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Early Hawaiian Newspapers and Kanaka Maoli
Intellectual History, 1834–1855

This essay aims to provide a fuller history of the characteristics and contents of the first four Hawaiian-language newspapers, Ka Lama Hawaii (1834), Ke Kumu Hawaii (1834–1839), Ka Nonanona (1841–1846), and Ka Elele Hawaii (1848–1855). I seek to identify the Kanaka Maoli (Native Hawaiian) writers, describe the kinds of writing they engaged in, and to suggest a few ways in which, from the outset, the newspapers provided a space within (and against) which a distinctively Hawaiian intellectual tradition in writing progressively took shape. Although the value of the Hawaiian-language papers has long been recognized in Hawaiian studies, not enough attention has been paid to the writers themselves as authors, journalists, pundits, and creative
artists of literature. Many advanced students in Hawaiian language and history are familiar with only a handful of writers and their works. And that is because the works of that handful, S. N. Hale‘ole, Ioane (John Papa) Ii, Samuel Kamakau, Kepelino, and Davida Malo, have been translated into English. Beyond these few well-known writers, there are hundreds more who contributed their works to the papers (table 1). These include, but are certainly not limited to, ali‘i nui who penned decrees, spokespeople for the ali‘i who crafted public policy and engaged in debates, Native Hawaiian missionaries who wrote of their experiences in foreign lands, ministers who composed Sunday school lessons and debated religious issues, and schoolteachers who shared their knowledge of a number of different subjects. Many of them also created works of literature, ranging from translating traditional mo‘olelo into writing to composing fictional stories, and composing all manner of mele (song or chant) from mele inoa (name songs) in honor of ali‘i to kanikau (mourning songs) for loved ones.¹

The majority of these works are signed and many of the writers created significant bodies of work. The writers need to be recognized as authors, not merely as passive carriers of the oral tradition, as ethnology and history have sometimes treated them. This can be seen in the books of Nathaniel B. Emerson, for example, who drew heavily upon signed written literature for both Pele and Hiiaka: A Myth from Hawaii and Unwritten Literature of Hawaii.² Another example can be seen in Place Names of Hawaii; in the entry for Kawaluna, an article written and signed by J. H. Kanepuu is cited only by the name and date of the paper.³ The writers also need to be recognized as influential in the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Newspaper</th>
<th>Years Published</th>
<th>Number of Identified Writers</th>
<th>Number of Writers of Multiple Pieces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ka Lama Hawaii</td>
<td>1834</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ke Kumu Hawaii</td>
<td>1834–1839</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ka Nonanona</td>
<td>1841–1845</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ka Elele Hawaii</td>
<td>1845–1855</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
political events of their time. This historical lack of recognition can be understood as an extension of the colonial project of erasing or diminishing natives as actors in our own history. It also suggests how historians of Hawai‘i have ignored the Hawaiian language newspapers as a rich resource and index into the complexities of Hawaiian history and Hawaiian political thought. While the common denominator of the early newspapers discussed here is the desire that their editors had to convert Hawaiians to a radically different system of beliefs and practices, the opening up of spaces for written expression, coupled with the Hawaiian embrace of reading and writing, made the newspapers a vital arena in which crucial questions about culture, knowledge, and politics could begin to be publicly debated. In this sense, the early newspapers anticipate the Hawaiian intellectual tradition that would flourish later in the century. To identify and appreciate the writers who contributed to the early papers is to begin to chart the development of a complex intellectual history in the Hawaiian language.

Because so many of the writers are unknown (as writers—some are known as government officials), I am approaching this task through a fairly comprehensive reading of the newspapers, cataloguing the writers’ names and titles of their works, and then examining and reporting on the results. This survey of the first four newspapers published in Hawaiian covers a period of twenty-one years, from 1834 to 1855. This period is important as the first group of writers is seen to emerge. They are the first Kānaka Hawai‘i to translate their knowledge from oral forms into writing, and further, from writing to print.

The new technology of print created demands of its own, such as deadlines and a fixed amount of space to fill. The apprehension of time itself had to change for these newspaper writers. It also necessitated re-thinking some values about knowledge: how knowledge is passed on and who is entitled to learn traditional knowledge such as genealogies. In this same period, the lāhui Hawaii was experiencing severe decimation as a result of epidemics and other abrupt changes in lifestyles. The old rules (kapu) did not always fit into this new situation. The writers for the newspapers saw opportunities to pass on and preserve knowledge in print. They also created new knowledge, new rules, and new genres of writing in their individual works and, more importantly perhaps, through printed debate and argumentation.
In this paper, I am building, first, on two major bodies of work in the history of the Hawaiian newspapers. The first is *Hawaiian Newspapers* by Esther K. Mookini. The second is the body of work by Helen Geracimos Chapin: “Newspapers of Hawaii 1834 to 1903: From ‘He Liona’ to the Pacific Cable;” “From Makaweli to Kohala: The Plantation Newspapers of Hawai’i;” and *Shaping History: The Role of Newspapers in Hawai’i*.

I am also building on the research of other scholars who have written about Hawaiian intellectual history. Among these are John Charlott’s biography of Moses Nakuina and Noelani Arista’s introduction to the new publication of *Kepelino’s Traditions of Hawaii*, in which she explains:

Hawaiian intellectuals like Kepelino were wide-ranging in their apprehension of knowledge, and they brought together their education in various schools and branches of Hawaiian knowledge with the training offered through religious seminaries and schools. The writings they left were shaped by plural intellectual traditions of Hawai’i, Europe, and America. And because their writings emerge out of their negotiation of multiple intellectual traditions, their texts will continue to be compelling sources not only to enrich our knowledge of the Hawaiian past, but also as a window unto [sic] the multi-layered present in which each author lived.

The recognition of this rich, complex intellectual tradition has the potential to substantially revise our collective ideas of Hawaiian history. To the degree that we acknowledge Hawaiian intellectuals as producing and/or influencing all of the events of Hawaiian history, that history becomes more visibly and palpably Hawaiian history and less the history of European and American domination of Hawai’i (which includes the appropriation of the means to control the production and circulation of history itself). For about a hundred years (1834–1948), Hawaiians produced knowledge, opinions, literature, political and religious discourses, and debates in print, leaving an extensive archive, including nearly 80 newspapers now preserved on microfilm and digitally, and an uncounted number of books. It is time we find out who these Hawaiian writers were and how they influenced history in our land.
Ka Lama Hawaii (1834)

The early newspapers, as suggested, were largely missionary-run, and stamped with the character of their respective editors. The first of them, Ka Lama Hawaii, was the school newspaper for Lahainaluna on Maui, more pedagogical (text-book and forum for composition) than it was a newspaper with news meant for wider circulation (although it is an excellent example of how, once committed to print, written expressions can circulate far beyond their intended audience). Lor-rin Andrews, principal of Lahainaluna and editor of the paper, was the rare missionary who had a lifelong interest in Hawaiian language and literature. He was committed to building a Hawaiian intelligentsia that would help Hawai‘i convert to Christianity. This forms the intent of the paper, as Andrews defined it in a letter:

. . . First, to give the scholars of the High School the idea of a newspaper—to show them how information of various kinds was circulated through the medium of a periodical. Secondly, to communicate to them ideas on many objects . . . Thirdly, it was designed as a channel through which the scholars might communicate their own opinions freely on any subject they chose.

The last point—on the preservation of part of the paper as a free space for student opinion—may not have been literally true, but it stands out in anticipating the role Hawaiian newspapers would come to play. Some of the content of page four, supposedly reserved for students, appears not to have been written by students. Some of the short essays in the column called “No Ka Lama Hawaii” (For Ka Lama Hawaii), for example, sound as if they were written by Andrews or one of the teachers. One kanikau (mourning song) was signed by Davida Malo, the famous writer and advisor to the monarchs, who was a student in the first class of 1831. One account of a death of a man was signed by Ke‘liiumiumi, a student who entered the school in the second class, 1833. These are the only two pieces signed by students. It is difficult to determine exactly who might have written the other pieces, since the paper reported 76 students in attendance. Most of the content of the paper’s pages one through three consists of textbook-like instruction on the animals of Europe, Asia, Africa, and
The page four essays, however, often concern the “pono hou” or the new morality or puritanical Christian sense of what constitutes rightness or righteousness. This debate, as conducted in this first paper, alerts us to the complexity that attends adaptation to ways that would eventually become hegemonic. These are the first of many debates on issues that continue until the Hawaiian language papers end in 1948. In other words, these essays in *Ka Lama Hawaii* in 1834 give us an idea of how the Kanaka students contended with the contrast and conflict between the traditional ideas of pono they were raised with and the new ideas of morality brought by the missionaries and taught in their school. In her 2007 dissertation, Leilani Basham explains that the missionaries chose the word “pono” to represent their ideas of right and righteousness but that these do not correspond to the traditional ideas of pono. These two different thought worlds then became entwined in the word pono. Briefly, in the old world sense, pono connoted balance among the strata of society, the ‘āina, and the spiritual realm, i.e., in the words of Lilikalā Kame‘eleihiwa, “a universe in perfect harmony.” The new pono was everything the puritanical missionaries considered moral or right, including heterosexuality, monogamy, patriarchy, and a disdain for any kind of entertainment.

Basham examines some of these essays to explore how the students articulated their ideas about the “pono kahiko” (the old pono) and the “pono hou” (the new pono). She notes that in the article called “No ka Poe Kuai a me ka Hoolimalima,” the student writer says that when one is selling or renting out something, it is not pono to be greedy and try to get the best price; rather it is best to consider the welfare of one’s “hoa kuai” or trading companion. It is recommended that “kuai laua me ka oluolu, a me ke aloha i kekahi i kekahi; oia ke kuai pono” (they trade kindly, with aloha for each other; that is pono trading). Basham points out how this contradicts the American system of capitalist trading, which depends on each trading partner attempting to maximize profit or get the best bargain. Basham also examines another essay called “No ka Pono Kahiko a me ka Pono Hou” for similar insights. That essay critiques aspects of the pono kahiko—that people could be taxed at the whim of the ali‘i—and of the pono hou—that people are now taxed the same regardless of their ability to pay.
A Kanikau (Mourning Song) Written and Signed by Davida Malo and Published on August 8, 1834 in Ka Lama Hawai'i. The song, titled “He Kanikau No Kaahumanu,” was composed by Malo in honor of the ali'i wahine Ka'ahumanu.
Perhaps because of Andrews’ interest in Hawaiian language and the emerging literature, and because of the general way in which the paper aimed to encourage student expression, it included several surprising entries, most strikingly, the moʻolelo kahiko (traditional tale) “No ke Kaiakahinalii” (About The Tsunami); an unsigned article in “No Ka Lama Hawaii” (For Ka Lama Hawaii) describing the writer’s desire to work at a printing house; and a two-part unsigned autobiography called simply “No Koʻu Wa i Hanau mai ai, a Hiki mai nei i nei Manawa” (From the Time I was Born Until Now). “No ke Kaiakahinalii” is the story of Hinaʻaimalama (Hina who eats the moon), who lives under the sea, and gets taken up to dry land; Kaiakahinaliʻi (the tsunami) is one of her grandmothers who goes searching for her by flooding the land. It includes the episode of Hina desiring to eat the moon, from which she gets her name. This is significant as it appears to be the first moʻolelo kahiko ever published. The autobiography tells the writer’s story of being born and growing up in the time of the first missionaries’ arrival and of the transition from his young life of games and entertainments to his maturity into marriage, getting schooled, and being converted to Christianity.

Ke Kumu Hawaii (1834–1839)

Ka Lama Hawaii ended publication after several months and a new mission paper began called Ke Kumu Hawaii. Ke Kumu was published out of mission headquarters in Honolulu and was aimed not just at a single school, but at all the mission schools as well as the general public (or at least at that portion of it that was willing to accept evangelism). According to Mookini, “Ke Kumu Hawaii represented the broad aim of the Mission to create a nation that was not only Christian in name and spirit but also intelligent and industrious.” It was edited by the missionary Reuben Tinker, and most of the articles were written by fellow missionaries. It did not take long, however, before both aliʻi and makaʻainana began to use the publication space for their own purposes. Ke Kumu eventually published approximately 146 writers, including Davida Malo, Samuel M. Kamakau, Luna Makaʻainana (Rep.) Simiona P. Kalama, Ioane Ii, Debora Kapule, and Gideona Laaui. It thus expanded in scope as well as readership far beyond Ka Lama Hawaii. It is difficult to determine an exact count of the writ-
ers as some used variations on their names or sometimes used pen names, such as “Ikemaka” (“Eyewitness”) or “Kinaibaka” (“Extinguish Tobacco”). Many writers signed with a single name, which might actually be shared by another person, or signed with one or more initials. Kalama, for example, signed his articles with his full name (as above), with S. P. Kalama, and with S. P. K.

By the second year, converted Kānaka Maoli begin to write letters to the paper supporting their anti-tobacco campaign, and also occasionally to report the death of a family member, or to ask for a school in a certain area.

Kānaka Maoli commented on the utility of the newspaper for communicating to the entire nation at once, as in this letter by a writer named Kaunahi:

Aloha oe e ke Kumu Hawaii. O oe no ke kumu nui i ko’u manao. E hiki no ia oe ke olelo aku i ka poe nui, a me ka poe uuuku. E hiki no ia oe ke olelo i ka mea ma ke kuaaina, a me ka mea hoi ma ke alo o na ali‘i. E hiki no ia oe ke olelo i na kanaka, a me na‘li‘i, i ka poe ekalesia, a me ka poe ekalesia ole; i na kanaka maoli, a me na kanaka o na aina e. Aole hoi e pono i ko‘u manao, e hookuli na kanaka i kou leo; no ka mea, o ka leo no ia a ke Kumu Hawaii.20

Greetings to you, ke Kumu Hawaii. You are the important kumu (teacher, source) in my opinion. You can speak to the big people and the little people. You can speak to the people in the countryside and also to those in the court of the ali‘i. You can speak to the ordinary people, to the ali‘i, to the church members and the non-church members; to the native people and to the people of foreign lands. It is not pono in my opinion to be deaf to your voice because it is the voice of the Kumu Hawaii.

The remainder of the letter supports the campaign against tobacco, reporting a story about a woman burned because of smoking. No information is given about who Kaunahi is or where he or she might have been writing from.

The ali‘i at this time were persuaded that the formation of a Western-style government was the best way to fend off colonization by any of the major powers. Leading up to the development of a declaration of democratic rights and a constitution, the Mō‘i (King) proclaimed
several laws prohibiting murder, theft, and adultery, and others concerning the sale of alcohol, which were published in *Ke Kumu*.\(^{21}\)

The thoughtful essays that Lorrin Andrews encouraged at *Ka Lama* continued in *Ke Kumu*. Davida Malo published several essays on theological questions—always in support of Calvinist doctrine.\(^{22}\) He also reported on the death of his child. Among his contributions were a skillfully crafted sermon titled “No ka hiki ana mai o ko ke Akua aupuni” (Concerning the arrival of God’s kingdom).\(^{23}\) This essay argues the arrival of Jehovah’s kingdom based on analogous events in the establishment of Kamehameha I’s rule over all the islands.

Malo also submitted a “mele hoolea” (song of praise or eulogistic song) for Jesus. Although the word ho’ole’a implies joy, the mele seems a sad and fearful one. Here is an excerpt with my translation:\(^{24}\)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{E Iesu e aloha mai,} & \quad \text{Jesus, have mercy,} \\
\text{O make au ko kauwa nei.} & \quad \text{Or I, your servant, will die.} \\
\text{Ka hunalepo o kou kamaa.} & \quad [I am but] the dust on your shoe. \\
\text{Na weuweu o ko a la nei.} & \quad \text{The grass upon your path.} \\
\text{Ina haalele mau mai o,} & \quad \text{If you leave us forever,} \\
\text{Ota ko makou make mau,} & \quad \text{That will be our death forever,} \\
\text{Ka make loa i ka po,} & \quad \text{Death in the pō,}\(^{25}\) \\
\text{Malalo o ka pouli mau.} & \quad \text{Under continual darkness.}
\end{align*}
\]

It appears that some writers in *Ke Kumu* felt that memorializing people and events was very important. Besides kanikau, memoirs and biographies began to appear. Gideona Laanui wrote a short memoir of his life with Kamehameha I, two and a half pages long and untitled.\(^{26}\) Ioane Ii (also known as John Papa Ii) wrote a biography of the Kuhina Nui (Premier) Kïna’u.\(^{27}\) It seems that Ii intended a serialized biography but unfortunately, the paper ended with that very issue. Ii was an ali‘i in the inner circle of Kamehameha III who was greatly influential in the formation of the Western-style kingdom. He later wrote a historical series in *Nupepa Kuokoa* under various titles between 1866 and 1870, most of which was translated into English as *Fragments of Hawaiian History*.\(^{28}\)

That many of the authors, like Ii, who published essays and news in *Ke Kumu Hawaii* were appointed or elected officials in the kingdom government suggests that the paper had a political as well as religious
An Article Signed by Kauikeaouli, Kamehameha III, Proclams Laws Concerning Murder, Theft, Adultery, and the Sale of Alcohol. The article, titled "He Olelo No Na Kanawai," was published in the September 13, 1837 issue of Ke Kumu Hawaii.
focus, a context against which many of the articles and essays may have a particular resonance. Among these officials were Barenaba, Kina’u herself, Mataio Kekianâoa (father of A. Liholiho and Kapuâiwa), Kaisara Kapa’akea (birth father of Kalâkaua and Lili‘uokalani), Paulo Kanoa, and the aforementioned Simiona P. Kalama. Kalama was one of the most prolific writers, contributing about 30 essays to the paper. He was, according to Jonathan Osorio, a representative (Luna Maka‘ainana) from Kaua‘i, who “serve[ed] one of the longest continuous terms in office (from 1853 to 1870), [and] was listed as konohiki of Kalihikai . . . As such, he wielded very traditional kinds of authority, with the right to place kapu on fish and timber.”

Despite that traditional role, Kalama’s essays in Ke Kumu were mainly evangelical. He also, perhaps in a blending of the two roles, advised the ali‘i “no oukou na kanawai he umi i loaa mai ai Mose” (The ten laws received by Moses apply to you [plural]). Other writers of interest include Debora Kapule, who wrote an essay encouraging women to convert to Christianity, and Thomas Hopu, one of the original Hawaiian converts who returned home with the first company of missionaries. The first of many genealogies and arguments about them was published in Ke Kumu Hawaii. Kepookulou, a relatively early convert in Kapi‘olani’s circle, contributed a genealogy of Kamehameha III that begins with Häloa. The genealogy is followed by a series of questions by Binamu (Hiram Bingham). He wanted to know if Kepookulou knew in what years each of these ancestors lived, and what their deeds were; were they pono or not? Bingham disagreed respecting the Mö‘i based on his mo‘okū‘auhau ali‘i, and ended with “ua o i aku ka iesu pono mamua o ka lakou,” (The righteousness of Jesus is greater than theirs).

It is notable that, although Ka Lama Hawaii contained the one mo‘olelo kahiko, “No ke Kaiakahinalii,” no mo‘olelo kahiko were published in Ke Kumu Hawaii. A handful of mele were published, including the two by Malo; a kanikau by Kahekili for his aikâne, printed without further explanation; one by Hekekia giving lā‘au lapa‘au (traditional medicinal) treatments for maladies, with a note disavowing the value of the knowledge; and a number of clever Christian songs, at least one, by Ha‘aheo, containing elements of traditional oli. The song is in praise of the newspaper and of Christianity and its bible. Here is an excerpt that shows some of the classical Hawaiian elements:
The “awake” call is used in some chants for Pele, in order to “awaken” the lava flow, but Ha’aheo has adapted it in this song to wake up to Christian enlightenment. This suggests how the writers were meshing traditional forms with their new beliefs, although the missionaries generally wished them to abandon these altogether.

The inclusion of only these few mele and the lack of any mo’olelo kahi kiko likely speak to the lack of interest on the part of Tinker and perhaps other missionaries in the oral and literary artistry of the Kanaka Maoli. The lack of mo’olelo is also indicative of Ke Kumu’s primary purpose: to promote the conversion of Kanaka Maoli to Christianity and, concurrently, to persuade the Kanaka that their values and knowledge systems were inferior to the “new” haole ways.

Ke Kumu Hawaii ended publication in May 1839 with no explanation, although Ka Nonanona later implied that the reason was financial. The last entry in the paper was an index of stories that had been published. Several important changes happened in the kingdom in 1839 and 1840 that may be related to the end of the paper. Osorio views this as a time in which “the social landscape had altered favor-
ably for the missionaries,” and the missionaries apparently felt that the natives needed not only Christian conversion “but the conversion of the entire Native way of life.” As part of increasing its sphere of influence, the mission started Kahêhuna, the Royal School for the children of ali‘i. In addition, the publication of the Rights and Laws of 1839,

made startling changes in the authority of the chiefs and the Mō‘i . . . [in which] the ultimate responsibility for the maintenance of the land and the people in Hawai‘i passed from the ancient line of Ali‘i and the gods they represented to the newer and much less understood authority of law.

William Richards, Gerrit Judd, Richard Armstrong and perhaps other missionaries were advisors to the Mō‘i, and it was at this time that the first constitution of the kingdom was drafted and became law. It may be that the mission had turned its attention and resources to the government, and Ke Kumu was consequently retired. It was not until two years later that Ka Nonanona, the next newspaper, started up.

**Ka Nonanona (1841–1845)**

Ka Nonanona was striking in its difference from Ke Kumu Hawaii. Its primary intent was to be a newspaper that carried news from the capital, Honolulu, to all the other islands. Although still in the hands of missionaries and still evangelical in some ways, it greatly expanded its scope in content as well as in intended readership. The newspaper became a site for public debate and discourse.

Ka Nonanona was edited by the missionary, Richard Armstrong (called Limaikaika, or Strong arm, in Hawaiian). According to Moo-kini, Armstrong “had an accurate knowledge of the Hawaiian language, was a skilled translator, and was always connected with some Hawaiian newspaper.” It seems he realized the power of the print media to achieve missionary goals and to influence politics. On the first page of the first issue, Ka Nonanona is personified, and speaks for itself, saying that it is a teacher and its job “o ka houana aku i na kanaka o kela ano, keia ano” (is to educate people of every kind). This is followed by a list of what it intends to include: news; support for schoolchildren, teachers, school directors, and parents; a bit of assis-
tance for the pono of the ali‘i, in publishing new laws and new positions in the government, as well as “e kuhikuhi aku i na mea e pono ai, a me na mea e pono ai ke aupuni” (to point out the things that will be pono and the things that will harm the government), including criticizing the ali‘i; and finally, to testify to the pono of God.39 We can see from this that Armstrong believed in the superiority of his faith and knowledge so much that he felt he could criticize the Mö‘i and the other ali‘i nui.

Starting with the second issue, Kanaka wrote in to Ka Nonanona with their own ideas, although nothing contrary to Limaikaika’s mission was printed. In a comprehensive survey of the paper, I catalogued 121 signed pieces, mainly letters, by (approximately) 72 different writers. Many of the letters reported the actions of Catholic missionaries around the islands, with whom the Protestant mission was constantly struggling. Other writers brought important issues to the paper in hopes of having them resolved—one of these was the refusal of the local government authorities to pay school teachers. Many supported the temperance efforts of the missionaries, and several reported news, especially of deaths. The paper thus increasingly became a place to court public opinion, perhaps even to organize to get things done.

As in Ke Kumu, many of the writers in Ka Nonanona were prominent in government and politics, including Ioane Ii, George L. Kapeau, Davida Malo, and Ioane Richardson. Samuel M. Kamakau, the historian, also submitted pieces to the paper, most notably the mo‘okū‘auhau of Kamehameha III, which led to a debate with the traditionally trained genealogist, A. Unauna. Iona Kapena, member of the Hale Ali‘i (House of Nobles) and later, editor of the important paper, Ke Au Okoa, wrote in Ka Nonanona.40 Other contributors included Kauwahi, who may be the J. W. H. Kauwahi who was the first editor-in-chief of Ka Hoku O Ka Pakipika;41 Pomare, the Ali‘iwahine (Queen) of Tahiti, whose letter to Kamehameha III was printed;42 and Unauna, whom Kamakau addressed as “ka haumana kuauhau a Auwae ka mea i ike” (the genealogy student of ‘Auwae, the knowledgeable one).

Kamakau and Unauna had the first printed battle over ali‘i genealogies in Ka Nonanona. This battle was merely the first of probably hundreds of debates and arguments in the Hawaiian papers over all kinds of issues, including forms of government, who the Mö‘i should be, what language government should be conducted in, and many
A Portion of a Mo'okū'auhau (Genealogy) Published by S.M. Kamakau in Ka Nonanona on October 11, 1842.
other issues. Study of this history of argumentation and debate would surely yield important insights into the workings of the kingdom government, the establishment of certain kinds of institutions and not others, and the influence of Hawaiian discourses on public policy and opinion. This would assist in understanding more clearly how the kingdom government and law contained elements of American, British, and classical Hawaiian values. And it would also help in clearing the misapprehension that 19th century Hawaiians were passive and polite.

The argument started when Kamakau wrote a more elaborated mo‘okū‘auhau of Kauikeaouli than Kepookulou’s, starting with 20 generations before Wākea. He accompanied the genealogy with a short essay explaining the different branches of the genealogy, including which ali‘i were associated with which islands. Although there were many ali‘i families with many branches, he says, “Hookahi wale no mea nona ia mau kupuna i keia manawa.” “There is just one to whom [all] these [different] ancestors belong at this time.” That person was obviously the Mō‘i Kamehameha III (Kauikeaouli). Kamakau’s long title tells us that he was concerned about this knowledge being imparted to the youth of his time as well to the Kanaka Maoli of our own time. It translates as something like: “The Genealogy of the Most Ancient Ancestors of Hawai‘i to Wākea. From Wākea to the Time We are Living in, in Order that it Be Understood by this Generation, and all the Generations Following.”

On November 8, 1842, A. Unauna wrote in to protest Kamakau’s publication of this kü‘auhau. First, he asserts that it should not be public knowledge. He says, “I ka wa kahiko, he olelo kapu loa keia” (In ancient times, this was very sacred speech). It was only to be passed down to the children of the same family. Furthermore, “Aole e loaa keia olelo i ka makaainana; aole i na kanaka kuainana; aia o na lii ka mea e loaa ai” (Maka‘ainana did not have this speech, nor did the country people; it was only the ali‘i who had it). He explains also that knowledge of the genealogies was a “puuhonua” or a refuge that could save lives in the old days. His final point concerns the next-to-last generation, in which Kamakau had grouped Kamehameha I and Kepookkalani together above Kamehameha’s and Keōpūlani’s children—but the way it was printed made it unclear which line Kepookkalani was on. Unauna wonders who this Kepookkalani is, or which Kepookkalani
it is. He doesn’t agree that Kepookalani is of Kamehameha’s family, and he ends by demanding of Kamakau, “Mai hana i ke kuauhau me ka lohe ole” (Do not do genealogy without listening). This could be interpreted at least two ways—one being that unless one has received the genealogy through the rules of the oral tradition, one should not repeat it; or it could be a demand that Kamakau not publish another genealogy without listening to or heeding the advice of Unauna himself.

Kamakau replies rather insultingly to Unauna. He begins: “E Unauna e, e noho mua ilalo, e noonoo, e pelu iki mai, e heluhelu iki iho, e noonoo iki no a maopopo loa; alaila e kakau iho me ko akamai” (Unauna, first sit down, think, kneel a little bit, read a little bit, think a bit more until you really understand; then write with your intelligence). Kamakau explains that Kepoookalani was another name for Kamehameha’s brother, known as Ke’liimaikai. That Unauna did not know or had forgotten this was extraordinary:

He mea e ko kuhihewa a me ka nana pono ole, a maopopo, alaila hoolowa wale aku. No hea la ke kahihiwela? No ka maka paha, malie he uuku ka ike, e hoonui hou ae, i mahuahua ka ike; e hoomahuahua hou i ke poo, i nui ka noonoo. O ka mea pao mai ia’u ma keia kahihiwela: e ku no ia ma ka puka o ka hoka, a e haule iho malalo o ku mau wawae, a e kolo aku ilalo me he naio la.

Your error, lack of observing completely until you understood, and then placing blame are an amazement. Where does this error come from? From the eyes perhaps, or perhaps the knowledge is little, you should increase it some more, so that the knowledge will be greater; and also enlarge your head some more, so that your thinking will increase. The one fighting with me in error: he stands at the door of frustration, and will fall under my feet, and crawl below like a pinworm.

Kamakau then asks Unauna a whole list of questions to test his knowledge and ends with this: “Aka i loaa ole ea, e akaaka makou, na haumana o ke Kulanui ia oe, me ka henehene. ‘E hele oe mai hana hewa hou aku’” (Should you not get [the answers], we, the students of the School [Lahainaluna], will laugh at you, teasing. “Go and do not do wrong again”). This sounds like he is quoting Jesus saying “Go and do not sin again,” because “hewa” is the word adopted to mean sin. It
is also funny because it is the young Lahainaluna students rebuking an elder, a reversal of the normal order of who tells whom where to go and what not to do.

More important, a struggle is going on here between the accepted ways of legitimately knowing important history and genealogy, i.e., the oral tradition and its rules, and the new way, the way Kamakau was being trained at Lahainaluna. Unauna had been trained and lived most of his life adhering to the kapu that regulated genealogies. He knew how those kapu kept the genealogies accurate and also how they could be manipulated. They were to be kept as a sign and a method of ali‘i power. Kamakau, on the other hand, while no doubt respecting the classical knowledge (as is obvious in his later body of writing), is sure of his own knowledge and methods, and believes in writing and publishing his work for reasons Unauna likely disagrees with. Kamakau is one of the generation seeing mass death among the lähui—the mass death that causes a massive loss of knowledge. Writing and especially print were powerful tools to insure that my own generation has some of this knowledge. Moreover, although Kamakau is younger, he takes on the task of keeping Unauna accountable. Keeping genealogists accountable would have taken place orally in the old world, in relatively private venues; here, somewhat embarrassingly for Unauna, it remains in print.

Davida Malo also contributed pieces in the paper now important to our developing understanding of his time and of him as a pivotal figure of that time.46 He wrote of the death of his ali‘i, Kuakini, and also the death of his wife, Batesepa Puhia. He wrote a biography of Kuakini a month after the news of his death, and also wrote a kanikau for his wife.47 Besides Malo’s, several unusual kanikau were published in Ka Nonanona, including “Kanikau no Tahiki” by G. L. Kapeau—at this time, Tahiti was being overtaken as a colony by France and the paper kept the public informed of these events.48

Ka Nonanona is very valuable as a historical source not only for the question of Tahiti’s sovereignty, but, more importantly, for Hawai‘i’s. As Chapin points out, Ka Nonanona was the only paper publishing when the British Captain Paulet threatened the kingdom, and Kamehameha III temporarily ceded sovereignty.49 Its pages contain letters from Ke Ali‘i Timoteo Ha‘alilio, the Mō‘i’s emissary who, with William Richards, persuaded Great Britain and France to recognize
the kingdom’s sovereignty. The paper also printed the exchanges between the Mō’i and Paulet, the news of the arrival of Admiral Richard Thomas and an account of his act of restoring sovereignty to the Hawaiian Kingdom. These were followed by accounts of the church service and the elaborate ‘aha ‘aina (feast) that celebrated the return of sovereignty. The ‘aha ‘aina was in ali‘i nui style—huge. The paper reported the names of the konohiki and what food they contributed to the feast. Then,

When the food was ready [it was placed] on the table that had been covered with forest greenery, it was 32 anana (approx. 192 feet) long and 2 anana (approx. 12 feet) wide. The amount placed on this table was 60 pigs, 300 chickens, 40 turkeys, and 53 ducks. . . . When the feast was finished, most of the people left on foot, all together, men, women, and children, there were about 2,000 of them, maybe more.

Each year following this, the return of sovereignty was celebrated in the kingdom as a holiday, known as Lā Ho‘iho‘i Ea. Sovereignty activists today have revived the celebration, gathering each July 31 at Thomas Square.

Although Ka Nonanona expanded the mission’s scope to include the news of events crucial to the kingdom, it also maintained the editorial policy of not publishing any mo‘olelo kahiko or many mele. Richard Armstrong was still a missionary dedicated to changing Hawai‘i’s culture to make it puritanical and as American as possible. Chapin wrote that “he at first vigorously advocated in his papers that Hawaiian be taught in the schools” but that later “In one of those paradoxes of history, Armstrong’s newspapers assisted in determining that . . . the English language would be victorious beyond all expectations.” I would add that the proselytizing and condemnation of Hawaiian cultural practices affected more than just the language. It worked to instill a sense of inferiority in the native people that was
part of the long-term process of colonization and dispossession. That was the role of *Ka Nonanona*, for the missionaries, but many Kanaka Maoli brought their own specifically Hawaiian sensibilities and intellects to the paper. More in-depth study of this paper will allow us to read and understand the different discourses being deployed by different political actors in the earliest days of the Hawaiian Kingdom.

*Ka Elele Hawaii* (1845–1855)

After *Ka Nonanona* ceased publication in 1845, it was followed by *Ka Elele Hawaii*, also edited by Limaikaika. *Ka Elele Hawaii* was likely supported more directly by the government and so enjoyed a long life of ten years. Although they shared an editor, *Ka Elele* looked very different from *Ka Nonanona*. It had fewer Sunday school lessons and much more government news, including full texts of treaties and laws. The comprehensive survey of the paper’s contents from June 8, 1848 to January 1855 done by Iokepa Badis (a Hawaiian language MA student in the Hawaiian Research Theory and Methods course) shows that many people wrote in to *Ka Elele Hawaii* with news of conflicts and deaths in their communities, unusual events such as the volcano erupting, and their opinions on politics, religion, and the economy. The paper published “Na Palapala Hoopii O Na Makaainana” (Petitions of the Maka‘ämäna) and the reply of the Mö‘i, together with the two legislative houses, written by Keoni Ana and Jeone [sic] Ii. The petition, not the only one of its type, was signed by 1,600 “makaainana ponoi o [ke] aupuni” (the government’s own citizens). It asked the Mö‘i Kamehameha III and his Kuhina Nui, Kekäuluohi, to preserve the independence of the country, to refuse to appoint foreigners to high office, to refuse to allow foreigners to take the oath to become citizens, to disallow the sale of government land to foreigners, and to correct the confusing taxes. They went on to say that the reason for their dislike of foreigners in these positions was because of the “pilikia a me ka makau i ke kaumaha e loohia mai ana” (trouble and fear of the burdens that will befall [them]). They recommended that the Mö‘i appoint the descendants of his father’s (Kamehameha I) advisers.
Keoni Ana and John Ii Respond on Behalf of the Government to a Makaʻainana Petition in this Article Titled “Na Mana o Ka Aholelo No Na Mea I Hoopiia.” Published in the July 3, 1845 in Ka Elele, they respond to petitioner’s request that foreigners not hold government office, be citizens of the kingdom, or own land.
The Mō‘i and legislature answered that the government needed haole government officials to be able to make treaties with other governments. They explained that Hawai‘i is on the path to Asia and that ships will always come here, and so it was important to protect the kingdom in this way. They also answered that it was better to have foreigners swear their allegiance to the kingdom than not, and also that it was better that they have land so that they are more settled. They said that they did not agree to allow those foreigners to re-sell the land to other foreigners. That all changed shortly thereafter, and those changes were also reported on and discussed in the pages of *Ka Elele Hawaii*.

Besides these views into the workings of the early Hawaiian Kingdom government, Badis’s survey reveals about 88 different writers of letters, articles, and kanikau to this paper, including the aforementioned S. N. Hale‘ole, S. M. Kamakau, Kapeau, and W. N. Pualewa writing from Kalaupapa. Like *Ka Nonanona* and *Ke Kumu* there are no mo‘olelo kahiko and few mele, mostly kanikau. Notably, W. Uaua wrote an article called “O Ka Ike Ana I Na Moolelo Kahiko He Mea Ia E Pomaikai Ai Na Kanaka O Keia Wa” (Knowledge of the Ancient Mo‘olelo Is Something That Benefits People Of This Time). Uaua says that one can learn what is pono and what is hewa (wrong) through the stories in the bible but also through knowledge of Hawai‘i’s history.

The paper reports on the tremendous loss of life among the Native people and the worry that accompanied it. Many people wrote in to let others know of the deaths of family members, with some accompanied by kanikau. Missionaries and their native converts believed that the mass deaths were caused by people not heeding the word of God. In one example, when Mataio Kekūanāo‘a reported on the number of deaths in December 1848, his report was followed by an editorial claiming that so many deaths were the result of sin:

> He leo keia mai ke Akua mai; e pono ia kakou e hoolohe a noonoo. No ka hewa mai ka make, pela mai o Paulo. No ka hewa o kakou paha keia pilikia. E pono e noonoo na ‘lii a me na kanaka a e mihi i ka hewa.

This is a voice from God; it is pono that we listen and think. According to Paul, death comes from sin. Perhaps this trouble comes from our sinning. The ali‘i and the people should think and repent their sins.
By 1855, when *Ka Elele Hawaii* published its last issue, it had become a lively venue for community interaction, although always with Limaikaika’s strong editorial hand. People enjoyed writing and made use of the paper to let the government—now a well-established constitutional monarchy—know their views and issues. Limaikaika would go on to edit one more paper, *Ka Hae Hawaii* (1856–1861) which was a further extension of his scope and audience. *Ka Hae* was a government paper and Limaikaika was “head of the Kingdom’s Department of Public Instruction.” But that is the subject of another essay.

**Conclusion**

I hope that this sketch has given readers a fuller sense of these four early Hawaiian language newspapers and an idea of how each one expanded its readership over the previous paper. We can see how the newspapers were growing into spaces where intellectual traditions could be expressed much more fully. *Ka Nonanona* and *Ka Elele Hawaii* became the primary Hawaiian language venues for public policy debates and struggles over whether the Hawaiian language, epistemologies, cultures, and modes of governance were to remain hegemonic or be subordinated to English and the American ways. Important arguments, narratives, and discourses were printed in these pages that determined the outcomes of those struggles.

Some of the more prolific and important writers in these pages that need to be studied include Ioane Ii, S. P. Kalama, J. P. Ka’uhane, G. L. Kapeau, and Davida Malo for their very early influence on the development of the kingdom government, its institutions, and policies, as well as for styles of thinking and engaging and ways of negotiating change. I am including Ii and Malo, even though they are well-known. Ii’s *Fragments of Hawaiian History* has been published and studied, but these earlier writings deserve study for their influence on government. As for Malo, it seems that, aside from Noelani Arista’s 1998 thesis, Malo’s manuscript *Ka Mooolelo Hawaii*, never published in his lifetime, is the focus of the most study, but these political articles are perhaps even more crucial to our understanding of the time. Many others, including (see table 2) bear study for their reports and opinions of the daily events of the kingdom. In other words, these papers
Table 2. Listing of the most prolific writers in the four Hawaiian newspapers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Writer</th>
<th>Papers Published In</th>
<th>Total Number of Pieces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Haanio (Haanio, S. &amp; Haanio, Samuela)</td>
<td><em>Ke Kumu Hawaii</em></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopu, Toma (Thomas)</td>
<td><em>Ke Kumu Hawaii</em></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaehu, J. H.</td>
<td><em>Ka Elele Hawaii</em></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li, Ioane (Li, J.)</td>
<td><em>Ka Nonanona</em></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaapa</td>
<td><em>Ka Nonanona</em></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiana, Ioane (Kaiana, Ioane B.)</td>
<td><em>Ke Kumu Hawaii</em></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalama, Simona P. (Simiona, S. P.)</td>
<td><em>Ka Elele Hawaii</em></td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamakau, S. M.</td>
<td><em>Ka Nonanona</em></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanoa, Paulo</td>
<td><em>Ke Kumu Hawaii</em></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapae</td>
<td><em>Ke Kumu Hawaii</em></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapeau, G. L. (Kapeau)</td>
<td><em>Ka Nonanona</em></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kauhane, J. P. (Kauhane, I. P., J. P.N.)</td>
<td><em>Ka Elele Hawaii</em></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kawailepolepo, H.</td>
<td><em>Ke Kumu Hawaii</em></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keauiaole, G. H. E. (Keauiaole, H. E.)</td>
<td><em>Ka Elele Hawaii</em></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keukuanoea, M.</td>
<td><em>Ka Nonanona</em></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malo, Davida (Malo, D.)</td>
<td><em>Ka Lama Hawaii</em></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nana</td>
<td><em>Ke Kumu Hawaii</em></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oleloa, Daniela. (Oleloa, D.)</td>
<td><em>Ke Kumu Hawaii</em></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punihaole</td>
<td><em>Ke Kumu Hawaii</em></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomona</td>
<td><em>Ke Kumu Hawaii</em></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
are a window into the world of our kūpuna through which we gain a fuller idea of where we come from. One of the benefits that comes from taking in such a view is that we can see how lively the political debates of the early kingdom were—how so many Känaka Maoli, from the very beginning of this new form of government, actively worked to shape their own world. This helps us to understand that Känaka Maoli were not passively colonized, nor was the process of putting new laws and government structures into place a simple one in which the ali‘i nui’s ideas remained stable or hegemonic.63

Notes
1  I am not italicizing Hawaiian words in keeping with the idea that these words are not foreign to me nor the place in which this article is being published.
9  Lorrin Andrews 1835 quoted in Mookini, Hawaiian Newspapers, iv.
19 Mookini, Hawaiian Newspapers, iv.
20 Kaunahi, Untitled letter, Ke Kumu Hawai‘i, 23 Dec. 1835, 201.
24 In many ways, it is nearly impossible to translate thought from Hawaiian to English. I have merely attempted to give the reader a sense of how the Hawaiian sounds. The same is true for all translations in this article.
25 It would not make sense to translate “pö” with one word here. In the Pukui, Elbert dictionary the entry for pö begins: “Night, darkness, obscurity; the realm of the gods; pertaining to or of the gods, chaos, or hell; . . . benighted . . . Fig., ignorance; ignorant.” The entry continues for four more inches of the page. Mary Kawena Pukui and Samuel H. Elbert, Hawaiian Dictionary, rev. and enl. ed., (Honolulu: U of Hawai‘i P, 1986) 333.
26 Gideona Laanui, [Untitled], Ke Kumu Hawai‘i, 14 Mar. 1838, 81–84.
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