

## The Decline of Puritanism at Honolulu in the Nineteenth Century

Gavan Daws

The fiftieth anniversary of the arrival of the first Protestant missionaries at the Sandwich Islands was celebrated in 1870 by almost fifteen thousand Hawaiian natives, about a fourth of the total population of the kingdom, organized into fifty-eight churches, thirty-nine of which had native ordained ministers.<sup>1</sup> This was evidence of a considerable achievement for American evangelical Calvinism, a success that was not matched in any other group of islands in the Pacific at such an early date.

But, as the Protestants themselves were forced to admit, the great days of Puritanism in Hawaii were already in the past. The Sandwich Islands Mission itself had already been formally disbanded. An administrative re-organization carried out in the eighteen fifties and sixties lessened its dependence on the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions at Boston, and brought into being self-sustaining churches in the islands.<sup>2</sup> This was regarded as an acknowledgment that the missionaries had done their work well, that the Hawaiian kingdom could be fairly described as a Christian country. If this was the case, however, the credit would have to be shared with missionaries of other denominations—Catholic, Mormon, and Anglican. If one-fourth of the population was Calvinist in religion, the other three-fourths was not. The American Protestants had hoped for total victory, but they had to be satisfied with partial victory. And by 1870 even that partial victory was compromised.

It was not simply that other religious groups were competing for the souls of Hawaiian commoners. More significantly, Englishmen, Europeans, non-Puritan Americans, and members of the Hawaiian ruling class were taking it upon themselves to decide what might or might not be regarded as acceptable behavior at the islands, and their decisions amounted to a rejection of Puritan standards.

The missionary virtues, to put it bluntly, were becoming unfashionable. Mark Twain, who visited the islands in the eighteen sixties, spoke for a good many residents when he called the missionaries "pious; hard-working;

---

*Gavan Daws is assistant professor of history at the University of Hawaii.*

hard-praying; self-sacrificing; hospitable; devoted to the well-being of this people and the interests of Protestantism; bigoted; puritanical; slow; ignorant of all white human nature and natural ways of men, except the remnants of these things that are left in their own class or profession; old foggy—fifty years behind the age. . . .”<sup>3</sup> The missionaries had only a simple social past to draw upon in trying to make the future secure for their faith, and they did not know how to cope with a complex present in which the enemies of holiness were much more subtle, devious, and disarming than they had been in the old days.

A drift away from Puritanism was clearly evident by the time the young chief Alexander Liholiho became king in 1854, and indeed he embodied anti-Protestant sentiment. Gerrit P. Judd, former missionary and former minister of cabinet, put it unkindly when he wrote that Alexander Liholiho, “educated by the Mission, most of all things dislikes the Mission. Having been compelled to be good when a boy, he is determined not to be good as a man. Driven out by morning prayer meeting, Wednesday evening meeting, monthly concert, Sabbath school, long sermons, and daily exhortations, his heart is hardened to a degree unknown to the heathen. Naturally he chooses associates whose feelings and practices are in union with his own.”<sup>4</sup> Alexander Liholiho’s personality was much more complex and sophisticated than Judd imagined, and as king he was moved by considerations more important than mere animus against the Calvinists, but it was true that he set himself to escape from missionary tutelage. In this he was encouraged by the fact that other groups of people in the kingdom, and especially at the capital city of Honolulu, were doing the same. During the reign of Alexander Liholiho, and the reign of his brother Lot, who followed him on the throne, the Puritans fought a series of test cases on the old moral issues and lost almost every one. By 1870 the holy community at the islands was in disarray.

The first of these test cases involved the matter of theatrical performances. The Protestant mission, from the beginning, had been stringent in its condemnation of the drama, regarding western theater as only slightly less corrupting than the Hawaiian hula. Not so much because of this as because of the inadequate resources of Honolulu’s isolated white community, organized theater did not appear until 1834, when a group of young Americans (most of them Unitarians) founded the “Oahu Amateur Theatre.” The mission kept up a steady proscriptive barrage, but the theater attracted good houses, which included natives as well as whites, indiscriminately seated. A decade later, interest in theater was sufficient to bring into being the Oahu Thespian Association (whose members were mostly Americans and Englishmen). The “devil’s playhouse,” or *Hale Diabolo*, as the Protestants urged native Christians to call it, was attended reasonably well, and when the Royal Hawaiian Theatre was erected in 1848 at Hotel and Alakea Streets, audiences continued to be satisfactory.<sup>5</sup>

Thenceforth, Honolulu’s theaters were never without royal patronage. Amateur performances were given particular encouragement in the late fifties by Alexander Liholiho and his wife Emma, who sometimes took part in

musical concerts and excerpts from opera. By the sixties, all but the most intransigent in the mission community had conceded defeat on the question of the theater. In fact, the flow of influence was in the other direction. The mission group had always been willing enough to allow church buildings to be used for "suitable" performances (for example, benefit concerts of sacred music by reputable singers for worthy causes). By mid century, conditions were liberalized to include the use of churches for temperance dramas produced by Sunday school associations; and church members were permitted to take part in concerts or *tableaux-vivants* staged in the town to raise money for church improvements. Partial rapprochement was assisted by the fact that Mary Cooke, daughter of the Chiefs' Children's School teachers and a graduate of Punahou School, developed a voice of professional quality and went on to become an operatic singer in the United States, thus giving the mission community of Honolulu something of a vested interest in respectable though profane theater.<sup>6</sup>

As with the theater, so with social dancing: from the beginning, the Protestant mission regarded it as immoral, like the hula. The course of subsequent events was similar. The white community in the twenties and early thirties was so small that the issue did not arise in public; but from the mid thirties, with more whites—and especially white women—in town, and more visits by war ships whose officers liked to dance, the question of acceptability became overt.

A test case arose quite soon. In 1836, a party was given for the British officers of Lord Edward Russell's *Actaeon* by Mrs. Little, the church going widow of an American sea captain. The guests drank brandy, played cards, and danced with her and with other Honolulu ladies. Mrs. Little held that dancing had nothing to do with the state of her soul. She had danced at home on the American mainland and had been at the same time a member in good standing of her Protestant congregation, and she could not see that geography altered morality. When she was threatened with excision from the newly formed Bethel Church for foreigners unless she stopped dancing, she continued and was dismissed. Several other foreign women followed her lead, and the exhortations of Seamen's Chaplain John Diell did no good.<sup>7</sup>

This was a straw in the wind. The appetite of naval commanders for sophisticated entertainment persisted, and many people in town were ready to meet them more than half way. Dancers, by 1839, were caught between two kinds of criticisms: visitors found that Honolulu's ladies could not waltz fast enough, and Protestant missionaries damned the ladies for daring to waltz at all. The first criticism was corrected by practice; the second was ignored.<sup>8</sup>

During the next few years (and for decades thereafter) shipboard balls were held almost every time a foreign man of war came to town, and often a foreign consul gave a dance in return at his home. When the socialite bachelor Robert Crichton Wyllie became Hawaiian Foreign Minister in 1845, the invasion moved a step closer to the center of society. Wyllie was a tireless dancer as well as a persuasive advocate of the idea that the monarchy should encourage the social graces. Less than eighteen months after his appointment, and in the

face of strong mission criticism, there was dancing at the palace. Thenceforth, the mission was on the defensive. Courtesy dictated that royal and official invitations should be accepted; morality dictated that dancing could not be condoned. Commonly, missionaries attended dinners and departed before dancing began; and Wyllie (so one missionary complained) could hardly wait until they were out of the room. Former missionaries in government were caught fairly in the middle. Richard Armstrong found dancing at the palace "very objectionable." His colleague Gerrit Judd held out for some time, but finally allowed his eligible daughters to dance.

The missionary retreat became a rout in the fifties. Opponents of dancing had been able thus far to avoid royal balls and attend only soirees, but by 1851 dancing was beginning to encroach even upon minor social functions. During the next few years, most holidays were celebrated with dances in the evening, including some of the solemn national days which in the past had been marked by temperance feasts and early nights or periods of fasting and humiliation.<sup>9</sup>

One of the most lavish events of Alexander Liholiho's reign was a gigantic fancy dress ball given by Foreign Minister Wyllie in 1860 and attended by every prominent Honolulu outside the mission community (including the Catholic bishop, who of course came as himself). Special music for waltzes and quadrilles was composed by two resident German professionals, Herren Waldau and Hasslocher; the hall was decorated by the professional artist Paul Emmert, and the catering was by the French hotelier Victor Chancerel. Wyllie came as a Scottish highland chief, and so did the venerable Governor Kekuanaoa. There was a Titania, an Undine, and a Beau Brummel; and Queen Emma herself came as Cybele—a *very* non-Protestant religious figure.<sup>10</sup>

Just as theater had made its way into mission preserves, so did dancing. Punahou girls, confined to calisthenics in school, turned to dancing after graduation. The young New Englander, J. B. Atherton, arriving with fine Protestant credentials to seek his fortune in Honolulu at the end of the fifties, was surprised to find that his letters of reference led him to families in which the young people danced. The apparent victory of frivolity was complete by the late sixties and early seventies. Queen Emma was present at the opening of a skating rink to watch the grand march, the lancers, and quadrilles—all on roller skates. Public balls were so crowded that two bands were needed, and the gallopade became a positive danger. Temperance lodges sponsored temperance balls; the native members of Kawaihau's choir organized mid summer dances; and missionary offspring were seen "dancing themselves giddy" at weekend parties in the country.<sup>11</sup>

The lower classes of Honolulu—white "mechanics" and seamen and common natives—were quick to imitate their betters. As early as 1840, common seamen of the United States Exploring Expedition were able to find native dancing partners in down town Honolulu. During the next fifteen years, there was a rapid importation of foreign dance forms. By the mid fifties, the down town world was able to celebrate Christmas and the Hawaiian Thanksgiving Day with an elegant supper, toasts to all and sundry, and "the most intricate quadrilles, foreign waltzes, mazurkas, redowas, etc." The "Working-

Man" who recorded this was amazed to find among the "humbler orders" of the native population so much "grace and elegance."<sup>12</sup>

What struck him as grace and elegance appeared to the official world as nothing more than swinishness. Marshal of the Kingdom William C. Parke, in his annual report to the legislature in 1852, described the public dance halls of Honolulu as the great sources and indeed the primary cause of the vast amount of fornication and adultery that disgraced the city. He urged their suppression, predicting that otherwise the rising generation of Hawaiians, "from whom so much is expected, and for whom so much has been done, must irretrievably fall, and be consigned to infamy and shame."<sup>13</sup> Parke carried out a campaign against the dance houses in 1853, under existing laws on common nuisance. It was then announced prematurely that, although some young men had opposed the purge, the dance houses were dead.<sup>14</sup>

That they were not dead was indicated unequivocally by their reappearance during the fall whaling season of 1856. Bar room hours had been extended till midnight,<sup>15</sup> and once again sailor and citizen alike might "pass the night in the 'mazy dance' with chaste Island maidens, or make appointments to 'meet me by moonlight alone.'" Opposition on the part of officialdom was not dead either. At the end of 1856, two well known hotel keepers, Joe Booth of the National Hotel and Joseph Dawson of Liberty Hall, were prosecuted and convicted under the common nuisance laws for allowing native women to assemble for "lewd purposes" at the dance houses they ran in conjunction with their taverns.<sup>16</sup>

Booth's conviction was reversed on appeal, and he and his fellow dance hall proprietors opened their houses again after the trial. By then, the whaling season was almost over. The circus and the theater were closed for lack of business, and the dance halls stayed open just long enough to prove their point. Defeated in court, the moralists turned to executive means of putting down the nuisance. It was quite simple in the short run. Booth and others held retail spirit licenses issued by the government. In mid-1857, a clause was included in these, prohibiting the attachment of dance halls to premises used for the retailing of spirits. Booth and Joseph Dawson petitioned the government against this, but Prince Lot, heading the Department of the Interior at the time, ruled against them, and the triad of liquor, sex, and dancing was broken up for the time being.<sup>17</sup>

Was public morality served by the dispersal of the dance hall women from their former haunts? Evidently not. In the fall of 1857 no dance hall opened—without a liquor connection, money could not be made. Neither was there, as it happened, a theater company or a circus in town during the first months of the fall whaling season. Yet convictions for offenses against morality, in a town offering no "immoral" amusements, increased rather than decreased for the fall months: 422 in 1855, 349 in 1856, and 513 in 1857.<sup>18</sup>

The tavern keepers soon found ways of evading the license requirements. Dances were held in buildings close to but not owned by publicans, or were held by customers "privately" in halls rented by them rather than by a licensee. In 1864, the legislature passed a regulatory act, and more prosecutions

followed, but the dance house area retained its characteristic flavour until the end of the whaling era. A roving reporter on Nuuanu Street in 1866 found whalermen, gaudy women, "nymphes du pave" awaiting customers in crowded coffee shops, and at Booth's Corner a "fantastic babel" accompanying dancing to violins, piano, and castanets.<sup>19</sup>

Concurrently with the dance hall affair, another case was producing acrimony between the Protestants and others whose definitions of public morality were less stringent. At the time when the Honolulu Sailors' Home was being planned as an adjunct to the Seamen's Bethel, its trustees memorialized the Privy Council, asking that no liquor licenses be granted in the block upon which the Bethel and the proposed Home were located. They further suggested that no licenses be awarded on the opposite sides of the streets bounding the block—King, Nuuanu, Merchant, and Bethel. This area fell within margins previously designated by the legislature as open to licenses. An English tavern keeper named John Maxey had already bought a lot on the corner of Nuuanu and Merchant Streets, and, having been assured by the Minister of Interior that he would be granted a license, had spent \$11,000 readying his new Royal Hotel for business. By the time Maxey applied for his license, however, the privy councillors had received the trustees' memorial. They decided that Maxey's license should be for one year only, not renewable.

At the end of the year, which was up in mid-1856, Maxey petitioned for a renewal, and the trustees of the Sailors' Home petitioned against it. Maxey pointed out that to deprive him of his license after only one year would be to ruin him. His hotel had been well run, without indecent dancing or other disturbances; furthermore, he said, no sailors from the Home came there—they would have been seen entering his place. Finally, there was another hotel on the other side of Nuuanu Street not more than fifty feet from the proscribed block, and there were three more in the immediate vicinity. The privy councillors rescinded the decision limiting the period of Maxey's license, and informed him and the trustees that the Royal Hotel might remain open.<sup>20</sup>

The Maxey affair was part of a larger struggle over the place of liquor in the community. Temperance followed much the same curve as did other moral crusades, rising and falling with the Protestants. King Kamehameha III had signed the pledge in the early forties, and, although he broke it regularly, he made intermittent appeals for abstinence among his fellows. For some years in the forties, no liquor was served at official functions.

Liquor, imported and dispensed legally or illegally, had always been a part of low life down town. It made its way into polite society at about the same time as dancing. Once more, Wyllie was its great champion. Protestant resistance was perhaps most methodical on this front. Honolulu's temperance societies were organized along the lines of those in New England. Even so, exhortation and example were nothing more than self sustaining. Sunday school children and Christian natives marched regularly in procession, waving temperance banners and singing cold-water hymns. Young men in the community formed groups such as the Dashaways (who promised to "dash away" liquor from their lips), and temperance societies of all kinds were given

great publicity by the dry press—the *Pacific Commercial Advertiser* and the Hawaiian language Protestant papers. Most of this, however, was mere preaching to the converted, and the converted did not necessarily remain convinced. During the forties, for instance, every surviving high chief who had become a church member was under censure or suspension at one time or another, many of them for offenses connected with drink. By the time of Alexander Liholiho, with Protestants unseated from the cabinet, much of white society pleasure bent, and the chiefs' example to the natives in ruins, any Puritan hope for a community free of liquor was futile.<sup>21</sup>

Even the compromise of a tightly controlled liquor traffic proved impossible to accomplish. No matter how high the price of liquor licenses, competition was always keen, especially for retail licenses (interestingly, the retail liquor trade of Honolulu up to the seventies was overwhelmingly in the hands of Englishmen, the only major business that could be so categorized). Outside the law, smuggling was rife; and probably more liquor was made illegally in the islands than was brought in by importers at the customs house and by smugglers combined.

As late as the seventies, licensing laws excluded natives from legal access to alcohol in any form other than communion wine. The laws survived a test of their constitutionality, brought in 1862 by Joe Booth of the dance halls, but although the law was judged sound, it was unenforceable. Convictions for drunkenness among natives ranked near the top of criminal statistics in the capital and elsewhere. In 1860, Honolulu's native policemen ceased to be paid out of fines levied by the courts. Lacking direct incentive, they nevertheless arrested drunken natives by the hundreds each year. Liquor duties and liquor licenses between them were in many years the biggest direct money earners for government, but those revenues were often matched dollar for dollar by the costs of running Honolulu's courts and prisons, whose business came in fair measure from crimes associated with liquor.<sup>22</sup>

The Queen's Hospital, for the treatment of native Hawaiians, was opened at Honolulu in 1860. Almost immediately a basic question of policy arose, one which arrayed the white community long much the same lines as the dance hall case had done. The question was, indeed, in some ways an extension of the moral questions posed by the existence of dance halls. Should prostitutes be admitted to The Queen's Hospital for treatment? Prostitution meant disease, and both were rife. What should be done? Moral obloquy had been tried, but it did not cure infections. Perhaps a system of licensing, inspection, and medical treatment would work. The issue was argued briskly in the period between 1855 and 1860, with the town split into familiar camps: permissive, regulatory, and prohibitive-punitive.<sup>23</sup>

Those in favor of licensing and inspection tended to dissociate questions of morality from questions of public health. Those against licensing argued that legal recognition implied legal approval of the institution of harlotry. They spoke at length about the wages of sin. Over strong Protestant opposition, the legislature of 1860 voted into law "An Act to Mitigate Evils and Disease Arising from Prostitution." The legislature's view was that experience had

demonstrated the impossibility of stamping out prostitution. The public good therefore demanded that the traffic be regulated. Honolulu's prostitutes were ordered to register with the sheriff, on pain of imprisonment. Treatment for diseased women was to be provided without charge. Any registered prostitute found free of disease might have her name removed from the register on declaring her intention to give up prostitution.<sup>24</sup>

Where might prostitutes be inspected and housed for treatment? The Queen's Hospital seemed to be the logical place. The Minister of the Interior and the hospital's trustees agreed toward the end of 1860 that the hospital should accommodate and treat prostitutes at the rate of forty-five cents per head per day, paid by the government. An instant objection was made by the ladies of Honolulu's Protestant community, thirty-four of whom inveighed against the proposal in a memorial directed to the trustees. The ladies interpreted the "Act to Mitigate" as having been passed to put "the mark of infamy on vice," thus making its votaries feel the "shame and disgrace" which were the due of such profligates in moral cities in other lands. This procedure in itself, the ladies claimed, would stimulate in the "young and ignorant nation of Hawaii" a love of character. No arrangements should be made which tended to "lessen the shame and ignominy which it is desirable should be attached to those who voluntarily and openly choose the path of vice." Prostitutes should be kept away from respectable people. Comfortable quarters at Queen's would only encourage them; a separate Magdalen hospital ought to be set up, where moral as well as medicinal influences could be brought to bear.<sup>25</sup>

The trustees' answer showed once more that moral initiative at Honolulu no longer rested with the Protestants. Governmental appointees on the board and those elected from among generous subscribers combined to agree that the hospital had been created for the benefit of the whole nation, and that no restrictions ought to be placed upon classes of patients or kinds of diseases. Even felons, said the trustees, were entitled to sympathy and care when they were ill; they should not be left to depend upon "a good Samaritan who might *not* pass near them to save them from physical destruction."<sup>26</sup>

The prostitutes were housed on the grounds at The Queen's Hospital in an old building that had been standing when the government acquired the land. No official "moral influences" were brought to bear on them, although Protestant remonstrances continued unabated. The *Advertiser* took every opportunity to criticize the intent and working of the Act to Mitigate; so did the Protestant Hawaiian language *Hokuloa*. The Oahu Clerical Association added its condemnations, and a Hawaiian language almanac printed at the mission press defined the Act to Mitigate as an act to "defend" or "encourage" prostitution.<sup>27</sup>

One offshoot of wrangling over the treatment of prostitutes was that the Protestant church was less than enthusiastic in its support of the Queen's Hospital. Clergymen themselves were not among the constant subscribers (contributors generally were spread among the Honolulu community: the cause crossed most factional lines). Even native Protestant congregations gave more to foreign missionary work than to the hospital. By the early seventies,



most missionaries-turned-businessmen at Honolulu (people such as Samuel N. Castle, E. O. Hall, and Henry Dimond) were life members of the Queen's Hospital, but elections to the board of trustees tended to pass them by.<sup>28</sup>

Concurrently with the drive to establish the Queen's Hospital, an attempt was made to regulate the practice of physicians and surgeons at the islands. The Oahu Medical Association was formed in 1856, and in 1859-1860, legislation was passed stipulating that licenses to practice would be awarded only after examination of applicants by the Board of Health.<sup>29</sup>

Caught in the net were two Protestant missionaries, Dwight Baldwin of Lahaina and Lowell Smith of Honolulu. Baldwin had attended medical lectures before coming to the islands. Although he was always known as "Doctor," he had never taken a medical degree. He arranged through the ABCFM in Boston to have Dartmouth College grant him an honorary degree, but the Hawaiian Board of Health did not accept this as evidence of competence.<sup>30</sup> Lowell Smith, pastor of Kaumakapili Church at Honolulu, had been treating natives since 1832 on the basis of a very sketchy medical knowledge. A great devotee of bleeding, he was described in 1859 by the *Polynesian* as a "well intentioned, but mischievous amateur in phlebotomy." Refused a license by the Board of Health in 1860, he continued to practice. He was fined in the Honolulu Police Court in 1863, when one of his Hawaiian patients died of lockjaw, following a phlebotomy.<sup>31</sup> Under circumstances that are not clear, he either obtained a license to practice, or dispensed medicines to natives under an existing law. Then, in the seventies, a succession of his native patients died, among them Z. Poli, a member of the House of Representatives. At an inquiry held by the Board of Health, qualified doctors testified that Smith was likely to have caused or hastened some of the deaths, by improper use of phlebotomies and administration of unsuitable medicines. Smith was ordered to cease attending natives, but apparently he did not comply: in 1876, another patient, a Hawaiian girl, died after he prescribed medicines for her which were dangerous, according to expert testimony. There was talk of prosecuting Smith, but in the end it was simply and strongly suggested that he stop practicing.<sup>32</sup> The whole episode is interesting, not only in terms of rising standards of medical practice, but also in terms of the falling prestige of the Protestant mission. Smith was regarded no longer as a selfless healer, but as a public menace.

It might fairly be said that the Puritan version of moral virtue, transplanted from the villages of New England early in the nineteenth century, did not take permanent root at the port of Honolulu. The town simply outgrew it. By the eighteen seventies a new and more liberal dispensation was in effect. But a more generalized version of Puritanism, characterized by the exercise of a civic conscience, a solid conservatism in business, an insistence on the need for elementary honesty in politics, and a belief in the saving power of education, stayed alive permanently. These things became part of the principles and practices of a good many descendants of Protestant evangelists—unto the fourth generation, in good Calvinist fashion. And that is why, a century and a half after the landing of the first company of evangelists, the word "missionary" is still a shibboleth in Hawaii.

## NOTES

- <sup>1</sup> Rufus Anderson, *History of the Sandwich Islands Mission* (Boston, 1870), 323.
- <sup>2</sup> Hawaiian Evangelical Association, *Proceedings, 1863* (Boston, 1864).
- <sup>3</sup> Mark Twain, *Letters from the Sandwich Islands* (San Francisco, 1937), 101-102.
- <sup>4</sup> Judd to Anderson, May 1, 1861, ABCFM Letters, HMCS.
- <sup>5</sup> Helen P. Hoyt, "Theatre In Hawaii—1778-1840," HHS, *Annual Report*, 69 (Honolulu, 1961), 7-18; AH, PCR, IV, 73; G. M. Robertson to Stephen Reynolds, Oct. 25, 1847, AH, IDLB, II, Part 1, 160-161; Stephen Reynolds Journal, Sept. 11, Oct. 28, Nov. 8, 1847, Peabody Museum, Salem, Mass.; P, Sept. 11, 1847. HAA for 1881 has a good short account of the 1848 season, taken mainly from the P and the SIN.
- <sup>6</sup> The liberalizing process may be observed in the Protestant-dominated PCA, May 20, 1858, Dec. 3, 1863, Nov. 17, 1866, April 6, 20, Sept. 28, Oct. 5, Nov. 2, 30, Dec. 14, 1867, Nov. 19, 1870, Oct. 21, 1871.
- <sup>7</sup> Peter Brinsmade to his wife, Nov. 23, 1836, Brinsmade Papers, AH.
- <sup>8</sup> Faxon Dean Atherton, *California Diary, 1836-1839*, ed. Doyce B. Nunis, Jr. (San Francisco, 1964), p. 122; SIG, May 4, 1839; P, Nov. 28, 1840.
- <sup>9</sup> Wyllie to John Young, Mar. 5, 1846, AH, FO & Ex; Wyllie to Steen Bille, Oct. 28, 1846, AH, FOLB, V: AH, CCMB, Mar. 3, 1846; Amos Cooke Journal, Mar. 11, 1846, HMCS; Richard Armstrong Journal, Mar. 17, 1851, HMCS; Stephen Reynolds Journal, June 19, 1840, May 12, 1842, Feb. 27, 1843, Oct. 29, Nov. 21, 25, 1845, Mar. 5, 17, 1846, Jan. 14, 1852; Estrella Mott, "Honolulu 1848", HHS; P, April 17, 24, 1841, Feb. 13, Aug. 28, Oct. 16, 23, 1858; SIN, Sept. 23, 1846, April 20, 27, 1848; PCA, April 3, Aug. 14, 1862.
- <sup>10</sup> P, July 7, Dec. 1, 1860.
- <sup>11</sup> J. B. Atherton to Sisters, Jan. 3, 1859, HMCS; Charles Alfred Castle to Wife, July 21, 1873, HMCS; PCA, Aug. 3, 1867, July 1, 22, Nov. 18, Dec. 16, 1871, April 6, July 6, 1872; *Bennett's Own*, Dec. 7, 1869, Jan. 11, 1870.
- <sup>12</sup> P, Oct. 10, 1840, Dec. 27, 1856.
- <sup>13</sup> Chief Justice, *Report*, 1852, p. 112.
- <sup>14</sup> P, Mar. 26, 1853.
- <sup>15</sup> AH, PCR, X, 112; S. Spencer to Messrs. Booth and others, Dec. 30, 1856, AH, IDLB, VI, 436.
- <sup>16</sup> PCA, Nov. 13, Dec. 4, 1856.
- <sup>17</sup> AH, PCR, X, 152; AH, CCMB, Aug. 26, 1857; copy of letter (unsigned but obviously from Minister of Interior) to J. Booth and J. Dawson, Aug. 14, 1857, AH, IDLB, VII, 8a.
- <sup>18</sup> P, Nov. 21, 1857.
- <sup>19</sup> *Daily Hawaiian Herald*, Oct. 30, 1866. For a sampling of dance hall issues in the sixties and seventies, see PCA, Sept. 10, 1863, Jan. 14, 21, 1865; HG, Jan. 21, 28, 1865 (with the text of the 1864 regulatory act and comments on it), April 15, 1865 (a prosecution under the act); AH, IDLB, XII, 6-7; W. C. Parke to E. Bond, Dec. 18, 1876, AH, Marshal's Letter Book.

- <sup>20</sup> In the manner of the dance hall case, the Maxey affair took up a disproportionate amount of newspaper space. It may be followed in the P and PCA between Aug. and Dec., 1856. Some of the official correspondence was printed. There are copies of many angry letters from Wyllie to Whitney in AH, FOLB, XXIX. The following documents in AH are helpful: Memorial to the King in Council from the Trustees of the Sailors' Home Society, May 21, 1855, FO & Ex, Miscellaneous Local; Ministerial Conferences, [May?] 1855; Petition of John Maxey, Privy Council Petitions, Aug. 5, 1856; PCR, X, 80, 90-92; Lot Kamehameha to S. N. Castle, Aug. 8, 1856, IDLB, VI, 395-396; Wyllie to Elisha Allen, Aug. 9, 1856, FOLB, XXIV, 52 ff. Wyllie suggests here that one reason Maxey's license was extended was that the government, short of money, owed Gerrit Judd \$1,000 from a long-standing case. The money had just come due; Maxey's license fee would be \$1,000; it could be used to pay Judd.
- <sup>21</sup> For a sampling of the rise and fall of temperance societies, see PCA, July 17, 1856, Nov. 24, 1859, Feb. 6, 13, 27, Mar. 1, 1862, Nov. 5, 1864, Feb. 25, June 17, 1865, Feb. 16, Mar. 2, 16, 23, 30, April 6, July 6, 1867, Feb. 26, April 23, 1870; P, July 9, 23, Aug. 13, Sept. 24, Oct. 1, 1859, June 16, July 14, 1860, Jan. 24, 1861; HG, Feb. 25, June 17, Sept. 2, 9, 1865. My impression is that the Protestant churches kept up a fairly steady temperance campaign, but that most organizations formed in the white community of the town had active lives of only a year or two before sinking into stagnation to re-form or re-organize a year or so later.
- <sup>22</sup> The most convenient way to begin a study of the liquor question is in the successive annual reports of the Minister of the Interior, the Minister of Finance, and the Chief Justice. The chronic question of allowing natives to drink may be followed in the Journals of successive legislatures and in the press, where it occupied a disproportionate amount of space—the PCA was against, the P in the middle of the road. Joe Booth's test case decision is in *Hawaiian Reports*, II, 616 ff.; and comment is in the press for Nov.-Dec., 1862. From the fifties, it was legal to make wine. In 1864-1865, acts were passed permitting legal brewing of beer and distillation of spirits under license at Honolulu. None of these enterprises produced quality products; all were economic failures. Up through the seventies, Honolulu was the only place in the kingdom where liquor could be sold legally (another instance of the attempt to isolate vice), but contemporary comment and court reports make it clear that the illegal liquor traffic among whites and natives was brisk everywhere, from Lahaina and other port towns to the remotest countryside. For illustrative comment, see P, May 27, July 1, 1854, Dec. 1, 1855, Dec. 25, 1858, Jan. 13, May 14, Dec. 17, 1859, Feb. 18, Mar. 24, 1860, Aug. 23, 1862; HG, Jan. 21, 1865.
- <sup>23</sup> Wyllie was one of the strongest proponents of licensing. The mission group generally was against licensing. The following letters in AH give the issues clearly: Wyllie to G. M. Robertson, Mar. 7, 1855, FOLB, XX, 163 ff.; Wyllie to Henry Hill, May 3, 1855, FOLB, XX, 73; Wyllie to C. W. Wheat, Dec. 2, 1855, FOLB, XXII, 90a-91; Armstrong to Wyllie, Mar. 11, 1858, FO & Ex, Local Officials. See also *Laws*, 1855, pp. 2-3; P, May 26, 1855, Mar. 1, 1856, Jan. 24, 1857, Jan. 16, 1858, Sept. 10, 1859.
- <sup>24</sup> *Laws*, 1860, p. 35; AH, CCMB, Sept. 18, 1860; David Gregg to J. W. Austin, Sept. 20, 1860, AH, IDLB, VII, 288; Austin to Gregg, Oct. 8, 1860, AH, IDM, Hospital; S. Spencer to Austin, Oct. 22, 1860, AH, IDLB, VII, 305; P, Jan. 28, Feb. 11, 25, April 21, Aug. 4, 18, 25, Sept. 11, 29, Nov. 17, Dec. 8, 29, 1860; PCA, Aug. 23, 30, Sept. 6, 1860.
- <sup>25</sup> The arguments against admission are set out in an undated MS entitled To the Committee on the Memorial of Ladies of Honolulu to the Trustees of the Queen's Hospital, Kalaniana'ole Papers, Kamehameha IV's Reign, 1860-1861, AH.
- <sup>26</sup> The trustees' deliberations and response are printed in P, Dec. 29, 1860.

- <sup>27</sup> For the newspaper war, see PCA, Jan. 31, Feb. 14, Mar. 7, 28, 1861, Feb. 20, Mar. 27, 1862; P, Jan. 12, 26, Feb. 2, 9, 22, Mar. 2, 9, 23, July 6, 1861, Feb. 15, Mar. 8, 1862, Jan. 16, 1864.
- <sup>28</sup> P, Dec. 22, 1860, Dec. 28, 1861, Mar. 8, April 5, 1862, June 27, Aug. 15, 1863, Jan. 2, 1864; PCA, Jan. 2, 1862. Lists of life members were compiled from time to time and may be found scattered through AH, BH.
- <sup>29</sup> AH, Privy Council Petitions, May 19, 1856, Jan., 1859; AH, PCR, XI, 9; AH, BHM, Feb. 24, 1866; Susan E. Barry to F. W. Hutchison, Jan. 31, 1867, AH, IDLB, X, 450, ff.; *Hawaiian Reports*, III, 462; J. Brown to W. Moehonua, Aug. 20, 1875, AH, BH.
- <sup>30</sup> Baldwin to Rufus Anderson, Dec. 17, 1861, HMCS; Baldwin to W. Hillebrand, Feb. 3, 1863, AH, BH; R. McKibbin to Baldwin, May 13, 1863, AH, BH; AH, BHM, May 12, 1863.
- <sup>31</sup> P, Feb. 12, 1859; Lowell Smith to Board of Health, Aug. 22, 1859, AH, BH; AH, BHM, Jan. 30, 1860; P, Nov. 8, 15, 1862; PCA, Nov. 13, 20, 1862; David Dayton to C. T. Gulick, Sept. 8, 1875, BH.
- <sup>32</sup> AH, BHM, Sept. 8, 1874, Sept. 8, 9, 15, 1875, Mar. 7, 1876; Lowell Smith to Minister of Interior, Sept. 2, 1875, AH, BH; Petition in favor of Lowell Smith, Sept. 15, 1875, AH, BH; C. T. Gulick to Smith, Sept. 15, 1875; Statement by Dr. Shipley to Board of Health, Mar. 7, 1876, AH, BH; Statement of Attorney-General W. R. Castle to Board of Health, Mar. 20, 1876, AH, BH.