The Challenge Issued To Bishop Henry Bond Restarick (1854–1933)

“Some people appear to think that the ‘spiritual life’ is a peculiar condition mainly supported by cream ices and corrected by powders. But the solid norm of the spiritual life should be like that of the natural life: a matter of porridge, bread and butter, and a cut off the joint.”¹ When he was elected the first American Episcopal Bishop of Hawai‘i following its 1898 annexation to the United States, Hawai‘i was no “cream ice” for Henry Bond Restarick, but more like a “cut off the joint”—a challenge for his spiritual and administrative talents. In Restarick’s lifetime, many admired his faith-filled peacemaking skills, his conciliatory, decisive leadership style, and his dedication to research and writing.

The bishop was contentedly serving his flock in San Diego when he heard he might be nominated Bishop of Kansas. His wife May said, “...impossible to live in the climate of Kansas.” Restarick agreed “...it was about the last place I wanted to live.” They were both relieved when on April 18, 1902, the House of Bishops sent him the telegram: “You have been elected Bishop of Honolulu on the first ballot.” Restarick accepted the position.²

Marilyn Stassen-McLaughlin, retired Punahou teacher, contributed “Unlucky Star—Princess Ka‘iulani” to The Hawaiian Journal of History, in 1999. She has published in Honolulu magazine, and contributed a chapter to The View from Diamond Head by Don Hibbard and David Franzen. She was asked to write this paper on Bishop Henry Bond Restarick and present it at a conference of NEHA, National Episcopal Historians and Archivists, held in Honolulu, June, 2005.

Except for a brief conversation with John Usborne, the rector of St. Clement’s, Honolulu, Bishop Restarick knew little about Hawai‘i. Until annexation, the Anglican Church in Hawaii had only English-bred bishops. Some prominent island churchmen wanted the Anglican Church to continue. After annexation, however, the prevalent island feeling, and also the sentiments of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Honolulu, was to “follow the flag.” So Bishop William Ford Nichols, the bishop of California, was selected to move the Anglican Church into American jurisdiction and sailed for the Islands to prepare the transfer. Restarick said, “Bishop Nichols advised me to go to Honolulu, praised the spirit of the laity, assured me that now that Bishop [Alfred] Willis had left, difficulties would soon be forgotten, and I should find a loyal set of clergy.” Restarick wanted to avoid resurrecting any harsh sentiments. He was eager to begin with a clean slate.

Convinced that he could aid the church in Hawai‘i, the bishop, his wife May, son Arthur, daughters Constance and Margaret, and a company of friends sailed for Honolulu from San Francisco on July 19, 1902. Always the scholar, Restarick spent the journey reading to prepare for his new position. Some worried that Canon Alexander Mackintosh, Bishop Willis’ “Chief Adversary” who was then in San Francisco, would sail on the same ship and influence the new bishop; however, Mackintosh returned on a different vessel, and Restarick concentrated his effort preparing for the task ahead. Well aware of the colorful history and the controversies and misunderstandings that preceded him he wanted to consider all sides before making decisions.

The group arrived in Honolulu Harbor on Thursday, August 3, 1902. Tenney Peck and Wray Taylor from St. Andrew’s Cathedral came out on a launch to greet the Restarick party aboard the Peru. The bishop’s group was also greeted by two San Diego choirboys who now lived in Honolulu. The Restaricks were taken to the Royal Hawaiian Hotel, then located in downtown Honolulu, close to St. Andrew’s Cathedral, his new church home. The bishop refused many invitations proffered because he dared not show favoritism to any church faction. To newspaper reporters seeking a juicy story about an American replacing a British bishop, Restarick said, “. . . the only policy I had was to endeavor to get the people to pray and to work.”
The Sunday following his Thursday arrival, the bishop gave his first sermon at the Cathedral. Queen Lili‘uokalani was present. He took as a theme the inscription on the seal of the diocese: “He Lanakila ma ke Ke‘a,” “Victory by the Cross.” In the evening he preached at St. Clement’s.

Bishop Restarick decided not to hear about past problems and made all his appointments “impartial.” In the church itself, he deftly handled difficult situations. At the suggestion of Bishop Nichols, he appointed himself Dean of the Cathedral since the congregation wasn’t big enough to warrant both a bishop and a dean; thus he could also “avoid placing any representative of a faction to that office.”

Restarick was careful. Bishop Willis had made his own appointments, and bitter feelings still surrounded annexation.

The Royal Hawaiian Hotel was satisfactory for a few weeks but the bishop, Mrs. Restarick, and family were eager to settle in. Looking back on those times 40 years later, Mrs. Restarick wrote how exhausting it was to get used to the climate, the bugs, and, worst of all—the mosquitoes! “I couldn’t help weeping at times.” There were no screens at the Donna Hotel on Beretania Street where they stayed after the Royal Hawaiian. The long lanais “dismayed” her and she “darned socks under Mosquito netting.” Also, laundry bills were “terrible” because everyone lived in whites. Honolulu was “under-built and overcrowded.” People had warned them before they arrived that mosquitoes were “so big that the natives catch them, paint them yellow and sell them to the tourists for canaries.”

A Brief History of the Anglican Episcopal Church in Hawaii

To understand the impact of Bishop Restarick’s tenure, it might be useful to describe the Anglican Church in Hawaii prior to his arrival. Beginning with George Vancouver’s 1792 arrival, the Hawaiian monarchs were interested in the Church of England. Both Isaac Davis and John Young, advisors to Kamehameha I, were practicing Anglicans. As early as 1822, Kamehameha II, known as Liholiho, wrote to King George of England: “We wish the Protestant religion of your majesty’s dominions to be preached here.”
The Anglican church in the Islands enjoyed a great advantage when Kamehameha IV came to the throne in 1855. He married Emma Rooke, a woman steeped in the Anglican tradition, in 1856. The granddaughter of John Young, Emma was adopted by her maternal aunt, Grace Kamaʻikuʻi Young, wife of Dr. Thomas Rooke, a loyal communicant of the Church of England. Later as Queen Emma, she founded Queen’s Hospital and St. Andrew’s Priory for girls. Not only had her husband, Kamehameha IV, been impressed with service at Westminster Abbey when he visited England, but many Hawaiians responded positively to the ritual of the Anglican ceremony, rather than to the stark simplicity of the missionary Congregational service. Finally on December 15, 1861, the Bishops of Oxford and London consecrated the Reverend Thomas Nettleship Staley as Bishop of Honolulu. Staley, his wife, and seven children sailed from Southampton on August 17, 1862. On their October 11 arrival in Hawai‘i, they received sad news: the four-year-old Prince of Hawai‘i, only son of Kamehameha IV and Queen Emma, was dead. The bishop was to have baptized the child. As her gift, Queen Victoria had sent an impressive silver baptism cup.

Despite the sad beginning, Bishop Staley remained and his congregation grew. The king and queen were confirmed, and the Anglican Church caused a stir in the community. Many years later, Bishop Restarick researched and wrote about the excitement at 11:30 p.m. on Christmas Eve, 1862 at a temporary church building on the corner of Kukui Street and Nu‘uanu Avenue.

... the church was a blaze of light, the King having lent all his silver candelabra. After service guns were fired from Punchbowl, and lighted tar barrels rolled down the hill. A procession was formed, the King, the Bishop and W.M.F. Singe, the British representative, walking together. The King had provided twenty torchbearers and there was a vested choir of twenty. The procession marched through the streets singing Christmas hymns and at the Palace fireworks were set off, and the large crowd which had gathered cheered the King and Queen.

This pageantry bothered the Congregational missionaries. They had been ministering to the Hawaiians for 40 years and had little use for the ritualistic practices of the Roman Catholic church, and
by extension, that of the Anglican church. Congregationalist Rufus Anderson wrote in his 1864 book:

[Anglican worship] is too showy for religious tastes of people: too much like the Roman Catholic church... with surplice and stole; with alb and cape and crosier; with rochet and mitre and pastoral staff; with Episcopal ring and banner; with pictures, altar candles, robes, intonations, processions, allelujas.13

But Hawaiians and residents liked that Bishop Staley was not opposed to a bit of wine, some dancing, sports, and even watched ancient hula. Mark Twain was amused at Staley’s attendance at hula and wrote that “His holy head [was] decked out in the flower and evergreen trumpery of the hula hula girls.”14 Restarick described “Protestant Puritanism,” as “rigid and austere” and often “negative in practices.” The Congregational missionaries thought “all amusements had in them the nature of sin,” while both the Roman Catholics and the Episcopalians believed that “things were not sinful in themselves.” It is true that between 1823–1863, “... about 8,000 Hawaiians had been excommunicated by the missionaries for various offenses...” But as Dr. James Jarves, founder and editor of the Polynesian, observed, “the missionary was a far more agreeable man than his catechism, and the trader not as bad a man as the missionary would make him out to be.”15 In his private journal, the missionary C.S. Stewart described the natives who were “eating drinking, lounging [sic], sleeping, sports of the surf, cards, hearing songs of musicians, [their] recitations are accompanied by much action,” and he witnessed “performances of dancers.”16 If this was the life of Hawaiians before the missionaries arrived, we can understand their preference for the more liberal view of the Anglicans. G.P Belshaw, an Episcopal priest at St. Matthew’s Mission, Waimanalo, who in 1934 wrote biographies of Episcopalian “Pioneer Builders,” noted, “To their credit, in a short time the missionaries accomplished much: they created an alphabet of Hawaiian written language, translated the Bible, established an education system, provided good examples for family life, and built many churches.”17 Restarick stated in his book “If [missionaries] were narrow in some matters, as viewed from present day standards [it is the] fault of the age in which they lived and of training they received.”18
Anglican Bishop Alfred B. Willis, Restarick’s Predecessor

Bishop Restarick found the church “torn and weakened by political and other causes.” One problem Restarick had to face was Bishop Willis, who had been the Anglican bishop in Honolulu for 30 years. Loyal to the Anglican tradition, Willis questioned the entrance of the American Episcopal Church and established himself as a “Royalist,” vocally objecting to the Americans’ heavy-handed overthrow of the Hawaiian monarchy. Restarick heard from an Anglican bishop of Perth that the trouble in Honolulu was caused by a “bull-headed Englishman.” Indeed, Willis ruled with an iron hand.

Bishop Willis was most unpopular with many American and British business leaders of the Cathedral, who wished to control the Islands. Between 1892 and 1894 Willis had been “outspoken in his denunciation of those who by revolution had deprived the Royal Family of Hawaii of their rights. . . the United States would never countenance by annexation the great wrong of the overthrow.” During her confinement, under arrest in ‘Iolani Palace rooms, Queen Lili‘uokalani welcomed visits from Bishop Willis, who showed great sympathy for the royalist cause. Partly because of his attentions, the queen joined St. Andrew’s Cathedral and was active in women’s gatherings there. He spoke openly against the “Missionary Party,” which had few missionaries on its roster but included many Americans eager for annexation.

Bishop Willis had driven a thick wedge between his church and the missionary Congregational church, Central Union. Belshaw notes that upon Willis’s arrival, “Arbitrary, authoritative, staunch Royalist, Willis also helped spread rumors that the church [Anglican] is inseparably associated with the royal family.” The Congregationalist missionaries had reason to distrust Willis’s church. But Belshaw defended Willis by acknowledging “. . . any man who, after spending thirty years as a bishop, could quietly resign when the Islands were transferred to American jurisdiction, and then move to the South Pacific and carry on under great hardships as a loyal missionary for another eighteen years captures the imagination.”

The annexation of Hawai‘i to the United States occurred exactly four years before the arrival of Restarick. As the first American bishop, Restarick made peace with the Hawaiians and royalists who held a sizable grudge against the manner in which the Islands had been
annexed. The Hawaiians preferred the British to the Americans, partly because the British knew well how to treat royalty. Bishop Restarick had to bring together the congregations and become friends with the Congregational missionary church leaders at Central Union Church. In addition, he had to win Queen Lili‘uokalani to his side so that the Hawaiians would continue to embrace the Episcopal tradition in Hawaii.

Bishop Restarick’s Approach To His Dilemma

Restarick established the Sunday services, including the Hawaiian service at 9:30 a.m., the English services at 7:30 and 11:30 a.m. and, in

the 'Iolani Building, a Japanese service. Changes were made in the Prayer Book: now the “Collect for the Queen” was omitted in Communion services and the words in Morning and Evening Prayer changed from “O, Lord, Save the Queen,” to “O, Lord, save the State.”

Bishop Restarick was a peacemaker and researcher. After reading several books on Hawai‘i and gathering information from those around him, Restarick decided he would start healing the church. He called on Queen Lili‘uokalani, who made a note of his visit in her diary on August 16, 1902. The Bishop told her he “would only focus on his work which needed to be done. He was sure he’d have her sympathy,” and he did receive the queen’s support. According to Restarick’s daughter, Constance, who reported her father’s words: “Shortly before her [Lili‘uokalani’s] death [in 1917], the Queen said to me that she had come to the conclusion that things were best for her people as they were.”

At that first meeting, Bishop Restarick clearly stated he did not want to be involved with any troubles that occurred before he arrived, but desired to heal wounds and gain the respect from all concerned parties. The bishop reported that the queen agreed. Lili‘uokalani attended St. Andrew’s and wanted Prince Kuhio and his wife to be confirmed there, which indeed they were. However, in her diary, the queen noted she attended Kawaiaha‘o Church, Central Union, and Roman Catholic, and Mormon churches often. She also commented that frequently she didn’t go to church at all, but went to Waikiki to bathe or to rest. True, Bishop Restarick buried Lili‘uokalani, but the Mormons claim she joined their church, too. The queen was fair to all.

Restarick took a stand and solidified his new American congregation. Many in the Hawaiian congregation possessed anti-Caucasian and anti-American feelings. The first priest for the Hawaiian congregation, an Englishman, fostered those sentiments. Restarick eventually removed him from the position although the queen pleaded to retain him. By 1910 no Hawaiian services were offered because all knew English.

Restarick wished to support the “Episcopate by nurturing responsible leadership, downplaying the earlier autocratic notions of the bishop as church ruler.” He also reached out to the multiracial population, bringing all to Christ. “I try to be a friend as well as a bishop,”
he said. Warm and cordial to other Christians, he helped overcome antagonisms leveled at the American Episcopal Church.

Unlike their response to Bishop Willis, the missionary Congregational church took to Bishop Restarick, who defended it and admired the work of the early missionaries. He may have felt the Puritan and Calvinistic principles grated against the Hawaiians' view of the world; however, he admired what the missionaries had accomplished in such a short time. One of his articles was entitled: “Did the Missionaries Steal the Land of the Hawaiian?” He repeated more than once, “I can tell you in a few words that whatever lands the missionaries got were purchased in the open market and obtained in the same way other foreigners got their lands.” He also noted that the “Missionary Party” was really a political term describing anyone who desired to overthrow the monarchy, and, as a result, the descendants of the first Congregational missionaries were often misjudged. In a special article, Restarick defended Henry Perrine Baldwin for his philanthropy: “It can never be said that he grabbed the land of any Hawaiians, and I know how often he urged them to hold on to their property and tried to help them do so in financial ways.”

The Congregational leaders wisely selected Bishop Restarick to deliver the sermon at Central Union, April 11, 1920, celebrating the 100th anniversary of their missionaries’ arrival in the Islands. Because of his patience, his leadership, and his understanding, the bishop won many friends among the various denominations.

But problems also befell the bishop. St. Andrew’s Cathedral, which had been completed in 1886, needed repair. Soon after he arrived, Restarick declared it also needed electric lights and new pews. “Do contribute and offer memorials. We are not building for today, but for ages to come.” The girls’ school, St. Andrew’s Priory, was also in need of repairs. Loyal families supported the girls’ school, and the Priory became one of the Bishop’s pet projects.

The boys’ school, ‘Iolani, which had outgrown its home on the St. Andrew’s property, became one of Restarick’s frustrations. He was willing to let the Reverend Frank S. Fitz continue as head of the school, giving him housing and a salary of $75.00 a year. Restarick lent money to Fitz for his brother’s fare from England. Fitz sent the $250 to his brother, who was to teach at ‘Iolani. The brother spent much of it, got sick, and never came. When asked, Restarick gave Fitz $150 more
and took his note. The next year Fitz reported the expense of caring for his mother. Restarick tore up the previous note and made Fitz a present of the money he had lent him. The bishop traveled to San Francisco and raised $11,000 to buy the nearby Armstrong place for 'Iolani. Fitz “never hinted to me that he considered Iolani in any way not a church school under me,” said the bishop. Imagine his surprise when Fitz announced, “I want you to understand, I claim Iolani School as mine!” More problems followed, and finally the bishop had to seek out a new headmaster on the mainland and hired Mr. and Mrs. J.R. Morgan. Fitz remained as a teacher and consultant. Restarick raised his salary. The problem was not settled, but with the help of the Morgans, the Bishop put 'Iolani back on the right path.

Other challenges were mitigated because of Restarick’s conciliatory hand. Canon John Usborne was not recognized by Bishop Willis because of a disagreement regarding the building of St. Clement’s Chapel. When Willis traveled to the Lambeth Conference, he had put Usborne in charge. As canon and vice dean of St. Andrew’s Cathedral, Usborne wrote to Bishop Willis with plans for a mission in the Makiki

St. Andrew’s Cathedral Grounds, 1930. Bishop Museum.
district, near Punahou School. Willis agreed with the need for such a mission but requested further information regarding the financial arrangements and numbers of people it would serve. Meanwhile Usborne and two other gentlemen from the church found a property on Makiki and Wilder Streets that would be a perfect location. The three of them purchased the land. Eager to get started, Usborne and his family lived in a tent on the grounds, started building the chapel, and began planting flowers and greenery.

By the time Bishop Willis returned to Hawai‘i, Usborne was ready to have the chapel dedicated and begin serving its congregation. The bishop was horrified that they had purchased the land and put up a building. First of all, the land belonged to the three men and not to the Episcopal diocese. Willis refused to recognize St. Clement’s as part of the diocese, nor would he allow any representatives of St. Clement’s or its rector to attend diocesan gatherings. When Restarick arrived, he knew of the problem. Quickly, he blessed the chapel, invited Usborne to attend the first convocation, and, when construction was completed, dedicated St. Clement’s Church.32

Opportunities abounded for missionary work with the Chinese and Japanese congregations that already existed in the Kalihi and Mö‘ili‘ili areas. As the immigrant Asian farm laborers left the fields and moved into Honolulu, they were eager to establish church-centered communities. St. Elizabeth’s in Palama, therefore, established the “Girl’s Friendly Society,” which offered classes for Asian women. In time, St. Elizabeth’s prospered with a new “house,” which allowed instruction of Chinese four evenings a week. On Saturday it became an industrial school with mornings for Chinese girls and afternoons for Hawaiian girls. There were 25 girls in each department. The bishop and his wife were most interested in St. Mary’s mission on King Street in Mö‘ili‘ili, which they supported throughout their lives. Holy Trinity mission in another part of the city became a center for a Japanese congregation.

The missions were under the watchful eye of the bishop. The Chinese, Japanese, and Filipino laborers were generally not segregated when they moved to the city; Restarick worried about young Chinese men in Chinatown and established a place on the corner of Beretania and Queen Emma Streets where they could sleep and have their meals. Several of these young men eventually became Episcopalian priests. Restarick was particularly impressed with the Chinese Chris-
tians: With the penchant at that time for generalities, he announced “Chinese have no ‘fair weather’ Christianity. They not only live, but they die Christians . . .”

In 1915 Bishop Restarick learned of a Japanese man educated at Seabury Divinity School in Fairbault, Minnesota. He sent the gentleman money for passage to Hilo, but “he spent it.” Eager to help the plantation workers in Hilo, the bishop sent him more money. He came, but later caused problems, telling immigrant workers they should be paid the same as white workers.

BISHOP RESTARICK, HISTORIAN AND COMMUNITY ACTIVIST

Bishop Restarick read voraciously in Hawaiian history. He also became president of the Hawaiian Historical Society and edited papers for that organization and the Hawaiian Mission Children’s Society. He was never shy about stating an unpopular opinion. In his book, he described the philosophy of his writings:

> It is an easy matter to be the advocate of a cause, concealing facts and passing over opinions of those who differ. But I have given extracts from writers on both sides of any question treated.

Bishop Restarick’s strong suit was his pastoral office. It’s important to note here that the sweeping generalities that were common at the time wouldn’t be tolerated in our modern world. Even the clergy used racial stereotypes which would not be acceptable today. At one time the bishop noted that the “Hawaiians themselves are by nature the most lovable and friendly of people but they are of a retiring and timid disposition. They are not aggressive like the Orientals.” Nevertheless, the Bishop, for his time, was most accepting of the various races in Hawaii, worked with the missions, and welcomed all into the church.

Restarick was an advocate and defender of those accused of crimes primarily because of their race. In September of 1931, Mrs. Thomas Massie, wife of a Navy lieutenant, disappeared after a party at the Ala Wai Inn. After several hours, Mrs. Massie showed up beaten, jaw broken in two places, claiming that five young, local [non-Caucasian] men had attacked her. The five men were tried, the jury deadlocked, and a
Mistrial was declared. Publicity named the assault as a “native” crime, stirring up racial feelings in the Islands and on the Mainland. While a re-trial was being considered, Lt. Massie, Thalia’s socialite mother, Grace Fortescue, and two Navy men kidnapped one of the Hawaiian defendants, Joseph Kahahawai, and took him to their Mānoa house, punched and manhandled him for a confession, then murdered him. On January 8, 1932, the four accused of murdering Kahahawai were found guilty of manslaughter. Governor Lawrence Judd intervened and commuted their mandatory sentence from ten years to one hour. The Massies left Hawai‘i. Native Hawaiians saw this case as an example of a dual system of justice. In February of that year, Restarick wrote an article titled “A Time for Calmness and Fairness in Judgment.” In it he stated among other things “… neither Caucasian, Hawaiian, or those of other races should judge each other because of the action of degenerates. Using the word “native” when five men were accused of rape: Two were Japanese, one was Chinese and only one was Hawaiian.” Actually two were Hawaiian, two Japanese, and one Chinese-Hawaiian, but Restarick’s basic point was valid.

One controversial issue Restarick waded into was interracial relations, such as racial/ethnic diversity and intermarriage. Here once more we hear Restarick mouthing the racial stereotypical language used commonly at the time. The bishop delved into this topic in an article for the Honolulu Advertiser, July 13, 1922, after both Walter Dillingham and Henry Baldwin were criticized for their testimony before a congressional committee regarding the labor situation in Hawai‘i. A few weeks later Dillingham explained his views in a letter to Restarick:

“… assimilation is far from a reality, and that there is [a] crying need for rebalancing of the races we have in our midst…” [I didn’t mean to disparage Japanese] though we can not escape the realization that, because of their great preponderance in numbers, the very qualities that we admire in the individual Japanese make them, as a racial group, a distinct menace to further American industrial and political control of the Territory.

Baldwin wanted to bring in Chinese to break the Japanese hold. He wanted people “more assimilable” and mourned that southern Euro-
peans preferred California to the Islands. He concluded, in his letter to the bishop, “We must keep these islands in fact, as well as name, American, and by that I mean White.”

Restarick had defended Dillingham and Baldwin in the Advertiser, saying they were not attacking the Japanese and then praised Japanese accomplishments. But Restarick did not want Hawai‘i to become a Japanese colony. “How would the Japanese feel if a group of their islands had as many Americans and British as we have here of Japanese?” he asked. “Assimilation must carry with it inter-marriage which the Japanese do not want. Neither of us wants to assimilate . . .” he continued. He defended Hawaiian and Caucasian intermarriage because Hawaiians “are Aryans—proved by ethnologists.” Restarick, a product of his time, believed that the Japanese could not and did not want to assimilate. But simultaneously Restarick desired peace among people of all races and concluded his newspaper article saying, “nations need kindly consideration which races show each other in aloha land. Then we might hope for peace in the world.”

The Bishop’s Retirement

When the bishop retired, he could have relaxed and basked in honors he well deserved. But the period from his retirement in 1921 to his death in 1933 were busy years. Not only did he and his wife move to a home on Anapuni Street, near St. Clement’s, he joined that congregation. In an unsolicited letter to the rector, E. Tanner Brown, Restarick wrote: “I am a communicant of the parish and attend to my own business.” He had a soft spot in his heart for that church because of its struggles with Bishop Willis. It was understandable for him to join as a communicant, a substitute cleric, and a member of the vestry.

He served as a member of the Hawaiian Historical Society for 25 years, its vice president from 1905–1925, president from 1926–1933, and as an editor for its publications. From 1927 to 1931 he wrote more than 312 lengthy articles of 2000 or more words for the Saturday Honolulu Star Bulletin. The topics he chose show both his diverse interests and thorough research. In June 1936, his wife May gathered his articles into a large scrapbook, which graphically illustrates his varied topics. He described a retired sea captain living on another island,
shared an interview with a man who knew Lincoln, and wrote a treatise in defense of the early missionaries. He traveled to other islands, walking through *heiau*, and interviewing Hawaiian *kupuna* [elders]. He wrote “Historic Sites Should be Kept: Objections to Marking Heiaus” (Dec. 10, 1927). “Ale, Cards, and Late Hours Banned for Prince Liholiho while Abroad” (October 17, 1928). On November 30, 1929, he published “Kamehameha the Great is Described as Apollo by Sailor

Who Knew Him.” An article entitled “Amusements and Sports of Old Time Hawaii” appeared on July 21, 1928. He shared parts of a sailor’s journal that described “Luaus and Hulas of 100 Years Ago . . .” on June 1, 1929. He insisted Captain Cook did not bring venereal disease to Hawaii or to other islands. Today many would argue that he was incorrect. But Bishop Restarick perused Cook’s ship’s logs and spoke with noted physicians to defend his British hero.

Restarick was not fearful of unpopular topics. His article “Library Won’t Suppress Book on Mrs. Eddy’s Life,” defended the Hawai‘i Public Library for circulating Mary Baker Eddy’s books, although libraries across the mainland banned her writings.41

Soon after Bishop Restarick arrived, he met “Colonel” Samuel Norris, a pioneer and owner of part of what is now Parker Ranch on the Big Island, aboard the Mauna Loa. Norris told him “I was here in 1844. The natives were happy . . . these damn missionaries spoiled it all.” Obviously uncomfortable, the ship’s captain nudged Norris and wrote on a tablet that his conversation was with the Episcopalian Bishop Restarick. “Well,” Norris replied, “I don’t care. He’s not as damn bad as the rest of them. He is not a real missionary anyhow.” Bishop Restarick was highly amused by Norris’s response.42

On December 8, 1933, at age 79, he wrote a letter to Diocesan Bishop Samuel Harrington Littel explaining why he wouldn’t be going to convocation. “While I feel fairly well, I can not stand physical, mental, or nervous strain and I tire easily . . . . The fact is I realize that I am an old man . . . . P.S. The death of Bishop Cheshire leaves me number sixteen in the list of living American bishops.” 43

At the 50th anniversary of his ordination, a granddaughter of one of the Congregational missionaries said, “. . . you were able to bring order out of chaos and dissension and Christian association out of division.” Bishop Restarick accomplished all of this with skillful leadership, great compassion for others and, most of all, faith. At a St. Clement’s vestry meeting where the members hesitated over hiring a man they felt the church couldn’t afford, Restarick shouted out, “You must have faith!” His faith in God was the cornerstone of the bishop’s remarkable accomplishments. His faith stood strong even on his deathbed. E. Tanner Brown wrote that the Bishop said to him, “I am not afraid. It is all right, whatever happens.” 44
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