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Abraham Kaleimahoe Fernandez:  
A Hawaiian Saint and Royalist, 1857-1915  

by Isaiah Walker

As the sun neared the horizon after a beautiful summer day in 1906, two Hawaiians entered the Hamohamo river in Waikiki. Elder Abraham Kaleimahoe Fernandez baptized and then confirmed Queen Lydia Kamakaeha Liliuokalani a member of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. Although technically she was no longer the queen of Hawai‘i in 1906, Elder Fernandez recorded and reported to President Samuel E. Woolley that he had baptized Her Majesty Queen Liliuokalani.¹

Abraham Fernandez was both a friend and former employee of the Queen. From 1891 to 1893 he served the Kingdom of Hawaii as a member of the Queen’s Privy Council.² According to oral family tradition, prior to becoming a member of the LDS church himself, the Queen assigned him to monitor Mormons in the islands and report on their activities and aspirations.³ Although he was first exposed to the church while spying on it, Abraham was eventually baptized a Mormon on October 22, 1895, after Peter

Shortly after his conversion, Abraham began filling important church leadership callings in the islands. He served as a full-time missionary in Hawaii, became a member of the Hawaiian mission presidency under Samuel E. Woolley, and adopted or hanai’d missionaries, prophets, and apostles who regularly visited the islands (including and most notably President Joseph F. Smith).

In this presentation I will recount the history of Abraham Fernandez, his family, and his service in the church here. However, this story is more than just a narrative about an important man. It is also a story about a woman. Minerva Fernandez, Abraham’s wife, was just as prominent a leader as he was. Like her husband she was both an ali‘i of Hawai‘i and a Mormon leader. Furthermore, this presentation is more than simply a narrative plump full of historical tidbits about an important and under-explored person in our local history. With this story of my great grandparents I make two key arguments. First, that the Fernandez family, like many other Hawaiian families, was strong believers in both the church and the Native Hawaiian Monarchy. They not only fought to preserve the kingdom as it was under attack, but continued to support the Queen years after she was forced from her throne. Many Hawaiian royalists found a comfortable place to be both Christian and Hawaiian in the church. Thus my second contention is that in the late 1800s and early 1900s the LDS Church was a healthy alternative to Calvinist Christianity which at that time became associated with those who deposed the Queen and pushed for annexation to the United States.

In a 1955 Honolulu Star-Bulletin series called Tales about Hawaii, Clarice Taylor explained that “Minerva and Abraham lived like ali‘i. There was not question of “who are you?” Other ali‘i knew of their ancestors and that was sufficient. No one in those days dreamed that the genealogies of the ali‘i would ever be forgotten.” Since genealogy was so important to them, and to Hawaiian mo‘olelo or histories in general, I will briefly explain their Hawaiian lineage.

It is unclear who Abraham’s real father was. In most accounts, he was the adopted son of Peter Fernandez, a Spanish gentleman of Bombay India and third husband of Abraham’s mother, Kalama Kalei Mahoe. Not much is known of his real father, other than the fact that he was a Hawaiian and first husband of Kalama. In one version his father was Ah Hoy, who was either a full-blooded Hawaiian or Hawaiian-Chinese. Others have speculated that David Kalākaua was Abraham’s biological father. Other than family rumor, such speculations are supported by the fact that Kalākaua made regular visits to Abraham’s mother’s family in Lahaina even prior to Abraham’s birth. Kalakua remained close to Abraham and the Fernandez family up until his death in 1891. When Abraham’s first son, Edwin Kane Fernandez (otherwise known as EK Fernandez) had his first birthday in 1884, King Kalākaua threw a week-long-luau for the child. Kalākaua provided everything from flags, to a massive fireworks display. He also provided the food—several pigs, pounds of fish, opīhi, salmon, and barrels of poi. Cases of Kalākaua’s favorite Champagne were given out, and the royal Hawaiian band, under the direction of
Henry Berger, was one of the many musical groups to entertain the guests. Although hula was frowned upon by many non-Hawaiians in the nineteenth century, a hula competition was held at this party where many of Hawai‘i’s best hula halau’s vied for accolades. It is no wonder that E.K. Fernandez established Hawaii’s greatest entertainment venues throughout the 20th century.  

Abraham’s mother Kalama Kalei Mahoe was named after and by Queen Kalama the wife of Kauikeaulani, or Kamehameha III. Whereas family names were held sacred and often kapu, this honor most likely meant that she was a close relative of the Queen. As a close relative her lineage would have stemmed from the Moana line, a chiefly line descended from King Keawe II. But Abraham’s mother also claimed Mahi-o-pelea, a fourth generation descendant of Umi-a-Liloa, as an ancestor.

Abraham was born in Lahaina, Maui and like many ali‘i was educated in mission schools. He was a good student and acquired a profound knowledge of the Bible. However, after his mom, Kalama, married her third husband, Peter Fernandez, the family relocated to Kapalama on O‘ahu and lived in a large house built by Mr. Fernandez—on what is now the upper section of Asylum road. Peter adopted all of Kalama’s children and became very fond of Abraham, and even later made him his partner in a lucrative hardware business.

While on O‘ahu, Abraham became friends with Andrew Johnson Davis, a half-Hawaiian and half-haole boy also from Maui. Shortly before Abraham turned twenty, Andrew convinced Abraham to travel back to Maui and court his older sister Minerva. During his voyage to Maui, the commuter vessel encountered extremely rough seas and Abraham was tossed overboard. Although he recovered a rowboat which the ship captain cast overboard on his behalf, the boat sprung a leak and Abraham found himself in a precarious situation. Legend tells us of his miraculous escape: After praying for assistance a great shark appeared, lifted the boat on his back and pulled Abraham safely onto a beach in Hana. He arrived on Maui sooner than the big ship did.

Abraham married Minerva Eliza Davis on December 31, 1877 at Makawao, Maui. Minerva Eliza Davis (Fernandez), was also an ali‘i. She was the daughter of Keumikalakaua and William Lyman Davis. They had twelve children. Although each of the Davis children were given proper English names, their mother, Keumikalakaua, also gave them hidden Hawaiian names—missionary law by the late 1800s required all Hawaiians to have English names. Keumikalakaua’s grandfather Mahihelelima was a lead warrior of King Kalaniopu‘u. Most likely a member of the King’s elite Keawe guard, Mahihelelima became the governor of Hana, Maui in about 1777, just prior to Captain Cook’s first visit to Hawai‘i. Mahihelelima was also the brother of Kanekapolei, King Kalaniopu‘u’s favorite wife. Mahihelelima was also known as a spiritual man and gifted fisherman. He worshipped the fish gods Ku‘ula, Hina and Aiai. Hawaiian Mo‘olelo (histories) explain that he could call forth great schools of fish to his nets. Mahihelelima descended from the famous Mahi family line of Kohala, and traced his ancestry back to King Umi.
Although Minerva Davis was trained, as ali‘i were in those days, in Congregationalist mission schools, her teachers concentrated on teaching her “womens work,” or domestic and household duties. This was a drastic change for Hawaiian women since in years prior women of Hawai‘i engaged in rigorous activities later deemed to masculine for a proper woman to participate in—these included surfing, boxing, wrestling, and even fighting in warfare.

Shortly after the two were married they moved to a family home in Honolulu, on King Street. They had four daughters, Adelaide, Madeline, Clara, and Minerva and one son (EK was the third oldest). As the hardware business continued to prosper, Abraham built a second home on a 12 acre lot in Kalihi, 2001 Beckley street. Called the country house, it was large enough to accommodate their many friends and visitors.

As they raised their young family the Fernandez’s still made time to associate with other Hawaiian ali‘i, including King Kalākaua and his wife Kapiolani. Minerva had a close relationship with Kapiolani and supported her efforts at preserving the health of the Hawaiian people. Minerva became a charter member of Kapiolani’s birthing center and served as chairman of the board at that hospital. When Kalākaua died in 1891, Minerva came to the Queen’s aid, and Abraham was appointed Privy Council member under Hawaii’s new Mo‘i, Queen Lili‘uokalani.

Abraham’s new job was most-likely very stressful. Lili‘u inherited a torn and tense administration in 1891. In the decades preceding her inauguration Sugar had rotted more than just the teeth of Calvinist missionary grandchildren. Sugar had become a big business that thrived in Hawaii as the Gold Rush in California provided demand, and boycotts on southern sugar during the American Civil War enabled Hawaiian sugar
to enter the US tax free. But when the war ended and this tax-free agreement was on its way out, haole businessmen (now led by the grandkids of the early Calvinist missionaries) were willing to make great concessions to keep that tax exemption. While the United States wanted Pearl Harbor, and the business community was ready to give it to them, Kalākaua refused. In 1887 he was convinced, while guns were pointed at him, to see things their way. But not only that, the king was forced to sign a new constitution, dubbed the bayonet constitution, which yielded much of his executive powers to them. One of the first things they did was appoint themselves cabinet and council members of the Kingdom of Hawai‘i.¹⁴

Thus, when Lili‘uokalani came into office she had a bold agenda; ratify a new constitution and replace haole politicians with more Hawaiians. The bayonet constitution made it difficult to appoint new people since legislators could now shut down her selections. She did however manage to appoint six new Privy Council members (there were about 25 members in total) during her first few weeks in office. A young 34-year-old Abraham was one of them (so was Prince David Kawananakoa). Although it took a little over a year, the queen, with the help of advisors like Abraham, drafted a new constitution, one that restored the executive powers of the Monarch and weakened foreign influence in government (for example the constitution stipulated that foreigners couldn’t vote, unless they were married to a Hawaiian).¹⁵ However, when the queen tried to promulgate the new constitution on January 14, 1893 those cabinet members still aligned the with the business community refused to sign it. Then, they ran off and leaked her plans to the opposition. Led by Lorrin Thurston, Sanford B. Dole, and others the opposition now organized into a gang called the committee of safety and secretly planned to oust the Hawaiian Monarch.

After convincing US minister John L. Stevens to support their coup, this committee, with the help of a company of US marines ransacked Hawai‘i’s government building, pointed guns and cannons at the palace, and forced the queen to surrender on January 17, 1893. Despite the exhortation by US President Grover Cleveland to return Hawai‘i’s administration back to Native Hawaiians, the perpetrators declared Hawaii a Republic and Sanford B. Dole as its first governor.¹⁶

But the Hawaiian community didn’t just roll over. The queen and her supporters sought ways to restore her throne. Huge rallies were held and thousands of Hawaiians signed petitions protesting the idea of annexation. In 1895 some Hawaiians even attempted a covert operation to restore the queen to power through force. The attempt failed. The new courts blamed the queen for this insurrection and imprisoned her in a small upper-room in the palace. Few were allowed into her chambers during her sentence. But as the queen explained in her book, Hawaii’s Story, Minerva Fernandez was one of them.
Minerva smuggled forbidden Hawaiian newspapers into her chambers and bolstered the Queen’s hopes in a political restitution.

As Abraham and Minerva prayed for the Hawaiian kingdom, they found spiritual support in the LDS Church. After Peter Kealaka‘i healed their eldest child, who previously found no remedy to her ailment from the best doctors in Hawaii and San Francisco, the family, including Minerva’s sister, Hattie, was baptized in Kewalo Stream and confirmed members of the church in Auwaiolimpu on Oct 22, 1895.

But 1895 was a crazy year in Hawai‘i. The queen was just released from prison, rumors were spread that Abraham was on a secret hit-list drafted by the opposition, and the family was struggling to define its place as ali‘i under a haole run government.

Well, the Church provided a place for the Fernandez’s to help Hawaiians in more ways than one. Months after his baptism, Abraham became a key speaker at many church meetings. Samuel E Woolley wrote of one such meeting: The new convert spoke with Peter Kealaka‘ihonua, the meeting was packed, a full house. Abraham became a traveling guest speaker at many meetings thereafter. Soon, he was called as a missionary and later a member of the Hawaiian mission presidency under Samuel E. Woolley. Minerva became the President of the LDS women’s organization, the Relief Society in all the islands—a calling she held for nearly 30 years. As family friends of the queen, Abraham and Minerva occasionally brought Lili‘uokalani out to Laie where she was warmly received. While on such visits Lili‘uokalani came to admire several church members there. The Queen also made at least two trips to Salt Lake City, Utah. On at least one of these trips, she accompanied the Fernandez family and friends. In the “Liliuokalani and Party” photo, it is speculated that the purpose of the trip was to send off EK to his first year of college at BYU in Provo, Utah. While accompanying the Fernandez’s on various Mormon visits, the queen gained an appreciation for the Latter-day saints. Speaking to a close friend Lydia Aloho, Lili‘uokalani said, there was an affinity between the old Hawaiian aloha and the practices of the Mormons, “they always take care of their own.”

The Fernandez’s did just that. Within days of their conversion, they hosted LDS gatherings where they housed and entertained church leaders.
and missionaries. Samuel E. Woolley’s journals are heaving with entries about having dinner and a good time at the Fernandez home. Their house was not only a place where church was discussed, but where music, hula, and food were in abundance. They loved to have guests and they were very good hosts.

The Fernandez’s found in the LDS church a vehicle to help the Hawaiian people. Whereas his Privy Council position was stripped from him, these callings provided a forum for him and his wife to address the Hawaiian community. As the church provided spiritual sanctuary from the tense political scene in Honolulu, they began sharing that solitude with other ali‘i. Minerva began teaching the Queen lessons learned in the Relief Society and they together gained a testimony of things like priesthood blessings. W.W. Cluff recorded an incident where the queen asked Minerva to send George Q. Cannon to her Palace to give her a priesthood blessing. Although spiritual solutions were sought by many Hawaiians at this time, the fate of the Hawaiian Kingdom still enveloped Hawaiians, including the Fernandez’s.

In August of 1898 their fears became a reality. Hawaii was Annexed to the United States. The new McKinley administration, with its uniquely aggressive and colonial-like foreign policy pushed the annexation bill through a divided congress through a joint resolution. Puerto Rico and the Philippines also came under United States control in 1898. While the death toll of Filipino nationals grew by the tens of thousands, the Queen’s resolve to fight lessened. On August 12 the new regime celebrated in Honolulu with a Hawaiian flag lowering ceremony. During this party the Fernandez family, along with the vast majority of Hawaiians, hibernated at home. A journal entry by Samuel E Woolley allows us to peer in on this community of sorrowful saints.

On August 12th, 1898 he wrote “This is an important day as the American flag was raised at 12 noon after the Hawaiian flag was lowered. When the flag was lowered it was more like a funeral than anything else….Everything was quiet. No great demonstration. I did not go. I thought it best not to go as the saints are nearly all opposed to the flagraising so I concluded not to show them that I was rejoicing at their downfall.”

Abraham continued to serve in the LDS church and found lesser roles in Hawaiian politics under the new government. He was a member of the board of health under the territory and in 1914 was a Republican candidate for city treasurer. In 1915 Abraham died at his Honolulu store (Abraham Fernandez and Son). He was 58. Minerva continued to labor in the church and helped the Hawaiian community through Kapiolani Hospital. Their children raised families of their own, many of whom remained active in the Church. As seen through the example of Abraham and Minerva, many Hawaiian saints found in the LDS church a place to be both Christian and Hawaiian. As they were stripped from political positions under the Hawaiian monarchy, the church also provided an avenue to serve the Hawaiian people as leaders.

Endnotes

1 Baptismal record archived in BYU-Hawai‘i Archives, also document attached in appendix here


1 John Helekunihi Duke, “The Abraham Fernandez Family of Hawai‘i,” pg. 7. This is an unpublished family history and genealogy book (see author or John Duke for copy).


1 Duke, pg. 3


1 Taylor, “Tales,” Vol. 15.

1 Taylor, “Tales,” Vol. 15.


1 See the 1894 draft of her constitution at http://www.hawaii-nation.org/constitution-1893.html

1 The President of the United States, Grover Cleveland, sent a special commissioner, James Blount, to investigate the overthrow. He interviewed various people and parties and came to the conclusion that what happened was immoral, illegal, and not cleared by US channels. He ordered the Queen to be restored to power. A full record of his report can be seen in the Blount Report, Executive Documents of the House of Representatives, 53rd Cong., 3 sess. (1894-1895) found online at: http://libweb.hawaii.edu/digicoll/annexation/annexation.html

1 Samuel E. Woolley, Journals of Samuel E. Woolley, pg. 73. These are archived in BYUH archives, Joseph F. Smith Library.


1 Kēhaulani Kauanui has explained that the joint resolution was for domestic policymaking only and, according to U.S. law, a treaty was required for such an act. Thus, annexation was unconstitutional and illegal. See J Kēhaulani Kauanui, “Precarious Positions: Native Hawaiians and US Federal Recognition,” The Contemporary Pacific, 17 (2005), 34.

1 Woolley, Journals, pg. 215.

Appendix
1. Baptismal Record of Queen Lili’uokalani’s Baptism by Abraham Kaleimahoe Fernandez.
The First Ward

Elder Abraham Donamy

R. P. C. 16th June 25th, 1905

My dear Brother Donamy,

I have recently returned from visiting the Union Stake quarterly conference in Oregon and found your returned family of May 25th with P.O. order for 45th from Union

Oregon. It was my wife Eliza, who sent the 45th and she did not expect any more for it the day she came home. She sent me a letter telling me that you would like to have her in the stake. I have not been in the stake as long as I would have liked, but I shall be glad to have her. She is a fine woman and is very kind.

I have been pleased to hear from you, and I hope that your family is in good health and that all is well with you.

My family are all well, and I hope that you will prosper in your Heavenly Father's work. May you have all that you desire.

I am yours truly,

Elder Abraham Donamy

[Signature]

3. Missionary Certificate signed by the Prophet Wilford Woodruff and his councilors October 10, 1896. Abraham was on paper as a missionary until he died in 1915.
Edward LaVaun Clissold:  
“The Second Most Powerful Man in the Church”  

by Brian S. O'Brien

Introduction

While conducting research on various history projects relating to the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints (hereafter referred to as LDS), I kept coming across the name of Clissold. Similarly, while examining group photos of Church gatherings and events during the mid-20th century, a short, serious-looking man with a receding hairline is frequently seen. This man is Edward LaVaun Clissold, who spent 50 years of his life in Hawaii devoting tremendous time and talent to the LDS Church. He lived in an intriguing time when Hawaii was transitioning from a patriarchal and plantation society to a more self-reliant and cosmopolitan society.

Edward Clissold, far left, next to Pres. McKay. CCH campus groundbreaking.  
(BYU-Hawaii Archives & Special Collections)

Most interesting was his capacity and willingness to accept numerous Church assignments, or callings, simultaneously. This resulted in unprecedented responsibility and power being placed in a single man far from the Church's Utah headquarters.
Because of his multiple responsibilities, he has been referred to as "Mr. Everything", or in the words of one Hawaiian man, “the second most powerful man in the Church” (Church President David O. McKay being the single most powerful).

**Early Years**

Edward LaVaun Clissold was known by his business associates as Ed but he was Vaun to his friends. To everyone else he became known as President Clissold. Pres. Clissold was born in Salt Lake City, Utah on 11 Apr 1898. He grew up in Salt Lake City and attended East High School. After high school he received at least some education from the University of Utah. World War I apparently cut short his education as Pres. Clissold served in the Navy along with his brother Albert aboard the battleship USS Arkansas in the Atlantic. Returning from the Navy at age 22, he married Irene Picknell.

**The Die Is Cast**

While still barely a newlywed, he made a monumental decision that would affect the rest of his life. At age 23, a war veteran, a husband and soon to be father, he chose to serve a mission in a time when only a few served missions. For 37 months (1921-24) he served as a missionary in Hawaii. When he returned home to his wife in Salt Lake City in 1924, he met a two-and-a-half year old daughter he had never seen before.

As a brand new missionary, he sailed for Hawaii on the S.S. Manoa alone. When he arrived in Honolulu a week later on 27 Jul 1921, there was no one to meet him. He sat alone with his trunk on the dock not knowing what he should do next. A baggage man approached him, asking if he were a Mormon Missionary. He replied yes and asked how he knew. The man replied "Well, we have a forlorn-looking group come in here every once in awhile. I take their baggage up to the mission home." And so the baggage man took Elder Clissold to the mission home.

His mission president was E. Wesley Smith, the son of Joseph F. Smith. Elder Clissold was assigned to the Oahu Conference (zone) and two months later to Laie where he would serve from August to November of 1921. In Laie, of course, was the Temple, which was less than two years old. At that time, most temple workers were missionaries, so Elder Clissold soon became acquainted with the temple as well as temple President William Waddoups, who would be instrumental in his life. This service instilled in him a lasting love for temple work.

He left on November 15, 1921 for Kona (Big Island) where he would spend the next 13 months. Kona had the reputation of being the most primitive area of the mission, and his assignment was seen by some as a banishment. But he did not view it as such. He had the desire to learn the Hawaiian language and Kona was the place for that. His senior companion insisted on using only Hawaiian in all their conversation, which quickly caused frustration for Elder Clissold who remarked that he could have resorted to violence against his companion, Elder Roscoe Cox. But he persevered and later appreciated his companion. It should be noted that Elder Clissold was impressed by Elder
Cox's love for the Gospel. When he was set apart as a missionary by Melvin Ballard, he was promised that the food would be palatable and the language would be given him as a gift. In Kona these blessings came true, though not without the requisite effort first.

Elder Ballard's promise dramatically came to pass in April of 1922. One day at the home of a member in Holualoa, while Elder Cox was conversing in Hawaiian with an elderly lady, Elder Clissold suddenly became conscious of Elder Cox's speech and clearly understood what was said. He seemed to feel a buzz in his ear at that moment and to his great elation realized that he was hearing and understanding everything Elder Cox said. From that day on, he completely understood all that was said in Hawaiian, and his speaking fluency greatly increased. Elders Cox and Clissold soon found themselves at a missionary conference in Honolulu. Elder Clissold was unexpectedly asked to speak and as he approached the podium, he was instructed to speak in Hawaiian. Nervous as he contemplated his task, he nevertheless delivered a fine talk in the Hawaiian language. The result of this was that he had an assurance of his language skill and never again felt inadequate about his language ability.

Elder Clissold spent the remainder of his mission in the Honolulu area, serving in leadership positions for the Sunday Schools, as was often the practice for missionaries in those days. In these experiences he learned leadership skills.

A summation of his missionary experience might be made from his own words: "A Hawaiian from Kalaoa (Kona) was assigned to me as a companion for a short period. He had a slight disfigurement in his face and unruly hair, the combination of which would have denied him any prize in a beauty show. But if a picture could have been taken of his spirit, it would have taken a blue ribbon. We slept together on the floor, on the ground, and on rough lauhala mats. Oft times I would look at his face as he slept and to me looking through the outward to the inward, he was beautiful." (Clissold, 1982, p.40)

**Connections, Preparation & Experience**

The years following his mission saw Pres. Clissold establishing himself in business and the community, as well as in the Church, which prepared him for his great leadership in the 1950s.

Pres. Clissold returned to Salt Lake City in 1924 following his mission. William Waddoups, the Hawaii Temple President, was also home from his mission and was involved with American Savings in Salt Lake City. Brother Waddoups persuaded Pres. Clissold to work for the company. American Savings wanted to open a branch in Honolulu and Pres. Clissold was offered the job of running the Honolulu Branch. At the same time, Pres. Clissold was offered the position of sales manager at a Salt Lake auto dealership. Upon the counsel of his mother-in-law, Pres. Clissold & Irene decided to go to Hawaii for a year or so, in order that they may both experience Hawaii together.

Pres. Clissold arrived in Hawaii in January 1925, with Irene following a few months later. However, he was soon uncomfortable with American Savings' overpriced business
practices. In August of 1926 he moved to State Savings and remained there until 1970. During those 44 years, his stature in business and wealth increased. He did quite well, so much so that members in later years thought of him as a tycoon and remember him driving his Cadillac convertible. But there is no indication that his wealth distracted him from his gospel priorities or led him to pride. Other business activities include his establishment of Home Factors, Kahili Investment, and partnership with Wendell Mendenhall in livestock investments in New Zealand.

His business activities brought him important connections with community and business leaders. These associations would prove very beneficial to the Church in later years as Pres. Clissold would call on them for their assistance in advancing the causes of the Church. Examples include obtaining land free of charge from Harold Castle for the Kailua Chapel site. Others are the establishment of the concrete plant in Laie by Henry Kaiser and the Cackle Fresh Egg farm, which Pres. Clissold had solicited in order to generate a broader economic base in Laie.

During the 20s and 30s, he was involved with the Lions Club in addition to his other responsibilities, becoming the president at age 33 and District President at age 42. Associated with his business activities at the time was his desire to learn to speak Japanese. He had observed that approximately half of Hawaii's population at the time was first and second generation Japanese. He thought it made good business sense to learn their language and hired a tutor to teach him the language from 1926-34. His Japanese apparently was not as good as his Hawaiian, as Japanese speakers remember his Japanese skills were less than that of a native speaker. However, the fact that a Haole businessman could speak both Hawaiian and Japanese was most unusual, and earned him respect from the speakers of these languages. Additionally, the Clissold children attended the Makiki Japanese School from 1934 to 1936.

Pres. Clissold resumed his association with Navy in 1936 by joining the Navy reserve as a Lieutenant. He soon went on a shakedown cruise to the South Pacific on the destroyer USS Maori, DD-401. He could not have realized then how significantly his life would be affected only five years later.

The Church of the early 1920's was still essentially all-Hawaiian. Some leadership was given to branch members, but many responsibilities for the general membership rested with the full-time missionaries, as was the practice for most areas outside of Utah. By the time the Clissolds moved to Honolulu, this was beginning to change. The Honolulu of 1925 was still under the leadership of the mission president, but President Neff was beginning to place more responsibilities on members. Pres. Clissold soon found himself as the President of the Mission MIA. His responsibilities and experience quickly grew.

Ten years after he moved to Honolulu, the Oahu Stake was created, and Pres. Clissold was called as 1st counselor to Stake President Ralph Woolley. Many thought that Pres. Clissold should have been the President, particularly in light of the fact that Pres. Woolley had not been particularly active or committed to the Church prior to this calling, although he was quite prominent in the community. It is to Pres. Clissold's credit that he
knew his place as a counselor, and faithfully served President Woolley for nine years. Pres. Woolley was good at policy while Pres. Clissold was good at details, so their relationship was complimentary.

The period of the mid to late 1930s saw an extensive effort to bring the Gospel to the Japanese in Hawaii and making those Japanese Latter-Day Saints feel comfortable. At this time there were two missions working the same geographical area: the Hawaiian Mission and the Japanese Mission (which was renamed the Central Pacific Mission during World War II). Pres. Clissold played a great part in this work for both missions, but his modesty makes it difficult to determine how much of a part he had in this work.

In 1936, Pres. Clissold became the Hawaii Temple President, following the departure of President William Waddoups. This responsibility was in addition to his Stake Presidency calling. He felt inadequate in this new calling, a feeling that became a nagging fear. One afternoon as he was walking through the celestial room, he had the feeling that he was Brother Waddoups; he felt like him, and walked like him. As he sat in a chair, the thought entered his mind that if he could detach himself from his body and look back at it, he would see Brother Waddoups sitting there. That feeling satisfied Pres. Clissold that the mantle of President had passed from Brother Waddoups to himself, and he no longer had any feeling of inadequacy. He served as the president until 1938.

War

The first Japanese bombs of December 7th fell at 07:55, and at 08:15. Pres. Clissold received a call to active duty. For the next few years he performed all of his Church duties while in Navy uniform. The Navy assignment for the 43-year-old Lieutenant Commander was in the Radio Cablegram Censorship of the Pearl Harbor Communications Department. His assignment was not terribly inconvenient, and it allowed him to continue his Church responsibilities. However, he did have to set aside his business responsibilities for the duration.

1942 found him serving as the Hawaii Temple President again due to the departure of the former president and the lack of replacements to serve because of the war. However, the temple was seldom open during that time. At the same time, he became the acting president of the Japanese Mission. It was during this time that the mission name was changed to the Central Pacific Mission.

In 1943 the war finally carried him away from Hawaii as he was sent to the Mainland, first to Charlottesville, Virginia and then to the University of Chicago, to teach the US occupational forces who were preparing for post-war Japan. He received a release from his multitude of church callings in 1944. His military service overseas saw him participating in the military government in Philippines, Okinawa and Japan. While in Japan, he surveyed the situation in anticipation for reopening missionary work there. He finally returned home to Hawaii in 1946.
With only 2 years of respite, Pres. Clissold was then called to Japan as the Japanese Mission President during 1948-49. He reopened the mission which had been closed since 1924. The work of that time can occupy a book in its own right and is not the subject for this paper. Suffice it to say, he firmly established the foundation for the Gospel in Japan. He is also credited for "miraculously" acquiring property for the mission headquarters, which property is today occupied by the Tokyo Temple.

**Maturity and Responsibility**

The year 1950 found Pres. Clissold finally released from multiple years of overseas assignments for both Church and nation. He had been away from his business for quite some time and felt the need to resume his career. But his Church career was just beginning; the next decade and a half would see the Church in Hawaii indelibly marked by his contributions in multiple and simultaneous callings.

The first assignment of the new decade found him as mission president. During his tenure, he merged the two co-located missions, the Hawaii Mission and the Central Pacific Mission into the single Hawaiian Mission. He was released the following year, 1951.

Next came his single most influential calling, Oahu Stake President, which he fulfilled from 1951 until 1963. He had served as Ralph Woolley's counselor in the stake presidency, and now became his successor. Among his first actions, and controversies, was to follow the order of the church regarding which ward members should attend. Up until that time, most of the Haole people attended the Waikiki Ward regardless of where they lived on the island. Many had only recently moved to the island and were employed in Honolulu but lived in diverse locations. Most enjoyed the Sunday association with others of similar circumstances which meant meeting at the Waikiki Ward (that chapel still stands today on South King St. at Artesian St. in Moiliili.) Soon after becoming the stake president, President Clissold directed that all members should attend the ward in which they lived. There was some annoyance at this, but eventually most members abided by the instruction.

At the same time Pres. Clissold became president of Oahu Stake, David O. McKay became president of the Church. Years earlier, during a visit to Laie in 1921, Pres. McKay experienced a vision in which he saw a college established in Laie. No sooner than he became president of the church, he began energizing the effort to establish the school. His point of contact in Hawaii became President Clissold, and soon, Pres. Clissold found himself having the responsibility of bringing Pres. McKay's vision to reality. Although responsibility for the establishment of the school was shared by many, Pres. Clissold was chairman of the Continuing Committee which was leading the effort. In this position, Pres. Clissold soon found himself in an awkward situation: the order of the Church instructed that Pres. Clissold report problems and progress up the chain of command, passing through various individuals before being brought to the attention of the President of the Church. However, Pres. McKay had personally telephoned Pres. Clissold numerous times and gave instructions that Pres. Clissold call him personally to
report on the school's progress. This provided Pres. Clissold a little consternation as to what he should do: obey the order of the Church or the instructions of the prophet. Personal challenges aside, the school was opened in 1955 in temporary facilities after a great deal of preparatory activity.

In addition to being on the committee for the Church College, he was also a member and then the 1st Chairman of the Pacific Board of Education which oversaw all Church schools in the Pacific. Church commercial properties in Hawaii were managed by Zions Securities which was the successor of the old Laie Plantation. Pres. Clissold became the manager and then chairman of Zions Securities during the years 1953 to 1970. He stirred controversy with this position. Until that time, Laie residents were leased the land under their homes from Zions for little or no money. Pres. Clissold thought it better that they take more responsibility for themselves and their community by having them pay for the services they received via increased lease rents. He did have at least one secular "calling" during this time, that of membership on the Hawaiian Homes Commission from 1954 to 1958.

Simultaneous with these activities, he was also laying out the foundation of what would become the Polynesian Cultural Center (PCC). While President McKay had the vision of a school in Laie, Pres. Clissold had a vision of the PCC as early as 1951. This vision followed the success of the Laie Ward's fund raising hukilau and Maori cultural activities in Laie during the 40’s and 50’s. Realizing the need for students to find employment near the Laie campus, as well as sensing a good business opportunity, Pres. Clissold acted to establish the PCC. He faced many skeptics in this venture from within and without the Church, but by 1963 the PCC was operational. Pres. Clissold was a vice-president and served in various management positions, including director, until ceasing all association with the center in 1976.

Upon his release as the Oahu Stake President in 1962, Pres. Clissold was soon called, for the third time, as the Hawaii Temple President. During his tenure, which lasted until 1965, he oversaw the translation and recording of the temple ceremony onto audio tape for the Japanese Saints who were beginning to seek out their temple blessings at the Hawaii Temple. Pres. Clissold noted with satisfaction that this recording process took just a few days, when compared to the several weeks it took for the similar process in the European temples.

It is very difficult to express in the limited time allotted here the tremendous work he accomplished for the Church in Hawaii in the 1950s. Much of it was done quietly behind the scenes. He exercised his leadership responsibilities while capitalizing on his business and personal associations to build the Kingdom. The acquisition and expansion of physical facilities of the Church, alone, could easily inspire an entire book. His spiritual leadership and testimony are, as would be expected, not well documented. But suffice to say, some have said that he should have or would have become a General Authority, except that the Lord needed him too much in Hawaii to allow him to be taken away to Utah.
"Therefore, What?"

Elder Dallin Oaks posed the question "therefore, what?" during his address to the Church in the October 1997 general conference regarding 1997's celebration of pioneers. His intent in this was to question how we might grow from the examination and celebration of the pioneer experience. I believe that Pres. Clissold's life and personal attributes are worthy of the inspection envisioned by Elder Oaks.

Pres. Clissold's personality has been described by himself and numerous others. Adjectives include: quiet, humble, private, self-effacing, with a tendency to detail. He held an unprecedented number of callings and responsibilities, simultaneously mind you, which gave him unprecedented power. Yet there is no intimation that he ever used any position for his own gain. He pushed his counselors and subordinates to the center of attention, giving them credit for accomplishments. He was pleasant and made friends of everyone he met, even though he was not by nature outgoing. One example of his nature comes from Ed Ludloff, who, as a young seaman newly assigned to Pres. Clissold's Naval Reserve unit, was greeted by Commander Clissold by an arm around his shoulder and an expression that he was glad to have Seaman Ludloff in his unit. This personal and warm greeting is a practice which is very uncommon among Naval Officers, then or now. Some members of the stake thought of him in terms as either "just" the stake president, or as a tycoon. Given his private nature, and if the members did not have the opportunity to interact with him on a one-on-one basis, this superficial impression is understandable.

His impressive list of accomplishments makes one ask, How did he do it? He was very organized; he looked after details. He delegated responsibilities. Of course, he was constantly on the go, and had no time to fool around, which required self-discipline to stay with the task at hand without diverging to tangent issues. Amazingly, he was always home for dinner. And his wife often accompanied him on his journeys throughout the island and mission. As previously mentioned, he was trilingual, which earned the respect of those whose language he spoke. He was interested in other people, their culture, and how they lived. As Mission President, he would spend hours with new missionaries trying to make them see the different cultures, economic levels, the ways of life and how different people react to situations. Pres. Clissold successfully wore many hats. Wherever he served, those around him had the impression that when he was with them, they and their task at hand were the only things in his life.

An examination of his life would be incomplete without asking why he did what he did. The answer, I believe, is simple: his testimony. He loved The Lord, His Gospel and Church. Pres. Clissold was converted and committed in all respects. The key turn at the crossroads was when he submitted his papers to serve a mission.

Reflections About Hawaii

After six decades in Hawaii, Pres. Clissold had the opportunity to reflect on these islands during a 1982 interview. Here are some of his observations. Up to 1920, the Church was an all-Hawaiian church. The period 1920-50 started bringing in other nationalities: in
1938 the work formally began amongst the Japanese in Hawaii; World War II brought Mainland LDS servicemen who settled in Hawaii after the war. By the early 1960s, the Church in Hawaii reflected Hawaii's population. He was dismayed about the urbanization of Waikiki, and wondered that if he could make the tall buildings in Waikiki go away with the flick of a wrist, if he would not do it. He did miss the sleepy tropical Waikiki of 1921. A positive aspect was the increased affluence that allowed individuals the "opportunity to feel and experience the power of money, to get an education and to see and feel the pulse of the world". However, many had lost much in the quality of life due to the ever increasing costs associated with living in Hawaii. Lastly, he missed the old Polynesians, and the opportunity to just sit and speak in Hawaiian with the old timers about the old days. (Baldridge, 1982)

Conclusion

Edward LaVaun Clissold lived an abundant and service-filled life. He no doubt made many important decisions that affected his Christian discipleship throughout his life. In my assessment, however, one crucial decision early in his adult life made all the difference: to temporarily leave his family and serve a mission. From this, all his future blessings and opportunities followed.
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Isaac Fox, My Great-Grandfather:
A Three-Time Missionary to the Hawaiian Saints

by Melanie Fox Harris

My purpose today is to introduce my great-grandfather, Isaac Fox, to you as an example of missionary work in Laie during the 1880’s and commend us all to follow his example of journal writing. Isaac was born one year after his parents and other siblings of age joined the church in Leeds, Yorkshire, England. The date was 17 May 1849. He served two missions to Hawaii in the 1880’s and another mission to Iosepa in Skull Valley, Utah in 1895. There is much more to this story, but first I would like to share the story about the path that led me to him.

In 1961 as I was completing high school I wanted to apply to a college for further education. Though I was raised in Salt Lake City, Utah, I didn’t want to go to the University of Utah because it was too pagan. I didn’t want to go to BYU Provo because it was too big. I didn’t want to go to Ricks College because it was too much “Idaho.” But then I heard there was a Church College in Hawaii and knew it was just “right.” Small enough, church enough, and far enough away from home. My roommates were from all over the world—Hawaii, Samoa, Tonga, New Zealand, Asia, United States, etc. I count them as my friends even today. My eyes opened to the varied cultures of the world and I went home after that year determined to earn a degree in English and return to the islands to teach. However, I took a detour in that quest because I met Carl Harris, a returned missionary from Samoa, at the University of Utah and we married in 1964. In 1968 Carl was offered three different opportunities, Ph.D. work at Cornell or Illinois or teach psychology at the Church College of Hawaii. Using prayer and fasting, we felt prompted to accept the CCH opportunity and that has made all the difference based on other things that have happened in our lives.

During our time at CCH raising our young family, Jerry Loveland mentioned to me that my great-grandfather, Isaac Fox, was an important missionary to Laie in the 1880’s and had a lot to do with establishing the Laie Band and had a marvelous journal. I was surprised because my parents had never mentioned anything about him. All I knew was that they would go to Iosepa on Memorial Days now and then with my Dad’s brothers and sisters, but they never took us children with them. When we left Hawaii and returned to Utah, I went to the Salt Lake City Archives of the Church and read for two hours in his journal and wept with the saga of his life—losing wives and children in childbirth, going on missions while trying to farm a piece of land to make a livelihood, and being willing to answer yet another call to go on a mission. At the time they would not allow me to make a copy of this journal.

Fast forward now to 2006, when Carl and I were able to be service volunteers at BYU-Hawaii where I met Matt Kester, the Archivist who was preparing a presentation on the
early days in Laie for the 2006 Mormon Pacific Historical Society Conference. I asked if he knew my great-grandfather, Isaac Fox. “Yes,” he replied, “and I have his journal in the archives.” Of course, I was thrilled and asked how I could get a copy. “I’ll make you one.” In reply I asked what I could do to express my appreciation for something that was so special for me. “You could index it if you would like to.” So for the next two months, I worked diligently to accomplish the task. The whole process was thrilling to me because I didn’t know this man at all and felt so thrilled to discover each new detail.

One of the first steps in indexing is to read through the journal and highlight names, places, and events. As I began this process, my brother came to visit us in Hawaii and the first place I took him was to the Pali. We went on a day when the wind was blowing fiercely. Here is my brother, 6’4,” 200+ pounds, with his 60’s ponytail blowing behind as he faces into the wind. We look over the edge of the railing and see this tiny little road cut into the rock wall and marvel that anybody would ever go over that in such a wind. The very next day as I continued my indexing work, I read the following passage and ran to share it with my brother.

Honolulu is on the Island of Oahu. We left Honolulu this morning to go to Laie. We went on horseback and we went over a mountain called pollie (Pali) and we gradually ascended until finally we find ourselves on the top of the pass and the sight is grand. Hundreds of feet down a perpendicular wall of rock, you see the beautiful fields—rice and cane and all kind of trees—and the road to go down is cut in the solid rock and it appears almost impossible to get down. And I never felt a more heavy wind—Chinese with the loads had to lay right down to save themselves from being blown off the dugway. Brother Young’s children was (were) lifted from the ground. After arriving at Laie the natives came with wreaths of flowers and put them around our necks and sang for us.

(Entry from Isaac Fox’s Journal #1, May 14, 1883, page 4. Edited for punctuation and spelling)

After reading, my brother got this sweet look on his face and we had this nice little bond of turning hearts to each other and turning us to our fathers. I thought—“There is one really good reason for keeping a record.”

It also made me curious to know more about my great-grandfather’s life before and after his mission. I know from my grandfather’s journal that Isaac’s family was baptized into the church in Sheffield, England in 1848, a year prior to Isaac’s birth. In 1860 when Isaac was 11, his family emigrates from England to America. They stay a few days in New York then travel to Winter Quarters where the family stays while his father goes to Florence, Nebraska to buy a wagon and oxen and supplies to cross the plains. On the
plains Isaac entertains the company with his songs. Again from my grandfather John’s journal I learned that in later years, George Q. Cannon asks Isaac if he was the young man who sang across the plains. They arrive in Salt Lake in time for October conference and then head to Lehi to begin their life among the saints in America.

The following information and pictures are supplied by Russell Felt, a great-grandson of Isaac and Lucy Hartley living in Lehi, Utah. I found Russell as I continued to ask questions at a Fox family reunion—another marker on this path to learn about Isaac Fox.

Isaac marries his first wife, Christiana Gaddie, 22 September 1876. She dies in childbirth a year later. In 1881 he marries Elizabeth Zimmerman, my great-grandmother. They were blest to have a first son in 1882. When Isaac receives his first mission call to the Sandwich Islands, their son is 11 months old and Elizabeth is pregnant with my grandfather, John, which I didn’t recognize until much later into the indexing process. While on his mission Isaac is frantic to receive mail from home and his journal mentions awaiting the mail and being so disappointed when the letters do not come. Later I could understand his concern. He doesn’t want to lose another wife in childbirth and is anxious for a letter to reassure him that everything is all right. Fortunately, the birth takes place safely for both mom and babe—a joyous letter, indeed.

After this mission, Isaac returns home to Lehi, Utah in 1886 to greet his beloved wife and son, Isaac Jr, three years old and John now two years old. Their reunion is sweet and they begin once again to gather materials so they can build their own house. By December, 1886, a third son is born, Clyde Samuel. Three years later in 1889, Isaac is called again to the Sandwich Islands. This time he leaves Elizabeth with three little boys to care for so she goes to live with her parents again. Both sides of the family are very proud that Isaac can serve a mission and do all they can to support this effort. When he returns from this mission, they are able to have one more child, Libbie, but Elizabeth dies...
a week later due to complications from the birth. Isaac feels that he can’t care for a small baby and still provide for the family, so he sends baby Libbie to be raised by Elizabeth’s cousin and her husband while he and John and Clyde go to live with Grandmother Fox. His oldest son, Isaac Jr., goes to live with the Zimmerman’s to help them with the chores and yard work. After three years, he is called on a mission to help the Hawaiians settle in Utah so they could be close to a temple. So he marries Lucy Hartley and immediately goes to Iosepa taking his three boys and new wife to begin his third mission. Isaac and Lucy go on to have four more children of their own. My grandfather, John, as one of the children being raised by Lucy remembers the great love that she showed to all the children of Isaac and he, personally, was grateful for her generous spirit.

Now back to the process of indexing Isaac’s journal. After I read through the two journals underlining names, places and events I set up a table to note the various categories and list the page numbers. With each of these examples I have only included the first page of a larger document. As I continued with this process, I also felt a timeline of Isaac’s mission would be helpful so I began one of those. See Appendix A and B.

Isaac spends one week in Laie, then begins a mission tour of Kauai which is a real challenge. He goes alone on the boat, is seasick, and can’t speak Hawaiian. The missionary that is to meet him, does not. A Hawaiian family notices his plight and invites him into their hale. He tries to make them understand that he needs to find Elder Gardner, that he is seasick and can’t eat. It is very disheartening for him. After several days of going from place to place, he finds Elder Gardner and they go to various villages convening meetings and trying to build up the gospel in the lives of the people. This takes about 2 ½ months and then they return to Oahu. For another 2 ½ months he works on the plantation, wrestling cattle, repairing fences, making mortar for the chapel, etc.
One of the big things for which they prepare is the dedication of the new chapel and a visit from King David Kalakaua. This is what he writes.

...We expect the King will be at our conference on the sixth of October and we are making great preparations for him. Tonight I was appointed on a committee with four others to receive the King at the house... Wednesday, October 3. Today I have been decorating gates and preparing for the King...Saturday, October 6, This morning all was (were) up by daylight stirring around. At eight-thirty o’clock the King’s vessel was in sight. At nine-thirty the procession began to form. Brother Marchant was appointed pilot. Brother Reed received the King on the shore with a speech. Twenty-four horse

men under the supervision of H A. Woolley was to escort him from the beach to the house. The Relief Societies and Mutuals was (were) formed in two lines one on either side of the road by Brother Gardner. The Sunday Schools was (were) formed into line in the front of the house by Brother Pack. The Kahana choir met him also on the Beach. The Laie choir was at the house. The king landed at ten forty and after the reception on the beach came on horseback through the two lines of people and under arches beautifully decorated and the people cheering him as he past and the church bell tolling as the marched along. The distance from the beach to the house is a mile. President Partridge and wife, brother, and Young and others—myself also was appointed to receive him at the house. When he came to the door the President was introduced to him then President introduced us to him, and I had the honor of shaking hands with him.
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After changing his clothes he took lunch then went to meeting and as the King entered the house the people all raise to their feet and the choir sang a hymn the composed for him. After singing, prayer and singing, the dedication prayer was given by the President. Then the King spoke, and he spoke well. Was pleased with the reception. Told the people to stick to the church and hearken to the counsel of the Elders. The choir sang. A short speech by Mr. Cummings, the King’s friend. Song. Remarks by the President. Hymn. Benediction by Brother Reed. The King and party and the elders went to the old meeting house to the feast which was native in style. All sat on the floor and ate with our fingers. After dinner all the people escorted the King to the beach. We all shook hands with and bid him goodbye. When he got in the boat he stood up, took off is hat and gave three cheers. The natives gave him two pigs, a barrel of poi and a lot of bananas. The King was very free. He is a fine looking man.

Entry from Isaac Fox’s Journal #1
September 29, 1883, pages 30-33

Then Isaac is assigned to do a mission tour of the Big Island of Hawaii with Elder George Cluff which lasts another 2 ½ months. Again they travel from place to place encouraging the people to live the gospel and to have their meetings. They also check out the working of sugar mills as they traveled in order to use the information when they return to Laie to get sugar production started again.
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Isaac returns to Laie in December 1883 and repairs a water flume for the mill, fights off the fleas which are terrific, and uses his musical talents to plan a Christmas program, organize a choir, and sing a comic duet with Sister Young.

Back to the indexing now. I noticed themes which represented the work that Isaac did, the variety of talents and skills he developed, and his priesthood work. Consequently, I developed another table where these themes were emphasized as well as an Interesting Stories category. Again, this is just the first page of each index. (See Appendix C and D.)
Now back to Isaac. His mission continues with much hard work in the sugar mill in Laie—fixing boilers, repairing centrifugals, sacking the dried sugar, shipping the sugar, and planting more cane for the next year. He alternates this work with the work of the plantation—driving cattle to be slaughtered, meeting with the butcher, branding calves, gathering the work oxen, retrieving strays, shoeing a horse, skinning a cow, and a phrase he uses frequently, “out among the stock learning as much about them as I can.” He spends the first year of his mission laboring very hard, trying to learn Hawaiian, missing his family keenly, and having numerous opportunities for baptizing and rebaptizing the saints. He is anxious to be given more priesthood responsibility but because he is weak in speaking Hawaiian when April Conference business is read and assignments are given out for the next six months here is what he heard: “W. G. Farrell to teach school at Laie and Isaac Fox to take care of the stock.” He records: “Brother Brim spoke for the first time in native and occupied about one minute. Then I was called up and spoke in native but did not occupy one minute which made me feel very bad.” (Journal, 1, p.86.)

However, by the 3rd year in the mission, he is speaking enough Hawaiian to take charge of meetings, give a speech and, consequently is no longer in charge of the stock. He is instead leading the Laie choir, playing his fiddle, repairing the organ, teaching band, buying instruments, writing choir lessons and music for the band. He is appointed President of the Oahu conference and given authority to extend callings in the work.

One of the things that pleases me most about being able to index Isaac’s journal is to note his increased involvement with the Hawaiian saints in the missionary work. He learns who they are and what they can do. He tries to spell their names. He writes of the great faith of the Hawaiian elders who are helping on Oahu. “A native by the name of Kekuewa has just come from Laie to help us with our meeting tomorrow. He walked all the way a distance of 20 miles.” … “I learned the president of the mission, by President Smith’s suggestion, called two natives to assist me in the ministry. Their names are Kealaka’ihonua and J. L. Kanikapu.” (Journal 2, p. 72-73.)
In conclusion I would like to say that as I have made preparations for this presentation, it has been very satisfying to revisit the indexing I did last year and look at the various types of writing that Isaac used in his journals. So, of course, I had to create another table to represent what I found. (See Appendix E.)

This process is giving me an idea of how I can spread the spirit of Elijah to our family when we have a family reunion. For instance I can pick one of my charts and ask, “What do you want to hear from great-grandpa’s journal? Do you want to hear something funny.” I can go right down to my humor category which I will continue to build, and pull out a story. Or how about the Low Days? “Do you think everything was good for great-grandpa. No, do you realize on Christmas Eve everyone left and went to Honolulu and no one was left but him to take care of the stock all by himself? He felt so bad. And not long after they all got a “setting up” by President Smith. But then there were the High Days to be able to sit at the feet of President Smith as he gave powerful sermons.”

I would like to bear you my witness even though this is not a testimony meeting that this good man and all good men and women in the church who are willing to have faith, to sacrifice and be led by the Spirit are blessed with good lives. Even if you lose your family—your children, husbands or wives, He provides other ways for you to serve and care. I have seen this in my own life and have seen it in the life of my great-grandfather, Issac Fox, and bear you this witness in the name of Jesus Christ, Amen.

APPENDIX A: EXAMPLE OF INDEX
First page of Index – Isaac Fox Journal #1 from May 1, 1883-Dec 18, 1884
Indexing completed by Melanie Fox Harris, a great-granddaughter of Isaac Fox
(while serving as a volunteer at BYUH Jan 2006-July2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administer</th>
<th>129,139</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allred, Sanford</td>
<td>97,98,100,104,105,108,110,111,132,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anapai</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apela (native)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashton, Jos.</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awa</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker, W. O.</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptize</td>
<td>13,19, 21,23,30,55,120,136,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>birthday</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonepart</td>
<td>40,41,44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brim, A.A.</td>
<td>1,3,27,65,67,70,71,72,76,77,84,85,86,88,89,91,92,96,100,119,122,126,132,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell, Mrs.</td>
<td>117,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canoe</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captain Cook</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caves</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choir</td>
<td>30,32,33,82,84,122,131,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluff, George</td>
<td>27,28,34,35,36,37,38,39,41,42,43,44,47,48,49,50,51,53,55,56,58,59,62,63,64,77,85,86,91,92,94,97,98,100,119,120,121,122,123,124,134,135,138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coles</td>
<td>9,11,26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concert</td>
<td>84,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference</td>
<td>33,84,120,123,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culler, Bishop</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumings</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donated</td>
<td>21,25,45,63,85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eclipse</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farr, Enoch, Jr.</td>
<td>135, 136,138,146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleas</td>
<td>47,48,65,66,69,70,71,77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food - feast</td>
<td>4,7,8,9,10,15,16,17,22,24,32,33,37,38,40,41,42,44,45,47,50,53,54,62,66,73,80,81,87,88,100,104,108,109,111,115,118,119,120,126,129,130,131,132,133,135,141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox, A.M. (brother)</td>
<td>101,102,139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox, Elizabeth Z.</td>
<td>30,45,67,68,75,80,81,88,101,105,112,126,129,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(wife)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox, George (brother)</td>
<td>45,81,127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox, Isaac Wilson</td>
<td>45,76,111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(father)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox, Mary Ann (mother)</td>
<td>112,139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox, Robert (brother)</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaddie, Mrs.</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Games/Celebration</td>
<td>108 (24th of July),114,115,119,120,126,128,137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardner, Jas. H.</td>
<td>6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 21,22,23,24,25,26,27,32,34,67,74,81,85,86,89,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Gates</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haena</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halikikai</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanamaulu</td>
<td>11, 18,22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanapepe</td>
<td>9,24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX B: EXAMPLE OF TIMELINE

First page of Isaac Fox Timeline 1839-1934

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29 June 1839</td>
<td>Isaac Wilson Fox and Margaret Ann Slinn marry</td>
<td>Sheffield, England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 children born before Isaac—Charles, Alfred, Martha Ann, Robert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 May 1849</td>
<td>Isaac born</td>
<td>Leeds, Yorkshire, England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 May 1860</td>
<td>Age 11 sails with his mother, father and 5 siblings from</td>
<td>Glasgow to Liverpool, England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sailed on boat William Tapscott</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 May 1860</td>
<td>Arrives in America</td>
<td>Liverpool to New York\</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within days travels by train and boat</td>
<td>Winter Quarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 June 1860</td>
<td>Family stays here</td>
<td>Florence Nebraska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Isaac Wilson, father, goes to buy wagon, oxen and supplies to cross</td>
<td>Crossing plains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>plains</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Isaac sings songs as they cross the plains in a wagon train</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>George Q Cannon asks him later in life if he was the young man who</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sang (John Fox journal item)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Sep 1876</td>
<td>Married Christiana Gaddie- first wife</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877</td>
<td>She and baby die in childbirth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Sept 1881</td>
<td>Married: Elizabeth Zimmerman</td>
<td>Endowment House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Salt Lake City, Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Apr 1882</td>
<td>Birth of first son, Isaac Jr.</td>
<td>Lehi, Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 May 1883</td>
<td>1st Mission</td>
<td>Sandwich Islands (Hawaii)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lehi to Salt Lake – set apart by Wilford Woodruff</td>
<td>Salt Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Travels to meet other missionary companions</td>
<td>Ogden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Travels by train crosses the Sacramento River</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Takes ferry boat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sees Woodward Gardens and Palace Hotel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Takes passage on Steamship Australia- Arrives May 13—went to Mission</td>
<td>Oahu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Home had first poi</td>
<td>Laie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traveled over the Pali to get to Laie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 May 1883</td>
<td>Travels by horse back and boat - tries to meet up with Elder Gardner</td>
<td>from Laie to island of Kauai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stays in Koloa with Apela</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finds Gardner in Makaweli</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Holds meeting at Popii</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Then Hanapepe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wahiawa where met Brother Coals (Kohls?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trip to mountains with guide and Sister Kohls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Koloa Branch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ihulaia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hanamaulu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wailua</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traveling of east side of Island from south to north p.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anapai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Halikikai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX C: EXAMPLE OF TYPES OF WORK

First page of Isaac Fox Types of Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building new house</td>
<td>J2/96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made a ruler</td>
<td>J1/29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortar making for foundation of new meeting house</td>
<td>J1/28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving old houses</td>
<td>J2/94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patching up old house</td>
<td>J2/95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Put up windmill to pump water</td>
<td>J2/95, 106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putting rafters and sheathing on barn</td>
<td>J2/43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putting up fence</td>
<td>J2/28,92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarrying rock for a new house</td>
<td>J2/95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebuilding a kitchen</td>
<td>J2/90,92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shingling shed</td>
<td>J1/65,91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tacking down the carpet in meeting house</td>
<td>J1/29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheeling dirt in wheelbarrow</td>
<td>J1/65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Farm Equipment</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helping survey the rice field</td>
<td>J2/109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making a lasso</td>
<td>J1/91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set a wagon tire</td>
<td>J1/90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveying for Queen’s lot</td>
<td>J2.109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hauling</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Getting load of sand</td>
<td>J1/28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving water flume</td>
<td>J1/89,90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picking up goods from the wharf</td>
<td>J1/89,94,134, J2/23,24,25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traveling to Punaluu for goods</td>
<td>J1/134</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mending- Repairing</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carts</td>
<td>J1/86,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garments</td>
<td>J1/114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mending saddle</td>
<td>J1/138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plow</td>
<td>J1/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reset flag pole</td>
<td>J1/28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saddle</td>
<td>J1/138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water flume</td>
<td>J1/65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Misc Work</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business for Pres, i.e. banking, taking horses, trading</td>
<td>J2/36,49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copying Spaulding Manuscript</td>
<td>J2/48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decorating Gates in preparation for king</td>
<td>J1/31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Store- taking care of</td>
<td>J1/113</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Music

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Band lesson</td>
<td>J2/95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducted singing</td>
<td>J2/20,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directing Laie Choir for conference</td>
<td>J2/87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiddling</td>
<td>J2/21.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New instrument comes</td>
<td>J2/109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organ repair</td>
<td>J1/28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving new music for band</td>
<td>J2/107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sang and played guitar for Pres. Smith</td>
<td>J2,14,18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sing song request of Pres. Smith</td>
<td>J2/26,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singing and playing the organ</td>
<td>J294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taken charge of choir</td>
<td>J2/91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching band</td>
<td>J2/99,108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching girls and boys to sing</td>
<td>J2/108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching native boys a song</td>
<td>J2/11,92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training choir</td>
<td>J2/10,27,73,75,77,80,82,84,108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX D: EXAMPLE OF INTERESTING STORIES
First page of Interesting Stories from Isaac Fox Journal—in chronological order

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First poi</td>
<td>J1/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shark Story Meldrum</td>
<td>J1/27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gathering Wild honey</td>
<td>J1/38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saints living on the Lava</td>
<td>J1/39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonepart – his horse on Hawaii</td>
<td>J1/40,41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dreams of home</td>
<td>J1/42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thought he was going to die</td>
<td>J1/43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife pregnant when he left, with John A. Fox</td>
<td>J1/45 letters on Big Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcome with sadness at not being able to speak language</td>
<td>J1/51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making war with fleas and mosquitoes/2 parts/ dream at bottom</td>
<td>J1/70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processing of sugarcane</td>
<td>J1/73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Election day</td>
<td>J1/78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hula Description</td>
<td>J1/78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gathering ferns and oranges</td>
<td>J1/80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of a wedding</td>
<td>J1/82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of fishing experience</td>
<td>J1/83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointments</td>
<td>J1/86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of Farewell dinner</td>
<td>J1/87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kicked by a mule</td>
<td>J1/88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brother Cluff’s birthday panorama</td>
<td>J1/92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First year thoughts</td>
<td>J1/93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bringing the beef</td>
<td>J1/93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34th Birthday and lame arm</td>
<td>J1/96, J2/43-44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shipping sugar</td>
<td>J1/98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catching the cow with Tilby</td>
<td>J1/106-107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horses in the pasture</td>
<td>J1/108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Letter Day, Oct 12</td>
<td>J1/126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accidents</td>
<td>J1/101,105,113,116, J2/22,90,91,97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photos of his family</td>
<td>J1/133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lady at the steamboat</td>
<td>J1/135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting sugar to wharf</td>
<td>J1/138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descriptions</td>
<td>Over the Pali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Events</td>
<td>First Poi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning language issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Going to Kauai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hawaiians involved in missionary work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Events</td>
<td>Types of Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Reflections</td>
<td>First year, Homesick- letters, Food Hawaiian Band</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Events</td>
<td>King Kalakaua visit to Laie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Queen Emma funeral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Queen Kapiolani visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joseph F. Smith coming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humor</td>
<td>Mail and tricks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactions</td>
<td>Missionary companions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Farr, Tilby, Brim, Cluff, Davis, President Joseph F. Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Days</td>
<td>--First letters from wife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>--Announcing birth of son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>--(My grandfather)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>--Pres Smith Sermon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Days</td>
<td>--On Christmas Eve all leave for Honolulu except Isaac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>--“Setting up” to all missionaries by Pres. Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>--Not being able to speak language</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A Leavening Effect in the Pacific
by Paul Alfred Pratte

Background

My colleague, Clark T. Thorstenson, claims that the article on the front page of BYU Provo’s Daily Universe with a picture of a Caucasian man and African American woman was the first time that he had ever seen such a story concerning intercultural marriage in the student newspaper. “In my day, I remember being counseled that such relationships were not in the best interests of young people getting married because there was a greater chance that such a union would contribute to intercultural conflict and their children not be fully accepted in the community,” said Thorstenson, a retired professor in the BYU-Provo College of Health and Human Performance and former LDS Mission president from 1987-90.

Nearly one quarter century after he received such counsel, however, Thorstenson and millions of other students, parents and others have seen a mighty sea change in attitudes and approach, or been witnesses in the mass media to the great promises as well as perils of intermarriage. Statistics indicate that the success rate of such marriages in the general public is not necessarily better or worse than those of the same race or culture. But for intercultural marriages in Hawaii, the success rate is much higher in a state that has one of the highest non-white population in the U.S. Further, in the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, the chances for staying in the marriage for the long haul may be even better if couples are married in a temple for time and all eternity.

In contrast to the post World War I and II eras, “mixed marriages” today now have an added divine dimension of diversity not evident in other religions and faiths. As the headline in the Provo campus paper exclaimed about the marriage of the African American and Caucasian couple: “Interracial couple sees marriage as strengthening Zion.”

Michael Buxton of the BYU-Provo counseling department said that intercultural marriages reflect the “subtle paradoxes” that surround the doctrine of marriage for time only, eternal marriage, as well as free agency, which allows partners to make those decisions and face the consequences. Rather than look at what some have construed as absurdities, contradictions, inconsistencies and ironies surrounding these principles, Buxton said my historical research shows the importance of the need to examine how to manage the issues of race, romance, religion, culture, prejudice, and how LDS Church leaders at various levels have provided members freedom and latitude, first within the seductive paradisiacal island environment of BYU-Hawaii, then in North America, and finally on a global basis.

This historical research further provides reasons why intermarriage has evolved even before the founding of BYU Hawaii to become one of the most noticeable characteristics
of the BYUH campus, and why the campus now serves as a model, not only for successful intermarriage in temples in Hawaii, but throughout the world. It describes how the isolated Pacific islands and a multiracial population required the people to live together in harmony and peace while moving toward greater independence and equality in the establishment of idealistic Zion communities beginning at the family level and expanding through wards and stakes throughout the United States and the world.

Despite charges from others in the U. S. Congress at one time proclaiming that mixed races would lead to a “mongrel population” oral histories, interviews and evidence from scholarly studies reveal how Hawaiians, haoles (Caucasians), Japanese, Chinese, Portuguese and Filipinos met and grew up together, worked, attended school, and church, fell in love, got married, had children, got sick, and died. The faces of the students, like those of the rest of the people in Hawaii, may have been brown or white or black and some of their eyes are slanted and some talked in a pidgin potpourri. But, in most cases both the eyes of the people and their minds were open and in the particular case of the Polynesian culture the hearts of a significant part of the population were open, accepting, giving, and infused with the “Aloha Spirit” and values that served as a life-enhancing influence throughout the Pacific rim.

Donna Brown, who attended what was known as the Church College of Hawaii from 1955-74, described her experience in a state and at a college that was “like no other place she had known.” The people in Hawaii and BYUH were “more open-minded” she observed. Many Mainland students were “blinded” to the various cultures and became part of one campus bonded by a common faith when they came to Hawaii. Students grew accustomed to the fact that people looked different from each other, particularly in The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in Hawaii. “When I shake hands with a person or see a person in church, I don’t automatically identify the person as a Chinese, Japanese, a Tongan, a Samoan or whatever,” Brown said in an interview with Mei Ling Huang in 1986. “He is a brother, or a sister, to me. And I feel we should always treat each other as such. So, I think it’s good that we become blinded to the fact that the people here are different. … in other words, we all begin to look alike. Sometimes, I can’t tell the difference between a Samoan and a Tongan, or a Chinese and a Japanese. To me … everybody blends so well together. And they forget about those things. Sometimes, downtown in Honolulu, there still are those prejudices. But I feel in La’ie, people are not so much that way. There may be a few, but generally, I don’t think people are that way.”

In short, what other kamaainas such as Brown discovered was the indescribable and elusive “Aloha spirit” that has been a factor in promoting the values of acceptance, harmony, Christian love and unity, as well leadership in the Hawaiian community
through its education system. According to George Kanahele, who was described as the spiritual father of the Hawaiian political, economic and musical renaissance in Hawaii, the Aloha spirit helped develop that color blindness by educating the people about Hawaiian values.xxvi

**Purpose of Paper**

This historical account, originally intended to be used, in part, as a chapter in the history of the Hawaii campus of Brigham Young University from 1954-2000, discusses intermarriage (marriage of mixed ethnicities, religions, cultures, races, etc) from 1955 when the Church College of Hawaii was founded until today.

It highlights the daring, faith, commitment, and courage of LDS students, faculty and staff who risked intercultural marriages in the face of opposition from other peers, families, communities, countries and even LDS Church leaders who expressed concern over such marriages for reasons of (1) the unwholesome attitudes against such unions in the United States as well as nations of the Pacific rim where it was equally unpopular for cultural reasons and because of racial prejudice among Polynesians/Asians (2) the fact that mixed marriages would make child raising more difficult when viewed by those of other races, and (3) the concern that intermarriage would contribute to an ongoing “brain drain” as students left their homelands for the United States or other nations and deprived developing countries of economic, political and religious talent and leadership.

**Methodology**

The primary sources for this research-in-progress come from the oral histories compiled by Kenneth Baldridge, William K. Wallace, Greg Gubler, and Matt Kester, as well as my own interviews with students and residents of La’ie and the state of Hawaii. Baldridge, one of the founders of the Mormon Pacific Historical Association, also wrote a 950-page history of the Church College of Hawaii and BYUH (1955-1986). The unpublished manuscript continues to serve as the best single source of interpretive information on the campus.xxvii

In particular, Baldridge has a chapter on “intermarriage” which this writer commends to those who are interested in an issue which has been debated for the first half century of existence of the Hawaii campus, and continues today. Of additional importance in understanding the community and state which has provided information and inspiration about the environment and has served as major catalyst in providing greater acceptance of mixed marriages is an unpublished history of the Polynesian Cultural Center, co-authored by David Hannemann, a former Hawaii Temple president, and R. Lanier (Lanny) Britsch, a former vice president of BYU-Hawaii and BYU-Provo, who wrote the book as part of a service mission for the LDS Church.xxviii Britsch, now a patriarch in the Church, is also the co-author with Terrance F. Olson of *Counseling: A Guide to Helping Others*. It includes a chapter on “Intercultural Marriage.xxix
I also acknowledge Dr. Morris Graham, a private consultant, faculty member at CCH/BYUH, and author of five major studies on intercultural marriage, who helped review early drafts of my intermarriage chapter, as well as other chapters xxx

My primary sources come from interviews I conducted with other administrators, faculty members, staff, and above all, the distinctive students who come to Hawaii from more than 72 countries around the globe to study at BYUH and work at the Polynesian Cultural Center. As members of the BYU-Hawaii Married Students Stake, my wife June and I also have had the chance to live in the married student’s housing complex for 22 months, and get to know intimately more than 100 inter-culturally married couples and their children from around the world and learn first-hand from them. Two of my research assistants had married women from Tahiti and Thailand. I also spoke with seven of the eight presidents of CCH/BYUH about the topic, as well as more than 25 Church leaders, both past and present. I also conducted a survey of more than 100 residents of the La’ie community, identified as being interculturally or interracially married.

The Historical Setting

Lanny Britsch, who was vice president at BYUH from 1986 to 1990, noted that even with an increasing number of intermarriages on campus and throughout the nation, intermarriage is much more than an issue of civil rights alone. Traditionally, interracial marriage was not well accepted in the U.S., and frequently was even more harshly viewed in countries outside the U.S. Intermarriage remains an emotional issue for many people, both inside and outside the Church – particularly because of the increase in divorce. But other factors have helped damage marriages: pre-marital intimacy, infidelity after marriage, inadequate communications and coping skills, failure to agree on divisions of labor and money, power struggles, marital intimacy, drugs, children, family and friends. xxxi

Britsch also cited a number of reasons why mixed marriages occur: some marry out of their own race or culture because they “want to make a statement about social equality or some shared cause. Others marry the first person available in the hope to escape from preexisting problems – unhappy homes, feelings of insecurity and loneliness, revenge or repudiation.” xxxii Some, like in the movie, “Guess Who’s Coming to Dinner?” tumble into love. But the same factors are true in other marriages that are not racially or culturally mixed.

Still others intermarried after they were separated from their own cultural group, and no longer shared the traditions and values of family and friends back home. Often such motivations were tied to the desire for new experiences, for excitement and for the need to be different. Among college students, couples found themselves in a setting where both parties developed new values, similar goals and new tastes. Generally speaking, students in university and college environment were more liberal and accepting of most social anomalies than society in general. “College life can be a safe haven before a life of storms.” xxxiii
R. Wayne Schute, the dean of students from 1972 to 1974 and a former mission president in Samoa, said that concern about intercultural marriages were repeatedly emphasized by local LDS Church leaders in Polynesia and Asia. In a 1984 interview he reported that several stake presidents had made it clear that they “did not want their sons or daughters of Japan to marry other than Japanese.” He discovered that that they were not objecting to Americans only. “The Koreans never wanted their children to marry Chinese or Japanese,” Shute said. “In the 1960s and 1970s that was as great a racial and cultural change for them as it is for them to marry an American,” he said.xxxiv

Schute said that for some the “love of American citizenship” sometimes prevailed over claims of love. There were two levels of concern, he said: One was from Church leaders worried about the intermarriage that seemed to be almost a deliberate desire on the part of many people to marry an American as a step-up status and “a passport to the Mainland.” “That was a bit of a problem for students who wondered: “Does he love me for my citizenship?”

“I think a lot of them were just unable to grasp that, plus the dating practices, of course, between Mainland girls and the Polynesian boys. Neither one was prepared for the other….And some girls would be absolutely startled at this island fellow who was a returned missionary, faithful in the kingdom, at his response to overtures. “I mean, they just simply couldn’t believe that this guy would behave that way. But on the other hand, to the fellow, she was flaunting her sexuality. But to her it was quite a natural process that was her typical, perhaps flirtacious, behavior to a Mainland boy…”xxxv

For hundreds of students, the reason for their interracial marriage was not so involved and complex. The two of them simply fell in love. Among the first of many couples to consider an intercultural marriage was Sione Feinga and Adele French. They first met in Tonga where she was teaching at Liahona High School. Then in 1960, Sione was called to Hawaii on a second building mission.

In the fall of 1961, Adele, a Caucasian from Oroville, California, was hired as faculty member at CCH. When she and Sione announced that they planned to be married when Sione was released from his mission, Adele was told by the chair of the Pacific Board of Education that she would no longer have a job at CCH if she married Sione. Adele was later invited back to teach at CCH in the fall of 1964. She taught just two years. In that time, Sione completed construction of a home in La’ie, which they still live in and where they raised four children. After their temple marriage, Adele was able to stay at home and be a full-time mother.

“We never had any hard feelings about my job termination,” Adele said. “Each of us had fasted and prayed about our decision to marry each other. We each received our own confirmation that this marriage was approved by the Lord. Since then our son and two of three daughters have served full-time missions, all four earned at least a bachelor’s degree, and all four were married in the Temple.”xxxvi
Sione worked in the construction industry. He eventually returned to BYUH where he became the Associate Director of the Physical Plant. He has served in several responsible church callings including nine years as the president of the La’ie Hawaii Stake. In his 1991 book *Tongan Saints: Legacy of Faith*, Eric B. Shumway wrote that Feinga represented “the many Tongan Saints who became trusted Church leaders outside Tonga.”

Reuben Law--No regulation that prohibited association

From its very beginning, CCH’s first president, Reuben Law, said that marrying within races was a critical element among many factors to assure marital stability, harmony and permanency. It was the advice of most Church leaders to members to marry within their own races because of the greater possibility of their having common appreciations and understandings with each other and greater sociological possibilities of the marriage working out favorably. “I think the advice isn’t based on prejudice because the gospel is for all races and we know that,” Law said in an interview with Baldridge. “Certainly, the General Authorities know that better than any of us. So it was not based on racial prejudices; it was just based on the desire to have these marriages work out advantageously.”

In his oral interview with the first president, Baldridge asked if there were any regulations that were designed to thwart any type of interracial marriage? ”Only as it occurred in families,” Law replied. He knew of cases where families had a family meeting and said, “Now we love these people these Hawaiians, Samoans, Filipinos and others; we sense a great love that exists here in Hawaii, we’ve been the recipients of it, but let’s be careful about getting mated up with someone of another race.” Some of that happened within families. But there were no overall regulations that forbid their association with each other.”

Wootton -- No Policy Against Inter-racial Hiring

Richard Wootton, the second president of the college, also said that there never was any policy against hiring interracial faculty during his administration from 1959-64. “In fact, the Board itself approved the hiring of an interracial couple, both of them, and I had recruited them myself,” Wootton said in an e-mail to the author. “They did not actually come to CCH, but that was because of entirely different circumstances.”

A religion professor and director of public relations, Wootton encouraged the CCH students in religion and other classes to think and pray about the principle of eternal marriage in LDS temples. He said that understanding this was critical in a course he taught on courtship and marriage similar to those encouraged by other Church counselors and Church leaders. Wootton said students appreciated the course. “The board and faculty were equally in harmony with the Hawaii spirit and good sense about intercultural marriage.”
Wootton said there were two intercultural marriages involving Caucasians during his administration, a Mainland girl and a local Polynesian boy and a Samoan girl married in the Temple to a Mainland boy. “None of the intercultural marriages in our administration were viewed askance by any faculty, local Church official, or parents in my memory or journal notations, though I am sure there was much counsel about using wisdom in choices for marriage given in religion classes and student wards.”xli

A more personal view of Wootton’s tenure came from David Miles, who was seeking a position in the chemistry department at a time when Miles thought that CCH faculty members might be discouraged from having interracial families. David and his wife, Mary, had already adopted two Native American children and were considering the adoption of more racially mixed children for their family.

In an interview with the author, Miles remembered that Wootton was simultaneously sympathetic to the Miles’ family and aware of possible concerns from Church leaders who knew that many intercultural marriages discouraged students returning to foreign countries. Wootton told the Miles family that the children would be welcomed in Hawaii with open arms. “You don’t need to say anything to anybody,” he advised . . . What you do in your family is your personal thing.” When the Miles family wondered if they needed to get permission from anyone, Wootton repeated that it was the family’s private business “and not to worry about it.” That ended the discussion for David and Mary. A year later, they adopted an additional four children from Mexico.xlii

The Miles family lived in La’ie from 1960 until 1995 when they left Hawaii to serve the first of three missions for the LDS Church. At CCH, Miles contributed substantially to the fledgling chemistry program, helped inaugurate the college’s computer science program, and became the first scientist to be honored as a McKay lecturer (1970). He also served as a bishop, high councilor, and sealer in the Hawaii temple. Mary obtained her bachelor’s degree from CCH.

They said they appreciated Wootton’s leadership and understanding at a critical time in their lives as well as the spirit of toleration and love from the people of Hawaii. “There couldn’t have been a kinder people to us, a place where we’d feel more welcome, more at home,” Miles summarized. “Our children were loved and well accepted. . . . I think it (La’ie and the college) was a city of refuge anciently. I think it has been for all of us, too.”

The Counsel Was “Strict”

Not all students similarly interpreted the latitude provided by Church and college administrators such as President Wootton, however. David H. H. Chen, a Chinese student who later joined the CCH faculty, said the blinking caution lights of intercultural marriage were a strong factor among some students, causing them to postpone marriage on the cosmopolitan campus. “The counsel was strict,” Chen remembered in a 1989 interview. Because members were faithful after being advised by Church officials, they declined to marry with others not of the same cultural background. The counsel made
Chen was angry, but he said he followed the advice not to marry out of his race. Chen, whose life embodies a remarkable story of education, teaching, and service to his nation, including resistance work against the Soviet incursion into Manchuria, later served as a mission president in Hong Kong with his Chinese wife, Nallie.

Chen’s recollections, as well as those of others, may have evolved from the statements of some of the general authorities who were very concerned about the fact that many students from Polynesia and later from Asia, who, after entering into mixed marriages, did not return to their homelands. Encouraging the students to go back to the land of their birth was a primary purpose for establishing the institution foreseen by David O. McKay at a flag raising ceremony led by 127 multiracial students at La’ie in 1921. After waiting until after the end of the depression and World War II, he provided the green light for work on the college to begin in 1955. Because it would be one of the most expensive institutions of higher education in the Church, it was periodically under the threat of being closed down if its students did not return after they had been educated.

Are They Still Mad at Me?

One of the “strict warnings” that Chen may have been referring to came in a devotional address by Elder Bernard Brockbank, who spoke to the CCH students in the school auditorium in 1969 when an estimated one quarter of the faculty and staff at the PCC and in the community were intermarried racially and inter-culturally. In his remarks, Elder Brockbank, an assistant to the Quorum of the Twelve, quoted from a number of Old Testament scriptures; one of them a judgmental warning from Ezra, who was not a prophet spokesman but rather patriot reformer of Jewish statutes and genealogy. He discouraged the marriage of males with “heathen wives.”

Although the warning had less to do with intercultural marriages in Hawaii than marriages with Jewish women, who practiced idolatry, it left bad feelings among many faculty members included Morris Graham, who was married to a Hawaiian Chinese woman. The upshot of Elder Brockbank’s well-intended remarks were a number of letters to the editor in the student newspaper and a visit from student body president, Ted Maeda, seeking a clarification on the address. In an interview in 2007, Maeda said that even though he could not remember the exact words Elder Brockbank spoke, he did recall that the intent was “for students to marry within their races, even if they did not always understand the reasons why.”

Over the years, the legendary talk and those from other general and local Church leaders gained lives of their own by being occasionally misunderstood and misquoted. When Elder Brockbank returned to the campus in 1973 he asked CCH president Stephen Brower, “Are they still mad at me?”

In a 1992 interview with Tavita Iese in La’ie, Iese recalled that some haole girls married Samoans after the students joined Samoan cultural clubs. “Although most LDS Church leaders encouraged dating within similar cultures, the advice was not always followed.” He said he heard another assistant to the Twelve recommend “marrying within your culture.” The attitude of a few students at that time about intercultural marriage was to
“ignore all those counsels and advice,” he said. “They did whatever they liked. When they fall in love that’s it; they get married.”

In the light of well-intended speakers doing their best to halt increasing divorce and encourage students to return to their homelands and misinterpretation of the intent to discourage cross-cultural marriages, President Cook suggested that….. “A carefully worded statement is needed regarding the Church’s viewpoint on interracial marriages. We see this as a cultural problem or a social problem, and not as a religious problem. If we can properly define our terms and what the problem is, I am sure it would be a comfort and a real help to the students here at the College, as well as those at the BYU who engage interracial dating that may lead to marriage.”

**Changing Courtship Habits**

The history of intermarriage at CCH shows that the process was accelerated in part due to shifting and often contradictory courtship practices among the international students. Students coming from American high schools held hands and often hugged and kissed each other publicly. It used to be called “necking,” former Dean of Students, Larry Oler, recalled: “To Polynesians from the South Pacific that kind of social activity (necking) was done (in private) only when a boy and girl were seriously interested in each other. With Americans it was a very common thing”

For some Polynesian students “dating” could mean anything from holding hands to fornication. Traditionally they were allowed little, if any, social interaction as youth. Liahona High school and its American teachers and Utah Mormon social traditions being offered to the Tongan teenagers was sometimes considered scandalous by outside Tongan observers. You didn’t even have to be very interested in each other. In the American custom, you saw them kissing and hugging. It was a very superficial kind of activity. Whereas with Polynesians and Asians, that type of activity was only participated in between a man and a woman who were seriously thinking of marriage or at least some kind of deeper relationship.”

Wootton recalled the bitterness Hawaii youth had when local girls dated Mainland men and it nearly lead to violence between “town and gown.” Local boys were incensed by college men attempting to date La`ie girls. One night in the early 1960s, as he approached the edge of La`ie with some of his children, Wootton stopped his Rambler station wagon because a group of young men were obstructing the road.

He locked the car doors, got out and saw that the locals from La`ie were on one side of the road, and college men on the other, in a “menacing confrontation.” Wootton ordered the college men to return to campus immediately, which they did. He noticed that several on each side had knives, and a college man had a rifle. Wootton immediately called burly Athletic Director, Al Lolotai, and reported what had nearly happened. He asked Lolotai to tell the locals that they would have to deal with him and the police if they ever gathered again. Wootton told Lolotai to assure the locals that the college would prohibit college men from dating local girls.
Wootten took the issue up with the Administrative Council and a “hands off” policy was issued to the college students. The confrontation ended rather well. The chair of the Department of Health, P.E., and Recreation and a coach of nearly all sports on campus, Lolotai was also a world class heavy weight wrestling champion, at least as reported in Honolulu where he regularly contested. He had been a university football star on the Mainland before accepting his position at CCH.

**Most Intercultural Marriages Succeeded**

The third president, Owen Cook said that most intermarriage such as those between Tongans and Samoans generally succeeded. When students were worthy to go to a temple and be sealed for time and eternity, it was hard to keep any blessings from them, he said. “Interracial marriage was a social problem; we clearly indicated to the student body that it was a serious social problem that they had to consider.”

Cook, the first of two college presidents whose children entered into intercultural marriages, contrasted the dating habits of two composite students at CCH in a 1970 speech before the Phi Delta Kappa honor society. The two hypothetical Tongans – “Mele and Sione” eventually married and returned home. But not before they were assaulted by the barefaced shame of much American-style romance starting to impact on the Church College of Hawaii during the 1960s.

According to Cook’s address, Sione immediately became interested in American social opportunities, especially the *haole* girls. Some of his friends were even advised by their parents to marry American girls. Their economic future would be much more secure, residents of the islands imagined. Sione also found dating American girls easier than dating his Tongan cousins. He had never dated before. He had never kissed a girl. He had not held hands with girls. Such Western customs were *tabu* in his society.

In contrast to most American girls, the Tongan girls had not been exposed to soft or hard core pornographic literature or in movies or over the public airwaves. The girls, particularly those raised in LDS homes, were wholesome and innocent, Cook said.

On Sunday, the Sabbath was strictly observed in Tonga. The Americans, necking, arms around each other on campus, in parked cars, were shocking sights, to say the least, Cook said. Most Tongan girls, however, held fast to their customs no matter how they were ridiculed. Sione had to adapt readily to American social customs regarding dating, and had to try to secure a car even though it might cost his loan privileges at the college, said Cook.

**Controlling Families**

Riley Moffat, a student at BYUH in the late 1960s, said the strict standards could be attributed to the fact that “many Polynesians had very observant and controlling parents, siblings, aunts and uncles. On the other hand, after they arrived in Hawaii some Polynesian girls and boys, liberated from family and cultural restrictions could be “very
forward,” Moffat recalled. In 1971, Pres. Cook said that one of the first research studies on the problems of interracial marriage was underway at CCH. But he also predicted that despite the warnings, intercultural and even interracial marriage would continue. “This would be so even if no Mainland students came to the islands,” Cook said. There were enough Caucasian students from Hawaii and other South Pacific countries attending CCH that inter-racial marriage would always take place. Inter-racial marriages occur [even] at BYU [Provo]. This is a fact that the Church must live with, since it cannot eliminate it and since Priesthood bearers of all nationalities did not yet have full temple blessings [This statement preceded the historic 1978 declaration approving Priesthood blessings to all worthy males], Cook said. The administration of CCH had discouraged inter-racial marriages only because of the social problems attached thereto.

Carmen Cuizon, a member of the Traveling Assembly (performing arts group), and one of the campus beauty queens, remembered young people of different backgrounds and races got along fairly well at CCH. A part-Filipino who later married part-Hawaiian Ishmael Stagner, she was thankful for the Mainland Caucasians who came to CCH in the 1960s and who often dated local girls. It helped local students keep “updated” when haoles from the Mainland came. She said it also helped the local students learn to speak better and bring “more class in their behavior.”

In the early 1960s the local men primarily dated haole girls “left and right,” she said. Few would call the local girls for a date. If the local girls went out with a haole guy, the local boys got really mad. “It seemed as if they expected us to stay home and twiddle our thumbs while they went with the haole girls and had a fun time,” she said.

The local girls did enjoy the treatment they got from the mainland boys. “The haole boys would open the door. They knew how to treat you and they knew where they were going instead of asking where you would like to go on a date. I think, basically, the diverse races got along. Of course, you did have your differences sometimes; you did have your small fights between the Samoans and Tongans.”

Adapting to the western style of dating

In a 1984 interview, Howard Lua said a great problem for students was to learn to adapt to the Western style of living and dating. “When students came to Hawaii they brought cultural differences with them but worked hard to fit in with everybody else. Sometimes blending in with an American male or female was helpful. Some foreign students saw it as step toward upward mobility to date Americans,” Lua recalled:

“The American students couldn’t understand why all the Tongan men were proposing marriage five or six times a week, and the Tongan men could not understand why the American women refused though they were free with their kisses and often held hands. These were differences in their culture. In Tonga these things were not known … America [was] a free-for-all. There [was] always some problem. So, adjustment to the different cultures was important.”
Tongan-born David Mohetau recalled meeting his wife, Jan, a native of Pleasant Grove, Utah, at CCH. After they dated for a month Jan went home for the summer. After she returned, they decided to get married but not before she finished school. They couple decided that she would go to the mainland and graduate from BYU-Provo while he stayed in Hawaii for one year. After the year of separation, they decided that if they still had the same feeling, they should get married. She went to the Mainland and Mohetau stayed in La`ie until Christmas time when he went to Utah and spent Christmas with her family. The family seemed to approve. Mohetau came back for another eight months. When he returned to the Mainland, they got married in the summer of 1965. While in Provo, she applied for a teaching job in Hawaii and got the job before their marriage.\textsuperscript{iv}

Like other colleges, students, staff, faculty and administrators took it for granted that marriages naturally followed students’ dating and falling in love even when there were racial and cultural differences. “You expected that,” Charlene Shelford said. “As long as there are boys on one side and girls on the other, the odds are that they will run across each other.” There were a lot of successful intermarriages of women from her dormitory, she recalled.

**Number of Temple Weddings Increased Each Summer**

After confronting the issues of church cautions, decreasing family control and conflicting courtship patterns the number of weddings used to increase each summer. “Much of the campus attended the colorful, convivial receptions that followed the quiet and private weddings in the La`ie Temple Charlene Shelford recalled. “Nearly everyone took a gift. Nearly everyone used to get in and help out with the wedding. Couples used to hold receptions in the cafeteria or at the beach. Things had to be organized and set out after breakfast, before lunch, or straightened after lunch before dinner. But it all seemed to work out.”\textsuperscript{v}

More than that, however, many of the intermarriages were “very successful,” Shelford said. “Many of the couples went on to be leaders in their own towns and countries.”\textsuperscript{vi} Some examples she cited were the marriages of Tui Hunkin from Samoa, Ana LaBarre from Hawaii and George Moleni from Tonga, Similati Vanisi from Tonga and Marie Nin from New Zealand, and Sosaia Paongo from Tonga.

In his 1972 master’s thesis, Paongo wrote a follow-up study of Tongan students who graduated from CCH to examine their attitudes toward the values of higher education and its subsequent effect on their lives. Among his findings were that most Tongans who graduated wanted to return home. When they did not, it was for the following reasons:
they wanted a better education for their children, they found employment which provided their families with satisfactory security, they claimed American citizenship.\textsuperscript{lviii}

In his 1965 remarks, Pres. Cook used Tongan student Peter Vamanrav as an example to illustrate why they had a responsibility to parents and church leaders and government officials in their homelands to continue to remind students to return to their homelands after receiving a subsidized college education. Vamanrav, a handsome rugby player and PCC performer, had dated a \textit{haole} girl who sent him on his mission and promised she would wait for him. Before he left, Vamanrav asked Cook if he thought the problem of color would ever go away. It wasn’t a color problem; Cook said. It was a social problem.” But Vamanrav got the message. The underlying issue was less racial or even religious bigotry but mostly related to honest efforts to stem the “brain drain” and enhance religious leadership in Polynesia and Asia.

When Vamanrav returned from his mission he married a Tongan girl, Seini Pasi. He finally understood what the Brethren had been talking about. “If you marry within your race you can live anywhere, Cook said. “You can live in the United States; you can live in Tonga. But a mixed marriage, just may not work.”\textsuperscript{lix} Vamanrav later became a successful entrepreneur and an Area Authority Seventy for the Church in Tonga before his death in 2005.

The Wisdom of the General Rule

Elder Boyd K. Packer, who later became an apostle in April 1970, described the reflexive opposition to generalizations concerning intercultural marriage, when he described the experience of a Relief Society president after she responded to a sister who supposed the rules being explained at a leadership session did not apply to her group “because they were an exception.” “Dear sister, we’d like not to take care of the exception, first,” she responded. “We’ll see to the rule first, and then we’ll accommodate the exception.”\textsuperscript{lx}

Elder Packer advised the students to accommodate the rules in their life first, “and if you’re to be an exception, or if the others are to be an exception, that will become obvious in the inspiration that comes,” he advised. “There is great power and safety adhering to the scriptures with abounding obedience to a constituted priesthood authority, and for students to be able to pray and receive revelation on their own.”\textsuperscript{lxii}

The former director of LDS Seminaries and Institutes of Religion and father of ten children, Elder Packer stressed the importance of not being an exception, when following the rule was clearly the better course. “We’ve always counseled in the Church for our Mexican members to marry Mexicans, and our Japanese members to marry Japanese, our Caucasians to marry Caucasians, our Polynesian members to marry Polynesians. That counsel has been wise.” He acknowledged that some intermarriages do work well, but added that many young people recognize that these marriages are unique and that” no one should try to be the exception.”\textsuperscript{lxii} Counsel from Church leaders has been on this wise even when people they know of are exceptions that have resulted in successful marriages
You might very well say, “Well I can show you local church leaders, or even General Authorities, perhaps.” And I say, yes, exceptions. And then I hark back to the scriptural statement of that crippled little Relief Society woman who said, “We’d like not to take care of the exception first. We’d like to follow the rule first, and then we’ll accommodate the exception.”

Need For Rational Thinking and “Informed Consent”

Elder John Groberg who spent much of his life in the Polynesian culture gave a more detailed address on the subject a decade later, two years before the revelation granting the Priesthood to all worthy males in 1978. In effect what Elder Groberg’s remarks provided are what BYU-Provo marriage counselor Mike Buxom in 2007 described as an in-depth “informed consent” personal statement concerning intercultural marriage. In his remarks, Elder Groberg, whose missionary experiences were later depicted in a major motion picture, The Other Side of Heaven, spoke to hundreds of faculty and staff as well as cosmopolitan students on dating and planning marriages. As in all BYU devotionals or forums many were holding hands as Elder Groberg read his carefully prepared speech. At the time he spoke, all three Polynesian members of the La‘ie Stake presidency were married to Caucasians.

He told his audience that some students “did not think rationally about marriage,” and more particularly about interracial or intercultural marriage. This was easier in Hawai‘i and at BYUH which provided many role models in the classroom and in Church leadership positions where successful mixed marriages had been solemnized in the La‘ie Temple. But other variables besides a shared religion entered into the equation beyond the happy mixed matrimony surrounding them in Hawai‘i, and in the movies and other media of the 1970s.

“Too often,” Elder Groberg warned that audience of nearly 2,000 students, they “depended primarily on their hearts to lead them and not their heads, or common sense.” Youth often relied on images created by popular culture to guide them instead of a thorough investigation of the individual, the family and the culture, followed by fasting and prayer. Intercultural marriage was not a religious issue. It was not necessarily a mistake. “The only real mistake is not to know all the facts before marriage. Still, you’re free to make your choice,” Elder Groberg said in his prepared remarks, “Just make certain you have all the facts. Remember, we’re not talking about the Hollywood or TV versions of love and romance stories where if a problem occurs one way or another, someone can always get drowned or killed or die of something else. But we’re talking about an eternal script with the same actors, writing their history together forever.”

“Limiting Factors”

Along with the two individuals involved, Elder Groberg suggested other implications were in place beyond the subjective reasons of students who thought they were in love. Although intercultural marriages were accepted in Hawai‘i, the United States and an increasingly international LDS Church, there were “limiting factors” on the relationships
beyond those existing in the media or even in the optimistic educational comfort zone of BYUH where the couple fell in love. Intermarriage was a limiting dynamic that was often overlooked, along with many other factors. Marriage itself was a limiting factor, he told the students.

Still, the students were also free agents. “With this agency you choose, we all choose, to limit ourselves in some areas. When you get married to anyone you further limit yourself. For example, he said getting married and obeying and abiding the true marriage covenant, you are no longer free to go on dates with others. You have limited yourself to one eternal companion, which of course is not a limitation at all in the eternal sense, he added

There were other limitations, which are obvious. There are some limitations, which are not so obvious. The point is that you must weigh all of these factors and make your own choice. You cannot make the best choice if you are not aware of all the factors.”

It was not right, but nevertheless true, he said that certain areas of the world in the 1970s had not yet come to accept interracial marriages he reminded the students from more than 70 nations. Even some members of the Church still needed to learn to accept interracial couples. “Unless couples learn all the facts, there may be more limitations than you can accept,” he said referring to parents unwilling to understand mixed marriages. “You can say as much as you want about the fact that people should accept these marriages, and I agree that they should. But if they don’t, saying that they should doesn’t change them. So, there is another potential problem.”

To illustrate, Elder Groberg counseled that in many Polynesian cultures the husband’s family comes first. Money is sent to his side of the family and wives learn to their disappointment that some husbands wanted to spend their spare time with friends, and not with wife and family. One non-Polynesian wife considering divorce complained that such extreme generosity to other families at the expense of their own was more than she could take. The couple later divorced.

He quoted a Polynesian man who came for advice and said, “Knowing what I know now, I wish I had married someone from my own island. I sold my birthright for a mess of white pottage.” The young man had found it impossible to make his wife happy anywhere but on the Mainland, a place where he was decidedly unhappy.

Elder Groberg also warned about issues of identity among children of inter-cultural marriages. With which set of grandparents does the child identify? How will language and depth of word meanings affect the children? He noted that not infrequently intercultural marriages were entered into with other than pure motives. Desire for citizenship or income was the reason behind some marriages, and these almost always ended in unhappiness. Repeating that he did not speak for the Church, but was expressing his own ideas, he told the students that the spirit approved of the guidance he gave.
His remarks concurred with those of other Church leaders as well as marriage counselors. Each of them was consistent in describing intercultural and interracial marriages as being among significant variables that students often fail to realize or practice and which contribute to divorce once the honeymoon is over. He concluded:

“The underlying philosophy given by the brethren is that Polynesians, all other things being equal, should marry Polynesians. Caucasians, other things being equal, should marry Caucasians. That experience had shown that in most instances this works out the best. Not that the other way is wrong, just that this usually works best. It takes such a deep and abiding love, physical as well as spiritual, to see husband, wife and children through to eternal life, to stick with one another through thick and thin. It is just unfair to ourselves and to our eternal companion, to our children, and to our eternal future to add greater stress and problems than will already be there.”

**More Sacrifice, Patience, and Commitment.** —The Morris Graham Studies

Because both Hawaii and the PCC continued to be living laboratories for successful intermarriages, both students and faculty exploited the college and community to conduct research projects exploring such issues as ethnic background and perception of beauty, comparisons of the ideal body shapes between Asian and Caucasian couples, cross cultural comparisons between Americans and Japanese over qualities desired by spouses and other topics related to romance and marriage. Much of the research was promoted by Ronald S. Jackson, the chair of the psychology department before his death in 2004. Other faculty mentored students and scholarly papers and abstracts were read or presented in posters in the Aloha Student.

Among those developing research models on intercultural marriage was Morris A. Graham of BYUH’s Division of Behavioral and Social Sciences. A 1983 study was conducted jointly with the Chinese University of Hong Kong. It reported that intercultural marriage was a “dilemma” facing most undergraduates including Hong Kong Chinese students attending the BYUH campus. Graham’s study of 109 students, 17-20 years of age at BYUH from 1976-81, indicated intercultural marriage was “a perplexing decision” for most students.

Graham reported that the majority of the students did not think it was wrong; however, only a few students expressed personal interest in marrying outside their own culture. He noted a significant difference was found between Chinese male and female senior class students. Chinese females attending the college were significantly “Americanized” over a four year period and if given the opportunity preferred not to return to their homeland and marry “traditional” Chinese males. It was just the opposite for Hong Kong Chinese males.

In a 1985 study conducted jointly with Judith Moeai of BYUH and Lanette S. Shizuru of the East-West Center Institute of Culture and Communication, Graham studied 108 intercultural and 62 intracultural, intra-religious marriages in Hawaii in terms of causality or internal or external variables affecting the satisfaction of the relationship.
The study, which included BYUH students and faculty along with others who had a mean average of 11 years of marriage reported that intercultural couples had “significantly more external problems” (intercultural experiences attributed to extended family members, relatives, friends and community), greater assimilation pressures on the females toward accepting the husband’s culture and greater negative responses toward intercultural marriages *per se* than intra-cultural couples. Responders agreed that for an intercultural or intra-religious marriage to succeed, there were necessary demands for “considerable more sacrifice, patience, and commitment.”

In a 2005 interview looking at his findings after two decades, Graham said the changing attitudes toward mixed marriages emanating from Hawaii, coupled with the 1978 revelation to the LDS Church that worthy men of all races are eligible to receive priesthood authority, added to the increase in mixed marriages at BYU-Hawaii during the last quarter of the 20th century. The growing globalization of the Church since BYUH was founded in 1955 had added to the change in tone on campus.

**Brothers-in-law as well as brothers in the gospel**

Graham said that by the last decade of the 20th century intermarriage was an accepted part of the social, religious and cultural scene at BYUH. Few Mainland students or those from Polynesia and Asia were anxious or apprehensive about the issue as was evident until the youth revolution in the 1960s and the 1978 revelation on universal priesthood for all worthy males. The high percentage of temple marriages in Hawaii coupled with role models on the campus and throughout Hawaii also contributed to the acceptance of intercultural marriage through the La‘ie community and which some general authorities and BYUH presidents such as Alton Wade and Eric Shumway agreed contributed to a “leavening process” throughout the Pacific-Asian Asian Rim. The key sociological and historical factor in maintaining successful intercultural marriage (as well as union between similar cultures and races) continued to be worthiness to be married in the temple and a commitment to remain faithful to the covenants made there.

By their very nature, temple marriages demand an exceptional commitment by husband and wife, to each other, as well as to God, whom the couple believe is an integral, ongoing part of the marriage whether it is intermarriage or not. Satisfaction and inspiration from the living laboratory of La‘ie and BYUH were amplified, according to Professor Lance Chase, “by the growing realization that people of all races might find joy, not only as brothers and sisters in the restored gospel, but as brothers-in-law.”

The prelude to temple marriage was critical to success, however. Examining all of the facts objectively was only the first, but a critical first important step pointed out by Wootton and other church leaders that encouraged couples take marriage preparatory classes together.

Another method to help students become better aware of the disadvantages of cultural intermixing, according to marriage counselor Garth Allred was to create a forum or even classes on the subject so that objectivity enters into the final decision along with the
personal subjectivity of romance and even personal prayer. Although costs made it prohibitive much of the time, Church leaders advised students to meet the families of those they were dating by traveling to their homelands and recognizing that one of the partners, if not both, had promised to return home after graduating. Like all couples, the marriages had to meet the guidelines of patience, sacrifice and commitment before and after the honeymoon. But in their cases all the ingredients essential for success, as reported in Graham’s study, had to be extraordinary.

Limited Divorces in La’ie

An informal review of 1,000 names in the BYUH telephone directory in 2003 conducted by the author, and librarians Phil Smith, Riley Moffat and Angela Ieli revealed the names of 110 faculty or staff members who had intermarried. Surprisingly in the United States, where 43 percent of marriages end in divorce, only 15 intercultural marriages of those 110 listed at BYUH, or about 13 percent, were identified as having ended in divorce. It was not known how many the intermarried couples had been married in the LDS temple.

This casual study was unable to determine whether intermarriage problems contributed to divorce or if there were other factors. Census data suggest that LDS members married out of the temple had divorce rates similar to that of the national average of approximately 40 percent. Those identified as “born-again” Christians throughout the U.S. had a 27 percent divorce rate for all adults. Non Christians reported a 24 percent divorce rate. LDS members including those who intermarried in the temple had a 6 percent divorce percentage.

Moffat said that the large numbers successful intermarriages on campus were evidence to overcome the confusing message, however unspoken, that a new paradigm prevailed at BYU and in the Pacific. Discouraging intercultural marriage at a university that has a motto: “Harmony Amidst Diversity” does not always make sense to those who don’t live in Hawaii. But students have figured this out, he said. “We admit a multiplicity of cultures, students with love and testimonies in their hearts and put them all together. “What else can we expect but that some of them will fall in love with each other? Many have served missions in the target area and already have a love for the people they served amongst. It’s natural that they will socialize with each other.” Both Moffat and Graham said that further studies needed to be conducted with students from targeted countries as Tonga, Samoa, Tahiti, Fiji, Japan, Korean, Taiwan, Hong Kong and Philippines as well as non targeted countries such as Pakistan to examine the issues of intercultural marriages and perhaps determine their value to the troubled institution of marriage throughout the world.

Working Twice as Hard

Even after intercultural couples make the decision to get married in a temple, there is still a long way to go before the couple and ohana (family) are able to feel comfortable about their marriage. They still have to continue to nourish their partnership for time (and all
eternity). Successful couples in intermarriages, even those married in temples, can not rest on their laurels—even in Hawaii.

Such an approach was emphasized by BYUH Dean of Students and former mission president, Isileli Kongaika, and his blonde, Utah-born wife who lived with Isi in his native island kingdom of Tonga and also American Samoa for 17 years. Kongaika said that because his own family and the family of his Caucasian wife all opposed their union, and said their marriage would fail, the couple promised each other they would “each work twice as hard” to assure their temple marriage not only would succeed but would thrive. “Working twice as hard is why their marriage has worked wonderfully for three decades.”

By 2005 the couple’s three sons were married to Caucasian or Filipino women. Their only daughter was married to a Mainland Tongan. In all, there were eight grand children. “Our grand parents love our children,” Joel Kongaika said dispelling initial mistrust over interracial marriages. “Any doubts they had about mixed marriages in the past are gone forever.”

Even Greater Worries About Returnability

In addition to the concerns raised by Church leaders in the past, additional studies provided new priorities relating to this ongoing issue. In contrast to the title of Thomas Wolfe’s 1940 novel “You Can’t Go Home Again,” graduates in the last decades of the 20th century and new century “wouldn’t go home again.” Concerns about returning to your homelands, please, went from the polite but urgent pleas of the past to in-depth reality checks, wake-up calls and ringing alarms about risk to Third World and developing countries as well as the LDS Church. As important as the personal preferences of the couples involved was the educational, economic and spiritual vacuum that grew cumulatively when students did not return to their homelands. It had also become much more difficult for potential students from some countries to obtain visas to come to BYUH if their compatriots had a poor track record of returning.

At the turn of 21st century, economies, cultures, and families in China, India and in the Muslim world were allegedly being cheated when the educated students did not return to their homelands with their spouses. Past concerns about intermarriage now transcended the fact that they were more accepted and that interracial marriages performed in temples were generally more successful. Some of the Church leaders were advising in louder voices about survival of the restored Church itself in the Third World and developing countries who depended on the trained or educated youth of Zion to be the Elders Quorum Presidents, Relief Society and Primary presidents, Bishops, Stake Presidents or even Mission Presidents needed in the remote “Zions” of the Church throughout the world.

How could BYUH fulfill its institutional destiny if it was used simply as a launching pad to more successful professional careers on the Mainland? How would the graduates of BYUH fulfill the 1973 prophecy of Elder Marion G. Romney, a counselor to President
McKay, for its graduates to become future apostles and prophets if they did not go home after getting married and receiving their diplomas? Although an encouraging number of students did indeed return home, national and Church leaders continued to plead for those who had promised they would return. Was BYU supposed to be just another way station for students planning for better professional careers in the developed nations?

A 2001 survey of alumni from 1990-2000 by William Neal and Paul Freebairn reported that 60% of all international graduates returned home to live. But the total did not tell the whole picture as far as local leaders are concerned: only 31% resided in their home country at the time the survey was conducted, 11% had returned home to live, but did not live there in 2001, and 14% had not yet returned due to further schooling or other reasons, but were planning to return in the future.

Reasons Why Students Do Not Return to Homelands at the Turn of the Century

In responses from 914 graduates (a 36% adjusted return rate of surveys mailed to 2,663 graduates), Freebairn revealed that 56% of international graduates did not return home because they had married, 20% had become U.S. citizens, 17% had spouses who were still in school, 15% lacked work or employment opportunities. Four out of ten of the respondents said they never planned to return to live in their home country.

Neal and Freebairn reported that 39% of the Asian graduates returned to Asia. Of those who did not return home 18% percent lived in California. Nearly four out of ten Pacific Island graduates who responded returned to the Pacific. Nearly one in four of the Pacific Islanders who did not return remained in Hawaii. Sixty percent of the Asian graduates resided, returned, or planned to return to their home areas. Fifty seven percent of the Pacific Island graduates resided, have returned, or planned to return to their home areas.

The graduates gave many reasons for their reluctance to return home primarily because of limited employment opportunities. This was particularly true in the less-populated Polynesian islands. In some cases Polynesian parents encouraged their children to stay in the United States, to have a better lifestyle, and perhaps subsidize them to some extent by sharing the wages of American employment with family members back home. In some areas such as Pakistan and Indonesia, cultural and political reasons hinder Christians, and other minority religions, from advancing beyond low level jobs. Similar problems can be seen at the turn of the century triggered by the influx of “illegal” immigrants from Mexico, central and South and America and even European countries such as Russia.

Keith Roberts, BYUH Vice president for Academic Affairs, saw such economic obstacles in the past being alleviated. BYUH was making an intensive effort to assure graduates jobs through a strengthened placement center. It focused on getting students internships before students graduated and find them internships and employment. “The reputation of the university rests in part on our graduate’s finding jobs.” Although the returnees were critical to the needs of their nations and the restored Church, there were other issues.
It “just isn’t fair to ask students who have sacrificed and been trained in an area or skill to send them home to learn there is nothing for them and they have to be a farmer, or fishermen,” Roberts said. On the brighter side, Roberts and Career Services Director Kim Austin said many new jobs and entrepreneurial opportunities have opened in Asia and the Pacific that will employ BYUH graduates. Since 2000, Roberts said 120 internships were arranged in target areas including Tonga, Fiji, the Philippines and Mongolia as well as Hong Kong, Japan and South Korea. 

**Other Reasons for Non Returnability**

A big reason why students had second and third thoughts about returning home was because of what they perceived as a double standard that favored western Caucasian students. With a few exceptions Caucasians were not counseled to return to their homelands in Europe or in rural areas in the United States, Europe or Canada. Still others who married interculturally said their spouses refused to live in less-developed countries. In some nations the non-native spouse could be in danger of his/her life by returning to the spouse’s homeland together. Nearly all couples married in LDS temples reported their decisions to stay in the U.S. were reached only after fasting and prayer. Their decision, they believed, was one for the couple to make, not outsiders, no matter how well-intentioned they were.

Speaking at a BYUH devotional in 2004, one Chinese couple recognized the complexities of going back to countries that on the surface lack economic, political and educational advantages and other cultural advantages. “Marriage, social unrest, extreme economic situations, and individual circumstances may divert, delay or postpone return, Joyce Chan said. But “returning of the heart is a vital part to the physical return.” In joint remarks, Peter, and Joyce Chan warned that graduates who disconnect themselves from the Church, the university, and the circle of friends they once embraced at BYUH do not fulfill the spirit of returnability. Members must strive to be stalwart leaders in the Church as well as in their professions. “All members need to be more effective tools in building up God’s kingdom, and if we are truly desirous to serve our Heavenly Father, we must ask Him to inspire us on what, where, and how to serve.”

**Intercultural Marriages as Tool in Missionary Work and as a Global Model**

The comments by the devotional speakers in 2006 as well as hundreds of couples who challenged the economic, social and cultural taboos of love and intercultural marriage with a new “brother-in-law-hood” in the gospel was foreseen in even greater detail long before Hawaiian statehood and two decades before the founding of the Church College of Hawaii in 1955 by another general authority of the Church. He was J. Reuben Clark, Jr., an influential statesman and counselor to three LDS Church presidents, who accompanied LDS Church President Heber J. Grant to Hawaii to create the Oahu Stake in 1935. Clark saw not only examples of the many “mixed marriages” but foretold that the children of the relationships would contribute to the spread of the gospel in the Pacific region. In short, he envisioned intercultural marriages as having a leavening effect or
influence spreading throughout the Pacific Rim to a measured and mighty contribution through the marriages of its peoples.

A counselor to four LDS Presidents including David O. McKay, President Clark had an intimate understanding of the relationships among peoples and nations and the civil rights movement long before it became politically popular. Long before the changes wrought by World War II, the fight for statehood, and the civil rights movement, he envisioned that the Hawaiian Islands and their mixed population were indeed “the outpost of a great forward march for Christianity and the Church among those mighty peoples that face us along the eastern edge of our sister hemisphere.”

The U.S. ambassador to Mexico from 1930-1933, Pres. Clark was impressed by the love and generosity of the various races and cultures of Hawaii and their adoption of Christianity in general, and in particular the restored gospel of Jesus Christ. Like President McKay, he saw the emergence of an international Church in the dark days of the depression even before the start of World War II in Europe and in Hawaii in 1941. In an article in the Improvement Era, Elder Clark, saw Hawaii as “an outpost in the Pacific” and as model whose LDS members had come together from many races and religious persuasions and been married in LDS temples for time and eternity.

“Considerations of race, common ancestry, and a common language at its source, drew all the South Sea Islanders and the Hawaiians together in a close common bond,” Clark wrote, in recognizing that the Hawaiians should be allowed full participation in the organization of full Church units (stakes). Church government had a great and beneficial influence upon the whole Polynesian race. As Elder McKay prophesied in 1955, Elder Clark earlier called attention to the significance of La`ie “stretching out its sanctifying welcome not only to that great group of descendants of Lehi in the Pacific, but also and equally to all others in New Zealand and Australia who had in them the blood of Israel.” Who could estimate or measure “the unifying influence of the inspiration and fructifying spiritual power of the little temple at La`ie, and the glorious work for salvation of the millions and millions who have gone before, carried on within its walls, as it rests there in the midst of the mighty waters of the Pacific?” Pres. Clark asked.

As the first counselor to President Grant (who had dedicated Japan for the preaching of the restored gospel in 1901, and dedicated the Hawaii temple in 1919), Pres. Clark envisioned the spread of the restored gospel even further in the Pacific. Along with Elder McKay, he foresaw the spread of the gospel to Japan, India and China, which Elder McKay had dedicated in 1921. Hawaii was to be the base of operations for the next thrust with its racially unique people and their children as the vanguard.

For a variety of reasons Elder Clark did not discuss why he foresaw Hawaii as the most favorable place for the Church to make its next effort to preach the Gospel to the Japanese people. He saw a strong colony of Japanese Saints operating from Hawaii into their homeland in a way that he predicted would attract many Japanese to the knowledge not only of Christianity, but of the restored gospel. He saw evidence that the fields were
ripening and would be ready sooner or later for the harvest to begin. The school envisioned by Elder McKay became the foundation of the base of operations. “While no separate and distinct work had yet been done among the Chinese as a group, Pres. Clark said that individual Chinese had become members of the Church inaugurating work among the Chinese group. It awaited only “initiation and organization.”

As with the Japanese-Hawaiian and the Chinese-Hawaiian residents, the Chinese Saints in Hawaii would be seen as a means to reach the Chinese in the homeland and later throughout the Pacific Rim and the world. (As an example, in the 1930s, Pres. Clark referred to High Council member Henry W. Aki, a full blooded Chinese who came into the Church after he married his Hawaiian wife.) The same leavening effect on the Pacific was true for the Filipinos. “Moreover, the myriads upon myriads of India also face us here.”

His assignment to the Islands, twelve years after the round-the-world trip by Pres. McKay, gave Pres. Clark an admiration beyond the problems of intermarriage into the potential contributions of the children and descendents of such marriages born from those married in the temple. Like Pres. McKay, he visited the four major islands and appreciated and respected the unique blending of race and culture into an intangible Aloha Spirit which characterized the U.S. territory as it did in the new century. Pres. Clark knew that side by side, in the stores, on the streets, on the plantations, in one capacity or another, Japanese, Chinese, Portuguese, Filipinos, Hawaiians, and “whites” came together.

Intercultural Progeny: “The equal, and some say superior, of the races themselves”

As one became conscious of these various race groups, Pres. Clark was responsive to the great intermixing and remarkable children who, Pres. Clark said were “the equal, and some say the superior, of the races themselves. Certainly we saw some remarkable men and women who were the product of this intermixing.”

The 1935 visit preceded the intensive post World War II efforts by Southern Senators to halt Hawaiian statehood due in part to the “intermixing of alien races.” By contrast, Pres. Clark recognized that the intermixing “was already exerting a sensible and considerable influence upon the Church in Hawaii and upon the spread of the gospel in the Pacific, “and that potentially that influence might, under proper direction, be so increased, that “it might appropriately be termed great.” The positive power of mixed marriages reached out in several ways that have continued as a great rock out of the mountain without hands.

The first benefit took place when LDS spouses of mixed races converted their non-Church member spouses. This frequently happened, Clark said, and the children of such a union were reared in the Church. “The bringing in of such a new Church member enlarged, through his friends, the circle of those brought to feel the spirit of the Gospel. …the influence increased because reasonable, sober-minded men and women could
hardly refuse listen to reputable friends or kinsmen who affirm they have a message of truth affecting eternity.”

A final exclamation point in regard to the current positive regard of intermarriage in the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints was seen in comments by Alton Wade after meeting with members of the Church Board of Education in Salt Lake City prior to his resignation as president of BYU-Hawaii to return to Provo. After explaining the value of the mixed marriages and the role of the students of promulgating the gospel as well helping in communities throughout the Pacific and on the Mainland United States, Wade took a photograph that showed a group of couples of intercultural backgrounds from around the world standing in front of the Hawaii Temple where they had been married. “This is what has happened because of your faith and patience for our students from around the world when they are married in the temple,” Wade said.

**Conclusion**

Nearly eight decades after Pres. Clark’s inspired insights and the oral histories of Baldridge’s and Graham’s pioneering cross-cultural research on the BYU-H campus, intercultural marriage has been recognized, accepted and embraced as a culmination of prophetic insight and foresight. The validation of this mixing of races and culture through marriage of a man and woman and their offspring is a fact of life in Hawaii as well as an American model for matrimony.

Even beyond the marriages of a melting pot population in the isolated Hawaiian islands effected by an environment touched by an elusive “Aloha spirit” are the other factors of being married for time and eternity in LDS temples. In order for an intercultural or intra-religious marriage to succeed, there are extraordinary demands for “considerable more sacrifice, patience, and commitment” if partnership is to succeed and progress.

In other words partners have to each work twice as hard as non intercultural couples even when they are married in temples. When successful, resultant families have been major factors in the internationalization of the Church through missionary work and in providing leadership for an unpaid ministry as predicted by J. Rueben Clark, and David O. McKay who envisioned the Church College of Hawaii as the major educational laboratory contributing to the leavening process which began in the Pacific rim and has now expanded on a world-wide basis.

In light of this, Graham said he has changed to metaphors he believes are more accurate than the “melting pot” and fruit “salad” metaphors used in the past to illustrate intermarriage. He now sees successful intermarriages as “a rich stew.” The stew is composed of potatoes, taro, rice, bamboo shoots, curry, breadfruit, and other foods indigenous to Hawaii and the Pacific region. “It all cooks together,” Graham said. “Each single ingredient contributes to the juices (acculturation) and each absorbs (assimilation) the richness of the mixture. The longer the stew cooks, the greater the commonality each ingredient shares.”
“This type of an intercultural mixture has been most successful in the Pacific as a leavening effect,” Graham said. “It’s now more a part of life and accepted globally. The Church and BYUH have contributed to this gathering and mixing within the House of Israel.”

The only thing that will hinder this process and which has periodically occurred throughout the history of the Church College and BYU-Hawaii is when intermarried students fall short of their agreement to return to their homelands as they promised in exchange for their subsidized education. That is the paradox of the issue of intermarriage in the new century and one which must be resolved if the University and the Church are to achieve their destiny on a global basis.
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Kāingalotu: Tonga Saints in the Diaspora  
*by Tēvita O. Ka‘ili*

I want to begin by defining the terms *kāingalotu* and diaspora. The term *kāingalotu* is actually made up of two important pan-Polynesian terms. *Kāinga* basically means kin, relatives, or land. In some places in Polynesia, *kāinga* means family or kin and in other places it means land. Here are two examples: Samoa has the term *'āiga* and Hawaiian has the term *'āina*. Both terms are cognates (or linguistic cousins) of *kāinga*. Some anthropologists claim that *kāinga* was the name of the first social unit in Ancestral Polynesia around 3,000 years ago (Kirch & Green 2001). In Ancestral Polynesia (3,000 years ago), *kāinga* probably referred to people who are related to one another and also share a communal land (Kirch & Green 2001). This is why the term *kāinga* (*'āiga, 'āina*) carries the meaning of kinship and land.

*Kāingalotu* is also made up of the word *lotu*. In Polynesia, *lotu* basically means worship or to pray. It also means religion. *Kāinga* and *lotu* were put together to create the term *kāingalotu*. Individuals who worship (*lotu*) together become kin (*kāinga*). In other words, if you worship together you are *kāingalotu* (kin members). Tongan LDS wards are perfect examples of *kāingalotu*.

The other term that I want to define is diaspora. Basically, diaspora refers to the scattering (dispersing) of people away from an ancestral homeland. For example, a large number of Tongans left Tonga – their ancestral homeland – and they are now scattered in places such as American Samoa, Hawai‘i, continental U.S., New Zealand, and Australia. These are the places that we call the diaspora. My presentation will focus on the Tongans who have left Tonga and are now living in different places in the world. I will focus specifically on LDS Tongans and Tongan LDS wards.

I now want to give you some statistical background about Tongans who live outside of Tonga. The number of Tongans abroad are more or less equal to the number of Tongans living in Tonga. Approximately 100,000 Tongans live in Tonga and about 97,540 Tongans in U.S., New Zealand, and Australia. There are 36,840 Tongans in the U.S. (Bureau, U. S. C. 2000), 40,700 in New Zealand (New Zealand Government 2001), and around 20,000 in Australia (Australian Bureau of Statistics 2001). As an anthropologist, I find these statistics to be very interesting. These statistics indicate that the Tongan culture is going through a transformation. Tongans in the diaspora are influencing the development of the Tongan culture. In the U.S., nearly 88 percent of Tongans live in five states: California (15,252), Utah (8,655), Hawai‘i (5,988), Texas (1,371) and Washington (1,029) (*A Portrait of Tongans in America*, 2000). Today, we find Tongan stakes, Tongan wards, and Tongan branches in California, Utah, Hawai‘i, Texas, and Washington.

The statistics on LDS Tongan kāingalotu indicate that there are 4 Tongan Stakes outside of Tonga (LDS 2007):
Provo Utah Wasatch (Tongan) Stake  
Salt Lake Utah (Tongan) Stake  
Salt Lake Utah South (Tongan) Stake  
San Francisco California East (Tongan) Stake  

There is a total in of about 70 Tongan wards and 11 Tongan branches (LDS 2007):  

- **U.S.**  
  - 52 Tongan Wards  
  - 8 Tongan Branches  
- **New Zealand**  
  - 10 Tongan Wards  
  - 2 Tongan Branches  
- **Australia**  
  - 6 Tongan Wards  
- **American Samoa**  
  - 2 Tongan Wards  
  - 1 Tongan Branch  

The LDS Church plays a vital role in the Tongan diaspora. In fact, during my field research in Maui, I was told by one research participant that the LDS Church is the "gateway to America" (Ka'ili 2005, 2008). Tongans in Maui, both LDS and non-LDS, were assisted in their migration to Maui by LDS Tongan members.

**Tongans in Maui**

Tongans began migrating to O'ahu, Hawai'i in the late 1950s. Most Tongans migrated to attend BYU-Hawai'i, a L.D.S Church-owned university in La'ie, Hawai'i. It was not until early 1970s that they start migrating to Maui to take advantage of its tourist economy as a way to improve their socio-economic conditions and to help their kin back in Tonga. Maui, the second largest island in Hawai'i, is a major tourist destination for more than 2 million visitors per year. In the 1970s two Tongan families (a L.D.S family and a Church of Tonga family), moved to Maui, and started a kin-chain migration. There main reason for moving to Maui was to work as tree-trimmers. In the beginning, tree-trimming was the main work attracting Tongans to Maui.

Today, many Tongans are working in other tourist related work such as building stone-fences, woodcarving (tā tiki), construction/landscaping (iāte), and hotel housekeeping. In 1990 there were only 631 Tongans in Maui. By 2000, the Tongan population has doubled to1,269—making Tongans second only to Native Hawaiians as the largest Pacific Islander group in Maui (The State of Hawaii Data Book 2000). Most Tongans in Maui live in three major tourist cities: Kahului, Kihei, and Lahaina. Most of the Tongan Christian churches are located in these three cities. In the early 1980s, when the number of Tongans was relatively small, all Tongans in Maui (regardless of denomination) held Sunday services together in the same church building. Over time, as each Tongan denomination increased in size, they started to move to their separate church buildings. Today, there are 11 Tongan separate church congregations in Maui: 3 Tongan United Methodist Churches, 2 Wesleyan Churches, 2 Siasi Tonga (Church of Tonga), 2 Latter-
day Saints (Mormons), 1 'Aho Fitu (Seven-day Adventist), and 1 Maama Fo'ou (New Light). The most visible of these churches are the Tongan United Methodist churches. This is apparent in the posting of Tongan Language Services' schedule on the kiosk outside of the churches. In addition, local newspapers such as the Lahaina news, print Tongan services' schedule on their newspaper.

**Tongan Conception of Space**

**Vā**: Space between People or Things

*Vā,* the Tongan word for space, is not unique to Tonga for cognates of *vā* appear in many Polynesian languages. *Vā* can be gloss as space between people or things. This pan-Polynesian notion of space is known in the Tongan, Samoan, and Tahitian languages as *vā,* while it is known in Maori and Hawaiian languages as *wā* (Tregear, 1891:583-584).1 *Vā* (*wā*) points to a specific notion of space; it gives a sense of space between two or more points. This is different in many respects to the general Western notion of space as an expanse. *Vā,* according to Māhina (2002), means space, social, and spatial relations. Moreover, Māhina found in his research four dimensions of *vā*: 1) physical, 2) social, 3) intellectual, and 4) symbolic. (personal communication, November 6, 2002). All four dimensions of *vā* intersect and weave together to define and influence one another.

Since *vā* is the Tongan term for both social relations and space, it suggests that spatiality and sociality are inextricably linked together in Tongan ontology. Tongans conceptualize social relations spatially and understand space socially. Thus, for Tongans, human relationships are both socially and spatially constituted. When *vā* is used in the context of objects, it refers to the physical space between the objects. However, when it is used in the context of people, it refers to the social spaces between individuals or groups. It is a social space that both relates and connects individuals and groups to one another. For *kāinga* (kin) members, *vā* refers to the social spaces that are created between *kāinga* who are woven (connected) together genealogically. In this sense, *vā* can be construed as genealogical spaces. How is *vā* created in the first place? It appears that *vā* is created out of the genealogical *lalava/lālanga* (binding/weaving) of people in space. Weaving metaphors appear in the ways Tongans conceptualize people and their *hohoko* (genealogy).2 This is clearly expressed in the Tonga saying: "'Oku hangē 'a e tangatá ha fala 'oku lālangā," man is like a mat being woven (Rogers, 1977: 157;180). This saying expresses the Tongan idea that a person is woven genealogically from multiple kinship strands.3 Framing *vā* within weaving, we can then understand *vā* as the social spaces that are created between *kāinga*.

---

1 Other Malayo-Polynesian languages have cognates of *vā* or *wa.* For example, in the Cebuano language (in the Philippines), *wanang* is the term for certain kind of spaces.

2 The word *hohoko* literary means jointings or connections. It probably refers to the way *kāinga* members are jointed and connected biologically as well as socially.

3 The Tongan proverb, *Ko e va'ava'a he ko e tangata* (Multiple branches are the nature of man) points to the idea that a Tongan person has numerous social relations (*vā*) created out of their multiple branches of kinship ties. Nothing in nature can compare to the numerous *vā* of humans.
members who are woven together genealogically—like a mat.\(^4\) Genealogy that produces vā encompasses various kinds of connections. In other words, genealogy goes beyond mere biological kinship. It not only encompasses biological connection to kin and social connection to land (fonua), but it includes social link to important social groups such as fellow church members/church-kin (kāingalotu).

Tracing of genealogy is a way of locating one's vā with another Tongan. This practice is common when Tongans meet one another for the first time. Through hohoko (genealogy) kāinga members are socially and spatially jointed. In a formal arena, these social and spatial connections are reaffirmed and reinforced through performance of fatongia (reciprocal duties). The performance of fatongia creates the flow and circulation of goods and services between kāinga members and it simultaneously reinforces and reaffirms the socio-spatial ties of their genealogy.\(^5\)

Because vā is a social or relational space connecting people, it suggests that the Tongan notion of space, vā, places more emphasizes on spaces that link and joint people rather than spaces that divide and demarcate people. In other words, vā is a connecting bridge linking one person to another.

**Tauhi vā: Taking Care of Spaces Between**

For Tongans, vā is an important space; it must be maintained and cared for at all time. Thus the Tongan term tauhi vā; it means to take care of one's social/connected space with others. In everyday terms, tauhi vā (or tauhi vaha'a) is often defined as the value and act of keeping good relations with kin and friends. However, in a more abstract level, tauhi vā is the Tongan cultural value and practice of taking care of social/relational spaces between individuals or kāinga via reciprocal exchanges of economic and social goods (Māhina 2002).\(^6\) Furthermore, through the practice of tauhi vā, individuals or kāinga linkages are reaffirmed.

Even though tauhi vā is easily apparent during formal cultural events—such as christenings, birthdays, misinale (church offerings), marriages, and funerals—tauhi vā also exists in informal and everyday practices such as mutually sharing of foods and other resources with kin and church-kin. Tauhi vā also takes place across various generations. For instance, a person can reciprocate goods to the children or grandchildren of the person from whom he/she received goods from in the past. This will affirm and reaffirm

---

\(^{4}\) The connection of kin members through social space is clearly apparent in the Tongan (or Polynesian) practice of fe’iloaki, kissing-cheek-to-cheek, when Tongans come in contact with one another. To me, fe’iloaki (lit. mutually knowing one another) appears to be a physical manifestation of the way kāinga members intersect and connect in a social space. Maori hongi (greeting by pressing nose-to-nose) is a uniquely Maori form of fe’iloaki.

\(^{5}\) Depending on how individuals fulfill their fatongia, Tongan socio-spatial relationships can be vā-ofi (close-warm relationship), vā-mama’o (distant relationship), and vā-tamaki/vā-kovi (bad relationship). When fatongia are neglected relationships fall apart. In this case, Tongans often say, "kuo motu hona vā," their social space has been broken.

\(^{6}\) Tauhi vā is related to the Samoan phrase teu le vā (Shore, 1982:136; Duranti, 1997: 345) or tausi le va (Palaita, personal communication, November 18, 2002).
the social spaces across generations. Children are born into multiple pre-existing social spaces. They often inherit the social spaces of their forebears. Thus, tauhi vā is the active on-going practice of maintaining and reaffirming social spaces across many generations. Vā must be actively maintained—like maintaining a mat—otherwise relationships could potentially fall apart. Here, we can see why tauhi vā is defined in everyday terms as keeping good relations. By taking care of one's social spaces with others through reciprocal exchanges, one is maintaining good relations.

**Tongan Kāingalotu**

Membership in Tongan churches provides important vā for Tongans in Maui. The vā of church members are created by the fact that they are connected to the same church. By belonging to the same church, it creates a genealogical link among church members (kāingalotu). The kāingalotu genealogical link gives rise to vā. I think of this space as religious social spaces because it is constructed out of one's religious genealogy. Within this space, tauhi vā (taking care of one's social space) occurs among church members. In Maui, I became aware of my vā with my fellow L.D.S. (kāingalotu) church-kin when I met 'Api, a Tongan tiki carver, for the first time at one of Lahaina's tourist markets. In the process of tracing our genealogy—both our kāinga (kin) and kāingalotu (church-kin) genealogy—'Api found out that we both belonged to the L.D.S. church/religion. He said: "te u 'alu atu he Sāpate ke ta 'alu 'o lotu pea ta foki mai ki 'ai 'o kai haka" (I'll come Sunday so that we can go to church and then will go to my house for dinner). The way 'Api related to me was repeated many times in my interactions with other Tongans who belonged to my church. In Wailuku, (city where I stayed in Maui) Tuki, a Tongan from my church, invited me to his house every Sunday for dinner. He picked me up for church every Sunday and he fed me after church. One day when I was at his house, he said to: "Ko ho'o ha'u pē mei 'api ki 'api" (My home is your home). In essence, he was telling me that I am no stranger but kāinga (kin member). While in Maui, he offered me food, a place to stay, and the use of his vehicle to travel to my research sites. What is interesting is that the very first time I met Tuki he invited me to his house for dinner. Our kāingalotu genealogical ties created a vā between me and him. Tuki took care of our vā, religious spaces, by picking me up for church and feeding me after church. Many of the Tongan churches encourage their members to take care of their social/religious spaces with their kāingalotu (church-kin). Many of the sermons and Sunday school messages are aimed at reminding Tongans of their religious duty to take care of their social/religious spaces with others.

In the diaspora, the kāingalotu emerge as a significant form of kin. For Tongans who do not have kāinga (biological kin) in the diaspora, the kāingalotu performs all the role of the kāinga. For example, the LDS Tongan wards (and branches) are actively involved in pulling resources together to help out with funerals, wedding celebrations, graduation celebrations, and birthday parties. The bishop often acts like a Tongan chiefs. He coordinates the food assignments and the division of labor. Other ward leaders – such as relief society president, high priest group leader, elders quorum president, and ward clerk – are also involved in the gathering of resources and assigning of labor.
References


The Early LDS Missionaries: 
Teaching English and Converting Tongans.”
by Haitelenisia Uhila

I am indeed humbled and yet honored to be here. I aim to teach English to my people someday, but I still struggle with the language because it is my second language. Anyway, I heard of this effort that the Tongan history people (‘Uho o Tonga) are doing and they’re trying to read the journals of the missionaries from Tonga and produce papers out of it, and my thought was, “I want to write something about my people,” Then I asked myself the question, “How were these LDS missionaries from the U.S. mainland, who spoke very little Tongan, able to teach Tongans English, a language which they knew very little or maybe nothing at all about and also how it influenced their conversion to the church, thus the topic of my presentation “The Early LDS Missionaries: Teaching English and Converting Tongans.”

Before I go on I would like to read a story that was published in the Church News in 1959 that basically touches on all the things I want to talk about in my presentation—using one vehicle to get to another:

Elder James R. Walker and Robert A. Smith were tired and hungry. Since morning they had walked from village from village on the Tongan island of Niuafo’ou, distributing tracts and conversing with the people. They had not eaten since leaving the ship that morning and had been unsuccessful in finding a place to spend the night. “You had better go to another village,” they had been told. Finally towards evening they arrived at the village of the chief of the island and made their way to his house. To their request to a night’s lodgings he answered ‘yes” but we have no food to offer you. Glad for a piece of shelter if nothing else the elders accepted his hospitality. As they explained their work to the chief he became increasingly friendly. He called to a girl and told her to go to one of the neighbors and boil some rice. In a short time the elders were invited to sit down to a meal of rice and fried chicken. Elder Smith, his spirits considerably revived after eating, drew a shiny harmonica out of his pocket. The eyes of the little brown children opened wide as he began to play. The chief smiled approvingly. The merry tones drifted out through the still night air and the villagers began following them to their source. The house soon was filled. The crowd sang some songs to the accompaniment of the harmonica, then the elders delivered their message and distributed some tracts.

Thus went the early missionary work in Tonga in 1896—maybe I should say, went even till now. When I refer to the early LDS missionaries, I mean from the late 1890’s up to 1960. I read some of journals of the following missionaries – some I skimmed through and some I read in detail:

Brigham Smoot – 1891
Marcus Woolley – 1907
Wiliam O. Facer – 1907
My main argument is that missionaries in Tonga were neither trained ministers nor fluent speakers of Tongan at first, but they knew of the Tongans’ passion for learning new things, their social inclination, love of music, and willingness to work. By incorporating these elements into their teaching, missionaries were successful early on in enrolling Tongans in classes of various kinds and then converting them to the LDS Church. In particular, conversing and learning English was beneficial to many Tongan commoners as it provided social mobility in the Tongan society.

The first characteristic that I mentioned above is curiosity and passion for something new. In Tonga we live in small communities and so it is very common that anything new or someone new coming to the village is noticed in an instant. When missionaries came, they often brought new things with them including some musical instruments like the violin and harmonica. Because of this, they drew a lot of people into their gatherings and
also to the places the missionaries lived. In fact the Tongan’s were so fascinated by these new things that they named their children after them.. Some are named Violini (violin), some were named “Misini” after sewing machines, even very big numbers and numerals were amazing to the Tongans and they thought of naming their children after them. My last name is Uhila, which means lights or electricity, so maybe my ancestors were fascinated by the electricity so they decided to name their children after those things. Such was the case with English. When people in Tonga heard people speaking English it was something new so they wanted their children to go and learn English, their passion and curiosity for new things. One such Tongan was Samuela Fakatou: “My great desire to learn English led me a LDS missionary who taught English in the mission school in Fahefa. All elders at this time became school teachers of English in the various branches of the mission. This seemed to be the best lead the elders had of introducing the gospel to our people.”

Obviously talent and curiosity for learning new ideas led them to missionary-run English classes and then for many, conversion into the LDS Church.

Next was the implications of English. In my mind, I think the missionaries didn’t really understand, but to the Tongans there were many more implications to them that the missionaries knew at first. Such implications included being “educated” or cultured. To the Tongan people, if you spoke English at that time and maybe even now you are thought to be educated, so you’re respected amongst the community. Not only that, but it also had a sense of being American, foreign or cultured. There were people that came to the church only because it gave them a sense of being American being from a foreign country, when they speak English. Some of the missionaries wrote in their journal their frustration on finding that these natives they ask queer questions and they’d rather ask questions about America than ask anything about the gospel or anything about education. So, in my mind, attending the LDS Church meant being American or being somewhat of a higher status than being merely a Tongan. Not only that, but learning English also built up their reputation, helped in getting a government job and otherwise earning money for the family. One of the Elders, Marcus Woolley, who served in Tonga 1907, wrote that he went to this concert and most of the people performing in the concert were boys who went to the church school where they taught and so they could speak some English. Because of that they had government jobs, even though these government jobs only meant helping the doctors and helping around the hospital. But since they could speak English they enjoyed a high reputation.

Another thing I noticed is that the missionaries did not understand that the Tongan people had their own motive when they came to learn English and that was social mobility. You see, in Tonga, when you are born you are either a commoner, a chief, a noble or a king. The majority of the Tongans are commoners. I am one. Moreover, it is impossible to become a chief or a noble because class is inherited through the bloodline. However, when the missionaries came, they affiliated with a lot of the chiefs and nobles, which the Tongans were afraid to do because it would be fematamu’a or forbidden to do so. In most of the pictures that I came across, if there are Tongans in the picture they are either lower in level or very far away from the chief or the king. However, the palangi missionaries affiliated more easily with the nobility and so when the men in Tonga associated with these missionaries it was also a way of getting close to their chiefs and nobles.
There was a bit of a challenge or barrier when the Tongans first interacted with the missionaries because these missionaries as they taught English were inexperienced \textit{palangi} missionaries. In fact, in the early years, the majority of the missionaries had not finished high school, but when they got to Tonga they found out they were going to teach English to these people. Indeed many missionaries when they got to Tonga were assigned to teach English in the church schools. Those who later became fluent in the Tongan language were then sent out to do real missionary work amongst the people. George Sealy served in Tonga around 1911, said in one of his entries “Started for the first time in my life to teach school and never did before know how little I knew, but got along alright.” These teachers, a lot of them, were frustrated because first they didn’t know they were going to teach and secondly they were inexperienced in the teaching profession, yet here they were--sent to a classroom to teach the Tongans. Another elder, by the name of Winward said “Some of the kids they got the best of me, but wait until I get to know them. I will show them who is the boss. I lick the kids and will lick some more if they don’t look out. I’m the boss, not them.”

To me this gives a sense of the inexperienced teaching and the fact that these teachers were very frustrated. I don’t blame them because first, they didn’t expect it and second, maybe the Tongans were just so naughty in the classroom.

On an even more negative note, some of these missionaries were nevertheless overconfidant in teaching because they saw the Tongans as stupid, ignorant, tender-minded and not knowledgeable.

In one of the journals written by Marcus Woolley, he wrote a poem. Part of it said:

“I talked to them from daylight until dark
and tried to teach them by sign and by mark.
I worked until I was nearly dead,
but none of it seemed to stay in their heads.”

This to me, has an air of superiority, of feeling better than the Tongans. “The things that they were taught did not stay in their heads” . . . yet I would ask the question “Is it a
problem with the students or is it a problem with the teaching.” I suppose it was both. The problem resided on both sides. For you see the Tongans were deluded by their overwillingness to gain knowledge. The missionaries were faulty for they were inexperienced in the teaching profession.
The Reverend Buzacott, who served in Rarotonga in the 1800’s, said something that I believe summarizes well the natives overconfidence in their foreign but inexperienced teachers. He said, “The thirst for general knowledge . . . was excited and deepened and every week the people felt that their missionary was qualified by knowledge as well as office to lead them into the truth.”
Of course when the missionaries gathered, these students would sing a couple of songs, ask about England or America and as time went by, developed absolute confidence in the teachers. That the teachers might be inexperienced never occured to them. The mere fact that the teachers could speak English was the thing that mattered most to them.

Makeke School, Tongatapu, Tonga

However, to makeup for this inexperience, missionaries knew the natural interest of the Tongans. One of these interests was social gatherings and performances. Missionaries used socials and performances to get a lot of people to come, not only to the church schools, but also to the church and listen to their conferences.
One Elder, Tamar Gordons, wrote, “Liahona (school) became the most important socializing body of the church and the primary source of youthful converts.” So, a lot of people came into the church because they liked socials. Tongans love to socialize, to go to dances and socialize with other people.
One problem occurred with this in converting people to the church is the conversion into the church became merely a social thing. This is the term called “kaungapapi” in Tongan, which means you “only baptized because the crowd is doing so.”

President Coombs, one of the Mission Presidents in Tonga in his reports to Salt Lake City wrote: “Many of them are good and are excellent when one looks at them knowing the depths from which they have come, but still I hardly think they would not stand the test that our pioneers stood. They will sin and feel ever so bad and truly repent about it and will live it down for four, five or more years and then go do the same thing over again. . . only 30 saints have what it takes that brought your parents and my grandparents across the plains.”

True or not, I believe this is partly a problem in using socialization as means of getting people to church meetings because many were baptized into the church just because the crowd was doing so. Boyd K. Packer wrote that “true doctrine understood changes attitudes and behavior.” This conversion process happened in Tonga among many, to be sure, but for a significant number the effects were temporary as Coombs pointed out. My next point is that the missionaries knew and used the Tongans love of music.
One of the writers in *The Improvement Era*, Carter E. Grant, wrote “the Tongan people responded readily to music, especially to the youth and adult choirs organized by the Elders and in no time at all the choirs became fertile sources for converts.” This was particularly true after the choirs were turned into schools for singing and speaking the English language. The Tongans were very confident that they were good because some of them would laugh at the missionaries when they attempted to sing. Also, when they travelled around in trucks they would sing wherever they went and the Tongans loved to sing too so the missionaries, when they found this out, used it as part of the curriculum at school. They used singing and music as part of motivating kids in learning English and also converting to the church.

One of the elders, Elder Facer wrote “The Tongans have marvelous voices and love to sing more than anything else. They were so delighted with this new music that our church house was ringing with song every night. There is no difficulty here in getting the choir members out to practice. The Tongans were intrinsically motivated to go learn English because they knew they would also sing, which is something they love to do. For the parents, teaching the kids how to sing in English was just amazing.

Elder Facer wrote “I told them the words, and Sione Tekongahau the music, and I could take them to any village, sit down in the shade of a large tree, start them singing and right away we would have an audience. The entire village usually, and they would be amazed that the boys could sing in English. The result? An opportunity to teach the gospel and more applications to enter our school.” For the missionaries, singing was a very effective way of hiding their inexperience, both in the Tongan language and in teaching.

In addition to singing, there was also labor. The Tongans were always willing to work and some of them not only went to school to be students but also to help out in other work.
A lot of times the missionaries would also use the natives to clean their houses. Labor was part of their assignments at school. Some of the kids would be beaten if they don’t stay after school and help out with the work and because of this a lot of the Tongans were left to do a lot of hard work, even building the houses, but a lot of them did not feel badly because they felt like it was part of their church calling to do these things.

One elder, David E. Cummings, in his journal wrote “The Tongans were a people with amazing faith in God and pathetically eager for chapels where they could worship in beauty as well as in truth. People were willing to do anything to obtain them . . . willing to work without pay, to depend on any uncertain food supply, to live in any kind of dwelling, to handle tools they had never touched before, put in long hours and change their ancient easy-going way of life into a discipline of organized activity. The people delighted in laughter and song, and were rich in good fellowship, loyalty, human sympathy and love.”

The missionaries felt that when they worked together with these Tongans it benefited both of them. They were not only able to build chapels and classrooms, but it also helped them to learn each others’ languages. Sometimes as they would work’ the missionaries would speak to the Tongans and use signs and marks to get through to them and the Tongans in turn would do the same.

In conclusion, understanding the culture of the people and the things they loved played a major role in teaching them English and also in converting them to the church. Although faced with difficulties and their own prejudices and inexperience, the missionaries were able to teach the Tongans by uncovering passions for learning new things, socializing, music, and a willingness to work. The Tongan people, in turn, found meaning and progress in their lives and status. Elder John H.Groberg once said “We declare Christ, not English.” His point is well made. I believe we can do both, we just need to do it on separate tracks.
The mutual benefit of success, as defined by both parties, led to many early successes in the development and growth of the church in the Kingdom of Tonga... to the point where about 40% of its citizens are LDS... the highest percentage of any nation on earth.
The story of what is commonly called the “‘Awa Rebellion” in Lā‘ie has been printed and published at various times. The basic story goes something like this: In 1873, Frederick Mitchell, a Mormon missionary, arrived in Lā‘ie to become the new mission president and plantation manager. Shortly after Mitchell arrived, he attempted to more fully implement the Word of Wisdom in Lā‘ie. Although it was reported that few residents abused ‘awa (which is a traditional root crop in much of the Pacific, also known as kava, and which some consider to contain mild narcotic properties) and that most of the ‘awa grown in Lā‘ie was exported to New York City, Mitchell put a kapu (ban) on the production of ‘awa. Many of the residents of Lā‘ie resisted this kapu, with some moving off the plantation and relocating to nearby Kahana. Mitchell disfellowshipped those who moved to Kahana. The disfellowshipped Kahana Saints wrote an appeal to Brigham Young, who agreed with the Kānaka Maoli (local Hawaiians) and called Mitchell home.7

One of the questions emerging from this narrative is why Mitchell put a kapu on the production of ‘awa when the Word of Wisdom was not strictly administered in the Church at that time and when George Nebeker (the departing mission president) and plantation manager had not banned it.8 In answering this question, Chase concluded that Mitchell’s history of religious orthodoxy helps explain this decision.9 I would like to add to this religious and moral focus an analysis of how the market economy and labor relations in Hawai‘i may have also shaped choices of Kānaka Maoli and Mitchell. It appears that Mitchell’s kapu on growing ‘awa was motivated, at least in part, by his desire to more efficiently regulate and control labor on the plantation. It also appears that some of the Kānaka Maoli response to Mitchell focused on maintaining control over their daily work life by drawing on Hawaiian cultural paradigms and utilizing Church channels to resist Mitchell’s efforts.

In the early 1870s when Mitchell arrived on the plantation, Mormon colonies throughout the West and in Hawai‘i were mixtures of faith and finance. Often when Mormons were called to settle an area, the call included using personal resources to underwrite the endeavor. This was the case in Lā‘ie. Some of the missionaries called to come and

---

7The earliest known record that we have was written by the Mormon missionary, Harvey Cluff, who was present when the series of events that made up this “rebellion” took place. See Harvey Harris Cluff, Journal and Autobiography, 142-47, 159-62, Pacific Island Room, Joseph F. Smith Library, Brigham Young University Hawai‘i, Lā‘ie. Unfortunately, I have not yet located any Kānaka Maoli (Native Hawaiian) accounts. One of the earliest and best-known published accounts of these events is Lance Chase’s piece, which he gave at the first meeting of MPHS in 1980, with a subsequent inclusion in the book Voyages of Faith. Lance D. Chase, “The Hawaiian Mission Crisis of 1874: The ‘Awa Rebellion Story,” in Voyages of Faith: Explorations in Mormon Pacific History, editor Grant Underwood (Provo: Brigham Young University, 2000), 59-70.

8Cluff, 145.

9Chase, 62.
proselyte among Kānaka Maoli invested their own funds in establishing the mission and the plantation in Lā‘ie. Thus many of those who came to Lā‘ie, both Kānaka Maoli and missionary, willingly expressed their faith in material, concrete ways. For example, Maria Louisa Dilworth Nebeker was a wife of George Nebeker, one of the first mission presidents in Lā‘ie. She describes the financial sacrifice she made in coming to Lā‘ie:

> When my son William G. Nebeker was but four months old, my husband, Bro. George Nebeker, was called on another mission to the Sandwich Islands. I thought of course, he would take his first family, but what was my surprise when I was told that all my property (left me by my first husband John Leonard, deceased), was to be sold—my home, my farm, cattle, city lots—all that remained to me of my departed husband—and I was to go with Bro. Nebeker to a strange land, buy property there and help to make a gathering place for the native Saints. It seemed I was then offering my Isaac, yet I never faltered, sold all but a change of clothing for my child and myself, and I thought not of myself—only to perform my duty.¹⁰

Her investment in the economically high-risk endeavor of operating a sugar plantation created pressures on the Nebekers and other missionaries as they attempted to break even with their investment. Such pressures affected relations in the mission and on the plantation. When Nebeker came to Lā‘ie, the title and responsibility for the land was in a large sense carried by him. Harvey Cluff gives an example of how these pressures played out: “Bro. Nebeker took charge of the store and immediately raised the price of goods from 10 to 30 percent above what had been previously charged which caused dissatisfaction.”¹¹ Financial pressures also explain why some of the missionaries that served under Nebeker felt more like hired hands than missionaries.¹²

When Mitchell came to Lā‘ie, he replaced George Nebeker as mission president and plantation manager. Mitchell became a business partner to Nebeker and took on one-third interest in the property.¹³ Thus his call as mission president included not only stewardship over the mission, but also included personal interest in the financial success of the plantation.

Mitchell invested in the Lā‘ie sugar plantation and became its manager at a time that was challenging for sugar planters in Hawai‘i. In the early 1860s the American Civil War had made sugar production a promising endeavor; but by 1873 when Mitchell arrived, the

---

¹⁰Maria Louisa Dilworth Nebeker, 7 July 1865, in Andrew Jenson, comp., “History of the Hawaiian Mission of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints,” photocopy, 7 July 1865, Pacific Island Room, Special Collections, Joseph F. Smith Library, Brigham Young University Hawai‘i, Lā‘ie.

¹¹Cluff, 126.


¹³Cluff, 142.
sugar market had declined. In 1873 Hawai‘i had not yet received favorable trade status with the United States and would not until 1876 when Hawai‘i and the United States cemented the Treaty of Reciprocity. In such difficult times large, efficient plantations fared the best. However, Lā‘ie was a small plantation with a small mill and a small portion of land cultivated in sugar. All of which meant that Lā‘ie Plantation had little chance of making a profit.

Missionaries working on the plantation at the time of Mitchell’s arrival understood the challenging prospects of sugar production. Harvey Cluff, one of those missionaries tried to warn Mitchell that it would be hard for him to make a return on his investment. He recorded their exchange in this way:

As brother Mitchell, several other brethren and myself were walking over the plantation he related to us the nature of the contract with brother [sic] and the option of choosing ten percent of profits or four percent of the gross receipts. When brother Mitchell finished his statement as to the percent it was to draw for his Services, I chiped in and said “if I were you brother Mitchell I would take the gross receipts 4 percent. He spoke up very sarcastically and said “When I want advice I will ask for it.” That was a stunner, for I was innocent as could be and based my suggestion on what my experience on the plantation for several years had taught me about gross receipts and actual profits.

Implied in this conversation is that the net income was so low that even at a lower interest rate Mitchell would be better off taking his share from the gross income. In other words, the plantation was not doing well financially.

It was not just Utah missionaries who experienced tensions between faith and finance; Kānaka Maoli also experienced such tensions. It is important to understand that one of the reasons this gathering place was sustainable was because Kānaka Maoli could raise needed cash working on the sugar plantation and by growing ‘awa for the market. The cash was required to pay the taxes that had recently been imposed by the government. Secondly, Lā‘ie was a place that Kānaka Maoli could grow crops that they and their ancestors had grown for many years, such as kalo (taro). The ability to combine cash work with growing food for their own families grew out of the underlying logic and

---


15 Cluff, 143.
purpose of the Lā‘ie plantation. The plantation was implemented to financially sustain missionary work and the gathering of Kānaka Maoli converts. Thus the missionaries were loath to impose contracts on them. In other words, Kānaka Maoli who worked in Lā‘ie often could decide when to work or when not to work for the plantation, depending on their own economic needs and their desire to spend time working with their own crops. This contrasted with other Kānaka Maoli around the islands who were bound to plantations by contracts for six months to one year.  

In the 1870s and 1880s, Kānaka Maoli in Lā‘ie were increasingly drawn into the market economy. Not only did they grow kalo for their own families, but increasingly they grew ‘awa as a cash crop for an international market, particularly for New York City. ‘Awa was an effective cash crop to grow because it did not require much labor, attention, or water. Since it was generally grown in the hills and mountains, it provided little competition to the growing of either kalo or sugar. The influx of cash from ‘awa not only helped Kānaka Maoli pay taxes, it helped ensure the survival of the gathering place. Cluff noted that when Mitchell arrived, the ‘awa crop that was about to be harvested was worth several thousand dollars and, in his words: “We needed the money badly.”

Thus we come again to the central question. Why would Mitchell prohibit the growing and harvesting of ‘awa as a cash crop when cash was so needed to ensure the success of the gathering place in Lā‘ie? Cluff’s journal suggests that Mitchell saw the production and consumption of ‘awa as breaking the Word of Wisdom. The willingness of many early Mormons to make sacrifices for their beliefs suggests that we should not minimize Mitchell’s faith as a factor in his decision to stop the production of ‘awa either for use or for sale.

However, humans are complex creatures who often act from multiple motivations. It would not be surprising if Mitchell, either consciously or unconsciously, drew on economic and social motivations for insisting that Kānaka Maoli stop producing ‘awa. At first glance, it may appear that Mitchell’s action would negatively affect the plantation.

---
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and his own investment since it would cut off a source of cash and a source of support for the Kānaka Maoli Saints trying to make it in Lāʻie. However, if we examine his actions in the context of the plantation economy, it becomes clear that, in fact, the kapu would work to Mitchell’s benefit by creating a more pliant workforce.20

There are three reasons that suggest this. The first has to do with the nature of the timing of the kapu. Although Mitchell had emphasized the Word of Wisdom from the pulpit and in Church councils, he did not impose the kapu when it carried an ecclesiastical mantle. Instead he made the announcement at a community New Years’ celebration.21 It is not hard to imagine a celebration that would challenge Mitchell’s sense of propriety and induce him to initiate a temperance movement, including a ban on ‘awa.

The second reason may have to do with the timing of work on the plantation. Unlike other plantations, Lāʻie did not use contracts to bind Kānaka Maoli workers to the plantation. Since the plantation had been designed to financially support the gathering place, it did not make sense to the missionaries to use a contract system that they saw as exploitive.22 Without contracts Mitchell did not have a legal, binding way to hold or control the workers, as did surrounding plantation owners. Although there seems to have been enough workers willing to work on the plantation, it also appears that many of them worked primarily when they needed cash. In other words, they did stint labor. Missionary diaries attest to both a plentitude of Kānaka Maoli workers willing to do stint work and at the same time the difficulty of finding regular workers, willing to work for the exact time frames that the missionaries wanted them to work.

It is clear that Mitchell arrived at the plantation when it was extremely difficult to make a profit and to a plantation without having a steady, tractable workforce that would work on demand. This is where ‘awa enters into the labor equation. If Mitchell could successfully cut off the cash flow that came from ‘awa, then the Kānaka Maoli workers in Lāʻie would need to work in the sugar fields and mill more often in order to earn money.

Whether Mitchell consciously thought this through we cannot know; however, the intensity of the reaction of Kānaka Maoli suggests that they saw that the kapu would make them more economically dependent on the plantation, and this was unacceptable to them. The rejection of such control over their labor was manifested by their move to Kahana. In precontact times, if a konohiki or aliʻi acted oppressively, the people were entitled to move to a different location. That this cultural pattern held over into the 1870s is attested to by the fact that as other sugar plantations tightened up their labor practices, Kānaka Maoli refused to work on sugar plantations. Increasingly, plantations turned to

---

20 As of yet, I have been unable to find any journal entries by Mitchell for this time period, so our evidence cannot be based on his perspective. Thus while much of what I conclude is speculative, it is grounded in the evidence of plantation life from that era.

21 Cluff, 147.

22 Harvey Cluff to Deseret News, 15 March 1870, in Jenson.
Asia for workers. As on other plantations, when Mitchell moved to limit the amount of control Kānaka Maoli had over their work lives, they left the plantation.

The third piece of evidence that Mitchell used his authority to make the plantation more profitable was when he disfellowshipped some of those who moved to Kahana. Because he had no contracts with Kānaka Maoli, he had no legal recourse to hold them to the land. Instead, he resorted to ecclesiastical authority and disfellowshipped them.

Mitchell’s heavy-handedness caused dissatisfaction among Kānaka Maoli Saints and missionaries. Cluff records in his autobiography his own disgruntlement with how Mitchell spoke to him and with how he handled the kapu. Shortly after the conflict over ‘awa, Cluff’s mission ended, and he returned to Salt Lake City. He met with Brigham Young and other Church leaders who had Hawaiian connections. He learned that some Kānaka Maoli had written complaining about how Mitchell had treated them. As of yet there is no known copy of the letter. The actions of Kānaka Maoli were sustained in the Salt Lake meeting. Brigham Young did not ask them to work by contract or to return to Lā‘ie. Instead, Mitchell was called home. Kahana became one of the three strongest Mormon communities in the islands. It also became a place where Hawaiians attempted to recreate labor and food pathways while negotiating the growing market economy.

This story suggests that the history of the mission in Hawai‘i should not be told without it being contextualized by the history of the plantation and the economy of the times. The story also tells us that the phrase “‘Awa Rebellion” is reductive. The term “rebellion” does not adequately capture the nuanced, interculturally complex, and successful means by which Kānaka Maoli resisted inappropriate economic domination by an overbearing missionary while simultaneously maintaining their faith. Their efforts to be faithful Saints in an intercultural and colonial setting, suggests an important and faithful rendering of a pioneer spirit.

---
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“God Hates a Quitter”

Elder Ford Clark: Diary of Labors in the Hawaiian Mission 1917-1920 and 1925-1929

by Dean Clark Ellis and Win Rosa

Aloha. My name is Dean Clark Ellis. I grew up on the mainland. I have lived in Hauula for the last 3 years. I’m here with my uncle, Win Rosa. He grew up here in the islands with my mother and her sister and ended up marrying my mother’s sister. (Both my mother and her sister have passed away.) After raising his family on the mainland, he has moved back to the islands and has been living in Kailua for the past 2 years.

We have been invited to speak about the missionary travels of my Grandfather, N. Ford Clark. This is Grandpa as I knew him.

The title for our presentation is taken from the title page of the first volume of his journal, “God Hates A Quitter.”

First, let me give you a quick overview of his missions and then we'll get into some of the details of his adventures.
Elder Clark served his first mission to the islands from 1917-1920. Returning to Utah he graduated from the University of Utah, got married and was called on a second mission to Hawaii from 1925-1929. Of the second mission, the Hawaiian Mission Record simply states,

Clark 1917

“Saturday March 21, 1925—...Elder Nathan Ford Clark and wife Monty B. Clark of Farmington, Utah arrived at Honolulu per S.S. ‘Calawai’ as missionaries to Hawaii. This [was] the second mission of Elder Clark to Hawaii, he having previously filled one from 1917 to 1920.”

A couple of months after arriving in the islands for his second mission, my mother was born in Honolulu.

Monty Clark

N. Ford Clark and Daugther June 1925

My grandfather stayed here in the islands the rest of his life. My mother and Uncle Win grew up in Kaimuki, attended Punahou together, and both left the islands shortly after World War II. Mother did not return until 1975. She met me here, as I was returning from a LDS mission in Japan. Grandpa met us and we had a great week revisiting my mother’s childhood memories. I was also here in Laie at the beginning of my mission. I was assigned to the Language Training Mission (LTM) at The Church College of Hawaii, now BYU Hawaii. I spent a lot of sleepless nights in Hale 2, dreaming in Japanese. So, in a way, Win and I are returning to our roots.
While Grandpa was on his first mission he wrote extensively about his mission. We have his original journals which make up 4 volumes. He also had a camera and took many pictures. During his second mission, he did not keep a journal. Most of the information from his second mission has been found in the official mission record and a recently found journal written by Elder Clark’s wife, Monty.

Elder N. Ford Clark – Hawaiian Mission Journal

Elder Clark was not an exceptional missionary. He didn't have a lot of converts. Upon leaving his first mission, the mission clerk simply wrote, “Elder Clark...good language, average missionary.” From reading his journals and knowing him in his later life, I suspect he was an average missionary. The one thing he wasn't average about was his love for the islands, the people who lived here and their language. In 1978, I was with him when he made his last trip to Laie. We stopped by the house of his old friend Bill (Pops) Sproat. They sat down on the floor and immediately started speaking in Hawaiian. They were both in their 70’s. Pops’ 17 or 18 year old grandson came walking through the room. Pops looked up at his grandson and said, “you'll never be able to speak Hawaiian like this haole.” Grandpa died a couple of months later and was laid to rest at Punchbowl Memorial Cemetery. Pops Sproat passed away just last year; he was over a hundred.

N. Ford Clark was born on May 31, 1899, in Centerville, Utah to Nathan and Esther Clark. He grew up in Farmington, Utah and was the oldest of 14 children. He was called to serve his first mission when he was 17 years old. About a year into his mission, he writes the following about his initial call:

“I had not thought of going on a mission when I went...to Clarkson to spend Christmas, but after arriving home, Sam [Cowley, brother of Matthew Cowley] and myself began seriously thinking of one, so consequently we both...
being green kids were started off to Hawaii on a mission. I left rather suddenly as I was called to leave Salt Lake on the 25th of January 1917...On the 24th we received our instructions and were sent into the Presidents office, I being set apart by Rudger Clawson. I well remember how Sam and I stuck pretty close together during all of these things although we little dreamed of what we were going to experience.”

He continues,

and Clark 1917

“I left Grandma's on the morning of the 25th and we all rode together on the street car as far as Aunt Mary’s. It's a good thing I had to say good-bye to Mother on the street car or she might of made a fuss. I was 17 years old, but I guess I looked just a little bit like a kid and to Mother, I was her first baby.”

He traveled by train from Salt Lake City to San Francisco. There he boarded a ship bound for Honolulu. The Hawaiian Mission Record records the following:

“Monday Feb. 5, 1917. Elders Samuel P. Cowley and Nathan Ford Clark of Logan, Utah, arrived at Honolulu per S.S. 'Sonoma' as missionaries to Hawaii. Elder Cowley was assigned to labor in the East Maui Conference, and Elder Clark in the Honolulu Conference.”

Elder Clark wasn't in Honolulu long, when he was called to go to the Big Island. He had a short stint in Hilo before heading up the Hamakua coast where he was to spend most of his mission. While in Hilo, Joseph F. Smith came for a visit. Elder Clark's Journal records:

Elder Clark - 1919

“Friday May 11, 1917-Pres. Jos. F. Smith came this morning and we were all busy visiting the saints and telling them to come to the meeting on Saturday. We went down to Sister Wright's for dinner and I shook hands with Pres. Smith. I was very glad to see him and the rest of the party. After dinner they went up to the volcano.”

“Saturday May 12 1917-I worked in the yard in the meeting house, decorating things for the meeting for Pres. Smith. The people started coming at nine o'clock and the house was full for meeting at ten o'clock. It lasted two hours and Bro. Smith gave a fine talk on baptism and temple work.”

Within a few months, Elder Clark was transferred to the Hamakua Coast and in particular, Waipio Valley. He spent the next two years in Waipio Valley.

His first description of Waipio Valley is as follows:
“Monday Sept. 24, 1917-I shall never forget my first descent into the Waipio Valley from Kukuihaele. It is about a 2000 foot descent.

about 1918

“on a narrow trail which is steep for a horse, into a valley that is spotted with green rice fields and taro patches and streaked with small brooks.

The valley is about one mile wide and about four miles long, with steep mountains on all sides except on looking toward the ocean, which occupies one side.”

1918

“From the valley can be seen the numerous and large falls, that come over the pali and drop into the valley to run out at the ocean.”
“The land is quite level and not over four feet above sea level. It took us about half hour to descend and we went to an Hawaiian’s house by the name of Solomon Poliahu, who is the President of the Branch."

“His work is of mostly raising taro. He treated us fine and gave us a house to ourselves which is surrounded by taro patches. It seemed good to be in such a beautiful place and have plenty of water, as water has been scarce everywhere for six months. Also good feed for the horses which we staked out.”

He would have many experiences with Bro. Poliahu. On September 6, 1918, almost a year after arriving in the valley, this picture was taken of Solomon Poliahu, flanked by Elder Clark on the left and Elder Byron Jones on the right. On the occasion, Elder Clark wrote:

“All, I took pictures today…when Poliahu returned from Kukuiaele we also had one taken of ourselves with him. He dressed up for the occasion and looked like a Prince.” (September 6, 1918)

After a 20 mile ride back to Kukuiaele and a walk down to Waipio, Elder Clark writes:

“All seemed good to me to get back but old Poliahu ma took it like an every day occurrence. I don’t believe he and his family ever laugh once in 6 months and I’m going to make them if I can to see what it looks like.” (October 18, 1917)
Well, it was hard work living down in the valley. Sometimes they would use a cow to work the land and other times it was all by hand. On July 17, 1919 Elder Clark records:

“Poliahu was cleaning one of his taro patches so Leland and I got some knives and helped him a little while and then we went fishing oopu... We put our nets out 6 times which filled our bucket and sack.”

Elder Clark finally concludes:

“I certainly like the old man Poliahu and he is about the straightest old Saint I have ever seen. He is probably the only worthy one in the conference of going to the temple.”
(August 4, 1918)

Well, 3 days after the temple is dedicated, Elder Clark records:

“Sunday morning we all went to the meeting house, after which I took Poliahu thru the temple... It was so nice to be under the wing of the temple, one feels a peaceful something that can hardly be described.” (November 30, 1919)

Who would have thought then, that Solomon Poliahu's great-great grandson would serve as the stake president of the Kona Stake today, President Aley Auna. Brother Vanley Auna, who works here at BYU Hawaii and lives in Hauula, is also a great-great grandson of this early leader of the church.

[Reference LDS Family History PAF]

Elder Clark would spend the next 2 years living in Waipio Valley and visiting all the saints in the Hamakua District, from Waipio and Kukuihaele to Kalopa, Honokaa and Waimea, with side trips to Puako and Hilo.

In 1917, Waipio Valley was a thriving community of about 700 people. There were 4 villages in the valley. There was no electricity, but there was a phone. People began to leave the valley in the 1920 ties. As the people left the valley buildings fell into disrepair. The crowning blow was the destruction caused by the 1946 tsunami which destroyed homes, kalo and rice fields near the shore. In 1996, the estimated population in the valley was 35.
Well, it was here in old Waipio, that Elder Clark and other missionaries learned the ways of the Hawaiians and the ways of a haole missionary serving in Hawaii.

The missionaries would learn the language from the people and from the Hawaiian Book of Mormon and Doctrine & Covenants which they carried with them. The language wasn't easy but after about a year in the islands, Elder Clark records:

“Bro. Jones and I were the only speakers, but the saints certainly enjoyed it and the words were certainly given to us to by the Lord and the Hawaiian (language) just rolled out of my mouth as fluently as if I were talking English.” (December 23, 1918)

The Hawaiians cooked on wood and kerosene stoves and the imu. The missionaries were largely dependent on Church members for housing and meals. On one occasion he records:

“After meeting we went over to Sister Auna's in hopes of dinner.” (December 12, 1917)

“Being a little hungry for a piece of kalo (taro) we went up to the poi shops and visited a few saints and got what we went after.” (June 6, 1918)

They ate what the members ate, such as taro, poi, taro leaves, fish, pork, chicken, jerked beef, crackers and sardines. Elder Clark mentions once of eating poi ulu, the paste pounded from the fruit of the breadfruit tree. Elder Clark describes one meal in Puako at the Kaono's as follows:

“The folks at Puako were glad to see us...Stayed at Kaono's...They treated us great and gave us the best they had...flour poi [sea salt] and onion for supper...there being a great number of gnats that got into our food we could hardly eat.” (May 14, 1918, June 18, 1919)

Mosquitoes were also a problem.

July 19, 1918- “The mosquitoes at Alapai's are worse than ever and I find it hard to stay there without a paku [net] over me all the time...”

From Waipio the missionaries would service branches in Waipio, Kukuihaele, Honokaa, Kalopa and Waimea. Along the way they would find their lunch; coconuts, papayas, mangoes, oranges, bananas, mountain apples, lilikoi, guava, alligator pears (avocados), wild raspberries. On one occasion Elder Clark records:
“We had a pretty good ride and gathered some wild raspberries on the way.” (May 24, 1918)

“About noon, being a little hungry, we stopped on the road and got a few papayas and ate them.” (September 26, 1917)

“We...gathered some papayas from the gulch taking turns in climbing the trees. One of my trees fell with me and I rolled in the ditch, but I got my papaya so the fall was not much noticed.” (June 14, 1918)

Most of the time they would stay at the members’ homes. Besides the mosquitoes, other things would keep them up at night:

“Bro. Jones and I did not sleep very good on account of a little gray cat which mewed under the window and on the house all night. In spite of the efforts of Bro. Jones who got up 2 or 3 times and chased it away with my trousers, we could not get rid of it.” (May 20, 1918)

Sometimes they wouldn't be able to find a place to stay, so they would stay at the meeting house. On one such occasion in Waimea, Elder Clark records:

“Our bed in the Meeting was certainly a cold one along toward morning and Bro. Jones and myself seemed to know about it, as we rolled around in our raincoats quite a bit. When we got up, frost was

on the windows and we went down to the store to warm up.” (June 8, 1918)
Waimea Chapel about 1919

The missionaries would learn to travel long distances by horse or foot along Mud Lane from Waipio to Waimea

or up the road from Honokaa to Waimea as shown here. There were steep grades in hot weather and 4 times he would hike the 12 palis from Waipio to the remote valley of Waimanu.

“To get out of Waipio Valley we had to climb a zig zag trail, 2000 feet high which took us about ¾ of an hour...There were 12 palis...to cross over...we were continually [going] over steep inclines, which looked dangerous to us, but the Waimanu people think it is nothing...It's a regular cow trail. (January 21, 1918)
In 1918, the trail looked like this as Elder Clark continues:

"...It took us 3 1/2 hours and we came into view of Waimanu. (January 21, 1918)"

"It was certainly a grand sight to look straight down 2000 feet over a high precipice, at a flat little valley, surrounded by perpendicular mountains on all sides except toward the sea, where the large waves came rolling in... (January 21, 1918)"

Water is the essence of Waimanu. Much of the valley floor is a fresh water marsh. In heavy rains locals report that Waimanu thunders to the sound of falling water as flowing white ribbons pour over every notch of its cliffs. It was here in Waimanu that Elder Clark learned of another Hawaiian mode of transportation. He writes:

"There is a large stream which comes down from the mountains called the Waimanu River and as it was close to the house and there were some little Waas (canoe) there I got in and had a nice little ride. A waa is a small hand
made row boat with an out-rigger fastened to it to balance it. They were carved out of tree trunks by hand.”

_I with one of the children started up the river...We were going fine when...she turned over. The water was about 4 feet deep, but we both went clear in...The Hawaiians certainly had a fine laugh over it, but it was alright with me, so long as they furnished me with dry clothes, which they did... (January 21, 1918)_

Along with long walks to Waimanu, Waimea and Honokaa there were also long rides by horseback.
He would ride a horse named Laka, Ol' Billie, Lock or Lady, up to Waimea or over to Honokaa to get the mail. Other times the missionaries would catch the plantation train in Paauilo, bound for Hilo to attend meetings and conferences.

The missionaries would hitch rides in what few cars would pass by. They would hitch rides with Bro. John Kealoha, the President of the Kukuihaele Branch, who owned an old car, as he was the jailer in town. (September 24-28, 1917)
Sometimes the missionaries would hitch a ride on a ranch truck from Parker Ranch down to Kawaihae.

Elder Clark writes,

“Brother Jones and I had planned to go to Puako on the Ranch Truck going to Kawaihae...we caught the truck early and were soon in Kawaihae. (May 14, 1918)

Once they were in Kawaihae they would then Sampan or walk down to Puako. Elder Clark records,

“At Kawaihae we fell in with an old portagee who had hired a sampan to take him over to Puako to buy pigs, so we went along with him.” (June 18, 1918)

On another occasion the missionaries walked to Puako and Elder Clark continues,

“Our trail being along the beach toward Kona...Arriving at our little sandy beach 'Hapuna' we had a long swim and took a few pictures.” (November 6, 1918)

During much of their travels they would perform ordinations, baptisms, administrations to the sick in addition to conducting and teaching at Sunday meetings or teaching cottage meetings at the members homes where their neighbors were invited to attend. At these gatherings they discussed gospel principles and encouraged people to accept baptism.

One of the favorite topics was the Temple under construction in Laie and how the members might
attend the Temple dedication and take part in activities there.

After a year out in the country Elder Clark records:

**Hawaiian Temple about 1917**

“I feel good today and think I could stand it out here one more year at least, but present we are all waiting for the Temple Dedication and when the time comes we will flock in to Laie...” (July 19, 1918)

They would also organize fund raisers for the Temple Fund, organizing dances and luau’s, going house to house selling tickets to further the cause. They recruited musicians for entertainment, often the evenings before Branch Conferences. At one event Elder Clark records:

“...gave a dance the night of the third for the benefit of the Temple. We made daily walking trips all over town selling tickets for the grand event. Our dance was a success and everybody had a good time and we also feel pretty good over it as we cleared about $30.” (July 4, 1918)

“We visited most all of the saints that afternoon and got a little Temple money.”

Most of their evenings were spent talking story, singing songs and playing guitar or ukulele and Pule Ohana or Family Prayer.

“Spent the evening in talking on the porch and listening to music played by the people” (May 14, 1918)

“spent the evening chatting with Poliahu” (June 3, 1918)

“we all sang songs until late in the evening” (February 16, 1919)

“went home and talked the day over with Poliahu” (July 19, 1919)

“I sat and talked so long on the porch with Poliahu” (April 11, 1919)
“We had a good talk with Poliahu and played the graphaphone in the evening.” (June 27, 1919)  
Elders Byron Jones and N. Ford Clark

“Pau, we all had a bath and went back to the house...spending a fine evening together. We always have Pule Ohana, and the old man [Poliahu] always takes charge and it almost seems like a little Bible class” (June 28, 1919)

Such was the missionary life in Waipio and the Hamakua District of the Big Island. The church no longer has an official presence in Waipio (no more missionaries), but the legacy of past missionary work is evident in the strong membership in the general area and throughout the the Big Island. The Temple in Kona is part of that legacy.

Elders N. Ford Clark and Byron Jones

1918

As I read Grandpa's journal I was struck by the lack of money and food that the Elders encountered among the members. That said, sometimes with great sacrifice from the members they would get by.

Upon leaving Puako November 7, 1918, Elder Clark writes:

“The old lady Kaono slipped us a dollar and I had a little talk with her before leaving which made her feel good. ”

Old Lady Kaono's granddaughter is Sister Irene Cordiero-Vierra who lives here in Hauula. In an interview with her and her sister, several weeks ago, how well they remember their grandma slipping them a dollar bill to take to church on Sunday. Other occasions demonstrated the member's kindness and generosity to the Elders:

“We asked Bro. Robert Kanihu if we could stay with him and he at last consented and after supper he and his wife with Annie played and sang for us. They parted their one room with a curtain and gave us their bed to sleep, while they slept on the floor.”  
(December 13, 1917)
“We made our way up to Judge Makekau’s who was out in the yard working. He was glad to see us however, and insisted that we stay all night with him...the Judge made us feel at home and then went to kill the ‘chicken’ which he and his son prepared for us with a right good supper.”

And finally, Elder Clark writes:

“June 26, 1919-Leland [Heywood] and I stayed at Kukuihaele and slept in Meheula’s house. He was in Laupahoehoe and his wife and children were going down to Kahakai to sleep, so we had the house to ourselves. The poor lady gave us every cent she had--$.40-- to eat before she left us and it nearly made tears come into my eyes to see her faith and generosity, but that is an Hawaiian over and over and I see it everyday.”

One of the most touching events recorded in Elder Clark’s Journal is the dedication of the Laie Temple.

He came by boat with some of the members from the Big Island, stopping in Lahaina, picking up more missionaries and members. They arrived in Honolulu on November 25, 1919.

“We pulled into Honolulu in the morning—city at last after 2 years and 2 months in the country...motored out to Laie—it’s a little new city to me...”

Wednesday, November 26, 1919—“In evening was the first meeting of Conference and we heard from the visitors, Pres. Grant, Lund, apostles Clawson and Richards and Bishop Nibley...”

Thursday, November 27, 1919—“Thanksgiving! We all assembled in the Temple at 10:00 for the first Dedication service and what feast!--4 ½ hours. Also held another meeting in the Hale Pule in the evening. The meetings in the Temple are over 300 people while over 600 attend at the meeting house.”
Friday, November 28, 1919-“During the day were two services in the Temple. I had the privilege of attending them both...Was nearly frightened to death when I talked in the Temple this afternoon. Ano e koie noonoo i ka noho ano i kuu hoohanau we. Maina ma.” [I was thinking I was born here]

Saturday, November 29, 1919-“...I did get to attend the afternoon session at the temple”

Sunday, November 30, 1919-“...It is so nice to be under the wing of the Temple, one feels a peaceful something that can hardly be described.”

Monday, November 31, 1919-“...In the evening a testimony meeting was held in the Temple assembly room for the Elders.”


Elder Clark's Journal continues:

Wednesday, December 3, 1919-“Bro. Waddoups had spoken to me about working in the Temple, so that is where I was all day—it being the first day of endowments, 36 in all. We got out about dark, tired and hungry, but it is a great work.”
Thursday, December 4, 1919- “Again I went to the Temple and took my part...”

Elder N. Ford Clark and Elders at Lanihuli House 1919

Friday, December 5, 1919- “Worked in the Temple again.  Old Sis Ma [Manuhii] was one of them Newman and I had to carry her thru.  When she came out she said she had seen Joseph F. Smith's face and he said 'aloha' to her.  Also in one of the rooms a dove flew in thru the window and sat on the end of her bench.”

Sister Ma Manuhii took care of Joseph F. Smith during his first mission to the islands. This is a first person account of Sister Ma Manuhii's experience during her own endowment session.  She was in her 90 ties, was blind and couldn't walk.  She died shortly after.
Following these days in Laie, Elder Clark was sent back to the Big Island and then on to Maui. Elder Clark left Lahaina for a Mission Conference in Laie on July 7, 1920. Once he reached Laie, he records the following:

*Monday, July 12, 1920-* I helped Barlow decorate the hall for the cantata in the evening. All Elders repaired to the Temple in the afternoon, received our appointments and bore testimonies. *I am released...*

That's the way they did it in those days. There was not a set time limit for the mission, so you never knew when your release would come. You could be honorably released at almost anytime for almost any reason.

Without mentioning the names, look at this release of a missionary couple I came across in the Hawaiian Mission Record from 1901:

*Wednesday, Apr. 24, 1901-* Elder P was released early because he was ruled by his wife, and his wife was released because she was adverse to doing anything.

Well, that's the way they did it in those days. Elder Clark's last days in the mission are spent as follows:

*Tuesday, July 13, 1920-* I wrote the folks, went to the Temple...all day.

*Wednesday, July 14, 1920-* I went thru the Temple again twice...

*Thursday, July 15, 1920-* To the Temple again—twice.

*Friday, July 16, 1920-* To the Temple again. These are happy days...

On July 19th, 1920, he left on the morning train from Kahuku, bound for Honolulu. On July 20th from Honolulu he writes;
“Yesterday, we were all out to Bro. Eli’s to a luau in honor of we returning elders, and again this afternoon we were served to another big repeat in honor of our worthy selves in the Hale Pule. **Goodness it’s lonesome.**”

The next day “covered with leis”, he left the islands after 3 1/2 years. He left with the words, “I am coming back to Hawaii.” Little did he know it would be less than five years when he would return with his pregnant wife, for his second mission.

He caught the boat to San Francisco and then by train to Salt Lake City. After living in a tropical paradise for 3 ½ years, it is no wonder that he describes the train ride home as “a more dusty ride I never had. The desert is awful.”

Upon arriving home, not unlike the missionaries of today, he records:

“It’s nice to go away even to come home again. I think I will appreciate home now. Mother and I went to bed in the early hours of the morning...This is the closing of a diary of the pearl of 'My first mission'...and a few happy days at home...aloha nui”

*e noho i loko o ke aloha a kou makuahine.*

(dwell with the love of your mother)

**Sources:**

- Nathan Ford Clark Mission Journal, 4 Volumes, Originals in possession of Dean Clark Ellis and Win Rosa
- All photos in the possession of Dean Clark Ellis and Win Rosa, except as noted.

**Dean Clark Ellis** is the grandson of N. Ford Clark. He graduated from the College of Engineering at Utah State University. He is a retired Vice President of Callaway Golf Company. He has traveled extensively and authored several technical papers in the field of materials and welding. He currently resides in Hauula, HI. ([deancellis@juno.com](mailto:deancellis@juno.com))

**Win Rosa** is the son-in-law of N. Ford Clark. He graduated in Civil Engineering from Stanford University. He retired from California Department of Transportation. He is an avid hiker and has traveled extensively. He is the author of a hiking and trails book, “Hawaii Wild”. He currently resides in Kailua, HI. ([winrosa@comcast.net](mailto:winrosa@comcast.net))

Our appreciation to Matt Kester and BYU Hawaii Archives. Also our appreciation to Keith Ellis for his research in finding many of the Elder Clark’s photos and Monty Clark’s Journal.
The LDS Church on the Kalaupapa Peninsula
by Riley Moffat

LDS missionaries first proselyted on the peninsula from 1853 to 1856. Their greatest success was at Kalawao. It is doubtful, however, that a branch was functioning when the first patients were brought to the peninsula in 1866. Given the resurgence of missionary work in the late 1860s it is likely that LDS Hawaiians were among those first patients.

Church organization came with the arrival of LDS pioneer leader Ionatana (Jonathan) Napela, a kokua, and his wife Kiti (Kitty) Richardson Napela on the same day as Father Damien in 1873. Peter Kaeo, younger half brother of Kauikeaouli, Kamehameha III, cousin of Queen Emma and Napela’s neighbor on the peninsula says that Napela held meetings in a grove of trees inside the windward rim of Kauhako Crater. By 1877 meetings were being held in a schoolhouse according to a visiting missionary. In 1878 Elder Henry P. Richards and Elder Keau Kalawaia reported that there were two branches, one in Kalawao and one in Kalaupapa with 88 members in a district presided over by Pres. Napela. This is the time Father Damien reportedly tells Elder Richards that Napela is his ‘yoke-mate’. The visiting Elders often stay with Father Damien and enjoy lively conversations.

After Pres. Napela died in 1879 the Elders continued visiting once each year. In 1888 four Elders visited to sustain a new branch presidency in Kalawao and to visit Napela’s limestone covered grave on the rim of Kauhako Crater. Baptisms were performed in a tidal pool near the Kalawao landing. In 1895, Andrew Jenson reports there were 149 members in the Kalaupapa branch and 78 at Kalawao making them some of the largest branches in the mission. Linda Greene (1985) says that the Kalawao chapel shown just west of Siloama on the makai side of the road on M.D. Monsarrat’s 1895 survey for the Hawaiian Government Survey was replaced in 1904 by a chapel across the road on the mauka side. As the patient facilities moved from Kalawao to Kalaupapa this chapel was no longer needed, though it may have been used up until the 1920s. Ku’ulei Bell tells the story that the Church traded the chapel for land on Maui and the new owner used the building materials for a beach house.

Monsarrat’s 1895 map shows a Mormon chapel just north of the butcher shop in Kalaupapa. A second chapel in Kalaupapa was begun in 1901 and the two chapels were dedicated in 1904 by Elder William W. Waddoups. The Kalaupapa chapel sat 200 and was “one of the finest buildings in the entire mission” according to Elder Waddoups (Jensen, 1919). At the time there were 200 members in the two branches. In the community cemetery just north of the village a large Mormon section developed. In 1919, President Waddoups trained the Saints at Kalaupapa how to collect their genealogy so that they could submit names for proxy work in the new Hawaii Temple.
RELIEF SOCIETY AT KALAPAPA CHAPEL CIRCA 1910?
By 1926, LDS membership on the peninsula had dropped to 90 under the leadership of branch president Elder John Bright who served from 1918 to 1926. In 1927 the Kalaupapa chapel was remodeled and rededicated by Pres. Waddoups. President E. Wesley Smith of the Hawaii Mission visited in 1920 and was very impressed by the great gospel knowledge of the Saints there.

In the Kalaupapa chapel there are two pulpits and two bathrooms, one for patients and one for visitors. Patients sat on one side and visitors on the other. A little apartment for the missionaries was built in 1935 on the chapel lot and a cultural hall was added next to the chapel in 1947. With the development of new treatments that eliminated transference of the disease, missionaries could stay and help with the branch but not proselyte. By 1949 membership was down to 25 as old patients died and no new patients arrived. Interviews and recollections highlight the fact that all religious denominations cooperated and supported each other in addressing the needs of the patients. The physical and emotional suffering engendered by the disease mitigated the parochialism that tended to divide denominations elsewhere in the Islands. Elder David Hannemann recalls spending the first 6 months of his Hawaiian mission in Kalaupapa in the early 1950s with fond memories. As part of this ecumenical cooperation, Elder Hannemann and his companion were put in charge of the peninsula’s boy scout troop.

In 1934, Jack Sing was converted to the Church by his wife, Mary, and baptized. In 1952, he was called as branch president and served for 32 years. Many recall him driving visitors around in his Cadillac. Many also remember Jack receiving BYU-Hawaii’s Distinguished Service Award in 1977 at its annual graduation ceremonies and receiving a bearhug from Church President, Spencer W. Kimball.

By 1965, the 1904 chapel had been so damaged by termites and damp weather that it was replaced by the current frame chapel which was dedicated by Elder Marion D. Hanks of the Seventy. (Linda Greene suggests that the chapel was damaged in the April 1, 1946 tsunami). After Pres. Sing died in 1984, Sis. Ku'ulei Bell has “led” the congregation under the direction of Priesthood leaders from “topside” who regularly visit and conduct sacrament meetings.

[Editor’s Note: Elizabeth Kuulei Bell passed away on Feb 8, 2009.)
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Nā kōkua o Makanalua
by Kerri A. Inglis

Aloha mai kākou. (Greetings to you all.) Let me begin by explaining the title of my presentation. “Nā kōkua” refers to those who came to the leprosy settlement to offer assistance to their loved ones who were ill. “Makanalua” refers to this peninsula on the northern coast of Molokai. The peninsula is actually divided into three ahupua’a (land divisions, districts): Kalawao on the eastern side, Makanalua (where Kauhako crater lies) in the center, and Kalaulapapa to the west. Kalaupapa is the name we commonly give to the peninsula today, but traditionally, the name of the entire peninsula was Makanalua.

Thus, what I want to talk to you about today, are the many “helpers” who came to this peninsula from 1866 on, during the times when the leprosy epidemic was of great concern to the people of Hawai‘i.

Nā kōkua o Makanalua

The tradition of kōkua (to help, helper) is a long-standing one in Hawaiian culture and history. Certainly, to help and care for our loved ones is a part of almost every culture, but it is a quality that seems to have been exemplified by Kānaka Maoli (Native Hawaiians) during some of their most trying times in the 1800s. Since the time of Captain Cook’s encounters with Native Hawaiians, beginning in 1778, foreign infectious diseases have taken a horrendous toll on the indigenous population. Epidemics such as cholera, measles, influenza, tuberculosis, venereal diseases, smallpox, and leprosy each took their turn at assaulting the Native Hawaiians.

In his writings titled Ruling Chiefs, Samuel Manaiakalani Kamakau was speaking about the 1853 smallpox epidemic when he explained that “the wife nursed the husband or the husband the wife, and when the children fell ill the parents nursed them”. Since all of the epidemics of the 1800s were of a foreign nature (not previously experienced by Kānaka Maoli) it is reasonable to expect that their reaction to each disease experience would be essentially the same – that is, to help their loved ones through the pain and suffering; to kōkua.

Indeed, when the Queen’s hospital began – a temporary facility first opened its doors on August 1, 1859 – there was no nursing staff. Instead, patients admitted to the clinic were accompanied by their makamaka (friend, watcher) or kōkua (helper) right from the start. Thus it is not surprising that when those diagnosed with leprosy were sent to the settlement on Makanalua peninsula, many kōkua went as well.

The “Act to Prevent the Spread of Leprosy” was put forth by a haole-led Board of Health, and signed by King Kamehameha V in 1865. The Act allowed for the selection of a place to send those with the disease, for those suspected of the disease to be arrested and examined, and the Board was charged with seeing to the medical and physical needs of those who were quarantined/isolated/banished.

By 1903, on the official register, there were 5641 persons with leprosy listed as having been sent to Makanalua.

Throughout the early decades of the settlement there were constant struggles for proper shelter, food, medicine, a good water supply, and basic care. From the very beginning, the Board of Health was not prepared to deal with the circumstances of their own isolation policy. And from the very beginning, kōkua accompanied their loved ones to the leprosy settlement.

Who were these kōkua?

They were the spouses, mothers, fathers, sons, daughters, of those sent to Makanalua. According to Board of Health records found in the Hawai‘i State Archives, 203 persons were officially listed as kōkua by 1889. Yet records also show that many more “unofficial” kōkua could also be found at the settlement and throughout the peninsula. Indeed, it is believed that a total of some 400 – 500 kōkua went to Makanalua by 1900. Almost all the kōkua were of Native Hawaiian ancestry. Less than 5% of those who went as kōkua ever contracted the disease. And only two kōkua are recorded in the official Board of Health records as contracting the disease after being discharged as a kōkua.

The first kōkua, officially recognized by the Board of Health (i.e. listed in the official book/register) was Hoolimakani. She was 31 years old and came from Lahaina, Maui. Hoolimakani was admitted on August 22, 1868, as a kōkua to her husband, Kalanao. After his death she remarried twice, once to another kōkua, and the second time to a patient. Having remained in the settlement since her arrival in 1868, Hoolimakani was pronounced a “suspect” in December 1891. The records do not indicate what happened to her after that point.

In many respects the Board of Health records are sparse when it comes to telling us about the lives of the patients and their kōkua. But there are moments when the records offer us some recognition of the essential nature of nā kōkua. For instance, in 1878 a group known as the Sanitary Committee was organized and sent to Kalawao to inspect and report on the conditions of the leprosy settlement. When it came to a discussion of nā kōkua, the committee told of a man named Keoni, who “had accompanied his wife on account of his great love for her; he had been with her in the settlement about five years, and would remain with her as long as she had breath.”

Another kōkua, Hao, told the committee that “many . . . in the settlement would have perished ere this, were it not for the faithful help between parent and child, husband and wife, brother and sister, and between friend and friend.”

There are also some many well-known examples of nā kōkua in this mo‘olelo (history) of leprosy in 19th century Hawai‘i. Some of you may be familiar with the story of Kamiano? Perhaps you know of him as Joseph de Veuster, or Father Damien. “Kamiano” was the name by which the Hawaiians knew the Belgian priest. His legacy on this peninsula is certainly significant, but I like to think that his contribution might best be remembered in the context of the many kōkua who came to give of themselves in this place.

---

29 MMHC Hawaiiana Archives (1886), Leprosy in Hawai‘i [Extracts from reports of presidents of the Board of Health, government physicians, and others, and from official records, in regard to leprosy before and after the passage of the Act to Prevent the Spread of Leprosy, approved January 3, 1865, “The Laws and Regulations in Regard to Leprosy in the Hawaiian Kingdom”; Box 27, Leprosy, File 289(1)]. Honolulu, HI: Daily Bulletin Steam Printing Office.

30 MMHC Hawaiiana Archives (1886), Leprosy in Hawai‘i.
You may also know of Jonatana Napela as a kōkua. Kitty Napela was admitted as a patient, here in Kalawao, on May 2, 1873. Jonathan accompanied Kitty as her kōkua. For a short time he would also serve as a resident superintendent of the settlement. But later, on April 22, 1878, he was also admitted as a patient. One of my most prized finds in the Hawai‘i State Archives is a letter written by Jonathan Napela to the Board of Health. The letter is dated October 23, 1873. It was only five months since he had brought his wife to Kalawao, but it was a time when the Board of Health was trying to be stricter in its enforcement of the quarantine law, and was trying to limit the number of kōkua who could come to or remain at the settlement. Thus in his letter, Napela is pleading with the Board to allow him to stay. He speaks of the needs of the settlement and the needs of his wife, to have nā kōkua there to be of assistance, but then he also offers the most profound expressions of his love for his wife and for the many patients of Kalawao.31

There is also another well-known story within the history of leprosy in the Hawaiian Islands that often gets a lot of attention because many story-tellers have sensationalized the violence and “criminalization” of the main character.32 But I would like to submit to you that the mo‘olelo of Ko‘olau and Pi‘ilani is at its heart a story about kōkua. Indeed, the crux of the story is Ko‘olau’s refusal to go to Kalawao and his resistance was based on his being denied the right to have his kōkua go with him.

The year was 1893; a small group of businessmen had illegally overthrown the government of the Kingdom of Hawai‘i, and a Provisional Government had been set up in its place. Ko‘olau’s resistance to the (Provisional Government/Board of Health) order to go to Kalawao centered on the government officials telling him that his wife, Pi‘ilani could not go with him as his kōkua.

Being denied in this way was incongruent to Ko‘olau on two levels. First, it went against the Christian teachings that he and his ‘ohana (family) had embraced. Told that his wife could not accompany him to Kalawao, Ko‘olau stated:

I am denied the helping hand of my wife, and the cord of my love for her is to be cut, and I am commanded to break my sacred promise before God and live alone in a strange land; . . . . The consecrated law of marriage has come to us and we swore on the holy book to live together in the time of food and of famine, in sickness and in health, to live together until death should part us, and now the power of the government wants to break the law of man and of God, making the oath before Almighty God as nothing. We swore to become one, never to leave one another and now it is commanded that we be parted. The love that is implanted in my heart for my wife shall never be extinguished and the oath I swore before God shall continue until I die.33

Secondly, the government’s denial of his wife as his kōkua went against his Hawaiian sensibilities (namely the caring for/burial/hiding of his bones). As Pi‘ilani explained:

My husband . . . would refuse until the end, since he had heard of how in the strange land the bones would be laid to rest without the knowledge of

31 Hawai‘i State Archives. Series 334-5, Board of Health, Incoming Letters, 1873.
32 For example, the works of Jack London...
33 Francis N. Frazier, The true story of Kaluaikoolau, as told by his wife, Piilani (Lihue, HI: Kauai Historical Society, 2001), 16.
the one who should attend to hiding his bones; whereas, here in the land of his birth, I his wife, would, he knew, lay him to rest forever.34

It was important for family to care for family – not only in times of illness but also in death. As Kawena Pukui explained in Nānā i Ke Kumu: “for any Hawaiian, the body was exposed only to close family members. And so, just as they did in sickness, family cared for family in death”.35

Finally, for those who were able to come and be a kōkua to their loved ones – their contribution in this mo‘olelo of leprosy in 19th century Hawai‘i was immeasurable. In 1882, in his report to the Board of Health, physician to the settlement, Dr. N. B. Emerson stated that

The kokuas are an indispensable arm of service at the settlement. Without them it would be a very difficult task to carry on the establishment. They climb the pali and drive down the cattle, they fetch the wood from the mountains and carry water from the valleys, they go into the water and cultivate and pull the kalo, they handle the freight landed at Kalaupapa, all of which are services the [patients] cannot perform for themselves . . . .

This important and necessary class of people supply hands and feet for the [patient] when his own give out.36

The kōkua were indispensable to this settlement in its early days. Those who were banished to this peninsula because of a disease needed the kōkua to shelter, feed, and care for them. While the history of leprosy in these islands is in many ways a tragic history, there is also a legacy of kōkua that infuses this mo‘olelo, that we can learn from. And this legacy continues in the works and lives of so many associated with the settlement today. The state workers, the national parks personnel, the family and friends who remain connected to this place, continue to offer their kōkua. Indeed, many of the former patients have become kōkua themselves – for example, Bernard Punikai‘a (first sent to the Kalihi Receiving Station at age six) has spent most of his adult life standing up for patients’ rights and educating others about Hansen’s disease. And many other residents of Kalaupapa (former patients) watch out and care for one another, as family would care for family. They all provide meaningful examples for us to follow today. Mahalo.

Questions & Answer Session:

Did Napela have the disease prior to coming to Kalawao with Kitty in 1873?
The incubation period of the bacillus is thought to be an average of between 3 and 7 years; there have also been extreme cases of as little as 3 months incubation to 40 years incubation, before there were visible signs of the disease on a person. So, yes, it is possible that the mycobacterium leprae (the bacillus that causes Hansen’s disease) could

34 Frazier, 16-17.
36MMHC Hawaiiana Archives (1886), Leprosy in Hawai‘i.
already have been in his system, and he may or may not have been aware of it himself, before he was declared a patient.

**Why are no children under the age of 16 allowed in the settlement?**
The policies concerning children in the settlement have changed over the many decades of this history. In the early days, children could come as kōkua and children born to patients who were here could stay. Then policies began to be introduced to remove children, who did not have the disease, first from their parents and then from the settlement. Before the 1900s, children could be removed from their parents at birth, but then cared for by kōkua in the settlement, as infants, before being sent to family on the “outside” or to orphanages. By the early 1900s, children were removed from the settlement immediately and sent to family or orphanages. Within a few decades after that, women would be taken to Honolulu to give birth to their children, and the children were given to family or an orphanage.

So today’s policy originates in earlier Department of Health policy. And, for many of the patients who remain in the settlement today, they have gone through that painful experience of having their children removed from them at birth. So to have young children in the settlement can be a difficult experience for some. The other thing is that since they have not had young children around them, they are reluctant now to have young ones around, fearing the dangers of the surrounding ocean, cars and trucks on the streets, etc.

**What is going to happen to Kalaupapa once the last patient leaves?**
That is a difficult question to answer. Today the settlement (and its history) is protected as a part of the National Parks system, and it is hoped that it will remain as such. There are many interested parties involved with this peninsula (the federal government, the state government, Hawaiian homelands) and there are others, such as the ‘Ohana o Kalaupapa, who are dedicated to maintaining this very special place and protecting its natural, archaeological, and Hansen’s disease histories for the long-term.

**What kinds of efforts were made by the kahuna la‘au lapa‘au (Hawaiian medical practitioners) to deal with leprosy?**
My research has shown that many kahuna la‘au lapa‘au were involved with trying to treat or cure leprosy. Many Native Hawaiians continued to go to their kahuna la‘au lapa‘au for treatment of all diseases, though they were also many times hopeful for what the western physicians had to offer (aside from isolation). Kahuna la‘au lapa‘au wrote to the Board of Health asking for the opportunity to treat patients, both in Honolulu and here at Kalawao. And it appears that some were given that opportunity. The biggest problem I’ve seen is that, because of western perspectives on the role of medical treatment, if a treatment did not “cure” it was viewed as useless, even if it was helping the patients to “feel better”. Most of the kahuna la‘au lapa‘au treatments offered comfort, but because they did not “cure”, were not allowed to carry on.
If conditions here were so harsh/unfavorable, why did the Board of Health choose this peninsula as the place to send those with leprosy?

When the Board of Health chose Makanalua/Kalawao as the place to quarantine those with leprosy in 1865, much of the decision was based on a report that was done in the previous decade. The report was glowing, as to the bountiful nature of the land and its potential for agriculture. [Kalaupapa had been a major exporter of sweet potato to California during the gold rush years.] And the Board had intended that the patients would establish a “colony”, in which they would produce their own food, build their own houses, and care for themselves. Of course the worst cases were sent first, that is those who were extremely ill. As the disease progressed in their bodies, they would lose feeling in their feet and hands, blindness could occur, and because Hansen’s disease compromises the immune system, they were highly susceptible to other infections such as tuberculosis and influenzas.

I think it is also fair to say that the Board of Health’s main concern was with removing those with leprosy from the general population (their actions were carried out under the authority of the “Act to Prevent the Spread of Leprosy”), and not with the conditions the patients would find themselves living and dying in.
KALAUPAPA
NATIONAL
HISTORICAL
PARK

KALAUPAPA SETTLEMENT
EST. 1866
NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK
EST. 1960

- AREA: 12.17 SQ.MI
- CENSUS: Jan. 2000
  - INMATES: 35
  - BAN STAY: 25
  - CAR PARK: 14
  - CLOTHING: 3

COUNTY: KALAWAO
KALAUPAPA SETTLEMENT
EST. 1865
NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK
EST. 1980

- AREA - 12.17 SQ.MI.

- CENSUS: JUN. 2006
  - RESIDENTS - 35
  - DOH STAFF - 38
  - NAT. PARK - 40
  - CLERGY - 3

COUNTY OF KALAWAO
Some came by plane . . . some descended the 2,000-foot cliffs by mule
St. Philomena Church built by Father Damien de Veuster (Kalawao side of peninsula)
Londa Chase with Kuulei Bell, member of MPHS, and one of only 3 LDS patients left
LDS chapel and cultural hall (note separate pulpits for patients and visitors)
Missionary quarters (built in 1935) to the left of the chapel.

Our Damien Tours “stretch limo” while on the peninsula.
View of the peninsula from “topside”

1 Baptismal record archived in BYU-Hawai‘i Archives, also document attached in appendix here
7 Duke, pg. 3
14 For a more thorough history of this time period in Hawai‘i see: Jonathan Osorio, Dismembering Lahui: History of the Hawaiian nation to 1887 Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i press, 2002; Ronald

15 See the 1894 draft of her constitution at http://www.hawaii-nation.org/constitution-1893.html

16 The President of the United States, Grover Cleveland, sent a special commissioner, James Blount, to investigate the overthrow. He interviewed various people and parties and came to the conclusion that what happened was immoral, illegal, and not cleared by US channels. He ordered the Queen to be restored to power. A full record of his report can be seen in the Blount Report, *Executive Documents of the House of Representatives*, 53rd Cong., 3 sess. (1894-1895) found online at: http://libweb.hawaii.edu/digicoll/annexation/annexation.html

17 Samuel E. Woolley, *Journals of Samuel E. Woolley*, pg. 73. These are archived in BYUH archives, Joseph F. Smith Library.
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xxix The manuscript, *Not By Happenstance: A History of BYU-Hawai‘i, 1955-2005*, was completed by Alf Pratte in June, 2005 after 22 months of research. As of March, 2007, the 500-page document was still under consideration by President Eric Shumway and a review committee. After more than a year of review the three Baldridge, Hannemann-Britsch, Pratte manuscripts relating to the history of the school have added to an elephant’s graveyard of unpublished books.
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The movie was based on Elder Groberg’s 1993 book The Eye of the Storm, recounting his missionary experiences in Tonga and republished in 2001 as The Other Side of Heaven. He has also published “A Christmas on The Other Side of Heaven,”(2004), and The Fire of Faith as well as a DVD The Other Side of Heaven.


According to BYUH political scientist Dale Robertson, Elder Groberg was also open to additional information after his addresses. In a question and answer period in a classroom conducted by Paul Spickard, in the mid 1990s, Elder Groberg said he had modified his views on intermarriage.
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Divorce statistics are compiled from the Divorce Statistics collection, from Americans for Divorce Reform, from polls and other family related articles.
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As a means of full disclosure, the author confesses to never returning to his homeland of Canada after being refused admittance to the University of Alberta and other Canadian schools for failure to meet minimal standards in trigonometry and physics. After being educated at BYU in Provo the author married interculturally to a U.S. citizen, worked for the *Honolulu Star-Bulletin*, took out U.S. citizenship and has been gainfully employed from 1960 until his retirement as a professor of print journalism at BYU Provo in 2003. In the spirit of Thomas Wolfe’s *Look Homeward Angel*, I believe that not all foreign students look forward to returning home after tasting of the American style of life. Rather most of us are convinced that *You Can’t Go Home Again*.


Victor L. Ludlow, “The Internationalization of the Church,” *Out of Obscurity: The Church in the Twentieth Century*, Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 2000. In an address at the 29th Annual Sperry Symposium, Ludlow said the baseline year for the internationalization of the LDS Church was 1955, the same year that CCH was founded when only 12 percent of the Church membership was outside United States and Canada. By the year 2000, the majority of LDS members were outside of North America.


After his graduation from Columbia College of Law in 1906, Clark served as assistant solicitor general and later as solicitor. During World War I, he was instrumental in preparing the original Selective Service regulations. In 1928, he was appointed by Calvin Coolidge as undersecretary of the State Department. In 1930 he was named ambassador to Mexico, a position he held until 1933.
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