New Land, New Lives: Hawaiian Settlement in British Columbia

Between the late eighteenth and mid-nineteenth centuries a thousand or more, perhaps several thousand, native Hawaiians visited the west coast of North America as seamen, fur trade laborers, or independent adventurers. While most returned home, a handful stayed behind. Patterns of Hawaiian settlement and family formation in British Columbia are distinctive from those of Hawaiians elsewhere in the Pacific Northwest. Immediately to the south, Hawaiians were subjected to the legalized discrimination inflicted on Indians and blacks, whereas those who settled in British Columbia were accorded the same civil rights enjoyed by members of the dominant society. The consequence has been that, despite some racism based on physical appearance and aboriginal origin, descendants have not become segregated, or segregated themselves, but rather married and lived in ways similar to others of comparable socioeconomic status.

Hawaiian men began to arrive on the west coast of North America almost from the time British sea captain James Cook visited the Hawaiian Islands, named by him the Sandwich Islands, in January 1778. The islands quickly became a wintering and stopover point for European and American merchant vessels. Local men—sometimes termed Owyhees, an adaptation of Hawaiians, but more often called Kanakas, a Polynesian term meaning simply a human being or per-
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son—were taken on as crew members or recruited as laborers. The word *Kanaka* came to be used extensively in the Pacific Northwest, by others and by the individuals themselves, to mean ethnic origin and sometimes language. Over time, the terms Owyhee and Kanaka have taken on negative connotations, and Canadian descendants prefer to be known as Hawaiians.

The first two dozen indigenous Hawaiians hired for the fur trade arrived in 1811, and thereafter they worked alongside Orkney Islanders and French Canadians as boatmen, blacksmiths, carpenters, farm workers, mill hands, and general laborers. The Hudson’s Bay Company acquired control over the entire Pacific Northwest fur trade in 1823, and from 1829 to 1850 the company had its own agent in Honolulu to oversee trade and recruit local men on two- or three-year contracts. Virtually every fur-trading post west of the Rocky Mountains had a contingent of Hawaiians, repeatedly praised for their reliability, cheerful dispositions, and hard work. A Catholic priest reported back from Honolulu in 1842, likely with a touch of exaggeration, that “more than 500 Sandwich Islanders” were “in the services of the Company” in the Pacific Northwest. At the company’s principal coastal fur trade post of Fort Vancouver, now in Washington state, Hawaiians’ numbers were large enough to be accorded separate quarters known as Kanaka Town. Susan Kardas has counted up a total of 122 Hawaiians employed there between 1827 and 1860 out of a total paid labor force of 535.

Although the fur trade had largely run its course by the middle of the nineteenth century, this decline did not necessarily signify Hawaiians’ return home. Numerous men remained, at least for a time, at the expiry of their contract or following arrival on their own. Contemporary references, usually to unnamed individuals or to place names with the word *Kanaka* in them and therefore likely signifying the presence of Hawaiians, turn up from California northward through British Columbia. Port Townsend, Washington, resident James Swan noted in 1859 how “a couple of Kanakas arrived from Smith Island,” about six miles offshore, with a message concerning some belligerent Indians.

Other Hawaiians came to North America, by choice or chance, through much of the nineteenth century. According to the story passed down through a descendant,
Natives, local natives tell the story that when the early sailing ships arrived with the cattle, etc., that they often picked up supplies in Hawaii and they took on Hawaiian crews and then when they got up off of San Juan, rather than pay the Hawaiian crew, they simply threw them overboard. That's how the natives say some, not all, of the early Hawaiians arrived here. They were just thrown off the ships out on the San Juan Islands.\(^\text{13}\)

Several reasons may explain why some Hawaiian men considered staying on in North America. Visiting seamen likely brought news of deteriorating conditions at home, where indigenous Hawaiians were losing their autonomy and self-respect in the face of religious and economic exploitation by outsiders. Land on the west coast of North America was plentiful, unlike the Hawaiian Islands, where newcomers had acquired control of much of the best land. One Hawaiian, William Naukana, is said to have returned home sometime in the 1850s only to find that family land had been appropriated for a sugar plantation, and so he came back again to the Pacific Northwest.\(^\text{14}\)

Many of the men had produced families by Indian women and thereby acquired personal reasons for remaining in North America.\(^\text{15}\)

For Hawaiians thinking about staying, discrimination and the denial of civil rights in the Oregon Territory may have then driven some of them back home, others north to British Columbia. The brunt of American racism was against blacks, but Hawaiians were also targeted. Some were physically very dark, and they were all identified with the Hudson's Bay Company, viewed by American newcomers as the principal obstacle to the area's integration into the United States. A December 1845 act stipulated: "That all persons who shall hereafter introduce into Oregon Territory any Sandwich Islander... for a term of Service shall pay a tax of five dollars for each person as introduced." Any person employing Hawaiians and not returning them to the Islands was liable to an annual $3 tax.\(^\text{16}\)

The agreement by Britain and the United States on an international boundary in 1846 and then the creation in 1848 of the Oregon Territory (comprising the future states of Oregon, Washington, and Idaho) brought matters to a head. A number of Hawaiians sought American citizenship and the right to vote in the territory's first election. As described in a contemporary Hawaiian newspaper,
William Naukana (c. 1813–1909), after a decade working for the Hudson’s Bay Company, likely returned home and, disappointed, went back to the Pacific Northwest, where he settled first on San Juan Island and, after it became American territory in 1872, on Portland and Saltspring Islands in British Columbia. Naukana fathered six daughters by Indian women. (Photo courtesy of William Naukana’s great-granddaughter, Rosemary Tahouney Unger.)
some Hawaiians presented themselves before the proper officers, and desired to become American citizens, and be allowed to vote in the coming election on the 1st of June [1849], but the Governor did not feel authorized by the existing laws of the U.S. to allow them to do it. They were excluded on the basis of federal legislation limiting naturalized citizenship to white males. The 1849 Oregon census, titled “an enumeration of the inhabitants and qualified voters,” did not count Hawaiians.

In May of the next year, 1850, the U.S. Congress passed a land grant act for the Oregon Territory. In good part through the determination of the territorial delegate, Samuel R. Thurston, Hawaiians were excluded from applying for grants of public land or for ownership of lands already occupied. Thurston’s argument, reflecting local sentiment, linked racial prejudice with the general dislike of the Hudson’s Bay Company. Thus Thurston spoke out against a proposed amendment to the bill on the grounds that “it would give land to every servant of the Hudson’s Bay Company, including some hundreds of Canakers, or Sandwich Islanders, who are a race of men as black as your negroes of the South, and a race, too, that we do not desire to settle in Oregon.” Thurston subsequently moderated his position, making clear that race was the fundamental issue.

Those foreigners in Oregon, who have left the company, or shall leave it, and prove their love of our country by completing their final oath of love and allegiance, should have an appropriation, and be taken into the fold of American citizenship—a ye, sir, should have a donation of land; but I am not for giving land to Sandwich Islanders or negroes. I have no fears of defining my position here.

Noting recent Oregon territorial legislation excluding free blacks from the territory, Thurston pronounced that “the Canakers and negroes, if allowed to come there, will commingle with our Indians, a mixed race will ensue, and the result will be wars and bloodshed in Oregon.” The bill, as passed, provided for land grants to “every white male settler or occupant of the public lands, American half breeds included.” Not only were Hawaiians in the Oregon Territory unable to acquire a land grant, be naturalized, or vote, they also could not purchase liquor or testify against whites in the courts.
The consequence was, according to historian Janice Duncan, that "by 1900 most Kanakas resident on the mainland had recognized the futility of seeking homes, security, and equality in the United States and retreated to their homeland where their abilities were respected and where the benefit of their experiences was eagerly sought." The few who remained in the Oregon Territory "married into various Indian tribes and disappeared from local records." The few who remained in the Oregon Territory "married into various Indian tribes and disappeared from local records."27 Hawaiians who went south or who came directly from Hawai'i to California for its gold rush of 1848 also encountered discrimination, there being lumped together with the Chinese as objects of disfavor. Not only were all foreigners, including Hawaiians, required to pay $20 a month for the privilege of mining, but another, more general act of 1853 called for the exclusion of "Chinese or Kanaka carpenters, masons, or blacksmiths." Concerned about the sudden departure of hundreds of young indigenous Hawaiians for California and about population decline more generally, the Hawaiian government enacted restrictions on emigration at about the same time. At least a few Hawaiians in California did, unlike those in the Oregon Territory, eventually become American citizens and vote. A number of them enjoyed some success within the dominant society. In sharp contrast to the adjacent Oregon Territory, Hawaiians living in British Columbia possessed the same civil rights as did white males, due perhaps to the respect earned in the fur trade. So far as can be determined, their possible exclusion was never discussed. Whereas Chinese and Indians were virtually never listed in provincial directories and were enumerated only in cursory fashion in the censuses of the late nineteenth century, Hawaiians were included on a par with the province's white population. As a descendant has summed up, I think the difference for the Hawaiians was that they were considered to be Indians in the United States and not allowed to be citizens and the Hawaiians in British Columbia were treated as if they were whites—they were allowed to have citizenship. When British Columbia became a province, if you were a Hawaiian, you could be a citizen, you could vote, own land, you could do everything.32 Thus, when the San Juan Islands, long in dispute between the United States and Britain, were awarded to the Americans in 1872, a
year after British Columbia joined Canada, a number of Hawaiian families who had settled there moved north. A grandson has recalled the story passed down in his family: “The minute San Juan went to the United States, well they moved back here to Canada to be under Queen Victoria.” The story recounted to white neighbor children about the Hawaiians who moved from San Juan Island to Saltspring Island in the Gulf Islands is similar: “About 18 of these Kanakas came over from, actually they came from the San Juan Islands.” “They had wonderful names, there was Nawana, Kahana, all kinds of musical names.”

Despite the many Hawaiian names included in British Columbia voters’ lists and other public records, the comparatively menial positions that Hawaiians occupied in the fur trade, their tendency to have a single name or just a nickname, and the ease with which names were altered for ease of pronunciation makes it extremely difficult to trace men of the first generation through their lifetimes. The early Catholic marriage, birth, and death records described most Hawaiians only by some version of Kanaka, Owyhee, or the equivalent, such as “Pahapale Whyhee,” “Charles Kanack,” or “Honololo (Canac),” this clearly being how they were known. The annual “Abstracts of Servant’s Accounts” of the Hudson’s Bay Company, giving wages and job descriptions, are the principal fur trade source where Hawaiians were systematically named. Even then there was usually only a single name, often very similar in pronunciation—Kalama, Kalemaku, Kalenopale, Kaluaikai, Kamai, to give just a few. Moreover, a name’s spelling sometimes so changed from instance to instance that it becomes impossible to know whether a single individual, or several with similar names, was being employed over a period of time. Some alterations have a certain pattern, as the letters K and T being interchanged at the beginning of a name, but others were largely arbitrary, depending on the way in which a name was heard and then written down. By systematically going through fur-trade records, Bruce Watson has been able to distinguish four hundred separate, named Hawaiians employed across the Pacific Northwest between 1813 and 1858.

These limitations mean that the Hawaiians who stayed behind can be linked back to Hawai‘i only at the level of oral tradition. Most often, asserted ties go back to Hawaiian royalty. Thus, according to
FIG. 2. William Naukana's close friend Johnny Palua (c. 1817–1907), or Pellow, as "Pulau (Kanaka)" preempted and purchased land adjacent to Naukana on Portland Island. He married Naukana's second daughter, Sophia, who was almost forty years younger. (Photo courtesy of Rosemary Unger.)
the son of a longtime Hudson’s Bay employee at Fort Langley, “Peon Peon was a relative of the Kamehamas (Kings of the S.I.) and came to Ft Vancouver Wash in the Early Twenties [1820s] as a guardian of the Sandwich Islanders Employed by the Hudsons Bay Co.” William Naukana was “believed to have been a grandson of King Kamehameha I.” A member of the Nahu family of North Vancouver was described on his death in 1957 as “a grandson of Miyu, Hawaiian prince, who was expelled by his brother, King Kamehameha, after attempting to gain the throne.” Similarly, the Kalama family of Washington state has speculated about a relationship to “Queen Kalama, wife of Kamehameha III.”

Naming practices make it almost as difficult to link with assurance men employed in the fur trade or coming over as ship hands with the names of Hawaiians known to have settled in British Columbia. In the Pacific Northwest some Hawaiians also took a first name, usually Christian, although others continued to use a single Hawaiian name whose spelling, and even the name itself, might alter through time. Yet others were called only by Christian names, as with the child baptized on Portland Island in British Columbia in early 1893 by a visiting Catholic priest whose parents were given in the official register as “John and Cecilia (Canakas).” The Catholic Church’s records of baptisms, marriages, and deaths on the Gulf Islands, where many Hawaiians settled, were kept in Latin until 1946, meaning that spellings of names were systematically, and unsystematically, “latinized.”

Exemplary of the complexities of names and naming is a fur trade employee of the 1840s known in the Hudson’s Bay accounts as Newanna. The extant evidence suggests that it may have been the same man who settled on San Juan Island, and that it was very possibly his son Joe Nohamo who was hanged there in 1874 for the murder of three Europeans. By that date, San Juan Island had been awarded to the United States, and, indeed, young Nohamo’s parents and half-sister lived in Victoria’s “Kanaka Row.” An individual by the name of “Nuana (Kanaka)” then turns up in the 1881 provincial voters’ list as farming at Isabella Point on Saltspring Island. By the time of the 1891 manuscript census, and then again in 1901, he had become William Nahana. However, in the principal history of Saltspiring, based on personal recollections, the same individual is referred to as Nawana. As if that were not difficulty enough, the son...
who became the progenitor of the present-day family changed his surname sometime in the 1890s from Nuana to Tahouney, by which descendants are known. To add even further complexity, these same descendants believe that the family name was originally Kahana and that it somehow became mispronounced as Nuana, Nahana, or Nawana.

The difficulties of names and naming mean that even the precise number of Hawaiians who settled in British Columbia is impossible to calculate. Contemporary sources, including provincial voters’ lists, land records, directories, Catholic church records, newspaper stories, and the manuscript censuses of 1881, 1891, and 1901, suggest that a hundred or more did so, at least for a time. In some cases, little more than a name survives to indicate an individual’s presence, although in others family recollections, photos, and local histories make it possible to piece together the story of a family.

Several clusters of Hawaiian settlement existed by the late nineteenth century, primarily in coastal areas. The oldest was near Fort Langley in the Fraser Valley east of present-day Vancouver. In 1841 Oblate missionary Modeste Demers reported that “about twenty men are employed there at agricultural activities, of whom eight are Canadians, one an Iroquois, and the others Kanakas, inhabitants of the Sandwich Islands; all having wives and children after the fashion of the country.” Hudson’s Bay employee Jason Allard remembered a Christmas afternoon in the 1840s or 1850s when, after being invited for treats in the fort’s big hall, the “women who were married to white men,” were “related to the chiefs,” and clearly considered themselves superior got into a fight with “the wives of the Kanakas.” “From one imaginary insult or slight the fight was on. There was no prancing and sparring. It was run and grab for the hair of the head. A regular tug-of-war ensued. Finally they were separated by their husbands and all was peace and quietness.”

Apart from such a holiday afternoon, Hawaiians were not permitted to bring their wives into the fort. The men eventually took up land on the north side of the Fraser River near present-day Maple Ridge. The settlement’s core lay with Peon Peon or Peopeo, a Hudson’s Bay employee from the 1820s who “married one of the Sub chiefs daughters.” Peopeo’s older daughter, believed by Allard to be “about one of the first to be born at the first Fort,” married “a Sand-
wich Islander” known as Nahu who worked as a river pilot. Her sister Sophie wed a Hawaiian named Ohule, and Peopeo’s son, Joseph Mayo, worked alongside his father and Ohule as coopers at the fort. When their contracts came up for renewal, some of the Hawaiians chose to go off on their own, so that by 1858 there was “a large body of Kanakas—a mixed race half Indian half Sandwich Islanders” living in the vicinity of Fort Langley. The Hawaiians’ continuing presence is attested by the son of a Hawaiian named Apnaut being elected to the Maple Ridge council in 1879. In the late nineteenth century a cluster of Hawaiian families, including the Mayos, Nahus, Apnauts, Chiers, Schells, and Wawakinas, lived in the Maple Ridge area.

Other Hawaiians sought paid employment in the sawmills on Burrard Inlet, the site of present-day Vancouver. A few families lived at Kanaka Ranch in what became Stanley Park, while the Nahus from Fort Langley were among those residing on Kanakas Row in Moodyville on the Inlet’s north shore. The Nahus became an important longshoring family in North Vancouver. Among those working at Hastings Sawmill was James Keamo, who, according to his son, arrived on his own, “just came for the trip, and stayed here.” Keamo’s employer decided one day that for ease of pronunciation he should henceforth be called Campbell, which is precisely how all but a few dissident family members have henceforth been known. Nearby New Westminster also attracted a number of recent arrivals from Hawai‘i, single men with names like John Kahano, Joe Kanaka, and Kanak Moses, all born in the 1830s and 1840s, who may or may not have remained to rear families in British Columbia.

Yet other Hawaiians lived and worked in and around the capital city of Victoria, where they preempted land from the early 1860s. Victoria’s Colonist newspaper reported in 1860 on a fight in the city’s “Kanaka Row,” in which “Palew, a Kanaka, became enraged at one of his countryman” and smashed all the windows in his house. Three decades later, a Thomas Pellew was working as a moulder at the Albion Iron Works, perhaps the same man or more likely his son. Another handful settled in the Nanaimo area, mostly working in the coal mines.

Reflecting their Island heritage and undoubtedly a desire for an independent lifestyle, many if not most of the Hawaiians preferred to live on one of the many Gulf Islands dotting the British Columbia
coast. Subsistance farming was combined with fishing and some logging or other paid employment in order to acquire the necessary cash to purchase necessities like sugar and flour from the local store. The Hawaiians became exceptionally self-reliant, planting some of the first and finest orchards on the Gulf Islands and growing and curing their own tobacco. According to a contemporary woman’s description, her Hawaiian neighbor

would cut a round off a log and bore a hole right down through the middle of it and he would crush the tobacco leaves and put the leaves down in the bottom, pour a little molasses on it and a tod of rum, more tobacco leaves and right up until he had got it crammed full. I suppose that would have to set for a while. He would split the log open and he would have his long tobacco stick which they cut and smoked when they needed a smoke.  

At least eighteen Hawaiians, some of whom had moved from San Juan Island, homesteaded and raised families on southern Saltspring Island. Numbers were sufficiently large for a visitor of 1885 to label that part of Saltspring “a Kanaka or Sandwich Islander settlement.” Other Hawaiians sought their own small island. William Naukana and his good friend and son-in-law Johnny Palua together preempted Portland Island. Kama Kamai and Alexander Korney, the latter born in British Columbia of a father born in Hawai‘i, opted for Coal Island a few miles south of Saltspring. William Hamea lived first on Saltspring and then, in the mid-1880s, homesteaded Russell Island just off Saltspring’s south coast. Further north, George Kamano settled on Harbledown Island after a stint working at Fort Rupert on northern Vancouver Island.

As had been the case with Peopeo at Fort Langley, all of the Hawaiians who can be traced produced families by an Indian woman or possibly the half-Indian daughter of a fellow Hawaiian. This pattern of marriage was in no way unique, paralleling the course taken by many other settlers of the first generation in response to British Columbia’s longtime shortage of white women. It has been very difficult for descendants to find out much about these women, personal glimpses such as that from the Christmas party at Fort Langley being extremely rare. As was the case with men of the fur trade more gener-
ally, some of the Hawaiians had several partners throughout their lifetimes and had children by each. Mothers were sometimes no longer part of the family by the time children became conscious of their surroundings. One woman’s comment has repeated itself time and again: “We don’t know anything about it, we don’t know who the woman was, we don’t know where she was from except we think she was a Salish Indian. But we don’t know, there is nothing there that we can go by. There are no records.”

The studio portraits and more informal photographs that survive of these early families, carefully posed and neatly dressed in Victorian or Edwardian fashion, underline the importance given to respectability and to correct behavior. From the mid-nineteenth century to the time of the Hawaiian Islands’ annexation by the United States in 1898, the government of Hawai‘i maintained consular offices abroad. The infrequency with which Hawaiian consuls at Victoria, Port Townsend, and Vancouver dealt with infractions of the law or cases of destitution by Hawaiian settlers equally testifies to individual and family pride. The sole British Columbia case coming to a consul’s attention concerned a Nanaimo man known as “Kanaka Pete,” sentenced to death in 1869 for having killed his Indian wife and family on discovering her adultery. Twenty of Vancouver Island’s leading citizens plus the Hawaiian consul unsuccessfully sought clemency for the condemned man due to the mitigating circumstances.

Hawaiians, particularly those on Saltspring and nearby islands, appeared on voters’ lists virtually from the time of British Columbia’s entry into the Canadian Confederation in 1871, underlining how early many took British citizenship and shifted their allegiance to Canada. Through naturalization, they publicly declared their intention to behave as did members of the dominant society. As passed down orally, with a touch of exaggeration, “Well our first elections here in B.C., the Hawaiians all voted. Because, when they came out to vote in them days, there were very few whites around you see. Well there was just as many Hawaiians that voted as were white people. Those that stayed in this country see, well they got their vote.”

A descendant has reflected, quite accurately, that British Columbian “Hawaiians were mostly Catholic” and “quite religious.” Perhaps this was due to the energetic and sustained Oblate missionary activity among fur trade laborers, possibly to the influence of Indian
FIG. 3. William Naukana's third daughter, Julia, poses with her husband, George Shepard, son of a Vancouver Island settler from the United States and an Indian woman and for some time employed by his father-in-law on Portland Island. (Photo courtesy of Rosemary Unger.)
FIG. 4. William Naukana’s eldest daughter, Delia, in a studio portrait with her first husband, George Napoleon Parker, and children taken during an 1890 visit to Tacoma from the Gulf Islands. According to family lore, Delia’s husband, a recently arrived Hawaiian, was related to the family that owned the large Parker Ranch. (Photo courtesy of Rosemary Unger.)
wives and mothers themselves already converted. In 1836 the Anglican minister at Fort Vancouver had remarked on Hawaiians’ rejection of missionary efforts in favor of their own religion. In the 1850s a few Hawaiians were married or buried at Anglican Christ Church Cathedral in Victoria, but this appears to have been short-lived. All but three of the more than two hundred Hawaiians by birth or descent located in the manuscript censuses of 1881, 1891, and 1901 gave their religion as Catholic, the three exceptions being daughters married to white Protestant settlers. It was George Kamano who assisted the Oblates in constructing a mission on Harbledown Island off Fort Rupert in 1863. Hawaiian families were a mainstay of St. Paul’s Church on southern Saltspring, for which William Naukana donated the land and other Hawaiians supplied building materials. The church’s very first event was the baptism on December 27, 1885, of grandsons of William Naukana and of fellow Hawaiian William Mahoi. A hand-drawn map of St. Paul’s cemetery, done by Naukana’s youngest daughter, Matilda, in the early 1930s before many stones were lost in the course of road widening, contains thirty to thirty-five members of the Hamea, Kamai, Mahoi, Nawa, Nawana, Palua, and other families. Hawaiian religiosity likely underlies the advice passed down to a grandson, “Don’t feel bad when I go, I’m going to heaven. It is you folks that is going to be left with all the problems of the sicknesses, the politics, and all this and that.”

Although members of the first generation, both the Hawaiians themselves and their Indian wives, were mostly illiterate, their offspring, so far as geography permitted, attended local schools alongside neighbors’ children. From 1874, when Emma Palua from Saltspring was sent away at the tender age of four, daughters of several families boarded at St. Ann’s Convent School in Vancouver Island’s Cowichan Valley. Schooling continued to be prized. A treasured photo of 1905 celebrated the presentation of the Roll of Honour to a fifteen-year-old Saltspringer of the younger generation.

Yet, when the time came for marriage, many sons and daughters turned inward. As put by one woman discussing the Mahoi clan, “they all married and intermarried.” William Naukana’s eldest daughter wed her father’s friend and fellow Portland Island settler Johnny Palua, almost forty years her senior. The men Peopeo’s daughters married were likely friends of their father’s. More often neighbors’
children married each other, as with the Kamais and Korneys on Coal Island and the Naukanas, Mahois, and Nawanas on Saltspring. As had their parents, many descendants had two or more relationships in their lifetime. As one has observed: “A lot of families married and separated and remarried.”89 Perhaps not surprisingly, only at the end of a long afternoon of conversation with me did two long-time friends realize that they shared common great-grandparents of mixed Hawaiian and Native descent.90

All the same, marriage patterns in the second and subsequent generations were remarkably similar to those of other British Columbia settler families where the father came from elsewhere and the mother was Native. In general, sons found it more difficult than their sisters to be accepted within the dominant society. Many sought out Indian women, and by the third, if not the second, generation had
outwardly become Indian. The Fraser Valley Chiers, for instance, became one of the three major families on the Whonnock Reserve.91

The continuing paucity of non-Native women in British Columbia combined with women’s inferior position generally to give daughters more options. A few wed another person of mixed descent or a Hawaiian, but many married white men, and over time their families became absorbed into the dominant society. Maria Mahoi, half-Hawaiian and half-Indian, had seven children by a sea captain from Maine. She then married the son of an Englishman and an Indian woman and had another half dozen children.

The best-known Hawaiian of the first generation in British Columbia, William Naukana, had six daughters by at least two Indian women as well as, very likely, a son who died young. The eldest, Delia, first married a recent arrival from Hawai‘i and then one from the Philippines; Sophie, her father’s close friend John Palua; Julia, the son of an American and a Native woman; Mary Ann Naukana, a fisherman who had recently arrived from Denmark; and Annie, first a continental European and then a recent arrival from Hawai‘i. The youngest, Matilda, first married a young Englishman and then a man of likely mixed descent.

Gender has taken some families in two different directions. A Cowichan Indian woman had children by two former fur-trade laborers, Eihu and Joe Nahance, both of whom worked at Hastings Sawmill and, with the Keamos and several other Hawaiians, lived at Kanaka Ranch. Her son wed a Squamish woman and became the patriarch of the Nahanee clan, part of the Squamish Nation in North Vancouver, whereas the children of Eihu’s daughter were absorbed into “white” Vancouver.

If within two or three generations many Hawaiians were living outwardly as “Indian” or “white,” this did not mean that they necessarily lost consciousness of their distinctive identity. Unlike the American Pacific Northwest, where by the mid-twentieth century “many descendants of the early Hawaiians had lost the awareness that they were part Hawaiian,” some sensitivity to origins has survived in family after family in British Columbia.92

Elements of culture acquired through the female line, such as the hula, did not transfer, due to the lack of women of the first generation to pass it on to their daughters. The only Hawaiian woman so far
Fig. 6. Maria Mahoi, daughter of a Hawaiian fur trade laborer, William Mahoi, and an Indian woman, who had seven children by Abel Douglas, a whaler from Maine, and then another six by George Fisher, son of an Englishman and an Indian woman. (Photo courtesy of George and Maria Fisher's great-grandson, Karey Litton.)
found to have had a family in nineteenth-century British Columbia was Teresa Aponi, who came to New Westminster in the 1860s with her half-Polynesian, half-Spanish husband.93

Language was another early casualty. Most families spoke English, possibly in combination with Chinook, the trading jargon long used across the Pacific Northwest. According to a granddaughter, "the wife of Grandpa Naukana spoke Indian and Chinook, but he wanted children to speak only English and Chinook, not Native Indian and not Hawaiian."94 All that survived of the Hawaiian language in most families, as exemplified in the recollection of a granddaughter-in-law, were words and phrases. There were "a lot of the Hawaiian words that we used everyday, just in our general conversations." "We always used to use these phrases. We didn't know the meaning of them and we didn't even know if we were saying them right." "When we went to Hawai'i on our first trip, we heard these words and began to put
FIG. 8. Maria Mahoi’s children illustrate the role of gender in fashioning marital decisions and thereby place in British Columbia society. Her eldest son, George Douglas, half white and a quarter each Hawaiian and Indian, married Nettie Sparrow, half Indian and half white. (Photo courtesy of George and Nettie Douglas’s grandson, Ken Seeley.)
meaning to them." Their origin lay with this woman's mother-in-law. "They came down from her father. He taught her, I suppose. She picked it up from him and then she used to use them and then her children did likewise and used them."95

Many descendants have nonetheless retained some sense of their Hawaiiainess, aided perhaps by the continued existence across coastal British Columbia of such place names as Kanaka Creek opposite Fort Langley, Kanaka Bluff on Portland Island, and Kanaka Bay on Newcastle Island off Nanaimo.96 According to Saltspring neighbors, the Kanakas who settled nearby "brought their own flag with them over here I believe, the Hawaiian flag."97 A love of music and a delight in playing stringed instruments passed down in many families. "They all brought their guitars with them. I think that you could have called this a little Hawai‘i along here."98 Eihu, said to have been a teacher in native schools in Hawai‘i before coming to the Pacific Northwest, treasured his Hawaiian-language Bible, subsequently donated by descendants to the City of Vancouver Archives.
Well into the twentieth century families on the Gulf Islands celebrated each autumn’s harvest with a lu‘au-style party, where food was roasted in a fire pit dug in the beach. The party moved virtually intact from family to family, island to island. William Naukana and Johnny Palua would throw a lu‘au on Portland. After a week or so, celebrants would go on to the Nawanas on Saltspring and then to the Kamais on Coal Island and then to a Hawaiian family on tiny Piers Island and on to the Hameas and so on. “Well they sang and danced all winter until the time came to put in their crops.”

Physical appearance has created another enduring bond. The daughter of a Hudson’s Bay officer on San Juan Island remembered how in her childhood she would frequently “meet a big kinky haired black-faced Kanaka. . . . [I]t seemed to me the woods were quite full

Fig. 10. The enduring bond of physical features is illustrated in this Saltspring Island school photo from the early 1930s. All except the two girls on the right in the second row and the boy on the left in the first row were descended from Hawaiians. (Photo courtesy of Bea Shepard, whose husband is descended from George and Julia Shepard and Abel and Maria Douglas.)
of them going and coming, hither & thither, through the little trails in the woods." Such distinguishing features as being "well made" and having brown eyes, a skin color varying from light olive to darker shades, and wavy "brownish black" hair, to cite Captain James Cook's description of the late eighteenth century, have appeared and reappeared in British Columbian families generation after generation. Describing her husband, a Hawaiian of the third generation, a woman has recalled, "He looked like an Hawaiian. He had the complexion, the features, the whole bit. When we went to Hawai'i the men folks down there would say, 'Hi bra, what island you from?" Sometimes these characteristics have been cause for prejudice and discrimination, as with the woman who married a Kwakiutl chief only to find herself disparaged as "not fit to be his wife" because "only her mother was the part of her that was Indian" and her father was "from Honolulu, or some place, and he was dark brown—almost black." Physical features have also served as a bond uniting families and clans. The son of a man with "dark skin" who was born with "eyes that go from dark green to gray" mused approvingly that it might come from the Hawai'i link.

Perhaps several thousand British Columbians descend from Hawaiians, although the number may be considerably larger given that among just one extended family, the Nahanees of the Squamish Nation, some four hundred trace their origins back to a single man. Although never a clearly defined community in the sense of having formal institutions, Hawaiians in British Columbia have valued their heritage. Stories passed down from generation to generation remain remarkably intact, in part perhaps because many members of the first generation were illiterate and subsequent generations have been for the most part ordinary British Columbians whose culture is as much verbal as written. Many who know very little about their precise family histories are nonetheless aware of their origins, and for the most part descendants take greater pride in being Hawaiian than in being Indian, due very likely to the greater respect accorded Hawaiians historically. Particularly since the 1970s some families have begun to visit Hawai'i, hoping, so far without success, to recover an actual as well as a spiritual link with families there. Operation 'Ohana, the recent initiative by the Hawaiian government to enroll all persons of aboriginal Hawaiian ancestry into a cul-
tural association based in pride in heritage, has been greeted with enthusiasm.

Current attitudes are indicated by a somewhat spontaneous event of 1992. While individual families had gotten together from time to time, a first general reunion titled "The Hawaiian Connection" was organized by a descendant of Stanley Park's Eihu in conjunction with celebrations marking Canada's 125th anniversary. Although news of the event only spread informally, more than two hundred persons turned up representing virtually the entire British Columbia socioeconomic spectrum from First Nations leaders to a former provincial cabinet minister to ordinary men, women, and families. Most had never met before, but many discovered that they shared the same stories and in some cases common ancestry. Dominant physical features created a special bond. One man quipped that, while looking for a parking space, he had seen his uncle nine times even though his uncle was long since dead. An elderly man who grew up in Victoria as "white" told of the shame he had felt as a boy whenever his visibly Hawaiian grandmother came to visit and how he now wished he had not denied her a place in his childhood. The editor of the province's principal Native newspaper summed the event up as "a reaffirmation of ourselves." 106

The 1992 reunion, and its annual successors, have also attracted some more recent, ethnically diverse immigrants from the Hawaiian Islands. Overall, relatively few persons explicitly identifying themselves as Hawaiian have settled across Canada. In the 1991 census just 545 people termed themselves Hawaiian, and another 2,490 claimed Hawaiian as part of a multiple heritage. The majority of persons from the Hawaiian Islands, however, likely classified themselves as American in terms of origin.

The Hawaiians' contribution to the development of the North American Pacific Northwest extends far beyond early seafaring and the fur trade. The men who stayed behind in British Columbia were deemed citizens of Canada, and they behaved as such. Their experience belies the myth that legal discrimination necessarily followed, historically, from distinctive physical features. Hawaiians and their families contributed in innumerable ways to the settlement of British Columbia. Their descendants continue to testify to the strength and durability of both the Hawaiian and Canadian fabrics.
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