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CHAPTER 1 - INTRODUCTION

1.1 Senate Bill 1520

In an attempt to further self-determination for Native Hawaiians, the Governor of Hawai‘i, Neil Abercrombie, signed Senate Bill 1520 on February 06, 2011. The ceremony was held at the historic Washington Place and was attended by approximately 150 people, including representatives from various Native Hawaiian societies, State lawmakers, and Office of Hawaiian Affairs trustees.¹ Senate Bill 1520, now Act 195, “gives the Governor the power to appoint a five-member Native Hawaiian Roll Commission that will build a foundation for self-determination and eventually lead to Native Hawaiian Recognition.”² Governor Abercrombie later stated that, “with the signing of this bill, the State of Hawai‘i is closer to reorganization of a Native Hawaiian governing entity. As Native Hawaiians rise, all of Hawai‘i rises.”³ While some praised Abercrombie’s gesture, others interpreted the bill as another method to curb Hawaiian sovereignty. It was written in the Honolulu Star-Advertiser that, “sovereignty advocates decried the measure as an attempt to deny Native Hawaiians’ claims to govern as a sovereign independent nation.”⁴ The signing of this act can be construed as a step towards self-determination for Native Hawaiians, yet it still remains confined within the boundaries of the

²Ibid.
United States. The restrictions of this bill are similar to the limitations of the historical interpretation of Washington Place in regards to Hawai‘i’s colonial history. In the same way that the Bill attempts to control and constrict Native Hawaiian attempts for self-determination, the narrative and current uses of Washington Place are confined within the boundaries of the State of Hawai‘i’s historical interpretation of Hawai‘i’s colonial history.

1.2 A Queen’s Home and a Governor’s Mansion

As a public icon, Washington Place is intimately connected with the political sphere of Hawai‘i. It can be viewed as a microcosm of Hawai‘i’s colonial past and present. Similar to other historical sites, the inhabitants of Washington Place imbued the site with meaning. These inhabitants held different opinions and views about the overthrow, annexation, and statehood of Hawai‘i. The contemporary uses of Washington Place reveal the inadequacy of the site to address the complexity of these inhabitants’ beliefs pertaining to Hawai‘i’s colonial history; instead only one interpretation is offered. The preservation of Washington Place is understood as an act of preservation of Native Hawaiian culture due to its association with Queen Lili‘uokalani, the last reigning monarch of the Hawaiian Kingdom and one of the inhabitants of Washington Place. Yet this type of preservation offers a limited view of Native Hawaiian history, one that is confined within colonial boundaries.

Located on 320 South Beretania Street, Washington Place is memorialized for two main reasons: as the personal residence of the late Queen Lili‘uokalani and as the Governor’s mansion for the Governors of Hawai‘i after the home was purchased by the Territory of Hawai‘i in 1921. A few other notable distinctions attached to Washington Place are the inclusion of Washington Place on the National Register of Historic Places in 1973 and the prestigious title of National
Historic Landmark (NHL), which the site received in 2007. To receive either of these distinctions, a site is required to pass a particular set of criteria as approved by the Secretary of Interior. A decisive factor for any NHL is that its history compliments and coalesces mainstream American history and culture. The NHL website, in a statement of significance for Washington Place, explains that Washington Place,

symbolizes the westernization and Americanization of the Hawaiian Islands. Located near Iolani Palace, also a National Historic Landmark, Washington Place was the home of the last reigning monarch of the Hawaiian kingdom, Queen Liliuokalani, from her marriage to John O. Dominis in 1862 to her death in 1917. During that period, Hawaiian society merged with American society and Hawaiian self-determination gave way to United States control. Washington Place is also of significance as the home of the Territorial Governors from 1918 to 1959, and after Hawaii became the 50th State of the Union, the State Governors Mansion from 1959 to 2002.\(^5\)

Situating the NHL interpretation of significance within the context of public history of Hawai‘i reveals the way the state and nation attempt to downplay their colonial involvement and presence in Hawai‘i. Downplaying the negative effects that colonization had and has on the indigenous population of Hawai‘i allows for the perpetuation of the image of Hawai‘i as racially harmonious and prosperous as a result of colonization. The above NHL statement lends the impression that the assimilation of Hawai‘i by the United States was an easy and conflict free transition.\(^6\) It is made to appear that Hawaiian and American society joined together in an almost natural progression in which control by the United States and Americanization of the Hawaiian Islands was expected. The NHL statement also leads one to believe that Hawaiian self-determination submitted to a greater power, the United States, and that at that moment, Hawaiian self-determination was extinguished. It also consolidates Hawaiian self-determination into a


\(^6\) Ibid.
single group of Native Hawaiians. Today, the Native Hawaiian movement does not consist of a single group, nor do groups have the same goals; instead, there are multiple factions fighting for Hawaiian self-determination with different ideas of how this should be achieved. Thus, the NHL statement, which lumps the Native Hawaiian self-determination into a single entity, is problematic.

Although Washington Place features a museum portion that memorializes a significant Native Hawaiian figure, Queen Lili‘uokalani, the memorialization distracts from the historical and contemporary political struggle of Natives Hawaiians for self-determination. It accomplishes this by focusing on the life of the Queen and her charitable contributions to the Native Hawaiian community without addressing the dissent that the Queen had with the “merging” of her Hawaiian Kingdom with American society. Silence about the Queen’s opinions and actions against assimilation reinforce the NHL statement that Hawaiian self-determination died and, like the Queen, both gave way to Americanization and the United States.

Washington Place is no longer the residence of the Governor of Hawai‘i, yet it is still incorporated in the political sphere of Hawai‘i. As legal property of the State of Hawai‘i, Governors are the privileged stewards of the site. The Governor’s power over the site can be interpreted as a representation of the State’s power over the indigenous population. The purchase of the site by the Territory of Hawai‘i in 1921 transformed the meaning of the house from a symbol of Hawaiian royalty into a colonial symbol. The State of Hawai‘i does not view itself as a colonizer - this is reflected in the museum portion and the public uses of the site, which attempt to detract from their colonial involvement and power in Hawai‘i. In spite of these
efforts, the erasure of meaning is never absolute, for, as Eilean Hooper-Greenhill explains, meanings are frequently constructed and reconstructed.\(^7\)

### 1.3 A Theoretical Perspective

This paper is concerned with the construction of meanings in a museum setting – the way objects and artifacts are interpreted, arranged, and displayed to create a cohesive representation of a particular culture. As pedagogic institutions, museums exhibit knowledge in a way that is easily available for social consumption. The fact that certain narratives and histories are made visible through the museum setting, while others are hidden, demonstrates the inherent power and privilege that museums possess in constructing meanings and defining culture.

When discussing meaning in museums, it is important to understand the concept of culture. Culture can be understood in various ways. The first is known as ‘high culture.’ ‘High culture’ is understood as the “‘best that has been thought and said’ in a society…as represented in the classic works for literature, painting, museum and philosophy.”\(^8\) Opposite of ‘high culture’ is a more modern definition known as ‘mass culture’ or ‘popular culture.’ These terms portray culture as “forms of popular music, publishing, art, design, literature, or the activities of leisure time and entertainment, which make up the everyday lives of the majority of ‘ordinary people.’”\(^9\) The ‘anthropological definition’ of ‘culture’ is “used to refer to whatever is distinctive about the ‘way of life’ of a people, community, nation or social group.”\(^10\) Similar to the

---

\(^9\) Ibid, 2.
\(^10\) Ibid, 2.
anthropological definition of the term, ‘culture’ can also be “used to describe the ‘shared values’ of a group or a society.”

Along with these more traditional understandings of culture, Stuart Hall and Eilean Hooper-Greenhill explain the way that the ‘cultural turn’ in critical theory “emphasize the importance of meaning to the definition culture.” Instead of culture being defined as things, “culture is concerned with the production and exchange of meanings – the ‘giving and taking of meaning’ – between members of a society or group.”

Hooper-Greenhill summarizes the four contemporary uses of ‘culture’ according to Raymond Williams, a major theorist of culture. The first usage of culture is as “a general process of intellectual, spiritual and aesthetic development.” In this first usage, culture is “something that can be acquired…the pursuit of the spiritual rather than the material; it is a state of mind that may be achieved through the family, through going to the right school, through participating in the arts and higher education, and through visiting museums…culture is understood as a training in discrimination and appreciation.” This is similar to ‘high culture;’ however, the focus is on the development of the mind rather than on best things that society has produced. In other words, a person can be trained to be cultured.

The second usage of culture is defined as the “works and practices of intellectual and especially artistic activity.” Williams’ second usage of culture is “made up of specific products that may be characterized as painting, sculpture, music, literature, and drama, along with their

11 Ibid, 2.  
12 Ibid, 2.  
13 Ibid, 2.  
14 Hooper-Greenhill, 11.  
15 Ibid, 11.  
16 Ibid, 11.
associated practices.” In this sense, culture could be located in the cultural institutions that featured those artistic works, such as museums and theaters.18

Williams’ third usage of culture is defined as “a particular way of life, whether of a people, a period or a group.”19 Culture “describes ways of life of groups, subcultures, or ethnicities” as opposed to the attributes of the individual.20 This usage of culture has an anthropological approach about it. This “approach to culture signals an intention to be inclusive, to view social groups in a relative rather than absolute way.”21

Williams’ fourth usage of culture is summarized by Hooper-Greenhill as the “signifying system through which necessarily (although among other means) a social order is communicated, reproduced, experienced and explored.22 According to Williams, culture is a set of material practices that in their performance construct meanings, values, and subjectivities. Williams defines culture as a ‘realized signifying system’.23

Culture is a complex concept in which a single definition is impossible. Hooper-Greenhill argues that the “key to understanding ‘culture’ is to identify the discursive context within which it is used.”24 Thus, when analyzing culture, it is important to also interrogate the discursive field or discipline that culture is being discussed. As Hall explains, “meaning and meaningful practice is therefore constructed within discourse.”25 Discourse, according to Foucault, is the words and thoughts that construct ideas and ways of thinking – it is “about the

---

17 Ibid, 11.
18 Ibid, 11.
19 Ibid, 11.
20 Ibid,12.
21 Ibid, 12.
22 Ibid, 11.
23 Raymond Williams, Culture (Glasgow: Fontant Paperbacks, 1981), 207 as cited by Eilean Hooper-Greenhill, Museums and the Interpretation of Visual Culture, 12.
production of knowledge through language. But...since all social practices entail meaning, and meanings shape and influence what we do – our conduct – all practices have a discursive aspect.”

Discourse is about the construction of knowledge through both language and practice. The discourse in a cultural museum aids in the way a culture can be socially discussed and understood. A particular discourse that is perpetuated at a museum is privileged with the power to define a culture, the meaning of that culture, and ways that a culture can be discussed. Often times, an inclusive and cohesive display of a particular culture is exhibited – one that does little to address the diversity that exists even within a culture. Henry Giroux views culture as a “site of multiple and heterogeneous borders where different histories, languages, experiences and voices intermingle amidst diverse relations of power and privilege.”

Culture within the museum setting is best understood through the lens of visual culture theory. Visual culture typically focuses on artifacts and practices that are related to art history and media studies. However, Hooper-Greenhill argues that “any artifact, specimen, or object within a museum collection plays its part in the complex processes of bringing to visibility, of making visible, of constructing visual meaning, and is therefore subject to analysis as part of visual culture.”

The significance of visual culture theory for this paper is that it “problematises the acts of looking, and disturbs the conventional notion of the transparency of the visible.” Visual culture

---

28 Hooper-Greenhill, 16.
29 Ibid, 15.
theory “enables the problematisation of the meaning of an artifact in its setting.” As Hooper-Greenhill summarizes, “the style of the setting, the display technology used, and the codes of design are all influential in the construction of meaning in museums. Things mean differently in different contextual settings.” This is an important factor to consider when analyzing Washington Place because the meaning of the narrative told at Washington Place is influenced by the history of the site and the site’s relationship to the State of Hawai‘i.

1.4 Museum Pedagogy

Museums are educational institutions that developed in the nineteenth century during the age of imperialism. Since their inception, they have been utilized as social institutions to educate the masses. Where previously the knowledge provided in museums was unquestioned, museums today are held accountable for the type of information they impart and the collected artifacts they possess. Those with the power and influence to construct the knowledge in a museum are being considered as crucial components when it comes to analyzing a museum exhibit.

Michael Ames explains that before the public museum there existed what was termed the curiosity of cabinets. This was the term because royal and noble households in Europe during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries collected exotic artifacts from colonized lands. There was no particular rhyme or reason for what they collected, which was the reason for the varied assortment of artifacts; however, this type of collecting laid the foundation for the scientific study of cultural materials. From the curiosity of cabinets there evolved a natural history

---

31 Ibid, 15.
approach to understanding exotic artifacts and indigenous populations. Primitive societies were classified as part of natural history as defined in the field of anthropology. Tony Bennett interpreted the museum during the nineteenth century as a tool used by various government entities to control the cultural aspects of society. Bennett interrogates the way that museum policies and politics in the nineteenth century were developed in tandem to control popular thought and the behavior of citizens through “democratizing the eye of power.” The museum was utilized as a pedagogic tool for the government, its purpose multi-dimensional. It provided a space for the education of popular thought, regulated citizenry, instilled nationalism, and demonstrated the power of the state through their colonial conquests. Anthropology aided to justify imperialism by classifying colonized lands and people as inferior. Royal works of art and artifacts were re-codified and inscribed with a democratic meaning that provided an abstract ideology of the nation through artifacts that belonged to the people. As a disciplining regime, the museum made visible this type of thinking and understanding while also making visible acceptable behavior through the commingling of classes. It was believed that the working class would become cultured through an introduction to ‘high culture’ experienced through royal works, arts, and artifacts, and by mixing and imitating the social behavior of the middle class. The government utilized the eyes of the masses to incorporate the public as regulators of society, each person a possessor of power. Self-regulation was developed and fine-tuned in fairs, exhibitions, and department stores and transferred to the museum space to regulate and control the population in a pedagogic atmosphere.

Thus, the inception of museums as pedagogic institutions developed with these strategies in mind. Understanding the history of these social and educational institutions provides a framework to understand the power and privilege that museums possessed to create and control meanings. Subsequently, the struggles that contemporary museums face are a result of the initial creation and function of museums. Where previously knowledge was disseminated to the masses without question, audiences now hold contemporary museums accountable for the meanings they create and share.

While the development of museums in Europe during the nineteenth century influenced the construction of meanings, the way that traditional sites in colonized lands were museumized has also influenced the knowledge about native populations. Benedict Anderson focuses on this occurrence in Southeast Asia. Anderson identifies Thomas Stamford Raffles, a prominent colonial official, as one of the first colonial rulers to express an interest in the history of antique monuments in Southeast Asia. Along with an accumulated personal collection of local ‘objects d’art,’ he also studied the history of their colonized people. European colonizers took an invested interest in what was significant to the local communities. Sacred sites were museumized in an effort to establish a unified national identity amongst a heterogeneous population. Sites in Southeast Asia, such as Borobudar, the largest Buddhist stupa in the world, were “disinterred, unjungled, measured, photographed, reconstructed, fenced off, analysed, and displayed.” The natives were stripped of their religious and sacred ties to these location and colonizers fashioned an image of themselves as the guardians of local tradition. The taking over of these sites was representative of the inability of the indigenous population to care for

36 Ibid, 181.
their own culture and of the necessity of the colonizers to do so, thus serving to legitimize their presence in foreign lands.

The age of mechanical reproduction served to reify the role of Europeans as guardians, and promote tourism and another way of visualizing colonized lands. Anderson discusses the way that print-capitalism and mass media made visible foreign lands. Maps and photographs of traditional sites were disseminated, which aided in the spread of nationalism amongst two very different cultures by allowing those at the metropole to see what colonizers had conquered and absorbed into their nation. The indigenous populations were interpreted as inferior and incapable to caring for themselves or their traditional sites. Their lands were romanticized.

It is important to consider the meanings that were produced from colonizers musemizing and controlling traditional sites and artifacts important to the indigenous population in their own lands. This act transformed the site and instilled it with a new meaning. Similarly, sites in Hawai‘i were museumized. In Legendary Hawaii and the Politics of Place, Cristina Bacchilega argues that in Hawai‘i during the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, non-Hawaiians (Americans) constructed and appropriated Hawaiian *mo‘olelo’s* for their political and economic gains. The three modes of production that facilitated in this (re)creation were translation, tourism, and photography. She coins the term *legendary Hawaii* to refer to the constructed space not restricted to, but for the benefit, of non-Hawaiians through the appropriation of *mo‘olelo* narratives. The colonial practice of labeling native narratives as folklore belittled natives and situated their beliefs and narratives under the categories of ignorant, savage, and mythical.

---

37 Ibid, 181.
Bacchilega investigates the creation of *legendary Hawaii*. She relies on such works as *Paradise of the Pacific* and *Hawaiian Annual* and the two influential men associated with those works, William D. Westervelt and Thomas G. Thrum. Bacchilega’s study of these work reveal the way that the English translation of *mo`olelos* provided by these two men, combined with photography, were economically motivated for tourism and subsequently delegitimized the Hawaiian culture. These works illustrated Hawaii as a desirable tourist destination and illustrated a soft primitivism and safe exotism for potential travelers. Visual aid enhanced people’s desire to visit Hawai`i and the translated narratives made Hawai`i appear exotic, yet safe.

The purpose of her project was to study counter-narratives, one of them being *mo`olelo*, to dismantle the romantic image of Hawaii and allow for the “re-envisioning of Hawaii as an indigenous storied place.” Bacchilega’s visual and textual analysis of Anne Kapulani Landgraf’s 1994 book, *Na Wahi Pana O Koʻolau Poko*, serves as proof of a counter-narrative that portrays an accurate view of the significance of place to Native Hawaiians. Bacchilega analyzes Landgraf’s work and believes that Landgraf’s photographs challenge the traditional landscape photos and that her incorporation of Hawaiian and English text (the Hawaiian text before the English text), convey a native perspective of relation to the land.

Museums represent a selection from the cultures of society that brings to the foreground questions of how a particular culture was selected and what makes the information presented official knowledge. The type of knowledge presented about a culture is also a selective process.

---

that often excludes the negative aspects of colonization and the influence that colonization had on the population. These are among the issues that this paper will address.

Hall was interested in Foucault’s theories of discourse and power/knowledge because museums are social institutions that impart meaning, knowledge, and ways of thinking about culture. Viewed as regimes of truth, museums possess an unquestionable truth, yet truth is not an absolute thing. The meanings and truth produced in a museum setting are linked to power dynamics. Hall is interested in questioning who has the authority to determine which culture is displayed and how that particular culture is interpreted.41

Museums are no longer viewed as objective institutions. As Hooper-Greenhill asks, “who has the power to create, to make visible, and to legitimate meanings and values?”42 The power that museums have to define the social world and create official versions of history and culture brings into question whose interest is being satisfied with the current representation. Exhibitions can make visible formerly invisible histories.

Moria Simpson believes that since museums tend to reflect and serve the cultural elite and dominant cultures, the representation of indigenous and minority cultures is framed in a way to reflect the power dynamic and relationships between colonizer and colonized. Many traditional and tribal societies are outraged by the ways that curators, scholars, and anthropologists demonstrate and portray their cultures as either dead or vanished rather than as a vibrant, living, and thriving. She explains that the main struggle between museums and communities is the negotiation between self-definition and scholarly definitions. When critiquing the display of traditional and tribal societies, Simpson accuses scholars, curators, and

42 Hooper-Greenhill, 19.
anthropologists of transforming the creators of the ethnographic artifacts into passive informants that are observed, studied, and recorded and have no involvement in the planning processes.\textsuperscript{43} Addressing issues such as colonization is important because it is a crucial historical moment in an indigenous group’s history that connects the past to the present. It demonstrates the change that occurred – the change in culture, lifestyle, and education and how that has affected present day culture.

Another concern regarding cultural politics in museums is the homogenous interpretation of a culture that is displayed. Factions and differences exist within a cultural group. The selection of one faction over another in defining their culture is also representative of a power struggle. As Hall states, “in any culture, there is always a great diversity of meanings about any topic, and more than one way of interpreting or representing it.”\textsuperscript{44} As argued by Stacy L. Kamehiro, “Native Hawaiian society was never unmarked by internal social cleavages and political contests, and it cannot therefore be understood as an undivided, homogenous entity with a unified will and subjectivity.”\textsuperscript{45} Sometimes differences between cultural groups are emphasized to further aid in the homogenous appearance and understanding of a culture. As Kamehiro further notes, “insisting on an unambiguous distinction between “Hawaiian” and “haole” cultures in the nineteenth century distorts the complexity of intercultural relations and cultural production.”\textsuperscript{46}

\textsuperscript{44} Hall, ed., \textit{Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices}, 2.
\textsuperscript{46} Ibid, 12.
1.5 Asian Settler-Colonialism

Regarding the complexity of intercultural relations, it is important for the history presented about Native Hawaiians to incorporate narratives about colonization by the United States and Asian-Settler Colonialism in Hawai‘i. Asian-Settler Colonialism is discussed in museums even less than colonization, but it is just as important of a subject matter and extremely influential on the current political, social, and economic circumstances in Hawai‘i and the indigenous population.

Patrick Wolfe distinguishes settler colonialism from genocide, claiming that settler colonialism is “inherently eliminatory.” He goes on to further elaborate on the characteristics of settler colonialism, which include,

- dissolution of native societies….officially encouraged miscegenation, the breaking-down of native title into alienable individual freeholds, native citizenship, child abduction, religious conversion, resocialization in total institutions such as missions or boarding schools, and a whole range of cognate biocultural assimilations.”

As cited by Candace Fujikane, Johnston and Laswon define settlers as, “colonizers in an ineluctable historical and continuing relationality to the indigenes and indigenny.”

The settler-ideology prevalent in the islands lends the impression that everyone in Hawai‘i, including the indigenous population, is a settler in the islands and entitled to equal rights as immigrants and citizens of the United States. Haunani K. Trask explains that the “doctrine of terra nullis, that is, the vacant land argument used by Europeans who colonized the

---

48 Ibid, 388.
49 Fujikane, “Asian Settler Colonialism in the U.S. Colony of Hawai‘i” in Asian Settler Colonialism: from Local Governance to the Habits of Everyday life in Hawai‘i, eds Candace Fujikane and Jonathan Okamura, 7-8.
Americas, Australia, and other lands,” provides settlers with an image of the land as vacant and erases the native peoples traditional relation to the land.\textsuperscript{50}

Settlers interpret the land as a space of equality and this masks the colonization of Native Hawaiians and their political status as colonized subjects. Trask further explains that, modern Hawai‘i, like its colonial parent the United States, is a settler society; that is, Hawai‘i is a society in which the indigenous culture and people have been murdered, suppressed, or marginalized for the benefit of settlers who now dominate our islands. In settler societies, the issue of civil rights is primarily an issue about how to protect settlers against each other and against the state. Injustices done against Native people, such as genocide, land dispossession, language banning, family disintegration, and cultural exploitation, are not part of this intrasettler discussion and are therefore not within the parameters of civil rights.\textsuperscript{51}

Upholding a settler narrative in Hawai‘i also helps maintain the ideology of Hawai‘i as a racially harmonious state. In Hawai‘i, multiculturalism is a concept intentionally fixed to Hawaiian culture that further perpetuates a settler imaginary. Rona Halualani argues that the “State of Hawai‘i codifies the Aloha spirit into the civil discourse and ideology of multiculturalism” and that the appropriation of the Hawaiian term Aloha and the aloha spirit by the State perpetuates the identity construction of the native population as friendly, while promoting the ideology of multiculturalism.\textsuperscript{52} This particular identity construction identifies Native Hawaiian activist struggles and protests against settlers, colonization, and the State, as “un-Hawaiian,” to those unfamiliar with the contested history of the islands colonization. This ideology distorts images of native Hawaiian’s that fight for sovereignty.

Patrick Wolfe writes about the contradiction of settler societies appropriating parts and symbols of indigenous culture. He uses Australia as an example, 

\textsuperscript{51} Trask, From a Native Daughter: Colonialism and Sovereignty in Hawai‘i, 25.
\textsuperscript{52} Halualani, xiv.
in Australia, by contrast (as in many settler societies), the erasure of indigeneity conflicts with the assertion of settler nationalism. On the one had, settler society required the practical elimination of the natives in order to establish itself on their territory. On the symbolic level, however, settler society subsequently sought to recuperate indigeneity in order to express its difference – and, accordingly, its independence – from the mother country.53

Wolfe goes on to explain the way Aborginal motifs are borrowed by the state government in their sports teams, films, airlines, etc, a process that can be recognized in Hawai‘i.54

The settler ideology in Hawai‘i creates a settler imaginary. KarenKosasa explains that “settler imaginary encourages settlers to “misrecognize” the colony as a democratic space of opportunity, but in doing so it allows us to avoid the fact of colonialism and the subjugation of indigenous peoples.”55 Consequently, if historical representations about Native Hawaiians addressed the issues of colonization and Asian-settler colonization, it would provide an opportunity for settlers to learn of the ways that they too, contribute to the “subjugation of indigenous peoples”.56

1.6 State of Hawai‘i’s Discourse

Since the Washington Place is owned by the State of Hawai‘i, the discourse and meaning of the site presented by the State is privileged over other discourses. The discourse applied by the State of Hawai‘i is that of a settler ideology that conveniently lacks discussion of colonization. The State of Hawai‘i’s discourse reinforces a settler ideology that everyone in Hawai‘i, including the indigenous population, are settlers in the islands and entitled to equal

54 Ibid, 388.
56 Ibid, 196.
rights as immigrants and citizens of the United States. By addressing the inadequacy of the narrative of Washington Place to discuss colonization, this paper attempts to locate and expose the hidden and controversial meanings inherent at Washington Place with information gathered from tours of Washington Place, interviews with docents regarding the script of the tour, and interactions with guests during events held at the site.

Critiquing the discourse of Washington Place reveals the constraints of which discourse is allowed to prevail and which is restricted. Contradicting discourses are silenced or downplayed, exposing who holds the power to share what knowledge is to function as truth. The survival of the State, as an entity, requires that other voices and discourses that may challenge their survival be silenced. Thus, if the museum portion of Washington Place addressed the colonization of the indigenous population of Hawai‘i, this discourse would undermine the State, and allow for greater legitimization for Native Hawaiian self-determination.

It is important to distinguish between a colonial and settler-colonial discourse that is prevalent in Washington Place. While both are visible and intertwined, there is a distinguishable difference between the two interpretations. When I refer to a colonial discourse, I am referring to the colonization of Hawai‘i by the United States. A colonial interpretation does not acknowledge the act of colonization or the negative effects that colonization has had upon the indigenous population. Thus, the colonial interpretation at Washington Place, does not acknowledge the illegal overthrow of the Hawaiian Kingdom, and lacks a discussion about the political and economic investments in the islands. A settler-colonial interpretation focuses on elimination. A comprehensive examination of the logic of elimination in settler-colonialism is
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too broad of a topic; this paper focuses more particularly on the way a settler-colonial discourse in Washington Place eliminates from their historical narrative the Native Hawaiian demands and struggles for sovereignty. Washington Place museum is transformed into a democratic space that eliminates past and present Native Hawaiian demands for sovereignty by focusing instead on the social, political and economic achievements of the settler community.

The State’s discourse has colonial and settler-colonial interpretations as demonstrated at Washington Place. The rhetoric of the museum is that it is a preservation of Native Hawaiian culture, a cultural institution – the home of significant Native Hawaiian figure, Queen Liliʻuokalani- however the museum is political in its display and narrative.

1.7 History of Hawaiʻi

To fully understand the complexity of Washington Place, it is important to provide a brief background of Hawaiʻi’s history. The Hawaiian Islands were united in 1810 by Kamehameha I, creating the Kingdom of Hawaiʻi. The Kamehameha dynasty ruled the islands until 1872 when Kamehameha V died without an heir. Following his death, King David Kalākaua assumed the throne in 1874. When he passed, his sister, Liliʻuokalani, became the ruler in 1891, serving until January 17, 1893, when the Kingdom of Hawaiʻi was overthrown. The overthrow was initiated by a group of elite Caucasian businessmen in Hawaiʻi, the Committee of Safety, led by Lorrin A. Thurston, in response to the Queen’s attempt to promulgate a new constitution. As a result of the devastating changes that occurred under the 1887 Bayonet Constitution, requests were made to Queen Liliʻuokalani for change. In consultation with her advisers, the Queen drafted a new Constitution that would restore her power as sovereign ruler, decrease property requirements for voters, and help empower Native Hawaiians. The foreign oligarchy in Hawaiʻi consisted of
planters and businessmen economically invested in the islands and they felt threatened by the possible increase of the Queen’s power. They conspired with U.S. Minister John Stevens to land U.S. troops in the islands and proclaim themselves the Provisional Government of Hawai‘i.\(^{58}\)

Following the overthrow, a Provisional Government was established and Queen Lili‘uokalani temporarily yielded her authority to the United States Government to avoid violence and bloodshed until the American Government would reinstate her as sovereign ruler. The Queen wrote appeals to the President of the United States to restore her Kingdom and made personal voyages to the United States. She appealed to President Cleveland and, later, President McKinley to restore her Kingdom. The Queen, knowledgeable of international law, wrote letters that demonstrated her intelligence and expressed her rightful authority over the Kingdom of Hawai‘i.\(^{59}\)

Discontent about the overthrow reverberated throughout the Kingdom. The Native Hawaiian community organized to protest the 1893 coup. Organizations such as Hui Hawai‘i Aloha ‘Āina and the Hui Hawai‘i Aloha ‘Āina o Nā Wāhine wrote formal protests to the American Government for a restoration of their Kingdom and challenged accusations that the Kanaka Maoli (Native Hawaiians) were incapable of self-government.\(^{60}\) Protests continued in 1894, when the Republic of Hawai‘i was established. In 1896, when William McKinley was elected President of the United States, the Kanaka Maoli directed their protests towards the U.S. Congress.


\(^{59}\) Ibid, 172.
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Mass petition drives were formed by the Kanaka Maoli to protest the annexation of Hawai‘i. Signatures and support for this cause were gathered from the Kanaka Maoli from all the Hawaiian Islands. However, in the end, Hawai‘i was annexed illegally to the United States in 1898.

Once annexed, Hawai‘i became a territory of the United States. In 1945, Hawai‘i was listed as a Non Self-Governing Territory under the United States Administration. This was a trust relationship in which the U.S. was obligated to promote the political desires of the territory.61 In 1959, the citizens of Hawai‘i were allowed to vote to decide their political desires, but only two options were provided: territorial status or statehood. Neither Commonwealth nor independence were listed as options.62 In 1959, Hawai‘i became the 50th State of the United States of America. The trajectory leading up to Hawai‘i becoming a member of the United States is very controversial. The United States violated domestic and international laws. Thus, discontent over this issue still exists today. Understanding the historical basis for this discontent provides a different perspective for contemporary Native Hawaiian politics and struggles.

The presentation of contested meanings at Washington Place would educate visitors as well as inform them of the current political status of Native Hawaiians. Ownership by the State allows the Governor of Hawai‘i and, by extension, the State of Hawai‘i to attach itself to antiquity. Similar to the way Hawaiian royalty legitimized their rule through their lineage, the State of Hawai‘i attaches itself to Hawaiian royalty, in this case, Queen Lili‘uokalani, in an effort to legitimize the power of the State.

---
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1.8 Methods

The methods used in this research incorporate discourse analysis and visual culture theory combined with participant observation and interviews. Discourse analysis allows the researcher to look beyond the information displayed in a museum to interrogate the structures that craft and disseminate the knowledge. I hope to shed light on the following questions throughout this research paper:

1. How does the narrative of Washington Place perpetuate a colonial discourse?
2. What type of symbolic meaning is produced due to the site’s ownership by the State of Hawai‘i?
3. How does Washington Place contribute to the suppressing of the historical act of colonization and settler-colonization?
4. How did Bishop Museum’s Hawaiian Hall present a colonial discourse?
5. How did Hawaiian Hall incorporate a native narrative that addressed politically charged historical moments in Hawai‘i’s history?
6. How can Washington Place modify their exhibit to reflect the historical colonization and settler-colonization of Hawai‘i?

I apply Foucault’s discourse analysis and Stuart Hall’s application of that discourse analysis to the museum setting. Critical discourse analysis combined with visual culture theory will be applied to the narratives featured at both Washington Place and Hawaiian Hall prior to and after the renovation. As summarized by Stuart Hall, Foucault believed that,

discourse...constructs the topic. It defines and produces the objects of our knowledge. It governs the way that a topic can be meaningfully talked about and reasoned about. It also influences how ideas are put into practice and used to regulate the conduct of others. Just as discourse ‘rules in’ certain ways of talking about a topic, defining an acceptable and intelligible way to talk, write, or conduct oneself, so also by definition, it ‘rules out’,
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limits and restricts other ways of talking, of conducting ourselves in relation to the topic or constructing knowledge about it.\textsuperscript{63}

A critical discourse analysis will help to determine what information is discussed, suppressed, and manipulated, and reveal the discourse that is allowed to prevail, thus exposing the power dynamics of the museum display. Discourse analysis and visual culture theory are also applied to a critique of the renovated Hawaiian Hall. To limit the data to a workable amount, I focused my critique on the interpretation of Native Hawaiian culture and the political events that led to the end of the Hawaiian Kingdom.

1.9 Data Set

For an analysis of the history at Washington Place, the Queen’s biography and First Lady Jean Ariyoshi’s memoir are used as primary sources of my research. In \textit{Hawaii's Story by Hawaii's Queen}, the Queen’s writings provide a personal narrative of events that occurred in her lifetime. Her biography outlines the overthrow of her beloved Kingdom, her imprisonment, and the struggles and efforts taken on her part to seek the legal restoration of her Kingdom. Included in these historical moments are stories about her feelings toward her home, Washington Place, and events that occurred there. An understanding of life at Washington Place once it had become a Governor’s Mansion is provided by Jean Ariyoshi’s memoir, \textit{Washington Place: A First Lady’s Story}. Included in this work are details of past First Ladies of Hawai‘i and their influence and contribution to Washington Place. Ariyoshi was the First Lady to spearhead the renovation and redesign of the museum portion of Washington Place that exists today. She also provides stories of life at Washington Place, including her emotions toward the site, political guests who visited, and personal life in Washington Place.

Another vital source to the paper is *Washington Place: Historic American Buildings Survey*. This book provided an understanding of Washington Place as a National Historic Landmark, and includes information on the site’s architecture, design, renovations, and historical significance. This detailed account of the site provides an equally detailed account of the occupants of the house and each physical addition to the home. Since Washington Place is recognized by the United States as a National Historic Landmark, this piece of work provided an understanding of how and why Washington Place was selected to be a National Historic Landmark in the eyes of the United States.

For an analysis of Hawaiian Hall prior to renovation, Marjorie Kelly’s PhD dissertation, “Memory Banks and Political Ranks: Looking at Culture at Hawaii’s Bishop Museum,” is used as the primary source of my research. Her dissertation is a comprehensive critique of the content, design, layout, and display of Hawaiian Hall. I focus on her critique of content provided about Queen Liliʻuokalani at Hawaiian Hall.

### 1.10 Internship at Washington Place

My research methodology also includes qualitative research. During the Fall of 2011, I was privileged to be an Executive Branch Intern with Governor Abercrombie’s Communication’s Department. I was informed that, due to my interest and background in museum studies, I would be placed at Washington Place. The directors of the department explained Governor Abercrombie’s desire to make Washington Place more accessible to the public. The directors and I determined that I would work on historical research for the Washington Place website, a project that allowed me to navigate around security issues at Washington Place and tours that were offered only once a week. However, due to various
reasons, the website project was cancelled. Since the curator had liked the idea of making
Washington Place more accessible through the internet, she came up with an idea to create a
historical timeline of Washington Place. Consequently, my internship focused on researching
the history of the site.

My internship began in September 2011 and ran until December 2011. I dedicated at
least ten hours each week to assist the curator in addition to staffing functions held at
Washington Place.

1.11 Participant Observation

I conducted participant observations while on tours and during events. A few of the
events that I helped to staff are listed in the table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Event Hours</th>
<th>Type of Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 2, 2011</td>
<td>8:30am-1:30pm</td>
<td>Queen Lili‘uokalani’s Birthday Celebration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 8, 2011</td>
<td>10am-2pm</td>
<td>Overseeing floral decorations/set up of house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 10, 2011</td>
<td>3pm-9pm</td>
<td>Washington Place Foundation Benefit Dinner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2, 2011</td>
<td>10am-2pm</td>
<td>Children &amp; Youth Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 18, 2011</td>
<td>6pm-8pm</td>
<td>Hawaii International Film Festival (HIFF) Reception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 28, 2011</td>
<td>2pm-4pm</td>
<td>Teacher of the Year Awards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 4, 2011</td>
<td>9am-11:30am</td>
<td>Department of Hawaiian Home Lands (DHHL) Leadership Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 7, 2011</td>
<td>11am-1:30pm</td>
<td>Baker Tilly Spouse Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 8, 2011</td>
<td>6pm-9pm</td>
<td>Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) Sponsoring Organizations Reception Dinner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 13, 2011</td>
<td>12pm-1:30pm</td>
<td>Department of Business, Economic Development &amp; Tourism (DBEDT) China Luncheon (APEC Related)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 8, 2011</td>
<td>10:45am-11:40am</td>
<td>QLCC Molokai Tour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 9, 2011</td>
<td>11am-3pm</td>
<td>Attorney General’s Office Holiday Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 16, 2011</td>
<td>5:30pm-8:30pm</td>
<td>Washington Place Foundation Open House</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While at these events, I was able to witness how visitors interacted with docents and the museum, and, more specifically, note the types of questions that the visitors asked the docents. As an observer, I was able to witness who took an interest in the history at some events and who was just there for the party on the patio. Docents were typically required to attend every event – the quantity dependent on the size of the function. Almost all of the functions were held on the covered lanai. The Governor often spoke at these events, and during his remarks he always acknowledged the historical significance of the event site.

1.12 Docent Interviews and Data

I conducted formal and informal interviews. The formal and structured interviews were held with the docents. Structured interviews with docents about the script narrative provided an understanding of the narrative that was provided for docents to share with the public. The list of questions that I prepared for the docents included:

1. How and when did you become a docent at Washington Place? Are you a docent at any other museum?
2. As a docent, are you paid or are your services voluntary?
3. When did tours of Washington Place first begin?
4. What is the narrative that accompanies the tour?
5. Who created the narrative for the docents to tell?
6. When there are functions held at Washington Place, are the guests usually interested in hearing the history of the site?
7. In all your years of experience as being a docent during functions at Washington Place, which history is of particular interest to visitors, the house’s function as a Governor’s Mansion or the fact that the residence of a Queen?

8. In your interaction with people, do most know that Washington Place was once the residence of Queen Lili‘uokalani?

9. How do you think that Washington Place, being on the site of where the Governor lives, makes visiting Washington Place difficult for the public?

10. In your personal opinion, how do you think that the community can relate to Washington Place?

11. Have you notice any changes in the types of function held at Washington Place or narrative told at Washington Place with the change in administrations? How do you think different administrations have or nor influenced Washington Place?

12. In your mind, which administration do you feel contributed most, in either the preservation of Washington Place or the opening of the house to the public?

Docents are knowledgeable resources because they are experts in the history of the house and they interact with a plethora of people during events and tours. At the time I was an intern, there were approximately 15 active docents. It was difficult to get all of the docents to commit to structured interviews. Some did not want to participate and others were too busy. As hesitant as some may have been to participate in structured interviews, the docents were very easy to talk to and open to share their opinions about the management of Washington Place, the guests they encountered, and the different administrations the docents served under. As such, I was only able to secure two structured interviews, though these were with two of the most active docents.
I emailed the docents the questions I had prepared prior to my interview so that they were aware of the types of questions that I would be asking at our interview. When I met with the docents, I used a tape recorder and took notes of the conversation. Following the recorded interviews, I transcribed the entire conversation. While at events, I was able to perform unstructured, informal interviews with the other docents.

My structured interviews with the two docents provided insight on the narrative presented during the tours. In my interview with Docent 2, she provided me with a few of her personal documents, “Washington Place Docent/Tour Program as of Feb 2003,” “Descriptions of rooms occasionally used on display,” “The guideline for open house tours,” and “Washington Place Foundation: Docent Training, October 14, 2000 – The Tour Pattern”. I incorporated these documents into my research as well, since they provide a clear picture of how the narrative was standardized and presented.

1.13 Outline of Thesis

In chapter two, I discuss the unique and complex history of Washington Place. An emblem of Hawaiian history and political authority, Washington Place is a house in which the political and symbolic resonances are inherently conflicted. Washington Place has always been a part of the political and cultural landscape in Honolulu. However, an incomplete historical account of the house is provided. For the purpose of this paper, I will not focus on each individual inhabitant’s social and political understanding. Instead, based on the dual symbols of Washington Place, I will focus on the political desires of Queen Lili‘uokalani in comparison to the Territory/State of Hawai‘i. In doing so, I will demonstrate how the State’s colonial discourse is perpetuated and how it is allowed to prevail. Analyzing what knowledge is provided in the
narrative tour of the museum portion of Washington Place will reveal which information has been silenced and suppressed. This chapter attempts to answer why certain information is hidden and how such hidden information supports the image of the State of Hawai‘i’s discourse.

Another exhibit in Hawai‘i that encountered similar obstacles is Bishop Museum’s Hawaiian Hall. Similar to Washington Place, the display of Hawaiian Hall perpetuated a colonial discourse and portrayed the power dynamics in Hawai‘i during that time. It told a story of Native Hawaiians in a Western voice with an interpretation that illustrated the native community as a passive, static, and, ultimately, an extinct culture. In 2006, Hawaiian Hall closed for renovation to change this type of narrative and display. The newly renovated Hawaiian Hall reopened in 2009 and has been acclaimed for offering a Native Hawaiian perspective and voice, addressing the difficult and controversial moments in Hawai‘i’s history. Chapter three will provide a critique of Hawaiian Hall’s display prior to renovation to demonstrate the way the display of indigenous royalty aided in the perpetuation of a colonial discourse. The second part will explore the processes and the measures that were taken to incorporate a Native voice and display Hawaiian culture as a living culture instead of an extinct culture.

Chapter four will suggest ways to reinvent Washington Place. Hawaiian Hall provides a lens through which to view a potential transformation of Washington Place. An examination of the transformation of Hawaiian Hall and its incorporation of a native discourse and a native subject position will provide insight as to how Washington Place can combat its settler colonial discourse.

The only way to liberate Washington Place from its colonial representation is to address Queen Lili‘uokalani’s struggles with the overthrow of the Hawaiian Kingdom and the annexation of Hawai‘i, and to include references to the contemporary struggles of Native Hawaiian
independence groups. As a historically significant figure, any type of museum display that features Queen Liliʻuokalani should show her respect through a comprehensive interpretation of her life. This paper argues for the co-existence of both narratives to accurately represent and memorialize the site and all the inhabitants of the house. Included in this chapter will be suggestions to increase community involvement and understanding at Washington Place through tours, signage, and events.
CHAPTER 2 – WASHINGTON PLACE

2.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to problematize the contemporary politics of indigenous representations at Washington Place, and deconstruct the State of Hawai‘i’s privileged discourse. Through a historical analysis of Washington Place - the structure, inhabitants, and museum display - this chapter will pave the way for a discussion about the colonial discourse perpetuated at Washington Place.

The current Governor of Hawai‘i, Neil Abercrombie, frequently mentions in his public rhetoric that Washington Place is the Queen’s home and not a Governor’s Mansion. This public gesture can be interpreted as an attempt to disguise the colonial and settler-colonial discourse that is perpetuated at Washington Place by focusing on only one of the identifications of Washington Place, that of Queen Lili‘uokalani’s home, which has been transformed into a symbolism of indigenous sovereignty. However, there are multiple meanings of the home, meanings that are conflicted. While Washington Place is memorialized as Queen Lili‘uokalani’s home, it also functioned as a home for the Governors of Hawai‘i and their families. The social, economic, and political complexities of the residents of Washington Place have added layer upon layer of meaning to the house. As stated by Eilean Hooper-Greenhill, “meaning is dense and multi-layered.”64 The current narrative at Washington Place is fragmented, focusing on only one side of a complex story to distract from the colonization of the indigenous population in Hawai‘i. The stories provided about Queen Lili‘uokalani are aspects of her life that are manipulated to support the State of Hawai‘i’s discourse of Hawai‘i as a racially harmonious settler community.
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Exploring the narrative presented during a tour of Washington Place demonstrates the selectivity of information provided to accomplish this task.

The State of Hawai‘i’s discourse is one that omits a discussion about the political history of the overthrow, annexation, and Statehood of Hawai‘i. The discourse of the State of Hawai‘i creates and maintains an image of a seamless and peaceful transition from the Kingdom of Hawai‘i to Statehood, as exemplified in the changeover of Washington Place from the home of Queen Lili‘uokalani to an executive mansion for the Governors of Hawai‘i. The State’s discourse also promotes an imaginary that everyone in Hawai‘i, including the indigenous population, are settlers to the islands, and thus everyone is entitled to the same rights as citizens of the United States.

The discourse perpetuated at Washington Place influences the way that Queen Lili‘uokalani and the State of Hawai‘i are understood. Since “meaning and meaningful practice are constructed within discourse,” a particular discourse that is perpetuated at a museum is privileged with the power to define a culture, the meaning of that culture, and ways that a culture can be discussed.

2.2 Structure of Washington Place

Washington Place is an attractive white, two-story home built between 1841-1847 for New England sea Captain John Dominis and his family. Unfortunately, Captain John Dominis was never able to enjoy the home because he was lost at sea in 1846 while on a voyage to China. His wife, Mary Dominis, saw to the completion of the house. Today, Washington Place still
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maintains its original style characteristics and is representative of a nineteenth century Greek revival home. The interior of the home maintains its original Georgian plan with the lower level still consisting of its four parlors, central hall, and grand staircase made of Koa wood. However, alterations have been made to Washington Place. Most modifications occurred after the site’s purchase by the Territory of Hawai‘i to accommodate the Governors and their families. Most of the alterations occurred in the early and mid-twentieth century, Governors and their families wanted to ensure that they would still have privacy though they lived in a public setting. In her memoir, former First Lady Jean Ariyoshi’s outlines the structural changes that were a result of the families that resided in the home. In 1922, Mrs. Farrington added the porte cochere, state dining room, and the enclosed lanai. In the early 1950s, Mrs. Long saw to the building of a garage and servants’ quarters. Mrs. King added the patio, which is now the covered lanai, a kitchen, pantry, emergency fire staircase outside the dining room, a governor’s office outside the Queen’s bedroom, and modernized the upstairs bath and dressing rooms. The Quinn’s saw to the creation of a family recreation room over the lanai roof. Mrs. Burns added an upstairs study and enlarged the kitchen to include an informal dining area for the family and staff.

2.3 Inhabitants of Washington Place

The inhabitants of Washington Place have imbued the site with multiple meanings. Those who have produced the most lasting meanings are Queen Lili‘iuokalani and the Governors of Hawai‘i. For the purpose of this thesis, I group together the Governors of Hawai‘i and their

alliance with the United States’ political desires for the colonization of Hawaii. While each Governor held different perspectives on governing styles of Hawai‘i, I am mainly concerned with the Queen’s political desires for sovereignty in contrast to the Governors of Hawai‘i political agendas that participate, knowingly or unknowingly, in the colonization and settler colonization of the islands. It can be argued that the Governors of Hawai‘i participate in the colonization and settler colonization of Hawai‘i through their lack of acknowledgement of colonization and settler colonization in the historical narrative of Washington Place. The opposing political stances of the Queen and the Governors of Hawai‘i have caused the meanings of the site to be inherently conflicted.

In 1824, Captain John Dominis married Mary Lambert Jones of Boston. He relocated his wife and son to Honolulu in 1837. John Owen Dominis was born in Schenectady, New York in 1832, but grew up at Washington Place. When Captain John Dominis was lost at sea in 1846, Mary Dominis converted the lower floor of the home into private apartments to provide for her and her son. Coincidentally, the name for Washington Place was suggested by one of the renters of those apartments. It was suggested by American Commissioner Anthony Ten Eyck that the home be called Washington Place in honor of George Washington.

Born of the highest chiefly rank, Lydia Lili‘u Loloku Walania Kamaka‘ehe Pākī, later known as Queen Lili‘uokalani, was born on September 2, 1838. John Owen Dominis and Lili‘uokalani were married on September 16, 1862. Washington Place was the home where

---

70 Hays, 15.
71 Ibid, 15.
72 Ibid, 18.
73 Ibid, 17.
75 Lili‘uokalani, Hawaii’s Story by Hawaii’s Queen (Honolulu: Mutual Publishing, 1990), 1.
76 Ibid, 22.
they started their life together.77 When Mary Dominis, Lili‘uokalani’s mother-in-law was alive, she resided at Washington Place and Lili‘uokalani did not live there exclusively. Lili‘uokalani owned other properties and traveled between her other dwellings.78 She was chosen as heir apparent to the throne of Hawai‘i in 1877 by her brother, King Kalākaua, and given the title H.R.H. Lili‘uokalani.79 When Mary Dominis passed away in the month of April of 1889, Lili‘uokalani was able to transform Washington Place into her home.80

While on a voyage to the United States, Lili‘uokalani’s brother, King Kalākaua, died. On 29 January 1891, his remains arrived to Honolulu and Lili‘uokalani ascended to the throne.81 Shortly after becoming Queen she suffered another loss when her husband fell ill. On 27 August 1891, only seven months after she had ascended to the throne, her husband died.82 Lili‘uokalani inherited the Kingdom during difficult economic and political times. On 17 January 1893, the Hawaiian Kingdom was overthrown and the Provisional Government was then established.

In January 1895, Queen Lili‘uokalani was arrested at Washington Place for her alleged knowledge of a resistance against the established government of the Republic of Hawai‘i. She was put on trial and imprisoned at ‘Iolani Palace for about eight months.83 She was notified of her release from imprisonment on the 6th of September when she was notified by Colonel McLean that he was no longer responsible for her custody.84 After her release from imprisonment at ‘Iolani Palace, the Queen was held under house arrest at Washington Place for
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several months. On 6 February 1896, Lili‘uokalani was released from her parole as prisoner, yet she was still forbidden to leave the island of O‘ahu. In October 1896, Lili‘uokalani received a document which she explains, “purported to be an entire release of all restrictions, an absolute pardon, and a restoration of my civil rights.” Once able to leave O‘ahu, Lili‘uokalani made trips to the United States in an attempt to restore her Kingdom. She returned to Hawai‘i unsuccessful and the Hawaiian Islands were annexed by the United States in 1898. Following annexation, Queen Lili‘uokalani continued to reside at Washington Place, remaining an advocate for the rights of her people. In November 1917, she died at Washington Place.

Following her death, her nephew, Prince Jonah Kūhiō Kalani‘anaole, suggested that Washington Place be used as an Executive Mansion by the territorial government. In the interim before Washington Place was purchased by the Territory, Governor McCarthy leased the property from the trustees. Thus, between 1922 and 2002, Hawai‘i’s territorial and state governors lived in the house with their families. Territorial Governor’s included Charles McCarthy (1918-21), Wallace Farrington (1921-29), Lawrence Judd (1929-34), Joseph Poindexter (1934-42), Ingram Stainback (1942-51), Oren Long (1951-1953), and Samuel King (1953-1957). When statehood was approved by U.S. Congress in 1959, William Quinn was the last Territorial Governor (1957-59) and the first governor of the state (1959-62). Following him were John Burns (1962-74), George Ariysohi (1974-86), John Waiheʻe (1986-94), and Benjamin Cayetano (1994-2002).
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The Governors and their families, while occupying Washington Place, always acknowledged the legacy of the Queen. The First Ladies took it upon themselves to see to the maintenance of the site and many of those women contributed a great deal to the preservation of the historic home. In the book, “The First Ladies of Hawai‘i,” Nancy Quinn wrote of her experience at Washington Place that the “door was always open in Washington Place and all kinds of people came wandering through...The Queen’s bedroom downstairs was for show.”

The second first lady of Hawai‘i, Beatrice Burns, restored the gardens of Washington Place. She also regularly took groups on tours of the first floor and garden. Toward the ending of her term she began the restoration of Washington Place. Mrs. Jean Ariyoshi, the third first lady led the restoration of Washington Place, particularly the four parlors of the museum portion on the first floor. She also initiated a docent program for the house with the help of Jim Bartels. With the help of Dr. Mary Ellen Des Jarlais and her students at the University of Hawai‘i, she cataloged and researched the objects of Washington Place. Vicky Cayetano, the fifth first lady of Hawai‘i celebrated her marriage to Governor Benjamin J. Cayetano on 5 May 1997 at Washington Place. She is recognized as the founder of the Washington Place Foundation - a non-profit organization that raised money for the creation of a new Governor’s Mansion so that Washington Place could be further preserved. Washington Place remained the Governor’s official residence until 2002, when the Cayetano family became the first family to reside in a new residence located directly behind Washington Place.
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2.4 Washington Place as a Museum

Mrs. Jean Ariyoshi has been credited with the design and redecoration of the museum portion of Washington Place. Ariyoshi went through great lengths to appropriate funds and recreate an image of the four parlors reminiscent of the eras of the Queen’s life. Ariyoshi states,

my overwhelming sense of stewardship from the day I moved into Washington Place led me to pursue other gifts for the Queen...the redecoration and restoration of Washington Place...the cataloging of all the historical items in the home and...the return of the Queen’s possessions to her home. I wanted to give the Queen a home that all Hawai‘i could be proud of and I wanted to share the home with the people of Hawai‘i.  

Ariyoshi enlisted the help of interior designer Phyllis Spalding Bowen to guide the restoration of the historic interiors. Bowen had helped Bea Burns redo the State Dining Room, thus Ariyoshi saw it fitting to contact her with her project ideas. An estimated $85,000 was determined necessary to redecorate the four parlors – the Mary Dominis Parlor, the Blue Room, the Queen’s Room, and the Music Room – and the ground level with an additional $45,000 to redecorate the upper level. The 1975 Legislature granted Ariyoshi the funds to complete the renovation project.

Presently, the museum portion occupies the first floor of Washington Place. The second floor is closed to the public with a few of the rooms utilized as office space for workers. The main rooms visited on the tour are the Reception Room, also known as the Mary Dominis Parlor, the Music Room, also known as Queen Lili‘uokalani’s Parlor, the Queen’s Bedroom, the Blue Room, and the State Dining Room. The Mary Dominis Parlor is reminiscent of the 1847-1870s. On the docent tour and in the script, Mary Dominis is the central topic for this room. Guests to the home are informed that the parlor,
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reflects the home’s early period, when Mary Dominis entertained sea captains and other visitors who brought the latest news from abroad. The furniture is in the Rocco Revival style which was at its height during the very time Mary Dominis first made the 150-day voyage from New York around South America to the Hawaiian Islands.98

Docents point out the two portraits located on the wall of two young ali‘i painted by Robert Dampier. The young man is named Karaikapa and the young lady is Tetuppa.99 Directly across the Mary Dominis Room is the music room known as Queen Liliʻuokalani’s Parlor. This room is reminiscent of the 1890s. It consists of Hawaiian kahilis - symbols of royalty, rare feather leis, and the Queen’s piano, which was custom made for her with koa logs.100 Docents focus on the Queen as a famous poet and talented composer and musical artist. This room celebrates the musical contributions of the Queen and her legacy as an artist.

In the hall that leads to the Queen’s Bedroom, guests pass a glass cabinet that houses mementos, personal possessions, and pictures related to Queen Liliʻuokalani. Artifacts in the case include an “Aloha” bracelet woven from the hair of Pāki, the adoptive mother of Liliʻuokalani, and a turtle shell comb from Konia, Liliʻuokalani’s adoptive father. The artifacts in the case are identified by accompanying labels. The connection between the assortment of objects and the museum is that the objects in the case had at one point been either used or displayed in Washington Place following Liliʻuokalani’s marriage to John Dominis. At this point in the tour, docents point out the Koa staircase, which leads to the second floor, but is closed off to the public. When entering the Queen’s Bedroom the focal point of the room is her bed. It is the same bed in which the Queen died. Docents explain that her bedroom was moved downstairs when it became difficult for her to go up the stairs and that this bed was the bed she

---

98 “Open House Tour Format” (docent training materials, Washington Place, Date unknown), 2.
99 Ariyoshi, 111.
100 “Open House Tour Format,” 3.
died in on 11 November 1917. Another story that docents tell about the Queen’s bed is that the height of the bed was taller when the Queen was alive, however one of the First Lady’s tragically had the legs sawed off the bed to make it easier for her to access. Upon hearing this story, most guests are shocked that Governors and their families had used this bed.

The next room visited on the tour is the State Dining Room. The focus in this room is the large portrait of Queen Lili‘uokalani located in the center of the room. The portrait is a reproduction of the original Lili‘uokalani portrait commissioned in 1891 by William Cogswell for ‘Iolani Palace. Docents point out the large portrait and connect it to the original portrait located in ‘Iolani Place. They also tell funny anecdotes of dignitaries, emperors, kings, queens, and presidents that were entertained in that very room by Governors of Hawai‘i. The Blue Room is located across of the State Dining Room. The Blue Room is reminiscent of the 1830s-1980s. It is decorated largely with Chinese furniture that had been gathered from the house by Mrs. Ariyoshi in the 1970s and 1980s. The blue room functioned as a diplomatic reception room. While on the tour, docents highlight the pieces of furniture in the room and also the famous diplomats that were at one time entertained in that room. In the hall between the State Dining Room and the Blue Room there are portraits of the Governors and their families that have resided at Washington Place; the last portrait is of Governor Cayetano and his family since they were the last executive family to reside in the house. Most tours conclude in the glassed lanai where visitors can continue to ask docents further questions.

The image of Washington Place that is projected to the public is that it is the Queen’s Home. As emphasized by Governor Neil Abercrombie, Washington Place is a Queen’s Home and not a Governor’s Mansion. However, the narrative at Washington Place does not reflect this 101

101 “Open House Tour Format,” 3.
purported image. Instead, the narrative of Washington Place focuses on the home and its subsequent residents. The political complexities of the transition of Washington Place from the Queen’s Home to an executive mansion is excluded from the narrative making for an inadequate historical narrative. The inherent contradictions are conveniently eliminated and visitors are persuaded to accept the narrative at Washington Place as the natural historical progression.

2.5 Docent Data

Tours of Washington Place are offered by docents every Thursday morning by reservation. Docents are trained in the historical significance of the house, from a script largely created by Mrs. Ariyoshi and Jim Bartels. In an interview with Docent Two,¹⁰² she explained that “much of the information came from the program created by Mrs. Ariyoshi and supplemented by information Jim found.”¹⁰³ Mrs. Ariyoshi contacted Jim Bartels, the curator of ‘Iolani Palace at that time, to help develop a docent script following the completion of the renovation of Washington Place. During the Ariyoshi administration, Mrs. Ariyoshi and volunteers led tours of Washington Place. What remains today of the museum was the result of Ariyoshi’s dedication and research, paired with the historical information provided by Jim Bartels.

The docents at Washington Place have a passion for Hawai‘i’s history, demonstrated by their vast knowledge of Hawai‘i that extends beyond the narrative of Washington Place. Some of the docents are also docents at ‘Iolani Palace, which means that they participated in the historical training program for docents provided at that museum. Recruiting docents from ‘Iolani

¹⁰² In order to keep the names of the docents that I interviewed anonymous, I will refer to each as Docent One and Docent Two.
¹⁰³ Docent Two, interview by author, 26 February 2012, Honolulu, tape recording, University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa, Honolulu.
Palace was strategic. In a document provided by Docent Two, titled, “Washington Place Docent/Tour Program as of Feb 2003,” it explains how the,

docent program began in January 2000. Jim recruited us from ‘Iolani Palace. He wanted only active ‘Iolani Palace docents. His thinking was that we already had a good background in Hawaiian history, which mean he did not have to start at the very beginning and could begin with the history of Washington Place.  

Since Jim Bartels was originally the curator of ‘Iolani Palace in 1975, he was acquainted with the docents at that museum. Bartels resigned as curator in 1998 and became Washington Place director in 1998. When he passed away in 2003, Corinne Chun Fujimoto was appointed as the new curator for Washington Place.

During my interviews, the docents demonstrated that they were aware of the political history of Hawai‘i and the Queen; however, when I enquired about the historical narrative at Washington Place, their responses echoed the narrative script. If a guest inquired further about the complex politics of the site, docents were willing to share their wealth of knowledge, but due to time constraints on tours or at functions, a shortened version was always provided. Through the interviews, my personal observations, and analysis of the documents provided by Docent Two, I was able to deconstruct the State of Hawai‘i’s discourse at Washington Place, which downplayed and often omitted the political events of the overthrow, annexation, and transition to statehood.

104 “Washington Place Docent/Tour Program as of Feb 2003” (docent training materials, Washington Place, Date unknown), 1.
In the document, “Washington Place Foundation Docent Training–The Tour Pattern” it is written of the Diamond Head Parlor, also referred to as the music room or Queen Lili‘uokalani’s Parlor,

Liliuokalani redecorates after Mary’s death, brings Hawaiian items and sense of responsibility, her music, becomes queen, is deposed, arrested, imprisonment, and return home (a very short story – this is a story of her home not her political life), parole, balance of her life. Stories about kids visiting.\textsuperscript{107}

This statement emphasizes that the Queen’s political life should not be discussed in length. The contradiction of this statement and the museum is apparent – if the story of Washington Place is supposed to be of the house as the Queen’s home, then the portraits of the Governors and their families that hang in the museum should be removed. A more appropriate narrative about the Queen’s home would incorporate the historical political events that occurred in her life time and that have also come to define this significant woman. Given that those events are eliminated there is a gap in the narrative that is filled with stories of Governors and their families who have resided in the house. Since the discourse at Washington Place attempts to downplay any type of conflict, an incomplete and fragmented narrative is presented.

The statement above emphasizes to docents that Washington Place is the Queen’s home and Governor Abercrombie’s public rhetoric echoes the same idea. However, placing this statement within the context of the actual museum tour, only two rooms on the tour can be directly linked to Queen Lili‘uokalani – her bedroom and the Queen’s parlor. The first room on the tour focuses on Mary Dominis and although the focal point for the State Dinning Room is the large portrait of Queen Lili‘uokalani, the State Dinning Room was an addition made to the original structure during the territorial period. The history of the Blue Room is that it was

created by Mrs. Ariyoshi. Of the Blue Room, Docent One stated, “it was just an ordinary room and then I believe it was Mrs. Ariyoshi who made it into what we not call it, a protocol room, I call it a protocol room.”

In her memoir, Ariyoshi states, “some of the Chinese furniture was upstairs, some on the landing, some in hallways. I decided to mass it all together in what became the Blue Room. We lightened the heaviness with a simple blue and white color scheme.” Ariyoshi’s statement lends the impression that the narrative script created for Washington Place followed the redesign of the museum portion. In other words, instead of first developing a historical narrative of Washington Place and designing a museum around that narrative, it appears that a narrative was developed as a result of the way the museum was redecorated. When I enquired with the docents if they thought that the rooms of the museum were replications of eras during the Queen’s life Docent One responded, “probably not, you know things change so much over the years and the first ladies decorated in the ways they wanted to.”

When plaques were used, it is written of Queen Lili‘uokalani’s Parlor, “although she was loved by many people her time as Queen was short and sad. For 24 years afterwards she lived in Washington Place and still guided the Hawaiian community.” Docent Two explained that,

This is, um plaques we put up in home for an open house. I think the first time we used them was when the Foundation had a fundraiser for the new house. So it was like 2000, 2001? These are really lengthy descriptions of each of the room. And I don’t think anyone is interested in reading this much information, to be honest with you...they were put up so people can have information without having to depend on the docents...The docents wanted it continued when Corrine became curator but she wanted to edit. And I

108 Docent One, interview by author, 23 January 2012, Honolulu, tape recording University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa, Honolulu.
109 Ariyoshi, 103.
110 Docent One, interview by author, 23 January 2012, Honolulu, tape recording, University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa, Honolulu.
111 “Plaques for Open House,” (docent training materials, Washington Place, Date unknown), 1.
don’t think there is anything wrong with it. I think she thought maybe that they were too long and some of the volunteer...was working on a revision to shorten it...But it never seems to have gone back up. But then again I wouldn’t know because I’m not in the house when it would be appropriate for them to put up.112

During my internship at Washington Place, I did not see these plaques in the museum. However, the information provided for the open house plaque of the Queen’s Parlor is a little disturbing because it completely glosses over the political history of Hawai‘i and the Queen. From this plaque, the viewer is provided with no understanding of why her time as Queen was cut short. The State’s discourse is perpetuated by this plaque because the description provides a seamless transition from the Kingdom of Hawai‘i to the State of Hawai‘i and omits a discussion about political history.

Another document that I was offered was a handout that docents were provided with for an open house format. Docent Two stated, “This was more detailed...I’m pretty sure this is something that Jim wrote, but I’m not sure because I don’t have a date on it. Um, but it was a format to be used when we had open houses and stationary docents instead.”113 In this document, of the Queen it was written, “Lili‘uokalani becomes Queen in 1891, only to be overthrown in 1893, arrested in 1895, and imprisoned in ‘Iolani Palace for almost eight months. Thereafter, she lives in this home and elsewhere as a symbol of strength for her people.”114 Again, the description of the political aspect of the Queen’s life is short. Historical dates of events are provided but no further elaboration. In my experience as an intern, if there were stories relevant to the event being hosted or upcoming holiday, they were incorporated into the

112 Docent Two, interview by author, 26 February 2012, Honolulu, tape recording, University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa, Honolulu.
113 Docent Two, interview by author, 26 February 2012, Honolulu, tape recording, University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa, Honolulu.
114 “Open House Tour Format,” 3.
narrative. For instance, during the Christmas Open House, docents talk about Mary Dominis having the first Christmas tree on the island.

I was also interested in the way that docents interacted with guests that were at Washington Place for a function as opposed to a tour. Docent Two wrote in “Washington Place/Docent Tour Program as of Feb 2003,”

At one event we staffed the home with volunteers to do ‘tours’ to offer information and answer questions as guests were arriving for a meal. (Fundraiser for the Washington Place Foundation.) Most of them said hi or Aloha and headed straight for the bar. Having host/hostesses around to answer questions would be great but not necessary—posting the information in the rooms is most likely enough for the great majority of meal/reception guests.115

When I helped staff events at Washington Place, I, too, noticed that majority of the guests walked straight through the museum portion to the lanai where their function was being held. Since guests were welcomed through the front door, they were required to walk through the museum to get to their event. Of the guests that did take some time to view the exhibit, Docent Two explained that most guests were interested in Washington Place as the Queen’s home and the fact that “she is still caring for the community today via QLCC,” instead of the home as a Governor’s Mansion.116

When I asked Docent Two if the guests are usually interested in the history site, she responded,

Depends. Local residents only if they haven’t been in the house before. NonLocals sometimes, if there was a strong statement (in their program) about how special it is to be able to have their event in the home about how special the site is they are more interested.117

116 QLCC are acronyms for the Queen Liliʻuokalani Children’s Center. Docent Two, interview by author, 26 February 2012, Honolulu, tape recording, University of Hawaiʻi at Mānoa, Honolulu.
117 Docent Two, interview by author, 26 February 2012, Honolulu, tape recording, University of Hawaiʻi at Mānoa, Honolulu.
I also enquired about the background knowledge that most visitors have prior to visiting Washington Place. Docent One explained,

usually the people that tour the house are there because they’ve never been there before, and they don’t know anything about it. They don’t know the history of the Queen, the history of Hawaii. Now many times the local people will say, Yeah, I had Hawaiian history in fourth grade when they are already 53 or something. Um, very seldom do I get questions about the Governor, because normally at the foot of the stairs after we leave the glass case I mention that about 1923 on all the governors and their families lived upstairs and they don’t anymore of course because of the new home on the adjoining lot.\textsuperscript{118}

These responses that the docents provided are important because they demonstrate that most visitors to Washington Place are unaware of Hawai‘i’s history or have a basic understanding of that history. Subsequently, when they come to Washington Place for a tour, function, or open house, the knowledge that they receive from the tour is often unchallenged and allows for the perpetuation of the State’s discourse.

2.6 Performing a Colonial Narrative

The master narrative featured at Washington Place is the State’s discourse that is manifested within the site through a narrative that emphasizes a seamless transition of Washington Place from the home of Queen Lili‘uokalani to an executive mansion for the Governors of Hawai‘i. Since Washington Place is intimately connected to the governing structure in Hawai‘i, this transition of owners is representative of the transition from the Kingdom of Hawai‘i to Statehood. A political discussion of the Queen’s life is not discussed. As stated by Moira Simpson, “inaction can be interpreted as a political stance.”\textsuperscript{119} One reason why historical political moments are concealed could be because, if revealed, these moments would shed a negative light on the State and, by extension, the United States.

\textsuperscript{118} Docent One, interview by author, 23 January 2012, Honolulu, tape recording, University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa, Honolulu.

\textsuperscript{119} Simpson, 37.
In the United States, exhibits that focus on indigenous peoples and African Americans have faced the difficult task of exhibiting conflicting histories, because confronting negative historical incidents such as slavery, genocide, and colonialism portray a negative image of the United States and are based on democratic opportunities for all peoples. The fragmented histories presented in the museums owned or funded by State or nation are attempts by those in power to uphold a particular image that fits into the schema of a national ideology. Admitting historical injustices committed by the United States toward the indigenous populations and African Americans disrupts the ideology of America as a nation of immigrants. The idea of a nation of immigrants is an ideology also propagated in the State of Hawai‘i. Native Hawaiian scholar, Haunani Kay Task explains that Native peoples and African Americans challenge these types of immigrant ideologies.

The historical and contemporary realities of both African Americans and natives peoples, then, undercut the official ideology that the United States is a nation of immigrants….acknowledging the debt owed to African Americans contradicts and therefore undermines the official ideology of the United States as a nation of immigrants.¹²⁰

Trask’s argument references the American government's actions to address injustices towards immigrants as opposed to indigenous populations and African Americans. She argues that greater restitution is provided to immigrants than to Native peoples because tackling the wrongs committed against immigrants maintains the immigrant ideology and supports the image of a benevolent system created by the United States. On the other hand, acknowledging the wrongs committed against native peoples and African Americans depicts the United States in a negative light, thus attempts are made to conceal this information. If the government is hesitant

to address their negative involvement with African American’s and indigenous peoples, it leads one to question the difficulty federally funded museums may encounter when exhibiting similar stories.

The discourse of the State of Hawai‘i’s ignores the historical colonization of Native Hawaiians and focuses on protecting the rights of settlers “against each other and against the state.”\textsuperscript{121} This is the way that that colonization of the indigenous population and settler colonization is perpetuated in Hawai‘i and at Washington Place. Erasure and suppression is key. Some people are unaware of the settler colonialism and colonization of the indigenous population in Hawai‘i because attempts have been made to suppress this politically charged historical information.

Addressing the fragmented narrative presented at Washington Place is important since the site can be viewed as a microcosm of Hawai‘i’s history. Offering a comprehensive historical narrative of Hawai‘i is important because it informs and educates community members and visitors. The difficulty with providing only selected historical moments in a museum is that museums are considered to be sites of unquestionable truth. As stated by Puakea Nogelmeir,

\begin{quote}
this kind of power over knowledge is able to essentialize the people, define the field in which they exist, and completely frame the understanding about the entire subject. Left unchecked, the power-generated “knowledge” is internalized by the disempowered subjects of the discourse, the people themselves. In Hawai‘i, this insidious process has affected the place, the people, and their own perceptions of the past and present, as generations have internalized a modern power over knowledge.\textsuperscript{122}
\end{quote}

The current discourse encapsulated at Washington Place eliminates the complicated circumstances about the overthrow and annexation. The museum operates without a discussion

\begin{flushleft}\textsuperscript{121} Ibid, 25. \textsuperscript{122} Puakea Nogelmeir, \textit{Mai pa‘a i ka leo: Historical Voice in Hawaiian Primary Material: Looking Forward and Listening Back}, (Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press, 2010), 4.\end{flushleft}
of the political circumstances that occurred in the Queen’s life through an emphasis on the fact that Washington Place is a story about the Queen’s home and not her political life. It is evident from the narrative tour is that a master narrative of Washington Place solely as the Queen’s home is not possible. Washington Place should offer both discourses and symbolic meanings of the house, even though they conflict, instead of trying to create a united narrative with fragmented historical moments.

There may be a hesitation to present both discourses because it may be that in order for the State to survive as an entity, it requires that other voices and discourses that may challenge its survival be silenced. If the museum portion addressed the colonization of the indigenous population of Hawai‘i, this discourse might undermine the State and allow for greater legitimization of Native Hawaiian determination. However, the legacy of Washington Place is too rich and significant to the community of Hawai‘i to leave out certain historical moments.
CHAPTER 3 – BISHOP MUSEUM’S HAWAIIAN HALL

3.1 Introduction

Prior to the 2009 renovation, Hawaiian Hall presented a discourse that portrayed the Native community as static and extinct. A Native discourse was excluded from the historical presentation. However, following the renovation, the new exhibition demonstrated that Native Hawaiian culture is alive, adapting, and constantly evolving. The process of Hawaiian Hall’s transformation serves as a perfect example as to how Washington Place could incorporate a Native discourse by addressing the sensitive historical moments in Hawai‘i’s history. Since Bishop Museum is a private entity and Washington Place is a state institution, the factors that allowed for the renovation of Hawaiian Hall greatly differ from Washington Place. However, Hawaiian Hall’s renovation provides a lens to imagine a reinvention at Washington Place.

This chapter is a case study of Bishop Museum’s Hawaiian Hall. While there are many different factors that can be analyzed in Hawaiian Hall, the focus of this critique is on the perpetuation of the discourse of colonization through the representation of Hawaiian royalty. First, this chapter will analyze sources written about the content and display of Hawaiian Hall prior to renovation in order to examine how a colonial discourse was perpetuated and benefited the colonizing structure in the islands.\(^{123}\) The creation of Bishop Museum and the political turmoil in Hawai‘i are closely connected, and this link will also be critiqued. Additionally, I will analyze nineteenth century Western museums and the type of discourses fundamental in those museums since they were influential in the formation, layout, and goals of museums in Hawai‘i, beginning with the Hawaiian National Museum and Bishop Museum.

\(^{123}\) Since I have never visited Hawaiian Hall prior to renovation, this section will rely on sources that have researched and critiqued the exhibition.
The 2009 renovation of Hawaiian Hall demonstrates a shift in the function and purpose of museums. In the 21st century, museums have shifted towards better representing historical moments and controversial material of indigenous societies. In my examination of the renovated Hawaiian Hall, I analyze the ways that Hawaiian Hall transformed the discourse of the exhibit from a colonial representation to an exhibition that offers an indigenous discourse. This discourse empowered Native Hawaiians by enabling them to define who they are and how they would like others to perceive them, as Native Hawaiian groups were involved in the renovation.

This case study contributes to my larger research project because both sites, Washington Place and Hawaiian Hall, are intimately connected to Hawai‘i’s controversial history. Examining how staff members and contributors to Hawaiian Hall tackled sensitive issues and transformed the exhibit provides a framework to re-imagine Washington Place as a site that incorporates multiple narratives.

3.2 Hawaiian National Museum

Museums were a Western creation that functioned as symbols of a civilized, modern society. The purpose of museums is multi-functional: museums serve the needs of the government and cultural elite, portray a nation as civilized, are pedagogic institutions, and instill nationalism. Thus, smaller nations during the age of imperialism made attempts to appear modern according to Western standards by establishing museums. In Hawai‘i, prior to Bishop Museum, there existed the Hawaiian National Museum. Although short lived, this institution demonstrates the way that indigenous rulers in the Kingdom of Hawai‘i adapted Western museums practices because they understood the significance of having a museum in their society. The idea for a national museum in the Hawaiian Kingdom originated during the reign of
Kamehameha V, who signed into Law “An Act to Establish a National Museum of Archaeology, Literature, Botany, Geology, and Natural History of the Hawaiian Islands,” on July 1872. The preamble states,

Whereas, we as a nation, have taken our position among the civilized and enlightened nations of the earth, both in respect to capabilities in self-government and in the facilities as we enjoy in our high and common schools in the diffusion of popular intelligence; and whereas, a national museum representing the archaeology, literature, geology, and national history of our kingdom would be but another form of school for the education of our youth, as well as a repository for reference to the scientific world at large; and whereas, every succeeding year is rendering it more difficult to gather from the archives of the past the mementoes and relics of our early existence as a nation, as well as the pre-historic age of these islands.

Therefore be it enacted that the board of education be authorized to establish a national museum in some suitable government building or apartment to be provided by the minister of the interior, in which should be collected and preserved such articles illustrating the subjects named.”

Similar to other nineteenth century museums, one of the main functions of this museum was to legitimize rulers through the display of royal objects and artifacts. The Hawaiian National Museum was located in Aliʻiōlani Hale, a government building during that era. It was fully developed during the reign of King Kalākaua who strived to legitimize his rule, instill national pride, perpetuate cultural aspects, and demonstrate to the Western nations the modern and civilized nature of the Hawaiian Kingdom. He understood the symbolic effect that institutions such as museums could have in communities and he hoped to achieve this with the Hawaiian National Museum.

Stacy Kamehiro’s analysis of the Hawaiian National Museum demonstrates the way the historical narrative of the Hawaiian National Museum was centered on Hawaiian royalty, such as

---
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King Kamehameha, with little attention given to foreign contact, conflict, or involvement.\footnote{Ibid, 110.} Kamehiro explains that the “Hawaiian National Museum relied on objects’ metonymic and metaphoric references to the specific chiefs, events, and places to (re)collect a narrative of Hawaiian history that demonstrated the continuity and integrity of the nation.”\footnote{Ibid, 124-126.} The objects collected and displayed in the Hawaiian National Museum affirmed Hawaiian rule and legitimized the Hawaiian Nation.\footnote{Ibid, 110.}

Although some aspects of the museum were similar to Western museums, the discourse at the Hawaiian National Museum differed from those of Western museums. The way of ordering ancient history and science differed from classification by Western nation’s discourse of anthropological objects and artifacts. Kamehiro explains,

\begin{quote}
 in adopting the museums institution and natural history systems of knowledge, the indigenous elite aligned itself with the very imperial values and discourses of power and civilization that threatened Hawaiian independence and national parity. Yet, by insisting on a historical presence and thereby subverting the expectation of the (ethnological) collection, the museum redirected these discourses and undermined ahistorical scientific classifications.\footnote{Ibid, 126.}
\end{quote}

The indigenous rulers were able to appropriate particular functions and symbols of Western museums that demonstrated that the nation was modern and civilized, yet maintained its cultural heritage. Charles Bishop was also involved with the Hawaiian National Museum as he understood the significance of national museums. When the museum shut down, Bishop was able to acquire some of the artifacts from the Hawaiian National Museum and combine it with his personal collection of Hawaiian artifacts.
3.3 Bishop Museum

Charles Reed Bishop founded Bishop Museum in 1889 in memory of his late wife, Princess Bernice Pauahi Bishop. Bishop was an American from New York who arrived to Honolulu on October 12, 1846. While in Honolulu, he fell in love with Princess Bernice Pauahi, the great granddaughter of King Kamehameha, and the two were married in 1850. Mrs. Bishop passed away in 1884, and in her will she stated that her “property (which amounted to 375,569 acres or 1/9 of the kingdom of Hawaii) be used to found a school for (ethnically) Hawaiian children...Mrs. Bishop’s personal property, including her valuable collection of Hawaiian artifacts, was willed to her husband, Charles." Bishop had acquired an abundance of royal artifacts, those of his wife’s, and those she had inherited from Princess Keʻelikōlani and Queen Emma, the last three high-ranking female aliʻi of the Kamehameha dynasty. A “codicil of Emma’s will required Bishop to found a museum as a condition of his inheriting her collection of ‘native curiosities.’ Bishop announced in 1885 his plan for a museum to house the magnificent collection of kahili, calabashes, feather capes, and lei.

The political tensions that were present in Hawai‘i during the establishment of Bishop Museum are important to consider when examining discourses of power and colonization in Hawaiian Hall. The plantation economy was becoming more prosperous along with the infusion of foreign investment. There was also an increased threat of annexation of the islands to the United States. At this time, Bishop shifted the focus on Bishop Museum into a scientific establishment that concentrated on natives and nature in the Pacific instead of a focus on

---

Hawaiian royalty. In 1893, Bishop put his own money in a Trust for Bishop Museum for the study of nature and natives in the Pacific.\textsuperscript{133} The trustees agreed,

\begin{quote}
\textit{to use the revenue only in procuring objects belonging to and illustrative of the life habits and customs of the aboriginal inhabitants of the Islands of the Pacific Ocean and of the natural history of said Islands.}\textsuperscript{134}
\end{quote}

When Bishop Museum’s collection expanded to include artifacts and research in Polynesia, new annexes were built to accommodate the growing collections, one of which was Hawaiian Hall. In that same year, the Hawaiian Kingdom was illegally overthrown by the Committee of Safety. Following the overthrow, a Provisional Government was established until the islands were annexed by the United States in 1898. Coincidentally, those who participated in the overthrow and annexation of Hawai‘i were also members of the Board of Trustees for Bishop Museum. Sanford B. Dole, who was the President of the Provisional Government and the Republic of Hawai‘i, as well as the first territorial Governor of Hawai‘i, was elected to be Vice President of the Museum Trust in December 1896.\textsuperscript{135} Another connection that Dole had to Bishop Museum was through his longtime friendship with the first curator of Bishop Museum, William T. Brigham. When Bishop resigned his trusteeship, Dole was elected President of the Museum Trust on October 13, 1897.\textsuperscript{136} Dole’s close involvement with Bishop Museum, as well as his participation in the colonization of Hawai‘i, is representative of a colonizers involvement and investment in the scientific classification and representation of the indigenous cultures that they colonize.

\begin{footnotes}
\item[133] Ibid, 197.
\item[135] Ibid, 197.
\item[136] Ibid, 201.
\end{footnotes}
Dole’s involvement with Bishop Museum is an example of a colonizer who utilizes a museum to forge an association with the indigenous rulers and royalty through the preservation of their royal artifacts. This act is also representative of the paternalistic ideology that colonizers assert over indigenous populations as the protectors of the indigenous peoples, their culture, and their heirlooms.

The history of Bishop Museum and its predecessor, the Hawaiian National Museum, demonstrate two ways Native Hawaiian culture can be represented. The Hawaiian National Museum maintained a Native discourse that perpetuated Native Hawaiian cultural heritage instead of imitating Western scientific classifications. Bishop Museum, on the other hand, was a Western run institution with a collection of indigenous artifacts that classified indigenous people as scientific objects in natural history. Thus, the discourse manifested in both of these museums was one of power, though the power was asserted differently to suit particular needs of the cultural elite at that time.

3.4 Hawaiian Hall 1903-2006

As an internationally recognized museum, Bishop Museum was seen as the authority on Hawaiian cultural material, tradition, and history. As Kelly argues, the “museum’s near monopoly on Hawaiian material culture made it the final authority on cultural traditions.”\textsuperscript{137} The authoritative power that the leaders of Bishop Museum exercised as definers of Hawaiian cultural traditions was accepted as unquestionable truth.

The trustees of the Bishop Estate understood the pedagogical advantages of such a museum. A member on the board of trustees, who was also the first principal of Kamehameha

\textsuperscript{137}Kelly, “Memory Banks and Political Ranks: Looking at Culture at Hawaii’s Bishop Museum,” 104.
Schools, Dr. Reverend William Brewston Oleson expressed this ideology in an essay he wrote in February 1886, entitled “Hawaiian Antiquities.” He explained,

> It is well that the schools should emphasize the essential nobility of the privileges that civilization has conferred on Hawaiian youth. But to do this there must be an acquaintance with what was characteristic of the pagan past. The teacher should have at hand such accessories as can be found in almost any ordinary collection of Hawaiian antiquities…Let the native boys and girls of today see with their own eyes what the past has bequeathed that they may intelligently realize how inestimable are the blessings of the present. What an invaluable possession would a collection of kapas, war implements, tools, and household utensils be to such schools…Who will be the first to found a cabinet…?”

Before Bishop Museum was even created, the significance of a museum as a social, educational institution was envisioned. The museum was imagined to educate and inspire the indigenous youth to appreciate their present circumstances and view the past Hawaiian Kingdom and royalty negatively. The type of discourse that Oleson wrote about in his essay reflects a discourse of power and colonization that attempts to emphasize the benefits of colonization (without using the word), and the improvements that colonization has had for society by portraying the past, in this case, Hawaiian royalty and material culture, negatively. This was a strategy utilized by colonizers to legitimize their rule and presence in Hawai‘i. The colonizers were represented as paternalistic heroes that saved Hawaiians from their pagan past and enriched society with their presence, culture, and education, while informing audiences of the power structure and hierarchies in the islands.

The enormous collection of royal artifacts, instead of being praised as traditional, sacred, cultural heirlooms, served to separate royalty and commoners. The royal artifacts were made to represent the entirety of Hawaiian culture, and the demise of Hawaiian nobility could be

---

interpreted as the demise of the entire culture. Kaeppler also critiqued Bishop Museum and stated that in “most of these museums, objects are exhibited essentially as things associated with the chiefs and gods of old.” 139 Hawaiian royal artifacts were displayed in a museum setting and made to represent the entirety of Hawaiian culture. Subsequently, the deposing of the Hawaiian Kingdom and Hawaiian royalty translated into the death of Hawaiian culture. 140 Kelly explains that,

by turning royal possessions into artifacts and carefully preserving them, Bishop Museum literally did what the government claimed to do; namely, saved Hawaiians from destruction by putting them in an isolated, safe environment (in the government’s case, Hawaiian Homelands), while non-Hawaiians developed their former property into something else. Placed on a pedestal, Hawaiians were out of the political fray. 141

The display of royal possessions in a museum setting influenced the message transmitted to audiences. Placed on the museum floor, behind glass boxes, Hawaiian artifacts and culture was interpreted as a dying or extinct culture. Adaptations or changes that developed over time in Hawaiian culture were excluded from this message.

In regard to the influence that the layout had upon the overall meaning of the exhibit, Kelly argues that Hawaiian Hall lacked a holistic sense of indigenous life due to the segmentation of culture that was caused by the layout of the Hall. Kelly wrote that the “neglected condition of Hawaiian Hall is an accurate reflection of the political reality. Were one to rely on it for history of Hawaii’s indigenous people over the last hundred years, one might be forgiven for thinking that they all disappeared after the 1893 overthrow.” 142 According to Kelly, the condition of Hawaiian Hall could be interpreted as the way colonizers neglected the
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indigenous population in Hawai‘i. In this case, the visual setting communicated to audiences that colonizers were benevolent and paternalistic due to their preservation efforts; however, as Kelly argues, the neglect of care for the condition of the artifacts was representative of the political neglect of the Hawaiian people and culture.

Particularly relevant to Washington Place is the information that was provided about Queen Liliʻuokalani in Hawaiian Hall. Kelly explains that only bare facts were listed about the Queen, and the facts that were provided portrayed the Queen negatively. Since those who were involved in the overthrow were influential in the museum and the political sphere of Hawai‘i, the absence of this discussion and their involvement in the colonization of Hawai‘i perpetuated a colonial discourse. Colonization and those who participated in the colonization process are excluded from the discussion about the overthrow of the Hawaiian Kingdom. Kelly references the signage at Hawaiian Hall to demonstrate ways that the Queen was portrayed negatively, her determination to reassert absolute monarchial rule soon brought her kingdom to the brink of armed revolt, and she was deposed in January, 1893. After a brief experiment with republican government, Hawaii became an American Territory in 1900, and 59 years later joined the union as the fiftieth state."

This statement lends the impression that it was because of the Queen’s selfish desire for absolute monarchial rule that led to her being deposed. It creates an image of the Queen as an unstable leader that craved power and that her being deposed was for the better of the community. By “armed revolt,” the Queen is portrayed as a leader who almost brought war, bloodshed, and violence upon her Kingdom. Colonizers are positioned in a positive light, as guardians of the well-being of the community, and the Queen as a selfish and careless leader.
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The brief mention of the Queen being “determined to restore royal powers”\textsuperscript{144} does very little to address measures taken by the Queen to restore the Hawaiian Kingdom. “She was removed from office two years later by the business community,”\textsuperscript{145} downplays the manipulative and power hungry desires of the business community to gain power in the islands.

The display of the Queen along with other royal Hawaiian artifacts helped to perpetuate a discourse of power and colonization. The colonizing structure attempted to legitimize their rule in Hawai‘i by demonstrating through the museum, that indigenous rulers were incapable of rule in a modern world, at the same time, informing local, national, and international audiences of the power structures and hierarchies that existed in the islands.

\section*{3.5 Hawaiian Hall 2009-Present}

Hawaiian Hall closed for renovation in 2006 and reopened in 2009. The current version of Hawaiian Hall offers a Hawaiian cultural perspective and explores the progression of Hawaiian culture and history through various historical moments. Like the Hawaiian National Museum, Hawaiian Hall perpetuates a Hawaiian cultural heritage, yet does not focus solely on royalty. Through an incorporation of the history, lives, and contributions of commoners, attempts are made to encompass the entirety of Hawaiian life.

The exhibition celebrates the past and present of Hawaiian culture, demonstrating that culture, as a concept, is thriving in contemporary times, rather than a stagnant notion. Noelle M.K.Y. Kahanu, one of the five staff members on the content development team that over-saw the restoration of Hawaiian Hall, explains,

\begin{quote}
when we closed Hawaiian Hall in 2006, we closed the door on speaking about Hawaiians in the past tense with that anonymous omnipotent all knowing Western voice. On
\end{quote}
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speaking of lost arts and the pure objectification of Hawaiian artifacts. On speaking about Hawaiians, not with them. In its place, through consultation with Hawaiian community leaders, scholars, artists, and practitioners, we have created a hall that reflects a Hawaiian world view.”146

Hawaiian Hall provides a counter-colonial discourse through the incorporation of a Native perspective and discourse. This allows for a multiplicity of voices and narratives to be heard, as opposed to a single, authoritative voice. Where colonial discourses demonstrate a hierarchal structure between colonizers and the indigenous population, incorporating a Native perspective distributes power more evenly, or, in some cases, gives more power to the indigenous populations.

Not only does the exhibition incorporate Native perspectives, the design of the exhibit provides a better flow than the prior exhibit. Kelly had expressed concern about the “segmentation of the culture given the layout of the hall,” but the renovation team was able to create an exhibit in which the content flowed easily and transitioned naturally from one subject to the next.147 The first of the three floors begins with the origin of Hawaiians as a people, the second floor focuses on the commoners, and the third floor transitions to the history of Hawaiian royalty. The content transitions smoothly from one topic and floor to the next.

When examining the way the renovated Hawaiian Hall offered a counter-colonial discourse, I am particularly interested in the way a discussion about the overthrow and annexation of the Hawaiian Kingdom is incorporated. Colonial discourses tend to gloss over a discussion about colonization and instead offer a biased historical account of life prior to colonization as a way to juxtapose positive aspects of colonization. Investigating the ways that

147 Kelly, “Memory Banks and Political Ranks: Looking at Culture at Hawaii’s Bishop Museum,” 189.
counter-colonial discourses are presented in museums provides ideas as to how Washington Place could incorporate similar information. In this section, a brief overview of the layout of Hawaiian Hall will be provided, followed by a more in depth discussion of how Hawaiian Hall featured a counter-colonial discourse.

Combating Western scientific notions about creation, the first floor of Hawaiian Hall features the creation origin. The first floor is titled *Kai Ākea*. Wākea, sky father, and Papa, earth mother, are introduced along with the Kumulipo – the genealogical chant of creation. The gods who dwell in environments, such as the famous volcano goddess, Pelehonuamea, Kanaloa, the god of the ocean, and the demigod Māui, are introduced. The stories of their lives and contributions are made visible in a world-renowned educational institution. If the knowledge in a museum is accepted as an unquestionable truth, the presence of this cultural history in a museum setting can challenge notions of this history being classified as folklore or viewed as unworthy displays of information.

The second floor’s focus on commoners provides an easier connection to be established with Hawaiian audiences than a display that focused solely on Hawaiian royalty. The middle floor of Hawaiian Hall is titled *Wao Kānaka, ‘Āina Ho‘omalu: Realm of People, Nurtured Land*, and a floor dedicated to the realm of man. Prior exhibitions that did not include a discussion about commoners resulted in Hawaiian tradition being subsumed under the royal culture and its confrontation with Westerners. The ways of life of the common man, of fishing and farming, are traditions and expressions of Hawaiian culture that are still practiced today.

Transitioning to the third floor, the focus is on the Hawaiian royalty. Titled Wao Lani, this floor focuses on the realm of the ali‘i and spirits. This floor is of particular importance because it includes display cases that incorporate the history of the overthrow and annexation of
the Hawaiian Kingdom. A close examination of the display, wording, and historical facts presented in the display cases on this floor reveal ways that a counter colonial discourse was incorporated.

The new display outlines the historical circumstances that precipitated the events that led to the overthrow of the Hawaiian Kingdom. Whereas colonial discourses refuse to acknowledge these historical moments and instead portray the indigenous population or rulers on the path of eventual demise and inevitable conquer, the new exhibit introduces key players, agitators, and their motives. As mentioned prior in this paper, Kelly’s findings revealed that the legacy of the Queen was negative and incomplete. For example, it had been stated that the Queen’s “determination to reassert absolute monarchial rule soon brought her kingdom to the brink of armed revolt, and she was deposed in January, 1893.”148 This negative portrayal is a strategy of colonial discourses to bolster support for colonization by illustrating indigenous royalty and the indigenous population in the hands of careless leaders.

An introduction to this sensitive subject begins with a discussion about the Bayonet Constitution. In a display case titled National Crisis, visitors are informed about the native opposition to the 1887 Bayonet Constitution, which led to the rise of Native political parties that created petitions protesting the stipulations of the Bayonet Constitution. Visitors are then informed that the Queen sought to address those concerns of her people and decided to promulgate a new Constitution. Thus, by acknowledging the problem – the 1887 Bayonet Constitution, and the Queen’s response to that dissatisfaction – a new Constitution counteracts the prior colonial discourse that the Queen was determined to reassert absolute monarchial rule.

Another display case contains an introduction to the Committee of Safety, the group largely responsible for the overthrow of the Hawaiian Kingdom. Pictures are provided of the men that were in this organization followed by a section that highlights the specific role that U.S. Minister John Stevens played. It is explained that this annexation committee was formed to challenge native activism against the Bayonet Constitution. Of the Committee of Safety, it is written that, “comprised largely of American business interests, these men saw an opportunity to promote their annexationist views, deeming the Queen’s actions “revolutionary” and that “steps had to be taken at once to form and declare a provisional government.” This statement outlines the annexationist desires that American businessmen had invested in the islands. Whereas colonial discourses would not admit the desires of colonizers to conquer or take over a community, this statement clearly acknowledges the intentions of the key players who participated in the overthrow. Furthermore, the display highlights the role of U.S. Minister John Stevens during the overthrow. The display label further states that, “rather than protect the lawful government, Stevens indicated that should a provisional government be established, he would recognize and support it.” The wording used in this label is straightforward and clear. It acknowledges the Hawaiian Kingdom as the “lawful government,” bringing to the foreground the illegal actions taken by the Committee of Safety and U.S. Minister John Stevens. Two things are accomplished with this display case that counter colonial discourses: key players and their motives for annexation are exposed and the legality of the situation is introduced and brought into question.
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On another label, President Cleveland’s discontent with the overthrow is highlighted. It is explained that Cleveland sent Special Commissioner James H. Blount to investigate the situation in the islands and Blount’s report condemned Minister Stevens for his actions. Provided on this label is a quote that President Cleveland gave to the Senate and House of Representatives on December 18, 1893 that states,

> by an Act of War, committed with the participation of a diplomatic representative of the United States and without authority of Congress, the Government of a feeble but friendly and confiding people has been overthrown. A substantial wrong has thus been done which a due regard for our national character as well as the rights of the injured people requires we should endeavor to repair.”

This label helps to counter a colonial discourse because it demonstrates that although American businessmen initiated the overthrow, President Cleveland and other government officials disapproved of the actions committed against the Hawaiian Kingdom. However, further discussion as to the reasons why President Cleveland did not reinstate the Queen and her Kingdom are not provided. The only information provided reveals that when President Cleveland lost the election to President McKinley, restored independence for Hawai‘i was lost as well. However, the label accomplishes the task of bringing to the foreground issues of legality. Addressing issues of legality is one small step that helps to counteract a colonial discourse, although a deeper discussion into the present legal issues of colonization would help dismantle a colonial discourse.

Continuing with the display cases that offer a counter-colonial discourse, visitors are informed of the attempted coup led by Robert Wilcox in 1895, which resulted in Lili‘uokalani being tried by a military tribunal and imprisoned. Of Lili‘uokalani, it is written, “she was

---
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convicted, although she played a minimal role, if any."152 This sentence acknowledges the historical uncertainty of the extent of Liliʻuokalani’s involvement with Robert Wilcox, to restore the Hawaiian Kingdom. It is also written, “in exchange for clemency for the rebels and herself, Liliʻuokalani formally abdicated the throne.”153 This sentence portrays Queen Liliʻuokalani as a compassionate ruler who was genuinely concerned about the wellbeing of her citizens instead of a selfish, power hungry ruler that colonial discourses had illustrated prior.

3.6 Anti-Annexation Petitions

Also located on the third floor is a discussion about the anti-annexation petitions. One kiosk holds digital scans of all 556 pages of the anti-annexation petition. An interactive kiosk allows visitors to click on an island then, choose a district of that island to view the signatories of the petition. Above the kiosk is an informative label that outlines the history of the anti-annexation petitions, the native political parties that spearheaded the petition drive, and the number of signatures gathered. Included in this label is statement that explains,

the overwhelming opposition helped defeat the annexation treaty, which required a two thirds majority in the U.S. Senate. Undaunted, annexation proponents successfully sought a joint resolution, which only required a simple majority. Signed on July 7, 1898 by President McKinley, the legality of the “Newlands Resolution” continues to be called into question by contemporary Hawaiian scholars and activists.154

The beauty of this statement is that it attempts to connect historical moments to contemporary struggles.

The anti-annexation petition is particularly groundbreaking because it was a piece a public history unknown to people in Hawai‘i. Its presence in Bishop Museum validates and
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challenges non-resistance myths to colonization that have been constructed as a method to historically ignore resistance efforts of the colonized. Noenoe Silva located the 1897 petition in the United States National Archives. She and an ad hoc committee of community members approached Bishop Museum with a request to educate the public about the 1897 annexation petition. Silva explains that, “Bishop Museum agreed to display a reproduction of all 556 pages to the petition. Because of the publicity generated by the museum to promote the exhibit, the Kanaka Maoli community throughout the islands suddenly knew of the existence of mass opposition to annexation in 1897.” Silva maintains that the “petition represents the political struggle of the makaʻāinana, for although the hui were led by aliʻi (rulers) and kaukaualiʻi (aliʻi of lesser rank) it was the collective power of the makaʻāinana – 21,269 signatures – that gave it its force.” This artifact demonstrates the collective cooperation between aliʻi and commoners. It also demonstrates that the commoners were not passive or lacking in an understanding of the political atmosphere at that time. Commoners were aware and were active in demonstrating that they were against annexation, similar to their leaders. The benefit of the display of the petition is two-fold. As Silva maintains, “it is not just the Kanaka Maoli who can benefit from this knowledge: the untruth and half-truths of history have harmed the descendants of the colonizer along with the colonized, although in different ways.” The display of the petition also demonstrates that there had been collaboration and cooperation between Hawaiian royals and commoners. It is an artifact that aids in a counter-colonial discourse because it empowers the Hawaiian community and informs audiences that may have been educated only by a colonial discourse of Hawaiʻi’s history.
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The renovated Hawaiian Hall was transformed from exhibits that featured a colonial discourse about Native Hawaiian culture into a setting that openly discusses the overthrow and annexation of Hawai‘i. The display cases discuss sensitive historical material, introduced key players involved in the overthrow and their motives, and appropriately questioned the legality of the overthrow and annexation of the Hawaiian Kingdom. The section that features the anti-annexation petition demonstrates the way that Hawaiian royalty and commoners worked in unison to achieve the same goal. Incorporating Native Hawaiian creation beliefs perpetuates a native perspective and discourse because it challenges Western notions of creation and evolution. The sections that featured commoners, their hard work, and their way of life also contributes to counter a colonial discourse because it demonstrates the way that Hawaiian culture has survived and adapted overtime through its people and practices, that, although the Hawaiian Kingdom has ceased to exist, the culture, beliefs, and the people still persist.
CHAPTER 4 – REINVENTING WASHINGTON PLACE

4.1 Introduction

The previous chapter demonstrated the transformation of Hawaiian Hall from exhibits that featured a colonial discourse into an exhibit that incorporated a native perspective and counter-colonial discourse. Chapter Four discussed the way Washington Place currently perpetuates a colonial and settler-colonial discourse through a commemorative narrative of Queen Lili‘uokalani. Using Hawaiian Hall as an example of a successful transition, this chapter suggests ways that Washington Place could offer a counter-colonial discourse while incorporating the competing symbols that exist. As discussed in each chapter, this section will also consider who would benefit and what would be gained by featuring a counter-colonial discourse. In both Washington Place and Hawaiian Hall prior to renovation, displays of indigenous royalty and content provided about royalty were manipulated to perpetuate a colonial discourse. The narratives featured at both locations were fragmented, leaving out histories of conflict and colonization as a strategy to legitimize colonizers’ involvement in Hawai‘i.

The most obvious way to incorporate a counter-colonial discourse is to openly discuss colonization and settler-colonialism in Hawai‘i. The beauty of a museum setting is that there are many ways to creatively incorporate such historical events. Each museum differs in their presentation techniques and style - some rely solely on labels, others have docents who tell the narratives, and some do a combination of both. Others use exhibits to recreate historical moments to tap into the people’s empathy and some utilize technology – music or videos – to teach audiences. History museums can be creative educational outlets and the list of ways to creatively teach history is large and diverse. This chapter will focus on the historical narrative of
Washington Place – on which historical moments could be incorporated with the current narrative to allow for a counter-colonial and native discourse. This chapter will also briefly suggest ways that Washington Place could integrate this knowledge into their present exhibit.

While this paper argues for a counter-colonial discourse at Washington Place, this does not mean that only an indigenous history and perspective should exist. On the contrary, the beauty of Washington Place is that it encompasses different historical meanings. According to Hooper-Greenhill, “meaning…is constructed and reconstructed as the frameworks for interpretation and interpreting subjects change. Meaning is dense and multi-layered; not all can be mobilized at any one time.”

The history of Washington Place and its residents represent a microcosm of Hawai‘i’s history, and the inhabitants have each instilled the site with diverse meanings. The social, economic, and political circumstances that each person experienced while occupying the site have imbued the house with layer upon layer of meanings, meanings which do not always complement each other. While some symbols are emphasized to a greater extent, any of these meanings can be mobilized at a particular moment to suit particular needs.

The history of the house as Queen Lili‘uokalani’s home and as a mansion for the Governors of Hawai‘i is two significant historical narratives for the State. The current interpretation of the house does little to address these complexities; instead it fashions an incomplete historical narrative that privileges a colonial and settler-colonial interpretation. I would like to suggest that both stories co-exist. Washington Place is not only a site for the Native Hawaiian community – with its legacy deeply rooted in the political spheres of the islands’ history – it is a historic site for the entire community of Hawai‘i.
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4.2 Re-telling the Narrative of Queen Liliʻuokalani

One way to transform the narrative at Washington Place from its colonial discourse is to address Queen Liliʻuokalani’s struggle against the overthrow and annexation of the Hawaiian Kingdom similar to the approach done at Hawaiian Hall. Since Washington Place is a different type of historical site than Hawaiian Hall, I will offer suggestions of which historical facts could be incorporated and creatively linked to the historical significance of the site. Beginning with the overthrow, the historical facts that should be provided include that the overthrow occurred on January 17, 1893 and was initiated by the Committee of Safety, led by Lorrin A. Thurston after the Queen’s attempt to promulgate a new constitution. The new constitution was initiated by the requests of the Queen’s people and was intended to restore power to the Queen and empower the Native Hawaiian people after the devastating changes that had occurred under the Bayonett Constitution in 1887. It is written by Liliʻuokalani that,

petitions poured in from every part of the Islands for a new constitution; these were addressed to myself as the reigning sovereign. They were supported by petitions addressed to the Hui Kalaaina, who in turn endorsed and forwarded them to me. It was estimated by those in position to know, that out of a possible nine thousand five hundred, or two-thirds, had signed the petitions.159

Drafted in consultation with her advisers and with the Hui Kālaiʻaina, the constitution would restore the Queen’s power as sovereign ruler and decrease property requirements for voters and help empower Native Hawaiians. The foreign planters and businessmen were threatened by the increase in the Queen’s power and conspired with the U.S. Minister John Stevens to land U.S. troops in the islands and proclaim themselves the provisional government of Hawaiʻi immediately following Liliʻuokalani’s attempt to promulgate the new constitution.160
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These historical moments are important to incorporate because they demonstrate that the Hawaiian Kingdom was forcibly and illegally taken from Queen Lili‘uokalani. Contrary to colonial discourses that display indigenous royalty as selfish and power hungry, this information demonstrates that Queen Lili‘uokalani was neither selfish nor power hungry, instead she was concerned with empowering her people. These pieces of historical information exposes the men on the Committee of Safety as the selfish actors because the overthrow allowed them to secure their financial investments in the islands. The current discourse at Washington Place does little to address these historical facts. While the narrative does not portray indigenous royalty negatively, the discourse at Washington Place does conceal this information.

Addressing the overthrow paves the way for discussion about the strategies of Queen Lili‘uokalani and her people to restore her as rightful ruler of Hawai‘i. Lili‘uokalani wrote appeals to the president of the United States to restore her Kingdom and made personal voyages to the United States. After the Provisional Government was established in Hawai‘i, Queen Lili‘uokalani temporarily yielded her authority to the United Government to avoid violence and bloodshed until the American Government would reinstate her as authority. She appealed to President Cleveland and President McKinley to restore her Kingdom. Incorporating information about resistance efforts challenges the myth of passive acceptance that is popular in colonial discourses.

Another strategy to counteract a colonial discourse at Washington Place is to include the ways that indigenous populations responded to the overthrow. This would demonstrate the way the Queen was supported by and collaborated with the Native Hawaiian community. The Kanaka Maoli was very active in protesting against the 1893 coup. Organizations such as Hui Hawai‘i Aloha ‘Āina and Hui Hawai‘i Aloha ‘Āina o Nā Wāhine wrote formal protests to the
American Government for a restoration of their Kingdom. Protests continued in 1894 when the Republic of Hawai‘i was established. In 1896, when William McKinley was elected President of the United States, the Kanaka Maoli directed their protests toward the U.S. Congress. Silva writes that the “Kanaka Maoli strategy was to challenge to U.S. government to behave in accordance with its stated principles of justice and of government of the people, by the people, and for the people. They hoped that once the U.S. President and members of Congress saw that the great majority of Kanaka Maoli opposed the annexation, the principles of fairness would prevail and Lili‘uokalani’s government would be restored.”

Mass petition drives were formed to protest annexation. These historical acts demonstrate that the indigenous populations understood the complexity of the overthrow and knowledgeable of political activism. This type of content is important because it exemplifies the support that Lili‘uokalani received from the Native Hawaiian community. The collaboration between Lili‘uokalani and the Kanaka Maoli against the overthrow of the Hawaiian Kingdom refutes the myth that Lili‘uokalani and the Native Hawaiian community were passive about the loss of their nation.

On July 7, 1898 with the Newlands Resolution signed by President William McKinley, Hawai‘i was annexed by the United States. In August 1898, a ceremony was held to signify the official transfer of Hawaiian sovereignty to the United States. Portraying the continuous struggles by Lili‘uokalani and the Kanaka Maoli beginning with the overthrow and leading up to the annexation of Hawai‘i by the United States illustrates for the community of Hawai‘i and visitors from around the world that there had been consistent struggle for Hawai‘i to remain an

---
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independent Kingdom. Incorporating this historical trajectory of the way Hawaiʻi became a territory of the United States is one way to provide a counter-colonial narrative.

Now I will suggest creative ways that the aforementioned historical facts can be incorporated and connected to the history of Washington Place. For instance, following the Queen’s imprisonment at ‘Iolani Palace, she was released on parole and placed under house arrest at Washington Place. The Queen wrote of her release from ‘Iolani Palace,

I was driven from my prison – once my palace – to the gateway at Washington Place, my earlier home, it seemed as though Nature, our kind mother, smiled on my return. The flowers, the shrubs, the trees, had never to me looked so charming. How I enjoyed their welcome!...But my welcome was not altogether from the silent, waving leaves. Those of my people who had been released from imprisonment were here to greet me also with their fond Aloha.\textsuperscript{163}

While under parole at Washington Place, President Dole assigned to her a custodian. The Queen was prohibited from going anywhere with large groups of people, prohibited from holding large functions at her place, and only allowed a certain number of servants.\textsuperscript{164} Although she was in her own home, her life was still monitored. Of her custodian, Mr. Wilson, she writes, “he was obliged – he said – to give Mr. Dole a faithful report of all my visitors and doings each day.”\textsuperscript{165} Since currently the history of the home is provided for guests by docents, it would be easy for docents to discuss the historical facts of the overthrow, leading up to the Queen’s imprisonment, and connect that information to her house arrest at Washington Place. It would create an interesting discussion about the way her Palace and home both functioned as prisons.

\textsuperscript{163} Liliʻuokalani, 295-296.
\textsuperscript{164} Ibid, 296.
\textsuperscript{165} Ibid, 297.
Another historical moment that can be directly linked to Washington Place is the Queen’s emotional journey home from Washington D.C. after hearing of the passing of the annexation treaty. It is written that when she arrived home on August 2, she was,

greeted by a crowd, including her niece Ke Kamālīʻiwahine Kaʻiulani, her nephew Ke Kamālīʻikāne Kawananakoa, and the presidents of the hui. She spoke, in tears, to the crowd, saying she felt the circle around her there at the wharf in the middle of the night meant they were saying, “eia no makou a pau mahope Ou e ke aliʻi, no ke kupaa i ke aloha i ka aina” (we are all still behind You, Ke Aliʻi, steadfast in love for the land). The crowd then followed her to Washington Place, where the columns, doors, and chairs of the house had been draped in forest greenery by a reception committee.¹⁶⁶

This statement intimately connects Washington Place to a significant moment in the Queen’s life, the lives of the Kanaka Maoli, and the residents of the islands of Hawaiʻi. This moment is extremely emotional and demonstrates the immense sadness felt by her and her people over the loss of the Kingdom of Hawaiʻi. Again, this would be another historical moment experienced at Washington Place that can be directly connected to the annexation history of Hawaiʻi. These historical accounts provide opportunities for the historical facts about overthrow and annexation to be intimately connected to Washington Place.

4.3 A Governor’s Mansion

Keeping the history of Washington Place as a Governor’s Mansion is also important. Doing so facilitates the ability of the museum to portray the multiple symbolic meanings of the house. It would also allow for a discussion about Asian-Settler colonization in Hawaiʻi. Currently, a brief history of Washington Place as a Governor’s Mansion is provided. I suggest that the history of Statehood should be incorporated alongside the narrative of Washington
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Place’s transition to an executive mansion. Including this content would aid in counteracting a colonial discourse and settler-colonial imaginary.

Since the purchase of Washington Place by the Territory of Hawai‘i in 1922 and the incorporation of a museum, an ideological space was created which constructed an American imaginary of American democracy. This constructed imaginary lends the impression that everyone in Hawai‘i, including the indigenous population are settlers in the islands and entitled to equal rights as immigrants and citizens of the United States. Settlers interpret the location as a space of equality and this masks the colonization of the Native Hawaiians and their political status as colonized subjects. However, some settlers are unaware of the ways they contribute to the colonization of the indigenous population. Thus incorporation about the history of Statehood would help to educate settlers about their participation in the colonization of the indigenous population.

Included content should be the fact that in 1945, Hawai‘i was listed as a Non Self-Governing Territory under the United States Administration according to the United Nations. Additionally, the narrative should also include mention of the lack of options during the vote for statehood. This would make visitors aware that commonwealth or independence options were not made available to the citizens Hawai‘i. This information is important because it informs people about the contested history of statehood in Hawai‘i and can serve as an example of settlers in Hawai‘i achieving social, political, and economic gains in the islands at the expense of the subjugation of the indigenous population. It can be argued, that with Statehood, settlers were able to protect and secure the rights.

It also paves the way for a better understanding about the contemporary sovereignty movements. Misconception toward sovereignty movements may exist if a person is unaware of
the history of Hawai‘i, and, it can be argued, these misconceptions exist because the State creates an identity characteristic of the native population as culturally friendly and welcoming to all.

The advantage of incorporating these historical moments – overthrow, annexation, and statehood – into the content at Washington Place is that it provides an important transition into the discussion of contemporary Native Hawaiian life and struggles. Regardless if the museum has time or space to discuss contemporary Hawaiian struggles, this historical narrative would introduce visitors to the contemporary political reality.

4.4 Tours/Labels/Brochures/Online Exhibit

Incorporating this information in docent scripts can help with addressing the multiple narratives attached to Washington Place. Since written material in the form of brochures and labels are not provided, one way to receive information regarding this subject matter is through docent tours. Most docents adhere to a script of the house that fails to include a discussion about the overthrow or annexation.

Another way to integrate this information at Washington Place is with labels. Currently, there are very few labels that provide historical content, and the few labels that exist merely identify the objects instead of situating those objects within the larger historical context of Washington Place. While docent tours provide a more interactive form of communication, when docents are not available or if groups are too large, some people may miss what the docent is saying. The labels are beneficial because they can help to fill in those gaps. Beverley Serrell explains, “good labels are guided by a strong, cohesive exhibit plan—a theme, story, or communication goal—that sets the tone and limits the content.”¹⁶⁷ It is crucial for there to be cohesiveness between labels and the exhibit in order to accurately convey a particular message.

Labels need to be proactive and educational in their ability to stimulate visitors. Serrell explains, “interpretive labels tell stories; they are narratives, not lists of facts.” If the big idea at Washington Place is to feature a narrative about the Queen and a Governor’s Mansion, labels can narrate the trajectory of this history. Currently, in Hawaiian Hall, docents are available to provide tours but labels are included in the exhibit for visitors who want to explore the exhibit themselves. The labels in Hawaiian Hall are concise and effective in communicating the master narrative of the exhibit.

Brochures are tools that can aid with a counter-colonial discourse at Washington Place. Since a brochure is typically a synopsis, there could be two brochures of Washington Place. One brochure can be used to entice visitors to visit the house to learn of the history of Washington Place as the Queen’s home and the Governor’s Mansion. The second brochure can be provided after the tour. This brochure can offer highlights from the tour and include links to websites or suggestions of books for visitors interested in learning more about Hawai‘i’s history.

An online exhibit of Washington Place would be a brilliant way for the public to gain more access to the site. An online exhibit allows people the flexibility to view the historical site when it is convenient for them and help with security concerns. Access to the site by internet would alleviate many of the difficulties of an on-site visit while increasing awareness of the significance of the home and Hawai‘i’s history.

4.5 Community Involvement

Washington Place is open to the public through annual events like the celebration of the Queen’s birthday, a celebration of Children and Youth Day, and a Christmas viewing. The Governor also hosts various functions at the site. However, not many people in the community
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are aware of Washington Place; or, if they are aware of its existence, they believe it to be the Governor’s Mansion. Located on the Washington Place Foundation website is a statement that reads,

In 1901, Queen Lili‘uokalani executed a Deed of Trust, to establish an institution dedicated to the welfare of orphaned Hawaiian children. At this time she also expressed a vision for the future of Washington Place following her death—that it become a place where the Hawaiian language and music would be preserved. As such, the non-profit Washington Place Foundation is committed to perpetuating our Queen’s legacy to continue to educate people in Hawaiian history, language, and music in the spirit of Lili‘uokalani whose integrity, courage, and all abiding faith has always inspired the people of Hawai‘i.¹⁶⁹

One suggestion to fulfill the Queen’s desire could be through a partnership with a Hawaiian immersion program. Students could translate the tour in Hawaiian and also utilize the property for their events. Since history museums are creative educational outlets, this type of partnership with Washington Place would be a unique way to educate students about Hawai‘i’s history and politics. Students could also participate in volunteer projects to clean the yard and help maintain the property at Washington Place, since they are already understaffed.

The Cliveden Mansion in Philadelphia provides a great example of the benefits of a community’s involvement with sites that possess sensitive material. A historic site, the Cliveden Mansion experienced a reinvention due to the discovery of new historical information. In 2001, documents were uncovered that revealed that the site had ties to slavery. Located in an area in which 85 percent of the population is African-American, the curator thought this information could have a significant impact on the community. The curator, Philip Seitz, and an African-American maintenance man, John Reese, worked together to research stories of slave resistance and applied for grants to further their project. With money from grants, they were able to afford

an African-American community relations consultant. With the help of a consultant they were able to organize community groups to hear stories from community members and they also offered their ideas and suggestions of ways to incorporate discussions of slavery at Cliveden. Through community and group gatherings, the consultant team helped establish trust between the curator and the community to discuss emotionally difficult history and garner suggestions as to how the community felt such information should be presented. As Seitz claims, “our active outreach, along with new programming, revealed how eager audiences are to discuss difficult subjects in history and to share their own individual connections to history in meaningful ways.”

Cliveden’s outreach to the community provides an example of how Washington Place can better serve Hawai‘i. Similar to Hawaiian Hall, community members, scholars, and activists participated in the redesign and re-conception of the exhibit. Increasing public access will increase the relevance of Washington Place.

4.6 Conclusion

This chapter offers a means to reinvent Washington Place. Unlike Bishop Museum, Washington Place is a state entity, thus transitioning the discourse could prove to be extremely difficult. Washington Place would encounter different obstacles than faced during Hawaiian Hall’s renovation. I am also fully aware that it would require a substantial amount of time and financial support to make these changes. Washington Place is already understaffed and operates with the help of volunteers. Even something as small as interpretive labels would require money; however, if it were possible through grants or fundraisers to raise even a small sum of
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money, interpretive labels, along with changes to the docent script, would raise awareness about the colonization of indigenous people in Hawai‘i. There are many factors to consider if a redesign of Washington Place were to occur. Unlike Bishop Museum’s Hawaiian Hall, Washington Place is a house that was built during the nineteenth century; thus, the amount of traffic through the museum could, in the long run, be strenuous on the structure as it was not built to accommodate large audiences. Similarly, if Washington Place were to incorporate such a complex and sensitive subject matter, an advisory board, similar to the one used for Hawaiian Hall and Cliveden Mansion, would be crucial to help with the presentation of this material.

However, including a comprehensive historical interpretation of a historically significant house such as Washington Place would transform the museum into a space that generates dialogue, initiates debates, and sustains a conversation of Hawai‘i’s past, present, and future. There are many benefits to featuring a counter-colonial discourse. As experienced with the 1897 anti-annexation petition at Hawaiian Hall, the revelation of the existence of an important historical document not only countered colonial narratives about the annexation, but it had an emotional impact on lives. Silva writes that,

> the petition, inscribed with the names of everyone’s kūpuna, gave people permission from their ancestors to participate in the quest for national sovereignty. More important, it affirmed for them that their kūpuna had not stood by idly, apathetically, while their nation was taken from them. Instead, contrary to every history book on the shelf, they learned that their ancestors had, as James Kaulia put it, taken up the honorable field of struggle. For people today, the petition represents the political struggle of the maka‘āinana, for although hui were led by ali‘i (rulers) and kaukauali‘i (ali‘i of lesser rank) it was the collective power of the maka‘āinana – 21,269 signatures – that gave it its force.  

Knowledge is power, and this knowledge gave power to the indigenous population because they learned about their ancestors’ beliefs and activism that was once suppressed. Based

---
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on this response to the anti-annexation petition, one can only imagine the impact that a
discussion about colonization and settler-colonialism at Washington Place could have on guests
to the site. The impact would not only be on the indigenous population but also on visitors who
may be unaware of Hawai‘i’s history. As explained by Silva, “it is not just the Kanaka Maoli
who can benefit from this knowledge: the untruths and half-truths of history have harmed the
descendants of the colonizer along with the colonized, although in different ways.”

Museums can function as agents for social change and they can have a significant impact
on community reconciliation. Washington Place currently legitimizes colonization and settler-
colonialism through a discourse that erases and suppresses certain historical events. The
museum should create a comprehensive and visible landscape of the contested history of the site.
It is absolutely possible for Washington Place to participate in a reconciliation process, one that
is occurring around the world involving partnerships with museums and indigenous
communities. This partnership would include the indigenous community in the master narrative
and the representation process. While this paper is merely one person’s suggestion, it would be
interesting to see how an advisory board, paired with community members, would reinvent and
redesign Washington Place to exhibit a counter-colonial discourse and represent competing
symbolic meanings of the house.
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APPENDIX – IMAGES OF WASHINGTON PLACE

Figure 1. Dining Room, Washington Place (Ariyoshi, 100)

Figure 2. Blue Room, Washington Place (Ariyoshi, 104)
Figure 3. Music Room / Queen's Parlor, Washington Place (Ariyoshi, 104)

Figure 4. Reception Room / Mary Dominis Parlor, Washington Place (Ariyoshi, 104)
Figure 5. Queen’s Bedroom, Washington Place (Ariyoshi, 104)
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