Introduction

*Mai Kahiki Mai: Out from Kahiki*

They came from the south. We do not know exactly when they came, why they came, or how many of them there were, but we know they came from the south. We know they came from a millennia-old tradition of Austronesian voyaging, discovery, and settlement that had colonized all the inhabitable lands of Oceania. They brought with them a set of agricultural practices and knowledge, developed over thousands of miles and hundreds of generations of voyaging into a transportable agricultural toolkit that would allow them to survive in a wide range of island ecosystems. They brought, either on the initial voyage or later ones, the plants and animals that provided not just their food, but their containers, medicine, and cloth. They brought kukui to fuel their lamps and 'awa,1 to ease the weariness and pains of daily life.

They brought with them their gods, genealogies, and heroes; their arts and sciences; their knowledge of the seas and the skies; their dances, chants, feather work, and carving. They brought their language, the Eastern Polynesian line of the broader Austronesian language group, which stretches from Madagascar to Rapa Nui. They brought with them all the things that would one day define so much of Native Hawaiian culture, and of Native Hawaiians as a people, but they were not Native

---

1 Following on the work of other historians working on Oceanic and indigenous topics, I have opted not to italicize terms from Oceanic and indigenous languages, as these are not foreign languages but rather indigenous languages of Oceania. When the terms are italicized it is only when specifically discussing a word or term as a word or term. For instance, 'awa is not capitalized in the preceding text, but it would be capitalized in a discussion of the difference between the Hawaiian word *awa* and the Tahitian term *kava*.
Hawaiians. The history of Hawai‘i starts not with Native Hawaiians, but with islanders from distant parts of Oceania.

Over the ensuing centuries, however, their descendants would become what we now call Native Hawaiians, Kānaka Maoli, Kānaka ‘Ōiwi, Kānaka Hawai‘i, or more simply just Kānaka. Cultural and social innovations, variations in ritual and worship and language, and most importantly a strong cultural connection to the land and seas of their new home would define them as a separate people from their migratory ancestors. They would become the Lāhui Hawai‘i, the Hawaiian people. New variations of agricultural practices adapted to the lands and waters of their new homes allowed them to first survive and then thrive. They developed vast networks of loko i‘a (fishponds), lo‘i kalo (taro paddies), and dry-land ‘uala (sweet potato) farming that allowed them to feed a population that eventually surpassed that of many of the other islands their ancestors had settled.

The great distances involved and the lack of need for persistent travel meant that voyaging to the south eventually either ceased completely or became so rare as to take on an almost mythic quality. As David Chang has argued, however, the lack of direct communication should not be mistaken for a lack of understanding that other lands and other peoples existed beyond the horizon. The people of Hawai‘i would maintain numerous mo‘olelo (oral histories and legends) regarding voyages to and from Hawai‘i. These mo‘olelo and other forms of oral culture often retained the names of important places from the south, such as references 1
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1 The terms Native Hawaiian, Kanaka Hawai‘i, Kanaka Māoli (true/real person), and Kanaka ‘Ōiwi (native person) are all in common usage to refer specifically to the indigenous people of Hawai‘i. Except in specific cases when Kanaka (singular) or Kānaka (plural) might need to be clarified, I have chosen to primarily but not exclusively use the term Kanaka/Kānaka or Kānaka Hawai‘i throughout this text. I have also chosen to use Hawaiian as an adjective to describe things explicitly tied to Hawai‘i as a whole, rather than just Kānaka, such as Hawaiian history or Hawaiian politics. I have used Kanaka as an adjective to describe things related to Kānaka Maoli as a people, such as Kanaka missionaries being specifically missionaries who are Kānaka. Finally, I have chosen to use ‘Ōiwi to modify things specifically tied to or stemming from Ka Wā ‘Ōiwi Wale, the time before Cook’s arrival that was exclusively shaped and directed by Kānaka, such as ‘Ōiwi value systems or ‘Ōiwi agricultural methods.

2 Hard archeological evidence of such voyages is scarce, but by its nature archeology is much better suited to tracing broad shifts in a society rather than specific isolated journeys. There is some hard evidence of such journeys, however, most notably Petroglyph styles specific to Hawai‘i that have been found in Tonga. Shane Egan and David V. Burley, “Triangular Men on One Very Long Voyage: The Context and Implications of a Hawaiian-Style Petroglyph Site in the Polynesian Kingdom of Tonga,” The Journal of the Polynesian Society 118, no. 3 (2009): 209–232.
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to Bora Bora as the original home of Pele and her family. As time passed however, the specific details of these stories sometimes faded into obscurity, and Kahiki (Tahiti) soon dominated Kanaka collective memories of the South. In addition to specifically signifying Tahiti, the term Kahiki became a catchall term for all foreign lands. The kolea, or golden plover, for instance, frequently wintered in Hawai‘i but laid its eggs elsewhere. Not knowing where exactly that elsewhere was, Kānaka described its homeland simply as Kahiki, somewhere beyond the waters of Hawai‘i.4

In these mo‘olelo, Kahiki remained a place of significant mana, the term used in Hawai‘i and other parts of Oceania for a mix of power, authority, and prestige. Indeed, the lack of regular contact may have even inflated the sense of Kahiki as a place of mana. Stories of the arrival of the priest Pa‘ao and his chief Pili, for instance, remained prominent on Hawaii‘i Island, as did the story of the arrival of the female god/chief Pele and her relatives. These mo‘olelo and the genealogies related to them explicitly connected the people of Hawai‘i to their ancestral homelands, granting the descendants of these lines tremendous mana within the islands. The ruling chiefs of Hawaii‘i Island and the later monarchs of the Hawaiian kingdom based their authority in part on genealogies that traced their ancestry to Pili, while powerful kāhuna traced their own lines back to Pa‘ao. Similarly, O‘ahu chiefly lines traced themselves to La‘amaikahiki (La‘a from Kahiki), another chief from the south. Families in Puna and Ka‘u still trace their lineages, familial responsibilities, and mana back to Pele, whose epic story includes her family’s migration from Bora Bora.

This period of isolation, which historians and others often define as “Pre-Contact Hawai‘i,” might also be referred to as Ka Wā ‘Ōiwi Wale, the time that is exclusively ‘Ōiwi, following the practice of the late Kanalu Young. Young developed the term ‘Ōiwi Wale, as a way of defining this period not by the lack of contact with foreigners but rather by recognizing, “the foundational nature of seventeen centuries of settlement and societal development by Native Hawaiian kūpuna [ancestors] before foreign arrival.”5 While some may assume that such a period of isolation would result in a static and potentially moribund civilization, Ka Wā
'Ōiwi Wale was still an era of social, cultural, and environmental changes in Hawai‘i, albeit changes exclusively developed without outside foreign interference or contributions.

In 1778, Ka Wā ‘Ōiwi Wale came to an end when the people of Kaua‘i spotted an unusual pair of ships approaching the island, ships arriving not from another island in the chain, but from foreign shores. The men aboard those ships must have struck the Kaua‘i people as incredibly strange, in both behavior and appearance. Their speech no doubt struck the Kaua‘i people as unusual as well. At times, it would have been absolutely unintelligible, yet at other times the strangers spoke words and phrases in a language quite similar to their own, Tahitian to be exact. These men and their ship had not only come from Kahiki in the generic sense of coming from a foreign place, but they had also spent time on this journey and others in Tahiti. Indeed, Tahiti had been their last stop before Kaua‘i. Among this group of partial Tahitian speakers was the expedition’s leader, Captain James Cook, whose arrival in Hawai‘i launched the islands into an era of rapid demographic, political, social, and cultural change.

RELATIONSHIPS WITH KAHIKI, RELATIONS WITH THE PAST

While Cook’s arrival opened the way for a flood of ideas, people, and objects into Hawai‘i, it also opened paths for ideas, people, and objects to flow out of Hawai‘i. As David Chang has explored in The World and All the Things upon It, Kānaka Maoli, like other Oceanic peoples, eagerly explored the world opened by interactions with European and American shipping. Within a generation, Kānaka Maoli had traveled to Europe, the Americas, Asia, and, of course, to other parts of Oceania.

This book examines how Kānaka Maoli understood and developed relationships with other Oceanic peoples as a part of a broader effort to ensure the survival and success of the lāhui in the face of social, political, and cultural changes. These relationships with other Oceanic peoples were inherently colored by Kanaka understandings of their connections to Ka Wā ‘Ōiwi Wale. More specifically, Kānaka often viewed their relationships with other Oceanic peoples through the same set of lenses – positive, negative, or somewhere in between – that they viewed their own past.

Nineteenth-century Hawai‘i was the site of a prolonged cultural and social conflict over the proper role of Ka Wa ‘Ōiwi Wale in shaping the
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Hawaiian present and future. A simplified version of this conflict might be posited as being between two extreme visions, a future Hawaiian culture and society that in all possible ways reflected Hawaiian during Ka Wā ‘Ōiwi Wale versus a future completely free of all traces of Ka Wā ‘Ōiwi Wale. In reality, few Kānaka held either extreme view, as neither could be mistaken as a practical option by the mid-nineteenth century. Disagreements over historical memory tended to revolve around the degree to which ‘Ōiwi Wale culture might/should remain relevant in Hawai‘i and what types of culture and knowledge should be practiced or preserved.

Those who leaned toward distancing themselves and the Hawaiian future from the Hawaiian past also tended to follow the teachings and the rhetoric of the American Congregationalist missionaries who arrived in 1821. These missionaries deemed anything from Ka Wa ‘Ōiwi Wale, and indeed anything outside of their rigid worldview, to be full of na‘aupō (ignorance and inner-darkness). Such individuals, and their Kanaka followers, typically looked to Congregational religion and an idealized version of American culture to define the Hawaiian future, a future bathed in foreign na‘auao (inner light or enlightenment). To further complicate things, even those Kānaka who sought to retain connections to Ka Wā ‘Ōiwi Wale tended to adopt the term na‘auao with respect to the mastery of foreign knowledge and often shared with their more rigid Congregationalist brethren a sense of pride in their shared mastery of foreign na‘auao.

In terms of broader understandings of time, another way of positioning these debates may be through two opposing visions of humanity’s position relative to time. In the common European perspective of time, humanity stood with its back to the past, looking forward to the future. In the traditional Hawaiian view, and in much of Oceania, humanity stood with its face to the past, which they described as the time ma mua, in front of them. Through tracing the past and understanding it, one could then chart the path of the future, which sat unknown and unpredictable ma hope, or behind one’s back. While either perspective can be used to either embrace or deny the past, the European/American “face the future” perspective certainly worked better for those who understood Ka Wā ‘Ōiwi Wale as Ka Wā Na‘aupō, the time of ignorance. Coming from such a perspective, they would also be inclined to create a Hawaiian future as far from that past as possible. For those who wished to design a Hawaiian future guided by values, practices, and knowledge rooted in Ka Wā ‘Ōiwi Wale, the “face to the past” perspective had far greater resonance. While such a perspective could easily incorporate foreign
influences as part of the global past, the Hawaiian past remained the foundation for the Hawaiian present and future.

On a practical basis, nineteenth-century Kanaka views of their past not only differed from individual to individual but also from situation to situation. As Marie Alohalani Brown has shown in her work on John Papa I'i, I'i's Congregationalist beliefs led him to often portray the sexual and religious culture of the pre-Christian past as inherently na'aupo. Yet when it came to his understanding of his personal role in the world, he strongly maintained an 'Ōiwi Wale-derived sense of personal duty to the royal family as a kahu or caretaker. John Tamatoa Baker, the Kanaka/Tahitian/British businessman and politician whose story forms the final chapters of this book, was part of King David Kalâkaua's Hale Nauā, an organization dedicated in large part to pursuing the wisdom of 'Oiwi Wale culture. At the same time, he was an agricultural entrepreneur constantly deriding other Kânaka for failing to move from subsistence-plus farming into cash cropping and a full-throated embrace of capitalist ethics. Class, religion, education, gender, nationalism, and politics all played their role in shaping how individual Kānaka might understand and value the 'Ōiwi Wale past in any situation.

Nineteenth-century Kānaka's conflicted and conflicting views of Ka Wā 'Ōiwi Wale are especially important in understanding their relationships to other Oceanic peoples because, then and now, many Kānaka tend to understand other islanders through the lens of the Hawaiian past. The Hawaiian past, after all, is rooted in and built on a broader Oceanic past, leading to a logical association between other Oceanians and the Hawaiian past. Furthermore, by the mid-nineteenth century most Kānaka, saw themselves as more advanced than their fellow Oceanic peoples in terms of their collective naʻauao, defined as the acquisition and mastery of European/American knowledge and material wealth. Between this sense of Hawaiian exceptionalism and their southern roots, many Kānaka developed an understanding of other islanders as being even closer to Ka Wā 'Ōiwi Wale than Kānaka were.

Thus Kānaka perspectives on their own past heavily influenced their understanding and relationships with other Oceanic peoples. Those most eager to turn their back on Ka Wā 'Ōiwi Wale were also the most likely to dismiss, condemn, and separate themselves from other islanders as
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7 Some sources also refer to him as John Timoteo Baker.
part of that past. Those who were most likely to embrace Ka Wā ‘Ōiwi Wale as an essential component of the Hawaiian future were also the most likely to embrace other islanders and their collective origins. While still frequently espousing Hawaiian exceptionalism based in a sense of a superior Hawaiian mastery of the na‘auao, they also frequently promoted relationships based on kinship and a shared Oceanic past. In an age where people across Oceania faced common threats from foreign empires as well as common opportunities stemming from easier access to a rapidly changing nineteenth-century world, such relationships would be vital to the futures of all the peoples of Oceania.

HAWAIIAN HISTORIOGRAPHY AND KA WĀ ‘ŌIWI WALE

These arguments over the meaning of the Hawaiian past and relationships to other islanders are rooted in two separate but intertwined bodies of academic literature, namely Kanaka-centered histories of nineteenth-century Hawai‘i and the work loosely connected under the umbrella of Native Pacific cultural studies. In terms of Hawaiian historiography, the arguments presented in this book build upon a larger body of work examining nineteenth-century Kānaka’s negotiations between ‘Ōiwi Wale ideas, institutions, and values and those coming from abroad. Such work has largely been undertaken as a way of correcting a historiography that for nearly a century had served up little more than apologetics for American imperial expansion into and rule over the islands.

While thorough and professional in their own way, many of these older historians such as Ralph Kuykendall and Gavan Daws relied largely on English-language sources and a set of cultural and disciplinary biases that favored the perspectives of European/American empires over those of Native peoples.8 The more recent wave of Kanaka-focused histories, however, have employed Hawaiian-language sources as well as Kanaka-centered analytical frameworks to reexamine Kānaka and foreign motivations for implementing nineteenth-century changes; the methods Kānaka and foreigners used to institute such changes; and the results of these changes upon the Lāhui Hawai‘i. One of the central currents running through such work has been the degree to which such changes

were either adapted and adopted by Kānaka versus being implemented upon Kānaka through coercion and trickery. By no coincidence this often corresponds to how individual historians also portray the results of such changes.

Looking specifically at monographs on Hawaiian history, the start of this historiographic period can be traced to 1992 and Lilikala Kame'eleihiwa's *Native Land and Foreign Desires: Pehea Lā e Pono Ai?*, which examines the disastrous effects of European/American diseases, cultural beliefs, and land tenure in eroding many of the foundational values/metaphors that undergirded much of 'Ōiwi Wale culture. Though by no means dismissive of Kanaka agency, Kame'eleihiwa's work underscores how foreign interlopers actively sought to undermine the relationships that informed Kanaka society, such as that between the maka'ainana (the people of the land), the ali'i (the chiefs), and the 'āina (land). Jon Osorio's *Dismembering Lāhui* presents a similar argument regarding the Hawaiian kingdom's adoption of European political practices. Osorio, however, also examines Kanaka adoption of and adaptation to the system and their success in employing parliamentary democracy and party politics in the 1870s and 1880s. Other scholars have focused more on Kanaka efforts to meld together 'Ōiwi and foreign practices and ideas in ways that allowed for the preservation of 'Ōiwi ideas, culture, and independence. Noenoe Silva's *Aloha Betrayed* and Kamana Beamer's *No Mākou Ka Mana*, for instance, examine Kanaka cultural and political efforts to preserve and act upon 'Ōiwi logics and values while employing foreign systems and technologies.9

While these changes have been the primary focus of these works, one of the underlying issues that these monographs have addressed, either explicitly or implicitly, has been the ongoing conflict throughout the nineteenth century over the value of the Hawaiian past, and particularly the proper role of Ka Wā 'Ōiwi Wale in determining the Hawaiian future. The cultural, political, and social norms and institutions being replaced, after all, were rooted in Ka Wā 'Ōiwi Wale. Changes in Hawaiian culture, for instance, required those carrying out and negotiating those changes to determine what elements of Ka Wā 'Ōiwi Wale should remain, a
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determination often informed by the general positive and negative associations one had with that past.

Because of the centrality of the Hawaiian past in defining the institutions and norms being challenged, altered, and often attacked in the nineteenth century, one can even map out many of the key moments and trends of the conflict over the Hawaiian past through the existing historiography. One of the earliest and most significant changes, for instance, came in 1819 when Liholiho, Kamehameha II, ended the kapu system under considerable pressure from Kaʻahumanu and Keōpūolani, the most influential of Kamehameha the Great's queens. Due to her genealogy, Keōpūolani was one of the most sacred persons in the islands as well as being Liholiho's birth mother. Kaʻahumanu, though of lower genealogy, was one of the most politically powerful figures in the kingdom based both on her familial connections and her considerable political skill. Kameʻeleihiwa presents this event as a result of a loss of religious faith brought about by sustained foreign contact, particularly depopulation from introduced diseases.¹⁰

The turning point in Native Lands comes less than a year after the end of the kapu system with the arrival of Congregationalist missionaries from the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions (ABCFM), a group whose religious and nationalist devotion led to a tremendous distaste for anything remotely related to the pre-Christian Hawaiian past. Lead missionary Hiram Bingham, recalling his first memories of Hawai‘i in 1820, wrote, "Some of our number, with gushing tears, turned away from the spectacle. Others, with a firmer nerve, continued their gaze, but were ready to exclaim, 'Can these be human beings?'" Though Bingham would go on to answer in the affirmative, it was only in stripping away all vestiges of their nativeness that such humanity might be revealed.¹¹ Already introduced to the Hawaiian language by Kanaka converts living in New England, the missionaries soon began to use the Hawaiian language to try and create a wedge between Kānaka and their past.¹² As noted earlier they made frequent use of the terms naʻauao and naʻaupō to refer to enlightenment and ignorance, respectively. The former was associated entirely with New England Congregationalist values and ideas while anything remotely connected to the Ka Wā ʻOiwi Wale

¹⁰ Kameʻeleihiwa, Native Land and Foreign Desires, 74–81.
¹¹ Hiram Bingham, A Residence of Twenty-One Years in the Sandwich Islands (Canandaigua, NY: H. D. Goodwin, 1855), 81.
¹² Kameʻeleihiwa, Native Land and Foreign Desires, 137–142.
they decried as na‘aupō. These concepts of na‘aupō and na‘auao would remain relevant to Hawaiian discussions of the proper role of Ka Wā ‘Ōiwi Wale throughout the nineteenth century and efforts to define, redefine, and control those terms were among some of the hardest fought rhetorical battles of the nineteenth century.

Despite tense relations with the mission initially, first Keōpūolani and then Kaʻahumanu converted, in no small part due to the largely unrecognized work of Tahitian missionaries Auna and Taua. After conversion Kaʻahumanu used New England-style Congregationalism to create a state religion that filled the religious and legal void left by the end of the kapu system, strengthening her social and cultural position over a kingdom she already exercised effective political control over. Kameʻeleihiwa has shown how the death toll and the desire for a new state religion soon led to rapid conversions to a religion that promised eternal life in exchange for denying and deriding the Native past. According to both Kameʻeleihiwa in *Native Land* and Osorio in *Dismembering Lāhui*, the perceived na‘auao of Western political and diplomatic traditions and the growing mission-promoted portrayal of Native traditions and the Native past as na‘aupō led many Kanaka elites to follow the lead of Haole advisors in creating new political, legal, and economic systems.¹³

By no coincidence these systems also favored the interests of Europeans and Americans in Hawai‘i. Kameʻeleihiwa examines the way that foreign advisors under Kamehameha III broke land-based reciprocal relationships between the aliʻi and the makaʻāinana through the “Great Māhele” in 1848, which created private property. This, by design, removed the incentives of the makaʻāinana and the aliʻi to support one another economically, a problem further exacerbated by allowing foreign investors to buy land in 1850. Osorio argues that governments set up under the constitutions of 1840 and 1852 came about as a direct result of Haole discourses that “continually subjected [Kānaka] to the pronouncements of their difference and inferiority, which both enabled and validated their dispossession.” These pronouncements of inferiority relied heavily on dismissals and condemnations of the Hawaiian past and, by extension, traces of that past among contemporary Kānaka. The governments set up under these constitutions, as well as the decision to allow foreigners to vote and hold office in Hawai‘i through a conveniently rigorless

naturalization process, provided the relatively small Haole population with a significantly outsized political voice, which they used primarily to benefit their economic, social, and political interests.\footnote{Kameʻeleihiwa, Native Land and Foreign Desires, 298–305; Osorio, Dismembering Lāhui, 252.}

Alohalani Brown and Kanalu Young have examined more specifically how tensions over the role of Ka Wā ‘Ōiwi Wale affected the kaukau aliʻi, a lower order of chiefs who served the aliʻi nui as personal caretakers, guardians, advisors, and resource managers. Young’s *Rethinking the Hawaiian Past* follows changes in the lives of the kaukau aliʻi, starting with the era of the kapu system, through the immediate years after the end of the system, and into the political world of the kingdom under a constitutional monarchy. Brown’s *Facing the Spears of Change*, follows a relatively similar path but does so through the life of prominent kaukau aliʻi statesman John Papa ʻĪʻī. In both cases the authors argue that despite massive changes such as those described by Osorio and Kameʻeleihiwa, the underlying cultural role of the kaukau aliʻi, to act as servants and advisors of the aliʻi nui, remained intact. The details of such service differed tremendously of course, as seen in ʻĪʻī’s changing role from guardian of Liholiho’s spittoon to a member of the House of Nobles under King Kauikeaouli. The underlying role of the kaukau aliʻi, however, the ethic of their class, remained unchanged, reflecting the ethics and values of the Hawaiian past while their specific services reflected a changing time.

Other relationships, however, changed far more drastically. Sally Engle Merry’s *Colonizing Hawai‘i* provides a number of examples of how an American-style legal system radically reconfigured society and culture in nineteenth-century Hilo, including a particularly relevant discussion of sexual norms and gender roles. In part these changes were brought on by a privileging of foreign visions of law, sex, and gender rather than understandings rooted in Ka Wā ‘Ōiwi Wale. Their adoption and enforcement, meanwhile, also acted to further dismiss the values of Ka Wā ‘Ōiwi Wale. The imposition of Western law brought with it an imposition of foreign understandings of sex, essentially outlawing any sex outside of state- or church-sanctioned heterosexual marriage. Laws defining the legitimacy of children and parentage provided a legal assault on more inclusive ‘Ōiwi conceptions of parentage, while Western-style marriage gave men legal control over their wives’ independence, labor, property, and sexuality. Where once men and women could decide to create or dissolve sexual and romantic partnerships at will, they now found
themselves, particularly the women, locked into relationships sanctioned and enforced by the state. As shown through the sheer number of people arrested for and found guilty of “crimes” such as adultery, bigamy, and abandonment, many Kānaka rejected such ideas, preferring to maintain individual control over their sexual and romantic activities rather than surrender them to the state. Nevertheless, enforcement of such laws reinforced the missionaries’ insistence that Kanaka sexual practices and relationships were proof of a lingering naʻaupō that needed to be extinguished, equating nonconformity with the supposed evils of Ka Wā ʻŌiwi Wale.15

Many Kānaka challenged such changes, often explicitly or implicitly rooting their challenges in the authority of the Hawaiian past. In 1819, for instance, Liholiho’s cousin Kekuaokalani declared the end of the kapu system as an unacceptable rejection of the Hawaiian past, and specifically of the religious legacy of King Kamehameha the Great. He led an army to battle against Kaʻahumanu’s supporters despite overwhelming odds, choosing to die in battle rather than abandon the old system.16 Kameʻeleihiwa and Osorio have both shown how Kanaka petitioners expressed their dissent against a number of foreign-driven changes during the reign of Kamehameha III, citing their well-grounded fears that such changes threatened the historical relationships that formed the basis for the lāhui. Repeated explanations by the king’s representatives failed to quell the fears of the petitioners, leading them to respond with point-by-point rebuttals in later petitions. The use of written petitions and literacy in general showed a population that was by no means reluctant to adopt and utilize foreign innovations, but was eager to preserve elements of Ka Wā ʻOiwi Wale still vital to their contemporary lives.17

On a more general note, during the period between 1820 and 1850 many Kānaka pushed back against mission-led efforts to reject Hawaiian culture and practices simply by defining them as relevant parts of modern Hawai‘i rather than shameful remnants of a sinful past. Kamehameha III, for instance, spent the first years of his adult reign celebrating elements of Hawaiian culture decried as satanic by the missionaries. During the earliest years of his reign, his stepmother Kaʻahumanu had acted as his regent, instituting strict laws promoting Christian marriage, Sabbath observance,  

16 Kameʻeleihiwa, Native Land and Foreign Desires, 78.
17 Ibid., 193–198; Osorio, Dismembering Lāhui, 30–33.
and banning practices associated with Ka Wā ‘Ōiwi Wale, including hula, gambling, and even kite flying. Under Kamehameha III’s adult rule such practices returned with a vengeance. As Kanalu Young has written, the king’s court renormalized practices such as hula and same-sex sexual practices. When one of his ali‘i was seen flying a kite, a brief explosion of kite flying occurred among the nearby population as people signaled, quite visibly, their refusal to deny such pastimes when released from the threat of persecution. Soon, however, the pressure of the Christian ali‘i and sorrow over the death of his sister and lover Nahi‘ena‘ena pushed the king, and with him the kingdom, back into the mission fold. Those foreigners most eager to denounce Kānaka ‘Ōiwi and their past as inherently inferior returned to their positions of influence.18

The year 1855 marked the ascension of another youthful king eager to push back against the social, cultural, and political power of the mission faction, Alexander Liholiho, Kamehameha IV. He was educated at the mission-run Chiefs’ Children’s School with many of the other ali‘i children, including future monarchs Lot Kapuāiwa, David Kalākaua, Lydia Lili‘uokalani, and William Lunalilo. Due to a mix of his treatment at the hands of mission educators, his visits to America and Europe in his late teens, and the increasingly strong hold of the American mission faction over the kingdom, Alexander’s reign was marked by a strong push against the influence of the American mission faction. A cadre of young Kanaka nationalists aided him in these efforts, including other ali‘i nui such as his brother Lot and then Prince David Kalākaua. As Beamer and others have noted, Alexander and Lot removed many missionaries and mission allies from government posts, replacing them with Kānaka and Haole who were hostile to the mission faction’s political and cultural agendas. The mission faction was less than pleased by these events, expressing particular anger when Lot handed control of the kingdom’s schools over to Abraham Fornander, a naturalized Swede known for his respect for and research into the culture of ‘Ōiwi Wale Hawai‘i.19

Alexander and Lot also used their reigns to create multiple avenues for Hawaiian culture to be celebrated publically, something Noenoe Silva has written about in Aloha Betrayed and elsewhere. Alexander’s introduction and patronage of the Anglican church created not only a
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18 Young, Rethinking the Native Past, 157.
Protestant competitor for Congregationalism, it also introduced a creed almost as eager to excuse practices such as hula as the Congregationalists were eager to condemn them. Kanaka missionary James Kekela, returning home from the Marquesas in 1859, was appalled to see the revival of hula, noting that even church members had joined in the dancing. Silva has also written about mission- and planter-driven efforts to stem the growing hula renaissance, efforts stymied through the work of Alexander, Lot, and hula-friendly legislators who managed to water down the resulting hula “ban” to the point where it was effectively toothless. The royal brothers also oversaw the adoption of a licensing system that gave government sanction to Kanaka medical practices, something the missionaries had sought to stamp out for its spiritual dimensions. As seen with the licensing system and hula, the brothers quite eagerly sought to show their people that not only was Ka Wā ‘Ōiwi Wale not forgotten, but it lived on in the present and future of the kingdom.

Furthermore, Alexander helped to bring about perhaps one of the most important tools for preserving a place for the Hawaiian past within the Hawaiian future, independent Hawaiian-language newspapers. In 1861, a small ‘ahahui (association), of Kanaka writers and nationalists published Ka Hoku o Ka Pakipika, the first Hawaiian-language newspaper outside of missionary supervision. As Silva has shown, Ka Hoku was printed on the government press, which the ‘ahahui had leased from the government alongside an agreement to publish government documents. From the start, Ka Hoku’s publishers stated a desire to serve the broader Hawaiian community, not just the Congregationalists, as well as printing Hawaiian cultural texts such as oli (chants) and mo’olelo that often dealt tangentially or directly with spiritual and religious content rooted in Ka Wā ‘Ōiwi Wale.

The mission community and the more doctrinaire among the Native Congregationalist population responded with absolute horror and hatred, both at their loss of a print monopoly and at the use of a newspaper to promote and even celebrate Ka Wā ‘Ōiwi Wale. They attacked the newspaper from the pulpit and sought to undercut it by subsidizing Ka Nupepa Kuokoa (The Independent Newspaper), which was published

10 James Kekela, “Ko J. Kekela Palapala Aloha Hope in na Ekalesia a pau ma Hawai‘i nei,” January 19, 1859, RJKC, Awaiaulu.
12 Silva, Aloha Betrayed, 63–68.
by a missionary descendant and featured angry attacks on *Ka Hoku*, its publishers, and its readers. The mission faction’s primary argument was that the newspaper was a tool of the na‘auao and to use it for na‘aupō purposes such as oli and mo‘olelo was to use it for Satan. The publishers of *Ka Hoku* replied by turning the missionary faction’s rhetoric against them. If newspapers were a sign of the na‘auao, then clearly the Hawaiian people were na‘auao for they now had an independent press. By extension their cultural texts must also be na‘auao if they were published in a newspaper. The real na‘aupō, they continued, came from those who sought to contain and limit the expansion of knowledge, such as those who attacked the publication of *Ka Hoku*.

Abraham Fornander, himself no fan of the mission faction, wrote a short congratulatory note to the king about the willingness of the ‘aha-hui to fight back against the mission on their own turf, noting that the mission’s “unceasing interference will be severely rebuked this time, not by ‘licentious and malignant foreigners’ but by their own well sheared lambs.” Though *Ka Hoku* eventually folded, a series of other independent papers would rise to take its place, filling the lāhui’s desire for news, an independent editorial voice, and Kanaka cultural texts. Even the *Kuokoa* would soon begin publishing mo‘olelo and other cultural texts in an attempt to maintain their readership.

With the exception of the brief reign of William Lunalilo, the monarchy remained quite firmly behind the development of a national culture rooted both in *Ka Wā ‘Ōiwi Wale* and the adaptation of foreign innovations. When David Kalākaua was elected king by the legislature in 1874, he did so by winning a hotly contested election against Queen Emma Rooke, the widow of Alexander Liholiho. The lack of support from Emma’s backers and others among the Kanaka ‘Ōiwi population left Kalākaua as the first Hawaiian monarch since Kamehameha I with a true need to shore up his support among the population. In addition to economic, diplomatic, and political projects intended to strengthen both his position and the kingdom, Kalākaua also set about on the most ambitious set of cultural initiatives of any of Hawai‘i’s monarchs.

Perhaps more than any other monarch, Kalākaua sought to combine foreign and ‘Ōiwi elements into a national culture as in touch with its own
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past as it was with the world beyond its borders. Silva’s *Aloha Betrayed* examines how a number of Kalākaua’s cultural projects did exactly that, including the king’s coronation in 1883 and his 1886 jubilee, massive public events that included hula, formal balls, public Hawaiian-style feasts, and state dinners. The king’s celebration of hula at these events promoted them as a key component of national culture, part of a broader effort to rejuvenate the national culture through ‘Ōiwi Wale culture. By publicizing and including a variety of hula performances at his coronation, the king forced a confrontation with the mission faction over the future of ‘Ōiwi Wale culture in the kingdom. Despite a successful indecency case against the printers who published the coronation programs, popular opinion lay solidly behind the king and the hula, preserving and strengthening that essential link to Ka Wā ‘Ōiwi Wale. By the king’s jubilee a few years later, even the mission-friendly press was more interested in gossiping about specific hula being performed rather than condemning the art as a whole.  

In *The Arts of Kingship*, Stacy Kamehiro examines these same events as well as other Kalākaua projects through the lens of nationalist art. In addition to hula, Kalākaua also used architecture, public art projects, and other forms of material culture to promote his vision of a Hawaiian future informed by Ka Wā ‘Ōiwi Wale. With an art historian’s eye, Kamehiro examines the finer details of well-known landmarks such as the Kamehameha statue and ‘Iolani Palace, as well as lesser-known projects such as the national museum, many of whose holdings eventually found their way into the Bishop Museum. In some cases, Kalākaua’s role in these nationalist art projects took the form of the preservation and display of items directly from Ka Wā ‘Ōiwi Wale, such as the malo of Liloa, a wide feather belt associated with Hawai‘i Island royalty. In other cases, however, Kalākaua purposefully employed European styles of art alongside subject matters or symbols important to the Hawaiian nation and the monarchy, such as the Kamehameha statue.

Silva has also written about the cultural work of two of Kalākaua’s most innovative projects, the Board of Genealogy and its successor the Hale Nauā. These two groups, packed with prominent Kānaka, served as the king’s think tanks, seeking out and examining authorities, sources, and artifacts of ‘Ōiwi Wale culture and knowledge and applying them
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to modern political, cultural, and scientific projects. The Hale Naua also worked to develop the kingdom's image abroad, including planning for the kingdom's exhibit at the 1893 Columbian Exhibition. The exhibit would have combined opera, hula, high diving, marksmanship, and displays of artifacts, clearly intended to proclaim Hawai'i as part of a cosmopolitan global culture yet distinct from the European/American empires that dominated that culture. The overthrow of the monarchy by the mission faction and a deployment of US Marines in January 1893 upset those plans. Mission scion and overthrow mastermind Lorrin Thurston used the exhibition to promote tourism and the Kilauea volcano instead.

Between the overthrow and annexation, the vast majority of Kānaka gathered behind the deposed queen, Lili'uokalani, and against the coup leaders and their plans of annexing Hawai'i to the United States. A combination of Grover Cleveland's anti-imperialism, massive petition drives in the islands, and the queen's personal lobbying of the US Senate defeated the first two attempts at annexation. A third attempt, approved through the questionable means of a joint session of the US Congress, led to what some consider the annexation of Hawai'i and others argue to be the start of the US occupation of the islands. Either way, American imperial control led to a process of Americanization that aimed to strip Kānaka, particularly young Kānaka, of any form of identity that might challenge their loyalty to the empire. Kanaka 'Ōiwi culture came under immediate attack, particularly the Hawaiian language, which the territory banned in schools and in official business. In addition, the mixture of sugar barons and missionary scions who pushed through the overthrow and annexation developed an informal oligarchy that controlled the economy and the ruling Republican Party. Through their control of the territorial governor's office, the oligarchy continued the process of land alienation that had begun under the Māhele. The loss of the language and of connections to the land worked together to squeeze the life from the Hawaiian culture, replacing it with a version of American culture suitable for life as a territorial subject.
Kānaka did what they could to preserve the culture, with older generations attempting to put as much as they could through the newspapers. Stephen Desha’s series of articles on Kamehameha I and his mentor/advisor Kekuhaupi‘o came out in this period, as did numerous similar works. Hula and other practices remained, some in public and some in private. As Davianna McGregor writes, the Hawaiian civic clubs emerged in these times, seeking both to save what elements of the culture that they could, while also preparing Hawaiians to thrive individually under the American empire. Success in both was limited by the circumstances of empire and the fact that the two goals were often at cross-purposes. Between these various efforts and the already sizeable repository of Hawaiian knowledge in the newspaper archives, enough of Ka Wā ‘Ōiwi Wale culture remained to seed a renaissance in the 1960s, a renaissance that continues into today.31

Taken together, the body of work created by Silva, Osorio, Kame‘elehiwa, and others has created a strong foundation for understanding Kanaka negotiations between the values, institutions, and ideas rooted in Ka Wā ‘Ōiwi Wale and those introduced from foreign lands. While the specific subject of these negotiations differed from case to case, period to period, the core of these negotiations and conflicts remained the same: the value of Ka Wā ‘Ōiwi Wale as a path for the future of Hawai‘i. Without question, foreign interests that stood to gain power by devaluing all things connected to Ka Wā ‘Ōiwi Wale – particularly the Kānaka – influenced such negotiations and fed, even led, many of the conflicts. Until the Overthrow and Annexation, however, the primary decision makers in these negotiations and conflicts were Kānaka, be they the various monarchs, the ali‘i, the maka‘ainana, or the lāhui as a whole. As these histories have shown, the value they placed in Ka Wā ‘Ōiwi Wale influenced the way they envisioned the relationships with one another and with the European and American powers.

While this Native-driven historiography has created a strong foundation for this book and other works, it should be noted that the often explicit and always powerful desire to counter the imperial apologists who had previously dominated Hawaiian history has resulted in its own problems. The historiography of Hawai‘i remains quite tightly focused on Native engagements with various official and unofficial projects of
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American imperialism and the resulting changes in Kānaka relationships with one another. Unfortunately, this heavy emphasis on relationships between the United States and Hawai‘i has still left us with an incomplete and ahistorical understanding of the Hawaiian past by placing the imperial American present at the center of Hawaiian history. In accepting the idea that the only worthwhile outside relationship to study is between Kānaka and their past/present/future imperial rulers, historians have reinforced such thinking and in doing so, intentionally or unintentionally, naturalized empire. Furthermore, if Hawaiian historians only conceive Hawaiian history through interactions with empire, it makes it very difficult to truly understand that past or envision a Hawaiian future without empire. This problem is hardly unique to Hawaiian history; indeed it can be found throughout Oceanic history, where island group and national histories tend to focus largely on relationships with past or present imperial masters. Even when done to validate or historicize nationalist or anticolonial sentiments, they still reify both the normality of those relationships and the political borders created by such relationships.

While the recent wave of Native-centered yet imperially focused works of history may have contributed to this particular type of myopia, they have also helped create the necessary conditions to begin curing it. As the anti-imperial upstarts have become the new canon, the driving need to push back against imperial apologetics has eased. Though the simple realities of nineteenth-century Hawaiian history dictate that such imperial projects must be acknowledged and addressed, the work done by this new canon has created room for new subjects of inquiry, many of whom have received little to no study in the period of imperial apologetics or in the more recent push back against those apologetics.

Among those neglected subjects of inquiry are Kānaka ties and connections to parts and peoples of the world other than the “Great Powers,” as well as the associated Kānaka understandings of those connections. There are a few major exceptions, however, including several studies of Kānaka on the West Coast of the United States.32 Nancy Morris’s dissertation on Native Hawaiian missionaries provides an overview of the motivations, training, and lives of Native Hawaiian

missionaries in Oceania. In addition to being of tremendous aid in the development of Chapters 1 and 2 of this book, it is also probably the fullest exploration of the lives of Kānaka living overseas as individuals and families.33 Perhaps the most significant work looking at Hawaiians beyond the US/Hawaiian binary has been David Chang's *The World and All the Things upon It*, which includes not just substantial examinations of Hawaiian connections to and travels within the broader world, but the way Kānaka have envisioned their ties and relationships with the peoples around the world. Anchored in examinations of Kanaka travelers and writers in the nineteenth century, Chang argues that Kānaka sought to intellectually and physically explore the world beyond Hawai‘i’s shores. Furthermore, they used travel, education, religion, and other means to develop a framework for understanding both the world and Hawai‘i’s relationships to it. Rather than seeing themselves as an isolated and inferior people, a view American missionaries and other foreigners often tried to promote, Kānaka understood themselves as connected into and engaged with that world, when at home or abroad.

In a similar vein, *Return to Kahiki* helps to improve our understanding of Hawaiian history by examining Kānaka through their relationships with other peoples of Oceania. Part of the impetus for doing so is simply to help develop a fuller and more nuanced understanding of Hawaiian and Oceanic history while also providing historical context for modern relationships between Hawai‘i and other parts of Oceania. At the same time, this focus on Oceanic ties also destabilizes the America-centric vision of Hawai‘i’s connections to the world beyond its shores, envisioning Kānaka Maoli as a people eager to explore their existing connections to the wider world and eager to develop and shape further connections beyond their future imperial rulers. Furthermore, Kānaka retained a strong sense of their connections to the rest of Oceania, and at times explicitly sought to make use of those connections to maintain the religious, political, and cultural sovereignty of the lāhui in an age of empire. Where the empires and their representatives sought to repeatedly cast Hawai‘i as either deviant or unqualified for independence in an imperial world, Kānaka repeatedly used their ties to Oceania to recast Hawai‘i as part of a world independent of empire even if not entirely disconnected from it.

OCEANIA

While Hawaiian and other Oceanic histories have remained within the conceptual and geographical constraints of their imperial and anti-imperial pasts, the broader field of Oceanic studies, particularly the academics often lumped together as Native Pacific cultural studies, have moved toward an embrace of fluidity and movement as a way of understanding Oceanic pasts, presents, and futures. One of the defining moments for the field occurred in 1993, when Epeli Hau‘ofa published the landmark essay “Our Sea of Islands.” After visiting Hilo for an anthropology conference, Hau‘ofa had taken a quick drive to the Kilauea volcano where he witnessed lava pouring into the sea, expanding the island. It seemed to him an appropriate metaphor for the continued growth and expansion of Oceanic peoples as well, one that ran counter to the imperial narratives of dying and increasingly invisible Natives. With the ease of communication and travel, Oceanic communities were growing: growing beyond our home islands, growing across Oceania, and growing Oceania beyond the physical boundaries of the Pacific.

Waiting for his flight back to Fiji at the end of his trip, Hau‘ofa had a chance encounter with a Tongan friend, a frequent visitor to Suva who engaged in a small but profitable trade in kava between Fiji and the Oceanic community in Berkeley, California. The encounter helped birth Hau‘ofa’s vision of Oceanic travel creating and strengthening a network of islanders stretching across the ocean and the globe – spread wide, but not thin. This network, Hau‘ofa argued, and particularly the relationships formed between different groups of islanders and island groups, could solve Oceania’s problems where the outside world, namely empires and former empires, had failed – and in many cases not really tried. Hau‘ofa also became a strong voice for thinking of the peoples of the Pacific Ocean not as Pacific Islanders, a term implying, to some at least, isolated specks of land scattered across the water, but instead as Oceanic peoples, peoples connected to each other through the ocean rather than separated by it.34

As Joni Madraiwiwi and others have noted, Hau‘ofa’s personal history of Oceanic travels provided the right sort of intellectual and cultural soil to nurture just such an idea. Born to Tongan missionaries in Papua New Guinea, Hau‘ofa was educated in Tonga, Fiji, Canada, and Australia. Though he worked briefly for the Tongan government, he

spent most of his adult life as a professor at the University of the Pacific in Suva, eventually becoming a citizen of Fiji. He was best known for his fictional accounts of yet another island group, the fictional and yet all too real islands of Tiko.\(^3\) By the 1990s, such trans-Oceanic life stories were increasingly common, as travels within and away from Oceania created pan-Oceanic communities and identities. While Hau‘ofa would be one of the first within academia whose work examined and was informed by this trans-Oceanic world, he was certainly not the last.

At the same time that Hau‘ofa was developing his “Sea of Islands” understanding of Oceania, a handful of Oceanic scholars were developing the intellectual foundation for what would eventually be referred to as Native Pacific cultural studies. Like Hau‘ofa, many of these scholars came from personal and academic backgrounds that crisscrossed both Oceania and the Oceanic diaspora. One of the early contributors to the field, for instance, was Vince Diaz, of Filipino and Pohnpeian ancestry, born and raised on Guam, educated at the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa and the University of California, Santa Cruz. Teresia Teaiwa, another major contributor to the field, was an I-Kiribati who was born in Honolulu, raised in Fiji, received her doctorate from Santa Cruz, and taught in Fiji and Aotearoa. Furthermore, as she explains in her essay, “L(o)osing the Edge,” her experiences meeting with and engaging with other Native Pacific Islander academics at academic conferences had proved essential in creating a broader sense of what Oceania was and what Oceanic scholarship could become. She also described the importance of the brief explosion of Oceanic students at UC Santa Cruz’s History of Consciousness program in creating a cohort of academics that would go on to develop Native Pacific cultural studies, which included herself, Diaz, and Kēhaulani Kauanui. Like Diaz and Teaiwa, Kauanui’s personal history lent itself to an understanding of Oceanic peoples as fluid, being a Kānaka ʻŌiwi born and raised in California, educated in part through the Māori studies program at the University of Auckland. Similarly, her research and thinking have been heavily influenced by her experiences studying, teaching, and working with Native American and First Nations scholars and activists within the continental United States as well as with other indigenous scholars from Oceania and elsewhere.\(^3\)


36 Vincente Diaz, *Repositioning the Missionary: Rewriting the Histories of Colonialism, Native Catholicism, and Indigeneity in Guam* (Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press,
Introducing their backgrounds, it should come as no surprise that many Native Pacific cultural studies scholars have envisioned and written about the peoples of Oceania not as isolated groupings separated by the sea, but rather as Hau‘ofa did, as a people connected to and connected by the Pacific. Diaz’s work, for instance, routinely questioned the geographic and cultural “fixedness” of Oceanic peoples, and even of islands. Teaiwa’s work similarly examines Oceanic peoples articulations and rearticulations of their identities in response to international and local tensions, desires, and opportunities. Building on these initial works, other Oceanic scholars, many sharing the trans-Oceanic backgrounds of their predecessors, have further developed this understanding of the fluidity of islander cultures, identities, and communities. A Chamorro scholar educated in Guam and Hawai‘i, Keith Camacho’s *Cultures of Commemoration* examines the role of historical memories among the Chamorro peoples of Guam and the Northern Marianas through the lens of World War II commemorations, critiquing the reification of imperial divisions within the island and the Chamorro, Japanese, and American roles in perpetuating them. Kamana Beamer’s and Noenoe Silva’s work in Hawaiian history also fit into this general vision of islanders as fluid and engaging the outside world without losing the connections to each other, ‘Ōiwi culture, and to the lands that birthed them.37

Like Teaiwa and Hau‘ofa, other recent Oceanic scholars have explicitly examined the connections and relationships between different Oceanic communities as an important part of understanding Oceania and its people as a whole. Hokulani Aikau’s *A Chosen People* includes a significant discussion of the development of a pan-Polynesian community in Lā‘ie, Hawai‘i. Alice Te Punga Somerville, a Māori scholar who received her PhD at Cornell but who wrote her dissertation in Hawai‘i, has explored such issues in her *Once Were Pacific*. *Once Were Pacific* examines how Māori writers such as Witi Ihimaera have understood and envisioned the Māori people as part of a broader Oceanic world. Though it is not the focal point of her work, Somerville also includes enough historical context to argue that such understandings are not entirely new, indeed that
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this identification with other islanders extends to the life and work of Te Rangi Hiroa/Peter Buck in the early twentieth century, to Māori connections with the Raiatean navigator Tupaia in the 1760s, and even further back to the Oceanic origins of the Māori people. Finally, though not often seen as part of Native Pacific cultural studies, Nicholas Thomas’s work in Islanders also contains significant discussions of trans-Oceanic travelers and settlers, and their importance in developing an overall understanding of the nineteenth-century Pacific.38

The recent group of scholars forming loosely under the banner of “Pacific Worlds” scholarship also deserves some mention as part of the intellectual environment in which this book is being released. Matt Matsuda’s Pacific Worlds, probably being the most well known of these, lays out something of an agenda for reimagining the Pacific along the same lines as was done with Atlantic studies over the past few decades. Similar to Chang and many of the scholars mentioned in the preceding text, they imagine the Pacific in terms of movement and connection rather than a static collection of unrelated histories. While useful in terms of understanding connections between Asia, the Americas, and Oceania, for the most part Oceania’s role in these histories seems largely incidental to the relationships between Asia and the Americas.39

WHY OCEANIA?

As noted previously, this book deals not only with Kānaka Maoli, but also with their relationships to other peoples within Oceania, a term I have chosen in part because of its mix of geographic flexibility and specificity. The following episode from King David Kalākaua’s 1881 circumnavigation of the globe might help illustrate this point. During the voyage he received an invitation to visit with Sultan Abu Bakar, the Maharajah of Johor, today part of Malaysia. Kalākaua’s missionary-descended travel companion, William Armstrong, seemed most interested in the

38 Hokulani Aikau, A Chosen People, a Promised Land: Mormonism and Race in Hawai’i (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2012); Alice Te Punga Somerville, Once Were Pacific: Maori Connections with Oceania (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2012); Nicholas Thomas, Islanders: The Pacific in the Age of Empire (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2012).
Maharajah's displays of wealth, othering him as a decadent "Asiatic" ruler while reveling in his hospitality.40 Kalākaua's lasting impressions of the Maharajah, however, came not from his wealth or his otherness, but from the connections he and the Maharajah shared as descendants of the ancient Austronesian migration. Writing back to his brother-in-law, the king described the Maharajah as "a fine looking man [who] resembles the first Leleiohoku very much. If he could have spoken our language I would take him to be one of our people."41 Leleiohoku, it should be noted, was an aliʻi nui, a high chief, of the generation before Kalākaua. His widow, Princess Ruth Keliʻiokalani, had adopted Kalākaua's brother and renamed him Leleiohoku in memory of her deceased husband. In 1877, the second Leleiohoku, then heir to the throne, had died as well. One can only imagine the potential emotional weight of such a moment, the near recognition of one's own kin in the face of a stranger a thousand miles from home.

The two monarchs quickly discovered a mutual interest in ethnography and began discussing the theory that the people of Polynesia had migrated from Malaysia. Though communicating largely in English, the two began exploring linguistic ties between their native languages, finding several similar terms between the two branches of what is now called the Malayo-Polynesian language family. The discussions satisfied the two monarchs of their shared connections not just as monarchs, but as "long-lost brothers." After a state dinner that evening, the two talked into the night, eagerly comparing legends and oral histories that further uncovered their shared Austronesian past. Though his visit with the Maharajah only lasted a single day, their conversations left a lasting impression on Kalākaua, who continued to cultivate personal and official ties to the Maharajah throughout his reign.42

Kalākaua's embrace of the Maharajah as kin, albeit distant kin, demonstrates a practical problem for any work seeking to examine this concept of distant kin tied together by the voyaging past, specifically what to call the geographical space in question and its inhabitants. The Pacific is simply too broad, while Pacific Islands and Pacific Islanders are too narrow, leaving no room for regions like Johor, tied to the Austronesian migration yet not considered as Pacific Islands. Both sets of terms are so commonly
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used, however, that it can be difficult to avoid simply slipping back into them. Kahiki, though a useful concept for capturing ‘Ōiwi Wale understandings of the world, is less useful for examining how Kānaka saw related peoples within the Pacific as Kahiki still referred to both Tahiti specifically and to foreign lands in general.

The vast majority of the events described in this book take place in the areas commonly referred to as Micronesia and Polynesia, but these terms are both too narrow and too divisive to frame this book. The historical usage of those terms as a way to divide the peoples of Oceania within colonial contexts and the potentially divisive use of those terms today presents a clear discursive problem. Though many of the Kānaka discussed in this book used the terms Polynesia and Polynesian to define the people and places they saw themselves as connected to, the geographic limits of that term ignore not just Micronesia and Melanesia, but chunks of Austronesian South East Asia as well. To a certain degree the use of the terms by Kānaka indicates the strength of these divisive European visions of the Pacific, although in some cases Kānaka used the terms in a much broader geographic sense. Kalākaua’s proposed “Polynesian Confederacy,” for instance, included parts of Micronesia, suggesting a certain fluidity in his usage. In the end, however, the common use of the term for a specific geographic area make it both problematic and inaccurate for the scope of this book. Despite this, in specific cases when sources used the terms Polynesia and Polynesian, that terminology will be maintained in this current work for the sake of accuracy.

In the past few decades the terms Oceania and Oceanians have increased in use among Pacific scholars, in large part through the influence of Epeli Hau‘ofa. The focus on the ocean seems appropriate for descendants of the Austronesian voyagers, and the term has acquired a geographic flexibility under Hau‘ofa’s usage that can accommodate the Maharajah, the Mō‘i, and everyone in between. Though not a term used by many of the historical subjects of this work discussed within this book, its flexibility and connotations of ocean-based connectivity make it a useful term to refer to the broader area and people connected to the Lāhui Hawai‘i through a shared connection to their voyaging ancestors.

SCOPE

This book examines three different trans-Oceanic projects initiated by Kānaka to better understand how they understood and shaped relationships to other peoples of Oceania: (1) Kanaka missionary efforts in
Micronesia and the Marquesas, (2) King Kalakaua’s diplomatic legation to Sāmoa in 1887, and (3) politician and businessman John Tamatoa Baker’s travels through Oceania in 1907. These projects were chosen in large part because of the written records they left behind. The missionaries and the diplomatic legation both left behind substantial archival records and Baker recorded his journey in a series of letters published by the Hawaiian-language newspaper Ke Aloha Aina. Thus this book is largely limited to examinations of the actions and thinking of various types of Kanaka elites. Less documented but arguably more common Kanaka interactions with other Oceanic peoples, namely through immigration to and from Hawai‘i, are more difficult to trace and as such have largely been neglected in this study. In addition, to manage the scope of the project, non-Hawaiian Oceanians living in Hawai‘i are not examined in any real depth except in cases in which they are relevant to other elements of this project, such as with Baker’s grandfather, Steven Pupuhi of Tahiti.

CONTENTS

Chapters 1 and 2 focus on Kanaka missionaries working in Micronesia and the Marquesas between 1850 and 1900. Chapter 1 examines how the postmillennial worldview they inherited from the American missionaries in Hawai‘i colored their understanding of the pre-Christian past as inherently na‘aupō and provided the primary motivation for their own foreign mission work. This mission work allowed them to support the expansion of Christ’s kingdom while also pushing back against the paternalism and racism of American missionaries in Hawai‘i and in the field. Their understanding of a world separated between warring armies of Christ and Satan, combined with their insecurities over their closeness to the Hawaiian past, also led them to understand other islanders as archaic Kānaka Hawai‘i‘i, trapped in the na‘aupō of their shared Oceanic/satanic past. Their portrayals and treatment of these other islanders display a clear attempt to display their own distance from Ka Wā ‘Ōiwi Wale by making clear distinctions between themselves and their hosts, resulting in a general devaluing of the cultures, independence, and even lives of other islanders.

Chapter 2 continues this examination of Kanaka foreign mission work focusing on the efforts of these Kanaka missionaries to retain their own personal separation from the supposed na‘aupō while in the mission field. Believing themselves beset by Satan at all sides, the missionaries
constantly feared that they would ho‘i hope (turn back) to the ways of the na‘aupō. At times they did. This chapter examines those fears, the handful of recorded incidents when the missionaries actually did ho‘i hope, and the efforts of their fellow missionaries to deal with the spiritual and public fallout of such incidents. Taken as a whole, the incidents and the response of other Kanaka missionaries mark out the boundaries of a Hawaiian Congregationalism that followed the central ideas of Congregationalism while still quietly accommodating various aspects of Ka Wā ‘Oiwi Wale.

Chapters 3 and 4 follow the diplomatic legation King David Kalākaua sent to Sāmoa in 1886/1887 as a first step in building an explicitly anti-imperial, Native-centered Oceanic confederacy. Chapter 3 examines the dual set of appeals Kalākaua and his lead diplomat, John E. Bush, made to Malietoa Laupepa and other Samoan leaders. To create a foundation for such an unprecedentedly close alliance between two nations with little previous diplomatic contact, the Hawaiian kingdom relied heavily on historic and cultural connections between the two peoples. At the same time, the kingdom promoted itself as having both a firmer grasp of Western na‘auao and greater access to global diplomatic networks. By promising to use these to both shelter and tutor their Samoan kin, they offered the Samoans possible salvation from the clear and present danger of German imperial aggression.

Chapter 4 surveys the work of the legation after Malietoa Laupepa’s signing of the confederacy agreement in early February 1887. As the legation worked to secure support among other Samoan chiefs and to gather information about Sāmoa, they also began to develop plans for what the future relationship between Sāmoa and Hawai‘i might look like. Overall the legation planned to develop Sāmoa along the Hawaiian model, based on a faulty understanding of the Samoans as underdeveloped Kānaka Hawai‘i. The legation’s Envoy John E. Bush and its Secretary Henry Poor, both of whom were hapa-Haole (part-Haole) Kalākaua loyalists, soon split on the way such changes might be brought about. Bush’s continued outreach to the Samoan people indicated a growing understanding of the role of consent and local/regional independence within Samoan politics and a desire to shape a relationship grounded largely in kinship and associated responsibilities to one another. Poor, however, seemed far more willing to envision and plan the relationship along imperial lines, with relatively little concern over Samoan consent and an eye toward the exploitation of Samoan resources and lands. A coup by American settlers in Hawai‘i and a German invasion of Sāmoa killed the confederacy, leaving permanently
unanswered the question of whether the confederacy would wind up as a thinly veiled Hawaiian attempt at creating empire or fulfill its promise as a Native-driven bulwark against empire.

Chapters 5 and 6 follow former royal governor John Tamatoa Baker on a trans-Polynesian voyage in 1907 and his letters back to Ke Aloha Aina. Chapter 5 focuses on Baker’s portrayal of the similarities and ties between the lāhui Hawai‘i and other peoples of Oceania despite geographic distance and the imposition of imperial boundaries and rule across the Pacific. Baker presented the linguistic, cultural, and even geological similarities he found between Hawai‘i and other areas of Oceania as evidence of Kanaka ‘Oiwi connections to a broad pan-Oceanic lāhui. This sense of Oceania-based belonging served as a direct counterpoint to American attempts to dismiss the Lāhui Hawai‘i as isolated, archaic, and even aberrant according to American norms.

Chapter 6 follows Baker as he grappled with the future the Lāhui Hawai‘i faced under American empire and by extension the futures various other Oceanic lāhui faced under their own respective empires. Based on his personal success, Baker heavily promoted the creation of small-scale agricultural entrepreneurship envisioning a future dominated by Oceanic yeomen touting Native identities and capitalist values. From the very start of his journey, however, Baker met with other Oceanic peoples who forced him to acknowledge the potentially destructive nature of capitalism, particularly the value systems underlying it. The most powerful of these critiques focused on the noticeable lack of a culturally defined upper limit on economic desire. By expanding this critique to the political and cultural sphere, Baker was able to develop it into an Oceanic critique of imperial aggression as not just destructive, but also abnormal and deviant.

SOURCES AND TRANSLATIONS

The three specific projects covered in this book all generated sizeable written records. The Native Hawaiian missionaries produced thousands of pages worth of reports, letters, and accounts that are now held in the Hawai‘i Mission Children’s Society Archives. Originally written in Hawaiian, most were translated some time ago by a descendant of the missionary Judd family, though a sizeable fraction are still only available in Hawaiian. Portions of both the translations and the Hawaiian originals are available on microfilm through the Pacific Manuscript Bureau. Awaiaulu.org’s D. Nakila Steele, Puakea Nogelmeier, and Bryan Kamaoli
Kuwada have transcribed and translated the letters of one prominent missionary, Reverend John Kekela, as well as several articles he wrote. Awaiaulu’s Dr. Puakea Nogelmeier was kind enough to lend me an electronic, and thus searchable, copy of the unpublished compilation. This proved very useful during the development of the first two chapters.

Due to the turmoil of the 1887 Bayonet Constitution, the overthrow, and the Republic Era, the various records of the Samoa legation are scattered in different locations in Hawai‘i. A sizeable portion of the legation’s records have been lost, destroyed, or were never placed in the archive, such as King Kalâkaua’s letters to Bush. The majority, however, can be found in the A. C. Carter letters and the Foreign and Executive Office files at the Hawai‘i State Archive. Typescript versions of Walter Murray Gibson’s correspondence with the legation are bound with other Miscellaneous Foreign Office and Executive correspondence, and Kalâkaua’s letters to Malietoa Laupepa and George Tupou of Tonga can be found in various forms in the Executive Correspondence-Outgoing folders. Smaller portions of the legation’s documentation can be found at the Bishop Museum and some of Henry Poor’s drafts and personal letters from the trip can be found at the Hawaiian Historical Society (Folder MS 327 H31).

Baker recorded his trip in a series of letters he wrote to Ke Aloha Aina, which were then published as a serial between 1907 and 1908. These are available digitally on the website Nupepa.org. After a badly damaged January 11, 1908 issue, there are no available copies of Ke Aloha Aina until October of that year. Except for a brief portion of Baker’s account of Hong Kong, nothing else is available from his time in Asia. If any future reader knows of further copies of Ke Aloha Aina, or has other access to Baker’s letters, please let me know. Baker’s impressions of Asia, particularly his month-long stay in Japan, would be useful for examining Native Hawaiian understandings of Asia. The Māori scholar Paul Meredith has also provided a transcription and translation of an article about and an interview with Baker from the September 1907 issue of the Māori newspaper Te Pipiwharauroa.

All other translations directly from the Hawaiian-language sources are mine unless noted. When a translation was not available for Hawaiian Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions (HBCFM) missionary records, the translations are mine as well, specifically in the cases of Samuel Kaaia’s letters, Simeon Kahelemauna’s letters, Samuel Kekuewa’s letters, David Kanoa’s letters after 1880, and Robert Maka’s letters from 1887 and 1888. When using the available
translations for the other letters, I backtracked at certain places to verify the original language when relevant and to seek some of the detail lost in translation. William Lono’s journal was partially translated by his daughter and I used her translations as a general guide, but verified or did my own translations of relevant parts. Translations taken from the Samoan-language documents in the fourth chapter were all taken from official translations or staff translations available in the same collections.

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