While the Civil War raged in America, a conflict of another kind flared between two Christian groups in the Hawaiian Islands: the American Congregationalist community and a newly arrived Church of England mission. On the surface it was a war of mutual insults and condemnations over church order, forms of worship, and theology, but the real issue was political power. The two groups were symbolic of chronic tensions between Americans and the British over the Islands. British interests in the Sandwich Islands, as the archipelago was first called by Captain James Cook, began when he came upon them in 1778 and continued with subsequent British visits and immigration. American religious and political influence began in 1820 with the arrival of zealous missionaries sent by the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions (ABCFM), a joint venture of Congregationalists and Presbyterians based in Boston, with Congregationalists playing the leading role. The missionaries, largely descendants of New England Puritans, were of that evangelical Calvinist tradition which had been reinvigorated by the Second Awakening in New England. From 1820 to 1862, the Congregationalists maintained an almost exclusive monopoly over missionary activity in Hawai‘i. English immigrants made occasional attempts to secure the minisra-
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tion of the Church of England, but without success. There had been an occasional brief visit of a British ship's captain or itinerant Anglican priest, but these visits led to nothing because of the general disinterest of both the English government and the Anglican Church, plus American missionary interference. There was, however, a long tradition within the local British community that early Hawaiian monarchs had been promised a mission of the English Church.

From the 1820s to the 1850s, American Congregationalist missionaries and their descendants increasingly influenced the indigenous culture and monarchy, even to the point of advocating annexation of the Islands by the United States. Bowing to missionary pressure, King Kamehameha III curtailed traditional social and religious customs such as the hula, a dance that had been a crucial element in the transmission of Hawaiian history and culture. The Americans had denounced the hula as corrupt and sinful. In 1852, they persuaded the king to introduce a constitution creating a more representative and democratic government, thus initiating a movement toward republicanism. American republican ideology was the Congregationalist missionaries' accepted truth, as they championed the egalitarian spirit of American democracy throughout the world in their missionary work. The growing American claim of "manifest destiny" to support continental expansion and increased trade with the Far East further fueled rumors of possible annexation.

Because of French political interference in Hawai'i in the same year, two young princes, the future kings Kamehameha IV and Kamehameha V, sailed to England to appeal for diplomatic assistance in thwarting French designs on the Islands. While on a stopover in the United States, the brothers felt the pain of racial prejudice owing to their dark skins and as a result developed some anti-American feelings. When Kamehameha IV became king in December 1854, he essentially killed any movement toward annexation set in motion under his predecessor. In addition, his trip to England stirred his admiration for the British monarchy, which he considered a model for stability, and for the Church of England, which he saw as a more accommodating, less strident, and more ritualistic expression of Christianity, closer to the traditions and temperament of his people. When he married Emma Rooke shortly after becoming king, the marriage service, although performed by a Congregationalist minis-
ter, was at the royal couple’s request celebrated according to *The Book of Common Prayer* of the Church of England.\(^5\)

Perceiving American missionary influence in the kingdom as essentially negative, in 1859 Kamehameha IV and Queen Emma asked Queen Victoria to send them clergy of the Church of England.\(^6\) This was part of a general scheme to bolster the monarchy and curtail growing American political influence. Kamehameha IV asked his foreign minister, Robert Crichton Wyllie,\(^7\) to instruct Manley Hopkins, the Hawaiian consul in London,\(^8\) to begin negotiations for an English mission.\(^9\) Wyllie told Hopkins that the king and queen “would prefer that the Episcopal Clergyman . . . have a family of his own, and be eminently liberal in all his principles and ideas.”\(^10\) The king offered to donate a site for a church, pay out of his personal funds the equivalent of one thousand American dollars a year to support a cleric, and provide him with housing. He also expressed the wish that his son, Prince Albert Edward Kauikeouli Leiopapa a Kamehameha, be instructed in the fundamentals of Church of England worship.\(^11\) Wyllie reminded Hopkins that the mission was personally sponsored by the king and in no way by the Hawaiian government, an action that would have been unconstitutional.\(^12\)

In England, Samuel Wilberforce, the bishop of Oxford, early in the discussion of an Anglican mission, suggested expanding the initial plan to send a “clergyman” to include a missionary bishop with authority to establish a complete church organization in Hawai‘i. In March 1860, Hopkins told Wilberforce he had acted on the suggestion and had asked Kamehameha to alter the original request.\(^13\) Kamehameha subsequently informed Wilberforce that “this new course will have the effect of a more enlarged establishment, and a consequently extended sphere of usefulness.”\(^14\) This is significant since the issue of a bishop and not just a priest was to become a flash point in the conflict with the Congregationalists, who would make much of the perceived change. Wilberforce took the reins and emerged very early as the principal organizer of the mission. It was Hopkins, however, who did much of the initial groundwork at the prompting of Wilberforce. Writing the bishop, Hopkins proposed that it would be an advantage to select a mission support committee at once and asked the bishop to assist in obtaining the cooperation of some lay persons of influence who were interested in the foreign
mission of the Church. The first committee meeting for the establishment of an “English Episcopal Church in the North Pacific” took place at the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel headquarters in London with Wilberforce taking the chair and inaugurating the proceedings.

In July 1860, Hopkins asked British Foreign Minister Lord John Russell to present the mission plan formally to Queen Victoria, and in November Kamehameha sought her approval. The queen responded in a letter from Lord Russell to Wyllie that clearly indicated her support for such a venture. Simultaneously, Wyllie presented a proposal for the establishment of “Episcopacy” to John Bird Sumner, the archbishop of Canterbury, who quickly assented.

Meanwhile, Wilberforce was expanding his special role as chairman of the Polynesian Church Committee, as the organizing group was soon called. In the spring of 1861, he led a debate in the Upper House of Convocation of the Church of England regarding the subject of missionary bishops, during which time he stated that “the King of the Sandwich Islands was most eager to see a Bishop of the Church of England” sent to his dominions. He added that Kamehameha “proposes to make the Bishop Preceptor to the Crown Prince.” Wilberforce referred to a letter that he had received from Episcopal Bishop William Ingraham Kip of California in which he indicated the importance of making Hawai‘i a missionary center and alluded to the fact that the American Episcopal church was most interested in working with the Church of England in this enterprise.

The next step was to find a bishop. Through an undetermined selection process, ailing Archbishop Sumner, under the careful influence of Wilberforce, designated the Reverend Thomas Nettleship Staley, a Cambridge graduate and educator of some distinction, as the proposed bishop of the new missionary diocese. Staley had been a mathematics lecturer at St. Mark’s College, Chelsea, London, and was a principal of the Collegiate School in Wandsworth, Surrey. It was undoubtedly Staley’s experience in education that most interested the selection committee, and it was his later role in establishing schools for native boys and girls in Hawai‘i that has left the most lasting mark of his ministry in the Hawaiian Islands. (Staley founded several schools, among them St. Alban’s School, the precursor of the Iolani School, and St. Andrew’s Priory School, two Honolulu institu-
tions that continue to reflect their Anglican heritage.) Staley was just what the king wanted. His daughter described him as being “a broad liberal in politics, he was like Dr. [Edward Bouverie] Pusey, vitally interested in rescuing the poor from city slums, and from the ignorance that hindered their efforts to raise themselves.”

She said Staley had long displayed liberal views in church and social matters, many of them well in advance of his time. Much of his thought was in keeping with the liberal social views of many in the Anglo-Catholic
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party of the English church. Close to Prime Minister Gladstone and a frequent correspondent with Charles Darwin, Staley was also a "suffragist" and a strong supporter of the underprivileged, in addition to being greatly interested in and having a love for indigenous peoples, according to his sister. Staley would soon discover that few American missionaries, if any, shared his liberal views.

After gaining the approval of Archbishop Sumner and being formally announced as bishop-elect for Hawai‘i, Staley was off touring England, preaching, and raising money for the mission. He circulated ten thousand copies of a fund-raising pamphlet, "The Church in the North Pacific," and made many personal calls upon wealthy potential supporters. In all his solicitations, as in his pamphlet, Staley argued, with little evidence to support his claim, that there was "much opposition" in Hawai‘i to the American Congregationalist missionaries, "as they were not the religious instructors whom the King and chiefs expected from England." He added it was only through the influence of John Young, the grandfather of Queen Emma, "and on his assurance that the same Gospel was preached by them [the Congregationalists], that they were erected in many parts of the Kingdom." Staley apparently based his views only on the feelings of the monarchs and several British diplomats.

He continued to criticize Congregationalists, whom he generally referred to as "Puritans." Writing to Samuel Wilberforce, the son of the "Great Emancipator" and Evangelical William Wilberforce, Staley asserted that "it is evident . . . there is a great work to do in obviating the moral effects of [Staley's underlining] Puritan teaching under which the people have been Christianized—chiefly unreality or worse." The bishop set himself at odds with the American Congregationalist community from the very beginning.

The first problem to confront the new bishop-designate concerned whether a royal license was needed for his consecration. Except for the controversial and short-lived Jerusalem bishopric in the 1840s, no English bishop had ever been consecrated to a see in a territory that was not a colonial possession, so the issue was one of considerable significance. Hawaiian mission sponsors feared any action by Queen Victoria and her government might infringe upon the sovereignty and independence of the king of Hawai‘i. Staley, wary of the charge of being a British agent, or part of a colonizing scheme, argued
against a license. Nevertheless, after lengthy debate, both government and church authorities in England decided a license was necessary.28 Trying to avoid potential trouble, Staley convinced the bishop of London to use his influence to secure at least an “unfettered license,” that is, “free from language likely to give offense and be as naked permission or sanction for His Grace consecrating TNS [Staley] without the specification of territory.”29 Staley and others opposed to the license, including Wilberforce, accepted the wording, realizing it was mild and left both church and king free and in possession of all their rights, privileges, and prerogatives.30 Staley’s fears would prove well-founded when American Congregationalists soon claimed he was sent to Hawai‘i to spy for the British government. Staley was consecrated bishop of Honolulu on December 15, 1861, in the chapel of Lambeth Palace, London. The three consecrating bishops were Sumner, the archbishop of Canterbury; Archibald Campbell Tait, the bishop of London; and Samuel Wilberforce.31

There was an uproar even before Staley set foot in Hawai‘i. The Congregationalists there were not opposed to an Anglican church, with a chaplain for the royal family and British adherents of the Church of England, but they wished to be certain that the clergyman would be one with whom they would be comfortable. They reiterated that the king had requested a “simple cleric,” not the bishop and his entourage now headed their way—an argument that would be repeated over and over again. In the early stages of this process, American Congregationalists, along with a group of evangelical American Episcopalians, asked their London Missionary Society contact, the Reverend William Ellis, to look out for their interests. They insisted that any High Churchman or one of “loose habits” would not succeed in Hawai‘i.32 When Ellis, a former Pacific island missionary, informed his contacts that a bishop was to be sent, there was general alarm. Ellis told Dr. Rufus Anderson, foreign secretary of the American Board of Commissioners and the man who would become Staley’s greatest antagonist, that Staley was “associated with that section of the Church of England from which the greatest number of perverts to Popery has proceeded, and between whom and the Roman Catholics the difference is reported to be slight. . . .”33

Anderson responded in anger, writing letters of protest to the archbishop of Canterbury and the bishop of London, but to no avail.
He insisted "an evangelical presbyter of the Episcopal Church" was the only viable option in Hawai‘i, that is, a cleric who would not antagonize American Congregationalist culture and political goals. In his first retort, Staley challenged Anderson to explain just how an episcopal-based church could operate without a bishop. "I leave it to the Board to show how 'Protestant Episcopacy with its ritual and ecclesiastical arrangements,' could receive a fair experiment without a Bishop."
One of the 'ecclesiastical arrangements,' of 'Protestant Episcopacy,' is Confirmation." In addition, Staley refuted Anderson's claim that the king originally only wanted a priest.  

Staley, his wife, seven children, a nurse, a governess, and two priests set sail from Southampton on August 17, 1862, and arrived in Honolulu on October 11. What should have been a joyous occasion was turned into grief by news of the death of the four-year-old prince several weeks earlier. The child's death crushed Kamehameha and his hopes for a stable hereditary monarchy. Staley's first act was to have been the prince's baptism, with Queen Victoria as godmother through proxy. The prince's demise also dealt a major blow to the success of the Anglican mission. With the monarchy less secure, any plan for using an Anglican church presence to aid and abet the king and queen's desire to curtail the American republican political agenda was placed in peril. The monarchy now would be more vulnerable to attack.

Upon Staley's arrival, the Hawaiian government provided a charter of incorporation for the mission under the name "Hawaiian Reformed Catholic Church." This title immediately became a lightning rod: it aroused alarm among many British and most American Episcopalians, many of whom were of the evangelical Low Church persuasion, and elicited charges of "popery" from Congregationalists. Staley defended the title as having been chosen "to divest it of national colour as much as possible." However, the words more accurately reflected Staley's Anglo-Catholicism. He felt that the name gave him freedom to exercise his own sentiments, a kind of middle way, as he saw it, between "Popery and Calvinism" in distant Hawai'i, far from the prying and critical eyes of Anglican church leaders. Staley's wife wrote her sister that

the Bishop has decided after many consultations with the King's Privy Council to have the Anglo-Catholic branch of Christ's Church sent from England to these Islands... The word 'Anglo' excited morbid feelings from Americans—'Reformed' marks how we differ from the Church of Rome which has many adherents here and is in Her turn resolved to resent it if our Church is called 'The Hawaiian Church' simply.
Staley was genuinely mystified by the reaction of the Congregationalists to his appointment. In a sermon preached in Westminster Abbey prior to leaving England, he stated the mission did not seek to enter into any conflict with either the Congregationalists or the Catholics in Hawai‘i. (Staley’s relations with the Roman Catholics in Hawai‘i were generally congenial.) “Nothing would shake all religious in the islands more effectually than for us to assume an attitude of hostility to those forms of Christianity with which they are now familiar. We are to speak the truth, but it must be in love. . . . We must make it clear we do not go forth to ignore or override what has been done by others.”

On arriving in Hawai‘i, however, Staley was considerably less irenic and more rigid, and he would continue to be so, convinced that he was right. He soon advised his clergy and laity not to be discouraged by “Puritan” attacks for, “if in this remote spot of the globe, the battle between modern Puritanism and primitive Catholicity is to be fought, let our opponents know we are ready to meet them.” The holy war was on.

From the beginning, Staley had to confront the persistent belief among many Americans both in Hawai‘i and on the mainland that he and his mission were part of a plot to strengthen British influence in Hawai‘i and possibly make the kingdom a part of the empire. There is no evidence to support these claims by the Americans. Staley was adamant in his denial of any such plot, as were the British diplomats. Writing to Lord Russell, William W. F. Synge, the British commissioner to Hawai‘i, boldly reiterated the position of the British government that “Her Majesty’s government have nothing to do with sending out the Mission,” and that the Americans affect to see in [the mission’s] arrival another proof of the desire of Great Britain to establish a predominant interest in these Islands. Exasperated by the recent ill success of their arms at home, they seek their usual solace in abuse of England. . . . All this is sufficiently absurd; but I think that the King and all well disposed persons will be unmoved.

Nevertheless, it can be argued that the Hawaiian monarch certainly saw the mission as a way to thwart American republican movements in his kingdom no matter what the British government’s intentions were. Kamehameha IV welcomed the Staley party with a speech in
which he declared, “You have now come at our earnest solicitations, under the benignant countenance of my great and good friend, the Queen of Great Britain and Ireland, and encouraged by the sympathy of the generous English public.” Thus it would appear that the arena was set for battle between the American Congregationalists and the English mission under Bishop Staley. The primary issues at hand were: who would win the war over the souls of the Hawaiians and who would ultimately hold political power?

The adversaries viewed a number of subjects with different lenses. For example, they perceived the indigenous peoples of Hawai‘i and their traditional culture somewhat differently. The American missionary community had seen the natives as “barbarous pagans” and “savages” who were in need of conversion from “primitive heathenism” that had led them into “immorality and degeneracy.” This view was in keeping with the general nineteenth-century American evangelical Protestant image of “heathendom,” referring to the non-Christian world that was ripe for missionary proselytization. In their missionary journal, the Congregationalists displayed these racial and cultural biases as they described the

great and marvelous work . . . done by the American Board in these Islands. A whole nation of the most degraded, naked, savage idolaters of earth, in a single generation civilized, Christianized, and now standing on a level (in many respects) with the most favored nations of the world!46

In his history of Hawai‘i, Rufus Anderson, the ABCFM foreign secretary, vowed that American missionaries had eradicated many “heathen” practices such as “idolatry,” polygamy, infanticide, and disrespect and abuse of the “maimed, blind, the aged.” He alleged that in premissionary times the Hawaiians had practiced such evils as “gambling, drinking, and sports.”47 Anderson seemed particularly preoccupied with sex and nudity. He observed that native Hawaiian children were naked until nine or ten years old. “In bathing in the sea, or sporting in the surf, no articles of clothing were ever worn. . . .” After the Americans arrived and introduced Western clothing customs such as the plain black loose-fitting “Mother Hubbard” dress for women, “this universal custom of wearing clothing, so far as they can obtain it, should be regarded as some proof of advancement. The
change from nakedness to the use of decent apparel is certainly very important."

Staley, true to his principled Anglo-Catholic support of social justice for the poor and indigenous peoples, argued that Anderson’s portrayal of the primitive condition of the Island peoples, and their great rise to pure morality and religion as a result of American efforts, was essentially flawed. In a report to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in March 1864, he wrote,

Forty years ago these Islands embraced Christianity in the form of American Congregationalism and that of the strictest New England order. It was thought possible to make . . . this people . . . the merriest, gentlest and the most loving race in the world, a puritan’s paradise. But instead of tales of chastity, temperance, respect for an oath, and abandonment of heathen practices, all one hears are the number of meeting houses built and the number of Bibles circulated.

Staley then quoted a magistrate on the island of Maui, married to a native Hawaiian, who claimed missionary activity only created cosmetic differences in the people. According to this commentator,

Of all the creeds of Christian sects the Calvinistic, as laid down by its founder, is the least qualified to take large, generous and comprehensive views of the great mass of humanity lying without its pale. Hence its incapacity at all to apprehend, and still less to sympathize, with the rude virtues of semi-barbarous tribes.

Staley argued that the Calvinists actually brought about negative effects and caused many “converts” to return to their native faith. On the whole, he championed the distinctive Hawaiian indigenous culture and tradition as long as it did not conflict with his concept of Christian morality or the realities of any particular situation. He contrasted the English system with that of the Americans: “We believe [American Congregationalism] as a system, to be utterly unable to solve the moral problems of the universe. We believe it most unsuited for that light-hearted race, those laughing children of the sun, who dwell in these islands.” Staley’s imaging of Hawaiians is strikingly like the late eighteenth-century romantic notion of “noble savages,”
as opposed to the “ignoble savage” imagery of the American missionaries in Hawai‘i.

Staley delighted in pointing out the differences in the worship styles of the Congregationalists and the English mission. He observed the American’s style of worship as so bare, drab, and devoid of symbol that it was “powerless against that craving for the objective which, if not used and directed aright, draws the Hawaiians back into idolatry.”53 His “objective” expression of Christianity was geared toward the Hawaiians’ love of symbol, myth, ceremony, ritual, and the transcendent, most of which had been obliterated by the American missionaries.

Anderson, who visited Hawai‘i between February and July 1863, continued to attack Staley and his mission in both books and periodicals over issues ranging from the refusal of an Anglican priest to accept an invitation to attend a Congregationalist prayer meeting to charges of “popery” and monarchical authoritarianism.54 Much of his rather scathing criticism has a somewhat hollow ring and suggests a smoke screen for the real issue: political power in Hawai‘i, over which the Americans and Staley, who strongly supported the monarchy, were fighting. However, allegations played well in the press, especially in major newspapers controlled by Americans, and the English mission lost much credibility with the Islanders and with the international community as a result. Staley, perhaps unwittingly, provided the Americans with ammunition. Not content with advanced ritualistic practices and broadsides against “Puritanism,” he introduced a group of religious of the Society of the Most Holy Trinity from England to teach Hawaiian girls.55 The society, being one of the first revivals of women’s religious orders in the Church of England since the Reformation, disturbed many observers, particularly in England, where the order was widely condemned. The Congregationalists’ opposition to Staley stiffened.

The Congregationalists were certainly formidable competition for the fledgling Anglican mission. They had translated the Bible into Hawaiian in 1839 and by 1863 claimed to have converted and admitted to membership some fifty-one thousand Hawaiians.56 The Anglican mission could only count about one thousand members by the end of the same year, although it was quite a remarkable number
after less than two years' work with few clergy and very little money.\textsuperscript{57} Hoping to further diffuse and diminish Staley's influence in Hawai'i, Anderson publicly argued that Staley's personal impact, and that of the Reformed Catholic Church, were negligible, although he continued to hammer away at Staley's ritualistic practices.

Excepting on a few extraordinary occasions, the audiences were everywhere small. The worship was evidently too showy for the religious taste of the people; too like the Roman Catholic—with surplice and stole; with alb, and cope, and crosier; with rochet, and mitre, and pastoral staff; with Episcopal ring and banner; with pictures, altar-candles, robing, intonations, processions and attitudes. The mitre was worn at the confirmation of the king and queen, but it is said to be very seldom worn by a bishop in England.\textsuperscript{58}

Staley liked pomp and ritual, as did the king and queen and most of the court, and he spared no expense or impediment in his liturgies. The king's love of ritual and the consequent appeal of Anglo-Catholic ceremony reflected the monarch's attempt to strengthen the monarchy against the republican movements within the American religious and political community. Deliberately playing to his understanding of the Hawaiian love of pageantry, Staley introduced Gregorian chant, solemn Sunday choral, and daily said communion services in his "pro-cathedral." The king had translated \textit{The Book of Common Prayer} into Hawaiian himself and it was used regularly by Staley and his clergy, who learned Hawaiian and preached in it. Initially the natives appeared to be enthralled with the "new religion," but after unrelenting broadsides from forceful Congregationalists they gradually slipped away.

In October 1862, Staley baptized Queen Emma, probably the mission's greatest advocate, in a palace court room festooned with elaborate liturgical vestments, and a month later he confirmed the king and queen in the temporary cathedral. The English service was the perfect ritual expression for the monarchs. Soon Kamehameha, at Staley's suggestion, proclaimed the first public celebration of Christmas and the observance of Good Friday in Hawai'i. The Congregationalists, who, true to their Puritan heritage, never celebrated Christmas, thinking it a pagan holiday, and never observed Good Friday as a holy day, roundly condemned the royal proclamations.\textsuperscript{59}
Ironically, it was American Episcopalians and British Church of England adherents in Hawai‘i, many of whom had Low Church (Evangelical) backgrounds, that caused Staley the most trouble. Not content with complaining to the bishop and his clergy about the ritualistic practices, they often appealed to the archbishop of Canterbury or other English church leaders. On several occasions Staley defended himself against these charges in correspondence with the bishop of London and others.\textsuperscript{60} The height of Staley’s ritualism was the state funeral of Kamehameha IV, which resembled a solemn pontifical Catholic mass. In \textit{Five Years’ Church Work in the Kingdom of Hawaii}, Staley proudly described the scene.

The Pro-Cathedral was beautifully decorated, the super altar having thirty wax lights and six vases of white flowers. Above it was written ‘Resquiescat in Pace.’ [The king’s bier] was raised six feet from the floor, and approached on all sides by steps. Over this had been erected a canopy, draped in black, round the cornice of which were written the words, ‘I know that my Redeemer liveth.’ The crown, sword, and hat of the late King were placed on the velvet pall, which had been embroidered with the Hawaiian coat of arms. . . .\textsuperscript{61}

The sung service of Holy Communion was celebrated as a requiem. Most of the service was in Hawaiian, except for the choral settings of the mass. It was a state funeral befitting a king, approximating that for an English monarch, and nothing like it had ever been seen in Hawai‘i. The Congregationalists were aghast. The king’s death, however, was a serious blow to Staley’s mission, since the monarch had been his strongest supporter.

Perhaps the most publicized “bad press” that Staley received was from American writer Mark Twain. In \textit{Letters From the Sandwich Islands}, consisting of reports to the Sacramento \textit{Weekly Union}, Twain devoted an entire chapter to “Bishop Staley’s Church.” His harsh words were probably influenced by his friend, the Reverend Franklin Samuel Rising, an extreme evangelical Episcopal priest who had been a missionary to the Territory of Nevada, a rector of St. Paul’s Church in Virginia City during the time Twain lived there.\textsuperscript{62} Twain referred to the English mission as “the Royal Hawaiian Church, otherwise the ‘Reformed Catholic Church,’ a sort of nondescript wildcat religion imported here from England.”\textsuperscript{63} His criticism was spawned by obser-
vations of the funeral for Princess Victoria Kamamalu Kaʻahumanu, heir presumptive to the crown and sister of Kamehameha V. The king was not married and had no children. The traditional Hawaiian ceremony included a kind of harrowing wailing about the deceased that could last many days. The Congregationalists thought they had suppressed the ancient practice, but it arose following the death of Kamehameha IV and surfaced again at the death of Princess Victoria. On both occasions, Staley saw no need to criticize or curtail it. He felt this indigenous custom did not interfere with any Christian teaching and was of no harm. Twain strongly disagreed; asserting that the bishop was reviving the long forgotten customs of a barbarous age, he wrote,

... one of the first things Bishop Staley did when he arrived here a few years ago was to write home that the missionaries had deprived the natives of their innocent sports and pastimes (such as the lascivious hula hula, and the promiscuous bathing in the surf of nude natives of opposite sexes), and one of the next things he did was to attend a hula hula at Waikiki with his holy head tricked out in the flower and evergreen trumpery worn by the hula girls. When the late King died the bishop revived the half-forgotten howling and hula dancing and other barbarisms in the palace yard, and officiated there as a sort of master of ceremonies. For many a year before he came that wretchedest of all wretched musical abortions, the tom-tom, had not been heard near the heart of Honolulu; but he reinstated it and brought it into its ancient esteem and popularity.64

Twain saw much of Staley’s ritualism as reeking of superstition and magic, supporting the very things that the American Congregationalist community had tried to eliminate in the Hawaiian culture. Although the puritanical Twain apparently never met Staley, he vehemently attacked him, characterizing the Anglican leader as a “weak, trivial-minded man” who had been elevated to a position of “rank and power. He miscalculated the force, the confidence, the determination of that Puritan spirit which subdued America and underlies her whole religious fabric to-day—which has subdued these islanders, and whose influence over them can never be unseated.”65 Twain echoed the thinking of the American Congregationalist community regarding their clout in Hawai‘i, their republican ambitions, Staley
and the English mission’s corresponding weakness, and likely weakness of the monarchy as well. The homespun writer claimed

The moneyed strength of these islands—their agriculture, their commerce, their mercantile affairs—is in the hands of the Americans—republicans; the religious power of the country is wielded by Americans—republicans; the whole people are saturated with the spirit of democratic Puritanism, and they are—republicans. This is a republic, to the very marrow, and over it sit a King, a dozen Nobles and a half dozen Ministers. The field of the Royal Hawaiian Established Church is thus so circumscribed that the little cathedral in Nuuanu Street, with its thirty pews of ten-individual capacity each, is large enough to accommodate it in its entirety, and have room to spare. One might worship this strange production itself without breaking the first commandment, for there is nothing like it in the heavens above or in the earth beneath, or in the water under the earth. The Catholics refuse to accept it as Catholic, the Episcopalians deny that it is the church they are accustomed to, and of course the Puritans claim no kindred with it.66

The lengthiest and most severe attacks on the Anglicans came, however, in Rufus Anderson’s two books on the history of the American mission. In a book published in 1864, Anderson targeted the origins of the English mission and the American Board’s futile attempt to control its character. He quoted a letter to the archbishop of Canterbury going to the heart of his concern: the English church in Hawai’i implied the probable “extension of British dominion,” a step “regarded with jealousy by the government of the United States.”67 As a key figure in the republican movement among the American Congregationalists, Anderson was distressed by the influence of Staley and his mission at court, despite their limited members. Ironically, while scheming to annex Hawai’i, the Americans continually accused the British of the same thing. Anderson wrote,

At the present time, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, the Minister of the Interior, a Justice of the Supreme Court, the Attorney General, and perhaps one or two native gentlemen in office are connected with the Reformed Catholic Church. The only other cabinet minister—the one having charge of the finances—is a French gentleman and a Roman Catholic. The present king retains Bishop Staley as his chaplain, and, though remaining at the head of his mission, has made him a member of his Privy Council.68
Staley was outspoken and unbending in his public opposition to the American republican agenda in Hawai‘i, primarily since it was at the heart of any opposition to both the English mission and the monarchy. He believed this was due to political motivations, not to differences in church order or worship styles. He asserted the “Puritan’s political reign” influenced the government greatly during the time of Kamehameha III when the American-backed constitution “accorded to [Congregationalist] clergymen the right to sit in the Legislature.” This was, in his view, an egregious attempt to break the power of Hawaiian chiefs, noting in a letter to a cleric friend that “a more preposterous system for a people just emerged from barbarian could not have been devised.” The British Commissioner Synge echoed Staley in a letter to Lord Russell stating the “American residents, however, whose hatred and jealousy of everything English, always sufficiently violent in these Islands, now amounts almost to monomania...”

Staley attempted to defend the British despite their worldwide colonizing efforts by essentially claiming that the situation with regard to Hawai‘i was different, as indeed it would seem to have been.Replying to Anderson and other American critics, Staley published A Pastoral Address by the Right Reverend The Bishop of Honolulu, With Notes and a Review of the Recent Work of the Rev. R. Anderson, D.D. Entitled “The Hawaiian Islands” in 1865. Answering American charges of British political interference, Staley chided his opponents by claiming that the English mission had not gone to Hawai‘i to be sources of political unrest or to act as political demagogues but to aid the king in his work of not only raising his people to a higher moral life, but also saving them from extinction. Writing in capital letters for emphasis, Staley exclaimed, “LET ME SAY ONCE FOR ALL, THAT ON NO OCCASION WHATEVER HAVE I EVER OFFERED HIS MAJESTY POLITICAL ADVICE, OR INFLUENCED HIS MEASURES IN THE SLIGHTEST.” Staley argued that Anderson was wrong in his assumption that the Anglican mission had “intruded” upon the Christian community and all the people of Hawai‘i.

How a mission can be said to be ‘intrusive’ which has been invited hither by successive Sovereigns of this nation qualified, at least, by their sympathies and knowledge to judge what was best for the moral and religious elevation of their subjects, I leave to the Board to determine.
Can it be said of either of the two forms of Christianity now in the Islands, that it was established with the immediate consent, much less on the invitation of the Chief Ruler of the State? 71

The bishop also replied to Anderson's accusations of cabinet interference by arguing that the only services that he gave to the Privy Council were as acting chaplain and member of the Bureau of Public Instruction, the king acting on Staley's experience within popular education in England. 72

Seemingly besieged by the American community in Hawai'i, Staley's California counterpart, Episcopal Bishop Kip came to Staley's defense. Writing in the California diocesan newspaper, the American bishop Kip reasoned

For five years past, Mr. Editor, the secular press, and a part of that called 'the religious,' have rung with misrepresentations about the appointment, by the English Church of Dr. Staley as Bishop of Honolulu. It was represented to be entirely a political move, intended to strengthen English influence at the Sandwich Islands. The whole charge [underlining by Kip], indeed, was thus summed up [as] the Episcopal Mission to those Islands originated in a 'political object on the part of the English Government,' and Bishop Staley was sent out as 'a political Missionary.' 73

Kip reiterated the claim the American Episcopalians had worked toward getting a mission to Hawai'i, and it should have been a joint endeavor. The charges of "English influence" and "English politics" were "perfectly absurd." 73

Reacting to an editorial in the Congregationalist-controlled newspaper, the Pacific Commercial Advertiser, Staley described both an American desire to abolish the monarchy and disloyalty to a dynasty to which "they [the Americans] owed so much." He wrote,

After commenting severely on the policy of His Majesty in dissolving the American-backed [1864 constitutional] convention, it [the article] concludes with these words, [Staley's capitals] 'IT IS POSSIBLE KAMEHA-MEHA V. MAY NEVER HAVE A SUCCESSOR TO SIT ON THE THRONE. A REPUBLICAN FORM OF GOVERNMENT MAY BE ESTABLISHED BY THE PEOPLE. IT IS NOT PROBABLE THE HAWAIIAN NATION WILL TAMELY SUBMIT THEIR NECKS TO THE YOKE OF DESPOTISM.' 74
In his classic volume *A Religious History of the American People*, Sydney Ahlstrom noted that the “American Board’s semi-imperialistic projects in Hawaii belong in almost the same category as its earlier work in Oregon, since Hawaii, too, was ultimately annexed (1898) and made a state of the Union (1959). Both are examples of ‘foreign’ missions that were quite literally ‘domesticated.’” He added these Americans introduced constitutional reforms that finally led to the overthrow of Queen Lili‘uokalani in 1893 and the proclamation of a republic. Another scholar asserted the American Congregationalists were not “semi-imperialists” but full-scale imperialists. Perhaps nowhere was this more clearly seen than in Hawaii.

After the death of Kamehameha IV, attacks by the Congregationalists on the English mission increased. The Americans saw Staley as more vulnerable under Kamehameha V, who was not as devoted to the English church nor as pious a Christian as his brother. Staley wrote, “The death of the King . . . was followed by an outburst of the most malignant writing in the Congregationalist organs, English and native, in Honolulu. To the credit of the more respected of the American missionaries and the French Romanists, it met with their strong reprobation.” Under Kamehameha V, the grieving dowager Queen Emma was given only a small role at court; however, she was still held in great esteem by the Hawaiian people, and her strong influence on the English mission continued as it had under her husband’s rule. Just the notice of her appearance at any Anglican church drew huge crowds; but when she left the area, attendance dropped off sharply.

During the time of Kamehameha V, the republican-minded Americans kept up the pressure on Staley and the mission. Finally, after nearly a decade of fighting off attacks, begging for funding, dealing with disagreements over ritual and practice, in addition to the high cost of maintaining his family, Bishop Staley reluctantly resigned his episcopate in 1870 and returned to England.

In 1893, American businessmen, many of whom were descendants of Congregationalist missionary families, finally overthrew the monarchy headed by Queen Lili‘uokalani without the consent of the Hawaiian people or of their government and shortly thereafter established their long-sought republic. In 1898, the United States formally annexed the Islands. The Hawaiians who had struggled for years to stop America from taking their country have in the present time ini-
tiated a move to regain their heritage and sovereignty. The centen-
nial of the 1893 overthrow of the kingdom brought an extraordinary official resolution from the U.S. Congress, signed by President Clinton, which apologized for the overthrow of the monarchy. The her-
itage of Bishop Staley and the English mission, his identification with the indigenous peoples of Hawai‘i and their cultural traditions, his support of the indigenous monarchy in its determination to thwart the advances of American republicanism, his liberalizing influence on the American-introduced puritanical ethos in the Hawai‘i of his time, and the republican-minded Congregationalist’s “holy war” with the English mission must now be viewed in a new light.
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