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Samoan Terms

Aiga-family

Fa'asamoa-Samoan customs; to act according to them

Fale-traditional house

Faiffeau-pastor

Faikava-to drink kava or the ceremony of drinking kava

Fautasi-longboat

Malaga-a journey

Malo-government; the victor; visitors

Mamona-Mormon way of life; oftentimes a term to refer to a Latter-day Saint

Matai-the head of the family

Papalagi-white people (foreigners)
Samoa within Oceania

\[^2\]
Main Islands of Samoa. Savai’i and Upolu were territories of Germany, then later New Zealand up until 1962.$^3$.
The expansion of the LDS Samoan Mission during the Nineteenth Century⁴.
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Introduction

Underneath a brilliant moon 5,147ft above sea level on the side of an arid mountain overlooking the southern reaches of Zion, technically known as Utah Valley, may seem a strange place for me to come up with the foundation of my thesis topic. After all, my topic is set in tropical Samoa, the spatial and geographical antithesis of the mysterious, harsh desert climate of Utah. Yet there I was one summer night several years ago on the trailhead of Y Mountain listening to explosively loud reggae music emanating from an SUV, drinking kava for the very first time and taking in the incredible view of Provo and Brigham Young University. My Tongan friends, who I had met for the first time ten minutes earlier, happened to be Latter-day Saints and were explaining that many Latter-day Saints believed that Polynesians originated in the Americas. At that moment, with that massive rock beneath my feet, the wind sweeping upwards over the mountain peak and the full moon illuminating the sagebrush, I experienced a tremendously poignant feeling that I was supposed to be there on that night, with that company, on that spot on the surface of the Earth. As we passed around coconut shells filled with kava, our discussion turned to Thor Heyerdahl, who had set out on the Kon-Tiki voyage to prove that the pre-Columbian indigenous communities of America were capable of voyaging to Polynesia. Ever since I read Heyerdahl’s account of the successful voyage in his book Kon-Tiki at the age of twelve, I had been fascinated with the problem of the origin of the people of Polynesia and made it a personal goal to see the romantic South Pacific in person. Interestingly, many Latter-day Saints point to Heyerdahl’s theories and research as evidence to support their belief that Polynesians are the ancestors of the Lamanites, a group of people integral to the Book of Mormon. The Latter-day Saint missionaries in Samoa during the Nineteenth and Twentieth
Centuries shared this belief in the Polynesians being the progeny of the Lamanites of South America.

The nearly universal imagining of the South Pacific conjures up paradisiacal visions of verdant foliage abruptly jutting through the immensity of the crystal Pacific Ocean. A galaxy of Eden’s amidst the peripheral Ring of Fire. A world where peace reigns, harmony is the golden rule, relaxation displaces exhaustion, love conquers hate and time is truly an unimportant concept. At the very least, this was my personal myth of Oceania. Tellingly, this myth has been forcefully buttressed by my recent experience in Oahu. But there are other memories, other stories and other realities which rarely find their way into the global imagination of what Oceania consists of in its totality. Two elements of the historical and contemporary reality of Oceania are imperialism and colonialism. The narrative of colonialism in Samoa is dramatic, tragic and inspiring. The story of colonialism and resistance in Samoa has been interpreted and reinterpreted, but never has the story been told through the lens of the Samoan Mission of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (LDS).

This thesis attempts to locate the LDS Samoan Mission within the context of colonialism. The Latter-day Saint missionaries in Samoa during the 1890s publicly and explicitly spoke out against the Western imperialist nation-states that were wreaking havoc in the island group while the Latter-day Saint missionaries in the early Twentieth Century actively became more accommodating towards the imperialist colonial administration within Samoa. This shift in the role of Latter-day Saint missionaries in Samoa between the decades of the 1890s and the 1920s is manifest through the Latter-day Saint missionary public and private discourse from Samoa. The shifting trend in how the Latter-day Saint missionaries themselves conceived what the proper position they as missionaries should hold within the social and political hierarchies in Samoa was
contingent on the localized, empirical realities of proselytizing within a colonial construct as well as changing notions of the proper location of The LDS Church within the context of Western social, political and religious norms. The factors which determined the self-conceived role of the Latter-day Saint missionaries within the hierarchical colonial realities of Samoa were both internal and external to the Samoan Islands. In very general terms, the collective Latter-day Saint response to the complex alterations within the social, political, economic and metaphysical surfaces within the Samoan Islands evolved over space and time.

This thesis discursively analyses then contextualizes the Latter-day Saint missionaries’ Samoan discourse through their correspondence with LDS affiliated newspapers and magazines, their personal journals, LDS General Conference minutes as well as the shifting objectives of the LDS Samoan Mission in relation to fa‘asamo‘a and the various colonial administrations in the island group. Fa‘asamo‘a is generally accepted to mean the ‘Samoan way’, a definition which is applicable to the complex totality of social norms and conventions within Samoan tradition. The term ‘tradition’ is itself ambiguous because Oceania was not a stagnant, unchanging totality before the arrival of Westerners but a complex, integrated and evolving entity. As mentioned above, the factors which determined the collectively conceived role of the Latter-day Saint missionaries in Samoa, as indicated through their discourse, stemmed from the personal experiences of the missionaries vis-à-vis colonial Samoa and fa‘asamo‘a as well as the alteration of the conceived role of the LDS Church in America. Though the LDS Church Headquarters in Salt Lake City and the LDS Samoan Mission were separated by 5,000 miles of the largest ocean on earth, the evolution of the Latter-day Saint missionary response to political and social events within Samoa mirrors a similar trajectory followed by the LDS Church in the continental United States. Beginning by the early Twentieth Century, the LDS Church in the United States sought to
break with its more tumultuous past and attempted to assimilate to a greater extent into the norms and conventions of American identity and culture. Specifically, LDS Church Leaders in the U.S. sought to depoliticize the Church and to internalize topics of a political nature within the bureaucratic functions of the Church. Simultaneously, the Latter-day Saint missionaries in the Samoan Islands eliminated the polemics that were prolific in the public discourse of the earlier Samoan Mission and began to identify themselves more closely with the colonial administrations or at the very least, tacitly accept the status quo of colonialism in Samoa. This does not necessarily mean that the evolution of the Samoan LDS Mission was wholly contingent on the evolution of the LDS Church in the United States, though it certainly played a role. It may seem an obvious point, but it is useful to remember that the Latter-day Saint missionaries were generally only in the Samoan Islands for two or three years at a time (though some stayed significantly longer) and brought with them the collective identities of the LDS Church contemporaneous with the years that they served.

A crucial element of the collective identity that Latter-day Saints held in the Nineteenth Century was the notion of alienation from American culture and a legacy of violent oppression perpetrated against the LDS Church; violence which was at times sanctioned by local, state-level and municipal-level political apparatuses. The narrative of the LDS Church during the Nineteenth Century is filled with joy, love, salvation, community and tangible as well as theological accomplishments. Also permeating this narrative are accounts of institutionalized disenfranchisement, polemical and theological attacks, persecution and oppression, alienation and exile, mob violence and government sanctioned extermination. Even in contemporary times, this collective identity of persecution among Latter-day Saints is very much alive. Latter-day Saints today are very much cognizant of the violence and persecutions perpetrated against the
LDS Church historically and in a sense internalize those elements which are in turn synthesized into the general collective Latter-day Saint identity. This collective identity of persecution was that much more salient, more tangible during the Nineteenth Century. After all, the majority of Latter-day Saints during the Nineteenth Century either directly experienced violence or acute hardship or were related through family or close friendship to somebody who had. This profoundly impacted the Latter-day Saint notion of self-location in relation to the LDS Church, community, localized and national political structures and American culture generally. The Latter-day Saint missionaries during the late Nineteenth Century brought with them to Samoa this collective identity of persecution which determined their outspoken condemnations of Western imperialist nation-states actively persecuting and disenfranchising the Samoan people and confronting faʻasamoa.

The public discourse of Latter-day Saint missionaries in Samoa must be distinguished from their private journals. During the 1890s, they condemned Western imperialism in Samoa through their public discourse. However, by the early Twentieth Century their public discourse was riddled with omissions of political topics. Rather than an obstacle, the silences prolific in their discourse in the early Twentieth Century should be viewed as useful tools for explaining the conceived role within colonial Samoa that Latter-day Saint missionaries embraced. In other words, these silences are far from mute. Rather, these silences shout in order to contextualize and decipher the discourse of the Latter-day Saint missionaries in the early years of the Twentieth Century. J.B. Harley, who previously lectured in historical geography at the Universities of Liverpool and Wisconsin-Milwaukee and influenced the field of geography through his ideas on the meaning of maps, pointed out that “silences should be regarded as positive statements and not merely as passive gaps in the flow of language”⁹. The omissions within the Latter-day Saint
missionary discourse, particularly in the early Twentieth Century, reveal the prioritized agenda of the LDS Samoan Mission as well as their tacit acceptance of the colonial administrations in Samoa. The politicized discourse of the 1890s was extinguished from the discourse of the Latter-day Saint missionary discourse between 1900 and 1930. This eradication of political topics implicitly reveals, at the very least, a tacit acceptance of the hierarchical, colonial apparatuses in Samoa. This point becomes all the more poignant against the backdrop of the oftentimes acute suffering experienced by the Samoan population during these decades. There is hardly a mention of an influenza epidemic which swept through Western Samoa in 1918 or a massacre in 1929 which has come to be known as Black Saturday. Similarly, an inspiring anti-colonial movement known as the Mau was largely omitted from the public discourse of the LDS Samoan Mission. When these events are mentioned within the public discourse, political references are omitted. This separation of political ideas from the suffering of the Samoan people within the public discourse essentially implies that the colonial apparatuses are free from blame for this suffering. Generally, in the early Twentieth Century, Samoan suffering and political references were mutually exclusive within the public discourse of the LDS Samoan Mission.

Throughout this thesis I use the term ‘discourse’, which I use in a more general sense; discourse as both public and private communications in regards to a specific idea, topic or field. Furthermore, this discourse is conducted within a specific community consisting of members who generally share sets of understanding, beliefs, truisms and language. The discourse referred to throughout this thesis indicates the communication of ideas, beliefs, identity and even notions of power-relations among the Latter-day Saint community in regards to the role of the LDS Samoan Mission in the context of economic, political, militaristic and cultural imperialism within the Samoan Islands. In The Archeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language,
Michel Foucault points out that discourse is “at once controlled, selected, organized and redistributed according to a certain number of procedures”\textsuperscript{10}. To Foucault’s statement I would add that the contents or elements of a discourse are also prioritized and at times omitted in accordance with the agenda of the producers of the discourse. This epistemological assertion can be applied quite congruently to the discourse of the LDS Samoan Mission, particularly the discourse during the early Twentieth Century. Besides the new role of the LDS Samoan Mission as a “colonization system”, as one Latter-day Saint missionary put it in 1911, the discourse of this era was controlled, selected and redistributed in accordance with the policy norms and protocols of the LDS Church in general. The contemporaneous shift to depoliticizing LDS Church rhetoric in the continental United States influenced the Latter-day Saint missionaries in Samoa to follow suit.

The discourse of the Latter-day Saint missionaries in Samoa during the late Nineteenth Century is profoundly unique in that it seems to be unrestricted, unrestrained, uninfluenced by institutional protocols. Dr. Barbara Cooper of the History Department at Rutgers University has recently explained to me that historically it was quite typical for Christian missionaries to speak out against colonial administrations. However, through every step of my research, Latter-day Saint scholars informed me that it would be highly unlikely to find anything of a political nature within the public discourse of the LDS Samoan Mission\textsuperscript{11}. Comparatively, the LDS Hawaiian Mission discourse of the 1890s was intentionally apolitical upon the urgings of the mission president there. Furthermore, during the ceremony by which the United States officially annexed the Kingdom of Hawai‘i in 1898, the LDS Hawaiian Mission President did not participate in any way\textsuperscript{12}. In contrast, the Latter-day Saint missionaries in Samoa were disturbed when they weren’t invited to participate in the annexation ceremony of American Samoa in 1900\textsuperscript{13}. Latter-day Saint
missionaries weren’t supposed to meddle in local politics by action or through words\textsuperscript{14}. The fact that the Latter-day Saint missionaries in Samoa were not only politically outspoken, but also condemned the imperialist Western Powers indicates the extent to which the missionaries there embraced the collective identity of persecution shared by members of the Church, but also indicates the extent to which the LDS Samoan Mission remained embryonic during the 1890s. Indeed, the Latter-day Saint missionaries in Samoa were truly pioneers and proceeded with the construction of the LDS Samoan Mission without established procedures and protocols, particularly in regards to public discourse. The fact that the Latter-day Saint missionaries in Hawai’i remained apolitical should not be seen as contradicting my point that the politicized nature of the Samoan LDS discourse was contingent on the shared collective identity of persecution experienced by the LDS Church. Rather, the fact that the President of the Hawaiian LDS Mission felt compelled to urge Latter-day Saint missionaries in Hawai’i to refrain from contributing to the political discourse indicates that they too embraced this identity of persecution and a legacy of LDS Church involvement with the political sphere.

Investigating the LDS Samoan Mission explicitly and specifically through the political lens of colonialism in Samoa has never before been done. As mentioned above, the story of colonialism in Samoa has been recounted and reinterpreted by scholars. Journalist Michael Field’s exciting account of the Mau movement through the early Twentieth Century and culminating in the dramatic years of the late 1920s is a credible, yet accessible account of colonialism in Samoa during the early Twentieth Century, particularly during the years of the New Zealand administration. However, Field fails to investigate fully the experience of Samoa under German rule between the years 1900-1914. Furthermore, Field focuses mostly on Western Samoa and only briefly glosses over colonialism under the United States on the island of Tutuila.
Historian Mark Wilson criticizes Field for not grappling with the complexities of *fa’asamoa* and for conferring a “non-existent unity on the Samoan community”\(^{15}\). Both Wilson and historian I.C. Campbell argue that Field exaggerates the malevolence of the New Zealand Administration and fails to convey the totality of colonialism in Samoa. While this may be true to an extent, I would argue that Field’s accessible accounts successfully brings this story to a wider audience than Campbell and Wilson could ever hope to do and should be appreciated for its accessible, dramatic style. David Chappell supplements Field’s historiography of Samoan Colonialism by shedding light on the Mau movement within American Samoa in his article “The Forgotten *Mau*: Anti-Navy Protest in American Samoa, 1920-1935”\(^{16}\). Campbell follows suit with his own account of the Mau in American Samoa in “Chiefs, Agitators and the Navy: The Mau in American Samoa, 1920-1929”\(^{17}\). Featuna’i Ben Liuaana’s *Samoa Tula’i: Ecclesiastical and Political Face of Samoa’s Independence, 1900-1962*, purports to view Samoan Colonialism through an “ecclesiastical” interpretation\(^{18}\). Rather, he almost exclusively grapples with the London Missionary Society’s experience with Samoan colonialism and resistance, only briefly mentioning the LDS Samoan Mission. Though he doesn’t seem to acknowledge this, Featuna’i Ben interprets Samoan Colonialism from the perspective of *fa’asamoa*, a perspective lost in Field’s, Chappell’s and my own account.

The history of the LDS Samoan Mission has been recounted by LDS scholars, but those accounts mainly focus on the spiritual dimension of the growth of the Church in Samoa, the structure of the LDS Samoan Mission and the personal experiences of Latter-day Saint missionaries. Carl Harris’s account of the LDS Samoan Mission, *Samoa Apia Mission History: 1888-1983*, was crucial to this thesis\(^{19}\). Lanier Britsch delves into the relationship between the LDS Samoan Mission and colonialism in Samoa briefly, but only to a miniscule extent\(^{20}\).
Kenneth W. Baldridge’s research profoundly impacted the conclusions of this thesis. In his article “Sauniatu, Western Samoa: A Special Purpose Village, 1904-1934,” Baldridge reveals the tensions between the Latter-day Saint missionaries and Samoan Latter-day Saints in the midst of colonialism and resistance on the microcosm of an individual village. These secondary accounts themselves are largely apolitical in nature. Arguably, Baldridge’s interpretation is exceptional in that his work touches somewhat on the conflict between the Samoan Latter-day Saints and the LDS Samoan Mission. Baldridge seems unaware of the anti-colonial Mau movement and is unable to contextualize the conflicts he perceives within the primary sources that he utilizes. Essentially, this thesis attempts to synthesize the story of colonialism and resistance in Samoa with the history of the LDS Samoan Mission.

In order to juxtapose the LDS Samoan Mission with the political sphere within the context of Colonial Samoa, a solid foundation of manifold varieties of primary sources was necessary. Probably the most valuable sources for this project were articles from the Improvement Era, a magazine closely affiliated with the LDS Church. These articles were gleaned from “Articles Relating to the Pacific Islands from the ‘Improvement Era’ Vol. 1 1898-Vol. 72 1969,” from the Pacific Manuscripts Bureau 110. As mentioned above, Kenneth W. Baldridge’s oral histories were profoundly important as were the various documents, journal excerpts, maps and manuscripts found in the Brigham Young University Hawai’i archives. Earl Stanley Paul’s personal diary gave an in-depth look at the day-to-day life of a Latter-day Saint missionary as well as references to the larger social context during the years before World War I. Ernest Adelbert Gardner’s personal journal illustrates how Latter-day Saint missionaries were forced to contend with divergent allegiances under different colonial regimes. The mini-autobiography of Seiuli Le-Tagaloatele Fitisemanu within his collection of Samoan folklore,
“Samoa: Land of Legends,” gives a very unique account of a Samoan Latter-day Saint within the context of resistance and the Mau movement during the 1920s. The LDS General Conference Reports indicate the official discourse of the LDS Samoan Mission throughout Samoa’s colonial experience.

I have borrowed several conceptual tools from other scholars which have aided my research as well as led me to develop my own conceptual frames to better analyze and contextualize the sources for this thesis. Historian Laurie F. Maffly-Kipp investigates the different factors which made the interaction between Latter-day Saint missionaries and the various societies of Oceania during the Nineteenth Century unique. Maffly-Kipp points out that many of the LDS Missions in the Pacific during this time were relatively impoverished, a factor which forced Latter-day Saint missionaries to live amongst Islanders to a much greater extent than their counterparts from other Christian denominations. Also, the LDS emphasis on laying hands on the ill correlated with many Islander beliefs. Furthermore, many Latter-day Saints believed that the Book of Mormon implied that Polynesians were the descendents of Laman. Thus, an acceptance of the LDS Church on the part of Polynesians wasn’t only a leap of faith, but a teleological confirmation of identity, an identity which fit into the narrative of the Book of Mormon. Finally, and most importantly, the Latter-day Saints of the Nineteenth Century shared a collective identity of persecution, an identity which allowed them to identify more closely with Islanders within the context of colonialism. Maffly-Kipp only briefly refers to this concept and doesn’t further investigate the implications of this in regards to Latter-day Saint missionary experience within the political sphere. In “God and the People: Theodemocracy in Nineteenth-Century Mormonism,” historian Patrick Q. Mason traces the concept of ‘theodemocracy’ from the era of Joseph Smith’s presidential campaign to the early Twentieth Century. In doing so,
Mason argues that through the decades between the mid-Nineteenth Century and the early-Twentieth Century, the discourse of the LDS Church within the United States progressively became depoliticized as the Church sought to integrate more fully into American society. I expand on the concepts of an identity of persecution and a legacy of a politicized discourse and apply them to Samoan Colonialism.

Chapter 1 of this thesis narrates the introduction of Christianity into Samoa, followed several decades later by Latter-day Saint missionaries. We follow the manipulative adventurer Walter Murray Gibson around the globe as he finds his way into LDS Church infamy. His hand in unofficially establishing the LDS Samoan Mission indicates the extent to which fear and perceptions of persecution existed within the Latter-day Saint community. Just as importantly, it indicates the embryonic nature of the LDS Samoan Mission during the late-Nineteenth Century, a condition which permitted the outspokenness of the Latter-day Saint missionaries through public discourse. The efforts of establishing the LDS Samoan Mission and the methods of proselytizing indicate the extent to which Latter-day Saint missionaries felt alienated from American culture. The underhanded tactics used by missionaries from other Christian denominations to undermine Latter-day Saint efforts in Samoa only strengthened this feeling of alienation. Several tragic examples of violence and persecution perpetrated against Latter-day Saints in the United States are recounted to illustrate the collective identity of persecution prolific among LDS Church members, particularly during the Nineteenth Century.

Chapter 2 illustrates the location of the Latter-day Saint missionaries within the official beginnings of colonialism in Samoa. A depiction of the social turbulence and violence caused by the imperialist Three Powers gives context to the discourse of the Latter-day Saint missionaries. Themselves victims of United States expansionism, the Latter-day Saint missionaries in Samoa
during the 1890s spoke out against the military aggression of the United States, Great Britain and Germany. Elder William Lee in particular articulately and passionately condemned the deleterious effects Western colonialism and culture had on fa’asamoa through articles in the Improvement Era. Such openly political commentary from a Latter-day Saint missionary is anomalous. The public condemnation of Western imperialist aggression is exceedingly remarkable.

By the early Twentieth Century, we begin to see a shift in the public discourse and actions of the Latter-day Saint missionaries in Samoa. Chapter 3 illustrates the shifting role of the LDS Samoan Mission under the German and American colonial regimes. By the early Twentieth Century, the LDS Samoan Mission had evolved from a fledgling entity to an established institution within Colonial Samoa. The gathering process of bringing Samoan Latter-day Saints to specific villages was implemented. Consequently, Latter-day Saint missionaries were placed in a new role within the social hierarchy of these villages. Political commentary was excluded from the public discourse and replaced by politically benign accounts of the efforts of the LDS Samoan Mission. These silences became more salient against the backdrop of New Zealand’s seizure of Western Samoa and the catastrophic influenza epidemic. The Latter-day Saint missionaries began to exhibit notions that their role necessitated ‘civilizing’ the Samoan Latter-day Saints as well as spreading the Gospel. Elder John Q. Adams spoke of efforts to eventually eradicate fa’asamoa. This objective was shared by the German colonial regime in Western Samoa.

Chapter 4 briefly grapples with the historiography of the Mau and explores the anti-colonial movement through the lenses of memory, Christianity and the LDS Samoan Mission. The Mau not only challenged the political authority of the New Zealand Administration and
Western commercial interests. It challenged every facet of Western culture as it existed in Samoa. The recent hierarchical position of the LDS Samoan Mission placed the Latter-day Saint missionaries on a collision course with the Mau. During the ascendency of the Mau movement, we witness a disconnect between the public and private discourses of the LDS Samoan Mission. The public discourse asserts that the Mau is a blessing in disguise for the LDS Samoan Mission while the private accounts reveal tension, conflict and violence within the Latter-day Saint villages.

The greatest weakness of this work is my personal experience. As Edward Said has pointed out, “No one has ever devised a method for detaching the scholar from the circumstances of life, from the fact of his involvement (conscious or unconscious) with a class, a set of beliefs, a social position, or from the mere activity of being a member of a society”\(^\text{30}\). Consequently, this work fails to give fa’asamoa the space or time that it deserves. My experience as a member of the proletariat oftentimes led me to criticize the plantation owners, government officials and imperialist nation-states more sharply than say, I.C. Campbell, would appreciate. Most importantly, it is hoped that this thesis doesn’t contribute to the enormous corpus of erroneous information in regards to the LDS Church. It is not meant to be an attack on LDS Church principles or virtues. Perhaps the greatest weakness of this thesis is my failure in depicting eloquently the warmth, love, joy, and happiness felt when in the midst of the LDS Church community. I have strived to keep the depiction of the LDS Samoan Mission in accord with the findings of my research, in an even-handed and objective manner.
The Mormons must be treated as enemies, and must be exterminated or driven from the state if necessary for the public peace-Lilburn W. Boggs, Governor of Missouri, 1838.

Flooded with feelings of joy, satisfaction and purpose, Hawaiian Latter-day Saints Kimo Pelio and Samuela Manoa landed safely in the Samoan Islands in January of 1863. These determined men were the first Latter-day Saints to set foot in this island group. In addition to their clear sense of purpose, tremendous feelings of angst probably weighed heavily on their hearts. These devout men of Christian principles were misled to believe that the LDS Church in the Utah Territory of the United States, a region often referred to as Zion by Latter-day Saints during the Nineteenth Century, had been wiped from the surface of the Earth by the United States Army. In response to rumors of a “Mormon Rebellion” in the Utah Territory, the U.S. Federal Government had sent troops to suppress any insurrection there in 1857. Fortunately, serious conflict was averted when the United States troops realized that the rumors of rebellion were false. This event, which is commonly referred to as the Utah War, allowed renegade missionary Walter Murray Gibson to convince the Hawaiian Latter-day Saints to believe that Hawaiʻi was the last place on Earth where the LDS Church existed. Thus, it was the duty of the Hawaiian Latter-day Saints to keep the Church alive and bring the Gospel to the people of Oceania.

The Utah War played a crucial role in the introduction of the LDS Church into Samoa. It also holds an important place in a larger story of Latter-day Saint struggles against oppression
and violence, a struggle which reinforced a collective identity of persecution. When the LDS Church leadership caught wind that U.S. troops were marching toward Zion to suppress insurrection, all missionaries serving abroad were called home to take up arms and defend against the invaders. The Latter-day Saint missionaries serving in Hawai‘i responded to President Brigham Young’s call to arms and left the LDS Hawaiian Mission for Zion. The Hawaiian Latter-day Saints were left to wonder if the United States Army had indeed crushed the LDS Church. Several years later, Gibson was sent to check on the Hawaiian Saints and immediately began to deceive them, claiming that the LDS Church had been wiped out by the U.S. troops.

The Hawaiian Latter-day Saint missionaries labored in the Samoan Islands for years without realizing that the LDS Church still existed in Zion. Most of the proselytizing conducted by Elder Pelio and Elder Manoa was confined to Tutuila, though it appears that some of the people that they baptized were from Upolu. Elder Pelio and Elder Manoa were able to convert somewhere between 50 or 70 Samoans to the LDS Church, though many fell away from LDS teachings over the years. Elder Manoa was left alone to contend with building the LDS Samoan Mission when Elder Pelio died in 1876, apparently never learning of the existence of the LDS Church in the United States. Alone in Samoa, Elder Manoa wrote letters to the LDS Hawaiian Mission but for reasons unknown, the letters either never reached their destination or the Latter-day Saint missionaries in Laie, Hawai‘i failed to react to the news that an unofficial LDS Mission existed in Samoa.

One day, while in Pago Pago, Elder Manoa was brought aboard a large vessel for the purpose of piloting it into the harbor. Afterwards, the captain offered Elder Manoa the use of the ship’s mess to cook himself breakfast. In the process of kindling the fire with old newspapers, he
noticed an article in a newspaper from San Francisco that mentioned the LDS Church’s semi-annual general conference in Salt Lake City. From this, he realized that Gibson had misled the Hawaiian Saints into believing the LDS Church no longer existed and immediately wrote a letter to the President of the Church in Salt Lake City, John Taylor, requesting that missionaries be sent to Samoa. Again, through a series of misunderstandings and great oversight, action wasn’t immediately taken by the Church Leadership. The letter was sent from Salt Lake City to the Mission President in Hawai’i. For some reason, the President of the Hawaiian Mission failed to look into the matter and filed the letter for future reference. The letter sat filed and collecting dust for years until Joseph H. Dean from Utah, who was serving his second mission in Hawai’i, found the letter in 1887 and made moves to securing permission from the Church to travel to Samoa to meet with Elder Manoa and help with the unofficial LDS Samoan Mission.34

The story of Pelio, Manoa and Gibson is integral to the history of the LDS Samoan Mission. This is not necessarily because it was the first instance of Latter-day Saints in Samoa, although it is important for that reason. More importantly, this story illustrates the extent to which the efforts of the LDS Church in Oceania during the Nineteenth Century were conducted in an oftentimes uncontrolled, almost haphazard fashion, albeit with good intentions. The fact that Gibson was able to get away with his sordid actions in Hawai’i indicates the lack of control that the Church in Salt Lake City wielded over its far flung missions. Perhaps the most important conclusion to draw from this story is that Gibson was only able to get away with defrauding the Hawaiian Latter-day Saints because of the growing fears in Zion that the United States Army truly was marching toward Utah Territory with the intention of finally sweeping away the LDS Church. Prophet Brigham Young recalled all Latter-day Saint missionaries serving abroad so they could defend Zion by force if necessary. In other words, the unofficial beginning of the LDS
Samoan Mission was a direct consequence of the collective identity of persecution among Latter-day Saints, an identity which was very valid in light of the historical experience of the LDS Church. The history of violence and persecution that the LDS Church faced in the continental United States throughout the Nineteenth Century must be further explored in order to better understand the Latter-day Saint missionary reaction to colonialism in Samoa during the 1890s.

Extermination may seem a disturbing term to many, particularly when used within the official proclamations of a United States governor. Indeed, a modern day governor ordering the extermination of the “Mormons” would undoubtedly raise quite a few eyebrows. Astonishingly, Missourian Governor Lilburn W. Boggs officially decreed on October 28, 1838 that the “The Mormons must be treated as enemies, and must be exterminated or driven from the state”35. Two days later 240 armed Missourian vigilantes attacked Latter-day Saint men, women and children at Haun’s Mill. At least seventeen Latter-day Saints were slaughtered and thirteen wounded during the massacre36. This specific massacre was merely the precursor of a Missourian Government sanctioned assault on the LDS Church which resulted in more violence and the expulsion of some ten thousand people, virtually at gunpoint, from the state. It must be remembered that during the mid-Nineteenth Century the slavery issue was very much integral to the political landscape of the United States. This issue was acutely relevant to the formation of Missouri as a state in 1821 and to the political discourse within the newborn state. In fact, the issue oftentimes became the crux of Missourian denouncements of the influx of Latter-day Saints into their region. Many Latter-day Saints were outspoken opponents of slavery. Major General John B. Clark of the Missouri militia told a group of Latter-day Saints that “If I am called here again…you need not expect any mercy, but extermination, for I am determined the governor’s orders shall be executed”37. In other words, Governor Boggs’s extermination order was not a
hollow declaration made by an eccentric political leader. Rather, it was a piece of legislation taken very seriously by those that enjoyed an institutionalized monopoly of force within the State of Missouri.

The notion that a United States governor would order the extermination of an entire group of people legally residing in his state may sound unbelievable to some. Of course this occurred on a much more massive scale against various and diverse Native American communities that were considered as obstructing the creed of private property and expansion which is sacred to capitalistic dogma. But the assault on the LDS Church differed from government sanctioned assaults on other minorities for two salient reasons. First, Latter-day Saints generally did not shun the concept of private property (though they did experiment with the construction of small collectives in Zion). Secondly, and arguably more notable, the majority of Latter-day Saints were White, a designation which typically exempted a person from wholesale oppression, disenfranchisement and institutionalized extermination within American society. One may ask how and why could such an atrocity occur in the ‘Land of the Free’? A question of greater importance for the purpose of this thesis would be how did such experiences shape the collective mental map of Latter-day Saint identity and to what extent does this identity linger within the collective consciousness of members of the LDS Church? Even today, over 150 years after the most egregious oppression of Latter-day Saints, members of the Church are generally aware of this identity of oppression. Latter-day Saints living in the Nineteenth Century were acutely cognizant of attacks against the Church. Their identity of oppression was much more tangible, and thus, more relevant than Latter-day Saints in subsequent decades. Indeed, most members of the LDS Church during the Nineteenth Century had either directly experienced hardships due to violence and disenfranchisement or had family members, relatives or close
friends who survived such atrocities and violence. The Latter-day Saint missionaries in Samoa in the late-Nineteenth Century should be viewed through this lens of a collective identity of persecution. Unfortunately, the expulsion of the Latter-day Saints at gunpoint from Missouri wasn’t the only incident of violence experienced by members of the LDS Church.

The persecution against the LDS Church continued in Illinois. Following the forced relocation of the LDS Church in Illinois, Joseph Smith spearheaded the development of Nauvoo, a Latter-day Saint settlement of refugees on the banks of the Mississippi River. This fledgling settlement quickly grew to be larger than any other city in Illinois, including Chicago, which had a smaller population than Nauvoo at the time. The fact that the Church Leadership organized the Nauvoo Legion, an armed militia, indicates the violence that members of the LDS Church faced and the extent to which the Latter-day Saints felt alienated and persecuted. It has been argued by Mason that Nauvoo was the birthplace for a new strain of politics of a more radical nature. This new relationship between the LDS Church and the political sphere directly impacted the response of Latter-day Saint missionaries in Samoa to imperialism and colonialism.

One would think that the murder of a presidential candidate of the United States at the hands of a rabid mob would leave a marked imprint on the historical discourse and consciousness of American society. This was not the case with LDS Prophet Joseph Smith. Prophet Smith had decided to run for President of the United States while in Illinois in 1844. The Nauvoo Legion was disarmed despite the fact that other militias were allowed to retain their arms and citizens from neighboring settlements such as Warsaw and Carthage were “passing resolutions to ‘utterly exterminate’ the Mormon leader.” Joseph Smith and his brother were arrested for inciting a riot and for “treason” for organizing the Nauvoo Legion. The trial was apparently improperly conducted. After all, the Justice of Peace Robert F. Smith that presided
over the trial was also a captain in Carthage Greys militia, the Nauvoo Legion’s rival. It has been argued that several officials, including Governor Ford, may have colluded in the murder of Joseph Smith.\footnote{43}

Members of the Warsaw Militia marched toward Carthage where Joseph Smith was still imprisoned. In “Martyrdom at Carthage,” Reed Blake alleges that the militia members received a note from the Carthage Greys guarding Carthage Jail stating that the “time was at hand to kill the Smiths” and that the prison guards would offer minimal resistance\footnote{44}. The Warsaw Militia arrived in Carthage, blackened their faces with mud and gunpowder to conceal their identity and marched to the jail holding the Smith brothers. The Smith brothers, trapped in their cell, were murdered by the Warsaw militiamen and other civilians.

The murder of Prophet Joseph Smith is the most salient manifestation of the persecution of Latter-day Saints in the Nineteenth Century. Richard E. Bennett lucidly stated that the “musket balls that pierced the Prophet Joseph Smith at Carthage on 27 June 1844 were also aimed at the heart of the Church”\footnote{45}. This statement made by a contemporary scholar indicates the extent to which the martyrdom of Joseph Smith permeates contemporary Latter-day Saint identity and discourse. The story of Prophet Joseph Smith’s presidential run and his murder profoundly shaped Latter-day Saint identity, forcefully fusing the notion of persecution with their collective identity. The fact that the Church’s Prophet entered the Presidential race indicates the extent to which Latter-day Saints embraced political notions of democracy. Indeed, it could be argued that the LDS Church embraced the political sphere out of a feeling of necessity in the face of state sanctioned extermination and disenfranchisement. This collective identity of persecution coupled with the LDS Church’s experience with the political arena during the
Nineteenth Century directly influenced the public discourse of the LDS Samoan Mission during the 1890s.

Even the murder of Prophet Joseph Smith did not soothe the fears and eliminate the anger of fellow Illinoisans. The violence and mob actions continued through the following years. Brigham Young was chosen as the next Prophet and President of the LDS Church. Over the next few years, Brigham Young and a large portion of the LDS Church began migrating west to escape persecutions. When they arrived in the Great Basin Region of Utah, they had found Zion. This region had not yet been incorporated officially as a state into the Union. This point is worth emphasizing. The fact that they concluded that the only remedy for their problems was to march, on foot, clear across a continent beyond the borders of the United States and into ‘the Wilderness’ reveals the extent to which Latter-day Saints perceived persecution, a perception which became inherent with their identity of disenfranchisement and societal alienation.

Even in Zion, the LDS Church was not safe from harassment. This time the threat came from the United States Federal Government. Rumors circulated in Washington that there was a “Mormon Rebellion” occurring in Utah Territory. It must be remembered that at this time Utah was not officially a state. The decision to send troops to the Utah Territory could be seen as a forceful expansion of American borders into a region in which the LDS Church sought refuge from persecution. When Brigham Young and the Church leaders caught wind in 1857 that a large army was headed toward Zion to suppress an alleged rebellion, they were quick to organize for resistance.

Undoubtedly, the Latter-day Saint legacy of disenfranchisement, oppression, mob violence, massacres and government sanctioned extermination remained firmly implanted into
the collective psyche and identity of the members of the LDS Church. Brigham Young and the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles were determined that this would not occur on the soil of Zion\textsuperscript{47}. Latter-day Saints who had spread throughout the Great Basin region and even further to extend Zion were called to rally and defend the Salt Lake region. By September of 1857, Brigham Young declared martial law and officially forbade the entry of armed forces in Zion. The Nauvoo Legion was put on alert and directed to prepare for defense against invasion. Missionaries serving in far-off places, including Hawai’i, were recalled to defend Zion. Brigham Young directed the Bishops in the various villages to burn everything of value if hostilities broke out. Attempting to cover all potential outcomes of the impending invasion, Brigham Young sent out a special group known as the White Mountain Expedition to scout out possible regions for relocation in case the Latter-day Saints were forcefully uprooted once again\textsuperscript{48}. Church leaders declared in a broadside proclamation to the Latter-day Saints that:

\begin{quote}
The issue which has thus been forced upon us, compels us to resort to the great first law of self-preservation, and stand in our own defense and right, guarantied unto us by the genius of the institutions of our country, and on which the government is based. Our duties to ourselves and families requires us not to tamely submit to be driven and slain, without an attempt to preserve ourselves. Our duty to our country, our holy religion, our God, to freedom and liberty, requires that we shall not quietly stand still\textsuperscript{49}.
\end{quote}

This proclamation reveals manifold elements of Latter-day Saint thought during the Nineteenth Century. First, and most saliently, the Latter-day Saint willingness to defend themselves with force against the authority of the United States indicates feelings of alienation from American society, distrust of authority and even an element of radicalized political rhetoric. Secondly, there is an ideological respect, even a reverence, held for the institutions of a democratic society. In other words, the ideas which led to the creation of the United States—freedom, liberty and democracy—were endangered by the very government representing American society. Thirdly,
there is a clear juxtaposition of the LDS Church and freedom, God and the State, the metaphysical and the material world.

Fortunately, the Utah War quickly ended when Captain Stewart Van Vliet and other United States officials realized that the “Mormon Rebellion” was a myth and convinced politicians in Washington, including President James Buchanan, that further military engagements would be unwise and destabilizing. A peace commission was sent to Salt Lake City which granted pardons to the Latter-day Saints if they submitted to United States authority. Part of this meant the installation of Alfred Cummings as the Governor of Utah. The Church leadership agreed and violence was averted. However, this peace agreement stipulated that U.S. troops were guaranteed safe entry into the territory. This occurred and Zion was occupied. This created some tension between Latter-day Saints and the troops, who were typically held anti-Mormon inclinations.

The story of the Utah War and the concomitant legacy of persecution directly led to Elders Peilo and Manoa being sent to Samoa as the very first Latter-day Saint missionaries in that island group. The recently converted Walter Murray Gibson was sent on a mission to Japan and Malaysia in 1861. Prophet Brigham Young instructed Gibson to check on the status of the Hawaiian Latter-day Saints before continuing on to Japan and Malaysia. The Hawaiian Latter-day Saints had been left without the guidance of the LDS Church or Latter-day Saint missionaries ever since Prophet Brigham Young had recalled all missionaries serving abroad in 1857 amid growing fears that the United States Army had been sent to annihilate the LDS Church.
The introduction of Latter-day Saint (LDS) missionaries into Samoa is one of the more interesting stories within Samoa’s interaction with Christianity and the LDS permeation of Oceania. Gibson defied Prophet Brigham Young’s instructions and stayed in Hawai‘i. He defrauded the Hawaiian Latter-day Saints, convincing them that the LDS Church had been swept from the surface of the Earth. It is not all that astonishing that the Hawaiian Latter-day Saints believed him. After all, they remembered the American Latter-day Saints being called to defend Zion against the invading United States Army. It was during Gibson’s stay in Hawai‘i that Elders Pelio and Manoa introduced LDS doctrine to the Samoan Islands.

Gibson is often described as an “adventurer” within LDS history who infiltrated the Church and defrauded the Hawaiian Latter-day Saints. I would take it a step further by describing him as a manic schemer of the boldest type, a high class conman that, due to his nature, was doomed to fail. He definitely led an exceedingly interesting life, travelling the globe and associating with the elites of all the places he visited. An article from the Improvement Era titled “Walter Murray Gibson: A Sketch of His Life and Adventures in Two Chapters”, written in 1900 by Andrew Jenson, Assistant Historian of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, gives great insight into the life of this fascinating conman. Other than the magazine article cited above, LDS scholarly literature typically focuses only on the aspects of Gibson’s life which intersect with the LDS Church. This is a great disservice to the reader, who subsequently fails to grasp the extent of Gibson’s lifetime of misadventures and schemes. Unbeknownst at the time, the LDS Church had a real problem on their hands with Gibson, who had at one point, nearly brought the United States to declare war on Holland because of his mischievous global wanderings. His story also illustrates the extent to which the LDS Church Headquarters in Salt Lake City lacked control over its far-flung missions abroad during the Nineteenth Century.
Walter Murray Gibson was born on January 16, 1822 on board a Spanish vessel in the Bay of Biscay. His birth at sea seems a fitting precursor to his later wanderlust and endless travels as well as his infamous experience in Polynesia. An article titled “A Modern Knight-errant in Town” from San Francisco’s *Evening Bulletin* outlines his early career:

Walter M. Gibson is almost as noticeable a specimen of the genuine roving Yankee as ever turned up; yet he was not born in America at all…He was born in the Bay of Biscay, was raised in the rebellious state of South Carolina…married at seventeen, and was a widower with three children at twenty-one, at which same ripe age he was master of the first iron steamship ever built in the United States…For a while, he was consul-general for Guatemala, San Salvador and Costa Rica, and in 1849 and 1850, we hear of him sojourning at Mango de Clava, Santa Anna’s residence; and while a Russian envoy and convoy of soldiers, visiting every state in Mexico, and rummaging in the subterranean ruins of Xochychalco…Next we hear of him as the guest of General Robles at Vera Cruz, and then master of the late U.S. revenue cutter *Flirt*, in the harbor of New York; with an armament on board for the service of General Carrera of Guatemala.

Apparently Gibson purchased the Revenue Cutter the *Flirt* and attempted to illegally sell it to General Carrera of Guatemala, but was prevented from doing so due to “the vigilance of the United States authorities”. After he failed to sell the vessel, he felt it prudent to load the hull with ice and sail south. By the time he reached Pernambuco, Brazil, the cargo of ice was reduced to one or two tons by the equatorial heat. He successfully sold the remaining ice.

Before his insidious deeds in Polynesia, Gibson’s first experience with the Pacific began when he sailed toward the East Indies, survived a storm and arrived at the Dutch Fort Mintow on the island of Banca, Malay Archipelago in January of 1852. Several days later he landed in Palembang in Sumatra where it was reported that Gibson stated that he was bound for Singapore “to make inquiry after the estate of a collateral relative who had died there some eighteen years before, which had descended to him”. However, before departing, Gibson felt it impossible to resist the urge to meddle in the local politics of the territory of Djambi, which adjoins Palembang.
and fell under Dutch jurisdiction. The mate of the *Flirt* was arrested by Dutch authorities while attempting to deliver a letter written by Gibson and addressed to the Sultan of Djambi. Gibson was also arrested. The following is a translation of the letter:

**A Trusty Word**

This letter, accompanied by many salutations and ceremonies from me, Lord Captain Walter, residing in America, to whom the Lord of all hosts grant that he may appear in the presence of the Lord Sultan, who reigns over the Empire of Djambi…I am now able to assist you, Sultan, with everything you desire, as the American government has no want of powder, bullets, guns, muskets and lelahs, [long, metal, native guns with small orifices]. I can assist to make it good to all Malays because I do not like all the Dutchmen of which you, Sultan, can give assurance to all Malays, and you will be able to make one with me…I can assist to make everything fine, and I wish that the Malays may be ruled as in former times. In one month, I can be at the mouth of the Djambi River. With this, my first officer, you can agree, Sultan, what is best, as the American government has no want of steamers and warships…and you Sultan, need not trouble yourself on this head. The whole of the upper countries of Djambi and that of Palembang, I will bring in good order, and, if possible, get rid of all the Dutchmen excepting some…

“Walter Bin Gibson…”

“At Palembang, 4th February, 1852”

Jenson’s account of Gibson’s life fails to indicate whether or not the American government had previous knowledge of Gibson’s intentions in Djamba or whether he was acting as a renegade. The Dutch Administration charged him with “stirring up treason in their dominions”58. He survived three separate trials, but was found guilty by the fourth and faced sentencing with penalties ranging from standing half an hour under the gallows to twelve years of prison. He managed to escape to the United States without bothering to learn of his sentence, but not before enduring imprisonment for sixteen months in the military prison in Wiltevreden during his numerous trials. Upon his arrival in Washington, he pushed the United States Government to demand indemnity from Holland. Interestingly, Secretary of State W.L. Marcy took up the
matter with vigor despite the recklessly dangerous actions that Gibson displayed in Djambi. August Belmont, the American Minister at The Hague, demanded an indemnity of $100,000 which the Dutch flatly refused. This pushed Gibson to make an astonishing demand through a letter dated November 11, 1854, demanding “that the government of the United States resort to the only means remaining for enforcing just demands”, an implicit demand for a declaration of war. Instead, Marcy instructed Belmont to press the matter “temperately but resolutely upon the Dutch government” to which Holland informed Belmont that Gibson would be arrested if he attempted to enter The Hague. Belmont replied that if that occurred, “the most deplorable consequences might follow”. Fortunately, before Gibson could push the United States further toward the brink of a declaration of war, the U.S. Congressional Committee on Foreign Affairs released a report which exposed Gibson’s recklessness in another of his adventures in India. Gibson admitted guilt and meekly withdrew his demands for indemnity. If only the LDS Church leadership had been aware of Gibson’s tumultuous geopolitical experience, they would have undoubtedly thought twice before sending him to Polynesia.

It seems that over time, Washington forgot Gibson’s mischievous past and President Pierce sent him as a diplomatic agent to Europe. During this time while on a visit to Washington, Gibson proposed to Dr. J. M. Bernhisel, Utah’s delegate to Congress, “a plan for removing the ‘Mormons’ from Utah to some great unoccupied island of Oceania”. It is baffling to dwell on how Gibson conjured this unsettling plan.

Gibson seemed to be drawn to the Pacific. He designated the Malay Islands as the destination of his next journey. Travelling west with his daughter and two sons, he stopped in Utah to discuss Oceania with the Church’s Historian Office. In Salt Lake City, he captivated
Latter-day Saints with his lectures detailing the lands that he had visited. He was baptized in the Church on January 15, 1860.

He arrived in Hawai’i on July 1861 and led the Hawaiian Latter-day Saints to believe that the Church Leadership had succumbed to Colonel Johnston’s Army and there no longer existed a Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints except to the extent that it had survived in Hawai’i⁶¹. Upon his arrival in Oahu, he crafted a letter directed toward the Hawaiian Latter-day Saints which read as follows:

I, Walter Murray Gibson, your elder brother and leader, the one appointed to be chief priest…to you on the islands of the great ocean by the hands of the prophet of God in Zion…My heart is with the red-skinned children of Abraham. I am a child of the ocean and of God…Like Moses shall I lead you; like Joshua shall I fight for you; and like Jesus, if God wills it, I will die for you⁶².

The document was signed “Walter Murray Gibson, Chief President of the Islands of the Sea, and of the Hawaiian Islands, for the Church of Latter-day Saints”. This declaration blatantly exceeded the bounds and the authority bestowed upon him by Prophet Brigham Young.

Gibson convinced many faithful Hawaiian Saints to donate their land and possessions for the use of the LDS Church, but it all legally became Gibson’s possessions. When the Church sent elders to check on Gibson, they were appalled at what they found. When the elders arrived, there was no place to conduct church services because the Hawaiian Saints had relinquished ownership of their meetinghouses. Gibson had a chamber cut into a large rock in which he placed the Book of Mormon and convinced the Saints that the grounds near the rock were so sacred that they would be struck dead if they set foot in the area. He managed to surround himself in an aura of sacredness to such an extent that the Hawaiian Saints would enter his house on their hands and knees, as was the custom upon entering a high chief’s residence in times past.
When the Church headquarters in Salt Lake City learned of his apostasy, he was excommunicated. Gibson later died penniless and friendless in San Francisco. A story such as this could have only occurred in the Nineteenth Century. By the Twentieth Century, the LDS Church was well established, more integrated through the latest technological advancements and institutionally capable of dealing with a character like Gibson. Gibson’s deceptive endeavors in Hawai’i and the subsequent introduction of the LDS Church in Samoa were contingent on two factors. First, his defrauding of the Hawaiian Latter-day Saints was only possible during the early era of the LDS Church’s history, an era where the Church’s leadership in Salt Lake City lacked the technological and bureaucratic capacity to extensively supervise the overseas LDS Missions. Second, and more important to this thesis, the very origin of the LDS Samoan Mission was a direct consequence of the Latter-day Saint collective identity of persecution, an identity which was manifest when Prophet Brigham Young recalled the Latter-day Saint missionaries serving abroad to defend Zion against the invading United States Army. This recall of the Latter-day Saint missionaries serving in Hawai’i allowed a character like Gibson to convince the Hawaiian Latter-day Saints that the LDS Church in Zion had been exterminated and that the future of LDS principles lay in the proselytizing efforts of Hawaiian Saints like Elder Pelio and Elder Manoa. Both the collective identity of persecution and the lack of control that the LDS Church headquarters wielded over its overseas missions, along with the reality of imperialistic, political manipulations within in Samoa, directly led to the unguarded Latter-day Saint missionaries’ denunciations of Western imperialism in Samoa. The Hawaiian Elders were the first to bring LDS doctrine to the Samoan Islands, but Christianity had taken firm root in the islands decades earlier.
Christianity had become a crucial element of faʻasamoa decades before the arrival of Elders Pelio and Manoa. Dutchman Jacob Roggeveen visited the Samoan Islands in 1722 and in 1768, Frenchman Louis-Antoine de Bougainville visited and dubbed them the “Navigator Islands”. Samoans were introduced to Christianity through fleeting encounters with Western whaling crews who passed through from time to time. Also, Christianity came to Samoa from Tongans, who had missionaries before the Samoans.

The influx of Christian missionaries in the Nineteenth Century set in motion a profound readjustment of cultural reality within Samoa. John Williams of the London Missionary Society (LMS) sailed from the Tongan Islands aboard the missionary vessel *Messenger of Peace* to the Samoan Islands, landing on the eastern side of Savai’i in 1830. He was guided to the Samoan shores by Fauea, who had resided in Tonga with his family for 11 years. Williams is generally depicted as the Christianizing pioneer of Christianity in Oceania.

Williams arrived in the Samoan group during a very interesting time. Malietoa Vainu’upo was on the verge of defeating his opponents on the battlefield and attaining the title Tafa’iifa, one of the most revered titles in Samoan culture. The general narrative depicts an immediately warm friendship between Malietoa and Williams. Many academics cite the Samoan legend of the goddess Nafanua as the prominent reason for Malietoa’s swift conversion to Christianity. Nafanua defeated all of her enemies and gave malo (the authority of conquerors) to the district of A’ana. When Malietoa asked for his share of the malo, Nafanua informed him that he would have to wait and that his malo would eventually come from Heaven. William’s arrival on a large vessel named the *Messenger of Peace*, looking for him specifically, must have made a profound impression upon Malietoa in regards to the myth of Nafanua. Malietoa’s
conversion to Christianity is typically seen as the catalyst for the subsequent widespread conversions throughout Samoa.

Historian of Oceania, Andrew Robson, amends the general narrative of the introduction of Christianity into Samoan society by questioning the importance of the relationship between Malietoa and Williams. He delineates four main reasons for the Samoan embrace of Christianity; prior encounters with Europeans, prior knowledge of Christianity, the legend of Nafanua and the utility of European commodities as perceived by Samoans. The point of the prior knowledge of Christianity is particularly interesting, indicating the interconnectedness between Samoa and Tonga (where an LMS Mission was already established) as well as the extent to which European whalers interacted with the Samoan population. Fa’afouina Iofi suggests that Samoa’s virtually universal embrace of Christianity is predicated on the similarities between fa’amoa and Christianity. Iofi points out that both Christianity and fa’amoa “recognize the interrelatedness of the individual and the community”. The compatibility between Christianity and fa’amoa has led observers to comment on the resulting syncretism which is manifest in unique and interesting ways.

The notion of a top-down, comprehensive societal conversion wholly contingent on Malietoa strips Samoan individuals of agency and is discordant with fa’amoa. Elise Huffer and Asofou So’o point out that decisions made within the aiga (extended family) or within a village are reached through a process of reaching a consensus. At the level of the aiga, individuals choose the matai (head of the family). If the matai fails to represent the interests of the aiga effectively at the village level, his or her title may be stripped through the consensus of the aiga. Decisions may be made in a top-down fashion, but the decision must be acceptable at a grassroots level. The saying ‘O le ala i le pule o le tautua (The path to authority/power is
service) illustrates the responsibility of the matai\textsuperscript{70}. The social agency enjoyed by Samoans is illustrated by William’s observation of ordinary Samoan’s deliberating the advantages and disadvantages of converting to Christianity\textsuperscript{71}. Malietoa’s prominence undoubtedly influenced individual Samoans to convert, but those individuals had the agency to make the commitment on their own. This point must be kept in mind when investigating the extent and limits of imperialism, particularly cultural imperialism. Christianity is clearly a mode of cultural imperialism in the academic sense. However, we must be cognizant that the cultural flow between the islands and the West was bilateral and that Samoans were not simply acted upon by missionaries, but exhibited their inherent agency by either accepting or rejecting Christianity on their own terms.

European commercial interests arrived in the “Navigator Islands” on the heels of Christian missionaries. In 1854, August Unshelm came from Chile to represent the Hamburg based firm, Godeffrey and Sohn. The firm sought to take advantage of Samoa’s equatorial climate by developing plantations for coconuts, cacao and rubber. Unshelm represented the firm’s interests in Samoa until 1864, when he was lost at sea. Theodor Weber took over operations at the age of 20. The firm’s operations expanded dramatically under the direction of Weber, who was able to secure over 75,000 acres of Samoan land for plantation use\textsuperscript{72}. The firm was forced to import laborers from the Solomon Islands because the Samoans showed “a strong and perhaps natural disinclination to work as wage earners for other people”\textsuperscript{73}. Labor shortages within the plantation economy became a reoccurring theme within governmental dispatches and correspondences in the late 19\textsuperscript{th} and early 20\textsuperscript{th} centuries\textsuperscript{74}. However, the plantation owners weren’t the only people in the world with problems.
The decade of 1880 was a difficult time for the LDS Church in Zion. The most serious problem was the polygamy issue, which led to the imprisonment of many of the church’s most prominent leaders. Joseph H. Dean was husband of two wives and father of five children from his first wife, Sally. Dean spent time in prison from 1886 until May 13, 1887 for charges of “illegal cohabitation”. The day of his release, he immediately became a fugitive when he learned that deputies sought his arrest on charges of illegal voting. His close friend William O. Lee harbored him in his home, temporarily giving Dean shelter from his storms. While hiding out, Dean was approached by Apostle Franklin D. Richards in regards to Dean serving a second mission in Hawai’i. The LDS Church Headquarters in Salt Lake City “agreed that the mission call would relieve more problems for the thirty-one-year-old fugitive than it would cause”. Dean and his second wife Florence said goodbye to Sally and the five children and left for Hawai’i shortly afterwards. After finding Elder Manoa’s letter in the files of the Hawaiian Mission, Elder Dean began corresponding with him, making concrete plans to come to Samoa. Through this correspondence, Elder Manoa informed Elder Dean that he was welcome to stay with him and his wife Faasopo in their home in Aunu’u, a small island off of Tutuila. This gracious offer was a great relief to Elder Dean since Florence had given birth to a baby boy in February of 1888.

The experiences of Latter-day Saint missionaries in the early years of the Samoan Mission were nothing short of adventurous and, at times, harrowing. The Deans sailed from Hawai’i to Samoa aboard the mail ship, Alemeda, but the captain refused to enter the harbor of Pago Pago. A few miles west of Tutuila, the young family was lowered over the side of the Alemeda to a small rowboat that had been sent by Elder Manoa. The rowboat brought the Deans to Pago Pago. The boat trip from Pago Pago to the island of Aunu’u was described as
“harrowing”\textsuperscript{79}. This must have been a terribly exciting experience for Elder Manoa who had not seen another Latter-day Saint from Zion in over twenty-five years\textsuperscript{80}.

Elder Dean, First President of the LDS Samoan Mission\textsuperscript{81}.
Joseph and Florence Dean with their two children.
The Deans were completely dependent on the generosity and graciousness of their Samoan and Hawaiian hosts. Elder Dean described their new living conditions as more primitive than what they were accustomed to. Dean wrote that there was “no stove, no cows, no bread…no running water, rainwater being all that they use here”. He added “It seems that we will have to live on straight native fare”\textsuperscript{83}. This comment not only indicates the extent to which Latter-day Saints from America lived among and in close contact with Samoans, but also sheds light on the great sacrifices they were willing to make to spread the LDS Church abroad. It is a daunting notion to leave every comfort that a person has come to know behind and travel to the other side of the globe to live among people who are deemed ‘primitive’ and even ‘savage’ in newspaper and magazine articles.

Laurie F. Maffly-Kipp argues that Pacific Islanders viewed these Latter-day Saint missionaries as unique, a people distinct from the other White Protestants. Maffly-Kipp suggests that the ridicule heaped on Latter-day Saint missionaries by competing Christian missionaries is what drew the attention of Islanders in the first place\textsuperscript{84}. This narrative of oppression coupled with the context of colonialism within Oceania lent a distinctive dimension to the LDS Church’s efforts in the Pacific. Indeed, Maffly-Kipp points out that some Latter-day Saint missionaries actively sought to capitalize on this narrative. She writes:

When Parley P. Pratt described the Mormons in his first Pacific Mission pamphlet as a people ‘disenfranchised, robbed, plundered, dispersed, slandered in every possible way, and driven to the mountains and deserts of the American interior,’ one might have thought this a strange way to attract followers. But the description held potential resonance for almost every indigenous group in the nineteenth-century Pacific, and for some it still does\textsuperscript{85}.

When placed into the context of colonialism, this message of oppression became a powerful tool for conversion.
Maffly-Kipp also points out that in the Nineteenth Century Latter-day Saint missionaries from America were likely to be much poorer than other Protestant missionaries. Thus, Latter-day Saints were forced to live amongst Islanders to a much greater extent than other missionaries. Latter-day Saint missionaries often slept in Samoan *fales* and even slept on Samoan style beds. They were not always comfortable with this arrangement. However, the fact that they endured these culturally uncomfortable experiences is indicative of their extraordinary faith in the Church and the LDS cause. A consequence of this poverty was an acute lack of resources. For example, the Sydney Branch owned two copies of the Book of Mormon, which were read aloud in meetings. Because of this lack of resources, Latter-day Saint missionaries in the Pacific “paraphrased, told stories, testified, prayed and sang—in short, used precisely the kind of communicative techniques familiar to members of an oral culture”\(^6\). In contrast to Protestant missionaries with a more Calvinist approach to Christianity, Latter-day Saints exhibited a more spiritual approach, emphasizing healing, visions and prophesies. The practice of laying hands on the sick in order to heal particularly meshed well with many traditional Islander practices. In the record of the Samoan Mission, there are numerous accounts of extraordinary events experienced by missionaries as well as Samoans, including healings and other events\(^7\).

The Latter-day Saint belief that Polynesians were Lamanites added an extra element to the rich texture of Islander experience with the LDS Church. This notion of a common ancestry, a belief that Latter-day Saints descended from Nephi while Polynesians descended from Laman, Nephi’s brother, created a unique spatial, conceptual map to integrate Islander converts into a sacred narrative. Oftentimes, Latter-day Saint missionaries approached potential converts, held up a copy of the Book of Mormon and declared that it was a history of the Polynesian people\(^8\).
This strategy seems to have been practiced by some missionaries in Samoa at least up until 1914.  

Elder Dean’s first sermon in Samoa occurred on June 24. It wasn’t a smooth process. Elder Dean spoke the sermon in Hawaiian and Elder Manoa translated it, sentence by sentence, to the Samoans. By July 3, Elder Dean had performed fourteen baptisms and on July 29, he gave a sermon in Samoan for the first time. By October, he was observed speaking quite fluently.  

Almost immediately, Elder Dean requested that the presiding leaders of the Church send William O. Lee and his wife to Samoa as missionaries. Recall that Lee harbored Elder Dean in Salt Lake City following Dean’s release from prison. Elder Lee would become one of the most prolific writers of the LDS Samoan Mission, eloquently speaking out against Western imperialism in the Samoan Islands. On October 10, 1888, the Lees arrived in Tutuila, along with Elders Edward J. Wood and Adelbert Beasley. This small band of devout and determined Latter-day Saints immediately began organizing the Church in the Samoan Islands. On October 28, 1888, the first official Latter-day Saint conference was held in Samoa. The official statistical report of the conference reveals that by that time, there were thirty-five baptized members and twelve unbaptized children (Latter-day Saint children aren’t baptized until they reach the age of eight). Among the missionaries, there were five elders, four Americans, one Hawaiian, two missionary sisters and two children. At this conference, Pologa was set apart as the first official Samoan Latter-day Saint missionary (within the LDS Church, new missionaries are ‘set apart’, a term denoting that they take on a new, spiritual identity as representatives of the Church for a designated amount of time). In August of 1889, President Dean purchased land in Fagali’i which is west of Apia on Upolu. On September 10, the missionaries finished the construction of a mission home on this land. It was at this time that the missionaries could turn their focus from
daily survival to mission organization and proselytizing. Quickly, the members of this fledgling mission expanded their proselytizing to Upolu, Manua and Savai’i.

Latter-day Saint missionaries in Samoa faced many problems, especially in the early years of the Mission, but one of the more serious obstacles they would contend with through the decades was stiff animosity from the other missions. It is true that tension existed between all of the missions in Samoa, but the LDS Mission received the greatest magnitude and some of the more egregious attacks. Sometime in 1890, President Dean and Elder Wood went to Palauli on Savai’i, the first time that Latter-day Saint missionaries had set foot on the island. They were there to visit an important matai by the name of Afualo, who had been converted while living in Siupapa on Upolu. Afualo revealed that a minister from another church had offered him a boat at a bargain price if he left the LDS Church. In the end, Afualo remained a faithful Latter-day Saint and the missionaries were able to use Afualo’s social network to establish a branch of the mission on Savai’i. Shortly after Afualo’s confirmation of his faith, Opapo Fonoimoana joined the Church. Opapo would become a very devout and prominent member of the historical record of the Samoan Mission. He was one of the pioneers who helped build Sauniatu years later and his son would later be interviewed by Baldridge.

The collective identity of persecution among Latter-day Saints was valorized by tragedy, violence and extermination throughout the Nineteenth Century. This persecution influenced the LDS Church leadership to enter the political sphere to an extent not seen during the Twentieth Century. The Latter-day Saint missionaries brought this identity of persecution and tradition of political thought with them to the Samoan Islands. As we’ll see in the next chapter of this thesis, the Latter-day Saint missionaries in Samoa during the 1890s became outspoken critics of Western imperialism within the island group. Indicative of the lack of control the LDS Church
Headquarters in Salt Lake City wielded over its public discourse of the time, the public discourse emanating from the LDS Samoan Mission was astonishingly anti-imperialist and even denounced Western culture for the deleterious impacts it had on fa’asamoa.
Chapter 2-The Mamona in the Midst of the Colonial Takeover of Samoa: Late-Nineteenth Century

“Samoa is all the world to them, and unless a more humane policy is adopted they will keep on fighting until like their neighbors, the Hawaiians, and their North America cousins, the Indians, they are wasted away”-WM. O. Lee, Missionary in Samoa in 1899

Latter-day Saint missionary George H. Blood was hoping that he would not run into any trouble while travelling to Apia. The Samoan civil war was heating up and hostile war parties were all over the island. Suddenly, Elder Blood came upon 400 heavily armed Samoan warriors who had been “ordered to kill all the whites they could find”. His heart pounded for what seemed an eternity; a time during which Elder Blood was sure the Samoan men would slice his head clear off. Finally, one of the men noticed an LDS tract in the young man’s pocket. They told him to hold up a white flag while on his journey or they would surely shoot out his brains. This harrowing account of one Latter-day Saint missionary in the midst of violent civil war reveals the danger that missionaries oftentimes face while abroad. Also, it describes the violent environment in Samoa during the late Nineteenth Century, an environment that the Latter-day Saint missionaries blamed Western imperialists for.

Newspaper articles and letters composed by Latter-day Saint missionaries in Samoa indicate the degree to which they were thrust into the midst of a period of the 1890s which was made exceedingly chaotic by the imperialist ambitions of the United States, Germany and Great Britain. Furthermore, this discourse also indicates the extent to which Latter-day Saint missionaries in Samoa prioritized the political realm at this time. The articles clearly show that the Latter-day Saint missionaries in Samoa through the 1890s were completely at ease dealing with contemporary topics of a political nature. These accounts are valuable not only for the insight they lend to better understanding the location of Latter-day Saints in the midst of this
militaristic turmoil, but they are more useful for understanding the complexity, flux, contradictions and ruptures within Samoa at this time than many other accounts that I have come across. This point is particularly relevant. The mere fact that Latter-day Saint missionaries in Samoa delved into the political discourse of the time is indeed anomalous. The fact that they articulated strong opinions which oftentimes condemned Great Britain, Germany and the United States (often referred to as the Three Powers or the Great Powers) is profoundly remarkable to say the least.
Speaking of the turbulent and oftentimes violent social dynamics in Samoa during the late Nineteenth Century, Latter-day Saint missionary W. O. Lee explicitly condemned the Three Powers. This is the same Lee who had harbored Elder Dean in Salt Lake City. His verbal attacks on the imperialistic militarism of the Three Powers were anomalous relative to the general discourse and ethnocentric justifications espoused by many other Westerners at the time. Western commercial and Christian missionary activity in the tiny island region of Samoa
eventually drew the attention of three global powers, Germany, Great Britain and the United States. Great Britain’s interest in Samoa stemmed from the presence of the LMS Mission in Samoa. Germany’s interest was rooted in the extensive German plantations throughout Samoa, mostly concentrated on the island of Upolu. The United States only became interested in the islands with the introduction of steamships in the 1870s. The harbor of Pago Pago in Tutuila suddenly became geographically important as a coaling station. The involvement of three separate imperial nation-states in Samoa, a society of exceeding complexity with cultural norms that often eluded Western comprehension, led to complicated and tumultuous turmoil and proxy violence within the island group.

In response to the Three Powers manipulations of fa’asamoa, Elder Lee wrote in a public magazine article, “That the natives alone are responsible for the recent factional wars and present disturbed conditions on the Samoan group we are not willing to concede. In our opinion national jealousies and mercenary motives among the foreign population have had something to do with nearly all, if not all, of the uprisings of late years.” A few comments should be made in regards to this passage. Elder Lee explicitly blames the violence and strife in Samoa on the Three Powers. Also, one should note Elder Lee's usage of the terms ‘we’ and ‘our’, which reveals that his opinion was not an anomaly among the Latter-day Saint missionaries in Samoa at the time, but rather the consensus. Elder Lee informs his audience that while “it is true that the Samoans are cursed with idleness, and have nothing to do for the greater part of the time but eat the tropical fruit that grows almost spontaneously, drink kava…yet, left to themselves, the natives had a comparatively good form of government”. Elder Lee’s objection over the Samoan norm of relying almost exclusively on the natural world to sustain them nutritionally became a reoccurring objection throughout the later Latter-day Saint discourse and is founded
within the capitalistic Protestant Ethic. Also, he concedes that the *fa'asamoa* form of government was, in his opinion, relatively good. The fact that he uses the term government at all is significant and stands out of the general discourse of the time which tended to depict the cultures of Oceania as obsolete and primitive. Elder Lee states that the virtues of Samoan society are “surprising to the foreigner, who has been falsely taught to look upon these brown-skinned Polynesians as but little above cannibals”\(^\text{102}\). He states that if “you want to know how it feels to be treated like a king, go to Samoa and partake of the natives’ hospitality in some remote part of the islands where the white man’s selfishness has not contaminated them”\(^\text{103}\). This is Elder Lee’s boldest and most provocative statement, an explicit rejection of the concept of the ‘White Man’s Burden’ to civilize the ‘natives’. However, it contradicts his objection to the Samoan concept of material value, namely because the “white man’s selfishness” was predicated on industrial production as a source of material value which Elder Lee apparently wished that the Samoans would embrace. It seems that Elder Lee rejected the Anglocentric habit of viewing Samoans, as well as colonial subjects globally, as ‘natives’.

The interactions and the resulting relationships which developed between Samoans and representatives of Western culture were shaped, in part, by the construction of the ‘Native’ as a social reality. Stewart Firth, of the Australian National University, argues that the Native, within the Western conceptualized ethnic map, “lacked European virtues such as application and foresight. His mind—the Native Mind—worked in mysterious ways”\(^\text{104}\). The category of the Native embraced all non-Europeans. A common thread running through the government reports and personal accounts of Western colonial administrators was that the mysterious Native Mind was incapable of grappling with the rigors of nation-state politics. Thus, they were to be ruled for their own good; to protect the Native from himself. New Zealand’s later experience in Samoa
added an extra element to the narrative of colonialism and the Native. New Zealand’s Samoan Administrators voiced a desire to protect Samoan’s most popular anti-colonial movement, the Mau during the 1920s, from rapacious Europeans. According to administrators, the Mau was the result of Europeans instigating Samoan dissent. In other words, the simple Native was manipulated by the intellectually advanced European to act against his own well being, thus stripping the Mau of legitimacy. Firth points out that Pacific Islanders viewed social reality through an ethnocentric lens as well. He states that “Colonialism is perhaps better seen as an interaction of many competing ethnocentrism, with European racial prejudice forming an overlay”¹⁰⁵. Samoans exhibited pride in fa’asamoa, revealing their ethnocentric conviction of superiority over Western culture¹⁰⁶. This belief in the superiority of fa’asamoa was most popularly manifest in the Mau movement of the 1920s. Important to this thesis was the Mau’s embrace of Christianity, a collective act which allowed the rebel Samoans to emphasize the belief that the Mau adhered to Christian principles to a greater extent than the Westerners who had introduced those principles to the people of Oceania. In other words, through Christian principles, fa’asamoa was superior to the hypocrisy laden Western culture. Westerners on the other hand justified commercial and military imperialism through the concept of ‘the White man’s burden’. Remarkably, the Latter-day Saint missionaries in Samoa during the late-Nineteenth Century turned this concept on its head. They concluded that Western culture inherently destroyed the morality of fa’asamoa.

In the second half of the Nineteenth Century, Samoa experienced an unprecedented juxtaposition of cultures representing a myriad of belief systems, value systems, commercial interests and imperial ambitions. Missionaries sought to harvest Samoan souls while German entrepreneurs sought to harvest copra as nation-states sought to expand their sphere of influence
into the Pacific region. The United States, a relative newcomer to the stage of empire and expansion, played the role of mediator between Great Britain and Germany. The Three Powers were well aware that the fluidity of Samoan politics was inherently incompatible with the tenets of commercial exploitation, which calls for political and social stability. Europeans and the three powers could not resist involvement with Samoa’s internal, political evolution. Paradoxically, this external manipulation oftentimes increased the internal turmoil of Samoa.

Eugen Brandeis, an employee of Godeffroy and Sohn, encouraged Tupua Tamasese Titimaea to declare a rebel government in Leulumoegam, A’ana in 1885. The coup was successfully crushed, but not before Germany intervened and captured Tupua Tamasese’s opponent, Malietoa Laupepa and exiled him to the Cameroons off the coast of Africa in 1888. Mata’afa Iosefo took Malietoa’s place, leading to a civil war which included the naval involvement of Germany, Great Britain and the United States. There were rumors that the United States secretly aided Mata’afa. In fact, the Latter-day Saint missionaries generally supported Mata’afa. The warships of the Three Powers restrained from open hostilities with the other Western warships, but regularly bombarded the villages of rival Samoan factions. With the tension building between the warships in Apia Harbor, it seemed as if direct open conflict between the powers would erupt at any moment. In 1889, a catastrophic meteorological event thrust itself into this jumbled mass of imperial ambition, commercial intrigue and cultural interaction.

The Three Powers displayed their military might through the presence of warships in the Apia harbor. Germany was represented by the Adler, the Eber and the Olga while the Calliope, under the command of Captain Henry Coey Kane, represented Great Britain. The United States flexed her muscles through the Vandalia, the Trenton and the Nipsic. On March 15th, 1889, the
barometers plunged and heavy rains began to fall. By nightfall, ferocious winds set in, presumably of hurricane force. In the darkness, the *Eber* struck a reef and sunk. All seventy-four hands on board the vessel were lost to the fierce seas. The *Adler* struck the same reef and quickly sank beneath the surface, taking twenty lives to the harbor floor. In all, six warships were lost and 146 men drowned. The only ship to survive the storm was the *Calliope*, which sailed out to open sea on the morning of March 16\(^{th}\)\textsuperscript{113}. Interestingly, three Latter-day Saint missionaries watched from the shore as the ships were destroyed and the sailors perished\textsuperscript{114}. With the defeat of their navies in Samoa at the hands of the sea, the Three Powers took it upon themselves to establish a system of tripartite supervision of Samoa in order to eliminate civil war.
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*The Western Navy is destroyed by a storm in 1889*\textsuperscript{115}
The Western Navy is defeated by a storm in 1889.116

The Treaty of Berlin of 1889 designated Samoa as a neutral state. The treaty granted the ‘natives’ the right “to elect their chief or king according to their own laws and customs”117. Immediately, the Three Powers breached this right by naming Malietoa Laupepa as king118. They conceded to Samoan demands by naming Mata‘afa as ‘vice-king’. It could be argued that the position of head chief or ‘king’ was invented by representatives of Western imperial interests. Others have suggested that the position was invented by Christian missionaries119. If this was the case, Latter-day Saints had no part in it since they officially arrived in 1888, after the invention of the position. Of course, before the introduction of Western interests in the Samoan political landscape, the title of Tafa‘ifa existed in Samoa. The fact that this title was rarely attained indicates the great difficulty of centralizing power in such an egalitarian society. By inventing
the position of ‘king’, the Three Powers sought to do just that; centralize power within Samoan society in order to rule it more easily. Tellingly, later an official from the United States called the position of king “an empty honor”\textsuperscript{120}. The position was always viewed by the Three Powers as a way of controlling Samoa through a puppet government.

Latter-day Saint missionary Lee gives an in depth analysis of the impact that the Berlin Treaty had in Samoa in an article for the \textit{Improvement Era}\textsuperscript{121}. It is important to point out that the following account is based solely on his article and indicates the extent to which Latter-day Saint missionaries in Samoa at this time entered the political sphere through their public discourse. The Treaty stipulated that Samoans pay a one dollar per capita tax and that a foreign chief justice would decide disputed land titles. Also, the municipality of Apia was to have its own town council elected from among the foreign residents who would also act as the king’s advisor. The first chief justice chosen was German Dr. Wilhelm Solf\textsuperscript{122}, which immediately led to contention among Western residents\textsuperscript{123}. The most notable opponent of the Germans was novelist Robert Louis Stevenson who wrote numerous articles to newspapers in London detailing German misrule\textsuperscript{124}. The majority of Samoans also responded to this new political apparatus with dissent by refusing to pay the per capita tax. Malietoa was incapable of enforcing the tax law, resulting in a direct threat to the legitimacy of his authority\textsuperscript{125}. The Treaty of Berlin essentially failed to mitigate Samoan political conflict, which erupted into internal civil war yet again only a few years later. The fact that the above account of the Treaty in action is based exclusively on a public magazine article written by a Latter-day Saint missionary reveals a comfort with dealing with political topics on the part of the author.

On July 7\textsuperscript{th}, 1893, open battle broke out between the forces of Malietoa and Mata‘afa. Thirty of Mata‘afa’s forces were killed and twenty were wounded. He retreated to the island of
“Manovo” (Sic, presumably Manono). Mata'afa ignored Malietoa’s demand for unconditional surrender issued on July 13th. In a classic example of Warship Diplomacy, the Three Powers intervened and issued a demand for unconditional surrender to Mata'afa and his forces. Word was sent that failure to surrender by 1:00 p.m. would result in the warships shelling his forces. Apparently at this time, the United States lacked a naval presence within the island group.

Mata'afa surrendered and the Consuls of the Three Powers issued the following statement:

To All Samoans: We Consuls of the treaty powers, hereby give notice to all Samoans that Mataafa (sic) and his chiefs have surrendered. The war is quite finished. Any further disturbances will be suppressed by the men-of-war. All Samoans must return at once to their own districts.

Mata’afa and ten others were exiled. The declaration and the action taken by the Three Powers reveal two mechanisms utilized by later colonial regimes to combat discontent and insurrection. First, the order for Samoans to return to their districts seems to be a precursor of later regimes prohibiting residents to freely travel around the islands. Secondly, exiling became just as useful as the prohibition on travelling in order to combat unrest. There is evidence, cited in later chapters, that Latter-day Saint missionaries used the latter tactic in an attempt to quell the open defiance of their authority by some Samoan Latter-day Saints.

Malietoa’s death in August of 1898 bucked the stability that the Three Powers sought with persistent futility. Mata'afa returned from exile in September of 1898 much to the dismay of the United States Consul General at Apia. There seemed to be much confusion among the Consuls of the Three Powers in regards to how to respond to the new political development. After all, they relied on a rather cumbersome and slow communications network in the midst of a rapidly evolving political reality. Great Britain wished that Malietoa’s “successor should be elected strictly in accordance with the provisions of Article I of the general act of Berlin of June
24, 1889, and that the return of Mataafa (sic) and his exiled companions should be deferred until after the election”\textsuperscript{130}. As stated above, the Treaty of Berlin gave Samoans the right to elect their own matai. London’s representatives failed to explain how the Three Powers could uphold the stipulation for Samoan freedom to elect their leaders while simultaneously barring the entry of one of Samoa’s most popular matai. These two notions are inherently incompatible but this example sheds light on the imperial mindset of the representatives of the Three Powers. The Samoan culture should be protected through the dictates and manipulations of Western nations. John Hay, Secretary of State under the William McKinley Presidency voiced his concern over the hypocritical stance which London’s representatives exhibited. Apparently Hay overlooked the U.S. Consul General’s concern over returning Mata‘afa to Apia.

Although the Berlin Treaty of 1889 guaranteed Samoan rights to elect their own leaders, Article III, section 6 of the act allowed the Three Powers to intervene through a chief justice if political conflict erupted in violence\textsuperscript{131}. Through this stipulation, the Three Powers, through the authority of the chief justice, could handpick the chief that they saw fit to be ‘king’. By December of 1898, American Chief Justice, William L. Chambers declared Malietoa Tanumafili the rightful ‘king’\textsuperscript{132}. Malietoa was only eighteen years old and inexperienced in the rigors of leadership. Almost immediately Mata‘afa’s supporters began to organize and intimidate supporters of Malietoa. In response, the Consul for Germany unilaterally issued “an aggressive” condemnation to Mata‘afa and his supporters\textsuperscript{133}. This unilateral action on the part of the German Consular created a bit of tension amongst the Three Powers.

The following depiction of the developing military and political situation up until the notes concerning the formation of the Western Power’s tripartite Samoan Commission is based exclusively on Latter-day Saint firsthand accounts. These accounts contradict each other at times,
but generally construct a fairly comprehensive picture of events as they unfolded. They give the reader a view of these events from the perspective of first person observers standing on Samoan soil amidst the chaos. They also illustrate the uniqueness of the Latter-day Saint missionary interpretation of these events in Samoa. This dependence on Latter-day Saint sources is intended to illustrate the degree to which the Latter-day Saint missionaries delved into the political discourse of Samoa.

The unilateral condemnation issued by the German Consul failed to intimidate Mata’a’a’s armed supporters, which numbered around 5,000, while Malietoa could only muster 2,000 armed supporters. Westerners sought refuge in the London Mission House and the *HMS Porpoise*. The battle commenced within Apia while foreigners hid in their houses. A few houses were struck by bullets. The *HMS Porpoise* failed to support Malietoa’s troops by firing on Mata’a’a’s forces. With this lack of support from the British man-of-war, Malietoa’s forces panicked and swam out to the *HMS Porpoise* for refuge. Mata’a’a’s forces inevitably prevailed with 20 Samoans in total killed.

After the battle, the German President of the Council, a Dr. Raffel, who had been appointed Executive Officer of Apia’s provisional government, declared that the supreme court of Samoa was closed, an act which was supported by the German Consul. The British and American Consuls denounced this unilateral move by the Germans as outrageous. Chief Justice Chambers, who had taken refuge aboard the H.M.S. *Porpoise*, was landed and escorted, along with the British and American Consuls, by armed British soldiers to the court house to confront Dr. Raffel and the German Consul. A war of words ensued while a sledgehammer was used to forcefully open the courthouse doors and Chief Justice Chambers was placed on his seat of
justice. Fortunately no German or American warships were in the harbor at the time. If so, this quarrel of words could have led to open violence.

Mata‘afa’s rule was short lived. In February, 1899, the U.S. man-of-war Philadelphia and the HMS Royalist arrived in Apia Harbor. The consuls and Chief Justice Chambers decided to reinstate Malietoa as king, by force if necessary. Mata‘afa refused to surrender and the warships took positions to began shelling. The Philadelphia fired the first shell. The HMS Porpoise took up a position off of Mulinu’u point and began firing, along with the HMS Royalist, until dusk. Shelling resumed the next day, with the HMS Porpoise cruising up and down the coast firing into Samoan villages. The shelling resulted in thousands of dollars worth of damages. United States and British marines were landed to engage Mata‘afa’s forces. As mentioned, the above narrative was constructed exclusively from the accounts of Latter-day Saint missionaries. These in depth, exceedingly detailed narratives reveal details not found in many other non-LDS sources. In other words, the Latter-day Saint authors not only referenced the political environment of Samoa during these years. They grappled with the details, constructing a narrative richer than many other accounts of these events. The Latter-day Saint missionaries in Samoa during the 1890s were exceedingly comfortable immersing themselves within the political discourse of Samoa.

Latter-day Saint missionaries attempting to carry on their duties in the midst of open battle faced grave dangers. Elder George H. Blood from Kaysville, Utah recounted some of his experiences in a letter home, which was published in the Millennial Star in May of 1899. On April 1, 2,500 of Mata‘afa’s men forced the retreat of 130 marines and 100 of Malietoa’s forces near Fagali‘i. Apparently Latter-day Saint missionaries witnessed this gruesome battle. The dead and wounded marines and Samoans were decapitated and buried. Speaking of the
shelling of Samoan villages by the Western warships that he witnessed while travelling to Apia, Elder Blood writes:

After riding two miles I found a village on fire and saw a man-of-war just outside the reef, and, talk about shelling! They were using eight-inch guns, Browning ‘peacemakers’ and Nordenfedts. Shells and small bullets flew thick and, burning houses on each side…All of the houses between that village and Apia, a distance of ten miles, had been burned that morning

This account from a Latter-day Saint reminds us of the extent of the violence perpetrated against Samoa during the colonial takeover. Continuing on his journey to Apia, Elder Blood encountered Mataʻafa’s forces. His account below emphasizes the dangers that Latter-day Saint missionaries faced during this time:

About eight miles from Apia I was met by 400 Mataafā warriors, painted and well armed. They had been ordered to kill all the whites they could find. Forty or fifty flocked around me, brandishing their knives. They were about to take my head off, when one of them saw a book in my coat pocket…when he saw that it was a tract he said ‘faifeau,’ which means ‘missionary’ and I told them ‘Yes, a Mormon missionary, and found myself breathing easier…A half-caste, who could talk English, told me to put up a white flag or they would shoot my brains out. I obeyed orders and moved on, but was stopped about a dozen times by Mataafā (sic) men, some of whom leveled guns at me, or raised knives to see me dodge

Elder Edward J. Wood, a Latter-day Saint missionary in the midst of this chaotic conflict, wrote an article for the Deseret Evening News detailing the conflict between Mataʻafa and Malietoa which was published in April of 1899. In this article, Elder Wood delineates the two opposing arguments for which of the matai should be king. He writes:

In order to show that I have, or we the Elders in Samoa have no particular preference for each candidate, I will briefly state the main reasons from the native point of view showing why Malietoa and Mataafā (sic) should be king, and also why they should not be king, and then the public may judge as to each candidate's just desires.

The reader should note the usage of the phrase “we Elders in Samoa”, indicating that Elder Wood’s article summarizes the consensual belief of the Samoan Mission and not just his own
conviction. Furthermore, this statement claims the arguments to be predicated upon some sort of scientific objectivity or rational truth. Interestingly, Elder Wood frames the argument in such a way as to force the reader to reach one conclusion; that Mata‘afa should be king. Elder Wood gives one, lonely premise supporting the proposition that Malietoa should be king, the fact that “his family had possession of the throne for several generations, the first Malietoa, Vainupo (sic)…being king when the first missionaries went to Samoa over seventy years ago”\textsuperscript{146}. Three short paragraphs later, Elder Wood discredits this sole premise by pointing out that Mata‘afa’s “family of Kings dates back even farther than Malietoa’s”\textsuperscript{147}. In other words, Elder Wood implicitly undermines any argument in support of Malietoa.

The strongest premise, reiterated by Elder Wood throughout the article, is that the majority of Samoans support Mata‘afa as king. By emphasizing this concept of a majority rule, he reveals a strong sense of democratic conviction and ethics based in the American tradition. Among the premises against the proposition that Mata‘afa should be king is the fact that he was a devout Catholic. Elder Wood voiced concern that Mata‘afa would use his influence against the other denominations or the LDS Samoan Mission. Also, he writes that Mata‘afa “is charged with having incited the natives to rebellion against the government (?) for several years…”\textsuperscript{148}. His placement of the question mark within the sentence seems to question the allegation itself. Or, possibly more provocatively, he is implicitly questioning the legitimacy of this Western imposed government. However, even overlooking the seemingly odd placement of the question mark, this article makes clear that the Latter-day Saint missionaries in Samoa supported Mata‘afa. Elder Wood condemns the Three Powers when he states “Now what good all this can do and why wasn’t it all averted by appointing Mataafa (sic) are questions some one (sic) will possibly have to answer one day”\textsuperscript{149}. While sifting through the accounts of the colonial takeover of Samoa 113
years after Elder Wood made this statement, I was just as baffled over the Three Powers support of the unpopular Malietoa.

Elder Lee comments that the London Times and other leading papers had mentioned a plan to divide Samoa into three sections, England receiving Savai’i, Germany receiving Upolu and the United States receiving Tutuila. He asks, “If this comes to a test which of the three mothers will say: Do not cut the child in three, I will relinquish my claim, let the child live?” He claims that such a division would relegate the Samoans of Savai’i to the same fate as other inhabitants in England’s possessions, such as India; presumably he meant that they wouldn’t fare well. The Samoans of Upolu under German rule “would either be killed off or speedily emigrate to the more humane government of England on Savai’i, or the still more free Republican government of the United States on Upolu”. In regards to the United States seizing Tutuila, he states that “surely the United States is too great too brave and we hope too honest to become a party to any such steal.” While Elder Lee denounced the imperial aggression of England and Germany, he categorizes the United States as the democratic land of the free, indicating the value that he placed on democratic ideals. Elder Lee may have placed too much faith in the benevolence of the United States, for Tutuila is still to this day a possession of America.

The Samoan Commission sent by the Three Powers consisted of Bartlett Tripp, formerly a United States minister to Austria-Hungary, Baron Freiherr Speck Von Sternberg representing Germany and C.N. Elliot of the British Embassy at Washington. The Commission was to sail on the U.S.S. Badger from San Francisco. The ship stopped in Honolulu to take on a supply of coal and arrived in Apia on May 13, 1899. The commissioners found the supporters of Mata‘afa and Malietoa in a sort of unofficial armistice. Mata‘afa and his forces had withdrawn from Apia and garrisoned in improvised fortifications. About “1,000 of the native adherents of
Malietoa Tanu, commanded by American and English officers, armed with American and English rifles, together with detachments of marines from American and English ships in the harbor” remained within Apia. The Three Powers had moved beyond political manipulation and ‘gunboat diplomacy’ to becoming directly involved with the conflict, deploying troops on the ground.

Mata‘afa and his supporting matai immediately contacted the commissioners through a letter and claimed his faction to be the legitimate provisional government. Claiming to merely be a provisional government indicates that Mata‘afa intended to cooperate with the Samoa Commission. In the letter there was a request that the commissioners disarm and disperse Malietoa’s forces with the promise that if this request was met, the Mata‘afa forces would disarm as well. Also, they requested permission and guaranteed safety to travel to Apia to meet with their lawyers. The letter was signed “Mataafa (sic) and the 13 Chiefs of Tanua and Pule”.

The commissioners responded through a letter and guaranteed their safety. They added that the “great powers have learned with regret that the Samoan people have been unable to agree upon a king; and they have been shocked at the atrocities which have followed this disagreement”. Of course the commissioners were condemning the militaristic actions of Samoans exclusively. We can assuredly assume that they weren’t condemning the actions of the Western warships that rained death from the sky onto Samoan villages. Furthermore, they fail to mention the role that Chief Justice Chambers and the Western officials played by supporting the unpopular Malietoa. More significantly, the commissioners told the Mata‘afa faction through this letter that the ‘great powers’ have “sent us to take over the government of these islands now, and to prepare for Samoa a strong and stable government for the future”. The letter was signed by each commissioner.
Both Mata 'afa and Malietoa along with both factions agreed to comply with the demands stipulated by the Samoan Commission in the future. This compliance, particularly on Mata'afa’s part, was contingent on the promise that the demands of the Commission would be enforced “with the guns of the great warships in the harbor, and the Commission would send for other warships if need be.” Both factions complied with the Commissions demand for disarmament. Unlike Malietoa’s forces who had been armed by the British and Americans, Mata'afa’s forces had purchased their firearms with their own money. The Commission guaranteed monetary compensation in return for their weapons. In his report to Washington, Tripp indicates that the Commission initially relied heavily upon missionaries for information on the Samoans since they were well acquainted with them. Unfortunately, Tripp doesn’t specify which denomination of missionaries he was referring to. It is quite possible, even likely, that he was referring to Latter-day Saint missionaries. This is of course speculation, but it is true that Latter-day Saint missionaries at this time had a far more intimate relationship with Samoans than missionaries from other denominations.

On July 15, 1899, Mata'afa and 12 of his followers along with Malietoa and 12 of his followers, met the commissioners onboard the Badger and signed “A Declaration Respecting the Neutrality of the Islands of Samoa” which officially introduced joint rule of Samoa by the Three Powers. This government was acknowledged at the outset to be provisional and to exist only until a better solution could be reached. Malietoa formally resigned as king and executive power of the provisional government was placed in the hands of three consuls with Dr. Wilhelm Solf as advisor. The commissioners sought to create a provisional government which mirrored as much as possible the Treaty of Berlin of 1889.
One of the changes made from the language of the Treaty of Berlin was the extension of the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court in Samoa to felonies committed by Samoans against other Samoans. This was done upon the advice of Christian missionaries who felt that it would advance the “condition of morality among the natives”\(^{165}\). Tripp argued that:

> If a government is to be maintained in these islands it must be a strong, simple, and economical one. It must be so strong as to be respected and feared, so simple as to be understood by the native and white, and so economical as to impose neither too heavy a burden upon the people nor the powers that must be responsible for its success\(^{166}\).

Later on, Tripp added that the Samoans:

> Require a prompt and energetic government rather than a strong and powerful one. A few small vessels with rapid-fire guns can reach every village of the islands and a few detachments of soldiers for police duty on shore would maintain peace everywhere\(^{167}\).

Tripp’s frightening notion of the role of government and in what fashion its dictates should be implemented seems to be a theme embraced by later administrations in Samoa.

The commissioners travelled to every island except for Manu’a. They interacted with the matai of each village to gain an understanding of Samoan political norms. Tripp explained that they drank kava and “explained our own theories of the central and the native governments, and we found them not only quite unanimous, but at the last enthusiastic in favor of the central government…”\(^{168}\). The commissioners sought to leave the Samoans as much freedom as possible while simultaneously teaching “him self-government”. Tripp didn’t comment on the fact that Samoans had governed themselves for several thousand years before the Westerners showed up to ‘teach’ them self-government. Tripp’s feelings about Samoan self-government can be summed up in his statement below:

> But at present he [the Samoan] is unfitted for extended self-government, and no one appreciates this fact better than himself. He is anxious to learn. He wants a white man’s government\(^{169}\).
Tripp sees the seizure of the Samoan Islands by Western imperialists as a mission of mercy, a way to save the ‘native’ from himself and to inculcate him in the virtues of ‘civilization’. Many Westerners saw this process of ‘civilizing’ the Samoans as contingent on education and promoting the embrace of the written word. Tripp emphasizes this notion when he states that “Thanks to the missionaries the great bulk of the natives and nearly every chief can read and write and are adopting the habits of civilization with great alacrity”. Embracing ‘civilization’ meant, in part, embracing capitalist production, privatizing land and selling one’s labor for wages. A few years later, German Officials referred to the impossible task of convincing Samoans to work on plantations, lamenting that the Samoans “feel that working for whites is disgraceful”. Several decades later, New Zealand Trade Commissioner R.W. Dalton noted the failure of this process of education in regards to convincing Samoans to submit to labor based exploitation. In 1919, Dalton reported:

> Whether in time the Samoans could be educated to work for the planters or even themselves must remain in doubt. Moreover, they show a strong and perhaps natural disinclination to work as wage earners for other people.

This statement sheds light on the commercial based perspective of the benefits of promoting literacy among the Samoans. One can almost imagine witnessing the disdainful disbelief exhibited by Dalton upon finding that Samoans refused to sell themselves for material items. This is just one example among many of the collective Samoan pride in fa’a Samoa. Tripp claims that the greatest obstacle to civilizing the Samoans was their communal character of landownership. He states that:

> The missionaries and other humanitarians here are using every effort to induce the natives to abandon their communal plan and to become, like the whites, individuals and men.
The Samoans were less than men. The road to achieving a manly status that the Whites mastered was to metaphorically lay prostrate and sell themselves to a foreign capitalist.

In his final report to Washington, Tripp reveals a desire for Washington to expand the United States Empire to include a part of Samoa. In fact, it seems that Secretary of State John Hay already had imperial designs for Pago Pago Harbor on Tutuila. Tripp reported to Hay that the importance of the Samoan Islands lay not so much in their commercial potential as in their geographical location. Tripp wrote to Hay that “I can not (sic) impress upon my government too strongly the necessity of its undivided possession of this harbor”\textsuperscript{174}. During the commissioners’ visit, contractors began work on constructing a wharf and coal sheds within the harbor.

The Samoan question would not be addressed at this time in Apia or Pago Pago. Rather the fate of the Samoan Islands was decided in London and Berlin, then finally Washington. Politicians in Berlin were the first to set in motion the negotiations for the official annexation of Samoa\textsuperscript{175}. On November 14, 1899, German and English officials signed a treaty which superimposed national borders upon the Samoan Islands\textsuperscript{176}. Articles I and II gave Tutuila to the Empire of the United States and Savai’i and Upolu to the German Empire. Great Britain was granted the Tongan Islands as well as territories in Africa. Article IV guaranteed German access to laborers in the Solomon Islands, which “belonged to England”. Because of the general refusal among Samoans to labor for wages, this particular stipulation was crucial for the survival of German plantations. This same document was signed in triplicate by the imperialist nations in Washington on December 2, 1899\textsuperscript{177}. In this way, the nations of German Samoa (later known as Western Samoa) and American Samoa were invented, drafted on paper in offices in Berlin, London and Washington.
Elder Frank Soderborg wrote a letter for the *Deseret Evening News* which was published on February 17, 1900. Other than his opening sentence which trumpets “The Stars and Stripes will wave over Tutuila…”, Elder Soderborg’s account of the United States annexation of Tutuila is remarkably ambivalent. He doesn’t seem to place the annexation by the United States into any categories such as right or wrong, inept or messianic. He states that the “main reason, and perhaps the only one” that the United States seized Tutuila was due to Pago Pago’s strategic navigational utility. However, Elder Soderborg adheres to the general LDS Samoan Mission discourse and implies that all Three Powers were responsible for causing the violence and social turmoil in Samoa in the late Nineteenth Century. He goes on and states that the “misapplied ‘Berlin Treaty’ made by the governments a number of years back has never been lived up to”. These allegations conveyed by Elder Soderborg confirm that the notion that the violence and turmoil in Samoa was caused by the Three Powers seemed to be unanimously accepted by the Latter-day Saint missionaries.

Elder Soderborg wrote another letter to the editor of the *Deseret Evening News* detailing the hoisting of the American Flag over the Pago Pago Harbor. Elder Soderborg expresses patriotic enthusiasm stating that “at 11:45 a.m. the Star Spangled Banner spread out her protecting wing above us, and like the proud eagle she represents, she flew upwards to her future station”. This remarkable patriotism almost seems out of place within the general Latter-day Saint discourse of Samoa in the 1890s and even Elder Soderborg’s previous correspondence. It is also noteworthy when placed in relation to notions of loyalty experienced by Latter-day Saints, a loyalty which was dichotomized between the Church and the State by the experiences of the LDS Church during the Nineteenth Century. The LDS experience and concomitant identity of disenfranchisement, oppression and mistrust of American Society complicated Latter-day Saints’
notions of loyalty and allegiance. In this article, Soderborg exhibits firm nationalist patriotism, a feeling expressed frequently by Latter-day Saint missionaries in Samoa in subsequent decades.

During the annexation ceremony of Tutuila by the United States, Consul General Luther W. Osborn gave a dramatic speech in which he defined the Samoan people as easily governed and law abiding “if treated with justice, and that America would, no doubt, have no trouble at all from her new colony”¹⁸³. This statement was ironically portentous. At the ceremony, an LMS Reverend Mr. Cooper was asked to pray and the flag was presented by a Catholic priest. Elder Soderborg voiced his resentment that the Elders were not asked to participate in the ceremony, despite the fact that they were the only United States citizens outside of the naval presence. However, he added:

We don’t wish our readers to think that our government is against us, for we all shook hands with the governor and enjoyed the very best treatment from him and his staff, many favors are being shown us which naturally alarm the clergy who mean to stop the little rock from rolling on its course to final victory. Long live Old Glory! May we stand by her forever!¹⁸⁴.

He doesn’t elaborate on “the many favors” experienced by the Latter-day Saint missionaries, but it indicates that the LDS Samoan Mission in American ruled Tutuila was gaining credibility and social acceptance. At the very least, this seems to be the message that the LDS Samoan Mission wished to convey to the outside world.

This experience with the official ceremonies declaring America’s success as an imperialist aggressor must be contrasted to how the Latter-day Saint missionaries in the newly invented German Samoa reacted to a similar set of formalities. Elder Ernest Adelbert Gardner recorded in his diary on January 26, 1901 that “The people are having a large celebration here today in honor of the Emperor of Germany, but none of us went down…”, indicating a great deal
of ambivalence toward the German Administration\textsuperscript{185}. Five months later, German Governor Wilhelm Solf banned the teaching of the English languages in schools, including LDS Samoan Mission schools\textsuperscript{186}. Latter-day Saint missionaries generally perceived this as an attack against the LDS Samoan Mission.

The Latter-day Saint missionaries in Samoa in the late Nineteenth Century were anomalous in the fact that they were engaged with chronicling the political and social turmoil experienced in Samoa at this time. Furthermore, the fact that they openly articulated political opinions, oftentimes condemning the Western imperialist nations, is profoundly remarkable\textsuperscript{187}. In general (and more so in the Twentieth Century), Latter-day Saint missionaries were urged to refrain from commenting on any political developments, let alone publicly espousing political opinions, in the regions that they proselytize in. A comparative example is the Latter-day Saint Mission in Hawai’i during the late Nineteenth Century. Similar to the Latter-day Saint missionaries in Samoa, the Latter-day Saint missionaries of Hawai’i found themselves in the midst of political turmoil. The President of the Hawaiian Latter-day Saint Mission forbade the Elders to make any comments whatsoever concerning the tumultuous political environment\textsuperscript{188}. However, the fact that the Hawaiian Mission President thought it necessary to forbid the Latter-day Saint missionaries there from entering the political sphere through their discourse indicates that they too were inclined to speak out.

Far from silent, the Latter-day Saint missionaries of Samoa during the 1890s were outspoken, opinionated and critical of the imperial ambitions of the Three Powers. In contrast to the Anglocentric depictions of \textit{fa'asamoa} as articulated by Samoan Commissioner Bartlett Tripp and other Western officials, the Latter-day Saint missionaries in Samoa viewed Western culture as corrupting the virtue of Samoan cultural. In this way, the Latter-day Saint missionaries turned
the concept of the “White Man’s Burden” on its head and condemned Western imperialism in Samoa.
Chapter 3-Mamona in German Samoa and the New Zealand Takeover: 1900-1920

*With respect to the old-time customs and habits which are difficult to eradicate, we may depend upon time and gradual weaning to produce an entirely different idealized race of people.*

Elder John Q. Adams, 1911

The New Zealand infantrymen stood on the decks of their transport vessels and nervously eyed the Samoan coast, searching for signs of life. World War I had just begun and New Zealand was about to seize Western Samoa from Germany. The troops from New Zealand, unaccustomed to military conflict, anxiously awaited the response from German officials. They were aware that if the Germans refused to surrender peacefully, they would be thrust into battle, a violent baptism into military conflict. The German response was ambiguous, stating that they would not accept the terms of surrender but would offer no resistance if troops were landed. This ambiguity undoubtedly increased the anxiety of the green New Zealand troops.

By 1914, friction between imperialist nations in Europe finally exploded into open conflict, a conflict of global proportions which has come to be called World War I. The German Administration in Samoa had constructed a wireless radio station on Upolu, giving the island group a strategic naval value. With the outbreak of open warfare, Great Britain requested that imperialistically ambitious New Zealand seize German Samoa. The New Zealand Government was more than happy to oblige Great Britain and plans for invasion were immediately drawn up.

Over 1,300 armed men were landed on the shores of Upolu without a shot fired. This moment is generally depicted by historians as a momentous rupture in the trajectory of Samoa’s colonial history. The seizure of the Islands of Upolu and Savai’i introduced a new era to the Samoan historical narrative, ending Germany’s short tenure as colonial administrator and the
beginning of New Zealand’s ill-fated rule of Western Samoa. One would think that the sight of warships appearing on the horizon, 1,300 armed men landing on the shores of Upolu, the arrest of the German Administrator and the raising of a foreign flag over the island would have made a profound impression on observers. The fact that Latter-day discourse, news articles, personal correspondence and personal journal entries largely omit the invasion of Western Samoa by New Zealand’s Expeditionary Force is baffling and astonishing to say the least.

This ear shattering silence indicates an acute break with the earlier years of the LDS Samoan Mission. By 1914, the LDS Samoan Mission had become a firmly established institution within the social fabric of the Samoa. Indeed, by this year the Latter-day Saints had been largely accepted by the German Administration. German Administrator Dr. Wilhelm Solf may not have been an active supporter or even friendly with the LDS Samoan Mission. In fact the German Administrator explicitly conveyed his personal dislike of the LDS Church and the LDS Samoan Mission faced difficulties in relation to German rule. However, the LDS Samoan Mission was generally tacitly accepted by the administration. The German order banning English-language schools greatly hindered the efforts of the Samoan Mission and apparently the Latter-day Saints felt “singled out” and “persecuted”. Despite this, the German order that classes be taught in the German language was applicable to all of the Christian missions in Western Samoa, not only the LDS Samoan Mission. Not only was the LDS Samoan Mission accepted by the colonial administrations during the early Twentieth Century, the Mission began to associate more closely with the colonial administration. This more accommodating stance toward colonialism in Samoa altered the self-perceived role of Latter-day Saint missionaries within Colonial Samoa, especially as articulated by President John Q. Adams.
The LDS Samoan Mission’s correspondence with American newspapers decreased significantly during the colonial era of Samoa. Furthermore, the content of this correspondence was largely politically benign and even ignored social and political events of tremendous importance to Samoa, such as was the case with the New Zealand seizure of Upolu and Savai’i. At this time, the Latter-day Saint missionaires in Samoa seemed preoccupied with the expansion of the LDS Mission. One new feature of the development of the LDS Samoan Mission was the concept of “gathering” the Samoan Latter-day Saints into special purpose LDS villages. The politicized accounts of current events seem to have disappeared from the Latter-day Saint missionary discourse during the era of German Samoa.

With the annexation of Samoa complete by 1899, the German Administration fell under the masterful direction of Dr. Wilhelm Solf, who had previously served as the advisor to the three consuls of the Great Powers. The very nature of Solf’s administration of German Samoa is debated by contemporary scholars. Michael Field fails to give much space in his narrative for analysis of the German Administration. However, he categorizes the New Zealand Administration as inept and possibly criminal, overlooking the shortcomings of the German and American Administrations. In fact, Field argues that Germany was more efficient and capable than New Zealand in ruling Western Samoa because of Germany’s experience as a colonial power. Field concedes that “Solf had a heavily attitude paternalistic towards the Samoans, even if he did have a greater understanding of their culture than other Germans.” I.C. Campbell would agree with Field in that Germany’s previous experience made their rule more efficient, but not in a positive light. Campbell posits that “By comparison to the other regimes, Solf appears ruthless where institutions were concerned, however cautious he may have been when it came to an outright struggle for power.” Furthermore, Campbell points out that Solf’s only
contribution to welfare and development in German Samoa was to bring peace, disarm the populations and to establish the Land and Titles Court to eliminate causes for conflict\textsuperscript{195}. Solf’s philosophy and style of rule is indicated by his summation of notions on the “Right relationship between officials and Samoans”:

The Samoan mores, customs, and legal usages need to be further studied. What’s good needs to be retained and eventually integrated with our customs and practices. The bad, barbaric and dumb has to be excised\textsuperscript{196}.

Interestingly, Solf acknowledges the bilateral nature of trans-acculturation and implicitly concedes that there are elements of \textit{fa’asamoa} which are superior to German culture. However, there is an obvious presupposition in Solf’s statement that somebody or group of people enjoy a certain degree of objectivity in order to determine which cultural elements are ‘good’, ‘bad’ or ‘dumb’. Presumably, Solf envisions Germany or even himself as that axiological judge of metaphysical aesthetics and cultural norms.

Solf’s capable administration sought to both eliminate Samoan political power and to stabilize German Samoa after years of violence and chaos. He was largely successful in both regards. His success was largely contingent on his political knack for pushing his agenda in gradual, almost imperceptible ways, yet with profound consequences for Samoan enfranchisement and \textit{fa’asamoa}. However, there was one significant threat to his rule, Mau a le Pule (the opposition movement in Savai’i), the first Mau\textsuperscript{197}. The technical definition for the term ‘mau’ can mean “to be decided, unwavering” or “a testimony”. Field argues that in usage it generally “indicated a movement or group of people with a particular opinion, usually an opinion opposed to ruling authority. In essence the word means opposition”\textsuperscript{198}. In other words, there is some confusion or ambiguity in regards to the actual meaning of the Mau as a movement or even as a term. However, in order to circumvent the academic debate over what the Mau actually was,
the term is used here in the simple and succinct definition proposed by Field; Mau generally “means opposition”. This definition seems the best fit to describe the actions of Lauaki Namulau’ulu Mamoe in response to German authority in Samoa.

Lauaki issued a challenge to Solf with the simple statement “We are Tumua and Pule, we are the rulers of Samoa”\(^\text{199}\). In response Solf created the Fono a Faipule, an advisory group to Solf holding no real power\(^\text{200}\). Lauaki organized his own fono, the Mau a le Pule based in Savai’i. This move was a direct challenge to Solf’s authority. Gunboat diplomacy was used to reaffirm Western power over Samoa once again. The arrival of the warships *Leipzig, Arizona* and *Jaguar* intimidated the Mau, but didn’t crush it\(^\text{201}\). Solf ordered the surrender of Lauati and some of his key supporters within eight days. The Mau refused and prepared to flee to the internal forests. Interestingly, it seems that Christian missionaries convinced the majority of Lauati’s supporters to surrender\(^\text{202}\). With his forces diminished, Lauati and his closest supporters surrendered. Solf had them exiled to Saipan, where Lauati later died\(^\text{203}\). Samoa’s first Mau was defeated through a collusion of warship diplomacy, Solf’s administrative skills and the authority enjoyed by a group of anonymous Christian missionaries.

It is unclear which missionaries were responsible for the surrender of Lauati’s supporters. Their actions reveal the notion that when push came to shove, the Western Christian missionaries generally sided with the Colonial Administration. In this light, the Latter-day Saint missionaries of the late Nineteenth Century must be viewed as unique. Their outspokenness and highly politicized tone within the general discourse of contemporaneous events should be seen as anomalous, accurate and courageous. On the other hand, the tendency of the Latter-day Saint missionaries in Samoa during the early Twentieth Century to side with the colonial administrations should not be seen as unique, but rather the norm.
Other than the Lauati led rebellion, the period following the annexation of the Samoan Islands by Germany and the United States was one of relative stability. No longer precariously fighting for survival amidst chaotic turmoil in Samoa, the LDS Samoan Mission set out on a process of expansion and began implementing the concept of the “gathering” of Saints in Samoa. It should be noted that although Samoa was divided (artificially) by the United States and Germany, there was only one, unitary LDS Samoan Mission. Actually, Tonga fell under the umbrella of the Samoan Mission for several years during the early Twentieth Century. The LDS Samoan Mission expanded dramatically in the early years of the Twentieth Century. The Latter-day Saint missionaries began turning their attention more and more to regions which had up until then been neglected by them. Several LDS branches were established on the island of Savai’i and the missionaries built a meeting house in Tuasivi, Savai’i which was seen to be strategically placed in terms of its accessibility by small boat. However, in 1910 the German Administration confiscated the land and used dynamite to destroy most of the buildings that had been constructed by that time. One would think that this bombing of LDS Mission buildings by the colonial regime would have warranted some sort of reaction within the news correspondence, but I was unable to find any. The priorities of the Latter-day Saints seemed to have shifted dramatically at this time. With the political chaos of the Nineteenth Century seemingly over, the LDS Church was to be organized in Samoa on a much larger scale. Between 1900 and 1920, 23 new branches were established in the Samoan Islands.

This work transcended merely proselytizing among Samoans but involved much labor, literally constructing villages, mission homes, chapels, meeting houses, schools and plantations. The latter was destined to play a controversial role in the LDS Samoan Mission while the schools were to play a crucial role in the process of augmenting the membership of the LDS Church.
However, as noted above, the German decree banning English-language schools created difficulties for the LDS Mission. In April 1902, Mission President Joseph H. Merrill received word from Salt Lake City that several Latter-day Saints of German birth were in route to Samoa to teach German to the Samoan Latter-day Saints. After several years however, the German speaking Latter-day Saint missionaries failed to meet Dr. Wilhelm Solf’s standards for education in German and the schools were disbanded until 1913. This meant that the American born Latter-day Saints were expected to learn the Samoan tongue in a very short amount of time in order to teach the gospel in their schools. In 1913, a second attempt was made by Latter-day Saint missionaries to organize German-speaking schools. In his personal journal, Elder Earl S. Paul expressed the difficulty in trying to teach the Gospel in a language that he wasn’t very familiar with to students who aren’t familiar with either the English or German languages.

Around the turn of the Century, the Latter-day Saint missionaries began the process of gathering the Samoan Latter-day Saints in villages set aside for the sole occupation of members of the Church. As early as the close of the Nineteenth Century, Samoan Latter-day Saints began gathering in Falieniu, Upolu. By 1903, it was decided by Mission President Merrill and other Latter-day Saint missionaries that there should be two gathering locations, one in German Samoa and one in American Samoa. Mapusaga, Tutuila was designated the gathering spot in American Samoa while Sauniatu, Upolu was designated in German Samoa. Sauniatu was purchased from the German firm Deutschen Handels und Plantagen-Gesellschaft, the progeny of the Godeffroy and Sohns firm of the Nineteenth Century.

The dynamics of hierarchy at times complicated the social environment on the LDS special purpose villages. Similar to the American, German and New Zealand colonial governments, the LDS Samoan Mission, on a micro level scale, attempted to reconcile
fa’asamo with Western notions of power relations and hierarchical social adhesiveness. One specific conflict experienced in Sauniatu involved the fa’asamo concept of respect for the elder members of the community. Despite this, Samoan Latter-day Saints in the special purpose villages were expected to submit to the authority of Latter-day Saint missionaries, even if the missionaries were significantly younger than many of the Samoan Latter-day Saints. Several instances of conflict and insubordination occurred in Sauniatu. In 1917, a “minor challenge to mission authority” was confronted by Mission President Ernest Wright. Apparently a minor disagreement in 1920 turned into a fight. A Latter-day Saint missionary records “Our first fight up here but we won out…” Kenneth W. Baldridge points out that “In spite of the implications of the word ‘fight’, the confrontation was probably vocal only, not physical”. At times, a conflict in Sauniatu became so acute that the Latter-day Saint missionaries felt it necessary to call for the aid of the German police.

Only a year after the village was founded, a group of Samoan Latter-day Saints became angry with Elder Felix Baird. After clearing land one day, they accused the missionaries of “making slaves out of them”. Interestingly, about eleven years later, in the same village of Sauniatu, the same allegation was made against Elder Earl Stanley Paul by Samoan Latter-day Saints. Apparently some village men wanted to go play a game of cricket against a group of men from another village. Elder Paul recounts:

I told them they couldn't go on Wednesday but if they wanted they could have them come up here, or they could go down there on Saturday. Some of the men said they were slaves and they talked kind of sorrey (sic) to us. After talking to them...we got them to feeling better. We left them but the mist had not cleared way. But since then we have talked with some of the men and the most of them are feeling fine.
Of course the term ‘slave’ here is an exaggeration. Regardless, it is unsettling when it is used on more than one occasion by Samoan Latter-day Saints in reference to the missionaries. The relationship between Latter-day Saint missionaries and Samoan Latter-day Saints within the context of LDS plantations is difficult to define, difficult to grasp.

Group Photo of Latter-day Saint missionaries sometime around 1912. Elder Earl Stanley Paul can be seen to the right of President J. Nelson. Elder Paul ironically came down with influenza as a soldier in France during WWI, while the epidemic was raging in Samoa212.

Carl R. Harris, President of the LDS Samoan Mission in the early 1980s, concedes that the historical development of plantations within the Samoan Mission may seem controversial213. However, he stresses that the plantations were not created for the purpose of accruing capital through the
exploitation of Samoan labor. The income generated through the productive capacity of the plantation and Samoan Latter-day Saint labor was used to cover the cost of the LDS Mission schools and other social functions. One benefit that Samoan Latter-day Saints received from this arrangement was learning the rules, structures and symbolization of the written word in the LDS Samoan Mission schools. This was considered crucial for the Samoans in an increasingly economically and politically integrated global system. The capital generated by these plantations was insignificant and insufficient to offset the expenditures in Samoa that the Church headquarters in Salt Lake City paid, which stemmed exclusively from the generous tithes of Latter-day Saints globally\textsuperscript{214}. According to one Samoan Latter-day Saint account, the plantation in Sauniaitu seemed to be considered collectively owned. All of the Latter-day Saints worked it from time to time but all had access to the fruits of their labor as well\textsuperscript{215}.

Despite this, there were instances when tension stemming from the newly implemented hierarchical relationship between the Latter-day Saints from America and their Samoan Latter-day Saint brothers and sisters erupted into open conflict. By 1910, there seemed to be an ideological shift in the way Latter-day Saint missionaries from the United States conceived their role as missionaries in this relatively new colonial system in Samoa. As the LDS Samoan Mission became an established institution, the objectives transcended merely proselytizing among Samoans to augment the number of Church members to actively altering the social and economic landscape of Samoa by spurring the drive to gather the Samoan Saints on the special purpose villages. This concept of gathering Latter-day Saints into centralized locations had been practiced in the United States since the mid-Nineteenth Century. On a localized level, especially under the direction of President Brigham Young, Latter-day Saints constructed special villages throughout Utah. Many of these villages were collectively operated and the products of labor equally distributed. The story of one of these villages, which was called Orderville,
reveals the benefits, joys, obstacles and grief of attempting to construct such an egalitarian society.\textsuperscript{216} The Great Basin region was considered Zion, the epicenter of this gathering. Gathering Latter-day Saints in Samoa was merely an extension of this process.

The Latter-day Saint missionaries in Samoa may have considered other factors when contemplating the gathering drive. As mentioned in previous chapters, the Christian missions in Samoa were exceedingly competitive. Furthermore, it seems that the other denominations in the islands seemed to especially despise the efforts of Latter-day Saint proselytizing. Rumors circulated in the Samoan Islands that Governor Solf had suddenly decided that the LDS Samoan Mission should be driven from his domain.\textsuperscript{217} The Elders were convinced that the rumor was invented by missionaries from competing denominations in order to intimidate Samoan Latter-day Saints or Samoans wishing to convert to the LDS Church. This belief on the part of the Elders is not farfetched. According to W.E. Tangreen’s article to the \textit{Improvement Era} in 1910, some ministers from other denominations went so far as demanding that Samoans make an oath to God that members of their \textit{aiga} would not join the Latter-day Saints.\textsuperscript{218} This strategy was presumably highly effective due to the social norms of \textit{aiga} interrelations. If a Samoan broke this oath, they would oftentimes be driven from the community and exiled from the \textit{aiga}. A Samoan contemplating joining the Latter-day Saints was oftentimes forced to decide between the \textit{aiga} and the Church, tradition and personal faith. So the process of gathering Samoan Latter-day Saints on special purpose villages removed the Samoan Saints from the influence of rival missionaries and the influence of Western culture which was perceived to be laden with vices deleterious to the Samoan population. More importantly, these villages served as a new life, a new community, a new set of norms and mores for those Samoan Latter-day Saints that were shunned by the \textit{aiga}. However, this process of gathering Samoan Latter-day Saints oftentimes led to some Samoan members of the Church to renounce their membership, sometimes en masse.\textsuperscript{219} These Samoans
specifically chose to embrace fa’asamoa and their traditional aiga rather than LDS Church doctrine and LDS based notions of community. It is interesting that in theory, the LDS collective villages in Zion were similar to fa’asamoa in regards to the egalitarian nature of the distribution of wealth and, arguably, the democratic, localized nature of authority within the community.

Through this process of the gathering of Samoan Saints as well as the development of the legitimization of the LDS Samoan Mission within the colonial context, the American Latter-day Saint missionaries began to see it their duty to socialize the Samoan Latter-day Saints to not only embrace the LDS Church but also Westernized forms of culture as well. At least this was the message conveyed by President John Q. Adams through public discourse. A fundamental element of this cultural mission was to instill an appreciation of what has been called the ‘Protestant Ethic’ within the collective psyche of Samoan Latter-day Saints. Samoan Latter-day Saints were inculcated in the virtues of hard labor, which was seen as crucial to the road to a ‘civilized’ Samoa.

While the German government desperately sought to fill the vacuous labor shortage in Samoa due to the Samoan abhorrence to working for wages (especially for foreigners), the Christian Missions were the benefactors of a seemingly tireless Samoan labor force. A report from 1919 reveals that Samoans produced fifty percent of the total copra production on private land in the Samoan Islands\textsuperscript{220}. German plantations, namely the Deutsche Handels Und Plantagen Gessellschaft (DHPG), accounted for most of the remaining fifty-percent of the total copra production. In an effort to promote the productive capacity of plantations and, in the worst case scenarios, to buttress them to keep them from going bankrupt, the German Administration exempted the plantation owners from taxes\textsuperscript{221}. The DHPG firm owned around 56,000 acres of land in Upolu, 9,000 of which were utilized for copra production, the rest consisting of wild bush terrain. The three main plantations on Upolu owned by DHPG were Mulifanua, Vaitele and Vaiele. Around 16,500 acres of Upolu land
were owned by Britons, Americans and other foreigners, bringing the total acreage of land in Upolu owned by foreigners to around 72,500 acres. This is out of a total of around 275,000 acres in Upolu, meaning that around 200,000 acres of land on Upolu were owned by Samoans. The German Administration had implemented strict criteria for purchasing land from Samoans. This included guaranteeing that the Samoan selling the land still owned enough after the sale to produce enough crops for the family. Related to this criterion was the policy that an individual Samoan was prohibited from selling any land which other Samoans may hold claim to.\textsuperscript{222} Considering the collective nature of land ownership amongst the \textit{aiga}, meeting these criteria proved to be very difficult.

To combat the labor shortage in German Samoa, the administration began importing Chinese labor. The first shipment of Chinese laborers occurred in 1903 when 289 workers from Shantou arrived in Apia.\textsuperscript{223} By the outbreak of World War I, 2,184 Chinese and 870 Solomon Islanders worked the plantations in Samoa.\textsuperscript{224} The treatment of Chinese laborers in German Samoa was notoriously poor. There were numerous reports of poor medical treatment, bad food, forced labor, wage cuttings and floggings.\textsuperscript{225}

As mentioned above, the Christian Missions enjoyed a seemingly tireless and generous Samoan population. New Zealand Trade Commissioner R.W. Dalton reported in 1919 that:

The extent to which the Samoans can be induced to give money (and incidentally, to work to get money to give) for religious purposes is remarkable. This is particularly true proved by their attitude toward the missionaries and their keenness in raising money for the erection of churches and other religious purposes.\textsuperscript{226}

The Samoan Latter-day Saints seemed to take this generosity and liberality of expending labor for religious causes to soaring heights. A rather disturbing account of the construction of a special purpose village reveals both the intense dedication that Samoan Latter-day Saints
exhibited towards the LDS Samoa Mission as well as a shift in the role of the Latter-day Saint missionaries as articulated by a Latter-day Saint missionary.

In 1911, John Q. Adams, President of the LDS Samoan Mission, wrote an article for the *Improvement Era* titled “Mapusaga, a Factor in Progressive Samoa” which detailed the construction of special purpose village Mapusaga. The article implies a new objective for the LDS Samoan Mission as well as a new self-perceived identity of Latter-day Saint missionaries within Colonial Samoa. It is difficult to gauge how much this really was the case through this public discourse. In fact, it is very difficult to come to grips with the meaning of and objective of this article. It is a very unsettling account of the role that Samoan Latter-day Saints played in the construction of the village. Elder Adams saw the “practical, forceful system of training natives, have done much to raise the standard of intelligence of this island race to the requisite level of comprehending the meaning of life…”227. This passage alone is laden with a myriad of concepts and terminology which are divergent from the discourse articulated by Latter-day Saint missionaries in Samoa during the late Nineteenth Century. First, the term ‘forceful’ itself is laden with explosive implications, such as a concept that Latter-day Saint missionaries must be virile in their drive to socialize the Samoan Latter-day Saints in Western norms and values. It gives the image of a dominant Latter-day Saint missionary acting upon a subordinate Samoan Latter-day Saint. Also note the use of the term ‘natives’ instead of ‘Lamanites’ or Samoan ‘Saints’ which had been typically used in previous decades. Essentially, the term ‘native’ is rooted in the lexicon of colonialism in the Pacific and Samoan context. Elder Adams does use the term ‘Lamanite’ once toward the end of his article. Also, the notion that the Samoan Latter-day Saints had failed to grasp the “meaning of life” before cultural interaction between the Islanders and the West is obviously a textbook example of ethnocentric thought.
According to President Adams, this achievement on the part of the LDS Samoan Mission in inculcating the true meaning of life among the Samoan Latter-day Saints was contingent on their “combined school and colonization system…” Not only is the LDS Samoan Mission seen as an entity which promotes particular religious beliefs but also it is a “colonization system” within the larger context of German Samoan colonialism. The Protestant Ethic and capitalist zeal was the remedy for the “tropical laziness” which proliferated Samoa at this time. Indeed, “one irrefutable fact must be implanted in the mind of the native, that no true happiness exists in an idle village”. President Adams realized that it took gradual time to “eradicate” customs and habits in order to “produce an entirely different idealized race of people”. According to President Adams’s logic, the LDS Samoan Mission not only existed to spread the Gospel but also to construct the perfect, “idealized” new society of Samoans. Schools were seen as a crucial tool in this construction of an improved Samoan. Revealing notions of cultural superiority, President Adams writes that:

One sees the small, uncouth [Samoan] tot begin an uphill career in the school, his instinct telling him that Samoan ideals are in advance of all others, while his teacher and surrounding conditions forcefully proclaim the contrary. By degrees, as months mould themselves into years, perhaps two or three, the once rough diamond takes on a polish of sort that most encourages the teacher.

The construction of the perfect Samoan tot began “forcefully” with the culturally sophisticated and superior teacher, who inculcates civilization within the child’s essence. On a theoretical note, it is interesting that President Adams seems to reject the concept of the tabula rasa. Rather, he conceives a deconstructive process followed by a process of inculcation. Again, it was believed by President Adams that another crucial element to this racial construction was the process of hard labor.
Describing the layout of Mapusaga, President Adams writes that the elders house “looms up pretentiously from its elevated side” above the houses that the Samoan Latter-day Saints resided in. He adds that the LDS church building and schoolhouse also hold a commanding spot of ground. He writes that an observer witnessing these large buildings:

is struck with astonishment to learn that the material for both of these large buildings…was all carried up a narrow, stony, bushy trail, a distance of three miles, on the backs of school boys and girls…Tons of sand and lime-rock, boards, timbers, roofing iron, kegs of nails, barrels of cement, each weighing three hundred and sixty pounds…all find a secure resting place upon the calloused shoulders of these children, and all without complaint…Is it any wonder that the elders learn to love them?230

What can be said about this passage? I am still coming to grips with the meaning of this depraved and disturbing description of the construction of Mapusaga. Was it really as horrendous as President Adams indicates? There is reason to believe that these “children” were teenagers or even older231. Despite this, President Adams clearly uses the term children. His purpose in emphasizing the terribly strenuous labors of the children was to point to the astounding and tremendous level of devotion to the construction of the LDS Church in the islands that Samoan Latter-day Saints displayed. President Adams’s point is acutely poignant. The Samoan Latter-day Saints were free to leave the village at any time; their agency was inherent to their terrible labors. Of course, the missionaries (and the Samoan parents for that matter) shouldn’t have allowed children to experience labors cut out for giants. Still, even with the reality that the Samoan Latter-day Saints weren’t physically forced to labor under such horrific conditions, this account is just plain bad. It is astonishing that President Adams felt it prudent to very publicly depict the LDS Samoan Mission in such a malevolent light. Perhaps it is even more astonishing that a professional editor working for a magazine closely associated with the LDS Church would allow such a depiction to be printed for all eyes to absorb.

In August of 1914, following the outbreak of World War I, Great Britain wired the New Zealand government requesting that New Zealand armed forces seize German Samoa232. During
the German occupation of Upolu and Savai’i, a radio wireless station had been built on Upolu which connected to a transoceanic telegraph network in the Pacific. Great Britain viewed this antenna and Samoa by default as strategically important to seize. The New Zealand government responded, confirming their adherence to the plan and requested naval support during the operation due to the possibility of German Warships patrolling the area. Englishmen Colonel Robert Logan was chosen to lead the force. The New Zealand governor also reported the list of personnel to be used for the invasion as follow:

List of personnel: “one battalion of infantry, one company of engineers, two fifteen-pounders, two six-pounders, with signal, medical, and army service corps details, two transports. Total force, 1,383.

The troops were loaded on two transport ships, Moeraki and Monowai, and sailed toward Samoa under the protection of the warships Australia, Melbourne, Psyche and Philomel. The convoy stopped in Suva, Fiji along the way. The Fijian governor supplied them with geographical information pertaining to Samoa. Also, upon the advice of Reverend Father Fox, the convoy took on board eleven Samoans “of some standing” in order to facilitate the acceptance of New Zealand rule among the Samoans of Upolu and Savai’i.

Upon arrival at dawn in Apia Harbor on August 30, the Psyche was sent under a flag of truce to deliver an ultimatum for surrender. The naval officers aboard the warships in the harbor heard the wireless station tuning up. Rear-Admiral Patey messaged the wireless operators to desist or they would be blown away by the gigantic guns of the warships. At 8:30 a.m. the next morning, the British flag was hoisted over Apia in front of the New Zealand Division and the rest of the troops, personnel from the Royal Navy and “the leading native chiefs”. Governor Solf was arrested and placed onboard the Monowai. By the time the New Zealand troops reached the wireless station, they found that some mechanical parts essential to the motor were
missing. Eventually, the New Zealand officials learned that the Germans had planned to destroy the wireless station with dynamite. The imperial mission was successful and Western Samoa fell under New Zealand rule.

As noted above, the seizure of Samoa by New Zealand troops was barely mentioned within Latter-day Saint discourse. The few references to New Zealand rule tended to be in retrospect and very brief as well as ambivalent. It seems that by the early Twentieth Century, political topics within the public discourse of Samoan Latter-day Saint missionaries were extinct. Even the private discourse seemed to omit political topics. One example is the diary of Elder Earl S. Paul, who arrived in Samoa on his mission on December 30, 1912. A native of Rexburg, Idaho, Elder Paul was very consistent with keeping abreast with journal entries on a regular basis. However, there is a gap in his journal entries between March 23 and December 23 of 1914, the summer of the New Zealand invasion of Western Samoa. Why all of a sudden an entire section of the journal is missing, during the dates of the New Zealand invasion, is perplexing. Interestingly, the entries cut off at around the same time that Elder Paul was called to serve at the special purpose village Sauniatu. It is very likely that Elder Paul’s increased responsibilities in Sauniatu led to a decrease in journal entries. However, this does not explain why an entire section of the journal was omitted. It almost seems as if it were deliberate or even cut out. It is also a possibility that this section of his journal was damaged during Elder Paul’s extensive journeys on foot through Upolu. If this was not the case, this clearly illustrates a lack of concern for events of a political events on the part this Latter-day Saint missionary. This silence is all the more astonishing vis-à-vis Baldridge’s belief that New Zealand troops marched through Sauniatu at some point following the invasion. One would think this event would be noteworthy enough to jot down in a journal.
As soon as Colonel Logan set foot on Upolu he faced graves challenges, challenges which were caused by the war. Mason Mitchell, the United States Consul to Apia, informed Colonel Logan that there was a severe shortage of food in the islands. Presumably, this was due to the war, which undoubtedly altered the priorities of the German Empire as they geared for conflict. The indentured Chinese had been on short rations since the outbreak of war. European residents feared a Chinese uprising if rations weren’t increased. Increasing rations was impossible because only ten days of food remained for the Chinese. The explosive situation erupted in rebellion on September 1, two days after the New Zealand troops landed on Upolu. On a plantation seven miles from Apia, 120 indentured Chinese rose against a German plantation owner, surrounding him in his house. New Zealand troops and “native police” suppressed the rebellion and Colonel Logan decided that for the time being, Germans could retain their guns to defend their lives and property. Colonel Logan wrote that he “found it necessary to allow the German planters to their arms for self-protection, considering it that we would run some risk in this direction rather than that a European family should be placed at the mercy of the Chinese… who, in my opinion, are a menace to the European population unless very carefully handled.”

It is noteworthy that despite a raging world war between Great Britain and Germany, Colonel Logan was willing to keep the German population armed rather than disrupt the social, economic and racial hierarchy in Western Samoa. After all, the Germans were Westerners.

The labor question in Western Samoa was far from solved by this point. To the utter dismay of the foreigners, the Samoans could not be convinced of the practicality of laboring on plantations for ten hours a day instead of embracing fa’asamoa, and laboring for far less time a day to produce their sustenance, thereby buttressing their self-sufficiency. The indentured Chinese were necessary for the production of material value, which in turn was appropriated by
the plantation owners. However, many people in Western Samoa were uncomfortable with the presence of Chinese in the islands. Samoan matai approached Colonel Logan and voiced their concern over the racial mixing of Samoans and Chinese and suggested that the indentured laborers be repatriated. The Chinese question weighed heavily on Colonel Logan. Field writes that Colonel Logan “became almost obsessive about the Chinese.” This obsession culminated in Colonel Logan promulgating Proclamation No. 42, which prohibited any Chinese laborer from entering any Samoan fale.

This concern over the interaction between the Samoans and the Chinese indentured laborers was not unique to New Zealand’s rule of the islands. While travelling near Sauniau, Elder Paul and his companions Elder Rhead and Elder Ransom ran into indentured Chinese. Elder Paul writes:

We run acrosed (sic) two chinamen (sic) they were on the opposite side of a creek than we were. They are not allowed in the village. So I told them to pelase (sic) go in Samoan. They didn't understand so I had to repeat two ore (sic) three times. One of them though (sic) we wanted him to carry us across the stream and he come a running we all the time telling him to go. He came and backed up to Bro Ransom. We finely (sic) made him understand. They are very polite little fellows but we have quite a time keeping them one.

It is unclear whether Elder Paul’s comment that the Chinese weren’t allowed in the village was due to the policy of the German Administration or of the LDS Samoan Mission. However, it is indicative of the segregationist environment in German Samoa at the time.

In 1918, with the end of a world war of unprecedented destruction and suffering in sight, influenza swept around the globe, with an estimated 15 million lives lost to the sickness globally. This efficient killer claimed more lives than all of the conflict of World War I. The devastation caused by the epidemic in Western Samoa has become one of the most controversial
events of New Zealand’s rule of the islands. Influenza reached Western Samoa aboard the Talune, which arrived in Apia on November 7, 1918\textsuperscript{248}. Influenza had been introduced to the Talune in Auckland, New Zealand days earlier. The New Zealand officials in Western Samoa were aware that an epidemic was swiftly permeating the globe, but they were unaware that it had reached New Zealand and could have possibly been on the Talune. In a cruel twist of fate, the letter informing that influenza was raging in Auckland was unopened and onboard the Talune, the very vessel that was carrying the deadly cargo. Talune’s Captain John Mawson informed the port health inspector, Captain Frank Atkinson, that all of the passengers were healthy. The passengers were allowed to disembark before the letter revealing the deadly nature of the Talune’s cargo was read by Colonel Logan.

The influenza swiftly swept through the Samoan population. The Samoans immunity to the influenza was heartbreakingly weak and upwards of 8,500, or 22 percent, of the Samoan population perished\textsuperscript{249}. Field’s account of this tragedy in Mau: Samoa’s struggle against New Zealand oppression reveals the pain, agony, sorrow and devastating results of the epidemic in Samoa. He recounts many heart wrenching stories experienced by Samoans. Field wrote about one such stunning story as follows:

A chief died in Apia and a fautasi came from his village to pick up the body. None of the seventeen men who rowed the fautasi returned home; they all died in Apia\textsuperscript{250}.

The New Zealand Administration was completely unable to cope with the calamitous situation. Colonel Logan himself seemed to be on the verge of some sort of breakdown. At the very least his behavior seemed erratic and unpredictable. Field wrote that Colonel Logan, for an “unknown reason”, ordered that no food be sent to LMS School Papauta, despite the fact that influenza was raging throughout the all girl population there. The LMS missionary in charge of the school,
Miss Elizabeth Moore, sent for some meat from Apia in order to make stew for the 150 gravely ill children. Colonel Logan was outraged by the request for food and paid a visit to Papauta, where he loudly and dementedly berated Moore. Field quotes Moore’s account of the exchange as follows:

…he began…by saying in a voice which became louder and more angry, ‘Miss Moore…I wish to inform you that no meat will be given you…Send them food! I would rather see them burning in Hell! There is a dead horse at your gate-let them eat that! Great fat, lazy, loafing creatures…Send them down to the public burial ground to dig graves! A disgrace to Christianity! I should like to see them all in Hell,’ etc. etc.

When I remonstrated with him by saying that they were ill! ‘Let them come bury the dead!’

I told him I was trying at that moment to find any who were strong enough to bury their own dead, but he kept on, ‘If you do not send me twenty-five of these girls to help dig graves, I will come back this afternoon and burn down the school’251.

It is difficult to imagine the reason for Colonel Logan’s seemingly depraved outburst, but it probably had much to do with the tremendous amount of stress he must have felt in the midst of this calamity. New Zealand troops carried out the brunt of the mass burials, which was such a gruesome activity that they could only handle it while drinking strong whiskey. A missionary protested the vast consumption of whiskey among the grave diggers. In response, Colonel Logan ordered the missionary to help with the burials and in a short time he was seen swigging the bottle with the troops252. By this time, Elder Paul had finished his first mission in Samoa (he was to again serve as a missionary in Samoa decades later) and gone to Europe to fight in the war. Ironically, while the influenza epidemic decimated the Samoan population, he fell ill with the flu in Clermont-Ferrand, France as a soldier253.

One of the most outrageous and sad elements of the story of the epidemic in Western Samoa was Colonel Logan’s refusal to allow doctors from American Samoa help administer to
the sick. It is difficult to understand why he would make such a deadly decision, other than the fact that he seems to have been truly breaking down under the stress. American Samoa was one of the few places on Earth that did not experience the epidemic. To the credit of the American Administration, they had successfully thwarted influenza through strict quarantine procedures. Colonel Logan’s refusal of outside aid was criminal and quite sadistic.

Other than one notable exception, the Latter-day Saint missionary discourse was largely silent in regards to the epidemic. The only LDS document that I came across which referenced the epidemic is “The Sauniatu of Now-a-days” by President John Q. Adams. This article was published in 1920, around 2 years after the epidemic struck Samoa. President Adams waits until the very last paragraph of the article to mention the epidemic and begins by writing “One more paragraph and we our done” as if it were an afterthought. That being said, President Adams’s account of the epidemic in Sauniatu is both moving and poignant. He writes from the perspective of himself returning to Sauniatu after over a decade. He wrote:

We note the absence of many a familiar face of a dozen years back, and are welcomed by but a handful of the original band of pioneers… Crossing the river and gaining the graveyard, we are confronted abruptly by the reason written in tombs that dot the earth in little mounds of pebbles…As the writer stood silently viewing the city of the departed, our most faithful Saint and veteran of the village since its inception, came to his side and pointed out the last resting place of this and that brother and sister or child who went down in the influenza epidemic a year ago, like grain before the sickle, some of them being buried in their own dooryards and others in whatever place they dropped dead. Heart rendering incidents were recounted in simple, touching style, and after a mental review of the horror and helplessness of it all, one is lost in wonder that even this remnant survived that we find. Strangely like old Chingagook of Cooper’s tale, appeared our old Lamanite chieftain, Opapo, as he stood in that quaint native cemetery that day and swept his trembling arm from point to point—one of the links that connects the past of Sauniatu with its present.

Poor Opapo had been a devout Latter-day Saint since the earliest days of the Samoan Mission. His son, who survived the epidemic, would later be interviewed by Baldridge. Elder Adams’s
account is heavily sympathetic with the Samoan Latter-day Saints. As mentioned above, in his previous article from 9 years earlier titled “Mapusaga, a Factor in Progressive Samoa”, Elder Adams used the term ‘native’ when referring to the Samoan Latter-day Saints, a term which is solidified in the lexicon of colonialism in general. It is noteworthy that nine years later, he refers to Opapo as a “Saint”, implying recognition of a shared identity between the Latter-day Saint missionaries and the Samoan Latter-day Saints. Despite this, his account is starkly apolitical, omitting any perceived condemnations in regards to the failure of the New Zealand Administration to mitigate the decimation of Samoans caused by influenza. While sympathetic with the pain and misery that the Samoan community experienced, this passage tacitly affirms the allegiance of the LDS Samoan Mission to the contemporaneous status quo by ignoring the root of the Samoans’ pain and misery, the ineptness and criminality of the New Zealand Administration.

Between the years of 1900 and 1930, the LDS Samoan Mission became firmly established within the Samoan community. President Adams came to see themselves on a mission to replace fa’asamo a with Western based norms and ideas. In a sense, President Adams saw Latter-day Saint missionaries as ‘colonizers’, a role which spurred them to attack fa’asamo a head-on and to construct Samoan Latter-day Saint villages with the missionaries at the apex of the concomitant hierarchical social relations within these villages. Gone from the consciousness of these Latter-day Saint missionaries was the notion of a collective identity of oppression and alienation that their predecessors from the 1890s shared. Instead of publicly standing up and voicing their support for a group of people they perceived to be oppressed, oppressed by the very society that had violently oppressed the LDS Church in the Nineteenth Century for that matter, the Latter-day Saint missionaries in Samoa in the early Twentieth Century tacitly supported the
colonial regimes ruling Samoa. Indeed, to an extent, President Adams’s notions of the role of the LDS Samoan Mission were, at times, congruent with the objectives of the colonial administrations in Samoa, namely the German and New Zealand Administrations.
A miserable Sunday as usual because recently, the devil and his angels have been in attendance, trying to break up the meeting-Elder Howard B. Stone, September 15, 1929.

Dressed in a white jacket and a white lavalava, Tupua Tamasese Lealofi III stood alone in the center of the intersection enveloped in the tropical humidity of Apia, Samoa. The revered high chief raised his arms and cried out in Samoan and English, “Filemu Samoa, peace Samoa!”.

It was around that moment when a single shot rang out. The bullet ripped through his body and Tamasese crumpled to the street in front of his Mau brethren. Three Samoan men ran to the aid of the beloved Matai and they were met by a swarm of bullets from the muzzle of a Lewis machinegun perched atop the police station. Despite the danger, at least three more Samoan men ran through the hail of fire into the intersection. One courageous Mau youth, Tu’ia, threw his body over Tamasese to shield him from the assault. After the massacre it was found that Tu’ia’s corpse was pierced in no less than thirteen places. In total, nine Mau were gunned down by the New Zealand police force. As many as fifty more were wounded.

This tragic episode commonly referred to as Black Saturday illustrates one possible and bloody outcome of colonialism in Samoa as well as the extent to which the Mau movement embraced and adhered to Christian principles. Understandably, following the massacre of many Mau youth desired violent retribution for the killings. Considering the social and political popularity that the Mau enjoyed, an all-out assault of revenge would have been cataclysmically disastrous for the foreigners residing in Western Samoa. The fact that the Samoans were able to ‘turn the other cheek’ in the wake of such a horrendous event is truly remarkable. On his deathbed, Tamasese appealed through a message to his Mau brethren:
My blood has been spilt for Samoa. I am proud to give it. Do not dream of avenging it, as it was spilt in maintaining peace. If I die, peace must be maintained at any price\textsuperscript{259}

This penchant for Christianity does not imply an allegiance to the capitalist catechism of Western culture, nor even the authority of the Western Christian missions based in Samoa. It is safe to assume that many Samoans perceived themselves to be better Christians than the foreigners who had introduced them to the principles that Jesus taught. Inevitably, the Mau resistance against colonialism and imperialism permeated the relationship between Samoans and Christian missionaries. The LDS Samoan Mission faced a direct challenge to their theological and social authority.

Tupua Tamasese laying in state\textsuperscript{260}.  
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The most popularized Mau, the Mau under the New Zealand regime, officially came into existence as the ‘Samoan League’ in March, 1927. Article I of the Samoan League’s constitution affirmed the Samoan reverence for Christianity:

> We declare and believe that man’s heritage from God is to help each other irrespective of station, race, colour, and creed, and that all men are equal in the sight of God.

This evocative declaration stands in direct conflict with the hierarchical reality that Samoans experienced daily within Colonial Samoa. Essentially, this statement almost tautologically relegates the colonial administration and its adherents to a position outside of Christian principles. Relegating Samoans to an inferior position was inherently un-Christian. Through Christianity, *fa’asamoa* was morally superior to the Western foreigners.

The inability of the New Zealand Administration to cope with the influenza epidemic gave tremendous impetus to the Samoan articulation of grievances and passive resistance. However, as Campbell points out, this conceptual narrative of an inept New Zealand Administration spurring Samoan resistance implies the legitimacy of the German and American regimes in Samoa. Indeed, such a notion of a malevolent New Zealand Administration implicitly legitimizes colonialism in Samoa in general. A better understanding of Samoan notions of the illegitimacy of colonialism in general can be gleaned from Latter-day Saint missionary Elder Paul’s personal journal. The journal entry reveals that a sense of resistance existed within the Samoan population years before the influenza epidemic and even before New Zealand seized control of Western Samoa.

Samoan notions of the superiority of *fa’asamoa* in regards to Western culture are illustrated by the following journal entry from March 4, 1913. Elder Paul writes as follows:
Standing alone, this assertion of the collective sentiment of Samoans toward Western foreigners is telling. When contextualized in relation to the Christian oriented discussions between Samoans and Latter-day Saint missionaries, the statement becomes all the more poignant. Elder Paul’s reference to “how much love they [Samoans] had for one another” conjures the principles of Jesus concerning community and loving your neighbor. The Samoan community is contrasted to the “hard hearted beasts” of the Western world who are perceived to fall very short of Christian principles. Again, faʻasamoa is conceived by Samoans as being congruently compatible with Christianity, the very religion that was introduced by Western foreigners who often and hypocritically shunned those same Christian principles. This journal entry indicates that widespread discontent with Western rule of the islands existed among Samoans before the influenza epidemic of 1918. It also illustrates the distinction between the private journals of individual Latter-day Saint missionaries and the silences which dominated the public discourse of the LDS Samoan Mission during the early Twentieth Century. There was rarely (maybe only one) mention of social discontent among Samoans within the public discourse of the LDS Samoan Mission discourse throughout the 1920s when the Mau were at their apex of popularity.

The very nature of the Mau is still contentiously debated within the historiography of Colonial Samoa. Also, an interesting element of this resistance was the debate over which government was responsible to respond to the Mau; New Zealand or Great Britain. Secretary for Native Affairs, C.C.A. McKay, retrospectively posited that the years when the Mau was the most active “were Western Samoa’s political emergent days.” Field seems to imply this concept of the Mau as an anti-colonial, nationalist movement throughout his
works as well. Campbell, with his caustic language, opposes this concept. He writes “The Mau protest is widely regarded by people with the slightest knowledge of Samoan history to be a nationalist movement of justifiable protest…”\textsuperscript{266}. It is reasonable to accept that depicting the Mau as a mature political party in the conventional nation-state context may be an aberration. Also, his right hook toward “people with the slightest knowledge of Samoan history” may seem justified. However, I would argue that while many people lacking an intellectual mastery of \textit{fa’asamoa} make somewhat unfounded statements regarding the Mau, Campbell himself seems to lack ‘the slightest knowledge’ of the memory that some Samoans share in regards to the past.

One night during my research trip in Oahu, I encountered a scenario eerily similar to my experience on Y Mountain several years ago. During a bout of restless wandering I came across group of Samoan and Tongan gentlemen who were in the middle of \textit{faikava}. When they got wind of why I was in Laie and learned of the topic of my research, one of the men explained the importance of the legacy of the Mau within \textit{faʻasamoa}. He asserted that the Mau resistance was the first time that Samoans stood up as a unified people to the injustices of imperialism and colonialism. He implicitly associated the Mau with the emergence of nationalism in Western Samoa. While Campbell’s apologetic tone in regards to the New Zealand Administration and his denigration of the Mau movement may hold some validity, in the end what’s notable is how the Mau is remembered within the collective consciousness of Samoans.

Perhaps it is best to look to the actual words of Mau leaders for a more precise notion of what the movement actually was. Or at the very least, how the Mau perceived themselves within Colonial Samoa. O.F. Nelson, one of the most prominent leaders of the Mau, explained that the “word \textit{Mau} means an opinion and also represents anything that is firm or solid”\textsuperscript{267}. In a general sense, Mau means to hold fast to an idea. Nelson goes on to specify this idea by saying:
In this case the Mau represents that very large majority of the people of these islands who are of the firm opinion that drastic changes are necessary in the Administration and in the method of government in Samoa²⁶⁸

In this light, the Mau was clearly perceived by its leadership to be a resistance movement formed to oppose the New Zealand colonial administration. Tupua Tamasese stated that “It is the wish of the Mau that Samoa should be controlled by Samoans”²⁶⁹. Whether or not this was a nationalist movement in the conventional sense is irrelevant to the purpose of this thesis and is debated elsewhere. What is important in regards to this topic is the fact that the Mau was exceedingly popular among the Samoan population, that its members purported to adhere to Christian principles and that the movement challenged every facet of Western authority, including the LDS Samoan Mission.

“Samoa Mo Samoa” (Samoa for Samoans). The Office of the Mau. Tupua Tamasese is dressed in white in the center²⁷⁰.
It seems that the one thing all scholars, first-hand observers and retrospective sympathizers of the Mau can agree on is the enormous popularity that the Mau enjoyed among Samoans during the late-1920s. This powerful social force confronted every mode of authority and power within Colonial Samoa. As mentioned above, the LDS Samoan Mission faced this Mau based, defiance of Western culture. As the previous chapters illustrate, by the 1920s the LDS Samoan Mission had clearly taken a more accommodating stance towards colonialism in Samoa. This tacit acceptance of the status quo, coupled with the new hierarchical relationships between Latter-day Saint missionaries and Samoans through the gathering of the Saints process placed Latter-day Saint missionaries in an uncertain and uncomfortable position vis-à-vis the ascendancy of the Mau. There seems to be a disconnect between the official, public discourse of the LDS Samoan Mission and the private journal entries of Latter-day Saint missionaries in regards to this threat to their authority. This disconnect indicates that the LDS Samoan Mission had began to control, select, organize and redistribute information in a favorable light.

By the early Twentieth Century, the LDS Church leadership in Salt Lake City sought to take a more accommodating stance in regards to U.S. political and social norms. The notions of theodemocracy articulated by Joseph Smith and other Church leaders from the Nineteenth Century began to be eradicated from political discourse in the Twentieth Century. When theodemocracy was mentioned, the Church leaders were cautious to emphasize that the concept was only applicable to the ecclesiastical sphere or the functions of the Church. Essentially, the LDS Church depoliticized and controlled its discourse.

A similar process of depoliticizing LDS discourse was occurring in Samoa during the early Twentieth Century. Following the militaristic eviction of the German Administration from Samoa, the LDS Samoan Mission sought to normalize its image and establish positive relations
with the New Zealand Administration. Sometime during the presidency of Elder William A. Moody, U.S. naval officials had requested that Samoan Latter-day Saint children come onboard one of the warships and sing. By 1923, the Latter-day Saint missionaries had given copies of the *Improvement Era* to Governor Major-General Richardson and other officials of the colonial administration and apparently the officials were “unanimous in pronouncing it a good wholesome magazine.” Of course this response doesn’t reveal a profoundly powerful relationship between the LDS Samoan Mission and the colonial administrations. In fact, it may imply the opposite. However, what is apparent is that the Latter-day Saint missionaries were interested in methodically solidifying the relationship between the Mission and the colonial apparatus. This should not necessarily be viewed in an insidious light; rather it should be seen as an attempt to progress from the uncertainty experienced under the German regime and to establish the Mission more firmly within the new colonial context.

About a year later, this strategy of building relations between the colonial administrators and the LDS Samoan Mission began to bear fruit. Latter-day Saint missionaries had been asked by the chaplain of the U.S. Navy in Tutuila to hold services for the naval men from time to time. Their services became so popular, that on the days when it was known that Latter-day Saint missionaries would be in charge of the service, the navy men would turn out in large numbers. Around fifty naval officers and their wives attended one such meeting. Also in attendance was Governor Kellogg of American Samoa. After the service, every single person who had attended, including Governor Kellogg, came and shook the hands of the Latter-day Saint missionaries.

The Latter-day Saint missionaries in Western Samoa were making strides toward further solidifying a relationship with the New Zealand Administration as well. By around the year
1924, Governor Richardson, his wife and other New Zealand officials were entertained at the LDS Samoan Mission Headquarters in Apia and Governor Richardson was given a book explaining the LDS Church\textsuperscript{276}. Before leaving Samoa for Utah, President Butler of the LDS Samoan Mission paid a visit to Governor Richardson’s home. Richardson asked:

Why is it that your boys come out here, young men, and can stay here three years, and we never hear of a smirch upon one of their names, but our boys come from New Zealand in government capacity for government positions, and we have to send a certain percentage of them back, because their acts bring a stigma upon the government?\textsuperscript{277}

This passage shows the extent to which Latter-day Saint missionaries in Samoa were respected for their lack of hypocrisy in regards to Christianity. While reading through this thesis, which focuses on the LDS Samoan Mission through the lens of Samoan Colonialism, it is easy to overlook how principled these Latter-day Saint young men were, a fact which greatly impacted the prestige and success of the Mission.

This strategy of firmly establishing the LDS Samoan Mission within Samoan colonialism placed the Latter-day Saint missionaries in direct conflict with the Mau. In the most abstract terms, the Mau was the manifestation of the contradiction between \textit{fa'asamo\texta} and Western imperialism intrinsic to Colonial Samoa. The gathering process implemented by the LDS Samoan Mission under the German Regime was an attempt to construct close-knit Latter-day Saint communities in the midst of a hostile ecclesiastical community. Also, it was deemed necessary to gather Samoan Latter-day Saints because such a large number had been exiled from their own villages by \textit{matai} who were loyal to other denominations of Christianity\textsuperscript{278}. Concomitant to this gathering process was the attempted eradication of elements of \textit{fa'asamo\texta} conceived to be incongruent with Western culture; at least this seemed to occur under President Adams. This gathering process oftentimes met stiff resistance from Samoan Latter-day Saints.
who did not wish to leave their villages. LDS Church membership began to decline. In 1908, President William A. Moody of the LDS Samoan Mission voiced his concern over the consequences of the gathering process, namely the dissatisfaction of the Samoan Latter-day Saints. The LDS Church leadership in Salt Lake City wrote to President Moody that “We too are of the opinion that too much stress was made to induce the breaking up of established homes…for the purpose of making new ones at the gathering places named” 279. This statement implies that the LDS Church leadership in Salt Lake City had never meant for the gathering process to become an assault on faʻasamoa and that LDS Church practices and doctrine should be accommodating to local norms and customs. The letter continued, stating that “…we are inclined to the belief that the colonizing effort has been undertaken with too much sacrifice”. The usage of the term ‘colonizing’ conjures notions of imperialism and cultural aggression. Such a conception may be too simplistic and contingent on contemporary shades of linguistic meanings. It is difficult to ascertain the precise meaning of the usage of the term in the above statement. What is clear from the statement is the notion that Christianity and LDS practices should be disseminated and encouraged among the Samoan Latter-day Saints, but not excessively and to the detriment of Samoan Latter-day Saint faith and, implicitly, faʻasamoa.

Despite the concerns of the LDS Samoan Mission president and the urgings of LDS Church leadership from Salt Lake City, the Latter-day Saint missionaries in Samoa seemed to increase their efforts to combat and eradicate faʻasamoa in the subsequent decades. This did not necessarily occur through the gathering process. In fact, by the early 1920s, the LDS Samoan Mission presidents placed less of an emphasis on gathering the Samoan Latter-day Saints 280. However, during the presidency of Willard Lisbon Smith, Samoan Latter-day Saint children were “removed from the control of the matai” and housed in compounds under the direct control
of Latter-day Saint missionaries. Essentially, this attack on *fa‘asamo’a*, set the stage for confrontation with the Mau during the second half of the 1920s.

With the ascendancy of the Mau, the authority of the LDS Samoan Mission was challenged. This challenge doesn’t necessarily mean a rejection of Christian teachings or LDS beliefs, but a challenge of missionary authority within the context of Christianity. Featuana‘i Ben points out that “The Mau not only touched the political disposition of the Samoan people, but also its religious vein.” Field has pointed out that his knowledge on Christianity within the context of Colonial Samoa is scant. However, he has informed me that throughout his interviews and discussions with Samoans in regards to the Mau, he has repeatedly been confronted with the fact that Samoans generally emphasized the role of Christianity within the Mau. The Mau didn’t only confront Western imperialism. The Mau appropriated Christianity, adhered to it to commendable extents and utilized its principles to emphasize the hypocrisy of colonialism in Samoa.

By the 1920s, the public discourse emanating from the LDS Samoan Mission was completely diluted of political and social commentary. It is difficult to ascertain if this shift to a public relations oriented discourse was due to the decisions of editors in Utah or the missionaries of the LDS Samoan Mission. Similarly, it is difficult to ascertain the reason for the decreased quantity of articles written by Latter-day Saint missionaries in Samoa and published in Utah. It could have been that editors in Utah weren’t interested in Samoan articles or that the missionaries themselves weren’t interested in drafting articles. Another possibility is that there was an intentional decision on the part of the LDS Samoan Mission presidents or the Church leadership in Salt Lake City to control the discourse from Samoa. Whatever the case, the glaring
silences within the articles that were published during this time indicate an implicit acceptance of the contemporary status quo within Samoa and a tacit acceptance of colonialism.

The only public discourse from the LDS Samoan Mission which references the Mau movement does so only briefly and doesn’t even use the word ‘Mau’. An article from 1928, “Work Progressing in the South Seas”, published in *Improvement Era*, indicates that the Latter-day Saint missionaries in Samoa viewed the Samoan resistance to colonialism as “unpleasant” but also as a blessing in disguise. The secretary of the LDS Samoan Mission, Elder Dewey, wrote that the growing conflict “has enabled us to present our message to all the chiefs of the island. We are very hopeful that the increased activities will continue to bring new converts to the Church as they are doing at the present time”\(^{284}\). According to this official version, the growing Mau resistance led to an increase in LDS membership. This posit of an increased conversion seems inaccurate and misleading. In fact, between 1925 and 1931 LDS Church membership increased a measly 140 new converts, from 3,695 to 3,835\(^{285}\). In comparison, between 1920 and 1925 membership increased by over 1,000 and another 1,000 between the years 1931 and 1935. The Mau resistance clearly had a negative impact on LDS Church membership during the late-1920s. Another indication of the negative impact of the Mau on the functions of the LDS Samoan Mission can be gleaned from the record of the celebration of Pioneer Day. This day was celebrated annually in Sauniatu, except for the years between 1928 and 1931, the years when the Mau were at its apex of resistance\(^{286}\).

Elder Dewey’s reference to presenting the LDS message to “all the chiefs of the island” seems to indicate that there was some circumstance where many *matai* were gathered together in one central location, allowing Latter-day Saint missionaries to convey their message to the *matai* as an audience. This is somewhat speculative, but I would argue that this indicates direct
interaction and modes of communication between the Mau and the LDS Samoan Mission, at the very least fleetingly. After all, by 1928, the Mau did consist of the majority of the *matai* of Samoa, a condition unrivaled in any other organization in Samoa during this time.

The private journals of Latter-day Saint missionaries seem to contradict this assertion that the Mau positively impacted the LDS Samoan Mission. Within Sauniatu, tensions between Latter-day Saints and the Samoan Latter-day Saints increased steadily during the late 1920s. In “Sauniatu, Western Samoa: A Special Purpose Village,” Baldridge seems unaware of the existence of the Mau during these years and is unable to contextualize the tensions. He points out that President Smith’s decision to evict the adults from Sauniatu may have been in response to the increasing tensions in the village. Conversely, he also posits that the opposite may have been true; that the increased tensions were directly caused by President Smith’s announcement to evict the adults. Britsch refers to President Smith’s eviction of Samoan Latter-day Saint adults in a clearly apologetic tone. Britsch states that the removal of the Samoan children “from the sometimes dictatorial control of the matai” was a necessary development that “allowed the children to spend a greater part of their time working on school matters.” He adds that the children were still required to work on the plantation.

Baldridge localizes this conflict to Sauniatu and fails to contextualize the tensions within the larger Mau movement. However, his sources do not. In his personal journal, Elder Howard B. Stone, missionary head of Sauniatu wrote on August 13, 1929, “Flaming youth!...Our village ‘mau’ consiting (sic) of Filiaga, Aiulu and Pulusi left the village...Elder Bailey was hot on their trail but they beat him to Apia” This excerpt from Elder Stone’s journal contains the only explicit reference to the Mau made by a Latter-day Saint missionary that was found through research for this thesis. While the recent eviction of the adult population of Sauniatu assuredly
increased the tensions in the village, the conflict within Saunitu has to be contextualized within the larger social force of the Mau. In fact, I would strongly argue that President Smith’s eviction of the Samoan Latter-day Saint adults from Sauniatu was an attempt to quell the manifestation of the Mau in the village. Even Britsch concedes that President Smith chose to purchase land separated from the village of Tapuelele because “he did not want the village heads…to have too much control”\(^\text{290}\). The fact that President Smith felt compelled to circumvent the authority of local *matai* indicates the extent to which he perceived the Mau to be a threat to the authority of the LDS Samoan Mission.
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Mau parade through Apia, Upolu\(^\text{291}\).
It is not surprising that the rebellious Samoan Latter-day Saints referred to above in Elder Stone’s journal entry chose Apia as their destination. By the middle of 1929, Mau parades occurred in Apia with greater frequency. In June, 500 Mau in uniform marched to Apia to hear Faumuina’s speech. For several days, over 100 uniformed Mau marched through Apia’s streets. Field writes “The whites found it all rather unsettling”292. The Apia region witnessed an enormous increase in Mau activity and became a prime destination for rebellious Samoan Latter-day Saint youth.

At times, the tensions in Sauniatu boiled over and threats of violence against Later-day Saints were articulated. Elder Stone writes of quarrels which resulted in “threats for murder…But ended up with a fiafia [party]293. Sometimes the threats materialized in unsettling ways that didn’t always end in a fiafia. On September 18, 1929, Elder Stone wrote in his diary:

…I licked Leamoni for beating Siai. The Siliva’s “mau” (sic) came over for a settlement. Meisa carried a rock that weighed (sic) about a ton. He wanted to drop it on my bean. Other boys had clubs and iron rods. I stod (sic) there in the door way…My arms folded. I talked them out of throwing rocks at me294

This dramatic account contradicts in sharp, loud terms the assertion that the Mau was a blessing in disguise for the LDS Samoan Mission. Indeed, the trajectory that the Mission took in the decades preceding the formation of this particular Mau relegated Latter-day Saint missionary young men to a position of danger and potential violence. A point that should be remembered is that these young men typically served as missionaries in Samoa for two or three years. This lack of experience in regards to the rapidly shifting social reality in the islands served as a disadvantage to Latter-day Saint missionaries. Essentially, upon arriving in Samoa, they were thrust into a political maelstrom of which they had no previous knowledge.
On May 21, 1929 the young Elder Stone wrote that “It seems as tho’ everything is in an uproar”\textsuperscript{295}. Several months later Elder Stone entered in his journal that “No Mutual was held because only a very few were in the village and we feared also a quarrel among our saints (sic) and the ‘mau’(sic)”\textsuperscript{296}. The Mau had become a player within the social structure of the Sauniatu Village. One of the more serious threats to the authority of the Latter-day Saint missionaries in Sauniatu occurred sometime during the summer of 1929\textsuperscript{297}. During a testimony meeting, several Samoan Latter-day Saints articulated the virtues of tithing when one individual arose and attacked the practice. Baldridge points out that speaking out and attacking Church doctrine, particularly during a testimony meeting, is “virtually unheard of in a Mormon meeting”\textsuperscript{298}. Elder Stone publicly denounced the actions of this individual and he was eventually told to leave the village by the Samoan Latter-day Saint community there. The individual refused to leave and Elder Stone requested the support of the chief of police in Apia\textsuperscript{299}. On August 2, the police arrived in Sauniatu to forcibly remove the rebellious individual, but by that point, he was supported by a group of Samoan Latter-day Saints. A disturbance broke out and the arrest became impossible. One Latter-day Saint missionary wrote that “…everyone turned traitors (sic) and wanted to \textit{fasi le faife’au}” which means (apparently in a mangled, Anglicized translation) ‘attack the missionaries’\textsuperscript{300}. Several aspects of this account of tensions boiling over in Sauniatu indicate the extent to which resistance was manifest within the relationship between the mostly American Latter-day Saint missionaries and Samoan Latter-day Saints. First, the fact that Elder Stone felt it prudent to call in the police to the village reveals a fear of acute upheaval or resistance. Second, the physical, group response to the attempted arrest is very similar to a tactic of the Mau. Less than
two months before this incident, several police attempted to arrest a wanted Mau member named Tagaloa in Apia. In response, forty Mau-some who were reportedly armed with batons-closed in and prevented the arrest. This is just one example recounted in Field’s *Mau* among several other instances of this tactic being used by Mau to prevent arrests. It seems that this tactic was used in Sauniatu as well. Third, the alleged threats to ‘attack the missionaries’ indicates the extent to which Latter-day Saint missionaries perceived the potential for violence. At this time, the usually peaceful Mau became more assertive, at times resisting arrest with force. Elder Stone’s above account of armed Samoan Latter-day Saints threatening him with a very large rock corroborates this perceived threat of violence. Indeed, the Samoan individual who had been temporarily saved from arrest reportedly threatened Elder Stone with a bush knife.

This incident also reveals that the Latter-day Saint missionaries used banishment as a tactic to combat insubordination or open defiance. Banishment was also a tactic wielded by both the German and New Zealand Administrations. Before his assassination on Black Saturday, Tupua Tamasese was exiled from Samoa by the New Zealand Administration. Furthermore, the New Zealand Administration frequently banished rebellious Samoans to villages that were not their own. There is evidence that the LDS Samoan Mission also utilized banishment as a tool to combat dissent as well. The above example of the attempted arrest of a defiant Samoan Latter-day Saint is one example. I would argue that President Smith’s decision to remove the adult Samoan Latter-day Saints from Sauniatu is another example. It is clear that there were tensions in the village when he implemented this collective banishment. Although Baldridge speculates that the banishment could have caused the tension, it seems reasonable to
argue that it only exacerbated already existing tensions and was only decided upon by President Smith in order to eradicate this tension. In response to the incident when a group of Samoan Latter-day Saint youths threatened Elder stone with “clubs and iron rods” as well as a “rock that weighed (sic) about a ton”, one of the perpetrators was ordered by the Latter-day Saint missionaries to leave the village. The conflict in Sauniatu became so acute that Elder Stone felt compelled to exile four Samoan Latter-day Saints for “many atrocious crimes…and causing trouble with the elders and saints”. By January of 1930, the Latter-day Saint missionaries of Sauniatu sought to implement a curfew. It is unclear if this was the policy of the New Zealand Administration, the LDS Samoan Mission or specifically the Church in Sauniatu. This conflict and reaction to resistance within Sauniautu must be contextualized within the larger umbrella of Mau resistance.

It must be pointed out that there were other Samoan Latter-day Saint memories and accounts which omit resistance and the Mau. In fact, during certain of the interviews conducted by Baldridge, he seems to urge his interviewees to discuss resistance and “trouble” within Sauniatu and Samoa during the 1920s. Again, in “Sauniatu, Western Samoa: A Special Purpose Village,” Baldridge seems unaware of a larger Mau movement but keenly aware of conflict and tension within Sauniatu Village. Fa’ane’e Tapusoa either had no recollection of conflict or didn’t wish to discuss the topic. It is significant that she doesn’t seem to remember conflict or many other events of a political nature, such as the New Zealand seizure of Western Samoa. It seems that these events failed to make a lasting impression on this Samoan Latter-day Saint.
Rather she recounted the way in which her father accepted the LDS Church because they weren’t required to give the Latter-day Saint missionaries monetary gifts, unlike missionaries and priests from other denominations. Also, because her father felt that the “Mormon faith was a church of harmony and righteousness”. This point must be emphasized. Many Samoans were drawn to the LDS Church because of the extent to which the Latter-day Saint missionaries adhered to the principles they taught, rarely acted hypocritically and led by example\(^{309}\). I would emphasize the fact that the Latter-day Saint missionaries who were confronted by the Mau were thrust into a political and social environment that they, personally did not create. The position of the LDS Samoan Mission in relation to the Mau was the consequence of previous Latter-day Saint missionaries in Samoa, particularly under President Adams.

During Teila and Mataniu Fonoimoanas’ interview, Baldridge seems even more determined to delve into any conflict or tensions within Sauniatu\(^{310}\). Despite this, the couple seems to have no recollection of serious disturbances. This probably had much to do with the fact that they had both moved from Sauniatu by 1926, potentially before the conflict between the Latter-day Saint missionaries and the Mau youth (or Mau supporters\(^{311}\)). It also may indicate the lack of importance that this Latter-day Saint couple placed on political or non-spiritual matters. They both had no recollection of New Zealand’s seizure of Western Samoa, despite Baldridge asserting that there was a New Zealand force that came marching over the mountains and paid a visit to Sauniatu sometime around 1915\(^{312}\). However, they both remembered the terrible influenza epidemic. In fact they were both ill from the sickness. Teila was the son of Opapo, one of the prominent Samoan Latter-day Saints of the early Twentieth Century. Apparently
Opapo lost loved ones during the epidemic\textsuperscript{313}. Fortunately Teila survived the calamitous epidemic.

Another faint voice emanating from the narrative of the LDS Mission in Colonial Samoa illustrates the role of one Samoan Latter-day Saint as a member of the Samoan Constabulary during the Mau era. Unlike many Samoan Latter-day Saint youth from Sauniatu, Seiuli Le-Tagaloatele Fitisemanu II chose a position within Colonial Samoa diametrically opposed to the Mau\textsuperscript{314}. Fitisemanu’s great grandfather was Malietoa Vainu‘upo, the Matai who was vying for the title of Tafa‘ifa when John Williams arrived in 1830\textsuperscript{315}. Around 1915, Fitisemanu’s mother sent him to Sauniatu, but he left after a short time and went to Mapusaga. A devout Latter-day Saint, Fitisemanu was very liberal in dedicating his time for the development of the LDS Church in Samoa. In 1929, Fitisemanu sought employment in the Native Affairs Office. Harry Griffin, LMS missionary as well as the Secretary for Native Affairs, laughed Fitisemanu out of his office after learning that he was a Latter-day Saint\textsuperscript{316}.

A.L. Braisby, the Commissioner of the Police Constabulary during the Mau era, contacted Fitisemanu and hired him as part of the Samoan Constabulary on September 5, 1929\textsuperscript{317}. Black Saturday occurred only four months later. However, it is highly unlikely that Fitisemanu played a role in the massacre. If Fitisemanu were a member of the Samoan Constabulary, he would have served alongside New Zealand officers, including Richard Waterson\textsuperscript{318}. Waterson was the officer who wielded the Lewis machinegun during the Black Saturday massacre\textsuperscript{319}. However, by June of 1929, only White police officers were allowed to carry firearms\textsuperscript{320}. Also, Braisby and Governor Colonel Stephen Allan had begun to use only White officers during important operations because of their
distrust of Samoan officers. With this in mind, even if Fitisemanu was present on Black Saturday, he was most likely unarmed and only present to keep order.

Fitisemanu doesn’t reveal many details about his duties as a police officer. He mentions that the “Mau Organization” was causing “serious trouble” between themselves and the administration. During this time, he won several badges of merit “for duty performed above my regular call”. He refers to these actions as “very serious and difficult duties,” but unfortunately fails to further elaborate. His story adds breadth do the Latter-day Saint experience in Samoa. It is difficult to make any generalizations about the Samoan Latter-day Saints in regards to the Mau from this story. Rather, Fitisemanu’s experience is just one of many possible outcomes in the context of Colonial Samoa.

The silences within Baldridge’s interviews as well as Fitisemanu’s explicit identification with the New Zealand colonial apparatus in Samoa reveal that the defiance and resistance exhibited by some Samoans in relation to the LDS Samoan Mission was not universal among Samoan Latter-day Saints. Rather, the Mau seemed to be unimportant to at least a few Samoan Latter-day Saints. The relationship between the larger Mau movement and the Samoan Latter-day Saints was complex, confusing and, at times, contradictive. Furthermore, the location of the LDS Samoan Mission in proximity to the Mau and the New Zealand Administration was not anomalous. The LMS Mission was far more entrenched within the colonial apparatus in Samoa. Consequently, the Mau posed a more direct and more organized threat to LMS authority. What is clear, however, is that the LDS Samoan Mission not only failed to support the largely Christian anti-colonial Mau, but actively opposed it in Sauniatu. Further research into other Samoan Latter-day Saint villages, such as Mapusaga, would probably reveal similar
conclusions. Long gone were the voices of Latter-day Saint missionaries during the 1890s publicly speaking out against imperialism in Samoa. In the wake of these loud voices were silences. These silences voiced acquiescence to the colonial status quo and hushed the Mau demand for justice.
Afterward

The preceding pages narrate the story of the LDS Samoan Mission and its relationship to imperialism, colonialism and resistance within Samoa during the late-19th and early-20th Centuries. It is the story of a somewhat verbally rebellious group of Latter-day Saint Missionaries speaking out against the ills of Western imperialism, the shift in the priorities of the LDS Mission to a more accommodating stance toward the status quo and finally, its failure to support the anti-colonial Mau movement. There are two perspectives from which to view this story which are particularly relevant to today’s geopolitical, social, economic and religious global reality. One could abstract from the particulars of the religious affiliations of the LDS Samoan Mission. We are left with the story of a Western institution and its role in the colonial (and inherently, decolonial) processes intrinsic to the relationship between industrial cores and peripheral economies within an increasingly integrated globe. On this very general level one could draw conclusions from the interaction between Western institutions and localized cultures globally, particularly the desire for cultural sensitivity.

Another perspective calls for emphasizing the LDS Samoan Mission’s affiliation with the LDS Church in order to illustrate one example of how the LDS Church has grappled with a localized culture. As the LDS Church becomes more accepted and attains greater prominence globally, it is crucial to understand the tensions inherent to spreading the Gospel within non-Western cultures. In fact, it is of great importance for the LDS Church leadership to be aware of the problems which arise when attempting to eradicate local culture and replacing it with LDS Church social norms. It is telling that the Church Leadership cautioned the LDS Samoan Mission against excessively combating faʻasamoa. The LDS Church seemed to be aware, even in the early Twentieth Century, of the problems intrinsic to combating local culture. In this way, the
LDS Church headquarters seemed to exhibit sensitivity to *faʻasamoa*. Unfortunately, the LDS Samoan Mission continued on its path to combat *faʻasamoa* and eventually found itself in the path of the Mau. The story of the LDS Samoan Mission under the German and New Zealand colonial regimes during the early Twentieth Century should be preserved for the purpose of not repeating history.

Similarly, the Latter-day Saint missionaries’ condemnations of imperialism during the 1890s should be preserved as well, at the very least for its inspirational value. In a world still very much hostile to the LDS Church, such a story brings to light a very positive story within the larger LDS narrative. The story of the LDS Samoan Mission in the midst of a Western imperialist-caused Samoan civil war during the 1890s illustrates one example of how Latter-day Saint missionaries navigated a tumultuous localized social arena. Silencing their discourse would have been an insult to the notion that history is socially valuable, an injustice to the missionaries themselves and a disservice to the image of the LDS Church.

Exploring the role of the LDS Samoan Mission between the years 1930-1962 and beyond would probably prove fruitful. A better understanding of the Mission’s role in Samoa following the partial success of the Mau, Western Samoan independence in 1962 and the subsequent decolonization process would undoubtedly prove valuable to academia in general as well as to Latter-day Saints and Latter-day Saint missionaries specifically. It would be a great supplement to this thesis. It would also undoubtedly contribute to the history of *faʻasamoa*. 
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