

Alan C. Miner

December 15, 2004

A Chronology of LDS Thought on Polynesian Origins

A Reflection on Book of Mormon Geography

1921 -----> 1980

Copyright 2003 by Alan C. Miner. All rights reserved

Statements by Church Authorities

Significant *Books*, "Articles," & Events

[Significant Theoretical or Illustrated Models, or Illustrations Related to Book of Mormon Geography]

Notes*

YEAR1

PERSON

PRIMARY SOURCE2

Note 1: The mark ^ after the year is purely a research tool indicating that a copy of the article or book is on file in the author's personal library.

Note 2: The year (listed on the left) for the event or quote is not always the same as the date of the primary source (listed on the right) from which the information was taken. If the source information (the

later publication of the information) was significant, in and of itself, to the later time period in which it came forth, there will also be a separate listing for that later year. When appropriate, additional sources will be listed.

1921^ Willard Young "Notes on Geographical References in the Book of Mormon", n.d.
(post-1920)

LDS Church Historical Dept., MS 5094 4.

Note* This is a typescript from an item from the Church Historical Department (MS 5094 4). The title is, "Notes on Book of Mormon geography" [n.d.]. On the last page there is a note which reads, "There is no trace of a date on this material, but obviously it is post 1920 for he refers to that edition." The following note is pertinent:

P. 358, v. 5. Hagoth, taking his course northward, went into the Gulf of Honduras near the mouth of the Ulua. then northward sailing between the northeast corner of Ukatan (sic) and the Island of Cuba, and landing in Florida, probably Pensacola harbor. After landing, he and his party gradually spread northward, some going up the Atlantic coast, east of the Alleghany Mnts but most going up the great valley of the Mississippi. It is probable that the descendants of these people were the mound builders of the Mississippi River.

The Zicaue Indians are the Nephite Indians. The Poyas Indians are named for Pahoran in the Book of Mormon.

1921^ Duncan M. McAllister "Important Appeal to Native Hawaiians and Other Polynesians,"

(Polynesians) *Improvement Era* 24 (1921 June), pp. 703-12.

In this article, Duncan McAllister, Hawaii Temple recorder, briefly combines the arguments from his 1920 *Improvement Era* article (see notation) and the 1920 *Improvement Era* article by William Waddoups, Secretary of the Hawaiian Mission (see notation). He then connects these arguments and traditions with not only the history recited in the Book of Mormon, but the historical traditions chronicled by others:

The Reverend William Ellis writes in regard to Polynesia, "These islands were peopled from a country whose inhabitants were highly civilized." He further says, "Many customs . . . warrant the inference that the Polynesians have a Hebrew origin." He refers to many points of resemblance between them and the American Aborigines, in language, traditions, manners and customs, and says that some members of the

race inhabiting western America might "proceed to the Sandwich islands, and thence spread over Polynesia.

Sir George Grey, in his *Traditional History of the New Zealand Race* says, "The religious system of ancient Mexico was, probably, to some extent connected with them," the New Zealanders. He also states that traditions, poems and names commonly found among the natives of New Zealand are very similar to those of the Hawaiians.

All that has been stated by such celebrated writers as Kingsborough and Bancroft concerning traditions, manners, customs and religious ideas of the American Indians can be applied also to Hawaiians, and other Polynesians. Colton, another writer on American antiquities, says the American Indians assert that they have "descended from one man who had twelve sons, (Israel); that this man was a notable and renowned prince." This agrees remarkably with one of the Hawaiian traditions quoted by Fornander.

Lord Kingsborough says that the inhabitants of Guatemala, where America was discovered, "believed that they were descended from the Jews, and retained a tradition of the bondage which their ancestors suffered, and their miraculous passage through the Red Sea." He quotes the historian Boturini saying, "They were of the posterity of Shem, the son of Noah, who, at the confusion of tongues, scattered themselves over many countries, whence some of them journeyed until they arrived in America."

Surprise is sometimes expressed by historians, and other investigators, that the Hawaiians, Maoris and other Polynesians had no knowledge of the Christian religion before the coming of Europeans to these islands in modern times. The reasonable conclusion is that the Hawaiians, the ancestors of other Polynesians, came from the mainland to the Pacific Islands before the Christian era, consequently their religious traditions mainly embraced subjects of an Israelitish character, concerning the Creation, The Flood, the Tower of Babel, etc.

Assuming that the race from whom the Hawaiians have descended were Israelites, it is a reasonable probability that some of the forefathers left Palestine in very ancient times, to escape the terrible persecution to which they were subjected by the surrounding nations. That condition was strenuous about 600 B.C.; and historians of Polynesia have calculated it was near that time when some of those people began going eastward from the Asiatic continent. However, the best chronologies of the Hawaiians show that these islands were first inhabited only a short time before the Christian era, therefore it is deduced that the refugees referred to went to the American continent about the time mentioned, and subsequently came to Hawaii from there.

Sahagun, the historian, asserts, concerning the coming to America of the Indians of whom he was writing, "It would appear that they or their ancestors were in this affair directed by an oracle from God." Believers in the Divine Providence who guided his chosen people, Israel, in ancient time, will have no difficulty in agreeing with those American Indians, to whom Sahagun refers, that they were led to the great land of America "by an oracle of God." For a colony to cross the Indian and Pacific oceans, from Arabia, in those far distant times, would require the guiding inspiration of a man of God to enable them to build, provision and sail vessels to carry them on such an extensive voyage.

This prompts us to introduce consideration of the history of the peopling of the great American Continent, as related in the Book of Mormon, the only book in existence that claims to be an authentic history of the ancient inhabitants of America. . . . A circumstance is related in this Book of Mormon history that has great significance for Hawaiians and other Polynesians, as it demonstrates the probability that Hawaii, and possibly others of the Pacific islands, were peopled by colonists from the west coast of Central or South America. The circumstance was this, the locations in that region became overcrowded, and a clever artizan, named Hagoth, caused large ships to be built, near the narrow neck of land which we call the Isthmus of Panama, and many of the people embarked in those vessels for the purpose of settling in localities north of that section. It is stated that those ships made a number of successful

voyages from there, returning again for other passengers. Mention is made of two of the ships that departed with passengers, etc., but that they were never heard of again. It has been assumed that the prevailing winds and ocean currents may have carried them west to Hawaii. As the voyages of these vessels occurred, especially, in the years 55 and 54 B. C.; and the best chronological tables that have yet been formulated, concerning the ancient Hawaiians, indicate the probability that the original settlement of these islands took place a short period before the Christian Era, the coincidence is regarded as significant. Dr. S. Percy Smith, in his book entitled, *Hawaiki*, states: "About the year B.C. 65, we come to the first actual traces of any migration," (to the Polynesian Islands). He has inserted that date for migration in the Rarotongan chronological table, at the end of his book.

Note* The association of the narrow neck of land with the "Isthmus of Panama" implies a Hemispheric Model of Book of Mormon geography.

Note* Brigham H. Roberts notes that in the B. H. Roberts collection in the Marriott Library, there is a six-page article entitled "Relationship of American Aborigines and Pacific Islanders," "compiled by D. M. McAllister" and with notes from Reverend William Ellis's "Polynesian Researches."

1921^ **D. M. McAllister** "Evidence As to the Origin of the Polynesian People,," in *Liahona: The*
(Polynesians) *Elder's Journal*, vol. 19, No. 10-677 (November 8, 1921), Independence,
MO: Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, pp. 207-208

In an article recording the remarks by Elder D. M. McAllister, in the Salt Lake Tabernacle, Sunday, March 20, 1921 we find the following:

My brethren and sisters, and friends, I am unexpectedly called to speak to you concerning my recent mission to the Hawaiian Islands. I spent sixteen months there, associated with the natives of those islands. . . . I have no hesitancy in declaring to this congregation that they are descendants of the House of Israel. In my calling, as a Patriarch in the Church, I ministered in behalf of hundreds who came to me desiring Patriarchal blessings, and, under the influence of the Spirit of the Lord, I was able to tell them that they are descendants of Father Abraham.

In my experience among the Hawaiians, I observed a great resemblance, in their physical appearance, to the aborigines of this country. Upon investigating their history and traditions, I ascertained that there was much to verify the belief that they are of the same race as the American Indians. I obtained, from the public library in Honolulu, as many histories of the people as I could find, that had any reference to their origin, and I noticed that the historians invariably declare that the original country is a mystery, that it cannot be positively determined from whence they came to those islands of the Pacific Ocean. Most of the writers advance the theory that several hundred years before the Christian Era, there had been a gradual migration from Asia to these islands, but they can submit no positive proof thereof.

It is well known to the Latter-day Saints that George Q. Cannon and Joseph F. Smith, who were among the first missionaries of our Church to Hawaii--George Q. Cannon going there in the year 1850, and Joseph F. Smith in 1854, I believe, were led, no doubt under the inspiration of the Spirit of the Lord, to announce that the natives of those islands were of the same race as the American Indians, the Nephites or Lamanites, as we call them. I endeavored to verify their statement from the history and traditions that I had access to, and had some satisfactory experience concerning the matter. I found that, although a majority of the historians had failed to determine from whence the people came who first had inhabited those islands, they had formulated theories deciding that they were not of the same race as the American Indians. But I was gratified to learn there were two or three who intimated a belief that the Polynesians might be of the same race as the American Aborigines.

During my stay in Hawaii, after the Temple in Laie was completed and ordinance work had been commenced therein, it happened that a deputation of members of the Church came to Laie from New Zealand, to engage in the Temple work. They were natives of that country--Maoris. One of the first things they endeavored to do, after their arrival in Hawaii, was to prepare their genealogies, for the purpose of engaging in performance of Temple ordinances in behalf of their ancestors. As Recorder for the Temple in Laie, it was my duty to assist them in the preparation of their records. While formulating the genealogies we discovered that two of the brethren who had come from New Zealand, and who had not previously had opportunity to compare their genealogies, when we undertook to arrange them, we were pleased to find that the pedigrees of those two brethren merged together in the distant past, over a thousand years. We ascertained that the family lines then united, and that they were mutually and directly related to a prominent chieftain named Hema, who had lived in the Hawaiian Islands, and had gone from Hawaii to one of the South Pacific Islands, Tahiti. His descendants went from there to New Zealand, and were among the first colonizers of that country. Thus a racial relationship between Hawaiians, Maoris and other Polynesians was clearly demonstrated.

I had occasion to arrange the genealogy of the great king of Hawaii, Kamehameha, for Temple purposes, and I took for the foundation thereof a pedigree that had been prepared by the foremost Hawaiian historian, Dr. Fornander; who had succeeded in obtaining the traditional genealogy of the noted chief, going back for many generations. You may not be aware of the fact that the Hawaiians, and other Polynesians, have no written genealogies or history; their pedigrees are transmitted from father to sons, concerning the ancestors of this most celebrated Hawaiian ruler. Under instructions of the President of the Mission and the President of the Temple, I undertook to prepare that pedigree for Temple work, that it might, perhaps, be made possible to perform ordinances in behalf of those dead ancestors of Kamehameha. In the document thus prepared I found that the genealogies of the two brethren from New Zealand merged into the pedigree of the King of Hawaii; one of the individuals in his line was the same Hema who was an ancestor of the two men from New Zealand.

This, of course, was a very interesting disclosure; and it was subsequently ascertained that others of the Hawaiian members of the Church had pedigrees running into the lines of Kamehameha and these New Zealand brethren. Thus it was clearly determined that the New Zealanders and Hawaiians are related, a fact demonstrated so effectively that the discovery was made known to many of the Hawaiian residents of Honolulu, some of whom are direct descendants of King Kamehameha, or other Hawaiian chiefs.

When this was disclosed to them, and articles were published in the Honolulu newspapers calling attention to the fact, prominent Hawaiians were delighted, and they asked these Maoris, then visiting Laie--fourteen brethren and sisters--to meet with them in Honolulu, and talk over this matter of the discovered relationship between Hawaiians and the New Zealanders. The meeting resulted in the Hawaiians becoming satisfied that our discovery was an undoubted demonstration of the fact that the natives of Hawaii, New Zealand, and others of the Pacific Islands, were originally of the same race. The Honoluluans were so pleased about this that they held a public reception and demonstration in honor of the Maoris, in one of the largest buildings in Honolulu, the Armory Hall. The members of the Hawaiian societies came there in large numbers, also many prominent officials of the city and Territory. I was present and was delighted to witness the esteem and affection manifested by the Hawaiians for their

brethren and sisters, as they called them, of New Zealand. About three thousand persons were present on the occasion. It truly was an enthusiastic demonstration in recognition of racial relationship.

There are other things of interest, connected with my experiences in Hawaii, that I might relate, but I must not intrude further upon your attention, but will close my remarks by stating that it has also been ascertained, at least to the satisfaction of the members of the Church, believers in the Book of Mormon, that the pedigree of Kamehameha, which we were able to formulate, furnishes evidence that the natives of Polynesia came from the American continent about fifty years before the Christian Era; corresponding with the statement we find in the Book of Mormon regarding the departure of certain vessels from the western coast of this continent, vessels built by Hagoth the shipbuilder, two of which never returned. This also was a very interesting discovery.

As Latter-day Saints, we have reason to claim that everything connected with this Church, the doctrines, the history, the development which we have heard discussed this afternoon by President Ivins, all things clearly evidence that we are not mistaken in our testimony, that this is in very deed the Church of Jesus Christ. . . .

1922^ John Q. Adams "Origin of the Maoris," in *Improvement Era* 25 (1922 April), pp. 507-8.

(Polynesians)

In 1922, John Q. Adams, President of the Samoan Mission would write:

A very interesting bit of narrative was given me by Brother James Southon of this mission, who himself, remembers it distinctly from reading it in a current magazine, the *Australian Review of Reviews*, a decade since. At the time, for some strange reason, it impressed him deeply, and since joining our Church, some seven years ago, its real significance becomes more apparent as an additional light upon Book of Mormon truths. Here is the narrative as Brother Southon relates it:

A certain Captain Barclay, of *H. M. S. Orpheus*, cruising in New Zealand waters, was at one time the guest of Sir George Grey, the governor of New Zealand. In conversation, the topic discussed turned to the origin of the Maoris. The governor informed the captain that on the island of Motutapu (forbidden or sacred island), there were at that time two stone gods which were looked upon by the Maoris as so sacred as to be viewed by no one except attending priests, upon pain of death. The governor himself had been permitted this privilege, however, through some favor extended the natives in days gone by. The result of the conversation was that Captain Barclay became sufficiently interested to desire a glimpses also of such relics.

Through intercession of the governor, the captain obtained permission to visit the island. He was greatly struck with the enormous size of the two images, upon coming to examine them. Both were some fifteen feet in height, and of an estimated weight of more than a ton each. Upon inquiry as to the source of the origin of the images, the Maoris informed him that they had been brought from an island called Hawaiki, which place they were accustomed to visit in former days. . . .

As regarding the stone from which the images had been sculptured, no similar material of like formation existed in New Zealand. This gave Captain Barclay the idea that, providing he could trace the

source of the origin of the gods, he would simultaneously be able to connect the origin of the Maoris with their present abode.

Some two years after this event, the captain was cruising in his vessel in the vicinity of Easter Island, some four thousand miles from New Zealand, engaged in survey work. Upon setting foot ashore he was astonished to see several gods very similar to those encountered in New Zealand. Some were in a perfect state of preservation, while others were partially demolished, some being in the sea where they could be seen at low tide. Here again the search was instituted for the quarry from which the images could have been taken, but all to no purpose.

Puzzled but still persistent, the captain later on heard of such a quarry having been discovered in South America on the banks of the Orinoco River, in Peru. Having occasion to pass that way, on one of his cruises, he made it a point to call, and found the identical sort of god in material shape, size, and in every particular that he had originally observed in the New Zealand images! Although these three strangely encountered places where he had providentially stumbled upon his clue, were thousands of miles apart, and in isolated sections of the earth, yet they became at once well connected links in a chain of perfect evidence as to these sacred images originating in South America.

In the face of such a remarkable and incontrovertible fact as this, that in some olden generation the Polynesian island groups could have been peopled by inhabitants from the American continent far to the eastward as easily as that such massive handiwork of theirs could thus be transported across an ocean, how can skepticism of the most pronounced character, scoff at such unimpeachable testimony? Bit by bit conclusive evidence of the divinity of the Book of Mormon, with its history of the ancient Israelitish inhabitants of the Western Hemisphere, is accumulating as the years pass . . .

Note* It is a little stretch to refer to a second-hand story 10 years removed as "unimpeachable testimony." Concerning the origin of the stone for the gods on Easter Island, see the Jan. 1933 *Improvement Era* article by George Paul (see notation).

Additionally, the Orinoco River was considered by many members of the Church who espoused a Hemispheric Model of Book of Mormon geography as the River Sidon. Its location, however, was in Colombia.

1923 Melvin J. Ballard Conference Report, October 1923, p. 29

In the October Conference of 1923, Apostle Melvin J. Ballard spoke of "millions of Lamanites" who have the blood of Lehi in their veins":

For this very purpose, therefore, were these plates preserved, to bring to pass the redemption of the children of father Lehi, known in North and South America, in Central America, and in Mexico, as the American Indians and some of the natives upon the isle of the sea. . . . I have seen the hand of the Lord at work in preparing the way for their redemption. . . . when these thousands, yea these millions of Lamanites on this Western Continent who have the blood of Lehi in their veins, or of his descendants,

shall be touched by the power of the Almighty, and the day of their redemption when it does come, will be one of power.

1924^ Edward Henry Anderson "Hagoth's Lost Ships and Hawaii," in *Improvement Era* 27

(Polynesians) (1924 March), pp. 482-83.

Edward Anderson writes:

In many of the religious ceremonies of the early Hawaiians and their priests there is a close alliance with Israel of ancient Palestine. . . . It indicates clearly that many Hawaiian practices , and even the manner of constructing their temples, bear resemblance to those of ancient Palestine. As witness this quotation:

The Hawaiians had their temples of refuge into which the pursued from justice, malefactors, and innocently accused person, could seek and receive shelter and respite from injury, until the temple authorities could determine their guilt or innocence. . . . They had their purification of temples with salt, similar to the ceremony in Palestine. They performed the ceremony of the circumcision as it was performed in the Holy Land. They had their ashes and sackcloth. The priesthood was related to the government and to the direction of the habits of the rulers, as the priesthood was related to the rulers in Palestine.

May not this similarity confirm the idea that the Hawaiians may have come west from America to settle these islands and that they are related to the Indians whose ancestors came to the American continent from Jerusalem, as related in the Book of Mormon? . . . [He quotes Alma 63:5-8] . . .

The Hawaiians are undoubtedly related to the Polynesians whose mariners sailed back and forth to and from Hawaii, and it is not unreasonable to credit the idea that the Lamanites from the American mainland drifted to the islands and became mixed with or even the progenitors of the present natives.

1927^ J. M. Sjodahl *An Introduction to the Study of the Book of Mormon*, SLC: Deseret News

Press, 1927

Chapter 6

Hagoth.

In the Book of Mormon, Hagoth, we are told, built an exceedingly large ship on the borders of the land Bountiful, by the land Desolation, and launched it forth into the West Sea, by the narrow neck which led into the land northward. Afterwards other expeditions to the land northward were undertaken. This was about the year 55 B.C.

California Indians attribute a large artificial mound formed of mussel shells and bones of animals, on Point St. George, near San Francisco, to a prehistoric people which they call *Hohgates*. Whether this name is the Book of Mormon Hagoth is a question which seems to be pertinent.

According to traditions, the Hohgates were seven strangers, who arrived from the sea and who were the first to build houses to live in in that part of the country. **(note)** . . .

Lehi.

In the November number, 1921, of *The Paradise of the Pacific*, a magazine published in Honolulu, the statement occurs that the ancient name for *Diamond Head*, a prominent volcanic mountain, was *Leahi*. This is but a very slight variation in spelling, from the name, as it is given in the Book of Mormon.

1929 Rufus K. Hardy *Te Karere*, New Zealand Mission Magazine, 21 August, 1929

(Polynesians)

In a 1977 paper, Elwin Jensen would write the following:

President Rufus K. Hardy of the First Council of Seventy had a firm testimony that the Polynesians were descendants of Lehi. He mentioned this fact in a number of sermons, some of which have not been preserved. But in a speech given in Salt Lake City he spoke of his love for the Maori people and said that they are of the true blood of Israel. He stated his belief that the Polynesians would someday return to the land of America, for "this land belongs to them . . . as it does to all the descendants of Lehi."

Source: Elwin W. Jensen "Polynesians Descend from Lehi, According to Statements of the Prophets," 1977, LDS Archives.

Note* See the Jensen notation for 1977.

1933^ **George F. Paul** "The Mystery of the Pacific," in *Improvement Era* 36, January 1933,

(Polynesians) pp. 148-49.

George Paul writes:

Few spots in all the length and breadth of the globe have the enthralling interest that is centered around Easter Island, "the mystery of the Pacific." . . . This island is in the South Pacific, about 2,000 miles from Chile, to which it was annexed in 1888. It is on this island that are preserved the enduring memorials of workers in cyclopean stone. These great images are far beyond the capacity of the present islanders. These stone statues are huge masses of tufa-crowned human shapes mounted upon platforms, usually along the edges of the cliffs. They are found in all stages of development, from the partly hewn block in the quarries to the monument finished and erected in place. They are claimed by the traditions of the islanders as the work of their forefathers down to quite recent generations. Yet, despite the tradition, it is difficult to see how a people unacquainted with metals could hew these great masses of volcanic rock, or how, without some mechanical help, they could lift these weights over the crater rim, transport them long distances and rear them on end.

1933^ **Archibald F. Bennett** "The Ancestry of Hyrum De Fries," in *The Utah Genealogical and*

(Polynesians) *Historical Magazine*, January 1933, pp. 1-3.

Archibald F. Bennett writes:

In February, 1931, an excursion of eager workers went from Los Angeles Stake to the Arizona Temple. In the company was Sister Hazel Vance, who was going to be baptized for the dead. While in the temple she was blessed by a servant of the Lord, and promised that she should be granted the desire of her heart, which was that she might later receive in that holy houses blessings for herself and her forefathers.

After his return to Los Angeles, this same elder who had pronounced the blessing upon her was called upon to administer to Brother Hyrum De Fries. The doctors had declared that Brother De Fries could not possibly recover, for his whole side was paralyzed. Under inspiration the elder promised him that he would not be called to depart this life until a work should be performed for his dead.

After the administration Hyrum De Fries said that he had prayed continually to the Lord that he might be spared to gather his genealogy. It was now learned by the elder that Sister Vance was the daughter of Brother De Fries. . . .

The elder, knowing of the promises made through him to both father and daughter, sought some means of helping them trace their pedigree. To his surprise he learned that Hyrum De Fries, although son

of a father born in Hanover, Germany, and married to a wife whose parents were born in Denmark, was himself born at Hanalii, Hawaii. His mother was *Hale-o-Keawe*, a native Hawaiian said to be descended from families of highest rank and even from the royal family of Hawaii. . . .

About this time a representative from the Genealogical Society of Utah came to Los Angeles to attend a Stake Genealogical Convention. . . . [Becoming acquainted with the story of Hyrum De Fries] the representative returned to the genealogical Library in Salt Lake City. There he found that Hawaiian genealogies, carefully preserved for generations by natives especially trained to remember them, had been printed many years ago. These books are now very rare, but a set is in the Library. With the help of these a pedigree has been traced back from Hazel De Fries Vance, daughter of Hyrum De Fries, 62 generations to *Hawaii-loa*, who was born about 88 years B.C. . . .

The legend of *Hawaii-loa* has been preserved in detail, and the version printed is that given by one of the ablest native genealogists. The story it tells is almost word for word like the story of Hagoth in the Book of Mormon. . . .

Others beside Sister Vance and her parents have received great joy from this result, for they see in it a direct fulfillment of the prayer offered by President Heber J. Grant, at the dedication of the Hawaiian Temple at Laie, Oahu, on Nov. 27, 1919, in which he said:

We thank thee that thousands of the descendants of Lehi, in this favored land, have come to a knowledge of the Gospel. We thank thee, our Father and our God, that those who are living and who have embraced the Gospel, are now to have the privilege of entering this holy house, and laboring for the salvation of the souls of their ancestors. . . .

1934^ G. Albin Matson "Blood Grouping Among the Indians" in *Improvement Era* 37,
(Polynesians) March 1934, pp.

In 1934, Albin Matson, an assistant professor in bacteriology working toward his Ph.D. in bacteriology and immunology would write the following:

The percentage distribution of the blood groups among full blooded American Indians has been a matter of particular interest to anthropologists and serologists, since there has consistently been reported a very high percentage of group I among them, i.e., from 72 per cent to 99 per cent among various tribes. This high occurrence of group I has been interpreted by anthropologists as evidence that the American Indian was at one time a pure Group I people and that other groups among them is a result of racial crossing. It has also been supposed that the American Indian is a very primitive race which separated from the rest of the human family before the factors which determine groups II, III, and IV developed.

Very recently, however, investigation made among the "Blackfeet" and "Blood" tribes of American Indians has revealed the fact that among these people group II is just as preponderant as is group I among other Indian tribes studied until now. The Blackfeet showed 76.5 per cent group II and the Blood tribe 83.3 per cent.

Only a few other instances are recorded in which a similar high frequency of group II occurs. Baffin Island Eskimos have been reported by Heinbecker and Paulli as having 63.89 per cent group II. Dr. Nigg

found 60.8 per cent group II among native Hawaiians and group II has been reported as high as 62.6 per cent among the Laps of Sweden.

This data of the blood groups among the American Indians has, I believe, a peculiar interest for Latter-day Saints. Not only is this interest an academic one, but it is stimulated by the fact that the "Book of Mormon" gives an account of the origin of the American Indian.

It is significant that putative full blood Indians are so overwhelmingly either group I or group II, and that the blood group distribution becomes more like that of the white man the more admixture there is with the white race. This is what would be expected for any hereditary characteristic. It means that both group I and group II Indians were at one time pure races and that other groups among them are a result of racial or tribal crossing. . . .

Another interesting theory that has been held by some anthropologists is that the American Indian is of Mongoloid origin. It is supposed that he came from Asia to this continent via Behring Strait. The blood group data obtained among the Blackfeet and Bloods does not support this conclusion. The Hirsfelds found that the factor which determines group II is most concentrated in peoples of western Europe and the factor which determines group III in peoples of Asia, and most writers have concluded that these factors had their origin in these respective localities. Mutation II it is assumed, probably occurred in Europe and mutation III in India or the Orient, and were carried and spread by migration from these places. II spreading eastward, III westward. If this is correct one would expect to find group III and not II in a people of Mongoloid origin.

Attention has already been called to the fact that the Polynesians, notably the Hawaiians, have a high percentage of group II among them. On the basis of the tentative "law" of serological race-classification, formulated by Dr. L. H. Snyder, this may be a matter of considerable importance. The third of Snyder's "laws" is as follows: "If any person shows blood group frequencies similar to a group of peoples not known to be related to it, the conclusion may be drawn that the former traces back to the latter somewhere in its ancestry, or else that the former has undergone crossing with the latter group or some similar people."

It must be pointed out, however, that while the blood groups may profitably serve an additional criteria in determining racial relationships, their value should not be overestimated. . . . While the datum obtained among the Blackfeet Indians when considered by itself does certainly not prove that the group II American Indians and the native Hawaiians are related, it may nevertheless be regarded as significant evidence in this direction when viewed in the light of social and religious traditions among these peoples. For such information the reader is referred to such books as "Collection of Hawaiian Folk Lore," Dr. Abraham Fornander; "Traditional History of the New Zealand Race," Sir George Grey; and articles by Elder Duncan M. McAllister, "Improvement Era," June, 1921; "Liahona," page 97, 1920, Nov. 22, 1921, and Dec., 1922; "Deseret News," Sept. 9, 1922; also an article by Elder Wm. M. Waddoups, "Improvement Era," Oct., 1920.

In conclusion then it may be said: (1) that the evidence of the blood groups points to the existence of two serological classes of American Indians; (2) these Indians had a separate origin and were at one time pure races, each probably coming from a small homogeneous group so far as the blood groups are concerned; (3) the "Blackfeet" and "Blood" tribes of American Indians at least did not separate from the human family before the inheritable factor for group II developed in the race; (4) the theory of a Mongoloid origin of the American Indian is certainly not strengthened, if not definitely weakened by finding so high a percentage of group II among the "Blackfeet" and "Blood" tribes of Indians; and (5) the finding of such a preponderance of group II among the "Blackfeet" and "Bloods" is further evidence of a relationship between these American Indians and native Hawaiians.

1934 (Mission President) LDS Quarterly Reports, Nuku'alofa and Salt Lake City, August, 1934

(pol)

In a Ph.D dissertation concerning the dynamics of Mormonism among the Tongan people, Tamar Gordon writes:

Mormon missionaries had attempted to establish a mission in Tonga in 1891, and then again in 1916 after a hiatus. . . . the first recorded attempt to promulgate Lamanite origins to Tongans appears in an entry by the Mission President in *LDS Quarterly Reports* in August, 1934. . . :

A small projection machine and a film showing ancient ruins in America has proven to be a very valuable instrument in the tongan mission. The presentations have stimulated so much concern among the people relative to their own origin that most of all our priesthood members, missionaries and many of the saints are finding themselves busy answering questions asked by their neighbors and friends.

Source: ^Tamar G. Gordon, "Inventing Mormon Identity in Tonga," Ph.D diss., University of California, Berkeley, 1988, pp. 130-131.

1935[^] J. Reuben Clark, Jr. "The Outpost in Mid-Pacific," in the *Improvement Era*, vol. 38, September,

(Polynesians) 1935, No. 9,

In this article, President J. Reuben Clark, Jr., First Counselor in the Presidency of the Church, chronicles a visit of the First Presidency to the Hawaiian Islands in June, 1935 in order to organize a new Stake. Heber J. Grant was President of the Church at the time. President Clark sets forth the significance of this action by reviewing the history of missionary work in the Pacific Islands. He writes:

Among the most reverent and touching memories to be found in the Islands today are those upon the missionary labors of President Cannon, particularly those having to do with his work in Maui. . . . On the slopes of the lofty crater of the extinct volcano Haleakala, at the little village of Pūhā, stands a monument erected to President George Q. Cannon, marking the place where he translated the Book of Mormon; it is near the place where he performed his first baptism in the Islands. . . .

Again, Hawaii is the gateway to all of our branches in the widely scattered islands of the Pacific. . . . Furthermore, the Temple at Laie stretches out its sanctifying welcome not only to that great group of descendants of Lehi in the Pacific, but also and equally to all others in New Zealand and Australia, who have in them the blood of Israel. . . .

It was a great satisfaction to President Grant to find that under the able direction of President Castle H. Murphy, the people had been trained to a point where it was possible to set up a stake and ward

organization which was largely manned by Hawaiians. Indeed, the distribution of stake-offices, regular and auxiliary, between the Hawaiians and the other Church members was essentially proportionate to their relative numbers. This was a matter of peculiar gratification to President Grant, first, because, he felt that the Hawaiian Saints were entitled to a large representation by reason of their long faithfulness and training; next, because he felt it was a demonstration to all the descendants of Lehi, wherever they may be, that they are in fact and in practice entitled, when they join the Church and remain faithful, to all the blessings promised them in Holy Writ.

1935^ Harold Christensen "Speculations on Polynesian Origins," in *Improvement Era* 38,
(Polynesians) November 1935, pp. 672-74, 711.

Harold Christensen spent several years as a missionary in the South Sea Islands where he learned the language of the Maoris and spent considerable time listening to the stories they had of their origin. He later graduated and subsequently became a member of the faculty at Brigham Young University. He writes:

Hagoth's ships sailed "forth into the west sea by the narrow neck which led into the land northward." In other words, the point of sailing must have been somewhere on the western shores of Central America. In that event, it is highly possible that the lost expedition was caught in an ocean current and carried by it from the mainland to the Hawaiian Islands. Oregon pine frequently found on the Hawaiian shores as driftwood is evidence that this strong Pacific current exists. Conclusive evidence is on file with the United States Geological Survey at Washington, where there is record of a note in a bottle being picked up on the coast of the Hawaiian Islands just six days after it was deposited off the coast of Southern California. It is feasible, then, to believe that some of Hagoth's ships may have drifted westward to the Hawaiian islands, and that later expeditions left from there to the more southern Polynesian Island groups of Samoa, Tonga, Tahiti, and New Zealand. It may be seen from what follows, that the reasonableness of such a suggestion is not only apparent, but is highly probable. . . .

All of the Hawaiian traditions on origin point to the east and infer that their people came from the "land of the rising sun." This could only mean the Americas, for these two great western continents stretch almost from pole to pole. Other Hawaiian traditions say that some of their people sailed southward to other Islands. Maori legend supports this contention by claiming a voyage from "Hawaiki," a term which is very similar to "Hawaii." . . . Curiously enough, all Polynesian traditions seem to support the theory of American origin.

[Christensen then cites the same arguments on tradition, language, and genealogy found in the 1920 notation for the *Improvement Era* article by Duncan McAllister and E. Wesley Smith]

Clifford E. Gates in an article found in the *Scientific Monthly* of September, 1922, speaks of the Polynesians as the "Caucasians of the Pacific." He says: "The appearance and characteristics of the people point at once to a Caucasian lineage." G. Albin Matson, in his recent *Improvement Era* discussion of "Blood Groupings Among the Indians" points out the significant fact that the Polynesians have a very

similar blood test to that of the American Indians. . . [Wissler] infers that the Polynesians are later arrivals than the American Indians and he admits contacts between America and the Pacific Islands. . . . Hrdlicka, noticing the similarity in culture traits between American Indians and Polynesians makes a similar observation to Wissler: "It is probable that the western coast of America, within the last 2,000 years, was on more than one occasion reached by small parties of Polynesians." . . . Ettie A. Rout, in her recent book on "Maori Symbolism," contends very strongly that the Maoris are Israelites and even suggests that the migration started somewhere in Assyria (The Maori word for the starting place is "Ihira"), went from there to the American continent, and then to the Islands of the Pacific ocean. She served as government reporter in New Zealand and gathered her material by firsthand methods without relying upon previous European writings. This is a fact that makes her conclusions even more valuable. There will not be space in this present article to review all of her splendid material, most of which gives support to what we have been saying, but I comment the book itself to those who are interested. . . .

According to William E. Safford in his article "The Potato of Romance and of Reality," nothing was known of our cultivated potato before it was grown by the Aranco Indians of Chile and the Incas of Peru. The sweet potato preceded all other varieties, and its original home has been proved to be America. Now, besides this original home, the only other places in the world where this sweet potato has been found to be growing natively are Hawaii, New Zealand, Samoa, and Tahiti. If we are to believe that this potato developed separately in each place then we would expect it also in other parts of the world; but since we find it only in Polynesia and America, and since it originated in America, we are to conclude that the Polynesians came from America and took the potato plant with them to the Pacific Islands.

When the white man first landed in Polynesia he was astounded by the existence of many Israelitish customs and traditions. In New Zealand, the ordinance of baptism by immersion was administered by authorized priests called Tohungas. A form of temple (Whare Wanaanga) existed . . .

The evidence is not all in yet, but from what we have, it seems logical to assume that the Polynesians are the blood of Israel and that they left the American shores at the time Hagoth built his many ships. . . .

1936^ ??? **"Polynesian Ancestry and Traditions of the Book of Mormon,"** Deseret News

(Polynesians) Church Section, 6 June 1936, pp. 2, 6.

Tracing Polynesian ancestry has a number of fascinating features. A study of these genealogies reveals the interrelationship of all South Sea Islanders, tells the story of migrations of these people and when viewed by a Latter-day Saint missionary definitely establishes them as direct descendants of the Nephite inhabitants of this western continent in Book of Mormon times.

Such a study has occupied the attention of William Arley Cole of Rupert, Idaho, who has been a missionary in New Zealand since December, 1933, engaged principally in genealogical work. It is Elder Cole's second mission to New Zealand, the first one ending in 1924.

He was a visitor in Salt Lake recently on his return to his home in Rupert and while in this city he visited officials of the Genealogical Society of Utah and called at the editorial rooms of *The Deseret*

News. Here he reported many of the interesting discoveries made in his studies and left an eight-foot chart showing the complete pedigree of his friend, Stuart Meha, a full-blooded native of New Zealand who is in charge of genealogical work for the mission.

Elder Cole had served as an assistant to Elder Meha during all of his last mission and for the latter part of which he was released from all other missionary duties except that of genealogy and the pursuit of research.

As a result of these studies he made many discoveries some of which he reports as follows:

The Polynesian inhabitants of all of the Pacific Islands are direct descendants of a common ancestor. The story of migration of these peoples as revealed through their genealogies shows that the Hawaiian Islands were the first occupied. Three important migrations followed, the first being from Hawaii to Tahiti; the second from Tahiti to Rarotonga and the third from Rarotonga to New Zealand. Many hundreds of migrations took place back and forth amongst the various islands, thus eventually peopling all the eastern Pacific Islands with the Polynesian race.

The traditions of the Hawaiians, the Hohgate Indians of northern California and the Toltecs of Central America all correspond with the story of Hagoth, found in the Book of Mormon: [Alma 63:5-8 is quoted]

According to Hawaiian tradition the first man to set foot on the Hawaiian Islands was Hawaii-loa, having arrived there with one canoe. When he saw the fertility of the islands, with the abundance of fruit, fish and birds, his thoughts returned to his people, so accordingly, he and his crew sailed for their homeland, Ka-aina-kai-melemele-a-Kane (America), and with his family, relatives and friends, returned again and settled the Hawaiian Islands. (From the *Journal of the Polynesian Society*.)

Today, it is possible through genealogies to trace the ancestry of the Hawaiians, Maoris, Tahitians, Tongans, Samoans, Rarotongans, Aitutakians, Mangaian, Maukeans, Re'iateans, and Marquesas back to their one common ancestor, Hawaii-loa.

Of interest to students of the Book of Mormon is the time of the arrival of Hawaii-loa to the Hawaiian Islands in his canoe. To find this the number of generations from the present time to the time of the common ancestor are determined. This averages eighty generations and the Polynesian Society of New Zealand, many of whose members are well versed in Maori lore, customs and traditions, has established the period of 25 years as the most consistent estimate per generation in tracing the Polynesian genealogies.

It is established that the eighty generations of 25 years each would take the searcher back to the year 64 B.C. According to Book of Mormon chronology, Hagoth's first ship sailed northward in the thirty-seventh year of the reign of the Judges or about 55 B.C. This leaves a difference of nine years to be distributed among 80 generations to establish Hagoth and Hawaii-loa as the same person from a standpoint of time. . . .

1937[^] Richard Hyland "The Gospel in the South Seas," in *Millennial Star* 99, 25 November 1937,

(Polynesians) pp. 758-59, 766.

Richard Hyland writes:

According to the teachings of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Polynesians are from one of the tribes of Israel--descendants of that Joseph who was sold into Egypt--migrated to America from Palestine about 600 B.C. and American Indians are their descendants.

Further Brigham Young wrote to King Kamehameha V, in 1865, "We believe your Majesty and the people of your Majesty's nation . . . are a branch of this same great family . . . you are of the House of Israel, and heirs of all the promises of the chosen seed . . ."

While some anthropologists suspect Polynesians migrated from west to east, from Asia to the islands of the Pacific, Mormon students believe Hawaiians, Samoans, Maoris and other south sea peoples originated on the American continent. In evidence, they present the fact that the three great native foods of Polynesia, the coconut, sweet potato and taro root are American; and add it is illogical to suppose that man migrated in one direction while his food came from another.

Mormon students of Polynesian genealogy contend that all south sea island natives spring from the same source because they have found the name lines of such widely separated peoples as New Zealand Maoris and Hawaiians unite 65 generations back to the person of Hema, who, by Maori legend, led a migration to New Zealand. Prior to Hema, they state, the names in both Hawaiian and Maori legends are identical.

Perhaps the most startling of these island tales is that of the formation of man. With a change of names it could be put back into the Old Testament without jarring a syllable, including the murder of Abel by Cain.

In the beginning, runs the ancient chant, was the Kukaua-kahi, or trinity of Kane, Ku, and Lono. The former was the chief god, Ku was all the destructive forces of nature, and Lono was a white god. It was the latter, incidentally, the Hawaiians thought, had come to them when Captain Cook discovered the islands in 1778.

Kane, all powerful, created three heavens, a host of spirits, the earth, moon, stars and sun.

And Kane created Kumuhonua--man. Using his own spittle he fashioned a body of red clay and a head of white clay, breathed into it, made it live, took a bone from it and created Kealokuhonua, the first woman. It is worthy of note that "Edum," the Hebraic word for Adam, means "red," in the light of the Hawaiian's red clay first man.

Kumuhonua and Kealokuhonua lived in the happy land of Kaluna-i-wai-hau-ola, or land of divine water. In this land were two forbidden fruit trees. One, the bread fruit, was called Ula-kapu-a-Kane.

While man and woman lived happily in their divine water land, some of the spirits, led by Kanaloa, rebelled against Kane because they were forbidden to partake of awa, a narcotic drink much like the present Samoan "kava." Kane fought, defeated and drove out the rebelling spirits; where he drove them is not told.

Kanaloa then desired to set up a world of his own and tried to create a man in imitation of Kane's. But no matter how hard he tried he could not give the clay body he fashioned the life it needed. Jealous and full of rage, he then set out to destroy the image Kane had made.

Whispering lies to Kealokuhonua, he so deceived her that she encouraged Kumuhonua to eat with her the sacred and forbidden apple of the breadfruit tree and Kane drove them out of the happy land for disobeying him. . . .

Additional evidence, aside from the similarity between their legends and biblical stories, that Polynesians are of Hebrew ancestry, is to be found in many of their customs, according to Mormon authorities. Hawaiians practiced circumcision, knew sack cloth and ashes for sorrow, purified their temples with salt and sprinkled the homes of the dead with salt water, had cities of refuge which could not be violated and, even as is noted in the Old Testament (Leviticus 15) they isolated women at certain regular periods. . . .

1937^ **Josiah E. Hickman** *The Romance of the Book of Mormon*, Salt Lake City, Utah: The
Deseret News Press, 1937

On pages 78-82 we find the following about the Polynesian connection with the Book of Mormon:

Pacific Islanders, Nephites: Hebrews.-- Mr. W. P. Pycraft, of the British Museum, remarked that no scheme for the classification of man could stand the test of criticism, because all had been built up of materials which could not possibly hand together. "No race had been more misunderstood than the Polynesian. Yet the Polynesian was one of the most characteristic of all human skulls, and it was quite certain that it had nothing in common with the Mongoloid skull. From a comparison of skulls from ne Guinea, Oregon, and California he drew the inference that the Polynesian was a migrant from America." (As quoted by Ettie A. Rout, *Maori Symbolism*, p. 13)

The probability that those first Islanders were Nephites from the western coast of South America is urged from the following account related in the Book of Mormon: (Alma 63:5-9) . . . [The Hagoth episode is then related] . . . Might not those shiploads have been the colonizers of the Pacific Islands? The natives of these Islands have the legend that their ancestors came from a great land east of those Islands. Many of their words, customs, beliefs, and traditions are similar to those of America, as attested by some investigators. Such facts are in harmony with Joseph Smith's declarations that those Islanders are of Israelitish ancestry.

[Note* Hickman is probably referencing Joseph F. Smith rather than Joseph Smith Jr., however he fails to specify which one. I know of no comment by Joseph Smith Jr. concerning the idea that "those Islanders are of Israelitish ancestry."]

In *Hawaiian Antiquities and Folklore*, Fornander gives us the tradition of Hawaii-loa, born 88 B.C., who was known for his sea-coasting voyages near the land in which he originally lived. On one long voyage he, with his company, touched the eastern shores of a new land, rich with vegetation; ideal in climate. They named the new land Hawaii-loa in honor of their hero leader. After a time they left for their old homes with a vow that they would return and colonize the new land they had found. After remaining in their home-land for a time, Hawaii-loa took his family and a great company of his countrymen and set sail for their new land. He was hence known as hero and leader of the colony. (Vol. VI, pp. 278 f. For further details see "Church Section," Deseret News, p. 1, November 19, 1932.)

Some of the Latter-day Saints believe Hagoth to be the Hawaii-loa or the traditional navigator who became the progenitor of the Hawaiians. Let us note (a) that they sometimes called their people Hawaii-Nei (See Fornander, op. cit., p. 278) which is not unlike Hawaii-Nephi; (the sound of ph or f are not found in some native American languages). (b) Dates of the Book of Mormon and Hawaiian correspond as to time. (c) Colonists arrived on the east side of the island--suggestive of their coming from America. (d) The leader was a prominent man, known as voyager or navigator, as was Hagoth. (e) Both traditions mention a large company of people with the navigator; although the Nephite historian supposed Hagoth's ships were lost in the Pacific, no one of the Nephites really knew their fate.

The Mormon convictions as to the same origin of continental and island natives may be somewhat supported by linguistic relationships, traditions, and customs. (See Rout, op. cit., pp. 3 ff) . . .

Genealogies were strictly preserved. (They [the Maoris] can name every leader from the first to the last, which constitutes 62 generations. This is also true with the Hawaiians.)"

Maori Customs Show Hebrew Influences.-- That traditions and practices of the Maoris show unmistakable relationship to those of the old Hebrew seems well established by the survey made by Mr. Charles Hardy. (*The Messenger*, 1907. Auckland, New Zealand. This publication was not available for checking.--Ed.) He published the following brief: [what follows is a list of thirty parallel cultural traits of the Hebrews and Maoris]

These last two or three pages of data from scientist and chronicler certainly tend to verify the Latter-day Saint claim of Israelitish ancestry of both Islanders and Continentals, and that the former are a branch of the latter.

1937 (Polynesians)

Children of the Covenant, The Deseret News Press, 1937

In 1937 the Genealogical Society of Utah would prepare and publish a lesson book for second year Junior Genealogical Classes. A number of the lessons would contain material relative to the Polynesian origins. Some of the pertinent material is as follows:

Lesson 16--Other Children of Lehi: . . . In the Church today are thousands of members with Indian blood in their veins, who bear the Priesthood and power to officiate in temples for their progenitors of the Lamanite and Nephite races. Not only have missions been opened in Mexico, South America, among Indian tribes, in Hawaii, Samoa, New Zealand, Tahiti, and elsewhere among native races, gathering many thousands of descendants of Lehi into the Church, but even among the so-called white members are literally thousands who are lineally descended from Lehi and are true representatives of him in the great temple work now going forward. Probably few suspect the extent to which his blood flows in the veins of Latter-day Saints. (p. 57)

Lesson 17--The Ancestry of Hyrum De Fries: The inhabitants of Hawaii and New Zealand and many of the Pacific Islands are descended from Father Lehi. Through all the generations since they made their home on these islands they have preserved in memory the genealogy of their race. Since the dedication

of the Temple at Laie, Oahu, these genealogies can be utilized for temple work. Many descendants of the ancient hawaiians are in the Church to administer these ordinances. The Spirit of the Lord has impressed them with the magnitude of the labor waiting for them to perform. The Lord hears and answers the prayers of those who desire to find the records of their forefathers, that they may do ordinance work for them in the temples. (p. 61)

[The Story of William De Fries is then told--this is quoted more fully in the notation for 1933 so it will not be repeated here]

1938 (George Albert Smith) LDS Quarterly Reports, Nuku'alofa and Salt Lake City, May, 1938

(pol)

In a Ph.D dissertation concerning the dynamics of Mormonism among the Tongan people, Tamar Gordon writes:

President George Albert Smith, who visited Vava'u in May, 1938, chose to combine paradigms from the Book of Mormon and the Bible in order to encourage the Tongan LDS mission against its adversaries: the other Tongan churches . . . :

If you will be straight and upright like your forefathers the Nephites you will become worthy people in the sight of God . . . We believe that the people of the islands of the Pacific were the descendents of Lehi, and when Jesus spoke of the other sheep it meant you people or your forefathers. You Tongans are blessed with the blood of Israel in your veins and you can enjoy the powers of the priesthood but there are many who try hard to keep you from getting this power as there were in the time of Christ. . . . You have the best blood in this world and the Lord wants you to do this work so you will inherit the kingdom.

Source: ^Tamar G. Gordon, "Inventing Mormon Identity in Tonga," Ph.D diss., University of California, Berkeley, 1988, Gordon, p. 131.

1939^ **C. Douglas Barnes** "**Lehi's Route to America,**" in Improvement Era 42, January 1939,

(Polynesians) pp. 26-28, 49.

Douglas Barnes first quotes James E. Talmage concerning Lehi's travels, that he went across Arabia "to the shores of the Arabian Sea" and then "eastward across the Indian Ocean, then over the South Pacific Ocean to the western coast of South America," (see the Talmage notation for 1899). He states: "it has been found that ocean currents exist which in proper season move eastward from the Arabian

peninsula toward India and even to Sumatra. By taking advantage of mergings into other existing ocean current systems, it is possible to outline an ocean route to the Americas. (see the map below) These points will now be amplified." He then provides some evidence for this protracted journey.

[1939 Illustrated Map Lehi's Route to America: Diagram Showing a Speculative Possibility]

Source: C. Douglas Barnes, "Lehi's Route to America," *Improvement Era* 42 (January 1939): p. 26.

Barnes then comments:

It is proposed by the author that the Lehi colony reached the Americas by means of the current combinations outlined above. Provided the craft followed the natural ocean stream eastward across the Pacific Ocean, as described, it appears logical that the colony arrived at a point on the western shore of Central or South America, somewhere between the equator and 15 north latitude. . . .

The colony as a whole grew and spread northward, ultimately and after several centuries, reaching a high state of civilization, as judged both by the written history in the Book and by the physical evidences found in the ruins in Central America. during this development the activities of a portion of the group extended again to the sea, and within approximately the century of Christ's advent, colonizers were being carried by boats under Hagoth to the land northward, and the claim is made in the record that at least two boat loads of people and provisions were lost at sea. (Alma 63:5-10; Helaman 3:14)

It is naturally assumed that these marine activities extended into both the Pacific Ocean and Caribbean Sea, and some students of the Book of Mormon claim it resulted in the transplanting of a portion of Lehi's descendants into the Hawaiian and other of the Polynesian islands, possibly representing the boat loads which were lost as just mentioned. The acceptance of a direct relationship between the Hawaiians and the descendants of the Lehi colony in America is important from the standpoint of what follows, for if it is established, it means that the progenitors of the Hawaiians originated in Jerusalem and came first to America as the Lehi colony, before migrating to the Islands. On this basis any information as to the travels of the Hawaiian progenitors may logically be applied to the travels of the original Lehi colony. With this in mind we shall review evidences of Polynesian origin and of their travels.

Judge Abraham Fornander some years ago, and with the help of well-educated native research assistants investigated the traditions and folklore of the Polynesian races and his discoveries which are quite illuminating, were presented in three volumes as: *An Account of the Polynesian Race: Its Origin and Migrations*. . . . The author may have startled some and shocked others by seeking a Polynesian ancestry beyond the Malay Archipelago; but their undoubted folklore, their legends, and chants, gave no warrant for stopping there. They spoke of continents and not of islands, as their birthplace. The referred to events in the far past which have hitherto been considered as the prehistoric heirlooms of Cushites and Semites alone. . . . Summarizing, Judge Fornander found evidence leading to the following conclusions concerning the Hawaiian progenitors:

1. They were originally a white race.
2. They came from the high-lands of Southwestern Asia.
3. They had contact with peoples south of Chaldea in India (Northwestern Indian).
4. They touched Deccan (India, south of the Norbada River including the southern tip).

5. They contacted points in the Asiatic Archipelago bounded by Sumatra and Timor on the south to Luzon in the Philippines on the north.

Judge Fornander was unable to establish the time of arrival of the group at the archipelago, but genealogies and legends indicate that in roughly the first or second century A.D. properly organized migrations of Polynesians into the Pacific Ocean took place from the archipelago. He believed they went first to the Fiji Islands, although he states there appears to be nothing to indicate that some of the migratory expositions may not have pushed on to some of the eastern, northern, or southern groups of the Pacific now held by the Polynesians. Also he claims "that branch of the Polynesian family from which the oldest ruling line of Hawaiian chiefs claim descent arrived at the Hawaiian group during the sixth century of the Christian Era."

Judge Fornander, in his discussion, raises a logical question which, if unanswered, might interfere with the acceptance of his theory of migration involving the archipelago as a stopping point. Briefly it is in substance: Why should they have pushed some thousands of miles into the Pacific Ocean before establishing themselves in new homes instead of stopping at islands closer to the point of embarkation? . . . Perhaps the Book of Mormon . . . holds the answer . . . [namely that] Lehi's descendants moved westward to the Islands, not eastward, coming immediately from the Americas, rather than directly from the East Indies. Naturally the islands adjacent to America would be given first consideration in selecting their new homes. . . .

If the relationship of the Lehi colony to the Hawaiians is accepted, there is further evidence that Lehi followed the path defined, and in particular that he entered the Bay of Bengal as a step in his migration to the new land. Sugar cane, claimed to be a native of Bengal, was known in India prior to 327 B.C., only 270 years after the Lehi colony passed en route to America, and it is probable that it was cultivated there well in advance of that date. Also it is claimed that it was cultivated exclusively in India until the 5th century A.D. Yet it was found in the Hawaiian Islands by Captain Cook in 1778.

Traditionally, at least, the cane was carried to the islands by early Polynesian immigrants, ancestors of modern Hawaiians. It would not be difficult to believe that Lehi, while en route to America, visited the Bengal shore, or adjacent islands, and that he added to his limited cargo, growing sugar cane plants, cuttings, or perhaps even seeds, which in some varieties are fertile, which later were a source of sugar for his people in America. Naturally, if these plants were available, new colonizers leaving the Americas would take with them the necessary starts, and it is proposed that groups migrating from continental America to the islands carried cane with them, ultimately establishing the plants in many islands, and particularly in the Hawaiian group.

The fact that early explorers in the Americas did not report the discovery of sugar cane need not be considered contradictory to the theory presented, since the native American discovered by explorers in the late 15th or the early 16th century was poorly adapted to agricultural pursuits. It would not be surprising to learn then that an industry depending on agriculture had wholly disappeared as the early civilization waned in America.

On the bases of material which has been presented, it is not difficult to harmonize the account of the journeying of the Polynesian progenitors with the story of Lehi's travels. It appears probable, therefore, that Lehi followed the ocean currents to the new land, as outlined above, and furthermore that he made the journey in stages, stopping perhaps only for very brief period at the various places perpetuated in the traditions and folklore of the Hawaiians. This information makes it possible to outline, tentatively at least, the possible path of the journey, as shown in the accompanying chart (see p. 26).

1939^ J. N. Washburn *An Approach to the Study of Book of Mormon Geography,*

Provo: New Era Publishing Co., 1939, p. 33.

Washburn writes:

The record itself tells of many who set sail in the sea in ships and did not return. They might easily have peopled other lands, and perhaps did, and yet those lands, the islands, remained unknown to the main body of Nephites.

1940^ Harold Iven Velt "The Origin of the Hawaiians," in *Saints Herald* 887 (6 April 1940): pp. 431-32.

(Polynesians-RLDS)

Harold I. Velt, a member of the RLDS Church writes:

Those who have heard of Quetzalcoatl, the fair god who miraculously appeared in ancient America from across the mighty waters from the east, will be interested to know that the Hawaiians have corresponding traditions. . . .

We read: "When Captain Cook landed in 1778, he was greeted as the god Lono, whom the Hawaiians had been taught by their priests would arrive on a floating island; he was given quarters on a temple at Napoopoo and worshiped as a deity" (*National Geographic Magazine*, February 1924, "The Hawaiian Islands" by Gilbert Grosvenor, L.L.D.). This finds corroboration by other writers . . . (*National Geographic Magazine*, "Hawaii Then and Now," by William R. Castle, October, 1938). W. D. Alexander in *History of the Hawaiian People* says, "The majority of them looked upon Captain Cook as the incarnation of the god Lono, who as they supposed had now returned in fulfillment of an ancient prophecy, and upon his crew as supernatural beings" (Footnotes, pages 106, 107). . . . You will notice how strikingly in harmony this is with the fact of the promised return of Quetzalcoatl as stated by Prescott and Verrill, and which paved the way for the conquest of Mexico by the Spaniards who were quick to take advantage of that cherished tradition.

Furthermore, as we have previously pointed out, Hyatt Verrill stated that he has positive proof that Quetzalcoatl was a Hebrew leader. Together with this we have shown many other evidences of the Hebrew origin of the ancient American peoples. (See *Riddle of American Origins*.) . . .

Just after I had given some of the foregoing in lectures in Hilo recently, there appeared in the Honolulu *Advertiser* of February 1, 1940, the following by Mrs. Flora K. Hayes: "The culture of the Hawaiian race as we gather from reading its traditions, legends and history brings out one fact rather clearly, that it grayly resembles that of the ancient Hebrew race. The gods Kane, Ku, and Lono bear a resemblance to the Jehovah Moses, and in the story of Lono, the expected arrival of the Messiah. . . ."

This is all of peculiar interest to Latter-Day Saints who believe that Jesus after his resurrection at Jerusalem appeared to his people in America and told them they were the other sheep he had referred to (John 10) who were to hear his voice, and that there were still other sheep to whom he would appear, and who were of the houses of Israel. (See 3 Nephi . . .)

[The *Book of Mormon*] states that the ancient Americans were descendants of Joseph through the line of Manasseh. In Alma 30 . . . we have an account of a ship building era under one named Hagoth, when thousands of people migrated from place to place, many departing from America and never being heard of again. . . . The fact that American trees have found their way to Hawaii would indicate the possibility of the discovery of Hawaii by some of these people, and the subsequent possible migrations to other Polynesian peoples, though in any case they would be descendants of Joseph through Manasseh, and therefore a Hebrew or Israelitish people. This is the best explanation of the unquestionable similarities between the Hawaiians and the Hebrew peoples in their religions and customs, and concerning their fair god Lono, who, by reason of ancient prophecies and promises they had expected to return. . . .

Recently, . . . at an open air meeting in Mooheau Park, . . . I felt led to preach some things I had not intended to touch upon that night. I told them of the fall of the Gentiles and the rise of Israel; of their god Lono being Quetzalcoatl or Jesus Christ, of their being a remnant of Israel. I said "Elder Puuhau and I are related. I am of Ephraim, he is of Manasseh; Ephraim's brother.

1940 (President Dunn) LDS Quarterly Reports, Nuku'alofa and Salt Lake City, October, 1940

(pol)

In a Ph.D dissertation concerning the dynamics of Mormonism among the Tongan people, Tamar Gordon writes:

American and lately Tongan mission presidents and missionaries have always attempted to bring the knowledge of the Tongans' Lamanite ancestry to chiefs and high-ranking commoners who command influence to change peoples' church affiliation. . . . An LDS Mission entry, dated October, 1940 finds the Mission President taking the concept to the highest level of Tongan authority:

President and Sister Dunn met with Queen Salote and Tungi to present them with a Navajo rug and had an opportunity to talk to her majesty and Tungi for an hour about the American Indians and mostly about the connections the Book of Mormon ah with the American Indians and the Tongan people. Several points of doctrine were spoken about, and her Majesty seemed quite interested in the reason why the Elders are being called to leave Tonga [i.e., due to World War II].

Source: ^Tamar G. Gordon, "Inventing Mormon Identity in Tonga," Ph.D diss., University of California, Berkeley, 1988, Gordon, pp. 131-132.

1942[^]
for

LDS Church

Birthright Blessings: Genealogical Training Class Sunday School Lessons

the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. Published yearly by the

Deseret Sunday School Union Board, and printed at Salt Lake City, Utah,

Copyright 1942, by George D. Pyper for the Deseret Sunday School Union

Board.

In Lesson 34, "Polynesian Traditions and Genealogies," we find the following on pages 97-101:

The Legend of Hawaii Loa. As an example of their traditions Fornander quotes the "Legend of Hawaii Loa," compiled and condensed from the natives, Kepelino and S. M. Kamakau, the latter of whom he calls "probably the best informed Hawaiian archaeologist of the present day."

The legend gives an independent story of the creation of the earth, yet so strikingly similar as to indicate this people must have had, at some time before the settlement of Hawaii, access to some record like that contained in the Book of Genesis. In the legend we read of the Garden of Eden, the Fall, Cain and Abel, Enoch, Noah and the Flood, Shem, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, with his twelve sons. These characters, of course, all appear under Hawaiian names. The first man, it states, was a tall, handsome, majestic looking person, and so was his wife. In ancient chants he is called the fallen chief--he who fell by, or on account of the tree. Seth, their son, "was a pious man and progenitor of the true worshipers." The seventh in line (Enoch) was "the most upright and pious man of his time. Hence he was taken away alive from earth and did not die." Nuu (Noah) became the second progenitor of all present mankind. He had three sons. Shem, the third and favorite son of Noah, was the progenitor of the pure white people, Abraham, called the second Noah, left his native land. By his slave-woman he was father of a son who with his posterity became a wanderer in the desert. The other son, Isaac, became the progenitor of a "large and powerful race, *the ancestors of the present Hawaiian people.*" In time the race got far from their original homeland, under a leader quoted in both Tahitian and Hawaiian legends as a progenitor of their nations.

A descendant, Hawaii Loa, became the ancestor of the Hawaiian family. His story reads very much like that of Hagoth in the Book of Mormon. He was leader of the colonists which first settled the Hawaiian Islands, named after him. (Fornander: *Hawaiian Antiquities and Folklore*, Vol. 6, pp. 266-278. Compare Alma 63:5-8)

Maori Traditions and Genealogies. . . . These genealogies preserved in the memories of highly trained experts prove the Hawaiians and Maoris are descended from common ancestors. The Maoris, like the Hawaiians, are descendants of Lehi, and are heirs to all the blessings pronounced upon the covenant people of Israel.

The Maoris have a traditional saying, "tawhiti-nui, tawhiti-roa, tawhiti-panahomaho, meaning "long distance, longer distance, and still longer distance." It seems to refer to the voyages from the places from which their ancestors came to New Zealand, and is interpreted to mean that the voyage from new

Zealand to Hawaiki was a long distance; from Hawaiki to the mainland was a longer distance; and from there to their original home a still longer distance.

The tradition states that great wars caused the ancestors of the Maoris to migrate from their original homeland. This first home was a land of hills and mountains. This may be interpreted as the voyage of Lehi from Palestine.

They generally refer to their migration from the mainland to the islands of Hawaiki as leaving the mainland at the junction where two continents joined one another, lying to the east of Hawaiki. At this place there were two kinds of people, the "Kiritea" (white-skinned) and "Manauri" (dark) people. The place of the "pa" (town) they left on the mainland was at the north end of the south continent. The tradition says that this was a very great city. Elder George Bowles, who was intimately associated with the Maoris of New Zealand and the Hawaiians during three missions, and who was thoroughly conversant with their language, tells of a tradition related to him by an old Maori chief that the home of their ancestors was "a great land, in two divisions connected by a narrow strip, surrounded by oceans; and that if a man tried to walk around either of the divisions, and commenced the journey when he was a small boy, he would be a very old man before he could complete the journey."

A similar tradition from Hawaii tells of that people coming from a land "stretched far across the ocean," where "the people ascend to the backbone of Heaven," (high mountains), where "the haole (white people) dwelt, like unto gods." This land was "in the face of the rising sun," east of Hawaii. . . .

An Amazing Memory. The story is told of one worthy old man, Tamarau of the Tuhoe tribe, who gave in court the descent of his sub-tribe from an ancestor who flourished 21 generations ago, with explanations of intermarriages with other communities, in a recital which occupied three days. The descent of every living member of the clan he clearly showed. This involved the remembrance and recital of 1,288 names of persons in order to bring the various branches from the main line down to the oldest living member of each family, often a grandparent, occasionally a great grandparent. Later he recited the names of all living members of the clan.

Since the pedigrees and the traditions of the two peoples show them to be of common origin, and since the Hawaiians have been shown to be descendants of Hawaii-loa and his colony from Central America, who were the progeny of Lehi, then the Maoris must be also of his family, descendants of Lehi and heirs to all the promises pronounced upon the sons of Joseph in the latter days.

1946 James W. Lesueur *The Guatamalan Petroglyphs: The Nephite Story or From Whence*

(Polynesians) ***Came the Aztecs***, Mesa, AZ: n.p., 1946.

A number of Indian legends and beliefs paralleling the story of the Book of Mormon are cited in order to set the stage for an extensive interpretation of the Boturini Codex. James Lesueur writes:

About 200 years ago (1736), a French archaeologists named Boturini exploring in Guatamala and Yucatan, found an ancient story thirty feet long chiseled on stone in Guatamala and made copies of it for

the museums of Berlin, London and Mexico City. He called it: "Perigrinaciones do Los Aztecas Antiguas." In English: Travels and Migrations of the Ancient Aztecs. . . .

When I visited the Museum of the City of Mexico in February, 1941, I visited the room containing many Aztec and Mayan Codices and ancient writings. As I examined a writing on the wall I was shown the Boturini Codex and the Peregrinacion de Los Aztecas. As I looked it over, the interpretation of it came to my mind. I remembered seeing a copy of it in Reynold's Story of the Book of Mormon and Hickman's writings without either giving a full interpretation.

As the interpretation came to me, I asked the guide for the curator of the museum and was taken into his office where I told him in Spanish the story of the Codex and its agreement with the Book of Mormon. When finished he said in Spanish, "That is a remarkable coincidence." I answered, "It is more than a coincidence, it is a definite confirmation." . . .

I purchased a copy of the Petroglyphs from him and this is a photographic copy of the same. Note how it agrees with the Book of Mormon story in detail as well as chronologically. I give the story and page, chapter and verse where you can read a similar account in the Book [of Mormon].

On the page in which LeSueur corresponds certain glyphs with Alma chapter 63 (the pages are not numbered) we find the following:

A large ship built by Hagoth settled 4 countries: Mexico, California, Hawaii and Central America and later 5 other places in Mexico, Tenochtitlan, Cholulua, (Tula) Puebla and Teotihuacan, probably.

Alma, 63 chapter.

7th verse. And in the 38th year this man (Hagoth) built other ships and set out again to the land northward.

8. And another ship did sail forth and wither she went we know not.

(Evidently the lost ship went to Hawaii, agreeing with Hawaiian tradition.) See the Mescal or Maguay plant of Mexico shown.

1946 Spencer W. Kimball Missionary Setting Apart for Robert E. Parsons, 1946

(Polynesians)

Robert Parsons states:

It might be of interest to you to know that when Elder Spencer W. Kimball set me apart for my mission to New Zealand in 1946, he said: "We bless you with power and the 'gift of tongues' to learn the language of the Maoris. . . . We set you apart among the Children of Lehi to do good."

Source: Robert E. Parsons, "Hagoth and the Polynesians," in *The Book of Mormon: Alma, The Testimony of The Word*, Provo: BYU Religious Studies Center, 1992, p. 252.

1947^ Spencer W. Kimball Conference Reports, April 6, 1947, pp. 143-152

(Polynesians)

In the April Conference of 1974, Spencer W. Kimball said the following:

I have been thinking today also, of the pioneers, but of other pioneers, who preceded the ones we have been honoring today. About twenty-five centennials ago, a hardy group left the comforts of a great city, crossed a desert, braved an ocean, and came to the shores of this, their promised land. There were two large families, those of Lehi and Ishmael, who in not many centuries, numbered hundreds of millions of people on these two continents. . . .

I do not know when I began to love the children of Lehi. . . . It may have come from my patriarchal blessing which was given to me by Patriarch Samuel Claridge, when I was nine years of age. One line of the blessing reads:

You will preach the gospel to many people, but more especially to the Lamanites, for the Lord will bless you with the gift of language and power to portray before that people, the gospel, in great plainness. You will see them organized and be prepared to stand as the bulwark "round this people."

I do not know when my appreciation for them came, but I have always had a sympathetic heart for the sons and daughters of Lehi, and so, recently, when President [George Albert] Smith called Brother Cowley, Brother Ivins, and myself to give attention to their problems and to "the work of disseminating the gospel among the Indians . . . not only to the Indians close to us but also over the world, in the islands of the sea and elsewhere . . ." a great thrill came to me such as I have had few times in my life.

I had waited forty-two years for the fulfillment of this patriarchal blessing! . . . I [had] wondered, "Can I have failed, or did the patriarch err," and now, forty-two years after the promise, President George Albert Smith called me to this mission, and my blessing was fulfilled.

I love those downtrodden and deprived people. Brother Cowley and I spent some time on the Hawaiian Islands last summer, and those good people found their way into my heart. We have about a half-million children of Lehi in the Islands of the seas, and about sixty million of them in North and South America, and about a third of them perhaps being pureblood Indians, and about two-thirds are mixtures, but they have the blood of Jacob in their veins!" . . .

The predictions concerning the scattering of the early American was fulfilled to the letter. Not long before the birth of Christ, a great man by the name of Hagoth left continental America with colonies of people. [Alma 63:5-8 is then quoted]

It has been thought by many people that they went to the Pacific islands. And the scripture would so indicate: "But great are the promises of the Lord unto them who are upon the isles of the sea; wherefore as it says isles, there must needs be more than this, and they are inhabited also by our brethren." (2 Nephi 10:21)

Elder Cowley and I visited some of these peoples on the "isles of the sea" and found them developing and progressing and doing well.

1947^ Louisa Barnes Pratt Louisa Barnes Pratt, *Journal, in Heart Throbs of the West*, compiled

(Polynesians) by Kate B. Carter, Salt Lake City: Daughters of Utah Pioneers, 1947,
vol. 8, p. 273

Louisa Barnes Pratt was the wife of Addison Pratt, the first missionary to the Pacific islands. She joined him on his second mission to the islands in 1850. She records that in October 1851 she delivered an address to a group of females on Tubuai in which she informed them that "the Nephites were the ancient fathers of the Tahitians," at which "they appeared greatly interested."

Note* See the 1851 notation.

1947^ E. L. Whitehead *The House of Israel*, Independence, Missouri, 1947.

(Polynesians)

In this nearly 589-page book, E. L. Whitehead presents a major treatise on the dispersion and gathering of Israel. In chapters 26-28 he writes 66 pages on how the Polynesians are connected with the House of Israel. THIS WORK SHOULD BE QUOTED EXTENSIVELY

Whitehead acknowledges the help of William A. Cole for his contributions on the Polynesian people. Cole would himself co-author a book, *Israel in the Pacific* in 1961 (see notation).

1948^ Mark [E. Petersen?] Letter of Correspondence to "Spencer and Camilla [Kimball],"
Vernal,

(Polynesians) Utah. Sept. 9, 1948.

Dear Spencer and Camilla,

Your letter of Sept. 1 reached me when I was back in town for Labor Day, and I was most happy to receive it. . . . You surely wrote some stumbers in those questions you sent me. I am a poor hand to answer questions, but I will be glad to tell you what I think some of them mean, and admit my ignorance in all cases. . . .

[Question] 5 - How do you think the present day Lamanites may become light? The only way I can see is that the curse will be taken off them, when they cease to be filthy and loathsome, and when they accept the gospel. they will have to do their part. They will have to believe, and clean up, and be thrifty, and when they do their part, I think the Lord will do his. . . . I think they will have to completely change their method of living, and be delightsome, meaning clean and pure, and pleasant, etc., and that is part of the removal of the curse. . . . God put the dark skin on them, but he did not make them filthy and loathsome. . . . I think it is up to them to remove the filthy and loathsome part before God will be willing to remove the dark skin . . . I have never heard of any writer who has developed this theme; I don't think anyone really knows for the simple reason that the Lord has not revealed his plans in detail, and after all, when that is the case, the rest is speculation, which I admit mine is. . . .

[Question] 11 - Why are the Islanders dark if they are the progeny of Hagoth who was a Nephite? As I see it, the conclusion that the Islanders are descendants of Hagoth is purely speculation. All we know about Hagoth's people is that on one of their journeys they disappeared. It is altogether likely they drowned in the sea. They simply were "not heard of more." It is also just as likely that some of the Lamanites, who must also have traveled in boats, for they were as intelligent as the Nephites, might have drifted to the south seas and taken their dark skins with them. There is little doubt that somebody from America drifted to those islands, because of the traditions of the people, their genealogies, and the recent expedition of scientists proving that the ocean currents do take boats from our mainland to the islands. But there is positively NO REVELATION OR SCRIPTURE to indicate what individuals went down there that way, whether Hagoth or not. It just happens that the writer of the Book of Mormon happened to make his reference about Hagoth, and some bright boy among us READ INTO IT the theory that he was the father of the Maoris. The first man to go to those islands, according to the traditions of the Islanders themselves was a man named HAWAII-LOA, a name that doesn't resemble Hagoth much in my language. The tradition says Hawaii Loa drifted from the mainland WHERE THERE WERE WHITE SKINNED PEOPLE. This point in the tradition is interesting for several reasons, and one is the very fact that it is mentioned at all. Doesn't it indicate that the person who wrote the tradition must have been dark, when it was so unusual in his eyes that his forefathers came from a land where lived some WHITE SKINNED people? That is the way it hits me. The tradition also says, as I recall my genealogical lessons, that the people drifted from Hawaii southward in steps, until finally they reached New Zealand many years afterward. The way they happened to leave Hawaii, according to the tradition, was that the families fought among themselves, and some had to get out to have peace. Some tradition says too that fishermen drifted away toward the south. It seems the ocean currents go south from Hawaii, just as they go west from our mainland. . . .

With love and affection from us all,

[Signed] Mark

Source: Paul Cheesman Collection (MSS 2049, Box 55), L. Tom Perry Special Collections Library, Harold B. Lee Library, B. Y. U., Provo, Utah.

1949^ Doyle F. Green "Mission to Polynesia: The Story of Addison Pratt and the Society

(Polynesians) **Islands Mission," Parts I-VI, in *The Improvement Era*, March, May,**

June, July, Aug., Sept., 1949,

Addison Pratt was one of the first LDS missionaries to the Pacific islands. Among the material possessions which Addison Pratt left for posterity were a biographical sketch of his early life and a day-to-day diary recorded over a period of many years. These unpublished journals, which were presented to the Church by Nettie Hunt Rencher of Snowflake, Arizona, a granddaughter of that great early missionary, are the main reference sources for "Mission to Polynesia."

Note* See the notation for 1843, 1851.

1950^ George Q. Cannon "Excerpts from the Journal of George Q. Cannon," *Improvement Era*,

(Polynesians) Vol. 53, p. 672, (Aug. 1950) Salt Lake City, Utah.

In 1900 President George Q. Cannon and some of his family returned to the islands for the celebration of the fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the Hawaiian Mission. His son, Clawson Y. Cannon, acted as his secretary at that time and kept the diary as his father dictated it to him. Some of the notations are of the greatest interest and value. Selections have been made from the diary:

Wednesday, Dec. 12, 1900

Fifty years ago today I, with other elders, ten in all, landed at this place as missionaries to preach the gospel. . . .

Thursday, Dec. 13, 1900

. . . I landed here fifty years ago yesterday with very little money, a comparative youth without experience and knowledge of the world. When I commenced my ministry, I was a stranger to the people and to the language and friendless and homeless. . . . but when the message I bore was received and obeyed, then I was no longer with no one but God, my Father, for in conformity with my promise to the people that if they would obey the truth, the Lord would give them a testimony and a knowledge for themselves, he did bestow his Spirit upon the, and they became witnesses of the truth of the gospel as well as myself. In this way, thousands of friends were raised up. When I think of the goodness and mercy of God in sparing my life for so long a period to witness the grand results that God has caused to follow the planting of the gospel here, I am filled with praise to the Almighty Father for prompting me to do what I did . . .

Thursday, Dec. 27, 1900 (Maui)

I had many reflections this morning upon my first residence in this place. It was here where the Lord revealed to me the good that should be accomplished if I should stay and work with this people. So clear was I upon this point that I was resolved to stay here if I had to do so alone. . . .

I started out to find if possible the place where Nalinanui lived when she gave us shelter. I wanted to find the site of this house and the garden where I sought the Lord in secret prayer and where he condescended to commune with me, for I heard his voice more than once as one man speaks with another, encouraging me and showing me the work which should be done among this people if I would follow the dictates of his Spirit. . . .

Note* For additional pertinent comments concerning the beginnings of missionary work in Hawaii and Cannon's initial statement declaring the Polynesians as literal descendants of the house of Israel, see the notation for 1850 and 1850-54.

1950^ Marba C. Josephson "A Glance At Hawaiian Mission History,," in *Improvement Era* 53,

(Polynesians) August 1950, pp. 619-620, 666-669.

Note* This article is quoted at length in the 1850 notation entitled, "The First Missionaries are Sent to the Hawaiian Islands (then called the Sandwich Islands). The reader is referred to that notation.

1950^ E. S. Craighill Handy "Forebears and Posterity in the Pacific Isles," in Improvement Era

Mary Kawena Pukui 53, August 1950, pp. 617-618, 677-679.

(Polynesians)

Craighill Handy and Mary Pukui write:

In the last chapter of the Book of Alma we read that in the years 54 and 53 B.C., Hagoth, a builder of ships, led expeditions of Nephites, men, women, and children, "from the land Bountiful, by the land Desolation" (an apt description of Peru) northward into the Pacific, and "they were never heard of more." Were these the first settlers of the Polynesian Islands? Latter-day Saints believe they were. Ethnologists have in recent years recognized one undeniable bit of evidence indicating derivation of some of the civilization of the far-flung island world from South America. The key to this important bit of evidence is the humble sweet potato. (See *the American Anthropologist*, Vol. 34, pp. 40, 594ff.)

Prior to the explorations of Europeans in the Pacific, the sweet potato was unknown in the Asiatic-Euro-African area. It was cultivated only in the Americas, especially on the west coast of South America and throughout Polynesia. It was known in Polynesia as *kumara*, and the same word was one of its names in one dialect of Ecuador and Peru. Sweet potatoes do not swim, nor can they be borne upon storm winds as some seeds are, nor by currents or birds. Botanists tell us they originated in South America. If so, man carried them into the Pacific. This humble but valuable vegetable botanically and ethnologically may be the key to an early Polynesian migration westward.

But the problem of the origin and migration of the *kumara* cannot be solved by quoting scripture, nor will this story be written by perusing the history of this vegetable alone. As a cultivated plant, the sweet potato (*Ipomea batatas*) was, in the Americas and the Pacific, but one item in an era of cultural heritage which must be studied all together. Other elements in the Pacific Islands complex--for example, another vegetable staple, the *taro* (*Colocasia antiquorum*),--certainly were brought by migrants from South and East Asiatic lands. The *taro's* ancient distribution was wholly from the Pacific to Africa: it did not exist in America.

Such historical problems are deeply interesting. But they do not, for the authors of this article, deserve the center of the stage. To us it seems that it is not the past of this great Polynesian race that is of prime importance, but its future.

Note* The fact that the authors identify South America as the land Bountiful implies a Hemispheric Model of Book of Mormon geography.

1950^ Matthew Cowley "Maori Chief Predicts Coming of L.D.S. Missionaries, Improvement

(Polynesians) Era, 53, September, 1950, p. 696-698, 754-756..

In this article, Elder Cowley tells of an 1881 pronouncement by one of the Maori elders, Paora Potangaroa, concerning the source to look for the true gospel being preached to the Maori people. Cowley writes:

That which was written was called by the sage: "A covenant for remembering the hidden words which were revealed by the Spirit of Jehovah to Paora Potangaroa, and which words were proclaimed by him to the people assembled at the 'eight years house' located at the head of the island: and these hidden words of the Spirit were proclaimed on the 16th day of March 1881." . . . As it was stated in the 'covenant,' they would learn that they were the lost sheep of the House of Israel.

Note* This story is quoted in full in the 1881 notation, and it also appears in Cowley's 1954 book--see notation).

1950 Spencer W. Kimball Conference Report September-October 1950, pp. 66

(Polynesians)

You will be interested to know that there are some forty thousand Lamanite members of the Church in the world, including the islands of the sea.

1950^ **Thor Heyerdahl** ***Kon-Tiki: Across the Pacific by Raft***, translated by F. H. Lyon, Garden

(Polynesians) City New York: Garden City Books, 1950.

On a primitive raft made of forty-foot balsa logs and named *Kon-Tiki* in honor of a legendary sun king, Heyerdahl and five companions deliberately risked their lives to show that the ancient Peruvians could have made the 4,300-mile voyage to the Polynesian islands on similar craft. First published in Norway in 1948, the book has now been translated.

Note* See the 1951, 1953 notations.

[Illustrated Map: Map of the Kon-Tiki Expedition. Thor Heyerdahl, *Kon-Tiki: Across the Pacific by Raft*, translated by F. H. Lyon, Garden City New York: Garden City Books, 1950, Inside cover.]

Note* Although Heyerdahl was not of the LDS faith, his *Kon Tiki* voyage and perspectives provided a huge boost to those LDS researchers looking for cultural clues which might give evidence of the Book of Mormon story. The following is taken from an article entitled "Heyerdahl selected 'man of the year' in research" in *Industrial Research*, October 1972, pp. 23-24. It gives a quick biographical sketch regarding the impact of Heyerdahl's ideas on scholarly thought at the time:

Heyerdahl's scientific bent was established early. Born Oct. 6, 1914, in the shipping town of Larvik in southern Norway, he was the only child of Thor Heyerdahl, Sr., a brewery and bank chairman.

Inspired by a scientifically-minded mother and with financial assistance from an understanding father, he decided early in childhood to become a scientist and explorer.

His first training was as a zoologist and the Oslo University Department of Zoology sponsored his first field research, a trip to the Marquesas Group of Polynesia in 1937 and 1938.

The object of the Marquesas expedition was to study how animals had first found their way across thousands of kilometers of open sea to these ocean-born volcanic islands. The more Heyerdahl worked on the project, however, the more intrigued he became by the same question as it applied to man. How did the aboriginal Polynesians get to these islands?

Many years of study passed before Heyerdahl was ready to commit himself to the idea that a voyage from South America to Polynesia had been made on balsa rafts. Even then, eminent scientists still were listing this or that reason why it would be (and would have been) impossible to float or sail from Peru to Polynesia.

nevertheless, Heyerdahl believed he was right. His accumulation of research said he was. He decided to build a balsa raft and prove its ability to make such a voyage.

Thus it was in 1947 that *Kon-Tiki* sailed from Peru. One hundred and one days later it arrived in Polynesia--to mixed reactions almost none of them being what Heyerdahl expected.

Among the general public, the accomplishment was hailed a sportsman's achievement. Members of the scientific community took it as a kick against authority, an unacademic approach to a scholarly problem--one which inconveniently tore away the foundation of a large array of scientific dogma

Kon-Tiki didn't end all doubts, Heyerdahl made additional trips in the areas of Peru, Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, Brazil, the Galapagos Islands, and Easter Island to prove some of his points, slightly modifying some others.

1951^ John A. Widtsoe "Does the Kon-Tiki Voyage Confirm the Book of Mormon?" in

(Polynesians) Improvement Era 54 (1951 May), p. 318.

In May 1951, John A. Widtsoe of the council of the Twelve would write:

The most remarkable and fascinating sea story of modern days is the drifting of a primitive raft carrying six men from Peru in South America to the Tuamotu group of Polynesian Islands.

Thor Heyerdahl, Norwegian scientist, leader of the party, who had spent some time in Polynesia, became obsessed with the thought that the Polynesians might have come originally from South America. Upon his return to Norway, amidst the ugly years of World War II, the thought followed him. He read all that he could find about ancient Peru. Soon he became convinced that some Peruvians in prehistoric days had drifted on primitive rafts from the American mainland to the islands of the Pacific. While this did not prove that the Polynesian Islands were first settled by ancient Americans, it did point to a much freer intercourse among the nations of antiquity than was commonly held. . . .

Heyerdahl's theory that the Pacific Islands were settled by people from America may or may not be true. The Book of Mormon relates that one Hagoth, a Nephite, built ships and carried people into new places. One of his ships loaded with people never came back. Many believe that the settlement of the Pacific Islands was made by these voyagers of Hagoth. Of this there is no proof. It may have been so.

However, that there are currents in the ocean and winds that blow regularly in set directions such as carried the Kon-tiki across the Pacific, is recognized by all Book of Mormon readers. . . .

The crossing of the Kon-tiki proved that winds and currents lead from South America to the islands of the Pacific--over four thousand miles--and to that extent confirms the Book of Mormon story that long ocean voyages could be made by ancient men in primitive crafts.

It is interesting to note that no sooner had Heyerdahl published his theory, than other scientists called him to task. But to believers in the Book of Mormon, it is notable, that all agree that the ocean is full of currents which may enable man to drift from place to place, from continent to continent. The increase of knowledge confirms steadily the claims of the Book of Mormon.

1952^ John L. Sorenson "Evidences of Culture Contacts between Polynesia and the Americas

(Polynesians) **in PreColumbian Times,"** M.A. thesis, Department of Archaeology,

Brigham Young University, July 1952.

In this 154-page Masters thesis, John Sorenson examines the language and cultural traits of the Americas and Polynesia from a number of different perspectives. In his conclusions he states the following:

Chapters II to XI have presented a large number of similarities which we have suggested might be evidence of pre-Columbian contact between the Polynesian and American areas. We reiterate that not all this evidence is of equal value. Some of it may be of no value. But if there is a convincing amount of data that is of value, then we have shown that contact(s) actually took place. If voyages did span the eastern Pacific, the parallels of less convincing nature are bolstered as evidence. We believe that the number of

parallels, their complex nature and interrelationships, and the unsatisfactory results obtained from other hypotheses, all combine to demonstrate that complex cultural and ethnic movements have taken place in the eastern Pacific basin in the last few millennia.

The major questions now facing us are, how important were the contacts, when did they take place, whence did they come, and where did they go? . . .

We find two sets of parallels indicated by the evidence. The first consists of traits which appear to have originated or been elaborated to the greatest extent in America. From that source-area they must then have traveled to Polynesia. A good example of this class would be the technique of negative painting (or coloring) of gourds in Hawaii.

A second class of traits seems to be of great Oceanic (and often Asiatic) distribution and were therefore carried from Polynesia to America. An example is the concept of the umbrella as a symbol of royalty or divinity in the Maya area. Ethnobotanical evidence is particularly conclusive in distinguishing these two categories. . . .

Based on the view that diverse cultural influences would have reached Polynesia from a center such as Ecuador, we propose that actual voyages, perhaps concentrated in a short period of time, carried American physical types and culture elements to eastern Polynesia. There the "Polynesian" culture developed as a result of mixture between the new elements from America--many of which came from high cultures--and an old "basic Oceanic" population and culture. In the aspects of subsistence and general adaptation to the island environment the cultural mixture favored Oceania. In the aspects of religion and the higher arts a sort of dilute American culture resulted. The differentiation between eastern and western Polynesia would perhaps be due to differing degrees and times of American admixture, plus consequent regional developments. Such a view of basic Polynesian origins makes the Polynesian-Melanesian boundary something of the same order as the Chibchan/Mesoamerican border through Central America.

At least one more voyage from America seems necessary to complete the picture. This must reach Hawaii from North America. Possible sources for this voyage are the Northwest Coast, south-central California, and the west coast of Mexico. We suggest that possibly some sort of coastwise traffic from Mexico northward might have led to a voyage of a culturally mixed group to Hawaii in much the same fashion as the Ecuadorean mixture of cultures. . . .

The only acceptable solution, in the light of the number and complexity of the known parallels between western Oceania and America, seems to us to be that an early "basic Oceanic" culture extended right across the Pacific to South America, to which it contributed a significant cultural and racial element. . . .

In attempting to set dates for these movements we have little concrete information to go on. It has been regularly claimed by most students of the subject that the "Polynesian migrations" occurred about the period of the European Middle Ages. Actually the only concrete data on which to judge the matter comes from genealogies. These of course are the genealogies of the surviving, or immigrant peoples, not the "basic Oceanians," and as such cannot be expected to go back into the earlier period of the settlement of the islands. That there was such an earlier settlement seems certain. . . .

In part basing our conclusion on ethnobotany, we believe the "basic Oceanic" groups must have made contact with South America no later than 1000 B.C. The postulated migration from Ecuador westward seems on several counts to belong to the period from 300 and 700 A.D. The North American voyaging to Hawaii is almost impossible to place, but does seem earlier than the development of the typical Polynesian culture. We might then assign a range of 1 to 400 A.D. for this movement.

It will be seen that many "if's" enter our conclusions. . . .

Note* See the Sorenson notation for 1984.

1953^ Barbara Holbrook "Heyerdahl Seeks More Evidence Polynesians Came from South America,"

(Polynesians) in Church News 23, 24 January 1953, p. 15

In a 1953 *Church News* article, Barbara Holbrook would write the following:

GUAYAQUIL, ECUADOR--Thor ("Kon-Tiki") Heyerdahl, who stood science on its ear in 1947 when he crossed the Pacific in a balsa raft, has set sail from Ecuador on his first scientific expedition since Kon-Tiki headed for the little-known Galapagos Islands, astride the equator. . . .

The party will investigate especially one small island in the southern part of the group, Floreana. This island, 26 miles in circumference, is in the main sweep of the Humboldt Current, which carried the Kon-Tiki raft to a crash landing on a coral reef in Polynesia. Like his Kon-Tiki expedition, Heyerdahl's latest venture has its doubting Thomases. The Galapagos Islands were uninhabited when the Spanish arrived there and generally are considered too bleak and barren to have supported early day settlements.

Floreana, however, is one of the rare islands of the group which has fresh water and there fore might have attracted itinerants from the mainland of South America from time to time.

Heyerdahl's interest in this island grew when he learned that cotton growing semiwild there, was a variety of a species cultivated by the pre-Columbian Indians of the northern coast of Peru.

"Man," he says, "is the only agent who could have spread the plant to the Galapagos. The cotton seed dies in sea water; it's too heavy to be borne by the wind; and it's not a food for sea birds, that consequently would not have picked it up and carried it to the ocean island."

This botanical evidence gives Heyerdahl further optimism that his expedition may make a significant find in the Galapagos to bolster his Kon-Tiki theory. . . .

Scientists originally thought Heyerdahl was crazy when he suggested his theory of the source of Polynesian culture. However, following his Kon-Tiki expedition and the recent publication of his scientific study, "American Indians in the Pacific," many leading archaeologists are turning toward his way of thinking, he says.

Published in England last year, this weighty volume is scheduled to appear in a U. S. edition during 1953. It cites more than 1,000 sources and countless scientific examples showing the similarity between the early civilizations of South America and the Pacific Islands.

1953 Spencer W. Kimball "The Lamanite," in *BYU Speeches of the Year*, Provo: Brigham Young

University Press, 1953 April 15.

See the Kimball notation for 1955.

1953^ Harold Lundstrom "Heyerdahl Book Supports Theory Polynesians Came from 'America.'"

(Polynesians) in *Church News* 23, 29 August 1953, p. 13.

Under the heading, "New Book of Mormon Evidence," Harold Lundstrom would write the following:

The Book of Mormon passage regarding Hagoth and his building of ships which appears in the Book of Alma, Chapter 63, verse 5-7 reads . . . [verses quoted]

Book of Mormon students have long been of the opinion that these followers of Hagoth, or at least many of them, drifted westward to some of the islands of the South Pacific, and that at least some of the Polynesian races are descendants of these Book of Mormon peoples.

Thor Heyerdahl, the famed Norwegian explorer, and a non-member of the Church, continues intent on proving his point in his new book that the Polynesian races had pre-Inca beginnings.

Drawing on many branches of science in his study of a people who have long defied the scientists' attempt to classify them as Asiatics, Heyerdahl has put his findings in his new book published last week, entitled "American Indians in the Pacific--The Theory Behind the Kon-Tiki Expedition." The 821-page book is published by Rand McNally & Co. of Chicago, Ill. . . .

"American Indians in the Pacific" was featured as the "book of the week" in the Aug. 9 issue of "The New York Times Book Review." (This is a weekly supplement of the New York Times, comparable in size to the "Church Section.") The full-page review of Heyerdahl's book was written by Wendell C. Bennett, "a specialist in the field of Andean archaeology, and professor of anthropology at Yale." Specific permission has been given to the Church Section by Francis Brown, editor of the "New York Times Book Review" to quote excerpts from Dr. Bennett's copyrighted review. Some of the paragraphs of the review are as follows:

. . . This daring and dramatic journey demonstrated beyond any doubt that the pre-European inhabitants of South America could have reached Polynesia. "The possibility is one thing, the probability another.

In the present volume, Mr. Heyerdahl presents his arguments for the reality of such migrations. His thesis, to state it briefly, is that the earlier Polynesians came from Peru via Easter Island, and that the

later migrants came from the northwest coast of North America, traditional home of the totem-pole Indians, via the Hawaiian Islands.

The Polynesian islands form a great crescent in the eastern-most Pacific, from New Zealand to Easter Island to Hawaii. At the time of their discovery, these islands were occupied by a people noted for their uniformity in physical type, language and culture.

They cultivated breadfruit, sweet potato and taro, had domesticated pigs and chickens, but lacked ceramics, metal work, and weaving. Traditionally they migrated to the islands between A.D. 1100 and 1300. However, in the islands of Eastern Polynesia there is evidence of an earlier population, different both physically and culturally, which has dated back to approximately A.D. 450.

The origins for both of these migrations have generally been sought in the West, in the islands of Micronesia, Melanesia, and Indonesia. Although cultural parallels with the Americas have been noted, these have been interpreted as evidence that the seafaring Polynesians occasionally traversed the Pacific.

Mr. Heyerdahl is the first to propose seriously that the Polynesians originated in the New World. To support this thesis, Mr. Heyerdahl has assembled an impressive array of evidence and arguments, covering a vast bibliography and many fields of knowledge. He deals with the ethnography of Oceania and the Northwest Coast, geography, ocean currents, botany, archaeology, physical anthropology and linguistics. No author could have equal competence in all of these fields, but the approach is commendable. . . .

The quantity and quality of the materials which Mr. Heyerdahl has assembled are too great to be ignored.

Henceforth, American contributions to the Polynesian cultures will have to be considered. However, there are still serious objections to attributing total Polynesian origins to the New World. One is physical, namely how a distinctive Polynesian racial type could be derived from two basically Mongoloid Indian stocks. Mr. Heyerdahl argues at length that there was a Caucasoid strain in the early Indian populations, but the data are far from adequate.

The second is linguistic. The Polynesian languages are noted for their simple phonetics, analytic structure and positional syntax. The language of Peru and the Northwest Coast are phonetically complex and extremely polysynthetic in their extensive use of affixes. These differences cannot be dismissed with what Mr. Heyerdahl calls a "softening" process. Instead the affiliations of Polynesia are with the Malayan languages.

A third is archaeological. The ancient Peruvian civilizations long before A.D. 450 placed great emphasis on weaving, ceramics, metal work and domesticated maize. All of these are absent in Polynesia, although there existed suitable clays, native corn, and an intensive agricultural pattern.

Mr. Heyerdahl has, perhaps deliberately, overstated his case. In spite of his voluminous arguments he has not yet resolved the question of Polynesian origins, but he has at least introduced a new chapter.

1954[^] Matthew Cowley Matthew Cowley, *Matthew Cowley--Speaks*, Salt Lake City: Deseret Book,
(Polynesians) 1954, pp. 114-16.

In the preface "About this Book" we find the following:

. . . In it are his powerful conference addresses . . . also his addresses at Brigham Young University . . . Bound in the book are many of his stake conference addresses and a few of the funeral sermons.

In the "Introduction," Bishop Glenn L. Rudd writes the following (speaking of Matthew Cowley) :

Two months following the birth of this fine baby boy [born on August 2, 1897], during the general conference in Salt Lake City, Matthias Foss Cowley [Matthew's father] was sustained a member of the Council of the Twelve. . . .

In 1914, while Matthew was attending the L.D.S. University in Salt Lake City, he received a call to serve as a missionary in the New Zealand Mission. When he arrive in New Zealand, he was still only seventeen years of age, but because of his pleasing disposition and great ability, he soon won the hearts of the Maori people of that mission. He became fluent in the usage of the Maori language. At the conclusion of the normal three-year mission period, he received a special call from President Joseph F. Smith, President of the Church, to remain in New Zealand long enough to translate the Doctrine and Covenants and Pearl of Great Price into the Maori language, and also to revise and reedit the previous translation of the Book of Mormon. In 1919, after completing five years as a missionary, he returned to his home in Salt Lake City. . . .

On January 18, 1938, Matthew Cowley was set apart as President of the New Zealand Mission and departed the following day for his field of labor accompanied by Sister Cowley and their daughter, Jewell. During the first three years that he served as mission president, he had many missionaries laboring under his direction, but because of war conditions, these missionaries were all called to return to their homes or were assigned to other fields of labor; and he was left to handle the affairs of the mission without the assistance of Zion elders. He immediately organized the entire mission with its thirteen districts and approximately eighty branches under the leadership of local elders, and the mission prospered during this period as it had never done before. President Cowley and his family returned to Salt Lake City in September of 1945.

On October 5, 1945, Brother Cowley was sustained a member of the Council of the Twelve as the Church met in solemn assembly in its semi-annual conference. . . . Approximately a year later, a new position of responsibility among the General Authorities of the Church was created, and Elder Cowley was appointed to fill the position as President of the Pacific Islands Missions. In this new assignment, he was given the responsibility of directing the affairs of the Church in the many missions of the Pacific. His headquarters in this assignment continued to be in Salt Lake City, but during the following three years, he traveled almost continuously in the islands of the sea. The entire Polynesian people now had the opportunity of being blessed by him as had the Maori people during the thirteen years that he had lived with them as missionary and president. He had a great gift of language and was able to speak in the native tongue so that he could be understood by the people in all his travels. . . . After approximately three years in this special assignment, he was released, and from then until his death, he traveled extensively along with the other General Authorities visiting the stakes and the missions of the Church. . . .

The reader of this book will soon discover as he reads through each succeeding address and talk that nothing is complicated, but that Elder Cowley's entire thinking was based on simple fundamentals. It is this great simplicity that endeared him to the people of the Church and made him the beloved *Tumuaki* (president, leader) of the people of the islands. . . .--Bishop Glen L. Rudd

For the benefit of the reader, some excerpts from one of the more pertinent talks are recorded below. Note* Another talk from this book entitled "Maori Chief Predicts: Te Karere, November, 1950," is quoted in the 1881 notation.

"Testimony through Reading the Book of Mormon,,"

Address delivered at the annual General Relief Society conference, Wednesday, October 1, 1952.

After speaking a few words in Maori to a few of his friends in the audience, Elder Matthew Cowley of the Quorum of the Twelve said the following:

I would like to bear my testimony to you about the book which you are studying in the Relief Society, The Book of Mormon. I know nothing about archaeology. I have not studied the maps which apparently relate to The Book of Mormon, the travels of the Lehighites, the Lamanites, and so forth. I know very little about the outside evidences of The Book of Mormon, but I have a testimony of the divinity of this book, and that testimony has come to me from within the two covers of the book itself.

To me, archaeology, and all that archaeologists discover, which may in a way prove the genuineness of the book--these discoveries are lost in the spirit of the book itself, and if you can't find a testimony within the covers of this book, there is no need to look elsewhere. . . .

We have so much collateral reading in this Church. With all due respect to those who write books, I think there is only one place where we can really get a testimony of the divine mission of the Prophet Joseph Smith, a testimony of the truth of the gospel of Jesus Christ, and that is right back to the source material--the standard works of the Church, because within these covers, the voice rings out, "God hath spoken." These are not the opinions of men. These are not the opinions of men as to where Lehi and his party landed, either in the Pacific or the Atlantic. These are not the conclusions of the students of archaeology, of the drawers of maps. This is the word of God himself, and so, studying The Book of Mormon, brothers and sisters, you are getting back to God himself, and my, what this book contains! . . .

I urge you to read The Book of Mormon. I learned the Maori language, what little I know of it, not from studying the grammars of the language, but from studying The Book of Mormon, and after reading diligently and with fasting and praying, The Book of Mormon in the Maori language for eleven weeks, I stood up for fifteen minutes and bore my testimony in that language. I caught the spirit of that book and it revealed to me in a way that I cannot explain the language of those children of Israel.

Later on I assisted in a new translation of The Book of Mormon into the Maori language, and after fasting and praying, I learned what it is to translate under the inspiration and the power of God himself.

Now we have with us here my good Israelite friend (Wi Pere Amaru). I am glad he has come to speak to us Gentiles, to bring to us a message right from the heart and blood of Israel. You know, in the 63rd chapter of Alma, there is a little story which tells of Hagoth who was such an exceedingly curious man that he built a boat, and he went out on the seas, and he came back. He built other boats, and then finally the boats went forth and never returned. We are told in The Book of Mormon the place where those ships were built was near a narrow neck of land.

When I was on my first mission as a young boy, I used to ask the oldtimers out there, "Where did you come from?" They would say (in Maori), "We came from the place where the sweet potato grows wild, where it is not planted, does not have to be cultivated."

There is only one place in all the world where the sweet potato grows wild, and that is within the environs of that narrow neck of land where Hagoth built his ships. They will tell you that they came from several degrees of distance (Maori). One degree of distance, a greater degree of distance, and then a far greater degree of distance.

The Maori scholars tell you that . . . (spoken in Maori) means the place where the spirits are joined. But I have a little different interpretation of that. *Wairua* in the Maori language means "spirit." *Wairua* also means "two waters," *wai* meaning water, *rua* meaning two.

In the Hawaiian language *Wailua* means "two waters"; in the Samoan language *Vailua* means "two waters." The word for *Spirit* in those other languages isn't *Wairua*, the same as in the Maori language.

The Maori scholars say that they came from a far distant place, where the spirits are joined, or where the body returns to the spirit. But I say, knowing the story of Hagoth as I do, that they came from the joining of two waters, a narrow neck of land between the two bodies of water which joins those two great continents. . . .

When anyone tries to destroy the faith of Maoris who go to universities, the Maoris laugh and say, "You are talking to Israelites. You can teach us anything you want. We will try to pass in these courses. We will try to get passing grades. But there is something down in here which the wisdom of man can never withdraw, and that is our faith in God, his protecting care over us, as his children scattered over thousands of miles in the Pacific."--Matthew Cowley

Note* See also Robert E. Parsons, "Hagoth and the Polynesians," in *The Book of Mormon: Alma, The Testimony of The Word*, Provo: BYU Religious Studies Center, 1992, pp. 254-255.)

Note* Elder Cowley links both the sweet potato grown on the Polynesian islands and a favorite Maori tradition regarding their origins to a "narrow neck of land," which he interprets as the land between the two continents of North America and South America. He links the Polynesians with the story of Hagoth. His statements imply either a Hemispheric Theory, or a Modified Hemispheric Theory of Book of Mormon geography.

1954^ Matthew Cowley Henry A. Smith, *Matthew Cowley, Man of Faith*, S. L. C.: Bookcraft, 1954.

(Polynesians)

On pages 55-56 we find the following in a letter written by Matthew Cowley to his father from Maromaku, Bay of Isles, on April 17, 1917. In it he said:

Dear Father:

. . . I look forward with dread to the day when I will be released from this work among the Maoris. My love for this people has reached such a degree that I fear that I will be robbed of contentment after my return to Zion. I have also learned to like the country, and I can see many opportunities for a man to make a living here. Nothing would suit me better than to return here after being released from my mission and spend about ten years or so in farming and stockraising and of course do missionary work on the side. And perhaps I could find a pure native maid for a wife, thereby grafting the real unadulterated blood of Israel into M. F. Cowley's posterity. If it was not for the tie which binds me to my father, mother, brothers and sisters I would like to devote my whole life to the interest of the Pacific Islanders, not only the Maoris but the Hawaiians, Tahitians, Samoans, etc.

On pages 229-230 we find the dedicatory address given by Elder Matthew Cowley at the Laie Chapel, Laie, Hawaii, Sunday, March 5, 1950. In it he said the following:

When we see this beautiful building, I have the vision to look down and see standing on the Island of Aitutaki in the Cook Islands, a magnificent place of worship for those Polynesians. It won't be many years until we have on that island a beautiful chapel such as this, and we will have a large membership among the Cook Islanders.

Brothers and sisters, you are God's children--you are Israel. You have in your veins the blood of Nephi. You have the protection of God because he has made a covenant with you that Israel would never be destroyed. While I was in New Zealand during the last war, I was an air raid warden, and we were digging trenches, and I was the only missionary there from home. I would go around holding conferences with our people and told them to have no fear. The islands where Israel resides will be protected because they are God's covenant race. Why wasn't Hawaii invaded? Why wasn't Samoa invaded? Why weren't they invaded? I am simple enough to believe that God keeps his promises--that when he said Israel would be protected as a people, he meant just what he said.

1954^ Joseph Fielding Smith Doctrines of Salvation, 3 vols. edited by Bruce R. McConkie, Salt
(Polynesians) Lake City: Bookcraft, 1954-1956, 1:233.

In Chapter 14 ("The Church and Kingdom") of Volume 1 in his 3-volume work *Doctrines of Salvation*, Joseph Fielding Smith reviews the progress of the Restored Church in the Latter-days. Concerning missionary work he writes:

The first foreign mission was the British, which was opened in Lancashire, England, by Elders Heber C. Kimball, Orson Hyde, Willard Richards, Joseph Fielding, John Goodson, Isaac Russel and John Snider, in 1837. . . . In 1843, Addison Pratt, Noah Rogers, Benjamin F. Grouard and Knowlton F. Hanks were set apart to visit the islands of the Pacific. . . . Since that time the gospel has been preached in most of Europe, parts of Asia, South America, the Islands of the Sea, where many of the descendants of the Nephite race reside; and in Japan, which land was dedicated by President Heber J. Grant, September 1, 1901.

1954^ **Norman C. Pierce** *Another Cumorah, Another Joseph*, N.p., 1954

(Polynesians)

The author proposes a limited Central American setting for the Book of Mormon with a land northward being in the Yucatan area which in ancient times extended to a much greater area but which is now a sunken continental shelf (sunk at the time of the crucifixion). The land southward was situated in Honduras and Costa Rica. He then writes:

Yet, North America was inhabited by a highly advanced civilization of the ancient aborigines during Book of Mormon times; but so far we have been bound by the facts of the Book of Mormon exclusively to Central America.

Now, let us go back to our proposed "Narrow Neck of Land" as it was before the crucifixion, and see if we can find a large movement of people that would account for the growth and development of this great North American civilization. Obviously this movement of people will have to be by sea since the known lands of that period were already peopled.

[Pierce then quotes Alma 63:5-10 concerning Hagoth]

Here are at least seven ship loads of people, all sailing northward from this point. (Count them.) Now chart, if you please, a longitude line from our narrow neck of land at the base of the Yucatan Peninsula in what was truly a "Sea West," for Hagoth's sailing course, and see where it brings you. It is 90 degrees longitude, and it brings you straight across the Gulf of Mexico and directly up the Mississippi. . . .

And what do we find in the Mississippi and Ohio valleys? The great Mound Builders' Civilization. And get this fact!: It is the only civilization in North America of sufficient antiquity to account for Hagoth's mass migration. . . .

And now, what about the Hawaiians, Samoans, Tahitians, etc., who have very definite legends linking them with the people of Hagoth, or at least, with one Hawaii-loa, a great mariner of the same period?

Let us point out again that Hagoth sailed northward, and that all the islands involved are in latitudes to the south of Yucatan or equal to it; and, as we have shown, Hagoth sailed on the Atlantic side, while these islands are all on the Pacific side. Moreover, all the islanders have the dark skin curse of the Lamanites, while Hagoth's group were Nephites, mainly.

Furthermore, there is a little time element which enters into this. The islanders have a very definite legend of a White God having been among their ancestors, Who promised to return again, and they thought they recognized the return of this God in the arrival of the first explorer, captain James Cook in 1773-78. But Hagoth sailed in 54 B.C., before the advent of Christ to the Nephites in America, and so could not have taken such a legend with him at the time, --but later could.

Since Hagoth's Mound Builder Civilization spread from coast to coast in North America, we do find a strong possible connection with the islanders in the ancient city of the Hohgates, who bear a phonetic resemblance to Hagoth. | Their time is after Christ's visit.

The Hohgates were a mound building people who built a city on the California coast at St. George Point, near San Francisco. Then, according to legend, they suddenly disappeared in a ship by way of the sea, never to return again. (See Nadaillac, "Pre-Historic America," pp. 64, 65; Also Bancroft, "Native Races," 3:177)

A study of the ocean current off St. George point reveals that it sweeps surely and swiftly toward the Hawaiian islands! But from northern Mexico to Peru, the ocean currents are directly opposed to such a course, proving that no crippled ship could have drifted there from any point off the Pacific coast of Central America.

Consequently, we see no objection to the idea that this was the ship responsible for the settling of the islands byu this people, who no doubt, were peaceful Lamanites such as is characteristic of the islanders today. They were the Hohgates who set sail from a point near San Francisco, and with the wind and current all taking them that way, landed inevitably in the Hawaiian Islands. This also agrees with a popular island legend that the first islanders came from a father-land so big that it would require the lifetime of a man to walk around it. Certainly this applys to North America rather than Central America. The Kin Tiki story fits too. (pp. 32-34)

1955^ Spencer W. Kimball "The Lamanite," in *Improvement Era* 58 (1955 April), pp. 226-228,
246-258.

In the April 1955 *Improvement Era* Spencer W. Kimball of the Council of the Twelve would write:

We approach the day when . . . the Lord will remember the covenant which he made unto Abraham and unto all the house of Israel. . . . Columbus and others discovered this promised land; the colonists came and settled the country; the Revolutionary War was part of the program to bring freedom to the new world; and all of these developments were charted and permitted by the Lord. And when religious liberty was a reality through this God-given Constitution of the United States, then it was possible for the gospel to be restored. And Joseph Smith was raised up, the plates were found in the Hill Cumorah, and the Book of Mormon came forth, and the gospel was restored through the Gentile nations and thus came to the Lamanite people. The Prophet Joseph Smith immediately began to send the gospel to the red men, and this soon after the Church was organized. As soon as he read accounts of them in the Book of Mormon he became aware of their destiny. Repeated attempts have been made through these many years to reach the Lamanites.

Note See the notation for 1953.*

1955? David O. McKay ???

(Melanesia)

Note* I can't locate the source or the quote right now, but apparently David O. McKay made a statement to the effect that Fijians, part of the island group classified as "Melanesians" for their dark skin coloring, are negroid but not from the seed of Cain; therefore they can receive the priesthood. David Cummings refers to this statement as follows:

When President David O. McKay declared that they were a branch of the house of Israel and should receive the gospel, Fiji was added to the Samoan mission, two missionaries were dispatched to labor there and in 1956 the decision was made to build a chapel in Suva.

Source: David W. Cummings, *Mighty Missionary of the Pacific*, Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1961, p. 198

However, this date conflicts with information contained in an article by R. Lanier Britsch. He writes:

For the first 110 years that the Church was in the Pacific, Missionary work was limited to the peoples of Polynesia and Australia. It was not until May 1954 that LDS missionary work expanded to the Melanesian islands, specifically Fiji, and then it was under the auspices of the Samoan Mission. Anthropologists generally classify the peoples of Fiji, New Caledonia, Vanuatu (formerly the New Hebrides), the Solomons, and New Guinea as part of the Pacific Negroid family. Great diversity exists, however. As a rule, the peoples of this area have black rather than brown skin, curly or kinky hair rather than the generally straighter hair of Polynesia, and a smaller but taller body build. There is little question that Mormon missionaries shied away from Melanesia during earlier times because of the restriction against blacks holding the priesthood. Until the late 1950s, however, no high-ranking Church authorities had seriously considered whether the Melanesians were eligible to hold the priesthood. Even after missionaries were assigned to Fiji in 1954, there was still some question about this matter. It was not until 1958 that President David O. McKay authorized Church leaders to ordain Fijians, who have a considerable mixture of Polynesian blood, to the priesthood. . . .

In August 1954, Samoan Mission President Howard B. Stone sent Elders Boyd L. Harris and Sheldon L. Abbot to Suva, Fiji. . . . Missionary work in Fiji received a boost in 1955 when President David O. McKay had a stopover in Suva. . . . In late March 1955, the Church purchased a large piece of land . . . President McKay . . . decided that the Suva chapel should be a manifestation of the Church's interest in the area and proposed that a large building be constructed . . . While the Suva chapel was under construction, the First Presidency decided to transfer Fiji to the Tongan Mission . . . The transfer took place on January 15, 1958. (Manuscript History of the Samoan Mission, March 31, 1958)

Source: R. Lanier Britsch, "Founding the LDS Church in Melanesia and Micronesia, in *Voyages of Faith: Explorations in Mormon Pacific History*, ed. Grant Underwood, Provo: BYU Studies and the Joseph Fielding Smith Institute for Latter-day Saint History, 2000, pp. 267-288.

Armand L. Mauss writes the following in a chapter entitled "The Campaign to Cast Off the Curse of Cain":

A careful scrutiny of the Mormon historical record would likely turn up a number of acts and events with unintended consequences for racial policay. After all, the church ws always looking for ways to promote its growth among various peoles of the earth, so it was always unlikely that some peoples could be indefinitely ignored, set aside, or unequally treated without creating practical and theological problems.

Such consequences did indeed derive from certain practical and marginal policy changes that David O. McKay, president of the church, made during his world tour in 1953 and 1954. As a result of his observations in South Africa and Latin America, especially, he became aware of how much the work and growth of the church were hampered by the traditional requirement that priesthood candidates must demonstrate "pure" lineage back to Europe before they could be ordained, even if they had no visible characteristics of African lineage. More or less summarily, President McKay simply switched the "burden of proof," so that anyone in those countries could be ordained *unless* the local church leaders provided evidence of a candidate's African ancestry. During this same general period, Fijians, New Guineans, and Philippine Negritos were also reclassified from questionable to eligible lineages. (Mauss, *All Abraham's Children: Changing Mormon Conceptions of Race and Lineage*, Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2003, pp. 232, 264)

Note* For a thorough historical treatment of the Negro issue, see the following:

Lester E. Bush, "Mormonism's Negro Doctrine: An Historical Overview," *Dialogue* 8 (1): 11-68.

Lester E. Bush, "Writing 'Mormonism's Negro Doctrine: An Historical Overview' (1973); Context and Reflections, 1998." *Journal of Mormon History* 25 (1): 229-71.

1956^ Andrew S. Scott "Are the Polynesians Lamanites?" in *The Saints Herald*, vol. 103, February

(Polynesians-RLDS) 1956, pp. 153-155.

In this RLDS article in *The Saints Herald*, Andrew Scott takes exception to the traditional LDS concepts in regard to Polynesians origins. He writes:

Ever since Thor Heyerdahl and his companions survived the epic voyage by balsa raft from the coast of Peru via the Humboldt Current into eastern Polynesia, Latter Day Saints have been speculating on the probability of an American origin for the Polynesians. It is very easy to conceive an attractive idea and then search for evidences to support it, but this method is unscientific and too often resorted to in the field of religion. The true scientific approach is to accumulate evidences and, from the mass, attempt to tie them together in the form of a theory. As new evidences come to light they are incorporated into the original mass and the theory modified accordingly. The unscientific approach allows for too much

speculation, the warping of facts, and the use of doubtful references to the eventual discredit of the speculators and their ideas.

Speculation regarding the origin of the Polynesians has, in some quarters, brought discredit on the authenticity of the Book of Mormon. In New Zealand I have often heard comments to the effect that the claims of Latter Day Saints and their Book of Mormon must be false because they advocate an American origin for the Polynesians. Of course the Book of Mormon says no such thing, but some of the missionaries of the Utah church are spreading this theory among the Maoris of New Zealand and the Samoan Islanders and as a consequence falsely incriminating the Book of Mormon and thus bringing the Latter Day Saint approach into disrepute. . . .

From the early legends we can trace the migrations of these people in an easterly direction from their mythical homeland of Hawai-iki (shall we call it Terra Hawai-iki Incognito?) to the islands of Tahiti which were soon to become the hub of early Polynesia. There have been various theories of the migration routes. For example, Elsdon Best favors the route from the Asiatic mainland through Malaysia, Indonesia, Melanesia, Samoa to Tahiti. The New Zealander, the late Sir Peter Buck known to the Maori as Te Rangi Hiroa, favors a more northerly route from Cambodia (Indochina) through the Philippines and Micronesia to Samoa and Tahiti.

For the purposes of this article it does not matter much which route the original migrants took. In fact, through the centuries all these routes were probably used as wave upon wave of Polynesians departed from different areas of the seacoasts of Asia and the islands to the south. . . .

Although only a few items are mentioned briefly here, there is abundant evidence supporting the claim for eastward migrations of the Polynesians into the Pacific. I also believe that, as Heyerdahl proved possible, some South Americans may have survived the drift voyages of the Humboldt and landed in eastern Polynesia. At this point it is obvious that the effects of this tiny contact of the two peoples was transitory and resulted in the South American castaways losing their identity as such and becoming absorbed into an already vigorously developed Polynesian culture.

The most lasting artifacts of the Polynesians, their stone adzes and armulets, show no connection whatever with the American continent. To the contrary, their prototypes and duplicates are found in abundance on the Asiatic seaboard from Manchuria to Indonesia. Even the mysterious statues of Easter Island lose their mystery after being examined on a scientific level.

Basic legends of the Garden of Eden story and the Flood as well as of other cataclysms are notoriously universal in their geographical distribution and are unreliable in tying Polynesia to South America.

It has been mentioned in other articles on this subject that some Pacific Islanders have been given the lineage of Laman and other Book of Mormon characters in their patriarchal blessings and also the lineage of the tribes of Israel. This is taken by many Latter Day Saints to be conclusive proof of the American origin of the Polynesians. To the contrary, I interpret these interesting points in the following way without ignoring the previous statements in this article: It is not known for sure whether the lineages as given in a patriarchal blessing refer to actual biological lineage or to a spiritual lineage for the purpose of a future inheritance. If a biological lineage is what is intended, then it is quite possible for the living descendants of castaway South Americans (who had lost their identity after being absorbed into Polynesian culture) to be informed of their actual lineage through the means of a blessing. If it is a spiritual lineage that is given, then this factor is of no consequence in tying the two peoples biologically.

I mentioned the Asiatic seaboard as the area where Polynesian culture seems to have had its beginning. The legends of these people place their homeland of "Hawai-iki" further west than the western shores of the Pacific. To trace the location of Hawai-iki from this point one must leave the realm of ethnology and embark upon the misty waters of mythology. It has been suggested that the original

Polynesian homeland was near prehistoric India. Some have placed it farther west than that. Perhaps there is a large percentage of the ten lost tribes of Israel mixed up in those who are now known as Polynesians and who were forced to leave their occupation areas of the western Pacific seaboard and the southern archipelago by the invading Mongol hordes and brave the hazardous island-hopping journey to win for themselves the honor of the greatest navigators in history. These people never forgot Hawai-iki, and its memory is revealed today in the names of Savaii (New Zealand Samoa), Avaiki-tautau (New Zealand), and modern Hawaii.

This article is meant to show the accumulated facts of Polynesian ethnology and the scientific conclusions based upon them. I have tried to tie the material facts together with the spiritual experiences of some Polynesians into a cohesive whole in order to avoid unscientific and destructive speculation which has and may still bring the Book of Mormon into unjust condemnation.

1956 Hugh B. Brown Prayer at the Laying of the Cornerstone: New Zealand Temple, December
(Polynesians) 1956

David W. Cummings would write the following in his book *Mighty Missionary of the Pacific*:

By the middle of December 1956, the steel framework of the temple had been completed and was more than half hidden by the concrete covering. On December 22, twelve months and a day after ground was broken, the year's hard drive reached a rewarding climax--the cornerstone ceremony. . . . Nearly 2,000 gathered at Temple View for the ceremony.

Elder Hugh B. Brown, then an assistant to The Quorum of the Twelve, represented the First Presidency and General Authorities. He conducted the preliminary service, gave the principal address, officiated at the actual laying of the cornerstone and offered the prayer. . . .:

. . . We thank Thee, O God, for revealing to us the Book of Mormon, the story of the ancient inhabitants of America. We thank Thee that from among those inhabitants, the ancestors of these whose heads are bowed before Thee here, came from the western shores of America into the South Seas pursuant to Thy plan and now their descendants humbly raise their voices in grateful acknowledgement of Thy kindness, Thy mercy, and Thy love for them and those who went before them.

We humbly thank Thee that this building is erected in this land, so that those faithful Maoris who came here in early days, descendants of Father Lehi, may be remembered by their descendants and saved through the ordinances that will, in this House, be performed in their behalf.

Source: David W. Cummings, *Mighty Missionary of the Pacific*, Salt Lake City, Bookcraft, 1961, pp. 59-63. See also Paul R. Cheesman and Millie Foster Cheesman, *Early America and the Polynesians*, Provo: Promised Lands Publication, 1975.

1958 President Mendenhall Dedication of the New Zealand Temple, April 1958, eighth session

(Polynesians)

David Cummings writes:

At the eighth and closing session, President Mendenhall spoke as follows:

President McKay and other General Authorities of the Church, my brothers and sisters: It is, indeed, a pleasure and an honor to stand before you this day. I trust that the spirit of the Lord will continue to be in this service as it has been in previous services, the culmination of this great dedicatory program of the New Zealand Temple.

I did not know that I was going to be called upon this afternoon. But during this morning's session, the thought came to my mind that we would be remiss as members of this Church if we did not pay proper homage to the early missionaries of the Christian church. They paved the way for the gospel of Jesus Christ, for the missionaries to come traveling two and two and bear witness to the truth.

In this great South Pacific Polynesian triangle we have over two and a half million square miles of area, which is filled with the descendants of the House of Israel. I am sure that God in His wisdom saw fit to lead you people, your ancestors, to the various areas of the South Pacific and tuck you away in a land which is abundant and rich above all other lands in providing foods in their natural state. He did it to preserve a people for a day in which they should rise and become mighty before God.

Source: David W. Cummings, *Mighty Missionary of the Pacific*, Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1961, p. 90.

1958^ David O. McKay "Dedicatory Prayer Delivered By Pres. McKay at New Zealand Temple,"

(Polynesians) Church News, 10 May 1958, pp. 2, 6.

In the opening sentences of his dedicatory prayer at the New Zealand Temple, April 20, 1958, President David O. McKay stated:

O God, our Eternal Father, on this significant and hallowed occasion, we unite our hearts and lift our voices in gratitude, praise and honor to Thy Holy name. We express gratitude that to these fertile islands thou didst guide descendants of Father Lehi and hast enabled them to prosper, to develop and to become associated in history with leading and influential nations among mankind."

Other Sources: See Robert E. Parsons, "Hagoth and the Polynesians," in *The Book of Mormon: Alma, The Testimony of The Word*, Provo: BYU Religious Studies Center, 1992, p. 252. See also William A. Cole & Elwin W. Jensen, *Israel in the Pacific*, Salt Lake City: Genealogical Society, 1961, p. 388.

Note* In his 1995 book, *Lamanites, Lands and the Book of Mormon* (pp. 78-81), Gaylen Hinton would claim this quote as revelation and use it as a basis for having the seed of Lehi inhabit many "isles of the sea" including Madagascar and Japan. He writes:

In the Church, we generally hold that the dedicatory prayers of temples are given by revelation. At the dedication of the New Zealand temple, on the Polynesian island farthest removed from the Americas, President David O. McKay gave the dedicatory prayer. In it, he said the following: "We express gratitude that to these fertile islands Thou didst guide descendants of Father Lehi, and hast enabled them to prosper . . ." This and other reasons, give us confidence that the Polynesian people are of the blood of Lehi, but what of the rest of the isles of the sea?

1958^ Gordon B. Hinckley "Temple in the Pacific," *Improvement Era*, (July 1958)

(Polynesians) 61:506-509, 538.

Elder Gordon B. Hinckley commented upon Europeans being assembled with the Maoris of the Pacific at the dedication of the New Zealand Temple:

Then followed sessions on Tuesday afternoon, and Wednesday, for the people of New Zealand. Intermingled were Maoris and Europeans. Elderly Maori women, whose faces were tattooed and whose hands were wrinkled with the labor of years, sat with blue-eyed, fair-skinned, shawl-wrapped women who looked as if they belonged in the cities of England. Again, there was something prophetic about it. Here were two great strains of the house of Israel the children of Ephraim from the isles of Britain, and the children of Lehi from the isles of the Pacific" (509)

Additional Source: Robert E. Parsons, "Hagoth and the Polynesians," in *The Book of Mormon: Alma, The Testimony of The Word*, Provo: BYU Religious Studies Center, 1992, p. 252.

1959^ Hartt Wixom "Lehi Raft Captain Tells Communist Threat Cure," in the *Daily Universe*,

(abt. DeVere Baker) Brigham Young University. Provo, Utah: Wednesday, January 7, 1959, p. 1, 3

Hartt Wisxom, the editor of the Daily Universe writes:

"The Communist threat to the Free World is greater than most people realize and the young people of our Church are in the best position to combat the threat."

This opinion was recently voiced to the Daily Universe by Mr. and Mrs. DeVere Baker who spent ten years in Communist influenced countries while training crews on the rafts Lehi I, II, III, and IV. Mr. Baker has spent considerable time during the last ten years sailing Pacific Ocean currents to prove persons could have crossed the Pacific Ocean as detailed in the Book of Mormon, publication of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

"As a result of the successful voyage of the Lehi IV from the West Coast of South America to the Hawaiian Islands," reports Mr. Baker, "Hawaiian history books are being re-written." . . .

"I've known all along that the Book of Mormon account of the migration of Asiatic people to South America is correct, while those advocated by the majority of the world's historians are false," said Baker. "The world's historians believed that Near East-Asian influence in South America came about by races migrating island by island to the Gilberts and hence to South America.

In order to do that their motorless rafts would have had to sail upstream against both wind and current."

DeVere Baker will explain the objectives and results of the Lehi raft voyage when he addresses faculty members and interested students Thursday. He will speak at 4:15 p.m. in 1100 Smith Family Living Center.

Instead, the Near East-Asian groups sailed to South America as outlined in the Book of Mormon. Then, Hagoth the ship builder, and his crew, as well as those who followed after him, drifted easily westward from South America to the Hawaiian and other islands. . . .

Baker said that in spite of the hardships, the Lehi IV proved that sailing on natural ocean currents from South America to Hawaii would have been relatively easy for migrating races. . . .

1959^ Captain DeVere Baker *The Raft Lehi IV*, USA: DeVere Baker, 1959

(Polynesians)

After relating a number of similarities between ancient cultures in the Americas with the Book of Mormon story, DeVere Baker notes that the ancients had sailed ships of commerce back and forth from North America to South America, utilizing the consistent flow of what is now called the Japanese current. Referring to the story of Hagoth he theorizes, "Without doubt a majority of these ships caught an offshore wind and were blown into a branch-off of the Japanese current, then drifted and were blown to the Hawaiian Islands." (p. 20) He then chronicles 4 attempts at building a raft and sailing it from the San Francisco bay area (Crescent City) to Hawaii in order to prove this theory. After three failures, the final attempt was somewhat successful. After being towed out to sea from King Harbor in Redondo Beach,

California, on July 5, 1958, they drifted and sailed for seventy days before finally being picked up and towed into Maui on Sunday, September 21.

Illustrated Map: Planned Route for the Raft Lehi. This map based on a Navy hydrographic office chart of Pacific ocean currents for the month of July, shows the major trend of the water surface motions along the California Coast and West as far as the Hawaiian Islands. (The broken line arrows show the general route which was planned for the Lehi). (Captain DeVere Baker, *The Raft Lehi IV*, USA: DeVere Baker, 1959, p. 37)

1960[^] Rex A. Wadham "A Study of the Spiritual Characteristics of the Maori People--Both Ancient and

(Polynesians) **Modern--As a Key to Their Origin,"** July 15, 1960. (Paper submitted to

"Instructor: Mr. N. Richards" (L. Tom Perry Special Collections, Harold B.

Lee Library, B.Y.U.)

Rex Wadham writes:

I have, in writing this paper, two main purposes in mind. The first is to show the similarity that exists between the spiritual characteristics that the Maori people have possessed since ancient times, and the teachings of Christ as they are understood today, that is, the teachings of Christ as they are defined by the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints. . . . The second is to use the findings of this study as a key to the origin of the Maori people. The popular belief in the world today is that the original migration came to New Zealand from a westerly direction (Asia). This belief is supported by the writings of a dozen or more of the present-day scientists (Sir Peter Buck, Eldson Best and S. Percy Smith are among these men) who, in their estimation, have produced conclusive evidence to substantiate their theory. These scientists differ between themselves as to the actual geographical location of the origin, but in the main they all support the theory that the migration came from the West. I propose to show that the migration came from the western coastline of the American continent. In other words, I propose to prove to the best of my ability that the Maori of New Zealand came from the East and not the West. . . .

The study of the ancient spiritual characteristics of the Maori will be presented in three different parts. The first part will deal with the similarity between the ancient knowledge of the Maori and the teachings of the Old Testament. The second part will deal with similarities that exist between the ancient Maori and the religious philosophy of the Church. This philosophy is not generally understood by those who are not members of the Church. The third part will show similar relationships that exist between the ancient Maori and the ancient Israel. . .

After reviewing a number of evidences to support the above objectives, Wadham concludes with two stories. The first is of the prophecy of Chief Paora Potangaroa in 1881 concerning the coming of the Mormon elders with the true gospel (see the 1881 notation). Wadham adds: "I would like to add that

Paora Potangaroa was not the only Maori Prophet to predict the coming of the Church (see *Matthew Cowley Speaks*, page 205.)

The second story concerns the building of the New Zealand Temple:

The temple was built almost entirely by Maori labor. I was one of those who helped in this work and I can personally vouch for the enthusiasm and devotion that these people put into their work. . . . It must also be mentioned that these men did not receive any wages. The truth of the matter is that they simply refused to receive any form of reward for doing the work of the Lord. . . . I have been a witness in seeing how the Lord answered their prayers. This may sound strange to a European, nevertheless, during some of the critical stages of construction on the Temple, when it rained for days on end, I have seen the sky open up and hardly a drop of water fell on the site. This is the simple, child-like, faith that the Maori people have, yet it is faith enough to control even the elements. Theirs is the faith which is strong enough to put aside the things of the world and work--just for the simple reward of knowing that they were serving their Creator.

I would now like to further your understanding on the spiritual nature of the Maori people by telling you (the reader) a little about the Temple site. The area which surrounds the Temple is comprised of undulating grass lands. The area abounds with small, low capped hills. There is nothing outstanding about any one of these hills. They all seem to look alike. It was President David O. McKay (the President of the Church) who, during one of his visits to the Hamilton Farm at Hamilton, pointed to a hill that lay in the adjoining property and announced to those who were assembled nearby that a Temple would be built upon the top of it. We (the New Zealand Saints) understood that he had selected this site through the inspiration of the Lord. There was not many of us who knew whether or not this was true, but nevertheless, we were happy to hear that at last we were going to have a Temple in New Zealand.

It was not until several years later that we (the labor missionaries who were laboring on the project at the time) knew that the site had indeed been selected by divine inspiration. At the time the temple was three thirds of the way towards completion and the bulldozer crew had begun the work of landscaping the hill. It was the blade of one of these bulldozers that revealed a secret that had been buried for over three hundred years. The earth moving machine had uncovered a burial site of an ancient Maori grave yard. At the time this did not mean too much as it was something that could be expected in such a locality. The building supervisor called in a local group of old Maori Elders and showed them the uncovered graves. The skeletons were over a dozen in number and it was found that they had been buried in a sitting position. The old men related the story that this hill had once been the site of an old Maori "Pa" (Marae). They said that the Maori regarded such a place as holy or sacred ground. In other words, this hill in ancient times had been referred to as "Temple ground." This is the evidence from the past that I referred to as having a link with the present. It is the evidence that shows that the Temple site had not been selected by choice, but by the inspiration of the Lord through His servant, President David O. McKay. At the time President McKay selected the site, he could never have known anything about the past history of the hill. All signs to show that the hill had once been inhabited had long since been obliterated. The old Maori Elders knew of the existence of an ancient Pa in this district, but they were unable, up until now, to pinpoint the actual location. The graves revealed that the hill had been dedicated ground in ancient times. This shows, in view of the Church philosophy on such matters as Temples and Temple sites, that this piece of related evidence is more than just a coincidence. I offer my opinion that this is proof that the ancient Maori People worshipped the same God as the Christian world worships today.

1960^ U. A. S. *U. A. S. Newsletter*, No. 70, November 25, 1960, ed. Dee F. Green.

(Polynesians) BYU, Provo, Utah: University Archaeological Society.

70.0 "Ancient Trans-Pacific Migration. By Dee F. Green

"The question of trans-oceanic influence on the New World has been the subject of lively controversy for many years, and recent finds of many quite detailed cultural similarities between the hemispheres have reopened the question." With these words from the recent book by Julian H. Steward, *Native Peoples of South America*, we set the theme of this newsletter. Indeed the question has not only been reopened, but the seemingly impregnable dike of New World "independent inventionism" is receiving cracks that may soon be too large to fill with the fingers of traditionalism.

Weaknesses in the dike began appearing as early as 1896, when British anthropologist E.B. Tylor discussed the Aztec game of *patolli* and its striking similarities to the Hindu game of *partchisi* (parcheesi). Though this was an essay in method, the obvious question raised by these similarities could not be overlooked. This did not prevent independent-inventionists, however, from ignoring the irritating parallel or consigning the game to the knap-sack of some late land migrant from Siberia. To suggest trans-Pacific migration as the explanation of such parallels between ancient America and the Old World was still heresy. A similar reaction greeted the several studies supporting trans-Pacific diffusion that came from the pen of British Egyptologist G. Elliot Smith (*The Migrations of Early Culture*, 1915).

The debate received new impetus in 1947, however, when Harold S. Gladwin published his *Men Out of Asia*, and again in 1950, when Thor Heyerdahl followed with *Kon Tiki*--works arguing anew the possibility of ancient trans-Pacific migrations. Although the migrations they suggested went in opposite directions both rammed the dike of independent inventionism and the fight was on. The flood-waters of trans-Pacific diffusionism have not yet engulfed [the dike of independent inventionism] . . . but a new generation of Americanists is taking a second look at the theory of independent invention and seriously considering diffusion not only via the Bering Strait but across the Pacific as well.

Another decade of study may or may not resolve the problem. Whatever the outcome, we still have a great deal more research ahead and without doubt a few surprises. The more recent studies seem to point to a compromise solution; namely, that both independent invention and trans-Pacific influence were factors in the origin of the American civilizations. They also support the possibility that ancient contacts by sea between the Americas and Asia or Oceania occurred in both directions. Some of these more recent studies are reviewed in the following pages of this newsletter.

70.1 "Ancient Chinese--American Contacts." By Ray T. Matheny

70.2 "Early Voyagings among the Pacific Islands." By Carl Hugh Jones

A review of *Ancient Voyagers in the Pacific*, by Andrew Sharp, Penguin Books, 1957, 212 pages. . . . Sharp believes that the original voyagers found their way to the islands of western Polynesia by accident, and that the eastward movement was continued by accidental voyages. After an island to the east was populated, accidental voyages continued between the original islands and new islands in both directions. . . . Sharp's book is one of the best on Pacific voyagers, and provides a sound basis for the study of cultural diffusion in the Central Pacific.

70.3 "Polynesian-Peruvian Contacts." By Dee F. Green

A review of *Aku-Aku* by Thor Heyerdahl, New York: Rand McNally & Co., 1958, 384 pages. . . . This Book of the Month Club selection is an account of the first scientific archaeological work ever done on Easter Island. Three American archaeologists accompanied by the author on a fascinating expedition that combined archaeology, ethnology, and an extra dose of adventure . . . Of particular interest are the close parallels with ancient Peru uncovered by the archaeologists' spade. Heyerdahl's east-to-west oceanic migration theory may now command a more respected place among Americanist scholars.

70.4 "Success Both Ways: A Review of "From Raft to Raft." By Dee F. Green

A review of *From Raft to Raft*, by Bengt Danielsson, Doubleday, 1960, 264 pages. . . . The author, an anthropologist now living in Polynesia, reports the adventures of the Tahiti Nui expedition as told him by Alain Brun, one of the expedition members.

Tahiti Nui was a bamboo raft constructed on the island of Tahiti by the expedition leader Eric de Bisschop. He felt that a possible sea route to the American continent between 30 and 40 degrees South Latitude was used anciently despite the objections of some that the route was too stormy. The expedition left Tahiti on Nov. 8, 1956, but the raft sank off the coast of Chile on May 26, 1957. The crew was taken to the port of Constitucion, Chile . . . where they made preparations for a return trip.

Tahiti Nui II was built of cypress logs and was ready for sailing on February 15, 1958. The expedition sailed up the Chilean coast to the port of Callao, from which the Kon Tiki also put out to sea, and then out into the Pacific. Tahiti Nui II drifted somewhat north of Heyerdahl's route and succeeded in traveling several hundred miles further into the Pacific islands than did the Kon Tiki. . . .

The most significant contributions of de Bisschop's expedition are: (1) he shows that, despite the storms, it is possible to reach South America from Polynesia between 30 and 40 degrees south latitude, and (2) he demonstrates that a bamboo raft can float that far. Eric de Bisschop has answered two of the most serious objections to prehistoric ocean travel from Polynesia to the New World.

70.5 "Further on New World-Polynesian Contacts. By Lawrence O. Anderson

A review of *Evidences of Cultural Contacts Between Polynesia and the Americas in Precolumbian Times*, by John L. Sorenson, Master's Thesis, Department of Archaeology, BYU, 1952. . . . Mr. Sorenson's thesis of 165 pages is an excellent outline of the possible fields of research in the problem of trans-Pacific migration. . . . Mr. Sorenson concludes that there are enough positive evidences to show that, "complex cultural and ethnic movements between Polynesia and the Americas have taken place in the eastern Pacific basin in the last few millennia."

70.6 "Other Recent Studies." By Dee F. Green

Green lists a number current of books on:

70.60 Evidence of ancient trans-Pacific migration form eastern Asia to America.

70.61 Evidence of ancient trans-oceanic migration from western Asia to America.

70.62 Evidence of aneint trans-Pacific migration from America to Polynesia.

1960[^] Spencer W. Kimball "The Day of the Lamanites," in Improvement Era 63 (1960

December), pp. 922-924.

In a 1960 article in the *Improvement Era*, Spencer W. Kimball of the Council of the Twelve would equate skin color (or a lighter skin color) with becoming "white and delightful" as prophesied in the Book of Mormon. He writes:

A month ago I had the privilege of going into the mission field in the Southwest Indian Mission . . . I saw them beginning to accept the gospel of Christ. I saw them reclaiming their forfeited blessings which the Lord reserved . . . I saw acceleration in their progress and the time is at hand when the Lord will "remember the covenant which he made with Abraham and unto all the house of Israel." (Mormon 5:20) . . .

The day of the Lamanites is nigh. For years they have been growing delightful, and they are now becoming white and delightful, as they were promised. . . . The children in the home placement program in Utah are often lighter than their brothers and sisters in the hogans on the reservation.

At one meeting a father and mother and their sixteen-year-old daughter were present, the little member girl--sixteen--sitting between the dark father and mother, and it was evident she was several shades lighter than her parents--on the same reservation, in the same hogan, subject to the same sun and wind and weather. . . .

Not only the southwest Indians, but Lamanites in general, are facing an open door to education, culture, refinement, progress, and the gospel of Jesus Christ. The Church has spent its millions in Hawaii and New Zealand and other islands to provide schools for the young Lehighites.

1960 Melvin R. Brooks *L.D.S. Reference Encyclopedia.* Salt Lake City, Utah: Bookcraft, Inc.,

1960.

Polynesian Races. It is usually thought that the Polynesians trace their ancestry to Hagoth, the builder of ships, mentioned in Alma 63. (See *Conference Report*, April, 1947, Elder Spencer W. Kimball's talk.) [pp. 384-385]

1961[^] William A. Cole & Elwin W. Jensen Israel in the Pacific, SLC: Genealogical Society, Church

(Polynesians)

of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1961, pp. 116-119.

This 458-page book was prepared "as the result of a long felt need to provide lesson material for members of the Church" who were interested "in Polynesian genealogy and genealogy research, from both a doctrinal and a technical standpoint." It contains a number of chapters on Polynesian traditions and genealogies in a setting of chapters explaining the plan of salvation and specific instructions relative to genealogical and temple work. It was written and compiled by William A. Cole and Elwin W. Jensen "of the Polynesian Department, Genealogical Society of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints." The authors expressed their gratitude and appreciation to:

President Joseph Fielding Smith, Elder Mark E. Petersen, Elder A. William Lund, and other members of the Board of Directors of the Genealogical Society, for their interest and helpful suggestions; to Archibald F. Bennett, Librarian and General Secretary of the Genealogical Society, for his wise counsel, encouragement and assistance; and to L. Garrett Myers, Superintendent of the Genealogical Society, for sustaining this work.

In Chapter 14, we find the following:

Hagoth Builds Ships. Among those who built ships was an extremely curious man named Hagoth who built an "exceedingly large ship on the borders of the land Bountiful, by the land Desolation, and launched it forth into the west sea, by the narrow neck which led into the land northward."

Living also in this same land, known to the Hawaiians as *Ka-Aina-Kai-Mele-mele-a-Kane* upon a continent known as *Kahiki-moe*, there lived a chief of high renown and purest descent from Anianikalani (Nephi). He was known by the names of Hawaii-loa (No. 12, chart 1) and Hawaii-nui, and was sometimes called Ke-Kowi-Hawaii. He was known by the Maoris of New Zealand as Tama-rereti. "Hawaii-loa was the ancestor of the Hawaiian family. . . . We have reason to believe that Hawaii-loa was the *chief* of the large ship built by Hagoth and launched into the west sea. The Maoris of New Zealand give the name of this ship as *Uruao* (the cloud of Uru). Uru was the name of one of the homelands of the Maori people. . . . Malali'i (or Matariki), a famous steersman, sailed with Hawaii-loa. There were also seven other famous steersmen who assisted Matariki. Using stars as their guide and watching the fixed and moving stars they were able to steer their course toward the land northward.

American Indian Tradition. Because of a tradition found amongst the coast Indians in Northern California, it is believed that Hawaii-loa and his crew did sail to the land northward, in the ship built by Hagoth, and may have landed at a point near Crescent City in California. There still exists on the tableland of Point St. George, Crescent City, an immense bed of mussel shells and bones of animals. The Indians tell the story of the seven Hohgates who came to that place in a boat. If we knew the proper pronunciation of the names Hagoth and Hohgates we might be surprised at their similarity. These Hohgates built houses to live in at about the same time the first natives (Indians) came down the coast. We believe these Indians may have been Nephites who had gone into the lands northward, and as the people began to spread abroad on the land to the seas to the north, to the south, to the east and to the west, some of them reached the Pacific Ocean at a point further north, and coming down the coast they came across the Hohgates who had come there in a boat.

The Indian tradition states that these Hohgates living at the point mentioned spent most of their time hunting and fishing. They were undoubtedly gathering supplies for another ocean voyage. One day, according to the Indian legend, they harpooned a huge sea lion, and unable or unwilling to cut the line they were carried out to sea, at a fearful speed, toward a great whirlpool. Just as they reached the edge of this fearful place the rope broke and the boat was swept out of the water by a great whirlwind.

"Nevermore on earth were the Hohgates seen, but there are seven stars in heaven that all men know of, and *these stars are the seven Hohgates* that once lived where the great shell-bed near Crescent City now is."

Hawaii-loa Discovers the Hawaiian Islands. According to the Hawaiian story, Hawaii-loa and his crew, following their course by watching the stars, arrived at and discovered the Hawaiian Islands. Hawaii-loa named *seven stars in the heavens* after the *seven famous steersmen* on his boat . . . Those stars are known by these same names to this very day. The constellation known to us as the Pleiades, and commonly called the Seven Little Sisters, was named after the head steersman, Matariki, and by that name that constellation is known to this day by Polynesians throughout all the islands of the Pacific Ocean.

A Maori tradition states that the *Pleiades were seven chiefs*, translated after death to heaven, an eye of each only is visible.

After Hawaii-loa and his crew discovered the Hawaiian Islands they remained there for some time, until they had filled their vessel with food and fish. Delighted with the country, with its fertility and fruitfulness, they returned to their native land, with the intention to come back again to Hawaii-*nei* which they preferred to their own country. When they arrived at their own country they were detained for a long time before they set out again for Hawaii.

The Second Trip to Hawaii. In the meantime Hagoth "built other ships, and the first ship did also return (54 B.C.), and many more people did enter into it; and they took much provisions, and set out again to the land northward. And it came to pass that they were never heard of more (by the Nephites). And we (the Nephites) suppose that they were drowned in the depths of the sea."

However, they were not drowned in the depths of the sea, for Hawaii-loa had sailed again, accompanied by his wife, children, his brothers K'i'i and Kanaloa, the steersmen, and others, and following the stars as before, they returned to the Hawaiian Islands, where they became the first human inhabitants. The largest of the islands was named Hawaii, after Hawaii-loa himself. The island of Oahu was named after his daughter, and the island of Maui was named after his son. Other islands were named after members of his group. . . .

Hawaii-loa was not the only one to lead a colony of people into the Pacific. . . . There may have been other groups of Nephites and Lamanites who found themselves as settlers upon the islands in the Pacific. From the following account in the Book of Mormon we can assume that many ships were built, and much shipping took place, and it is easy to believe that others of these ships could have gone into the Polynesian islands.

1961[^] F. Edward Butterworth *Adventures of a South Sea Missionary*, Independence, Missouri:

(Polynesians-RLDS) Herald House, 1961.

For an extensive quote from this book, see the notation of 1852 entitled, "Missionaries Depart from French Polynesia." See also the notation for 1977.

1961^ David W. Cummings *Mighty Missionary of the Pacific*, Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1961.

(Polynesians)

In this book, David Cummings, a construction missionary for the Church, would give the history, scope and significance of the building program of the Church in the Pacific Islands. Along with his extensive details of the historical background of the building of numerous churches and temples, Cummings gives a number of authoritative quotes concerning the people of the islands of the Pacific as members of the house of Israel.

1962^ Robert L. Simpson "The Lord Is Mindful of His Own," April 4, 1962, *BYU Speeches of the Year*,

1962, 11.

Bishop Robert L. Simpson was first counselor in the Presiding Bishopric at the time. Prior to his appointment the previous October, he had served as president of the New Zealand Mission. He had previously served as a missionary in New Zealand from 1937 to 1940.

As we meet here today, I have only one real objective in mind, and that is to bear my testimony. . . . Now, young people, as I bear my testimony to you this morning, I want to relate some very intimate happenings. I want to tell you some things that have been important in my life, things that have been main structural supports in my testimony, and I want to tell them to you in all humility. I hope you will not misconstrue these remarks. I want you to be sure and realize that I tell them to you not in a boasting way. I tell them to you just because they are a part of my life and so much a part of my life that I do not know how to separate myself from them. I give them to you in hopes that you might be able to at least remember the spirit of what I say and perhaps make it a small part of your testimony, too.

I would like, in making reference to these wonderful people from New Zealand--especially the Maori folks here today--to turn to Alma 53:5-8, and read a very significant quotation. It talks about a man called Hagoth, a man who set sail from these Americas many centuries ago.

And it came to pass that Hagoth, he being an exceedingly curious man, therefore he went forth and built him an exceedingly large ship, on the borders of the land Bountiful, by the land Desolation, and launched it forth into the west sea, by the narrow neck which led into the land northward.

Now where would the west sea be? The west sea would be the Pacific Ocean, and by the narrow neck of land leading into the land northward, obviously this must mean the Panama Canal area.

And behold there were many of the Nephites who did enter therein and did sail forth with much provisions, and also many women and children; and they took their course northward. And thus ended the thirty and seventh year. And in the thirty and eighth year, this man built other ships. And the first ship did also return, and many more people did enter into it; and they also took much provisions, and set out again to the land northward. And it came to pass that they were never heard of more. And we suppose that they were drowned in the depths of the sea.

I would like to tell you young people that in a great gathering of Polynesians held right in Salt Lake City just prior to 1915, a prophet of the Lord, President Joseph F. Smith, addressing a group of Polynesians who had come to Salt Lake City to participate in their temple endowment work, made the statement that without a doubt this man Hagoth and his company were the progenitors of the Polynesian races, and that this migration was the beginning of the Polynesian population in the South Pacific.

Now up until recently men of science have said, no, the Polynesians have come from the Malay States, they have come from the African, from the Asian side, and they have migrated from a westerly direction to the Polynesian islands--not from the Americas. This has been popular thinking until about 1940, when a very bold scholar by the name of Thor Heyerdahl made the observation that indeed these people must be from the Americas. He set out to prove this by building some balsa rafts on which he set himself adrift off the shores of South and Central America. He and his companions drifted for about one hundred days, and depending only on the prevailing tides and winds of that area, they found themselves cast upon the shores of these South Pacific islands, not far from Tahiti. It seems rather significant that all of a sudden scientific opinion began to change and Thor Heyerdahl, since that day, has presented additional evidences that have further made it a very important consideration--that the Polynesians did originate from the Americas.

Now the Maoris themselves have something to say about this theory. They all have the same answer to the questions, "Where did your people come from? Where did you originate?" The answer is always the same: "I haere mai matou i tawhiti nui, i tawhiti roe, i tawhiti pamamau i te hono i te wai e rua." ("We came from a great distance, from a still greater distance, from a very, very great distance, from the joining place of two great waters.") Perhaps by the narrow neck of land that separated the two great seas, the narrow neck of land which led into the land northward. This is Maori tradition and I want to tell you that those who have joined the Church believe without reservation, that these things I have told you are part and parcel of Mormon doctrine. . . .

In conclusion I just want to tell you that the Lord is mindful of his own. The Lord was mindful of Hagoth. The Lord guided Hagoth. . . . I bear you this testimony and I do it in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ. Amen.

1962^ Mark E. Petersen Mark E. Petersen, "New Evidence for the Book of Mormon,"

(Polynesians) Improvement Era (June 1962) 65: 456-59; also in Conference

Report (April 8 1962) 111-115. Later published separately as Polynesians

Came From America," Salt Lake City: Deseret Book Co., 1962.

In his conference Message of April, 1962, Mark E. Petersen said the following:

It is a glorious privilege to be able to live in a day when there are prophets in the earth, and I am humbly thankful for the privilege of associating with President McKay and all of these wonderful men who surround him. I would like you to know that they are prophets of God, that the Lord guides them, that they are men without guile, and that they have their whole purpose set it serving the Lord.

So every one of us as Latter-day Saints may place our full and complete confidence in them, and I surely hope and pray that we will do so by keeping the commandments and maintaining the high standards that the Lord has given us.

My wife and I have had a glorious experience in the last month or six weeks. It was a great spiritual uplift to us. One of these great spiritual experiences began with our accompanying Brother and Sister John Longden into the mission home in Samoa one morning about three weeks ago. There we were met by the little five or six-year-old daughter of President and Sister [J. Phillip] Hanks, who preside in Samoa.

This lovely little child, filled with excitement, ran up to us and said, "I am going to Sauniatu." We smiled with her and enjoyed her excitement, but we were just as excited as she was, because we were going to Sauniatu, also. We could hardly wait till we got there, just as she.

As we went along in the automobile towards Sauniatu, the mission president told again the story of a tremendous spiritual experience that took place in Sauniatu about forty years ago. President David O. McKay was the central figure in that experience. As we neared the village, we saw the marker which designates the place where he stood as he called down from heaven a great blessing upon that village and upon all Samoa.

Then we went on into the village, and there we saw the larger monument that has been erected in commemoration of this glorious event and in recognition of the love of the people of Samoa for this great man who has become the president, the prophet, seer, and revelator of this Church.

We were surrounded by the people. We went to the monument and had again recounted the marvelous experience that had made it significant. There came to us a realization that this monument was also a monument to the great spirituality which is characteristic of so many of the Polynesian people.

We remembered the experiences of Brother Matthew Cowley among those people. You recall how he thrilled us with his faith-promoting stories of the experiences he had had among them. All of this came back to us as we, ourselves, were deeply touched, and we recognized the wonderful things that had lived on in the minds and the hearts of the people there.

As we met with the people in Sauniatu, we prayed with them, we spoke to them, we sang with them, and again recognized that these people were but representative of all of the Polynesian Saints and that the Polynesian Saints are characterized by a tremendous faith.

Why do they have this great faith? It is because these people are of the blood of Israel. They are heirs to the promises of the Book of Mormon. God is now awakening them to their great destiny.

As Latter-day Saints we have always believed that the polynesians are descendants of Lehi and blood relatives of the American Indians, despite the contrary theories of other men. For that reason, from the beginning of our Church history we have had more than an ordinary interest in them as a people. But now

that interest is even more keen. Recent research on the part of world-recognized scientists and scholars has focused a new light upon them, and writings of early explorers in both America and Polynesia have become available now for detailed study.

The new knowledge which has been developed shows that the Polynesians without any reasonable doubt did come from America, that they are closely related to the American Indian in many respects, and that even their traditions and genealogies bear that out.

So pronounced is this feeling among the world scholars of today that one of them, Thor Heyerdahl, widely known Norwegian anthropologist, who sailed the raft *Kon Tiki* from America to the Polynesian Islands, titled one of his books *American Indians in the Pacific*. It is a remarkable volume of great interest to Latter-day Saints.

With him are other writers who confirm and re-confirm the facts now being disclosed that there is every reason to believe that the Polynesians are directly related to the American Indians, that they came from American shores and sailed westward to their Pacific Islands, and that they took with them their customs, their food, and their religion, all of which have left a permanent mark upon Polynesia.

Pronounced as are these views establishing the relationship of Polynesians and American Indians, there are equally impressive data now available to disprove the theory that the Polynesians originated in the Orient and came eastward from Indonesia, Malaya, and nearby lands. Let us just mention a few of the convincing points of evidence.

Most of you have seen the great stone pyramids, or photographs of them, discovered by archaeologists in Mexico, Central, and South America. Pyramids of almost identical structure, both in plan and material, if not in size, have been found in Polynesia. I saw some of them myself within the last month.

Stone roadways, so characteristic of the pre-Inca period of America, are found to be duplicated in some of the Pacific Islands. Giant stone statues such as are found in the lands of South America and among the Incas are now discovered in the Polynesian Islands, with characteristics and markings so similar that few can doubt their common origin. This includes many of the structures found on Easter Island.

The sweet potato of the Pacific Islands, known in Polynesia as the *kumara* or *kumalla*, as it is called in Tonga, is now found by botanists to be the identical plant which is native to South America with impressive evidence as to the manner in which it was transported from Peru to the Pacific Islands.

Cotton, coconuts, pineapples, and papaya are likewise being traced from Polynesia to America by botanists who now announce that the Polynesian varieties of these plants are but offshoots of the parent plants in America.

The ocean currents have been observed in our time to carry drifting objects to Polynesia from two places in America, one being the Pacific Northwest and the other the Central and South American region. Large Pacific Northwest pine logs have been traced in the drifting currents of the Pacific Ocean from the Vancouver area of North America to the Hawaiian, Marshall, and Caroline Islands. Hawaiians and other Polynesians have made canoes from these drifted pine logs and in them have traveled from island to island. There are no such trees growing in Polynesia. They came by ocean currents from the Pacific Northwest of America.

This is the more notable when it is observed that customs and household articles characteristic of the Indians of the Pacific Northwest of America have been found on a wide scale in Polynesia.

Written descriptions of fortifications built on some of the Polynesian Islands remind one of chapters in the Book of Mormon which portray the fortifications built by the great General Moroni here in ancient America. Kivas, characteristic of American Indians today, are found in Polynesia.

Words and place names in the language of the Polynesians of the various island groups are now found to be identical to those common among the early people of Peru. Many of these words are actually identical in spelling and pronunciation.

I cannot resist mentioning one of them. It is *Kanakana*, the name of one of the deities of both the Incas and the Polynesians. The reason this name interests me so much is that it means brightness or light or knowledge or intelligence. They believed that the glory of God was intelligence and therefore named him so. This is noted in both pre-Inca and Polynesian religions.

There are many other religious teachings which are the same in both areas. Both peoples believe in the creation by the Almighty. They both believe that the first man was the father of all living and that the first woman was the mother of all living, using these actual phrases. They believe in the Flood. They accept an atonement by a Savior. They both believe in a White God who came among their forefathers and performed mighty miracles. They believe in the water of life or living water which is given by the Savior.

The islanders say that their forefathers came from the east, from a land of high mountains and plateaus in the skies, which fits the description of the western coast of South America. The genealogies of the Pacific Islanders are traced to American ancestors.

Large fonts which archaeologists claim were baptismal fonts have been found in both areas. Burial customs are similar. Both groups believed in an all-powerful governing Trinity of Gods. There is one story in Polynesia which reminds us of the story of the brother of Jared.

One of the most interesting of all the reports brought out by Heyerdahl and other scientists who have made a serious study of the Polynesians and their relationship to the Americans is this, and it surprised me tremendously:

These anthropologists have learned that prior to the coming of the Spaniards there were both white and brown people in America, that the white people were as white as snow, according to their descriptions, and that they had brown, blonde, or red hair. The hair was not dyed nor treated in any way. It grew that way. Now, to our great astonishment, they tell us also that white people as well as brown people emigrated from America to Polynesia and that some of these white people lived in the islands in the times of the early explorers in the Pacific who saw them and wrote about them. Think of the significance of that fact in relation to the Book of Mormon.

I repeat: Anthropologists now say that white people, more fair than the Spaniards, and brown people like the Polynesians of today, lived side by side in America in pre-Spanish times. Both white and brown people emigrated from America to the Pacific Islands. They were seen by the early explorers in those islands. The white people were blondes and redheads, and some had soft, brown hair. Their skins were as white as snow, whiter than the Spaniards. All of this from the anthropologists!

Significantly enough, these white men living in the islands wore beards and their faces resembled the faces of Europeans. Anthropologists now say that these white islanders were of Caucasian descent without a doubt, and remember, they were already there when the first explorers arrived and found them.

Such white people actually were seen on Easter Islands, as well as on other Pacific Islands, and although they no longer survive, the traditions of the natives tell of them as do the authentic writings of early historians.

On Easter Islands, Heyerdahl himself was told by the mayor of the principal community that there were two kinds of people on that island at first, white and brown, and that the white people were really white people with light hair. The anthropologists have long since discarded the idea that they might have been albinos.

Captain Cook saw some of these white natives on his journeys and wrote about them. One came aboard his ship. The other natives told Captain Cook that this white native was their leader and that he was of divine descent and was therefore held in high respect.

It is notable that the highest ideal of beauty among these islanders was the white skin. It was regarded as a sign of descent from the best of the ancient lineages and as a symbol of chieftainship of pure blood.

But where did these white people come from and how did they reach these islands?

The evidence recently compiled says they came from America.

But were there white men in early America, previous to the coming of the Spaniards?

Recently published records from the Spaniard Pizarro tell about similar white people found in Peru.

Pedro Pizarro, chronicler of the Spanish conquerors, wrote that whereas the majority of the Indians in the Andes Mountains were small and of brown complexion, the embers of the Inca ruling family were tall and had whiter skins than the Spaniards themselves. Pizarro says that these white Incas of Peru actually were white, not albinos, but white people with soft blonde or brown or red hair.

Archaeologists have now found mummies of the Inca period bearing out this fact. They were well-preserved mummies with soft hair, blonde, or red or brown in color. Colored photographs of these mummies have been published and widely distributed. They are available in books sold right here in Salt Lake City. They are the work of anthropologists and archaeologists having no connection with the Church whatsoever.

Pizarro asked the Incas of his day who these white people were and was told that they were the last of the descendants of a divine race of white men with beards. These men were given the name of *Viracocha*, or "sea foam" because they were so white.

We live today in a time of research, discovery, and knowledge. The new knowledge bears testimony that both Nephites and Lamanites lived in ancient America. Regardless of the names given them by the scientists or the early Incas, to us they were Nephites and Lamanites. This new knowledge likewise bears testimony that both Nephites and Lamanites emigrated from America to Polynesia, that they have been seen by modern explorers and seafarers who have written about them and that their customs and beliefs related to the Book of Mormon.

To me it all adds up to a renewed testimony that the Book of Mormon is true, that Joseph Smith was a Prophet of God, that the gospel is true, and that indeed Jesus of Nazareth is the Christ, the White God known as well to the Polynesians as to the early Americas, and that his coming to America after his resurrection in Palestine is the basis of the religion of both ancient Americans and ancient Polynesians, now handed down to modern times with the rest of their traditions.

It is glorious to see the confirming evidence as it comes forth from unexpected sources, sustaining in principle after principle our holy faith. We do not depend upon it for our faith at all, but we welcome its sustaining power nevertheless.

Additional Sources: Robert E. Parsons, "Hagoth and the Polynesians," in *The Book of Mormon: Alma, The Testimony of The Word*, Provo: BYU Religious Studies Center, 1992, p. 251. See also Paul R. and Millie Foster Cheesman, *Early America and the Polynesians*, Provo: Promised Land Publications, 1975, p. 18. See also Russell T. Clement, "Polynesian Origins: More Word on the Mormon Perspective," in *Dialogue* 13, no. 4 (1980 Winter), p. 88.

Note* Something striking about this printed talk filled with so many cultural claims is the complete lack of footnotes in the *Improvement Era* article.

1967^ Vernon Lynn Tyler "Some Evidences for the Book of Mormon from Polynesian Genealogies

(Polynesians) **and Legends,"** a Paper for Religion 622, Ludlow, Summer 1967, p. 3.

Paul Cheesman Collection (MSS 2049, Box 54 Fld. 2), L. Tom Perry Special

Collections Library, Harold B. Lee Library, B. Y. U., Provo, Utah.

In this 20-page graduate paper, Vernon Tyler uses two books as its primary sources: Cole and Jensen's *Israel in the Pacific* (1961) and Thor Heyerdahl's *American Indians in the Pacific* (London: Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1952). While he acknowledges "the myriad similarities between archaeological evidences" between the New World and the Pacific island cultures, he focuses primarily on ancient legends and traditions as well as genealogies that sustain evidences for Book of Mormon peoples in the islands. Tyler takes his cue from Omni 1:14-19 where the people of Zarahemla "brought no records with them" when they were "brought by the hand of the Lord across the great waters" and the fact that Zarahemla gave a "genealogy of his fathers" *according to his memory*.

Tyler concludes his paper with the following:

It was hoped to be possible to find some close connections with names found in The Book of Mormon and Polynesian genealogies. This was not too successful, for the reasons listed herein (p. 13) It is hoped, however, that the considerations made within this study are not without merit--that they may serve as the foundation for some future studies by those more qualified . . .

1967 Ian R. Barker *The Connexion: The Mormon Church and the Maori People*, M.A.
thesis. New

Zealand: Victoria University of Wellington.

1968^ **Sidney B. Sperry** *Book of Mormon Compendium*, SLC: Bookcraft, 1968, p. 369.

Sidney Sperry writes:

The remaining verses of the abridgment of Shiblon's records (63:4-9) related the occurrence of important emigrations of Nephites by means of ships to the land northward. A man by the name of Hagoth, "he being an exceedingly curious man," (63:5) built ships which carried several thousand of persons to the north. We must consider the possibility that many of these people reached what is now the United States and spread over parts of this country. Certain of these Nephite ships were never heard of more, and it is a favorite supposition of the Mormon people that they reached, or were wrecked on, the Hawaiian Islands. Hence the origin of certain groups of the South Sea Islanders, who are believed to be descendants of the Nephite branch of Israel.

Note* In view of the many authoritative LDS declarations concerning the heritage of the Polynesians which had been pronounced prior to the publication of this book by Sperry, can this heritage so easily be referred to as "a favorite supposition of the Mormon people"?

1969^ **Robert E. Parsons** *Letter to Sid Sandberg*, January 15, 1969.

(Polynesians)

Note* The following is an excerpt from a January 15, 1969 letter to Sid Sandberg by Robert E. Parsons, College of Religious Instruction [B.Y.U.]:

I received your inquiry, dated December 20, 1968 concerning the origin of the Polynesian people. As you have intimated in your letter, it is possible that Polynesian blood contains various strains--that migrations to the Islands have not been just one migration. The situation is analogous to the American Indian. We maintain in the Church that the present day American Indian is a descendant of the Book of Mormon people. But we do not say that it would be impossible to have other blood mixed with them from migrations across the Bering Straits, from Scandinavia, etc. Much the same is true with the Polynesian. We have taught that they have the blood of the Book of Mormon people in them (some or all of which stems from Hagoth's time), but this would not mean that other migrations could not have taken place to those lands.

From the tone of your letter, I gather that you are mainly concerned about Church documentation for this belief, since you have alluded to such secular theories as those proposed by Heyerdahl. If you are interested in non-Church sources concerning migration from the Americas to the Pacific, you might look in detail at Heyerdahl's *American Indian in the Pacific*, and the following archaeological publications--U.A.S. Issues 12, 70.4, 53.60. . . .

You would also no doubt be interested in reading Elder Mark E. Petersen's complete address in the 1962 April Conference, as he . . . provides abundant testimony of ties between the American Indian and the Polynesian . . .

During a Book of Mormon television lecture on Alma 43-63 by Richard Cowan, we used an audio insert by Stuart Meha, commenting upon Hagoth and the Maori people. Stuart Meha, now deceased, was a great High Priest in New Zealand. He resided in Waipawa, Hawke Bay. His statement, prepared for and at the request of President David O. McKay was recorded in July 1962 by Elders Bowcut, Marrow, Pace and Jenson of the New Zealand South Mission. I have enclosed a ditto copy of his address which answers your question as to why the Church believes the Polynesian is related to Hagoth's people. In brief, he gives personal testimony of hearing President Joseph F. Smith state that the Maoris descended from Hagoth's migrations. . . . (Letter contained in the Cheesman Collection [MSS 2049, Box 54, Folder 1], L. Tom Perry Special Collections Library, Harold B. Lee Library, B. Y. U., Provo, Utah)

Note* See the 1913 Stuart Meha notation.

1969^ Max G. Hirschi "Possible Origin of the Polynesian islands," a Paper for Religion 622,

(Polynesians) Cheesman, Summer 1969. Paul Cheesman Collection (MSS 2049, Box 54
Fld. 2), L. Tom Perry Special Collections Library, Harold B. Lee Library,
B. Y. U., Provo, Utah.

Max Hirschi notes that, "for nearly the first two hundred years after the discovery of these [Polynesian] Islands, . . . nearly all [theories] looked towards the Old World to the West as the source of their possible origin. However, the purpose of his paper would be to examine the new theories of Thor Heyerdahl (of the Kon-Tiki expedition) and Devere Baker (of the Raft Lehi IV expedition) both of whom "have the theory that the Polynesian Islands were settled by remnants of the American Indian moving from East to West, from the American shores to the Islands. This theory led each to build a raft and set sail from the shores of the Americas in an attempt to reach one of the Polynesian Islands . . ."

Hirschi concludes his paper with the following:

This paper is not meant to be a complete and concise treatus of the subject. Its purpose has been to bring together and analyze some of the theories concerning the origin of the Polynesian Islands, with special emphasis on the theory that is given in the Book of Mormon, namely, an American origin. . . . We cannot claim that all Polynesian people originated from the American Indian. Their culture is cosmopolitan and we must accept the diffusion theory and cannot look to one independent origin. However, emphasis can now be placed on the American theory which has been rejected in the past.

1970?^ Victory Ormsby "Letters to Editor: Reference in Article To Polynesian People

(Polynesians) Declared Misleading," *The Daily Herald*, n.d. (abt. 1970)

Editor Herald:

I am writing in reference to an article by a UPI writer in a recent issue of the Herald concerning Harold B. Lee's statement about the Negro and the Church. I thought the article did very well in explaining the Church's stand with the Negro and cleared a lot of points that would otherwise be misconceiving, however, there was one area that bothered me because I thought that it was very misleading, and this was in reference to the Polynesian people.

I am Polynesian and am a Maori from New Zealand. The article indicated that the Fijians, Samoans, Tongans, and Maoris were black like the Negroes but not of African lineage. If you're familiar at all with the Polynesian people you would have been aware that such subject is a controversial one and in most cases is avoided. The comparison of the Polynesians with the Negroes was most undiplomatic and unscholastic. I am appalled at how very little Americans and especially the Mormons know about the Polynesian people. May I take this opportunity to correct you concerning this matter.

To begin with, it is not the Polynesian race that is the black race of the Pacific but it is the Melanesian race. *Mela* meaning black. Melanesia meaning the black islands. Your article did not clarify this.

In some of the Polynesian islands there was an intermixture of the Melanesian strain evident especially in Fiji and to some extent in Tonga and Samoa with a small infiltration into the other islands of Eastern Polynesia. Most of the eastern islands retained the culture of Polynesia not Melanesia. The article gave the impression that the Polynesians were a Melanesian race like the Negroes and then to make it worse it mentioned every islands except Hawaii and Tahiti. It is no wonder many people think that Hawaiians and Tahitians are Oriental or some other race because they are always isolated from their full blooded cousins.

It may interest you to know that the Maoris came from Tahiti not Melanesia. We are not Melanesian, we are Polynesian. It may also interest you to know that many of our ancient Maoris were as European as any Danish Viking might have been. In stature, intellect, features, skin, and eyes. This descent was known as the ariki descent or chieftain descent. The fair skin was noted as being of noble descent and lineage. To generalize that we are a dark race as indicated in your article is not only unjust but false. This may be true of Fiji and Tonga where these islands sit on the borders of Melanesia but not so in New Zealand! We are proud of our race and our noble Polynesian descent and it offends us when people misconstrue the facts.

Members of the Mormon Church should be the most informed of all Americans concerning the true identity of the Polynesian people because of the Book of Mormon and the general philosophy that the Mormon Church upholds concerning the true origin of the Polynesian people. It is sad to see so many Mormons ignorant of this fact. The Polynesians, not the Melanesians, are of Israelite descent through the loins of Joseph. If you are familiar with Mathew Cowley's books you will know that he always emphasized the statement as he spoke to the Maoris and other Polynesian races--"You are of Nephite descent!"

The Maori race is one of the fairest, if not one of the highest cultured races of all of Polynesia and to refer to them as dark, to me, is as bad as calling a Mexican a Negro or Jew a Negro.

I am writing this not to show prejudice toward the Negro. I honor them as a race but I am writing this because I am tired of the ignorance of so many Americans concerning Polynesia and how easily they ignorantly refer to us and mislead others who know nothing about us either. All I ask is that you get your facts straight. Please leave us our dignity and identity as a race.

Time does not permit me to write further concerning this subject but for information that will add much light to your knowledge of Polynesia and its relation to the teaching of the Mormon Church, please read:

1. *The House of Israel*--Whitehead
2. *Israel in the Pacific*--Cole
3. *Maori Symbolism*--Hohep Te Rake
4. *Vikings of the Sunrise*--Peter Buck
5. *Maori and Pakeha*--Macmillan Brown

Your UPI article should have read that even though the Church does not permit the Negro to hold the priesthood it does allow the Melanesians to hold it even though their skin coloring is also black. No reference to Polynesia should have been made.

I respect your race, country and heritage as I trust you will respect mine.

Victory Ormsby

Note* This article was found in the Paul Cheesman collection (MSS 2049, Box 54, Folder 1), L. Tom Perry Special Collections Library, Harold B. Lee Library, B.Y.U., Provo, Utah. However it had no date. Since the author's name was in the local phone directory, I called. Mr. Ormsby was not available, but the woman on the phone remembered him talking about this when they first started dating, which was about the year 1970.

1970^ Mark E. Petersen "General Conference Address," Sunday October 4, 1970. Reported in

(Polynesians) Conference Reports, Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints,

October 2,3,4, 1970, pp. 139-140.

But more impressive than any of these facts about the early Americans is their account of a visitation among their ancestors nearly 2,000 years ago, of a divine personage who remained among them for many days, teaching and blessing them. . . .

The account of his appearance was preserved through generations of Indians from Chile to Alaska, and interestingly enough, it is likewise well known among the Polynesians from Hawaii to New Zealand, giving one more evidence of the close relationship between the Polynesians and the early inhabitants of the Americas.

In the main all such accounts agree. They differ in name and minor details from island to island and from country to country, but the overall conclusion is the same--there was a visitation by a heavenly being among those people nearly 2,000 years ago. . . .

This great being was known as Quetzalcoatl in parts of Mexico, primarily in the Cholula area. He was Votan in Chiapas and Wixepechocha in Oaxaca; Gucumatz in Guatemala; Virachocha and Hyustus in Peru; Sume in Brazil, and Bochica in Colombia. To the Peruvians he was also known as Con-tici or Illa-tici, *tici* meaning both creator and light. To the Mayans he was principally known as Kukulcan.

In the Polynesian islands he was known as Lono, Kana, Kane, or Kon, and sometimes as Kanaloa, meaning the great light or great brightness. He was also known among some Polynesians as Kane-Akea, the great progenitor, or as Tonga-roa, the god of the ocean sun. . . .

This personage, as he taught his religion, urged the people to build temples for worship, and his followers became very devout. (Pierre Honore, *In Quest of the White God*.) As he left them, he promised to come again, which caused the natives for many generations to look for his return even as the Jews look for their promised Messiah.

This faith led to disaster on two occasions, however, when the Spaniards came to America and when Captain Cook sailed to the Hawaiian Islands. But these tragedies served only to reinforce the truth of the tradition. . . . [An account of Cortez and Montezuma is told]

A similar situation occurred when Captain James Cook, the British explorer, came to Hawaii. Peculiarly enough, he landed there when the natives were celebrating their Makahiki Festival, which kept alive the tradition of the White God among the Polynesians. Cook also was received as Deity and taken to the sacred temple of Lono. But his men were far less than angelic, and their depredations brought down the wrath of the natives upon the entire landing party. In the battle which ensued, Cook lost his life.

But in reality, who was the Great White God? . . . Jesus of Nazareth was this White God! After his resurrection in the Holy Land he did in reality visit the early Americans. How do we know? [The Book of Mormon account is then quoted and referred to].

1971^ **Bruce G. Pitt** "**Possible Origin of the Polynesian Islanders**," a Paper for Religion
622,

(Polynesians) Cheesman, Summer 1971. Paul Cheesman Collection (MSS 2049, Box 54

Fld. 2), L. Tom Perry Special Collections Library, Harold B. Lee Library,

B. Y. U., Provo, Utah.

This paper touches upon some of the customs and traditions concerning Polynesian origins, some of which were covered in the 1969 paper by Max Hirschi..

1971^ Spencer W. Kimball "Of Royal Blood," Lamanite Youth Conference (4/24/71); *Ensign*,

(Polynesians) July 1971, pp. 1-10.

This article was "adapted" from an address delivered by President Spencer W. Kimball, acting President of the Council of the Twelve, to a Lamanite Youth Conference in Salt Lake City on April 24, 1971. In it Elder Kimball states the following:

The term Lamanite includes all Indians and Indian mixtures, such as the Polynesians, the Guatemalans, the Peruvians, as well as the Sioux, the Apache, the Mohawk, the Navajo, and others. It is a large group of great people. The Church has always maintained a tremendous interest and concern for the Indian people and all of the Lamanites. As early as 1845 a proclamation was issued by the Church, which said in part:

"The sons and daughters of Zion will soon be required to devote a portion of their time in instructing the children of the forest (Indians), for they must be educated and instructed in all the arts of civil life, as well as in the gospel. They must be clothed, fed, and instructed in the principles and practice of virtue, modesty . . . customs, dress, music and all other things which are calculated in their nature to refine, purify, exalt, and glorify them as the sons and daughters of the royal house of Israel and of Joseph, who are making ready for the coming of the bridegroom." (Parker Pratt Robinson, ed., *Writings of Parley Parker Pratt* [Salt Lake City, 1952], p. 5)

. . . One of the revelations that came to Joseph said: "But before the great day of the Lord shall come [the Second Coming], Jacob shall flourish in the wilderness, and the Lamanites shall blossom as the rose. . . . (D&C 49:24-25). . . . For example, in Tonga, where 20 percent of all the people in the islands belong to the Church, we have three large stakes. Two of them are presided over wholly by Lamanites and the other almost wholly by them. There are three stakes in Samoa and another is to be organized in those small Samoan islands. Four more stakes with Lamanite leaders! . .

The development and growth and progress of the Lamanite people are of prime importance to all Mormondom, to the whole Church program, to Christianity. In 1963, 23 percent of all the baptisms in the Church were Lamanite baptisms. There were twenty-five thousand in one year. . . . We have probably thirty thousand Lamanite members in Central America, and I remind you this is the result of only a relatively few years. There must be about one hundred thousand Polynesians in the Church, so that we have now approximately a quarter million Lamanites. I suppose a rough guess would give us only a few

thousand twenty years ago. Now we have a quarter million in this short period of two or three decades. We have been doing missionary work with some of the Polynesians for a hundred years and more. . . .

It might be interesting to know that of nearly one hundred missions, the four highest of all are Lamanite missions. That is, the Mexico North Mission, the Guatemala-El Salvador Mission, the Mexico Mission, and the Tonga Mission. These are the four highest in the world. What is the portent of that? It means the Lamanites are accepting the gospel as no other people. They recognize something for which they have been waiting for a long, long time, and now they are receiving the gospel. Of all missions, nine of the first twenty-one are Lamanite missions. . . .

My brothers and sisters, you belong to a great race. Your father is Joseph who was sold into Egypt, the virtuous man who went to prison rather than yield to the seduction of a queen. Your father was Jacob, the father of twelve sons. You came through one of them. One of the great prophets of all times, your father, was Isaac. Another great prophet, your father, was Abraham, than whom there were no greater ones. Abraham was a great man who walked and talked with God. He is your father back those many generations. Be proud of him and know that you are of royal blood; with your royal blood you can achieve, rising to the top. . . . There are no blessings, of all the imaginable ones, to which you are not entitled--you, the Lamanites--when you are righteous. You are of royal blood, the children of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, and Lehi.

Additional Source: *The Teachings of Spencer W. Kimball*, edited by Edward L. Kimball, Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1982, p. 596.

1971^ M. Dallas Burnett (Associate Editor) "Lamanites and the Church," in the *Ensign*, July 1971,

(Polynesians)

p. 11.

In 1971 Mr. Dallas Burnett, associate editor of the *Ensign*, stated the following:

The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints is unique in its theological and philosophical understanding of the peoples in the Americas known as Indians and of the inhabitants of the Pacific islands. These people are a remnant of the House of Jacob and descendants of Lehi, an Israelite who left Jerusalem and came to the Americas around 600 B.C. . . .

In addition to the basic church program, the Lamanites are served by the general auxiliaries, the Lamanite seminary program, the Lamanite student placement program, the Brigham Young University Lamanite education program, Church College of Hawaii, and Church schools in the Pacific islands and Latin America. There are also several special institutes and research programs at BYU and Church College of Hawaii.

1972^ N. Eldon Tanner & Marion G. Romney Letter of Correspondence on letterhead of the First

(Polynesians) Presidency, September 19, 1972.

In a letter to Ralph G. Rodgers, Jr., Mission President of the Samoan Mission dated September 19, 1972, and under the letterhead of the First Presidency (being signed by N. Eldon Tanner and Marion G. Romney), we find the following:

In your letter of September 6, 1972, you ask if the Polynesian people are Lamanites or Nephites. There has been much speculation about the origin of these people. We have, however, no scriptural evidence or revelation from the Lord that would tell us exactly where these people came from or their background.

Note* Ross and Millie Cheesman write:

While the above statement seems clear, it nevertheless does not dispute the idea that some of the Polynesians could have come from America. In the interpretation of the geography of the Book of Mormon the church has not yet announced any divine confirmation as to the location of the exact sites of the Book of Mormon cities. This substantiates the above statement when the letter states that there is ". . . no . . . evidence or revelation from the Lord that would tell us *exactly* where these people came from . . ."

Sources: Robert E. Parsons, "Hagoth and the Polynesians," in *The Book of Mormon: Alma, The Testimony of The Word*, Provo: BYU Religious Studies Center, 1992, pp. 250-251. See also Paul R. and Millie Foster Cheesman, *Early America and the Polynesians*, Provo: Promised Land Publications, 1975, p. 13.

Note* I can see how one might sidestep the specific "where" of Book of Mormon geography as it relates to the origins of Polynesians. And I can see how the specific question of whether the Polynesians "are Lamanite or Nephite" might have been considered a moot point in view of the absence of Christian beliefs before the coming of the Christian missionaries. However at the time of this letter, the Book of Mormon "background" or origins of the Polynesians had been (and would continue to be) commented on numerous times by Apostles and Presidents of the Church as a matter of "inspiration" and reassuring certainty. And among these comments we find multiple associations of the Polynesians with Hagoth's voyages mentioned in Alma 63. However, see the notation for Sept 9, 1948.

1974 **Elwin W. Jensen** ***Captain Cook as the Fair God Lono***, Bountiful, UT: author, April 26, 1974.

(Polynesians)

In 1961 Elwin Jensen would co-author the book *Israel in the Pacific* (see notation). On page 139 of that book he states the following:

A tradition of great interest to the Latter-day Saints concerns the belief in the god Lono, the great white god of the Hawaiians, and one of the three chief gods of the Polynesians. Lono had promised (according to some traditions) that he would return to them at some time in the future. When Captain Cook arrived in Hawaii, he was welcomed by the people as the god Lono who had returned as he had promised. Gifts were showered upon Cook. However, due to certain acts of some of Cook's men, which seemed a little "un-godlike" to the Hawaiians, hostilities . . .[the content abruptly ends here]

On page 179 Jensen would apparently add to this correlation of Captain Cook and the god Lono with the following:

When Christianity was preached to the Polynesians, it was easy for them to accept because they found so many stories in the Bible that reminded them of the traditions of their own ancestors. . . . They could believe in the second coming of Christ, because they had a tradition that Lono, the great white god, would return again. . . .

In a 1970 October 4 Conference address, Elder Mark E. Petersen would reinforce these ideas (see the notation). These ideas appear to be at least part of the basis of a year-long (1973-1974) controversy between Jerry K. Loveland and Church leaders. Loveland, would publish in subsequent years (1976 and 1983-see notations) some articles critical of certain legends and traditions used as "evidence" to support the idea that Polynesians were from the house of Israel and descended from Hagoth.

In a letter dated August 27, 1973, Jerry K. Loveland would write to Paul Cheesman at BYU stating the following:

I am enclosing a copy of an article I have just submitted to *BYU Studies*. It may be useful to you. I have only recently discovered that the Temple Bureau here is informing visitors that the Hawaiians greeted Captain Cook as the "returning white god," and comparing this with the Aztec reception of Cortez as Quetzalcoatl. This is all set up with translite displays and a tape recording. I only learned of this when someone came to me, in a very agitated condition, and wanted to know if this were true. It seems that some knowledgeable person had nailed him on this very thing, and told him we (the Mormons) were in gross error in presenting this as a real Polynesian tradition which of course, we are. I am currently attempting to reach the Mission President, who is responsible for the Bureau here, and let him know of this difficulty. (Cheesman Collection, L. Tom Perry Special Collections Library, Harold B. Lee Library, B. Y. U., Provo, Utah, MSS 2049, Box 54, Folder 5.)^

In an apparent response to this letter (and evidently after some discussion and distribution of this letter to higher authorities), **we find the following in a letter dated March 11, 1974, and directed to Jerry Loveland from Wendell J. Ashton, Managing Director, Public Communications for the LDS Church:**

Thank you for your letter of February 28, in which you give us more information regarding the "Returning White God Legend Among the Hawaiians."

It is clearly evident that you and Elwin W. Jensen of the Oriental Polynesian section of the Genealogical Society Library continue to disagree on this subject.

I am sending a copy of your letter, together with a copy of this letter, to Brother Jensen with the thought that you communicate with each other on the subject and then give us a joint report as to what you think we should do regarding the display in the visitors center at the Hawaiian Temple. . . . I am sure you are both honest and sincere in your convictions. With my limited knowledge of the subject, I certainly don't want to try to serve as a referee. If you and Brother Jensen cannot come to an agreement on the facts of the case, then perhaps we can invite a member of the Brigham Young University faculty who is familiar with the subject to meet with you and then attempt to reach a conclusion as to the facts. As we mentioned to you in our letter of January 30, we want to be accurate in every respect so far as our displays in our visitors centers are concerned. (Cheesman Collection, L. Tom Perry Special Collections Library, Harold B. Lee Library, B. Y. U., Provo, Utah, MSS 2049, Box 54, Folder 2.)^

So the stage would be set for Elwin Jensen's 14-page paper, "Captain Cook as the Fair God Lono," which would be published in April of 1974. He writes:

The story of Captain James Cook's final voyage of exploration into the Pacific, and of his untimely death in Hawaii, should have special interest for the Latter-day Saints. . . . Considerable evidence exists to indicate that there is a connection between the "fair god" traditions of the Polynesians and those of the native Americans. . . .

Leaving England on 12th July 1776 with two ships, Cook sailed around the Cape of Good Hope and crossed the Indian Ocean to Tasmania and New Zealand. He spent several months in the South Pacific, visiting many islands. The Hawaiian Islands were sighted on January 18th, 1778 . . . these islands he named for the Earl of Sandwich [Sandwich Islands]. . . .

To understand the deification of Cook, it is necessary to know something about the gods of Polynesia, and of this god Lono. . . . Legends indicate that one or more of the Polynesian gods was a fair god, a personage of light or bright complexion. This idea was not unique to Hawaii. There are also persistent legends which tell of a race of fair-skinned ancestors. This belief has historical significance. Buck stated that the Polynesians are Caucasians and like other Europoids, but that there is some evidence of a later inter-mixture with Melanesians. Percy Smith (and Peter Buck) refers to the urekehu, or red-haired strain, which is fairly common in Polynesia. Perhaps it is not correct to speak of white or blond gods in the islands; "fair" or "ruddy" may be more accurate. Tregear explains that urukehu (or 'ehu) means light-haired, reddish-brown or ruddy. . . . Captain Cook was accepted as the god Lono, this indicates that he, too, was considered to be a "fair-god."

It is not possible, today, to learn exacting and specific facts about the gods of Oceania, or of the periods of creation and early history. All Polynesian knowledge was handed down orally from generation to generation. The most sacred parts were reserved to the priest class, and much of this was never revealed to the intruding white-man. In some cases, the only portions now preserved are the "popular versions" known by the unschooled common people. As a result there are differing versions of many legends and traditions. [see notes 9-25 in paper] . . .

The native belief that Cook really was Lono gained strength from his actions following the return of the ships to Hawaii. But Cook could not know of his part in this unwitting deception. . . .

Since Cook had chosen to anchor in Kealakekua Bay, they were fully convinced he was Lono, come from afar. He had picked Kealakekua, "the pathway of the gods." Nearby in the little village of Napo'opo'o, stood a sacred heiau, a temple courtyard dedicated to the worship of Lono. The structure itself was

situated atop a massive truncated stone pyramid described by Cook as about forty yards long, twenty broad, and fourteen in height.

Not only had Cook found the "correct" locality for the return of Lono, he had delayed his landing until mid-January, the peak of the Makahiki season. The Makahiki was a great harvest festival, held annually in honor of Lono, god of agriculture. . . .Special attention was given to constructing the Lono-makua, the special idol, or banner of Lono, which was carried about from place to place. The banner consisted of a large pole, twelve to sixteen feet high, topped with a carved figure. A long cross-bar was placed at the top of the pole, and a large white tapa cloth was hung from the cross bar, giving the appearance of a square-rigged sail. The cross-beam was decorated with edible fern and feather leis. Emblems of Lono (feathered idols), imitations of the fabled kaupu bird, adorned the banner.

The square-rigged sails of Cook's ships were strikingly similar to the Lono-makua banner. Without knowing it, Cook came billowing into Kealahou Bay under the banner of Lono. The evidences were convincing, the signs were right: Lono had returned, at the right time, and to the right place. . . . All was peace and happiness and friendliness. [However] the pinpricks in the bubble of illusion were to come, but slowly and uncertainly. . . . [a description of how this happened and how Cook was subsequently killed by the natives then follows] . . .

Certainly this story of Cook, as Lono, has strange overtones of similar events that happened in Mexico and Peru when the first Spanish conquerors arrived. Many of the ancient American Indian tribes had traditions telling of the visit to their ancestors of a unique cultural hero, usually termed the "bearded white god." . . . Quetzalcoatl in Cholula, Votan in Chiapas, Wixtepecocha in Oaxaca, Zamna and Kukulcan in Yucatan, Gucumatz in Guatemala, and Tiki-vira-cocha in Peru are among those mentioned. . . .

It has now been generally accepted by the Latter-day Saints that the American Indian legends are merely distorted versions of the visit by the resurrected Christ to the peoples of America, as recorded in Third Nephi. May not the same thing then be said of the tradition of Lono, if the Hawaiians are also kin of Lehi? President John Taylor identified the Mexican divinity, Quetzalcoatl, with the Savior and his visit to the American continent. ("Mediation and Atonement," Salt Lake, 1882, pp. 201-3.) Milton R. Hunter has devoted an entire volume to this same topic. Other Church leaders have made similar comments. Do not the many similarities in the traditions of Lono, and of Quetzalcoatl, suggest the same common origin? . . .

It should be of interest to review a few of the evidences which indicate a relationship between ancient America and Polynesia. Traditions of Polynesia indicate that the ancients came from a "continental homeland." . . . A Maori chant tells of a voyager returning to the homeland who sings: "Now do I direct the bow of my canoe to the opening whence arises the sun god . . .direct to the Homeland." There is a similarity in the totem poles of the Indians, and those of Polynesia, and they also serve the same genealogical purpose. Both peoples used a paper cloth (tapa) made from the bark of a tree. Feathered helmets, headdress and feathered capes of chiefs of both groups have great similarity. Scientific tests have shown that blood grouping factors of the North-west Indians appear to match closely those . . . of the Hawaiians. Interestingly, the ancient Maya, and the Hawaiians, used a similar counting system (different from our common system of tens and hundreds). Weapons and fishhooks of the Polynesians and coastal Indians are much alike. . . . Perhaps the strongest scientific evidences may be found in the existence of the sweet potato in Polynesia. . . . Even its Polynesian name (Kumara) has close affinity to the Peruvian name (Kumar).

Perhaps the strongest evidence for a kinship between Polynesians and American Indians, judged from the viewpoint of the Latter-day Saints, is to be found in statements of leaders and Prophets of the Church. It has been a long-standing belief in the Church that the Polynesians have ancestral roots in America. (Note that this does not preclude the probability that they also have ancestry in other areas.) A number of Church leaders have made definite and specific declarations to this effect. This belief also seems to be based, in part, upon the story of the people of Hagoth (see Alma 63). . . . The Book of Mormon does not state, nor even infer that these ships sailed out into the Pacific and discovered Polynesia. The suggestion

that this actually could have happened, however, is made in an historical frieze which adorns the Latter-day Saints Hawaiian Temple, and in a special statue located on the temple grounds. The frieze depicts events in Book of Mormon history, and suggests that the Hawaiians are seed of Hagoth's people. The statue depicts father Lehi giving his final blessing to his youngest son, Joseph. Lehi covenants, and promises Joseph that his seed "shall not be destroyed." From this blessing, it is inferred (and that is the reason the statue was erected near the Hawaiian temple) that seed of this Joseph (who allied themselves with the Nephites) is still in existence today, and some of them are to be found in Polynesia.

If the Polynesians are seed of Lehi (and the author firmly believes this to be a truth), then the Hawaiian tradition of the fair god, Lono, surely has its origin in the same source as do the American Indian traditions of the fair god. And if this be true, then the unhappy episode of the death of Captain Cook in Hawaii may be a sign to the Hawaiians, and to all Polynesians, to help bring them to a true knowledge of their ancestors.

1974^ Norman Douglas "The Sons of Lehi and the Seed of Cain: Racial Myths in Mormon Scripture

(Polynesians) **and their Relevance to the Pacific Islands," in *The Journal of Religious***

History, Vol. 8, Num. 1, June 1974, pp. 90-104

At the time of this paper, Norman Douglas was a research student in the Department of Pacific History, School of Pacific Studies, Australian National University. He was preparing his PhD thesis, "Latter-day Saints Missions and Missionaries in Polynesia 1844-1960," which dealt with the history of Mormon missions in the Pacific Islands. Douglas had also previously presented an unpublished seminar paper in 1972 entitled "Mormon Missionaries and the Fijian: Caution, Confusion and Compromise," which dealt with the Mormon missionary effort in Fiji, an island which was part of a group of Pacific islands classified and referred to as Melanesia.

In this 15-page paper, Douglas proposes that while the Church's effort to proselytize the Polynesian Islands was encouraged by the belief that the Polynesians were Lamanites and thus heirs of the promised covenant blessings of the house of Israel, the Church's reluctance to proselytize people of dark (black) skin in the islands of Melanesia in the Pacific was a result of the LDS Church's views on the Negro. He writes:

Since 1844, when Mormon missionaries first arrived in the Pacific, the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints has been a gradually increasing force in the religious life of the Pacific Islander. By the early 1900s Mormon missionaries had visited every major Polynesian group, and had established permanent mission stations in French Oceania (the Society Islands, the Australs and the Tuamotus), the Hawaiian Islands, New Zealand, Samoa and Toga. . . . (p. 90)

The racialism of the *Book of Mormon*, while couched explicitly in terms of color, equating a white skin with moral purity and a dark one with moral degradation, nevertheless had a positive influence, providing the Latter-day Saints with a continual incentive for work among the people whom they regarded as the beneficiaries of the book's promise of salvation. But the contents of the *Book of Mormon* were not Joseph Smith's only pronouncements on the subjects of race and color. As the prophet had accepted and elaborated upon the theory that the Indian was of Hebraic origin, so he took also the Biblical stories of the

mark upon Cain and the curse upon Ham's son Canaan and added flourishes of his own. The end result of his re-creations was a totally negative attitude by Mormons towards people of "negroid blood." . . . (pp. 100-101)

[Thus] While other mission churches in the Pacific took little heed of racial boundaries and ethnic distinctions, the inseparability of doctrines of race from other aspects of Latter-day Saints dogma was to be of major importance to the geographical spread of Latter-day Saints missions in the Pacific Islands, affecting especially the larger Mormon faction. Just as the belief in the destiny of the Lamanites and by extension their Pacific brethren was to provide Latter-day Saints missionaries with a rationale and an incentive to magnify their offices in Polynesia, so the extension of the Mormon belief in the spiritual inferiority of the black man was to keep the missionaries away, throughout over a century of contact with the Pacific, from the black islands of Melanesia. (p. 104)

Note* For additional excerpts from this article, see the notations for 1843, 1851, 1852, 1852, 1852, 1865, 1868, 1881, 1890.

1974^ F. E. Butterworth *Pilgrims of the Pacific*, Independence, MO: Herald House, 1974.

(Polynesians-RLDS)

At the time of this writing, F. Edward Butterworth had been a member of the RLDS First Quorum of Seventy since 1944. He was considered an authority on the culture, language, and history of the peoples of French Polynesia, having spent the major part of his years as an appointee minister there. In his book *Pilgrims of the Pacific*, Butterworth proposes some theories regarding the routes of migration for the Jaredites and the Lehiters which connect them to the Polynesians. He writes:

Traditions speak of at least one noted migration out of Babylon under Votan who made it all the way to Ancient America. (*Native Races of the Pacific States*, by Hubert H. Bancroft, vol. 5, pp. 10-21) . . . (p. 42)

Gordon Childe stated that ancient Babylonia was divided into two sections. The southern half was called "Sumer" and the northern section "Akkad" or "Agade." These two rambling areas were united under the great leader Sargon I--or, as he was frequently called, Sargon of Akkad. Childe gave the approximate date of this period as 2200 B.C. . . . If these dates are fairly accurate and we accept the traditional dating of the Tower story at about 2200 B.C, we may safely place the Jaredites in this slot. We can also cloak the culture of this period about them, including the art of writing. . . . (p. 26-27)

I pointed out to Horahitu from a map of the area the names Nimrud, Nimroud, and Nimrod, all north of Babylon and below the mountain range. "To travel northward to Nimrod, the Jaredites no doubt followed the Tigris River," I began. "The Euphrates would have taken them northwestward away from the mountains." . . . (p. 32)

I pointed out to Horahitu the peculiar language used by the Lord when he answered the question about the direction the colony should follow when it left Nimrod: "Go into that quarter where there never

had man been" "You see," I said, "from the Valley of Nimrod, if they were to go into an area where man had never been, they would have to go east. They themselves had come from the south, and directly in front of them to the north stood Mount Ararat on which the ark of Noah is said to have alighted. Noah and his children had traversed and settled the area to the north and west along an arc from Ararat past the eastern seaboard of the Mediterranean Sea and as far south as Babylon. This would preclude any other route open to them except toward that difficult and strange terrain to the east." . . . (p. 34)

[Illustrated Map: Possible route of the Jaredites: (1) traditional site of Babel; (2) probable site of Nimrod Valley; (3) the Zagros Mountains; (4) east to India. F. E. Butterworth, *Pilgrims of the Pacific*, Independence, MO: Herald House, 1974, p. 35.

Tracing the trail of the wandering Jaredites from Babel to Nimrod and finally to India presupposes that there is to be found along this route the remains of an ancient civilization. Mohenjo-daro, India's mystery city mentioned by Mr. Stimson, fits neatly into this category. It was once a rambling community of stone, not unlike the aboriginal cities of Ancient America. . . . (pp 40-41)

Traveling eastward would ultimately have brought them to the Indus River. Their last campsite on the mainland, I believe, was on the west bank of the Indus at Mohenjo-daro. . . . The systematic scattering of the people from Babel was in progress. Now Asia, China, Africa, India, and finally the islands of the sea would be populated. . . . (p. 42)

[Illustration: The Civilization of the Indus Valley: Mohenjo-daro, India. F. E. Butterworth, *Pilgrims of the Pacific*, Independence, MO: Herald House, 1974, p. 41.]

Historian Hubert H. Bancroft says that a mysterious personage " . . . closely resembling Quetzalcoatl . . . assisted at the building of the Tower of Babel. After the confusion of tongues, he led a portion; of the dispersed people to America." (*Native Races of the Pacific States*, vol. 5, pp. 27,28) John T. Short (*North Americans of Antiquity*, p. 206) and Josiah Priest (*American Antiquities*, Hoffman and White, Albany, New York, 1833, p. 199) made similar statements. In Ether it is indicated that the "promised land" to which the Jaredites were led was beyond the "great sea which divideth the lands." I believe this to be the Pacific Ocean. . . . (p. 19)

In the study of Indian Ocean currents . . . Sverdrup says the currents change from summer to winter and that it is possible to travel by ocean current all the way to the south coast of Australia and beyond. . . . (p. 52)

The record of Ether describes Moriancumer as a place "beyond the sea in the wilderness." The "sea" mentioned here was no doubt the Arabian Sea or the Indian Ocean or both, which the Jaredites had successfully crossed. But the record of Ether indicates that the wilderness of Moriancumer was on the shores of the "great sea which divideth the lands." This could be somewhere along the Australian coast. . . . (p. 53)

If my theory is correct, they [the Jaredites] went northward to the great valley [of Nimrod], paused there for a time, then went eastward through the Zagros Mountains and across the continent to Mohenjo-daro,

India. At this point they probably turned south, crossed the Indian Ocean to Australia, then sailed the Pacific Ocean to Ancient America. (p. 88)

[**Illustrated Map: Possible Jaredite Route.** F. E. Butterworth, *Pilgrims of the Pacific*, Independence, MO: Herald House, 1974, p. 68.]

1975^ Robert H. Daines "The Globe-Trotting Sweet Potato," in *Ensign* 5, March 1975, p. 67.

(Polynesians)

In this article, Robert Daines comments on Elder Mark E. Petersen's use of the sweet potato to prove that Polynesians are descendants of Lehi. He writes:

In the April General Conference of 1962, Elder Mark E. Petersen of the Council of the Twelve said, "As Latter-day Saints, we have always believed that the Polynesians are descendants of Lehi and blood relatives of the American Indians, despite the contrary theories of other men." Surprisingly, one of the most tangible evidences of the influence of Lehi's descendants on the Polynesian culture may be the humble sweet potato. Botanists accept the fact that the sweet potato (*Ipomoea batatas*) is of Central or South American origin, and many scholars have attempted to satisfactorily explain its presence in Polynesia, where it is important to the people, both dietarily and culturally. Over the years, three controversial theories have been presented to account for the sweet potato's presence in Polynesia, where it bears the South American name of *kumara* or *kumal*.

The first theory, generally accepted as most logical for about 150 years, was that the sweet potato was introduced from South America into Polynesia by Spanish explorers during the 16th and 17th centuries. Even though early explorers did not record seeing the sweet potato.

Another theory claims the potato was introduced during pre-Columbian times by Polynesians who visited South America and then sailed back home. This theory gains support from the fact that the sweet potato is referred to in most archaic chants and myths throughout Polynesia. It also has a close association with Maori gods, and its planting, cultivation, and storage were traditionally accompanied by elaborate rituals. Similarly, a number of Hawaiian chants and sacred charms used in connection with the sweet potato are in an archaic form of speech. . . . Maori tradition says a fleet of five outriggers and a canoe brought people from Tahiti to New Zealand in the middle of the 14th century, and those people carried sweet potatoes with them. . . . [However this theory] has been challenged recently by Dr. James Hornell, who contends that such an event would have survived in the Polynesian legends like stories of voyages to and from Central Polynesia, New Zealand, Hawaii, and the Easter islands did ("How Did the Sweet Potato Reach Oceania" *Journal of the Linnean Society*, vol. 53, pp. 41-62.)

Dr. Hornell concludes [with a third theory]: ". . . there remains the possibility and even the probability that transmission of the sweet potato may have resulted from an involuntary drift voyage from Peru When such an occurrence happened, the northbound Peru current would take charge until a position was reached where the northward current merges into the South Equatorial Drift. This in turn would take charge and carry the helpless craft westward to the Marquesas (and other Polynesian Islands

In line with Dr. Hornell's thinking is the report in the Book of Mormon [Alma 63:5-8 is cited]

1975^ Spencer W. Kimball "Our Paths Have Met Again." *Ensign* 5, December, 1975, pp. 2-7.

(Polynesians)

In the December, 1975, *Ensign*, Spencer W. Kimball said the following:

These descendants of the Book of Mormon peoples . . . numbered in the millions and covered the islands of the Pacific and the America. . . . I rejoice that it has been my privilege to carry the Gospel to the Lamanites from the Pacific Ocean to the Atlantic . . . and in the islands from Hawaii to New Zealand.

1975^ **Paul Cheesman** **Paul and Millie Cheesman, *Early America and the Polynesians***

(Polynesians) Provo: Utah: Promised Lands Publication, Inc., 1975.

In chapter 1 the Cheesman's cite the theoretically proposed origins of the Polynesian people including a number of quotes from Church Authorities. They write:

There are four theories as to the origin of the Polynesians. One theory suggests that the Polynesian came from America, relying on the prevailing winds from the east, and that as European circumnavigator have usually crossed the Pacific from the east the Polynesians with their comparatively fragile craft must have come from the east. Similarity of customs, such as the use of the earth oven, substantiate this.

The second theory is that the Polynesians came from some part of Southern Asia--the part from which most ancient traditions stem, having been tentatively identified as the Ur of Chaldees, on the Euphrates River.

The third theory maintains that the Polynesians came neither from the eastern nor from the western continent, but were scattered from some center in the Pacific now no longer in existence--in some continental area of which the many scattered groups of islands are the unsubmerged remnants. Geologically, however, there is no evidence of such a continental area in the Eastern Pacific.

The fourth theory suggested is that the Polynesians originated in New Zealand. . . .

It should be noted, in passing, that half of the Polynesian Islands are closer to America than they are to other sources . . .

In chapters 2-8 the Cheesmans give a photographic journey of the different Pacific Islands. After giving multiple comparisons between Polynesian and ancient American cultures, they conclude:

As pointed out by the foregoing quotations, the story of the origin of the Polynesian people is not a simple diagnosis. . . . Most of the LDS writers who comment upon the Polynesian origin quote only concerning Hagoth and the possibility that some of his group were responsible for the migration. If Hagoth built ships others before him could have done likewise. We must remember that the Jaredites arrived in 8 boats; the Mulekites came by some marine transportation and the Lehi colony arrived in a new boat. Certainly these people would not allow these boats to rot at the port of entry. Curiosity among all men has always caused a few to search out the unknown. Since all three Mormon cultures were familiar with shipping it is entirely possible that ships would have been sent north and south and even westward into the Pacific. The Book of Mormon mentions shipping several times. (Helaman 3:10, 14; 1 Nephi 17:8; Alma 63) . . .

From all the writers' observation and research they therefore conclude that the source of truth (in the belief that some of the Polynesians came from the Americas) must be traced to the apostles, patriarchs and authorities of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. They have provided us with blessings and statements which unquestionably relate the Polynesian culture to the Lehi colony. And with this belief in mind, the writers humbly submit the preceding research with the hope that it will substantiate their conclusions. (p. 111)

Note* Concerning the patriarchal blessings mentioned above, Paul Cheesman noted in his book that Bruce G. Pitt, a graduate student, "viewed a portion of microfilm #34 in the BYU library" which contained the patriarchal blessings given to these people in regard to the lineage declared in the blessings. The following information was found: "Of 321 total Polynesian lineages viewed, 155 were declared to be of Manasseh, 2 of Manasseh and Ephraim, 68 of Joseph, 62 of Israel, 4 of Jacob, 28 of Ephraim, 1 of Lehi and 1 of Japeth. . . . Another [graduate] researcher, Max Hirschi, recorded that out of 35 patriarchal blessings given to Polynesians, thirteen were from the tribe of Ephraim, fourteen were told they were from Manasseh, and the other eight were of the tribe of Joseph" (p. 15)

During Dr. Paul Cheesman's visits to the islands, he questioned patriarchs in the various places and found "that nearly three-fourths [of the declared lineages] were from Manasseh and one-fourth were from Ephraim, with some being designated as descendants of the tribe of Joseph." (p. 15)

Source: Paul R. Cheesman and Millie Foster Cheesman, *Early America and the Polynesians*. Provo: Utah: Promised Lands Publication, Inc., 1975. Quoted in Robert E. Parsons, "Hagoth and the Polynesians," in *The Book of Mormon: Alma, The Testimony of The Word*, Provo: BYU Religious Studies Center, 1992, p. 253.

Note* In 1992, the Paul R. Cheesman collection was donated to the Harold B. Lee Library at B.Y.U. The collection includes manuscripts, about 10,000 35 mm slides, photographs, audio and visual materials, and historical books, covering over 30 years of research, the vast majority of which deals with relating ancient civilizations with the Book of Mormon.

1976 Spencer W. Kimball Remarks delivered February 13, 1976 at BYU-Hawaii Campus

(Polynesians)

Russell T. Clement, a special collections librarian at BYU-Hawaii writes that "possibly the most significant statements and clearest explanations of the Mormon belief regarding Polynesian origins and internal migration made by a Mormon prophet were delivered by President Kimball at Brigham Young University--Hawaii Campus, Laie, Hawaii." The original typescript of the address is housed at BYU-HC.

. . . A long time ago the Lord, I think, decided that the Middle East wasn't good enough for some of his people, so he sent Lehi and his associates to America where they would find the greatest land, the choicest land in all the world. After they had lived there for some 600 years, I think he found out that the people some of the people, were too fine, too good for the Americas that he had given them, so He sent Hagoth and his associates, several thousand of them, to Northward. We think they lodged here, and then that they moved from here to the Southland.

President Joseph F. Smith, who was President of the Church said to the New Zealanders, "Now, you are from Hagoth who is the founder of your nation." We understand from the Maoris that they came from the North, so it all fits quite well together. We think that it will be a wonderful thing to visit your people, you who are the natives of the islands of the Sea, and so we anticipate greatly being with them these coming weeks. . . . We realize that when Hagoth came here, he must have had some inspiration. He came from the Mainland, out here to the islands, and peopled the South Seas. There are thousands of islands, many of which are populated by the people here.

Clement notes:

For the first time in Mormon thought, a Church president has publicly explained migration within Polynesia. President Kimball makes it clear that Hagoth came first to Hawaii, then these descendants of Lehi "moved from here (i.e., Hawaii) to the Southland," eventually colonizing many of the South Sea islands.

Source: ^Russell T. Clement, "Polynesian Origins: More Word on the Mormon Perspective," in *Dialogue* 13, no. 4 (1980 Winter), pp. 92-93.

1976 Spencer W. Kimball Official Report of the Samoa Area Conference Held in Pago Pago and Apia,

(Polynesians) Samoa, February 15, 16, 17, 18, 1976 (Salt Lake City: The Church of Jesus

Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1977), p. 15.

Russell Clement writes that during the February, 1976, Area Conferences in Samoa, New Zealand and Tonga, President Kimball reasserted the ideas presented in his BYU-HC address and added further interpretations of Alma 63:4-10. During the First General session of the Samoa Area Conference, held at 10 A.M. on Tuesday, February 17, 1976, at the Church College of Western Samoa in Apia, Western Samoa, President Kimball said:

I thought to read to you a sacred scripture which pertains especially to you the islanders of the Pacific. It is in the sixty-third chapter of Alma. . . . [He then read the account of Hagoth.]

As so it seems to me rather clear that your ancestors moved northward and crossed a part of the South Pacific. You did not bring your records with you, but you brought much food and provisions. And so we have a great congregation of people in the South Seas who came from the Nephites, and who came from the land southward and went to the land northward, which could have been Hawaii. And then the further settlement could have been a move southward again to all of these islands and even to New Zealand. The Lord knows what he is doing when he sends his people from one place to another. That was the scattering of Israel. Some of them remained in America and went from Alaska to the southern point. And others of you came this direction.

President Joseph F. Smith, when president of the Church, said to the people of New Zealand, "I would like to say to you brethren and sisters from New Zealand, you are some of Hagoth's people, and there is No Perhaps about it!" He didn't want any arguments about it. That was definite. So you are of Israel. You have been scattered. Now you are being gathered."

Source: ^Russell T. Clement, "Polynesian Origins: More Word on the Mormon Perspective," in *Dialogue* 13, no. 4 (1980 Winter), pp. 93-94. See also Paul R. Cheesman and Millie Foster Cheesman, *Early America and the Polynesians*. Provo: Utah: Promised Lands Publication, Inc., 1975, p. 15. Quoted in Robert E. Parsons, "Hagoth and the Polynesians," in *The Book of Mormon: Alma, The Testimony of The Word*, Provo: BYU Religious Studies Center, 1992, p. 252.

1976 Spencer W. Kimball Official Report of the New Zealand Area Conference Held at Church College

(Polynesians) at Temple View, New Zealand, February 20, 21, and 22, 1976 (Salt Lake City:

The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1977) p. 3

Russell Clement writes that "Four days after the Samoan address, on Saturday, February 21, 1976, at 10 A.M., President Kimball spoke at the first general session of the New Zealand Area Conference held at the Church College at Temple View, New Zealand. The most pertinent section of his address is included, where President Kimball states unequivocally that the Maoris came from Hawaii and that Hagoth's people remained in the Pacific:

The Maori people came from the north country, from Hawaii. Their origin is recorded in the Book of Mormon where Alma gives an account of their journeys. Their common ancestor was Hagoth. [Alma 63:5-8 is then quoted]

Corianton was a member of that sailing party. President Joseph F. Smith, the president of the Church reported, "you brethren and sisters from New Zealand, I want you to know that you are from the people of Hagoth." For New Zealand Saints that was that. A prophet of the Lord had spoken. Nothing was said about records, or educational material, so it is reasonable to conclude that Hagoth and his associates were about nineteen centuries on the islands, from about 55 B.C. to 1854 before the gospel began to reach them. They had lost all the plain and precious things which the Savior brought to the earth, for they were likely on the islands when the Christ was born in Jerusalem.

Source: ^Russell T. Clement, "Polynesian Origins: More Word on the Mormon Perspective," in *Dialogue* 13, no. 4 (1980 Winter), pp. 94-95.

1976 Spencer W. Kimball Official Report of the Tonga Area Conference Held in the Liahona High

(Polynesians) School in Nuku'alofa, Tonga, February 24 and 25, 1976 (Salt Lake City:

The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1977) p. 3

Russell Clement writes that President Kimball's longest explanation of Hagoth and Israel in the Pacific occurred at the Tonga Area Conference, held February 24-25, 1976, at the Liahona High School in Nuku'alofa, Tonga. On Tuesday, February 24, 1976, during the first general session, President Kimball said:

Through a thousand years of difficulties, these people, the Lamanites and the Nephites, wandered through the American world, having come here across the ocean.

After the people had been pretty well scattered over the earth it was necessary that there be a gathering of Israel. And so the Lord began the gathering processes. Hagoth, who was from among the Nephites, apparently came into the islands of the Pacific. The country had become a little too well settled for him in America, I suspect, so Hagoth went north in some boats that he had made and took thousands of his people, mostly Nephites, with him. (this was still a part of the scattering.) And then about fifty-five years before Christ was born, this large contingent of people, Nephites, came to the islands of the sea. Hagoth gathered together 5,400 men with their wives and their children. Then they departed from their land going westward and northward. He was a very curious man and a very well trained man. (See Alma 63)

As we talked with some of the New Zealanders the other day, they said that there were traditions which indicated that the people of the islands of the sea came from far away and then from farther away and then from still farther away where two oceans met together. The narrow neck of land which connects North America and South America is what they apparently were talking about at that time.

We were amazed at the scattering of Israel through the islands of the Pacific. There must have been many well trained mariners among these men who went north with Hagoth. I suppose as they grew and multiplied through the hundreds of years that have passed since then, that the little country of Hawaii probably became too small for them. The New Zealanders tell us that the traditions of their fathers indicated that they came from the north in seven vessels. In this way, the thousands of islands in the Pacific became populated.

The Book of Mormon says further that there were many of the Nephites who entered into these newly made ships of Hagoth and his companions. "And (they) did sail forth with much provisions, and also many women and children" (Alma 63:6). In the thirty eighth year of the reign of the judges there were still others who went, including Corianton, who was also one of the scattered Israelites. We assume that because there must not have been any records taken, that the record was lost of their migrations to the islands of the sea. It would have been a most interesting history if we had all the details of what happened in that thousand years after Christ came. Little or nothing was ever heard from these people in an official way.

As we have toured the islands of the sea, we have learned that many of the native people have retained in their traditions and their memories certain genealogies of their people. And so we are expecting that the good people of these islands will bring forth the numerous charts of their genealogies that have been memorized and try to reproduce them, so that they can take them to the temple, where the work can be done for their relatives who have passed away. Now that the genealogical program and the temple work is under the direction of the high priests all over the church, we hope that they will get very busy and work out many, many temple names.

The Lord put it into the heart of Hagoth and others; they wanted to move, they wanted to travel. and perhaps that was the way the Lord was to get the scattering of Israel accomplished. In the beginning the Lord created the heavens and the earth, and made all these islands beautiful places to live. He perhaps would not have accomplished his desires if all his people had remained in the central part of North America. So it seems to me that the Lord used this plan to scatter Israel.

Source: ^Russell T. Clement, "Polynesian Origins: More Word on the Mormon Perspective," in *Dialogue* 13, no. 4 (1980 Winter), pp. 95-97.

Note* These remarks also reflect a Modified Hemispheric Model of Book of Mormon geography.

1976^ Jerry K. Loveland "Hagoth and the Polynesian Tradition," *BYU Studies* 16 (1976
(Polynesians) Autumn), pp. 59-73.

Jerry Loveland has lived and taught among the Polynesians for a number of years. He is a professor of history and political science at Brigham Young University, Hawaii campus. He writes:

The question of Polynesian origins has been debated for nearly 200 years, but it has been only in the last generation that the greatest efforts have been made to determine the possibility of the entrance of cultural influences and people from the Americas into the Pacific. . . . In most scholarly circles now the argument is not whether there was American influence in the Pacific, but upon how it got there and how significant it was. As Roy Simmons notes:

There is no Polynesian [origins] problem, other than that created by ourselves, for it would seem that a handful of men and women from the east and west, and not racial groups as we know them today, produced the Polynesian people as a distinct entity among the races of Man.

Most students of the subject think American influences were minimal, preferring to believe that the bulk of the peoples and culture originated to the west--the islands of Melanesia, western Polynesia (i.e., Fiji, Samoa, Tonga, Rotuma, the Tokelaus, and the Wallis Islands) being settled before Eastern Polynesia (which includes the Hawaiian, Marquesas, Tuamotu and Society Islands, as well as New Zealand and Easter Island, which are the areas most likely to have been visited first by voyages from America). . . .

Archaeological investigation is just beginning in Polynesia, and other than the C-14 data which supports the possibility of early settlement from the West, no archaeological evidence has yet been found which specifically substantiates the Hagoth story. Because of the warm, humid, tropical climate of most of the area, anything but bone, shell, or stone disintegrates quickly, and it is unlikely that many artifacts will be found.

Cultural similarities between Polynesian practices and any customs and traditions Book of Mormon people might have brought into the Pacific are also virtually impossible to trace. We do not know enough about the culture of the people of Hagoth nor of the earliest Polynesians to make any comparisons or to cite any parallels.

It would seem, then, that if there is any evidence of Book of Mormon people entering the South Pacific, it must come from the oral traditions, histories, and genealogies of the Polynesians until such archaeological evidence as there may be comes to the fore. . . . Between 1775 and 1800 when these traditions were being written down, any Hagoth-carried traditions would have been about 1,850 years old. How reliable oral accounts could be expected to be after that generation by word of mouth is a serious question. . . .

Much of the Polynesian culture and tradition was gone within a generation after the coming of the Europeans. . . . Among the collection of traditional evidence from Polynesia which we have today, we will look at two categories which might suggest a contact between Hagoth's adventurers and the peoples of the Eastern Pacific. These are the parallels between Old Testament stories and Polynesian traditions, and the tradition of migration accounts.

Parallels Between Religious Traditions: Some students of Polynesian-American Indian relationships point out certain parallels in their respective religious traditions as proof of their common ancestry. Such parallels do exist and they are significant. But . . . there is a profusion of religious parallels between Polynesian religious beliefs and practices and practically every other major religion of the world, both

ancient and modern. . . . Then too, there are differences in Polynesian religion from area to area and even within a given island group. . . .

But parallels between Old Testament and Polynesian traditions have been recorded. In fact, the similarities are sometimes so close that the initial recorders of them refused to believe they were authentically Polynesian. A good example of this comes from Tahiti where the missionary-scholar William Ellis arrived in 1816, fifty years after its discovery by European explorers, but only a couple of years after the first converts to Christianity were made. Ellis wrote this interesting account:

A very generally received Tahitian tradition is, that the first human pair was made by Taaroa, the principal deity acknowledged by the Tahitian nation. On more than one occasion, I have listened to the details of the people respecting his work of creation. They say, that after Taaroa had formed the world, he created man out of *ararea*, red earth . . . some relate that Taaroa one day called for the man by name. When he came, he caused him to fall asleep, and that while he slept, he took out one of his *ivi* or bones, and with it made a woman, whom he gave to the man as his wife, and they became progenitors of mankind. (*Polynesian Researches*, Polynesia. 1831: reprint ed., Rutland, Vt. and Tokyo: Charles E. Tuttle, 1969, p. 110)

But Ellis discounted the authenticity of the tradition:

This always appeared to me to be a mere recital of the Mosaic account of creation, which they had heard from some European, and I never placed any reliance on it, although they have repeatedly told me it was a tradition among them before any foreigner arrived. . . .

Sheldon Dibble, a Congregational missionary who arrived in Hawaii in 1831, was less skeptical than Ellis. Noting the same resemblance between Hawaiian traditions and biblical accounts, he said that the Hawaiian oral traditions

. . . were told to the missionaries before the Bible was translated into the Hawaiian tongue, and before the people knew much of sacred history. The native who acted as assistant in translating the history of Joseph was forcibly struck with its similarity to their ancient tradition. Neither is there the least room for supposing that the songs referred to are recent inventions. They can all be traced back for generations, and are known by various persons residing on different islands who have had no communications with each other. Some of them have their dates in the reign of some ancient king, and others have existed time out of mind. It may also be added, that both their narrations and songs are known the best by the very oldest of people and those who never learned to read; whose education and training were under the ancient system of heathenism. (*A History of the Sandwich Islands*, Honolulu: Thomas Thrum, 1909, p. 18)

[However] A strong attack on the authenticity of Hawaiian legends and traditions with Old Testament overtones has been made . . . Recently, Dorothy Barrere has argued that the Kumuhonua legends were "fabrications of the latter nineteenth century, and not traditions of pre-Christian days." (note 32) . . . They were, she says, part of "an on-going attempt among some Hawaiians of that time to introduce 'traditions' compatible with Christian teachings." (note 33) . . .

In summary, we must conclude that . . . [while] the similarities are so close as to suggest the Polynesians' ancestors brought these oral accounts with them into Polynesia, at the same time, we must

be aware of the influence of time, error, and distortion which have either deleted from or added to the oral record. . . .

Migrations: The most striking Polynesian account of a Hagoth-like voyage is that of Hawaii Loa, or Hawaii-nuii. . . . Mormon tradition has it that Hawaii Loa and Hagoth are the same person, and LDS temple records show them as being the same. . . . The descendants of Hawaii Loa were also travellers, and according to the Fornander account, they settled the rest of Polynesia and Fiji. . . .

The Hawaii Loa story is certainly suggestive of the Hagoth reference in the Book of Alma, but its authenticity has fallen under suspicion because it is part of the "discredited" portion of the Kumuhonua story published by Fornander from the notes he took from Kepelino and Kamakau. The most serious difficulty, however, is the fact that no other Hawaiian tradition or legend refers to the Hawaii Loa account. (note 41) . . . Kepelino's and Kamakau's motives are . . . impugned by Barrere, who accuses them of intellectual dishonesty and outright fabrication. Her supposition that the geographical details in the Hawaii Loa story could not have been known to the prehistoric Hawaiians is a telling criticism. This explanation is not entirely satisfactory, however, because it is supported primarily by the unprovable inference that Kamakau and Kepelino were so desperate to have an account of the peopling of Hawaii that they invented a migration myth. Cartwright suggests that we not throw the baby out with the bathwater. He accepts the proposition that Kamakau and Kepelino doctored up the Kumukonua account with biblical tales, but he believes that Hawaii Loa was still a real character who figured prominently in Hawaiian history. ("The Legend of Hawaii-loa," *Journal of the Polynesian Society* 38, 1939: 105-119.)

Conclusion: . . . We have accepted the theory that people from the Americas did become part of that heritage. We have not, however, found irrefutable evidence in the histories and/or genealogies of the Polynesians to suggest that they had a tradition of Hagoth's voyages. The biblical parallels and the Hawaii Loa account certainly suggest a remote ancestry with the Book of Mormon people, but we have seen that they are somewhat suspect. It seems unlikely that we shall be able to learn anything more from Polynesian traditions because the old wise men, the learned *tohungas*, the chanters of the genealogies, are long in their graves, and present day traditions, although purporting to be of ancient things, are generally considered unreliable by the critics.

If the Hagoth account is to be verified scientifically, it must come from other means. Stratigraphic archaeology and other more sophisticated scientific techniques have only just begun to be applied to Polynesia. The great age of Polynesian discovery may lie just ahead of us--and here tradition may become a guide for the investigator.

1977 Elwin W. Jensen "Polynesians Descend from Lehi, According to Statements of the
(Polynesians) Prophets," (1977). (Collection: LDS Archives)

In this 14-page paper, Elwin Jensen quotes some definite statements referring to descendants of father Lehi in the Pacific Islands, which have been made by Church leaders including:

George Q. Cannon Matthew Cowley Spencer W. Kimball

Brigham Young Rufus K. Hardy Gordon B. Hinckley

Joseph F. Smith David O. McKay J. Reuben Clark, Jr.

Heber J. Grant Mark E. Petersen

Note* All of the quotes referred to above are found within this paper.

1977^ F. Edward Butterworth *Roots of the Reorganization: French Polynesia*, Independence, Missouri:

Herald Publishing House, 1977.

At the age of twenty-six, F. Edward Butterworth and his bride of a few months made their first trip to the South Pacific as missionaries for the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints. That was in 1944. Since that time they have made two other missionary tours of French Polynesia, the latest ending in 1958. In 1961 he was to publish a collection of his experiences in *Adventures of a South Sea Missionary* (Herald House, Independence, Missouri). To contrast this with the way the islands were a century earlier, he wrote a second book, *Adventures of John Hawkins, Restoration Pioneer*. In 1977 he published a third book, *Roots of the Reorganization: French Polynesia*. This book is a sequel to this latter work and covers one hundred years of South Sea Island history. In it appear rare photographs, diaries, biographies, autobiographies, and other materials never before published. He then began work on a manuscript which, to date, has never been formally published entitled, *Sons of the Sea*.

[See the notation for 1843 and 1852]

1979^ Church Educational System *Book of Mormon Student Manual: Religion 121-122*, SLC:

(Polynesians) The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1979, p. 349.

Under the heading "(35-12) Alma 63:4-9," we find the following:

These verses speak of two separate migration from the land of Zarahemla: one apparently by land and the other by sea. Later, the organizer of the sea venture, Hagoth, returned to Zarahemla to lead a second group of people away. Elder Matthew Cowley felt strongly that these colonists may have been the forefathers of some of the peoples of the South Pacific:

When I was on my first mission as a young boy, I used to ask the oldtimers out there, "Where did you come from?" They would say (in Maori), "We came from the place where the sweet potato grows wild, where it is not planted, does not have to be cultivated."

There is only one place in all the world where the sweet potato grows wild, and that is within the environs of that narrow neck of land where Hagoth built his ships. They will tell you that they came from several degrees of distance (Maori). One degree of distance, a greater degree of distance, and then a far greater degree of distance.

The Maori scholars tell you that . . . (spoken in Maori) means the place where the spirits are joined. But I have a little different interpretation of that. *Wairua* in the Maori language means "spirit." *Wairua* also means "two waters," *wai* meaning water, *rua* meaning two.

In the Hawaiian language *Wailua* means "two waters"; in the Samoan language *Vailua* means "two waters." The word for *Spirit* in those other languages isn't *Wairua*, the same as in the Maori language.

The Maori scholars say that they came from a far distant place, where the spirits are joined, or where the body returns to the spirit. But I say, knowing the story of Hagoth as I do, that they came from the joining of two waters, a narrow neck of land between the two bodies of water which joins those two great continents. (Matthew Cowley, *Matthew Cowley Speaks*, pp. 114-15.)

Note* The exact reference is, "Testimony through Reading the Book of Mormon," Address delivered at the annual General Relief Society conference, Wednesday, October 1, 1952, in Matthew Cowley, *Matthew Cowley--Speaks*, Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1954, pp. 114-16. [see the 1954 notation]

Note* By including this quote from Matthew Cowley, which speaks of "a narrow neck of land between the two bodies of water which joins those two great continents," the CES gives subtle support for a Hemispheric Book of Mormon geography model.

1980^ Russell T. Clement "Polynesian Origins: More Word on the Mormon Perspective,"
in

(Polynesians)

Dialogue 13, no. 4 (1980 Winter), pp. 88-98.

Russell Clement writes:

In few cases is the Mormon Church at such odds with "the learning of men" as in its answers to the intriguing questions of Polynesian origins and migrations. Apostle Mark E. Petersen expressed the Mormon viewpoint in a conference address on April 8, 1962 (see notation): "As Latter-day Saints we have always believed that the Polynesians are descendants of Lehi and blood relatives of the American Indians, despite the contrary theories of other men." (*Conference Report*, April 6-8, 1962, pp. 111-115. Later published separately as *Polynesians Came From America*" (*Salt Lake City: Deseret Book Co., 1962*). . . . The scientific community indeed favors a contrary theory, that of an approach to Polynesia from the west. Based upon an impressive and increasingly cohesive array of archaeological, linguistic, ethnographic, and ethnobotanic evidence, modern Pacific scholars accept a Southeast Asian origin for Polynesians. With minimal exceptions, scholars agree that explorers called Lapita (Mongoloid and Malanesian Australoid Phenotypes) migrated from South-BC. From Tonga and Samoa, scholars conclude, they settled the Marquesas, Easter Island and finally Hawaii and New Zealand. . . . Regarding internal Polynesian migration, the consensus of the scholarly community is that after Tonga and Samoa were settled between 1200 and 1000 B.C., the Marquesas Islands were settled about A.D. 300, Easter Island by A.D. 400, and Hawaii by A.D. 500. A second movement to Tahiti or the Society Islands occurred by A.D. 600 and from there New Zealand was settled by A.D. 800. Secondary migrations from Tahiti to Hawaii and New Zealand happened after A.D. 1000. It is important to keep this scholarly pattern in mind as the comments by President Kimball are presented. . . . Recent statements by President Spencer W. Kimball about internal Polynesian migration and settlement are . . . at odds with the academic community.

A brief overview of both sides of the issue is needed to understand and appreciate the little-known but extremely significant remarks of President Kimball delivered between February 13, 1976, and February 24, 1976, at Brigham Young University--Hawaii Campus and at the Area Conferences at Samoa, New Zealand and Tonga.

[Clement then quotes the scientific reasoning and the Kimball talks (see the 1976 notations)]

Clement concludes:

The purpose of this short essay was to present both sides of a major discrepancy between Mormonism and the scientific, academic world. No doubt the debate over the fascinating problems of Polynesian origins and migrations will continue although it appears unlikely that new discoveries and research could completely reconcile the differences. In light of the Mormon Church's firm assertion and long-standing beliefs on the matter, one must conclude that Mormonism will likely continue to oppose conflicting anthropological theories, choosing instead to rely on the statements of its leaders.