

FRANK J. KARPIEL

A Multinational Fraternity: Freemasonry in Hawai'i, 1843–1905

ON MARCH 30, 1843, in the midst of a short-lived British occupation of the Hawaiian kingdom's capital, the *Ajax*, one of the few French whaling vessels in the Pacific, sailed into Honolulu harbor. It had been seven months since it had collided with an American whale ship in the Indian Ocean, and her captain, Joseph Marie Le Tellier, needed the repair facilities of the mid-Pacific port. Le Tellier also had another purpose during his stopover: Named a "Special Inspector" by the Supreme Council of France, he was specially authorized to create new Masonic lodges. Within days after arriving in Honolulu, Captain Le Tellier contacted the local representative of the French government, the Mauritius-born merchant Jules Dudoit, and they recognized each other as Masons. Little more than a week later, Le Tellier acted on his commission, gathering Dudoit and fourteen other men to organize the first Masonic lodge in the Pacific, Lodge Le Progrès de l'Océanie.¹ Initially meeting aboard the *Ajax* and then at Dudoit's store, the group soon moved its meetings to an adobe house owned by another charter member, John Meek, an American seafarer.

A system of fraternal societies centered on convivial sociability and complex ritual, Freemasonry originated in the British Isles and had spread like wildfire throughout Europe and America during the eighteenth century. Although entering into a decades-long decline in the

Frank J. Karpriel teaches at Ramapo College of New Jersey in Mahwah, New Jersey.

The Hawaiian Journal of History, vol. 34 (2000)

United States beginning in 1830 after a scandal triggered a nationwide anti-Masonic movement, the Masonic order continued to enjoy wide popularity among middle-class men in Europe. In Honolulu, the original lodge members were European and American mariners, shopkeepers, and farmers.² Other Freemasons visited the Islands prior to 1843, including Captain George Vancouver and many lesser-known mariners and traders. Even Captain James Cook has long been reputed to have been Mason, although no evidence has been found to support that contention. In an 1859 essay, scholar and longtime lodge officer Abraham Fornander referred to these earlier sojourners, employing the characteristic quasi-religious imagery that characterized Masonic discourse:

For many years they lay like rough diamonds in an unwrought mine; yet now and then a bright edge would reveal itself and gradually the conviction gained ground that, by the organization of a Lodge, the luster and value of these scattered materials would be enhanced and the Masonic light extended to those who long had been in darkness.³

Authorized by the Scottish Rite Supreme Council of France to establish new lodges “in all lands whereof the jurisdiction has been neither decided nor recognized,” Le Tellier launched Lodge Le Progrès in a growing city whose people were divided into a galaxy of quarreling factions.⁴ Hawaiians contended for power with missionaries, traders, and mariners of many nationalities through litigation, political maneuvering, economic competition, newspaper wars, and occasional rioting. The battle to influence the still-dominant chiefly class of indigenous leaders was incessant and rowdy because plenty was at stake: the form of government, the nature of “reform” that would allow foreigners to gain ownership of the *‘aina* (land), the system of religion, the pattern of social dominance and subordination.

What is Freemasonry and how did it fit into the social scene in Hawai‘i? It is difficult to give an exact definition of the movement because its historical foundations are so diverse and ill-defined. We can say with certainty that the secret society emerged from the medieval guilds of stonemasons in Britain and Europe that set standards, protected workers’ rights, and provided other benefits. Though only Scottish and English associations can be connected to the modern Masonic fraternity, similar craft guilds and companies existed across

Europe, playing an important role in the construction of abbeys, cathedrals, and castles. Masonic organizations also functioned within wider geographic regions and consequently came to serve a wide array of purposes at an early date. These included feeding and sheltering traveling journeymen and providing them a structured social life. There is early evidence of precise physical gestures of greeting, which members were forbidden to reveal and which provided a means of recognition during one's travels. A broader form of association that influenced modern Freemasonry was the medieval religious confraternity in which lay people prayed for the souls of deceased relatives and friends. They also permitted the pooling of funds to pay for funerals and care for survivors.⁵ Members also banded together to perform religious plays, assist in building cathedrals, and celebrate saints' days. The feast day celebrations involved two of the essential features of latter-day fraternalism, dramatic pageants or plays and processions.⁶ By the middle of the seventeenth century, Freemasonry had evolved in England into a more philosophical and "speculative" incarnation, attracting scientists, freethinkers or Deists, and aristocrats. Not until 1717 would these groups combine into an official "Grand Lodge," which oversaw subordinate lodges in which "speculative" members soon outnumbered "operative" craftsmen.

One indicator of how this unique form of association fit into Hawaiian society lay in an intriguing feature of the new Masonic lodge—the diversity of the national origins of its members. Oddly enough, it was a French mariner who introduced this British cultural export into Hawai'i at a time when the Union Jack flew over the kingdom's capital. Only two months before Captain Le Tellier arrived, Lord Paulet, a British naval commander, had taken control of Honolulu in a dispute over the rights of English citizens. Yet Britons were hardly alone in their heavy-handed approach to diplomacy. French and American armed forces also menaced the kingdom during the 1830s and 1840s, attempting to intimidate Kamehameha III (Kauikeaouli) and his government.⁷ A myriad of petty disputes paralleled these intimidations and divided foreigners in Honolulu. As an ameliorative to such divisiveness, Freemasonry, with its commitment to interdenominational and international fellowship, played an integrative civic role. Within the decade, Hawaiian royalty would also join the order for their own purposes and expand the role of the order in the Islands.

AT THE BEGINNING

Of the fifteen men who met on Friday evening, April 7, 1843, at French merchant Jules Dudoit's store to organize the lodge, three were sea captains, two were master mariners and nine were merchants (see Table 1).⁸ Moderately successful at first, Lodge le Progrès de l'Océanie attracted both affiliates (members who had joined lodges elsewhere) and new members. Since oaths of secrecy were an important part of attaining each degree, few records exist detailing the experiences of men participating in rituals and other lodge functions in the mid-nineteenth century. We do know that behind guarded lodge room doors, Le Progrès officers conferred the three degrees of the order (entered apprentice, fellowcraft, master mason) and solidified the ties of brotherhood during the step-by-step process of guiding initiates through the symbolism behind the ritual. Initiates absorbed the legendary history of the order dating back to the building of King Solomon's Temple through dramatizations of the stories

Table 1. Lodge Le Progrès de l'Océanie Charter Members, April 1843

Name	Place of Birth	Profession
Joseph M. Le Tellier, Founder	Lorient, France	Master mariner
John Meek*	Marblehead, Mass.	Master mariner
Stephen Reynolds*	Boxford, Mass.	Merchant
Capt. Eliab Grimes*	Massachusetts	Master mariner/merchant
George Pelly*	England	Agent, Hudson's Bay Co.
Robert C. Janion*	England	Merchant
Robert W. Wood*	Stowe, Mass.	Physician
William Paty	Plymouth, Mass.	Merchant/harbor master
John Paty	Plymouth, Mass.	Master mariner
William Davis	Honolulu	Merchant
Robert Davis	Honolulu	Merchant
Abraham H. Fayerweather	New Canaan, Conn.	Sugar planter
Frederick W. Thompson	Charlestown, Mass.	Auctioneer
John R. von Pfister	Germany	Merchant
Jules Dudoit	France	Merchant/French consul
Joseph O. Carter Sr.	United States	Master mariner

Note: Asterisks indicate previous Masonic affiliation before joining Le Progres.

Source: "List of Members of Lodge Le Progres de l'Océanie, From 1843."

behind each degree. Masons' tools such as the level, square, and compass served to underline the fraternity's values: equality, honesty, spirituality. Secret passwords and grips were whispered, "mouth to ear" in Masonic parlance, illustrating the importance of oral tradition to the fraternity.

Le Progrès' small size in a small community of foreigners produces further difficulties in gauging community interest in the fraternity in these years. Proportionally, however, Masonry was already a factor in this community: at least 10 percent of the 353 resident male foreigners were members of Lodge Le Progrès in 1847.⁹ And in a small city that attracted large numbers of seamen and other travelers, the local lodge members were sometimes outnumbered by visiting brethren. Between 1846 and 1848, at least a dozen members regularly attended Le Progrès meetings, along with varying numbers of visiting Masons from the United States and Europe and unaffiliated brethren in Honolulu such as Foreign Minister Robert Wyllie.¹⁰ Among the founding members were some of Honolulu's most notable foreigners. One of these was Captain John Meek, who first visited Hawai'i in 1809, eleven years before the first missionaries arrived. In addition to captaining King Kamehameha III's schooner, Meek worked as a harbor pilot, raised cattle, and constructed numerous downtown structures. His adobe home served as temporary headquarters for Lodge Le Progrès before he furnished a more substantial two-story frame building for its use.¹¹ Another founding member, Eliab Grimes, had served on a privateer during the War of 1812, making a small fortune before coming to Honolulu as master of a ship owned by sandalwood traders Marshall and Wildes of Boston.¹² Grimes then commenced a prosperous career as a merchant, moving between Honolulu and California.

Stephen Reynolds, another charter member, and an early lodge master played an important role in the first years of Lodge Le Progrès. A successful and respected but also "erratic and irascible" merchant, Reynolds is now known primarily for the personal journal he kept, a mine of civic information about Honolulu from the 1820s to the 1850s. Reynolds took part in the earliest gatherings of Lodge Le Progrès but noted few details about what transpired there other than to mention the names of those attending and being initiated. Of the third meeting he observed, "There was very little order and less information in any of their proceedings." In remarking on the next meet-

ing, Reynolds said he attempted to “give some illumination on the Entered apprentice’s degree.”¹³

Examining the roster of Freemasons in the first six years of Lodge *Le Progrès*’s existence reveals certain general features. The members came from differing national backgrounds and engaged in a variety of occupations, and many of them—notably John Meek, Eliab Grimes, and Stephen Reynolds—were critics of the Protestant missionaries.¹⁴ Others, including part-Hawaiian brothers William Heath Davis and Robert Grimes Davis, along with builder Charles Vincent, merchant Robert Janion, and rancher Thomas Cummins, became influential members of the inner circle of the new generation of Hawaiian royal leaders who emerged in the 1850s. Although local lodges were never antagonistic toward the missionaries, and indeed eventually welcomed several of their progeny into their fold, they were more a home away from home for the merchants and mariners as well as hotel and tavern keepers than for Congregationalists.

Membership in Masonic lodges has always served to facilitate business contacts as well as social ones. In the late 1840s there were about thirty-five merchants and storekeepers in Honolulu, of whom about one third were Masons. Similar ratios existed for the other 150 skilled “mechanics” and professionals in town. Their numbers soon declined as the discovery of gold in California prompted an exodus of skilled tradesmen from the Islands. Yet the Gold Rush also proved a boon to Island business, since it cost less to ship agricultural commodities and other goods from Hawai‘i to California than from the east coast of the United States. Still, a majority of Lodge *Le Progrès* members left the Islands beginning in late 1848. Eager gold-seekers appropriated almost all seagoing craft in Honolulu, and “the exodus was so great that Honolulu was almost depleted of its foreign population.”¹⁵

In an October 1849 meeting, Captain Le Tellier expressed his disappointment at seeing “so few of the Brethren present” and, as counterpoint, recounted his visit to an active and enthusiastically attended Masonic lodge in Sydney, New South Wales, a few months earlier.¹⁶ By March 1850, after having enrolled between fifty and a hundred members during the previous four years, Lodge *Le Progrès* indefinitely suspended all activity.

A NEW ERA, A NEW LODGE

French cultural, political, and economic interests in Hawai'i had never been substantial, and French Admiral de Tromelin's aggression (including seizing Honolulu's fort and the O'ahu governor's house) in August 1849 did not help the declining fortunes of the French Masonic lodge. And after the Gold Rush had expanded trade between Hawai'i and California, hundreds of immigrants from the United States moved to Honolulu. Several of these newcomers took the initiative in forming a new Masonic lodge in late 1851 under the jurisdiction of the year-old California Grand Lodge. Joined by seven members of the deactivated Lodge *Le Progrès*, they founded Hawaiian Lodge No. 21, F. & A.M. (Free and Accepted Masons). The appearance of the new lodge set the stage for the expansion and growth of Masonry as it became a social nexus of Honolulu, drawing attention to its banquets, parades, and other festivities as well as curiosity for its secret meetings.¹⁷

Joining the new lodge was twenty-three-year-old Prince Lot Kamehameha, the brother of the heir apparent, Prince Alexander Liholiho, and grandson of Kamehameha I.¹⁸ A month after Prince Lot gained his first Masonic degree in June 1853, Foreign Minister Robert Crichton Wyllie sent the lodge a request from King Kamehameha III that the reigning monarch be initiated "into our ancient and benevolent order."¹⁹ The approbation of the order by the highest ranks of the Hawaiian royalty had an immediate effect. Applications for membership increased, and the press manifested an interest in and acceptance of the organization.²⁰ Strangely enough, the lodge did not take the opportunity to enroll Kamehameha III. Part of the reason may have been lodge politics or, perhaps, the king's reputation as a heavy drinker. Lodge records and other historical sources give no clue about the puzzling lack of response.

Like their counterparts at Lodge *Le Progrès* eight years earlier, the eleven charter members of Hawaiian Lodge were a varied lot, diverse in national origins and occupations (see Table 2). They tended to share one characteristic—they were all dedicated to succeeding in their respective professions. Alexander Cartwright, a twenty-five-year-old aspiring merchant, had recently arrived in the Islands from New York, where he had formulated the rules of modern baseball and

organized the first team, the New York Knickerbockers.²¹ Carpenter and builder Charles Vincent served as the first master of the lodge and constructed many of the business buildings along the waterfront during the 1830s and 1840s, including Hawai'i's first theater, the Thespian, in 1847.²² Although mariners comprised a substantial portion of the original membership of the new lodge—roughly a third—as they had of Lodge Le Progrès, the whaling era was drawing to a close. Merchants, craftsmen, and professionals constituted the largest element in the new lodge and tied Masonry to the new economic order emerging in Hawai'i.

One important group that had few ties to Masonry in Hawai'i was the missionaries. Over the course of the last half of the nineteenth century fewer than a dozen former missionaries or sons of missionaries joined Masonic lodges in Honolulu. Yet even that number effectively shielded the lodges from charges that they were anti-Christian or politically conspiratorial. One of the more significant Masons who was also a minister was Lorrin Andrews, Sr., the educator and an ardent abolitionist who resigned from the board overseeing missionary efforts in 1842 because it accepted donations from slave states. Andrews first became a lodge member in Maysville, Kentucky, and

Table 2. Hawaiian Lodge Charter Members, May 1852

Name	Place of Birth	Occupation
Lemuel Lyon		Hatter
John Meek	Marblehead, Mass.	Master mariner/customs official
Charles W. Vincent	Denham, N.J.	Carpenter
David P. Penhallow	Portsmouth, N.H.	Master mariner
William Wond	Rothershite, England	Taverner
James G. Sawkins	United States	Portrait painter
Frederick W. Thompson	Charlestown, Mass.	Auctioneer
Alexander J. Cartwright	New York, N.Y.	Merchant
Andrew C. Mott	England	Master mariner
Joseph Irwin	Essex, England	Clerk
F.M. Stokes		Merchant

Source: "Names of Charter Members, Original and Honorary Members, Hawaiian Lodge." Hawaiian Lodge Archives, Honolulu.

never formally affiliated himself with a Honolulu lodge, though he was an honorary member of Hawaiian Lodge.

One of the more well-traveled charter members of Hawaiian Lodge was artist James Gay Sawkins, whom the government of the kingdom commissioned to paint a portrait of Kamehameha I.²³ Sawkins, Charles Vincent, and several other Masons in Honolulu, including Kamehameha IV, were avidly interested in art and played important roles in developing the social and intellectual life of the city. The French-trained Sawkins also created a number of notable landscapes and portraits during his time in the Islands. In a lecture before the Honolulu Athenaeum in 1851, Sawkins recalled that the civilizations of the classical world—Egyptian, Greek, Roman, Chinese, and Aztec—had emphasized training in artistic skills, particularly drawing.²⁴ Sawkins insisted that the fine arts had a practical value for his audience of businessmen and commented favorably on the skill of young Hawaiian artists at the Honolulu Academy, observing:

Those youths by pursuing their studies in the fine arts may increase the treasury of the State—the coffers of the merchant . . . this however is the least part . . . by adhering strictly to the elements of the sciences he must necessarily call on to aid his studies, the mind will be carried into channels whose serene waters will conduct him through life with a tranquility much greater than the generality of his fellow men.²⁵

Other well-known members of Hawaiian Lodge included William Wond, a tavern-keeper “of the better sort,” who became lodge master in 1854; Richard Coady, a ship chandler; and Henry MacFarlane, proprietor of one of the finer hotels in Honolulu. But if the membership of Hawaiian Lodge reflected Hawai‘i’s new economy, it also incarnated many of the political currents of the 1850s. The lodge included proponents as well as adversaries of American annexation. James Blair, Barnum Field, and Alexander Cartwright—all recently arrived in the Islands—were defiant annexationists and critics of the monarchy. American Minister David Gregg described Blair as “a poor lawyer and almost a simpleton,” adding that, “he is for Revolution and a Republic in order to find a suitable theatre for his immense abilities!”²⁶ A leading member of the committee of thirteen that secured the dismissal of Gerrit Judd from the cabinet in 1853, Blair subse-

quently agitated for an American-led revolution, thereby generating “intense aversion” to him among the royalty, chiefs, and people of Hawai‘i, according to Gregg.²⁷

On the opposite side of the annexation issue were Dr. Thomas Rooke, Robert Davis, John Meek, Thomas Cummins, Henry Sea, and many other lodge members. Rooke was an English surgeon who settled in Honolulu in 1830 and later married the daughter of John Young, a close adviser of Kamehameha I. The couple later adopted her niece, Kalanikauamakeamano, who eventually married Kamehameha IV and thereafter was known as Queen Emma. Well-respected among Hawaiians as a dispenser of free medical services, Rooke was part of the pro-royalist faction in Hawaiian Lodge, thereby differentiating himself from the newly arrived businessmen bent on Americanizing the Islands. Most royalist Masons had lived in Hawai‘i for decades, had friends among the *ali‘i*, married Hawaiian women, and were citizens of the kingdom. Some, like Rooke, Abraham Fornander, and Thomas Cummins, immersed themselves in traditional Hawaiian culture. Given the fact that the kingdom’s indigenous leaders began actively participating in the “craft” during the 1850s, and considering their added prestige and power, it is apparent that advocates of Hawaiian independence had a dominant voice within the local Masonic organizations from mid-century to the 1880s.

Alexander Cartwright and Abraham Fornander, who arrived in the Islands within a few years of each other in the late 1840s, exemplified the differing perspectives among Caucasian Freemasons in Hawai‘i. When they arrived in Honolulu, their backgrounds and circumstances were dissimilar, but in the mid-1850s both were struggling businessmen in a port city in which the decline of whaling and the prevalence of epidemic disease were causing economic dislocation. Members of Hawaiian Lodge for more than thirty years, both came to prosper in their respective careers. Cartwright would eventually succeed as a businessman, and Fornander emerged as a widely respected student of Hawaiian culture as well as a judge and member of the inner circles of Kamehameha IV and Kamehameha V. Yet Cartwright remained a die-hard American. After a decade in the Islands, he wrote a friend, “I still think New York is the only city in the world and I am still an American citizen and not a whitewashed Kanaka and all

the office and all the wealth of the island would not tempt me ever to forswear my allegiance to Uncle Sam.”²⁸

In contrast, Fornander, an educated Swede and former seaman, had a keen eye for the foibles of his own race. Speaking in front of the Royal Hawaiian Agricultural Society, he said of *haoles* in Hawai‘i,

In their pride of place, too many too often forget the meanness of their own origins, that the most civilised people of today is but the slow and painful development of the most barbarous, that this development required a period of nineteen hundred years and that, after all its past struggle and present boasting, its luminous disk contains many black spots which neither time nor any future lustre can efface.²⁹

Fornander criticized Westerners who satisfiedly waited for indigenous Hawaiians to become extinct. “They have not studied civilisation in their own lands,” he said, “and have no conception of its workings here.”³⁰

Cartwright never gave up his American citizenship and occasionally wrote disparagingly of Hawaiians, but he nonetheless became heavily involved in civic endeavors in the kingdom. By the early 1880s he was a business agent for King Kalākaua and Queen Kapi‘olani as well as the dowager Queen Emma.³¹ Fornander continually expanded his intellectual horizons, concluding his career by writing the multi-volume *An Account of the Polynesian Race*. Deepening his knowledge of Hawaiian cultural traditions while traveling throughout the Islands as a school administrator and circuit court judge (eventually rising to associate justice of the Supreme Court), Fornander sought solutions to the demographic decline and cultural conflicts that confronted Islanders. One of Fornander’s unheralded endeavors was hiring small groups of knowledgeable Hawaiians to gather genealogies, local histories, and myths for preservation as he journeyed around Maui in his duties as a judge.

A CONFLICT BETWEEN BRETHREN

Masonry’s popularity in the Islands brought with it conflict that was typical of disagreements within the fraternity. Following the arrival of authorization from Paris for the reactivation of Lodge Le Progrès in

the summer of 1854, half a dozen members of Hawaiian Lodge demitted (resigned) to restart the lodge.³² Whether other considerations triggered the rebirth of *Le Progrès* is unclear, though most of the demitting brethren—C. W. Vincent, John Meek, Robert G. Davis, and David P. Penhallow—had originally belonged to the French lodge. Other Hawaiian Lodge members were baffled by the withdrawal. Hawaiian Lodge presented a Past Masters Jewel to C. W. Vincent a month after he joined Lodge *le Progrès*, indicating its high regard.³³

Once Lodge *Le Progrès* began accepting new initiates in 1855, some Hawaiian Lodge members began to shift their attitudes toward their brethren. At issue was whether the charter from the Supreme Council of France allowed *Le Progrès* to be reactivated after its four-year dormancy. The ensuing *contretemps* between the two Honolulu lodges in the mid-1850s illustrates the legalism that governed relations between grand lodges and their affiliates. Hawaiian Lodge members asked their superiors at the Grand Lodge of California for a decision on the “legitimacy” of the reactivated French Lodge, that is, whether they should communicate with its members. Grand Lodge authorities in California had no independent sources of information concerning the situation and decided that since all members had voluntarily left the original French lodge, they placed an interdict on all fraternal communication with members of the “clandestine and irregular” *Le Progrès* lodge. This action banned all visits and other forms of cooperation between members of the two Honolulu lodges.³⁴

After it became apparent that members of Hawaiian Lodge questioned the legitimacy of the *Le Progrès*, John Meek, who had moved from the former to the latter and who also owned the hall where both lodges met, raised the rent of Hawaiian Lodge, then threatened to refuse to rent to it at all.³⁵ In July 1856 Meek told a meeting at Lodge *Le Progrès* that the lease of Hawaiian Lodge expired in September and “that after that date he would not allow them to occupy it any longer.”³⁶ A discussion followed, during which Richard Coady, a merchant and, like Meek, a former Hawaiian Lodge member, expressed surprise “at the conduct of some of the members of Hawaiian lodge, many of whom were present when he knelt at the altar [the symbolic center of the lodge room], when he was told to nourish Brotherly love and friendship towards all Masons.”³⁷ Coady thought the best course for *Le Progrès* was “that of silence regarding their doings.”³⁸ Charles

Vincent concurred, saying, "Their proceedings regarding our Lodge arose more from ignorance of Masonry, than from a desire on their part intentionally to annoy us."³⁹

Conflict escalated between the two lodges from 1855 to 1857. Though it originated in a debate over the legitimacy of Lodge *Le Progrès*, the schism took a personal turn that illuminated not only the tensions between the two lodges but within Hawaiian Lodge as well. At least part of the controversy revolved around royal patronage and the question of which lodge would benefit by association with the Hawaiian monarchs. As the struggle heated up, several friends of the royal princes moved to *Le Progrès* from Hawaiian Lodge, and in December 1855 Prince Lot, a Hawaiian Lodge member, attended a *Le Progrès* meeting at which members initiated his friend Captain John Paty, another defector from Hawaiian Lodge. Several *Le Progrès* brethren, including Paty, Robert G. Davis, John Meek, and Charles Vincent, were part of Lot and Alexander Liholiho's circle, a fact that gave the smaller lodge a decided boost in status and publicity.⁴⁰

Le Progrès Master Robert Davis declared, "Whatever might have been the views expressed by members of Hawaiian Lodge, we owed Jurisdiction only to the Supreme Council of France."⁴¹ The dispute climaxed after the January 1857 initiation of King Kamehameha IV into Lodge *Le Progrès*. At least five members of Hawaiian Lodge attended the initiation and ensuing festivities, among them the monarch's brother, Prince Lot; his father-in-law, Dr. Thomas Rooke; his personal secretary, Henry Neilson; and Joseph Irwin, a past master of Masonic lodges in Ireland and London.

Although Hawaiian Lodge members excused Prince Lot from punishment, he and the five others were judged guilty of "un-Masonic behavior" for visiting a nonrecognized Masonic lodge. Normally in the Masonic world, attending meetings of other lodges was encouraged; it increased fellowship, brought news from distant jurisdictions, and helped visiting brethren adjust to new surroundings. What would seem a banner day for Hawai'i Freemasonry—the initiation of a young and respected monarch into the order—became the occasion for prolonged acrimony. The schism caused "moral and material injury" to local Freemasonry for two years, according to Abraham Fornander, then secretary of Hawaiian Lodge, who sought a reconciliation.⁴² Directives from the California Grand Lodge and the legal-

istic rules of the order assumed equal importance with the ritual work and fellowship that formed the core of Masonic experience.

In 1859, a national journal, *Freemason's Monthly Magazine*, took note of the discord in Honolulu:

the question in the debate was originally solely one of legality and jurisdiction; but as in the case of most questions long in dispute, the discussion naturally engendered unkind feelings where fraternal sympathies alone should have existed; and the consequence was that the progress and usefulness if not the reputation, of the Order in the island, were injured, and its power for good greatly impaired.⁴³

In the records of the controversy, one person stands out as chiefly responsible for instigating and sustaining it: Alexander J. Cartwright. In judging the members who visited *Le Progrès*, Cartwright insisted on their guilt and on expulsion as the only appropriate response.⁴⁴

In 1859, after receiving an invitation from *Le Progrès* to examine documents from the Supreme Council of France regarding its legitimacy, three members of Hawaiian Lodge found that the French lodge, as it had claimed all along, was in conformity with the regulations of its ruling body. There was a palpable mood of compromise in the air by this time, but Cartwright argued against it, objecting to the way *Le Progrès* performed "the work" (ritual) and declaring that the Supreme Council of France "was a body not recognized in Masonry below the 18th degree."⁴⁵ Hawaiian Lodge rejected this position and reauthorized contact with its sister lodge after being authorized to do so by the California Grand Lodge. Cartwright responded by announcing his resignation from the lodge, but apparently no one, including Cartwright, took his announcement seriously, and he remained a member.⁴⁶

THE LODGE AND THE CITY

Although the conflict overshadowed other Masonic activities in the late 1850s, commonplace functions of the fraternity were also noteworthy. Masonic lodges were sites of social contact, providing material and psychological support to visitors, immigrants, and residents alike. This support was often indispensable as economic change accel-

erated. After the legislature legalized the ownership of real property by foreigners in 1850, widespread real-estate speculation was fueled by profits from the lucrative trade with California in the Gold Rush years. Commercial land values and business profits increased as the city grew in size, transforming open land into urban space—what one scholar has labeled “abstract units for buying and selling, without respect for historic uses, for topographic conditions, for social needs.”⁴⁷ So while mid-century Honolulu was still an isolated port whose commercial activity followed the seasonal rhythms of whaling, it was also home to growing numbers of merchants, ranchers, and planters determined to quicken the process of economic growth.

Honolulu’s geographic expansiveness as well as its growing multinational and transient populations made forging an amicable civic culture difficult. One of the necessities for overcoming these obstacles was establishing mutual respect among peoples of different cultures, classes, and races. During the reign of Kamehameha IV (1854–1863), that respect began to emerge and a social consensus to solidify as observers at the time as well as later historians have noted.⁴⁸ These new circumstances coalesced concurrently with the town’s Masonic lodges emerging onto the social scene and becoming noticeable features of town life. A Swedish visitor remarked in 1855:

The ancient, and in many cases, benevolent order of the Free Masons had in Honolulu a lodge which had meetings and fine celebrations. It was remarkable that this order despite all the opposition that it has encountered had constantly increased the length of its chain of members.⁴⁹

In early spring 1859, the development of the Islands’ first hospital for Hawaiians, Queen’s Hospital, became a center of attention in Honolulu. After thirty years of determined American missionary efforts aimed at saving the souls of indigenous Hawaiians, standards of health care were still primitive and medical facilities almost nonexistent. Spurred on by Kamehameha IV and the lobbying of one of the leaders of Hawaiian Lodge, a French physician, Dr. Charles Guillou, the legislature created an ad-hoc committee to facilitate the building of a hospital. The committee consisted of two Masons: David Gregg, then the minister of finance and acting minister of the interior, and

Robert Wyllie, the foreign minister. They quickly completed a hospital charter and a plan to set up a dispensary. Then Gregg and Wyllie incorporated a hospital association that collected donations and got the government to donate land on which to build the hospital. Kamehameha IV personally led the fundraising efforts, taking to the streets of the city, soliciting funds at business and professional offices, private homes, and diplomatic residences. In July 1860 the ground breaking for the hospital included a traditional Masonic cornerstone-laying ceremony attended by thousands and presided over by the young monarch.⁵⁰

Masons played a prominent role in Kamehameha IV's effort to promote the anglicizing process (and thereby reduce American influence) in Hawai'i. Probably the most noteworthy of these endeavors was the establishment of an Episcopal church in Hawai'i. Like the Masonic order, the Episcopal church represented a more liberal and tolerant Christianity than the latter-day Calvinism of the missionaries. Alarmed at the prospect of competition, the American missionaries prevailed upon their superiors in Boston to protest to the archbishop of Canterbury. But the archbishop (as well as Queen Victoria) was also being lobbied by the king and Queen Emma and their well-connected consul general in London, Manley Hopkins.⁵¹ In August 1862, the archbishop designated Thomas Nettleship Staley as the first bishop of the Episcopal diocese in Honolulu. Staley was also a Mason, and shortly after arriving in the Islands, he attended a meeting at Lodge *Le Progrès* with Kamehameha IV presiding as master. Thereafter the Episcopal bishop occasionally appeared at meetings at both Honolulu lodges.⁵²

"AN OASIS IN THE PACIFIC": GILDED AGE HONOLULU

The appeal that Honolulu had for native Hawaiians who flocked to the city from neighboring islands extended to foreigners. For the latter, the city's image as a real-life south seas paradise proved a potent lure, as did its promise as a locale for economic opportunity. Dozens of books from the mid-nineteenth century extolled the unhurried pace of living and the enchanting climate of the city.⁵³ As organizations largely dominated by merchants and professionals, both of

Honolulu’s Masonic lodges acted as a type of clearinghouse for newcomers who were members of the brotherhood.

The distinctive rhythms of the Masonic world—initiations, public ceremonies, lodge meetings, and semiannual banquets—penetrated Honolulu’s civic life, made more prominent by the participation of the royal princes. Newcomers found the town a place where “conversational themes are not abundant . . . and little is to be found for the mind to feed upon, except for gossip and good stories.” Masonic lodges were one of the sources of both and for a lively evening’s company.⁵⁴ Visiting brothers flocked to meetings of the local lodges while in town. California Grand Lodge officials, among them grand masters John Mills Browne in 1878 and Edmund Atkinson in 1887, journeyed to Hawai‘i for extended stays.⁵⁵ Such sojourns gave Hawai‘i’s Masons opportunities to show off their connections to the kingdom’s leadership, and for Hawaiian royalty to host prestigious fraternal visitors. The logistics of hosting Masonic notables and staging receptions, tours, banquets, and balls were substantial. Among the several thousand dollars in charges for the reception for Grand Master Atkinson were stable fees for horses and bills for carriages, hotel rooms, printed programs, and musical entertainment by the Royal Hawaiian Band. The atmosphere at these proceedings was not exactly in harmony with the Women’s Christian Temperance Union meetings then occurring in Honolulu. A bill for one banquet at the Royal Hawaiian Hotel indicates the delivery of 128 bottles of champagne and claret for the 150 Masons attending.⁵⁶

INNOCENTS ABROAD

One lesser-known Masonic visitor’s stay in Hawai‘i helped establish his later renown with the biggest story of his young career as well as providing him enough material for long series of humorous lectures on his travels throughout the Islands. Samuel Clemens—before taking on his literary persona of Mark Twain—arrived in the spring 1866 as a thirty-one-year-old reporter for the *Sacramento Union*. Clemens had joined the local Masonic lodge in St. Louis five years earlier, before setting out for the Nevada Territory. Although he did not formally join a lodge during his adventurous years in the West, Clemens often

attended Masonic functions.⁵⁷ His first book, *Innocents Abroad*, published several years after his Hawaiian visit, contained numerous references to the fraternity and its mythology.⁵⁸ Upon returning from Kilauea volcano on the island of Hawai‘i, Clemens happened on the news of a clipper ship that had exploded and left its crew in a small lifeboat a thousand miles from land. After interviewing survivors and writing a lengthy dispatch, Clemens witnessed a display of the power of Hawaiian culture that impressed and unnerved him, followed up by his first, and probably only, visit to a Hawai‘i Masonic lodge.

Princess Victoria Kamamalu Ka‘ahumanu, a sister of King Kamehameha V, had died, and a month of rituals commenced while her body lay in state at the old ‘Iolani Palace. In a letter to his newspaper, Clemens set the scene:

Every night, and all night long, for more than thirty days, multitudes of these strange mourners have burned their candlenut torches in the royal inclosure and sung their funeral dirges and danced their hula-hulas and wailed their harrowing wail for the dead. All this time we strangers have been consumed with curiosity to look within those walls and see the pagan deviltry that was going on there. But the thing was tabu to foreigners, *haoles*.⁵⁹

According to Clemens, the grounds of the palace had been open to the public during the first days of mourning, but “several rowdy white people acted so unbecomingly—so shamefully, in fact—that the King placed a strict tabu on their future admittance.”⁶⁰ During the final days of June, a few foreigners were permitted to view the conclusion of the ceremonies, among them Clemens. He carefully recorded the movements of the hula and sounds of the sacred chants (*oli*) in over a dozen pages of his notebook.⁶¹

The young reporter noted approvingly Kamehameha V’s statement that foreigners’ religious beliefs were their own business but ancient Hawaiian customs were his preference.⁶² Several nights later, Clemens found his way to another site of secret ritual, at the monthly meeting of Hawaiian Lodge. Both fascinated and repulsed by what he had witnessed at the palace, his visit to the lodge may have added meaning to his observations of Princess Victoria’s funeral. Abraham Fornander, one of the foremost *haole* students of Hawaiian culture at the

time, also attended the lodge meeting that July evening. Clemens's journals do not reveal whether the two men conversed, but Hawai'i did remain on the author's mind. Twenty years later, Mark Twain published *Legends and Myths of Hawaii*, attributed to King Kalākaua and ghostwritten by a mutual friend of the two men (and a prominent Mason), U.S. Minister Rollin Daggett.⁶³

Public notice of the Masonic fraternity in Honolulu followed seasonal patterns of feasts and processions, dedicatory cornerstone layings for public buildings, and funeral services. Other sources of publicity for the brethren were fairs and theatrical entertainments in support of charitable causes or lodge building funds. In 1855 Lee and Marshall's National Circus held a benefit performance for Hawaiian Lodge that netted more than \$400, a considerable sum for a small lodge overburdened with obligations.⁶⁴ Similarly, several concerts, including a program produced by A. H. Havell titled "The Influence of Music on the Human Mind," benefited Hawaiian and Le Progrès Lodges in 1870.⁶⁵ Traveling entertainers gained several advantages in staging such benefits, whether or not they invoked Masonic affiliation, as did Havell. Since they routinely stopped in Honolulu for two weeks or more, advertising their performances was important in building and sustaining a following. Many of the services required by performers in staging their shows were obtained from members of the brotherhood—the printing of programs and tickets, renting musical instruments and performance space.⁶⁶ Discounted prices and complimentary services were thus a distinct likelihood if entertainers were known to the businessmen who were also brethren.

Periodically, theatrical troupes and minstrel shows were stranded in Honolulu and sought Masonic assistance. According to a longtime member of Hawaiian Lodge, John Hassinger:

Prepaid passage to the mainland . . . was considered the proper method of aiding these professional waifs, for they generally confessed to such a love for Honolulu and its surroundings that a money contribution tended to lengthen their stay as long as it lasted.⁶⁷

Hassinger also discussed the scarce opportunities for entertainment as one reason for the social appeal of Masonry. Aside from theatrical

presentations at the “illy-ventilated” Derby Theater, he noted, “there was only the barroom and the public dance house to resort to. Under the circumstances our brethren hailed the advent of lodge night.”⁶⁸ It was fitting that the Masonic Temple in which Hassinger made these remarks occupied the same downtown site as the old Derby Theater.

CORNERSTONES OF THE COMMUNITY

In a letter to a friend near the end of his long life, Abraham Fornander wrote:

You seem somewhat surprised that the cornerstone of public edifices should be laid with Masonic ceremonies, and you say that such is not the custom in Sweden. I know not the esteem and consideration in which Freemasonry is now held in Sweden, but I well remember that when you and I were boys, “Frimurane” were looked upon with great doubt if not positive aversion as dreadful and mysterious beings, at whose mention old men shook their heads and children nestled closer to their mother.⁶⁹

Fornander assured his friend that though European Freemasonry had once been tainted with political subversion, “in England and America, Masonry and Politics have been kept strictly apart.” Because of the identification of speculative Masonry with medieval temple builders and architects, Fornander continued,

the custom of employing freemasons to lay the corner-stones of public buildings is but a continuation of an ancient custom that has never created surprise nor evoked criticism in England or America, where Freemasonry, as now understood is immensely more prevalent than in any other countries; and referring to English and American journals, past and present, you will hardly find a public secular building, bridge, or monument of any note, whose cornerstone was not laid with Masonic ceremonies.⁷⁰

Although some people still thought of Freemasons as a concealed network of men conducting enigmatic rituals, lodge members purposely made themselves visible at times and in ways that reinforced their fraternal identity and civic status. This helps explain their collective role

in laying the cornerstones of important buildings, which were highly newsworthy events during the nineteenth century. In leading these rites, brethren gained symbolic authority through associating themselves with political officials as well as the material manifestations of civic virtue and cultural authority at locations such as 'Iolani Palace (the official royal residence), Ali'iolani Hale (the site of most government offices), and at such charitable enterprises as Queen's Hospital and Lunalilo Home for indigent Hawaiians.

Among the dozens of buildings in Hawai'i inaugurated with Masonic ceremonies from the 1860s to the 1920s, the two Masonic temples constructed in Honolulu were the most evident manifestations of the fraternity's presence in the city. In turn, the two imposing Masonic temple buildings reified the symbolic power of the fraternity while serving as the locus for the order's internal activities.⁷¹ In January 1879, King Kalākaua, attired in Masonic regalia and accompanied by Queen Kapi'olani and the heir apparent, Princess Lili'uokalani, oversaw the laying of the cornerstone of Hawaiian Lodge's new temple. Eleven months later, Kalākaua conducted an even grander Masonic ceremony at the site of the new 'Iolani Palace, using Masonic silver working tools specially crafted for the occasion. Even the process of raising these modern-day fraternal temples helps underline the intertwining nature of fellowship, economics, and political life in Hawai'i. For the temple built in 1879, committees raised funds, searched for the sites, and discussed the size and design of the building for several years before finally buying two lots in the business district. The official who authorized the sale of the lots, Minister of the Interior Samuel G. Wilder, also allowed Hawaiian Lodge officers to conduct a lengthy Masonic trial involving charges of adultery in an Interior Department office in 1878, no doubt to facilitate secrecy.⁷² The lodge's long-time secretary (chief administrator), Charles T. Gulick, was also chief clerk of the Interior Department.⁷³

Beyond the lodges' role as archetypes of virtue and guardians of the social status of their members, the temples existed as portals of escape from the mundane realities of city life. During ritual sessions, lodge rooms became realms of fantasy and pageantry. Isolated by stairways, window blinds, thick lava-rock walls, and entrances guarded by sword-bearing officials called tylers, Honolulu's expansive new

Masonic temples simultaneously excluded the outside world and enveloped brethren in symbols and sensations. In spaces illuminated only by candles, lodge officers pulled blindfolded initiates by “cable-tows” around their necks. After stripping them to the waist and applying the point of a drafter’s compass to their chest, they required candidates to demonstrate proof of their worthiness through grips, passwords, and appropriate answers to cryptic questions.⁷⁴ They also led them through a process of “floorwork,” a series of sometimes intricate steps aligned with the cardinal directions and combined with angular movements of the feet and body.⁷⁵

Two notable facts stand out in the records of Masonic lodge meetings from the 1840s to the 1890s. The first is that gatherings were frequent, and core groups of officers and members attended regularly. The second is the relatively small number of those attending compared with the total number of lodge members. Even the impressive temples and public ceremonies that attracted large audiences did not assure regular participation by most members at lodge meetings. Far from being a local phenomenon, the decline in attendance at Masonic and other fraternal lodges was international in scope and seemed to accelerate as membership rolls grew. The number of men present at Hawaiian Lodge meetings slipped from an average of 40 percent of membership in 1852 to 29 percent in 1860 and 12 percent in 1900, rates that were slightly higher than those at an Oakland, California, lodge at the same time.⁷⁶

In 1860 Hawaiian Lodge Master Benjamin Durham addressed the problem of fraternal indolence, complaining,

The few men who have been regular in their attendance in the meetings of this lodge during the past year have with pain observed an apathetic feeling amongst a large proportion of our membership which seems to be growing into an utter indifference. Fully one third of our members who reside in the town whose business occupations certainly cannot prevent their attendance, have not attended lodge more than once on the average during the last twelve months.⁷⁷

Durham further spoke of having to go with other lodge officers “to some of our members and almost beg of them to attend.”⁷⁸ Addressing a meeting attended by fewer than half of the members, Durham reminded those present that their families might one day depend on

the lodge for “aid and protection” and asked them to consider the consequences of their “lukewarm attachment and zeal” in that light.⁷⁹

If boredom was one factor keeping members away from regular meetings, what was it that appealed to those who did attend? One aspect of Masonry that has been repeatedly cited by scholars studying fraternalism is that its complex rituals afforded an opportunity for religious expression and experience outside the church.⁸⁰ There was also a more immediate allure to men who were mainstays in the temple rituals. The combination of “floorwork” with the spectral atmosphere of the lodge room during rituals produced what an experienced Mason has termed “a mesmerizing effect” upon the consciousness of both initiates and observers.⁸¹ And a century ago, Masonic authorities agreed, saying that the “beauties of the Mystic Science” properly performed thus created an aesthetic enchantment.⁸² The sheer complexity of the rituals contributed to this effect. Participants moved in precise patterns about the lodge room while using their fingers, hands, and arms in prescribed fashion. Repeated exposure to the patterns was necessary for those who wanted to understand the rituals fully.

MASONIC PROFILES

Occupationally, most Masons in Honolulu were merchants, mariners, or professional men able to afford the expenses of joining and paying dues and able to contribute to their charitable causes. Beginning with the reign of Kamehameha III, some of them were officials in the kingdom’s government.⁸³ Whether Masonic membership was an advantage in seeking appointment to a government position is an open question, but it was obviously not an obstacle—in government or in private business. Members often asked lodge officials for recommendations for employment, as did a Hawaiian Lodge member who moved from Maui to San Francisco in 1890. Asking to demit, he wrote a lodge official,

I will arrive in San Francisco a complete stranger, and will be glad to get to work as soon after my arrival as possible, as my limited means don’t permit me to be idle for even so short a time and I have the hope that a recommendation from my lodge in Honolulu will be of the greatest help to me.⁸⁴

Under Kamehameha IV, every member of the cabinet was a Mason, as was the king himself. Two cabinet members, Foreign Minister Robert Wyllie and Finance Minister David Gregg, never formally joined a Honolulu lodge, but both frequently attended banquets, processions, and meetings of the fraternity. Similarly, while the *Le Progrès* controversy in the 1850s had alienated Prince Lot Kamehameha from Hawaiian Lodge, he subsequently entered the York Rite and became a royal arch Mason (the seventh degree). Elevated to the throne after his brother's death, Lot, as Kamehameha V, appointed a cabinet less dominated by Masons, though he maintained his social ties with lodge members, and many Masons continued to serve as commissioners, clerks, and department heads throughout his reign. David Kalākaua, for example, acted as an aide-de-camp to Kamehameha IV and then as head of the postal service as well as serving in several other posts under Kamehameha V.

In Kalākaua's own reign in the 1870s and 1880s, Masons regained the prominent role they had in government under Kamehameha IV. Interested in exploring the metaphysical knowledge contained in traditional Hawaiian as well as Masonic sources, Kalākaua appointed dozens of brethren to positions of public responsibility. Yet the tumult generated by his political lapses as well as frequent changes of personnel (some two dozen cabinets in sixteen years) ultimately destabilized his rule.⁸⁵

Americans were the most numerous nationality among Masonic lodge members in Honolulu, but they were not always a majority, and there were always substantial percentages of Britons and Europeans. During the first decades of Masonic activity in the Islands, Americans constituted 40 percent to 50 percent of all members, and Scots, Irish, and English together constituted another 30 percent. Native Hawaiians, on the other hand, comprised no more than 5 to 10 percent of the fraternity, but because they were frequently royalty or important governmental officials, they were highly conspicuous.⁸⁶

Masons in Hawai'i generally conformed to the occupational patterns among members in the United States during the nineteenth century, except for the profusion of mariners from the American, British, and French navies and commercial vessels. Craftsmen and proprietors (merchants, farmers, ranchers) predominated with low-level white-collar workers (clerks, bookkeepers, teachers) becoming

more numerous as the century progressed. This trend fits the pattern of American Freemasonry, as urban lodges with hundreds of members proliferated and total membership increased to more than a million by 1906.⁸⁷ But there were several differences between the occupational patterns of Masons in Honolulu and in the United States in the late nineteenth century.

Hawaiian and Le Progrès Lodges recorded the occupations of men when they joined the lodge. In the Live Oak Lodge in Oakland, California, studied by Lynn Dumenil, the percentage of high-level white-collar members (high government officials, professionals, and managers) was considerably less than in Hawaiian Lodge in the final decades of the century.⁸⁸ This disparity exists in spite of the fact that Dumenil searched the Oakland city directory to update the occupational profile of members over the course of their careers, which would “improve” occupational status as younger members prospered. Another scholar found a similar pattern among Masons in San Francisco between 1870 and 1900, although the latter study categorized occupational groups in a way that blurred distinctions between high-level and low-level white-collar categories.⁸⁹

With more than four hundred members in 1905, Hawaiian and Le Progrès Lodges were joined by three additional Masonic lodges on O‘ahu and the neighbor islands as well as chapters of the Scottish and York Rite organizations. Honolulu’s daily newspapers in their listings of dozens of fraternal organizations and secret societies in the 1890s thus hinted at a startling fact. Despite the triumph of Christianity and American ideals, Hawai‘i was awash in pagan symbolism dating back to the pre-Christian era as Red Men, Foresters, Workingmen, Freemasons, and Odd Fellows emerged from the shadows each evening to partake of esoteric rituals. Specifying meeting days, times, and places, daily papers also offered capsule biographies of national and local lodge leaders, histories of the various fraternal orders, and descriptions of public ceremonies.⁹⁰ While seemingly prosaic, these notices and stories emphasized the extent to which fraternalism helped define civic culture in turn-of-the-century Honolulu. Freemasonry as the oldest and most distinguished of these “invented traditions” also contained the most powerful expressions of symbolic practice and communication—a powerful ritual complex that influenced how men viewed themselves and their community.

NOTES

- ¹ Authorization from Supreme Council to Lodge Le Progrès, 1843, AMs, Lodge Le Progrès Archives, Honolulu. For background information relating to Hawai'i's first Masonic lodge, see Ed Towse, *Lodge Le Progres de l'Océanie: A Transcript* (Honolulu: Mercantile Printing Co., 1925); Journal of William Paty, Harbormaster, March–April, 1843, Register of Entries and Clearances, Volume 1, 1842–1849, Honolulu Harbormaster, AH.
- ² Towse, *Lodge Le Progres de l'Océanie* 6.
- ³ Abraham Fornander, "Masonry in the Sandwich Islands," 1859, Hawaiian Lodge Archives, Honolulu.
- ⁴ Lodge Le Progrès de l'Océanie Archives, Honolulu.
- ⁵ Mary Ann Clawson, *Constructing Brotherhood: Class, Gender and Fraternalism* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton UP, 1989) 34–35.
- ⁶ Clawson, *Constructing Brotherhood* 42–45.
- ⁷ Kauikeaouli, a son of Kamehameha I, ascended the throne in the spring of 1825 after Liholiho and his wife had died in London the previous year.
- ⁸ "List of Members, Lodge Le Progres de l'Océanie, No. 124, A.D. 1843," Lodge Le Progrès Archives, Honolulu; "The Journal of Stephen Reynolds," ms., HHS, 188; "Journal of William Paty," Series 104, Register of Entries and Clearances, Vol. 1, Honolulu Harbormaster, AH.
- ⁹ "List of Members, Lodge Le Progres"; Richard Greer, "Honolulu in 1847," *HJH* 4 (1970): 63–64. In late 1847 Lodge Le Progrès counted thirty-three members out of a permanent adult male foreign population of 353. There were probably additional members since a fire in late 1845 had destroyed lodge records prior to that date.
- ¹⁰ Unaffiliated members are Masons in good standing who do not belong to a lodge, having withdrawn (demitted) from their original lodge. Lodge Le Progrès Minutes, January 1846 to March 1850, Lodge Le Progrès Archives, Honolulu.
- ¹¹ Gorham Gilman, "Streets of Honolulu in the 1840s," *HAA for 1904* (Honolulu: Thomas G. Thrum) 88–90; John Hassinger, "Historical Address," in *Golden Anniversary Program, Hawaiian Lodge, No. 21, F. & A. M* (Honolulu: Gazette Printing, 1902) 24; Cletus F. Chaussee, "Centennial History of Hawaiian Lodge, No. 21, F. & A. M.," in *Souvenir Program of the Centennial Year of Hawaiian Lodge No. 21, F. & A. M.* (Honolulu: Centennial Program Committee, 1952) 44.
- ¹² Harold Whitman Bradley, *The American Frontier in Hawaii: 1789–1843* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford UP, 1942; reprint, Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1968) 233.
- ¹³ Stephen Reynolds, "Journal of Stephen Reynolds," March–April 1843, microfilm in HMCS Library, Honolulu.
- ¹⁴ Bradley, *The American Frontier* 181, 415.
- ¹⁵ Albion Clark, *Odd Fellowship in Hawaii: An Outline History of Excelsior Lodge no. 1, Independent Order of Odd Fellows, 1846–1928* (Honolulu: Honolulu Advertiser, 1929) 9–10.

- ¹⁶ Lodge Le Progrès Minutes, Oct. 8, 1849, Lodge Le Progrès Archives, Honolulu.
- ¹⁷ Minutes, December 1851–February 1852, Hawaiian Lodge Archives, Honolulu.
- ¹⁸ Minutes, June 15, 1853, Dec. 8, 1853, Feb. 27, 1854, Hawaiian Lodge Archives, Honolulu.
- ¹⁹ R. C. Wyllie to grand master of Grand Lodge of California, July 14, 1853. Hawaiian Lodge Archives, Honolulu.
- ²⁰ Minutes January–December 1853, Hawaiian Lodge Archives, Honolulu. The minutes indicate a jump in applications in summer 1853, despite the onset of the smallpox epidemic beginning in late spring of that year. Petitions for initiation jumped dramatically in July 1853 from an average of two or three to more than ten applications per meeting.
- ²¹ Manuscript Collection M-36, AH; Jesse Bowman, “Alexander Cartwright’s Encore,” *Honolulu Magazine*, September 1977, 57–59.
- ²² Charles E. Peterson, “Pioneer Architects and Builders of Honolulu,” *Hawai‘i Architect* 7 (November 1978): 18–19.
- ²³ Privy Council minutes, Vol. 6, p. 180. AH.
- ²⁴ P Feb. 22, 1851.
- ²⁵ P Feb. 22, 1851.
- ²⁶ Pauline King, ed., *The Diaries of David Lawrence Gregg: An American Diplomat in Hawaii, 1853–1858* (Honolulu: Hawaiian Historical Society, 1982) 110.
- ²⁷ King, *Diaries* 130.
- ²⁸ Alexander J. Cartwright to Alex Muir, Mar. 8, 1857, AH. During the same period, Cartwright, as secretary of the American Club, solicited the use of the Royal Artillery for a George Washington day celebration from Prince Lot Kamehameha, profusely thanking him after the favor was granted. Alexander Cartwright to Prince Lot Kamehameha, Feb. 22, 1857, Manuscript Collection, M-36, AH.
- ²⁹ Eleanor Harmon Davis. *Abraham Fornander: A Biography* (Honolulu: UP of Hawaii, 1979) 116.
- ³⁰ Davis. *Abraham Fornander* 116.
- ³¹ Manuscript Collection M-36, AH.
- ³² Minutes, July 1854–December 1859, Hawaiian Lodge Archives, Le Progrès Archives, Honolulu. These events are also detailed in several secondary sources, including Chaussee, *Centennial History* 61–71.
- ³³ Minutes, Sept. 4, 1854, Hawaiian Lodge Archives, Honolulu.
- ³⁴ *Proceedings of the Most Worshipful Grand Lodge of California* (1855), 350–52 (hereafter *Proceedings*).
- ³⁵ Chas. F. Guillou, T. Charles Bye Rooke, and E. Hoffman to Brethren of Hawaiian Lodge, Apr. 13, 1856, Hawaiian Lodge Archives. The above committee reported on its meeting with the landlord and its former lodgemate John Meek. It stated that Meek “affirms that he never admitted Hawaiian lodge as a sole or exclusive tenant” and that the “recent increase in rent is in consid-

- eration of investments made in the premises." Meek wanted \$20 a month for a shared lease from Hawaiian Lodge and "if that amount is not paid (or agreed to) then H.L. may leave the premises at once."
- ³⁶ Minutes, July 16, 1856, Lodge Le Progrès Archives.
- ³⁷ Minutes, July 16, 1856, Lodge Le Progrès Archives.
- ³⁸ Minutes, July 16, 1856, Lodge Le Progrès Archives.
- ³⁹ Minutes, July 16, 1856, Lodge Le Progrès Archives.
- ⁴⁰ King, *Diaries* 231.
- ⁴¹ Minutes, July 15, 1856, Lodge Le Progrès Archives.
- ⁴² Abraham Fornander, secretary, Hawaiian Lodge, to Alexander Abell, grand secretary, Grand Lodge of California, May 23, 1859, Hawaiian Lodge Archives, Honolulu.
- ⁴³ "The Lodges at Honolulu," *Freemasons Monthly Magazine* (Boston), XVIII (August 1859): 297.
- ⁴⁴ Minutes, Feb. 25, 1857, Hawaiian Lodge Archives, Honolulu.
- ⁴⁵ Minutes, May 2, 1859, Hawaiian Lodge Archives, Honolulu.
- ⁴⁶ Minutes, May 2, 1859, Hawaiian Lodge Archives, Honolulu.
- ⁴⁷ Lewis Mumford, *The City in History* (New York: Harcourt, Brace Jovanovich, 1961) 421.
- ⁴⁸ See, for example, Gavan Daws, "Honolulu in the 19th Century: Notes on the Emergence of Urban Society in Honolulu," *Journal of Pacific History* 11 (1967): 85; Albert Pierce Taylor, "Intrigues, Conspiracies and Accomplishments in the Era of Kamehameha IV and V and Robert Crichton Wyllie," *Papers of the Hawaiian Historical Society*, 16 (Honolulu: The Printshop Co., 1929) 22.
- ⁴⁹ C. Axel Egerström, "Honolulu in 1855," trans. Caroline Bengston, *HJH* 9 (1975): 43.
- ⁵⁰ A good source for further information on the building of Queen's Hospital is Richard Greer, "The Founding of Queen's Hospital," *HJH* 3 (1969): 110-45.
- ⁵¹ Ralph S. Kuykendall, *The Hawaiian Kingdom, 1854-1874* (Honolulu: U of Hawaii P, 1953) 88-91.
- ⁵² Minutes, Lodge Le Progrès, Nov. 5, 1862, Lodge Le Progrès Archives, Honolulu.
- ⁵³ A few of the titles and authors: William R. Bliss, *Paradise in the Pacific* (New York: Sheldon, 1873); A Haole [G. W. Bates], *Sandwich Island Notes* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1854); Charles Warren Stoddard, *South-Sea Idyls* (Boston: J. R. Osgood, 1873); Charles Warren Stoddard, *Hawaiian Life: Being Lazy Letters From Low Latitudes* (Chicago: F. T. Neely, 1894); Mary Eleanor Anderson, *Scenes in the Hawaiian Islands and California* (Boston: American Tract Society, 1865); James Jackson Jarves, *Scenes and Scenery in the Sandwich Islands* (London: Moxon, 1844); Henry S. Howell, *An Island Paradise and Reminiscences of Travel* (Toronto: Hart, 1892).
- ⁵⁴ Bliss, *Paradise in the Pacific* 161.
- ⁵⁵ *Proceedings* (1878), 414.
- ⁵⁶ Invoice, G. W. Macfarlane and Co., July 1887, Hawaiian Lodge Archives, Honolulu; *PCA* June 3, 1887.

- ⁵⁷ Clemens also served as junior deacon, a position subordinate to the wardens who assisted the worshipful master in governing the lodge. Frederick Anderson and Michael Park, ed., *Mark Twain's Notebooks and Journals: Vol. 1, 1855-1873* (Berkeley: U of California P, 1975) 66; Alexander E. Jones, "Mark Twain and Freemasonry," *American Literature* 26 (November 1954): 364-65.
- ⁵⁸ Jones, "Mark Twain and Freemasonry" 365-68.
- ⁵⁹ A. Grove Day, ed. *Mark Twain's Letters from Hawaii* (Honolulu: UP of Hawaii, 1975) 161.
- ⁶⁰ Day, *Mark Twain's Letters* 161.
- ⁶¹ Day, *Mark Twain's Letters* 162-69; Margaret Sanborn, *Mark Twain: The Bachelor Years* (New York: Doubleday, 1990) 281-82.
- ⁶² Day, *Mark Twain's Letters* 169.
- ⁶³ Davis, *Abraham Fornander* 229, 255-56.
- ⁶⁴ Henry Lee, Honolulu to worshipful master and brothers of Hawaiian Lodge, Nov. 26, 1855; Abraham Fornander, secretary, to worshipful master and brethren of Hawaiian Lodge, December 1855, Hawaiian Lodge Archives, Honolulu.
- ⁶⁵ A. H. Havell to W. Master and Brethren of Hawaiian Lodge, July 4, 1870; Charles T. Gulick, secretary, Hawaiian Lodge, to A. H. Havell, July 15, 1870; Horace Crabbe, secretary, Le Progrès de l'Océanie Lodge, to A. H. Havell, July 15, 1870; Hawaiian Lodge Archives, Honolulu.
- ⁶⁶ Lodge invoices from the 1850s through the 1890s point to the purchase of services and material from Masonic tradesmen such as Black and Auld, C. H. Lewers, A. S. Cleghorn, C. W. Vincent, H. Hackfeld, Von Holt and Heuck, B. F. Ehlers, John Hassinger, and Henry Macfarlane.
- ⁶⁷ John Hassinger, "Historical Address," in *Golden Anniversary Program, Hawaiian Lodge, No. 21, F. & A. M* 40.
- ⁶⁸ Hassinger, "Historical Address" 43.
- ⁶⁹ Abraham Fornander, Lahaina, to Eric Ljunstedt, Stockholm, June 10, 1880, Pinao Brickwood Houston Collection, Manuscript Collection M-67, AH.
- ⁷⁰ Fornander to Ljunstedt, June 10, 1880.
- ⁷¹ Masonic "temples" are so named in reference to King Solomon's Temple, "the most perfect edifice ever erected," according to Masonic authorities.
- ⁷² Building Committee, Hawaiian Lodge, to the worshipful master and brethren of Hawaiian Lodge, June 6, 1878, Hawaiian Lodge Archives, Honolulu. J. Mott-Smith was interior minister when the offer of sale was made to the Hawaiian Lodge Building Committee (E. P. Adams, Alexander J. Cartwright, H. J. Nolte, George Luce, and Albert F. Judd). Less than a month after the letter was sent, King Kalākaua named a new cabinet with Samuel G. Wilder as interior minister. It was he who concluded the transactions. Wilder had taken the entered apprentice degree in Hawaiian Lodge several years earlier but never advanced to the second or third degree. The Masonic trial involved charges that a brother had alienated the affections of another's wife. Masonic trials generally revolved around charges of "unmasonic conduct"—gross violations of mutual trust between members, crimes, and so forth.
- ⁷³ Annual Report of Charles T. Gulick, Hawaiian Lodge secretary, to W.M., war-

- dens, and brethren of Hawaiian Lodge, Dec. 2, 1878, Hawaiian Lodge Archives, Honolulu.
- ⁷⁴ Norman Mackenzie, ed. *Secret Societies* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967) 306–21.
- ⁷⁵ Mackenzie, *Secret Societies* 306–21.
- ⁷⁶ Lynn Dumenil, *Freemasonry and American Culture, 1880–1930* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton UP, 1984) 230–31.
- ⁷⁷ Lecture before Hawaiian Lodge of W.M. B. F. Durham, Honolulu, Apr. 2, 1860, Hawaiian Lodge Archives, Honolulu.
- ⁷⁸ Lecture before Hawaiian Lodge of W.M. B. F. Durham.
- ⁷⁹ Lecture before Hawaiian Lodge of W.M. B. F. Durham.
- ⁸⁰ Dumenil, *Freemasonry and American Culture* 41.
- ⁸¹ Grand Lodge of Hawai‘i Historian Herbert Gardiner, interview by author, August 1997.
- ⁸² Address to the Grand Lodge of California, B. D. Hyam, deputy grand master, *Proceedings* (1852) 149.
- ⁸³ Both Hawaiian and Le Progrès Lodges recorded each member’s date of admission to the order, occupation, date and place of birth, and original lodge affiliation, if applicable. Both lodges were sometimes erratic in listing date and place of birth, death, and other information, especially after 1880. Occupational information is for the time of admission so that John Dominis (eventually governor of O‘ahu and Maui), for example, is listed as clerk, his profession at his induction into the order in 1858.
- ⁸⁴ George Heinemann, Paia, Maui, to T. C. Porter, secretary, Hawaiian Lodge, OCT. 17, 1890, Hawaiian Lodge Archives, Honolulu.
- ⁸⁵ For more detail on the participation of Hawaiian monarchs in the Masonic order, see Frank J. Karpel, “Mystic Ties of Brotherhood: Freemasonry, Ritual and Hawaiian Royalty,” *Pacific Historical Review* 69.3 (2000).
- ⁸⁶ National origins and occupational status of lodge members in Hawai‘i were tallied using membership registers from Lodge Le Progrès and Hawaiian Lodge.
- ⁸⁷ Albert C. Stevens, ed., *The Cyclopaedia of Fraternities* (New York: E. B. Treat, 1907; reprint, Detroit: Gale Research Company, 1966) 91–92.
- ⁸⁸ Dumenil, *Freemasonry and American Culture* 226–31.
- ⁸⁹ Anthony D. Fels, “The Square and the Compass: San Francisco’s Freemasons and American Religion, 1870–1900” (Ph.D. diss., Stanford U, 1987) 70.
- ⁹⁰ PCA May 20, 1901; EB July 14, 1899; *Hawaiian Star* Apr. 29, 1896. Stories and notices on fraternal groups meetings appear in Honolulu’s English-language daily and weekly newspapers from the mid-1850s.