

Ka Hulikanaka a me Ka Ho‘okū‘ono‘ono: Davida Malo and Richard Armstrong on Being Human and Living Well

MICHAEL DAVID KAULANA ING
Indiana University, USA (ming@indiana.edu)

This article thinks through the work of Kanaka (Native Hawaiian) philosopher Davida Malo (1795–1853) and puts it in dialogue with the work of Richard Armstrong (1805–1860). It argues that Malo offers an account of being human that entails the proper management of impulses (makemake) and intentions (mana‘o) in ways that lead to flourishing (ho‘okū‘ono‘ono) in complex communities (kauhale) overseen by leaders (ali‘i) that are informed by the examples of leaders from the past. Standards for proper living, in this setting, are constructed by the community, the members of which are informed by their own experiences and the experiences of their ancestors (kūpuna) as the latter sought to ease the burdens (kaumaha) they confronted in daily life. Armstrong offers a similar picture of human beings as creatures that must learn to observe their intentions and to cultivate intentions that foster proper communal living—a community that Armstrong conceptualizes as a single family (ho‘okahi ‘ohana). Unlike Malo’s description, however, the standards of this family construct are based on universal laws of right and wrong that only pertain to humans and their standing before a divine figure understood as the Biblical God. The significance of this piece is not only to show how Malo and Armstrong may have conversed over the question of how to live well, but also to begin a conversation in the field of world philosophies about the viability of Kanaka ways of life.

Key words: Native Hawaiian philosophy; comparative philosophy; Indigenous ethics; Davida Malo; Richard Armstrong; ho‘okū‘ono‘ono; pono

This article thinks through the work of Kanaka (Native Hawaiian) philosopher Davida Malo (1795–1853) and puts it in dialogue with the work of his contemporary, Richard Armstrong (1805–1860). The questions I bring to these texts are questions at the core of the humanities, namely, what does it mean to be human and what does it mean to live well? Malo explores aspects of these questions in *Ka Mo‘olelo Hawai‘i*.¹ Likewise, Armstrong explores aspects of these questions in *Ka Hulikanaka*—a Hawaiian text based on *The Elements of Moral Science*, a book first published in 1835 by the philosopher Francis Wayland.² This article is structured to bring these two texts into conversation. It begins with a shorter section that provides background on Malo and Armstrong and then describes *Ka Hulikanaka*. The second section then examines Malo’s *Mo‘olelo Hawai‘i*, and the third section offers a few points of comparison, focusing on their different understandings of a key term, “pono” (“good,” “right,” or “well-arranged”). My argument, in short, is that Malo offers an account of being human that entails the proper management of impulses (makemake) and intentions (mana‘o) in ways that lead to flourishing (ho‘okū‘ono‘ono) in complex communities (kauhale) overseen by leaders (ali‘i) that are informed by the examples of leaders from the past. Pono, in this setting, is constructed by the community, which is informed by their own experiences and the experiences of their ancestors

(kūpuna) as they sought to ease the burdens (kaumaha) they confronted in daily life. *Ka Hulikanaka* offers a similar picture of human beings as creatures that must learn to observe their intentions and to cultivate intentions that foster proper communal living—a community that Armstrong conceptualizes as a single family (ho‘okahi ‘ohana). Unlike Malo’s description, however, the standards of this family construct are based on universal laws of right and wrong that only pertain to humans and their standing before a divine figure understood as the Biblical God.

1 Historical Context and *Ka Hulikanaka*

David Malo was born in Keahou on the island of Hawai‘i in 1795.³ He was raised by his maternal grandfather, a kahuna (cultural specialist), who trained him in traditional Hawaiian religious practices and other forms of cultural knowledge. Malo worked in the courts of the ali‘i (governing leaders) and continued to advise them throughout his life. The first Christian missionaries arrived in 1820 and were from the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions (ABCFM). By 1823, Malo, as representative of the ali‘i, was associating with the ABCFM and was teaching them Hawaiian. In the mid-1820s Malo converted to Christianity and continued his work with the growing number of missionaries, assisting them in translating the Bible into Hawaiian. When the ABCFM opened the Lahainaluna Seminary in 1831, Malo was in the first group of students, along with many other influential figures in Kanaka society. During this time, most of the ali‘i converted to Christianity, and although motives for conversion were mixed, they also instituted policies that encouraged conversion to Christianity *en masse*. After completing the Lahainaluna program, which included instruction in reading, writing, arithmetic, and other forms of western education, Malo remained at Lahainaluna for several more years to teach and work on projects including a compilation of oral accounts meant to serve as a history of Hawai‘i. These accounts were synthesized and edited by Sheldon Dibble (1809–1845) before being published in 1838 as *Ka Mo‘olelo Hawaii*.⁴ Malo’s work on this text undoubtedly shaped his own *Mo‘olelo Hawaii*, although Malo’s text departed from Dibble’s in numerous ways. By 1841, Malo, as a representative of the Hawaiian kingdom, was named a general school agent for the islands of Maui and Lāna‘i. Then, in 1843, he became superintendent for public instruction over all the islands. Malo’s conversion to Christianity extended throughout his life; in 1844, he was licensed to preach, and in 1852, he was ordained a minister. Malo was thoroughly Christian, but also thoroughly Hawaiian. Where these two overtly conflicted, he often deemed the “new” ways of Christianity better than the “old,” but there were many places where he did not find conflict, such as a shared emphasis on caring for others manifest in the form of proper social and political relations. Furthermore, in *Ka Mo‘olelo Hawaii* Malo often worked to recount the past, even those aspects he no longer accepted. Malo was deeply concerned about his people and their aupuni (government). He adamantly refused the idea that haole (foreign) simply meant better. Malo was not interested in becoming an extension of the west either culturally or politically, and he continued to function as an advisor to (and often critic of) the ali‘i as they transitioned in their system of government.⁵

Malo’s involvement with Christianity, education, and government brought him into close contact with Richard Armstrong, who arrived in Hawai‘i as part of the ABCFM in 1832. By 1835, Armstrong was on Maui, setting up churches and working with the Lahainaluna school. Armstrong likewise involved himself in education throughout the Kingdom of Hawai‘i, becoming the Minister of Public Instruction in 1847 and the President of the Board of Education in 1855. Sometime during the 1840s he commissioned Malo’s *Mo‘olelo Hawaii* on behalf of the Kingdom. By 1847, Malo was working on the text, and continued to work on it until his death in 1853. After his death, Malo’s family

presented the manuscript to the royal family, who passed it on to Armstrong. Armstrong himself reported being disappointed with the text, and left it under the care of the Board of Public Instruction. Around 1866, Lorrin Andrews translated portions of the text, publishing one chapter in a newspaper of the time. Then in the 1890s, the Bishop Museum commissioned Nathaniel Emerson to translate the text in its entirety.⁶ Since then, *Ka Mo'olelo Hawai'i* has been translated twice in full—once by Malcolm Chun in 1987 and more recently in a two-volume critical edition by Charles Langs and Jeffery Lyon (2020).⁷

Ka Hulikanaka was first published in 1841. The Hawaiian text is a reworking of Francis Wayland's *The Elements of Moral Science*, which was published in 1835 and was republished at least a dozen times in subsequent decades. Wayland's text is a 450-page treatise on moral philosophy articulated within a Christian theological framework. (Wayland himself was a Baptist minister, a student at Andover Theological Seminary, and by 1835, the president of Brown University.) Armstrong's Hawaiian text follows the organization of *The Elements of Moral Science*, but takes such liberties with the text that Armstrong is credited as having “written” (kakau) it.⁸ Like other texts produced at this time by missionaries in Armstrong's group, *Ka Hulikanaka* was possibly composed in consultation with Kanaka to ensure its intelligibility.⁹ In 1841, the ABCFM printed 2,000 copies of the book. In 1847, they printed 5,000 copies of a new edition, which was reprinted again sometime in the 1850s.¹⁰ The reprintings of the book suggest that it was widely disseminated. It was used as a textbook for decades in the Lahainaluna school, and it was advertised in hundreds of newspaper printings between 1848 and 1877.¹¹ In 1911, parts of *Ka Hulikanaka* were also reprinted in *Kuokoa Home Rula*.¹² Some of the text's reach may have been due to Armstrong's role in structuring education in the Kingdom of Hawai'i. The introduction to the 1847 edition actually states, “E pono e kula nui ia na haumana a pau o Hawai'i nei i keia buke” (“All the students of Hawai'i ought to be thoroughly schooled in this book”) (Armstrong 1847: 1).¹³ *Ka Hulikanaka* is possibly the only book in Hawaiian written explicitly about western moral philosophy.

The term “huli” in hulikanaka can mean “to turn” or “to change,” but can also mean “to search into” or “to investigate.” The term “hulikanaka,” therefore, can mean “to search into humanity” or “to study human beings.” In modern Hawaiian, hulikanaka is often used as a translation of “anthropology,” and at least once in the nineteenth-century newspapers, hulikanaka is explicitly noted as a translation of “physiology.”¹⁴ The term “huli kanaka,” however, is also used in the newspapers to refer to the ways in which human beings can be changed by (the Christian) God, and in this context can mean “to convert.”¹⁵ The title *Ka Hulikanaka* is, on the one hand, an interpretation of Wayland's term “moral science,” but on the other hand also has broader implications about investigating how humans work (particularly how they become moral beings); given the author's background, the title also implies conversion to the Christian faith.¹⁶

The world the text depicts is a world governed by “laws” (kanawai) such that every “cause” has “an effect” (he kumu a he hope). There are natural laws that, for instance, govern the way things grow, and there are similarly moral laws that govern what is right and wrong (ka pono a me ka hewa). These laws are ubiquitous, and God is the source of all laws. In the context of moral law, Armstrong explains,

Ua kapaia keia hooponopono ana no ka hewa a me ka pono, he *kanawai*; a o ka wehewehe ana, ka hoomaopopo ana, a me ka haiana'ku o keia kanawai, oia ka hana a keia palapala. (Armstrong 1847: 8)

This ordering of right and wrong is referred to as *lam*, and defining it, interpreting it, and explaining it—these are the objectives of this text.

The moral law, however, only applies to human beings. While non-living things (nā mea hanu ‘ole) like watches or windmills might move, they do not act under the moral law. They act, in short, without mana‘o (intention), and because they lack mana‘o, they cannot do right or wrong. This is the same, according to Armstrong, with non-human animals, or as he calls them “na holoholona uhane ole” (animals without souls). They engage in low-level thinking (no‘ono‘o iki), but according to Armstrong,

aole mea iloko o lakou e maopopo ai ka hewa a me ka pono. Hana wale aku no na holoholona me ka ike ole he pono kela, a he hewa keia: aka, o ke kanaka, ua ike. Ua maopopo ia ia he pono kekahi hana ana, a he hewa kekahi. He ike kona, he noonoo, he makemake, a e hiki no ia ia, ke wehewehe i na mea pohihihi; nolaila, okoa ka hana ana a ke kanaka, a okoa ka na holoholona a me na mea hanu ole. (Armstrong 1847: 10)

There is nothing within them to understand right and wrong. Animals simply act without the knowledge of this being right or that being wrong. But humans have knowledge. They are able to understand that some actions are right and some are wrong. They have the capacity for knowledge, reflection, and resolution; they are capable of explaining complexities; and so the actions of human beings are different from those of animals and non-living things.

Armstrong concludes this section of the book stating, “he mea manao ke kanaka, he mea noonoo: aole ia he holoholona uhane ole” (“The human is an intentional being, a reflective being; he is not a soul-less animal”) (Armstrong 1847: 15). In this process of human cognition, the intention, or mana‘o, is central. Armstrong elaborates,

E like me ka manao i hanaia‘i kekahi hana, pela no kona ano, ina paha he hewa, ina paha he pono. Ina i pono ka manao, pono wale no na mea a kakou e hana‘i, aka, hewa ka manao, hewa wale no ka hana ana. (Armstrong 1847: 12, italics removed)

A deed is done in accordance with the intention, and that is its nature, whether right or wrong. If the intention is right, then the things we do will be right, but if the intention is wrong, then our deeds will be wrong.

This is not to say that right actions will always have good results or that wrong actions will always have bad results; rather, it is only the quality of the actions that are determined by the intent, not the effects they bring about (Armstrong 1847: 11–4). But as far as the law of right and wrong is concerned, it is only the intent that matters. Thus, for Armstrong, ensuring that one always has the right intent is key. In Armstrong’s conceptualization of the human, the intent is rooted in the na‘au, which is his translation of “mind” (Armstrong 1847: 14). Intentions “flow” (holo) from the mind like the currents of the sea (ke au iloko o ke kai), some flowing toward what is right and some flowing toward what is wrong (Armstrong 1847: 37–8). The central task of human beings is to channel the flow in the right direction. Fortunately, in addition to the faculties of mind we also have a soul (‘uhane), which is equipped with a conscience that assists the mind in evaluating its intentions. Armstrong explains,

Eia no nae kekahi hana nui iloko o ka uhane o kanaka, o ka nana i ke ano o na manao a pau e kupu mai ana iloko, a e hoapono aku a e hoahewa aku i kela manao, a i keia manao, e like me kona ano hewa a me kona ano pono. He hana nui loa keia, a nolaila, ua haawiia mai kekahi mea

okoa iloko o ke kanaka e pono ai keia hana nui. E pono paha ke kapaia ua mea la, he *Lunaikehala*, no ka mea, oia ka luna e hookaawale ana iwaena o ka pono a me ka hala, a e hoomaopopo ana i ka hewa. (Armstrong 1847: 16–7)

Here, however, is an important task that goes on within the soul of man: namely, observing the nature of all the intentions that well up within, and to approve or disapprove the various intentions in accordance with their nature being right or wrong. This is a task of the utmost importance, and so human beings have been given an additional capacity so that this important work is done correctly. It might be proper to call this thing a *conscience* (Luna‘ikehala) because it is the overseer (luna) that differentiates between good and bad (hala) and understands what is wrong.

This conscience, which is given by (the Christian) God to differentiate between right and wrong, provides direction (kuhikuhi) as intentions arise from the mind. Once action is taken, it sets people at ease (‘olu‘olu) when acting on good intentions, and unease (‘eha) when acting on bad intentions. Yet, while the conscience is the highest moral authority within the self, it must be strengthened; if not used, it will wither; and if harmed, it might even disappear. Similar to other faculties of the body or mind that can be developed and toughened, the conscience can likewise be strengthened.

O ka hoohana pinepine ia ia ma kana hana iho, kekahi mea ia e ikaika ai a e pololei ai hoi kana hana ana. Ina i noonoo pinepine na kanaka a me na‘lii i ke ano o ka lakou hana ana a pau loa, a ninau ia lakou iho i kela la i keia la, penei, “Pehea la keia hana a‘u e hana nei? He pono anei? Ua hewa paha,” me ka makemake io e hahai i ka pono maoli, ina ua pololei koke ka lakou hana ana. No ka mea, o ka imi pinepine i ka pono io, me ka manao e hana maoli ona, ma na hana a pau a kakou e hana‘i, oia ka mea e ikaika loa ai ua lala la o ka uhane, o ka lunaikehala, oia ka mea e pololei ai kona kuhikuhi ana. (Armstrong 1847: 25)

What will strengthen and correct the functioning of the conscience is for it to be constantly exercised. If the people and the ali‘i constantly reflect on the nature of all their actions, asking themselves daily, “What was [the nature of] this action I undertook? Was it right? Or was it wrong?” with a sincere desire to pursue what is truly right, then their actions will in no time be correct. This is because, to constantly seek out what is truly right with the intention to actually carry it out in everything we do will greatly strengthen the faculties of the soul, namely, the conscience. This is the way its guidance becomes correct.

Besides constantly reflecting on one’s actions with a determination to do what is right, Armstrong adds that surrounding oneself with examples of people who choose the right will also strengthen the conscience. This includes not only people in the present, but also people in past. The Bible is especially helpful in this regard as it provides an account of the best example of all—Jesus.

Christianity plays an important role in the development of the conscience, although in theory Armstrong’s system does not require one to be a Christian in order to be moral.¹⁷ In other words, in Armstrong’s line of thought, Christianity provides the best resources in becoming a moral person in the form of the Bible, the community of believers, and the practices advocated by the community; but more importantly, since we all fall short in living up to the moral law, and since the moral law is not only about the relationships that human beings have with each other, but is more importantly about the relationships that we have with God, Christianity provides the only way to reconcile ourselves with

God. This is done through the sacrifice of Jesus, which we accept through baptism and continued commitment to the church.

Armstrong's theology (here leaning on Wayland) is set in a context of trying to make sense of religious diversity throughout the world. Their known world not only included Christians, Jews, and Muslims, but also more recently included Buddhists, Hindus, and those practicing religions native to Africa, the Americas, and Oceania.¹⁸ On the one hand they believed in the inherent equality of people, but on the other hand they asserted the superiority of their religion and culture. The way they reconciled these beliefs was by claiming that all people were essentially born with the same faculties of the body, mind, and soul, but each culture developed these capacities to differing degrees.¹⁹ The people of Hawai'i, in this case, were rather "undeveloped," but not as "undeveloped" as other peoples in Oceania (such as those of Nu'uhiwa).²⁰ In their view, Hawaiians were in a state similar to the one Europeans were in centuries prior to the nineteenth century. However, Christianity had enabled Europeans to progress in their development to the point that they had better mental and moral faculties than any other group in the world.²¹ Moreover, Europeans had knowledge of how to save souls such that after death one could enjoy the rewards of having lived a moral life. Thus, the missionaries' task was to teach Hawaiians not only of the salvific power of Jesus, but also how to strengthen their moral and mental faculties, which in their view was currently little different than a child's. Accomplishing this task required that Hawaiians not only accepted Jesus as the only true and living God, but also that they accepted social habits that enabled more developed forms of reasoning. This is why the missionaries were so invested in setting up structures for educating Hawaiians; their goal was social transformation. They wanted Hawaiians to build a fully developed Christian society.

This is also why the missionaries worked to reform the Hawaiian government. A different governmental structure would more easily allow this development; particularly a government predicated on laws that reinforced the laws of God. Armstrong heads in this direction in *Ka Huikeanaka*, advocating that laws are "the flesh and bones of the government" ("na iwi a me ka io o ke aupuni") (Armstrong 1847: 184). Interestingly, this section is largely absent in Wayland's text, so Armstrong must have thought it particularly relevant to the Hawaiian context. He defines government (aupuni) as follows:

o ka hui pu ana o na kanaka a pau ma kekahi aina, o na 'lii a me na makaainana, i hookahi ohana e hana pu i na mea e pono ai ko lakou noho ana, o keia hui pu ana i ohana hookahi he aupuni no ia.

A ua akaka ka pono o keia hui pu ana; no ka mea, aole hiki i na kanaka ke noho pu me ke kanawai ole, a me ke kokua ole o kekahi i kekahi. (Armstrong 1847: 183)

The assembling together of all people in a single area—the ali'i and the commoners, as a single family striving together in doing what is right for their livelihood. This assembling together into one family is government.

The right way of assembling together is obvious because people cannot live together without law and without helping each other.

He continues,

No laila, ua akaka ka pono o ka hui ana o na 'lii a me na makaainana, e imi pu a e hana pu i na mea e maluhia ai ko lakou noho pu ana; e hoopai i ka hewa, a e hooulu i ka pono iwaena o lakou, o ka hana no ia a ke Aupuni. Ina i noho pono a hana pono na kanaka a pau loa, alaila,

makehewa na kanawai a me na oihana alii a pau; aka, aole pela na kanaka a pau loa [...] nolaila, ke kanawai a me na oihana aupuni; no ka hewa, i oluolu, a i maluhia hoi ka noho pu ana o na kanaka ma kahi hookahi. (Armstrong 1847: 184)

As such, it is clear that it is right for the aliʻi and the commoners to assemble in order to search together and work together for things that secure their shared livelihood, to punish what is wrong and foster what is right among themselves. This is the task of the government. If absolutely everyone lived and acted in the right way, the laws and all the offices of the aliʻi would not be necessary; however, not everyone lives and acts as such [...] therefore, because of wrongdoing, there is law and the offices of government that are set up to ease and secure the shared livelihood of people as they live as one.

The task of the government is to institute laws and maintain order such that people can work together in living as is right. People function as a family, complete with a hierarchy of elders (in the form of aliʻi) who fill offices and institute rules to ensure that wrongdoing is punished and proper livelihood can be pursued.

To tie Armstrong's thinking together, for him, human beings are reasoning beings that live in a world replete with laws given by God. Among all things in the world, only humans live under the moral law that determines what is right and wrong. Our intentions, which arise from the mind, determine the moral quality of our actions. Our conscience, which is given by God, assists in our efforts to cultivate and follow after right intentions. We can strengthen our conscience by continual self-reflection on our intentions and actions; we can also strengthen it by surrounding ourselves with good examples of the present and the past. This is best done in a Christian context that not only provides the most efficient means of developing our conscience, but also provides knowledge of Jesus that ensures we will be reconciled with God after death. All of this is predicated on the understanding that human relations are essential. We gather together to work toward shared livelihoods. Government is a function of shared living much like a family. The best government acts with a system of laws that ensures fair treatment and encourages right action, while discouraging wrong action.

2 Davida Malo's *Mo'olelo Hawai'i*

Malo's *Mo'olelo Hawai'i* is a collection of just over 50 essays on a series of related topics. The term "mo'olelo" is a traditional literary term that spans categories inclusive of history, ethnography, myth, epic, and biography, although Malo's use of the term intersects most directly with ethnography and history. The term "mo'olelo" can be broken down into "mo'o" and "'ōlelo," literally meaning "a series of words," where the words are strung together to create a narrative. The idea of "mo'olelo Hawai'i" is most often used to provide an account of how Hawai'i, meaning both the islands and the people, came to be. Malo was not the first to use the term, and many during his time and afterwards used it to engage in similar projects. Malo's audience was primarily Kanaka of his time, although many writers of his era were acutely aware of the need to preserve knowledge in the face of massive death due to disease and the transition toward more western ways of living. His text begins with various accounts of the coming forth of the Hawaiian Islands, the peopling of the islands, and taxonomies of things associated with the islands including plants, rocks, and animals on land and in the sea. He also discusses how time and space are divided by Hawaiians as well as the social structure of Hawaiian society. Several chapters describe specific ceremonies, religious rites, or leisure activities. The last ten

chapters return to accounts of particular rulers of the past. The last chapter appears unfinished, and Malo likely intended the text to continue. The chapters most relevant for my purposes are the chapters on governing structure and the chapter on pono and hewa (roughly, “good and bad”).

According to Malo, Hawaiians descend from two early ancestors named Wākea and Papa, who lived in an unidentified area of the world known as Olōloimehane more than 70 generations before Malo’s time. Their descendants spread throughout parts of the world, settling areas such as Tahiti. Around 25 generations after Wākea and Papa, their descendants made their way to the islands of Hawai‘i (Malo 2020: 4.1–26). Contact then periodically continued between parts of the groups. Malo supposes that in the earliest generations after Wākea and Papa their descendants lived as one—there was no division between those who governed and those who were governed. This division between ali‘i and maka‘āinana (commoners, sometimes referred to simply as kānaka) arose sometime after those generations and continued through Malo’s day; however, Malo stresses there was no fundamental difference between these people such that one group would have thought they were inherently better than another. He states,

O ke ano o na lii, me na kanaka ma Hawaii nei, hookahi no o lakou ano, hookahi no keia lahui, he helehelena hookahi na kino apau mai na kanaka, a na lii, hookahi no kupuna o Wakea laua o Papa, na laua mai keia lahui kanaka apau, aole no i kaawale na lii me na kanaka, ma na hanauna ma hope mai o Wakea ma paha ke kaawale ana, o na lii me na kanaka. (Malo 2020: 18.1)

The nature of the ali‘i and the common people of Hawai‘i are the same; this people are one. Everyone, from the commoner to the ali‘i, all have the same features and share the same ancestors—Wākea and Papa. All people of this race come from the two of them. The ali‘i and the common people were not separate, but in the generations following Wākea and Papa they separated into ali‘i and common people.

While Malo is speaking explicitly about Hawaiians, I suspect he would apply this notion of ontological equality to all people. There is nothing in his writing to suggest otherwise, and in at least one other part of his *Mo‘olelo Hawai‘i* he recounts a tradition that claims all people in the world came from Wākea and Papa (Malo 2020: 44.1–2). As the number of people increased, the complexity of their living circumstances increased, and problems arose, leading to the need of a leader:

No ka hiki ole paha i na kanaka apau ke malama pualu aku i ke aupuni, me ka hooponopono pu walu aku i na pilikia, a me na kaumaha, a me na hihia, o na kanaka apau mai o a o, oia no paha ka mea i hoolilo ia ai kekahi mea i alii, i mea na na e malama hoo[kah] ke aupuni, nana no e hooponopono, a me ka hooko ma na mea o ke aupuni a pau, oia no paha ka mea i hookaawale ia ai kekahi poe i mau alii... (Malo 2020: 18.2).

Perhaps the separation occurred because the people could not collectively maintain the government nor manage the problems, troubles, and difficulties everyone faced from around the land. This could be the reason someone was made ali‘i; someone that could singularly maintain the government, manage it, and execute all aspects of it. This is perhaps the reason some people were distinguished as ali‘i.

Malo continues,

Ua hoonoho ia mai ke alii i mea kokua mai i ka poe hoopii aku no na mea kaumaha, i hooluolu ia mai ka mea pono, a i hookaumaha ia mai ka mea hewa, o ke alii no ka mea maluna o na kanaka apau, ia ia no na hana apau, ke pono nae kana hana ana. (Malo 2020: 18.3)

The ali'i were stationed to assist the people who voiced concern about their troubles, to put at ease those who were pono and to trouble those who were hewa. The ali'i was positioned over all people, and he directed all affairs as long as he acted with pono.

According to Malo, the ali'i came about as an organized means to address people's problems across the land; they came about in an effort to manage and maintain a government that lessened the problems of the people and eased their burdens. These ali'i organized things so that people lived in ways that did not create trouble; the ali'i also created a means to lead people away from things that would cause discontent. The ali'i, for Malo, are problem-solvers. They coordinate resources in ways that make resources accessible to people in order to meet their needs. In later chapters, Malo describes this system as a complex organization of land units ranging from larger to smaller sizes that were overseen by an ali'i nui (high-ranking leader), his kin, and advisors that oversaw the day-to-day activities of the organizational units. Everyone fits together like "one body" (ke kino hookahi) (Malo 2020: 38.1). In this chapter, though, Malo elaborates on the various activities of the ali'i before returning to reasons for the original separation between ali'i and maka'āinana. He makes several more relevant statements about this separation beginning in this passage:

Eia no ka mea i kaawale ai o ka lilo o na kanaka ma muli o ko lakou makemake iho, a hele ma muli o ka lealea a auana loa, ma kela wahi ma keia wahi. (Malo 2020: 18.58)

Here is the reason for the separation: people became engrossed in their own impulses, going after their pleasures, wandering far and wide.

The next several passages list other possible reasons including dishonesty ('āpiki), deceitfulness ('epa), thievery ('aihue), wandering astray ('ae'a), not having their genealogy (mo'okū'auhau) remembered, and all kinds of other harmful activities (nā mea hana 'ino a pau). The reasons Malo provides for the separation between the ali'i and the maka'āinana are largely about people pursuing their impulses in ways that create harm and disconnect themselves from people and place. The term translated here as "impulses" is "makemake," which does not single out something inherently negative, but rather is a larger category meaning "wants," "wishes," or "desires." The problem, in other words, is not makemake themselves, but the pursuit of makemake in ways that disregard others and harm them (or oneself). Ali'i come about to institute a proper government that manages these impulses such that they are addressed without harm.

This idea highlights several terms that have appeared throughout these passages including ho'oponopono, makemake, and aupuni. The term "ho'oponopono" literally means "to make good"; I have been translating it as "manage," where the context suggests a normative dimension to the management. Ali'i create good contexts for the fulfillment of makemake. I will say more about makemake and ho'oponopono (in terms of pono) later. Aupuni is often translated as "kingdom," "government," or "nation." Malo identifies aupuni as a particularly human phenomenon, explaining

that “ma ka aina kanaka ole, aole no he aupuni ma laila” (“when there is land without humans, there is no aupuni there”) (Malo 2020: 38.2). Aupuni is about human organization, which involves not only relationships between humans, but also relationships between humans and the land, sea, and all things on it or in it. The term “aupuni” could come from “au” and “puni,” meaning a designated or demarcated area (literally a “bounded realm”); it is also worth noting that “puni” carries meanings approximate to “desire,” and that Lorrin Andrews’ 1865 dictionary glosses “aupuni” as “to be in an undisturbed state; to be in a state of peace and quietness, as a kingdom.”²² Aupuni carries some sense of organizing relations in such a way that people’s wants are satisfied, and the realm is content. This aligns with many of the passages from Malo thus far discussed. To tie things together, governing is about the management of people’s impulses, or stated in ‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i, ‘o ke aupuni ‘ana, ‘oia i ho‘oponopono ‘ia ai nā makemake a pau.

Malo provides a more detailed account of how these impulses function in a chapter titled “No na hewa me na pono” (“Regarding hewa and pono”). This chapter begins,

He nui na ano o na hewa [a] kanaka i hana ai a he nui ke ano o na hewa ke heluia, aka, hookahi no kumu nana i hanau mai ua mau hewa la apau, o ka manao no o ka naau mai, oia no ka makua nana [i] hanau mai ka hewa he nui loa.

Ma kahi a ka naau i manao ai e hana hewa e hewa io no auanei, a ma kahi a ka naau i manao ai [e] hana pono, e pono auanei, no ka mea mai ka naau mai ka pono, mai ka naau [mai] ka hewa, aka, ua lele wale mai kahi hewa me kahi pono, he lele wale mai no.

Ina i ike ka maka i kekahi mea, aole nae i mak[e]make ka naau, aole no e pili ka hewa ma laila, aka i nana ka maka, a makemake ka naau i kekahi mea, e nui mai no na manao ma loko o laila, o ke kuko no ke kumu, o ka lia, o ka uluku, o ka hookaha, hoomakaulii, ka iini, halaiwi, me ka manao e lawe malu a lilo ia ia, ua kapaia keia mau hewa, he aihue. (Malo 2020: 21:1–3)

When enumerated, there are many kinds of hewa that people do; however, there is one source that creates all hewa. The intent that comes from the na‘au is the parent that creates hewa, and it is of the utmost import.

Whenever the na‘au intends to do hewa, hewa will eventually come about, and whenever the na‘au intends to do pono, pono will eventually come about. This is because pono and hewa come from the na‘au, and yet, sometimes pono and hewa swell up, they simply swell up [within].

If the eyes sense something, but the na‘au does not want it, hewa will not follow in this case. However, if the eyes see something and the na‘au wants it, the intentions that go on in this situation are many. Desire is the first, then craving, restlessness, fixation, avariciousness, fear of being without it, and ardently seeking it with the intent to secretly take it as one’s own. These kinds of hewa fall into the category of thievery.

The next several passages follow the construction of the last passage translated here, listing the various intentions and actions associated with hewa. These include pākaha (cheating), ho‘opunipuni (being deceitful), wahahe‘e (lying), moloā (being lazy), pakaulei (shifting from partner to partner), ‘ae‘a (roaming aimlessly), kū‘ono‘ono ‘ole (living meagerly), and many more.

In these passages, the arising of pono and hewa appear to follow a process of people relating to each other and other things in the world such that a person first perceives (‘ike) something (kekahi mea) that she or he stands in relation to, and this relation is then conceptualized in the na‘au (literally,

the abdomen or entrails) where impulses (*makemake*) and intentions (*mana'o*) emerge and are translated into action (*hana*).²³ The *na'au* also has a capacity for control such that it can prevent or encourage impulses and intentions from becoming action.²⁴ Thus, one can see something, be inclined toward it in particular ways, reflect (*no'ono'o*) on those inclinations, and determine whether or not to act on them.²⁵ The trouble, of course, is that these intentions and impulses can be more or less intense—sometimes they seem to move slowly, other times they seem to jump right to action. What is required, therefore, is a constant awareness of one's inclinations as well as the creation of contexts where inclinations associated with *hewa* will not quickly rise up. The project of governing aims for the latter. In the passages just translated, though, Malo appears to provide an example of the former. The last passage can be read as a progression, or even a genealogy, of intentions from first desiring something to eventually stealing it.²⁶ Stealing does not just happen, rather it is the culmination of intentions, and these intentions can be thwarted at any time.

Malo returns to this idea in the second half of this chapter where he discusses *pono*. Several passages are worth considering in detail:

He nui no hoi na mea i kapa ia he pono maoli no, a kanaka e hana ai, he nui no nae ka poe hana pono, aka, ua lele wale mai no, kekahi poino eia no ka poino, o na mea a ka maka e ike ai, a makemake ka naau i ka hai mea, e hoomanawanui ka pono, mai kii aku a lawe mai, e haalele loa, e hoopoina, aole e hoopa aku, oia [i]hola no ka pono.

Eia kekahi, o ka hana pololei, me ka lalau ole ma ka poopunipuni ole, me ka hele nui ole ma ko hai mau puka hale, me ka makilo ole, me ke noi ole, i ka hai mea, o ka pono ihola no ia.

Eia kekahi mau mea, i kapa ia he pono, o ka hookuonoono o ka noho ana, o ke aea ole, koaka ole, aole e pakaulei, aole aie i ka hai mea, o ka pono ia.

Eia kekahi mea pono no ka noho ana, o ke kane me ka wahine, a pono me na keiki, a me na makamaka, a me na hakuaina, o ka mahi ai, o ka lawaia, kukulu hale, kalai waa, hanai puaa, hanai ilio, hanai moa, he mau mea pono ia.

Eia kekahi mau mea i kapa ia he pono, o ka puni lealea ole, haalele i ka noa, i ka pahee, i ka maika, i ke ku[k]i, i heihei waa, heihei nalu, heihei holua, a me ka pukaula, a me ia lealea aku ia lealea aku. (Malo 2020: 21.16–20).

There are indeed many things that people do that can be called truly *pono*, and there are, of course, many people that do *pono*. However, sometimes disturbances will swell up. Here is the disturbance: The eyes sense someone else's things, and the *na'au* wants them. [In these situations,] persevere in being *pono*. Do not snatch them up. Abandon them. Forget them. Do not touch them. This is indeed what is *pono*.

Furthermore, act correctly without deviation, without deception, without frequently going to other people's doorways [to look for things], without looking longingly at things, and without asking for another's things. This results in *pono*.

Here are some other activities that were considered *pono*: to live with abundance, to not roam aimlessly, to not shift from partner to partner, to not move from house to house, and to not acquire someone else's things before working for them. These are *pono*.

And here are other things that are *pono* for the lives of men and women, as well as [their] children, friends, and heads of their family units: to farm, to fish, to build houses, to carve canoes, and to raise pigs, dogs, or chickens. These things are *pono*.

And here are other things that were considered pono: to not indulge in pleasures, to avoid games such as no'a,²⁷ spear throwing, rock bowling, foot racing, canoe racing, surf racing, sled racing, gambling, or other activities of pleasure.

Malo's description pays particular attention to hewa while stressing the prevalence of pono in people's daily lives. Pono, in part, appears to be maintaining an attentiveness to the many impulses that spring up as we carry out our day-to-day activities. Pono, in its most basic form, is stated as the negation of hewa—it is ensuring that our impulses do not reach the point of becoming hewa actions. This includes avoiding situations where these impulses might creep up, such as in games of pleasure or even looking into people's homes. In some regards, Malo is a moralist concerned that the pursuit of pleasure will lead to unbridled pleasure and the loss of means to pursue a good life (via gambling, for instance); on the other hand, understood in context, Malo is also writing for the Kanaka leaders of his time, many of whom he believed were neglecting the people and creating situations of discontent. Thus, Malo's focus on hewa is in part aimed as a critique of his day, but equally important, he also appears to believe that pono often occurs inasmuch as we can keep our impulses toward hewa in check.

Malo associates pono with "ka hookuonoono o ka noho ana," which I translated as "live with abundance." The term "hookuonoono" was widely used throughout the nineteenth century as a way of discussing the flourishing of Hawaiian society.²⁸ Andrews' dictionary glosses the term (or the related term "kuonoono") as "to be comfortably settled; to be well furnished with things for comfort and convenience; to be above want," "to have sufficiency," "to be well established," "to put in order; to keep in order," and as "persons living at ease having a competency of the means of living." Etymologically, ho'okū'ono'ono might be broken into three parts: "ho'o," a causative meaning "to bring about"; "kū," meaning "to reach a state or condition," literally "to stand"; and "'ono'ono," a reduplication of the word "'ono," meaning to crave or savor (often used in the context of food). Andrews glosses "onoono" as "palatable; hence, pleasant; comfortable," and Henry Parker's 1922 dictionary adds "pleasant to the taste; gratifying." Hence, ka ho'okū'ono'ono o ka noho 'ana can be understood as living in a situation where one's impulses are properly satisfied—or in short, living a life of contentment. This idea of contentment is about more than just having enough to get by one day at a time, and it is about less than acquiring vast quantities of wealth for consumption. Pono involves restraining impulses of indulgence, whether those impulses move toward illicitly acquiring another's property or hoarding "earned" goods to engross oneself. Another way of thinking about pono is in terms of transforming our impulses to consume into impulses to sustain.²⁹ Since kānaka are creatures that are situated in innumerable relationships, we are constantly stirred to action. Denying impulses altogether is impractical. Thus, we must work to create social situations that evoke and cultivate impulses to sustain. Sustainability, in this regard, is like health—to be healthy, one must be in a state of more than just barely breathing; instead, one must be free of ailment such that one can pursue aims in life while not having to direct one's full attention on one's physical or mental wellbeing. In this regard, Andrews explains pono as "to be well, i.e., in bodily health." Sustainability is also related to sustenance, or nourishment, which has echoes of 'ono'ono, and in this light, many of the examples Malo provides for pono make sense, such as farming, fishing, and raising livestock.

Interestingly, these positive examples of pono, which also include canoe carving, are all activities that take time. They take time to learn and time to see results. It is unsurprising that Malo uses "hoomanawanui" in the context of pono, which I translate as "to persevere." The term literally means "to make more time." Learning to farm, fish, and carve takes a great deal of time, and so do the activities themselves—kalo (taro), the staple food of Hawai'i, takes a year to grow; trees used for canoes must first grow for decades, and the process of carving canoes takes months; and fishing

expeditions, often done in canoes, were also activities that could take days or weeks. Importantly, these are all activities with significant components that fall beyond one's ability to control. Part of their value is in training those involved to resist the common impulse to demand the results we desire; in these contexts, results cannot more quickly be brought about simply because we desperately want them. Like a farmer tending to his crop, a fisherman waiting for his fish, or a canoe carver waiting for the right tree, pono takes time. Pono, in this regard, is an excellence, a virtue that must be cultivated throughout one's life. The fixed intent to carry out these daily excellences are intentions to sustain.

Malo also juxtaposes pono with hewa by using a number of terms that connote unfettered movement including 'auana, ae'a, koaka, and pakaulei. These terms all suggest some sense of uprootedness or disconnect. People that roam aimlessly (ae'a) do not cultivate the excellences associated with ho'okū'ono'ono, so they end up living off of others, and they remove themselves from their family networks. In contrast to this, ho'okū'ono'ono requires a certain degree of fixity. Kū, as mentioned previously, literally means to stand or be firmly in place. With regard to sustainability, kū means knowing when to stop in the production of goods, but perhaps more importantly, kū implies embedding oneself in a social and geographical location. It is about creating an area in which we are rooted and comfortable. Knowing who and what share our space, and how they function, enables us to enter into productive relationships with each other. The resulting familiarity creates a sense of security because we know what to expect, both good and bad. This sense of security forms a base of sorts from which we can operate. Knowing our home terrain enables us to take calculated risks and explore terrain further afield, all the while secure in our confidence that we have a base to return to.³⁰ The spirit of exploration is a part of Kanaka consciousness, and the idea of Hawai'i as a secure base may have fueled explorations across the known world throughout the nineteenth century and before.³¹

Malo provides more specifics about ho'okū'ono'ono in another chapter about housing. After a detailed description of the construction of a house (hale), Malo explains,

e hana no kela mea pono keia mea pono, i mau hale no lakou iho me na wahine lakou.

E hana no i hale e moe ai me ka wahine, me na keiki, a e hana no i mau hale a nui no kela hana, no keia hana a ke kane, a no kela hana keia hana a ka wahine, he halau kekahi hale, he aleo kahi hale, he amana kekahi hale.

Pela ka noho ana o ka poe kuonoono a pau, oia ka pono a ka poe kahiko o Hawaii nei i manao he pono ia, i ko lakou manao ana. (Malo 2020: 33.17–18)

All pono people would build several housing structures for themselves and their wives.

They would build a house to sleep in with their wife and children, and build many more structures for the various activities of the men and the various activities of the women. One kind of structure was open-ended and long, another structure had a tower, another had several structures surrounding a courtyard.³²

That was the lifestyle of all the people who created abundance. It was what the Hawaiians of old thought to be pono. It was pono in their line of thought.

To ho'okū'ono'ono meant to create a household with several housing structures. What made this a situation of abundance was not the possession of multiple homes in the modern sense of owning a primary residence and a vacation home; rather, Malo has in mind a traditional form of communal living often referred to as the *kauhale* system. The term "kauhale" means "multiple houses." In this way of living, a family unit ('ohana), comprised of three or more generations, lived in a shared space

with several living structures. As Malo notes, one structure was meant for sleeping, other structures allowed men and women to eat separately, other structures might be allotted for different professions such as canoe carving or farming. There were also structures for cooking and a structure set aside for women while menstruating, among others. These housing structures served to metaphorically “structure” complex forms of social living.³³ They marked spaces that were designated for particular activities that served to minimize impulses to consume and maximize impulses to sustain. The *kauhale* system fostered a robust community equipped with the resources to secure and sustain itself, and it is these attributes that made it *pono*.

Pono in terms of *ka ho‘okū‘ono‘ono o ka noho ‘ana* is related to how we stand in our embedded relations as we strive to create a situation of security. The term “*noho ‘ana*,” translated as “living,” also means “sitting.” Interestingly, Andrews’ dictionary additionally glosses *noho ‘ana* as “moral character.” He cites as an example the question, “*pehea kona nohoana?*”—“how is his sitting?”—to mean “how does he live? what is his character?” Similar to the way in which our standing becomes a means of expressing our commitment to aim for a *pono* lifestyle, our sitting is tied to how we behave in that commitment. *Ka ho‘okū‘ono‘ono o ka noho ‘ana* is tied to the basic acts of standing, sitting, and eating. This *philosophy of the everyday* is rooted in the mundane aspects of living that generate a contented life, a life abundant in relations to people and place, a life of *pono*.³⁴

For Davida Malo, being human means being embedded in countless relationships with the other things that inhabit the world. These relationships stir our impulses and create intentions that guide our actions. We have the capacity to prevent or encourage these inclinations from becoming action. However, even with great vigilance, these impulses sometimes swell within and become action with little time to reflect on them. Thus, it is important to create habits of social living that lessen the possibility of improper inclinations being aroused, and instead encourage inclinations that can be satisfied in ways that ensure the sustainability of the self and community. This is the responsibility of the *ali‘i* in governing the people. The best way to accomplish this is by structuring society in units that work together like one body. The most basic unit is the *kauhale*, or communal living households that organize the daily tasks of “standing,” “sitting,” and “eating” that become metaphors for the ways in which human beings grow to be rooted to places and people in situations of security that enable a life of contentment marked by the absence of *hewa*.

3 Comparative Reflections

In his translation of Malo’s *Mo‘olelo Hawai‘i*, Emerson states that Malo was an “eager reader of books,” elaborating that “every printed thing that was struck off at the newly established mission press at Honolulu, or afterwards at Lahainaluna, was eagerly sought after and devoured by his hungry and thirsty soul. He accumulated a library which is said to have included all the books published in his own language” (Emerson 1971: x). If this was the case, *Ka Hūlikanaka* was a part of that library, and even if not, Malo had numerous interactions with Armstrong where ideas were exchanged. It is difficult to tell how they influenced each other, and the problem here is compounded by the degree to which *Ka Hūlikanaka* is a representation of Wayland’s *Moral Science*. I bring Malo and Armstrong into conversation as distinctive modes of thought, not presuming any influence, although there are a number of places where they are compatible.

Both Malo and Armstrong understand people as beings with impulses and intentions that are stirred within as we encounter other things in the world. While Malo does not discuss the faculty of the conscience, he, along with Armstrong, does believe that human beings have the capacity to

evaluate our intentions before they take shape in action. Malo stresses the speed at which this occurs, but both thinkers advocate supporting our ability to reflect with a community of people committed to a shared lifestyle. The role of the government is to encourage this, creating one metaphorical body or family that works together.

While Malo and Armstrong share these views of human functioning in the construction of society, the foundation as well as the practicalities of their views are quite different. Besides being originally implemented in different geographical and cultural contexts, Armstrong sees this taking place in a Christian community founded on certain metaphysical assumptions. For one, human beings are singled out as the only beings with intentions, and therefore the only beings to which the categories of “right and wrong” apply. Interestingly, in making this point, Armstrong translates “inanimate” or “non-living things” as “na mea hanu ole,” literally “things that do not breathe.” In Hawaiian, there was no term to differentiate between animate and inanimate objects. Malo does not explicitly weigh in on this issue, although he does believe that there are some uniquely human phenomena (such as creating a government). Nevertheless, many other Hawaiian texts (mo‘olelo, mele, etc.) clearly depict a continuity between human and non-human things such that a *continuity of being* is a more accurate descriptor in Malo’s case than a Neo-Platonist *great chain of being*.

Perhaps more importantly, Armstrong’s views are founded on conceptions of universal laws that come from a divine being. Among these laws, the law of “right and wrong” (ka pono a me ka hewa) is particularly significant. In the previous section on *Ka Hulikanaka*, I translated the terms “pono” and “hewa” as “right” and “wrong.” I did this in part because Armstrong was following Wayland’s use of those terms (although Armstrong uses them much more frequently). In the section on Malo, however, I often left them untranslated, and occasionally translated them as “good” and “bad.” I did this to highlight their different understandings of these terms. For Armstrong, pono and hewa exist independent of human interpretation and serve to mark the status of humans in relation to God. In Armstrong’s line of thought, the laws regarding pono and hewa come from God, and God will (sooner or later) judge people according to those laws. Since all humans will in some ways break these laws, the relation between human beings and God is strained, only to be resolved by the sacrifice of God’s son, Jesus, who satisfies the demands of justice under the law in order to repair our relationship with God. This conceptualization of pono and hewa stresses the relationship between the human and the divine.

Malo describes pono and hewa differently. While he describes Kanaka belief in deities (akua), and describes how they believed it was important to situate ourselves properly in relation to these deities, he also makes it quite clear that the akua were not seen as the source for standards regarding pono and hewa. While akua can act as agents in rewarding or punishing people, relations between kânaka and akua are more often discussed in terms of kapu (taboo). Instead, pono and hewa tend to appear in contexts involving kânaka relations with each other. In a study of Davida Malo’s chapter on pono and hewa, Kapali Lyon describes the relation as follows: “The traditional understanding of hewa/pono appears to have operated primarily in the sphere of socially approved and disapproved actions, not the realm of prescribed (or unprescribed) behavior relating to gods or sacred chiefs.”³⁵ Lyon adds that pono is not “the righteousness of humans before gods or even the possession of a good conscience but rather the attainment of favorable status within the human community” (Lyon 2011: 106). As such, pono is a “social virtue” measured in terms of the “benefits” it brings society (Lyon 2011: 106). According to Lyon, the social nature of pono is such that it relates first and foremost to the communal regard of a person within Kanaka society. While akua may play into the regard with which one is held in the community, the focus of a pono relationship is not the individual’s moral standing in light of the purview of a god or gods.

Malo actually takes this a step further in the same chapter where he discusses “governing” (aupuni). In the latter portion of the chapter, Malo provides a list of pono and hewa characteristics of ali‘i. In providing this list, he explains,

Ina i ike mai na makaainana i ka hewa oia alii e hewa io no, i ike mai na makaainana i ka pono oia lii e pono io no.³⁶

If the commoners perceived an ali‘i to be hewa, then he truly was hewa; if the commoners perceived an ali‘i to be pono, then he truly was pono.

Part of what Malo aimed to accomplish was to empower the Kanaka of his time in the face of ali‘i that he believed were not always concerned with the good of the lāhui (community). These passages served as a stern rebuke for such ali‘i. But here, Malo also presents pono and hewa in a way that differs significantly from Armstrong. Instead of universal laws, pono and hewa are communally constructed categories. Pono and hewa are not eternal concepts of right and wrong that supersede human interpretation; rather, the lāhui, and more specifically, the maka‘āinana determine what is pono and what is hewa. In this light, Lyon’s suggestion of understanding pono/hewa as beneficial/harmful makes sense, although it may entail too many consequentialist implications. Armstrong, in contrast, does understand pono and hewa in a deontological framework; however, Malo’s notion of pono and hewa does not place as strong an emphasis on rules or laws. It is worth noting that the term Armstrong uses for laws, *kānāwai*, is a traditional term, but it did not play as prominent a role in Kanaka society until there was prolonged engagement with Euro-Americans such as Armstrong.³⁷ Instead, Malo’s conception of pono and hewa is rooted in ideas of flourishing (such as *ho‘okū‘ono‘ono*) as well as in personal examples provided by individuals from the past. This makes it more akin to a eudaimonist or exemplarist virtue ethic.

As noted previously, after making the statement about pono and hewa being determined by the maka‘āinana, Malo provides a list of characteristics pertaining to pono and hewa ali‘i. Pono ali‘i are *akahai* (modest), *‘olu‘olu* (kind), *noho mālie* (calming in their rule, literally, “sits quietly”), *ho‘oha‘aha‘a* (humble), and *ahonui* (patient) (Malo 2020: 38.101). Malo also provides a more detailed list of ali‘i who were hewa and why there were hewa, and the last several chapters of his text are narratives of individual ali‘i.

The bulk of Malo’s chapter on governing is geared toward explaining the role of the ali‘i’s advisor (*kālimoku*). The chapter begins by explaining that a primary task of the advisor is to look after the well-being of the maka‘āinana, which is done by leading the ali‘i toward what is pono and away from what is hewa (Malo 2020: 38.1–4). Later, the chapter explains what qualifies the advisor to do this:

Elua kumu nui a ka poe kalaimoku, o ko lakou ao ma na olelo akamai a ka poe kalaimoku kahiko, a o ko lakou noho mau meia alii aimoku. a make aku, noho hou aku, a make aku, a ike pono i ke ano o kela li ai moku, keia alii aimoku, me ko lakou lohe mai i ke ano o na lii aimoku kahiko. (Malo 2020: 38.97)

There are two important sources of learning for advisors: the instruction they receive in the wise teachings of past advisors and their having lived continuously with the head ali‘i until he died, then living with the new one until he died. Thus, [they] intimately knew the character of various ali‘i and how they accorded with the character of those in the past.

The next passage goes on to explain that a good advisor might come from the less prominent areas of the land, because even there, there were “people who observed the character of hewa ali‘i and pono ali‘i” (keka[hi] poe nana mai i ke ano o na lii hewa a me na lii pono). The advisor thus functioned as a storehouse for pono; he understood the examples of the past, and personally witnessed examples in the present. The advisor was meant to care for and represent a people who were a collection of their past and present experiences in living under the direction of various ali‘i. The measure of a pono ali‘i was whether he cultivated the characteristics of pono ali‘i in the past, all of whom lessened the burdens of the people instead of increasing them. Malo concludes this chapter saying, “aole loa e ahewa ia ke alii i pono kona noho ana, pela mau no mai ka wa kahiko mai” (the ali‘i who rules with pono will never be condemned; such has been so since antiquity) (Malo 2020: 38.105).

In their translation of Malo’s *Mo‘olelo Hawai‘i*, Lyon and Langas also propose understanding pono in terms of “well-arranged” (Malo 2020, Vol. 2: 368). I find this a very fruitful way of explaining the concept in light of the ali‘i’s task to order a complex society in ways that encourage sustainable impulses, which enable communal flourishing.

4 Conclusion

This article engaged broad topics about being human and living well by thinking through the philosophy of Davida Malo and situating his work in philosophical conversations of his time and place. Richard Armstrong’s *Ka Hulikanaka* served as a conversation partner in this regard. Malo articulates a philosophy of the everyday embedded in how people (literally and metaphorically) stand, sit, and eat in communal living complexes that are organized to create situations of abundance such that people’s impulses are properly managed and maintained. Those doing this managing are ali‘i informed by virtues embodied in the examples of the past. Armstrong maintains a similar focus on the management of impulses and the establishment of community, although his community looks very different from Malo’s. More significantly, Armstrong’s community is based on universal laws of right and wrong that emphasize the relationship between the individual and a God who in the end judges humanity according to those laws. For Armstrong, pono and hewa are qualities of the intention as they relate to a divinely sanctioned law, whereas for Malo, pono and hewa are qualities of the intention as deemed appropriate by a historically informed community that aims to create an abundant world.

Attitudes of exclusion pervaded the field of philosophy in the nineteenth century such that many westerners could not even conceive the possibility that Kanaka could think philosophically. The results of these attitudes linger today where Kanaka thought and even Kanaka themselves are rarely, if ever, included in the curriculum or faculty of philosophy programs. Even though Hawai‘i has played an important role in broadening the discourse of philosophy with events such as the East-West Philosophers’ Conference, which began in 1939, this article is, to my knowledge, the first piece published in a philosophy journal that thoroughly examines Kanaka sources, taking them as philosophy.³⁸ To put Davida Malo’s thought on par with Richard Armstrong’s and Francis Wayland’s, or to say that Davida Malo is a philosopher, is to stake a claim in the face of centuries of colonialism that have assumed otherwise. The significance of this piece is not only to show how Malo and Armstrong may have conversed over the question of how to live well, but also to begin a conversation in the field of world philosophies about the viability of Kanaka ways of life.

Michael David Kaulana Ing was raised by the ‘āina of Mānoa on the island of O‘ahu. In 2011 he earned his PhD from Harvard University, and since then he has been on the faculty in the Department of Religious Studies at Indiana University.

¹ For the text of *Ka Mo‘olelo Hawai‘i*, I follow the Carter copy of the manuscript and the transcriptions provided in the text edited by Jeffrey Lyon, *The Mo‘olelo Hawai‘i of Davida Malo*, Vol. 1 (Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 2020). I cite the text according to chapter and passage number as shown in Lyon’s volume (e.g., 38.10). I also consulted volume 2, edited by Charles Langlas and Jeffrey Lyon, although all translations are my own. See: *The Mo‘olelo Hawai‘i of Davida Malo*, Vol. 2 (Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 2020).

I thank Kapali Lyon, Kalikoaloha Martin, and the two reviewers of this article for their mana‘o that inform the piece.

² I cite the 1847 reprinting of the text, *Ka Wehewehehala, Oia boi ka Hulikanaka* (Honolulu: Published by the Missionaries). Francis Wayland, *The Elements of Moral Science* (New York: Cooke and Company, 1835).

³ This paragraph relies on Noelani Arista’s biographical essay in Langlas and Lyon as well as Langlas and Lyon’s introduction. For further background on Malo see Malcolm Naea Chun, *Na Kukui Pio ‘Ole—The Inextinguishable Torches: The Biographies of Three Early Native Hawaiian Scholars, Davida Malo, S. N. Hale‘ole and S. M. Kamakau* (Honolulu: First People’s Productions, 1993).

⁴ *Ka Mo‘olelo Hawai‘i* (Honolulu: Published by the Missionaries, 1838).

⁵ Langas and Lyon explain aspects of this in Langas and Lyon (2020: 9–13).

⁶ trans., Nathaniel B. Emerson, *Hawaiian Antiquities (Moolelo Hawaii)* (Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press, 1971).

⁷ Davida Malo, *Ka Mo‘olelo Hawaii (Hawaiian Antiquities)*, ed. Malcolm Naea Chun (Honolulu: The Folk Press, 1987).

⁸ The 1847 printing actually makes no reference to the book being based on Wayland’s text in its introductory material.

⁹ Although the process was not as thorough as the Bible.

¹⁰ ed. David W. Forbes, *Hawaiian National Bibliography 1780–1900*, Volume II (Honolulu: The University of Hawai‘i Press, 2001), 289 and 508.

¹¹ On its usage at Lahainaluna see, for example, E. K. Lilikalani, “He Hoomano no ke Kula Nui o Lahainaluna,” *Ka Puuhonua o na Hawaii*, 2 February 1917. For advertisements see *Ka Elele Hawaii*, 3 July 1848 and most editions of *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa* between 1865 and 1877. All newspapers were accessed electronically via the Papakilo Database—an online repository of Kanaka material sponsored by the Office of Hawaiian Affairs and available at www.papakilodatabase.com.

¹² “Ka Papa Alakai no ka Wehewehehala,” *Kuokoa Home Rula*, 27 October and 3 November 1911.

¹³ All translations are my own.

¹⁴ J. E. Hart, “Ka Hoike ana o ke Kula Hanai Kaikamahine o Maunaolu,” *Ko Hawaii Pae Aina*, 5 July 1879.

¹⁵ See, for instance, D. B., “No ka Pule Malama Hou,” *Ke Kumu Hawaii*, 13 May 1835.

¹⁶ The latter is clearer in the retitling of the 1847 edition—*Ka Wehewehehala*, “the remission of sins.”

¹⁷ Wayland makes a distinction between being “moral” and “pious” on pages 30–1 of his text, but Armstrong does not translate this portion.

- 18 On the rise of a paradigm of world religions see Tomoko Masuzawa, *The Invention of World Religions, or, How European Universalism was Preserved in the Language of Pluralism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005).
- 19 For a systematic example of this see Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, *Lectures on the Philosophy of Religion*, ed. Peter C. Hodgson, trans. R.F. Brown, P.C. Hodgson, and J.M. Stewart, with the assistance of J.P. Fitzer and H.S. Harris (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984–1987).
- 20 Armstrong gestures in this direction on pages 183–4. It is worth noting that missionary efforts in Nu‘uhiwa at this time were largely unsuccessful. On race relations across the Pacific (especially in Polynesia), see Maile Arvin, *Possessing Polynesians: The Science of Settler Colonial Whiteness In Hawai‘i and Oceania* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2019). See also Kealani Cook, *Return to Kahiki: Native Hawaiians in Oceania* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018), 32–94.
- 21 For an example of this see John Fawcett Pogue, “Mooolo Hawaii,” *Ka Hae Hawaii*, 7 and 14 April 1858.
- 22 All dictionary references follow the electronic texts at Wikiwiki Wehewehe: <https://hilo.hawaii.edu/wehe/>
- 23 Malo does not clearly differentiate between mana‘o and makemake, but the latter appears to be a less reflective type of the former.
- 24 In other words, it can assert a higher-order volition.
- 25 The term “no‘ono‘o” makes sense in this context, but Malo does not explicitly use it here.
- 26 It is worth noting the rich language used throughout this chapter in discussing the inclinations involved in performing bad actions. It may not be possible to read the entire chapter as systematically as the passage under discussion, but the chapter as a whole does reveal a complex taxonomy of the ways in which Kanaka understood human feeling and thinking. Unfortunately, many of the terms Malo uses are no longer understood (it seems that even Malo has to gloss some terms in parenthesis for readers of his time).
- 27 This likely involved searching for hidden a piece of wood or stone under bundles of kapa.
- 28 There is currently a total of over 5,000 unique results for “hookuonoono” and “kuonoono” in the Papakilo Database. Views of what a flourishing society looked like and how best to achieve it varied. Ho‘oku‘ono‘ono is one of several terms related to the discourse of flourishing in Kanaka thought. Other terms include momona, mā‘ona, lako, and lawa. For an example of the discourse on lawa (sufficiency), see Cook (2018: 188–220).
- 29 The notion of shifting from consuming desires to sustaining desires borrows from Michael Nylan, *The Chinese Pleasure Book* (New York: Zone Books, 2018).
- 30 The language of secure base comes from John Bowlby, *A Secure Base: Parent-Child Attachment and Healthy Human Development* (New York: Basic Books, 1988).
- 31 David Chang develops this idea of exploration in *The World and All the Things upon It: Native Hawaiian Geographies of Exploration* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2016).
- 32 The last of these structures follows Emerson’s reading in (1971: 122).
- 33 Samuel Kamakau provides a narrative where Kanaka began living in simple homes and moved to more complex living structures in “Ka Moolelo Hawaii,” *Ke Au Okoa*, 13 January 1870.
- 34 Contrast this with Emerson’s comment on this chapter: “It will be seen that the duties and faults that weighted most heavily on the conscience of the Hawaiian were mostly artificial matters, and such as in our eyes do not touch the essence of morality” (Emerson 1971: 76).
- 35 Jeffrey Kapali Lyon, “Davida Malo, Nathaniel Emerson, and the ‘Sins’ of Hawaiians: An Analysis of Emerson’s *Hawaiian Antiquities* as a Guide to Malo’s *Mo‘olelo Hawai‘i*,” *Hulili: Multidisciplinary Research on Hawaiian Well-Being* 7 (2011): 113.

-
- ³⁶ Malo, 38.99. This also coheres with the ‘ōlelo no‘eau (wise saying), “I ali‘i no ke ali‘i i ke kānaka” (“A chief is [only] a chief because of the people”). Mary Kawena Pukui, *‘Ōlelo No‘eau: Hawaiian Proverbs & Poetical Sayings* (Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press, 1983), number 1150; see also 1172.
- ³⁷ Malo actually says at one point in describing traditional Hawaiian society, “aohe kanawai oia wa” (“there were no laws at that time”) (Malo, 21.10).
- ³⁸ There may be a few articles in philosophy journals that mention Kanaka thought, and one article making the case that American is illegally occupying Hawai‘i (Rodney C. Roberts, “Rectificatory Justice and the Kānaka Maoli of Hawai‘i,” *Social Philosophy Today* 36 (2020): 89–103), but the only piece that engages Kanaka thought systematically is Sydney Morrow, “‘Terrestrial Identity’ as Grounded Relationality: A Comparative Study of Contemporary Chinese and Hawaiian Sources,” *Argument* 8 (2018): 289–302; however, Morrow’s analysis is a little less than seven pages and does not deal with any Hawaiian language sources.