohistorical studies of a specific island society, whose focus is not solely on Christianization, some works also examine cultural changes caused by Christian influence (cf. Dening 1980; Hanlon 1988).

On the other hand, ethnographic and anthropological works in the study of Christianity in the Pacific Islands have been mainly presented in the form of articles (cf. Barker 1990; Boutilier et al. 1978; Miller 1985). Addressing the scarcity of anthropological studies of the present Christianity in the Pacific, Barker (1990) mentions as follows:

Several anthropologists have called for studies of “missionization” in recent years and some have published innovative ethnohistorical studies of conversion in a number of societies. But few have attempted ethnographic appraisals of Christianity as it is currently experienced and practiced in Pacific societies. (Barker 1990:1)

According to him, the problem in the study of Christianity in the Pacific societies is “a tendency to focus on the Western/indigenous encounter rather than peoples’ experiences and understandings of Christianity” and “the relative lack of attention to the nature and practice of Christianity in post-mission village societies” (Barker 1990:9). It is thus
urgent and important to study how people practice and experience Christianity in their own way in the contemporary Pacific Islands.

There are a few studies that investigate how people in the Pacific region currently construct their cultural identity and embrace their Christian faith in daily experience. This dissertation will contribute to the study of Christianity in the contemporary Pacific, by investigating what kind of cultural identity is being created among Christian Hawaiians.

Theory, Methods and Outline

In this dissertation, I neither verify a particular hypothesis nor depend on a specific anthropological theory in order to study the construction of Hawaiian Christianity, although I conduct a theoretical examination of the problem of “culture” in the post-colonial Pacific as well as of the conceptual problem involved in “ethnicity” in the postmodern paradigm of anthropology. If I venture to specify the theoretical orientation of this study, however, I regard it as being descended from Geertzian interpretive anthropology, a kind of grand theory of ethnography that considers culture as text (or context) that can be thickly described (Geertz 1973a). Under the influence of phenomenology and hermeneutics since the 1980s, the static concept of “text” has been gradually replaced by the dynamic metaphor of “dialogue,” which “literally suggests the actual situation of anthropological interpretation in fieldwork” (Marcus and Fischer 1986:29; cf. Suga 1989). Following the pattern of this theoretical shift, a series of experimental ethnographies and essays have been published (cf. Clifford 1988a; Clifford and Marcus 1986; Crapanzano 1980; Dwyer 1982; Marcus and Fischer 1986; Shostak 1981). In a broader sense, however, a series of these post-Geertzian anthropological works still belong to the same paradigm of interpretive anthropology, which advocates anthropology as an interpretive science in search of meaning. The theoretical stance of interpretive anthropology toward the subject of investigation is always required in the practice of ethnographic study.
This dissertation is an ethnographic study that investigates the past and present of Hawaiian Christianity, by taking into consideration historical continuity and discontinuity. Geertzian interpretive anthropology has influence upon and resonates with cultural history that focuses on the everyday life of a small community or an individual in the past in order to grasp the contemporary social world (cf. Hunt 1989; Muir and Ruggiero 1991). Closeness between anthropology and history as interpretive science is noted by scholars who utilize ethnographic framework and methods to approach the subject. For example, the theoretical perspective of historical anthropology (or anthropological history) presented by Cohn (1980, 1987) and Dening (1980) is resonant with that of interpretive anthropology. The similarity between history and anthropology is indicated in their statements:

Historians and anthropologists have a common subject matter, "otherness;" one field constructs and studies "otherness" in space, the other in time. Both fields have a concern with text and context. Both aim, whatever else they do, at explicating the meaning of actions of people rooted in one time and place, to persons in another. Both forms of knowledge entail the act of translation. The goals of the accounts practitioners develop are understanding and explanation, rather than the construction of social laws and prediction, the goals of the more formally constituted social sciences of economics and sociology. (Cohn 1980:198)

History is a conscious relationship between past and present; anthropology is a conscious relationship between familiar and strange. In re-presenting the past, in re-constructing the different, there is no avoiding our present or our selves. (Dening 1980:3)

In his philosophical hermeneutics, which examines the understanding of historical texts, Gadamer proposes the concept of "dialogue" as a process of coming to an understanding and that of "fusion of horizons" as the basic nature of understanding (cf. Gadamer 1976, 1989). Both interpretive anthropology and historical anthropology (or anthropological history) can be considered practical hermeneutics that applies his philosophical hermeneutics to concrete objects in time and space. Echoing the aforementioned statements of Cohn and Dening, Marcus and Fischer (1986) point out the hermeneutic characteristics of anthropology by referring to Gadamer:
Gadamer is concerned with interpreting past horizons of history, but the problem of interpretation is the same whether pursued through time or across cultures. Each historical period has its own assumptions and prejudices, and the process of communication is the engaging of the notions of one’s own period (or culture) with those of another. (Marcus and Fischer 1986:31)

There is not enough space to discuss in detail the relation between Gadamer's philosophical hermeneutics, Geertz' interpretive anthropology and post-Geertzian ethnographic works. I think that it is not necessary to do so here, because such theoretical investigation does not directly lead to a practical ethnographic work, but rather contributes as an epistemological suggestion for an ethnographer. By duly considering the perspective of ethnography as a practical hermeneutic work, however, I attempt to conduct the research necessary for writing this dissertation.

The method of the research as well as the outline of the dissertation is categorized into two parts: one is about the past, the other is about the present. In the study of the construction of Hawaiian Christianity in the past, I peruse historical materials, such as The Friend, the Annual Report of the Board of the Hawaiian Evangelical Association, local newspaper articles both in English and Hawaiian, and other historical materials including letters, memoirs and booklets. By using a micro-film reader and a copy machine, I take copies of texts that are related with my research interest, and input the significant sections of these texts into the hard disk of my computer. Then, I read through the digitalized data, perform a search for particular words, categorize the texts based on the main ideas, consider the interrelation among the categorized texts and attempt to discover the significant theme. The historical investigation of Hawaiian Christianity conducted in Chapter 3 and 4 is, therefore, analytical and inductive, at least in the beginning of the investigation.

On the other hand, in the ethnographic study of present Hawaiian Christianity, I utilize a questionnaire and an ethnographic interview as the main method. In Chapter 5, I analyze the results of the questionnaire conducted among Hawaiian students. By so
doing, I aim at giving the basic picture of the current cultural condition surrounding Hawaiians and prepare for Chapter 6 and 7, in which I consider and interpret the narratives of Christian Hawaiians. Concerning the study based on the ethnographic interview, the working process is same as that of the archival research. First, I interview Christian Hawaiians and other informants and collect the interview data by using a tape recorder. Second, I transcribe interview tapes and save transcripts in the hard disk. Then, I read through the digitalized data, perform a search, compare and categorize different narratives, and attempt to discover the significant theme. As a result, the ethnographic investigation of Christian Hawaiian narratives is also analytical. However, by this systematic analysis, I attempt to comprehend their diverse and conflicting narratives as a whole.

I conduct the theoretical review of cultural constructionism in the post-colonial condition in Chapter 2 and that of the concept of ethnicity in Chapter 5 in a similar manner to the above-mentioned historical and ethnographic study of Hawaiian Christianity. The historical materials, the informant’s narratives and the anthropologist’s theoretical statements are texts that I present in the form of citation in the dissertation. All information is saved as digital data in the hard disk — the ultimate textualization — and the difference between orality and literacy disappears. The use of the computer clarifies that ethnography is a practice of interpretation.

The Beginning

On February 21, 1994, just before noon, I was in a pickup truck of a local Chinese male minister, driving toward West O‘ahu on the H1 highway. Several days earlier, my wife had made acquaintances with a Japanese female minister at a park in the neighborhood and obtained useful information from her about an elderly Hawaiian female minister who had agreed to my request for an interview. The Chinese minister — at the request of the Japanese minister — came to my apartment and he drove me to a
small town in West O'ahu, where the Hawaiian minister was living with her
granddaughter who she adopted from her daughter. It was a fine day. Everything was
advancing smoothly, I thought. According to the Chinese minister, she had been serving
as a pastor for more than 20 years, although she was currently inactive because of her
heart disease. I expected that I could collect a lot of interesting life stories from her.

The Hawaiian minister was 79 years old, had married a Filipino man in 1934 and
had five children. I introduced myself to her, explained the purpose of the interview and
told her that I was learning Hawaiian at the university, anticipating that we could have a
short conversation in Hawaiian. But she curtly said that she was not able to speak
Hawaiian at all because her parents had never used it with her. On the wall of her living
room hung several pictures of her sons in barong tagalog,[4] probably taken at their high
school graduation. I asked her whether her children followed her faith, but she did not
directly answer my question. The Chinese minister, sitting beside her, explained that
some children were Christian but others were not, because she did not force them to
become Christian.

Responding to my inquiry, she explained how she had become a Christian
minister. According to her, she once had a Filipino lady friend on Lāna'i, who suffered
from elephantiasis and, because of this disease, was not able to live with her family on
O'ahu. She made a call of inquiry on her on Lāna'i, rubbed her body with oil and prayed
to God. After three days of such treatment, her friend was miraculously healed. This
incident caused her to feel strongly that God really existed and she decided to become a
minister. During the interview, I occasionally asked her in a different manner about
whether she had ever had a conflict or problem with being Hawaiian and being Christian.
Although she did not give a clear answer to the question, she seemed to have no conflict.
Once in the interview, she said “I'm not Hawaiian” with an impish grin. It is probable
that being Christian was her strongest identity.
There were many photographs and trophies in her living room. During a pause in
the interview, I found small pictures of her on the wall. She was wearing *chima chogori*\(^5\) in the pictures, which were taken when she attended a conference in Korea. At that point, I remembered that the Chinese minister had told me on the way to her house that she was a little isolated from other Christian Hawaiians in her town because of her faith. I understood why she somewhat proudly explained how she had confuted Mormon missionaries, Pentecost missionaries and Jehovah’s Witnesses who had called upon her previously.

The Hawaiian minister was affiliated with the Unification Church. Because I had once conducted fieldwork in Japanese congregations of Jehovah’s Witnesses, I knew that the conversion stories of these unorthodox Christians were valuable texts by themselves. However, I did not plan to study Hawaiian followers of a new religion. Even if the new religion was a Christian denomination, its members were not appropriate subjects for my study. In a word, she was not an ideal Christian Hawaiian for the study, which aimed at following the historical change of Hawaiian Christianity. At least at that time, I believed so and thought that my first try failed. From hindsight, however, this incident symbolically predicts a part of my conclusion about Hawaiian Christianity; that is, the multi-ethnic and multi-cultural condition of Christian Hawaiians, which produces diverse positions among them.

After failing to locate an insertion point for the subject of investigation, I turned to different directions to look for more appropriate targets. I conducted preliminary fieldwork in several independent Hawaiian churches, a questionnaire survey in local schools and a university, and an interview research among Christian Hawaiians. In this way, *my main research awkwardly started, threading between what was feasible and what was impossible.* The following chapters are the results of trial and error I made in the process of approaching Hawaiian Christianity.
[1] I use the word "Hawaii" in order to indicate the state of Hawai‘i or the Hawaiian Islands, in order to distinguish it from a particular island, Hawai‘i.

[2] Hoomana O Ke Akua Ola was separated from Hoomana Naauao [Ho‘omana Na‘auao: Reasonable Service]: the oldest independent Hawaiian Church that I will investigate in Chapter 4. The mother church, Ka Makua Mau Loa [Ka Makua Mau Loa: Eternal Father], was erected in 1911 and the denomination was officially established in 1916. When conducting fieldwork in 1994, it was the biggest independent Hawaiian Church composed of about 1,500 members with 5 branch churches. Several offshoot churches broke away from Hoomana O Ke Akua Ola in the 1930s and the 1940s. The currently active offshoot churches that I confirmed are Lanakila Church, Ekalesia O Ka Mauna O Oliveta [Ekalesia O Ka Mauna O Oliveta: Church of the Mount Olivet], Ke Alii O Na Alii A Me Ka Haku O Na Haku [Ke Ali‘i O Na Ali‘i A Me Ka Haku O Na Haku: the King of the Kings and the Lord of the Lords] and Ke Alii O Ka Malu [Ke Ali‘i O Ka Malu: the King of the Peace]. Some of them have a few branch churches, while others are rather small churches composed of mainly a few families and their relatives.

[3] The Friend was the English monthly newspaper founded in 1843, and devolved to the Hawaiian Evangelical Association (HEA) in 1902. The Annual Report of the Board of the Hawaiian Evangelical Association, which had formerly appeared in The Friend, was separately published since the late 1870s. For further particulars of these two materials, see Chapter 3.


[5] Chima Chogori is a women’s folk costume in Korea, composed of a skirt (chima) and a upper garment (chogori).
Introduction

Discussions of culture, identity and tradition are often contentious and readily become political acts, particularly in reference to the Pacific region. In anthropological studies of this area since the early 1980s, there have been heated arguments about the construction or invention of tradition, ethnicity and cultural identity, which have given rise to the problem of “politics of culture” (Feinberg and Zimmer-Tamakoshi 1995a, b; Hanson 1989; Jolly and Thomas 1992a; Keesing and Tonkinson 1982; Lindstrom and White 1993a; Linnekin 1983; Linnekin and Poyer 1990). In these arguments, a theoretical shift from an essentialist to a constructionist and loosely defined “postmodernist” perspective has been advanced. Along with this shift, the meaning of “politics” itself has been altered. To talk about the politics of tradition is no longer to be confined to a discussion of tradition as a political symbol or a mode of post-colonial resistance. This topic also entails careful investigation of the problem of authority to represent the Other, and recognition of political differences between anthropologists and indigenous peoples over the representation of indigenous culture and identity in the post-colonial era. In this chapter, I begin with a brief overview of the theories of tradition and cultural identity, then highlight the difficulties facing the current theoretical perspective, in order to show why and how they arise as political problems for anthropologists, especially when making academic statements concerning the traditions and cultural identity of Fourth World peoples.11

A personal experience of mine offers an appropriate starting point for discussing theories and politics of cultural identity (Inoue 1998). While administering a questionnaire survey [Appendix A] on O‘ahu in local high schools and at the University
of Hawai‘i at Mānoa, with the aim of investigating the relation between Christian
tradition and Hawaiian identity, I received a telephone call from a Hawaiian student, who
insisted that I stop the survey. This student, part-Japanese and a fluent Japanese speaker,
claimed that all the university students of the Hawaiian language classes in which I had
conducted the survey were offended at one of the questions. It was aimed at investigating
the composition of cultural identity by using a paired comparison design (cf. Weller and
Romney 1988), which asked students to compare the importance of six cultural items:
“Hawaiian values,” “Hawaiian language,” “hula dance”[2] and Hawaiian music,”
“traditional Hawaiian religion,” “Hawaiian blood and ancestry” and “Hawaiian foods.”
He insisted that I had no right to ask Hawaiians to compare these cultural items and that it
was “unfair” that a non-Hawaiian researcher was asking Hawaiians these questions.
When we met and talked later, he continued to maintain that, as a non-Hawaiian, I was
not able to inquire into Hawaiian cultural identity, although it was permissible for
non-Hawaiians to ask other questions of blood quantum (the percentage of Hawaiian
blood), religious affiliation, religious activities, native politics and language, all of which
were in the questionnaire. After a long and tiring discussion in English and Japanese, we
parted without reaching agreement.

It is perhaps not surprising that a paired comparison design, in which any two
items are presented and respondents are asked which item has “more” or “less” value for
them, could have offended more than a few Hawaiian students. For the student who
objected, however, the problem was not only the way questions were framed but also the
fact that a non-Hawaiian researcher was questioning Hawaiians about their cultural
identity and drawing conclusions about “Hawaiian-ness.” He saw it as unfair that there
was little possibility that a Hawaiian researcher could conduct the same research on
Japanese people in Japan. When asked who had the right to ask these questions, he
answered that only Hawaiians had the right, but that they would never ask such questions
because, as "Hawaiians," they already knew well what being Hawaiian was like. According to him, a Hawaiian researcher who asks Hawaiians questions about their identity is not Hawaiian at heart, even if Hawaiian in ancestry. This is the ontological problem. For him, "indigenous anthropologists" never exist, because they are no longer indigenous once they ask about the indigenous point of view, which to them should be self-evident.\[13\] In politicized indigenous discourse, "being Hawaiian at heart" can be negated not only for local people without Hawaiian blood (cf. American Friends Service Committee 1993:113-114) but also for the people of Hawaiian ancestry who are at odds with an ideological standard that is set by other Hawaiians in a certain political arena.

This incident was my personal experience. However, it represents the political problem that can occur when a non-indigenous researcher conducts research on indigenous people, especially those who are a minority in their own land. It is easy to counter the student's argument by pointing out that anthropologists can contribute to indigenous understandings of their cultural identity by offering an etic different perspective. However, how can anthropologists respond, if the value of their perspective is rejected by some, if not all, indigenous people (Trask 1993:172)? Furthermore, the confrontation between anthropologists and indigenous people is not confined to the fieldwork arena but extends to theoretical and political debates in anthropology (Said 1989).\[14\] The problem of who has authority to represent the Other (their culture, tradition and identity) is, in a sense, a natural result of the post-colonial condition or a systemic product of the world system (Friedman 1992:846). To broach this problem, I now outline several major anthropological theories concerning tradition and cultural identity, and reorganize them in a framework that sets tradition and cultural identity as "text."

**Anthropological Theories of Cultural Identity**

As Sollors (1989:x) points out, the interpretation of previously essentialist categories, such as childhood, gender and history, as "inventions" has led to the
recognition of the constructedness of social reality in all areas of the humanities and social sciences. This shift from an essentialist to a constructionist perspective is an epistemological one, in which the textuality of the constructed reality is emphasized. Following this epistemological shift, and under the influence of an established anthropological way of viewing culture as something constructed (cf. Wagner 1981), constructedness has been identified as basic to tradition and ethnicity in anthropology. Culture, tradition and ethnicity are thus not givens passively received, but products actively created in social process (Linnekin 1990; 1992). While there are few who cleave strictly to the so-called essentialist perspective in the study of tradition and ethnicity, most anthropologists who reinvestigate these concepts adopt different positions.

Social scientists who promulgate a new theory tend to juxtapose their own position and the position they are contesting. In the study of tradition, ethnicity and cultural identity, a theoretical position recognized as conventional and outmoded is usually labelled “essentialist,” or sometimes “primordialist,” and is often wrongly identified with the work of Geertz (1973b). On the other hand, theoretical positions, each of which contests the essentialist perspective in a different manner, are variously labelled “instrumentalist,” “circumstantialist,” “constructionist” or “postmodernist” and form loosely the anti-essentialist camp (cf. Cornell and Hartmann 1998). Linnekin (1992) has already given a comprehensive outline of anthropological theories of cultural construction in the Pacific. Although I fundamentally agree with her position, I would like to simplify its outline and reinvestigate her argument from the perspective of textual theory. Using her terminology, I tentatively delineate both the “essentialist” and “postmodernist” ends of the continuum of cultural identity theories. To avoid a confusion of terminologies and to simplify the following discussion, I summarize the theoretical perspectives in the study of tradition and cultural identity into the following three groups: the “essentialist” perspective that posits something essential (a core or essence) in
tradition and cultural identity; the “objectivist constructionist” perspective, which emphasizes the constructedness of tradition and cultural identity, but retains the authority to distinguish what is “spurious” and what is “genuine,” or what can be relativized and what cannot; and the “postmodernist constructionist” perspective, which also stresses the importance of cultural construction but sharpens its deconstructive view and cedes (or, more accurately, attempts to cede) narrative authority.\[6\]

The point at issue in the recent anthropology of cultural construction is about how to overcome the limits of objectivist constructionist theory, represented by the “invention of tradition” school (Hobsbawm and Ranger 1983), which differentiates old and real tradition from new and invented tradition (cf. Jolly and Thomas 1992b; Lindstrom and White 1993b). Linnekin (1992), whose earlier stance was closer to objectivist constructionism (cf. Linnekin 1983), aims to set the postmodernist position by comparing several objectivist constructionists and differentiating her position from theirs. However, there seems to be a few problems in the theoretical dichotomies proposed in her discussion. First, the theoretical opposition between essentialists and constructionists is not as dichotomous as it appears to be in her argument. “A core or essence,” handed down to define the present generation’s cultural identity (in the essentialist proposition), and “the past,” which is intentionally selected to define tradition in the present (in the constructionist proposition), are not so different if reinvestigated as texts that ceaselessly appear before us and are given a meaning each time. The selected elements of the past to which constructionists pay attention are what essentialists rather naively call a core or essence. Linnekin’s substantialist view of the past gives the impression that the past is a depository of cultural elements, waiting to be exploited by those who construct tradition and cultural identity in the present. Although she points out the selectivity in the process of cultural construction, her stance, which fixes the past in the distance, impedes the
introduction of the concept of textuality into the study of cultural construction. She seems to be unaware that the past is already textualized whenever we look back to it.

Another problem in Linnekin's discussion is the relation between objectivists and postmodernists in the theory of cultural construction. In her argument, the difference between the two theories is basically an epistemological attitude, which inevitably becomes a political issue in the post-colonial environment. In other words, the difference is based on whether or not theorists understand the postmodern condition and eschew narrative authority. If the difference is reconsidered at the theoretical level, however, objectivist constructionists can be recognized as another type of essentialist, one who realizes the significance of cultural construction. It can thus be said that the real theoretical opposition in the theory of cultural construction is still between essentialism and postmodernism.

The essentialistic characteristic that objectivist constructionists are unable to discard is what postmodernist constructionists try to overcome. Facing this impediment, some postmodernists aim to deconstruct indiscriminately all cultural contents that can be labelled "a core or essence." However, the problem is at which level and in what sense a certain cultural content can be called a core or essence. For example, in the postmodernist proposition, the primordial sentiment, which originates in "the assumed 'givens'" (Geertz 1973b:259) such as blood and land, is denied as a fiction, no matter how real and strong the impact of this sentiment is for people. In the process of demystifying the essentialist conviction, postmodernists also disregard the significance of the primordial sentiment in the construction of identity. As a result of applying a relentlessly deconstructive view to the essential reality of everyday life, postmodernists face "the lingering misgivings" of postmodernism, that is, the problem of how to combine a deconstructive attitude and "the pursuit of 'good anthropology'" (Linnekin 1992:261; cf. Oda 1996:841). This predicament is clearly recognized in the post-colonial world, where anthropologists are
forced to ponder whether they can relativize indigenous people's representations of their
tradition and culture, and to become aware of the immediate and complicated relationship
between academe and politics.

**Anthropologists and Fourth World Peoples:**
**From A Hawaiian Case**

The range of problems surrounding the anthropological study of tradition and
cultural identity in the Pacific can be illuminated via examination of a few symbolic
incidents, which test constructionist anthropologists and their theoretical and political
positions in the post-colonial milieu. Anthropologists’ representations of the Other are
put to the severest test in the Fourth World, where indigenous people are an encapsulated
minority in their own land. Because both anthropologists and the indigenous people who
are studied by them may occupy the same time and space (sometimes, even the same
campus) as well as use a common language (mostly English) and Western academic
discourse, anthropological representations have become more vulnerable to refutation
from the objects of study, who were once silent and passive.

The first case is from Hawaii, where since the 1980s the flourishing of traditional
culture and the sovereignty movement have attracted a great deal of public attention and
academic interest. One of the most noteworthy discussions on the politics of culture in
Hawaii is an exchange that appeared in the journal, *The Contemporary Pacific*, between
Hawaiian nationalist Haunani-Kay Trask and two anthropologists, Roger Keesing and
Jocelyn Linnekin (Keesing 1991; Linnekin 1991a; Trask 1991). The theoretical and
political problems presented in this exchange and their related debates (Keesing 1989;
Linnekin 1983; Trask 1993) have already been reviewed in several articles (cf. Feinberg
1994; Oda 1996; Tobin 1995). Trask’s criticisms are directed at the nature of
anthropology as a colonial enterprise. This criticism in itself is not new. In the field of
anthropology, the contributors to *Anthropology and the Colonial Encounter* (Asad 1973)
discuss the way anthropology has been nurtured in the colonial encounter and, as a result, clad in colonial characteristics; and Said's *Orientalism* (1978) is very well known for its critique of Western disciplines as part of colonial discourse. Although Trask's criticism is very similar to some of that made in these earlier works, it underlines the fact that there are various viewpoints of tradition and cultural identity within the anthropological profession as well as between anthropologists and indigenous people.

In terms of the foregoing theoretical perspectives on tradition and cultural identity, Trask's stance is essentialist (it is another matter whether hers is a die-hard or a strategic essentialism), Keesing's is that of an objectivist constructionist, and Linnekin's is a postmodernist constructionist stance. Although Linnekin (1991a) emphasizes the theoretical difference between Keesing and herself in the exchange, Trask's criticism is originally directed at Linnekin's old works (Linnekin 1983; 1985), which to some extent bear traces of objectivist constructionism. Therefore, the point at issue is the theoretical confrontation between essentialism and objectivist constructionism, both of which differentiate traditions based on their own definitions (cf. Tobin 1995:156-158). By focussing on how Linnekin and Trask discuss the symbolic meaning of Kaho'olawe, the island used as a bombing target by the US Navy, and the concept of *aloha 'āina* [love of the land], I would like to clarify what makes them differ with regard to the interpretation of the island's meaning and traditional Hawaiian values.

What is at issue in the exchange between Linnekin and Trask is whether the symbolic meaning of Kaho'olawe Island and the traditional concept of *aloha 'āina* have altered or not, and, if so, to what extent and in what sense. According to Linnekin (1983:246-247), the symbolic meaning attached to the island was entirely altered by political circumstances. She mentions as follows:

Kahoolawe is an effective rallying point for the Hawaiian protest movement, but not because it was traditionally more sacred than any other ancient settlement area and not because Hawaiians now living regard their actual ancestors as being buried there. Kahoolawe has acquired a new
meaning for Hawaiians as a political and cultural symbol of protest, which is entirely distinct from its historical significance as a tabooed land. The bombing of the island is a graphic example of disregard manifest by white colonists for native lands and culture; in this sense, Kahoolawe is an apt focus for Hawaiian protests. The movement's slogan is “aloha ‘āina” [love of the land]. Kahoolawe symbolizes “‘āina abuse,” a phrase that evokes the transformation of taro patches into canefields and cool, forested ancient settlements into burning tracts of condominiums. Kahoolawe has become the archetype of the idealized Hawaiian land, even though, using historical data, many other Hawaiian lands could be regarded as more deserving of that status. (Linnekin 1983:246-247)

By referring to historical materials, she argues that the real history of Kaho‘olawe does not necessarily support the authenticity of the island’s kapu-ness [sacred and/or tabooed status], which is advocated by Hawaiian nationalists. The island that Hawaiian protesters try to protect and use as a political symbol could have been a barren place, which people once stayed away from and used only as a penal colony (Linnekin 1983:247).

On the other hand, Trask (1993) interprets Linnekin’s interpretation of the island’s symbolic meaning and its alteration as follows:

Jocelyn Linnekin, former student of Marshall Sahlins and a tenured professor in the Department of Anthropology at the University of Hawai‘i-Mānoa, has written a book — *Children of the Land* — and an article, “Defining Tradition: Variations on the Hawaiian Identity,” in which she asserts that modern-day Hawaiians have “invented” what they claim is a traditional value of love and caring for the land. She refers to this value, called ‘aloha ‘āina [sic] or mālama ‘āina, as a “slogan” (rather than a real cultural value) which is used by the Protect Kaho‘olawe ‘Ohana and other Hawaiian groups in their efforts to stop military bombing of Kaho‘olawe. She goes on to say that the sacred meaning of Kaho‘olawe was invented because Hawaiian nationalists needed a “political and cultural symbol of protest” in the modern period. Despite 19th century evidence of Kaho‘olawe’s importance, Linnekin argues that the island’s meaning has been created for the purposes of Hawaiian political maneuvering today. (Trask 1993:167)

Trask (1993:167) insists that the traditional concept of aloha ‘āina, with which the symbolic meaning of Kaho‘olawe is discussed, has persisted into the present and this is what Linnekin has missed in her argument. According to Trask (1993:168), “what has changed is ownership and use of the land,” and the concept of aloha ‘āina and the meaning of Kaho‘olawe are irresistibly politicized in the colonial context. In other words,
Trask sees "continuity" (a traditional value surviving a drastic cultural change) where Linnekin finds "discontinuity" (a traditional value being entirely altered in the process of cultural change). However, there is probably no critical disagreement between Trask and Linnekin as to the fact that the island's symbolic meaning is politicized in the post-colonial context. After all, Linnekin thinks that the politicization of the symbolic meaning of Kaho'olawe and the traditional concept of *aloha 'āina* is crucial enough to be called an "invention," while Trask believes that the politicization is not detrimental to the concept of *aloha 'āina* or to the sacredness of the island.

Without a doubt, as Linnekin (1992:249) mentions, "'invention' is itself an inflammatory word, inescapably implying something fictitious, 'made up' and therefore not real." This is part of the reason why the "invention of tradition" theory inevitably offends indigenous people. However, it is probably impossible to eliminate the negative connotation of this word even if the word is replaced by a less inflammatory word such as "construction." In this discussion, the problem is not the choice of a proper word, but rather the lack of a proper prefix that has the meaning of "again." When Linnekin (1983) refers to the invention of tradition, she is aware that invention is basically "re-invention." Her use of the word "invention" is that of Wagner (1981) rather than that of the "invention of tradition" school (Hobsbawm and Ranger 1983). As Wagner (1981:52) mentions, "we invent so as to sustain and restore our conventional orientation" and, therefore, "invention and convention stand in a dialectical relationship to one another, a relationship of simultaneous interdependence and contradiction." Because this dialectic of convention and invention is not fully explained in Linnekin's argument, Trask mistakenly believes that Linnekin insisted that Hawaiian nationalists fabricated the island's sacredness and concocted the concept of *aloha 'āina* out of nothing. However, we cannot invent something out of nothing; we need materials of some kind to make up something even spurious. Because the available cultural materials (such as symbols,
concepts and values) are already hybrid constructions, the problem is to what extent we must go back in history in order to identify what has become authentic and how (cf. Ota 1998:15).

The main point in Linnekin's argument is that the significance of Kaho'olawe is re-invented in the colonial context where Hawaiians are forced to use the traditional values as a mode of post-colonial resistance. The traditional concept of aloha 'āina, which has never been eloquently narrated or consciously represented but naturally experienced in everyday life, is now intentionally used as a cultural narrative in certain social contexts, such as the ecology movement and the sovereignty movement. In other words, the use of traditional values has been altered and politicized in the post-colonial context. However, following Wagner's theoretical framework, this invention (a new use of the traditional value) can be a reality for today's Hawaiians and has the possibility of becoming another convention in the future. It is this possibility that Linnekin does not fully examine in her argument. As a result, her deconstructive perspective ironically leads to a denial of culture in the making, which must be the most significant contention in cultural constructionism. At this point, Trask (1993) criticizes Linnekin (1983) for hurting Hawaiians' real culture by the "invention of tradition" ideology. She sees through Linnekin's narrative authority, characteristic of objectivist constructionism, with which she demystifies what indigenous people believe is traditional. Although Trask is at fault for discussing the issue as if everything surrounding it is politics, her criticism of the "invention of tradition" ideology is appropriate. In fact, Linnekin herself seems to have shifted her theory of tradition and cultural identity from objectivist constructionism to postmodernist (or post-objectivist) constructionism in the course of debating Trask.

On the academic side of the debate, it is worth considering the attainability of the "real" meaning of the cultural symbols, concepts and values that contribute to the construction of tradition and cultural identity. Is it possible to identify the "real" symbolic
meaning of Kaho‘olawe in a certain period and endow it with “authenticity?” As Linnekin (1983) concluded, it is possible to investigate how the island was used by examining historical data and to discuss the social importance of the island in a given period. However, its not-so-glorious past does not necessarily diminish the kapu-ness of the island. It does not matter whether the island was honored or abhorred; Kaho‘olawe was a special place in the past and is still so at the present in a different sense. The cultural concepts, such as aloha ‘āina and kapu, are too complicated to be identified in a certain period by positivistic investigation aimed at reaching a clear conclusion.

It is no longer acceptable to believe naively that we can identify the “real,” even if we follow a proper social scientific procedure, yet it is regarded as a renunciation of academic responsibility to accept agnosticism unconditionally. Still central here is the problem of interpretation; however, this battlefield has become more political in the post-colonial context, as interpretive clashes occur not only between anthropologists and indigenous peoples but also within both social arenas. Trask’s criticism highlighted the fact that there are a variety of anthropological perspectives on tradition and cultural identity. However, because her criticism is directed exclusively at anthropologists, Trask does not delineate diversity among indigenous perspectives, giving them instead a homogeneous tone. Other incidents from Australia show that disputes over the interpretation of tradition cannot simply be divided into anthropologists versus indigenous people, and that the politics of interpretations traverse the boundary between them.

Politics, Tradition and Academe:
From Australian Cases

I now examine two cases from Australia as further examples of a Fourth World context, which are more political and entail the contestation of anthropological interpretations of tradition, inside and outside academe. Now known as “the Coronation
Hill controversy” and “the Hindmarsh Island Bridge affair,” both cases entail a confrontation between local development and Aboriginal claims of sacred site conservation. These events were different from the Hawaiian case discussed above, and anthropologists in both were forced into a literal recognition of the politics of interpretation. They had to bear the responsibility for their own interpretations, not only inside academe but also in a political arena where their interpretations of Aboriginal tradition had some impact on the administrative decisions on proposed developments. Here, a brief chronology of each incident will be outlined and some debate over the incidents will be introduced, by referring to articles written by anthropologists who were directly or indirectly involved in the incidents (Brunton 1992, 1996; Keen 1992, 1993; Maddock 1998; Merlan 1991; Tonkinson 1997; Weiner 1995, 1997). I then offer another perspective on where anthropological interpretations of tradition and cultural identity are located in the post-colonial context.

Coronation Hill is located on the upper South Alligator River in the Northern Territory, where there had been intensive mineral explorations in the 1950s and 1960s. In 1984, the Coronation Hill Joint Venture resumed explorations and found gold and other mineral deposits at the hill. Subsequently, in 1985, the Aboriginal Areas Protection Authority (AAPA) registered a large area as a sacred site, called “The Upper South Alligator Bula Complex,” in which Coronation Hill was included. This registration made mining exploration subject to the approval of Aboriginal custodians authorized by the AAPA. The Complex is named after a mythical creator, known as Bula among the Jawoyn people, who could detect people’s wrongdoings in the area and cause catastrophic disasters. Since 1985, the Coronation Hill controversy has developed through many complications in which several governmental and non-governmental organizations have played active parts. In 1990, the then government referred the matter to the Resource Assessment Commission (RAC), which many experts were asked to join
to investigate the cultural significance of the Conservation Zone, as well as the social impact of development in the area. Following their final report that admitted the cultural significance of the sacred sites, Cabinet decided in June 1991 to prohibit mining at Coronation Hill, whereupon the Joint Venture brought an action in the High Court against this decision.

After the Cabinet decision, based heavily on the Jawoyn custodians’ claims of the traditional beliefs of Bula, controversy ensued among anthropologists about the credibility and genuineness of the claims. Assertions of credibility and genuineness were based on the historical continuity of tradition, which had to be proven by those who supported the Aboriginal claims, or denied by those who supported mining development in the area. The anthropologist Ron Brunton represented the latter and severely criticized the credibility of the Jawoyn custodians’ claims. He points out that there was no record of complaints about the mine at Coronation Hill between 1956 and 1964, although the Jawoyn in those days expressed concerns about mining development at other Bula sites (Brunton 1992:2). For him, there was no historical continuity in traditional beliefs about Coronation Hill, and the custodians’ claims of the Bula tradition were something invented or excavated from the past. Brunton (1992) criticized colleagues Ian Keen and Francesca Merlan, who prepared a report for the RAC, alleging that they showed partiality in selectively using evidence to exaggerate the continuity of tradition and strengthen the reasons for preventing mining. According to Brunton, anthropologists must be disinterested researchers who can tell the truth under any circumstances and never unconditionally take sides with indigenous people.

Merlan (1991:345) insisted that there was considerable continuity in the traditional beliefs of Bula among the Jawoyn people, and emphasized the close relationship between the Aboriginal history of this area and colonial interactions between Aborigines and the invaders, in which the Bula tradition had also been constructed. A
major difference between Brunton and Merlan is whether one regards tradition as a static and unchanging product or as a dynamic process. In the former view, authenticity is unconditionally placed on tradition imagined in the pre-contact period, and indigenous people are confined to the timeless past in which their culture is not allowed to change. As Keen (1993) points out, the objectivist perspective represented by Brunton’s argument denies the malleability of Aboriginal tradition and rejects its capacity to respond to changing social conditions. This objectivist negation of the dynamism of Aboriginal tradition leads to suppression of the autonomy of Aboriginal people, who have a right to control their own lives in the post-colonial context. In their treatment of Aboriginal tradition in the Coronation Hill controversy, Merlan’s and Keen’s constructionist perspective (that appreciate the malleability of tradition) look more reasonable than Brunton’s authoritative objectivist perspective (that rigidly differentiates the real and the false). However, the position that supports the autonomy of indigenous people is not unconditionally tenable in the politics of culture in the Fourth World. The second example from Australia, the Hindmarsh Island Bridge affair, leads us to this problem.

Hindmarsh Island, located near the mouth of the Murray River in the state of South Australia, has been the site of a marina development project since 1980. In 1992, public opposition to a planned bridge emerged among local residents and conservationist groups, and some of the local Aboriginal people, the Ngarrindjeri, joined the anti-bridge movement in the following year. In 1994, after the South Australian Government decided to proceed with the bridge construction, the Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement (ALRM) managed to intervene to prevent the development. Because the existence of archaeological sites was deemed insufficient reason to prohibit the bridge construction, the relevant Federal body requested additional information on the cultural significance of the island. After another appeal was made by the ALRM, the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs commissioned a legal scholar to investigate the significance of the island.
Meanwhile, the ALRM appointed an anthropologist to assist with this inquiry. In May 1994, the Minister accepted the contents of their reports and imposed a 25-year ban on the bridge construction.

According to the local Aboriginal women who opposed the bridge construction, the island was significant because of women’s cultural issues relating to birth, and it had to be separated from the mainland to avoid ill effects on Ngarrindjeri women’s productivity. This secret women’s tradition on Hindmarsh Island became known as “the women’s business” in a series of disputes. In May 1995, an Adelaide-based television station broadcast news that “the women’s business” was a recent fabrication, and subsequently a number of Ngarrindjeri women publicly denied the existence of “the women’s business.” In June, a State Royal Commission was appointed to inquire into the legitimacy of “the women’s business,” and in December the Commissioner’s final report stated that the original claim was a fabrication, aimed at preventing the bridge construction. In January 1996, the Federal Government initiated an inquiry into the Hindmarsh Island issue, and its report was later tabled in Federal Parliament, whose newly elected conservative government legislated to overturn the bridge construction ban. Then, the bridge developers sued a number of the parties involved, including the former Federal Minister who imposed the ban, the ALRM, the legal scholar, and the anthropologist who assisted her, for a huge sum of money.

According to Brunton (1996:2), the Hindmarsh Island Bridge affair was a turning point for indigenous politics in Australia, because “for the first time, Aboriginal objections to a proposed development were denounced as a ‘hoax’ by another group of Aborigines with no discernible interest in the development itself.” This incident certainly indicates that even within a particular Aboriginal group there are various interpretations of their own tradition, and makes anthropologists realize that it is no longer acceptable to dichotomize anthropologists and indigenous peoples in cultural politics in the Fourth
World. Here again, Brunton accuses both the legal scholar and the ALRM’s consultant anthropologist of intentionally manipulating information in their reports to prove the authenticity of “the women’s business.” He develops his argument in a manner very similar to the one he adopted in the previous debate on the Coronation Hill issue, pointing out that there was no record of Aboriginal opposition to a barrage construction in the area between 1935 and 1940. According to him, the reports of the anthropologist and the legal scholar try to explain the absence of objections in the late 1930s by referring to the meaningful distinction between barrages and bridges, as well as to the difficult situation of the Ngarrindjeri people in the past when they had no prospect of stopping the barrage construction. For the critics, however, neither of the arguments is sustainable. Tonkinson (1997) suggests that the conceptual gap between non-threatening barrages and culture-threatening bridges is too huge to be overcome, while Brunton (1996) denies the difficult situation surrounding the Ngarrindjeri by pointing out that they had no hesitation in conveying their anger about land clearing and archaeological excavation to anthropologists in the late 1930s.

From the theoretical point of view, this incident makes us realize that there is another vital issue concerning cultural constructionism in the anthropology of tradition and cultural identity. As noted above, the strong point of post-objectivist constructionism is that it recognizes dynamism in indigenous tradition, and respects the autonomy of indigenous people who live their own tradition. However, if anthropologists apply this culturally correct perspective from a particular doctrinal standpoint, without a careful analysis, they may not be able to distinguish tradition intentionally fabricated for a political purpose and tradition constructed as part of cultural dynamism. In a worst-case scenario, they could unwittingly collaborate with some indigenous activists in fabricating tradition by providing academic authority for it. Although postmodernist or post-objectivist constructionism ideally eliminates the dichotomy between genuine and
spurious tradition, careless constructionists are prone to authorize any tradition in the making if it is in accordance with their political opinions and academic principles.

Tradition must be appreciated as something always constructed, but this constructionist view of tradition must not allow us to be blind to political fabrication. Even though the multiplicity or partiality of truth in the postmodern condition makes it difficult to conclude whether a certain tradition is politically invented or culturally constructed (as seen in the Trask-Linnekin debate), we cannot escape the charge of academic negligence if we obliterate differences among various versions of tradition in the name of cultural constructionism. Tradition is neither an autonomous symbolic system detached from a social context nor an artificial product intentionally fabricated in the course of political struggle; it is typically located somewhere in between. Anthropologists are thus required to probe contexts for the invention of tradition in order to clarify what is being constructed and in what sense. We must recognize the complex dynamics of indigenous tradition in the post-colonial situation, and, in my view, anthropologists ideally should take the side of indigenous people. However, anthropological understanding of indigenous traditions must not be noncommittal by pleading the complexity of the actual situations or biased by siding with a particular party. Anthropologists are required to cope with both advocacy and impartiality in the post-colonial context (Keen 1992; Maddock 1998; Tonkinson 1997; Weiner 1997), where they are increasingly being asked to take clear positions, academically and politically, on cultural issues pertaining to indigenous peoples.

Texts, Readers and Realities

The definition of postmodernism is very equivocal. Anthropologists who are positively recognized as postmodernists often reject this label, while those who believe they are pioneers of postmodernism in anthropology are sometimes negatively categorized as modernists by other theorists. In offering another perspective to clarify the
problems of doing anthropology in the post-colonial era, I would like to redefine
postmodernism by following an argument advanced by Pool (1991) concerning the way
the concept of “text” is treated in different paradigms. According to Pool (1991:315-316),
in pre-modernist realism text is believed to represent an external reality. In modernism,
the focus shifts from the reality behind the text to the text itself (or, in a hermeneutical
way of speaking, the focus shifts to the world emerged in front of the text), while in
postmodernism the focus is further extended to the relation between text and reader. He
insists that what is generally recognized as postmodernism in anthropology are in fact
“certain aspects of high-modernism” or “a ‘straw-man’ postmodernism” (Pool 1991:310).

Following his strict definition, the essentialist perspective and the objectivist
constructionist perspective can be located in pre-modernist realism, whose focus is on the
reality behind the text, assuming that the “real” reality can be somehow grasped. Based
on this assumption, essentialists set up the immutable reality, that is, “a core or essence”
or “the given,” in a culture, and read cultural concepts, such as *aloha ‘āina*, as the
essential text, which has a fixed meaning and use all the time. Objectivist constructionists
also follow the same assumption. For example, Keesing (1989:35) assumes that
anthropologists can reach “the real ways of life” in the pre-contact Pacific, and insists
that we must closely investigate a large gap between “the authentic past” and “the
representations of the past in contemporary ideologies of cultural identity.” Thus, if
appropriate procedures are followed in the process of investigation, it can be determined
whether a certain cultural concept, such as *mana* [supernatural power], was culturally
crucial in the pre-contact Pacific, or is, rather, another example of the invention of
tradition in which both anthropologists and indigenous people have collaborated (Keesing

Alternatively, we can relocate the postmodernist constructionist perspective in the
modernist paradigm (or what Pool calls high-modernism) in spite of its name, because in
this perspective a thorough consideration is not yet given to the relation between text and reader, although text is no longer naively identified with reality. The difference between modernism and postmodernism is, however, a matter of degree. According to Pool (1991:315-316), both modernists and postmodernists can recognize fragmentation and chaos of the postmodern condition, but a critical difference between the two is in whether or not they can accept fragmentation and chaos where they must completely relinquish narrative authority. Linnekin (1992) understands the politics of culture in the post-colonial situation, where both anthropologists and indigenous people compete to represent cultures. Thus she suggests that we should begin an “unfashionable dialogue about whether — and where — deconstruction stops in the pursuit of ‘good anthropology’” (Linnekin 1992:261). This hesitant statement, which seeks the endpoint of deconstruction, is hardly deconstructive. Lingering misgivings or anxieties among post-colonial anthropologists are prompted by the loyalty test to the postmodern condition.

This is, however, a very proper reaction, because anthropological enterprise cannot escape the problem of narrative authority. Since the early 1980s, there have been various experiments in ethnographic writing aimed at overcoming the problem of an unquestioned objectivity in ethnographic study that had underwritten the narrative authority of ethnographers for a long time. In this trend, which can be called post-Geertzian interpretive anthropology, and is quite often attributed to two influential works (Clifford and Marcus 1986; Marucs and Fischer 1986), the presence of anthropologists in the process of fieldwork and ethnographic writing is revealed by introducing a dialogical relationship between anthropologists and their subjects into ethnographic texts. For example, in the study of life history, which is highly conducive to ethnographic experiments, the appearance of two characters (that is, an ethnographer and an informant) in the text has become a common strategy (cf. Crapanzano 1980; Dwyer 1982; Shostak
1981), leading to a new recognition that life history is a dialogue or double autobiography (Blackman 1991; Crapanzano 1984; Watson and Watson 1985). Although these experiments were able to attenuate the problem of ethnographic authority by introducing multivocal texts, they were open to criticism that anthropologists were still the dominant voices in the final products (cf. Clifford 1988b). When this criticism is made by indigenous people who have been the subjects of anthropological study, it becomes a very powerful blow that anthropologists cannot ignore. Representation of the Other is the core of anthropological enterprise, and in itself is an authoritative deed that preserves the hierarchical relationship between anthropologists and their subjects. Unless the people who are being represented take the place of those who do the representing, this problem will never be resolved. However, as far as this representation is made in the conventional academic system of anthropology, an indigenous anthropologist would become ontologically non-indigenous as I pointed out before, or “re-relegated to the status of informant” (Tobin 1995:161). Therefore, there is no way to bridge the gap between anthropologists and indigenous peoples.

According to Pool (1991:315-316), one of the requirements for postmodernism is the radical rejection of narrative authority. However, as seen in the discussion above, it is optimistic to believe that anthropologists can completely reject narrative authority. From the indigenous activist point of view, at least, it is impossible for anthropologists to relinquish narrative authority as long as they continue to write about the Other (for indigenous activists, “good anthropology” is an oxymoron if it means anthropology that does good for indigenous people). In this situation, it can be pointed out that anthropologists and indigenous people cannot attain a dialogical relationship (cf. Tobin 1995:161). However, dialogue is not necessarily a balanced exchange interaction, although it is a reciprocal relationship between two interlocutors. The search for a nonexistent ideal dialogue leads into power politics, in which both anthropologists and
indigenous people struggle to obtain the authoritative position from which they can interpret and represent cultures. In this context, it is natural that indigenous nationalists take a stance of essentialism (that is often retrospectively named strategic essentialism from the side of anthropologists) to achieve a dominant position over anthropologists, because essentialism is probably the one and only voice they can adopt without falling into the status of informants or non-indigenous people. This is certainly the present relationship between anthropologists and indigenous peoples, especially over the issue of tradition and cultural identity in the Pacific. Understanding this post-colonial predicament, Hereniko (1994) mentions as follows:

More and more, indigenous scholars prefer that outsiders refrain from pontificating about indigenous identities. It is unlikely, however, that non-indigenous scholars will stop writing about the constructions of identity among political activists and nations in the evolving Pacific; a more realistic approach would be for all concerned to focus on issues that will lead to the restoration of equality and human dignity between races. To understand the cultural, historical, and political reasons for the essentialist stance that present-day political movements have taken, and the reasons for the projection of selected images and symbols that highlight cultural differences is more important than whether or not these symbols are ‘authentic.’ (Hereniko 1994:417)

In this situation, anthropologists need to refrain from making any easy claim for a fashionable postmodernist position; instead, they should position themselves at the edge of modernism in a strict sense, from which vantage point they may see through the postmodern predicament. To do this requires them, firstly, to deepen their understanding of the textuality of cultural concepts (such as mana and aloha ‘āina). These concepts are deeply related to the traditions and cultural identities of indigenous peoples, and become objects over which both they and anthropologists compete for predominance in representational authority. Then, they must recognize the intertextual relationships among various readers over the same texts, from cultural concepts to cultural identity in general. In this intertextual relationship, where we are profoundly involved with each other, anthropologists can no longer cling to an exclusive position as interpreter.
Anthropologists are themselves interpreted when they attempt to interpret their subjects. Their interpretations expose what kind of theoretical positions they hold, what kind of political relationships they have with their subjects, and ultimately who they are.

Anthropologists must recognize that an act of narrating and representing is already embedded in this intertextual relationship. This intertextually established narrative act is what Briggs (1996:449) refers to by the phrase “metadiscursive practices,” that is, discursive practices that create (and, I think, are created of) intertextual relationship between various discourses. We are increasingly required to be conscious of our own position, from which we narrate and represent the Other. As Briggs (1996) has demonstrated, this self-reflective attitude, which relativizes even one’s own discourse, is what is required for anthropological study in the post-colonial situation. More positively speaking, we must search for a way to incorporate this attitude into our practical ethnographic studies as an effective method. Certainly, a dialogical relationship does not promise an equal relationship, and there is no easy way to “talk about making culture without making enemies” (Jackson 1989). However, if we could do good anthropology (that is, anthropology of good quality), it should start with the construction of a dialogical relationship that is open to further discussion, in order to avoid a breakdown between opposing voices.

Concluding Remarks

I began this discussion about the theories and politics of tradition and cultural identity by tentatively categorizing three theoretical positions: that is, the essentialist perspective, the objectivist constructionist perspective and the postmodernist constructionist perspective. Then, I suggested that postmodernist constructionists tried to overcome the limits of objectivist constructionism, but faced a postmodern dilemma as a result of demystifying not only essentialist tenets but also the reality of indigenous peoples in the post-colonial world. This dilemma originates in the nature of anthropology.
which cannot escape the problem of narrative authority in representing the Other. The Trask-Linnekin debate shows the post-colonial dilemma very clearly. Their arguments on the sacredness of Kaho‘olawe Island and the cultural concept of *aloha ʻāina* were not able to engage with each other, because they did not share a common recognition that “invention” in cultural constructionism is fundamentally re-invention. As a result, their debate became a black and white one, in which they argued for either the continuity or discontinuity of a certain tradition. As Tobin (1995:153) suggested, the Trask-Linnekin debate can be seen as a conflict between the two positions, one insisting “culture being politicized” and the other pointing to “politics producing culture.” However, what must be investigated here is the extent to which culture has been politicized in the post-colonial world and whether this politicization has a power to invent anew a culture detached from the past. To this end, we should study concrete ethnographic cases to examine the actual process of “re-invention” of tradition and cultural identity, and see how “convention and invention” (Wagner 1981) are interrelated with each other in cultural dynamics.

The Australian cases, in which the legitimacy of Aboriginal claims of sacred sites was disputed, exhibited an active politics of interpretation that traversed the boundary between academe and politics. Here, again, the authenticity of sacredness was discussed based on whether the historical continuity of a certain tradition could be proved, although a deconstructive argument asked whether such a questioning of the historical continuity was appropriate. It also became clear that a culturally correct perspective that appreciated the malleability of tradition and the cultural autonomy of indigenous people was not always perfect. If anthropologists are so easily clad in a stylish postmodernist narrative as to insist that there is nothing essential or that everything is constructed, they will run a risk of inventing a desired culture that fits their ideological preference. In such a case, originally culturally correct constructionism can be spoiled. Essentialists and objectivist constructionists who try to identify the real meaning of cultural concepts and traditions
tend to occupy an authoritative position. Yet postmodernist constructionists who attempt to overcome this difficult situation may highlight or emphasize the suppression of the cultural autonomy of indigenous people and, as a result, strengthen the authority of anthropologists (cf. Briggs 1996:460-461).

The strict definition of postmodernism (Pool 1991) based on the textual theory helps clarify similarities and differences among the aforementioned three theoretical perspectives, and also provides a different angle for reconsidering why and how the problem of narrative authority turns into a critical issue in the post-colonial context. A cultural text, such as the meaning of *aloha ‘āina* or the sacredness of a specific place, allows various interpretations, which are vested with a political significance in the politics of culture. Such texts are something like a mirror that projects different positions of the discussants. What was clarified in the Hawaiian and Australian cases was not the real meaning of cultural concepts or the authentic interpretation of traditions, but the different standpoints of discussants and their inter-relationships (cf. Tonkinson 1993:599). This tells us that in the post-colonial environment anthropologists are required to deepen their understanding of the fact that they also construct their own texts, which are vulnerable to other criticisms inside and outside academe. In order to stand face to face with indigenous people, anthropologists must realize that they can be deeply read as textual beings through their own works.

Culture, including tradition and cultural identity, is constructed. However, culture is constructed not only by being experienced but also by being deeply read and openly narrated. In other words, there are two kinds of culture: one is unconsciously cultivated in experience, the other more or less consciously textualized. Of course, this is not a simple dichotomy, but a matter of degree. The post-colonial condition of the Fourth World accelerates the textuality of concepts and values, tradition and identity. It is mainly highly textualized culture that is at stake in the politics of culture in the Pacific. Because of this
textuality, the issue of tradition and cultural identity easily traverses the boundary between academe and politics, and becomes problematic. Even if this sounds like a hackneyed cliché of interpretive anthropology, the concepts of text and, more importantly, of intertextuality are still indispensable in making anthropologists recognize the postmodern condition, one in which intellectual humility and sincerity are required for the discipline.
NOTES

[1] Following Tonkinson (1990:198), I use the word “Fourth World” to denote the socio-cultural condition where indigenous people have become a minority and structurally subordinated in their homeland.

[2] Every Hawaiian word, except for a proper noun, is basically italicized in the main text, with an English translation in brackets at the first appearance. I adopt Hawaiian orthography, using the macron and glottal stop.

[3] In addition to the ontological problem of being an indigenous “Hawaiian” anthropologist, there is also a cultural problem. Among Hawaiians, there is a cultural code to avoid being maha’oi [bold]. Asking questions, which is a basic conduct of ethnographic interviewers and social surveyors, is one of the behaviors that are regarded as maha’oi. When I asked a Hawaiian language teacher for advice to avoid being maha’oi in the survey, she simply answered, “Don’t niele [ask; inquisitive] if you don’t want to be maha’oi. Any kind of niele is maha’oi.” In Hawaiian society, where niele is avoided as an undesirable behavior, being an anthropologist (that is, being inquisitive) is very un-Hawaiian. Therefore, from a cultural standpoint, being a “Hawaiian” anthropologist is a very contradictory thing. Ito (1999) examines Hawaiian proper behaviors and the concepts of maha’oi and niele, in particular, by referring to her fieldwork experiences.

[4] There are many debates in which academic interpretation of indigenous culture is criticized by indigenous writers as anti-indigenous discourse. In addition to the Trask-Linnekin debate that I discuss here, the disputes arising from attempts by Hanson (1989) and Gill (1987) to deconstruct indigenous traditional culture can be cited as notable examples (cf. Briggs 1996; Linnkein 1991b).

[5] Although the term “primordialist” is often mistakenly used as a synonym of “essentialist,” it is important to distinguish clearly between these terms. The term “primordialist” should be used to indicate those theorists who maintain that the cultural and ethnic identity of people is influenced by the emotional power or “overpowering coerciveness” of primordial attachment, which stems from “the assumed ‘givens’” (Geertz 1973b:259), such as blood, land, language and customs. Essentialists see these factors not as the assumed givens but as the inherent components (that is, the genuine givens) that directly constitute ethnicity.

[6] Strictly speaking, it is impossible to locate all the theoretical perspectives on the same linear continuum, based on a single criterion. In addition, this type of categorization or labelling has a danger of caricaturing, which ends up missing important issues (cf. Bentley 1987:25-26; Oda 1996:810-815). Nevertheless, this outline helps draw a rough sketch of the schools and theories in this field of study, from which it is possible to begin discussion of what is at stake in contemporary anthropological theories of cultural construction.

[7] Weiner (1999) also discusses the Hindmarsh Island Bridge affair and investigates how both anthropology and the state legislature failed to recognize fully that Aboriginal tradition was relationally constructed and transformed by anthropological and legislative discourses.


[9] Merlan’s and Keen’s position is parallel with a trend of an “Island-centered history,” which originated in the “Davidson School” (cf. Davidson 1966; Howe 1979; Maude 1971). In the field of Pacific history, similar discussion on the politics of
representation (often phrased by "Who owns the past?") has continued concurrently. When Island-centered history is emphasized excessively (cf. Routledge 1985), theoretical propositions become highly ideological and problematic, especially in relation to the politics of representation and narrative authority (cf. Meleisea 1978; Thomas 1990).


[11] The critical attitude assumed by Brunton (1996) and Tonkinson (1997) against the media release of the Australian Anthropological Society (AAS) about the Hindmarsh Island Bridge affair is certainly concerned with this point. According to them, the AAS media release criticizes those arguing against "the women's business" by regarding their argument as a "crudely empiricist" one that tries to "judge the truth or falsity of Aboriginal beliefs" (Brunton 1996:5-6; Tonkinson 1997:6).

[12] Kuwayama (1997) and Ota (1998) argue the same problem exists for Japanese anthropologists who conduct Japanese studies in Western countries, such as the United States.
CHAPTER 3
HAWAIIAN CHRISTIANITY FROM THE LATE 19TH TO THE EARLY 20TH CENTURY

Introduction

Culture is a product of dynamic process of “convention and invention” (Wagner 1981). Therefore, an ethnographic study of Christian Hawaiian identity at the present time requires a historical understanding of Hawaiian Christianity. Hawaiian Christianity’s past has an influence on the current Christian Hawaiians’ identity and faith. More precisely, their understanding of the past influences their construction of Christian Hawaiian identity and Hawaiian Christian faith. In general, any interpretation of the present always requires one of the past as well. This applies to not only Christian Hawaiians but also anthropologists. By locating a subject in a broader historical context, we can relativize an ethnographic understanding of the present. By investigating how Hawaiians tried to assimilate Christianity into their culture in the late 19th century and what the social condition surrounding Christian Hawaiians was like, it is possible to shed light on the construction of the present Hawaiian Christianity from a different angle.

The purpose of this and the next chapters is, therefore, to describe how Hawaiians reacted to Christianity and incorporated it in the past, and to investigate how Hawaiian traditional culture functioned in the process of incorporation. In order to do so, this chapter aims to inspect how the social context influenced Christian Hawaiians from the latter half of the 19th century to the early 20th century. An object of study is the Congregational churches in this period. In this chapter, by referring to historical materials, such as The Friend, which is a Congregational publication, and the Annual Report of the Board of the Hawaiian Evangelical Association as well as local newspapers, I describe socio-cultural conditions inside and outside the churches. Through various conditions, such as the demographic changes, the activities of other Christian
denominations, the shift in the political structure, the erosion of Hawaiian language, and the interplay between Christianity and indigenous religion, Hawaiian Congregational Christianity has developed to the present form.

The main historical materials I utilize in this chapter are not of Christian Hawaiians, but of white missionaries and ministers. This means that I interpret the history of Hawaiian Christianity through the eyes of the outsiders who intruded into Hawaii with an intention of converting Hawaiians. Therefore, it may be difficult to find Christian Hawaiians, the leading character of Hawaiian Christianity, in my analysis. However, in the case that there is actually no easily accessible material left by Christian Hawaiians who had a different understanding of Christianity from that of white missionaries, we have no choice but to analyze the materials left by the outsiders, including white missionaries, in order to investigate Christianity for Hawaiians at that time. Although I try to read the available materials as painstakingly as possible, this does not mean that I totally agree with the missionaries' interpretation of the faith and practice of Christian Hawaiians. In such a difficult condition that is faced by most of ethnohistorical studies of the Pacific Islands, it is required not only to read carefully but also to write against the outsiders' writings. To give a different tone to missionaries' interpretation when there is actually no other material than theirs, we have to catch a glimpse or an open seam in their texts that gives a clue for reading a different story, which the original texts did not intend to tell.

It is a hard task to accomplish such a historical study, because there is always a trap of blind sympathy that nullifies such a painstaking reading of the outsiders' materials by denying them promptly as biased data. For example, someone might say, "These historical records were left by the missionaries who did not understand the indigenous people, so that they cannot show the reality of those who were managing to live through violent changes caused by external factors" or simply say, "There is no indigenous people
in the colonizers' texts.” There is some truth in these statements and Christian Hawaiians may be nearly absent in the missionaries’ texts. However, missionaries’ interpretations surely present some reality of Hawaiian Christianity at that time in which Christian Hawaiians as well as the white missionaries lived their lives. I am not sure to what extent I can give a different tone to the missionaries’ voices, but I attempt to write a history of Hawaiian Christianity not with blind sympathy but with careful empathy by reading diligently the available materials.

There remains another problem in my reading of the white missionaries’ writings. Even if a certain topic was interpreted by white missionaries in a definitely biased manner, I can carefully reinterpret their interpretation as far as it is left as a historical record. However, when a specific issue, which was significant for understanding a history of Hawaiian Christianity, is completely missing in their texts because of their same bias, it becomes very difficult to write against or give a different tone to their texts in which they actually wrote nothing about the issue. Of course, it is possible to point out that the specific issue is totally absent in the missionaries’ writings by referring to other historical materials than theirs. In the worst case, however, there is a possibility that I also miss the issue in my historical investigation just because it was not mentioned in the missionaries’ writings; and the possibility becomes greater when heavily relying on the their writings. In a word, it is easier to point out what they said wrong than what they did not say and why they did not say so.

The relation between Christianity and colonialism is such issue that is nearly completely absent in The Friend and the Annual Report of the Board of the Hawaiian Evangelical Association. In a historical study of the Pacific region, Christianity must be investigated not only as religion but also as a problem of colonialism. In a history of Christianity in Hawaii, religion, politics and economics were always intertwined, at least until the early 20th century. Because the aforementioned Congregational materials do not
mention a lot about this issue, they are not suited for embedding Hawaiian Christianity within the political and economic considerations. For example, the Kaona Insurrection that occurred inside a Congregational church on Hawai‘i in 1868 was a very serious and significant incident not only in a history of Hawaiian Christianity but also in a political history of Hawaii, but the paucity of reports on this incident in the Congregational materials can make us feel as if it did not actually happened or it was not so important. Although the political turmoil inside the Congregational community after the overthrow of the Hawaiian monarchy in 1893 was reported more in these materials, it was described as unexpected misfortune for which the Congregational churches were not responsible at all.

The neglect of the political and economic issues concerning Hawaiian Christianity in the missionary discourse may be more or less related with a mental attitude of some of the current Christian Hawaiians. This may be one of the reasons why there is still a tension between the sovereignty movement and the Congregational churches. Ideally speaking, it is indispensable to cover all the available historical materials in order to locate Hawaiian Christianity in the broader context of religion, politics and economics. The Friend and the Annual Report of the Board of the Hawaiian Evangelical Association are not sufficient data for conducting such a comprehensive study of Hawaiian Christianity. However, while giving due consideration to this problem, I dare to focus on the aforementioned historical materials to describe critically the world of Hawaiian Christianity from the late 19th century to the early 20th century. However self-satisfied and self-centered it was, the missionaries’ Christianity undoubtedly provided the basic elements which Hawaiians reacted to and appropriated in order to construct their own Christian faith and live their Christian lives. Of course, different stories that cannot be read in the missionaries’ texts were proceeding among Christian Hawaiians. In the next chapter, I will describe and interpret stories of how Christian Hawaiians tried to make
Christianity their own. This chapter's historical investigation of Hawaiian Christianity through the eyes of the white missionaries and ministers gives strong contrast and therefore is useful, when understanding how Hawaiians incorporated Christianity in a different way from the missionaries' expectation.

The Beginning of the Hawaiian Missions

Christian denominations that have played a significant role in the history of Hawaiian Christianity are Congregationalist, Catholic, Mormon and Episcopalian, all of which were introduced into Hawaii before and around the mid-19th century (cf. Mulholland 1970). The history of the Congregational mission is the longest and started when the first company of missionaries came to Hawaii in 1820. They were dispatched by the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions (ABCFM), which was organized mainly by Congregationalists and Presbyterians at the beginning of the 19th century in New England. Since then, the ABCFM sent a total of 12 missionary companies by 1848.

On the other hand, the French Roman Catholics began their mission work on a full scale in 1827 when a mission party was dispatched from their home country. At that time, however, Queen Kaʻahumanu and many members of royalty, who were at the center of politics, had already been converted to Protestantism. Catholic missionaries were not only unable to obtain cooperation from them, but also prohibited from doing the mission work and expelled from the islands. Although their missionary activities had somehow continued, Catholic Hawaiians including anti-Kaʻahumanu royalty had been persecuted under the anti-Catholic policy until 1839 when the oppressive measures were relaxed (Kuykendall 1938:137-147).

The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (the Mormon Church) started the mission work in 1850. Because there were fewer Americans than they had expected, the Mormon missionaries focused on Hawaiians as a target of conversion and actively
developed their activities among them by appointing native converts to various offices in the church (Kuykendall 1938:344). However, because of a worsening relation between the church's organization and the U.S. Government, white missionaries withdrew from the islands in 1858 after appointing native missionaries to take charge of mission work. The Mormon mission remained in a state of disorder until 1864 when it was reorganized under the direction of white missionaries sent from the home country organization (Kuykendall 1953:101-104). However, because of their relative tolerance of Hawaiian traditions (including dance and music) and their belief that Polynesians are descended from the Israelites (Burrows 1970 [1947]:156-158; Mullholand 1970:125-127), the Mormons steadily acquired more Hawaiian converts.

The Church of England began a full-scale mission work in 1862. Because Kamehameha IV adopted an anti-U.S. position at that time and the Church's views on royalty were favorable to the Hawaiian monarchy, they were able to convert some members of the royalty. However, Hawaii had already been occupied by the Congregationalists and Roman Catholics, with the Mormon mission increasing its influence, so the Church of England was not able to achieve the success they had hoped for (Kuykendall 1953:94-99). In 1872, the name of the church was changed to the Anglican Church in Hawaii, which in 1902 became the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States of America (Mullholand 1970:148-150).

Although other Protestant denominations began missions to Hawaii in the latter half of the 19th century, and so-called new Christian forces, such as the Pentecostalists, Seventh-day Adventists and Jehovah's Witnesses, are acquiring influence in the current Christian Hawaiian community, the above-mentioned four denominations can be recognized as the dominant forces in the history of Hawaiian Christianity. Among the four, the Congregational churches have had the strongest impact on Hawaiians.
When the first company of the ABCFM missionaries arrived in 1820, all the islands had been unified under the Kamehameha dynasty, the 'aikapu [eating taboos], which was the center of the traditional religious system, had been abolished (cf. Kame‘elehiwa 1992:67-79), and Hawaiians had become accustomed to communicating with Westerners. The ABCFM missionaries learned much from their brethren at the London Missionary Society (LMS) who had already accumulated mission experiences in Tahiti, and were able to gain the support of a LMS missionary who was fluent in Tahitian, a linguistic cousin of Hawaiian. Considering these factors, it was an ideal situation for the ABCFM missionaries in Hawaii (Howe 1984:170). They romanized the Hawaiian language, introduced printing machines to publish Hawaiian Bibles and textbooks, and established schools in every district on the islands to assign high priority to the education of Hawaiians based on the Euro-American knowledge systems. Their educational activities were supported by the ruling chiefs, and in 1831 the number of common schools throughout the islands reached about 1,100 attended by about 52,000 students (Kuykendall 1938:106).

However successful the missionaries were in promoting education, converting the Hawaiians to Christianity, their original aim, proved more problematic. In 1837, the number of Hawaiian followers of the Congregational churches was still 1,049. It is not because Hawaiians had no interest in a foreign religion, but because the early missionaries, strict Calvinists, were excessively cautious in granting Hawaiians regular membership in the church (Kuykedall 1938:114). Accepting advice from the mainland organization, however, several mission stations started to adopt a liberal policy to accept Hawaiians as regular members, which laid the groundwork for the foundation for the Great Revival; it centered on two churches, Hilo and Waimea, on Hawai‘i, from 1837 to 1840 (cf. Daws 1960). During this period, the membership of the Congregational churches increased by more than 17,000.
With this as a turning point, the number of Hawaiian members increased significantly in the Congregational churches, and their influence permeated through the islands to the extent that they sent Hawaiian missionaries to the Marquesas Islands and the islands of Micronesia starting in 1852 (cf. Morris 1987). On the other hand, the Hawaiian mission gradually changed its character from a foreign mission to a home mission (Kuykendall 1938:341). In 1848, the ABCFM and the Hawaiian government agreed that the missionaries and their families would be released from the ABCFM in order to become permanent residents of the islands; this afforded them the chance to own property in the islands (Loomis 1970:22-23). In 1854, the Hawaiian Association, organized in 1823, was dissolved into a new organization: the Hawaiian Evangelical Association (HEA) (cf. the Annual Report 1904), which in 1961 became known in its present form as the Hawaii Conference of the United Church of Christ (UCC). Finally, in 1863, the ABCFM completely withdrew from the islands and the HEA became an independent organization, establishing the Board of the HEA to conduct the business of the association. In general, a significant turning point in the Christianization of the Pacific Islands is when the mission controlled by the home country organization shifts to the independent local church activities centering on the islands. Such a transition period can be located around between 1848 and 1863 in Hawaii.

In the latter half of the 19th century, Hawaiian ministers gradually began to serve the Congregational churches in every area of the islands (Kuykendall 1953:99-101). However, they did not necessarily take the leadership in the Christian community. For example, the Board of the HEA was monopolized by white ministers. In addition, there was only one Hawaiian minister out of about 25 members who served on the editorial board of The Friend, an influential Congregational publication, even in the first quarter of the 20th century (Gallagher 1983:12). There are several reasons why Hawaiians were not able to attain a high position inside the Christian organization. Foremost was the white
missionaries’ and ministers’ low evaluation of Hawaiians’ ability, as seen in their efficiency evaluation of Hawaiian ministers against the Catholic and Mormon white ministers, and their paternalistic stance toward Hawaiian church members as they showed in a rapid linguistic shift from Hawaiian to English, both of which I will introduce later in this chapter. At the local congregation level, however, the attitude of ordinary Hawaiian church members toward Hawaiian ministers must be also considered. They were not always willing to accept Hawaiian ministers to lead their congregations, especially if they replaced white ministers who had served there before (Gallagher 1983:27-30).

**Social Changes Surrounding the Congregational Churches**

**Demographic Changes**

The Hawaiian population at the time of the European arrival in the last quarter of the 18th century is estimated to have been from about 300,000 to 400,000 (Schmitt 1977) to 800,000 (Stannard 1989). However, as a result of the contact with the Western civilization, which brought epidemics such as measles, smallpox, cholera, whooping cough, influenza and venereal diseases, the population of Hawaiians, who had no immunity, decreased drastically. It is estimated that their population decreased to under 200,000 at the beginning of the 19th century, and under 150,000 by 1820 when the missionaries came to the islands. According to the missionary census, the population from 1831 to 1832 was about 130,000 and from 1835 to 1836 was 108,000.

While the population of Hawaiians continued to decrease in the latter half of the 19th century [Figure 1], the demographic structure of Hawaiian society was changing from that of a colonial society composed of a small number of Caucasians and a large number of Hawaiians to that of a multi-ethnic society composed of not only Hawaiians and Caucasians, but also Chinese, Portuguese and Japanese immigrants who came to Hawaii as plantation workers. This mult-ethnic condition created by the immigrants not only led to intermarriages between Hawaiians and other ethnic groups, but also affected
Figure 1. Population of Hawaiians (1778-1990)

*from Schmitt (1977) and State Census (1980, 1990)
the Congregational churches whose activities originally focused on Hawaiians. By 1890, Hawaiians (including those of mixed blood) were not able to obtain a majority of the total population of Hawaii, and early in the 20th century they were overtaken by Japanese as the largest ethnic group.

In addition to the depopulation of Hawaiians as well as the multi-ethnic condition caused by the immigrants, the movement of population involving Hawaiians inside the island society must be considered. The Hawaiian islands are mainly composed of Hawai‘i, Maui, Lāna‘i, Moloka‘i, O‘ahu, Kaua‘i and Ni‘ihau. The end of the 19th century was a period when the most populated area started to shift from Hawai‘i to O‘ahu [Figure 2]; the population of O‘ahu was not drastically increasing, however, because the total population was decreasing in this period. Although there is no statistical data that follows actual population movement between islands, it can be surmised that Hawaiians on other islands than O‘ahu joined the drift of population to O‘ahu, which had the biggest port city, Honolulu.

It is quite natural that this gravitation of population toward Honolulu, O‘ahu influenced the Congregational churches [Figure 3], Hawaiian churches in particular. Since the end of the 19th century, more than a few articles started to appear in the Annual Report of the Board of the Hawaiian Evangelical Association, which pointed out the influence of the demographic changes upon the church activities. For example, one in the Annual Report (1896) goes as follows:

The conditions of church life and work seem to be improving in some quarters, though many churches are still at a very low ebb. At many places where there was once a flourishing people, and a large attendance upon Sabbath services, now owing to the general decrease of the Hawaiian population, and to their removal to the capital, there is to be found only the ruins of the church edifices that were erected forty, fifty, and sixty years ago.

In the Hilo and Hamakua region the native Hawaiians are to-day but a small part of the population. The Japanese, Chinese, Portuguese and Anglo-Saxons have taken the places once occupied by the aborigines. In localities where these conditions prevail, the once flourishing churches have disappeared, or if any Hawaiian churches are maintained, they are
Figure 2. Population by Islands (1850-1970)

*from Schmitt (1977)
Figure 3. The HEA Membership: Four Island Associations (1831-1962)

*from Minutes (1831-1868), the Friend (1869-1877), the Annual Report (1878-1962)
**The data of 1838, 1845, 1847, 1850, and 1874 are not available.
necessarily in weak and waning condition, as to numbers, pastors' support, and contributions to any cause. *(the Annual Report 1896:16)*

A superintendent of the Hawaiian Department of the HEA also referred to the depopulation of Hawaiians on Hawai‘i:

In many localities on Hawaii where there were flourishing churches fifty years ago, there remain but a handful of the descendants of the earlier native Hawaiian Christians. The generation that filled the land fifty years ago has passed away and left but few descendants. Where once stood churches and school-houses there remain but very few Hawaiians, and in the long reaches of coast the Hawaiian population is very thinly spread. The lack of a native Hawaiian population makes it difficult to maintain Hawaiian-speaking pastors and churches. Other races, especially the Japanese are filling the land. *(the Annual Report 1905:23)*

A minister on Kaua‘i commented on the work among Hawaiians on Kaua‘i and suggested the idea of changing the church system, from the district meeting covering a large parish to the direct house to house cottage meeting, in order to adapt to the new social situation:

Half a century or so ago, the Hawaiian churches, received at the hands of the missionary fathers a system of church work and government admirably suited to the conditions then existing. This system the churches have very naturally and perhaps wisely cherished to this day. But the conditions have changed very materially since then, and it seems to me it is time to change the system somewhat. Then there was a large Hawaiian population, the churches and church attendance were large. Now the population is small and scattered, and the church membership and attendance very much shrunken, while foreign interests and agencies have come in.

In many cases the "district meetings" and the Wednesday afternoon prayer meetings have ceased to be much more than a decaying form, a source of humiliation rather than strength to the church. The people are too few, too scattered and too much occupied to come to them. They would better be dropped and the much more direct and effective house to house cottage meeting substituted in their stead. *(the Annual Report 1899:20)*

Although these articles do not necessarily indicate that Hawaiians in local islands moved to O‘ahu, they are in a striking contrast to the following article that describes the population of Honolulu and its influence on Hawaiian churches. While Hawaiian churches in rural areas on each island suffered from the depopulation of Hawaiians, the influx of Hawaiians to O‘ahu constituted an additional burden on Hawaiian churches on
the island. An article in *the Annual Report* (1916) described the disparity between rural areas and Honolulu:

During the last fifteen years the population of Honolulu has grown by leaps and bounds. The casual observer would say that the increase was in the Oriental and Anglo-Saxon elements, but the fact is that the Hawaiian element of the city has grown greatly. . . . The situation has now reached the point where half of all the Hawaiian people live on the Island of Oahu. This circumstance has seriously affected our Hawaiian churches in two ways: the churches on the other islands, especially those in the country districts have been much weakened, while the churches on Oahu are facing heavier responsibilities than ever . . .

The superintendent, realizing this condition, has endeavored for the past few years to man the churches on Oahu with competent pastors, in order to meet the larger need.

The weakened condition of the country churches on the other islands is a serious matter. On Maui, the problem is being worked out by combining several churches in villages near each other into one country parish ministered to by one pastor. . . . On Hawaii also similar combinations of parishes have been effected in a number of cases. But even so there is still need for many new pastors. (*the Annual Report* 1916:25-26)

The latter half of the 19th century is a period when both the population of Hawaiians and the number of the Congregational church members were steadily decreasing. However, it is impossible to explain the decrease of the church membership and the stagnant church activities solely by the depopulation of Hawaiians, although it probably worked as a main factor in the rural area. In 1866, the population census counted a total population of 62,959 in Hawaii (including 58,785 full and part Hawaiians) and, 30 years later in 1896, it counted 109,020 (including 39,504 Hawaiians). In other words, the Hawaiian population decreased from 1866 to 1896 by 32.8%. On the other hand, the number of the Congregational church members in 1863, when the HEA became independent of the ABCFM, was 19,725 (the data does not include the members of non-Hawaiian churches), and in 1893, 30 years later, it was 5,438 (4,226 members in Hawaiian churches and 1,212 members in Non-Hawaiian churches). Membership of the Hawaiian Congregational churches decreased by 78.6% (the decreasing rate of the whole church membership is 72.4%). As these numbers show, the decreasing rate of the
Hawaiian church members was substantially greater than that of the total population of Hawaiians.

**Influx of Other Christian Denominations**

It is not only the immigrant plantation workers who came to Hawaii in the latter half of the 19th century. Various Christian denominations, such as the Methodists, Lutherans and Seventh-day Adventists, also sent missionaries to Hawaii respectively (cf. Mulholland 1970). However, because these denominations focused initially on ethnic groups other than Hawaiians, they did not influence the conversion of Hawaiians at this time. At the end of the 19th century, it was still an admitted fact that the term “Protestant Hawaiian” was synonymous with “HEA member,” and 98% of the Protestant Hawaiians were Congregationalists (Gallagher 1983:59).

Under this circumstance, the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (the Mormon Church) began their missions in 1850 and the Church of England followed in 1862; both used different strategies in focusing on Hawaiians. In the 1853 census conducted on 71,019 Hawaiians, there were 56,840 Protestants (Congregationalists) (80.0%), 11,401 Catholics (16.1%) and 2,778 Mormons (3.9%). On the other hand, in the 1896 census of 39,504 Hawaiians, there were 16,084 Protestants (40.7%), 11,060 Catholics (28.0%) and 4,764 Mormons (12.1%); and there were 7,596 Hawaiians (19.2%) who were affiliated with other religions or no religion [Figure 4]. There may be some problem with the validity of the 1853 census, because it assumed that all Hawaiians had to belong to some Christian denomination. From the results of these two census, however, it is quite clear that the Congregationalist force was falling off among Hawaiians and the influence of both Catholic and Mormon missions was rising, while Hawaiians affiliated with non-Christian religions or no religion started to occupy a considerable ratio of the Hawaiian population (cf. Lind 1952:12).
Figure 4. Religious Affiliations of Hawaiians (1853 and 1896)

*from the Polynesian (1854/04/15) and Report of General Superintendent of the Census, 1896.
The latter half of the 19th century is a period when the ABCFM, the home country Congregational organization, withdrew from Hawaii, and the traditional Hawaiian religion represented by kahuna [traditional priest] started to revive, and the Catholic and the Mormon missions were well under way. In particular, the Mormon missions focused on Hawaiians as their target and, as a result, of the 4,886 Mormon followers indicated in the 1896 census, 4,764 were Hawaiians. The multi-religious condition that was rapidly progressing in late 19th century Hawaii is plainly described in the 1948 statement made by Rev. Moses Moku, a Hawaiian pastor of the Haili Church:

About 60 years ago, Hawaiian Christianity was caught in the midst of a new influx of new-comers from the East and West. These new-comers brought along with them their altars and temples, crosses and rosaries, shrines and images, customs and beliefs. At that time, Hawaiian Christianity could be compared to a little boy watching a three-ring circus. He tries to see the acts of all three rings all at the same time. In like manner, the Hawaiian Christian did not know what to do with his Christianity. It had many new angles. His interest was divided. He was confused and did not know where to focus his attention. Some said this, others said that, and still others said you are wrong, we are right. However, he quickly adjusted his life with that of his new found friends, their new way of life, new ideas, new behavior, new interpretations of the Scripture, and new emphasis on some church doctrines.

These new-comers stressed the importance of baptism by emersion [sic.], forgiveness of sin, the healing power of God by prayer and fasting, the name of Jesus, baptism of the Holy Spirit, speaking with tongue, healing by prayer and laying on of the hands, aroused a new religious curiosity which moved him to join them. He was promised the power of physical healing for his sick child, wife or relative if he joined them.

Inter-marriages have also led to the division of our Hawaiian Congregational Church families. Today, we have in one family, Kalawina, Mormon, Catholic, Hoomananaauao, Seventh Day Adventist, Heathens, and Pagans. (The Friend 1948/07:29-30)[7]

Articles, which expressed distress at the influence of other Christian denominations, started to appear in The Friend and the Annual Report from the end of the 19th century to the early 20th century, when the Congregational churches was decreasing in strength. For example, one such article in The Friend mentioned that the Mormons had 42 houses of worship and 16 white Elders, and concluded that the strong force of the Mormon Elders and the Catholic priests accounted for the decline of the Congregational
churches among Hawaiians (The Friend 1895/09:68). Another pointed out that there were only five white Protestant ministers in active service who spoke Hawaiian, while there were 25 active white Catholic priests (The Friend 1903/08:5). A minister on Kaua‘i also referred to the influence of the Mormons on Kaua‘i and described the zeal of the Mormons, their faith healing and loose membership criteria that admitted those who had been excommunicated from the other churches, as the main reasons why they had drawn largely from the Hawaiian Congregational churches (the Annual Report 1900:23).

Although the HEA ministers insisted that the Protestants were dominant in the arena of the local media, politics and education (interestingly, however, they did not mention their dominancy in economics), they had to admit the existence of a relative increase in the Hawaiian membership in the Catholic and the Mormon churches (The Friend 1900/08, 1903/08).

In light of this critical situation, the consensus shared by the HEA ministers was that their Congregational churches were declining because the Hawaiian ministers were “seldom competent to hold the ground against active white teachers of error” (The Friend 1895/09:68) or “relatively less efficient” compared with the vigorous white workers of the Catholics and the Mormons (The Friend 1903/08:5). Although the leading ministers of the HEA laid all the blame on the Hawaiian ministers, the fact is that other Christian denominations started full-scale mission work in Hawaii, exactly when the HEA completed the transition of the leadership from the white missionaries to the native ministers. Furthermore, this occurred during an economically difficult time period, in which many Hawaiian churches were pastorless because of financial problems. It is in this difficult time when the Hawaiian ministers were assigned the charge of Hawaiian churches. Therefore, even if the white ministers judged that the native pastors were less competent, they were not able to relieve the Hawaiian pastors of their post or replace them with white ministers.
The Old System Disappears

In the beginning of the Congregational mission in Hawaii, there existed several members of royalty, such as Ka'ahumanu, who actively supported the missionaries on the Kingdom level. In each district, there were also local chiefs who became patrons in order to assist church activities. Therefore, it was not uncommon that almost all the people living in the same district came together to attend the Sunday service at church under a strict order of a local chief who had been already converted (cf. Emerson c.1895). Such a social structure was ideal for the missionaries, but it also involved a risk of reaching a deadlock in the mission work once they lost the support of the royal family or local chiefs.

Although his anti-American attitude was not expressed to the Congregational churches directly, Kamehameha IV, who ascended to the throne in 1854, supported the Church of England; this was a severe blow to the HEA, which had been gaining assistance from royal families until that time (Gallagher 1983:33). Furthermore, Kamehameha V, who was enthroned in 1863, also weakened the HEA by giving high priority to the revival of Hawaiian traditional culture, such as hula [dance] and kahuna (Kuykendall 1953:125). In particular, it was a great scandal in the then Christian society that he issued government licenses to more than 300 kāhuna [plural of kahuna] in c.1861 when he worked under Kamehameha IV (cf. The Friend 1888/07:53). Kalākaua, enthroned in 1874, further thrust forward the revival of Hawaiian traditional culture and, in 1886, established a secret society, called the Hale Naua Society, whose object was “the revival of Ancient Science of Hawaii in combination with the promotion and advancement of Modern Sciences, Art, Literature and Philanthropy” (Bicknell c.1890; Kuykendall 1967:345).

As I showed above, in the latter half of the 19th century, the Congregational churches were not able to gain the support of the royal family as they had before.
Moreover, the retrogressive movement against Christianization, such as the revival of Hawaiian traditional culture, advanced on the government level and was an additional blow to the HEA. As a result, the HEA ministers gradually took a confrontational position toward the royal family and their negative comments against royalty started to appear in *The Friend*. In the last quarter of the 19th century, the old system that the ABCFM missionaries enjoyed in the early years of the mission work had completely disappeared.

*Foundation of Non-Hawaiian Churches and Language Shift from Hawaiian to English*

Almost all Congregational churches that belonged to the HEA in the latter half of the 19th century were Hawaiian churches established by the missionaries and focused on Hawaiians, except for a few churches founded for non-Hawaiians living in main port cities, such as the Bethel Church and the Fort Street Church in Honolulu, and the First Foreign Church in Hilo. As such, church services were generally conducted in Hawaiian, rather than English. However, when the sugarcane industry made rapid progress toward the end of the 19th century, English services started to be held in church for English speakers living on the plantation. A paper read at the jubilee of the first English church service of the Union Church in Kohala, Hawai‘i, described how missionaries coped with the demands for English service in those days:

Up to 1865 there were no church services in the English language, in Kohala, any foreigners who wished to attend service going to the Hawaiian Church... The Plantation was begun in 1864, and that brought in more foreigners:...

The need of church services in English was soon felt, and Rev. Elias Bond was urged to begin such services. This he was loath to do, as his time was fully taken up in his work as pastor of the large Hawaiian church; but, yielding to their persuasions, he finally began to minister to the spiritual needs of the foreigners, holding the first service on October 16, 1865, in a schoolhouse which had been erected recently on the plantation.

Mr. Bond went directly from the Hawaiian Church, at close of the long service held there, arriving at the schoolhouse at about one o’clock, or, perhaps, one-thirty. We children, feeling the need of something to sustain
the inner man, hurried home from the Hawaiian Church and, making a hasty lunch, walked as fast as possible down to the plantation, to be there in time for that service. (*The Friend* 1915/11:250-251)

Subsequently, English congregations were organized, which were then established as Foreign Congregational churches (cf. *The Friend* 1879/04, 1915/11; *the Annual Report* 1902). Furthermore, other non-Hawaiian Congregational churches were organized for Chinese, Portuguese and Japanese immigrants respectively at the end of the 19th century and the early 20th century. As a result, the character of the HEA altered from a dominantly Hawaiian association to one composed of several ethnic churches, reflecting the multi-ethnic society. At the turn of the century, for example, there were five ethnic churches in Hilo, Hawai'i: the Haili Church (a Hawaiian church established in 1825, a center of "the Great Revival" in the late 1830s), the Foreign Church (established in 1867), the Japanese Church (established in 1890), the Portuguese Church (established in 1892) and the Chinese Church (established in 1901). The statistical data clearly shows the progress of the multi-ethnic character in the HEA in which strictly Hawaiian churches were losing their influence [Figure 5]. The multi-ethnic character was developing in the membership of each congregation as well. The Central Kona Church in Kona, Hawai'i, for example, reported its membership numbers of July 4, 1915 as follows: out of 101 members, there were 10 Americans, 3 Chinese, 33 Filipinos, 2 Germans, 7 Hawaiians, 26 Japanese, 2 Koreans, 2 Portuguese, 8 Hawaiian-Americans, 7 Hawaiian-Chinese and 1 Hawaiian-Portuguese (*the Annual Report* 1916:36-37).

From the end of the 19th century, the church activities conducted in English became more important in the HEA. It is "not only because of a multiplying resident white population as well as an increasing immigrant class, but also because of the larger use of the English language by the native and the Asiatic races" (*the Annual Report* 1901:31). Even in Hawaiian churches, there appeared a new generation of Christian Hawaiians who were educated in English and communicated easier in English than in
Figure 5. The HEA Membership: Hawaiian and Non-Hawaiian Churches (1831-1962)

*from Minutes (1831-1868), the Friend (1869-1877), the Annual Report (1878-1962)
**The data of 1838, 1845, 1847, 1850, and 1874 are not available.
Hawaiian whether they liked it or not. Such a linguistic shift was predicted in the Annual Report (1889):

The Hawaiian youth are being largely, almost exclusively, instructed in English; there is prospect of their acquiring an indifference to the services conducted in the Hawaiian churches, and by the Hawaiian pastors. On account of a growing ignorance of the literature of their own mother-tongue, there is the possibility of their escaping from our present appliances. From present developments, we may expect that by the end of this quarter-century the use of English language by the native population will be quite universal. (the Annual Report 1889:10)

In order to meet the demands of Hawaiians as well as foreigners, Hawaiian churches both in port cities and in plantation areas on each island started to hold the service partly conducted in English or had a Sunday English service on a specific week of every month (cf. the Annual Report 1897, 1902). An article of the Annual Report (1902) described the increase of services in English as follows:

Formerly missionaries had to depend on the vernacular, but now that English is the language of the schools, much religious instruction can be given in it to young and middle-aged Hawaiians. Moreover, formerly the missionaries of the country districts rarely held English services, as there was practically no English population, but now that the plantations have grown to such proportions, the white man forms an element to be cared for and the missionary has a complex problem in the variety of his constituents. (the Annual Report 1902:16-17)

Such a transition period “between the old and the new intellectual and religious life” was clearly recognized in the HEA and, in 1898, the first sermon preached in English by “a pure blooded Hawaiian” was delivered in the Kawaiahao Church in Honolulu (The Friend 1898/02:15). In this way, the language used in various church services gradually shifted from Hawaiian to English at the end of the 19th century. Hawaiian churches, which survived the depopulation of Hawaiians, suffered the division between the older generation of Hawaiian church members who understood only Hawaiian and the younger generation of those who preferred church activities conducted in English. As a result, this generation gap inside the congregation and a shortage of Hawaiian ministers fluent in English developed into a grave issue among Hawaiian churches.
At the beginning of the 20th century, the HEA ministers began to recognize that the language shift from Hawaiian to English in church was complete, the difficult situation caused by such a linguistic shift had ended, and English services in several districts had passed the experimental stage. Articles in *The Friend* mentioned as follows:

These years have been difficult and trying ones as a period of transition from the use of the mother tongue in instruction to the use of English and, for the time being, intellectual development was arrested. But now that the change has been effected, and the difficulty of the adoption of a new language has passed, . . . (*The Friend* 1903/10:6)

The experiment of occasional English speaking services in connection with some of our more favorably situated Hawaiian churches is proving its timeliness and wisdom. In deed, it can be no longer considered an experiment in some quarters. At Kalihi Settlement, at Hale Aloha, in Lahaina, at Waialua and Waiʻanae, at Kaumakapili, at Wailuku and elsewhere, these services seem to be arousing new religious interest among young Hawaiians, and to be meeting a long felt want. (*The Friend* 1909/05:8)

However, the shift from Hawaiian to English as an official language was not completed until the 1930s. Although various church activities of local congregations were gradually shifting to the use of English, the official language used in the formal association meetings of the HEA was, interestingly, still Hawaiian in the 1920s. This problem was indicated in an article of *The Friend* (1921/07), which summarized several points of the Annual Meeting held at the Haili Church in Hilo:

[The official language of the convention is Hawaiian. This is true in spite of the fact that the organic act makes English the official language of the Territory. The last legislature had many Hawaiian members and there was no call for an interpreter. The use of Hawaiian as the official language does much to hinder the enthusiastic attendance and interest of delegates other than Hawaiian whose churches now contain a membership totalling more than the Hawaiian churches. It is hoped by some that the official language of the Territory will soon be adopted as the official language of the Association and that such interpretation shall be made into the other languages as may be necessary. (*The Friend* 1921/07:153)
This linguistic problem in the association meetings lingered in the 1920s and some of the HEA ministers expressed their paternalistic view toward Hawaiian members as well as their frustration:

To deal with this lovable, retiring people, requires many virtues, but chiefly fairness and PATIENCE. The use of Hawaiian in the Associations very greatly hampers the progress of Christian union where all the other racial elements use English and every uplifting influence that comes to the Churches finds it's way through the medium of English. Yes, and every social and educational approach to the people has long ago sought English channels. English must come in the Associations but for a little we must exercise PATIENCE. (Reminders: Supplement to The Friend 1926/09)

The Annual Meeting is pau. There were many things that it was not. It was pretty largely Hawaiian for one thing, hence not representative of the large number of other nationalities in our churches. There is nothing new about this. It is like mumbling in one’s sleep to tell the reason for this, — it has been said so often. On one side it is ‘We don’t go because everything is in Hawaiian.’ On the other side it is ‘There are not enough of the “poe haole” present to warrant stopping to interpret.’ Both statements are reasonably true.

Ours remains the anachronism of Hawaii, the one important deliberative body that does not conduct its business in the language of the realm. Hence it is a blot on our leadership and no great credit to the Hawaiian people who should sense the danger to themselves of the isolation it creates. This from a friend of long standing. (Products: Supplement to The Friend 1927/06)

But in the 1930s, the growing use of English was gradually noticed in the annual meeting (The Friend 1932/09-10:501), and the constitution and by-laws of local Hawaiian churches started to be translated into English as well for those who were not able to read Hawaiian (The Friend 1936/05:91).

At the turn of the century, while non-Hawaiian churches were becoming established in local cities, Hawaiian churches in the same areas were becoming weak due to the decrease of Hawaiian followers. Although part-Hawaiians were increasing inside the church, it was thought that Hawaiian churches were no longer attractive to this new generation of Hawaiians. A minister on Kaua‘i pointed out this problem and proposed the idea of holding a union service, composed of Hawaiian speaking members and English speaking members:
The steadily shrinking membership of the Hawaiian churches through death, removal, etc., forces one reluctantly to face the question “What of their future?” Even though a mixed Hawaiian population should fill the vacant places in the community, these new factors are no longer entirely Hawaiian in thought and language, and the dwindling Hawaiian church does not appeal to them. Hence it seems to me that the most hopeful outlook for the future lies in the direction of amalgamation with the English-speaking congregations. The entering wedge for this has seemed to me to be Union meetings. As the result of this conviction I am initiating at Lihue and Koloa a system of such meetings conducted partly in English and partly in Hawaiian — both languages being very generally understood — in which the two congregations worship together. (*the Annual Report* 1900:23)

As a result, some Hawaiian congregations in local districts tried to survive by merging with an English speaking congregation to organize Union churches.^[10]^

**Overthrow of the Hawaiian Monarchy**

On January 17, 1893, Liliʻuokalani was forced to relinquish her authority to the United States and the Hawaiian dynasty came to an abrupt end, and a provisional government took over the sovereign power. Among those who actively participated in the overthrow of the Hawaiian monarchy, there were many descendants of the ABCFM missionaries, who were called the “Missionary Party” members. This fact naturally caused emotional as well as political turmoil in Hawaiian Congregational churches. The HEA lost its former trust among Hawaiian members and the attendance rate of its church services dropped. Although the leading ministers of the HEA expressed their support for the abdication of the queen in local Hawaiian newspapers, they had a hard time trying to persuade ordinary Hawaiian followers of the legitimacy of the overthrow (Walsh 1993:35).

For the white ministers who were playing a leading part in the HEA, the Hawaiian monarchy at the end of 19th century, ruled by Kalākaua and Liliʻuokalani, represented morally corrupt and disseminated heathenism. They thought that a small number of Hawaiian ministers, who deplored what they considered the ill effects brought about by the monarchy and wholeheartedly approved of the overthrow, were the most intelligent
Hawaiians, while the majority of Hawaiians were uneducated and had enmity toward the new government. For example, an article published just after the overthrow in The Friend (1893/02) described the sentiment of Hawaiian followers and optimistically forecast a bright prospect concerning their future relationship with Hawaiians:

It is doubtless premature to forecast confidently what shape the opinions of native Hawaiians will take, as to the political change now in progress. No doubt the majority of them are now governed by their long existing jealousy of white ascendancy, and are dissatisfied and sullen. We have, however, personal knowledge of some of the best and wisest among them who rejoice in the removal of the terrible incubus of Palace influence, with its debauching and heathenizing effect. These men also enthusiastically welcome the prospect of union with America. We are reliably informed that this feeling is growing and extending among the native people. After the final arrangements have been concluded, and the new form of government has been definitely settled, we anticipate satisfaction among the natives, and their cordial cooperation with the whites in public affairs. (The Friend 1893/02:9)

The schism inside Hawaiian churches was, however, too serious for the leading ministers of the HEA to neglect. Over the annexation as well as the restoration of the queen, there were bitter disputes inside Hawaiian churches, as described in the following articles:

The present is necessarily a time of somewhat painful solicitude for the spiritual welfare of our Hawaiian churches. Their Christian life is just now suffering very seriously by reason of the prevailing political animosity. The people are greatly divided upon the subject of annexation, and the most rancorous language is habitually used by the royalists in denouncing their opponents.

Among the earnest advocates of annexation are a majority of the best and ablest native pastors, who have long mourned the poisonous influence of the heathenising Court upon the life of their churches. Against these noble men there is bitter railing, and in their churches great division. These faithful pastors are habitually stigmatized in the two royalist papers, as the worst of traitors to their country and their people. (The Friend 1893/05:33)

The restoration of the queen threatened by Secretary Gresham would involve a variety of disastrous consequences. One of the most serious and most disgraceful would be its crushing effect upon nearly all of our best native pastors and upon the best class of Hawaiian Christians. Our native pastors of Protestant Churches are among the most intelligent and high minded class of natives. For a long period, they have been manfully contending against the overwhelming torrent of moral debanchery [sic.] and heathen superstition proceeding from the royal court . . . When that deadly power . . . was overthrown, the greater part of these good men rejoiced, . . . To some of them, race feeling and national prejudices made
the change unwelcome, but the majority of the pastors are deeply in sympathy with the new government. The majority of their people are not so, because they are far less intelligent, and have been taught to regard this movement as a trampling on the inherent right of the native Hawaiian to be supreme in the government of his own country, ... (*The Friend* 1893/12:91)

After all, the HEA leading ministers thought that it was ordinary Hawaiian followers, with discontent of long standing toward the white power structure, who disturbed harmonious church activities by introducing a political dispute into the church. In this period, Hawaiian ministers who supported the overthrow and the annexation bore the full blunt of an attack from a majority of Hawaiian members in their churches:

Naturally the winding up of the monarchical system in these islands is the occasion of considerable disturbance to the native work. Political issues have bred partizan measures. To pray or not to pray for the restoration of the deposed Queen has proved a test question in many a meeting of many a church, and by the answer he has been obliged to give to it, and by his disapproval of some of the measures passed by the late Legislature and sanctioned by the late Queen, the conscientious pastor has not unfrequently had to meet the opposition of a factions [sic.] element. (*the Annual Report* 1893:14)

As a result, some pastors were forced to resign their posts (cf. *The Friend* 1893/12, *the Annual Report* 1895).

At the end of the century, an article appeared in *the Annual Report* that suggested that the political dispute inside Hawaiian churches was over and that people were looking to the future (*the Annual Report* 1899:10). However, there were still political debates brought into the churches that aroused anxiety and discord. Some of the Hawaiian ministers seemed to leave the ministry to launch out into politics in order to return the political initiative into Hawaiians’ hands (*the Annual Report* 1901:26-27). Up to the present, at least latently, the damage that the Congregational churches and their Hawaiian members suffered through the overthrow of the Hawaiian monarchy has remained.\[11\]
Revival of Traditional Religion

_Lingering Idolatry and Resurging Kāhuna_

In the early years of the mission works, there were only two kinds of Hawaiians to the Christian missionaries: those who were converted and civilized to become Christian and those who remained in the pagan tradition (including backsliders). In the latter half of the 19th century, however, the white ministers started to recognize that some traditional religious practices and beliefs were still tacitly maintained among Christian Hawaiians, who they had believed had been entirely converted. One of the reasons why such a situation occurred is that the HEA eased the former strict regulation on the admission of Hawaiians to become church members. The simple dichotomy of “Christianized Hawaiians versus pagan Hawaiians” collapsed and, as a result, the HEA white ministers were forced to deal with what they considered the heathen and alien aspects of Hawaiian Christians.

In order to compel Hawaiian followers to abandon their traditional religious belief and practices, Rev. James Bicknell organized the Association for Bible Reading and for the Suppression of Idolatry in September 1889 and developed the ecclesiastical movement in the HEA (cf. _The Friend_ 1892/10). In _The Friend_ (1892/10), a few examples were cited from the record book of the Association to identify the un-Christian religious practices of some Hawaiian followers. For example, a Hawaiian deacon of the Hana Church in Maui kept in secret a gold coin as an object of veneration:

Palua, who is one of the members of the Association for Bible Reading and for the Suppression of Idolatry, reports that on his late visit to Hana, Maui, as an evangelist to press the work of the Association, he discovered a gold twenty dollar piece, which, for forty-two years, has been an object of worship. This fetish-god bore the name of Haka. It was the property of a man who is a deacon in the Hana Church. He and his wife came into possession of it in 1850. On the visit of Palua and by the aid of the son of the deacon, who is a teacher in a public school, the owners of this fetish were won from their idolatrous worship of a gold coin and were persuaded to give it over into the treasury of the Hana Church. (_The Friend_ 1892/10:79)
Such Hawaiian religious practices, which were regarded by the white ministers as idolatry, were sometimes referred to by Christian Hawaiians themselves in their confessional presentation. Rev. S. Kapu, "one of the leading pastors of the native church," who settled at Wailuku, Maui related idolatrous practices and kahuna's presence among Hawaiians in his presentation at a meeting of the the Association for Bible Reading and for the Suppression of Idolatry in October 1891 as follows:

Some two years ago I took into earnest consideration the matter of the deadness of my parish. My study of the subject gave me two causes; the first, the superstition that was in me; and the second the superstition that had been in my predecessor. As for myself I was given over to superstitious practices. I had been led into them by my stepfather, and I see that so my ministry has been greatly hindered. My preaching was formal and without heart. While clinging to superstition I was yet endeavoring to portray the Gospel in its power, and I have learned that this is a most sinful thing in the eyes of God. As to my predecessor, I found on entering the parsonage he had vacated, that he had left in it the marks of his superstitious practices. They were in every place. Over the doors and over the window frames were the bits of awa¹² root, the kalapahoa,¹³ and the little bundles and so on.

On the occasion of the sickness of one of my deacons he came under the influence of the fetish doctors. No less than ten were in attendance on him till he came near to death. I labored with him to give up these practices and to put himself into the hands of God, which at last he did, and recovered.

He is alive and well today and he, together with my wife and myself, are the only persons in my parish who are free from these practices, and I proclaim it here publicly, that these fetish doctors should be forced to stop their heathenish practices which are so prejudicial to the good. . . . (The Friend 1892/10:79)

According to Rev. Bicknell, Hawaiian church members disliked being called pagans, because they feared ridicule in church (Bicknell c.1890). Therefore, he believed, however deeply they were engaged in idolatrous practices, they would deny it strongly until their practices were exposed. However, the fetishes they kept were usually small enough to carry about in secret and difficult for the white ministers to discover (Bicknell c1890:2).

Facing this problem, Rev. Bicknell believed that the ministers had to ask a Hawaiian who had a good inside knowledge of idolatry among his or her fellow Hawaiians, to disclose what was going on with the Hawaiian church members (The Friend 1890/09:66).
"Kāhuna" represented Hawaiian traditional religious culture, and their influence upon Hawaiian followers was one of the most outstanding problems for the Congregational churches from the latter half of the 19th century to the early 20th century. The Hawaiian word “kahuna” means an expert in any profession. There were various kinds of kāhuna such as religious experts, medical doctors and craftsmen, all of whom had a religious character in greater or lesser degrees, having a personal relationship with the spiritual world (cf. Kamakau 1987 [1964]; Malo 1951). Their roles were subdivided and their social functions often overlapped each other. It is kāhuna as religious experts and medical doctors that the HEA leading ministers were especially disturbed by in the late 19th century. The licenses issued in c.1861 were to those kāhuna who were engaged in medical practices (The Friend 1888/07:53). Of course, there was no clear line that distinguished sorcerers and medical doctors in Hawaiian culture; the difficulty of distinguishing clearly these kāhuna was, to some extent, related to a problem of cultural translation. For example, kāhuna ‘anā’anā [sorcerers] who were believed to practice sorcery were also able to treat diseases, while kāhuna la‘au lapa‘au [medical doctors] not only used medicinal herbs but also often sought help from a spiritual being in order to cure a disease. For the leading ministers of the HEA, however, both kāhuna were pagan beings who associated themselves with indigenous spirits; the word “kahuna” was the title of pagan experts of any kind, whether they were sorcerers or medical doctors.

A noteworthy fact as to the revival of kāhuna in the late 19th century is that it proceeded systematically on the institutional level. As I mentioned before, the official licenses were issued in c.1861 to about 300 kāhuna with schedules of fees for their services (The Friend 1888/07:53, 1892/07:49). It was believed among the HEA ministers that after being officially licensed in c.1861, their activities increased. An article in The Friend (1888/07) mentioned a resurgence of traditional religious practices as follows:

The newly licensed kahunas of 1861 were active, and plied their arts industriously, to their own gain, and the impoverishment of their dupes.
Each one became at once an active propagator of the old paganism. Some
established classes for the instruction of the young in the half forgotten
lore of aumakuas and other forms of demigod powers, and how to
invoke and propitiate them. A considerable number of fetishes and idols
were set up in a rather private way, many of them in connexion with the
gross and filthy hulahulas, which Kamehameha V was especially active
in reviving. (The Friend 1888/07:53)

The HEA’s leading ministers considered that there had been “a gradual decline of
spiritual activity among the Hawaiian people” while “heathen sorcery and hulas” were
growing (The Friend 1888/07:53). And they thought that it was the Hawaiian Board of
Health, organized by the legislature in 1886, which promoted this revival of traditional
religion (cf. The Friend 1888/07, 1892/07). According to Pukui et al. (1979), however,
the government efforts to institutionalize the kahuna practices occurred as reactions to
“Western disapproval of Hawaiian medicine” and as “part of a general move to license all
healing practitioners, including Western and Chinese physicians” (Pukui et al. 1979:160-
161). They also point out that “the pressure to license came from a confusion or
overlapping of functions of the helpful kahuna and the hurtful kahuna” (Pukui et al.
1979:160). The Act to Establish a Hawaiian Board of Health carried a provision that
“[a]ny practitioner who shall be convicted of the practice of ‘Anā’anā, Ho’opi’opi’o,
Ho’ōiūnauna or Ho’omanamana shall forfeit his license” (Pukui et al. 1979:161). It
should be noted that the then legislature aimed to officially establish kāhuna as medical
specialists. However, in the eyes of the HEA ministers, the Hawaiian Board of Health
was “a Board of heathen sorcery” or “a Board of Kahunas” and as such, the political
move was a good example of retrogressing from civilization and Christianization (The

From the late 19th century to the early 20th century, the governments seemed to
make a series of efforts to legalize kāhuna. For example, an article of “Diploma for
Kahuna” was printed on a local newspaper, which reported that a “freak” bill was
introduced in the House to authorize “the issuance of licenses to ‘kahunas who are expert
in diagnosis, as physicians of the Territory of Hawaii” (the Pacific Commercial Advertiser 1901/03/20:9). The same news item predicted what the state of affairs would become like if the bill was passed [Figure 6]:

> There is little doubt but that if they were regularly licensed the natives would flock to their offices and receive treatment by the use of herbs and awa, and get prescriptions for running around one’s residence at night half naked, wearing only a girdle of grasses, and performing other absurdities which are supposed to take away the ills that flesh is heir to. (the Pacific Commercial Advertiser 1901/03/20:9)

However, it can be inferred from an article in The Friend (1901/04) that the proposed kahuna license was not necessarily condemned totally but painted in a good light by some of the press. The article criticized such a liberal opinion that supported a legislative move to license kāhuna:

> A recent local editorial appears to favor some proposed legislation to remove the prohibition against native Kahuna practice, and to license the sorcery doctors. It advocates this step on a general ground of liberalism, which is permitting practitioners of “Christian Science.” It also sets forth that the chief ground of objection to the Kahuna is that he works through an alleged idolatrous power, and he has as much right to hold that view as a Christianity has to trust in Jehovah’s power to heal.

> We believe “Christian Science” to be an unwholesome delusion; but it has no resemblance to, and is not to be compared with Kahuna sorcery. . . . (The Friend 1901/04:76)

Although the article concluded by insisting that “[t]he whole Kahuna practice is violently hostile both to Science and to civilized Religion” and that “[t]he only civilized treatment of it is absolute suppression” (The Friend 1901/04:76), it is possible to read in this condemnation a glimpse of the social condition shifting to “no more a Christian nation” (Gallagher 1983) in which public opinion was no longer totally in favor of Christian values.

**Kāhuna in the Eyes of Congregational Ministers**

As a background to the revival of kāhuna in the latter half of the 19th century, not only the depopulation of Hawaiians and their medical condition but also the Hawaiian traditional concept of illness must be considered. As I have mentioned, the population of
Figure 6. “When the Kahunas Get Diplomas.”

Cartoon from the Pacific Commercial Advertiser (1901/03/21)

* Among various items drawn in this cartoon, pay attention to the phrases written on the bag “he” carries, which read “kahuna anaana” [sorcerer] and “make wiki” [die quick].
Hawaiians continuously decreased until the end of the 19th century. From the beginning of mission work, sanitation and health control had been two of the most significant projects for the missionaries, along with education. Many Hawaiians appealed to the missionaries for medical aid, the funds of the ABCFM was largely used for medicines, and the missionaries allotted ample time to attend to the sick (Supplement to The Friend 1867/08:79). After the ABCFM withdrew from Hawaii, the Hawaiian government furnished the missionaries with medicine, but this financial aid soon ran out and, then, the medical care, dependent on the missionaries' voluntary work, also was discontinued (Supplement to The Friend 1867/08:79). The HEA ministers realized that various activities of kāhuna became very rampant in such a situation in which they were unable to maintain proper medical treatment for Hawaiians. Although it is difficult to judge to what extent their interpretation was appropriate, it was obvious to the white ministers that Hawaiian followers made contact with a kahuna when they were sick or on their deathbed. This problem was frequently pointed out in The Friend from the 1880s to the 1900s (cf. The Friend 1889/02, 05, 10, 1890/09, 1891/10, 1892/08, 1901/02).

The problem with making contact with a kahuna in case of need was not restricted to ordinary Hawaiian church members. Even "a prominent and honored Hawaiian pastor" yielded to "the importunity of his family" to employ "a sorcerer in a futile effort to save the life of a sick relative" (The Friend 1901/02:14). A letter from "one of the best of the native school teachers" introduced in The Friend (1889/05) read as follows:

The fact has not unfrequently been reported to us, of certain Hawaiian pastors permitting the employment of kahunas with their enchantments for sick members of their families, and even of such a pastor himself being attended in his last sickness by a kahuna with his idolatrous arts. (The Friend 1889/05:35)

The same letter pointed out that "out of one hundred church members there are ten who do not serve other gods, and ninety who do worship them" and that "[t]he ministers are very fearful about going out to resist these things, lest they die by the power of these
sorcery gods” (The Friend 1889/05:34). Realizing that the idolatry was still powerful among Christian Hawaiians, the HEA leading ministers believed that Hawaiian traditional religious faith was so deeply rooted in their minds that their heathenish spirit emerged when their minds were weakened by illness:

In the nature of things it would be impossible that the ancient religious belief and practices of any people could be extirpated at once. A belief in the powers of the aumakua, unihipilis,[18] and the various gods and demi gods of heathenism is inwrought into the mental constitution of the Hawaiian. He inherits an aptitude for such a belief, a deadly proclivity to it, from uncounted generations of heathen ancestors. Besides this hereditary proclivity, he absorbs the firm belief in these things from the people around him, from his earliest infancy. . . .

In view of these conditions, it is not strange that most Hawaiians continue to be more or less under the dominion of superstitious fears. It is not strange that the great majority of them, as alleged by Mr. Bicknell and others who know them intimately, turn to these evil powers in time of sickness, and in the hour of death, when the mind is feeble and the soul faint, instead of seeking unto the living God and Savior. (The Friend 1889/10:77)

It should be mentioned that the HEA white ministers did not necessarily overlook Hawaiian traditional views of illness and spirit, which were a firm basis for the kahuna ritual and the ‘aumakua belief. Among several leading ministers who were relatively well acquainted with Hawaiian religions, Rev. Bicknell, who organized the the Association for Bible Reading and for the Suppression of Idolatry and gave high priority to the disclosure and suppression of idolatrous practices, left several articles and papers on the Hawaiian view of illness and the kahuna practices. According to him, the medical practices of kahuna were based on the following beliefs:

1—That sickness is caused either by demoniacal possession or by disease.
2—That the spirits possess people of their own will, or are commissioned to do so by ill-disposed kahunas. The spirits being the “akua hoounauna,” (messenger gods).
3—That cases of possession are always curable through the use of charms under the direction of kahunas.
4—That cases of actual disease being dependent upon the use of medicine for cure, recovery is not always certain. (The Friend 1890/09:66)

This categorization, which distinguished between “demoniacal” possession and disease and assigned each illness to traditional medicine and Western medicine respectively, is a
very familiar case in the anthropological study of ethnomedicine. Rev. Bicknell (The Friend 1890/09) also pointed out that Christian Hawaiians relied on either Hawaiian traditional gods or Christian God according to the occasion. According to him, some church members mentioned “Aohe pono ke hahai pololei loa ia Lehova, e aho ke hookapakahi iki ae [It is not good to follow Jehovah fully, it is better to be less partial]” (The Friend 1890/09:67). He explained such a Hawaiian way of dealing with two religions as follows:

These people entertain the idea that Jehovah cares only for the soul, and does not hear prayer for physical ills. And as the body is the immediate object of concern to them they naturally enough think it would be hazardous to trust in Jehovah alone, they must hold on to the aumakuas as well to insure help in sickness. With strange inconsistency they pray to Jehovah for a blessing on their food, but upon their medicine they ask it of the aumakuas. . . .

Idolatry is religion for the body; its business being physical healing, consequently an idolater has occasion for his god only in sickness. It is during sickness that the fetiches are brought out and the incantations practised. Having no use for his god during health, an idolatrous church member can dispense with it and worship Jehovah, but when sickness comes he turns again to his god with the thought that it alone will help him in his extremity. It is impossible to crush idolatry until the fact is established that Jehovah cares for the body as well as for the soul. (The Friend 1890/09:67)

For this minister, who was born in Tahiti as the son of the LMS missionary parents and worked as a self-supporting missionary in the Marquesas Islands (The Friend 1892/10:77), the religious faith of Hawaiian followers, who prayed to Jehovah before the meal and prayed to ‘aumākua when taking medicine, was full of inconsistencies.

Other white ministers of the HEA also pointed out that Hawaiian followers assigned spiritual salvation to the Christian God and physical relief to Hawaiian gods. Such a grasp of the Hawaiian way of dealing with two religions can be detected in the following statement made by one such minister, who took a more tolerant view than many. After recognizing that Hawaiians had “a truly religious side” to their nature, he projected his hope about the future of Hawaiian Christianity:
Even those in partial bondage to old superstitions are yet greatly influenced by this ideal [Christian faith], and though in their physical ailments they may illogically turn to the kahuna, in their thoughts about God and the life of the soul they give preference to the teachings of the Bible and the minister. (The Friend 1903/10:5)

In the 1860s, another white minister referred to a peculiar view of illness among Hawaiians by pointing out “[t]he deep rooted sentiment that foreign doctors can cure foreign diseases but native doctors only can cure native diseases” (Supplement to The Friend 1867/08:80); if the “native diseases” were limited to spiritual possession, this view was almost analogous to Rev. Bicknell’s observation. Based on the deep-seated traditional view of illness and spirit, Hawaiian followers seemed to make the traditional religious and medical system and a set of Christianity and Western medicine coexist by placing each in separate categories. However, what Rev. Bicknell believed was that the missionary teaching had been confined too much to the salvation of the soul, while medical science was not taught in schools of theology; as a result Hawaiian followers had no knowledge concerning the proper care of body and the causes of disease (The Friend 1892/08:61). He believed that such superstitious medical treatment conducted by kāhuna could be “stopped by stationing trustworthy persons at the bedside of the sick” (The Friend 1892/08:61).

In the latter half of the 19th century, a common image of kahuna was shared by Congregational ministers who made strenuous efforts to deal with this traditional medical doctor. While they recognized a sort of authenticity in kāhuna in ancient times, they denied it in the contemporary kāhuna. They did not completely deny the value of the medical knowledge owned by ancient kāhuna, nor did they negate the agency of indigenous spiritual beings. The statement of Rev. Bicknell represents well the image imposed on kāhuna in those days:

In ancient times any one desiring to be a kahuna had to undergo a thorough training, but ever since idolatry was put under ban, and the practice of it made a crime punishable by law, the rules have been slackened. The majority of kahunas practising at the present time are
self-constituted, and only quacks in the profession. (The Friend 1890/09:66)

The HEA ministers, whether white or Hawaiian, thought that kāhuna in the late 19th century were only “idlers, going about and seeking some little gratitudes from credulous people; giving no substantial aid in return” (the Annual Report 1895:76-77), while admitting that the ancient kāhuna “possessed much medical lore after their sort and were useful, in lack of scientific medical treatment” (The Friend 1892/07:52).

Concluding Remarks

Since the latter half of the 19th century, the Congregational churches of the HEA had been influenced by various social changes, such as the demographic change of Hawaiians, the influx of other ethnic groups, the activities of other Christian denominations, the language shift from Hawaiian to English, the overthrow of the Hawaiian monarchy, and the revival of traditional religion. In the early 20th century, the Congregational churches were no longer able to hold a dominant position in the island society. Furthermore, inside the HEA, which was losing influence in the society, Hawaiian members were no longer able to hold a majority. These events have influenced the present society. In other words, throughout the latter half of the 19th century and early 20th century, Hawaiians became situated in multi-ethnic, cultural, religious situations in which they could no longer easily juxtapose themselves as the native Self against the alien and foreign Other. Present day Christian Hawaiians live such an entangled Hawaiian being constructed in the past. For example, they live in a multi-ethnic condition, use English as their mother tongue, make use of Hawaiian language in a specific context, such as singing hymns and giving prayers, and must consider the relation between the church and the 1893 overthrow in native politics. In this age of the sovereignty movement and cultural revival, some of them also must deal with Hawaiian traditions, some of which were decried by the white missionaries and ministers as
something conflicting with their Christian faith. This last issue, that is, the missionary
discourse of Hawaiian traditions, is the most critical for the construction of the present
Christian Hawaiians' cultural identity, while various social changes occurring from the
latter half of the 19th century to the early 20th century staged the present cultural
environment for them. In Chapter 6 and 7, I will investigate this issue in detail by
interpreting the present Christian Hawaiians’ narratives of their identity and tradition.

In this chapter, I described the changing socio-cultural conditions surrounding
Christian Hawaiians by citing the historical materials left by the Congregational
missionaries and ministers. The statistical data, such as the church membership, can be
treated as reliable information if setting an acceptable error range. For example, the
transition of the HEA membership of four island associations at the turn of the century
[Figure 3] confirms the then HEA ministers’ perception of the membership imbalance in
progress between O'ahu and the other islands. The changes of the total membership of
the HEA [Figure 5] clearly disproves a historical understanding, which I found during my
interview research, held by some Christian Hawaiians that the membership of the HEA
suddenly decreased after the overthrow of the Hawaiian monarchy because many
Hawaiian members were disappointed in the church and withdrew from the HEA.
Actually, however, the membership was decreasing drastically throughout the latter half
of the 19th century and the overthrow took place in the decade centering around 1890
when the membership hit its low. On the other hand, the descriptive information of
historical facts can be used as useful data, as far as it is restricted to the information of the
socio-cultural conditions, to which most of the HEA church members probably shared a
similar stance. For example, the multi-ethnic condition and the language shift from
Hawaiian to English can be pointed out as such a socio-cultural condition. They were
imminent issues that the HEA leading ministers had to deal with. Therefore, although a
sense of crisis shared by the HEA’s ministers probably led to a sort of exaggeration in the
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assessment of the situation, there must be some reality in it. They had to bear the entire responsibility for such an assessment, according to which their church activities had to develop.

However, sufficient caution must be exercised in using the historical materials that describe and analyze the resurgence of the traditional Hawaiian religion. Different from the multi-ethnic condition and the language shift in the Congregational churches, the problem of resurgent kāhuna was something to which the HEA members did not share a similar stance or understanding. Most of those who wrote articles on kāhuna in _The Friend_ and _the Annual Report_ were, of course, not Hawaiian, but white. A very few Hawaiians, who were called the “best,” “wisest” and “ablest” native pastors and school teachers, only voiced opinions that echoed the dominant voices of the white ministers. Their statements were cited mainly as a good example of the successfully Christianized Hawaiians, in order to confirm and strengthen the white ministers’ dualistic perspective that permitted “no happy medium between two beliefs” (_The Friend_ 1948/07:29) and that saw a shift from “the dark age of heathenism” to “the era of enlightenment” (_The Friend_ 1916/05:102). The Hawaiian followers’ voices presented in the Congregational organ were used as proof that the white missionaries and ministers obtained excellent results in their missions. By reading these historical materials, it is possible to reach an understanding of the historical reality of the white ministers and “ten out of one hundred” Hawaiian church members who did not serve other gods, but it is nearly impossible to catch a glimpse of the reality of the rest of “ninety” church members who were believed to worship indigenous gods (_The Friend_ 1889/05:34). If the voices of the majority of Hawaiian followers who did not meet the white ministers’ expectations cannot be found in _The Friend_ and _the Annual Report_, a question may arise as to the validity of such historical materials dominated by the missionary discourse. Is it possible to analyze the past of Hawaiian Christianity, its relation with the traditional religion in particular,
accurately by using the historical materials left by the white ministers as well as a few “good” Hawaiian Christians?

It is, however, this difficulty that historical study must confront and struggle to overcome. As Dening (1980) points out, “[t]he historical reality of traditional societies is locked together for the rest of time with the historical reality of the intruders who saw them, changed them, destroyed them” (Dening 1980:42), and one of “[t]he epistemological problems of ethnohistory” is that “[o]ne can see beyond the frontier only through the eyes of those who stood on the frontier and looked out” so that “[t]o know the native one must know the intruder” (Dening 1980:43). Therefore, in order to know the historical reality of Hawaiian Christianity by referring to the historical materials such as The Friend and the Annual Report, it is required to know the nature of the Congregational missionaries and ministers who left their voices in these materials. Dening’s ethnohistorical goal of knowing the “native” (Christian Hawaiians) by knowing the “intruder” (the white ministers) is, however, beyond the purview of this chapter. Rather, I would like to point out that the historical reality of the HEA white ministers was entangled with that of the Christian Hawaiians. The white ministers’ perspectives were surely developed in the context of the Hawaiian Christian community, in which they were constructed in various interactions with Hawaiian perspectives.

The leading ministers of the HEA in the late 19th century tried to shape the Hawaiians’ ideal Christian world by criticizing not only the traditional religion represented by kāhuna, but also any kind of dance including hula, drinking including the cheap Japanese rum “sake,” ‘awa [kava] drinking, gambling, the Mormon and other newly-risen Christian denominations, discord in the church caused by political disputes and disrespect for the pastor, and “extravagant life styles” (cf. the Annual Report 1892, 1895). All of these were regarded as obstacles to the church, which would in the end cause decadence in Christian life. By opposing various things surrounding them, the
white ministers drew a clear outline of their Christian world and a few “good” Hawaiian followers desired to remain in it. The suppression of superstition as well as the accusation of immorality and idleness is an act of constructing the Christian Self by negating the Other. But there were many Hawaiian followers who did not share the same outline of the Christian world or the same ideal model of Christian-ness. I was not able to find their voices in *The Friend* and *the Annual Report*, nor did I come across any historical materials left by them during my research, except for a few documents. It is nearly impossible to find a memoir from Hawaiian Christians who broke out of the Christian world presented by the white ministers. Therefore, I must investigate those Hawaiians who did not enter into the white ministers’ Christian world by reading the historical materials about the dissident movements that occurred inside the Congregational churches. The movements that I will investigate in the next chapter are the Kaona Insurrection that occurred in 1868, and Hoomana Naauao, an independent Hawaiian church, which was established in 1893. Both movements can be regarded not only as religious movements pursuing the Hawaiian initiative in the church, but also as a manifestation of Hawaiian spiritual culture in the acceptance of Christianity.
NOTES

[1] The Friend was the English monthly newspaper that was founded by Rev. Samuel C. Damon in 1843 as The Temperance Advocate, and Seamen's Friend (cf. Chapin 1984). The editorship was transferred to Rev. Sereno Bishop in 1887, and the paper was devolved to the Hawaiian Evangelical Association (HEA) in 1902 (Gallagher 1983:11-12). A close interrelationship between The Friend and the HEA was maintained from the beginning until the early 20th century (Gallagher 1983:11-13).

From the late 1860s to the late 1870s, the annual report of the HEA was reported either in The Friend or the Supplement to The Friend. Since the late 1870s, The Annual Report of the Board of the Hawaiian Evangelical Association was separately published in June or July every year after the annual meeting. In the Annual Report, the church statistics, the conditions of church activities, and the translation of the address delivered in Hawaiian at the meeting were printed.

[2] There are various views as to the size of Hawaiian population at the time of Western contact, from 300,000 to 800,000. A heated discussion about the pre-contact Hawaiian population size occurred when the sovereignty movement was rising up toward the centennial observance of the overthrow of the Hawaiian monarchy (Bushnell 1993; Howe 2000; Stannard 1989). Bushnell (1993:154) criticizes Stannard (1989) by arguing that, except for the ma'i ‘oku'u [disease at time of Kamehameha I, probably cholera], explosive epidemics — that Stannard’s theory requires to explain the drastic depopulation — did not occur until the 1820s. He insists that not only Hawaiians’ geographic isolation but also “their remarkable cleanliness, excellent diet, and healthful environment” resulted in a different experience with epidemics from many other parts of the New World (Bushnell 1993:154-155).

As Howe (2000) mentions, different from Australia and New Zealand, the depopulation of indigenous people is a controversial issue in Hawaii. However, the point is that the exact size of the pre-contact Hawaiian population will never be known, but only estimated based on hypotheses (Bushnell 1993). In the post-colonial context of Hawaii, those hypotheses cannot be free from the politics of culture. Therefore, Stannard can be recognized as one of those who “support indigenous sovereignty aspirations” and “wish to highlight the ‘horror’ of massive population decline” (Howe 2000:66). On the other hand, the counter-argument against those who emphasize the drastic depopulation tends to be accompanied by a sort of cultural correct phrases, as seen in the aforementioned statement by Bushnell.

The most important fact is, as Stannard and Bushnell point out, that Hawaiian population declined drastically since the time of Western contact and throughout the 19th century, and that it was surely a time of “horror.” How drastic it was is another issue, which is not a main subject of this study. In this chapter, unless otherwise indicated, the statistical data cited is from Schmitt (1977).

[3] It is in the mid 1880s when a non-Hawaiian church appeared for the first time in the statistical data of the HEA. Because all the church members of Hawaiian churches were not necessarily Hawaiian and probably a few Hawaiian members belonged to non-Hawaiian churches, the membership ratio between Hawaiian churches and non-Hawaiian churches does not exactly indicate the ratio between Hawaiian and non-Hawaiian members in the HEA. However, the ratio that the church members of Hawaiian churches occupied can provide a good estimate of the dominancy of Hawaiian members in the HEA.

On another note, the statistical data from 1904 to c.1943 presented in the Annual Report categorized the Congregational churches into Hawaiian, Union, Chinese, Portuguese and Japanese (from 1916, a Filipino Church was added): from 1908 to 1913 in particular, the statistical data of each ethnic church were reported in summaries of each
island association. It is clear that the early 20th century is the period when the multi-ethnic composition of the HEA was most sharply recognized.

[4] There is a great difference between the number of Protestants in the census (56,840) and the number of the church members announced by the HEA in 1853 (22,236). This difference can be regarded as that between the self-professed Congregationalists, probably including children, and the official members admitted by the HEA.

[5] Respondents who gave no answer in the census were included in this category. Here, I regard those respondents as Hawaiians who were affiliated with other religions or no religion (cf. Lind 1952).

[6] The Hawaiian word Kalawina literally means Calvinist, but conventionally means the Congregational churches. In the late 19th century when the majority of the Protestants were Congregationalist, their churches were also called Hoolepope [Hōʻolepope: denying the Pope, that is, the Protestant].

[7] The basic data of original sources, such as The Friend and the Annual Report, are indicated in the order of “year/month (if necessary)/date (if necessary): pages.” For example, “The Friend (1948/07)” means the July 1948 issue of The Friend.


[9] Correctly spelled poʻe haole, this means “white people.”

[10] Most of the Congregational churches, which were categorized as Union Church, started as foreign churches for the English speaking population, but sometimes the weakened Hawaiian churches seemed to merge with a newly organized Union Church, which probably started as a union service in the district.

[11] On January 17, 1993, at the centennial observance of the overthrow of the Hawaiian monarchy, an official apology was given by the President of the UCC to the Hawaiian people. However, in the Hawaii Conference of the UCC, even among Hawaiian ministers, there were various opinions about making the official apology, and it took more than a few months to give the apology on the Conference level. For more information, see New Conversations 15 (1).

[12] Correctly spelled ʻawa, this is a Hawaiian word for the kava, a native shrub in Oceania whose root is pounded to make a narcotic drink for various ceremonies and a medical use. In those days, drinking ʻawa as well as alcohol was criticized by the HEA ministers as being opposed to Christian life. Kāhuna, who were ʻawa drinkers, were severely denounced.

[13] Correctly spelled kālaipāhoa, this is the name of three woods that were believed to be the tree forms of two male gods and one goddess (Pukui and Elbert 1986). Small pieces of the wood and roots were believed to become poisonous if they were imbued with spiritual powers in black magic (cf. Kamakau 1987 [1964]).

[14] Correctly spelled ʻaumākua [plural of ʻaumakua], these are family or ancestor gods. They were believed to be protectors of their followers and take various forms of living creatures (shark, owl and lizard), natural phenomena (rainbow), Pele [volcano goddess] and so on (cf. Kamakau 1987 [1964]).

[15] Hawaiian words often repeat the same sound to strengthen or extend an original meaning of the word, such as holoholo [to go for a walk] and heluhelu [to read]. Hulahula means ballroom dancing or massed hula dancing (Pukui and Elbert 1986). Here, it has the same meaning as hula, the Hawaiian traditional dance. Congregational
missionaries and ministers in those days were so strict concerning physical amusement that any kind of dancing was prohibited among their communities. For example, an article in The Friend (1905/11:9) explained how the Board of the HEA dealt with the proposed concert of the Ewa Church that aimed at fund-raising for the removal of church edifice, but had the dance as part of the program.

Hula was denied in the 19th century Calvinist context in which any kind of dance was prohibited, but interestingly some of the present conservative Christian Hawaiians have a more negative feeling toward traditional hula than the other dances. When I was conducting an interview research, a Hawaiian minister of a Hawaiian church in the UCC mentioned that he had received objections from several church members when he had a young woman in holoku [a long, one-piece dress] dance so-called Christian hula to the Lord Prayer in Hawaiian in the church. According to him, he had no objection from them when he had young men dance the modern dance in the church, which he described as a type of dance with throwing hands and jumping around. He pointed out that these members were already against the hula before seeing how it was danced. For a detailed examination of the present Christian Hawaiians' various attitudes to the hula, see Chapter 6.

[16] All of these practices are considered black magic. 'Ana'ana is a black magic using prayer and incantation, ho'opi'iopi'o is a kind of imitative magic that injures a part of a victim's body by touching the same part of the practitioner's body, and ho'ouinauna (or ho'oumauna) is a black magic that sends spirits on an errand of destruction (Pukui and Elbert 1986). Ho'omanamana is a magico-religious practice of imparting mana to objects, and fetishism in general (cf. Kamakau 1987 [1964]).

According to Pukui et al. (1979), the Act to Establish a Hawaiian Board of Health was issued in 1868, but this is a typographical error; the act was actually issued in 1886.

[17] As I will explain later in this chapter, the allotment of medical work to Western medicine and Hawaiian traditional medicine can be considered as the background of the resurgence of kāhuna. It also must be considered that some Hawaiians were not able to receive Western medical treatment because of financial reasons, and others were reluctant to go to hospital because they were afraid of being poisoned (The Friend 1892/08:61).

[18] Correctly spelled 'unihipili, this is the spirit of a dead person. It was believed that they remained in bones or hair of the deceased and people could use them for their own interests (Pukui and Elbert 1986; cf. Kamakau 1987 [1964]).

[19] In the present orthography of Hawaiian, it is written “'A'ohe pono ke hahai pololei loa ia Iehova, e aho ke ho'okapakahi iki a'e.” Rev. Bicknell translated these sentences to “[i]t is not well to follow Jehovah fully, latitude should be given.” The second sentence is probably a free translation. “E+aho+ke+verb” is an idiom that means “it is better to do something,” “ho‘okapakahi” means “to become one-sided or partial,” and “iki a'e” means “less.” Therefore, the second sentence means “it is better to be less partial.”

[20] An address of Rev. W. Kamau, a pastor of the Ewa Church, entitled “A Glimpse of the Long Ago” (The Friend 1916/05:102-103) and an article of Rev. Moses Moku, entitled “High Points in Our Hawaiian Tradition or Hawaiian Christianity and its Significance” (The Friend 1948/07:26-30) are good examples that narrate the Christian dualistic perspective, well internalized by Hawaiian ministers.
CHAPTER 4
DISSIDENT HAWAIIAN CHRISTIAN MOVEMENTS
IN THE LATE 19TH CENTURY

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to bring Christian Hawaiians, especially those who had their own Christian world and hence were lost in the missionaries’ historical texts, to the stage of Hawaiian Christian history. In the field of ethnohistory in the Pacific Islands, since Davidson (1966) proposed the “Island-centered history” that tried to free historians from the Eurocentric perspective and placed the Pacific Islands at the center of historical investigation, minute case studies on the history of cultural contact based on the relativistic perspective have been accumulated (cf. Maude 1971; Scarr 1967; Shineberg 1966). At times, a few theoretical problems were pointed out, such as one called “monograph myopia” that historians adhere to the internal complexities so much as to lose a comprehensive framework (Howe 1979). Another more contemporary problem is that the tenet of the Island-centered history was prone to become so ideological to misplace its original aim — decolonizing the Pacific Island history — in the politics of representation (cf. Meleisea 1978; Routledge 1985; Thomas 1990). For example, Routledge (1985:90) maintains that “Islanders must be the main actors” in the history-writing and “the history must not only be Island-centered but Islander-oriented.” However, this seemingly politically correct tenet carries a lot of problems in a post-colonial context.

For example, Hezel (1988) — although agreeing with the ideal of Islander-oriented history proposed by apologists including Routledge (1985) — critically questions the practicability and some unrealistic norms of their efforts. According to him, some problems originate in the incompatibility between “orality” of native history and “literacy” of history as Western discipline. On the other hand, as Thomas (1990) justly...
points out, "such efforts [of Islander-oriented history] tend to postulate a unitary 'Islander' perspective" (Thomas 1990:141) and run a risk of only transferring the authorship of the Island history from the Western writers to the elite Islanders who have "their own reasons for constructing an authoritative history" (Thomas 1990:153). In the Islander-oriented history (of Routledge's version), the question of who is "better qualified" and "more entitled" to write the Island history is considered in a rather simplistic framework of the "insider/outsider" dichotomy, in which the insiders are unconditionally vested with authorship (Munro 1994). As Munro (1994) mentions, "the term 'insider' and 'outsider,' far from representing discrete categories, are convoluted and often permeable" and "there is no single insider perspective and no single outsider perspective" (Munro 1994:236). Furthermore, the post-colonial situation — involving indigenous nationalism and cultural politics — that surrounds the Pacific Island history, is too complicated and entangled to be grasped in such a simple dichotomy.

As I mentioned in Chapter 2 concerning cultural politics surrounding (and caused by) the "invention of tradition" theory, history and anthropology share the same issue of narrative authority and authorship ("Who is qualified and entitled to represent the native history and culture?") in the post-colonial Pacific. In anthropological arena, the possibility of native anthropology — another way of asking insider/outsider problem in the discipline — has been often discussed. This can be translated to the problem of the possibility of native history, which is conceptualized as the Islander-oriented history in the Pacific. Currently, Pacific studies — including history, anthropology and cultural study — conducted by "natives" are emerging as a new field, in which "notions of Pacific indigeneity" are explored and, at the same time, the dichotomy between insiders and outsiders is becoming blurred (cf. Diaz and Kauanui 2001).

In general, it is apposite to say that Pacific Islanders were not necessarily passive and helpless victims of Western colonialism but actively dealt with the Western culture in
their own ways. Although they did not win a sweeping victory, they were not just total failures. It can be said that, at some (epistemological and symbolic) level, not only the Westerners but also the Islanders “possessed” and incorporated the other at the moment of cultural contact (Dening 1986). As far as taking the theoretical position of the Island-centered (and Islander-oriented) history, however, it is a logical consequence to find “active agency” (Chappell 1995) in the Pacific Islanders’ reaction to the foreign elements. Therefore, as Chappell (1995) carefully examines, we should investigate whether we can really decolonize the Pacific Island history by representing “Pacific Islanders as active agents” as advocated in the Island-centered and Islander-oriented history. Here, at this point, the “victim/agent” dichotomy faces the same problem as the insider/outsider dichotomy does. As Chappell (1995) points out, this dichotomy may be an artificial and arbitrary construct that depends on a theoretical focus and political position of a scholar, because “[a]gents and victims are not mutually exclusive categories but contextually signified roles” (Chappell 1995:316). Before everything else, such binary framework is, again, too simplistic to deal with the complicated colonial (and post-colonial) history of the Pacific Islands.

Concerning the historical investigation of Hawaiian Christianity, it can be concluded that Hawaiians were not necessarily passively converted to Christianity but actively dealt with it in various ways, although their agency was more or less restricted in the colonial condition. If so, then, what should be done — in order to interpret their agency — is, first, to describe how they reacted to and incorporated Christianity and, second, to analyze what social and cultural factors worked in their incorporating it. As for the latter question, I examined social history of Hawaiian Christianity in the previous chapter, which can help grasp the socio-cultural factors that might have influenced on Hawaiian Christianity from the late 19th century to the early 20th century.
On the other hand, in line with the subject of this chapter, the first question is: How did Hawaiian church members respond to the HEA, which was developing under the direction of the Congregational white missionaries and ministers, throughout the 19th century? As Ralston (1985:316) points out, in the early mission days from the 1820s to the 1830s, Hawaiians were placed in a condition similar to what Tahitians, Samoans and Maori were facing, "in terms of internal political rivalries, foreigners’ assumptions of religious and cultural superiority and the spread of Western goods." In such colonial conditions, various syncretic religious movements emerged as a dynamic reaction to the foreign elements. In Tahiti, the Mamaia movement started in 1826 and spread over the Society Islands in the 1840s (Gunson 1962). The Siovili movement was started in the 1830s by a Samoan who was inspired by the Mamaia movement, and the Papahuliia movement occurred in New Zealand in 1833 (Binney 1966; Freeman 1959). Also in Hawaii, as a response to the whites who were rising to predominance in the island society, various prophets and faith-healers, who claimed to be the incarnation of Hawaiian gods such as Lono and Pele, appeared and had some influence in local society from the 1820s to the 1840s (Beaglehole 1937; Burrows 1970 [1947]). However, throughout the 19th century in Hawaii, there was no area-wide resistance or religious movement that developed on the islands under the direction of a prophet or a group of leaders with a strong leadership (Ralston 1985:327). The closest thing to an instance of a religious movement led by Hawaiians in the early mission era would be the Hapu movement.

The Hapu movement is a sort of millenarian movement, which occurred from 1831 to 1832 in Puna, Hawai‘i. It was a syncretic religious movement mainly composed of male followers who worshipped a girl called Hapu, who had worked as a prophet and a faith-healer in her lifetime, as a god classed with Jehovah and Jesus. According to Dibble (1909 [1843]:247-248), the followers dug up her bones and adorned them with kapa.
[tapa], flowers and feathers, and deposited them in a place called "the place of refuge."" They urged other Hawaiians to stay in this place of refuge in order to survive the forthcoming destruction of the whole world. There are so few historical materials concerning the Hapu movement that it is nearly impossible to learn about this religious movement in detail, but Ralston (1985:325) speculates that "it may have been a millennial cult in the making." Before evolving into a mature millenarian movement, however, the place of refuge and a thatched temple were destroyed by a missionary party led by Rev. Dibble; the movement thus became stagnant.

Syncretic religious movements that combined Christian motifs and indigenous religious traditions at the time of cultural contact appeared in various forms in the Pacific Islands. However, most of the movements in the early mission days in the Pacific Islands occurred outside the church; some did incorporate Christian doctrines, rituals and symbols into their new religion. Because the purpose of this chapter is to describe and interpret how Hawaiians incorporated Christianity in the past, it is necessary to study closely the Hawaiian Christian movements that developed, at least in the beginning, inside the church organization. By juxtaposing the past and present of Hawaiian Christianity, it is possible to interpret how the present Christian Hawaiians construct their cultural identity from a different angle than the ethnographic study that investigates only the present socio-cultural conditions of Christian Hawaiians. Therefore, in this chapter, I investigate the Hawaiian Christian movements occurring in the past, in which leaders and their followers internalized Christian doctrine in their own ways and believed that they were Christian in the true sense, even if the Congregational missionaries and ministers regarded them as heretics. In Hawaii, it was in the latter half of the 19th century that Hawaiian Christian movements of this sort occurred. This chapter describes and investigates two examples of such Hawaiian Christian movements whose development we can follow by referring to historical materials. The first is the Kaona Insurrection that
occurred in 1868, but was soon suppressed, and was considered a failed rebellion. The other is Hoomana Naauao, an independent Hawaiian Church, which was established in 1893 and officially authorized as a religious institution in 1911, although it was considered heretical initially.

The Kaona Insurrection

A Sign of the Incident

The Kaona Insurrection occurred in Kona, Hawai‘i, in the late 1860s at the time that the Congregational churches started to develop as an independent organization under the HEA. It became clear that a religious movement was occurring when Joseph Kaona and his followers occupied a church building in this district in 1868. The occupation caused a series of incidents that expanded beyond this local church and finally became a riot against which the government was requested to send armed forces. About this insurrection, there are various historical materials that remain, such as local English newspapers, a Hawaiian newspaper, memoirs of a white minister who was working in the district (Paris 1926), and that of a marshal who was dispatched to quell a riot (Parke 1891). It has been also narrated repeatedly (cf. The Friend 1902/10, 1938/09; HSB 1957/07/15-08/03 battle and studied as a symbolic incident in the religious and political history of Hawaii (cf. Daws 1968:188-190; Kuykendall 1953:105-106). Therefore, the Kaona Insurrection can be a subject of some interest from the standpoint of reconstructing a historical incident from diverse viewpoints. However, this chapter does not aim at an ethnographic experiment that focuses on the method of reconstructing a historical event, but intends to follow an incident scrupulously from beginning to end. Therefore, I mainly focus on describing the development of the insurrection chronologically by referring to articles published mainly in two local English newspapers; that is, the Pacific Commercial Advertiser and the Hawaiian Gazette, each of which has a different tone to the insurrection.
Joseph Kaona, the leader of this insurrection or Hawaiian Christian movement, depending on who described it, was educated at the Hilo Boarding School and graduated from the Lahainaluna Seminary that was a nursery of elite Hawaiians in those days (Paris 1926; Parke 1891). He had past experience working as the Police Magistrate in Lahaina (Parke 1891) and also as the District Judge in Honolulu (PCA 1868/10/24). He was arrested in 1867, when he took possession of the body of a neighbor who had died, refused to give it a burial and remained with it for four days. He declined the request of the friends of the deceased that he return the body, alleging that he could revive the dead (HG 1868/02/12). After this incident, he turned his efforts toward collecting a large quantity of Hawaiian Bibles and eventually settled in Kainalii, Kona, Hawai‘i. In Kainalii, a building for the Lanakila Church had been under construction since 1865 (HG 1868/11/18). According to Rev. Paris, who was working in this district, Kaona appeared in front of him in 1867, introduced himself by saying that he was from Kainalii, and had returned to reside in the district. He requested permission to store many of the Hawaiian Bibles he had collected inside the newly-built church building and secured such from the church luna [officers] (Paris 1926:50). However, he soon occupied the church building with a large number of his family and followers probably, in February 1868, and claimed to be a prophet of the Logi. This incident later developed into the riot called the Kaona Insurrection.

According to local English newspapers at the time, it seems that most of the contributions for a new church building were made by followers of Kaona and that he had already established a position of leadership in the Lanakila Church before this incident occurred (HG 1868/11/18). It is also surmised that a large quantity of the Hawaiian Bibles were utilized by him to acquire great influence over other church members. Kaona, as one of the church leaders, would take turns with a white minister at giving sermons in his church, but “began to introduce some slight innovations in the form
of worship" (HG 1868/11/18). Finally, in December 1867, he predicted that “the Saviour would appear about the 1st day of . . . January, bearing a flaming sword, to devour and slay his enemies” and “all who, at the ‘coming,’ were in the church with him would be saved, but all others without would miserably perish” (HG 1868/02/12). Following this teaching, nearly two hundred followers filled the church and remained together, engaging in religious exercises day and night (HG 1868/02/12). However, nothing happened on the predicted date and he postponed the end of the world for a year or two.

In response to Kaona’s conduct, Rev. Paris and a minority of the church members insisted on their rights to use the church building exclusively, but Kaona and his followers maintained that they also had the right to use the building in common with Rev. Paris’ party (HG 1868/11/18). Although Rev. Paris’ party locked the doors of the church in order to exclude Kaona and his followers, he seemingly mysteriously opened the doors or “perpetrated a little trick by unhinging them secretly, and then showing his followers how easily they opened in answer to his prayers, gave them a slight kick” (HG 1868/02/12) and they again occupied the building. As a result, a warrant was issued against Kaona and some of his followers. The sequence of events was described about nine months later in a correspondence that appeared in a local English newspaper:

Some three years ago, the neat little church at Kainaliu was built, by subscription, upon Mrs. Johnston’s (now Mrs. Roy’s) land, and a large proportion of the amount required was subscribed by the followers of Kaona, who, at that time, were members of the church, in good standing. Mr. Paris, the Pastor preached on certain Sundays, and Kaona, who was, I believe, one of the Lunas, would preach on others. For a time, all went on smoothly enough, until Kaona began to introduce some slight innovations in the form of worship, which were opposed by Mr. Paris and a minority of the congregation, and the church became split into two factions. Although the church was built by general subscription, and Kaona and his party were majority, Mr. Paris, and those thinking with him, claimed the exclusive use of the church, to the expulsion of their opponents. This was resisted by the Kaonaites. As they were subscribers to the building, and no trustees had ever been elected, nor any charter granted by the Government, they contended that they had a right to worship God in their own way, in common with those who differed from them. The feud continued to increase, and Kaona’s opponents, finding they had no law on their side to justify the expulsion of the Kaonaites, resolved to take the law into their
own hands, and fastened up the door of the church. Shortly after, the door was mysteriously forced open, and the Kaonaites all entered to worship. A warrant was then issued against Kaona and some of his leaders, on the charge of house-breaking. (HG 1868/11/18)

In the latter half of the 19th century, it was not unusual that a Hawaiian church member would be excommunicated from a congregation because of his or her misconduct, including what were considered heathenish practices. As I described in Chapter 3, the Congregational missionaries and ministers in those days were struggling to suppress idolatrous practices and eliminate the influence of *kahuna* [plural of *kahuna*: sorcerer] in Hawaiian churches. In the case of Kaona, however, he was one of the church leaders who would even preach the service and, more importantly, his party was a majority of the congregation. Although his faith and practices were characterized as curious innovations, his activity was not something categorized as paganism or idolatry, but based on Christian doctrine, which was for his followers embodied in the Hawaiian Bible. Kaona’s teachings were at worst a sort of Christian heresy; however, as was usual with the Congregational missionaries, his religious activity tended to be interpreted in relation to *kahuna* practices (Paris 1926:54).

After a warrant was issued for the arrest of Kaona and some of his leading followers, they were cited before the District Judge of North Kona, who was a Hawaiian by the name of, probably, Hoapili; whose name is hard to read in a microfilm (HG 1868/02/12). The District Judge, who was leaving for Honolulu at that time, decided to defer judgement until his return, but Kaona and his leading followers were put in irons and detained in a prison at Nāpōʻopʻo for about nine days (HG 1868/11/18). During his imprisonment, Kaona went on a fast. Although they were finally discharged from court, the court took possession of the church building in order to avoid further trouble and from that time neither party was allowed to use the building (HG 1868/02/12, 1868/11/18). After the closing of the church, Kaona and his followers returned to the district and started communal life. They built a large *lānai* [temporary open-sided roofed
structure near the church, on the land that was owned by William C. Lunalilo, who took the throne later in 1873 and is known as the first Hawaiian to donate his property to charities, and were waiting for the fulfillment of the prophecy (HG 1868/02/12, 1868/11/18). Early in March, 1868, Kaona was again arrested and taken to Honolulu for trial (HG 1868/03/11). A local newspaper article reported how he looked in the court room:

Kaona is a middle aged man, of pleasant countenance and quiet manners, who, as he sat in the court room in undisturbed contemplation of the scene and trial, did not appear in the least a dangerous person. Aside from his aberration on second adventism, and his success in obtaining a considerable following, and leading them into absurd practices, he might well, pass for a quiet and inoffensive subject. (HG 1868/03/11)

After the first trial, Kaona was committed to an insane asylum for one week to have a psychiatric test (HG 1868/03/18). In the second trial, both the physician and the superintendent of the asylum testified that “Kaona’s conduct while under their notice, had not been such as to warrant them in pronouncing him insane” (HG 1868/03/18). However, the Associate Justice decided to remand Kaona to the asylum until the physician issued a regular certificate of discharge; the judge remarked that his conduct was dangerous to the public safety and that an immediate discharge would leave an impression that the court gave an official endorsement to his and his followers’ activities (HG 1868/03/18).

Around this time, in April 1868, a series of eruptions and earthquakes began occurring frequently in Hawai‘i. According to Paris, the earthquakes lasted for three weeks, and there were many casualties from the mud flow in Ka‘ū (Paris 1926:55). Paris and his family were forced to camp outside, and he took his family to Honolulu for refuge. After returning to Hawai‘i, he started his mission work energetically in his district and acquired many new church members. In his recollections, he stated:

After renting a cottage and placing my wife and children in it, I returned to my missionary work, making preaching tours through the whole district, spending much time in visiting from house to house, seeking the
wandering and lost, trying to feed the lambs. A great number came inquiring the way of salvation. Many, after being instructed, were baptized and received into the churches. The judgements of the Lord led many, we had reason to hope, to repent and seek for salvation. (Paris 1926:55-56)

However, it is not only Rev. Paris who seized an opportunity to do mission work in a state of confusion caused by a natural calamity. Kaona also took advantage of the opportunity to promulgate among “the ignorant people” his own teachings that “the end of the world was at hand” and “the earth was to be burnt up with all its inhabitants except himself and his followers” (Paris 1926:52). He was sending out his messengers in the district in order to warn not only Hawaiians but also whites that they should turn to him as the true prophet and join his community (Paris 1926:52).

According to Paris, Kaona and his followers moved their camp to Kula, about a mile and a half nearer to the sea, because of hunger and the cold rain, and continued their communal life while conducting religious and political meetings (Paris 1926:51). This final campground was owned by Lunalilo and they seemed to have obtained the consent of his father, Kanaina, to take the lease of the land (HG 1868/10/21, 1868/10/28, 1868/11/18, The Friend 1902/10). Probably in the first week of October 1868, Kaona sent a messenger to Honolulu in order to negotiate with Lunalilo about the lease of the land where they were camping (HG 1868/10/21). The messenger took with him the first six months’ rent (HG 1868/10/28) or the first year’s rent of $150 as required by Kanaina (HG 1868/11/18), but “he found that they were forestalled by one of their opponents, who had induced the proprietor to refuse them the lease, and give it to himself” (HG 1868/11/18). It is William F. Roy, one of the opponents of Kaona, who obtained the lease of the land from Lunalilo.

An Outbreak

Kaona and his followers were preparing a feast when the steamer carrying the messenger arrived at Kealakekua on October 15. Although they became aware that they
had failed to obtain the lease, they remained on the land belonging to Lunalilo and confronted the Roy faction. A letter from Roy that was introduced in a local English newspaper described the development of the affair over the next four days (PCA 1868/10/24). On Friday, October 16, Sheriff Richard B. Neville, with his constables and probably also Roy, brought to the campground a notice that required Kaona and his followers "to meet at Mr. Roy’s home to arrange terms for living upon the land," although the legal validity of this notice was doubted by some observers (HG1868/11/18). However, "[a]s fast as the notice was put up it was spit on and then torn from the tree that it was nailed to" and the police force was driven back (PCA 1868/10/24). At the appointed time on the following day, on Saturday, the Magistrate, Neville and Roy were waiting at Roy’s house, but no one from the Kaona party appeared. Their names were called three times, but no response was made. The Magistrate then issued an arrest warrant and Roy, in company with sixteen constables, returned to the camp with three warrants (PCA 1868/10/24). They met with violent opposition from Kaona and his followers, and had no choice but to retreat (HG 1868/10/28, 1868/11/18; PCA 1868/10/24).

On Monday morning, October 19, Sheriff Neville, accompanied with Sheriff Moses Barrett who was half-white (The Friend 1902/10:6), and 30 to 40 native policemen and about 200 native and foreign special constables went to the camp in order to arrest Kaona (HG 1868/11/04, 1868/11/18; PCA 1868/10/24). When they arrived, Neville and Kamaauoho, a constable from Nāpōʻopʻo, proceeded on horseback to the encampment, where there were about 300 people staying together (HG 1868/10/28, 1868/11/04). Both of them were immediately attacked with stones by Kaona’s followers, and in this battle Neville was murdered and Kamaauoho was seriously wounded. The sequence of events leading to the murder of Neville was reported in detail by a newspaper article:
The late Mr. Neville visited Kaona's camp on the week previous, encountering opposition. Finally, at 9 A.M. on Monday, Oct. 19, he went with one Kamauoho, a constable from Napoopoo, to serve some notices to quit. Many others went with them, but only Neville and Kamauoho approached the land where the prophet's people were assembled. As soon as they appeared, the prophet ordered his people to drive them away. A powerful man seized Kamauoho and began to beat him severely. The whole crowd also threw stones, and the affair was so serious that Neville fired his pistol. The first discharge did no harm. The second wounded a man slightly. Meanwhile the shower of stones continued with great fury. One stone hit Neville on the side of the head and he fell from his horse. The crowd then attacked him, and, in the confusion, Kamauoho contrived to escape, although badly bruised, and in spite of being lassoed five times. Neville does not appear to have struggled violently, and as he is known to have been a very strong man, it is hoped he had become insensible. They bound him with pieces of vine, and left him in a helpless, sitting posture, very badly wounded. Accounts vary as to the length of time he remained in this condition, and there is a conflict of testimony as to whether he was conscious or not, but after an interval of an hour or two, Kaona inquired if he was dead, and being answered in the negative, told his people that Neville was a bad man, a rebel; and that God above would be angry with them if he was not killed. Thereupon he ordered Kahikoku, an older soldier, to kill him. Kahikoku went out with a stick "as large and long as a man's arm," and beat out Neville's brain in sight of all the people, who looked on in silence. When he returned and reported that his victim was dead, Kaona said that "God would be glad." (HG 1868/11/04)

It was mentioned in another article that most members of Neville's party deserted him and fled "without a single hand being raised for his defence or rescue" (HG 1868/11/18). In this encounter, Barrett was also seriously bruised and three Hawaiian policemen, probably including Kamauoho, sustained injuries (PCA 1868/10/24).

After Neville had fallen into the hands of Kaona's party, several persons in the district including Logan, Williamson and Greenwell, some of whom seemed to have tried to negotiate with Kaona on Sunday as mediators between the two parties, visited the camp to ask that Neville's body be returned, but this request was refused by Kaona (HG 1868/10/28). According to a newspaper article, Neville had been decapitated and his head stuck on a pole (PCA 1868/10/24). In the afternoon of the same day, there was another attack on Kaona's party in which one member of the attacking party, named Kamai, and three of Kaona's followers were killed (PCA 1868/10/24). The above cited article described:
One Kamaka, known to be expert with a lasso, came out and threw one around the neck of a native named Kamai, who contrived to extricate himself, but Kamaka then caught his shirt sleeve, and twisting it round the pommel of his saddle, dragged him away, until one Alika, in presence and by command of Kaona, split his head open with an axe. (HG 1868/11/04)

During a series of fights, “irresponsible persons” of the attacking group “very improperly set fire to” several houses of Kaona’s followers (PCA 1868/10/24); probably this group was one led by Kupakee (PCA 1869/06/05). As retaliation against this, Kaona and his followers threatened the opponents by saying that they would destroy the houses of their enemies (PCA 1868/10/24). In a letter to a newspaper editor, Roy mentioned that he would take his children and wife away because Kaona and his followers had threatened to kill his wife (PCA 1868/10/24). Despite the fact that Kaona’s party threatened to kill Roy, his wife and Rev. Paris, there seemed to be “one or two prominent foreigners” who were “in sympathy with and aiding the rebels” (PCA 1868/10/24).

The End of the Incident

On Thursday morning, October 22, the government received news of the insurrection and immediately dispatched a force of 176 armed soldiers by two schooners, Kaimaile and Prince, at 2 p.m. on the same day (PCA 1868/10/24). The armed forces planned to transfer to the steamer Kilauea at Lahaina, Maui, and reach Kona, Hawai‘i early on Saturday morning (PCA 1868/10/24). Sheriffs in other districts in Hawai‘i received the news on Wednesday. Sheriff Coney, who was at the Volcano House at that time, and Sheriff Chillingworth in Waimea arrived at Kainaliu respectively on Friday, October 23 (PCA 1868/10/31; HG 1868/11/18). According to a letter of Rev. Luther H. Gulick dated October 25 (PCA 1868/10/31), about 150 men in South Kona, both foreigners and natives enrolled as a special constabulary force, were summoned on Friday evening to keep a constant watch on the Kaona’s camp in order to block his followers’ escape. In the eyes of Rev. Gulick, however, Hawaiian guards did not actively perform their duty. On Saturday morning, October 24, the guarding force was further
reinforced to about 300 to 350 men by the addition of other forces from Ka'ū and, at 1 p.m., Sheriff Coney and others proceeded to the camp with the warrant (PCA 1868/10/31).

When the troops of Coney and Chillingworth approached the coconut leaf lānai in Kaona’s camp, they found that “about forty men and twenty women down, with bibles in their right hands held aloft, declared themselves simply servants of God and ready to do what was right” (Gulick’s letter 10/25 in PCA 1868/10/31). All of Kaona’s followers were dressed in white and some of them “gesticulated excitedly, and proclaimed themselves servants of Jehovah, and that they relied on his word as their arm of defence from their enemies” (HG 1868/11/18). There, the warrants of arrest were read aloud and two men, named Lumaawe and Kakina, and one woman, named Kalulo, came forward for a parley and, at 3 p.m., Lumaaawe and Kakina surrendered but Kalulo returned to the lānai (Gulick’s letter 10/25 in PCA 1868/10/31). Then, the warrants were again read and Kaona and his followers were summoned to surrender themselves, but no response was made. Twelve armed men entered the camp to seize them (HG 1868/11/18). There, the followers were “found bowed down upon the ground with their faces inward, in the act of devotion, one woman in the centre was kneeling upright with the bible held aloft, turning slowly round like a piece of machinery” (HG 1868/11/18). Most of them did not resist violently but clung to each other, but some of them, including Kaona, who did struggle actively, received rough handling (HG 1868/11/18; Gulick’s letter 10/25 in PCA 1868/10/31). At 3:30 p.m., when the steamer Kilauea, with assistance from Honolulu, was arriving, all of the congregation had been arrested and the flag with the word “Jehovah” was chopped down (HG 1868/11/18). Kaona and his followers were taken to Mr. Todd’s premises at 7 p.m., delivered to the armed forces that arrived from Honolulu at 8 p.m., and finally the special constables were dismissed (HG 1868/11/18; Gulick’s letter 10/25 in PCA 1868/10/31). There, both soldiers and prisoners had to remain in the
yard all night in the rain, because there was no building to accommodate them (*The Friend* 1902/10; Parke 1891).

The next day, Sunday, October 25, Kaona and his followers were sent down to the steamer anchored at Ka‘awaloa and, at 7 p.m., were taken to Kailua for preliminary trial (Gulick’s letter 10/27 in PCA 1868/10/31). On Tuesday, October 27, the trial was carried out at the Kailua Protestant Church. Kahikoku was charged with the murder of Sheriff Neville, and Kaona, Alika, Kamaka, and Kalama were arraigned for the murder of the constable Kamai, and all of them were committed until the next term of the Circuit Court in Hilo, which would be held in May 1869 (Gulick’s letter 10/27 in PCA 1868/10/31).

Many of the other followers were charged with being accessories after the fact and some of them were committed for trial; the details of the decision were reported in a Hawaiian newspaper, *ke Kuokoa* (1868/10/31). Many of the followers’ children were transferred to a responsible party’s custody (Gulick’s letter 10/27 in PCA 1868/10/31). After the preliminary trial, all the healthy followers were transferred to Honolulu and the remainder were left on Hawai‘i in the custody of the sheriff (Gulick’s letter 10/27 in PCA 1868/10/31).

In May 1869, at the trial in Hilo, Kahikoku was found guilty of murder in the first degree by unanimous decision and sentenced to 16 years hard labor (PCA 1869/06/05). As for the case of Kaona, Alika, Kamaka, and Kalama, who were charged for the murder of Kamai, the jury seemed to take more time to come to the final verdict, but in the end it was proved that Alika, aided by Kamaka and Kalama, beat Kamai’s head in at the command of Kaona, and the jury brought in a verdict of murder in the second degree, by unanimous decision, to all of them. Kaona and Alika were sentenced to ten years hard labor and the other two were sentenced to five years hard labor (PCA 1869/06/05). According to a newspaper article, a reason why Kaona was found guilty of murder only in the second degree was that “Kaona conducted his own defence, making a ‘most
wonderful speech, mild, vehement and sarcastic,' completely using up some of the witnesses, which doubtless had its effect upon the jury" (PCA 1869/06/05).

For several years after the incident, Kaona’s followers appeared to continue conducting religious and political meetings, and put up their candidates for election (Daw 1968:188-190). However, there is no record that mentions that they reorganized their religious commune or established their own church. According to Paris, after Kaona’s movement was suppressed, 300 to 400 Hawaiians left Kainaliu and, as a result, his church never recovered from the aftereffects of the insurrection (Paris 1926:54-55). As for Kaona himself, the only further information concerning him is that he was later discharged, after receiving a pardon from King Kalākaua, and returned to Kainaliu, where he died in 1883 (Paris 1926:54).

**Doctrine and Activity of Kaona**

According to Paris, Kaona “had a smattering of English, had read some of the Mormon and Mahomedan doctrines, and had imbibed the old kahuna doctrine of curing disease and raising the dead by his own power” and “told marvelous dreams and communications from the Lord, considering himself the Lord’s vice-regent on earth” (Paris 1926:54). It was pointed out later that Kaona had been influenced by the adventist teachings of William Miller, who developed the interdenominational “Millertie” movement in the United States in the 1830s and 1840s (The Friend 1902/10; HSB 1957/07/31, 1957/08/01). However, it is not clear whether his teachings were influenced directly or indirectly by the Millerite movement.

There is no historical material remaining that describes concretely Kaona’s teachings, except for that referring to his orthodox eschatology, which various millenarian movements have in common: that is, the Second Advent of Jesus Christ, the end of the world, and the chosen people surviving after that. Of the remaining historical materials, only the heterodox character of Kaona’s teachings is explained in its relation to
other religions, such as Mormonism, Islam, and the kahuna practices, all of which were regarded as heretical or heathenish by the Congregational missionaries. However, it is possible at least to glimpse how Kaona and his followers lived their communal lives, by reading carefully the articles of local newspapers in those days, the reports and memoirs of the persons involved in the incident, and his followers' letter[8] that was published in an English newspaper with the intention of giving some insight into their religious movement [Appendix B]. Although I will explain this letter in greater detail later in this chapter, its main purpose was to introduce their communal life, the dispute about the land with their opponents, and their financial difficulties. The letter contributed by the followers of Kaona gives a perspective on their movement from a different angle than that of other documents. Their letter and the other materials left by the outsiders take different positions toward the incident, so that referring equally to these materials somehow helps reconstruct their religious movement more or less reasonably.

It is not difficult to find severe criticism of the superstitions and idolatry held by Christian Hawaiians in the reports and notes of the 19th century missionaries. For example, after mentioning that “their [Kaona and his followers’] sect is closely allied in its spirit, and in its origin to the Pae Marire[9] of New Zealand, which proceeded to the murder of missionaries,” Rev. Gulick asserts that “its root is idolatry,” even if they seemed to have “made more of the Bible and exhibited more devotional spirit” in the more Christianized and civilized Hawaiian nation (Gulick’s letter 10/28 in PCA 1868/10/31). It is easy to deny his statement as a typical example of the ethnocentric observation of a strict Calvinist in those days. But it is not apposite to do so, because several icons and other objects appear repeatedly in the newspaper articles as well as the followers’ letter. For example, Rev. Gulick mentions in his letter:

On Sunday night a small Japanese box was found among the effects of the prisoners, wrapped in seven different handkerchiefs. Inside the box was the preserved skull of a small reddish bird, which connects their worship with the old idolatries of Hawaii nei. [10] This was an object of superstitious
reverence. In the box were also some writings, purporting to be revelations from Jehovah by Kaona, in which are allusions to this bird, as one of the important powers in the spirit world. (Gulick’s letter 10/28 in PCA 1868/10/31)

It is not certain what kind of bird this reddish bird was. But, red was a sacred color, bones were believed to have spiritual powers, and birds had symbolic meanings in ancient Hawaii. Considering these facts, it should be pointed out that Rev. Gulick’s interpretation of the bird skull as something that “connects their worship with the old idolatries of Hawaii nei” and as “an object of superstitious reverence” is ethnocentric, but not totally misdirected.

The number “seven” was also a meaningful symbolic number for Kaona and his followers. For example, the Japanese box that contained a bird skull was wrapped in seven different handkerchiefs. In addition, when the followers were waiting for the messenger from Honolulu who was expected to come back with a written contract of lease, they put up seven white flags and made preparations for a feast of seven days; they believed that their enemies would be destroyed during the seven day feast (HG 1868/10/21). Although a description of the flag color is different, the followers’ letter mentions that they have “seven banners of divers colors to present the seven vials of wrath which is to come” and that Kaona ordered that they “must keep it up for seven days, as they did amongst the Israelites of old” (PCA 1868/10/24). The same letter also mentions that Kaona “has to go to prison once more, which then will be seven times; and then will be the end, and we will be all right” (PCA 1868/10/24).

It seems that the white clothes that Kaona and his followers were wearing attracted public notice. There are several descriptions concerning this point in the newspapers and memoirs. According to these materials, Kaona and his followers were clothed in white robes or veils (PCA 1868/10/24); the men were “dressed in palm hats covered with white linen, and the women in white turbans” (PCA 1868/10/31), carrying a Hawaiian Bible in a white bag (The Friend 1902/10, 1938/09) or holding it “as a sword
hung by their side" (Paris 1926:50-51). In addition, when they were waiting for the messenger from Honolulu in the camp site, “[a] procession was to be formed of the followers, dressed in white, with Kaona at the head mounted on a white horse” (HG 1868/10/21). Congregational church members also dressed up in white for the church service in those days. However, Kaona and his followers attracted a great deal of public attention because they always dressed in white in their communal life.

The most significant icon (or “fetish” in the missionaries’ words) was, however, the Hawaiian Bible. The Bibles, which were held aloft in their hands in front of the constables raiding their camp, were also hung by their side as swords, as described in Rev. Paris’ memoirs (Paris 1926). Rev. Gulick who attended the preliminary trial described what attitude Kaona and his followers attached to the Bible as follows:

The persistence of these Kaonites in their fanatical belief, is something more wonderful to Hawaiian eyes. As many of them as possible still cling to their Bibles. A number of them were brought into the Court Room, clinging to them with devout care. Kaona and several who were brought into the Court Room at the same time, immediately on being seated, and at different times during the trial bent forward in the attitude of prayer. (Gulick’s letter 10/28 in PCA 1868/10/31)

Their devotion to the Hawaiian Bible, which was seen in that they were always carrying the Bible about with them, was immoderate even for the Congregational missionaries. Such emotional ties with the Bible are closely related with fundamentalistic attitudes and practices that literally follow the words in the Bible. The case of Kaona and his followers was no exception. The followers’ letter mentioned that they were living a joyful life while singing the 150th Psalm and explained how they had been preparing a feast following a precedent of King David in ancient time:

Some folks might like to know what a jolly time we had celebrating the 150th psalm. You see we are justified in having a big time. We had been a month previous collecting all the kerosene oil cans, tin pots and kettles, pipes and plates that we could think of, except the old harps of King David, which we did not know how to make. . . . Our Prophet says we must keep it up for seven days, as they did amongst the Israelites of old. (PCA 1868/10/24)
In the letter, they also mentioned that whenever they saw their enemies, or went by their houses, they would “strike up King David sung against his enemies” and the parents would instruct their children to do the same, which would bring immense joy (PCA 1868/10/24). Ella Hudson Paris, a daughter of Rev. Paris, also mentioned that “[w]earing white bands on their heads and carrying Bibles in white bags, they marched through the district chanting the Psalms of David” (The Friend 1938/09).

When this letter was written on October 9, the communal life in Kaona’s camp was reaching a climax. They were preparing for the aforementioned feast to accept the messenger from Honolulu and celebrate the lease of the land, which was called “Lehuula Nui.” In Kaona’s prophecy, they were going to remain there to see and survive the end of the world caused by volcanic eruptions. However, Kaona was said to have received another message from God in a trance just before the messenger returned from Honolulu. According to the letter, in this new message, God objected to their renting the land, predicted that the messenger would come back with the money the landowner declined to receive and that “a stream of lava would soon run down said land” (PCA 1868/10/24). After referring to this new prophecy, the content of the letter became suddenly entangled. First, the followers admitted that all the prophecies would not necessarily come about, but next insisted that they could find other land that would be the only safe place from volcanic eruptions (PCA 1868/10/24). Then, after insinuating that they were asking for a subsidy from the government, they requested the island of Lāna‘i or Kaho‘olawe, and finally they mentioned that they were going to occupy the Lanakila Church again (PCA 1868/10/24).

In their communal life, probably from the beginning, they remained in the camp and earnestly waited for the fulfillment of Kaona’s prophecy. They never left the campground, except when those who had taro, pig, poultry and other food at their homes went out and brought them back by orders of Kaona (HG 1868/02/12). According to the
followers' letter, they kept all-night watch for the clouds most likely to signal the coming of the end, while they observed a fast in the daytime; they were taught by Kaona that by doing so they would not be required to hold employment, and would talk with unknown tongues and make a prophecy by themselves (PCA 1868/10/24). In the letter, they mentioned that they suffered from a shortage of food and were looking for new disciples who were “influential ones” in order to help them keep up their feasts (PCA 1868/10/24). Although they insisted that Kaona would tell them “how to get along without it [food],” they only mentioned that they did “calculate to live mostly by psalm-singing” in addition to cultivating sweet potatoes, corns and beans (PCA 1868/10/24). According to an article published years later, Kaona acquired “a large number of the homes and kuleanas [kuleana: title, property] of the natives,” by “giving them in return a written promise to care for them as long as they should live”; in the promise was written “the ambiguous term” of “A like pu, me ka mea hiki [A like pū me ka mea hiki: as much as I can] (The Friend 1902/10:6).

The communal life of Kaona’s followers, in which they rejected any work for a cash income and waited for the fulfillment of the prophecy, quite naturally appeared as antisocial conduct of “idleness” to the outsiders, the Congregational missionaries in particular (cf. HG 1868/02/12, 1868/03/11, 1868/03/18). A newspaper article wrote as follows:

The injury of Kaona’s doctrine and conduct, appears not so much in his personal detriment to the safety of others as in his persuading large numbers of persons to part with their property and substance, and to impoverish themselves by idleness and belief in a religious delusion. (HG 1868/03/11)

Their behavior was quite easily connected to the stereotype of the indolent Hawaiian in those days (cf. Herman 1999). Kaona’s teachings were perceived as those that would reduce Hawaiians, who had been civilized by Christianity, back to the status of indolent heathen people.
Considering the lengthy treatment given in local newspapers, one would imagine that the Kaona Insurrection was considered a great incident in the Christian community. However, there is no article that refers to this insurrection in The Friend or the Annual Report of the Board of the Hawaiian Evangelical Association. There was only one short statement on Kaona in the Supplement to The Friend (1869/7), which was presented as the church report of the previous fiscal year at the Annual Meeting held in June 1869:

... during this year we have had no extraordinary convulsions of nature, such as we experienced in the year 1868. No earthquakes, no wars. Peace has reigned in all our borders, with the exception of an outbreak of fanaticism under a false prophet, by name Kaona, at Kona, Hawaii. (the Supplement to The Friend 1869/7:60)

After all, Kaona's activity, which became an influential movement for a while, did not grow into a stable institutionalized religious organization. There can be detected the germination of religious organization, but it was nipped in the bud by the overwhelming white power before it could be established as an organized religious movement. Similar to the Hapu movement that occurred in the 1830s, it had the character of a millenarian movement in which the followers gathered in a specific place and asked others to do so as well, and they waited for the end of the world. However, it must be noted that, different from the Hapu movement, their movement started inside a Congregational church; they directly conflicted with a white minister concerning the church leadership, and their movement was not able to be dealt with solely inside Christian society. It can be said that the Kaona Insurrection was an incident in which Hawaiian Christians tried to make Christianity their own in a more distinct and active way inside the church organization. However, the result of the insurrection indicates that a millenarian movement led by the native people in direct opposition to the predominant power of the white colonizers was limited in power and results.

It is important to pay attention to the fact that, in Kaona's religious movement, the dispute over the Christian doctrine and ritual ("orthodoxy" vs. "heterodoxy") and the
competition for leadership inside the church organization (a rivalry between a white missionary and the Hawaiian church members) was transformed into a political and economic struggle demanding economic aid as well as land accompanied with sovereignty (cf. Kodama 1974). In the latter half of the movement's development, especially after they were forced to camp outside, their religious activity shifted to a political movement based on the religious communal life, in which they lived together densely without working. This lifestyle is in itself anti-colonial in the sense that it goes against Western colonialism that pervades the rest of the world on the pretext of bringing the people civilization, industry and Christianity. It is possible to see in this shift the socio-economic conditions surrounding Hawaiians in the latter half of the 19th century.

It was not so unusual in the Congregational churches in the latter half of the 19th century that the white missionaries and ministers and the Hawaiian church members confronted each other concerning how to interpret the Christian doctrine and how to live a Christian life. As I described in Chapter 3, the white missionaries and ministers were nervous about not only the backsliding of the Hawaiian church members but also the traditional beliefs that they appeared to hold obstinately. In addition, as the Hawaiian Bibles started to circulate fully among Hawaiians, Christian Hawaiians appeared who expressed their own interpretations of the Christian doctrine. Among those Hawaiians, there were some, like Kaona, who tried to form their own religious group. After the Kaona Insurrection was put down, a small article appeared in a Hawaiian newspaper, *ke Kuokoa*, which reported that a couple of Hawaiians were doing their own mission work to establish a new religion in Hāmākua, Hawai‘i:

We heard that there are in Hamakua a Hawaiian man and a Hawaiian woman, named Kamaipielekane and Waahia respectively, who are establishing a new superstitious group, consolidating with the works of the Bible. Some ignorant people in the said district are following their teachings and are currently living without working. It is very similar to the work of the rebellious religious group of J. Kaona. As for Waahia, she is one of the priestesses well known here in Honolulu, and she propagated an ignorant prophecy, which is very similar to the recent Maluac’s work;
however, this woman’s work was very disappointing. Perhaps she has newly established her religious work there, that is similar to her [Maluae’s] work here in Honolulu. Therefore, we ask for the kindness of our correspondents who are staying everywhere in these islands, to inform us of the kind of work they are doing there, so we can carry a story to the public. So far, we don’t know the result of Kamaipelekané’s work which goes together with Waahia’s work. (ke Kuokoa 1868/11/14:3)\[14\]

I did not come across any further historical materials that described either what happened in Hāmākua or what Kamaipelekané, Waahia or Maluae were like. However, there is no doubt that, as the Bible was translated into the Hawaiian language and circulated among Hawaiians, it departed from the white missionaries’ control and was appropriated by Hawaiians in their own way. As a result of such appropriation, many Hawaiians must have appeared who started their own mission work outside the Congregational churches.

However, the less conscious the Hawaiian church members were of their act of incorporating Christianity in their own way, the more they tended to develop their peculiar Christian faith, one that could not be noticed by the white missionaries and ministers. Different from Kaona’s millenarian movement, there were other types of Hawaiian incorporation of Christian faith in the latter half of the 19th century. The incorporation of Christianity, which was progressing secretly inside the Congregational churches at least until Christian Hawaiians had the means to establish an independent church, is the next subject of investigation in this chapter. The name of the first independent Hawaiian Church, which was organized in the process of such tacit incorporation of Christianity, is Hoomana Naauao [Ho’oman Na’auao: Reasonable Service].

The Birth of Hoomana Naauao

“Jubilee Book”

On April 16, 1903, at Ke Alaula O Ka Malamalama Church\[15\] in Honolulu, John Kekipi Maia delivered a memorial speech to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the foundation of the independent Hawaiian Church, Hoomana Naauao [Figure 7]. On May 114
Figure 7. A Portrait of John Kekipi Maia [1831 - 1919]
(from "Jubilee Book")
20, in the same year, the memorial speech was published in a booklet, which is called the "Jubilee Book" and is still in circulation among present church members, and translated into English by Morrison (1984). The speech in this booklet is a significant Hawaiian text, not only in the field of Hawaiian education in which a text written by a native speaker is coveted, but also in the historical study of Hawaiian Christianity in which it is extremely difficult to find a voice among Christian Hawaiians (cf. Morrison 1984). By following the content of the speech in which Kekipi traced the roots of his church, it is possible to investigate the background of the establishment of the church. The "history" written in this text is, however, a narrative reconstructed in the form of Kekipi’s memoirs. Therefore, it is important to pay attention to the characteristic of such a narrative in which symbolic meanings are bestowed on historical incidents leading to the foundation of the independent church.

Considering the somewhat awkward position in which Kekipi’s church was probably placed at that time, it should be pointed out that a sort of political intention was embedded in his memorial speech. When delivering the speech, he insisted on the authenticity of his church by its 50 year church history, as opposed to a faction that was going to split from Hoomana Naauao. In fact, it is on April 16, 1881 when Kekipi started his mission work after receiving a revelation, and it is on July 31, 1893 when his church was organized. April 16, 1853, which Kekipi considered the first day of his church, is the date when Poloailehua, Kekipi’s mentor, started his mission work after having a divine revelation. The "Jubilee Book" is a text that includes symbolic meanings and political intentions. While giving heed to the character of this text, I would like to use it to explain how this independent church led by Hawaiians started and developed.

The Mission Work of Poloailehua

According to Kekipi, the history of Hoomana Naauao started on April 16, 1853, when John Hawelu Poloailehua first preached the gospel in Honolulu [Figure 8].
Figure 8. A Portrait of John Hawelu Poloalehua [1838 - ]
(from “Jubilee Book”)
Poloailehua was born in Kukuihaele, Hāmākua, Hawai‘i in about 1838, when the island was in the ferment of the Great Revival. In 1852, when he was 14 years old, he moved to Honolulu where he stayed with his employer Captain Long while working as a babysitter. In February of the next year, when he was incapacitated by a violent fever, he asked his employer to fetch the Bible. A luna of the Kawaiahaʻo Church brought the Bible and placed it on Poloailehua’s chest. He prayed while keeping his eyes closed and holding the Bible, and the letters of “Deuteronomy 32:39” floated before his eyes. As soon as he opened the Bible, read the verse and pledged his faith, he recovered from his illness. April 16, 1853 is the date when Poloailehua, still a 15-year-old boy, started his mission work after he recovered from his illness. He stayed in Honolulu to carry out mission work in his neighborhood where smallpox (ma‘i hebera) was prevalent at that time (“Jubilee Book”:7). Poloailehua’s family was also afflicted with this disease, but did not listen to his teachings. Soon afterwards, all members died except for himself. Thereafter, he continued his mission work on O‘ahu until 1854, although his teachings were not necessarily accepted by all people.

In 1855, Poloailehua boarded a schooner for Moloka‘i. However, he was again taken ill and disembarked at Hālawa, Moloka‘i, believing that he would die there. At this time also, he believed he was directed by the Spirit to read II Corinthians 12:8 and had a vision in which he saw a cow he had been raising in Hāmākua, Hawai‘i. It seems that in this vision Poloailehua discovered that his cow had been roasted despite his insurance that it would not be; this may have been the reason why he became ill. He asked for forgiveness for his sin in a prayer, and he immediately recovered from his illness. After returning to his birth place, Kukuihaele, Hāmākua, Poloailehua started to preach on his miraculous recovery from illness and worked hard in his mission work in the northern part of Hawai‘i, including Waipi‘o, Hāmākua and Kohala. He later extended his work to the whole islands. He seemed to belong to the Waialua Church and the Hau‘ula Church.
on O‘ahu for some years; but I was not able to find his name in the historical materials of these two Congregational churches. The central idea of his preaching was an orthodox one: that is, repentance as required for obtaining salvation. According to the “Jubilee Book,” however, he was put in prison six times because of his teaching. At that time in the late 1850s, his preaching based on the Bible, without missionary authority, was regarded as *hana ho‘omanamana* [superstitious work].

**The Conversion of Kekipi**

About a quarter of a century after Poloailehua had begun his work, Kekipi met him for the first time. On February 11, 1881, on his 50th birthday, he met Poloailehua at his house at Makapala, North Kohala. It seems that Kekipi had already heard about the mission work of Poloailehua and knew that his work was regarded as *hana ho‘omanamana*. However, despite this, he implored Poloailehua to stay for a while at his house. After dinner that day, together with Poloailehua, Kekipi held the family service, which included his employees, who were Chinese, Spanish and German. According to the present church members of Hoomana Naauao, the Kekipi family in those days seemed to be a wealthy family, but it is not clear why Kekipi, who was dubious of Poloailehua’s teachings, invited him to stay at Makapala and allowed him to lead the service. If this memoir is to be considered as his conversion story, however, it is not strange that Kekipi negatively described his attitude before his conversion in order to dramatize his story. At that time, his son John Eli Kekipi Maia suffered from tuberculosis. Because of his illness, he became interested in Poloailehua’s teachings and was seemingly healed by him miraculously. As a result, in March 1881, Eli was baptized by Poloailehua. On the other hand, Kekipi still had doubts about Poloailehua’s teachings. However, when another child had a toothache, Kekipi chanted a prayer that Poloailehua had used to heal Eli’s disease. Because his child’s toothache immediately disappeared, he
started to believe that Poloàihehua’s teachings could be correct, although some doubts remained.

In this year, from February to April, the family service was being conducted at their meeting house at Makapala under the guidance of Poloàihehua. On April 13, suddenly after the evening service, Poloàihehua stated that Kekipi would take charge of the service the next day. On April 14, without preparing, Kekipi stood before the attendants to start preaching a sermon based on the word in Genesis 3:9, which he had found by opening the Bible at random. He was again asked by Poloàihehua to preach on the next day, and this time tried to prepare but failed to do so. In the family service on April 15, he again randomly opened the Bible to find the word in Exodus 32:24, based on which he gave his sermon. He was again assigned to deliver a sermon for the next day, and this time he did not even try to prepare, believing that God would give him the sacred words. On April 16, he attended the service and preached a sermon based on the word in Psalms 51:6, which he found by once again opening the Bible on the spot. After Kekipi finished his sermon, Poloàihehua declared that the sermons preached by Kekipi in three consecutive nights were ones that he was given by the Spirit and that it was clear that he had been chosen by God as a preacher who would glorify His name.

When Poloàihehua was delivering this speech, Kekipi suddenly felt sick and went out of the meeting house to vomit at the side of the building. There, he felt he heard the voice of God who questioned him about his conduct of using Poloàihehua’s prayer in secret to heal his child’s toothache. However, once Kekipi accepted blame and begged His pardon, his bodily pains instantly disappeared. He entered the meeting house and delivered a speech from the pulpit to explain his conversion and announce his absolute devotion to God. In this way, Kekipi who was guided by Poloàihehua, started his mission work on April 16, 1881, exactly 28 years after Poloàihehua began his work.
At that time, Kekipi was a church member at the Kalähikiola Church, the Congregational church established in 1841, in Kohala, Hawai‘i. Rev. Elias Bond, who established the Kalähikiola Church and was still working for the church in those days, started the Kohala Sugar Plantation in 1861 to halt the outflow of local Hawaiians to the urban areas by providing employment for them, and also worked hard in the multi-ethnic society in Kohala (cf. Damon 1927). In his memorandum, he wrote “1881 Nov. 10, Kekipi goes out of office.” From this note, it is assumed that Kekipi, who started his own mission work in April of the same year, retired from some office of the church or the plantation. In the same memorandum is found a note that reads “1882 July 13, Left with Kekipi ma for Hamakua.” If Kekipi in the notes is the same person who we discuss here, it can be surmised that Kekipi and his group were acknowledged as influential members in the Kalähikiola Church.

From 1881 to 1886, Kekipi’s teachings spread throughout the entire area of Kohala. He preached that people could understand God as the only truth when they became feeble with an illness, stressed repentance as a premise for salvation, and seemed to practice a sort of faith-healing. From the evidence presented in a series of letters that Kekipi wrote to a Hawaiian minister named Rev. A. O. Polepe who stayed in Honolulu, Kekipi also purchased Hawaiian Bibles and Hawaiian Hymnals through him from 1883 to 1885. He was actively developing his mission work in Kohala in those days and was acquiring many followers from inside the Congregational churches. However, at the same time, his teachings were criticized by many as a false religion.

One Sunday, after the Kalähikiola Church service, Kekipi was openly charged by Rev. Bond with hana ho‘omanamana. It was a complete surprise to Kekipi and his followers in the congregation. Then, in the investigative meeting, he was asked by Rev. Bond whether he had conducted hana ho‘omanamana in opposition to the church. Kekipi’s answer was of course negative, while those who had informed the minister of
Kekipi’s superstitious religion admitted that they had only heard a rumor but never seen superstitious conduct by him. In this meeting, it was not Kekipi but another Hawaiian church member, named Kaiooni, who was found to be participating in the superstitious works. As a result, it was Kaiooni who was excommunicated from the church. There may have been an alternative reason to Rev. Bond’s accusation against Kekipi. From letters that Rev. Bond wrote to the ABCFM in the mid 1880s, it is clear that he took a negative attitude toward King Kalākaua. Because Kekipi seemed to be supporting the royal family, there may have been a conflict between Bond and him that led to the accusation of hana ho’omanamana against Kekipi. Although Kekipi’s teachings continued to spread even after this incident, his activity was, as he himself admitted, developed only inside the Congregational churches.

Toward the Establishment of an Independent Church

Early in the morning, on October 29, 1887, Kekipi heard a voice that ordered him to found a church, while he had a vision after he woke up to feed his baby milk. The vision that he had is as follows: he and his son, Eli, were in the living room of their house, and saw a man and woman standing at the door. Kekipi called them into the room, and they entered crawling on the floor. When he told them to stand up and asked them why they had come, they answered that they had come to enter his church. Kekipi asked them whether they were married. However, because their answer was negative, he would not allow them to enter his church. At that time, Eli had been converted to Mormonism. Watching how Kekipi was dealing with this couple, Eli asked them to join to his church. He took them out of the house and baptized them. As Kekipi was listening to the baptism performed by Eli, a voice suddenly called down on Kekipi. After looking around him, he found a man who looked like Noah just coming out of the Ark. God, who looked like Noah, explained to Kekipi that he should not behave in such an intolerant manner thereafter if he was going to build His church, and suggested he look at Romans 12:1.
and Hebrew 6:16, 17, 18. After which, He ordered Kekipi to found His church that, being “baptized by fire and the Holy Spirit,”[25] would accept anyone who asked.

In this description of the vision, it is possible to read symbolically the relation between the Congregational churches and the Mormons at that time in Hawaii. As I explained in Chapter 3, the Mormons were extending their influence among Hawaiians at the end of the 19th century. Having “no standards of church discipline” in the eyes of the Congregational ministers (the Annual Report 1900:23), they granted easy admission to the excommunicates of the other denominations. Kekipi, who was energetically doing his mission work inside the Congregational churches, was most likely frustrated with the relatively strict admission policy of the church, which would refuse potential church members, including someone who Kekipi thought needed real help. After he had this revelation, Kekipi decided to build his church, but needed several years to realize the foundation of the church.

In February 1889, Kekipi received another revelation from God, which ordered him to bring his teachings to the throne. He soon moved to Honolulu and tried to explain his teachings to King Kalākaua. Finally, he succeeded in meeting the King through the request of Queen Kapi‘olani who had at that time a weak constitution and thought Kekipi could help with this. He emphasized that the royal family should found a church of the Hawaiian people. On April 26, agreeing to Kekipi’s plan, the Queen decided to establish the church. John E. Bush[26] prepared a draft, which proclaimed that Hoomana Naauao was the religion of the nation as well as the throne. However, just when the Queen was ready to put her seal on the document, the King made a counterproposal that the establishment of the church was Kekipi’s work while the throne would merely play a supporting role. As a result, Kekipi’s plan came to a deadlock.

In July, of the same year, the King proposed that he, Kekipi and Robert Hoapili Baker[27] would make a pilgrimage to Calvary, prior to establishing the church. The privy
council was summoned to discuss the King’s overseas journey, while Kekipi was ordered by the King to go back to Hawai‘i to wait until a decision was made. However, the plan of the King’s pilgrimage was rejected by the council. Learning about the cancellation, Kekipi returned to Honolulu in August and stayed in a house given to him by the Queen. There, he started his mission work. His teachings again became the focus of the criticism, but he seemed to acquire many followers through his faith-healing. In Honolulu, Kekipi belonged to the Kaumakapili Church and he seemed to develop his work inside the congregation as he had in Kohala, Hawai‘i. However, in 1890, he left the Kaumakapili Church, taking his followers with him. He built a meeting house on the seaside of Kālia and started his mission work as an independent group. Reviewing the previous fiscal year, *the Annual Report* (1890:11) pointed out that various problems, such as political antagonism, race prejudice and the heathen spirit, had arisen in the churches, but considered that these problems were profitable lessons to improve their organization. It also reported that misconceptions had been planted in the minds of some church members and “the very extravagances” of those days were “their own revelation and exposure.” In the same article is mentioned that “[t]he chaff has been winnowed from the wheat” to suggest that a dissatisfied group had left the church. This “chaff” probably referred to Kekipi and his followers.

On July 31, 1893, about six months after the Hawaiian monarchy was overthrown, Hoomana Naauao was physically established in Honolulu, when Bush offered his chapel to be used as the church. At the second meeting held on August 4, in the same year, “Hoomana Naauao” was officially adopted as the church name, Kekipi was elected as the first minister of the church, and the principal doctrine and rituals, such as the Sabbath, baptism and sacrament, were discussed. In opposition, the leading ministers of the HEA criticized Kekipi’s activity as a heretical act taking advantage of the social confusion caused by the overthrow of the Hawaiian monarchy:
One Kekipi has thought this a good time to start a new religious organization among the natives of the town. The name he has chosen to designate the color of his belief is rather mystifying. It is the “hoomana naauao.” It is evidently an attempt to use the phrase which Paul employs in Rom. 12:1, “reasonable service,” in a way not justified by the text.

In the scripture where it is used it does not refer to a form of belief but to the quality of our worship which we are asked to make culminate in a hearty surrender of ourselves to God in service.

Evidently Mr. Kekipi has in mind a peculiar phase of thought; it is much easier to think peculiarly than it is to do the will of God. One Rev. S. Kaili, a Hawaiian minister without present charge, has helped Kekipi in his services and has so violated the comity which should exist between him and his brethren. (*The Friend* 1893/08:63)

Although Hoomana Naauao was gradually forming itself into an organized religious group in spite of the HEA’s opposition, there was some conflict from within the church.

Educated persons, who did not agree with Kekipi’s definition of “the baptism in fire and with the Holy Spirit,” left the church that they themselves had helped to construct.

On July 31, 1897, the new church building was sanctified and named Ke Alaula O Ka Malamalama. With this church as a mother church, more than ten sister churches were founded on Hawaiʻi, Maui, Lānaʻi and Molokaʻi, from July 31, 1893 to April 16, 1903 when Kekipi delivered a memorial speech. In this way, at the beginning of the 20th century, Hoomana Naauao was extending its influence gradually among Hawaiians, and was officially recognized as a religious organization on February 16, 1911.¹²⁸

**Early Doctrine and Activity of Hoomana Naauao**

The most significant characteristic of the doctrine of Hoomana Naauao, which can be read in the “Jubilee Book,” is the emphasis on repentance and the practice of faith-healing presupposing repentance. Poloailehua started his mission work, when he repented on his sickbed and made a miraculous recovery. Kekipi, who met with Poloailehua, had a sudden physical disorder because of his sin, and recovered his health by repenting in bodily pain and deciding to preach the Word of God.

*The Friend* criticized Hoomana Naauao as a heretical religion along with the kahuna practices and the Mormons in a serial article named “Unfulfilled Promises” (*The...
Although the article was written by the leading Congregational ministers, based on their negative interpretation of the religions, it helps us comprehend to some extent how Hoomana Naauao was developing its mission work among Hawaiians. After pointing out that Hoomana Naauao was similar to Christian Science, which had influence on the mainland, the article introduced examples of Hawaiians who they believed were deceived by the members of Hoomana Naauao:

Mr. N., of good education, holding an excellent position in the Territory, found himself growing blind. The physicians could give him no hope, probably because the optic nerve itself was injured. Instead of promising him strength to endure, the true mission of the Church, the Hoomana Naauao, promised sight. Being a member of our Church he hesitated long before committing himself into their hands, but in despair, as the darkness shut in, he told them to cure him as they had promised. Step by step they led him on. Soon he was told that he must join their body. As he did not improve, they demanded his wife. In time she yielded also, for the sake of her suffering husband. But there was no gain in spite of starvation diet, fasting, and prayers. Finally, as he ventured to question certain of their doctrines, he and his wife were expelled from membership as undesirable. (The Friend 1917/12:276)

A lady, Mrs. M., also joined them. She grew worse and worse, instead of better. They claimed that she must still have unconfessed sins, in view of her condition, but in spite of all that they could do she died at the hospital of cancer of the stomach. (The Friend 1917/12:276)

As seen in these examples introduced in The Friend, it is clear that only what Hoomana Naauao considered true and genuine repentance before God was required for the miraculous recovery from illness. Although this independent Hawaiian Church was not Christian Science, it was introduced as a religious group that was conducting very similar activity, that is, promoting faith-healing in the mission work (The Friend 1917/12). Therefore, it was later sometimes nicknamed “Hawaiian Christian Science” (Burrows 1970 [1947]).

In the practices of Hoomana Naauao, the importance of visions was one of the main characteristics. Poloailchua started his mission work after having a vision on his sickbed, in which he received a divine revelation. Kekipi also had a revelation in a vision, from which he decided to dedicate himself to God’s work. Furthermore, Kekipi’s several
important decisions about the foundation of Hoomana Naauao were made through the visions and revelations he received. Another significant characteristic of the practices of Hoomana Naauao was the opening of the Bible to a random page to see the divine will in sacred phrases on the page. This was called “wehe i ka Paipala” [opening the Bible] (cf. Pukui et al. 1972:204-206; 1979:185-186) As mentioned, Kekipi once opened the Bible at random at three consecutive family services in order to preach a sermon. On the other hand, Poloailehua tried to find God’s will in a specific scripture text, after he came out of a vision in which he was directed by the Spirit to read it. This act can be considered to have the same meaning of wehe i ka Paipala, because he did not choose a scripture text of his own accord.

The emphasis on repentance as a premise to salvation, the significance of visions, and the random opening of the Bible were the major characteristics of the doctrine and practice of Hoomana Naauao in the beginning, all of which are described in the “Jubilee Book.” Although there is no mention in the “Jubilee Book,” fasting, described in the above-cited article of The Friend (1917/12), was considered another important characteristic of Hoomana Naauao in those days. As seen in the case of Mr. N., it seems that a fast was performed often in combination with a prayer. Unfortunately, except for the “Jubilee Book,” I was not able to find any historical materials that referred to the doctrine and ritual of the then Hoomana Naauao. However, I would like to mention several teachings characteristic of Hoomana Naauao, which were introduced by Burrows (1970 [1947]).

Burrows interviewed Andrew Iaukea Bright, who had been one of the church leaders from the beginning and served as a head minister of Hoomana Naauao from c. 1924 to 1939. Burrows’ introduction of Hoomana Naauao is as it existed in the 1930s so it does not necessarily present accurate information of the doctrine of Hoomana Naauao from the early days. However, it helps shed light on how this independent church was developing in the early 20th century.
According to Bright (Burrows 1970 [1947]:156-158), the followers of Hoomana Naauao believed that Hawaiians were descended from ancient Hebrews and Egyptians and that the old Hawaiian religion and Christianity had the same origin. It was said that the doctrine of Hoomana Naauao was based on the law of God revealed in the Ten Commandments and that the law of God had been already written down in the *Malamahoa* (*Mālamahoa: Law of the splintered paddle*) by Kamahameha before the missionaries came to Hawaii. In the doctrine of Hoomana Naauao that emphasized faith-healing, the cause of illness was a sin a patient committed and, in order to recover from illness, the patient had to find out how he or she had committed a sin and repent sincerely. It was said that there were three kinds of sin: in thought, in word and in deed, and that the followers had to confess their sin to God, ask Jesus to be forgiven and pray to the Spirit to be healed. When prayer was of no avail, fasting was performed to ask for recovery.

Bright also disclosed to Burrows that in 1901 Kekipi cured a disease of his cousin, who had refused an operation advised by a physician, through prayer and fasting (Burrows 1970 [1947]:158-159). This case was reported by a local newspaper and Hoomana Naauao became the target of criticism in a local community for about three years. He also mentioned that Eli fasted for 40 days from November 4 to December 14, 1919; this case was also reported in a local newspaper. As seen in these examples, repentance in prayer and subsequent fasting were the main doctrine and practice of Hoomana Naauao in the early 20th century. However, Bright himself affirmed that he treated only patients who had been given up by their doctor. Therefore, it can be considered that, at least since Bright became a head minister in the mid 1920s, the Western medical treatment had not been totally rejected by Hoomana Naauao.

128
Hawaiian Culture Seen in the “Jubilee Book”

The “Jubilee Book” that explains the history of Hoomana Naauao is a narrative of Kekipi’s conversion to “true” Christianity as well as his mission works. It is a story of a Christian who devoted half his life to preaching the gospel. Ironically, however, it is also a text that thickly represents Hawaiian traditional religious culture. Through this text, it is possible to investigate how Hawaiian culture worked in the process of accepting Christianity.

For example, visions and revelations were typical characteristics of Hawaiian traditional religious culture (cf. Bathgate 1990; Kamakau 1987 [1964]; Pukui et al. 1979). In Hawaiian traditional culture, dreams were categorized into several kinds, such as moe ‘uhane [dream, lit: spirit sleep] in which a person’s spirit wandered about to see other places and people, and sometimes received a important message from a ‘aumakua [family god] while the body was sleeping, and hihi’o [vision] that a person saw just before sleeping or waking, or while dozing (Pukui et al. 1979:170). It was very significant to interpret hō‘ike na ka pō [revelations of the night]: that is, the message embedded in the dream that a person received from a ‘aumakua (Pukui et al. 1979:171).

Considering this cultural context, it should be noted that the visions and revelations that Poloailehua and Kekipi experienced were distinctive Hawaiian experiences, although they interpreted these as Christian experiences. As Pukui et al. (1979:182) mentioned, it is possible to see in their revelational experiences that Christian culture did not suppress but strengthen the significance of dreams in Hawaiian culture.

It can be considered that for Christian Hawaiians the Hawaiian Bible was a sort of instrument that had a spiritual power and could be used to communicate with God by its random opening. In other words, similar to visions and dreams, the Hawaiian Bible was a means to receive the message from God and, in addition, it gave an interpretation to the vision and dream Christian Hawaiians received. It was an extremely significant act for
Hawaiians to interpret correctly various signs and symbols appearing in the world of nature. Therefore, the use of the Hawaiian Bible such as *wehe i ka Paipala* was very suitable to Hawaiian traditional culture.

The faith-healing, which was the central activity of Hoomana Naauao in the beginning, was also the area of which *kāhuna* took charge in the pre-contact Hawaii. As I discussed in Chapter 3, in the latter half of the 19th century, when Kekipi developed his mission work, the institutionalization of *kahuna* proceeded and the significance of the *kahuna* as a medical doctor increased. Although the faith-healing of Hoomana Naauao was systematized based on the Christian doctrine, its social function was not different from that of institutionalized *kahuna*, considering that both of them aimed at Hawaiians who did not have the benefits of the Western medical treatment. The white Congregational ministers’ views, which placed the activities of both Hoomana Naauao and *kāhuna* in the same category, were not off target. As Bright explained (Burrows 1970 [1947]:158), a patient had to confess his or her sin to God, ask Jesus for forgiveness and ask the Spirit for healing in prayer. In this case, native gods such as ‘*aumākua* were replaced by the Christian God and Spirit at the stage of praying for healing. However, Christian concepts such as “sin” and “repentance” were added to the native religious medical system in order to Christianize the explanatory framework of illness.

**Concluding Remarks**

In this chapter, I investigated how Hawaiians reacted to Christianity and incorporated it in the latter half of the 19th century, by considering the Kaona Insurrection and the origins of Hoomana Naauao. In the field of ethnohistorical study of the Pacific Islands, it is pointed out that, at the cultural contact from the 18th century to the 19th century, Pacific Islanders did not passively accept Western culture but dynamically incorporated and appropriated the foreign culture in their own ways (cf. Davidson 1966; Maude 1971). This perspective also applies to the case of the Hawaiian
acceptance of Christianity. Joseph Kaona, who led a millenarian revolt, and John Kekipi Maia, who founded Hoomana Naauao, were Hawaiian Christians who lived during approximately the same period. Both of them tried to stretch the boundaries of Christianity to meet the needs of rapidly changing social situations. There were, however, not only similarities but also differences in their religious activities. In conclusion, I would like to address these similarities and differences, and refer to the reasons why the independent Hawaiian Church led by Kekipi succeeded to some extent as a religious organization.

First of all, what Kaona and Kekipi had in common in their religious movements is that both of them started and developed their movements inside the Congregational churches and asserted the sovereignty of Hawaiian Christians in church activity. Kaona was one of the church leaders in the Lanakila Church in which he, together with Rev. Paris, would lead Sunday services, while Kekipi was probably a key member in the Kalāhikiola Church. However, their attempts to make Christianity fit into their own styles were considered by the white ministers heretical and heathenish activities that deviated from orthodox Christianity. The Hawaiian Bible and the Word written down in it were the most significant for their religious activities; of course, this applies to Protestants in general, as Dening (1980:165) points out in comparison with Catholics. Considering that Kaona collected a large quantity of Hawaiian Bibles in the beginning of his movement, that his followers always kept the Hawaiian Bible with them, and that one of the main practices of Hoomana Naauao was wehe i ka Paipala, the significance of the Hawaiian Bible in their movements is quite obvious. By being translated into the Hawaiian language, the Bible was interpreted by Hawaiians in their own manner, and became a powerful instrument that they utilized to establish their own Christian faith. Another similarity between Kaona and Kekipi is that both of them developed their religious activity through the visions, revelations and faith-healing that were originally prevalent in
Hawaiian traditional culture. It is possible to see in their experiences of visions as well as their conduct of faith-healing that Hawaiian culture was not one-sidedly oppressed but aggrandized and developed in the process of accepting Christianity.

However, there were significant differences between the two as well. The foremost difference between Kaona’s movement and Kekipi’s movement is that Kaona’s was a typical millenarian movement, or at least the germination of such a movement, directed by the concrete prophecies of a religious leader, while Kekipi’s was a sort of new Christian movement that promoted faith-healing and whose leader’s revelation was not an eschatological prophecy but something that mapped out a future course of the movement by giving a guideline. Furthermore, while the former turned into a political movement in a short period and resulted in a religious revolt, the latter did not become a political movement but was established as a nonprofit religious organization. This difference partly came from the fact that Kekipi, unlike Kaona, had an acquaintance with those who were close to the royalty, and he did not suffer from financial problems. In the end, while Kaona’s movement was suppressed as a religious revolt of fanatics and failed as a social movement, Kekipi’s movement at one time became such a stable and influential religious organization that the HEA had to criticize it as an unacceptable opponent, along with the Mormons.

It is important to pay attention to the social conditions surrounding Christian Hawaiians at the end of the 19th century as indirect factors that contributed to the establishment of Hoomana Naauao. As I described in Chapter 3, when the royalty started to distance itself from the HEA, the Congregational churches were losing influence among Hawaiians; in addition, the overthrow of the Hawaiian monarchy caused by the “Missionary Party” decisively made some portion of Hawaiian church members part from the HEA. On the other hand, as indicated by the fact that the official licenses were issued for kāhuna, the significance of the medical treatment that Hawaiians could utilize
with mental and economical ease was increasing in the latter half of the 19th century. In such an environment, Kekipi’s activities, which emphasized faith-healing, met the demands of the Hawaiian community. Moreover, different from the mid 19th century, various religious organizations, including Christian denominations, were actively developing their mission work during the end of the 19th century to the early 20th century, so that Hoomana Naauao was only one of those religious organizations and was able to avoid the HEA’s concentrated criticism. In addition, the Congregational culture took a firm hold among Christian Hawaiians and, as a result, the family service and other meetings held outside the church contributed to the development of independent religious activities among Christian Hawaiians. These factors I mentioned above can be considered as the social context that made the independence of Hoomana Naauao possible.

This chapter has studied two historical cases of Christian Hawaiians who developed their own Christian movements, by departing from the Congregational churches the white ministers had established. However, as a matter of course, a large majority of the Protestant Hawaiians remained inside the Congregational churches. Therefore, it is important to investigate how these Hawaiians, who remained in the Congregational tradition, embraced their Christian faith in the late 19th century to the early 20th century, a period of rapid socio-cultural change. It takes on even greater importance when considering that the historical study of Hawaiian Christianity in this and the previous chapters has aimed at helping prepare a new angle for the ethnographic study of the present Hawaiian Congregational Christianity. Unfortunately, it is extremely difficult to find a journal or memorandum of a Christian Hawaiian of the late 19th century, other than those considered the “wisest” Hawaiian pastors or the “heretical” instigators who organized their own movements. Thus there is a limit to historical studies. Still, it can be mentioned that what Christian Hawaiians in the past tried to do was to become “true” Christians, whether they were the “best” or the “worst” in the eyes
of the white ministers. They desired to become real Christian, without grappling with
their Hawaiian being as a cultural problem — as some of the present Christian Hawaiians
do in the post-colonial condition in which the meaning of Hawaiian-ness is entangled in
cultural politics. In other words, the idea of being Hawaiian was not at stake when they
were constructing their Christian faith. Although they were gradually deprived of various
cultural elements in the process of colonization, their sense of being Hawaiian or
Hawaiian-ness was still too intrinsic to rise to the surface of their consciousness — and,
therefore, they were not involved in the politics of representation — when becoming
Christians.
NOTES

[1] This word is probably a translation of pu‘uhonua [place of refugee], “a place to which one could escape and be saved from being taken captive or from being put to death” (Kamakau 1987 [1964]:17). This indicates that the Hapu movement had some characteristics of Hawaiian tradition, although it was influenced by Christian eschatology.

[2] HSB indicates Honolulu Star-Bulletin. I use the same abbreviation for the said newspaper in the following pages. From July 15 to August 5, 1957, Honolulu Star-Bulletin ran a serial in eighteen parts, titled “Clarice B. Taylor’s Tales about Hawaii” that described the Kaona Insurrection. Although there is some interesting information about the insurrection, the story has several factual errors and omits footnotes concerning information sources.

[3] These two English newspapers were non-missionary papers, but their political standings were different. Those who participated in the Pacific Commercial Advertiser were “part of the ascendant haole [white person] missionary-planter-business elite but were not themselves Protestant ministers” (Chapin 1984:54). This paper started in 1856 as a bilingual weekly, became a daily in 1882 and changed its name to the Honolulu Advertiser in 1921 (Chapin 1984:55). The Hawaiian Gazette, an official press paper, became the government paper in 1865 under King Kamehameha V, replacing the Polynesian, the former governmental organ, but was dropped by King Ka1akaua after 1881 who supported other papers (Chapin 1984:59-60). There is, of course, a great difference between these two papers’ interpretations of the Kaona Insurrection as well as their descriptions of the murder of Neville.

[4] PCA indicates the Pacific Commercial Advertiser. I use the same abbreviation for the said newspaper in the following pages. Following the abbreviation, the basic data of original sources is indicated in the order of “year/month/date.” For example, “PCA (1868/10/24)” means the October 24th, 1868 issue of the PCA.

[5] HG indicates the Hawaiian Gazette. I use the same abbreviation for the said newspaper in the following pages. The basic data of original sources is indicated in the same way as the PCA.

[6] Rev. Luther Halsey Gulick was a son of Rev. Peter Johnson Gulick, who was a missionary of the Third Company to Hawaii. He was also a physician and served in the Board of the HEA as a secretary from 1864 to 1870 (HMCS 1969). He contributed several reports about the Kaona Insurrection to the Pacific Commercial Advertiser.

[7] Ke Kuokoa (or ka Nüpepa Kuokoa [ka Nüpepa Kū‘oko‘a: the Independent Newspaper]) began publishing in 1861 (Chapin 1984:53) and was “the longest-running and most successful Hawaiian language journal” (Chapin 1996:54). An article in ke Kuokoa dated October 31, 1868, listed the names of 5 persons charged with the murder. In addition, it listed the names of 60 males and 12 females who were sent to Honolulu, and 6 males and 57 females who remained in Hawai‘i, both groups being charged as accomplices in the murder; and 5 persons who were released.

[8] A letter written by Kaona’s followers, who called themselves ohana [‘ohana: family], appeared in the PCA (1868/10/24). Although I cite some portion of the letter in this chapter, I would like to present the full text in Appendix B, in order to help understand the cited portion in its overall context. It is not known whether this letter was originally written in English or translated from Hawaiian into English.

[9] The Pae Marire movement, which was also called the Hau-Hau movement, was begun by Te Ua Haumene, a Maori follower of the Methodist Church, in 1862 (cf.
Winks 1953). Because it became a radical militant movement against Pakeha [white person], it was decisively suppressed by the government.

[10] Following nouns and pronouns, a Hawaiian word “nei” means “this” and often indicates affection (Pukui and Elbert 1986). A phrase “Hawai‘i nei” means “this beloved Hawai‘i.”

[11] The 150th Psalm in the Baibala Hemolele [Holy Bible] and in the New King James version are as follows:

E halelu aku oukou ia lehova:
   E halelu aku i ke Akua, ma kona wahi hoano;
   E halelu aku ia ia, ma ke aouli o kona hanohano.
2. E halelu aku ia ia, no kana mau hana mana;
   E halelu aku ia ia, e like me ka manomano o kona nui;
3. E halelu aku ia ia, me ke kani ana o ka pu;
   E halelu aku ia ia, me ka violaumi a me ka lira;
4. E halelu aku ia ia, me ka pahukani, a me ka haa ana;
   E halelu aku ia ia, me ka pahu kaula, a me ka ohe.
5. E halelu aku ia ia, me na kimebala kani nui;
   E halelu aku ia ia, me na kimebala kani kiekie.
6. E halelu aku ia lehova, na mea hanu a pau;
   E halelu aku oukou ia lehova.

Praise the LORD!
   Praise God in His Sanctuary;
   Praise Him in His mighty firmament!
2. Praise Him for His mighty acts;
   Praise Him according to His excellent greatness!
3. Praise Him with the sound of the trumpet;
   Praise Him with the lute and harp!
4. Praise Him with the timbrel and dance;
   Praise Him with stringed instruments and flutes!
5. Praise Him with loud cymbals;
   Praise Him with high sounding cymbals!
6. Let everything that has breath praise the LORD.
   Praise the LORD!

[12] The “Lehuula Nui [Lehu ‘ula Nui]” literally means “big red ashes.” This land was also called “Honua-ino [honua ‘ina: bad land]” in The Friend (1902/10). Judging from these names, the land of which they wanted to have a lease was probably neither fertile nor convenient.

[13] The fiscal year of the then HEA ended in May and the annual meeting was held in early June.

[14] The original Hawaiian text of the article of ke Kuokoa (1868/11/14) is as follows:

HOOMANAMANAMA MA HAMAKUA
   Ua lohe mai nei makou, aia ma Hamakua kekahai kanaka Hawai‘i a me kekahai wahine, oia o Kamaipulekane a me Waahia (w) ko laua mau inoa, e kukulu ana i kekahai aaoa hoomonamana hou, i hui pu ia me na hana mai loko mai o ka Baibala, a ke hahai la kekahai mau kanaka naaupo o ua aina kuaaina la mahope o ka laua ao ana, a ke noho wale la lakou me ka hana
Following the present Hawaiian orthography, Ke Alaula 0 Ka Malamalama is spelled “Ke Alaula 0 Ka Mālamalama.” The word “alaula” literally means “flaming road” and connotes “light of early dawn” (Pukui and Elbert 1986), so that the name of this mother church of Hoomana Naauao means “Light of Early Dawn of Enlightenment.” The picture drawn in the panel with the church name inscribed, which is hung out on the altar of this mother church, represents well the meaning of the church name as well as the importance of the Bible for the church.

The title of the “Jubilee Book” is Buke Hai Euanelio 0 Ka Hoomana Naauao No Ka Piha Ana O Na Makahiki Jubile He Kanalima, Aperila 16, 1853 – Aperila 16, 1903 [Book of Preaching the Gospel of the Hoomana Naauao for Completing the 50th Anniversary, April 16, 1853 – April 16, 1903]. There are currently very few members of Hoomana Naauao who can read a Hawaiian text, so that the “Jubilee Book” has become almost a sacred book among the members. According to one of my informants, an elder member once tried to translate it into English but was not able to make a complete translation. No one seemed to know that the English translation was completed by Morrison (1984), until I informed them about it.

The English translation of the “Jubilee Book” by Morrison (1984) is a paper submitted to the graduate course of Religion 690 (Dr. Charlot) in the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa, in the spring semester of 1984. Although there are several errors in the translation, I refer to this English version as a main source to investigate the history of Hoomana Naauao; however, I directly refer to the original Hawaiian text when I find obvious errors in the English version.

Morrison (1984) translated ma‘i hebera [smallpox] to leprosy (ma‘i lēpela). However, it is not leprosy but smallpox that broke out in 1853. The main force of the smallpox epidemic was on O‘ahu and 2,485 deaths were reported in January, 1854 (Kuykendall 1983:412).

A Hawaiian particle “ma [mā],” which follows names of persons, means the company and associates of the persons, so that “Kekipi mā” means “Kekipi and the others” or “Kekipi and his company.”

Kekipi wrote three short letters in Hawaiian, dated October 5, 1883, December 12, 1884, and January 23, 1885, to Rev. Polepe, in which he informed the reverend that he received the Bibles, requested another order of the Bibles and the Hymnals, and explained about some trouble in payment.
The "Jubilee Book" only mentions that this event occurred in May. The exact year is unknown, but it probably occurred in or before 1887.

For example, see his letter dated February 18, 1887 (Bond Letters Vol.II, ABCFM-Hawaii Papers, Letters to ABCFM 1864 - 1894, Mission Houses Museum Library Collections of the Hawaiian Mission Children’s Society). In this letter, Rev. Bond was critical that Kalākaua indirectly engaged in the illegal business of introducing Micronesian laborers to Hawaii, promoted the rum and opium policy, and meddled in the Board of the HEA in order to exclude the influence of white ministers.

The name of Kekipi’s denomination, “Hoomana Naauao [Ho‘omanana Na‘auao: Reasonable Service], comes from Romans 12:1, whose Hawaiian and English versions are as follows:

No ia hoi, ke noono e nui au ia oukou, e na hoahanau, ma ke aloha o ke Akua, e haawi i ko oukou mau kino i mohai ola, hemolele, hooluolu i ke Akua; oia ka oukou hoomana naauao.

I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that you present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God, which is your reasonable service.

In the “Jubilee Book,” it reads as “he ekalesia i papetisoia i ke ahi a me ka Uhane Hemolele,” which means “a church baptized in fire and with the Holy Spirit” (cf. Luke 3:16). As I will mention later, Kekipi’s interpretation of the baptism with the Holy Spirit and fire caused the split of original members of his church.

In Kalākaua’s reign, a group of the royalist Hawaiians and that of the business elite of missionary descendants were in a state of high tension, competing for the initiative in politics and economy of Hawaii. John E. Bush, a part-Hawaiian, was the leading figure of the former group. He was once a member of the Cabinet and an editor of the royalist Hawaiian newspaper, Ka Leo a ka Lahui [Ka Leo o ka Lāhui: The Voice of the Nation] (cf. Kuykendall 1967; Daws 1968). His media campaign was severely criticized in The Friend (cf. Mookini 1974).

Robert Hoapili Baker was one of the leading ministers at the foundation of Hoomana Naauao. He was also very active in politics, as the central exponent of the royalist group.


Although Pukui and Elbert (1986) defines Ho‘omanana Na‘auao as Christian Science and the denomination was nicknamed Hawaiian Christian Science, these namings were denounced not only by a head minister in the 1930s (Burrows 1970 [1947]) but also by the present members of Hoomana Naauao.

There are a few factual errors in Burrows’ description, such as the year of the foundation, the name of the founder, and the relation with another independent Hawaiian church called “White Robes.” It is not clear whether these errors are due to Burrows’ or his informant’s.

It also spelled “Māmala-hoe.” This is the Kamehameha’s famous law, in which men and women of all ages were able to sleep in safety on the highway. It was also the significant law that decided life or death, and it is said that Kamehameha revived a person at the point of dying by using this law (Kamakau 1987 [1964]:15).

After John Kekipi Maia died on July 13, 1919, there was probably some conflict between the two factions inside the church. According to the PCA (1919/12/21),
John Eli Kekipi Maia’s faction lost in court, and this lost case was perhaps related with his 40 day fast. He died on December 20, 1919, six days after he finished the fast.

[33] In 1868 when the Kaona Insurrection occurred in Kona, Hawai‘i, John Kekipi Maia was probably in Kohala, the district on the north of Kona, and he was 37 years old. The names of “Kekipi” and “Maia” were on the list of the accomplices in the Kaona Insurrection (ke Kuokoa 1868/10/31), but it is unknown whether either of them was John Kekipi Maia. Regardless, it is likely he knew about the insurrection as well as Kaona’s other activities.
CHAPTER 5
THE MAKING OF HAWAIIAN IDENTITY
AND THE PRESENT SOCIO-CULTURAL CONDITION

Introduction

At the end of the previous chapter I mentioned in brief that late 19th century Hawaiian converts did not stake their Hawaiian identity when incorporating Christianity, because they actually did not consider Hawaiian identity or a sense of Hawaiian-ness as a problem for their Christian faith, as some of their offsprings currently — more or less consciously — face it when establishing their Hawaiian Christian faith. The relation between Hawaiian identity and Christian faith, which I will investigate in the following chapters in detail, is fundamentally a post-colonial problem. Whether or not they are separable, whether or not they conflict with each other, Hawaiian identity and Christian faith can be consciously juxtaposed or contrasted in the process of constructing Christian Hawaiian identity (and Hawaiian Christian faith) in the post-colonial situation that involves the politics of representation.

The 19th century missionaries' dualistic paradigm was so strong as to prohibit Christian Hawaiians from having the autonomy at the very basis of their Christian faith. It can be said that throughout the 19th century, at least in the domain of religious faith, becoming Christian was almost identical to forgetting being Hawaiian for those who obediently followed the missionaries' teachings. Therefore, the meaning of Hawaiian-ness rarely appeared as a clinging impediment when becoming Christian and, even if it entered one's consciousness, it did so only as something to be negated and discarded in the process of conversion. Evidence presented in the previous two chapters supports this assessment. However, this conclusion is based upon a rough comparison of 19th century converts with those of present day. In other words, it is a matter of degree. Certainly, there were Christian Hawaiians in the past who struggled with the idea of being Hawaiian...
and Christian, while there are contemporary Christian Hawaiians, who are not concerned with maintaining Hawaiian identity in their Christian faith.

The latter half of the 19th century was no longer the era in which Hawaiians were converted from traditional religion to Christianity; indeed Hawaiian Christianity had already taken root among them for a few generations. As I investigated in the previous chapters, however, it is clear that Hawaiian traditional religious culture among Hawaiians persisted. In this climate, Christian Hawaiians either accepted the missionaries’ dualistic discourse that separated what they considered heathen darkness and Christian enlightenment, or insisted that it was not the white ministers but they themselves who were true Christians, without seriously considering Hawaiian cultural elements in their Christian faith. It may sound paradoxical, but Christian Hawaiians often exposed unwittingly their Hawaiian characteristic or Hawaiian-ness when incorporating Christianity. As seen in the case of the two dissident Hawaiian Christian movements in the late 19th century, one can conclude that the more seriously they tried to be Christians, the more strongly they exposed their Hawaiian character. This is a quite natural conclusion, if considering that there is no culture-free Christianity and that people must incorporate Christianity through their culture; they must “culturalize” Christianity. The point is that Hawaiians did so without any intent to do so.

To incorporate Christianity unintentionally in a way particularly Hawaiian is one thing, to have Christian faith while keeping traditional religious beliefs is another. As the white missionaries and ministers soon discovered, even among the devout Hawaiian church members, there were some who still preserved a spiritual connection with the traditional religious beings unconsciously. In either case, however, the idea of being Hawaiian did not appear as a problem in their consciousness. Of course, there was another story in the local politics in the late 19th century in which the sense of being Hawaiian, which became synonymous with the idea of being oppressed and exploited in
their own land, played an important role; this sense of being Hawaiian is not a post-colonial problem but a colonial one. In fact, the two dissident Hawaiian Christian movements can also be re-interpreted in this political context. In the domain of Hawaiian Christian faith, however, the sense of Hawaiian identity had not yet assumed serious proportions.

Examining the present socio-cultural condition surrounding Christian Hawaiians, it may be assumed that they live in different conditions from those of their late 19th and early 20th century ancestors. Contemporary Christian Hawaiians are living the present on the tail end of Hawaiian Christian history, long after the drastic social changes in the latter half of the 19th century changed many circumstances surrounding Hawaiian Christianity. One of the most critical differences created by, or as a result of, such social changes is that the present Christian Hawaiians now have to consider acutely the relationships between Christian faith and Hawaiian identity, and negotiate between the potential tension of these two seemingly opposing factors (cf. Treat 1996a). Of course, the sense of being Hawaiian, that is, the self-awareness of Hawaiians as a distinctive group in a given social context, did exist among Christian Hawaiians in the past. For example, in the HEA, there was a clear categorization of ethnic churches based on their historical origin, and in the early 20th century, HEA membership was categorized by each individual ethnic group. Such an external definition certainly promoted the self-identification of Hawaiians inside the Congregational community. In addition to this official categorization, various features preserved in Hawaiian churches, such as Hawaiian hymns and prayers, the quarterly meeting of hoike [hō'i'ke: Congregational convention of Sunday Schools], serving Hawaiian food at lū'au [Hawaiian feast], and presenting lei [necklace] to visitors, certainly constituted a group identity among Christian Hawaiians. However, it is probably since the 1980s that Hawaiian identity (or self-conscious Hawaiian-ness) has become the central issue for Hawaiian Christianity.
This issue is not a question of a group identity against other ethnic groups inside the Christian community but rather one of Hawaiian subjectivity in their Christian faith.\footnote{11}

In order to investigate the construction of Hawaiian Christianity at present, not only a historical study of Hawaiian Christianity, but also that of Hawaiian identity must be conducted. Because the historical study of Hawaiian Congregational Christianity has already been conducted to some extent in the previous chapters, in this chapter I would like to investigate how Hawaiian identity has been historically constructed and is currently surrounded (and reconstructed) by the present socio-cultural condition. Of course, the making of Hawaiian identity itself is such a large issue that it requires a detailed and extended examination. Although such a thorough examination requires research beyond the purview of this chapter, here I aim to give a rough sketch about the historical background and the current condition of Hawaiian identity, a problem deeply involved in the establishment of Hawaiian Christian faith. By so doing, I also aim to help introduce the narratives of Hawaiian Christians on their faith and identity, which I will investigate more thoroughly in the following chapters. Included in this chapter will be a definition of “Hawaiian” as an ethnic group, the present cultural and political situations surrounding Hawaiians, and the result of the questionnaire survey I conducted among Hawaiian students (cf. Inoue 1998). First, however, it is important to explore theoretically the concept of “ethnicity.” This concept is not as critical as that of “culture” in anthropology, but similarly it is “a contested term, open to a range of definitions” (Anthias 2001:629), and therefore problematic, and has recently become a target of deconstructionist inspection (cf. Sollors 1989). What has been discussed recently in the anthropological study of “ethnicity” is closely related and highly suggestive to the issue of Christian Hawaiian identity. As such, I hope to investigate those discussions on “ethnicity” and clarify the confusion concerning the concept of “ethnicity.”
Problematics of Ethnicity

The term "ethnicity" is a significant concept as well as a popular research topic in anthropology. Research on the term, as well as that of its adjective form "ethnic," was especially popular in the 1970s (cf. Banks 1996). Whether the concept is still theoretically significant depends on the theoretical position, as well as the field of study, of anthropologists. Setting aside "ethnicity" as a practical research topic, that is, as various subjects modified by the adjective "ethnic" (such as ethnic groups, ethnic relations and ethnic conflict), it seems that "ethnicity" as a concept is losing its significance or is "of increasingly limited utility" (Banks 1996:10). In response to this predicament, several theorists are attempting to revise or reconstruct the concept and theory of "ethnicity," often from different perspectives. Jenkins (1994:218-219), for instance, argues that "ethnicity should be conceptualized within a theoretical framework that allows for its integration into the topic of 'social identity' in general" and investigates how social identities are practically accomplished between internal definition (self-identification) and external definition (social categorization) at the levels varying from individual to collective. At the same time, he points out that social anthropologists tend to emphasize the internal definition at the expense of the external definition in their study of "ethnicity." From a different perspective, Levine (1999) proposes a cognitive approach to "ethnicity," and aims at a reconstruction of "ethnicity" by exploring how it is produced in the conceptual space, or what Ardener (1989) calls "a 'taxonomic space' where external labels and self-designation interact" (Levine 1999:171). Levine (1999:165-166) believes that the current trend of deconstructionist writings on "identity" in anthropology is "agenda hopping" and goes so far to postulate that it is "the postmodern demolition of ethnicity." He thinks the postmodern ideological elaboration of identity politics isolates itself from a dynamic process of ethnic composition and tries to
rescue the anthropological study of “ethnicity” from what he considers such a miserable state.

Whether the postmodern deconstructionist analysis of “ethnicity” as identity politics is indeed “agenda hopping,” theorists working in this field feel the same concern about its problematics. Jenkins (1994) and Levine (1999), despite their seemingly different positions concerning whether “ethnicity” can be investigated as collective identity, share similar theoretical attitudes when grasping the dynamics of “ethnicity.” Although they use different terms, both try to see “ethnicity” in the interactional space between the internal self-definition of identity and the imposed external definition (Jenkins 1994:198-199), or between the activity of classifying and the systems of classification (Levine 1999:168-169). Certainly, their dichotomous frameworks are not identical, because in Levine’s view the content of classification depends on classifying while in Jenkins’ setting the external definition does not require the internal definition as a prerequisite. However, they similarly try to give the concept of “ethnicity” depth, solidity and dynamics by setting the interactional space through which “ethnicity” is composed.

The perspective that considers interaction between the internal, subjective self-identification and the external, objective categorization in the composition of “ethnicity” is not novel in anthropological studies. As Cohen (1978) mentions, one of the main contributions of the renowned and influential work of Barth (1994 [1969]) is his theory of “ethnicity as a subjective process of group identification in which people use ethnic labels to define themselves and their interaction with others” (Cohen 1978:383). In other words, the critical feature of ethnic groups or the significance of “ethnicity” is in the dynamics of self-ascription as opposed to ascription by others (Barth 1994 [1969]:10-15; cf. Nawa 1992). The boundary of an ethnic group is maintained flexibly while interacting with other groups. Any ethnic group requires the presence of other groups on the same
social order at the very beginning of its existence. Barth (1994 [1969]) regards this boundary maintenance of ethnic groups as more important than the objectively defined attributes of ethnic groups. The anti-essentialist approach to “ethnicity,” which was later adopted by the instrumentalism and circumstantialism and is currently recognized as the essence of constructionism in general, clearly geminates from Barth (1994 [1969]).

I have commenced discussing the problematics of “ethnicity” without actually defining the term, although many studies that aim at investigating the concept of “ethnicity” present the definition at the beginning of their discussion. The situation in which one must present the definition of the subject, however tentative, signifies that the subject itself involves a conceptual problem. In other words, everyone discusses subtly different things under the same name or almost the same thing under different names. Therefore, any case study that contemplates theorizing “ethnicity” starts with a definition in order to avoid the confusion that a study originally aims to resolve. Etymologically, the term “ethnic” comes into general usage one century earlier than the term “ethnicity.” The adjective “ethnic” that designates “[p]ertaining to race; peculiar to a race or nation; ethnological” first appeared in the mid-19th century, while the earliest appearance of the noun “ethnicity” that signifies “[e]thnic character or peculiarity” is from the mid-20th century (OED 1991). Formally, there was a tendency in the anthropological study of “ethnicity,” even after the seminal work of Barth (1994 [1969]), that viewed “ethnicity” as a common-sense concept, that is, a character or peculiarity of an ethnic group (or even ethnic group in itself). Understanding the situation in which a rigorous definition of “ethnicity” could not be presented (cf. Isajiw 1974), theoretical efforts were directed to distinguish it into several concepts, such as “ethnic group,” “ethnic identity” and “ethnic category,” all of which aimed at proposing a more precise definition of “ethnicity” (cf. Kunstadter 1979). Such an attempt sometimes caused a flood of conceptual categories.
Concerning the definition of “ethnic group,” a more substantially recognized entity that precedes the concept of “ethnicity,” there are two typical definitions.

According to Weber (1965 [1961]), ethnic groups are:

[t]hose human groups that entertain a subjective belief in their common descent — because of similarities of physical type or of customs or both, or because of memories of colonization and migration — in such a way that this belief is important for the continuation of non-kinship communal relationship. . . . regardless of whether an objective blood relationship exists or not. (Weber 1965 [1961]: 306)

On the other hand, according to Barth (1994 [1969]), the term ethnic group generally designates a population that:

1. is largely biologically self-perpetuating
2. shares fundamental cultural values, realized in overt unity in cultural forms
3. makes up a field of communication and interaction
4. has a membership which identifies itself, and is identified by others, as constituting a category distinguishable from other categories of the same order. (Barth 1994 [1969]:10-11)

Although Barth (1994 [1969]) accepts that this definition is close to empirical situations, he appositely warns that “such a formulation prevents us from understanding the phenomenon of ethnic groups” (Barth 1994 [1969]:11). However, in most studies that investigate something “ethnic” but do not probe into the concept of “ethnicity,” the term “ethnicity” is generally used unreflectively without realization that this abstract concept is prone to be essentialized, often excessively. In such studies, “ethnicity” is unconditionally presented as an essential quality of the group defined above. A problem caused by the aforementioned definitions by Weber (1965 [1961]) and Barth (1994 [1969]) is that it is sometimes difficult to distinguish the ethnic group and other similar conceptual groups, such as “race” and “nation” (cf. Banks 1996; Cornell and Hartmann 1998; Nawa 1992). However, an important problem that should be discussed here is who defines the character of ethnic groups, or where “ethnicity” is determined in what sense.
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This problem becomes more obvious in post-colonial situations in which the once colonized people attempt to retrieve their political rights by decolonizing their history in which their “ethnicity,” as well as traditions, has been constructed.

As I discussed in Chapter 2, the Pacific region is one of the fields in which the terms “custom,” “tradition” and “culture” have been discussed heatedly as crucial issues, not only in anthropology but also in politics. “Ethnicity” may be added to those issues of argument and similarly requires reconceptualization in the post-colonial context of the Pacific. For example, Linnekin and Poyer (1990b:2) define “ethnicity” as “a set of theories based on the proposition that people can be classified into mutually exclusive bounded groups according to physical and behavioral differences.” More important to this study, they further distinguish two kinds of “ethnicity” as theory; that is, “the Western popular theory of group identity” and “a theoretical construct developed by Western social scientists,” and point out that social scientists have often failed to distinguish the former (“ethnicity as Western ethnotheory”) from the latter (“ethnicity as an analytical tool”) because the essentialistic assumption of “ethnicity” has been so pervasive (Linnekin and Poyer 1990b:2). Since the late 1980s, “ethnicity” as ethnotheory has been under the constructionist inspection (cf. Sollors 1989) and, in anthropological studies concerning the Pacific, “ethnicity,” as well as “tradition,” was often regarded as an ideology that was formed socially in a specific historical condition (cf. Poyer 1999:219). However, the self-reflective perspective, which recognized that such anthropological interpretation of “ethnicity” was also a construct, had not yet attained full growth.

On the other hand, Banks (1996) defines “ethnicity” as “a collection of rather simplistic and obvious statements about boundaries, otherness, goals and achievements, being and identity, descent and classification, that has been constructed as much by the anthropologist as by the subject” (Banks 1996:190). For him, “ethnicity” is “an analytical
tool, devised and used by academics” rather than “simply a quality of groups” (Banks 1996:6). Following Banks (1996:185-187), it can be summarized that “ethnicity” is perceived by the people being studied as a substantial quality of their group and is sometimes utilized by them as an ideological instrument in pursuit of political and economic interests. At the same time it is also theoretically constructed by anthropologists as an analytical tool to investigate the phenomenon of ethnic groups. Anthropologists construct their own version of “ethnicity” (as an analytical tool) based on their theoretical positions, such as essentialism, primordialism, instrumentalism, circumstantialism and constructionism (cf. Cornell and Hartmann 1998).

The discussion of the anthropological theories of cultural identity in Chapter 2 is, as a matter of fact, about the gradated differences of the theoretical positions, from which anthropologists analyze various objects of study, including “ethnicity.” Essentialists regard “ethnicity” as the immutable essential quality of ethnic groups; Geertzian primordialists emphasize the importance of “primordial sentiments” that stem from the assumed essential quality (Geertz 1973b) ; instrumentalists insist that “ethnicity” often becomes an ideological instrument for the benefit of ethnic groups; and, finally postmodern deconstructionists classify “ethnicity” as construction, whatever form, meaning and reality it takes for the people being studied. One must remember, however, that these are anthropological constructions and should not be identified with what the people perceive as their “ethnicity.” Following Geertzian rhetoric on culture (Geertz 1973c:15), each anthropological construction of “ethnicity” is interpretation of interpretation, and the line between two kinds of interpretation — “ethnicity” as an anthropological construct and “ethnicity” of the people concerned— becomes blurred, as Linnekin and Poyer (1990b:2) also point out. The condition of people’s “ethnicity” cannot be simply interpreted by either essentialism, which insists that the people unconsciously accept the essentiality of their “ethnicity,” or instrumentalism, which
argues that they consciously utilize their "ethnicity" as symbolic capital. What is at stake for the anthropological theory of "ethnicity" is, then, whether it can present a more contestable interpretation of "ethnicity" that cannot be settled by any single anthropological construct mentioned above, by paying careful attention to the probability that anthropologists view the people's "ethnicity" from their own particular theoretical perspective.

"Ethnicity" is construction, not only anthropological but also of the people concerned. In Chapter 2, I conclude that culture is constructed in the Pacific region by being openly narrated and represented as well as by being cultivated in experience. This aptly applies to "ethnicity" as well. "Ethnicity" is construction in various ways and levels. It is constructed as much by anthropologists as by the people concerned. It is constructed not only discursively but also in experience. For those being studied, it is composed in the interactional space between the internal identification and the external categorization. Furthermore, even in a seemingly uniform ethnic group, there are socially distinctive subgroups that are divided by gender and social class (for example, the urban elite and the rural people of more moderate means) and, as a result, have different compositions of their "ethnicity." In the entangled post-colonial situation of the Pacific, the dichotomous framework of "discourse" versus "experience," and that of "objective" versus "subjective" no longer apply smoothly to either the oppositional relationship between the anthropologist and the subject or the relationship between the urban elite and the rural people.¹⁶¹

The post-colonial situation is one in which the people are forced to recognize and narrate not only their tradition and history but also their "ethnicity." To express and represent one's own "ethnicity" is synonymous to constructing identity. Such collective identity cannot be a plain cultural identity, but instead should be considered as ethnic identity, because in most cases it is located in the competitive relationship with other
people who also interpret and represent their collective identity and whose interpretation and representation take on political meaning, even if unintentionally. Furthermore, it must be considered that indigenous people such as Hawaiians do not just make up an ethnic group in a multi-ethnic society, but occupy a specific social and political place.

One of the purposes of anthropology is to approach “the native’s point of view” (Geertz 1983), so the anthropological study of “ethnicity” must take into consideration the issue of how the subjects interpret and represent their “ethnicity.” As I discussed above, such interpretation and representation are in essence identity constructions. Therefore, for many anthropologists, the term “ethnicity” is often identical to ethnic identity (Clark 1995:52) and, even if they are not aware of doing so, they are discussing the problem of collective identity in a particular context under the name of “ethnicity.” Particularly in the post-colonial situation where the once colonized people try to reconstruct their own tradition and identity, the tendency to focus on the problem of identity construction in the anthropological study of “ethnicity” is strengthened.

However, the perspective to see “ethnicity” as ethnic identity, or to focus on the subjective definition of “ethnicity,” is already detected in the work of Weber (1965 [1961]), who repeatedly refers to the “belief” in as well as the “sense” and “feelings” of common “ethnicity.” For Weber (1965 [1961]), “ethnicity” is the problem of consciousness: Geertz’ concept of “primordial sentiments” can be considered to be an extension of this perspective (Geertz 1973b). Also, for Barth (1994 [1969]), the critical feature of ethnic group is the fourth item in his ideal type definition, that is, “self-ascription and ascription by others” (Barth 1994 [1969]:13). Through this dialectical process the subject’s identity is incessantly constructed and reconstructed.

In the post-colonial context, the constructionist perspective of “ethnicity” leads to the deconstructionist discursive analysis of “ethnicity” as the politics of identity (cf. Hall 1996a, 1996b). This theoretical perspective is criticized by some (Levine 1999; Norton
1993), because the discursive analysis tends to detach identity from experience and reduces everything, including "ethnicity," to the problem of discourse. For example, after comparing the cases of Fiji, Vanuatu and New Zealand and insisting on the need for considering concrete social relations and practices that influence the discursive construction of identity, Norton (1993) concludes as follows:

Analysis of discursive processes tends to neglect the question of how meanings are socially experienced and lived. The equation of the social with the discursive seems often to flatten or impoverish the texture of social reality by devaluing longstanding sociological issues to do with how social relationships, solidarities and conflicts differ in their forms and conditions. (Norton 1993:756)

His caution is certainly worth heeding for anthropologists who study "ethnicity," especially in the post-colonial situation in which "ethnicity" becomes prominent by being narrated and textualized so as to be contested by anthropologists as well as natives. If an anthropological perspective is occupied too much by the phenomena of politics of identity in the postmodern condition and hence loses its focus on the concrete social relations and practices that contribute to the composition of "ethnicity," such a study becomes merely vain speculation lacking the reality of "ethnicity." However, if accepting the fact that "ethnicity" as discourse has a strong connection with the domain of everyday life and experience in which it is interactionally composed, we can derive a productive perspective from the constructionist discursive approach. In order to do so, we have no choice but to conduct case studies of "ethnicity" in the making, at the experiential level.

Thus, what is "ethnicity?" It may sound paradoxical, but I dare to define "ethnicity" in its commonsense meaning; in other words, as the character, peculiarity and quality of ethnic groups. A strict definition dries up the imaginative power of a term, but an ambiguous usage causes inflation of the concept of a term. Therefore, it is no so erroneous to adopt strategically the commonsense definition of "ethnicity," after paying enough attention to problematics involved in such a definition. As far as a more effectual concept, which helps approach the phenomena that have been examined with the term
“ethnicity,” is not available, there is no choice but to use the worn-out term cautiously and try to clarify the issues in order to make a breakthrough. Whether “ethnicity” is defined as a set of theories, a particular method of classifying people or a collection of statements, whether it is an academic tool or an ideological instrument, whether it should be reconceptualized as a collective identity, “ethnicity” is in the end about the quality of ethnic groups. The challenge, then, is to determine who constructs the quality of these ethnic groups, and in what sense.

I would like to present my idea and usage of “ethnicity.” First of all, the concept of “ethnicity” is heuristic. What has been recently discussed in the anthropological study of “ethnicity” may not contribute in restoring the theoretical significance that was once enjoyed by this term. However, what has been forged through the critical investigation of this concept in the post-colonial context: that is, the self-reflexive constructionist approach to “ethnicity” as discourse with the down-to-earth perspective that gives careful consideration to social relations and experiences of the people, can contribute much to the study of cultural identity in general. What has been discussed recently as the focal point in the anthropological study of “ethnicity” is the mechanism of identity construction. Any collective identity is constantly being constructed and reconstructed in the interactional space between the internal identification and the external categorization. It is also constructed in another interactional space between discourse and experience. The making of Hawaiian identity must be investigated in these interactional spaces. Therefore, in this study, the term “ethnicity” should be used carefully in order to keep the argument clear. Wherever the terms “ethnic identity” and “ethnic group” are more appropriate to use, we should avoid using the term “ethnicity.” We should use the term “ethnicity” only when this concept is a central issue in the theoretical discussion or when its usage is required in a certain context to denote something “ethnic” in a broader sense than that of ethnic group or identity. However, I do not deny the daily usage of this term that is used in a
similar manner as that of “race” and “nationality.” For example, when someone asks you about your ethnicity, you do not have to describe characteristics of your ethnic group in detail but may say merely that you are Japanese American or Native Hawaiian, the latter group of which I return to at this juncture.

**History of “Hawaiian” as an Ethnic Group**

The representation of the “Pacific Other” has been one of the most discussed issues in the historical study of the Pacific region. Much of the discussion centers on how the Pacific Islanders have been represented by various Westerners and incorporated into the Western system commencing from the cultural contact period and continuing through the post-colonial era. The Western means of relating itself to the Orient (labeled “Orientalism” by Said in his 1978 seminal work of the same title) was foresightedly discussed in regards to the Pacific by Smith (1960) (cf. Howe 2000:69; Linnekin 1997:11-12). Smith (1960) demonstrates how the Pacific Islanders were represented in different Western discourses of primitivism, while Howe (1977) writes how the representation of the Pacific Other as “Savage” changed in content over time to meet the deep colonial desire of the West. In his neatly summarized sketch of the Western representation of the Pacific Islanders, Howe (1977, 2000) relates how their image shifted from the 18th century romanticized “Noble Savage,” to the early 19th century empirically created “Ignoble Savage,” and finally to the late 19th century “Dying Savage,” represented by the “Fatal Impact” narrative (cf. Moorhead 1987[1966]). Whether the Pacific Islanders are noble, ignoble or dying, what underlies the Western representation of the Pacific Other is a combination of Western assumption of superiority that regards the islanders as inferior and passive, and nostalgia for the former times of the Pacific (Howe 1977:146-147).

There have been various studies since Smith (1960) and Howe (1977) on the issue of the Western representation of the Pacific Other, and some of which extend further their
perspectives to include interaction between Western perceptions and the indigenous counter-representations (cf. Howe 2000; Kasuga 1999; Stephen 1993; Thomas 1994, 1997; Thomas and Losche 1999; Torgovnick 1990). Many follow the framework that assumes that the representation of the Pacific Other is the reflection of the Western colonial desire and, therefore, if the latter changes, the former necessarily changes. It was Herman (1999) who first applied this framework to the case of Hawaiians, an indigenous people in Hawaii. According to Herman (1999), the representation of Hawaiians has undergone several stages of social and political changes and has been utilized to justify Western colonialism in each stage. After investigating various and sometimes contending representations, Herman (1999) summarizes the changes of the representation of Hawaiians as follows:

Over 200 years since Captain Cook, “the Hawaiian” has been given different guises that accorded with different stages in haole colonialism. When needed for labour, they suffered from indolence which hard work would cure. When no longer needed, they were useless and in the way. When their sovereignty impeded the expansion of white capital, they were immoral savages that had no right to rule. And when brought under American rule, they became relics of a noble past, friendly and receptive hosts, honest, accommodating [sic.], giving. And genetically intermixed with white Americans, the best citizens one could hope for. (Herman 1999:411-412)

Whether Hawaiians are represented negatively (as indolent immoral natives) or positively (as noble smiling natives), such representation undoubtedly reflects their location in the Western colonial system in each era. However, in the present post-colonial situation, Hawaiians realize how they have been represented by the West and, against such representation, express a self-representation, sometimes as a counter discourse. The political statement “We are not American!” is nothing but such counter discursive self-representation. Their identity is, to some extent, discursively constructed in the politics of representing culture, tradition and ethnicity, although it is composed also in daily personal experiences.
Hawaiians were represented by explorers, missionaries, officials, entrepreneurs and travellers in the past, and are represented not only in the tourist industry and mass media but also by social scientists at present. Among these imposed external representations and categorizations are the definition of “Hawaiian” in the demographic census and the “blood quantum” requirement for Hawaiian economic and political rights (Halualani 2001; Kauanui 1999). Hawaiians have naturally reacted to these seemingly objective definitive discourses in the process of constructing their own identity, even if they are not always conscious that their identity construction is intertwined with these discourses. I would like to investigate how Hawaiians have been externally categorized and defined by focusing on the definition of Hawaiian in the demographic census, one of the strongest racial and ethnic discourses on Hawaiians.

The favorite definition of “Hawaiian” in Hawaii is “anyone descended from those who inhabited the archipelago in 1778 (the year of Cook’s arrival)” (Linnekin 1990:154). This definition shows clearly the importance of “Nativeness” for claiming Hawaiian ethnicity. In this definition, setting aside the credibility of tracing one’s genealogy back to pre-contact Hawaii, a person can claim their Hawaiian ethnicity if they have (or believe they have) an ancestor in pre-contact Hawaii. “Nativeness,” which is a combination of territory (or land) and genealogy (or blood), is a decisive concept, not only for the subjective perception of Hawaiian identity but also for the objective definition of Hawaiian as an ethnic group in the demographic census. Historically, the ethnic group that is categorized as “Hawaiian and Part-Hawaiian” has been known by different names in different ages and sometimes has been labelled the same name although defined differently in population censuses. This historical change in terminology and definition shows the shift in the Western (mainly American) perception of and social attitude toward this ethnic group.\(^9\)
In the summary of the 1853 census conducted by the Hawaiian government, there were only two main ethnic categories: “Natives” and “Foreigners” (The Polynesian 04/15/1854). In the latter half of the 19th century, another category had to be added to the demographic census because of the increase in the “mixed blood” population due to intermarriage between these natives and foreigners. The new category of “Half-Caste” was seen in the 1884 Honolulu census in which “Natives” and “Half-Castes” were counted separately, and again in the 1890 census in which both categories were counted together. In the 1896 census, this pejorative term was replaced by “Part-Hawaiian” for two reasons. The Report of the General Superintendent of the Census, 1896 states:

The term Part-Hawaiian is used to signify every admixture of Hawaiian blood. The term “half caste,” previously used, is objectionable on two grounds. It does not cover all admixtures of blood, and it is a term which is regarded as an aspersion by many. The term “Part-Hawaiian” has no such objection either from the sentimental or the practical side. The Part-Hawaiians, then, have increased, as they have been steadily increasing, for years past. We now have part-Hawaiians who have married part-Hawaiians to the third generation, and it is difficult to trace out the originality of the foreign parentage. (Republic of Hawaii 1896:31-32)

Although the terminology was changed, the basic classification of Hawaiians into “pure (or full)” and “part (or half)” was firmly maintained. Examining this change of terminology, we must pay attention to the fact that “Part-Hawaiian,” rather than “Part-Native,” was chosen to replace “Half-Caste” and, accompanying this change, “Native” as the term for an ethnic group disappeared from the demographic census.

At the end of the 19th century, it was not only Hawaiians, but also foreigners who required new categories in the demographic census. In the censuses of 1884, 1890 and 1896, foreigners were separated into two categories: “Hawaiian-born (both parents being foreigners)” and “foreign born (of all kinds).” The latter group was further classified into several groups, such as American, British, German, French, Norwegian, Portuguese, Japanese, Chinese, Polynesian (South Sea Islanders) and so on. The classification in these censuses, which represented the multi-ethnic composition of the late 19th century.
Hawaii, did not make a clear distinction between nationality and ethnic or racial group; more precisely, the concept of ethnicity had not yet been introduced. In fact, Hawaiians, Part-Hawaiians, Hawaii-born foreigners and other foreign born foreigners were listed as “nationalities” in the table of the 1896 census. If the census had followed strictly the nationalities of these groups, Hawaiians, Part-Hawaiians and Hawaii-born foreigners should have been grouped under one category as native citizens of the Republic of Hawaii. Or, if the census had been based on the concept of ethnicity or race, there would have been no need to classify Hawaii-born foreigners (for example, Hawaii-born Americans) as a different ethnic or racial group from other foreigners (for example, mainland-born Americans). Classification in the 1896 census was fundamentally based on nationality, but new “ethnic” categories had to be introduced for distinguishing people who were born and raised in Hawaii from those who were born outside Hawaii.

The end of the 19th century in Hawaii was a transition period not only for the political system but also for demography, in which the categorization of ethnic groups became so confused that it may be called “a taxonomic nightmare” (Lee 1993:91). In this reshuffle of ethnic categories in the demographic census, we can see one of the reasons why “Native” as an ethnic category was eliminated from the census list. In the colonial society of Hawaii, “Nativeness” was no longer monopolized by Hawaiians and Part-Hawaiians because Hawaii-born foreigners could claim their nativeness through the category of “land.” Hawaii was their native land where they had been born and raised and for some, a place they had never left once their entire lives. The term “Native” implied anyone born and raised in Hawaii; it thus became inappropriate to distinguish between specific ethnic groups. In addition, it should be noted that “Nativeness” had a character that could not be appreciated by percentage but rather on an all-or-nothing basis. Whichever element of “Nativeness” was chosen, “Nativeness” had to be decided according to whether people had been born on Hawaiian “land” or whether they had
Hawaiian “blood.” This could be one of the reasons why the term “Part-Native” was not chosen to signify Part-Hawaiians in the census: “Part-Native” was a self-contradictory word, because there was no choice between “full” and “part” for “Nativeness.”

Although the term “Part-Hawaiian” might have had “no such objection either from the sentimental or the practical side,” there was definitely a racist discourse of “contamination” behind the new categorization of ethnicity at the end of the 19th century in Hawaii (cf. Stoler 1995). The Report of the General Superintendent of the Census, 1896 explains how nationality (or ethnicity) was defined in the census:

> It must be stated that in assigning nationality, that of the father is always taken. Thus, if a German has married a Frenchwoman, the offspring is classed as German; if an American has married an Englishwoman, the offspring is classed as American. Such cases, however, are comparatively rare. Of course, any admixture of Hawaiian blood is classed under part-Hawaiians, and the Bureau has even classed most of these by their paternal nationalities. (Republic of Hawaii 1896:32)

The definition that “any admixture of Hawaiian blood is classed under part-Hawaiians” is logically the same as the “one-drop-rule” in defining Black in the United States (Davis 1991). However, this racist discourse was actually less conspicuous because Part-Hawaiians married Part-Hawaiians “to the third generation” at the end of the century so that many Part-Hawaiian children had Part-Hawaiian fathers. As a result, the discourse of “contamination” or the “one-drop-rule” was hidden by the paternal priority in the definition of nationality (or ethnicity).

In the early 20th century, a few categories were newly defined for Part-Hawaiians in the demographic census. One instance of this is in the 1853 census, which used the word “Hapa Haole” (literally “part white”) to represent the “mixed blood” population. In the early stages of cultural contact, it was white people who were “haole [foreigners]” in Hawaii and most Part-Hawaiians in the mid-19th century were “Hapa Haole” or part-white. However, after Chinese and Japanese immigrants came to Hawaii as plantation workers in the latter half of the 19th century, another type of Part-Hawaiians emerged
due to intermarriage between Hawaiians and these Asian people. Interestingly, there was no specific Hawaiian word for this group, but they were generally called “Asiatic-Hawaiians.” In the censuses of the 1920s, the ethnic category of Part-Hawaiian was separated into “Caucasian-Hawaiian (hapa haole)” and “Asiatic-Hawaiian” (Akana 1992:103-115). However, it was not long before these two categories merged again into the moniker of “Part-Hawaiian.” Lind (1943) mentions that the “mixing of races” forced the United States Census Bureau in the 1940 census to reduce the number of racial categories that had been used for the previous three decades. Combining the terms “Caucasian-Hawaiian” and “Asiatic-Hawaiian” into “Part-Hawaiian” in the demographic classification was just one outcome of the “more-mixed” racial mixing in Hawaii.

Lind (1943) points out that in the 1940s, the demographic composition in Hawaii lost “the marks of the frontier,” such as the large proportion of foreign born residents, the relative dearth of children and the sex disproportion. In particular, the population of “foreign-born foreigners” drastically decreased from about 50% of the total population in 1910 to less than 20% in 1940 (Lind 1943:53). As a result, this category, which had confused the demographic categorization by dividing the same nationality (e.g. American) based on the birth place (e.g. foreign-born vs. Hawaii-born), was eliminated from the census list. While the demography of Hawaii stabilized, the population of Part-Hawaiians rapidly increased, because of the traditional definition of “Part-Hawaiian” and “their marked propensity for out-marriage which serves [served] to increase their numbers at the expense of the ‘pure’ groups” (Lind 1943:54). The concept of “contamination” continued to be crucial for the definition of “mixed stock (including Part-Hawaiian)” in the demographic censuses until 1960. According to Schmitt (1977:26), the “mixed stock” that did not include Part-Hawaiian was defined “by [the] race of nonwhite parent if part Caucasian or by race of father if non-Caucasian.” In this definition, paternal priority as well as ethnic hierarchy can be detected with Caucasians
taking the top precedence and Hawaiians at the bottom (cf. Lee 1993). For example, a person with Hawaiian blood would be classified as Part-Hawaiian, a person having both white and non-white blood — but no Hawaiian blood — would be included in the nonwhite ethnic group, such as Japanese or Filipino, and those without white blood would be classified by their father's ethnicity. In the federal census of 1970, however, the new definition of "mixed stock" was introduced and the category of "Part-Hawaiian" was eliminated from the list. This revision of ethnic categorization caused a problem because of inconsistencies with previous census data [Figure 1] (Schmitt 1977):

Persons of mixed stock, including part Hawaiian, are classified either on the basis of self identification or race of father. Many persons who would have been counted as part Hawaiians under the former definition were classified as Caucasian, Chinese, Filipino, or some other race in 1970. (Schmitt 1977:26)

The introduction of "self-identification" into the demographic definition signified the birth of the concept of "ethnicity." However, this definition brought about a new problem in that subjective views played a large role when determining one's ethnic category. This problem became apparent in the 1980 demographic data that was collected separately by the federal government and the state of Hawai‘i. The ethnic classification in the 1980 federal census was based on "self-identification or race of mother," while the state of Hawai‘i used "a somewhat different method to determine ethnic category" in keeping with the distinction between Hawaiians and Part-Hawaiians (Linnekin 1990:153-154). The former census counted 115,500 Hawaiians (12.0%), while the latter survey included 175,453 Hawaiians and Part-Hawaiians (18.9%).[15] In 1990, there was again a discrepancy between the federal census and the state survey with regard to the number of Hawaiians. In the census conducted by the federal Census Bureau, there was no "mixed" or "multi-race" category, so that people of mixed race or ethnicity had to choose one themselves. On the other hand, the Hawaii Health Surveillance Program conducted a more detailed survey among thousands of people and extrapolated the numbers to arrive
at statewide totals. The result was that the federal census counted 138,742 Hawaiians (12.5%), while the state survey counted 205,079 Hawaiians and Part-Hawaiians (18.8%). Interestingly, the ratio of Hawaiians in the federal census and those in the state survey is similar in both years. Out of every three persons who were identified as Hawaiian or Part-Hawaiian by the state survey, which presented mixed races or ethnicities as a possible ethnic category, two chose “Hawaiian” as their ethnicity in the federal census, which had provided no choice of mixed ethnicities. It is probable that some of those who were statistically identified as Part-Hawaiian in the state survey did not choose Hawaiian as their primary ethnicity in the federal census.

Despite the attempt to enumerate the Hawaiian population precisely in an objective manner, the different results of the federal census and state survey show that “Hawaiians” as an ethnic group are unable to exist as a clearly defined group. People of Hawaiian ancestry in Hawaii do not necessarily choose “Hawaiian” as their first ethnic identity, and the results of the demographic surveys are influenced by the way in which respondents are asked. In particular, if subjective criteria such as self-identification are introduced into the definition of ethnicity in a survey, respondents would be able to answer more freely, based on their cultural affinity rather than blood quantum or paternal (or maternal) ancestry.

**Hawaiian Cultural and Political Situations**

The Hawaiian cultural revival and the sovereignty movement have had a strong influence on the cultural identity of people of Hawaiian ancestry. The renewal of interest in traditional Hawaiian culture first began in the late 1960s and was referred to as the “Hawaiian Renaissance.” This led to a flourishing of Hawaiian music, dance and language in the cultural movement of the 1980s and 1990s, which is sometimes called the “Cultural Revival” in order to distinguish itself from the previous movement. Examples of the Hawaiian Renaissance include the Merrie Monarch Festival, one of the biggest
hula competitions in Hawaii, which began in 1971 (cf. Stillman 1996), the amendment of the state constitution in 1978 to create the Office of Hawaiian Affairs, a department of the state government that aims at the betterment of conditions for Hawaiians, as well as a 1979 amendment that made the Hawaiian language — in addition to English — an official state language. Another significant event that symbolized the Hawaiian Renaissance was the voyage of the canoe Hōkūle‘a [Arcturus]. The Hōkūle‘a, a reconstruction of an ancient double-hulled voyaging canoe, completed a round-trip voyage between Hawaii and Tahiti in 1976 using an ancient navigation system (Finney 1979). This accomplishment increased interest in traditional Hawaiian culture and helped resurrect pride in being Hawaiian. The experimental voyage by the Hōkūle‘a was repeated in the 1980s and 1990s. One of the longest voyages, the “Voyage of Rediscovery,” was conducted from 1985 to 1987, and included stopovers in several Polynesian islands, such as Tahiti, the Cook Islands, New Zealand, Tonga and Samoa (Finney 1994).

After Hawaii was annexed by the United States in 1898, the Hawaiian language came under suppression. The number of native speakers drastically decreased, although there were fluent Hawaiian speakers in certain cultural domains, such as Hawaiian Christian churches and the hula hālau [hula schools]. At present, however, interest in the Hawaiian language, Hawaiian music and hula, in which language plays a significant role, is so strong that it influences not only Hawaiians, but also people of other ethnic groups in Hawaii. The Hawaiian language is often used symbolically in Hawaiian Christian prayers and also in traditional chants at social gatherings, even when the majority of the audience may not understand what is being said. There are many Hawaiian language programs, such as the ‘Aha Pūnana Leo preschools that began in 1984, the state Department of Education language immersion program in public schools, and Hawaiian language programs in high schools and colleges (Wilson 1998). The number of
students enrolled in the Hawaiian language program at the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa has increased from 156 in 1985 to 742 in 1994,\textsuperscript{19} and in the Kamehameha Schools from about 60 in 1987 to more than 900 in 1994.\textsuperscript{20} Language is a driving force in the revival of Hawaiian music, hula and other traditional cultural activities.

The sovereignty movement, another factor that has had a great impact on the cultural identity of Hawaiians, started in the early 1970s when the first land struggle occurred in Kalama Valley, O‘ahu (Trask 1987) and gained momentum in the late 1970s to the 1980s. One can see evidence of this in nongovernmental organizations. Ka Lāhui Hawai‘i [The Sovereign Nation of Hawai‘i], one of the most active and influential organizations, was created in 1987 (cf. Feldberg 1996). With 25,000 citizens, full citizenship for Hawaiians and honorary citizenship for non-Hawaiians, and a written constitution, Ka Lāhui Hawai‘i advocates “Nation within a Nation” sovereignty (cf. Dudley and Agard 1990). This model follows closely the model of the self-government of the more than 500 Native American nations and corporations that are recognized by the United States. Another conspicuous pro-sovereignty organization is the Nation of Hawai‘i. The former name of this organization was the Ohana Council, led by Dennis “Bumpy” Kanahele, who made his mark in native politics in Hawaii by occupying Makapu‘u Beach on O‘ahu in 1993.\textsuperscript{21} The Ohana Council became the Nation of Hawai‘i in 1994 and now aims at full independence. There are other organizations and grass-roots groups, each with their own strategies for attaining the sovereignty of Hawaiians.

There are three significant events in the history of the Hawaiian sovereignty movement. The first is the controversy over the island of Kaho‘olawe. In 1976, the Protect Kaho‘olawe ‘Ohana, a grass-roots organization, began to protest against the U.S. Navy, which had been using the island as a bombing target since World War II. In protest, members of this group landed on the island several times. However, in 1977 when five members reinvaded the island, two were reported missing after attempting to
swim back to the island of Maui. This incident changed the political circumstances surrounding Kahoʻolawe, and the island became a symbol of the sovereignty movement whose slogan is “*aloha ʻāina [love of the land],” one of the pivotal traditional values of Hawaiian culture.[22] After a 19 year struggle, the island of Kahoʻolawe was finally returned to the state panel, the Kahoʻolawe Island Reserve Commission, which was assigned to supervise the transferal of the island.[23]

Another significant political event that became a turning point for the sovereignty movement was “Onipa‘a [Steadfast]” held in 1993, which was the centennial observance of the overthrow of the Hawaiian monarchy. From January 13 to 18, under the coordination of the state committee, events such as formal ceremonies, including an official apology to Hawaiians from the President of the United Church of Christ,[24] street dramas that covered the historical events of the overthrow, concerts and marches were held by public and private organizations in Honolulu. This centennial observance was one of the most significant events for Hawaiians in the 20th century. Through this event, Hawaiian nationalists further expanded their movement, and a large majority of both Hawaiians and non-Hawaiians in Hawaii were urged to think about what sovereignty was for Hawaiians and how it should be realized.

With different ideas and models of sovereignty, pro-sovereignty organizations in Hawaii sometimes struggle to form a united front in native politics. The 1996 incident concerning the Native Hawaiian Sovereignty Plebiscite represents the complicated circumstances behind this political issue, where rivalries and disagreements between several organizations and individuals have become apparent. This plebiscite asked Hawaiians to vote on the issue of whether they wanted a convention to be held in order to put forth proposals for their own Hawaiian government. It was conducted by a mail-out ballot by the Hawaiian Sovereignty Elections Council, formed by a then Hawaiian governor in 1993 and formerly known as the Hawaiian Sovereignty Advisory Council.
Commission. Between July 1 and August 15, 1996, ballots were sent to more than 80,000 people of Hawaiian ancestry 18 years or older. About 30,000 ballots were returned. The announcement of the result was made in mid-September after a short delay caused by several lawsuits against the plebiscite. The results showed that 22,294 (73%) voters voted in favor of a plan to elect delegates for a convention, while 8,129 (27%) voters voted against the plan. However, one should bear in mind that the voting rate among the eligible voters was less than 40% and the total votes in favor of the plan accounted for less than 30% among those qualified to vote. Both pro- and anti- plebiscite groups declared the results of the vote a victory for their respective sides (cf. Yoshino 1998).

Although I introduced above the cultural revival and the sovereignty movement separately, culture and politics are in reality inseparable in the current condition of Hawaiians. Culture is literally utilized in native politics; in addition, the representation of culture is in itself politics. For example, Hawaiian religious practices are often used symbolically in protest rallies and political meetings organized by Hawaiians. In such a case, the ahu [altar] is constructed in a specific place where people gather to attend a meeting. On such occasions, the ho‘okupu [offering] is offered at the ahu, the ‘awa [kava] ceremony is held, and the pule [chant] and hula are performed. The practices do not necessarily accompany political gatherings, but gatherings without any of the aforementioned practices are in fact rare, and a traditional practitioner is indispensable in order to expedite smoothly the ritualistic aspects of the gathering.

It is not only in political gatherings where Hawaiian religious traditions are symbolically represented. Religious traditions sometimes surface by accident. A 1991 shark attack incident, resulting in the first death of a local swimmer in 33 years, provoked a social dispute over how to deal with such attacks. Shark hunting planned by the state authorities was opposed by Hawaiian protesters who insisted that the shark was the ‘aumakua [family god] for Hawaiians, and there have been intermittent discussions on
this topic in local newspapers ever since. Some have insisted that traditional beliefs be respected, while others have argued that not all sharks are 'aumākua [plural of 'aumakua] or that one would lose the right to claim any relationship with 'aumākua after severing their obligations to them. Although the focus of public opinion has shifted from cultural correctness, which preaches respect for the native culture, to environmental correctness, which questions the effectiveness of shark hunting, this dispute has certainly given social recognition to traditional Hawaiian beliefs.

Hawaiian religious practices and beliefs are noticeable in social and political scenes in Hawaii. Hawaiian practitioners performing rituals at protest rallies or political meetings in traditional attire attract attention on the local television news and in newspapers. The cultural issues of Hawaiian people are seized upon and discussed whenever culturally sensitive incidents occur, such as shark hunting, the destruction of heiau [pre-Christian places of worship] or the inappropriate disposition of Hawaiian remains and artifacts. However, it is generally recognized that a large majority of Hawaiians are Christian. Most Hawaiians who attend political gatherings in the sovereignty movement are, in a strict sense, not traditionalists. Many acknowledge their Christian background. They were born into Christian families and formerly attended church although they are currently less active in church activities or are searching for an alternative.

Although Hawaiian religious traditions are seen to be eloquently narrated and represented in general, they do not necessarily constitute the backbone of Hawaiian society. If we can hypothetically set in a certain culture the consciously narrated parts and the unconsciously lived parts (the point I mentioned in Chapter 2), Hawaiian traditional religious culture and Western (or American) culture are the examples that most represent the relation between these two different aspects of culture. This is not a simple dichotomy; the narrated aspect (or representation) has in itself the potential of becoming
a part of the lived culture (or experience), while the lived aspect can be narrated under certain conditions. An interesting point concerning the current situation of Hawaiians is that the discrepancy between these can be recognized clearly and sometimes becomes a cause of tension.

The cultural position of Hawaiian people falls somewhere in between Hawaiian religious tradition — that is becoming prominent in various social scenes — and Western culture, in which Christian tradition still has significant influence. Of course, these two factors are not purely isolated binary oppositions, but rather ideas that I hypothetically set up as two prominent factors among various cultural factors surrounding Hawaiians. However, by tentatively placing Hawaiian religious tradition and Western (or American) culture at opposite ends of the cultural continuum of Hawaiians, and also by focusing on the dynamic interaction between these polar ends, I aim to set a new angle to investigate the composition of Hawaiian identity. In order to probe into the current situation of Hawaiians in detail, especially that of Christian Hawaiians, I will analyze ethnographic interview data collected mainly among Hawaiian ministers and Hawaiian church members in later chapters. In this chapter, in order to surmise the current cultural perception and religious affiliation of Hawaiians, I would like to examine the results of a survey conducted among Hawaiian students. Although it is impossible to draw a clear conclusion from the results of this sort of questionnaire, I believe that the study provides background information to help understand the interview data analyzed in the following chapters. Additionally, it sets the groundwork for interpreting the cultural identity of Hawaiians who stand somewhere between Hawaiian culture and Christian tradition.

**Questionnaire Survey Analysis**

*Culture, Blood and Land: Ethnic Identity of Hawaiian Students*

Aiming at investigating the relation between Christian tradition and traditional Hawaiian religions in the construction of Hawaiian identity, from November 1994 to
January 1995 I conducted a survey in Hawaiian language classes at the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa (UHM) and four local high schools. One reason I selected these particular Hawaiian language classes for this survey concerned feasibility: they appeared to be the sole places an individual researcher could collect a sizeable number of responses from Hawaiians. In the survey, I asked various questions in regards to ethnicity, Hawaiian language, religion and cultural identity [Appendix A], but wish to use data that relates to the main point of this section, which is the relation between Christianity and Hawaiian tradition in Hawaiian cultural identity.

The amount of data collected in these high schools varies widely. The largest amount of data was collected in School A; a total of 164 responses was collected of which 141 responses were from Hawaiian students. The second largest amount of data was from School E; a total of 90 responses was collected, including 69 responses from Hawaiian students. The data adopted from School I and School O was rather small; the total number of responses was 30 and 27 respectively, of which 15 and 10 responses were from Hawaiian students. In total, 235 Hawaiian students at the four high schools responded to the questionnaire. In the Hawaiian classes at UHM, a total of 78 responses was collected, of which 35 were from Hawaiian students.

Before analyzing the results of the survey, I should explain a characteristic of the sample in detail. In the process of extracting valid data for the analysis, I first eliminated responses from students who identified themselves as ethnicities apart from Hawaiian, even if they indicated their parents were Hawaiian or Part-Hawaiian (Question A-6 from the questionnaire). The responses from the students who chose several ethnicities for their ethnic identity were not excluded if they chose Hawaiian as part of their ethnic identity. In this section, I will use the term “Hawaiian students” to denote students who chose Hawaiian as their main ethnic identity or as a part of their multiple ethnic identity. The main focus of this survey is identity composition that is subjectively constructed
through each person's experiences. Therefore, I selected the subjects based on their self-identification.

Although the survey was conducted under the condition that the name of a school would not be disclosed, minimum information must be given in order to make a careful comparison possible. School A, School O and School I are private schools in Honolulu. School E is a public school located in the countryside of West O'ahu. The age of Hawaiian respondents from the four high schools ranged from 14 to 18 years old (average 15.9), while that of UHM ranges from 18 to 48 years old (average 23.4).

In question A-6, I ask the students which ethnic background they feel greatest affiliation with and why they thought so. By categorizing the key words Hawaiian students used in their explanations, we can find significant elements related to their perception of Hawaiian identity. Most prominent in their answers are cultural elements, which they refer to by using terms such as "culture," "tradition," "(cultural) heritage," "customs," "values," "beliefs," "way of life" and "style." All of these terms are often modified by the word "Hawaiian." These Hawaiian students also write that they felt they had been "raised in," "exposed to" and "brought up with" Hawaiian culture that was "rooted in" their lives. The cultural element was clarified occasionally by a concrete example, such as "hula," "Hawaiian language," "Hawaiian music," "paddling" and even "attending Hawaiian church." These Hawaiian "things" are often emphasized as knowledge rather than experience and practice, especially when they are described as abstract concepts. In their explanations, it emerges that Hawaiian culture (tradition, heritage, etc.) is what they "know about more than any others" or is the only background they "have knowledge of." Although Hawaiian language students could reasonably be expected to have an interest in learning about Hawaiian culture (including language), the conviction that Hawaiian culture, as knowledge, should be learned and enjoyed, is obvious in their explanations. Comments such as "I was taught about my Hawaiian
history and I am trying to learn even more,” “I try to learn the culture and preserve it,” and “I like learning about the Hawaiian culture,” demonstrate this conviction well. Some Hawaiian students, after explaining their multiple ethnic backgrounds, such as Hawaiian, Chinese, Portuguese and Filipino, mentioned that they did not have knowledge of any cultures other than Hawaiian. For example, some write “I hardly participate in Chinese events,” “I am not exposed to [my] Filipino side,” or “I know nothing of Filipino, Korean and Portuguese.” About 90 respondents out of the 235 Hawaiian high school students referred to the cultural element in some way as a main reason for identifying themselves as Hawaiian.

An interesting point in their explanations is that American culture does not acquire a meaningful position in their perception of cultural identity, although it is what they have the greatest familiarity with. There can be several reasons why American culture is not considered as a significant element in their discursive construction of identity. The simplest explanation is that haole [Caucasian American] is not counted as an ethnic group (it is unconsciously eliminated from the beginning in their perception of multi-ethnic identity). Another, but not so probable reason is that the students do not admit that haole have “culture”; the statement such as “We have culture, but haole don’t have culture,” sometimes uttered with different connotations, indicates this possibility.

There is a third possible explanation. Although the respondents who mention cultural elements as a main factor when determining their identity tend to deny the essentialistic definition of cultural identity based on “blood,” there is some possibility that even among them, cultural identity is first conceptualized in the metaphor of “blood” and different cultural factors are compared following this blood line. If that is so, American or haole culture is naturally eliminated from their identity perception because it does not have a corresponding “blood.” Although we may find a literal one-to-one correspondence between haole culture and haole blood, the concept of haole does not
function in the same manner as the other ethnic categories; it is at first constructed as the opposing category against Hawaiian. When Hawaiians consider *haole* blood on the same level of other ethnic bloods, they must (and often do) count a particular *haole* blood, such as English and Scottish, and probably admit to having more knowledge of Hawaiian culture than English or Scottish culture.

In the socio-cultural context of Hawaii, *haole* is recognized as an ethnic group; it is not the majority and, constructed in its relation with other ethnic groups, it cannot become an ethnically unmarked group in the Hawaiian multi-ethnic society. Therefore, the first explanation mentioned above, which simply points out that *haole* is not counted as an ethnic group, must offer reasons why *haole* as an ethnic factor disappears but other ethnic factors remain in the perception of Hawaiian identity. The third explanation resolves this issue. It takes into consideration that even the anti-essentialist cultural factor requires the metaphor of “blood” and that *haole* blood does not exist in the same manner as the other ethnic blood lines; those which remind Hawaiians of the strong connection between blood and culture. The metaphor of *haole* blood is more abstract than the other bloods, such as Hawaiian, Chinese, Portuguese and Scottish.

Because there is no *haole* blood, *haole* culture corresponding to *haole* blood cannot exist in the discourse of Hawaiian multi-ethnic identity. The forementioned second reason also explains this point; *haole* is definitely recognized as an ethnic group in Hawaii, but it is not considered to have its own culture, so it does not enter the discursive construction of Hawaiian identity. However, it is admittedly difficult to confirm this explanation from the results of the questionnaire only.

Another element that is not seen as frequently as the cultural element but still prominent in the respondents’ answers is genealogy (“blood”) and physical features (“look”). As the amount of knowledge about Hawaiian culture becomes critical for one who perceives his or her Hawaiian cultural and ethnic identity, the amount of Hawaiian
blood is significant for certain types of Hawaiian students when they consider their ethnic background. Students generally refer to their Hawaiian blood by referring to the blood quantum of their parents (for example, “My mother was 100% and [my] father was 85%”) or directly mentioning their own (“I’m 50%”). The “fact” that Hawaiian blood occupies the highest percentage of all the different “bloods” they have is an important factor when determining their Hawaiian identity. Physical features, as an element that contributes to their perception of identity, are mentioned in a more general way (“I look more Hawaiian”). The only specific feature several students point out is skin color (“dark,” “darker” or “brown”). Of the 235 Hawaiian high school students, a total of 25 respondents points to blood quantum as one of the main reasons for choosing Hawaiian as their main ethnic background, and a total of 11 respondents refers to physical features.131

There is one more noticeable element and that is the “land” element, which most of the respondents refer to by simply pointing out that Hawaii is their native land. Many say that “I have lived in Hawaii my whole life” or “I live in Hawaii,” and only a few respondents mention that they are from a specific island or place that is known as predominantly Hawaiian. The first statement can be a response of anyone who was born and raised in Hawaii, but “Hawaii” in this context is clearly not just a geographical area simply called hometown, but rather the native land that has a long history for the native people. As for the number of responses that refer to the “land” element, however, there is a salient difference between School A and School E. In the former private school in Honolulu, about 25 respondents (out of the 141 Hawaiian students) mention the “land” element as a reason why they identify themselves as Hawaiian. On the other hand, in the latter public school in the countryside of O‘ahu, only one respondent (out of the 69 Hawaiian students) refers to the land element.132
Between Two Traditions: Christianity and Hawaiian Traditional Religion

As I explained in Chapter 3, the Congregational, Roman Catholic, Mormon and Episcopal churches have historically played an important role in the Christianization of Hawaiians. However, the current situation of Hawaiian Christian society is too complicated to be summarized by these four denominations alone. Not only Catholics, Mormons and Congregationalists, but also newer forms of Christianity, such as Pentecostalists, Seventh-day Adventists and Jehovah’s Witnesses, are influential among Hawaiian Christians. The complexity of Christian Hawaiians may have been caused simply by the active work of these newer Christian forces as well as by other Protestant denominations entered Hawaii in the early 20th century. Another possibility is that it may be related to the “out-marriage” of Hawaiians to other ethnic groups affiliated with specific denominations; for example, Catholic Portuguese, Catholic Filipinos, and Baptist Caucasians.

Religious Affiliation

In question C-3, I ask Hawaiian students about their religious affiliation in order to find information that could help clarify the religious and denominational composition of Hawaiians. For high school students, however, it is difficult to give the exact names of their denominations, especially when they are Protestants. In such cases, “Protestant” was chosen without specifying any denomination, or “Christian” was written down under the section of “Protestant” or “Other Religion.” On the other hand, students who are Catholic, Mormon, or other fundamentalist Christians tend to identify clearly their denominations. Because students who submitted broad answers such as “Protestant” and “Christian” can be affiliated with any Protestant denomination, I have not subdivided the category of Protestant into each denomination, but instead have counted all the responses from Christian students (except for Catholics and Mormons) as Protestant [Table 1]. As seen in Table 1, the main religious affiliation among Hawaiian high school students is
Table 1. Religious Affiliation of Hawaiian Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roman Catholic</th>
<th>Protestant</th>
<th>Mormon</th>
<th>Other Religions</th>
<th>No Religion</th>
<th>No Answer</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School A</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School E</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School I</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School O</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>68</strong></td>
<td><strong>73</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>52</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roman Catholic</th>
<th>Protestant</th>
<th>Mormon</th>
<th>Other Religions</th>
<th>No Religion</th>
<th>No Answer</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UHM</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) This figure includes particular denominations, such as Congregational (3), Baptist (5), Episcopal (2) and Independent Hawaiian Church (2), as well as newer Christian forms, such as Pentecostal (5), Seventh-Day Adventist (3) and Jehovah's Witnesses (4).

2) 11 out of the 52 students mention that they attend Christian church services or believe in Christian teachings, but do not identify themselves as Christians.

3) 4 out of the 15 students mention that they attend Christian church services or believe in Christian teachings, but do not identify themselves as Christians.

4) Congregational (3), Baptist (1), Episcopal (1), Pentecostal (1) and Independent Hawaiian Church (1) are included.
On the other hand, there are no students who claim traditional Hawaiian religion as their faith, although one student implies that he participates in traditional religious practices. However, there is a possibility that not only Hawaiians who are unaffiliated with any religion but also others who are loosely affiliated with certain Christian denominations may become interested in traditional Hawaiian religion in the current climate, in which secularization is proceeding in Hawaiian Christian society. This possibility could increase in contemporary Hawaii because Hawaiian religious traditions are being increasingly represented in various social and political scenes.

*Aumakua*

Questions C-7 to C-13 aim at determining the current status of Hawaiian traditional beliefs and practices among Hawaiian students. To question C-7, which asks whether they know their *aumākua*, 136 out of the 235 Hawaiian high school students (57.9%) answer “Yes” [Table 2]. Here, there is a noticeable difference between Christian students and non-Christian students with only 54.2% of Christian students answering that they know their *aumākua*, as opposed to 66.7% non-Christian students. Although 34 students do not give the names of their *aumākua* to question C-8 by choosing “I don’t want to answer,” or simply neglecting the question, 102 students provide the names as shown in Table 3. However, merely knowing the names and particular stories of the *aumākua* is different from having practical knowledge of, or a spiritual relationship with them. Among Hawaiians, fascinating tales about the *aumakua* and their ancestors as well as their individual experiences with the *aumakua* are often related. But it does not necessarily mean that they have a strong relationship with the *aumakua* on a daily basis. In fact, it is often said that some Hawaiian students start to know their *aumākua* probably only after inquiring about them to their *kūpuna* [plural of *kupuna*: grandparent] in order to complete homework assigned to them at school.
Table 2. Affinity with the ‘Aumakua (High School Respondents Only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
<th>No Answer</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C-7. Do you know your family ‘aumakua?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>90 (54.2%)</td>
<td>58 (34.9%)</td>
<td>12 (7.2%)</td>
<td>6 (3.6%)</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Christian</td>
<td>46 (66.7%)</td>
<td>22 (31.9%)</td>
<td>1 (1.4%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>136 (57.9%)</td>
<td>80 (34.0%)</td>
<td>13 (5.5%)</td>
<td>6 (3.6%)</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C-9. Have you ever felt your family ‘aumakua?

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Christian</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) This choice applies to the students who know that their families do not have the ‘aumakua.

Table 3. Types of the ‘Aumakua

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>‘aumakua</th>
<th>High Schools</th>
<th>UHM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>manō (shark)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moʻo (lizard)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pueo (Hawaiian short-eared owl)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>honu (turtle)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manu (bird)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pele (the volcano goddess)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ānuenue (rainbow)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘io (Hawaiian hawk)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘api (surgeonfish)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘ilio (dog)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oʻopu (a type of fish)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not want to answer</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no answer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) 102 out of 136 respondents give the names of their ‘aumakua. 34 respondents offer more than one name; a few divide their ‘aumākua into mother’s side and father’s side.

2) 13 out of 19 respondents give the names of their ‘aumakua. 5 respondents name plural ‘aumākua.

3) No specification concerning the type of bird.
To question C-9, which asks whether they have ever felt the ‘aumakua, 54 out of the 136 Hawaiian high school students (39.7%) who know their ‘aumakua answered “Yes” [Table 2].[36] There is a remarkable difference between Christian students and non-Christian students in their responses to question C-9, only 30 out of 90 Christian students (33.3%) who know their ‘aumakua admit they have felt them, as opposed to 24 out of 46 non-Christian students (52.2%).[37]

**Ho’okupu**

To question C-12, which asks whether they have ever offered ho’okupu at a specific place, 73 out of the 235 Hawaiian high school students (31.1%) have marked “Yes” [Table 4].[38] As for the practice of ho’okupu, there is no critical difference between Christian students and non-Christian students; 50 out of 166 Christian students (30.1%) and 23 out of 69 non-Christian students (33.3%) answer that they have offered ho’okupu. As I will discuss later, this is partly because ho’okupu can be offered in both a traditional religious and Christian context. In a sense, any kind of offering could be called ho’okupu, if respondents prefer it to be labeled as such. This could be especially true in the current atmosphere, in which the Hawaiian language is used more increasingly. It is difficult from the survey to conclude exactly if the respondent who answered “Yes” to question C-12, actually offers ho’okupu in a traditional religious context.

**Table 4. Offering the Ho’okupu (High School Respondents Only)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No Answer</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C-12. Have you ever offered the ho’okupu?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>50 (30.1%)</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>12 (7.2%)</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Christian</td>
<td>23 (33.3%)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4 (5.8%)</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>73 (31.1%)</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>16 (6.8%)</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There are various responses to question C-13 that asks the students when they last offered *ho‘okupu* and why. Most respondents pointed out specific places, such as the *heiau* and altars (Pu‘ukohala, Pu‘u-o-mahuka, Ke-ahu-a-Laka), volcanic mountains (Kīlauea, Haleakalā), waterfalls, beaches and Kaho‘olawe island. They offer *ho‘okupu*, such as the *lei*, food and rocks wrapped in ti-leaves, when they hike in the mountains, visit the *heiau*, go fishing and swim or surf at the beach. Sometimes it is done at a *heiau* on a school field trip; other times, it is a regular event of a *hula hālau* before participating in competitions.

Although not all of the respondents explain the reasons why they offer *ho‘okupu*, several key concepts are evident in their answers. The word “respect” is most frequently used (eleven responses) to explain why they offer *ho‘okupu*; usually in general descriptions, such as “I showed my respect to my ancestors,” “I did [it] in respect for my family and the Hawaiian culture,” “I gave foods and a rock in [a] ti-leaf to pay my respect to my heritage,” and “I don’t know, just respect.” Seven respondents mention that they offer *ho‘okupu* to the ʻaumakua for “protection” and “guidance” when they hike in the mountains and swim at the beach. “Appreciation” and “thanks” are other reasons often mentioned (seven responses). These are also often explained in general ways, such as “to thank her (Kīlauea) for her beauty and allowing us to be there,” “to thank ancestors and the island (Kaho‘olawe)” and “thanking the spirits for using the land we were on,” or are described as a custom after fishing or taking native plants.

These respondents explain that they offer *ho‘okupu* when they visit a *heiau*, hike in the mountains or swim at the beach. For them, offering *ho‘okupu* itself is not the primary purpose for going to such places, with the exception of school trips and special family events or social ceremonies. On the other hand, several students mention that they offer *ho‘okupu* to pray for recovering sick family members and for solving family problems. However, it is not clear here either whether they offer *ho‘okupu* in a traditional
religious context, that is, asking for help from or showing respect to the ‘aumakua by offering ho’okupu at traditional sacred places. Although the names of a few native gods, such as Pele (at Kilauea and other volcanic mountains) and Lono (in the Makahiki [ancient harvest festival] season) are mentioned in the answers to question C-13, only one respondent explains the close relationship between her family and a native god to which she offers ho’okupu. No students mention that they offer ho’okupu as traditional practitioners. On the other hand, a few respondents mention that they offer ho’okupu to their late family members or close friends at cemeteries. In these cases, ho’okupu is offered in the context of Christian tradition, similarly to the practice of offering ho’okupu to famous missionaries and ministers in church ceremonies. This could be one of the reasons why there is no critical difference between Christian and non-Christian students in the responses to question C-12.

In summary, it can be said that about 58% of Hawaiian high school students know the name of the ‘aumakua of their family, and that 40% of those who know their ‘aumakua claim that they have felt it. On the other hand, 30% of Hawaiian high school students have offered ho’okupu in either Christian or non-Christian contexts. Among Hawaiian high school students, non-Christian students show a closer relationship with the ‘aumakua and practice ho’okupu more often than Christian students. Therefore, one may conclude that they feel stronger ties to traditional Hawaiian religion than do Christian students. However, there are actually no traditionalists who practice the rituals in a strict sense. Hawaiian students’ relationships with the ‘aumakua and practices of ho’okupu are not so much traditional religious beliefs or practices per se as they are ordinary customs in which they reconfirm the “traditional” relationship with the spirits and nature and therefore strengthen their Hawaiian identity.
Identity Composition of Hawaiian Students

In question D-1, which aims at studying the composition of cultural identity among Hawaiian students, six items were presented for comparison: “Hawaiian values,” “Hawaiian language,” “hula and Hawaiian music,” “traditional Hawaiian religion,” “Hawaiian blood and ancestry” and “Hawaiian foods.” Although I try to investigate which cultural element is recognized as relatively important for Hawaiian students, of particular interest is grasping how traditional Hawaiian religion is accepted in their perception of Hawaiian identity.

I utilized the paired comparison design for question D-1. The strong point of this design is that data can be analyzed for consistency, and responses can be compared for the same respondent and also between different respondents (Weller and Romney 1988:46). In addition, differences between presented items in this design are more noticeable than in the rating scale design. In the final survey, I adopted the complete paired comparison design in which \( n(n-1)/2 \) pairs must be created for \( n \) items. In question D-1, which compares 6 items, 15 pairs were created and presented at random for respondents. The rank of an item (cultural element, in this case) is obtained for each respondent by counting how many times it is chosen and also obtained for each categorized group (for example, each school, and a group of Christian or non-Christian students) by adding together all of the responses. Although “essentially, the rank of an item is a sum of the number of times it was chosen” (5 points means “the most” and 0 points means “the least”), actual responses do not necessarily follow this guideline because sometimes a respondent cannot tell the difference between two items or responds inconsistently (Weller and Romney 1988:45-46).

Compared to question C, the number of valid responses decreases in question D-1 with 183 out of the 235 Hawaiian high school students and 29 out of the 35 Hawaiian students of UHM giving complete responses. Table 5 and Figures 9 to 12 show the
### Table 5. Perception of Hawaiian Identity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hawaiian Values</th>
<th>Hawaiian Language</th>
<th>Hula &amp; Hawaiian Music</th>
<th>Traditional Hawaiian Religion</th>
<th>Hawaiian Blood &amp; Ancestry</th>
<th>Hawaiian Foods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>4 High Schools</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christians (136)</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Christians (47)</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL (183)</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UHM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christians (18)</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Christians (11)</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL (29)</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School A</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christians (87)</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Christians (23)</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL (110)</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School E</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christians (32)</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Christians (21)</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL (53)</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hawaiian Foods
Hawaiian Values
Hawaiian Language
Hula and Hawaiian Music
Hawaiian Blood and Ancestry
Traditional Hawaiian Religion

Figure 9-a. Perception of Hawaiian Identity
(4 High Schools)

Figure 9-b. Perception of Hawaiian Identity
Compared between Christian and Non-Christian Students
(4 High Schools)
Figure 10-a. Perception of Hawaiian Identity (UHM)

Figure 10-b. Perception of Hawaiian Identity Compared between Christian and Non-Christian Students (UHM)
Figure 11-a. Perception of Hawaiian Identity (School A)

Figure 11-b. Perception of Hawaiian Identity Compared between Christian and Non-Christian Students (School A)
Figure 12-a. Perception of Hawaiian Identity (School E)

Figure 12-b. Perception of Hawaiian Identity Compared between Christian and No-Christian Students (School E)
results of the responses of each categorized group. The basic composition of Hawaiian identity can be depicted by how each cultural element is rated. As seen in Table 5 and Figures 10 and 11, the basic composition of Hawaiian identity reveals similarities between UHM and School A. On the other hand, the data from School E shows a slightly different composition. Compared with the data from School A, the most prominent characteristic of the responses from School E is the higher rating of "traditional Hawaiian religion" and relatively lower rating of "Hawaiian values" and "Hawaiian language" [Figures 11 and 12].

The rating of "traditional Hawaiian religion" is also noticeably different between Christian and non-Christian students in the data from the four high schools and UHM [Figures 9 and 10]. This difference is in a sense natural. Christian students tend to give lower ratings to "traditional Hawaiian religion" (that may conflict with Christian beliefs) than do non-Christian students. However, when looking in detail at the responses from School A and School E by separating Christian and non-Christian students in each school, we can find an intriguing difference between the two schools [Figures 11 and 12]: in School A, Christian students rate "Hawaiian traditional religion" clearly lower than do non-Christian students, whereas in School E both groups of students rate it relatively equally. One can surmise that the critical difference of rating for "traditional Hawaiian religion" between School A and School E as well as between Christian students and non-Christian students in the four high schools is caused by the group of Christian students in School A, which has the largest number of high school responses.

In summary, both Christian and non-Christian students in School E tend to have similar compositions of Hawaiian identity, while in School A and UHM, Christian students show a noticeably lower rating for "traditional Hawaiian religion" than do non-Christian students. The results of question D-1, which show that the rating for "traditional Hawaiian religion" is higher in School E than in School A, are consistent
with the results of questions C-9, which show that Hawaiian students in School E have a much closer relation to the 'aumakua than do those in School A. Although there are interesting differences between School E and School A, it can be concluded that "traditional Hawaiian religion" is never highly ranked with regard to the perception of Hawaiian identity in any of the categorized groups. Cultural elements that occupy the upper ranks in identity composition are almost always "Hawaiian values," "Hawaiian blood and ancestry," and "Hawaiian language."[40]

Concluding Remarks

As I mentioned previously, Hawaiians have been assigned different definitions and names in demographic censuses since the mid-19th century. The confusion and difficulties in racial and ethnic categorization in demographic censuses, which resulted in introducing "self-identification" into the definition and created further confusion, were brought about by inter-marriage in a multi-ethnic society. Inter-marriage and social circumstances accompanying it blurred the boundary of Hawaiian ethnicity, which had been previously accepted as an essentially distinct entity. In addition, under the influence of the sovereignty movement, the concept of Hawaiian ethnicity has become highly politicized in Hawaii, where people of Hawaiian ancestry are not just one of many ethnic minorities, but have a specific political status because of their indigenousness. In Hawaii's current social and political situation, a few concepts related to Hawaiian ethnicity have also had their meanings and connotations altered. For example, the "Nativeness" of the Hawaiian people is now re-defined not by "land," but mainly by "blood" in the native nationalist discourse. With the shift in the definition of Nativeness, the principle of "contamination" or the "one-drop-rule" must also be re-interpreted and reversed in order to have a positive connotation in the strategic essentialistic discourse. In this discourse, a person with a small portion of Hawaiian blood is logically a native of Hawaii and has a right to be a citizen of the Hawaiian nation, even if they have no
cultural tie to Hawaii. What is at stake in native politics is not a simple problem of “race” defined by blood, but a problem of “genealogy (or ancestry)” — linking oneself to land through blood (cf. Kauanui 1999:137-139).

Of course, native politics do not explain the whole picture of the current situation surrounding Hawaiian ethnicity. In addition to the sovereignty movement, the cultural revival has created the current circumstances in which Hawaiian culture and history, as a backbone of Hawaiian identity, are more consciously narrated, represented, objectified, and accepted as something that must be remembered and perpetuated. In this situation, Hawaiian cultural identity has become complicated and diverse. As the results of the survey suggest, there could be a noticeable difference in the construction of Hawaiian identity among groups of different ages, religions and residential areas. The wide variety of Hawaiian cultural identity is partly related to the cultural situation in which the discrepancy between the narrated culture (the representation of “Hawaiian” culture) and the “experienced” culture (the daily experiences of the Hawaiian people in the United States) is strongly recognized. The discrepancy between these two cultures becomes critical for some Christian Hawaiians, especially those who are concerned about positioning their locus between Christian beliefs and Hawaiian religious tradition. I will investigate this topic in the following chapters.

In the questionnaire conducted among Hawaiian students, I tried to ascertain how Christianity and traditional Hawaiian religion are related to the cultural identity of Hawaiian students. The results of the survey indicate that: 1) the idea of culture, indicated by such words as “tradition,” “heritage” and “values,” is the most important factor when determining Hawaiian identity; 2) traditional Hawaiian religion per se does not occupy the central position in their Hawaiian identity, evidenced by their religious affiliations, the ‘aumakua belief, practice of ho‘okupu, and identity composition; and 3) the construction of Hawaiian identity can differ between different groups, not only between
Christian students and non-Christian students, but also between students in rural areas and students in urban areas.

Most Hawaiian high school students appear to be in a syncretic situation in which neither Hawaiian traditional culture nor Christian tradition takes predominance. A Manichean view that strictly separates traditional Hawaiian religion and Christianity is not popular among Hawaiian students. They believe that personal ties with the ʻaumakua, in which they only know its name or story but do not worship, instead showing only respect to it, is more acceptable than more active relations.

The relation between Christianity and traditional religion is a difficult problem that cannot be resolved easily, especially in the present cultural climate. During my interview research among Christian Hawaiians whose data I examine in the following chapters, I heard several times that whether to have the hula kahiko [traditional hula] danced inside the chapel has caused a tension in Hawaiian churches. A comment in the questionnaire by a UHM student, who is not affiliated with any religion, but whose parents are Roman Catholic, also suggests this tension:

About 3 years ago I belonged to a Protestant church which I was very active in. It seemed to be what I was searching for: a kind of spiritual realization of who I was, but there was always that nagging, bothersome problem of trying to resolve conflicting Hawaiian & Christian beliefs.

In my interview, a Hawaiian woman, who was active in her church and sympathetic to a certain form of the sovereignty movement, claims that she does not like to see any kind of hula danced inside the chapel but enjoys the hula ʻauana [modern hula] in the outdoor lūʻau after the church service. She draws a line between what is acceptable as general Hawaiian culture and compatible with Christian faith, and what must be rejected as Hawaiian religious tradition that conflicts with Christian doctrine. At the same time, however, she admits to difficulty in distinguishing where religion ends and culture begins. On the other hand, a Hawaiian minister who was also a kumu hula [hula teacher] said that there should be no misgivings about dancing any kind of hula in church because...
she believes that Hawaiian culture — including traditional religion — was bestowed by God to the Hawaiian people. Another Hawaiian woman insists that it is imperative to know whom the *hula* is dedicated to before dancing it, adding that as a Christian she could distinguish what could — and could not — be danced. Evidenced by these comments, there are various attitudes and opinions concerning *hula* among Christian Hawaiians. In reality, as a minister of a Hawaiian church points out in my interview, different people resolve the potential conflict between Christian tradition and Hawaiian religious culture, themselves in different manners. However, it is important to note that their resolutions are sometimes not only different, but also sharply divided concerning specific issues, such as dancing the *hula kahiko* inside the chapel and asking a *kahuna* [traditional that priest] for help with family problems.

As I showed in Chapter 2, in the post-colonial situation, in which issues tend to be interpreted politically, any anthropological analysis can be treated as text, another version of interpretation and representation. Statistical analysis used to investigate Hawaiian cultural identity in this chapter is vulnerable to post-colonial critiques because it is regarded as an overly authoritative narrative that determines who “natives” are. In the eyes of postmodernist deconstructionists, it is also criticized as a technique belonging to modernist realism because it presupposes that the collected data represents some reality among the subjects. However, it does not necessarily follow that anthropologists fabricate something spurious that suppresses natives’ own representation of tradition and ethnicity. The conclusions tentatively reached in this type of statistical analysis can provoke reactions, reinterpretations and criticisms among other anthropologists as well as the native people.

What I have presented in the last section of this chapter, through analyzing the results of the questionnaire, is neither a generalization of Hawaiian identity nor a general description of current Hawaiian students, but only a partial description of the cultural
condition of the Hawaiian students who cooperated with the survey. My interest is not so much in generalization (although I do not deny its significance) as much as initiating discussion on the issue of Hawaiian cultural identity between Christian tradition and Hawaiian religious culture. The questionnaire alone is certainly not a suitable method to investigate in detail the complicated relations between Christianity and Hawaiian culture. Indeed, this requires a more intensive ethnographic study. However, I believe that the results of the survey can provide the basis for grasping a general outline of the current cultural condition of Hawaiians and paves the way for a better understanding of Hawaiian cultural identity between Christian tradition and Hawaiian spirituality. When trying to deepen such understanding, the discursive construction of Christian Hawaiian identity can be highly suggestive. In order to approach the Hawaiian cultural identity from a different angle, I would like to focus on Christian Hawaiians’ perception of their identity. In the following chapters, I will investigate the spoken narratives of Christian Hawaiians in detail, using ethnographic interview data.
NOTES

[1] It is in the 1980s when the first conference of Hawaiian ministers was held, attended by about 80 participants, in order to discuss the Hawaiian characteristics of Hawaiian churches. The conference concluded that the present Hawaiian churches were not the same as those 100 years ago, although they shared several Hawaiian characteristics, from ethnic composition of the membership to the language used in the church service (a personal communication with a Hawaiian minister of the UCC, 10/25/1994). Also in 1991, the conference of Hawaiian ministers was held at the Kawaiahao Church to discuss whether Christian Hawaiians can be Hawaiian and Christian at the same time (a personal communication with another Hawaiian minister of the UCC, 05/02/1995). According to the informant, all of four or five speakers who made a presentation at the conference answered the question in the affirmative.

[2] The primary definition of the term “ethnic” that signifies “[p]ertaining to nations not Christian or Jewish; Gentile, heathen, pagan” came into usage in the late 15th century, much earlier than the second definition that signifies “pertaining to race,” but has not been used since the late 19th century (the OED 1991).

[3] It seems to be more appropriate to rephrase “the Western popular theory” as “the non-academic folk theory,” because the latter term covers a larger domain and clarifies the opposition between the academic theory and the non-academic (or popular) thought about “ethnicity.” However, the point I am making here in this discussion is that the Western academic discourse cannot shake free from the popular way of thought so that the former is influenced by the essentialistic perspective dominant in the latter. Although it is necessary to consider the non-Western ethnotheory, it is inconceivable that the non-Western ethnotheory directly influences the Western academic discourse.

[4] As I already explained in Chapter 2, I give different meanings to essentialism and primordialism, although many use the term primordialism to designate what I mean by the term essentialism.

[5] Bentley (1987), who tries to overcome the shortcoming of primordialist and instrumentalist theories by using the concept of “habitus,” makes the same point as follows:

Much of conventional social theory, including both instrumentalist and primordialist approaches to ethnicity, has foundered on ambiguities in the concept of rule (or law). Rules by which regularities in behavior are described become, by a semantic sleight of hand, rules by which observed behavior is produced. Thus analysts’ mental models are transformed into causal principles located in the (conscious or unconscious) minds of the people whose behavior is being studied. (Bentley 1987:48)

[6] Norton (1993) sets up the dichotomous framework that contrasts the political elite discourse at the center and the popular experience in the local and, proceeds to inspect how these two elements interact. One of the points in dispute between Linnekin (1983) and Trask (1993) is whether Hawaiian nationalism is urban or rural in origin (Trask 1993:168-169). In either case, the local experience of the ordinary people is unconditionally given a more authentic position in the politics of culture than the elite discourse in the center. Such dichotomization is no longer tenable in the post-colonial condition of the Pacific region, in which information as well as people freely transfers between the urban and the rural.

[7] I prefer to use the term “cultural identity” rather than “ethnic identity,” although cultural identity emerges as ethnic identity in most contemporary social settings. I choose the former here in this discussion because it represents the basic features of
collective identity more effectively than the latter, which connotes a restrictive social situation.

[8] Quoted from the title of Moorhead's *The Fatal Impact: An Account of the Invasion of the South Pacific, 1767-1840* (1987 [1966]), the term "fatal impact" is used to indicate a unilateral view that interprets the cultural contact between Westerners and the Pacific Islanders as disastrous and destructive to the latter. This perspective was dominant in Pacific studies until the 1940s when Davidson (1966) started to decolonize Pacific history (Howe 1977).

[9] The "blood quantum" signifies the percentage of Hawaiian blood. For example, the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act 1920 was designed to rehabilitate Hawaiians by providing homesteads for individuals with at least 50% Hawaiian blood. Concerning the history of blood quantum in Hawaii, refer to Halualani (2001) who investigates how Hawaiianess is constructed in the process of interaction between external categorization and internal self-identification. In her study of the the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, Kauanui (1999) also examines thoroughly the relationship between Hawaiian racialized identity based on the blood quantum criterion and land entitlement (and dispossession).

[10] As for the definition or usage of the terms for ethnic categories, there was a discrepancy between the demographic census and newspaper articles. Even after the term "Native" disappeared as an ethnic category in the demographic census at the end of the 19th century, it was still used in newspapers to signify Hawaiians. On the other hand, by the early 20th century, the term "Hawaiian" did not have standardized usage in newspapers; it meant both Hawaiians and the local whites of Hawaii who sojourned on the mainland. If the newspapers can be considered a good example of how these terms were used in daily conversation in those days, it can be estimated that there was no strict definition of these terms and that their usage varied according to circumstances.

[11] In the table of "(The) Polynesian Race only" in the same census, however, Hawaiians were separated into "Natives: Kanaka Maoli" and "Part Natives: Hapahaole." Their numbers totaled 70,036 and 983, respectively.

[12] The word "Hawaiian" to denote the native people in Hawaii was first used in this census, about fifty years after the name of Sandwich Islands was officially changed to Hawaiian Islands (cf. Clement 1980).

[13] After the Hawaiian Monarchy was overthrown in 1893, Hawaii functioned under two governments before becoming the Territory of Hawaii; the first being the Provisional Government (1893-1894), followed by the government of the Republic of Hawaii (1894-1898).

[14] Lee (1993) examines the United States population censuses between 1890 and 1990. Her study deciphers how the concept of race has been changing in the United States and is sometimes interspersed with the concept of ethnicity, while the official classification has fostered pan-ethnic racial groups. Her investigation of race as a social construction peculiar to a specific socio-political context can also be applied to the case of Hawaiian classification.

[15] The total population of the state of Hawaii was 964,691 in the U.S. Census, while it was 930,271 in the state survey, which counted 9,366 Hawaiians and 166,087 Part-Hawaiians (cf. Nordyke 1989).

[16] See *The Honolulu Advertiser*, 07/19/1994. The total population of the state differed again in the U.S. Census and the state survey. Although the state survey no
longer counted Hawaiians and Part-Hawaiians separately, Barringer and Liu (1994:2) estimated that the number of "full" Hawaiians stabilized at around 8,000.

[18] See also The Honolulu Advertiser, 05/19/1994.
[21] The Hawaiian word 'ohana means "family." In Hawaiian orthography, it needs the 'okina [glottal stop] at the head of the word, although the council did not include it in the organization name.
[26] Concerning the legal investigation of the Native Hawaiian Sovereignty Plebiscite, refer to Yoshino (1998). After examining in detail several legal issues raised by the Plebiscite, he concludes that the Plebiscite was "an unconstitutional method of securing sovereign rights for Native Hawaiians," but that "a Native Hawaiian claim to at least some form of self-government is justified" (Yoshino 1998:475).

In the native politics of Hawaii, a similar issue is provoked by the Akaka Bill (Native Hawaiian Recognition Bill), which recognizes Hawaiians as an indigenous people with sovereignty and has undergone several revisions since 1999. While the bill is disputed as an unconstitutional attempt to divide the people of Hawaii along racial lines, it is also opposed by some of native activists because it would hinder Hawaiians from achieving political independence.

[27] See articles from The Honolulu Advertiser, 11/30/1991, 10/23/1992, 02/11/1993, 09/19/1993, 11/16/1993, 01/29/1995, Star Bulletin, 11/27/1991, 11/30/1991, 11/13/1993, 01/28/1995 and Star Bulletin & Advertiser, 12/02/1991. The problem the shark attack incidents raised was how to deal with the three different issues: that is, public safety, protection of the environment and the sentiments of the Hawaiian people. In the process of discussion, the focal point shifted from the cultural issue per se to the effectiveness of shark hunting. While the latter two issues were discussed concordantly, shark hunting was seen not only as being against environmental and cultural correctness, but also as being ineffective as a reliable method of public safety.

[28] For example, in an interview with Mililani Trask, who was Kia‘aina [Governor] of Ka Lāhui Hawai‘i, she admits that she was once Christian and explains her conversion story in brief as follows:

Personally, I consider that my religious practices are appropriate to all of my blood-lines. I was born and raised a Catholic and went to Catholic school. I don’t reject Christianity; that is the religious tradition of my haole blood. I’m quarter-Chinese, and I’m proud that there is obana to our family that were Buddhists. When my parents were divorced, I left the Catholic Church and for many years was a practicing Tibetan Buddhist. Then five years ago I started learning the traditional practices, the 'awa
ceremony and others, so I’m also a traditional practitioner — which is what finally got me arrested at Halawa. (Ferrar 1994:6)

[29] This section of survey analysis is a summarized version of my previous work (Inoue 1998) that investigates in detail the results of questionnaire.

[30] Armstrong (1990) points out that Hawaiian identity has drawn some support from the establishment of Hawaiian churches. She explains that Hawaiians, as members of the UCC, contrast with Catholic Filipinos as well as Buddhist Chinese. In addition to this contrast, I should mention that intra-denominational separation based on ethnic background strengthens Hawaiian identity. For example, as I explained in Chapter 3, there are several kinds of ethnic churches, such as Hawaiian, Chinese and Japanese, in the Hawaii Conference of the UCC. The religious situation of Hawaiians (even among Christian Hawaiians) is, however, not as simple as Armstrong describes; Catholic, Mormon and Pentecostalist influence cannot be neglected when discussing the current situation of Christian Hawaiian society.

[31] There is a critical difference between the data of the high schools and those of UHM concerning this point. In the responses from Hawaiian students of UHM, none mentions “blood” as a reason for choosing Hawaiian as their ethnic background. As for physical features, only one respondent refers to them.

[32] In the data of UHM, seven respondents (out of 35 Hawaiian students) refer to the land element; the ratio is much closer to that of School A. The difference between School A and School E is probably caused by different environments, but it is not clear at this point whether the environmental difference is social (urban areas where Hawaiians are forced to think about their social position in relation with other ethnic groups vs. rural areas where they are less concerned with it, at least, in everyday life) or educational (for example, whether the importance of the native land is discussed often in the classroom). The amount of data from School I and School O is relatively small and therefore cannot be compared to the other two schools, but one respondent in each school refers to the land element.

[33] It is nearly impossible to generalize the denominational composition of Christian Hawaiians by the results of the questionnaire. Although Schmitt (1973) attempts to reconstruct the religious statistics of Hawaii from 1825 to 1972 and Lamb and Hartnett (cited in The Honolulu Advertiser 05/29/1996; cf. Lamb 1998) present the latest information of the religious affiliation in Hawaii, it is very difficult to single out Hawaiians from the current total membership of each religious organization in Hawaii.

[34] Christianity still comprises the largest portion (54.3%) of students at UHM, but the ratio of “Unaffiliated” is bigger (42.9%) and that of Roman Catholic is smaller (17.1%) than that of the high schools. Although it is too hasty to conclude from the small amount of data of UHM, it can be hypothesized that secularization will proceed among Hawaiians loosely affiliated with the Roman Catholic as they become older. Secularization is also obvious at the state level. According to Lamb and Hartnett (cited in The Honolulu Advertiser 05/29/1996), 51.2% of residents do not claim affiliation with any religion.

[35] There is no critical difference between School A and School E as to the results of question C-7. In the data of UHM, 19 out of 35 Hawaiian students answer “Yes” (54.3%) and 13 respondents answer “No” (37.1%). There is indiscernable difference in the responses between Christian students and non-Christian students.

[36] The breakdown is as follows: 28 out of 86 School A students (32.6%), 24 out of 41 School E students (58.5%), 1 out of 5 School I students, and 1 out of 4 School O
students. Again, there is a critical difference between School A and School E. It is especially remarkable that 15 out of 19 Non-Christian students (78.9%) in School E who claim to know the 'aumakua choose "Yes" to question C-9. In the data of UHM, 9 out of 19 students (47.4%) who know the 'aumakua answer "Yes" to question C-9.

[37] The data of UHM indicates an opposite result, although the amount of data is admittedly small: 6 out of 10 Christian students (60.0%) and 3 out of 9 non-Christian students (33.3%) answer "Yes" to question C-9.

[38] The breakdown is as follows: 45 out of 141 School A students (31.9%), 20 out of 69 School E students (29.0%), 5 out of 15 School I students (33.3%), and 2 out of 10 School O students (20.0%). In the data from UHM, 16 out of 35 students (45.7%) answer "Yes" to question C-12.

[39] There were 110 responses from School A, 53 responses from School E, 13 responses from School I and 7 responses from School O.

[40] There are several problems in using the complete paired comparison design when looking into the composition of cultural identity. First is whether it is appropriate to ask students to compare two cultural elements that seem to be in different domains ("Hawaiian values" vs. "Hawaiian foods") or interdependent of each other ("Hawaiian values" vs. "traditional Hawaiian religion"). In addition some of the cultural elements I ask the students to compare are complex, and they probably have different images and definitions, so that it is difficult to verify whether they compare the same items. Finally my own stance when "analyzing" their perception of Hawaiian identity presents a potential problem. What I do in this analysis is to decompose the image of cultural identity into several elements, and this approach to cultural identity differs from that of native people (cf. Hereniko 1994:407).

[41] In the colonial situation, "land" was chosen by foreigners as a decisive element for "Nativeness," whereas in the current sovereignty movement "blood" is a significant factor in determining "Nativeness or Hawaianness." For example, Mililani Trask stresses the strong relationship between Hawaiian identity and Hawaiian blood in her interview (The American Friends Service Committee 1993):

To be Hawaiian (for political and other reasons) you have to have the koko (blood). I don’t agree with, and do not support, the concept of being "Hawaiian at heart" — primarily because it is not something that is fairly applied to other races. You never hear of someone being “Japanese at heart." There is a racial connotation to that phrase. Being Hawaiian is now critically tied to land entitlements and birthrights. Being Hawaiian requires that you have some Hawaiian blood. There are many Hawaiians who live on the mainland who have never lived at home; they don’t have any cultural background. We still acknowledge that they are Hawaiian, they have the blood, and they always have the opportunity to return and regain their cultural heritage. That is something that you are never too old to reclaim. (AFSC 1993:113-114)

[42] It depends on individual churches whether they can dance hula inside the chapel. However, it is notable that there are different policies regarding the hula issue even among Hawaiian Congregational churches; influenced by the trend of cultural revival some churches actively incorporate hula into the church service, while others ban it entirely from the chapel. I return to this topic in the next chapter.
CHAPTER 6
CHRISTIAN HAWAIIAN IDENTITIES
THROUGH THEIR NARRATIVES OF HAWAIIAN TRADITIONS

Introduction

This chapter aims to reflect on the cultural identity of Christian Hawaiians on the narrative level, by adducing their spoken narratives of Hawaiian tradition as well as Christian faith. Christian Hawaiians can be complicated beings in the post-colonial era. First of all, they are, as Hawaiians, Fourth World people who are a minority in their own land and whose narratives of tradition and identity have become involved in the politics of culture, however unwillingly. Therefore, Hawaiian identity can be a sensitive issue in various social situations. In particular, since the “Hawaiian Renaissance” that began in the late 1960s and the Hawaiian sovereignty movement that gained momentum in the late 1970s, the discrepancy between the culture (narrated by Hawaiians as indigenous people) and the reality (experienced by them as Hawaiian Americans) often causes tension between being Hawaiian and being American. In these political and cultural movements, Hawaiian spirituality and traditional values are often articulately represented and stressed. However, at the same time, the loss of the traditional culture, including spirituality and values, is mourned by some Hawaiians. In general, Hawaiians have become more or less conscious of their act of interpreting and narrating Hawaiian histories, traditions and identities.

Native Christian identity has always involved a potential problem, which is ready to be actualized in a certain condition, like kindling charcoal (Kidwell et al. 2001; Treat 1996a; Thistlethwaite and Engel 1998; Weaver 1998). Their identity can be questioned and problematized in a straight choice between two contradictory beings, that is, being Native and being Christian. As Treat (1996b) mentions, it has been conventionally accepted that “a native who has become wholeheartedly Christian has lost some measure
of native authenticity; a Christian who is still fully native has fallen short of Christian orthodoxy” (Treat 1996b: 5-6). Although it is easy to criticize such a dualistic framework as a socially constructed missionary discourse, it is a difficult task for Native Christians to resolve this dualism and construct a unified identity; they must, at least logically, go through the process of juxtaposing two different beings before trying to integrate them into one unity. Furthermore, in the case of Hawaiian Christians, choosing to be Christian makes their position more complex in the era of the Hawaiian sovereignty movement and cultural revival. While being followers of the traditional religion in such an era is a consistent and comfortable choice that can cause no identity problem but rather strengthen their Hawaiian-ness, being Christian Hawaiians is often difficult. Some Christian Hawaiians are relegated to an ambivalent position especially in the sovereignty movement in which traditional concepts and symbols are brought forward and given a new significance; they often feel awkward when participating in a Hawaiian political rally without knowing beforehand and only to discover that a kahuna [traditional priest] or kumu hula [hula master] would dedicate Hawaiian chants and prayers to native gods and goddesses in the ceremony. It makes no difference in their ambivalent position whether they are conservative or progressive-minded. They must somehow negotiate two different cultures or beings in their pursuit of a stable identity. However, the difficulty which Christian Hawaiians are confronted with indicates the reality of their cultural conditions, which can be shared by non-Christian Hawaiians to some extent, and focusing on it gives another aspect for understanding the dynamics of identity construction of Fourth World peoples.

As I mentioned above, Christian Hawaiians must deal with their complex identity in two dimensions. First, as Fourth World people, they must construct Hawaiian identity in highly political circumstances in which they must somehow ease the tension between being Hawaiian and being American; the tension is partly caused by the discrepancy
between represented culture and lived reality. Second, as Native Christians, they must find a meeting point between two seemingly contradictory identities; that is, being Hawaiian and being Christian. When considering the complex identity of Christian Hawaiians, several questions can be hypothetically asked. How do Christian Hawaiians perceive and construct their cultural identity, not only as Hawaiians but also as Christians? How do they overcome the potential paradox and tension between being Hawaiian and being Christian? How do they deal with traditional culture in the process of becoming Christian? How do they utilize Christian faith and ideology to recreate their Hawaiian identity? How do they utilize Hawaiian cultural heritage to strengthen their Christian faith?

The main purpose of this chapter is to investigate the meaning of being Christian Hawaiian by talking with those who gave me a chance to do ethnographic interviews. With the aforementioned hypothetical questions, I aim at starting constructive dialogues with Christian Hawaiians. Although these questions originate from my prejudices, they are essential conditions of any understanding (Gadamer 1989). My bias may lead their narratives to a specific direction, but a sensitive issue — that is usually latent and averted — can be investigated in such a dialogue. This chapter is a descriptive study of their narratives that are generated dialogically in my interviews. The narratives are, however, presented as if they were monologues. It is partly because I purposefully let them talk stories like monologues in order to keep the continuity of their narratives, but it is also true that I was actually unable to intervene their stories pertinently because of my English ability.

Before considering their narratives of tradition and identity in detail, I would like to introduce a short outline of Hawaiian Christianity. As I mentioned in Chapter 3, Christian denominations that have played a significant role in the history of Hawaiian Christianity are Congregationalist, Catholic, Mormon and Episcopalian. Although other
Protestant denominations are acquiring influence in the current Christian Hawaiian community, these four denominations can be recognized as the leading forces in the history of Hawaiian Christianity. In particular, Congregational churches have had the strongest impact on Hawaiians. Their history started when the first company of missionaries came to Hawaii from New England in 1820. The local organization of Congregational churches was re-established as the Hawaiian Evangelical Association (HEA) in 1854 and became independent of the mainland organization in 1863. Following the merger of denominations on the mainland in the 1930s and the 1950s, the HEA became the Hawaii Conference of the United Church of Christ (UCC) in 1961 and has been active under that name since then (Loomis 1970).

A Hawaiian church is defined differently in different contexts. Generally, a church, which is, or was, composed mainly of Hawaiian members and is currently characterized by Hawaiian style activities, is recognized as a Hawaiian church. Although not all Christian Hawaiians belong to Hawaiian churches, Hawaiian churches occupy a significant niche in the Christian Hawaiian community. At the present time, most Hawaiian churches belong to the Congregational tradition: they belong to the Hawaii Conference of the UCC or once belonged to the HEA, or are so-called independent Hawaiian Churches.\(^{12}\) Christian Hawaiians who are active in these Hawaiian churches are more conscious of the history of their churches and the Hawaiian style and identity that they preserve in church. However, when they look at the past of Hawaiian Christianity, the relation between Congregational churches and the overthrow of the Hawaiian monarchy becomes a difficult issue that they cannot neglect. This is partly because of the fact that some businessmen of missionary descent and the leadership of the HEA were responsible for the overthrow of the monarchy (Walsh 1993). When the official apology to Hawaiians was given by the President of the UCC in the centennial observance of the overthrow held in 1993 (cf. Kameʻeleihiwa 1993), there was a controversy among
Hawaiian ministers at the Hawaii Conference about whether they should give the official apology at the local level. In such a political situation, the problem of identity and faith can be involved in the cultural politics, whether one likes it or not. Christian Hawaiians, especially some of those who belong to the Congregational tradition, find themselves in a delicate position and must actively negotiate Hawaiian identity and Christian identity.

Most of those whom I interviewed are Christian Hawaiians who find themselves in complicated circumstances generated by the Hawaiian sovereignty movement and cultural revival and, therefore, must grapple squarely with the problem of Christian Hawaiian identity. The interviewees can be roughly categorized into the following groups: Hawaiian ordained or lay ministers of Hawaiian churches of the UCC or independent Hawaiian Churches; non-Hawaiian ministers of Hawaiian churches, mainly those of the UCC, who were born and raised in Hawaii or have been in Hawaii for many years, and a few of whom are married to Hawaiians; and Hawaiian lay people who are very active in the church activity. Most of the interviewees are not converts but born into Christian families. The ethnographic present of this survey is from 1994 to 1996 when I intermittently conducted open-ended ethnographic interviews with about 30 interviewees. In most cases, an interview appointment was fixed by phone or mail and in some cases the main point of my interview was explained beforehand in detail. Interviews took from about 1 hour to 5 hours, mostly around 90 minutes. These interviews were tape-recorded by permission, with only a few exceptions in which short interviews were conducted without a recorder.

Severing ‘Aumākua

Religious beliefs permeate into all the spheres of Hawaiian traditional culture, so much so that to talk about Hawaiian tradition often becomes to talk about Hawaiian religion per se. Of course, today’s Hawaiians do not live a traditional religious life as their ancestors did in the pre-contact Hawaii. However, Hawaiian traditional cultures, not
only substantial cultural elements such as *hula* [dance] and *lapa‘au* [medical practice] but also cultural values and worldviews that belong to the epistemological domain (cf. Meyer 1998), have been handed down to present-day Hawaiians, transforming in themselves over the years. The interest in Hawaiian traditional culture increased in the Hawaiian Renaissance of the late 1960s to 1970s and further developed in the 1980s and 1990s, in which traditional values, such as *aloha ‘āina* [love of the land] and *‘ohana* [family], as well as Hawaiian music, dance and language, were revitalized and given new significance. Various Hawaiian traditions, which are represented as prominent cultural symbols in the cultural and political movement, are in many cases heavily religious. Above all, ‘*aumakua* [family god], *kahuna* and *hula* can be conspicuous issues with which Christian Hawaiians must deal and to which they must take a distinct position.

‘*Aumākua* [plural of ‘*aumakua*] are family or ancestor gods to whom individuals offer their allegiance and from whom they expect divine protection and guidance (Emerson 1968; Pukui et al. 1972). They are protectors as far as followers fulfill their obligations and offer worship, but they can potentially punish their followers if any duties are neglected. ‘*Aumākua* take the form of *manō* [shark], *mo‘o* [lizard], *pueo* [owl], *honu* [turtle] and other creatures, as well as *Pele* [volcano goddess] and natural phenomena such as *ānuenue* [rainbow]. They also take the form of wooden images and stones. Because children inherit the ‘*aumakua* of both their father’s and mother’s side, they can logically have a larger number of ‘*aumākua*. The basic knowledge about ‘*aumākua* comes from the writings of Hawaiian scholars (Kamakau 1987 [1964]; Malo 1951; Pukui et al. 1972, 1979), the historical material left by the foreign missionaries and ministers (Bicknell 1890) and the papers written by non-Hawaiian scholars. There are, however, few studies on the ‘*aumakua* belief in the contemporary Hawaiian society (cf. Barrow 1999). This is not because the ‘*aumakua* belief and rituals are completely forgotten, but partly because Hawaiians, especially those who deeply believe in ‘*aumākua* and make
ritual offerings, tend to be reticent about discussing their 'aumākua (Pukui et al. 1972: 41).

As I showed in the analysis of my questionnaire in Chapter 5, knowledge and beliefs of 'aumākua are more or less secretly maintained but practical rituals are not conducted regularly. Barrow (1999)'s study based on his ethnographic interviews draws a similar conclusion. He concludes that traditional beliefs of 'aumākua as family members, who protect their family but also punish wrongdoing by assuming many physical manifestations and sometimes communicating through dreams, persist to the present, although traditional rituals relating to 'aumākua are not currently performed (Barrow 1999: 55-56). In my interview survey, several interviewees mention that young Hawaiians are inspired to search for their 'aumākua, for example, by attending Hawaiian cultural classes at school where elderly persons are invited to talk about Hawaiian culture, including the 'aumakua belief. Such a statement fits in the current cultural climate, indicated by Barrow (1999) and my analysis in Chapter 5 (cf. Inoue 1998), where the 'aumakua belief persists, but the practical rituals are being almost lost in ordinary Hawaiian families.

Generally, elderly Christian Hawaiians tend to assume a cautious attitude toward 'aumākua (Charlot 1986: 445-446). In my interview, after reminiscing about her father who attended and donated to all kinds of churches from Congregational church to Shinto, F. I., a Hawaiian woman in her eighties who was a member of the UCC church, explained how her father had talked about 'aumākua: [a]

As for aumakua, my father never told us. We don’t have any. And he used to tell us, “Don’t let anybody tell me things about aumakua. I’m really afraid of these Hawaiian religious beings.” He said, “Don’t call them back.” (F. I., 01/21/1995)

According to her, her father who was open-minded to almost any religion rejected only the 'aumakua belief. Sitting with her for the interview, K. W., another Hawaiian woman in her seventies belonging to the UCC church, advanced her opinion about 'aumākua:
My mom was part-Hawaiian, part-Chinese. She was Christian. Because she went to the church in Haleiwa, a branch of Ka Makua Mau Loa, she spoke Hawaiian and understood Hawaiian... My mom never talked to us about aumakua. I have heard about it in my youth. I don’t believe in that. It seems to me just like a kahuna, you know, you can be punished by doing something wrong that you are not aware of. (K. W., 01/21/1995)

Although for them the 'aumakua belief is the lost tradition; both of them admit that they do not know about their 'aumakua, they concede that 'aumakua can be dangerous beings that should not be approached without adequate knowledge. This detached attitude, accompanied with a fear that 'aumakua still may have supernatural powers, is one that has been generated for a long time in the missionary tradition, but is not as negative as that of the 19th century missionaries who flatly denied the belief in 'aumakua as paganism and idolatry.

Some elderly Christian Hawaiians strive to establish themselves as modern Christians by severing the 'aumakua belief from the Christian faith, although they neither completely negate the value of the traditional religion nor are they fearful of 'aumakua. For example, F. R., a Hawaiian minister in his sixties of a Hawaiian church of the UCC, replied, when I asked him whether Christian Hawaiians could keep their relationships with 'aumakua, as follows:

It’s human nature that they do. It’s natural that they do. But, once they are true Christians, they won’t say, “The turtle is my aumakua,” but “the turtle used to be my aumakua.” Yeah, it was my parents’ aumakua... But these are the people who say, “My aumakua was such and such.” But you lose this because you have one God and He takes care of everything. He is one that protects you from everything. (F. R., 11/18/1996)

A Hawaiian minister of an independent Hawaiian Church made a similar comment when discussing this topic with me at his church office:

My grandparents did believe in the aumakua, fine. They just believed, they respected that god, because they had no other gods except than they had, except aumakua. But now Christianity came, and then they were converted, baptized as Christian. Now, this is where they’ve gotta draw a line. (11/15/1995)
To my question of whether his church members know their ‘aumākua, he responded by saying:

If they have knowledge, they don’t bring it out, because they hear it as Christians. OK. So church shouldn’t be a place where we discuss aumakua, you know. We don’t come to church to respect Pele, OK. This is not the place for Pele, this is the place for Jehovah. (11/15/1995)

The elderly Hawaiian women and the Hawaiian ministers have slightly different attitudes to the traditional Hawaiian religion: the former have a fear of ‘aumākua while the latter have no particular feeling. However, both sides recognize the traditional religion and Christianity as being different religious worlds that are independent of each other. Such a perspective fundamentally belongs to the missionary dualistic paradigm that separates tradition and modernity, or the era of darkness and the era of light (cf. Hau‘ofa 1994:149). This dualism dominates the Pacific narratives of all the socio-cultural aspects, from religion to political system.

Another perspective that belongs to the dualistic paradigm is a negative one that accepts the 19th century missionary teaching as it is and denies the power of ‘aumākua. After mentioning that hula dedicated to native gods and goddesses and kiʻi [wooden images] of those deities were a part of dead culture, F. Z., a Hawaiian minister of a Hawaiian church in his sixties of the UCC, said:

Aumakua . . . is a pagan part of Hawaiian religion. But it all has to do with idolatry, in that fashion of rock, or the point of arch in the ocean. It has a resemblance of something, and pour the mana [supernatural power] into it, and then out of which they draw mana. To me, a logical stance, a logical sense of looking at it, it’s just a kind of dumb. (F. Z., 11/20/1996)

Then he continued to talk about an incident in his childhood:

I remember sitting on my uncle’s aumakua without knowing, and he was furious, he told us, wife, grandmother to tell the kids get out of aumakua, our riding it. . . . It was a beautiful stone, shaped like a seal, you know, a regular seal, a large one at that, and it was a cold, cold stone, and it was a hot day, and I was on it, hugging it, because it was cool. And he was just out of his mind, but you know, I didn’t know that was his aumakua, who cares? (F. Z., 11/20/1996)
For him, ‘aumākua are not the spiritual beings, but the worshipped materials, such as stones and wooden images, which should be discussed as an example of idolatry and fetishism. In this context, he also denied one of the most popular Christian incorporation of ‘aumākua, that is, the interpretation of ‘aumākua as guardian angels (Pukui et al. 1972: 41). When I asked him what he thought about this interpretation, he responded as follows:

_I don’t think so. . . . There is no guardian angel and any aumakua, it sticks strictly with idolatry. It’s something you fashion your own or you inherit like a shocker. . . . It could be anything material, but not God. God in the truest sense is spirit, is only revelation and fleshes of Jesus Christ. But, otherwise, all other things are sticks and stones. All of them are idolatry. . . . We don’t worship angels, nor do we worship saints, like Roman Catholic supposedly do, not all, but strict Roman Catholics like you find in Guam. In the Scriptures, you find that a restriction on things like that, angels and saints._ (F. Z., 11/20/1996)

_Aumākua as Guardian Angels_

The belief in ‘aumākua as guardian angels is widely accepted among Christian Hawaiians whether they are Catholic or Protestant; however, it is denied resolutely by strict Protestant Hawaiians and the members of a certain independent Hawaiian Church that requires the denouncement of the traditional religion. For example, Y. I., an elderly Hawaiian woman who was very active in church activities of the Hawaii Conference, explained how she came in touch with her ‘aumākua:

_Our Hawaiian people in church never talked about angel. We don’t talk about angels. It seems like . . . it’s more Catholic kind of thing. But I think . . . aumakua is your angel, I mean, that’s how I think. . . . When I address my prayers, I have to do something very Hawaiian. I will call God the Almighty, Keakuamanaloa, I would call my aumakua and I would call my nā kūpuna,[6] my ancestors. And I thank all three the same time._ (Y. I., 05/03/1995)

Her family members are the most powerful members of a local Hawaiian church of the UCC, but the family also comes out of the kahuna background. Therefore, she was raised to have a particular Hawaiian style Christian faith that can be called a Hawaiian version.
of Trinity, including her own style of praying. Whether such Hawaiianized Christianity can cause tension in her religious identity will be investigated in the next chapter.

On the other hand, P. I., a Hawaiian minister in his middle years of a Hawaiian church of the UCC, explained his struggle between Christian theology and Hawaiian tradition. As an ordained minister of the church, he must cope with the ‘aumakua belief more consciously and consider how to locate ‘aumākua in Christian theology. He gave his opinion about ‘aumākua as follows:

I look at aumakua, like guardian angels. . . . For my family . . . manō, the shark, is aumakua. The pueo, the owl, is aumakua of another side of my family, my father’s line. And I was brought up to look at these aumakua as the guardian angels. I mean, the Scripture text tells us how God reused the birds of the air, the fish of the sea, as messengers, messengers to us. I look at that as messengers. . . . It would be difficult, theologically, to say to our people, “Oh, it’s OK. You practice aumakua in that old way, and come to church this way,” because the Bible teaches that you cannot have, you cannot serve two gods. I mean our Christian teaching tells us you cannot serve two gods. But, what I’ve done is just to say you cannot deny our families had aumakua. . . . Someone might say, “Do not worship that, because you are now Christian.” But, no, that’s part of us, then we cannot oki ['oki: cut]. Let other people say, “We no longer respect, understand, or have anything to do with our past.” But, you say, it’s there. It’s there, it’s part of us, part of our culture. That’s part of our life. But, now, we are Christians, and we serve Christian God. . . . We look at these things to help us to understand Christian God. . . . I recognize that our aumakua, the manō and the pueo, was part of my family, before they became Christians. And certain things happen in our family, like family dreams. . . . They name their children by the dreams of the ancestors that came to them. But we’re still Christian. So it’s in the struggle. But I like to say, for me I will give respect to the aumakua as our guardian angels, and not in terms of I worship them that way. (P. I., 04/21/1995)

He does not believe that he can consider the traditional religion, represented by the ‘aumakua belief, and Christianity as completely different worlds. In order to incorporate the existence of ‘aumākua into his Christian faith, he interprets ‘aumākua as mediators who stand between God and himself to help him understand God’s will.

L. F., a Hawaiian minister of a Hawaiian church in her fifties of the UCC, also admitted that ‘aumākua were similar to guardian angles and had a divine power, but
insisted that it did not change the fact that there was only one God for Christians. She explained her personal experience with her ‘aumakua:

One of my family’s aumakua is the pueo, owl. OK. Now I had, had throughout my whole life, many many experiences with owls. . . . I don’t know why. I remember hearing about the owl being our aumakua, no great emphasis is placed on it, it’s just a knowledge thing, you know, because my mother being a Christian woman, a faithful Christian woman. Probably, she would not entice us to be directed to, you know, place a lot of focus in that direction. . . . But I remember a time when my husband and I were going to Hilo in the evening, and because I had to work the next day, and on our drive all the way through the volcano. This is in the evening, when we were leaving . . . not even a mile away from home. . . . This huge owl, a huge white owl, just came in and flew in front of the car. That came forward as we were driving. And it scared me. And we kept on going and the owl flew on the side of the car. And it started going a little faster . . . in front of us. And I told my husband, I said, “Let’s turn you around and go back home, we can always go early in the morning.” And he said, “No, no, no, we can go.” And as we were going, the owl got more frantic and it got came to the point where it actually brushed his wings on the windshield, as we were going. And at end, covering the whole windshield. So that we couldn’t see. And all I could do was to pray. “Lord, are you trying to tell me something? Are you trying to tell me that I should not go because there was danger ahead?” I believed so. My husband wouldn’t listen, when I told him to go around . . . He didn’t listen at that time. And we kept on going, and as we got passed through the volcano area, the car died out on the road. And we were stuck in the middle of nowhere, in the dark. And it was raining. All we could do was to try to push the car off the side of the road. And we had to sleep in the car until morning. He was worried, because . . . he was certain that there was nothing wrong with the car. (L. F., 11/18/1996)

Various folk tales relating how ‘aumākua rescued their followers in trouble were recorded by Hawaiian writers, and Hawaiians often talk about their personal experiences of the same theme. The personal experience she told above can be counted as only one example of such stories. However, the important point here is how she interprets this incident as a Christian and tries to incorporate the traditional religious being into Christian theology. After giving an account of her experience, the Hawaiian minister explained how ‘aumākua as guardian angels can fit into her religious world without denying her Christian faith:

Now, when I think about that owl, I really believed that was my guardian angel, that was sent by God. See, the connection is not the aumakua just by itself. . . . It’s a spooky little god over here doing his own thing? No. The
aumakua is connected to the God, just like how today people talk about the angels, you know. It's just like a people have different visions and angels. But I truly believed even in my young years that God was telling me, was looking out for me. And this was His way of saying it's not safe to go any further. And we didn't listen. (L. F., 11/18/1996)

After explaining other ‘aumakua stories narrated among her family, she continued:

Those are numerous stories and we are foolish to say that is all coincidences, or it's all fantasy, or it's just somebody takes a little bit of the truth and make a legend out of it. No. And I speak from experience that no, we don't understand all of God’s ways. . . . So who are we to say that that was wrong? Not that we worship the aumakua, like people say. And I think people . . . non-participants use the word “worship” in a very wrong way. That is not what . . . we acknowledge. And we have great reverence and respect for everything that comes from the living God. . . . So there is no way that I would happen, able to have it, acknowledge the aumakua as guardian angel without making the connection to the living God. There is no way. And it is only ignorant that people, whether be Hawaiians or non-Hawaiians, tend to slot them into these categories . . . that people worship aumakua and leave it at that. No. I believe that the whole story has not been spoken. But people would pick up only what they want to be fascinated by, and hang on to it, and pass it. (L. F., 11/18/1996)

The dichotomy between the traditional religious world and Christianity undeniably preexists the missionary dualistic discourse. In this dichotomy is established the missionary discourse that places the traditional religion and Christianity in the oppositional relationships between “primitive” and “civilized,” “pagan” and “Christian,” and “traditional” and “modern.” P. I. and L. F., the two ministers I cited above, have different views from the dualistic perspectives that either consider the traditional religion as something dangerous, confidently disassociate oneself form it to construct the modern Christian identity, or flatly negate its value. They intend to overcome the missionary legacy and try to build a bridge between the two religious worlds. Both of them have a respect for ‘aumākua and try to incorporate them as angels or messengers into their Christian faith. One of them expresses his struggle of groping for the way that does not negate either Hawaiian spirituality or Christian faith, and the other criticizes the outsiders’ perspective that she believes wrongly applies the word “worship” to describe her spiritual relationship with ‘aumākua.
Conservative Christian Hawaiians relate mysterious experiences with 'aumākua as well. K. I., an elderly Hawaiian woman of a Hawaiian church of the UCC whose 'aumakua was ōnueunue, told me a story about how she and her husband barely escaped a traffic accident while driving because of her 'aumakua's warning. Her story is similar to that of the above-cited owl story, except that she escaped trouble by heeding the warning of ōnueunue. She seemed to recognize ōnueunue as her guardian, but not so positively as do the aforementioned two Hawaiian ministers who very consciously incorporate the existence of 'aumākua into their Christian faith. She explained how at the end she had understood her mysterious experience with the rainbow, when talking with a minister who visited her church:

One time we sat down and I was talking to one minister that had come to visit us, and then, I talked about it. And he said, “Never mind, because you are Christian, the rainbow is the covenant of God, maybe it’s alarming you to get out of there before everything go wrong.” I said, “I hope that’s what it is, and not the other way, because we were taught never to deal with the past. Even my grandmothers and grandfathers, they didn’t want to talk about that kind.” (K. I., 11/19/1996)

The elderly woman felt relieved when she heard the minister’s interpretation of the rainbow as a messenger of God, but she seemed to be bound by a conventional thinking that distantiates the traditional religion as do F. I. and K. W., the two elderly Hawaiian women I quoted first in this chapter. When I asked her about how she would respond if her grandchildren asked about 'aumākua, she explained as follows:

Well, they do. They do ask questions, because they have it in school now. . . Kupunas come to the school and they talk about it, see. So they come home and ask grandma, “What is aumakua?” I say, “It’s just like a guardian angel.” “Why?” “Oh, you know our kupuna say . . . some people get an owl, some people get a shark, some people get one stone, and you know, all kinds of stuff, or lizard or some kind of caterpillar. . . . I think that in the past they need that kind. People who were smart, they had that. But today, we are modern, we are Christain, we believe everything is to God now. Not that kind, but to God. Because He created everything on this earth.” . . . But, if they say, “How come our kupuna talk about that?” I say, “Well, maybe she is just telling you a story, because it did happen a long time ago.” . . . It’s OK to talk about it as a story. But not as the way they did worship that, yeah. I’ll believe in that. Maybe, incidents do happen, but yet, you think God is doing it. . . . It’s culture-wise, you know,
just the culture is different, because you tell you what old people used to
do. But it's not what you are gonna be doing, because you already know
the good and the bad. (K. I., 11/19/1996)

The interpretation of 'aumākua as angels or messengers sent by God is adopted
not only positively to incorporate the traditional religious beliefs into Christian faith, but
also passively to accept mysterious experiences, which are very Hawaiian in themselves
but require a Christian explanation. The former narrative — represented by those of P. I.
and L. F. — aims at the creation of Hawaiian Christian theology consciously, while the
latter narrative — such as K. I.'s — deals with Hawaiian spiritual experiences only as a
story to preserve a conventional Christian faith. At present, the positive attitude toward
the traditional religious world, which is seen in the former narrative, seems to have
become widespread among the younger Hawaiian ministers. However, they are currently
struggling to create a new Hawaiian Christian theology in church in which there are
various attitudes to the traditional religion. There are still many Christian Hawaiians who
are not willing to talk about their 'aumākua even if they know about them, because they
do not want to be misunderstood or they simply detest 'aumākua. In this situation, the
younger Hawaiian ministers must pay enough attention to various voices of their church
members. That 'aumākua are not talked about openly can be recognized in the statement
of I. J., a Hawaiian minister of a UCC Hawaiian church:

I do respect aumakua, too. What I tell you is not something that I always
preach to the people. This is my own feeling, but so, for me, now I have to
be careful what I say, but I believe, you know. Our aumakua from my
grandmother was Pele, and my other side probably is puco. I have respect
for both. I do not worship, but I have a very much aloha [love] and respect
to both, to Pele and to the owl. . . . In my early years, I saw an owl,
something very special happened to me. But other people, I know, they
don't know, or they know but they don't say. That's unfortunate. A lot of
things sometimes people don't say, they know but they won't say it to you,
because if they say it to you, then people will misuse it or misunderstand it
a lot. (I. J., 04/20/1995)
Dichotomizing Kāhuna into Good and Evil

The ‘aumakua belief is fundamentally a matter of the personal relationship with the traditional religious world, which is usually kept in each individual’s mind and not openly narrated. Unless it is exposed as practical offering rituals in which individuals actively participate, it usually does not become a serious problem for their religious identity. However, the relation with kāhuna [plural of kahuna] is a different issue. Kāhuna are experts in all professions. There were various kinds of kāhuna in the pre-contact Hawaii, such as religious specialists (priests, prophets, magicians), medical doctors and craftsmen, all of which had strong connections with the spiritual world (Kamakau 1964). At present, the term kahuna denotes mainly the following two types: kahuna ‘anā’anā [sorcerer], and kahuna lā‘au lapa‘au, or kahuna lapa‘au [medical doctor]. When the term is used without any specification in daily conversation, however, it often implies the sorcerer. A negative perspective that recognizes all kāhuna as religious specialists with evil powers, originates in the 19th century missionary discourse. On the other hand, another perspective, which distinguishes two types of kāhuna, originates in the counter movement to the missionary discourse in the latter half of the 19th century. In the 1860s, official licenses were issued for kāhuna and the Hawaiian Board of Health was established to institutionalize Hawaiian medicine. As Pukui et al. (1979) indicates, such a movement aimed to clear up “a confusion or overlapping of functions of the helpful kahuna and the hurtful kahuna” (Pukui et al. 1979: 160-161) and to preserve an acceptable part of traditional medical practices. As a result, however, kāhuna ‘anā’anā who did also healing and counseling were denied their raison d’être and vested with a negative image.

If Christian Hawaiians have personal contact with kāhuna in any way or conduct kahuna practices individually, it may cause tension in their religious identity because their relation with the traditional religious world is more visible. As I described in
Chapter 3, in the latter half of the 19th century, the foreign ministers of the HEA repeatedly criticized Christian Hawaiians, even Hawaiian ministers, for asking for kāhuna’s attendance when they were sick or dying. These foreign ministers recognized that Christian Hawaiians allotted physical well-being to native gods, and spiritual salvation to the Christian God. They saw only an inconsistency in the faith of Christian Hawaiians who prayed to Jehovah before a meal but asked ‘aumākua for help when taking medicine (Bicknell 1890). Such tension and role allotment between the two religious worlds are still recognized among present Christian Hawaiians. A non-Hawaiian minister, who had worked for more than seven years for a Hawaiian church of the UCC, pointed out that how to deal with the traditional religion is a sensitive issue for Christian Hawaiians and mentioned that some church members may still have relations with kāhuna:

Some of the more conservative Christians are carrying on the missionaries’ tradition of having cut off all of those traditional religions in that way. But, others are able to say, “We don’t have to take the missionary culture along with the religion.” But, I think that it’s a very complicated question. Different people resolve it for themselves very differently. I have never had discussion directly with those in my church, but I know that many of them experience that tension in some way. For example, some of older women, women in their fifties belong to hula hālau [hula school] ... and sometimes there’s a thing’s going around, like that they have a family problem at home, I know several of them went to see a Hawaiian kahuna person to try help them resolve it, but they would never tell me that. I only know that indirectly. So, I know a traditional belief is still there. (11/21/1994)

In general, Christian Hawaiians today accept the dualistic view that distinguishes the good kahuna and the evil kahuna. They have a cultural relativist attitude toward the former, kāhuna lā‘au lapa‘au, and acknowledge the value of the kahuna’s medical knowledge and spirituality. On the other hand, they deny the deeds of the latter, kāhuna ‘anā‘anā, having mixed feelings toward their spiritual powers. For example, P. I., the Hawaiian minister of the UCC who recognized his ‘aumākua as guardian angels,
acknowledged kāhuna lā’au lapa’au by pointing out the similarity between their belief and Christian belief:

You know, there are different types of kahuna practices. . . . I look at the kahuna laau lapaau, the kahuna anaana. As you know, there are specific practices. Now, I don’t agree with everything that the kahuna anaana might do, but kahuna laau lapaau . . . no, the term does not mean that they are witch doctors. The term means that they are the native healers who use native herbs. And many of the native healers pray to the old gods . . . and their use of the plant, that is traditional style. . . . They say, “Thank you akua [god] for showing me this plant, and I maybe use it for healing.” . . . Before they give the medication, they say to their client, “You must pray. You must live a spiritual life in order for these things to work.” So, they coincide with the Christian belief, because they’re speaking out there faithfully. So in terms of my view, the kahuna laau lapaau . . . I support it. They are the doctors. Consider the doctors in Hawaiian culture. . . . You know, there are also kahuna who are counselors, who give counsel in the matter of law, in the matter of human relations. . . . But I don’t agree with the kahuna anaana, and I don’t believe that they really pray somebody to death, you know. (P. I., 05/09/1995)

While there are those who do not believe in the magical powers of kāhuna ʻanāʻanā, there are others who affirm their ability to place curses, though they deny kahuna ʻanāʻanā practices from an ethical standpoint. F. R., the elderly Hawaiian minister of the UCC who insisted Hawaiians lost ʻauumākua once they were converted to Christianity, mentioned why he believed in the witchcraft power of kāhuna ʻanāʻanā, although admitting that their power was becoming less influential:

Well, there is not too many of them left nowadays. But . . . it’s just like a fortune telling. I tell you that you’re gonna be very sick, and you know, in the next few days, you’re gonna be sick, really really sick. Due to the power of suggestion, somehow the person becomes sick. So, they pray on this, and they pray on this, and they pray on this. . . . I’m sure they have some kind of witchcraft power, you know. . . . I say that, because the Lord gives us, everybody a certain gift, everybody all kinds of gift, a gift to play the piano, a gift to preach, a gift to sing, everybody has a gift. And these people are of course . . . they have this gift where they’re gonna pray and pray and this guy dies, you know. And, in fact, one was buried up in the church yard. One of them, anaana. . . . When I was young, I knew one or two, and people were lot of afraid of them and nobody would associate with them. But now, you know, people are not afraid of them. Of course, they don’t make fun of them, but they aren’t somebody to be feared all the time. (F. R., 11/18/1996)
Both of the Hawaiian ministers cited above negate the deeds of kāhuna ʻanāʻanā.

However, one denies the effectiveness of their magical powers (at least superficially), but the other affirms their ability to place a curse on people by the Christian reasoning. Such different feelings to kāhuna ʻanāʻanā probably come from different socio-cultural circumstances in which they were brought up. Whether they are actually acquainted with kāhuna ʻanāʻanā in person might be also a critical factor.

Of course, there are very conservative Christian Hawaiians who reject kāhuna almost completely, as well as their gods and goddesses, and accept only the traditional medical knowledge. For example, K. I., the elderly Christian Hawaiian who gave an account of her experience with ānuenue, said:

Well, they got all kinds. They got the kind that could make one person chase you, when the person don’t like you, and then . . . oh, there’s so many of them. There is only one or two good ones. One that practices medicine, uses all the herbs, yeah. That’s what we are being taught, but not by kahunas. It’s by our grandmas and grandpas, so father, mother, who knows what to do. So, that’s what we learned. And then, all these things I tried to keep a record. All the different plants they grow, what purpose, what can you use this for, and all that. But we were also reminded that ever we use that for medicine, you pray to God. You don’t pray to the forest goddess or whatever, because she don’t get back, yeah. And that’s how I believe that. . . . Some people might tell you that the forest belongs to Laka [hula goddess] and that if you pick the lehua glasses that belong to Pele, it’s going to rain. I say, “Well, I tell you what. If you had bad thinking of that kind, it might happen. But if you ask God to be with you, while you get this thing, nothing is gonna happen to you.” (K. I., 11/19/1996)

She replaces ʻauumākua and native gods with the Christian God in the traditional religious-medical system, accepting only useful traditional medical knowledge. She admits that medical kāhuna are good ones, but she wants to cut any relation with them; because even kāhuna lāʻau lapaʻau belong to a past era which she wishes to distance herself from.

All the aforementioned statements on kāhuna are from those who know about kāhuna in theory; in other words, their knowledge does not come from their practical experiences. However, even among Christian Hawaiians, there are some who have been
raised in families that have strong *kahuna* backgrounds. In fact, it is possible to find Christian Hawaiians, especially those over middle age, who have *kahuna* ancestors a few generations ago. Y. I., the elderly Hawaiian woman who explained how she prayed in a Hawaiian style, talked about how her father had obtained spiritual powers from her great grandmother, before talking about how she acquired spiritual powers to see visions:

I think I need to tell you a bit about my background... I come out of a *kahuna* background... You understand that there were many different kinds of *kahunas*. And my great grandmother was perhaps what you call sorcerer, witch... Anaana. But to our family, they were not that. They were all healers. And there's a few of them misused the powers, so everybody got... you know, called witch doctors, sorcerers. My father was also schooled to carry on tradition and inherit the last breath... My father would have to put his mouth on her mouth, and she would... then breathed her last breath to my dad. And then he would inherit this great spiritual powers. Well, Hawaii was changing. My father was born in 1890, and when he was young there was already overthrow of the monarchy. And my great grandmother foresaw that Hawaii was changing very rapidly and... the *kahuna* anaana was, we were already underground. I mean they were practicing underground. They couldn't practice openly... And so by doing that, she called my dad to her deathbed, and said, “All that I taught you, I am going to take with me, so that you would be free to follow the religion that your mother has already chosen.” My grandmother had already become Christian... with some visions or something like that, she decided, she wanted to become Christian and have nothing to do with the old religion. And at that moment my father said he could not hear, he could not see, he could not feel all that he learned... And so, as children, we were raised as Christians, never talked about the Hawaiian religion... until in the 80s. My father lost a large artifact collection he had collected. He was a historian... And he said to me, “These are material things I have lost. But I have to share with you... the spiritual things that I have within me.” (Y. I., 05/03/1995)

When Christian Hawaiians, whose families have been Christian for generations, talk about how their ancestors first converted to Christianity, they often refer to an influential ancestor who had strong spiritual powers and played a critical role in converting the whole or part of family. In such Christian families that have strong connections with the traditional religion, some family members feel stress between the two religious worlds after being pressed to choose Christianity over the traditional religion. Although there are some rare individuals who live in the synchretic world in which both Christian faith and the traditional religious practices coexist, for most Christian Hawaiians who have a
traditional religious background, how to live in the two religious worlds can be a difficult issue that they want to approach cautiously. The above-cited elderly woman is one of those who live between the two religious worlds. In today’s socio-cultural condition, created by the sovereignty movement and cultural revival since the 1980s, her (and others like her) religious background is exposed and sometimes her unique ability is utilized.

Different from the ‘aumakua belief, there is no place for kāhuna in Christian theology. In Christian Hawaiian narratives, first of all, they are divided into two types: kahuna ‘anā’anā and kahuna lā’au lapa’a’au. Then, the former is negated as an undesirable part of the tradition, while the latter is respected as a good part of the tradition. However, even the latter is accepted by only the cultural relativist perspective and never actively incorporated into Hawaiian Christianity; although their practices, such as folk medicine and counseling, are appropriated by Christian Hawaiians.[7]

Appropriating Hula in Hawaiian Churches

Hula is one of the most prominent and visible elements of Hawaiian traditional culture. Its popularity has grown since the 1970s when several annual hula competitions started (Stillman 1996). Hula was originally a dance whose purpose was to honor gods and chiefs. Arm and hand movements were used to describe the lyrics’ meanings. At present, hula is classified into two types: hula kahiko [ancient hula] and hula ‘auana [modern hula]. The 19th century missionaries tried to eradicate hula because they regarded it as an obscene heathen dance; they believed that hula was against not only Christian teachings but also their Puritan culture that emphasized the significance of discipline. In the 1880s, however, hula was revived by Kalākaua, the then king of the Hawaiian monarchy (Barrère et al. 1980). Hula kahiko is the dance that was revived to be played publicly in Kalākaua’s time. It is danced as interpretations of the Hawaiian chants and is accompanied by traditional musical instruments, such as pahu [drum] and ipu heke [gourd drum]. Differing from this, hula ‘auana is usually danced to the melodious
contemporary Hawaiian songs with stringed instruments. It developed at first as a show for tourists and now is evolving outside the tourist industry. *Hula* is performed not only in a daily context, but as a potent cultural symbol as well, and is utilized in the sovereignty movement as well as the tourist industry (Desmond 1997; Kamahele 1992).

*Hula* symbolizes the resurgence of traditional culture. It is currently gaining popularity with the younger generation in Hawaii, both Hawaiians and non-Hawaiians, as well as both non-Christians and Christians. It is common to see young Hawaiians who dance for the *hula hālau* and at the same time are active in the church activity. As a result, *hula* can be a more conspicuous topic and problem for Christian Hawaiians than the other traditional cultures. When I asked a Hawaiian minister in his sixties of a Hawaiian church of the UCC about whether Christian Hawaiians could offer *ho‘okupu* [tribute] to native gods, he denied it promptly and, continuingly, explained how he had discussed the problem of religious conflict involved in *hula* with his church member who was a *hula* performer:

Sometime I entered into dialogue with the person who has got through the hula, she is now a kumu hula. We had a long discussion about the traditional religion and Christian faith. Because part of their graduation was to go to Laka, and make offering... So, I didn’t say to her, “You cannot do that.” I said to her, “Who are you? Are you a Christian by faith and practice? Or simply a Christian by a fact that you once in a while come to church? And you consider yourself Christian because of your baptism? But if you are a Christian by faith and practice, you have to decide yourself whether or not going and making offering to Laka is what you want.”... That’s all. I don’t tell them what they should do or should not do. They have to make that, because they’ve got to live with them themselves. (01/18/1995)

The Hawaiian minister does not force his church member to withdraw from the religious ceremony of *hula*. It is partly because he is vaguely aware that there can be more than one resolution of this problem. What we must consider here is not a clear-cut choice between being a Christian or being a member of *hula hālau*. It is rather a question of how Christian Hawaiians can resolve the potential conflict between the traditional Hawaiian religion and Christianity. Some Christian Hawaiians may not pay attention to the
potential contradiction between the Christian faith and the traditional Hawaiian practices, such as dedicating *hula* to a native god or goddess in the traditional religious ceremony. However, in the circle of Christian Hawaiians who are more conscious of the resurgence of traditional culture, the conflict between the two religious worlds is becoming too prominent to neglect. I asked F. I., the elderly Hawaiian woman who professed a detached attitude to *ʻaumākua*, about whether Christian Hawaiians could dance *hula kahiko* that praised a native god or goddess. Her response is an indication of the culturally difficult situation that exists today:

That’s why it has caused confusion among the people, some people, you know........ I have a question in myself, where does culture end and where does religion start, where can I draw a line........ between culture and religion........ I have a question in myself........ Because I think the younger children, they don’t really understand whether they’re worshipping, dancing to the god or goddess, or dancing hula in part of culture. (F. I., 01/21/1995)

Different from the *ʻaumakua* belief and the *kahuna* practices, *hula* has been gradually incorporated into the church service of the UCC Hawaiian churches in spite of the immanent potential conflict. It is not only the tourist industry or the sovereignty movement but also the Hawaiian churches that require a cultural symbol that represents and strengthens one’s sense of being Hawaiian. *Hula* is also recognized by some Hawaiian Christians as a symbol that bridges Hawaiian tradition and Christian faith. At present, however, there is a great variance in individual Hawaiian churches of the UCC concerning the introduction of *hula* into the church service. Their different policies toward *hula* are often attributed to the characteristics of Congregationalism that insists on the autonomy and self-governance of each member church, while the Roman Catholic churches follow the Vatican’s order of either banning or allowing *hula* in services.¹⁸ Progressive Congregational churches are enthusiastic to introduce *hula* into the church ceremony. Some allow *hula kahiko* and Hawaiian chants inside the church on particular occasions. For example, one Hawaiian church dedicates *hula kahiko* during the memorial
service for a chief who is historically connected to the church. On the other hand, conservative churches are reluctant to introduce hula into the church ceremony and some of them do not allow any type of hula inside the church. Between these extremes, several Hawaiian churches assume a moderate position in order to incorporate so-called Christian hula occasionally into the church service and ceremony. This type of hula is composed of only hand movements that interpret Scripture texts, such as the Lord’s Prayer, and Christian songs. It does not have a formal name, but is often called “Christian hula,” “interpretive hula,” “hand-movement hula,” “spiritual dancing” or “interpretive dancing.”

Hawaiian churches of the UCC, which refuse the introduction of hula into church, do not totally neglect the current movement of Hawaiianization of the worship service in church. They are feeling pressure from the outside that has brought about tension concerning this issue. A non-Hawaiian minister, who had been working as a minister for 15 years in Hawaii, mentioned the difficulty of changing the characteristics of his church, responding to my inquiry about the relation between Hawaiian tradition and Christian faith in his church. He said:

In this church, we are trying to be sensitive to that issue. Hawaiians themselves struggle, because the kupuna before took maybe a hard line stance and wouldn’t let them bring cultural things into the church. For example, in this church, my Hawaiians all play guitar and ukulele on Saturday night, but refused to play it in the church, because they’ve been taught that’s for the luau [lā‘au: party], but it’s not for church. In church, we do sing with the instrument, that is piano and organ, that’s it. And they come for the carry-over from the kupuna. Over the years we modified that, loosened their feeling on that. But our people are still hesitant. I think that they could have hula dancing as a part of worship service, I personally am open to it, but they’re . . . still coming out of that mind, that hula is something you don’t do in the church. Really I think as much as anything they’re respecting elders. Maybe more than their respecting the God, but I’m not sure. And that’s OK. And we don’t push the issue. But I see them loosening up with this, as we go along. So, this church is not as hard line as some would be, and yet is not as liberal on that as others would be. And this congregation, and Hawaiians here, are evolving, they are in transition in this issue. (05/09/1995)
It is difficult to change the traditions that have long been rooted in church, because in Hawaiian society the younger people are required to respect *kūpuna*, who established and observed such traditions. Another non-Hawaiian minister, whose church was well-known as a very conservative Hawaiian church in the UCC, described the current situation of his church, when I pointed out that conservative churches draw a strict line between *Hawaiian tradition and Christianity*:

Your comment at the beginning is accurate for this church. Some of the older people, not just age-wise but even in their thinking kind of older people, forbid any hula in church at all. They want none of it. But, some of the younger people are more progressive and thinking either younger in mind or younger in body, you know, they see hula as being compatible with Christian worship, if it’s Christian chanting, and all of that is from the Bible, and the worship. So, presently this church does not allow hula in the worship services. They don’t like even hand-movement hula. The older people have a strong feeling that they don’t want it. But, there is others who are giving support, who are more sympathetic. So, my feeling is that within a few years, there could be a change, where people actually tolerate Christian hula in the church. But it needs, in my opinion, it needs more teaching, because many people still perceive hula as a devil worship. They don’t want any of it. But, others are realizing, and saying “No, it’s from, dancing is from God.” But you need to be careful and do it in a way to honor God. So, it’s a tension, right now in our church, it’s a bit of tension of this issue. (11/14/1996)

Even the progressive churches, which are currently using *hula* for the church service or ceremony, went through a similar situation when they first tried to introduce *hula* into church. According to a Hawaiian minister of the UCC, there was a preliminary action in Hawaiian Congregational churches that tried to introduce *hula* into church in the late 1960s and early 1970s. He was asked by the committee to help organize the workshop for Christian *hula*, which was originally planned by a Hawaiian female *hula* performer. Although he called all the Hawaiian churches, he was not able to obtain consent from any of them and the plan was deadlocked. Such an action was launched at the start of the Hawaiian Renaissance, but it was still too premature to introduce *hula* into Hawaiian churches in which conservative views about *hula* were dominant. After the transition period, however, several Hawaiian churches of the UCC under the direction of
Hawaiian ministers gradually succeeded in introducing *hula*, Hawaiian chants, and stringed and traditional instruments into the church service and ceremony. P. I., the Hawaiian minister who viewed *ʻaumākua* and *kāhuna lāʻau lapaʻau* in a positive light, explained how he had introduced *hula* and other Hawaiian cultural elements into church:

> We had a hula group from Maui. . . . They were Christian hula group, and shared the Christian hula dances. There was a kumu hula who taught Christian hula dancing, and she had a group and they would go to different churches and share the ministry with the church people, you know, like singing the Lord’s Prayer in Hawaiian and there’s girls dancing, hand movement hula. . . . Now they realized the Hawaiian church people were very conservative, very suspicious of the hula dance in the church, so they made a video of their performance, and they sent that and asked, you know. I could use it at a discussion time when I were with kupuna. OK. We showed the video to kupuna. Now, we had a mixture of Hawaiian kupuna and non-Hawaiian kupuna, who are the members of this church, to come for the discussion. You know, what’s surprising to me is that Hawaiian kupuna saw no problem with that, but haole [Caucasian] kupuna was offended, and so I asked, “Why are you offended?” “The swing of the hips.” I said, “What does that mean?” “Well, it is, you know, it is a reminder of the rascal-ness or the mai [maʻi: genital] kind of dances.” . . . I said, “If your mind is in that gutter, that’s what you’re going to see. If your mind is for God, and for beauty, you’re not going to do that. You’re gonna see that in a part of movement of the telling the story. The swing of the hips is part of the rhythm, that they must move to tell the story.” . . . Maybe five years ago, they would not have the hula. But we have to challege our people, because we have been so brainwashed to think only this, only way you can worship God. . . . You can only sing the hymns with the piano and organ, not with the guitar and ukulele. Why not? So I challege that. . . . Today, we have our own hula . . . in our church, and do the ministry. We have a group in our own, that case Hawaiian instrument, guitar, ukulele, the ohe hano ihu [ʻohe hano ihu: nose flute], the nose flute, the ipu, the drums, we can, we do that, and it’s quite a celebration of our culture in the church. We use those instruments for every Sunday service. They play along with the organ and piano. In sometimes, no organ and piano, just a ukulele and guitar. (P. I., 05/09/1995)

In the movement of the cultural revival, several Hawaiian churches of the UCC intentionally introduce Hawaiian cultural elements into church, in addition to the already established Hawaiian style service, in order to represent their Hawaiian identity. *Hula* as a strong cultural symbol is suited for this purpose, but the potential conflict involved in *hula* causes the Hawaiian churches to modify its form and content to be compatible with Christian teachings. The problem is to what extent they can Christianize *hula* in order for
it to be accepted by the majority of church members, including non-Hawaiian members. In general, Christian hula danced during the Lord’s Prayer and other Christian chants seems to be becoming gradually accepted by most of the UCC Hawaiian churches, or at least have some possibility of being incorporated in the near future. However, it remains difficult for the majority of Hawaiian churches to introduce the original hula, that with the lower body movement, into the church ceremonies and services. It is even more difficult to incorporate hula kahiko into church, because this type of hula is easily associated with the traditional religion by some of the church members even if it is not dedicated to a particular god or goddess.

What is the Acceptable Hula for Christian Hawaiians?

As I described above, Hawaiian churches of the UCC have various attitudes and policies for introducing hula into church. However, it is not only inside but also outside the church where Christian Hawaiians must deal with the issue of hula. They come into contact with hula regularly: for example, when watching a hula entertainment or dancing hula in a party, and they must act in accordance with their own judgement and feelings. Of course, most Christian Hawaiians do not strictly prohibit themselves from enjoying hula as did the 19th century missionaries, but they certainly have their own definitions of which hula is acceptable and which is not, more or less under the influence of the missionary discourse. Usually they do not have to consider the issue of hula so consciously and critically, but they are forced to do so in the cultural circumstances where Hawaiian traditional culture is highly narrated and discussed. Such circumstances are generated in the cultural and political movements that manipulate various cultural symbols to represent the Hawaiian-ness. It is in this context that Christian Hawaiians’ perception of the relation between Hawaiian identity and Christian identity is exposed and inspected on the conscious level. Hula is a strong cultural issue that tests their perception of Christian Hawaiian identity.
Some elderly Christian Hawaiians articulate their discontent with hula, especially its introduction into the church service under the influence of the cultural revival. For example, F. I., the elderly Hawaiian woman who lamented that the younger Christians uncritically participated in the traditional hula, expressed her personal feeling as follows:

For me personally, I would think we should not sing a certain song inside the church. You would sing it outside the church. . . . I would not like to see hula kahiko inside the church. I know now the teachers of halau, kumu hula, they are teaching ancient religion, they are going back to that. I question they are going back. . . . I feel ancient hula is . . . hula of the rites whatever in their own, you know. . . . So I would not like to have it in a Christian church. (F. I., 01/21/1995)

K. I., the elderly Hawaiian woman who related her experience with anuenue, expressed a similar feeling to hula kahiko. She complained that the church was becoming involved in the resurgence of hula and introducing the original hula that was more dynamic than Christian hula:

If you look at the dances, especially in Honolulu, even the teachers teach hula . . . yeah, you can see. It’s in the open to show who you worship. They never, never worship God. It’s always a certain goddess or a certain god. . . . If they gonna go put lehua to the place, and it’s a kind of worship. Always Pele first. Now where is our Creator? I can’t understand that. And if you listen to their chants, it’s all different gods. . . . I know that we used to do motions in our church, but we never moved our bodies. We just cited, telling the story in the Bible, telling how it was. Then, make your hands, and that’s all. It’s just like a sign language, yeah. That’s the way we used to do. . . . We did only with our hands and there was no swaying or no body-move-around, or whatever. . . . But today, they move this way and all that, on a sudden in a church. I’m just so angry, you know. I don’t care to watch hula. . . . To me, it can be more vulgar. (K. I., 11/19/1996)

As seen in these statements, elderly conservative Christian Hawaiians tend to have a negative attitude toward hula kahiko, especially one that honors a native god or goddess, by directly connecting it to the traditional religion. However, the elderly Christian Hawaiians do not necessarily negate all hula. They watch hula as entertainment and some of them dance hula themselves. For them, the important point is, first of all, whether hula is danced inside or outside the church. If hula is danced inside the church, most of the
elderly Christian Hawaiians think that it must be at least Christian hula, one that
terprets the Biblical stories by using only hand movements.

In general, the younger Christian Hawaiians tend to take a liberal position on
hula, although they have different opinions as to the introduction of hula into the church
service. For them, what is the most significant factor in deciding what is acceptable hula
for Christians is the content; that is, to whom the hula is dedicated. Their perception of
hula is in marked contrast to that of the elderly, who tend to feel antipathy to hula kahiko
only because it is the ancient type of hula. A Christian Hawaiian in her forties, who was
an active member of an independent Hawaiian Church and whose families were
Hawaiian entertainers, explained how she dealt with hula:

I dance a hula about the beautiful mountains, this island is that, that island
is that. But I won’t dance a hula to go and praise Pele, and go to the
volcano and sacrifices, which is what a lot of Hawaiians are doing now,
even though they’re never brought up to believe that. That was like, they
want to go back to sovereignty movement, that type of thing. And I’ll go
with the sovereignty, I believe, yes a lot of lands were lost . . . but I believe
in God, and I don’t believe in I have to go back to praying . . . Pele, Lono,
and all of these gods. . . . What I was told by my auntie when I grew up, is
that you respect those gods but there is only one God, you know. So, it’s
not that we put down those people, but we don’t do it. So, when I go to
hula, it’s like saying, “Not dancing, that’s all.” “I will do this song, I will
do that song.” Over here, we are not forced to not dance it. It’s a personal
decision, I just won’t dance it. It’s, you know, it would be feeling, my
preference type of thing. And by the same token, when I talk to my sisters
and cousins, I come to find out we all feel the same way. But, we never
really talked about it before. Just recently, we have talked about it.
(04/11/1995)

Among generally progressive Christian Hawaiians, the acceptable hula is one that is not
dedicated to a native god or goddess. As for hula danced outside the church, this
perception is widely accepted among Christian Hawaiians. However, even if hula is not
related to the traditional religion and is danced outside the church, the lower body
movement of hula is disapproved of by some of them as something inappropriate for
Christians, because not all but some movements look sensualistic in their eyes. Such an
attitude is detected in the following statement of F. Z., the Hawaiian minister who denied the 'aumakua belief as idolatry:

Family is getting together for luau, and enjoying some loving, caring type of hula dances, what have to do with sky, moon, stars, and flowers, and people, and I think it's fine. But when we get into some vulgarity, or paganism, forget it. (F. Z., 11/20/1996)

A non-Hawaiian minister working among Christian Hawaiians for a certain Protestant congregation summarized the point as follows:

Hula is art, dancing is art, music is art ... you know, painting is art. It depends on who you are worshipping with the art you have. . . . Is music bad? Music isn't bad. Depends on who you’re worshipping. So if the kahiko hula is used to worship Pele, then, yeah, it’s bad for Christian church. But if it is used to worship God, then it’s OK. . . . It’s not the dance, it’s who is being worshipped, you know. (11/15/1996)

Following his seemingly liberal definition of the acceptable hula, however, he insisted that an undesirable part of the body movement had to be eliminated:

There were certain moves that come into the hula. You know like a . . . for instance, to excite sexual lust or something like that. Those you can . . . clean out. (11/15/1996)

As described above, the perception of acceptable hula on the individual level has a gradated diversity, from conservative, which considers the type and form of hula as an important factor, to progressive, which accepts any type of hula as long as it is not dedicated to a native god or goddess. In brief, for a large majority of Christian Hawaiians, the acceptable hula for Christian Hawaiians must have no relation to the traditional religion. This is the line that they cannot cross. I asked I. J., the Hawaiian minister who was actively introducing hula and Hawaiian chants into the church ceremony, about how Christian Hawaiians could cope with hula kahiko and Hawaiian chants that honored a native god or goddess. He responded by saying:

Yeah, then you get into a touchy kind of thing in the church. I don’t have a problem with it myself, but I think some people in the church would have. . . . So, usually it’s in honor of a particular chief or whatever. . . I would think some people would have a hard time, if the chant is dedicated to native gods, although sometimes they don’t even know that, because they don’t speak Hawaiian. So they don’t know unless they hear the name like
Laka or whatever, they don’t even know what’s happening. (I. J., 04/20/1995)

Although not the majority, there are more liberal Christian Hawaiians who regard *hula kahiko* dedicated to a native god or goddess as compatible with Christian faith. When I discussed with N. N., a Hawaiian woman who was a lay minister of an independent Hawaiian Church, the relation between the traditional Hawaiian religion and Christianity, she first pointed out the similarity between the two religions and explained why she considered *hula kahiko* acceptable for Christians, while admitting that her interpretation would never be accepted by the elderly church members:

> Even above Laka, there is Io [Yo]\(^9\) which presides over her and all other gods. In that sense, hula is dedicated to this supreme god which equals the God of Christianity. We just changed the name which presides over everything. If you look at that way, there is no conflict. . . . Therefore, as for hula kahiko, I don’t see a conflict. The conflict which is related to hula kahiko is in a narrow perspective. (N. N., 11/03/1994)

This interpretation tries to resolve the conflict between the two religions by directly replacing the native supreme god with the Christian God. Such displacement is often seen in the native Christian narrative, but it is not wholeheartedly accepted by some of the even more progressive Christian Hawaiians who have a cultural relativist position toward the traditional religion.

Another interpretation that justifies dancing *hula kahiko* can be seen in the following statement of L. F., the Hawaiian minister who gave an account of her experience with *pueo*. When I proceeded with my interview to the topic of *hula*, she explained her understanding of the relation between *hula* and Christian faith:

> First of all, I am a kumu hula. I am a teacher of hula. I gained my kumu hula status years ago. . . . I forgot what year it was. But I danced for about 17 years and our halau was Keahahuokalama and kahiko was my passion. I do extremely well in that, and I love it. The kahiko just means ancient, old . . . OK? And a lot of people feel that, “Oh, the kahiko is like . . . you gonna be worshipping Pele and what not.” (L. F., 11/18/1996)

Here again, she complained that people tend to easily connect Hawaiian traditional culture and spirituality to the traditional religion. According to her, the intricate relation
between Hawaiian spirituality and Christian faith is neglected and dismissed in the name of “paganism” in which people “worship” innumerable native gods and spirits. Such an observer’s perspective misses the most significant point of Hawaiian spirituality. Therefore, she said, “If the missionaries have had any foresight, they would have known that the hula was such a part of the Hawaiian people. It would have been the simplest avenue or channel to teach God.” She insisted that her prayer is dedicated to the Christian God when dancing *hula kahiko*, even if the *hula chant* is dedicated to a particular native god or goddess. Over native gods and goddesses, she places the Christian God who watches affectionately over a Christian Hawaiian who dances *hula kahiko*. Following this insistence, she explained why she believed that she was able to dance *hula kahiko* as follows:

I don’t dance as much today, but I am quick to teach. I teach the hula kahiko that would be telling stories or dramatizing the history and legends that come along with it. And . . . well, unfortunate for a lot of Christians, part of Hawaiian history is a story of Pele. But it doesn’t mean that you’re worshipping Pele when you are dancing it. What I teach my children is . . . when you’re telling a story, you are dramatizing just as if you were doing the stage production. In a play of Romeo and Juliet, you are not Romeo, you’re not Juliet. But you are dramatizing their story. Same with hula. (L. F., 11/18/1996)

The typical narrative of the liberal Christian Hawaiians concerning their relation with the traditional religious world is that they do not “worship,” but, rather, “respect” their ancestors’ gods, goddesses and ‘*aumākua*. The aforementioned accounts by N. N. and L. F. belong to this narrative. However, such a cultural and religious relativist attitude is sometimes criticized by other Christian Hawaiians, who are not necessarily very conservative but point out the difficulty of distinguishing between “respect” and “worship.” One Hawaiian woman, who belonged to an independent Hawaiian Church, mentioned that even if Christian hula performers insisted that they would remain unruffled but have only respect for a native god or goddess, they exposed themselves to the danger of being immersed in a close relation with a native god or goddess when they
concentrated single-mindedly on the dance. In fact, hula kahiko requires of hula dancers deep concentration and devotion and, as a result, makes them enter a mental condition that could be described as “worship” rather than “respect.”

As I described above by adducing Christian Hawaiian narratives, their personal feelings toward hula kahiko as well as individual perceptions of acceptable hula are diverse, although their narratives grade from conservative to progressive. The style of Christian faith varies among Christians. In the case of Christian Hawaiians, such a style is influenced by how they deal with the traditional religious world in which Hawaiian spirituality is deeply rooted and, also, how they interpret the legacy of the missionary culture. Different from the issue of the ‘aumakua belief and the kahuna practices that are difficult to incorporate into Hawaiian churches, hula can present an opportunity for Christian Hawaiians to construct a new Hawaiian Christianity, which is in the process of making.

Concluding Remarks

Whether it is discussed as identity or tradition, the concept of “culture” is becoming more contentious in the post-colonial and postmodern era. This is especially so in regard to the current social and cultural condition of the Pacific region. The situation has become more imminent and complicated in the Fourth World, emerging in Hawaii, New Zealand and Australia, where the representation of indigenous culture has become a political act (Linnekin 1991b; Tobin 1995; Tonkinson 1997). In the rise of indigenous political movements re-claiming sovereignty and land, and the revival of traditional cultures, anthropologists who probe into the cultural dynamics of these phenomena utilize the theoretical framework of “cultural constructionism” (Hobsbawn & Ranger 1983; Sollors 1989; Wagner 1981). Culture, including identity and tradition, is no doubt constructed. This is a truism that is not the monopoly of constructionists. However, culture is constructed not only by being implicitly cultivated in experience of those who
live in the culture, but also by being consciously narrated and represented by them. In the postmodern condition that has manifested itself along with the decline of Western hegemony, the hierarchical relationship between the representer and the represented has collapsed and, as a result, those who were once deprived of an act of self-representation have begun to talk about their own histories, traditions and identities (Friedman 1992, 1993). Although this postmodernity allows indigenous people to narrate openly their culture, it also reveals the diversity of their voices, as seen in the different views of various sovereignty movement groups in Hawaii (cf. Tachihata 1994).

In general, we are concerned with such issues as tradition ("what our tradition is") and identity ("who we are"), only when they become problematized and politicized in a specific social situation. Such a situation is created everywhere in the post-colonial Pacific where tradition and identity are eloquently narrated and consciously represented. In this cultural and political context, the Hawaiian ministers of the UCC have started to talk about how to combine their own culture, which was once denied as inferior in the missionary discourse, and Christian doctrine, which they believe should be expanded beyond the Western culture. As a logical result of the postmodern condition, however, their perceptions of Hawaiian Christianity are too diverse to be summarized in a short description. Imagining what Hawaiian Christianity should be, Christian Hawaiians take various positions toward Hawaiian tradition as well as Christian doctrine, and construct different Christian Hawaiian identities. However, they are now in an ambivalent position concerning the symbolic components of Hawaiian tradition, which are fully utilized in the sovereignty movement and cultural revival. Hawaiian spirituality is indispensable for Hawaiian identity, but it is also deeply rooted in the traditional religious world that must be handled carefully when constructing Christian identity. The traditional religious world can be not only a source but also an obstacle for Christian Hawaiians who desire to combine two seemingly contradictory beings. By negating, distantiating or re-interpreting
the traditional symbols that seem to conflict with Christian doctrine, they now struggle to create their own identities.

In this chapter, I described Christian Hawaiian narratives of Hawaiian tradition, such as the ‘aumakua belief, the kahuna practices and hula, all of which would not have become critical issues for their identity construction if the trend of Hawaiian cultural politics had not made these cultural elements come to the fore. By considering seriously these traditions, which have never been grappled with squarely in the colonial situation, Christian Hawaiians are starting to construct new identities in a highly discursive form. Hawaiian religious traditions sometimes work almost as a litmus test in order to indicate how free their Christian faith is from the missionary dualistic discourse, and at other times work as a catalyst to promote the creation of hybrid identity. Some conservative Christian Hawaiians flatly negate the traditional religious elements and regard the ‘aumakua belief as idolatry or fetishism, mirroring the views of the 19th century missionaries. Others distantiate or avoid ‘aumākua with ūr, acknowledging that they still have supernatural powers. Somewhat more open-minded conservatives do not have such a negative attitude toward ‘aumākua, but relegate them to the past in order to establish a modern self. All of them are in varying degrees influenced by the conventional dualism that draws a strict line between the traditional religion and Christianity. On the other hand, some Christian Hawaiians, who are relatively free from the missionary discourse, strive to create a new Christian faith. They positively accept ‘aumākua as guardian angels and incorporate them into Christian theological context and, by so doing, attempt to break down the barriers separating the two religious worlds. For them, spirituality, which is the most significant factor for any faith, is not monopolized by a particular religion, and ‘aumākua represent and guarantee such universal spirituality in a local context. Once they are freed from the conventional dualism, their Christian
faith and identity become much more diverse. Such diversity of ideas and views characterizes the current condition of Christian Hawaiians.

When Christian Hawaiians imagine new Christian Hawaiian identities, they must deal with the traditional religious elements that have become conspicuous in the politics of culture. They must consider whether they can redeem a particular tradition, which was once denied by the missionaries, in order to represent their Hawaiian-ness in the current socio-cultural situation. However, such redemption is not always successful. While the 'aumakua belief finds a landing point in the Christian theological context, the kahuna faith and practices are not considered in such a positive manner by many Christian Hawaiians, because there is every possibility that the translation of kahuna into the Christian context could cause the collapse of a whole system of Christian faith and practices. As for hula, many of even the progressive Hawaiian churches of the UCC must remove the lower body movement from the choreography in order to incorporate hula into church service. However, some Christian Hawaiians believe that they can dance hula kahiko for native gods and goddesses as Christians. These liberal Christian Hawaiians consider the conventional dualism, which strictly opposes the traditional religion and Christianity, meaningless and are trying to overcome the barriers between the two seemingly opposing worlds.

According to Hall (1990), identity should be regarded as “a ‘production’, which is never complete, always in process, and always constituted within, not outside, representation” (Hall 1990:222). Based on this constructionist premise, he insists that identities are constituted through difference as well as similarity; it is impossible to speak about oneness of identity without acknowledging that it is composed of the ruptures and discontinuities. Therefore, cultural identity is “a matter of ‘becoming’ as well as of ‘being’ and “identities are the names we give to the different ways we are positioned by, and position ourselves within, the narratives of the past” (Hall 1990:225). From this
standpoint, he believes, "we can properly understand the traumatic character of 'the colonial experience'" in which the colonized people are not only misrepresented in the Orientalist discourse but also made to see and experience themselves as the Other (Hall 1990:225). In his anti-essentialist perspective, cultural identities are regarded not as "a fixed essence" but as "the unstable points of identification or suture" and "a positioning" (Hall 1990:226). In another article, Hall (1996b) rephrases this anti-essentialist concept of identity as follows:

"Identities are never unified and, in late modern times, increasingly fragmented and fractured; never singular but multiply constructed across different, often intersecting and antagonistic, discourses, practices and positions. They are subject to a radical historicization, and are constantly in the process of change and transformation. (Hall 1996b:4)"

After pointing out the need to situate the debates about identity in the historically specific, that is, postmodern, condition that disturbs various essentialist concepts, he mentions:

"Though they seem to invoke an origin in a historical past with which they continue to correspond, actually identities are about questions of using the resources of history, language and culture in the process of becoming rather than being: not 'who we are' or 'where we came from', so much as what we might become, how we have been represented and how that bears on how we might represent ourselves. Identities are therefore constituted within, not outside representation. They relate to the invention of tradition as much as to tradition itself, which they oblige us to read not as an endless reiteration but as 'the changing same'. . . . not the so-called return to roots but a coming-to-terms-with our 'routes.' (Hall 1996b:4)"

Such an anti-essentialist and deconstructive perspective can apply not only to Caribbean identity and their diaspora experience but also Christian Hawaiian identity and Hawaiian Christian faith. Christian Hawaiians live as Fourth World people and experience the discontinuities of Hawaiian tradition, of which they were once deprived in the process of cultural colonization and which they are still prohibited in the conventional dualistic discourse from appropriating to create hybrid identity and Hawaiianize Christian faith. As Hall (1996b:4-5) insists in the case of Caribbean identity, Christian Hawaiian identities also are constructed through the relation to Others, who happen to be their
non-Christian ancestors and contemporary traditionalists, or which are traditional religious symbols represented in the politics of culture. They try to differentiate their Christian faith and identity from those Others, with which they conceive their hybrid identity. While imagining what their identity and faith should be, Christian Hawaiians are using, manipulating and translating cultural resources that guarantee Hawaiian spirituality. Identity and faith that are desired in this way from diverse positions will be neither unified into oneness nor remain static. Like anuenue, it will continue to be diverse and changing, having a direction but without an identifiable end.
NOTES

[1] All the Hawaiian words are italicized in the main text. Although the word hula now becomes a common English noun, it is also italicized in accordance with this rule. In the interview transcripts, however, the Hawaiian words are not italicized, because interviewees are using those words as their native words.

I adopt Hawaiian orthography, using the macron and glottal stop, in the main text. Those marks are basically not inserted in the transcripts, because most interviewees do not pronounce a long vowel and a glottal stop in Hawaiian words with a few exceptions such as manō.

[2] The history of independent Hawaiian Church started when John Kekipi Maia, who was once a member of a Congregational church on Hawai'i, founded Hoomana Naauao [Ho'omana Na'auao: Reasonable Service] in 1893, in Honolulu, O'ahu (see Chapter 4). From this church, Hoomana O Ke Akua Ola [Ho'omana O Ke Akua Ola: Church of the Living God] was separated and officially established in 1916. At present, there are several independent Hawaiian Churches that belong to the tradition of these two, which are currently active (Aiona 1959; Inoue 1997; Paleka 1995).

[3] It is well known that the “invention of tradition” (Hobsbawm & Ranger 1983) discourse immediately provokes a countercurrent from the indigenous people concerned. Many anthropologists now understand that they cannot avoid the problem of authority to represent Others in the post-colonial situation. Here I have no intention of denouncing Hawaiian traditional values as something fabricated, but only point out that tradition is always reconstructed in the present (Wagner 1981). One of the most noteworthy discussions on the politics of culture in the Pacific was developed between Trask and Linnekin (Linnekin 1991a; Trask 1991), which I have already investigated in Chapter 2 (cf. Inoue 2000).

[4] In this and following chapters, I quote the same interviewees several times. In order to help keep track of these interviewees, I use their assumed initials when I quote them, if necessary. The statements of interviewees are transcribed from the recordings, but are partly modified to make the quotations more readable.

[5] Ka Makua Mau Loa [Eternal Father] is the mother church of Hoomana O Ke Akua Ola, which has daughter churches as well as offshoots (Inoue 1997).

[6] The word nā kūpuna is a combination of the definite article (nā) for the plural and a plural form of kūpuna [grandparent, ancestor, people of the grandparent’s generation]. Many Hawaiian nouns pluralize by making a particular vowel a long sound. In daily English conversation among Hawaiians, however, Hawaiian nouns are usually not pluralized. They use the same form in the plural or pluralize the noun by adding “-s” as in English grammar.

[7] For example, ho'oponopono [to correct] can be cited as one of such practices. It is the traditional method for solving personal problems and restoring harmony within the extended family (Shook 1985). Ho'oponopono has been introduced into the Western social work practices in Hawaii since the mid 1960s (Shook 1985:2) and is also incorporated into a certain independent Hawaiian Church as a formal practice.

[8] Also in the Catholic Church, hula in church can become a sensitive issue. In 1997, a Maui woman, who was offended by a hula performance during Mass, complained to the diocese and then to the Vatican. The complaint resulted in the Vatican’s reiterated ban on dance, including hula, in the liturgy. Not only Hawaiians but also local papers in Hawaii criticized this course of action. In December, 1998, after negotiating with the Vatican, Honolulu Bishop Francis X. DiLorenzo issued new guidelines — that became in 236
effect in January, 1999 — for allowing hula, as a Hawaiian “sacred gesture,” to be performed during Roman Catholic services. However, the guidelines did not attempt to reverse the original banning on dance, but only presented the formal opinions of the diocese that hula as entertainment is banned in church, while hula as prayer is permissible (cf. Adamski 1998a, 1998b; Kreifels 1998).

[9] ‘Io is believed by some Hawaiians to be the Supreme God for Hawaiian people in old days (cf. Kikawa 1994:29-30). In fact, I often heard about ‘Io, when I was conducting the interview research among Christian Hawaiians. For example, Y. I., an elderly Christian Hawaiian whose family has the kahuna background, referred to ‘Io when explaining the relation between her Hawaiian background and Christianity, as follows:

In my dad and in my father’s family, he believes that there was only one god. And that is Io. Very few Hawaiians believe that, or follow that tradition. Io is one god that encompasses all. Lono, Kū, Kanaloa and all the others are really patrons, or they’re care takers of a specific element, yeah. That’s the way, that’s how he was taught. So, Io is the God (Almighty). So, it was very easy for us to accept one god. And so these others are really care takers of specific element, you know. (Y. I. 05/03/1995)

The story of ‘Io, the Creator God, is told in connection with Christian monotheism. In such a narrative, ‘Io is believed to be proof that Hawaiians accepted monotheistic Christianity with ease and, sometimes, even considered to be identical to Jehovah.

The word ‘io means Hawaiian hawk, which is also one of the ‘aumākua. Handy (1941) mentions that “the cult of Io in Hawaii is not the veneration of an abstract concept but specifically the worship of the hawk” (Handy 1941: 136) and concludes that we should “not rush to enthrone Io as the Supreme Being in Hawaii: the evidence proves only that he was the superior protective deity in certain rituals of certain ali‘i [chief] and kahuna lines” (Handy 1941: 159). Following Handy (1941), Emory (1942) also points out the possibility that ‘Io as the Supreme God in Hawaii was constructed in a small group under the influence of the Maori cult of Io when Maori Mormons came to Hawaii in the 1920s. He mentions that “the informant who revealed ‘the cult of ‘Io’ was obviously striving to show that the Hawaiians had a cult equivalent to the Maori cult of Io” (Emory 1942: 206). It is ironic, however, that the Maori cult of Io, which was then believed to be authentic, also becomes a target of demythologization half a century later (Hanson 1989).

[10] The main point in Hall’s discussion on identities in the postmodern condition is that they are “unstable,” “fragmented” and “multiply constructed” in the process of “becoming,” in which the act of (self-)representing and that of being represented dialectically interrelate. His interpretation seems to contradict what I presupposed at the beginning of this chapter: that is, Native Christians try to resolve the potential conflict of being Native and being Christian in order to pursue a unified and stable identity.

However, we must pay attention to that he investigates the problem of identity mainly on the group level; this is the reason why he uses the term in a plural form “identities.” In this chapter, I described such diversely constructed identities in the case of Christian Hawaiians and, therefore, my interpretation does not contradict his.

The point is, although they try to pursue a unified and stable condition of their cultural identities (it does not matter whether they do so on an individual or group level) and they feel that they have attained such condition at some point of their lives, their identities are always in the process of becoming, never fixed in the stable condition that is guaranteed by a unified and essentialistic reading of their history and culture.
In other words, Hall’s discussion points out that the stable and unified identities that are desired and perceived in the emic perspective (cf. primordial sentiment) are actually not so in the etic inspection. However, the study of Christian Hawaiian identities shows that, even in the emic perspective, it is well recognized by some that their identities are multiply constructed and negotiated and, therefore, not so stable. In a sense, the postmodern condition in which Hawaiians are located is more advanced and complicated than Hall assumes.
CHAPTER 7
BEING HAWAIIAN AND BEING CHRISTIAN: 
THE ENTANGLED CONDITION OF HAWAIIAN CHRISTIANITY

Introduction

In the previous chapter, after addressing about the relationship between being Hawaiian and being Christian, and the conflict it causes concerning Hawaiian Christianity, I described how Christian Hawaiians perceive and construct their identities by investigating their narratives of traditional Hawaiian culture, represented by 'aumakua, kahuna and hula. I pointed out that Hawaiian spirituality and the traditional religious world, in which the spirituality originates, are indispensable for their Hawaiian identity construction, but must be dealt with carefully when establishing their Christian faith. Christian Hawaiians construct their identity and establish their faith by negating, by keeping some distance from, or by reinterpreting the traditional religious culture that can be a rich source as well as a formidable obstacle. My purpose was to emphasize — following Hall (1990, 1996a) — that the cultural identity of Christian Hawaiians is diversely constructed but at the same time loosely unified under the problem that originally brings about the diversity. To sum up, fission involving coherence, or unity embracing diversity, characterizes the current condition of Hawaiian Christianity.

The previous chapter uses a well-regulated analytical method that narrowly focuses on specific topics of Hawaiian traditional religion in the narratives of informants, and aims at describing various Christian Hawaiian identities by locating each informant’s attitude toward specific topics, such as 'aumakua. My overall purpose in this chapter shares similarities to that of the previous chapter; that is, I wish to describe and interpret Christian Hawaiian identities as well as their faith on the narrative level. One of the expected conclusions in this chapter is similar to that of the previous chapter, concerning the loosely unified diversity of Hawaiian Christianity. In this chapter, however, I do not
as rigidly concentrate on specific topics, but focus on Hawaiian Christianity as a whole. I delineate the current condition of Hawaiian Christianity by investigating the statements by informants who are aware of the problems involved in Hawaiian Christianity and are able to discuss them in a critical and more articulate manner.

Interview data analyzed in this chapter comes from the same group of interviewees — those who belong to the Congregational tradition in Hawaii — from the previous chapter. However, because this chapter focuses on their understanding of Hawaiian Christianity on a more conscious level, I use data predominantly from Hawaiian ministers who clearly understand my intention and logically discuss the problems. The ethnographic present of this survey is also from 1994 to 1996, as the Hawaiian sovereignty was becoming a more realistic issue after it reached its peak in the 1993 centennial observance of the overthrow of the Hawaiian monarchy. Because both Chapter 6 and Chapter 7 investigate the same issue of Hawaiian Christianity, they complement each other. The discussion developed in Chapter 6 helps prepare for better reading of Chapter 7 by clarifying what the problems are for the current Hawaiian Christianity, while Chapter 6 can be read over again by comprehending the complicated condition of Hawaiian Christianity described in Chapter 7.

As I pointed out in the previous chapter, there are various positions among Christian Hawaiians concerning the relationship between Hawaiian traditional religion and Christian faith. Their different positions can be understood as a part of the larger group of all Hawaiians, although their positions are more inclined toward the Christian perspective, rather than traditional religion. Diverse positions of Hawaiians — both Christian and non-Christian — between traditional religious culture and Christianity is well-recognized by Hawaiian ministers. In an interview with B. I., an elderly Hawaiian minister of the UCC, he outlines a rough sketch of the current situation of Hawaiians as a gradated continuum between traditional religion and Christianity:
Today, all Hawaiian people say that they live by Hawaiian traditions and Hawaiian values. All Hawaiian people have some sort of a religion that runs from the very basic Hawaiian conservative, which is those people who still affirm the old religion, and only that. And then, to the other side, completely opposite . . . they say that they affirm as a religion only Christianity, and only that. Now, this group of Hawaiians [traditionalists] on this end, of course, believes in Hawaiian values and traditions. This group [conservative Christians] on this end also believes that they are Hawaiian, they have some Hawaiian tradition. So, that’s the two groups. Right in the middle are the more perhaps liberal, neo-orthodox, neo-conservative Hawaiians, who say, “We can affirm our Hawaiian traditional values, but still be Christian . . .”

So, you go back now for this group [traditionalists], they basically claim they are only Hawaiian as being opposite to Christian, or they have negated (Christianity) or do not live in Christianity. So, they only affirm the Hawaiian traditions and values, that is what’s mixed up with religion. Now, as I said earlier, this group [conservative Christians] over here, they still say, “We believe in our Hawaiian tradition and values, but as (for) a religion, our faith is Christian.” And then you have this middle group, who say, “We can be a meeting of Christian tradition and Hawaiian tradition.” (But) there is only a few of us here, this group [traditionalists].

I would say without knowing all of them, I would say most of them belong to this middle group. Some of them that I know belong to strong Christian (tradition). But, they feel that there are certain tradition and values, right, to be able to go in the land, they affirm some religious sites, that they feel a presence of (spirits) . . . I would say that most of us are here [the middle group] or maybe somewhere I don’t know how to define it, but some between here [the middle group] and here [conservative Christians]. But, most of us [Christian Hawaiians], from this point of view, (are) from here [the middle group which is not so liberal] over to the more conservative. (B. I., 12/02/1994)

He roughly categorizes three groups of Hawaiians: traditionalists, “the middle group” and conservative Christians, and mentions that those who are “liberal, neo-orthodox, neo-conservative” Christians — somewhat leaning toward the conservative side — constitute the majority in the Hawaiian community. This understanding is probably accepted not only by most Christian Hawaiians but also by some non-Christian Hawaiians who actively participate in the sovereignty movement. A more significant point he makes in his statement is that Hawaiians of any aforementioned group have the conviction that they believe in their “Hawaiian values and tradition,” which are probably defined differently in each group.
The understanding that most Christian Hawaiians lean toward the conservative side is shared by other ministers as well. During our discussion about the relation between traditional religion and Christianity, Q. F., a non-Hawaiian minister of the UCC, who worked for Hawaiian churches for about 15 years, mentions that Hawaiians in his church are more conservative than he is:

As I talk with my Hawaiians now, and my Pacific Islanders all around the Pacific, the old religious values are there, some of which are cultural, some of which are religious nature or mixed together. It is an area of growth that they need time to work through, they need to learn and develop an understanding. . . . I find that my Hawaiians here in Hawaii, when I ask them about that, are much more hard line on that than I am. I am an evangelical conservative Christian, but I try to be open-minded with my people and recognize their struggles and help them grow through that. But I find that Hawaiians within my congregations both here and the church that I served on the Big Island, those Hawaiians were very cut and dry feeling of that. If you become a Christian, in Hawaiian, you ʻoki (ʻoki: to cut), you cut the old, and you leave it behind. And you go forward. (Q. F., 05/09/1995)

The Hawaiian word ʻoki is often used by Christian Hawaiians when they explain how their Christian faith was established by severing the relation with traditional religious beliefs and practices (cf. Charlot 1986:445; Pukui et al. 1972:174-178). In the previous chapter, I described these conventional dualistic perspectives, which separate tradition and modernity, or paganism and Christianity, by investigating different attitudes of conservative Christian Hawaiians toward ʻaumākua, native deities praised in hula, and kāhuna. Although younger, more liberal Hawaiian ministers of the UCC try to overcome this missionary legacy by giving new meaning to ʻaumakua and introducing some types of hula into church, there still remains a “cut and dry feeling” to traditional religion among many Christian Hawaiians.

**Syncretism and Multi-Ethnicity**

It is common sense that what people say does not necessarily correspond to what they actually do. A duty in ethnographic studies is to ascertain the discrepancy between what is said and what is practiced, and to consider why there is such discrepancy.
particularly if it is significant for understanding a target culture. It is probable that even very conservative Christian Hawaiians, who draw a strict line between Hawaiian traditional religion and Christianity, unconsciously maintain beliefs and practices that are particularly Hawaiian. Such folk beliefs and practices among Hawaiians range from a trivial custom, which does not have any impact on their Christian faith, to more significant ones that may cause a conflict in Christian identity. Whether a certain Hawaiian custom is trivial or serious depends on the individual’s perception of Christian faith and Hawaiian spirituality. This problem is seen in the comments of an elderly Hawaiian I introduced in the previous chapter: after complaining that younger Christian Hawaiians participated in hula uncritically, she adds, “I have a question in myself; where does culture end and where does religion start, where can I draw a line between culture and religion.” The syncretic condition surrounding Hawaiian Christianity, which sometimes presses Christian Hawaiians to draw boundaries, can be detected in the following statement of I. J., a younger Hawaiian minister of the UCC:

[I. J.]: My grandmother taught her children and grandchildren much about the church and faith, she was still, Christian. But she did Hawaiian culture things, either absent-mindedly or whatever, whatever sometimes she did, she was still honoring her Hawaiian culture. Whether it was obvious or not, you know, she did things Hawaiian that were not Christian. [Inoue]: It was not like worshipping Hawaiian gods? [I. J.]: No, just Hawaiian practices. When she would go to a funeral, she would use paakai [pa'akai: salt] to cleanse herself. She always did that. It is very Hawaiian, not Christian. So, she did these things. I don’t know whether she did it consciously or subconsciously, but those kinds of things, little things I would observe that she would do. But she was very closed about these things. I wanted, I wish I knew now what she did when I was younger . . . (I should have) asked her. (04/20/1995)

Using pa’akai, usually dissolved in water, for purifying funeral participants is probably traditional practice not likely to disturb those of Hawaiian Christian faith (cf. Pukui et al. 1972:179-182). However, the following example is more serious; and one that Christian Hawaiians must reconsider when deepening their Christian faith. To my question on the relation between traditional religion and Christianity, Q. F., the above-cited non-
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Hawaiian minister, cites an example of Hawaiian folk beliefs that still existed in the way of thinking of conservative Christian Hawaiians:

One woman in my church, a Hawaiian woman, five years ago, she broke her leg, when working in her yard. She broke her leg by stepping in a fence that had fallen down in the weeds, twisted her leg and she broke it. And she told me more often than not, “Kahu [minister], hewa [mistake, sin] the leg.” That means my leg sinned, and I tried to share with her through that... I understand the scripture (does) not, the God does not (teach) that way. That is not BACHI [“divine punishment” in Japanese]. But she was convinced hewa the leg, BACHI... and so I don’t know that that was the theological issue or that it was the cultural issue. And finally I just gave up and said, “I am gonna leave that to the Lord and continue to love her and teach her in Christ.” I don’t think it’s essential to her faith, and her well-being life. So, I’m answering your question, simply to say... For some people, it is still an issue. I think it causes an extreme sensitivity among us, (those) who are ministry to the people who are trying to make a cultural adjustment, and to leave behind whole (traditional) beliefs. And some are still struggling with that here in Hawaii. (Q. F., 05/09/1995)

It is not clear whether the Hawaiian woman believed that the accident was caused by a native spirit in the land. But the minister thought that she was influenced by Hawaiian folk belief when interpreting this accident, and he once tried to resolve this problem. Of course, Christian Hawaiians do not always consider the issue of how to deal with traditional religious beliefs and practices. An interesting point here is, rather, that a conservative Christian Hawaiian, who must maintain a strict line between Christianity and the traditional religion, still subconsciously maintains traditional beliefs and practices. Of course, as Q. F. mentions, such beliefs and practices are in most cases not essential to their Christian faith. However, it is also true that this problem emerges when Christian Hawaiians face a specific event or accident that can awaken lingering traditional beliefs. For example, if volcanic lava destroys a church building, Hawaiian members of the church would likely think about Pele, a volcano goddess, regardless of their belief in her.

How to deal with traditional beliefs and practices does not necessarily become a problem for some Christian Hawaiians, even if they understand that such beliefs and
practices can potentially become a problem for Christian Hawaiians. In the previous chapter, I investigated how some Christian Hawaiians positively deal with and interpret ‘aumakua and hula to establish their Christian faith. Those liberal Christian Hawaiians naturally accept traditional beliefs and practices, and consciously incorporate them into their Christian faith. For example, L. F., a Hawaiian minister of the UCC, relates the following story of her childhood in the 1940s. Although it is very long, I would like to cite the whole story, which tells of how her grandmother prayed to heal a serious injury she suffered on her leg by falling down on the gravel:

[L. F.]: When I was a child, the Inoue Store, the old Inoue Store used to be next door to the church. And every new year, we knew that my uncle and auntie were gonna make a big party, people were gonna come... All of us kids used to gather around (and say) “Oh, let’s go ask uncle so and so (for) some money.” So we get the money and we go down to the store and buy sky rockets and fire cracker, you know, and dirt, a whole bunch of kids buy its dirt... I remember my auntie’s house was on a hill.

And all of the kids, we all ran to go to the store. Well, they left me in the back kind of, and I ran with all my might, (then) I slipped on the gravel. When I slipped on the gravel, my leg went this way and I skated halfway down the driveway on the gravel. And I skinned off the whole front of my leg. It was dumb, too. You could see bone. I just skinned that all off. And I couldn’t move. And I was in dreadful pain. But my younger cousin was coming in the back, no, he was with me, he saw me fall, he stopped and came to help me... We were about 9 years old, 10 years old, you know. And he said, “Oh, I’ve gotta go get help.” And I said, “Yes, go get help, but don’t tell my mama, don’t tell my daddy, go get tutu [tutu: granny]” Tutu, my grandparents, my grandmother.

[Inoue]: Why?

[L. F.]: Because, if you go tell your mother and father, you might get licking, you know. So... you go to the one that you know is secure, and that’s tutu. Tutu is refuge. Anyway, he did go and get my tutu, and I have run back to the house, and it was dark. My tutu came out, my cousin led my tutu by her hand and brought her out, and showed her my bleeding leg. It was just bleeding drastically.

And my tutu realized how serious it was. And I remember, holding me, she said, “Are you all right?” I said, “No, I’m sore.” And she said, “OK, come.” So my auntie has this huge stone steps, wide stone laying. And we were down on the bottom level... My tutu asked me, “How did you get sore?” I said, “The stone.” “Are you sure the stone?” “Yes, tutu.” “The stone did that sore?” “Yes, tutu.” “Come.” She took me with all my blood and my sore, and I’m crying. And I held on to her, she took my leg and she held it, and she asked me, “Do you believe?” And I said, “I don’t know, tutu.” “DO YOU BELIEVE?” The tone she was using made me a kind of start shock and I was thinking, “What is she asking me to believe?” My heart is panicking, my mind is... and I said, “I think so.” And she asked
the third time, "DO YOU BELIEVE?" The way she asked me was so emphatic, I thought to myself, even if I don't know what I believe, I believe my tutu loves me, that I knew. And because I felt that my tutu loved me and she would not hurt me, I said, "Yes, I believe." And I said it very openly.

Now this is just a child. And I said, "Yes tutu, I believe." But actually, what I was believing in was not whatever she was asking me to believe in. I was believing in her love for me. She took my leg after that, and pressed it up against this laying wall, the stone wall, I mean PRESS! And she held my leg there and all I could do was ... Huh, you know, because this was real pain, you know. She pressed it against there. And she prayed in Hawaiian. And she prayed. And I closed my eyes and I tried to pray for myself to ... "Please God, take away this pain and help my leg better." I had no idea what she was praying, because I was too sore. But she was praying in the name of Christ, and Jesus Christ. Because I heard her say, "Ma ka inoa o Iesu Kuristo, ameni," (it means) in the name of Jesus Christ (amen). . . And we were pau [finished] and she told me, "Do not put any medicine on there." And she said, "You may wash it with water, but do not put any haole [foreign] medicine on there." "What was that?" I was (thinking) "No kidding," because I was in the seventh grade at Kamehameha School. Well, I did it. So I washed it. And my mother scolded me good. I was right, she was going to give me licking . . .

But I had to (go) back to school. I boarded there . . . it was healing. But it had this scab. Quite a bit of it healed up very well. But I had this scab right here, that was agry, round. And I didn't wanna go back to school. Everybody's seeing me that way. So when I went back to school, I went to the dispensary. I went to a doctor, a school doctor. And immediately, he took a pointed stick and peeled off the scab, and many he pleyed this scab. I felt uncomfortable. It was soar. But he was taking off the dried scab. He put medicine on it, as a disinfectant, because there was still a small pushing yet that had not healed well. It was the most sore thing that I had ever felt since I fell down. And at the same time, I felt the pain from my violate. I remember my promise to my tutu, and I knew I had broken the promise. I was permitting haole medicine to put on my soar. Till today, I have a scar right there where the medicine was placed. (11/18/1996)

According to L. F., Hawaiians believe that the breath of God is in everything. I introduced the story of her mysterious experience with the owl in the previous chapter. For her, God is in the stone as well as the owl, her 'aumakua. To her, these phenomena naturally occur, and she incorporates them into her Christian faith justly as a Hawaiian.

As for the case of 'aumakua, it is interpreted in its connection to God, as a guardian angel. Concerning the stone in the above mentioned story, its connection to God is affirmed by her grandmother's Hawaiian prayer, "Ma ka inoa o Iesu Kuristo, ameni." As
seen in her grandmother’s prayer, it is probable that a local traditional belief of the stone and Christianity merged to create a religious complex or syncretism.

Hawaiian Christianity is not only in the syncretic (multi-religious) condition but also in the multi-ethnic condition. What I mean by the multi-ethnic or multi-ethnicity is not that Christian Hawaiians are living in a multi-ethnic society, although it is certainly a significant factor when considering the current Hawaiian Christianity. The meaning of the multi-ethnicity of Christian Hawaiians in this discussion is that their Hawaiian being is composed as a multi-ethnic and multi-cultural existence. In other words, present-day Hawaiians cannot be assumed to be pure “native” entities that look upon Christianity as a “foreign” element. It is relatively easier to juxtapose native people and Christianity in other Pacific Islands, such as Tonga and Samoa, at least in the ideal model. However, the existence of Hawaiians is so entangled culturally as well as ethnically that it cannot be grasped fully in such a dualistic framework, which juxtaposes native people and foreign Christianity. Such a complicated and hybrid existence of Hawaiians is often disclosed in the process of the interviews. Discussing the problem of being Hawaiian and being Christian in the Hawaiian Christian faith, Hawaiian minister R. P. narrates his life history before starting to discuss the main subject:

I was born and raised in a Japanese church in a plantation. I was raised of Calvinistic idea that we were all sinful and we needed the same power of Jesus Christ. My father was half-Hawaiian and he told us a (Christian) lifestyle that I thought everybody must live. I’m not a Japanese son, (but) Hawaiian, German and Chinese. And I was shocked to discover that everybody didn’t live that lifestyle. My father told us cultural concepts never setting in the Hawaiian. My mother talked about Chinese things... The Chinese things clearly declined. In the plantation community, I think we were not Chinese, I identified me as Japanese, because we were going to the Japanese church... I realized that father was teaching us Hawaiian culture by living rather than teaching. I was learning my style without realizing I was taught.

As I got older, I began to understand the process of how the world developed. I began to realize that your American culture was always dominant culture, it always tried to dominate cultures, that way, you became an oppressor... I was (also) an American, but I wasn’t Chinese, I wasn’t Hawaiian, but I was American. I wasn’t even German, I was American... But I had a Chinese grandmother, who was never Christian.
And my concern was how she be saved when she died, because I loved this lady very much. (R. P., 11/03/1994)

His multi-ethnic and multi-cultural background as well as his ambivalent feeling to his American identity — that is the other side of his complicated Hawaiian identity — is neither special nor unique among Hawaiians. It is not rare that a Hawaiian who belongs to the UCC church has Chinese Buddhists, Filipino Catholics and Hawaiian traditionalists in his or her family and relatives. Therefore, the problem of Hawaiian Christianity cannot be thoroughly conceptualized in the simple dualism between being Hawaiian (as a pure “native”) and being Christian, although it is not totally misdirected to investigate the construction of Christian Hawaiian identity by setting the focused perspective that juxtaposes Hawaiian tradition and Christianity, as I did in the previous chapter.

**Feeling of Cultural Loss and Recovery**

Another factor that makes the condition of being Hawaiian more entangled and complicated is that Hawaiians have suffered from drastic cultural changes and cultural loss under colonial suppression and, more importantly, they themselves strongly perceive these changes and loss. In the interviews, Christian Hawaiians often express their feelings of cultural loss and recognition of being Westernized or Americanized. At the same time, they mention their awareness of cultural recovery. They say Hawaiians — both Christian and non-Christian — are now ready to “regain,” “recover,” “recapture,” “relearn,” “get back” and “bring back” the “old tradition,” “culture,” “special values” and “Hawaiian spirituality” that were once lost or drastically changed. Such cultural recovery is noticed not only in the cultural revival but also in the sovereignty movement, in which both traditionalists and liberal Christian Hawaiians participated. In the midst of this cultural condition, however, Christian Hawaiians who were raised with a Hawaiian religious background express some complaints. For example, an elderly Hawaiian who is a minister of an independent Hawaiian church and well-versed in the kahuna practice,
mentions that many Hawaiians do not have proper knowledge of the Hawaiian religion. According to him, they often “make up stories” and “fantasize about what Hawaiians have” (10/19/1994). After explaining about the ‘aumakua beliefs in detail, he continues as follows:

But the (current) Hawaiians make it ['aumakua]. (They say) “Oh, you can get any aumakua. You can grab anybody from . . . out of the closet,” and “That’s mine.” No, you don’t. And they don’t know that. And many many Hawaiians, they talk to them about that. So, (they say) “Oh, yeah, I’ve got four, five . . . I’ve got ten, I’ve got hundred.” They don’t know what they’re talking about, because they are not brought up (with Hawaiian religion). . . . And you have to realize (this), and maybe I would suggest this to you. In Honolulu here, a lot of the Hawaiians don’t really know what they have, in the relation of religion. If you go neighbor islands, some would talk about (Hawaiian religious) thing I am talking to you. Not the exact, but they have an idea. So in Honolulu here, things are so fast. (10/19/1994)

Another elderly Christian Hawaiian, who also was raised in traditional religious background, is critical of some younger Christian Hawaiians who are active in the political movement, pointing out that they want “so badly” to be Hawaiian, but they neither practice nor understand the Hawaiian tradition (05/03/1995). The politics of culture concerning the interpretation of cultural identity and tradition, which I discussed in the relation between natives and anthropologists in Chapter 2, also becomes a significant issue even within the native community; in this case, Christian Hawaiians. In the eyes of older Hawaiians, who have more detailed knowledge of Hawaiian traditional religion, younger Hawaiians who are enthusiastic in utilizing the old tradition in the sovereignty movement sometimes seem to be reinventing traditions. In the Hawaiian cultural context in which kūpuna must be respected, the criticisms by the older Hawaiians are critical.

However, the situation is further complicated, because the current narrative of respecting seniority as a Hawaiian custom is criticized by some Hawaiians as a recovered tradition itself that is given authenticity groundlessly in the context of the cultural revival. After admitting that Hawaiians are Westernized, P. I., a Hawaiian minister of the UCC,
relates that the idea that *kāpuna* must be respected is a problem in the current cultural condition of Hawaiians, in which the "invention of tradition" perspective becomes the point of issue (cf. Hobsbawm and Ranger 1983):

We become, Hawaiians become so Westernized that kupuna have lost their respect. Then, all of a sudden, this Renaissance and sovereignty, all of a sudden, these young folks say, "Oh, we must respect our kupunas," and, you know, kupuna all of a sudden elevate themselves. To me, (many) kupuna have no idea about what it was like. . . . (But) all of sudden, kupuna say, "You do this, and then you sit (to listen)." . . .

Our kupuna is like kahuna pule [pastor], like us . . . . The lay people always say to us, when the congregation call you kahu, or kahuna pule, it is not the title that you get, because you are ordained minister. It is a title that you earn. . . . Same with kupuna, you do not become kupuna because of your age, but because of your wisdom, knowledge. . . . (P. I., 05/09/1995)

According to P. I., the elderly who do not have wisdom or knowledge cannot be respected as *kāpuna* in a strict sense. Of course, his definition of *kupuna* can be contested as being yet another interpretation of a traditional value in the politics of culture.

However, what he wants to say concerning the problem of *kupuna* in the resurgence of traditional culture is that in such cultural condition the tradition is often recovered only superficially — without a content — and that such recovered tradition must be carefully inspected. He shares with the above-cited elderly Hawaiians the same cautious and critical stance toward the cultural movement, in which various traditions are recovered, recaptured and reinterpretated.[1]

As I showed above, because of the drastic cultural changes under colonial suppression, Hawaiians — both Christians and non-Christians — face a complicated cultural condition. The dilemma felt by them in the post-colonial condition is summarized by I. N., a younger Hawaiian minister of the UCC, who is active both in church and politics. After explaining his activity in the preservation of Hawaiian cultural sites and criticizing Western missionaries for looking down on Hawaiian culture, he continues:
Today what I feel is that we should begin here, yeah. We should begin as Hawaiians... And then, your Christianity is something that is coming to the Hawaiian people... but what I’ve seen happening more than anything else is the opposite, yeah. We’re (now) looking our culture as Christians, and we’re picking part from... from Hawaii culture, not dealing with the whole, Hawaii culture holistically. So like, this part of the Hawaiian culture is OK, and this part is OK... and... so it’s like we’re shopping, yeah? Where is... who are we, where is we begun? We begin with who we are as Hawaiians first. Hawaiians were indigenous people. Hawaiians have this spiritual relationship with the aina [ʔäina: land], with the land, (that) is very, very different from Western Christianity, which had no concept of the earth as a living entity, yeah? (I. N., 05/02/1995)

When he argues against the 19th century missionaries’ attitude toward Hawaiian people and culture, he differentiates between Hawaiian Christianity and Western Christianity by reasoning that only the former has a cultural value of aloha ʻāina. It is easy to critique his statement as a counter-hegemonic discourse, which reverses the missionary dualistic discourse contrasting paganism and Christianity, darkness and enlightenment, and evil and good. However, there is a more important point in his statement, which represents the entangled cultural condition of Christian Hawaiians. Although he stresses that Christian Hawaiians must start as Hawaiians in order to establish Hawaiian Christian faith, he also recognizes that they must deal with their Hawaiian culture in the same manner the white missionaries did, that is, like an outsider looking in. As he admits, he must extract traditional cultural values and practices, including aloha ʻāina, as acceptable parts from the whole Hawaiian traditional culture, of which he thinks he does not have a full practical knowledge.

This feeling of detachment from Hawaiian traditional culture is shared by other Christian Hawaiians. For example, an elderly Hawaiian minister of an independent Hawaiian church stresses that the university is the only place where younger Christian Hawaiians can learn about the past (11/15/1995), while an older Episcopalian Hawaiian mentions that younger Hawaiians have to “read up articles one night” in order to practice rituals in a proper manner at heiau [pre-Christian place of worship] (04/06/1995). Although they are not completely estranged from Hawaiian culture (indeed the degree of
estrangement depends on each Christian Hawaiian), Hawaiian-ness is often represented on the narrative level. Such post-colonial conditions, emerging after native culture has drastically changed under colonial suppression, brings about a situation that can be described as the politics of culture, in which anyone can present his or her own interpretation of tradition, culture and identity. In this condition, younger Hawaiian ministers' understanding of traditional values as well as their use of traditional practices in political activities can be a target of criticism from other Christian Hawaiians who are well versed in Hawaiian tradition. Of course, the main point of my discussion is not who has a real or authentic knowledge of Hawaiian tradition in Christian Hawaiian community, but that Hawaiian-ness, which is an indispensable element for constructing Hawaiian Christianity, cannot be interpreted in the same manner among various Christian Hawaiians.

Reinterpretation and Relocation of Hawaiian Tradition

In the previous chapter, I explained the different ways in which Christian Hawaiians interpret ‘aumakua, kahuna and hula and how the diversity of Christian Hawaiian identity can be investigated by locating their positions toward these Hawaiian religious traditions, which can cause conflict concerning their Christian faith. I now turn the focus toward traditional values and practices that are not necessarily recognized as religious, but accepted rather as more cultural and, therefore, are more actively narrated and represented among Christian Hawaiians.

One of the most significant traditional values that are reinterpreted among Christian Hawaiians is aloha [love], the most famous Hawaiian concept as well as the common greeting word in Hawaii. I present the following two statements to introduce a Christian reinterpretation of aloha. First, when arguing that Christian people must be clear about their relationship to God even if they represent their faith through their
culture, U. I., an elderly Hawaiian minister of the UCC, refers to the concept of *aloha* as follows:

I use a bowl of water, ti-leaf for blessing, and this is my Hawaiian culture. But blessing is not to a Hawaiian god. I talk to them [church members] about *aloha*, I talk to them about caring for each other, but it's always in terms of Scripture, I always hold Scripture. . . . Hawaiian idea of love, *aloha*, (is composed of) two words. “Alo” means to be in the presence of a life giver, and that is, for the (Christian) Hawaiian, that is Lord, God Almighty. “Alo,” be in the presence of (God) and “ha” is to receive the breath of the life from that life giver. So, when I say “aloha” to you, I’m saying to you, “May you receive the breath of life from Almighty God.” That’s what I’m saying. (U. I., 01/18/1995)

Next, L. F., who before narrated how she had her injured leg treated by her grandmother, gives a similar explanation of *aloha* when discussing Hawaiian spirituality:

We say “aloha” to each other. “Alo” means coming face to face with, confronting. “Ha” means the breath of life . . . not just breath. “Ha” is the breath of life. Where does the breath of life come from? From God. So the breath of God of life has been breathed into you . . . has been breathed into me. So when we say “aloha” each other, we are acknowledging the God in you, and the God in me . . . you acknowledge that fact, no matter what color you are. And many people just use it as hello, good bye, it’s not. . . . They just use it as a regular hello, good bye. But there is an underlying spiritual reason for the usage of the word, and for its application. And that’s why. It doesn’t really mean good bye, doesn’t really mean hello, either . . . .

But it’s strictly acknowledging the fact that the God that breathes life into you is the God that breathes life into me. So what were confronting each other? We are not confronting John and Jane. We are confronting God, you know. Then it puts the person into an attitude of humility and service, rather than aggression or, you know, that kind of attitude. It makes a big difference. (L. F., 11/18/1996)

Both of them separate the word *aloha* into “alo” [front, face, presence] and “hā” [to breathe]. In U. I.’s interpretation, the word “*alo*” means “in the presence of God” and “*hā*” means “to receive the breath of life,” and the greeting word “aloha” is translated to “may you receive the breath of life from God.” L. F. explains that “*alo*” means “face to face with God” and “*hā*” means “to breathe the breath of life,” and that the word “aloha” means “God breathes the breath of life into you and me.” Although this interpretation of *aloha* is popular among Christian Hawaiians, it is not certain whether such interpretation is etymologically correct. However, the notable point in their interpretation is that “*alo*”
connotes the presence of God that originally was not signified by the word “alo.” In addition, the god must become the Christian God quite naturally in their narratives, although He or She may be a Hawaiian God. The existence of the Christian God is appended in their interpretations of aloha, and as a result, Hawaiian aloha is translated to Christian love. In this way, a Hawaiian traditional value is Christianized.

Some Christian Hawaiians find a slight difference between Hawaiian aloha and Christian love. For example, Hawaiian minister B. I. mentions:

We use Hawaiian traditions when we feel it appropriate to affirm or reaffirm the Christian faith and particular Christian values. Now, for example, Christian love and Hawaiian aloha may be different, when we look at this poinsettia, for example, OK? In Hawaiian tradition, everything in life has meaning and purpose, this plant here has a purpose for each life. . . . Our Hawaiian people in Hawaiian tradition believe that the reason why this plant has a meaning and purpose about it is because one akua [god] looks after, takes care of it. We believe this in our Hawaiian culture. . . . Let’s easily understand. This flower is sacred, as God cares for this plant . . . almost as much as He cares for (others). But Christianity has a certain level of whole spiritual and creation, (someone) has more value (than others). . . . That’s basic difference (between) Hawaiian (tradition) and Christianity. . . . There is a certain layer (as for) sacredness (in Christianity), (but) Hawaiians say, “No, everything is same.” Trees, rocks, air, ocean . . . equal, everything is same. . . . But, ultimately, Christianity has got to affirm that everything is same. For me, as a Hawaiian, I affirm that Hawaianness, my Hawaiian tradition. (B. I., 12/12/1994)

While at first he mentions that Christian Hawaiians use Hawaiian tradition that reaffirms the Christian faith, he concludes that Christianity must accept the Hawaiian traditional view that sees no hierarchy in creation. Traditional Hawaiian values and world views recognize that aloha, or the breath of God, is in everything, from stones and owls to land and ocean. Aloha resides equally in all things. B. I. believes that Hawaiian value of aloha can help make Christian Hawaiians better Christians. The concept of aloha ʻāina, which the above-cited Hawaiian minister I. N. insists is a critical factor that separates Hawaiian Christianity and Western Christianity, can be interpreted in this cultural context.

According to an elderly Hawaiian minister of the UCC, Hawaiian aloha has a potential to be Christian love, but sometimes Christian Hawaiians do not allow it to be,
because “Hawaiians has not only aloha but also a great capacity of angry and stubbornness” (11/09/1995). Although admitting that there can be differences between Christian love and Hawaiian aloha, Hawaiian minister I. J. insists that both are almost the same and that it is more important for Christian Hawaiians to recover the Hawaiian value of aloha. Comparing Christian love and Hawaiian aloha, he says:

There may be differences, but very similar, and aloha existed before Christianity came. . . . I know in the days before Christianity, Hawaii was very much, you know, there were lots of destruction, there was lots of fighting, lots of people got killed, because chiefs were warring against each other. Maybe, it was not a perfect society as sometimes some wished it was. But, there was a society that evolved over, you know, a thousand, five hundred years or whatever is . . . into what it is. . . . But I think, for me, I think what will carry us through all of this, whether we’re Hawaiian or not Hawaiian, or whatever it is, it’s a concept of aloha, which is very much Christian, and very much Hawaiian.

So, the people are worried, non-Hawaiians are worried about what Hawaiian issues (in the sovereignty movement) do to them, or to their property . . . I would have to say to those people that base value of Hawaiian people is aloha. The base value, whether it’s Christian or Hawaiian, it’s still the base value, (which resides in) land and everything. So, I don’t have to be, I wouldn’t be worried (about whether the base value is Christian or Hawaiian). Sometimes you have to remind Hawaiians themselves what is values of our (culture) <laugh> . . . because they become very Western. (I. J., 04/20/1995)

He gives the highest priority to retrieving and forging the traditional value of aloha, which Hawaiians might have lost in the process of Westernization, rather than searching for differences between aloha and Christian love. As Christians, some Hawaiian ministers believe that Christian faith is a key point to salvage the value of aloha. The Christian morphological interpretation of the word aloha that I introduced before is one example of such reinterpreting aloha through Christian faith.

It is not only aloha, but also other traditional values, such as ‘ohana [family] and mihi [repentance], which are reinterpreted to fit the Christian context. The literal meaning of ‘ohana is “extended family,” which includes ancestors and in some instances ‘aumākua (Pukui et al. 1972:166-174). ‘Ohana is based on a principle of mutual help and is conceptually interrelated to other values, such as aloha and lōkahi [unity]. This concept
not only literally delineates Hawaiian churches of the UCC as well as independent Hawaiian churches, whose members are often composed of a few dominant families, but also represents the ideals of the Christian family. *Mihi* is often raised as another traditional value, especially in its relation with the practice of *ho'oponopono* [to correct]. According to Pukui, *ho'oponopono* is “the specific family conference in which relationships were ‘set right’ through prayer, discussion, confession, repentance, and mutual restitution and forgiveness” (Pukui et al. 1972:60). This traditional family practice of solving personal problems, which was practiced in pre-Christian time, has been maintained even while being partially transformed; the Christian God replaced ‘*aumākua* in the prayer, while a minister took the place of *kahuna* as a *ho'oponopono* conductor. According to Pukui, however, whether “*‘ohana* prayed to ‘*aumākua* or to God, the whole idea of *ho'oponopono* was the same” (Pukui et al. 1972:61). *Ho'oponopono* was introduced into the social work practices in Hawaii in the 1960s (Shook 1985:2) and is currently conducted in some independent Hawaiian churches (cf. Ito 1999).

The traditional values of *aloha*, *‘ohana* and *mihi* as well as practices such as *ho'oponopono* were reinterpreted and relocated into the Christian context. However, one should not see only discontinuity between pre- and post-Christian times concerning these values and practices. These traditions are infused with new meanings and functions, and partly emphasized or expanded, in the process of accepting Christianity, social transformation and colonial suppression (cf. Friedman 1992; Linnekin 1990c). Christian Hawaiians often indicate the similarity between Hawaiian tradition and Christianity that they believe is one of the reasons why many Hawaiians accepted Christianity with ease. This can be considered an example of the native narratives that not only narrate but also assure the continuity of native tradition in the process of social transformation. Hawaiian minister I. J., when asked about the Hawaiian value of *mihi* and the Christian concept of repentance (and forgiveness), answers:
Very similar, you know that . . . a whole hoononopono process is very Christian like. Hooponopono existed before Christianity came. So, you know, there are lots of, already lots of similarities of pre-Christian Hawaii to post-Christian Hawaii. And when missionaries came, it’s just, they just melted together. I know it’s not that simplistic, but that’s why the Hawaiian people embraced Christianity . . . but you know that Christian concept of forgiveness, and Hawaiians’ (concept of mihi) are very close. Once you acknowledge and you forgive, you put it aside . . . American Christianity sometimes doesn’t do that, you know, they don’t. But that’s a failure to really understand the Christian (doctrine) . . . That’s why I have a hard time with American Christians, who are (making their) own living in Hawaii, because their concept of Christianity is not what the Bible says. (It’s) very different, and they have a hard time to prepare or whatever . . . . But Hawaiians’ concept of (mihi) . . . In hoononopono, once you go through the process, you talk it out, and then you forgive, then you oki, you cut, and put it aside, which is very Christian. The Bible teaches a lot about it. Once you forgive . . . That’s how God forgives, God puts it aside, never to bring it up again. And that’s how it’s supposed to be. But, the humanness of people sometimes doesn’t work that way. But the models in the Bible and in the hoononopono process are very close. (I. J., 04/20/1995)

By inserting American Christianity as a third option in his comparison between a Hawaiian value (mihi) and practice (ho’oponopono) and a Christian concept of forgiveness, he emphasizes the difference between Hawaiian and American Christianity. By so doing, he clarifies the similarity between Hawaiian tradition and Christianity. As seen in his narrative, Christian Hawaiians not only reinterpret Hawaiian traditional values in the Christian context, but also rediscover “real” Christian values in Hawaiian tradition.

Reintroduction of Hawaiian tradition into the Christian context can be seen not only in the domain of cultural values and practices that I investigated concerning aloha, ‘ohana, hula and ho’oponopono, but also in the area of cultural items and styles. For example, ho’okupu [tribute], which is originally a Hawaiian style of “gift-giving to a chief as a sign of honor and respect” (Pukui and Elbert 1986), is introduced in church. Because it has been introduced in the Christian context for so long, the word ho’okupu now often means church offering for Christian Hawaiians, usually fruits, vegetables and other stuffs wrapped in ti-leaves. Different from hula, which is strongly related with
indigenous gods and spirits, ho’okupu can be more easily relocated into the Christian context only as a Hawaiian style or material of offering.\textsuperscript{31}

Another example of introduced cultural items or styles is a certain Hawaiian blessing, in which salt water in a koa [Acacia koa] bowl is sprinkled by ti-leaves. It is not uncommon for Hawaiian ministers to conduct this style of blessing when they give the blessing to a lot or building. Kāhili [feather standard] is another example. Several Hawaiian churches of the UCC furnish the altar with kāhili, which originally symbolizes Hawaiian royalty. There also appears to have been a movement that attempted to introduce poi [the Hawaiian staff of life, made from cooked taro corms] and coconut water as the eucharistic elements in the Episcopal Church (Hopkins 1996), but I was not able to confirm a similar movement in the Congregational churches. To recapitulate in the phrase of the non-Hawaiian minister Q. F., these cultural items and styles, which are relocated into the Christian context, are examples of “syncretism or amalgamation going on not on a theological level but on a methodological and cultural level” (05/09/1995). These items and styles do not threaten Hawaiians’ Christian faith, but, rather, are as useful in representing their Hawaiian identity and strengthening their Christian faith as the traditional values of aloha and ‘ohana are.

**Hawaiian Tradition and Christianity**

As I mentioned in the previous chapter, the missionary discourse places Hawaiian religious tradition and Christianity in the oppositional relationship between the eras of darkness and light, or the “primitive” and the “civilized.” As I have discussed so far in this chapter as well as in the previous chapter, liberal Christian Hawaiians strive to overcome such missionary legacy of dualistic discourse and to construct Hawaiian Christianity. They do this by reintroducing cultural items (kāhili) and styles (Hawaiian blessing) into church, by Christianizing traditional practices such as hula and ho‘oponopono, by reinterpreting traditional values — such as aloha and mihi — in the
Christian context, and by exploring similarities and continuity between Hawaiian traditional values and Christian values. Although Christian Hawaiians actively recognize the similarities between Hawaiian tradition and Christianity, dichotomy between them firmly exists not only in a chronological sense, which separates pre- and post-Christian times, but also as different religious and spiritual worlds. In addition, this dichotomy is magnified as a cultural problem if Christian Hawaiians feel that what they have been actually interacting with is Western (or American) Christianity.

In order to resolve the dilemma caused by the dichotomy between Hawaiian tradition and Christianity, a few Hawaiian ministers strive to translate the Old Testament into a context more “Hawaiian” in nature. Discussing the problem of hula kahiko for Christian Hawaiians, Hawaiian minister B. I. raises the subject of reinterpretation of the Old Testament:

Hula kahiko means more old way. . . . Those of us who are Christians believe in Jesus Christ, our faith is Judea-Christian, but Judea part of our Christian faith is the old way, Old Testament, completely Judea or Judaism. New Testament is completely Christian. So, the Bible for us is both old and new. I see there a very real parallel between hula kahiko and hula auana, old way and new way. I am now very interested in, I’m doing some research, doing the research where I want to rewrite the Bible for our Hawaiian people, to keep the New Testament as is, but to write the Old Testament in a Hawaiian way. If, as I said earlier, Old Testament in the Bible now is Judaism, we are able to understand Old Testament as a Judea literature, (that) is to say, it is a particular cultural story of a particular people, mainly Jewish. And so what has been preserved in the Bible is their story as to how they affirm their sense of religion with their love. And what I’m saying about writing about the old way of our Hawaiian people may be something like our Hawaiian cultural stories of our faith, and then these are going to point to certainly and hopefully . . . to affirm and comfortably affirm so-called New Testament. (B. I., 12/12/1995)

His narrative, which likens Hawaiian tradition to the Old Testament, belongs to the theological narrative of “inculturation,” which advocates that Christian faith must be implanted in a non-Christian culture in ways that appreciate the culture, just as Christ was incarnated into a Jewish society to present the Gospel in forms appropriate to a Jewish culture (cf. Costa 1988; Gallagher 1996). Not all Christian Hawaiians agree with
rewriting the Old Testament in this manner. However, many consent to reinterpreting Hawaiian tradition as a Hawaiian version of the Old Testament so as not to be ashamed of their traditions that were once despised by the 19th century missionaries. For example, when discussing the relation between Hawaiian values and Christian values, Hawaiian minister I. J. refers to the difficulties in developing Hawaiian Christian theology:

Language (used in church) is mostly English, but we do use Hawaiian. We sing Hawaiian hymns, my sermon tends to reflect Hawaiian values. I tried as much as I can . . . Hawaiian values which are very similar to me to Christian values. So I try to put it in a Hawaiian context, the Biblical story and Bible story into Hawaiian, translate it to Hawaiian, by using Hawaiian stories, by using . . . it's very difficult to find resources. So I just have some different resource books that I sometimes use to try to craft the liturgy, worship liturgy and sometimes prayers and other things. It is difficult, because there is not many resources. . . . (I. J., 04/20/1995)

Several liberal Hawaiian ministers of the UCC struggle to incorporate actively Hawaiian traditional values and moral stories into Christian theology. Such positive reintroduction of native tradition as well as reinterpretation of the Old Testament is not rare among native Christians who earnestly require “inculturation” (cf. Charleston 1996).

There is a similar narrative that relates native tradition and Christianity. It may be called a native Christian counter-hegemonic narrative, because it aims at reversing the power relation between native tradition and foreign Christianity in the missionary discourse. This type of native Christian narrative, conspicuous in the syncretic nativistic movements, has been examined more closely in anthropology than the narrative I introduced above. In this counter-hegemonic narrative, native Christians often claim themselves as descendants of the Hebrews; in a manner similar to the early Hoomana Naauao’s belief and the Mormon teaching of Polynesians as descendants of the Israelites (Burrows 1970 [1947]:156-158; Mullholand 1970:125-127). They sometimes reinterpret their own history by using various Christian motifs — such as the Ten Commandments and Noah’s Ark — in order to reconcile a clash between native traditional values and Christian values (cf. Keesing 1982), or they relate native deities, as well as their highest
gods, with Jehovah (cf. Kaplan 1990). As Friedman (1998) posits, it is not unusual for
native Christians, especially those who suffer from drastic social changes under colonial
suppression, to associate respectively their traditions and ancestors with the Old
Testament and the Hebrews. It is not a misunderstanding of the past, but a practice of
"the identification of a space or world within which to place oneself" (Friedman
1998:54). It is native knowledge actively forged on the articulation of local tradition and
Christianity in the colonial condition.

The Hawaiian ministers’ localizing narratives of the Old Testament and Biblical
stories are, however, different from the aforementioned counter-hegemonic narrative.
Although both acknowledge the similarity between tradition and Christianity and actively
localize the latter, the Hawaiian Christians’ reinterpretation of Hawaiian tradition as a
Hawaiian version of the Old Testament is conducted as a practice of “inculturation” in
order to establish Hawaiian Christian theology. The fact that they do so consciously also
differentiates their narratives from the counter-hegemonic narrative, which tends to
identify literally native tradition with the Old Testament. In other words, the act of
reinterpreting Hawaiian tradition as the Old Testament or rewriting the Old Testament in
a Hawaiian manner is not simple identification, but rather a deliberate comparison that
aims at overcoming the rigid dichotomy existing between native tradition and
Christianity.

It is not difficult in idea to assume a clash exists between Hawaiian tradition and
Christianity. It is easy to find actual historical events that indicate such a clash between
the two cultures. The revival of traditional religion in the Christian Hawaiian community
in the late 19th century, as well as the two dissident Hawaiian Christian movements,
which I investigated in Chapter 3 and 4, can be included in such historical events. Even if
current Christian Hawaiians are not familiar with those historical events, the tragic story
of Princess Nāhi‘ena‘ena, who was excommunicated from the HEA in 1835 because of
her planned marriage with her brother, is recognized by many Hawaiians as a symbolic event that indicates a clash between the two different cultures (cf. Sinclair 1976; Kameʻeleihiwa 1992:161-166). However, when considering the current condition of Hawaiians — Christian Hawaiians, especially — that I described and analyzed in this chapter as well as the previous two chapters, it is hard to juxtapose strictly Christianity and Hawaiian elements. As I indicated in the examination of syncretic and multi-ethnic condition as well as the feeling of cultural loss and recovery, it is difficult to set a complex of various Hawaiian elements as a rigid “native” entity against foreign Christianity. This difficulty stems from the post-colonial condition that produces the politics of culture, in which nativeness is experienced in an intricate and entangled condition and is more often represented — consciously and subconsciously — in the process of retrieving tradition and reimagining the past. Even in such a post-colonial condition that blurs what is Hawaiian and what is Christian, however, it is possible to discover small conflicts occurring between Hawaiian tradition and Christianity. I investigated such conflicts and tensions found in the Christian Hawaiian narratives of Hawaiian religious traditions in the previous chapter. Here, it is important to introduce other examples of their narratives that represent the conflict between Hawaiian tradition and Christianity.

The following statement by Hawaiian minister U. I. is in response to my inquiry about the perceived tension and conflict between Hawaiian tradition and Christian faith. It is rather long but neatly explains how he felt conflicted when returning to Hawaii from seminary and how he tried to resolve it, so it is beneficial to reproduce it in its entirety:

[U. I.]: When we come out of seminary, we come out with the . . . already being indoctrinated. This is the way to worship, and this is how you worship, and it’s in English and this is the part of American Christianity. We should come back out of that kind of experience, come back into our own cultural experience. It was a tremendous shock to me. When I finished seminary, I went to Maui. I went all way down to a rural district, a lot of Hawaiians (were) going (to church) there at that time, now not too
many. But, lots of Hawaiians were there and I served five Hawaiian churches.

And the first week, I was there, I was asked to come and do a home blessing... We were told in seminary a home blessing is the service, how you do it. But when you come into a Hawaiian community and are asked to (do) a home blessing, they are not talking about the home blessing that you learned in seminary. Hawaiians have a sense, style of doing that and this. It's a different kind of home blessing. And I found myself come in a dilemma, I didn't know what to do. I had to go back to the family who asked me to do a home blessing...

So I went back, I had to ask the man who asked me, “What do you expect... to see the God in the home blessing?” So, he asked me, “Have you done the home blessing?” I say “Yes.” But when you ask me (to) do a home blessing here, Hawaiian style, you know, I'm not familiar. That's why I needed to ask, what do you want me to do, what do you expect to see happen. Then he told... And here, you know, Hawaiian blessing, they bring what they call hookupu. Put in a ti-leaf fruits and vegetables, whatever. It's a gift. This is offering that you bring. And offering to the house or to the god of the house... So, and he said, “Do you object to our bringing that hookupu?” Wow, you know, I don't know, I didn't know what to say.

[Inoue]: You didn't allow that kind of offering?
[U. L]: No. Because, in my mind immediately I would say “No, I don’t want that. That’s not Christian.”

But I had to watch what I say at that time. I had a tremendous conflict. I didn’t know, you know, what I am to go that way. And that, even when they told me, they gonna have that hookupu. My American upbringing, schooling said that that’s pagan. And already I didn’t want to have that. If you gonna insist on doing that, they go get somebody else coming and blessing. But I'm the pastor of the church that he is a member of. So, what do I do? So I had a tremendous conflict.

So, I spent a good part of my years there, I spent five years in that area, but I had to go through tremendous struggle in myself. Because I knew what a Hawaiian wanted, and I knew what conservative Christianity was about. And anything that doesn’t conform to Christianity would be non-Christian... and, therefore, would be evil. That’s how I would immediately make that kind of judgement. But, over the years, I began to look at what it is that the folks wanted to be. Before I make harsh judgement, or quick judgement, I said, you know, “Oh, this is fine, but what do you understand?” “You make a hookupu, what does this mean to you?” And what he tells me, “Oh, this is a gift to god and thanksgiving for helping us the house.” Wonderful. I said “OK. Why? Let’s use it. No humbling to me, because that hookupu becomes part of our worship of God.”... God, who is God and Father... Jesus Christ. And we use the hookupu, no longer as the ancient Hawaiian ritual to appease the gods, but this becomes our thanks-offering to Almighty God who gave us the strength to build the house. (01/18/1995)

He probably faced a lot of shocking experiences, a great deal of counter-culture shock, when he started the ministry first in a local district just after graduating from seminary.
The aforementioned episode concerning a Hawaiian style home blessing is one such experience. The solution to this conflict, which he explains in the conclusion of the narrative, is a typical example of the reinterpretation and relocation of Hawaiian tradition into the Christian context. However, there is no decisive proof that both the minister and the man who asked for a home blessing prayed to the same God; while the Hawaiian minister dedicates ho'okupu to God, the owner of the new house may pray to the god of the house who he — as a Christian — considers a disciple of God. However, what I wish to emphasize in his narrative is that the conflict or dilemma he experienced does not occur in reality between Hawaiian tradition and Christianity, but rather between Hawaiian tradition and a particular form of Christianity, that is, American Christianity. Therefore, his reinterpretation of a Hawaiian style home blessing and ho'okupu can be considered an act of recovering Christian faith from American Christianity.

In the previous section of this chapter, I introduced the narrative of Hawaiian minister I. J., who tried to rediscover "real" Christian values in Hawaiian tradition by emphasizing the difference between Hawaiian and American Christianity. In a very similar manner, the above-mentioned minister U. I. tries to establish Hawaiian Christianity by objectifying American Christianity. [4]

The next example is from Y. I., an elderly Christian Hawaiian who has a kahuna background and is well versed in the traditional religious practices; I introduced her family story in the previous chapter. In the first half of our long talk, she mentions that because she had been experiencing tension, she accepted her father's advice and took temporary retirement from office in order to receive spiritual training from her father, who had inherited spiritual powers from his grandmother. The training continued for about four months and she was trained for three to four hours everyday, five days a week. At the conclusion of the training, she says, her father opened "a new avenue" for her, so that she could hear what people were not saying, and see and feel what people were not
able to perceive. She guesses that her father did not want her to be torn between her Christian commitment and the Hawaiian spiritual world. On his deathbed, however, he took her back to her birth in a dream — a skill he had learned from his grandmother — and said that he would share the sharable things with her, but he would take with him the unsharable. She expressed her disagreement with his suggestion of carrying away the unsharable so that, after he passed away, she began to “hear” and “feel” more clearly than before to such a degree that she was afraid.

For Y. I., “it is the choice to be a Christian,” but “it isn’t the choice to be a Hawaiian” because she was born and raised as a Hawaiian. Although her decision to succeed her father’s spiritual powers can be considered the choice she made, it is a choice to be made in order to be a Hawaiian; in retrospect, there was no other choice for her. Although she points out a parallel between Christian spirituality and Hawaiian spirituality, she criticizes a legacy of the missionary dualistic discourse by mentioning that many kupuna in the past had not been allowed to think by themselves. She herself, she claims, had been taught at school that there was no gray zone concerning Christian faith. During the interview, she is accompanied by a friend, a Christian Hawaiian affiliated with the UCC, who intervenes often with a counterpoint of view. Responding to my question about the potential conflict between Hawaiian tradition and Christianity, Y. I. commences the discussion as follows:

[Y. I.]: See, that’s my question to you. You know, some Hawaiian (is) never feeling that (problem), even though everybody had said that they had answers to this problem, Hawaiian spirituality and Christian spirituality, yeah . . . they seem to not have a conflict, or they have answers to . . . help them bridging.

[Friend]: You have a conflict?

[Y. I.]: I said, I may not personally have a conflict, but someone may perceive me as having a conflict.

[Friend]: You say you are a Christian, but is it OK for some of the (Hawaiian) practices?

[Y. I.]: I would conclude it depends on the practices.

[Friend]: You’ve gotta select . . .
[Y. I.]: No. I’d have to be selective.
[Friend]: You are using some of those (practices).
[Y. I.]: Because some of them are very parallel with the Christianity, some of them are parallel...
[Friend]: So you are not a true Christian.
[Y. I.]: Then, I’m not a true Christian, OK. I mean...
[Friend]: If you defined it that way...
[Y. I.]: Because to me, I’m comfortable after my experience and whatever’s gone through and all of them. I’m comfortable. But some of them may perceive me as a (false) Christian. Not being a Christian.
[Inoue]: Pagan Christian?
[Y. I.]: Then, you can have a pagan Christian, Oh!
[Friend]: You are a marginal Christian.
[Y. I.]: Marginal... he is making (another word).
[Friend]: Because I’m a marginal, I’m marginal in that, I respect it.
[Inoue]: On the other hand, it’s very difficult to find a true Christian.
[Y. I.]: Yeah.
[Friend]: That’s right.
[Y. I.]: We’d have to be monks. We’d have to go monastery.
[Inoue]: If Hawaiian Christians are not true Christians, probably Japanese Christians are also... not true Christians, because they have their way of thinking, Japanese religious thinking. So, who is the real Christian...
[Y. I.]: Well, who says that we cannot be both?... But I think your question might be correct, because most people are not at a point where they’re bridging. The majority keeps it separate... (05/03/1995)

Before this discussion, she admitted that she had previously felt the tension of being a Christian Hawaiian, and mentioned that Christian Hawaiians have to overcome a legacy of the missionary dualistic discourse, although there is not yet “a safe place” for Hawaiians to “truly say how they feel without being judged.” However, in the above statement, she mentions that she now may not have a conflict and is comfortable as a Christian Hawaiian, even if others try to see a conflict in her identity and define her as a false or pagan Christian. Of course, Christian Hawaiians — including her and other Hawaiians I interviewed — do not always struggle with the ontological problem of being Christian Hawaiian. Although many Christian Hawaiians recognize that Hawaiian Christian faith involves the problem, it is usually latent and becomes manifest only in a specific condition and context, such as the setting of an ethnographic interview. The point
in her narrative is that she acknowledges the potential problem of Hawaiian Christian faith but has reached her own interpretation of Christian faith with which she is comfortable as a Hawaiian.

**Culture and Faith**

As Y. I. mentions, it can be said that there are some Christian Hawaiians who do not believe there is a potential conflict between Hawaiian tradition and Christianity, while the majority, following the missionary dualistic discourse, keeps the two sides separate. In the course of the interviews, however, I rarely came across Christian Hawaiians who did not notice the potential conflict between Hawaiian tradition and Christian doctrine. Most Christian Hawaiians I interviewed recognize that there is a dichotomy between Hawaiian tradition and Christianity. Conservative Hawaiians rigidly separate them by emphasizing the differences, while liberal Hawaiians try to bridge them by finding the similarities. Generally, in the current social and political condition, many Christian Hawaiians, who attempt to bridge Hawaiian tradition and Christianity, are aware of the potential problem present in Hawaiian Christian faith. However, it is probable that even those who are sensitive to the problem do not always grapple squarely with it. They confront the problem that they usually sidestep by preparing a tentative answer, especially when they happen to participate in political rallies in which various Hawaiian traditional religious elements are conspicuously presented (or when an anthropologist suddenly asks them annoying questions about Hawaiian Christianity).

Y. I. mentions that she does not personally have a conflict as a Christian Hawaiian, even if others may perceive her as having such a conflict. I heard similar statements several times during the interviews. However, this does not necessarily mean that I am creating a problem that does not actually exist. Although liberal Hawaiian ministers and active Christian Hawaiians maintain that they do not have a problem, most of them mention that they once felt conflicted while establishing their Christian faith or
that they recognize that there is a potential conflict between Hawaiian tradition and Christianity. The following statement is Hawaiian minister I. J.’s written response to my request for an interview. Answering my question about whether Christianity is compatible with Hawaiian religious tradition, he writes:

I have no conflict between my being Hawaiian and my use of my culture in my faith as a Christian. I did feel differently before due to my conservative upbringing and teaching. I want my faith to reflect my culture and who I am as a native Hawaiian. . . .

I want to express my Christian faith through my Hawaiian culture — through the use of language, hula, values, chants, history, and hope that others also express their faith through their own culture. . . .

During the subsequent interview, he returns to this issue:

It’s hard to retain myself, my faith as Christian, and my culture as Hawaiian, I do not see any conflict. Others try to make conflict for me, but I do not have any conflict myself with it. Others I know are struggling with it, therefore I try to help them and teach by my example as well as from what I teach and what I preach, all these things that I do. Because I’m always in a community a lot, and I try to bridge those things together. (I can say) that faith and culture, faith and my Hawaiian culture are . . . complementary each other. There is no unanimous decision about that, but for me I have no problem, and I’m trying to make bridges . . . (I. J., 04/20/1995)

How to negotiate being Hawaiian and being Christian is certainly a problem that must be overcome in the process of constructing Christian Hawaiian identity as well as establishing Hawaiian Christian faith. However, the construction of Christian Hawaiian identity is not accomplished in the manner that one first becomes a Hawaiian and then later becomes a Christian. Christian “Hawaiian identity” and Hawaiian “Christian faith” are constructed simultaneously and, therefore, being (and becoming) Hawaiian and being (and becoming) Christian are inseparably intertwined. Hawaiian minister P. I. summarizes this well, when responding to my question about the relation between being Hawaiian and being Christian:

I don’t see a difference, I’m Hawaiian and I’m Christian. Being Hawaiian is what I know as I grew up Hawaiian as well as Christian. Because my parents never made them two distinctions, two different . . . we are Hawaiian, we are Christian. Hawaiian is my ethnicity, and Christian is my faith. Some Hawaiians I know, say, “Oh no, I’m Christian first, then I’m
Hawaiian." Which came first? Chicken and egg. I was born as Hawaiian, Hawaiian . . . (and) I accepted Christian faith. (P. I., 05/09/1995)

As seen in this statement as well as Y. I.'s, most Christian Hawaiians I interviewed mention that they were born as Hawaiians and then accepted or chose Christian faith.

The relation between Hawaiian tradition and Christianity is remapped and more clearly identified in the following statement, by Hawaiian minister I. J, when discussing how to reintroduce Hawaiian tradition into church:

When people criticize us Hawaiians for our introduction of Hawaiian tradition into church, what they're saying is that they want an American culture in the church, and that's not (right), that's wrong as well. If you place the same kind of criteria, that's wrong as well. You cannot have a culture-free faith. Cannot! Although there’re some people (who) say you should not have a culture in your faith, you cannot mix your culture, you should not mix your culture into the faith, I cannot do that. (I. J., 04/20/1995)

For him, there is no culture-free Christianity. If there is a conflict or tension, it exists not between Hawaiian tradition and Christianity, but between Hawaiian tradition and American Christianity. The understanding that any Christian faith must be embraced in a culture is a significant theological turning point for native Christians.

I would like to present another statement that echoes the aforementioned narrative about the conflict involved in Hawaiian Christian faith. It is the statement made by Hawaiian minister R. P., after explaining his multi-ethnic background. Concerning his mentor’s influence in his life, he says:

When I put together what he [my mentor] taught me and what my father taught, I realized, (in) all my life I have been trained, but I have been taught to be a Hawaiian spiritualist. I choose to be a Christian minister, a religious survival, but my spiritual foundation is native Hawaiian. And I operate out of this. For me, then, I have no conflict, because by my very birth I am a spiritual being. And I express that spiritualness at this time of my choice, by expressing it in the Hawaiian religious way and in the Christian way.

People have questioned me and even Christian ministers said, “You’re a pagan priest.” And I looked at them, and I learned it hurt very much, but I learned to say, “That becomes your problem.” Because I know where I come from. And they tell me, “How can you worship God?” I said, “The term God has been taken over and dominated by your American definition. I think that . . .” And they said, “No, it’s not Almighty God.” My question
to Christian churches is this, “How dare you claim Almighty God is your personal definition. How dare you devalue, ignore the existence of almost two thirds of the world (which are not Christian).” (R. P., 11/03/1994)

Like other liberal Hawaiian ministers, R. P. is active both in church and native politics and struggles to establish Hawaiian Christian theology, and he is also confronted with the problem of how to keep balance in Hawaiianizing Christianity for his conservative local congregation. He defines his position as a Hawaiian minister as follows:

My parents and grandparents grow up in the era when native people could not talk out. I am in the bridging between my parents and activists who are very outspoken and very angry. I have gone through some of those anger. And now I feel very comfortable where I am. Not everybody acknowledges or welcomes it. I am not welcome in some of our Hawaiian churches. They don’t trust me. Because my understanding of Christian Gospel clearly speaks of my understanding of who I am as a cultural person. And they say that’s radical. Hawaiian activists, many of them feel that I am not radical enough. So I’m in that bridge. (R. P., 11/03/1994)

Several Hawaiian ministers try to establish Christian faith through Hawaiian culture, believing that “both culture and faith can be one, joined together, and enriching each other” (I. J., 1995/04/20). However, the problem is how to reach a consensus among Christian Hawaiians concerning the definition of Hawaiian culture as a whole. What is at stake here is not which part of Hawaiian traditional culture is compatible with Christianity, but whether various versions of Hawaiian-ness that are imagined diversely can be appropriated to construct a more or less unified Hawaiian Christianity. Even if Christian Hawaiians overcome the missionary dualistic discourse and have pride in their own culture, the Hawaiian culture which they take pride in does not necessarily constitute the same Hawaiian-ness. Many Christian Hawaiians — especially liberal Hawaiian ministers — agree about the importance of establishing Hawaiian Christianity, but how to localize Christian faith in a Hawaiian way varies because of their diverse interpretations of Hawaiian-ness.
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Concluding Remarks

The relationship between being Hawaiian and being Christian is a complex issue for Christian Hawaiians who desire to embrace Christian faith in a Hawaiian way. There may be Christian Hawaiians who have never experienced a conflict between being Hawaiian and being Christian. However, a large majority of Christian Hawaiians — at least, most of the Christian Hawaiians I interviewed — have experienced this problem or still confront it, although some believe they have resolved the problem. Of course, even such perception undergoes constant revision and Christian Hawaiians are in a continual process of constructing Hawaiian Christianity. They try to do so by relocating traditional practices into the church, by reinterpreting Hawaiian values in the Christian context, and by reading Scripture as well as Christian teachings in a Hawaiian manner. In the process of establishing Hawaiian Christian faith, they not only Christianize Hawaiian values, but also discover Christian values in Hawaiian tradition.

When Christian Hawaiians are constructing Hawaiian identity, they are simultaneously establishing Christian faith, and vice versa. Except for this double construction of Christian Hawaiian identity (and Hawaiian Christian faith), there is no other way for them to be Hawaiian as well as Christian. For Christian Hawaiians — especially liberal Hawaiian ministers — who are aware that there is no culture-free Christianity, a real conflict exists not between being Hawaiian and being Christian, but between Hawaiian culture and American Christianity. Therefore, some Hawaiian ministers believe that becoming Christian means for Hawaiians to break away from American Christianity.

There are conservative Christian Hawaiians who are not free from the dualistic discourse of the 19th century missionaries, who dichotomized primitive paganism and civilized Christianity. As I have indicated in this chapter, however, a new generation of Hawaiian Christians are now emerging to lead the Christian Hawaiian community. For
these liberal Christian Hawaiians who are struggling to establish Hawaiian Christianity, the difficulty lies not in the legacy of the missionary dualistic discourse, but rather in a definition of Hawaiian-ness that can be shared by Christian Hawaiians. The problem they confront is how to establish Christian faith based on Hawaiian culture. Strictly speaking, it is a problem of how to deal with the relation between “culture” and “faith.” Although Christianity as faith is liberated from American culture in idea, Hawaiian tradition as culture is not clearly identified against Christianity. It is difficult to locate Hawaiian tradition as a rigid cultural entity against Christianity. It is also difficult to identify Hawaiian-ness as an integrated nativeness against the foreign faith.

This difficulty originates in the multi-religious, multi-ethnic and multi-cultural conditions surrounding Christian Hawaiians. It is also complicated by the post-colonial condition in which they are recovering their culture by surmounting drastic cultural change, but at the same time being involved in the politics of cultural representation. In the politics of culture, Hawaiian-ness, which is a symbolic complex composed of Hawaiian tradition, culture and identity, is represented in a highly discursive manner. If there are various competitive narratives and interpretations of what it means to be Hawaiian, Hawaiianized Christianity also becomes involved in the cultural politics. What I have described in this chapter is a part of the complicated condition of current Hawaiian Christianity. However, I think that it is neither a predicament nor a chaotic state in which Christian Hawaiians do not know how to reach the comfortable state of Hawaiian Christian faith. By remembering, recovering and retrieving the Hawaiian past, tradition and culture, they imagine and desire Hawaiian Christianity and Christian Hawaiian identity of the future.
NOTES

[1] As I have already discussed concerning the politics of culture in Chapter 2, to say that traditions are recovered, recaptured and reinterpreted does not mean that they are fabricated and forged for a specific socio-political purpose or that they are inauthentic traditions.

[2] In the interviews, I misunderstood the meaning of *mihi* [repentance] and confused it with *kala* [forgiveness]. Because informants also misinterpreted the word *mihi* as forgiveness, however, we were able to continue interviews without hindrance. We misunderstood *mihi* as forgiveness for good reason. According to Pukui et al. (1972:62), *mihi* and *kala* are the twin terms, in which a series of repenting-forgiving-releasing is embodied, in the context of *ho'oponopono*.

[3] In Chapter 5, I investigated the practice of *ho'okupu* in the questionnaire analysis of Hawaiian high school students. At least in the result of the questionnaire, it can be said that they offer *ho'okupu* both in Christian and non-Christian contexts; in the latter case, *ho'okupu* does not necessarily denote Hawaiian traditional religion. Many Hawaiian students seem to offer *ho'okupu* as an ordinary Hawaiian custom, whether they do so in a Hawaiian cultural cite or in church.

[4] As I discussed about the problematics of ethnicity in Chapter 5, self-identification always requires the existence of the Other. Therefore, in this case, American Christianity does not need to have a concrete substance, but rather it may be conceptually assumed as something negated. There are other terms that designate what American Christianity means, such as *haole* Christianity (or church) and missionary church; these terms have slightly different meanings and usages. However, such self-identification (through the objectification of the negated Other) is sometimes vulnerable in the politics of representation. For example, an elderly Hawaiian minister of the UCC once mentioned in my interview that even Hawaiian churches of the UCC were sometimes criticized as *haole* church by other Christian Hawaiians. It is significant to investigate in what context and for what purpose such labels as American Christianity and *haole* church are used.
CHAPTER 8
CLOSING REMARKS

Each chapter of this dissertation is written as an independent essay in order to approach Hawaiian Christianity as the problem of culture from different angles; some chapters focus directly on the construction of Hawaiian Christianity, while others reexamine the theoretical issues — the dilemma of cultural constructionism and the concept of ethnicity — that I find important in the process of investigating Hawaiian Christianity. The basic strategy of this study is to describe and interpret the present condition of Hawaiian Christianity that belongs to Congregational tradition — Christian Hawaiian identity and Hawaiian Christian faith — by putting it in the broader historical context. In order to do so, I attempt to contrast Hawaiian Christianity in the latter half of the 19th century, when Hawaiians experienced drastic social and political changes including the overthrow of monarchy, and in the late 20th century, when Hawaiians were recovering from the “slow genocide” (a certain Hawaiian minister’s phrase) and struggling to regain their political as well as cultural sovereignty.

The historical understanding of the past is indispensable to the ethnographic understanding of the present, especially when studying the people who must remember and recover their tradition from the past in order to imagine and construct their identity in the present post-colonial condition. In this dissertation, I conduct the historical study of Hawaiian Christianity in order to make a better interpretation of the present condition of Christian Hawaiians. However, this does not necessarily mean that I subjugate the historical study of the past to the ethnographic study of the present. One of the interpretations that I make in the ethnographic study of present Hawaiian Christianity is that Hawaiian-ness — a symbolic complex of Hawaiian tradition and identity — is the most significant factor for the present Christian Hawaiians who are establishing their own
Christian faith. From this interpretation, I come up with the idea that "culture" is seriously considered and consciously represented when it is considered to be in a drastic alteration. Based on this ethnographic understanding, I reinvestigate the construction of Hawaiian Christianity in the past from a different angle and question whether Christian Hawaiians in the past faced the problem of Hawaiian identity in a same sense as in the present, when accepting Christian faith. In this way, the ethnographic understanding of the present can be applied to the historical investigation of the past. The historical study of the past and the ethnographic study of the present can contribute to each other to improve interpretation.

My main interest throughout the dissertation is not so much in generalization of the construction of Hawaiian Christianity, but in initiating discussion or dialogue through studying Hawaiian Christianity as the problem of culture (or cultural identity). In the ethnographic study of present Hawaiian Christianity, I conclude that the cultural identity of Christian Hawaiians is diversely constructed, but unified under the problems — how to reinterpret Hawaiian tradition that was once denied by the missionaries and how to redefine Hawaiian-ness to establish Hawaiian Christian faith — that produce the diversity. While delineating the diverse positions of the present Christian Hawaiians, I also point out that they are in a continual process of constructing Hawaiian Christian faith and Christian Hawaiian identity. Another point I clarify is that while the past Christian Hawaiians did not grapple squarely with the sense of being Hawaiian as a problem between culture and faith, the present Christian Hawaiians are strongly aware of the problem of Hawaiian-ness. Different from their ancestors, the present Christian Hawaiians must become Hawaiian as well as Christian in the process of constructing Hawaiian Christianity. It is the double construction of Hawaiian Christian faith and Christian Hawaiian identity.
There are a few problems in this ethnographic study of Hawaiian Christianity in the past and the present. First, the strategic framework that compares Hawaiian Christianity in the late 19th century and the late 20th century cannot fully explain why at present the formerly latent oppositional relationship between culture and faith becomes actualized and is represented as the problem that must be overcome. There are several reasons for this. For example, the post-colonial condition, the Fourth world situation and the cultural politics surrounding the present Christian Hawaiians can be considered primary factors. However, in order to investigate not only why, but also when and how such a shift — from the past, when Hawaiians simply desired to be Christians, to the present, when they want to become “Hawaiian” Christians — occurred, it is extremely urgent to conduct an ethnographic study of Hawaiian Christianity in the early to the mid 20th century, which is considered a significant era for Hawaiian Christianity but not covered in this dissertation.

Another problem of this study is a manner of writing. Although I aim to describe thickly and interpret deeply the present condition of Hawaiian Christianity by contrasting the past and the present, I cannot fully integrate the historical investigation of the past and the ethnographic interpretation of the present into one. I am open to the criticism of only juxtaposing the past and the present and entrusting a reader with a task of dynamic integration of the two parts of the dissertation. This is partly because I write each chapter as an independent essay. I am now searching for a different way to write about Hawaiian Christianity in the past and the present, without excessively separating my investigation into the two parts.

I point out in Chapter 2 that good anthropology should start by constructing a dialogical relationship in order to avoid a breakdown between opposing voices. In this dissertation, however, I was unable to successfully accomplish a dialogical ethnographic study of contemporary Christian Hawaiians. This is the third — but no less significant —
problem. Many of the Christian Hawaiian narratives that I investigated in this study were collected through a dialogical interaction in ethnographic interviews, and my interpretation of these narratives was, from the start, made in such a dialogical relationship. However, my description and interpretation of contemporary Hawaiian Christianity is still presented rather monologically. Those who were investigated in this study will no doubt have various opinions about my interpretation. In order to incorporate such different voices in future work, I will have to continue a dialogue with the Christian Hawaiians who graciously provided me with their narratives through interviews and will have their own opinions about this dissertation. Through the construction of such "real dialogue," I would like to aim for an anthropology with intellectual humility and sincerity. This study is, therefore, only the first step in my study of Hawaiian Christianity.
APPENDIX A
A Questionnaire Sheet

SURVEY OF RELIGION & CULTURAL IDENTITY

This is a survey which aims at studying religion and cultural identity. Thank you for cooperating with this project.

A. GENERAL QUESTIONS
1. Your Sex
   ☐ male ☐ female

2. Your Age
   [ ] years old

3. Place of Birth
   City [ ] State [ ] Country [ ]

4. What is your father’s ethnic background? Check one.
   NOTE: If you think that two or more ethnic backgrounds are equally strong for him, choose “9) Other” and explain it in brief. You can also choose “9) Other” when you cannot find a single ethnic background which fits him.

   1) ☐ Caucasian  2) ☐ Japanese  3) ☐ Filipino  4) ☐ (part-)Hawaiian
   5) ☐ Chinese  6) ☐ Portuguese  7) ☐ Okinawan  8) ☐ Korean
   9) ☐ Other [ ]

5. What is your mother’s ethnic background? Check one.
   NOTE: If you think that two or more ethnic backgrounds are equally strong for her, choose “9) Other” and explain it in brief. You can also choose “9) Other” when you cannot find a single ethnic background which fits her.

   1) ☐ Caucasian  2) ☐ Japanese  3) ☐ Filipino  4) ☐ (part-)Hawaiian
   5) ☐ Chinese  6) ☐ Portuguese  7) ☐ Okinawan  8) ☐ Korean
   9) ☐ Other [ ]

6. What ethnic background do you feel the strongest for your identity? Could you explain it in brief?

B. LANGUAGE
1. Why do you study Hawaiian language? Please explain it in brief.

2. Who can speak Hawaiian fluently in your family? Check all that apply.
   1) ☐ father  6) ☐ aunt
   2) ☐ mother  7) ☐ brother
   3) ☐ grandfather  8) ☐ sister
   4) ☐ grandmother  9) ☐ other [ ]
   5) ☐ uncle  10) ☐ none
C. RELIGION
1. Which religion is your father affiliated with?
   - No Specific Religion
   - Buddhist
   - Roman Catholic
   - Protestant: which denomination?
   - Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints
   - Other Religion
   - I don’t know.

2. Which religion is your mother affiliated with?
   - No Specific Religion
   - Buddhist
   - Roman Catholic
   - Protestant: which denomination?
   - Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints
   - Other Religion
   - I don’t know.

3. Which religion are you affiliated with?
   - No Specific Religion
   - Buddhist
   - Roman Catholic
   - Protestant: which denomination?
   - Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints
   - Other Religion

4. If you belong to any church, how long have you been attending the church?
   [ ] years

5. If you belong to any church, how often do you attend the church service and activity?
   1) once or twice a year
   2) more than twice a year but less than once a month -- between 1) & 3)
   3) about once a month
   4) more than once a month but less than once a week -- between 3) & 5)
   5) about once a week
   6) more than once a week

6. If you attend the church service and activity, why do you do so? Please explain it in brief.

7. Do you know your family ‘aumakua?’
   - yes
   - no
   - n/a (My family doesn’t have ‘aumakua.)

8. If you chose “yes” in Q7, what is your family ‘aumakua’?
   [ ]
   - I don’t want to answer.

9. If you chose “yes” in Q7, have you ever felt your family ‘aumakua’?
   - yes
   - no

10. If you chose “yes” in Q7, have you ever fed or worshiped family ‘aumakua’?
    - yes
    - no

11. Do you have any family or relative who continues to feed family ‘aumakua’?
    - yes
    - no
    - I don’t know.
12. Have you ever offered ho'okupu at heiau or other sacred places?
   □ yes □ no

13. If you chose “yes” in Q12, when did you offer ho'okupu at the last time and why?

14. It is generally said that many Hawaiians are now Christian. Do you think that Christian Hawaiians can keep their relation with their 'aumakua?
   □ yes □ no □ neither “yes” nor “no”

15. Do you think that Christian Hawaiians can participate in any traditional Hawaiian religious ceremony for native gods and 'aumakua?
   □ yes □ no □ neither “yes” nor “no”

D. IDENTITY & OTHERS
1. In the following pairs, which element is more important for being Hawaiian? Please choose one in each pair (For example, you must choose “Hawaiian foods” OR “Hawaiian language” in question 1).

  1. □ Hawaiian foods □ Hawaiian language
  2. □ Hawaiian language □ Hawaiian language
  3. □ Hula and Hawaiian music □ Hawaiian language
  4. □ Hawaiian language □ Hawaiian language
  5. □ Hawaiian values (aloha, 'ohana, etc.) □ Hawaiian foods
  6. □ Hula and Hawaiian music □ Hawaiian language
  7. □ Hawaiian blood and ancestry □ Hawaiian foods
  8. □ Hawaiian values (aloha, 'ohana, etc.) □ Hawaiian foods
  9. □ Hawaiian language □ Hawaiian language
  10. □ Hula and Hawaiian music □ Hawaiian language
  11. □ Hawaiian blood and ancestry □ Hawaiian values (aloha, 'ohana, etc.)
  12. □ Hawaiian foods □ Traditonal Hawaiian religion
  13. □ Hawaiian foods □ Hawaiian values (aloha, 'ohana, etc.)
  14. □ Traditional Hawaiian religion □ Hawaiian values (aloha, 'ohana, etc.)
  15. □ Hula and Hawaiian music □ Hawaiian blood and ancestry

2. To what extent are you interested in the Hawaiian sovereignty movement?
   1) □ very interested
   2) □ somewhat interested
   3) □ neither interested nor uninterested
   4) □ somewhat uninterested
   5) □ not interested at all

3. Do you think that Hawaiians need some form of sovereignty in Hawaii?
   □ yes □ no
4. If you chose "yes" in Q3, which form of sovereignty is the most ideal for Hawaiians?

1) ☐ Nation within a Nation
   (Hawaiian Nation must work with the American government system.)

2) ☐ Hawaiian Sovereignty under the United Nations
   (Hawaiian Nation has its own status in the international arena.)

3) ☐ Total independence for a new Hawaiian Nation

4) ☐ I think that Hawaiians need some form of sovereignty, but I don't know which form is the most ideal.

5) ☐ Other [ ]

5. If you chose "no" in Q3, why do you think that Hawaiians do not need any form of sovereignty?

This is the end of this questionnaire.
Thank you very much for your kind cooperation.
APPENDIX B

A letter from Kaona’s followers published in the PCA (1868/10/24)

From the Camp at Kainaliu.

NORTH KONA, October 9th, 1868.

To the Editor of the Commercial Advertiser

Some folks might like to know what a jolly time we had celebrating the 150th psalm. You see we are justified in having a big time. We had been a month previous collecting all the kerosene oil cans, tin pots and kettles, pipes and plates that we could think of, except the old harps of King David, which we did not know how to make. Our thanks are due to a neighbor, who fitted us up with some big drums, made from sugar kegs, which answer the purpose well, he being a man well skilled in all manner of work. Our Prophet says we must keep it up for seven days, as they did amongst the Israelites of old.

We have seven banners of divers colors to present the seven vials of wrath which is to come, and we have other flags of different colors to represent the clouds at night, which we keep watch for, whilst other people sleep. It's true we feel very stupid in the morning, and are not able to do any work, although we have been offered work. But then our beloved Prophet tells us we don't require any work, provided we keep awake night and day a fasting, and that we will talk with unknown tongues, and then we ourselves will prophesy. Well, you see it is a fact, and that any man may see, if he will come and see for himself, for our tongues are so thick and ourselves stupid, that we can't understand each other from watching and fasting.

This same day we were much troubled by seeing our Prophet fall into a trance, so then we expected to hear of another volcano running down, as that would be fulfilling another prophesy that all outsiders are going to be destroyed, and we only saved, who were then stopping on the Land Lehuula nui. But when he came to himself, what astonished us most was, that God objected to our renting that said land, and that the man sent to Honolulu came back with the money, $120, Mr. C. Kanaina declining to receive it. That was all right, as God told the Prophet that a stream of lava would soon run down said land. We believe all this to be a fact, and so would others if they had taken their oaths on the Bible, as we have done, to stick to Joseph Kaona through thick and thin. So you see, when a man takes an oath on the Bible, it is hard to break it, although I don't mean to say that all the prophecies come right, for at the time we had a long drought he told us to fill all our bottles and calabashes with water, and stow them away in holes, caves and in our trunks, as there would be no more rain until the millennium, which would destroy all but ourselves.
Whenever we see our enemies, or go by their houses, we strike up the psalm King David sung against his enemies, and we, the parents, instruct our children to do the same, as therein we feel joyful.

Now, then, since the prophecy about the land, we understand that our neighbor, the Noble Duke, had secured the land previous to our application, and that we have no one to blame but ourselves, since we gave out what a fine time we would have gathering our enemies' stock. But our neighbor, who likes a retired life, did not like the idea of being harassed at the bar of justification, and having an eye to number one, he engaged the land in good time, for which he deserves the thanks of others of his neighbors in the same fix as himself. However, it will not be a hard matter for us to get other land, as that will be the only land that will be safe from the volcano that is to destroy all other places.

It is true we are getting short of products, such as hogs, turkeys, chickens and taro, and now that our feast of leaven is taking place, we have cooked all the hot stones or altar, as they did of old with the blood. You see our doctrine is an improvement. We are getting a good many new disciples, who are coming in every day, and we hope to get some influential ones, to help us keep up our feasts. They might as well do it, as they will lose all they have got if they don't join us. If they will come to us, they will not have to work, as our Prophet will tell them how to get along without it.

Sometimes persons come amongst us wearing our white veils, but whether they think as we do or not, is best known to our Prophet, who know all things; or whether it is to kill two birds with one stone or not, and who have kindly invited our Prophet to wine. So you see we are a respectable sect. We would like to bring all these things to light, so that this good government, so kind in subsidizing foreign steam navigation, might help us. It may now be late for us to ask for a little subsidy, yet if we are behind the last Legislature, we may be in time for the next Parliament. If not that, couldn't we get the Island of Lanai or Kahoolawe? We will not be particular about the soil, as we don't cultivate except sweet potatoes, corn and beans, which come to maturity quick; we calculate to live mostly by psalm-singing.

Another pilikia* we have just at hand. The tax-collector is coming along on the 6th of next month for money that we have not on hand, as we spent all we had for linens, which are costly, and got credit. But we did not consider that anything, as we expected before this time that all would be destroyed except ourselves. Another misfortune is, that instead of going to the place where the assessor told us to assemble, we would not go, because the owner of that house was not of our persuasion; the consequence is that he took down the last year's assessment, although previously we sold our horses to buy our white robes, to be ready for our passover. But we will soon know something mighty, as our Prophet prophesies that he has to go to prison once more, which then will be seven times; and then will be the end, and we will be all right. So you see we are waiting patiently for this last miracle. Some of us are prophesying; you must know by this time we all do a little at that business.
The Church Lanakila is going soon to be opened, and we are all going to make a grand rush to that building, as we all contributed towards the building of it, and that might be the time our great Head may do something that might commit him. But I am in hopes they won’t keep him altogether the next time they get him down there, for that would spoil our fun, and there might not be a chance of subsidy. We want reduction in the taxes, as we ourselves, and the blight, and the ants, are a heavy pressure on this little place, Kainaliu. There are over three hundred of us, and we are sworn to abide by our Makua,** and as he tells us we must not work, we need the subsidy or the island before-mentioned. We are not allowed to sign individually. We call ourselves

OHANA

New Camp, Lehuula

* The Hawaiian word “pilikia” means “problem.”

** The Hawaiian word “makua” literally means “parent.” But when it starts with a capital letter (“Makua”), it means “Father (God, in Christian prayers).”
| **ahu**     | heap, pile; altar.       |
| **akua**   | god, goddess.           |
| **ali‘i**  | chief, chiefess.        |
| **alo**    | front, face, presence.  |
| **aloha**  | aloha, love, affection. |
| **aloha ‘āina** | love of the land or one’s country. |
| **ānuenue** | rainbow.              |
| **Baibala Hemolele** | Holy Bible. also, Paipala Hemolele. |
| **hana ho‘omanamana** | superstitious work.     |
| **haole**  | white person, American, Englishman, Caucasian; American, English; foreign. |
| **hapahale** | part-white person; part white and part Hawaiian, as an individual or phenomenon. |
| **Hawai‘i nei** | this (beloved) Hawai‘i. |
| **hā**     | to breathe, exhale.     |
| **heiau**  | pre-Christian place of worship, shrine. |
| **hewa**   | mistake, fault, error, sin; wrong, incorrect. |
| **hihi’o** | a dream or vision, as while dozing; to dream while dozing. |
| **holukū** | a long, one-piece dress. |
| **honu**   | general name for turtle and tortoise. |
| **ho‘okupu** | tribute, tax, ceremonial gift-giving to a chief as a sign of honor and respect; to pay such tribute; church offering. |
| **Ho‘omanana Na‘auao** | the denomination title of the oldest independent Hawaiian church, derived from the phrase “reasonable service” in Romans 12:1. Ke Alaula O Ka Malamalama is the mother church. |
“Church of the Living God,” the denomination title of the currently largest independent Hawaiian church which separated from Ho'omana Naauao. Ka Makua Mau Loa is the mother church.

to impart mana, as to idols or objects; superstitious.
a form of imitative magic in which the practitioner, while concentrating, touched a part of his own body, thereby causing injury to his victim's body in the same place, as a chest pain or headache.

(a) to put to rights; to put in order or shape, correct. (b) mental cleansing; family conferences in which relationships were set right (ho'oponopono) through prayer, discussion, confession, repentance, and mutual restitution and forgiveness.
sorcery; to send spirits on an errand, especially of destruction. also ho'ounauna.

(a) to show, exhibit. (b) witness. (c) school commencement. (d) Congregational convention of various Sunday Schools with singing and recitation.

revelation from the gods (as in dreams or omens). also, hō'ike a ka pō.

Protestant. lit. Denier of the Pope.

the hula, a hula dancer; to dance the hula.

modern hula; informal hula without ceremony or offering.
hula school (lit. long house for hula instruction).
classic hula.

massed hula dancing.
gourd drum with a top section.
honored attendant, guardian; pastor, minister, reverend, or preacher of a church.

priest, sorcerer, minister, expert in any profession.

medical doctor, medical practitioner (lit. curing expert).
kahuna lā'au lapa'au  herb doctor (lit. expert of herbal medicine).
kahuna pule  preacher, pastor, minister (lit. prayer expert).
kahuna 'anā'anā  sorcerer who practices black magic and counter sorcery, as one who prays a person to death.
kala  to loosen; to forgive.
Kalawina  Calvinistic, Congregational.
kapa  tapa, as made from wauke or māmaki bark.
kapu  taboo, prohibition.
kāhili  feather standard, symbolic of royalty.
kāhuna  plural of kahuna.
kāhuna lā'au lapa'au  plural of kahuna lā'au lapa'au.
kāhuna 'anā'anā  plural of kahuna 'anā'anā.
kālaipāhoa  name of three woods (kauila, nīoi, 'ohe) believed to be the tree forms of two male gods (Kāne-i-kaulana-'ula and Ka-huila-o-ka-lani) and one goddess (Kapo); small pieces of the wood or roots were used in black magic.
Keakuamanaloa  Almighty God.
kiaʻāina  governor (lit. prop of the land).
kiʻi  image, statue, picture.
koʻa  the largest of native forest trees (Acacia koa), a valuable lumber tree.
koko  blood.
kuleana  right, privilege, responsibility.
kumu hula  hula master or teacher.
kupuna  grandparent, ancestor, relative or close friend of the grandparent's generation.
kūpuna  plural of kupuna.
Laka  Goddess of the hula.
lapa'au medical practice.
lānai porch, veranda, balcony; temporary roofed construction with open sides near a house.
lei necklace of flowers, leaves, shells, ivory, feathers, or paper, given as symbol of affection.
Lono one of the four major gods brought from Kahiki.
lōkahi unity, agreement, harmony.
luna foreman, leader, supervisor, officer of any sort.
lū'au Hawaiian feast.
maha'oi bold, impertinent, impudent.
Makahiki ancient festival beginning about the middle of October and lasting about four months.
make to die.
makua parent, any relatives of the parents' generation; Father (in Christian prayer)
mana supernatural or divine power.
manō general name for shark.
mā part. following names of persons. ex. Hina mā [Hina the others]
mālama to take care of.
mālama 'āina taking care of the land.
Māmalahoa the name of Kamehameha's famous law of the splintered paddle. also, Māmalahoe.
ma'i 1. sickness, disease. 2. genitals.
ma'i hebera smallpox (lit. Hebrew disease).
ma'i lēpela leprosy.
ma'i 'ōku'u disease at time of Kamehameha I, probably cholera.
mihī repentance; to repent.
moe 'uhane  dream; to dream (lit. soul sleep).
moo'o  lizard.
nei  following nouns and pronouns, nei means 'this' and may indicate affection, as in the common sequences Hawai'i nei.
niele  to keep asking questions; inquisitive, nosy.
pahu  drum.
pau  finished, ended.
p'aakai  salt.
Pele  the volcano goddess.
pilikia  trouble of any kind.
po'i  the Hawaiian staff of life, made from cooked taro corms, pounded and thinned with water.
po'e haole  Caucasian (lit. white people).
pueo  Hawaiian short-eared owl.
pule  prayer, magic spell; to pray.
pu'uhonua  place of refuge.
tūtū  granny, grandma, grandpa.
wehe i ka Paipala  open the Bible (at random, select a passage and interpret this as help or solution to a problem).
wiki  to hurry; quick.
'aikapu  to eat under taboo; to observe eating taboos.
'anā'anā  black magic, evil sorcery by means of prayer and incantation.
'aumakua  family or personal gods, deified ancestors who might assume the shape of animals, plants, minerals and nature's forces.
'aumākua  plural of 'aumakua.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>'awa</th>
<th>kava (<em>Piper methysticum</em>), the root being the source of a narcotic drink of the same name used in ceremonies.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'āina</td>
<td>land, earth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'io</td>
<td>Hawaiian hawk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'ohana</td>
<td>family, relative, kin group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'ohe hano ihu</td>
<td>nose flute.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'oki</td>
<td>to cut, sever.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'okina</td>
<td>glottal stop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'ukulele</td>
<td>ukulele (<em>lit.</em> leaping flea).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'unihipili</td>
<td>spirit of a dead person.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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