

Notes & Queries

The Journal welcomes responses to previously published articles, statements on Hawaiian and Pacific history, and queries for information that will assist research. Opinions expressed here and elsewhere in the pages of the Journal are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the Editorial Board or the Hawaiian Historical Society.

THE POPULATION OF HONOLULU SUB-DISTRICTS IN 1866

This brief note is intended to draw attention to a little-known, seldom-used set of small-area population statistics for O'ahu's Kona (Honolulu) District compiled from the 1866 census. This tabulation is notable for being the earliest to provide demographic detail for Honolulu's sub-districts; all earlier censuses—including those conducted by the missionaries in 1831–1832 and 1835–1836 and the Hawaiian government in 1849, 1850, 1853, and 1860—had limited their geographic breakdowns for Honolulu to the district totals. Honolulu district in those days extended from Moanalua to Koko Head.

The 1866 count, unlike its predecessors, provided separate statistics for each of the fifteen "sub-districts" recognized by the census officials. These areas, listed in the table in geographic order from Maunalua to Moanalua, were by and large designated by their traditional Hawaiian place names, although three apparently were named for large churches within their areas. Unfortunately, maps presenting the exact boundaries used in the enumeration cannot be found.

Only one of the fifteen sub-districts is difficult to identify. This is "Loma," a place name that fails to appear in *Place Names of Hawaii* and other standard reference works. However, inasmuch as it is listed between Kawaiahao sub-district (named for the church at King and Punchbowl Streets) and Kaumakapili sub-district (named for a large church then located at Beretania and Smith Streets), it presumably refers to the area now occupied by the Honolulu Central Business District. When capitalized, moreover, Loma is the Hawaiian word

meaning Rome or Roman—possibly an allusion to Our Lady of Peace Cathedral, the Roman Catholic edifice on Fort Street.¹

The tabulation contains twenty-nine columns, providing data for the district and each sub-district on total population by sex, marital status by sex, race by sex, age by sex, number of freeholders, selected occupations, and number of cattle, sheep, and goats. Only four racial categories are reported: native, half-caste, Chinese, and other foreign. Data are shown for three age groups—under fifteen, between fifteen and forty, and over forty, with no indication of the placement of persons exactly forty years old. Data on “professionalists” are limited to “the learned professions,” and “agriculturists” include “only those known to have some considerable amount of land devoted to agricultural and grazing purposes.” The figures for “laborers” include only those “permanently employed, generally on contract.” The occupational data obviously omit many members of the labor force.

For the entire district of Honolulu, the total population in 1866 was 13,521, or 5.5 percent less than the 1860 census total. The median age was about twenty-nine years, and there were 124.0 males per 100 females. Fully 79.0 percent of the population described themselves as natives, 4.6 percent were half-castes, 2.7 percent were Chinese, and the remaining 13.7 percent were haoles or other foreigners. About half of all males fifteen years old and over and two-thirds of the females fifteen and older were married. Freeholders numbered only 1,440. There were 39 “professionalists,” 29 “agriculturists,” 477 mechanics, and 226 laborers. Animals in the district numbered 3,685 cattle, 1,470 sheep, and 904 goats. Comparable statistics are reported for each of the fifteen sub-districts.

The full 1866 table is reproduced as Fig. 1 on the accompanying page. The original appeared in the *Hawaiian Gazette* for 30 January 1867. Further information on the 1866 census can be found in a monograph by the present author.²

Submitted by Robert C. Schmitt

NOTES

¹ Mary Kawena Pukui and Samuel H. Elbert, *Hawaiian-English Dictionary*, 2nd ed. (Honolulu: U Hawaii P, 1961) 195.

² Robert C. Schmitt, *Demographic Statistics of Hawaii: 1778-1965* (Honolulu: U Hawaii P, 1968) 55-56, 69-77, 236.

A LETTER AND A GREETING FROM JACK LONDON

Jack London's contributions to the literature on Hawai'i have been well documented by Grove Day.¹ The following note, however, is hidden away in volume 1, number 1 (May 1916) of the student yearbook, *Ka Palapala Hawaii*, of the then College of Hawai'i, now the University of Hawai'i.

Grace H. Morgan of the class of 1919, as editor-in-chief, apparently wrote to London, requesting a contribution for the yearbook. Jack London responded:

Puuwaawaa, Hawaii, April 13, 1916.

Dear Grace H. Morgan: Just a brief line, in a rush to catch the mail, to thank you for your good letter of April 9, 1916, and to inclose you this paragraph, which is no more nor less than a true statement of my spirit toward Hawaii.

With all best wishes, and hoping the paragraph may fill the space you are holding for it.

Sincerely yours,

Jack London

ALOHA!

Hawaii and the Hawaiians are a land and a people loving and lovable. By their language may ye know them, and in what other land save this one is the commonest form of greeting, not "good day," nor "How d'ye do," but "Love!" That greeting is *Aloha*—love, I love you, my love to you. Good day—what is it more than an impersonal remark about the weather? How do you do—it is personal in a merely casual interrogative sort of way. But *Aloha!* It is a positive affirmation of the warmth of one's heart-giving. My love to you! I love you! Aloha!

Jack London.

Submitted by E. Alison Kay

NOTE

¹ A. Grove Day, ed., *Stories of Hawaii by Jack London* (New York: Appleton-Century, 1965).

BOB KRAUSS'S JOHNNY WILSON

George Simpson's negative review of *Johnny Wilson: First Hawaiian Democrat*, by Bob Krauss, in Volume 29 of the *Journal* (1995), was disappointing.

Mr. Simpson, director for biographical research at the University of Hawai'i, rests his case against the Krauss book on the author's apparent errors in fact and judgment. Simpson states the book needs "1 percent to 25 percent more work" in order to be of real value. He outlines eight areas of "shortcomings," accuses Krauss of using a "country club fog" style of writing, and closes his condescending review with an inappropriate French phrase.

Unfortunately for the reviewer, he has based his case on an incorrect assumption from which all his criticisms then follow. He also contributes errors of his own.

The basic wrong assumption is that the University of Hawai'i Press, when it makes the decision to issue a publication under "A Kolowalu Book" imprint, does so because, according to Simpson, the book does "not carry scholarly analysis or interpretation far enough." Not so. "Kolowalu" means that the Press hopes the book will appeal to a more general readership, as well as to scholars and experts. It is not a judgment on the book but, rather, a marketing strategy.

I gave the Krauss book my own basic litmus test based on Dr. Samuel Johnson's prescription: does it instruct and delight? My response is that it does. Krauss has given life and breath to the Hawaiian, Tahitian, Scottish, and Irish Wilson, the "child of conflicting cultures," who, upon the death of James Joseph Fern in 1920, assumed the mayor's post:

Most of all, he spoke for the little man with a vision that was uniquely Hawaiian and American at the same time. His democracy was that of Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson, with overtones of taro planters and Hawaiian stevedores that could be understood by common people trying to find their place on an island caught between old Hawaiian

values and the new American system. He was tough, and fearless, and for this he commanded a great deal of loyalty as he stepped into the office of mayor. (p. 162)

How does this add up to Simpson's charge that Krauss writes in a "country club fog"?

Prior to the appearance of the Krauss volume, Wilson was in danger of being forgotten by history. So, too, was Kini Kapahu, who became Mrs. Wilson and, in widowhood, "Aunt Jennie Wilson." The author captures the down-home quality of both Wilsons, with their roots in the Pelekunu Valley on Moloka'i—the tenacious and determined Johnny, who as an engineer and road builder was also a clever entrepreneur and shrewd politico; the beautiful and vibrant Kini, who enjoyed a bohemian lifestyle and a career as a professional hula dancer on the mainland; who together shared a lifetime of personal devotion and public service. Krauss, with his well-known background in journalism, can turn a phrase, as in his term for the young boy's relationship to Queen Lili'uokalani: "The Queen's Baby Dumpling" (p. 5); or in his description of Wilson's later role as founder and leader of the Democratic Party: "Captain of a Mutinous Crew" (p. 261). Krauss paints a poignant picture of an archetypal mayor so thoroughly identified with his city that he never made it to the governorship, an honest man who died broke, in his pocket his "total assets" of 32 cents.

As to so-called errors, two of the more glaring ones are the reviewer's. Simpson asks, who was the "mysterious haole" who may have been Kini's father? His question was answered on page 18: John H. McColgan, an Irish tailor. Simpson asks, why does Krauss not reveal why the couple is childless? On page 84, we learn that Kini lost a baby through a miscarriage and was unable to have another. Krauss later expands on the theme of childlessness by describing how the couple took in, to their farm at Waiala'e on O'ahu, homeless youth from Tahiti and "wayward boys" from the Salvation Army Boys Home (p. 216).

This may not be a perfect book (nor is Boswell's famous biography of Johnson), but it is a very good one. Apparently the original manuscript had to be cut by 250 pages—a contemporary press requirement of authors to meet publication needs. One wonders, then,

where the “1 percent to 25 percent” additional work or pages would come from? This first real assessment of Wilson’s place in Hawaiian history is illuminating about the true founder of the modern Democratic Party, who was thus a major influence on modern Hawai‘i. It is a solid contribution to twentieth-century social and political history.

The Hawaiian Historical Society, in its centennial year of 1992, awarded the honor of distinguished historian to twelve authors, one of whom was Bob Krauss. It is ironic, too, in the light of Simpson’s review, that the Hawaii Publishers’ Association gave *Johnny Wilson* two awards: one for excellence in nonfiction and another for excellence in literature—no doubt, to the University of Hawai‘i Press’s delight.

I would like to add that of Krauss’s fourteen books, I especially like his biography *Keneti: South Seas Adventures of Kenneth Emory* (1988). The late noted scholar Alex Spoehr, former head of the Bishop Museum, highly praised it in volume 23 of the *Journal* (1989) for its historical soundness and readability. It, too, bears the Kolowalu imprint.

Submitted by Helen G. Chapin

A CORRECTION

The cover of the 1994 edition of *The Hawaiian Journal of History* (volume 28) carried a photograph of Adele Robinson Lemke by Ray Jerome Baker erroneously identified as having been taken in 1910. The picture actually dates from 1913. A note on the back of a copy of the photograph owned by Lemke’s family says, “February 22, 1913 (Washington’s birthday parade) age 16.” Adele was born October 6, 1896, and was sixteen years old in February 1913.

Submitted by William Lemke

