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ABSTRACT

Public education in the Hawaiian Kingdom is often looked at as a foreign endeavor, established and promoted by the missionaries. This dissertation demonstrates that public education was actually established and promoted in Hawaiʻi by Kanaka Maoli Aliʻi who employed the missionaries and other Haole to support the development of a successful system of education for Hawaiian subjects. Through the use of an occupation paradigm, this study analyzes aspects of public education during the kingdom period in order to elucidate the agency of Kānaka Maoli in government affairs, specifically in education. It also examines the positive culture of educational attainment that proliferated during that period. The eventual loss of Kanaka Maoli agency through the overthrow of the Hawaiian government and the occupation of Hawaiʻi by the United States contributed significantly to a decline in Kanaka Maoli school performance and the culture of educational attainment to where Kānaka Maoli have been the lowest achieving ethnic group in Hawaiʻi for decades. In terms of contemporary education, this dissertation employs a cultural-ecological theory of minority schooling to explain the importance of
maintaining a historical perspective in developing successful Kanaka Maoli educational programming today.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

In a recent conversation with a colleague, she and I were commiserating on all the contemporary literature about the Kingdom period in Hawai’i that highlights the gloom of the period. Even when Silva (2004) writes positively about the large-scale resistance Kānaka Maoli exhibited to “American Colonization,” there necessarily is an emphasis on the transgressions suffered by Kānaka. We could not come up with one publication that was celebratory of Kānaka Maoli’s accomplishments of that time.

Over the last 150 years, Kānaka Maoli have suffered significantly. This suffering includes health problems, psychological problems, loss of political control, displacement from the land, and cultural annihilation. For a people who have suffered so much, it is natural to want to have dialogues about those problems to get a better understanding of them in an effort to heal. If the history of these problems and the causes have been distorted by those who have the power to control the historical narrative, it is natural to want to retell the story from the victims’ perspective in an effort to hold the perpetrators accountable for their
transgressions. It is also natural to want to retell the story as a means to enlighten the victims to their history as a process of healing.

The titles of some of the more prominent books on Hawaiian history by contemporary scholars evince this desire to focus on the despair: 

*Aloha Betrayed* (Silva N. K., 2004); *Dismembering Lahui* (Osorio, 2002); *Native Land and Foreign Desires: Pehea E Pono Ai?* (Kameʻelehiwa, 1992); *Hawaiian Blood: Colonialism and the Politics of Sovereignty and Indigeneity* (Kauanui, 2008); *From a Native Daughter: Colonialism and Sovereignty in Hawai‘i* (Trask, 1999). Even the two most recent books that examine education during the Kingdom period are written from that perspective: *Culture and Educational Policy in Hawai‘i: The Silencing of Native Voices* (Benham & Heck, 1998) and *Challenging the Status Quo: Public Education in Hawai‘i 1840-1980* (Dotts & Sikkema, 1994). These books have done a great deal in shaping the way people, including me, interpret history, especially during the Kingdom period (1810-1893) and through the fraudulent annexation\(^1\) of Hawai‘i by the United States of America (1898).

*However, while these works are important components of the overall*

\(^{1}\) My qualification of the annexation of Hawai‘i as fraudulent is based on the lack of a treaty of annexation, the legal means by which a nation-state can acquire the territory of another nation-state. I will discuss this in more depth in Chapter 2.
literature of the period, a byproduct of them is that they have created a perspective of dread and depression in looking at the Kingdom period.

Fortunately, our kūpuna of that time used their skill in literacy to record many things, including traditional stories, songs, events, government proceedings and news stories. Through careful examination of these documents, a multitude of accomplishments can be found in government and education that are worthy of acclamation. From the profuse dissemination of literacy throughout Hawaiʻi to the achievement of being recognized, in 1843, as an independent nation-state and the first non-European member of the Family of Nations. These all represent momentous Kanaka Maoli accomplishments. Although Kānaka Maoli may have employed some foreigners to help them realize these accomplishments, it was the Kānaka\(^2\) who decided on these projects and saw them through. Understanding the connection between Kanaka agency and Kanaka success is liberating.

This dissertation is a project of celebration, and through this celebration, a project of liberation. I will demonstrate that the locus of agency in public education during the Kingdom period in Hawaiʻi is with Kanaka.

\(^2\) Throughout this dissertation, I will interchangeably use Kanaka Maoli (plural form: Kānaka Maoli) and Kanaka (plural form: Kānaka) to refer to the aboriginal people of Hawaiʻi.
the Kānaka Maoli rather than the foreigners, as purported in much of the contemporary literature. The latter part of this dissertation is about celebrating the intellectual capacity of our ancestors and the fervor with which they promoted intellectualism. I also explore how our lack of knowledge of this has been detrimental to our intellectual growth and, more importantly, how we can use this to support healthy intellectual growth and develop educational programs that will successfully promote Kānaka Maoli intellectualism.

In Chapter 2, I first provide a historical overview of the Hawaiian Kingdom to establish the political context which frames my analysis of the data. I also develop a framework for understanding Kānaka Maoli agency during the Kingdom period. I then introduce the current status of Kānaka Maoli in education and provide a framework for understanding Kānaka Maoli failure by using Ogbu’s cultural-ecological theory of minority schooling (1978). Ogbu’s theory is helpful for understanding how the loss of Kānaka Maoli agency with the overthrow of the Kingdom and eventual incorporation of the Hawaiian territory into the U.S. has affected Kānaka Maoli success in education. In the end of chapter two, I establish the idea that understanding the significance of Kānaka agency for Kānaka success
will help us develop educational programs that will turn around the educational attainment of Kanaka Maoli.

Chapter 3 is about research methods and methodology. I examine my position, as a Kanaka Maoli, within my research and what that means for how I conduct my research. I also look at how my research questions are a result of being influenced in my life by people like my family and colleagues, by works of our kūpuna like the Kumulipo, and my own work at the University of Hawaiʻi. These things have influenced my data collection, the analyses of my data, and how I intend to disseminate my findings.

Chapter 4 is an in-depth examination of the issue of language in public schools during the mid 1800s. I use the events surrounding this issue to examine Kanaka Maoli agency in both the government and public education. In the beginning of compulsory public education in the Hawaiian Kingdom, all government-supported schools were conducted in the Hawaiian language. In the late 1850s and early 1860s, the government using resources to support English schools became a significant issue of contention. There was much debate in the various government agencies. Where the players in the debate stood on the
issue is not as most people would expect. This makes for an interesting examination of agency.

Despite the debates within the government agencies, there was no definite outcome in terms of the creation of a law to say that one language or the other was the official language of the school system. However, over the following years leading up to the overthrow in 1893, there was a notable increase in the number of schools that were conducted in English.

Chapter 5 is about celebration. The two foci in this chapter are celebrating our rich history of Kanaka intellectualism and celebrating the passion for education during the Kingdom period, especially education from a Kanaka perspective. I look at the history of the pursuit of knowledge for the Kānaka Maoli: from the great migration to Hawai‘i; to the Kumulipo, the epic chant of creation; and to the spreading of literacy to the Hale Nauā, the Kanaka Maoli research institution established by King Kalākaua. I examine Hale‘ole and Nakuina, two strong promoters of Kanaka Maoli focused education. This chapter is also about reconnecting with that Kanaka intellectualism that was commonplace amongst our kūpuna when they maintained control of the government.
In Chapter 6, I re-examine Ogbu in order to elucidate how understanding the correlation between Kanaka Maoli agency and Kanaka Maoli academic success can inform educators today about how to develop educational programs that are most conducive to Kanaka Maoli success. An emphasis is placed on the need to develop a Kanaka identity in the various aspects of a program in order to realize a liberating success. However, as much as we work to develop quality programs for Kanaka Maoli youth, the overall political agency, like Kānaka had during the Kingdom period, is paramount to realizing the high level of success we know we can achieve. Ending the United States’ occupation of the Hawaiian Kingdom is the way to achieve the level of Kanaka control we once possessed.

Given the time period I am researching and the importance of using primary sources, there is Hawaiian text throughout this dissertation. I use contemporary diacritical marks (ʻokina and kahakō) for my own text but have chosen not to add the diacritical marks to quoted material that did not use any so as to maintain the integrity of the authors’ messages. If the source is more contemporary and included the ‘okina and kahakō, I left it that way. All English translations of Hawaiian texts cited are mine unless otherwise noted.
I have been motivated to do this research by the numerous Kānaka who believe that schooling, succeeding in school, and being an intellectual are foreign endeavors and that a Kānaka identity, on the other hand, is based on stereotypical malbehavior. As Hawai‘i County Mayor Billy Kenoi (2003, personal communication) recalled, in a talk he gave to my class, during his childhood, being Kānaka Maoli to him was defined by the number of beers he could drink, the number of guys he could knock out, and the number of chicks he could score. He has since developed a more positive and productive Kānaka identity. It is my hope that this research will contribute to the re-development of a Kānaka identity of academic achievement and intellectualism. It is also my hope that this research will help educators develop better academic programs that lead to the redevelopment of this Kānaka identity. It is my sincere hope that I can contribute to an understanding that our true liberation from thinking like Mayor Kenoi, and from our lack of orientation towards academic achievement, can most successfully be accomplished by ending the United States’ occupation of Hawai‘i. Our history abounds with many accomplishments of intellectual exploration and inquiry. Let us once again be proud of being a Lāhui Na‘auao.
The purpose of this paper is to

- examine the successes of pre-subjugation Kanaka education,
- use the idea of Kanaka agency to place the point of subjugation within education at a later date than suggested by most scholars, and
- contextualize this within Ogbu’s cultural-ecological theory of minority schooling to inform educators today how to best develop educational programs for Kanaka Maoli students while under U.S. military occupation.

The pertinent research questions based on this agenda are,

- Why do Kanaka Maoli have such low academic achievement today?
- Did Kānaka Maoli have a propensity for high academic achievement during the Kingdom period?
- If so, were those successes realized while Kānaka Maoli were in control of the political and educational systems?
- And if so, how can understanding Kanaka Maoli agency and education support the development of educational programs that liberate Kānaka Maoli within the current political system?
Chapter 2

Literature Review

The Hawaiian Political Context

The Hawaiian monarchy was established in 1810 when King Kamehameha unified all the major Hawaiian Islands. King Kamehameha began his conquest with the unification of the island of Hawai‘i under one ruler at the battle of Moku‘ohai in 1782, only four years after Captain James Cook first landed in the islands. Kamehameha’s successful unification of the districts of Hawai‘i Island led him to eventually conquer the Kingdoms of Maui and O‘ahu and negotiate the incorporation of Kaua‘i into his kingdom.

King Kamehameha died in 1819, assigning the rule of the kingdom to his son, Liholiho, known as Kamehameha II. To his nephew, Kekuaokalani, Kamehameha “committed the care of the war god Kukailimoku” (Kuykendall, vol.1, p. 65). One of Kamehameha II’s major acts was to abolish the Kapu System, the religious system that dictated social order. This was done with the influence of Ka‘ahumanu and Keōpūolani, two of Kamehameha I’s wives, and in spite of Kekuaokalani’s pleas to uphold the Kapu. While there was resistance such as the insurrection in Hāmākua (Kamakau, 1867) and the battle of Kuamo‘o in
which Kekuaokalani’s forces lost to Kamehameha II’s forces, the abolishment was successful in ending the religious system as a government sanctioned religion.

While this was taking place, Protestant missionaries were en route to Hawai‘i to “preach the gospel to every creature” (Mark 16:15, King James Version). This group, supported by the American Board of Christian Foreign Missions (ABCFM), was unaware that Kamehameha had died and that the religious system was abolished. Upon arrival they requested an extended stay in the islands to spread the word of god to Kānaka Maoli. The Ali‘i deliberated for several days on whether to allow them to stay or not (Kamakau, 1867). The deliberations concluded with the decision to allow the missionaries to stay for one year with the condition that they only share their religion with the royal families for the time being. Thus began the first establishment of a Christian mission in Hawai‘i.

One of the ABCFM’s practices was to have its missionaries learn the language of the people to whom they would preach, reduce the language to writing if no writing system existed and teach the people how to read and write in their language (Kekūanāo‘a, 1864). This provided a quicker and more efficient process to get the people to read the bible. So as this
process started in Hawai‘i, Kanaka Maoli royalty were most intrigued by the new and very useful technology of literacy. After becoming literate and having their lesser chiefs learn to read and write, leaders like Ka'ahumanu ensured that this technology be shared amongst all the people of Hawai‘i. They sent the educated chiefs around the islands to teach reading and writing. The Ali‘i were successful and people all throughout Hawai‘i became literate (Kamakau, 1868).

In 1824, Kamehameha II died while visiting Great Britain. His brother, Kauikeaouli, took over as the ruler of Hawai‘i and became known as Kamehameha III. In 1839, Kauikeaouli developed a Declaration of Rights, codifying and protecting the rights of the chiefs and the native tenants. In 1840, the King divested himself of his absolute power by promulgating a constitution, which created three branches of government — the Executive Branch, the Legislative Branch, and the Judicial Branch. The subsequent laws created in 1841 established compulsory education for youth, a progressive law that predates the United States of America making education compulsory by 77 years (Graham, 1974). Hawai‘i was actually the fifth country in the world to make education compulsory. Soysal and Strang (1989) provide a table showing Prussia (1763),
Denmark (1814), Greece (1834), and Spain (1838) as the only countries to introduce compulsory education prior to 1841 (p. 278).

Given the recent colonization of Pacific nations by European powers (e.g., Aotearoa by Great Britain and Tahiti by France), Kamehameha III decided to attempt to attain the status of a recognized independent nation-state by joining the Family of Nations to insure that Hawai‘i would be protected by the laws of the international organization. On November 28, 1843, Hawai‘i received the recognition as the first non-European run country accepted into the Family of Nations, thus achieving the status of an independent nation-state.

For the next few decades, Hawai‘i was engaged in the continuous modernization of its government including new constitutions in 1852 and 1864, the privatization of land through the Great Mahele in 1846, international treaties with numerous countries, and the declaration of Hawai‘i as a neutral country (Sai D. K., 2004). While some of these changes proved to be detrimental, especially to the aboriginal population, like the Great Mahele, many led to the overall improvement of the Kingdom.

The stability of the government began declining during the reign of the seventh King, Kalākaua, and the rise of the sugar industry. On July 1,
1887, a small group of Hawaiian nationals who were members of the Hawaiian League threatened the King with bodily harm if he did not agree to a new Cabinet Council comprised of their own members — William L. Green, Godfrey Brown, Lorrin A. Thurston, and Clarence W. Ashford (Kuykendall R. S., 1967). This greatly increased the insurrectionists’ influence on the Hawaiian government as they were looking to get Hawai‘i annexed to the United States. Six days later, the King’s new cabinet forced upon him a new constitution, which reduced the power of the majority native population and gave voting rights to foreigners. However, the legislative assembly never ratified the new constitution given that they were in a year in which the legislature did not meet. Through widespread coercion and in spite of some resistance, the people conformed to this constitution, known as the Bayonet Constitution. These two events in July 1887 were the beginning of a slow revolution against the Hawaiian government.

King Kalākaua died on January 20, 1891 while abroad in San Francisco. His sister, Lili‘uokalani, whom he named successor, ascended to the throne. After a trip around the islands to meet with the subjects of the Kingdom, Queen Lili‘uokalani decided to draft a new constitution in January 1893. Lili‘uokalani’s constitution, similar to the 1864
constitution, would restore power to the native population and reduce the power of the insurgents.

The serious threat to their recently gained power compelled the insurgents to engage in a full-scale revolution — the complete takeover of the Hawaiian government. Given the relatively small size of their group, they called upon the U.S. Minister to Hawai‘i, Minister Stevens, to land armed U.S. marines under the guise of protecting American lives. The Minister agreed since he was colluding with the insurgents to take over the Hawaiian government. This show of force was enough to prevent the Queen from forcefully apprehending the insurgents, as she did not want to run the risk of appearing to attack the U.S. military, thus providing it with cause to engage in battle possibly leading to the takeover of the Hawaiian government. Rather, upon the proclamation by the Hawaiian insurgents that they had taken over the Hawaiian government, Queen Liliʻuokalani yielded her executive authority to the United States through the following protest.

I, Liliʻuokalani, by the Grace of God and under the Constitution of the Kingdom, Queen, do hereby solemnly protest against any and all acts done against myself and the constitutional Government of the Hawaiian Kingdom by certain persons
claiming to have established a provisional government of and for this Kingdom.

That I yield to the superior force of the United States of America, whose minister plenipotentiary, His Excellency John L. Stevens, has caused United States troops to be landed at Honolulu and declared that he would support the said provisional government.

Now, to avoid any collision of armed forces and perhaps the loss of life, I do under this protest, and impelled by said force, yield my authority until such time as the Government of the United States shall, upon the facts being presented to it, undo the action of its representatives and reinstate me in the authority which I claim as the constitutional sovereign of the Hawaiian Islands (Kuykendall R. S., 1967, p. 603).

On the same day, U.S. Minister Stevens sent a note to Sanford Dole, the head of the newly proclaimed Provisional Government (PG), recognizing the PG as the *de facto* government of Hawai‘i. On February 4th, PG representatives, acting as if they had the legal right to cede the Hawaiian Islands, initiated a treaty to have Hawai‘i annexed to the United States (Kuykendall R. S., 1967). Although it was at the end of his term,
President Harrison signed the treaty and submitted it to Congress for ratification. When Grover Cleveland took over the office of the President, he withdrew the treaty until an investigation could be done in regards to the claims made by Queen Liliʻuokalani in her protest. This essentially terminated the treaty as the formal investigation conducted by Commissioner James Blount concluded that the blame for the revolution was on Stevens, the U.S. Minister in Hawaiʻi.

On July 4, 1894, the PG declared itself the Republic of Hawaiʻi and waited for the political climate in the U.S. to change. President McKinley took over for Cleveland in 1897. This provided a better opportunity for the revolutionaries to realize annexation, as McKinley was an imperialistic president. The representatives of the Republic of Hawaiʻi signed a new treaty of annexation and submitted it to the U.S. for their approval. Despite significant protest from the Queen and nearly 40,000 of the 48,000 subjects of the Hawaiian Kingdom through petitions against annexation (Associated Press, 2012), President McKinley signed the treaty and submitted it to Congress for ratification. However, Congress was split on the issue and the treaty could not garner the two-thirds vote it needed to pass. Thus, the second attempt at a treaty of annexation was dead. Hawaiʻi’s status remained as an independent nation-state
Due to the outbreak of the Spanish-American war in 1898, the U.S. military coveted Hawai‘i as a prime location to support its engagements in Guam and the Philippines. Unable to acquire Hawai‘i through any legal means, U.S. representatives decided to feign annexation. Representative Francis Newlands submitted a joint resolution to the Committee on Foreign Affairs to annex the Hawaiian Islands: a process that only required a simple majority to pass but was unilateral and had no legal effect outside the United States. In fact, every other territory the United States had acquired throughout its history was acquired through a treaty, the legal means by which a country obtains new territory. With no legal effect, the joint resolution was unable to cede any Hawaiian territory to the U.S. The U.S. military set up its first camp, Camp McKinley, subsequent to Congress passing the resolution. Thus began the military occupation of the Hawaiian Kingdom.

Until today, there has never been a treaty of annexation passed to have the independent nation-state of Hawai‘i annexed to the United States. During occupation, the U.S. has continued to pretend to have annexed Hawai‘i, passing laws in Washington D. C. that purportedly have legal effect in Hawai‘i such as the Statehood Act in 1959. However, they do not have any actual effect outside the U.S. The U.S. military has been
illegally occupying the Hawaiian Kingdom ever since 1898. But its status as an independent state remains intact under international law (Craven, 2004).

It is critical at this point that I elucidate what I believe to be a paradigmatic shift in scholarship on the politics of the Hawaiian Kingdom published after the beginning of the U.S. military occupation of Hawai‘i in 1898. I refer to the long-standing older paradigm as the colonization paradigm and the newer as the occupation paradigm. The shift has been effectual in two areas: one, the findings of the new scholarship has radically changed what some believe to be Hawai‘i’s political status today; and two, the perspective of the new scholarship has changed the way some scholars approach studying and analyzing events of the Kingdom period.

Colonization Paradigm

The leading scholar in the occupation paradigm, Dr. David Keanu Sai, asserts, “[C]olonization, as a social and political theory, has dominated the scholarly work of social and political scientists regarding Hawai‘i” (2007, p. 13). Those working within this paradigm do so under the assumption that Hawai‘i was once a colony of the United States of America or at least functioned as a colonial outpost.
Sai argues that the colonization paradigm is a fraud beginning with the ineffectual attempt by the United States Congress to annex the Hawaiian Kingdom through a joint resolution of Congress. This fraud was “necessitated” by the need to suppress the fact that Hawai‘i is indeed an independent nation-state, which can only be annexed through a treaty, a process that failed twice within the United States. This suppression of Hawai‘i’s real political status was critical to the U.S. maintaining its control of Hawai‘i. Sai notes several key actions throughout the 1900s that worked to continue the fraud.

One, in particular, deals with the United Nations:

Another case of fraud occurred in 1946, when the United States ambassador to the United Nations identified Hawai‘i as a non-self-governing territory under the administration of the United States since 1898, and, in accordance with Article 73(e) of the U.N. Charter, submitted Hawai‘i on a list of non-self-governing territories that would ultimately achieve a form of self-governance. The initial list comprised territories that were colonized by Australia, Belgium, Denmark, France, Netherlands, New Zealand, United Kingdom and the United States. In addition to Hawai‘i, the U.S. also submitted to the
list American Samoa, Guam, Panama Canal Zone, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. The U.N. General Assembly, in a resolution entitled Principles which should guide Members in determining whether or not an obligation exists to transmit the information called for under Article 73 (e) of the Charter, defined self-governance as (a) Emergence as a sovereign independent state; (b) Free association with an independent state; or (c) Integration with an independent state. None of the territories on the U.N. list of non-self-governing territories, with the exception of Hawai‘i, were recognized sovereign states. (Sai, 2007)

For decades, this fraud was perpetuated in the political discourse in Hawai‘i and became especially ingrained with the emergence of the cultural renaissance and sovereignty movement. Influenced by the civil rights movement in the United States, Kānaka Maoli in the 1970s, began a cultural and political renaissance induced by the political struggle in Kalama Valley on O‘ahu (Mast & Mast, 1996, p. 344). A product of this renaissance was the development of a number of sovereignty groups³

³ In the context of Hawai‘i social-political movements, the term sovereignty group refers to a group of people whose mission is to seek political redress from the United States of America for either the
(e.g., *Ka Lāhui Hawai‘i* and *The Reinstated Kingdom of Hawai‘i*). These groups were very diverse in terms of political agenda and means for achieving their particular agenda. Sai points out, “For all intents and purposes, the Hawaiian Kingdom, as an independent state and the protection it has under international law, was absent within the movement, while the historiography of European and American colonialism consumed the Hawaiian psyche” (2007).

Even the 1993 Apology Bill signed by President Bill Clinton, apologizing to the Native Hawaiians for the U.S.’s involvement in the overthrow of the Hawaiian Kingdom, was crafted in a manner to preserve the fraud. Firstly, the apology for overthrowing the government of an independent nation-state was made to only part of its citizenry — an ethnic group, the Native Hawaiians. Secondly, it spoke of the Kānaka Maoli as an indigenous group that deserves the rights afforded indigenous people. “Whereas, the indigenous Hawaiian people never directly relinquished their claims to their inherent sovereignty as a people or over their national lands to the United States, either through their monarchy or aboriginal people of Hawai‘i or subjects of the Hawaiian Kingdom. The type of redress they seek varies from group to group. For example, some want monetary reparations, some want nation-within-a-nation status for their group and some want to achieve independence via secession from the Union.
through a plebiscite or referendum” (United States of America Public Law 103-150). What is here referred to as inherent sovereignty is the type of sovereignty possessed by Native Americans. It is not a granted by another government but rather the consent of the people. The Native American groups are still subject to the supreme sovereign, the United States federal government. This is different from the sovereignty of the Kingdom of Hawai‘i recognized internationally in 1843.

This bill further entrenched the sovereignty proponents into the colonization paradigm by acting as a catalyst for further political action based on the concept that Kānaka are indigenous people colonized by the United States. Throng of books on the history of Kānaka Maoli lament the ill effects of this supposed colonization by the U.S. (e.g., Silva, 2004 & Osorio, 2006). While the ill effects they lament are real, politically speaking, they inaccurately point to colonization as the cause. Rather, the ill effects are the results of prolonged occupation coupled with a methodical suppression of that occupation through the promotion of a colonization model.

**Occupation Paradigm**

Over the past 10 years, a new paradigm in Hawaiian Kingdom scholarship has been developing (see Beamer, 2008; Craven, 2004; Sai,
Effectuated mainly through the research of Sai, this paradigm asserts that the nation-state of Hawai‘i is still intact albeit with an exiled government and occupied by the U.S. military. The same assertion I made earlier in the introduction (see The Hawaiian Political Context in Chapter two).

Therefore, we have two competing paradigms of Hawaiian Kingdom history scholarship — the colonization paradigm and the occupation paradigm. The former tends to view Kānaka Maoli as a people who were continually victimized throughout the Kingdom period and, of course, after the overthrow. The latter tends to take a more historical relativist approach and locates agency more with the Kānaka Maoli and other Hawaiian subjects up until the overthrow.

Where the two really take separate paths is in dealing with how to rectify the situation today. The colonized paradigm has a wide array of solutions, from status quo to nation within a nation (e.g., Akaka Bill⁴) to completely seceding from the United States of America through decolonization. Of course all of these require a presumption that Hawai‘i

---

⁴ Commonly known as the Akaka Bill, the Native Hawaiian Government Reorganization Act’s most recent iteration (2012) states its purpose to be, “To express the policy of the United States’ relationship with Native Hawaiians and to provide a process for the recognition by the United States of the Native Hawaiian governing entity.”
was actually annexed to the U.S. The occupation paradigm’s solution is to end U.S. military occupation and continue as the Hawaiian Kingdom, the independent nation-state. Although I state it so simply, it is a complicated process prescribed by international law (Sai D. K., 2008).

For a scholar working within the colonization paradigm, it is commonplace to render the status of Kānaka Maoli as one of two things, depending on the scholar’s political agenda — either as uncivilized people incapable of managing their own political affairs or as perpetual victims of a colonial agenda. In extreme cases, the latter tends to be so acute for “liberal” scholars — rendering every event as a colonial conspiracy — that it is akin to the former perspective. Within the context of education, most of the scholarship of the early 20th century portrays an inept Kanaka (e.g., Odgers, 1933; Wist, 1940) and most of the more recent scholarship tends to portray the perpetual victim Kanaka (e.g., Benham & Heck, 1998; Dotts & Sikkema, 1996). There has been no publication to date that analyzes education during the Kingdom period within the occupation paradigm except for a chapter on the Royal School in Beamer’s dissertation (2008).

\[5\] For a more in-depth discussion on the occupation paradigm, see chapter 3 of this dissertation.
Making the transition from colonization paradigm to occupation paradigm provides a perspective of Hawaiian Kingdom history that empowers the researcher to view people and events in a different way. It allows the researcher to see the Ali‘i as agents in Hawai‘i’s interaction with the West.

Beamer illustrates the difference nicely by analyzing the following passages:

We record once more our reverent and thankful acknowledgement of the success with which God, in his providence and by his spirit, has crowned with the work of our missionaries in that field, and by which a race of barbarians-- without letters, without arts, without industry, and with no humanizing institutions--has been transformed into a Christian nation, civilized, and free, under a government of laws, with free schools for all the children, and with the Bible in the homes of the people. (American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions Quoted in Bartlett, 1871)

When Captain James Cook stumbled upon this interdependent and wise society in 1778, he brought an entirely foreign
system into the lives of my ancestors, a system based on a view of the world that could not coexist with that of Hawaiians. He brought capitalism, Western political ideas (such as predatory individualism), and Christianity. (Trask, 1999)

Beamer explains that while these two passages seem in opposition to each other, they are very similar in perspective. “Yet, what is surprisingly similar about these two opposing viewpoints is that the exclusive agent is the missionary or European and the effect is an erasure or non-representation of the native agent” (Beamer, 2008, p. 20). Again, it is a matter of perspective. Were the Westerners manipulating the Ali’i or were the Ali‘i manipulating the Westerners, their concepts, and their technologies to benefit the Kingdom and its subjects? Beamer argues that the latter is much more the reality than the former.

Seeing Agency Through Hybridity

In terms of the concepts and physical technologies of the West, Beamer talks about the idea of hybridity — the incorporating and Hawaiianizing of foreign technologies. As foreign ideas, such as capitalism, and foreign technologies, such as the printing press, enter into the Kanaka Maoli world, there is a negotiation that determines how much
Kānaka are used by and how much Kānaka use the foreign idea. To incorporate foreign ideas that are beneficial, Beamer argues, “on certain levels it should be fairly common sensical” (2008, p.26). To adapt the ideas on Kanaka terms is evidence of the agency they possessed. These introduced technologies should not be shunned simply because they are of foreign origin. Rather their benefits and detriments along with the appropriate level of hybridization should be considered in determining whether or not to incorporate them into a society. Beamer asserts that this is the exact diligence with which the Ali‘i approached these decisions.

Of course, one of the early ideas to be introduced to Hawai‘i was Christianity. Although the Kānaka’s first exposure to this religion was upon the arrival of the first Westerners, the thrust to have Kānaka Maoli incorporate it into their society was upon the arrival of the first group of missionaries from Boston in 1820. Despite the earlier dismantling of the traditional religious system in Hawai‘i as a government religion, the missionaries’ welcome was not inevitable. In fact the Ali‘i thoroughly deliberated on whether or not to let them stay and share their religion.

According to Kamakau (1996),

ʻAha ʻōlelo ihola ka mō‘i a me nā aliʻi no ka noho ʻana o nā misionari ma Hawaiʻi nei; a he mau lā ʻokoʻa ka hui ʻana o nā
ali‘i. ... Ua noʻonoʻo nui nō nā ali‘i me ke akahele, no ko lākou makaʻu nui i ia manawa i nā haole i noho kū'oko'a mai i loko o kēia aupuni, o lilo lākou i mau mea keʻakeʻa i ka pono o ka lāhui. ... Noʻonoʻo nō nā ali‘i o ia mau là. Hoʻoholo ihola ka mōʻī a me kona mau kūhina a me nā ali‘i e ʻae like ana i ka noho ʻana mai o nā Haole misionari ʻAmelika ma ke aupuni Hawaiʻi nei, me ke keʻakeʻa ʻole ʻia o kā lākou ʻoihana, me ka hoʻomana ʻana i ko lākou akua, a me ko lākou aʻo ʻana i kā lākou ʻoihana misionari i kēia lāhui kanaka i hoʻokahi makahiki, akā, ina e ʻike ʻia ka pono o kā lākou hana, a laila, e noho loa lākou ma Hawaiʻi nei” (p. 245).

[The king and the chiefs held a council meeting regarding the missionaries’ stay here in Hawaiʻi. The meeting lasted three whole days.... The chiefs seriously and carefully deliberated because of their great fear at that time of the caucasians who lived independently in this country lest they become an obstacle for the wellbeing of the nation.... They indeed did some serious contemplation. The king along with his high advisors and chiefs decided to allow the American missionary}
Caucasians to reside here in Hawai‘i without impeding on their ministry, the worshiping of their god, nor the teaching of their mission work to this nation of people for one year. However, if their work is determined to be righteous, then they may stay here in Hawai‘i for an extended time.]

As an added measure of safety, the missionaries, for the time being, were only allowed to share their religion with the Ali‘i and not preach to the masses. A number of Ali‘i did convert while some refused. Those who did convert typically did so on their own terms. Beamer (2008) notes on this subject, “While many of the ali‘i were Christians, they were a particular type of Christian, vastly different from the kind of Christian as was Hiram Bingham or the kind of Christian Bingham wanted to produce. The ali‘i seemed to open a space for a Hawaiian-Christianity, a negotiated hybrid space, where there was no contradiction in having an individual soul while looking to genealogy for mana” (p. 29).

This perspective of hybridity, or co-optation, as a reflection of Kanaka agency is relatively non-existent in the literature on education during the kingdom period. The text that is looked to as the foremost authority on education during the Kingdom period, A Century of Public
*Education in Hawai‘i* by Wist⁶ (1940), is problematic in terms of its portrayal of Kānaka as agents. First, he describes Captain Cook’s arrival in Hawai‘i as a “discovery of Hawaii” (p. 13) completely disregarding the fact that Kānaka Maoli already developed a sophisticated society here over hundreds of years. Wist also excludes Kānaka from the narrative on Kamehameha’s unification of the islands. “The coming of the white man with his knowledge of firearms and of military strategy, made it possible for Kamehameha to consolidate the Islands under a single sovereignty” (p. 13). Not only does Wist attribute the unification to the white man, he eliminates all the Kānaka who made the conquest possible from Kamehameha’s priests and advisors to all his well-trained warriors. Wist continues by blaming Kamehameha for the lack of foresight to know that his political accomplishment would lead to the demise of the Hawaiian culture. “A staunch advocate of the civilization of ancient Hawai‘i, [Kamehameha] did not foresee that his conquest would help to facilitate the introduction of another culture” (p. 13).

---

⁶ Wist was appointed as the principal of the Territorial Normal and Training School in 1921. In 1931 he became the first dean of the Teachers’ College at the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa, which later became what is known today as the College of Education.
The Erasure of Kanaka Agency in Public Education

In summarizing the development of public education in Hawai‘i, Wist once again gives little, if any, credit to Kānaka. “[T]he extraordinary feature of the Hawaiian educational plan is that, in a land far removed in the Pacific, it did become typically American, and that the transformation was achieved even before the Islands themselves became American soil” (p. 36). Another salient example of minimization of the Kanaka agent is in Wist’s critique of Mataio Kekūanāo‘a. It is a gross misrepresentation of a great leader. Wist erroneously states, “This was definitely a political appointment. Kekuanaoa, while not himself of royal blood, was father of both Kamehameha IV and Kamehameha V….Kekuanaoa knew little English and was therefore handicapped in dealing with the problems which came before him….under existing conditions his appointment to the Board of Education was not conducive to progress in the public schools” (p. 76). A number of these assertions demonstrate the author was a poor researcher. Kekūanāo‘a was, indeed, of royal blood. According to Kameʻeleihiwa (1992), Kekūanāo‘a was “a kaukau ali‘i of O‘ahu and Maui lineages” (p. 123). And the claim that he knew little English is absurd given the extent of his governmental work with foreigners including his travels to England. Furthermore, Wist provides no citation for this
statement. In fact, Wist’s entire book lacks references to authoritative sources.

Another earlier piece by Stueber (1964) claimed, “Kekuanaoa did not speak English” (p. 103). This claim, too, is not substantiated with any reference. Brieske’s (1961) dissertation, although more thorough with citations, asserts definitively and without any citations that, “In reality, Kekuanaoa was only the nominal head because his inability to understand English prevented him from having much voice in the proceedings of the Board” (p. 60). In his dissertation that pre-dates Wist’s publication, Odgers (1933) paints a slightly different picture of Kekuanaoa stating, “The governor was a Hawaiian of unusual ability and high integrity” (p. 98) but follows this by, like the aforementioned authors, totally denying him any agency in education. “[H]e spoke and understood only his mother tongue. His two sons [Kamehameha IV & V] and their party used the splendid old noble as a figure head and a screen behind which to further their anti-missionary and anti-American policy” (p. 99).

Varigny (1981), who worked alongside Kekūanāoʻa, provides a much different description of the chief. “His unquestionable authority over native Hawaiians, whom he influenced as much by his title of high
chief as by his loyalty and famous courage, his practical experience, his
diplomatic skill, and his deep devotion to his son, all made him a valuable
ally. In all circumstances I found him a sincere and steadfast friend, and
his trust in me never faltered” (p. 138).

The treatment of Kekūanāo‘a in more recent works on education
during the Kingdom period is also inconsistent. In their book, *Culture and
Educational Policy in Hawai‘i*, Benham and Heck (1998) fail to even
mention him, thus omitting him as a significant player in Hawaiian
education policy despite Dotts and Sikkema’s assertion that, “Kekuanaoa
had an understanding of education and, upon his recommendation, a law
creating the position of inspector general of schools was passed in 1865.
This law acknowledged the need for educational leadership in the school
system. It was a factor in the shift toward secularization of the schools”
(1994, p. 25). Dotts and Sikkema, by far, assign the most agency to
Kekūnāo‘a, a person who was very involved in politics and was willing to
engage the Kings and the legislature in debate on the appropriate
language to be used as the medium through which to teach the children
of Hawai‘i (Kekūnāo‘a, 1864). So, the representation (or lack thereof)
of Kekūnāo‘a in the literature is illustrative of the larger omission of the
Kanaka agent from educational developments and achievements during
the Kingdom period. This warrants a new study and analysis of the agents of education of that period. Other key institutions for which this type of study will reveal a more significant Kanaka agency include the Royal School (see Kuykendall, 1938; Richards, 1970; Schultz, 1994; & Beamer, 2008) and the Hale Nauā (see Silva C. L., 1999; & Kuykendall R. S., 1938).

Kanaka Agency and Original Hawaiian Language Sources

To begin to understand compulsory public education during the Kingdom period, I turn to the historian who Kameʻelehiwa (1992) called, “[T]he greatest Hawaiian historian ever born” (p. iii), Samuel Mānaiaikalani Kamakau. Born in 1815, Kamakau became a prolific writer on many Hawaiian subjects after being schooled at Lahaina. He wrote numerous volumes in Hawaiian language newspapers including his longest serialized volume on Hawaiian history and politics in the newspaper Kūʻokoʻa. In 1961, Kamehameha Schools Press first published a translation of this work of Kamakau and titled the book Ruling Chiefs of Hawaiʻi (Kamakau, 1992). As a researcher of Hawaiian history, I find this publication problematic because it is a translation of original text into a language that is not even remotely similar to the original language. As skilled as the committee who did the translations was, there had to be a
significant loss of meaning. This is one reason it is necessary to use the original text written in Hawaiian. A close comparison of *Ruling Chiefs* and the original text reveals another major problem — an erasure of kanaka agency. Someone, or some people, who were working on the book made the decision to omit some of Kamakau’s original text\(^7\). The reason for the omission is not documented in the book. It seems rational to assume that omissions made were of text deemed less significant because of the length of the entire volume. However, closer examination of the content of the omitted pieces exposes a disappointing trend — the omission or inaccurate translation of accusatory, counter-hegemonic language and, in one case, the omission of a huge chunk of text that appears to be Kamakau’s counter narrative to the contemporary “great Captain Cook” narrative.

As Kameʻeleihiwa (1992) notes in her introduction, “Kamakau is also unafraid of giving his own opinions about the changes he observed in his society” (p. iii). In his December 7, 1867 column in *Kūʻokoʻa*, Kamakau makes some accusatory remarks about the Haole, remarks that

\(^7\) “The group included Mary Kawena Pukui, Thomas G. Thrum, Lahilahi Webb, Emma Davidson Taylor, and John Wise. Mary Kawena Pukui then reviewed the entire translation, together with Martha Warren Beckwith, who added the footnotes. Dorothy Barrere and Caroline Curtis proofread the manuscript” (Kamakau, 1992).
never make it into *Ruling Chiefs*. First of all, when speaking about a particular outbreak of smallpox brought into Honolulu in March of 1853 that killed thousands in that town, Kamakau (1867) noted, “Ua hoopaeia ae na Haole i loaa i keia mai ino ma Kahakaaulana e Kauka Poka” (p. 1) [*The Haole who were stricken with that disease were brought ashore at Kahakaaulana by Doctor Potter*]. He continues by describing the devastation caused by the introduction of other diseases including leprosy.

Kamakau then points to the causes of all this.

O ke kumu i loaa mai ai keia poino ame ka hooneo ana hoi i ka lahui Hawai‘i nei, ua maopopo, o na Haole no ka poe pepehi lahui; a o ka puni hano hano ame ka puni waiwai, o laua no na hoa aloha no ka mai luku; a o ke kaalalo ana ma lalo o na kanaka o na lahui e, he mau keena hookipa oluolu ia e hoola[h]aia mai ai na mai lele a me na mai aai… (Kamakau, 1867)

[As for the reason the Hawaiian race\(^8\) experienced this peril and devastation, it is known that the Haole are genocidal; and coveting glory and wealth are the companions of epidemics; and the subjugation under foreigners is a pleasant hospitable]

\(^8\) *Lahui* (Lāhui) can be translated as *nation* as well as *race*. Kamakau could have intended either or both.
location through which communicable and infectious diseases are spread.]

The accusations Kamakau makes here are so direct, that a colleague of mine, after reading the original newspaper article, expressed to me his curiosity about how this passage got translated in *Ruling Chiefs*. We searched for the page in *Ruling Chiefs* where this paragraph should be located. To our surprise it was not in the book at all. What made it worse is that there is no notation anywhere showing that some text was omitted. This text that was omitted is definitely significant. Thus, we speculated that it was perhaps too politically charged for the conservative group of translators. Other speculation is that perhaps the editor or publisher made the decision. Whatever the case, very important information was excluded from the English translation of Kamakau’s work which changed the overall tone and perhaps nullified one of his main objectives for writing the piece. Of course, there would need to be more evidence to corroborate this.

On December 22, 1966, in his column, Kamakau wrote about the Aliʻi Kalani‘ōpuʻu, Kamehameha and Kekūhaupiʻo. In *Ruling Chiefs*, this piece concludes chapter VII. However, at the very end, there is a three-period ellipsis indicating that there is text in the original that has been left
out of the translation. The subsequent chapter begins with an ellipsis then proceeds to discuss Captain Cook’s arrival in Hawai‘i. The publication date of his article on Captain Cook is January 19, 1867. Therefore, the omitted text that is simply noted by the ellipsis spans part of the December 22nd edition, the entire editions for December 29, January 5, January 12, and part of the January 19th edition. A cursory examination of the omitted text will give us some insight to conjecture the reason for the omission.

The first text the ellipsis replaces is at the end of the section on Kalani‘ōpu‘u. It says, “Eia ka manawa kupono no ka hiki ana mai o na Haole makamua ma Hawai‘i nei” [This would be the appropriate time for the arrival of the first Caucasians here in Hawai‘i.] (Kamakau, 1866 p. 1). However, Kamakau begins the subsequent section with a discussion on the prodigious amount of sea travel by Kānaka Maoli throughout the Central and Eastern Pacific. He asserts that they sailed to places like “Nuuhiva ... Bolabola ... Upolu ... Sawaii ... Holaniku ... Holanimoe ... Hakukake ... Lalokapu ... Kuukuu ... Malimali ... Muliwaiolena ... Maokuululu” (p.1) as well as other lands. He continues with a substantial discussion of even older Kānaka Maoli (e.g., Papa or Walinu‘u) who were prolific travelers in the Pacific Ocean. Other well known ancient ancestors of
Kānaka Maoli who Kamakau cites are Paʻao, Kaulu, Hema, Paumakua and Moʻikeha. Numerous others are mentioned as well.

Kamakau then examines all the instances where Haole came to Hawaiʻi prior to Cook, although he never mentions Cook in this section. In several instances, Kamakau refers to examples found in mele of Haole arriving in Hawaiʻi including one group he noted as probably being the ancestors of a white strain of people with light colored eyes in Waimānalo “mamua aku o ka makahiki 900” [prior to the year 900] (Kamakau, 1867).

The two examples examined here—relating to genocide and to the arrival of the first Haole people—are highly political narratives that speak to imperialism and colonialism. The former is an accusatory piece blaming the Haole for the diseases that ravaged the Kānaka Maoli and the latter is a counter narrative to the popular aggrandizing narrative of James Cook.

This extensive piece about the numerous sea expeditions of Kānaka Maoli as well as Haole, all prior to Cook’s arrival, gives a sense that the Pacific was somewhat of a “freeway” of ocean travel for hundreds of years prior. Kamakau is successful in relegating Cook’s arrival to just another one of the many arrivals in Hawaiʻi. This is a far cry from the heroic pedestal on which Cook is placed as a trail-blazing captain who “discovered” many new lands.
Kamakau, as an author, had a propensity for issuing politically charged critiques. He was an active mid-19th century Kanaka critic of his own history. The omission of his critiques covers up this fact. It relegates Kamakau to a passive receptor of circumstance rather than an agent working to effect positive change. As elucidated above, these critiques were perhaps too anti-hegemonic for the publishers (and/or editors) of the translation of his work to include in their publication, *Ruling Chiefs*. This omission has turned out to be a notable erasure of Kanaka agency. Fortunately, however, this omission only occurs in the translated text, not in the original Hawaiian text where his ideas are clear and to the point.

**Kanaka Agency in the Kingdom and Contemporary Education**

The exposure of Kanaka agency in education during the Kingdom era will have a significant impact on students and educators today. We need to know about the great successes the Kānaka Maoli realized in education during the Kingdom period and understand that Kānaka made the decisions that effectuated these successes. The rapid decline in education happened after the removal of Kanaka self-determination within education, after the overthrow of the government. This decline was
further ensured by the fallacious incorporation of Hawai‘i into the United States.

For Kānaka Maoli, compulsory education after the overthrow of the government ceased to be a Kanaka endeavor and rather became a White-American endeavor. Ogbu (1991) explains that the way in which a minority was incorporated into the U.S. determines its frame of reference on the difference in culture between the school and the home. With this holistic view, we understand that the problem of our people in education is both political and pedagogical. As Freire states, “A deepened consciousness of their situation leads people to apprehend that situation as an historical reality susceptible of transformation” (Freire, 1993, p. 66). He continues, “[T]o alienate human beings from their own decision-making is to change them into objects” (Freire, 1993, p. 66). The loss of political agency in Hawai‘i in 1893 changed Kānaka Maoli into objects to be subjugated by the occupying forces of the United States.

Because of forced (illegal) incorporation into the U.S., the content of education as well as the pedagogy became foreign to our people and represented the occupier’s ideology. One theory of the effect this has had is that many Kānaka have resisted the indoctrination into the foreign ideology and complete assimilation into their society through non-
conformance in education. This creates a situation where Kānaka have been failing in education as a form of resistance to the larger political oppression. In essence, our failure has been our successful resistance to acquiescing to the oppressor’s ideology although it has not necessarily led to the strengthening of the Kānaka’s social and political station. Although the pedagogical problem seems relatively simple to rectify, the political situation and the orientation of the oppressed group as elucidated by Ogbu make it much more complicated to resolve since pedagogy is so intimately connected to politics. Therefore, the larger context in which liberation is necessary is the political.

Wilson writes, “[I]f we wish to change this situation (i.e. the conditions under which we live), then we must change the power relationships. If we are to prevent ourselves from being created by another people and are to engage in the act of self-creation, then we must change the power relations” (1993, p. 17). This quest has been going on to various degrees since the overthrow of the government in 1893 and subsequent military occupation and fabricated annexation of 1898. As I noted previously, this is a slow process that has been compounded by our misunderstanding of history. Meanwhile, a number of
Kānaka are continuing to resist indoctrination through education, which leaves us in this complicated quandary.

Therefore, as Hawaiian subjects seek a resolution to the prolonged military occupation of our country, it is imperative that we develop educational programs with foundations that consider the pedagogical and political liberation necessary for our success. On a psychological level, if the crux of the issue for Kānaka Maoli is that education and success in education is a foreign, or more specifically a Haole endeavor, then our programs must liberate us from that perspective. This poses a significant challenge. As Wilson (1993) asserts on the African experience in America, “[W]e have a situation where the educational psychology that’s taught to teachers and others who are in charge of our children is a psychology based on the history and experience of another people, and despite the best intentions of these educators, they will miseducate our children in terms of that psychology” (p. 21).

As Kānaka Maoli work to end the occupation of our country, we must develop educational programs in which our children feel as if their experiences and success are Hawaiian. The three areas in which achieving this is most critical are educational content, pedagogy, and administration.
Wilson addresses the first two in the following passage.

We must develop a psychology of our children based upon our own history and experience. It is only then that our pedagogical and educational approaches will be in line with their personalities. Only then can we move our children forward to fulfill our needs and our desires as a people. If we wish to understand ourselves and wish to understand other people’s psychology we must then understand our history and their history. We must be very clear about this matter.” (1993, p. 22)

If an educational system does not increase the sense of Hawaiian identity of these three areas to some degree, it could be considered a part of the oppressor’s machine of indoctrination. This also applies to those initiatives that claim to be Hawaiian programs. Wilson opines, “A higher education means that we will just be educated servants — nothing more, nothing less” (1993, p. 18). Acquiescing to this type of system relegates the oppressed to serving the agenda of the oppressor.

In the final section of this dissertation, I will discuss a program at the University of Hawai‘i at Hilo that was established to Hawaiianize university content and pedagogy in various disciplines: Uluākea. This
program is currently under the administration of Kānaka Maoli. Uluākea
was founded in full consideration of the theories and some of the
historical content examined in this dissertation.

Contemporary Kanaka Maoli School Failure

“Hawaiians⁹ are Leading the World in Education¹⁰ and Literacy.”

Although this seems improbable as a headline today, at one time it was
accurate. In the mid 1800s, education was a top priority in the Kingdom
of Hawai‘i, especially reading and writing. So much so, that Hawai‘i’s
literacy rate was considered the second highest in the world
(Kamehameha Schools/Bishop Estate, 1991, cited in Benham & Heck,

---

⁹ During the Hawaiian Monarchy, the term Hawaiian referred to a
subject of the Kingdom, regardless of race. Today, it is equivocally used
to refer to those of aboriginal Hawai‘i descent or simply someone who
resides in Hawai‘i. The ambiguity in this sentence is intended. However,
throughout this paper, I will refer to those of aboriginal descent as Kānaka
Maoli or Kānaka, and to those who are subjects of the Hawaiian
Kingdom—a group to which most Kānaka belonged—as Hawaiian subjects.

¹⁰ Throughout this paper I will be referring to the concept of
education. As with the ambiguity of the term Hawaiian, education may
refer generally to the idea of the teaching and learning process whose
purpose is the perpetuation of a particular cultural heritage. In this
dissertation, it is used to refer to both public education in the Hawaiian
Kingdom and the education of Kānaka Maoli. I will provide descriptors or
the necessary context to give more clarity.
The technology of literacy was introduced formally to Hawai‘i only in 1820, when the first missionary group arrived. The Hawaiian language was eventually reduced to writing in 1822. In 1840, the Hawaiian government transitioned to a constitutional monarchy including a written constitution, bill of rights, and laws. An important component of the laws made education compulsory for Hawaiian youth. This established a sound foundation for a society that had an orientation towards academic achievement.

So why does the idea of Kānaka Maoli leading the world in education seem so improbable today? Perhaps because, over the years in the educational system in Hawai‘i, the achievement gap between Kānaka Maoli and other students continues to be significant (Kana‘iaupuni, Malone, & Ishibashi, 2005). According to Kana‘iaupuni et al., “On the whole, educational measures such as standardized tests, special education enrollment, high school graduation, and college completion reflect substantially lower achievement among Native Hawaiians compared with statewide norms” (p. 3). This statement, especially juxtaposed to the aforementioned hypothetical headline, is cause for great concern as the current status of Kânaka Maoli in education is reflective of the Kânaka’s station in Hawai‘i society. How can a people go from leaders in the world
in education to the worst in educational achievement in their own homeland, compared to other ethnic groups? Ogbu’s research on African and other minority students in the United States will shed some light on this question.

**Cultural-Ecological Theory of Minority Schooling**

Ogbu conducted his principal ethnographic research in the 1970s to understand the underperformance of African youth in education. His research on minorities in the urban area of Oakland, California led him to develop the cultural-ecological theory of minority schooling. Unlike most of the other theories developed over the past 30 years (e.g., cultural deprivation theory (Hirsch, 1987; Will, 1989), cultural difference theory (Au, 1991; Erickson, 1987), the cultural-ecological theory considers the historical, social, cultural and economical contexts within the larger context of the society in which they function (Ogbu, 1978, 2003). Ogbu (1992) explains the limitations of the competing theories, “(a) [T]hey often take an ahistorical perspective on minority school learning problems; (b) they tend to analyze the problem of minority schooling out of context; (c) they ignore the minorities’ cultural models and the effects of these models on the groups’ interpretations of and responses to schooling; (d) they ignore that group’s cultural frame of reference and
identity; and (e) they are generally non-comparative in their approaches” (p.288).

Ogbu’s need to understand why other minorities who face similar issues with cultural difference between home and school perform well academically helped him develop this theory on minority school performance. He asserts that there are differences between ethnic groups in their approach to schooling depending upon their terms of incorporation into the United States. And this difference accounts for the difference in “their view of schooling in terms of (a) its role in their striving to achieve upward social mobility or make it, (b) the extent to which the school and those who control it can be trusted to provide them with ‘the right education’ and (c) how the process of schooling affects their minority cultural and language identity” (Ogbu & Simmons, 1994, p. 3).

Ogbu and Simons (1994) classified minorities into three categories. First there are the autonomous minorities. These are groups that are culturally or linguistically distinct from mainstream American culture and language but are not subordinated to major degrees. Examples of these groups are Jews and Mormons. For the most part, autonomous minorities are of European descent. Members of this category of minority groups
tend to have a relatively high rate of success in school. They will not be
discussed further in this dissertation.

Voluntary minorities are immigrant groups who have moved
voluntarily to the United States to seek political freedom or economic
wellbeing. These groups tend to see the social barriers of culture and
language differences as obstacles to be overcome in order to obtain a
better life. Examples of these groups are the Chinese and Punjabis: two
groups who typically left a difficult situation in their homeland for better
opportunities for upward social mobility (Ogbu, 1978).

The third category is the involuntary minorities. These groups have
been incorporated into the United States as a result of force—through
slavery, conquest, colonization, or military occupation—rather than by
choice in expectation of a better future. Usually, involuntary minorities
have been displaced in their own homeland by the United States.
Examples of these are the Native American Indians, Kānaka Maoli, and
African Americans. Of these three, there is a difference between the
African Americans and the other two who are indigenous to the lands now
being called the United States of America, as the former has a homeland
outside the U.S. However, the African Americans who are the
descendants of the slaves forced to go to America are so disconnected
culturally and linguistically from Africa, that a return to the homeland is no longer a viable option.

In his explanation of the differences between voluntary and involuntary minorities, Ogbu differentiates between primary cultural differences and secondary cultural differences. Primary cultural differences are differences between the minority group and the dominant group that existed prior to immigration. This characterizes the relationship between the voluntary minority and the dominant group (e.g., Japanese Americans and Anglo Americans). Ogbu (1992) explains that this illustrates the voluntary minorities’ cultural frame of reference—“[It] is merely different, not oppositional” (p. 298) to the dominant culture.

Furthermore, voluntary minorities’ purposes for coming to the United States are usually to obtain economic wellbeing, better overall opportunities, or greater political freedom. These groups typically bring with them a strong sense of social identity and retain this, at least during the first generation, despite their acculturation into the mainstream of the host culture. Ogbu (1991) also contends that immigrants have a “degree of trust or acquiescence...toward members of the dominant group and the institutions [they] control, such as schools” (p. 13). Thus the response of the voluntary minority to economic, political and social
barriers is that they are simply obstacles that they will overcome with hard work or more education. These minorities also have a dual frame of reference in which they compare their current situation with their former situation or with that of their peers in their land of origin (Ogbu, 1991). This provides them with an optimistic view of the future.

Secondary cultural differences, on the other hand, are differences that developed after a group has become an involuntary minority. “[I]nvoluntary minorities tend to develop certain beliefs and practices, including particular ways of communicating or speaking as coping mechanisms under subordination. These beliefs and practices may be new creations or reinterpretations of old ones” (Ogbu, 1991, p. 15). The new or hybrid culture becomes a marker of identity as a member of the group and contributes to a frame of reference, which is not merely different from, but also in opposition to, the cultural frame of reference of the dominant group. Whenever there is an oppressive force, there is always an oppositional force of resistance that develops (Foucault, 1980). The cultural differences also serve as a mechanism for maintaining boundaries. Thus, the differences experienced by involuntary minorities are not viewed as obstacles they must overcome, but rather as symbols of identity to be maintained. For these groups, there is a dominant (i.e.
White) way of speaking and behaving and there is a particular way of speaking and behaving within their group.

Despite the views of involuntary minorities toward the dominant culture, they still hold on to the “folk theory of success” emphasizing the importance of education to get ahead (Ogbu 1978; 1991; 1992; 2003; Ogbu & Simons, 1994). However, “this verbal endorsement is not usually accompanied by the necessary effort” (Ogbu 1991, p. 24). The development of a culture that is oppositional to mainstream culture and their schools is detrimental to the success of the involuntary minorities in education. They also interpret the learning of the dominant group’s ideology and frame of reference as detrimental to the survival of their own culture, language, and identity. This leads to a conscious or unconscious opposition or ambivalence toward school learning. For example, Ogbu (1991) notes that in Stockton, Blacks interpreted school learning as “obeying White people’s orders as Blacks did in the days of slavery” (p. 27). And Gibson (1987) reported that Crucians felt that schoolwork was tantamount to slavery. This is also true for school rules of behavior—they are interpreted as an imposition of the dominant group members’ cultural frame of reference. Ogbu (1978) has suggested that
this probably makes it difficult for involuntary minorities to accept and follow school rules of behavior and to persevere at their academic tasks. Furthermore, when involuntary minority students behaved in a manner conducive to academic success, their peers often accused them of acting like their oppressors. Blacks are accused of acting like Whites or Uncle Toms and, likewise, Kānaka Maoli like Haole. This is a form of social control by the minority group in an effort to ensure its members are not conforming to the ideology of the oppressor. It is this phenomenon of social control that has resulted in contriving the myth of the “‘alamihi syndrome” where it has been claimed that Kānaka are like ‘alamihi crabs in a bucket (see Perry, 2002). As a crab attempts to climb out of this unfortunate situation, the other crabs pull it back down preventing it from improving its station. This type of social control is also a mechanism for cultural preservation—especially in groups that have been culturally devastated by colonization or prolonged occupation such as the Native American Indians and Kānaka Maoli. The more threatened the minority group perceives its culture to be, the more salient the oppositional culture and social control will be.
Kānaka Maoli as an Involuntary Minority

Popular belief today is that Kānaka Maoli have been incorporated into the U.S. through imperialism by annexation. Legally, however, this is incorrect. Rather, the Kingdom of Hawaiʻi, an independent nation-state, has been occupied by the U.S. military since 1898. Nonetheless, in the consciousness of the large majority of Kanaka Maoli, we have been incorporated into the U.S. through subjugation via annexation. “The Hawaiian sovereignty movement is now clearly the most potent catalyst for change. During the late 1980s and early 1990s sovereignty was transformed from an outlandish idea propagated by marginal groups into a legitimate political position supported by a majority of native Hawaiians. The vast outpouring around the events in January 1993 commemorating the centennial of the overthrow of the monarchy was a convincing demonstration of this rising consciousness” (Kent, 1993, p. 198). Sai further contends that, “For all intents and purposes, the Hawaiian Kingdom, as an independent state and the protection it has under international law, was absent within the movement, while the historiography of European and American colonialism consumed the Hawaiian psyche” (Sai, 2007, p. 12).
According to Ogbo’s theory, Kānaka Maoli have developed secondary cultural differences that are oppositional to mainstream school culture, which precludes us from performing well in school. We have the data to substantiate the effect part of Ogbu’s assertion (see Kana’iaupuni et al., 2005). The cause however, can be explored in multiple ways. The concept of subjugation under the United States as a cause for poor school performance does beg the question, “How did Kānaka Maoli perform in formal education prior to our subjugation?”
Chapter 3

Kahua Hawaiʻi Research

Just as the revival of the Hale Nauā\textsuperscript{11} by Kalākaua was focused on keeping our people connected to our story and our ways of understanding the world, so too do I seek to keep our people connected to our story from our perspective through my research.

Ua hoomahana a hoomaemae kahua, ua kukulu ia na kia ka pouhana, ua kau na kua, ua moe na kaola ua hia na aho, ua hoa kaula, ua kau ke pili, ua paa ka hale, ka Hale Naua a ke Alii, ua ku i ka makahiki puni i ka malama i o Welo i ka po i o Kane i ke au ali i o Kalakaua I, ka alua lau ali i eha kaau eono kauna me akahi mai ia Lailai. A mai ke au o Kumulipo ka po, a i o Kapomanomano ke ao ana. I kulike ai keia, me na makahiki 24,750 i ka helu makahiki kahiko; a, mai a Kumulipo a ia Kapomanomano he 4,000,000,000,000,000 mai ka hookumu ana o ka honua. A mai ka helu hou oia ka la 24, o Sepatemaba MH. 1886. (Hale Nauā, 1886)

\textsuperscript{11} Hale Nauā is “A secret society formed or revived by King Kalākaua for the study of the ancient Hawaiian religion and manner of living” (Pukui & Elbert, 1986)
The foundation has been warmed and purified, the posts have been erected, the beams are set, the rafter lashings have been bound, the rope has been secured, the grass thatching is in place, the house is complete, the Nauā house of the Chiefs that is, which within the month of Welo on the night of Kāne in the reign of Kalākaua I, the 985th from La‘ila‘i. And from the time of Kumulipo in darkness, until Kapōmanomano in daylight. Which is the same as 24,750 years in the ancient ways of counting years; and from Kumulipo to Kapōmanomano, it is 4,000,000,000,000,000 from the establishment of the the earth. And in the new system of accounting, it is the 24th of September, 1886.

Thus began King Kalākaua’s revival of the Hale Nauā also known as the Temple of Science. According to Article I of its constitution, “The object of this Society is the revival of Ancient Sciences of Hawaiʻi in combination with the promotion and advancement of Modern Sciences, Art, Literature and Philanthropy” (Hale Nauā, 1886). Kalākaua and the Society members were focused on reconnecting Kānaka Maoli to their
traditional relationships with the environment of which every component is akua (divine). This is evidenced in their emblems, their protocols, their formations and even the moon phase on which they chose to meet, Kāne\(^{12}\) (Hale Naua, 1886).

I, too, define my objective as promoting the reconnection of Kānaka Maoli and all other people in Hawai‘i to the traditional, indigenous relationships to the environment. The intimate connection of people to their environment is so fundamentally important that although my focus is on Kānaka Maoli, if all people make a similar connection the Hawaiian environment would benefit greatly. My pursuit of this intimate connection has shaped my philosophy on research as well as guided me along a particular path that compels me to see research in a distinct way. I am calling research in promotion of this agenda Kahua Hawai‘i research. The rest of the methodology section of this chapter contributes to my definition of Kahua Hawai‘i.

My research examines how Kānaka maintenance of agency was the major factor in their success in school during what is commonly called the Kingdom Period in Hawai‘i. The time frame of this period is from Kamehameha I’s unification of all the islands in 1810 until the overthrow

\(^{12}\) Kāne is the principal of the 4 major gods. He is the fundamental elements of life — fire and water.
of the monarchy in 1893. However, I begin my examination in the 1820s, the time when compulsory education for all was developed in Hawai‘i (Kamakau, 1996, p. 249).

The difficulty being a Kanaka Maoli researcher is that I see the possibility of liberation through a process that has promoted our subjugation as a people for over 100 years—research. As Smith (1999) writes, “The word itself, ‘research’, is probably one of the dirtiest words in the indigenous world’s vocabulary” (p. 1). That is not to say that Kānaka Maoli did not engage in research prior to their interaction with Westerners. On the contrary, research was a part of everyday life—an exploration into the natural world deepening our understanding of phenomena so as to improve our life. We still have a lot of the pre-Western research data today. It has been preserved through the chants that have been passed down through generations and, after the introduction of literacy, through publications. Unfortunately, very few people understand the complexities of the technical concepts used in this method of data reporting and distribution. Our disconnection from the environment, thus from the context, has led us to misinterpretations or incomplete interpretations of these traditional data.
One monumental piece of reporting of traditional data is the Hawaiian cosmogony, the Kumulipo. It is a Hawaiian interpretation of the order of the natural world beginning with its creation\textsuperscript{13}. The data found throughout this record is coded in a way that requires not only a strong understanding of the Hawaiian language and poetry, but also an intimate relationship with the environment in order to fully understand it.

Research, like that conducted by the Hale Nauā on the Kumulipo, has the power to liberate our people and, at the same time, the power to emasculate the opposition of liberation (Silva, 2004, p. 105). It often results in an understanding that in indigenous communities, traditional indigenous ways of life are more conducive to healthy living than foreign ways of life. It is, thus, a critique of the application of foreign ways in indigenous communities. Because of this, the Hale was often the subject of harsh criticism from the enemies of the Hawaiian government. Thus, it is not surprising that the insurgents who planned the coup against King Kalākaua were staunch public critics of the Hale Nauā and its agenda. The English language newspaper the \textit{Daily Bulletin} expressed its opinion about Hale Nauā members: “It is not a fit thing for respectable people ... sensible natives laugh at its proceedings, and further ... its apostles are

\textsuperscript{13} See the following subsection for more on the Kumulipo.
demented, crazed, pupule, off their base, clean gone, not proper subjects to be at large and should be closely watched by their friends” (as cited in Karpiel, 1999). Looking at the history of research in Hawai‘i, what becomes obvious is that research, in and of itself, is not malevolent. It is the agenda of the research and the political position relative to that agenda that defines its disposition. Research, then, is never neutral. It is the seeking of new knowledge in promotion of a particular agenda.

As a community we do not know our history well enough to have an understanding of the time when we used research for our own agenda of maintaining our connection, reconnecting us and uplifting our people. Therefore, the bad taste our people today have for research like that which Smith describes is the only memory we have. It is my hope that my research can contribute to the liberation of our people’s minds with regard to education and research to help guide us on the path to reconnection to the positive traditions of our ancestors.

Understanding the Connection to the Environment

As illustrated in the cosmogonic chant, Kumulipo, Kanaka Maoli philosophy holds that all things are related. Adhering to this philosophy, I believe that my research is influenced by all my experiences and the experiences of my ancestors. Of course, some experiences in my life
have influenced me more than others. Likewise, some of my ancestors have chosen to influence me more than others and I have chosen to call upon the energies of certain ancestors more than others.

Furthermore, the Kumulipo implores us to pay attention to our traditional spiritual connection to our particular natural environment. As an educator residing both in the moku of Kona on the island of O'ahu and the moku of Hilo on the island of Hawai'i, I am compelled by kuleana, the Hawaiian concept of responsibility, to honor the indigenous ways of these lands. I am even further compelled to do so as a Kanaka Maoli educator, one whose ancestors have engineered the indigenous culture to be most conducive to the health, and thus the survival, of the environment.

Therefore, although I recognize and honor all of the influences in my life, it is the survival of the environment, as the foundation of the indigenous worldview in Hawai'i that has been the paramount influence on my work.

The Kumulipo expounds the genealogical, thus biological, connection of all creatures as they are “born.” After the foundation of the Earth, evolution begins with the birth of the ‘uku ko‘ako‘a, the coral larva\(^\text{14}\), and progresses through the creatures of the Hawaiian

\(^\text{14}\) ‘Uku ko‘ako‘a is translated by Martha Beckwith in her book The Kumulipo (1951) as coral polyp. However, a colleague of mine, Dr. Misaki Takabayashi, a coral biologist, and I have been working on several projects
consciousness to the birth of Laʻilau, the first human, making an evolutionary link, thus a familial link, between all living things.

After the birth of many of the creatures, there is the recurring line, “O ke akua ke komo, aoe komo kanaka.” This can be interpreted in several ways. Beckwith (1951) translates it as, “The god enters, man cannot enter” (p. 59). I interpret it to mean that the creature is imbued with divinity, not a less-than-divine (human) essence. Hence the creature is not simply a representation of the god, but rather an actual body of the god. This interpretation is aligned with religious practices of Kānaka as evidenced in the salient concept of reciprocation with nature. In hula for instance, whenever the dancer needs to destroy or sacrifice a part of a plant for his or her religious practice, the dancer must reciprocate through sacrifice of his or her own in whatever prescribed form (e.g., chant). This is further illustrated through the human or human-substitute sacrifice practiced when removing an entire ‘ōhi’a tree from the forest to build parts of a heiau.

Thus, this belief that the plants, the animals, the land, the atmosphere and the sea are gods, genealogically connected to humans, positions Hawaiians to be proper stewards of the environment. A healthy over the past several years in which she has suggested that a more accurate translation for ‘uku koʻakoʻa is the coral larva.
life on a relatively small island depends on it. This is the foundation of the Hawaiian culture, the foundation that helps define the agenda for my research.

At the onset of frequent interaction of Kanaka with Westerners, Kanaka began a slow departure from this spiritual foundation. The abolishment of the kapu system in 1819 as the governing religious system of Hawai‘i, and the subsequent adoption of Christianity as the government religion, furthered the decline in adherence to traditional philosophies. Although Christianity was becoming the chief religion for most of the royalty, there was resistance amongst the masses to the change (Kamakau, 1996, p. 216). This moral decline was relatively slow but steady. The decline in followers of Kanaka principles was compounded by the considerable dwindling in population due to introduced diseases.

Education became the main battleground for this moral war. On one side was an education to lure Kanaka away from traditional morals and principles and on the other, an education to maintain or to keep people from abandoning Kanaka morals, principles and culture. In the 1820s and 1830s, the Calvinist missionaries focused on promoting the moral decline—the demise of Kanaka principles—through their preaching
and the government supported mission schools. Of course, they did not frame it as “moral decline.” Rather, to them, it was a promotion of moral ascension. However, the missionaries had the advantage of the lure of literacy—a mainly Hawaiian literacy, which for a people who highly valued the attainment of new knowledge, was an exceptional lure. And at the time, the technology of literacy could only be attained through the religious education being offered by the missionaries and their trained Kānaka Maoli.

My research, as a result of this history, is heavily motivated by my developing indigenous spiritual reconnection to the environment, a connection that, over the generations, has been systematically dismantled in my family by the Christian influences in Hawai‘i. I believe that my research, in an indirect way, contributes to the liberation that leads our people, and others, to realize the importance of maintaining our indigenous spiritual connection to the environment.

Ethics

In my childhood, I recall being regularly scolded for being nīele, or perhaps just overly niele. My mother and grandmother would simply exclaim sternly, “Nīele!” Pukui and Elbert (1986) define nīele as, “...inquisitive, curious, plying with frivolous questions (often used in
pejorative sense, as of a busybody asking things that do not concern him); ... As an exclamation of annoyance: you are too inquisitive!” (p. 265). My family was educating me on the boundaries of appropriate behavior for asking questions. Traditionally in the Hawaiian culture, we were expected to use the method of observation rather than direct inquiry. This is expressed in the Hawaiian saying, “Nānā ka maka; hoʻolohe ka pepeiao; paʻa ka waha. Observe with the eyes; listen with the ears; shut the mouth. Thus one learns” (Pukui, 1983, p. 248).

Today, as people in Hawaiʻi seek to reconnect with Kanaka traditions, there is a tendency to over-generalize concepts such as the disdain for questioning. The concept gets applied in every situation, even situations where its applicability is questionable. The concept of nīele must be appropriately contextualized and tempered with the concept of kuleana. Nānā ka maka; hoʻolohe ka pepeiao; paʻa ka waha is most appropriate in the context of a master-apprentice relationship where the apprentice is learning a particular skill from a master. This method of observation is also emphasized with young children as more critical to their safety than vocalized inquiry might be.

Most research, however, requires a particular level of inquiry. It requires me to be nīele. Given the fact that I am researching within
historical government or other published documents, I have some leeway to be that way. I believe that the kuleana I have as a Kanaka researcher who has dedicated his life to the betterment of the Hawaiian people through education provides me further leeway. In fact, because of my station, I believe I have an obligation—another aspect of the concept of kuleana—to be diligently nīele to ensure I am doing our kūpuna justice in telling their story.

Another salient context in which inquisitiveness was viewed with much disfavor is when inquiring where a person was going. It was considered bad luck to discuss any business beforehand, as it would result in failure. For example, it is believed that if a person was heading to the ocean to fish and was asked where he was going, his efforts would be futile. I have heard of stories where a fisherman was asked if he was going fishing. He turned around and returned home without even attempting to fish. In some cases, the responder would retort ambiguously, “Aia nō i ke au a ka wāwae. Whichever current the feet go in” (Puku‘i, 1983, p. 10) or sarcastically, “I ka pāhiʻuhiʻu. To play the game of pāhiʻuhiʻu” (Pukui, 1983, p. 129), a play on the word hiu which means to pry. There are a number of stories in which there is appropriate questioning, even in regards to where someone is going. It is common to
read about an Aliʻi asking a passing canoe, “He waʻa e hele ana i hea?” [Where is this canoe traveling?] as in the Kaʻao no Wahanui (Fornander, 1916, p. 517). An important component of this situation that allows the question to be asked appropriately is kuleana. Kuleana here refers to a person’s proper relationship to the situation, including the person being asked. The relationship considers the questioner’s social position to the content of the question, the station of the questioner and responder, and the questioner’s perceived agenda. In other words, excluding Aliʻi, appropriate inquiry may require the inquirer to be an insider or closely connected to insiders, be someone the responder feels is worthy of the information, and be responsible to care for the information and use it appropriately.

This conflicts with the Western concept of academic freedom, which allows for the freedom to investigate any issue. Wong (2009) says that unlike the Western concept of the production of knowledge, knowledge in traditional Hawaiian society “was not necessarily free flowing” (p. 4). Nor was access to particular knowledge equal. If someone did not have kuleana to possess the knowledge, the person was not granted access. It was the possessor of that knowledge, the steward of the knowledge, who was burdened with the responsibility to care for the
knowledge and insure that only the proper people were given access lest it be used perniciously. This principle is something I take seriously, causing me to regularly check myself to ensure it is appropriate for me to be doing this research.

Another fundamental principle in my research is the importance of having connections to or relationships with the research and the researched. Amongst Kanaka Maoli today, it is common protocol to work to discover established relationships with people when first meeting them. Upon introduction, the first question usually asked is, “Where you from?” or “What school you went?” One reason to do this is to gather data about the person to understand his or her regional culture. The principal reason, however, is to work to find a mutual acquaintance. Important to understand here is that there already exists an established relationship; it just needs to be brought to light. Likewise in research, there needs to be an existing relationship between the researcher and the researched. This is in conflict with typical ethnographic research that emphasizes the researcher as an outsider to reduce bias. The outsider ethnographer may work to develop some level of relationship with the researched in order to gain access to information otherwise not available. The whole premise of the relationship building here, however, is incongruent with the Kanaka
principle. It is not about going through the process in order to gain access to information. It is not about building relationships in order to do research. Rather, it is about having the relationship underpin the research.

**My Connection to the Research**

As a Kanaka Maoli, I believe that my genealogy provides me with *part* of my relationship with my research. It gives me *part* of the kuleana to do this research. The reason I emphasize part is because genealogy alone does not preclude a person from misusing the information. It cannot be assumed that the genealogy translates into connection or that Kanaka Maoli genealogy presumes an agenda of liberation. It would be too broad and conflict-ridden to define what I call Kahua Hawai‘i research, Hawai‘i-based research, by the scope of agendas of all Kanaka Maoli researchers. This is similar to how Christians and Muslims do not want their religions to be defined by the agenda nor the actions of hardcore fundamentalist groups on the margins of their respective religions. Rather, Kahua Hawai‘i research should be based on the fundamental principles of the indigenous culture of Hawai‘i.

There must be more required of the relationship of the researcher to the research and to the people directly connected to the research. The other part of my relationship to the research is the connection I have
with our environment, our akua, which forces me to prioritize their survival and health as an outcome of my research, at least indirectly. I believe that my agenda of social and political liberation for our people is a critical part of the relationship to the research that strengthens my kuleana to do the research. As Smith notes, “The elements [of the indigenous research agenda] that are different [from the Western research agenda] can be found in key words such as healing, decolonization, spiritual, recovery. These terms seem at odds with the research terminology of Western science, much too politically interested rather than neutral and objective” (1999, p. 117). Perhaps the most compelling reason that I have kuleana to do this research is the way I have been guided, over the years, towards this research.

My guidance begins with my name — not necessarily the meaning of my name but who named me. I received my name from my Uncle George Lin Kee. He was the last native speaker of Hawaiian in our family — evidence of the continual disconnection in our family from our culture and our way of thinking. In our extended family, he did not give anyone a Hawaiian first name besides my brother and me (his own children and grandchildren received English first names and Hawaiian middle names). Now, my family (my wife, my children and I) has been the one to bring
back Hawaiian language as a home language within our extended family. My wife and I learned it in college and from speaking with my uncle and my children, who are part of a new generation of native speakers of Hawaiian. Thus, I believe my naming started me off on this path, although I did not realize it until recently.

At the end of my middle school years, my life took a very unexpected and positive turn in my path to my research. I was recruited to play basketball for a varsity team at a high school outside of my school district. I only knew one student at this school. This was a big leap for me but kept me away from some of the negative influences I would have encountered had I remained in my district. At the end of my high school years, I was working hard to get into a college in California to play basketball. I was not successful. But a counselor of mine suggested a special program at UH Mānoa. The program took local students who may not have been accepted into UH Mānoa due to grades or SAT scores (mine was the former) but showed potential to succeed academically. While this may not seem like such a radical path change, it was definitely not the path on which I was looking to travel.

At UH Mānoa, I began as an aquaculture major. After a couple of classes, I became disenchanted and decided that I would like to be a news
broadcaster. So, I became a Journalism major. In the meantime, I was faced with a graduation requirement to take 1 year of a foreign language along with a year of a related culture course.

During my entire seven years as an elementary school student, I was enrolled in an afterschool Japanese language school. My mother, who was employed in the tourism industry at the time, believed that I would be greatly advantaged by knowing Japanese. So, when faced with the decision in high school to take a language, I registered for Japanese, which was easy for me. Now in college, it would have been more efficient for me to have either registered in beginning Japanese or tested out of the language requirement by taking the Japanese language test. However, the people with whom I associated at the time and those residing in pō, my kūpuna, had a different plan for me. They all influenced me to take Hawaiian language. This was probably the most significant path change in my life. It was a new path that led me to what Paulo Freire calls conscientização (1993) and to a much more profound Kanaka Maoli

---

15 Hawaiian language was included as a choice in the foreign language requirement even though it obviously is not a foreign language in Hawai‘i. Later iterations of the requirement called it a “second language requirement.”

16 “The term conscientização refers to learning to perceive social, political, and economic contradictions, and to then take action against the oppressive elements of reality” (Freire, 1993, p. 17).
consciousness. While learning Hawaiian language alone would have been transformative, it is the people with whom I had the good fortune of working and the opportunities we created together that have been acutely transformative.

Because I was doing so well in my Hawaiian language classes, I eventually began losing interest in Journalism and decided to major in Hawaiian without a clue as to the employment to which it would lead. Fortunately, the very semester after I graduated, I was recruited to teach Hawaiian at the University, a position I did not seek.

During my tenure as a Hawaiian language lecturer and instructor at UH Mānoa, I was not much of a student of Hawaiian History. Given my current research topic, this underscores the divine guidance that determined the path changes that happened since 2001. The birth of my daughter, Kauikamaluokalehua Hāweokupuna Makekau-Whittaker, in 1998 was the impetus for my wife and me to seek a way to move to her homeland of Hilo. We wanted to raise our family in a community where there were more opportunities to connect spiritually with the environment. Hawai‘i Island’s rural setting and strong spiritual energy provided by elements like the volcano and Maunakea made it conducive to strengthening the connection. It would not be difficult for my wife to
transfer to Hilo as a public school teacher. However, finding appropriate employment for me proved to be challenging. One day late in 2000, my wife, Leinani was checking her email. She received a message from someone she did not know. She read the message and realized that it was most likely intended for someone else named Leinani. The sender of the email was suggesting that the intended Leinani check out an announcement for a position at the University of Hawai‘i at Hilo, which he attached. The position was something I was interested in doing and I met all the minimum qualifications and most of the desirable qualifications. My wife and I were amazed that this “mistake” happened to us and were excited that this was our opportunity to move back to Hawai‘i island. I ended up accepting the position as an Educational Specialist at UH Hilo to develop a comprehensive support program for Kanaka Maoli students.

Being in Hilo has definitely afforded me the opportunity to develop and fine-tune my connection to the Hawaiian culture through the development of my relationship with the natural Hawai‘i environment. Living and working in a place where the forest is so prominent and where the volcano is so influential in the culture, I am impelled to acknowledge and honor these energies in my cultural activities. This mandates that I become more intimately connected with these environments. Having the
many opportunities, such as ‘awa and māweke ceremonies, to express this connection in an indigenous way (e.g., chant and ceremony) has influenced my research by highlighting the importance of the health of our natural environment to the health of our culture and us as a people.

The most recent event that influenced the path my research would take was the first time our program, the Kīpuka Native Hawaiian Student Center, invited Keanu Sai to speak at UH Hilo. Because the study of Hawaiian politics is so weak at UH Hilo, our program decided to invite several experts to speak on different aspects of Hawaiian history and politics. Although I realized that there is some relationship between my research and the research of each of these speakers, I did not expect to be so heavily influenced by any of them to focus my own research on the Hawaiian Kingdom period. But this is exactly what happened with Sai.

I believe that all of these significant events that have led me to do this research are connected to me because of my kūpuna in pō — the realm of the gods. What I research, why I research it, and how I research it are all influenced by those in pō. It is also from whence we humans come and where our spirit returns when we die. Thus, it is here that our ancestors reside. Part of what gives me kuleana to research what I research is the guidance I have had from those in pō. I cannot claim
complete agency in choosing the path I am on for my research. In other words, in some big decisions I have made that has led me to where I am today, there was another force with greater insight that guided me to make those decisions. Some of the turns in my life have been too abrupt and too radical to be planned by me.

I attribute these abrupt and radical changes in my research path to guidance from ancestors and others in pō. These “people” feel it is important for me to study the history of public education during the kingdom period. Perhaps it is to reveal something that has not been revealed in the available literature on the subject. Perhaps because they know the positive effect it will have on our young Kānaka Maoli. Perhaps both. Whatever the case, I believe that being guided to this point gives me some sense of kuleana on two levels: one, that it is appropriate for me to be doing this research because those connected to it guided me on this journey and two, that I have been given the burden of bringing this information to our people so that it will be used to assist in our transformation and liberation.

Data Collection

One of the difficulties in researching the concept of agency during a period when official government documents did not exist is that the
researcher must rely on second-hand accounts. Of course, these are all interpretations of events and thoughts. They must all be approached in that way. Understanding the inherent bias in each interpretation is crucial to developing a history that is as close to accurate as possible. The narrative posited by eminent scholars about the early years of education (e.g., Wist, 1940) was based on the perspective of the missionaries whose very presence in Hawai‘i necessitated a narrative that painted a picture of the aboriginal people as needy and incapable (e.g., Bingham, 1847). Unfortunately, the journals of these missionaries are some of the only data available from the 1820s in the context of education. Even most early Kanaka scholars, such as David Malo, were heavily influenced by Christianity and the missionary narrative, which can be seen throughout his work, *Hawaiian Antiquities* (1951).

As my examination of education moves into the 1840s, when the Hawaiian government is quickly transitioning into a constitutional monarchy and when public education is thus codified, there is a proliferation of government documents. These documents are my primary sources of data. The Report of the President of the Board of Education to the Legislature, for example, is presented to the legislature at its session every 2 years. This report gives insight into the key issues
with schools as well as provides some statistical tables regarding attendance, demographic information of teachers and the development of schools. Another key primary source is the correspondence letters between the heads of schools and the Department of Instruction/Education, which have been maintained in the Hawai‘i state archives. While these also report on statistics on particular schools, there are also letters discussing issues with the school including which language the agency is mandating as the medium of instruction. These documents are essential as they provide the most accurate picture of what was happening in that particular time period rather than relying on an interpretation by a contemporary observer or by another disconnected writer interpreting from a different time period. I can provide my own interpretation of the data, which considers the most current research and comes from the occupation paradigmatic perspective.

In my research on the Hale Naua, I again use a combination of primary and secondary sources, the official documents of the Society (Silva, 1999) as well as others’ interpretations of the Society. Most of the latter consist of critiques of the Society such as the Kalākaua’s Hawai‘i 1874-1891 pamphlet collection (Hawaiian Historical Society,
1968), Lorrin Thurston’s Memoirs of the Hawaiian Revolution (Thurston, 1936), and the newspaper *Pacific Commercial Advertiser*.

An additional secondary source of information is the Hawaiian language newspapers. In 1834, the first newspaper in Hawai‘i, *Ka Lama*, was published in the Hawaiian language. It was a missionary newspaper whose main objective was to promote Christianity. A number of missionary newspapers were published over the years thereafter and had a monopoly on the market in terms of the promotion of ideology through print. That was until the 1860s, when the first paper promoting a pro-Kanaka ideology, *Ka Hōkū O Ka Pakipika*, was published (Chapin H. G., 1996, p. 59). These documents were published prolifically, and when understood in their particular context, provide a wealth of information. As secondary sources, they are beset by bias. However, understanding and acknowledging the biases makes the use of these sources less of a concern.

Combining these four key sources of data—missionary interpretation of events, historians’ interpretations of events, newspapers, and primary source government documents—can contribute to a fairly accurate understanding of how Kanaka maintenance of agency was the major factor in their success in academics. It is important to note here
that these sources have been used regularly by other historians, except for the Hawaiian language newspapers, which were less accessible to scholars who did not possess the ability to read Hawaiian.

Data Analysis

The relatively recent work of Sai on the Hawaiian Kingdom and international law represents a shift in perspective on the events during the Kingdom period and their implications for Hawaiian nationals today. According to Sai, “[C]olonization, as a social and political theory, has dominated the scholarly work of social and political scientists regarding Hawai‘i” (2007, p. 13). His work, employing historical relativism within the context of constitutional law, maintains that the framework of military occupation of a recognized independent nation-state rather than colonization of a people is the accurate optic through which to understand what took place and continues to take place in Hawai‘i.

My functioning for years within the colonization paradigm along with my lack of research in the area are what led me to make the assumptions that the success realized in education during the Kingdom period was a byproduct of the colonial imposition. Sai’s research that sheds light on Kanaka agency within politics and government during the Kingdom era sparked a strong interest in me to use the occupation
paradigm in my quest to research and understand the educational successes realized by Kānaka Maoli during this period. I believed that if the story of education parallels the story of government, then all the stories of Kanaka success in education we were extolling to inspire Kānaka to pursue higher education were even more inspirational because it would be more of a Kanaka Maoli initiated and determined program of success rather than a foreign determined program. Furthermore, if the stories of these two domains were parallel, the actual establishment of compulsory public education would be a great story of inspiration. During one of my early discussions with Sai, he encouraged me to do the research to better understand public education from the 1820s to 1893 saying that it was one of many domains where good research has not been done and where we still have a lot to learn.

I began by looking at original government documents on education such as the aforementioned Report of the President of the Board of Education to the Legislature. My examination of this report provided me an experience that shed light on the difference between the colonized paradigm way of thinking and the occupation paradigm way. I was very intrigued by a lot of the content of the Report of the President of the Board of Education in the year 1864. Mataio Kekūanāoʻa was the
President. He made some strong statements in his report regarding the language to be used as the medium for the education of Kanaka children: “The theory of substituting the English language for the Hawaiian in order to educate our children is as dangerous to Hawaiian nationality as it is useless in promoting the general education of the people” (BOE report, 1864). This statement, along with others in the report, seemed to me, at that time, to indicate that Kekūanāo‘a was providing a counter narrative to the hegemonic powers that were conspiring to force the Kānaka Maoli to abandon their language and be educated completely in English.

Excited about this powerful official government document, I thought I would show it to Sai. I shared how I thought it was Kekūanāo‘a’s counter narrative to the missionaries’ desire to change the language of the schools to English. Sai disagreed with my theory. He shared with me how it was King Kamehameha IV, Kekūanāo‘a’s son, who was promoting education in English because of the influx of English speaking foreigners with whom Hawai‘i was dealing. Kekūanāo‘a was actually providing a counter narrative to his son’s idea. This was more indicative of a healthy government where important philosophical debate can occur on such important topics.
When the researcher is positioned within the colonization paradigm, he/she tends to see every struggle as a battle between the colonizer and the colonized. It has a strong emphasis on victimization. Sai’s quick reminder to me to follow the tenets of historical relativism positioned me back into the occupation paradigm. This paradigm tends to assign much more agency to the Hawaiian chiefs and their government. It forces the researcher to have a better understanding of the whole context in which these events happened and to theorize about them from that frame. Kekūanāoʻa should not be viewed as a victim in this context. Rather, he was a powerful government agent engaging other government agents in a debate over what would be the best course of action for their country in terms of education. The paradigm through which a researcher views a particular event is a key factor in determining the path his or her research takes. This new paradigm of understanding the historical events of the Hawaiian Kingdom from the reign of Kamehameha I to today has significantly influenced the path my research has taken. For me, this path does more to honor the brilliant work the Aliʻi did, such as establishing public education. I developed a much deeper appreciation for them through my research.
Therefore, the majority of this research is not about the uncovering of new sources of information never before looked at. Rather it is about applying a new paradigm of analysis to the interpretation of historical data. I will examine all the aforementioned sources in order to piece together a narrative that substantiates my theory that Kānaka Maoli were much more the agents and champions of the establishment and the successful continuation of public education in Hawai‘i than they have been given credit for.

I believe that this dissertation will contribute to the larger narrative of Kanaka Maoli agency. It speaks to the prodigious success that can be realized in academics when Kānaka Maoli exercise self-determination, controlling all aspects of education. It also speaks to the effect of the inability to exercise self-determination on young Kanaka Maoli students today. Our profound understanding of the history of education and politics in Hawai‘i in the 19th century can help us develop educational policies and educational programs that improve Kanaka Maoli success.

While there are many paths to liberation, I firmly believe that education provides the stones that pave each of those paths. The theories posited herein have helped us develop our programs at the Kīpuka Native Hawaiian Student Center at the University of Hawai‘i at Hilo.
Our goal of liberation cannot be realized without the critical mass of Kanaka attending our institution. The stories reanalyzed through this research will provide inspiration to the Kanaka Maoli students to continue their education at institutions like ours.

**Dissemination of Findings**

Smith (1999) writes, “Sharing knowledge is also a long-term commitment” (p. 16). She continues, “For indigenous researchers,...this is what is expected of us as we live and move within our various communities” (p. 16) Therefore, the dissemination of the findings of my research needs to happen on various levels. Most critically, it needs to reach those who have not realized the liberating power of education. This can be accomplished through presentations in the local communities, including high schools. However, in order to broaden that reach into the communities, the findings must be presented to the larger academic community at conferences or through presentations at the various local educational institutions. Based on this research, these institutions can then develop educational programming aimed directly at creating a more Hawaiian institution of learning similar to the goal of the Uluākea program
at the University of Hawai‘i at Hilo\textsuperscript{17} and similar to that which Kekūanāo‘a recognized as important over 140 years ago.

History teaches us, that the life of every nation depends upon the preservation of its individuality among other nations. The theory of substituting the English language for the Hawaiian, in order to educate our children, is as dangerous to Hawaiian nationality, as it is useless in promoting the general education of the people. The true policy of an independent Kingdom should be to encourage a patriotic spirit and a loyal pride among the people for its language, its King, its laws, and its institutions for the public good. No better way could be devised to destroy those feelings, which underlie the stability of all nations, than to allow the people to acquire a contempt for their native language... (Kekūanāo‘a, 1864)

Therefore, it is my hope that this research will inspire our people to honor the brilliant Ali‘i and other kūpuna, such as Kekūanāo‘a who possessed exceptional foresight, by heeding their messages, by understanding the extraordinary intelligence and diligence with which they led our people, and by acting upon these gifts to create educational

\textsuperscript{17} See http://kipuka.uhh.hawaii.edu/Uluākea/Uluākea.html
programs that are truly liberating for all people and for all aspects of our environment.
Chapter 4

Language, Education, and Kanaka Maoli Agency

When the missionaries of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions (ABCFM) arrived in Hawai‘i, the organization’s modus operandi was to learn the language of the natives and teach them to be literate and to be Christians through the native language. Arguing to have Hawaiian be the medium of education throughout the Kingdom, H.R.H. Kekūanāo‘a (1864) noted, “Dr. Anderson, the Secretary of the A. B. C. F. M., whose experience of almost half a century among the Missionary Schools of the Oriental and Polynesian nations, eminently qualifies him to decide upon the practicability of teaching English to our people, and the advantages to be derived from it, has declared, that the result of frequent and most expensive trials, in all those countries, prove, not only the impracticability, but the great disadvantages to the nation, of such a system as compared to one based upon the language of the country” (p. 11). Thus began the work of the first group of missionaries in Hawai‘i who arrived in 1820.

Literacy was a key first step. In order to more efficiently spread the gospel, it was critical that the Ali‘i—the only people to whom the missionaries were initially allowed to preach—could read and write. At
first, literacy and religious education were in English until the missionaries were able to reduce Hawaiian to writing. The context in which Hawaiian was reduced to writing and in which the technology of Hawaiian literacy was developed was Christian education. Thus literacy and the Christian religion became closely interconnected in the Hawaiian Kingdom.

In the Hawaiian language, the term *palapala* is used both to describe the *gospel* and *literacy*. According to Pukui and Elbert (1986), palapala is defined as, “Document of any kind, bill, deed, warrant, certificate, policy, letter, tract, writ, diploma, manuscript; writing of any kind, literature; printing on tapa or paper; formerly the Scriptures or learning in general; to write, send a written message” (p. 309). The fusing of these two concepts into one Hawaiian word is important to understand in order to comprehend what transpired after the introduction of palapala to the Ali’i. Kamakau (1868) explains the rapid spread of literacy through the work of Kaʻahumanu. She made Kaomimoe, an alphabet teacher, teach her attendants and retainers and the attendants and retainers of her daughters. When they were literate, she sent all the students around the islands to be reading teachers for the people. And all the other high Aliʻi followed suit. This is how literacy reached all the people throughout Hawaiʻi. Kamakau continues, “O ka noho ana o na misionari ma na apana
When the missionaries lived in the rural areas, they did not teach the older people [reading], they had known it for a while because they were taught by the school teachers of old, who were the alphabet teachers] (p. 1).

The technology of literacy experienced an efficient dissemination independent of the direct work of the missionaries. For Kaʻahumanu and many other early Kānaka, it seemed like Christianity, if they converted, was more about gaining access to the technology of literacy than simply switching religion. While both received attention and promotion from many of the high Aliʻi, literacy became more of a focus of government promotion and with highly successful results. Further study is needed on how palapala evolved and how the early Christianity movement in Hawaiʻi was more of a literacy movement is necessary.

Post-Colonial View of Hawaiian Language History

To a large extent the perception of the history of Hawaiian language in schools is incongruent with the brief story above. Literature on the subject takes more of a colonial view (e.g., Benham & Heck, 1999). In projects of hegemony around the world, the native people typically do not exercise the political and social control that the Kānaka did. Over the
past 30 years, many of the Kanaka scholars (e.g., Trask, McGregor, Kame‘elehiwa & Osorio) have studied and written from the same framework as post-colonial scholars such as Fanon, Said, Memmi and Ngugi. These Kānaka have shaped the way our people today view the history of language within Hawai‘i.

Post-colonialism holds that it is the colonial agenda to systematically destroy the colonized’s language and force them to use the language of the colonizer. Contemporary Maori scholar Smith (1999) writes, “Numerous accounts across nations now attest to the critical role played by schools in assimilating colonized peoples, and in the systematic, frequently brutal, forms of denial of indigenous languages, knowledges and cultures” (p. 64). It is easy to see how post-colonial scholars, viewing the grave situation our language has been in for over a century, can apply post-colonial theory to the Hawaiian situation. However, that application, without careful consideration of the political situation of the time, is tenuous.

Unfortunately, the post-colonial view of the history of language has become the common view of Kānaka today, which is generally that the missionaries, since their arrival, have plotted to destroy the Hawaiian language as a part of their colonial agenda in Hawai‘i.
Public education is pointed to as a key mechanism for foreigners to replace the Hawaiian language with English. The fact that there was a shift from Hawaiian to English as the language medium through which the children were taught provided the circumstantial evidence necessary to promote the theories of the post-colonialists.

However, the shift in language in schools is a much more complicated story. It is a story that, for the most part, has been told from the post-colonial perspective. It is a story that I aim to tell from a new perspective. It is a story that reveals who the agents were within government and public education. It is a story that suggests that perhaps Kānaka were not victims of a colonial agenda within the context of public education.

The Beginning of Public Education Under the Constitution

Prior to the promulgation of Hawai‘i’s first constitution, the primary medium for education was Hawaiian. When public education became codified in law in 1841 (Alexander & Atkinson, 1888, p. 5), David Malo was appointed as both the first executive of the entire public school system in Hawai‘i as well as the school-agent for the island of Maui. The second person in charge of the Kingdom’s education system was William Richards, a former missionary who had done much work for the Kingdom
government including securing international recognition as an independent nation-state. He was appointed as the first Minister of Public Instruction (Odgers, 1933). About a year and six months later, on November 7, 1847, Richards died, thus ending his short term as the agent of the school system (Brieske, 1961).

Richard Armstrong, the second Minister of Public Instruction, succeeded Richards. In his diary, Armstrong expresses his feelings regarding his appointment.

To-day received from the king the office of minister of public instruction. The subject of this office has cost me a long and severe mental conflict. To accept of it I could not & to reject it I dared not; to be brought into so close contact with the government, has seemed extremely objectionable & repugnant to my feelings, & yet to let the school system go down which has succeeded beyond all expectations, I could not do. (Armstrong, cited in Odgers, 1933, pg. 80)

Two phrases in this diary entry are of significance to this paper. The fact that Armstrong “dared not” reject the appointment reveals an immense pressure that was placed on people offered government positions by the King. It is especially intense in this situation because the offer was made
to a member of the mission and it was the policy of the A.B.C.F.M. that members of the mission could not work for the government and remain a part of the mission. In a sense, Armstrong was forced to leave the mission to do the work the King wanted him to do. He even expressed how “extremely objectionable & repugnant” it was to him to be so closely connected to the government, yet he took the job. This is illustrative of the power the Hawaiian government had and the agency it possessed to exercise that power to get the missionaries to work for the betterment of the Kingdom.

The second entry of interest is the phrase referring to the success the school system had experienced up to that point, “The school system...which has succeeded beyond all expectations.” Given my argument that the school system was a development of Kānaka in the Hawaiian government, this statement is one of great praise to the Kānaka Maoli. Perhaps Armstrong was further compelled to accept the position because he would be closely associated with such a monumental achievement.

Armstrong proved to be a wise appointment by the government as he did much to stabilize the school system during his nearly 13-year tenure (Odgers, 1933). However, Armstrong was known as a supporter
of a shift in the schools from Hawaiian as the medium of instruction to
English. Although this never happened while he was in charge of the
office, in several of the sessions in the latter years of Armstrong’s tenure,
the legislature did allow for the establishment of more partially-
government-subsidized English schools. To post-colonial scholars,
Armstrong’s push to change the medium of instruction to English
provides evidence, and is of little surprise, as he represents the colonial
establishment and it would be expected.

Kekūanāoʻa and the Legislative Session of 1864

After the passing of Armstrong in 1860, H.R.H. Mataio Kekūanāoʻa,
the father of Kamehameha IV and Kamehameha V, was appointed as
President of the Board of Education. He held numerous positions in
government, and at the time of his appointment to this position, he was
the Governor of the island of Oʻahu.

By law, the President of the Board of Education was required to
present a report on the status of the school system to the Kingdom
legislature, which convened once every two years. Typically this report is
part narrative and part statistical. The President would speak about
enrollment figures, quantitative data on teachers and teachers’ salaries,
and the needs of the schools and any significant changes that have
happened. The President also included some recommendations for new legislation that would improve education.

However, the report of 1864 was not typical. Kekūanāoʻa gave a lot of attention to a particular issue that was exceptionally political: the language of compulsory education. The report contained its usual parts but a large portion of it was dedicated to supporting the Hawaiian language as the medium of education. It began with rhetoric imploring the legislature to support the common schools, which were schools that were conducted in Hawaiian and were the vehicle for the education of the majority of people in the Hawaiian Kingdom: “The question now arises—Shall the Kingdom, while advancing in wealth, suffer its Common Schools to deteriorate, until they become little better than useless, or shall there be a light tax imposed upon the property and persons that can be devised” (Kekūanāoʻa, 1864, p. 4). Kekūanāoʻa continued with a quote from Kay (1850) on the philosophy of public education: “The statistics of all countries that have provided for popular education, prove it has done more to prevent pauperism, vice and crime than all the penal laws and prisons in Europe” (p. 4). Later in the report, Kekūanāoʻa decided to employ substantial rhetoric of nationalism to appeal to the legislators to support the common schools through a school tax:
Hawaii, though one of the youngest in the family of nations, stands proudly among them, as one of the few enlightened Kingdoms of the earth, whose people are all taught to read and write; therefore, if we wish, as a nation, to preserve un tarnished the honorable name we have acquired, we must keep on educating our people; if we wish to increase the value of our lands and develop the riches of our country, we must impart knowledge to the people, that they may better comprehend the advantages of industry, and more intelligently direct their labor toward those ends...If we wish to save the lives of the people; if we wish to perpetuate our race, and preserve the Hawaiian Kingdom independent and prosperous, in the land that God has given to Hawaiians, we must improve our Common Schools for its future fathers and mothers, that they may learn the natural laws of health, and how to hold their own when brought in competition with the foreigner, who has enjoyed the advantages of an education in more enlightened lands. (p. 4)

With a strong sense of nationalism, this rhetoric for the support of common schools through a tax is magnified by a subsequent statistical
table that displays the egregiously disproportionate cost to educate children in the Kingdom in English versus in Hawaiian. It showed that in 1863, to educate 665 scholars in English cost $10,254, or $15.42 per pupil, in teachers' salaries while the education of 7,632 (over 10 times more) scholars in Hawaiian cost $18,642.24, or $2.44 per pupil (p. 6). Education in English cost over 600% the cost to education in Hawaiian.

These two consecutive sections on nationalism and economics set the foundation for the next section in which Kekūanāoʻa expressed his view on the lack of pedagogical prudence in educating the masses in English.

He writes:

The result of experience warrants the assertion, that the attempt to give Hawaiian children, whose language out of school, in the playground, and at their homes, is exclusively Hawaiian, an education in day schools, through the medium of English text books only, has not met with success enough, when compared with the advantages to be derived from a common school education in their own language to warrant the change in favor of the English, even were the expense not so enormously disproportionate.
That Hawaiian children should be doubly tasked, first, to learn a language that has no analogy whatever, either in its construction or its pronunciation, with their own, and then to acquire through it an education, is much more complimentary to the natural powers of the Hawaiian race, than to the common sense of a Government, who would seek under such a system to educate the people (p. 6).

We must consider that Hawaii stands as an independent Kingdom among the states of the earth. Our people possess a full and comprehensive language, that can be read and written by almost every individual in the land; it is in some respects inferior, while in other [sic] it is superior to the English. It has been a written language for upwards of forty years. The Hon. Lorrin Andrews’ Dictionary (now in press), though compiled by a foreigner, has upwards of eighteen thousand words, and the author thinks a native, qualified for the task could double the number. Is such a language to be despised, in its own land, as unfit to convey foreign ideas to the native mind (?) [sic] (p. 7).
Appealing to the “common sense” and good judgment of the legislators, Kekūanāoʻa first utilized arguments of language acquisition. Then, in anticipation of a counter argument critical of the sufficiency of the Hawaiian language, he propounded that Hawaiian is in itself a quality language. Also in the previous section and in the next section, he managed to continue to weave the importance of nationalism and maintaining a nationalistic identity.

History teaches us, that the life of every nation depends upon the preservation of its individuality among other nations. The theory of substituting the English language for the Hawaiian in order to educate our children, is as dangerous to Hawaiian nationality, as it is useless in promoting the general education of the people. The true policy of an independent Kingdom should be to encourage a patriotic spirit and a loyal pride among the people for its language, its King, its laws, and its institutions for the public good. No better way could be devised to destroy those feelings, which underlie the stability of all nations, than to allow the people to acquire a contempt for their native language; and, no better way to teach them that contempt, than the establishment by
Government of a few expensive and well appointed schools for the purpose of giving a common school education exclusively in a foreign language, when, at the same time, the common schools for the education of twelve-thirteenths of the children, in its own tongue, are lingering out a miserable existence, in dilapidated school houses with ignorant teachers.

(p. 7)

The rhetorical use of the nationalism is clear in the line, “History teaches us, that the life of every nation depends upon the preservation of its individuality among other nations” (p. 7). Kekūanāo‘a cunningly used the strong sense of nationalism that has developed over two decades prior and positioned the use of English as the medium in schools as a serious threat to their swelling nationalistic identity. So, not only was educating through English pedagogically deficient according to his assertions, it will have destroyed the newly found collective identity that has galvanized the subjects of the Kingdom. In a subsequent paragraph, he continued to prod the legislators through rhetorical questioning:

[W]ho will say, with the present and future independence of the Hawaiian Kingdom in view, that it is good policy to thrust aside the Hawaiian tongue for that of the foreigner in our
national schools, and thus teach our children to despise and
treat with contempt their own language, through which all
native, and most of the foreign born subjects in the Kingdom,
can express their ideas clearly, and which almost every native
in the land can read and write? (p. 7)

In this passage, Kekūanāoʻa presses even more by alluding to the idea that the independence of Hawaiʻi, which was only realized a little over 20 years prior, would be in jeopardy should English become the language of instruction in schools.

After several pages of similar arguments in various contexts (e.g., school books, industrial schools), Kekūanāoʻa supports his arguments by providing an expert reference:

Dr. Anderson, the Secretary of the A.B.C.F.M., whose experience of almost half a century among the Missionary Schools of the Oriental and Polynesian nations, eminently qualifies him to decide upon the practicability of teaching English to our people, and the advantages to be derived from it, has declared, that the result of frequent and most expensive trials, in all those countries, prove, not only the impracticability, but the great disadvantages of the nation, of
such a system, as compared to one based upon the languages of the country. (Kekūanāo‘a, 1864, pp. 11-12)

The final section of the report that is pertinent to this paper is regarding the decrease of the population. Kekūanāo‘a posits,

A nation, whose children increase in numbers, can never die; and, where those children are blessed with an equitable government, which provides that all, from the highest to the lowest in station, shall have the privilege of acquiring an education, according to their respective abilities, which will enable them to keep pace with the general advancement of mankind; that nation, however humble its position may be among others, can never lose its individuality. But when, on the contrary, there are no children to intelligently take the place of their fathers, history teaches us that the foreigner — at a time not far distant — will push aside the feeble remnant of such a nation, and, treating them as an inferior race, crush them out from their birth-rights with his unsympathizing policy. (1864, p. 14)

Important to note in this passage is the recurring reference to the importance of maintaining individuality, something that was strongly
linked to the maintenance of native language throughout the report. The appeal to individuality as a nation is illustrative of the popularity of romantic nationalism during this period, which will be addressed later in this paper. **To further invoke consternation,** Kekūanāoʻa augmented his argument with the dreadful reality of the declining population Hawaiʻi was experiencing. Overall, he did well to interconnect his rhetoric throughout the different sections of the report, exhorting the legislature to preserve Hawaiian language as the medium of education in the common schools. He successfully employed the method of repetition to drive his point.

After my first reading of this report, I quickly made some assumptions as to why Kekūanāoʻa was so adamant about the preservation of the Hawaiian language as the medium of education. I became excited to see someone with such foresight using strong language to counter the hegemonic agenda of destroying the Hawaiian language. Through the post-colonial framework, this report provided more evidence, albeit circumstantial, of colonial settlers having more agency in governmental affairs than the victimized natives, especially because, despite this report, an increase of English common schools continued. It seemed to be a somewhat futile attempt to stave off the imposition of what the Haole wanted in terms of language in the schools.
So, why did this report not have more of an influence in the legislature to lead to stronger laws strengthening Hawaiian as the medium of education? Did the Kānaka really not have as much control in government as I have argued? Perhaps the answer could have been found in the details of the legislative records when the report was given. Unfortunately, the record of the legislature of 1864 did not have the details of any conversation that may have happened upon the submission of the report.

Language in the Common Schools Prior to the 1864 Report

In 1860, in his report to the legislature, Armstrong, the President of the BOE, posed the following question to the legislature: “What reduction should be made in the free schools, where the native language only is used, in order to increase the number and efficiency of the English schools?” (Committee on Education, 1860). This question was discussed in the legislature’s committee on education, which provided a report back to the legislature. Members of this committee were D. D. Baldwin (Chair), Valdemar Knudsen, Asa Hopu, G. W. Pilipo, and D. H. Nahinu. The committee’s conclusion of the discussion was:

[B]elieving as the Com. Do [sic] that instruction in their own language has been & is now of incalculable value to Hawaiians,
that any material deduction in the means & efforts used to
Teach them the elementary branches in their own language in
Order to teach them English, would tend to consign great
Numbers to ignorance, and greatly injure the cause of public
Education. The Com. however, believe [sic] that schools for
teaching Hawaiians English may produce great beneficial
Results provided they be established in central localities
Where there are foreign communities... (Committee on
Education, 1860).

This report of the committee did not note any dissenting opinion.
Despite the derogatory comments about the Kānaka’s ability to learn, the
Result of the report appears very pro-Kanaka in its political position,
Namely the maintenance of Hawaiian as the language of common schools.
The attempt to discontinue the use of Hawaiian in common schools was
defeated but the movement to have English be the language of these
Schools would continue. It would be Armstrong’s final report as he
Passed away in 1860.

In the 1864 report, prior to his push for Hawaiian language,
Kekūanō‘a did state that, “[M]y views relating to English schools...are
Not fully endorsed by one of the members of the Board of Education”
This dissent may provide insight into where people stood on this issue. Perhaps the minutes of the Board of Education (1864) could provide some clarity. At the September 19th meeting of the Board of Education, the King was also in attendance. He was very supportive of education and regularly attended BOE meetings (Varigny, 1981, p. 192). The portion of the minutes relating to the President’s report stated, “The President’s report to the legislature as prepared by the secretary was considered. Mr. Hopkins not agreeing with Mr. Varigny as to the policy for English schools for Hawaiians, it was decided to submit the matter to the Cabinet Council” (Board of Education, 1864, p. 236).

A significant revelation appears in the second sentence of this section of the minutes. It attributes the pro-Hawaiian language policy recommendation to Varigny rather than Kekūanāo‘a as the official report suggests. This is a crucial piece of information as it begins to debunk the idea that this was simply a Kanaka movement against the missionary imperialists.

The Cabinet Council, to which the issue was referred, was made up of Wyllie, Hopkins, Harris and Varigny. Interestingly, Hopkins was the dissenting voice to the 1864 BOE position on Hawaiian language and Varigny was the one who prepared the 1864 report and to whom the
The report was attributed in the BOE minutes. However, the Cabinet Council’s minutes of September 19, 1864, did not provide any insight into the opinions of the rest of the council. Rather, it noted that the King notified that he wished to call a meeting the Privy Council to discuss the same issue (Cabinet Council, 1864). The Privy Council was a more influential body and a larger body where the language idea could be better vetted.

The Privy Council debated this language issue over two days, September 22 and 23 of 1864. Those present at the meeting were King Kamehameha V, Wyllie, C.C. Harris, S. N. Castle, Varigny, C. G. Hopkins, F. Heuch, G. M. Robertson, L. Andrews, A. Kahanu, C. Kapaakea, P. Kamakau, Kapena, P. Young, and A. C. Lunalilo. The following table illustrates where the members of the Privy Council stood on the issue and provides a summary of their comments. It is organized chronologically according to when the members spoke.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Language Supported</th>
<th>Summary of PC Minutes (Sept 22, 1864)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Varigny</td>
<td>Hawaiian</td>
<td>He restated his position as expressed in the BOE report. The government should provide a common school education in the native language, which is the most effective method, rather than in a foreign language — English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopkins</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Mr. Hopkin’s views “in many respects were quite opposed to those of Mr. Varigny”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyllie</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>“To raise the Hawaiians to an equality with foreigners they must have the same medium of thought”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Andrews | Hawaiian           | Argued at length. Expressed “great surprise at
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Language Supported</th>
<th>Summary of PC Minutes (Sept 23, 1864)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kapaakea</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Agreed with remarks by Hopkins. Supported establishing English schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heuck</td>
<td>Hawaiian</td>
<td>“Hawaiians should be made to learn foreign languages through their own native tongue.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamakau</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Agreed with Hopkins. “Missionaries neglected very much at first, when they had great influence in the Government Affairs for not introducing in a grand scale the instruction of the English language.” Native schools conducted in a shabby manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robertson (again)</td>
<td>Hawaiian</td>
<td>Did not approve of more English schools. Stated it was not about abandoning English schools altogether.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrews (again)</td>
<td>Hawaiian</td>
<td>Noted the deficiencies of the Hawaiian language in explaining many words in the English language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyllie (again)</td>
<td>Hawaiian</td>
<td>Supported Robertson’s views</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopkins (again)</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Disagreed with Harris regarding government support of English schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varigny (again)</td>
<td>Hawaiian</td>
<td>Disagreed with Wyllie’s remarks. Hawaiian schools should be improved and English schools “confined to one on each of the large islands and if there would be no funds for promoting Hawaiian Common Schools then a property tax of ¼ of one percent should be imposed.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robertson (again)</td>
<td>Hawaiian</td>
<td>No objection that there should be no English schools. Ok with one or two select schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle (again)</td>
<td>Hawaiian</td>
<td>“[M]ade a long remark on the general views that had been given by the several speakers opposing the abolishtion [sic] of native Hawaiian Education.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Kahanu         | English            | Noted how important the issue is. “Sustane [sic] all
The September 23rd meeting of the Privy Council concluded noting the King’s sentiments, “[T]he opinion of the Government have [sic] been proved by the advice of the members of His Privy Council to be the right course they should pursue” (Privy Council, 1864, p. 221). It is unclear to me, however, the course the Privy Council advised. There was never any vote on the matter recorded in the minutes. However, the final count on where members of the Privy Council stood on this issue was as follows: five who support the ideas posited by the BOE and five who support the expansion of English schools or a complete replacement of Hawaiian schools. According to the minutes, three people present at the meeting did not share their opinions—Harris, Young, and Lunalilo. However, Mr. Harris was called upon by the King “[T]o explain the reasons why the King wished to take the advice of His Privy Council upon the system of public Instruction” (Privy Council, 1864, p. 209). He must have inserted his opinion at that point because, although the minutes do not show Mr.
Harris expressing his views during the meeting, they do say that Mr. Hopkins, who was in support of more government supported English schools, “[D]id not agree with Mr. Harris as regarding that the government should not support English Schools so far as the financial affairs could bear” (Privy Council, 1864, p. 219). This statement, along with the understanding of Mr. Hopkins’s view, positions Mr. Harris along with the others who support Hawaiian as the medium of instruction, making the total six for Hawaiian medium and five for English medium common schools. The two who did not comment on the subject were both of Hawaiian royalty. One, Lunalilo, would become the King of the Hawaiian Kingdom. I have found no evidence thus far to suggest where they stood on the matter at the time of the Privy Council meeting.

Kahanu made one comment in the PC that was relevant to agency in government. It further debunked the idea that foreigners controlled the Hawaiian government. He condemned “The people who first brought civilization in this country for not instructing them when they had influence and power in the administration of the Government” (Privy Council, 1864, p. 221). It can be deduced from this statement that the people to whom Kahanu was referring do not have power and influence
any more. Moreover, it can be presumed that either the Kānaka were in power or some other newcomers.

Another interesting note regarding the minutes of the Privy Council is that within the paragraph in which the thoughts of Kahanu are recorded, there is part of a sentence that is crossed out. It does not quite fit contextually but the content of the crossed out section is of very strong rhetorical value. Including the sentences around it, it states:

He is of opinion that the English language is required at large as we are having more or less business with foreigners who speak the English language and will naturally Kill the Hawaiian language his mother tongue who would regret the day to see in his life time that his own Hawaiian language is out of existence. He had heard at large and amonst [sic] the natives in general of the higher classes, condemning the people who first brought civilization in this country for not instructing them when they had influence and power in the administration of the Government. (Privy Council, 1864, p. 221)

These minutes for the Privy Council are written in both Hawaiian and English with each page alternating between Hawaiian first and then
English. A Hawaiian version of the English crossed-out words does not appear on the Hawaiian side. It is unclear to me in which language the meetings were held and originally recorded. There are a couple of instances where a member’s thoughts were interpreted in the other language. **One instance, in particular**, explicitly stated that a thought was expressed in Hawaiian after having been originally given in English. Whatever the case, these powerful words do not appear elsewhere and remain a mystery to me—a mystery that, if solved, could provide additional insight to the language debate.

The overall sentiment of the Privy Council on the issue is split with the three vocal Kānaka and two Haole members on one side and **six** Haole members on the other. At the conclusion of the meeting, it **appeared that** the King was satisfied that the opinion of the BOE — the Government — to continue to put more resources into Hawaiian-medium common schools rather than allow more government subsidies of English schools was the same as that expressed by the Privy Council. Although this may be true, the ultimate decision on the matter was the Legislature’s.
Impact of Language Debate

If the Privy Council’s discussion of the medium of education was the final venue for the King to have this idea vetted, the language debate of 1864 came to an inconclusive close. However, the BOE minutes of September 30, 1864 state that the King and the Privy Council approved the President’s report. The secretary was asked to condense it and it was submitted to the legislature.

What followed in legislation was probably more accurately reflective of the split sentiment in the Privy Council. In the following years, there was never any significant legislation establishing one language or the other as the official medium of instruction for common schools. Rather, the legislation did leave open the possibility of having English medium schools that would be subsidized by the Hawaiian government. This led to a steady increase in English common schools.

Events Leading up to the 1864 Language Debate

The question about whether Hawaiian or English should be the language of instruction in the schools was not new to the government agents when the 1864 Biennial Report of the President of the Board of Education was penned. It was being discussed for a number of years prior. A cursory glance at the issue, simply from the perspective of the 1864
report and the preceding reports, would not provide a clear picture. On the surface, we see that during the tenure of Richard Armstrong—a Haole, former missionary, promoting English—as the President of the BOE up until September 23, 1860, there was a push from his office to teach the common Kanaka through the medium of English. Then in 1864, in the middle of the tenure of Kekūanāoʻa, there was a strong assertion from his office, with one dissenting Haole voice, that Hawaiian must be the medium of education for all Kanaka children. Then over the next several decades, there was an increase in English schools. This pattern is classic of imperialistic hegemony.

However, we have seen that on several occasions, the 1864 report was attributed to Varigny rather than Kekūanāoʻa even though Kekūanāoʻa is the signatory. It was a practice, even in the adapted constitutional government of the mid-1800s, for ranking Aliʻi such as Kekūanāoʻa to have someone to do the groundwork, yet be accountable for the body of work by signing off on it (Sai, personal communication). Such was the case with the 1864 report. It appears as though it was the work and thoughts of Varigny supported by Kekūanāoʻa. Remarks by Andrews in the Privy Council meeting corroborate this. “The Honourable L. Andrews...concluded approving of Mr. Varigny [sic] suggestions
expressing great surprise at his coming to such correct ideas, having only been so short a time in this government” (Privy Council, 1864, P.213).

So, the powerful rhetorical piece assumed to be a counter hegemonic piece of a Kanaka is actually the composition of a Haole from France. Through the vetting process within the BOE and the King’s councils, Varigny was the one responsible for introducing the concepts and arguing the position of the BOE. How much of a role Kekūanā'o'a played in the development of the report is unknown. But we can conclude from his submission of it that he too supported its content. It could also be concluded that Varigny was the one controlling the voice of the Board of Education, including the President, Kekūanā'o'a. However, there is a considerable amount of evidence where Haole were used by Kanaka royalty to accomplish a task. For instance, when missionary Armstrong is asked to leave the mission to work for the Department of Instruction, when the Cookes are requested to start up and run the Chiefs’ Children’s School, and when William Richards is asked by Kamehameha III to work for him. In many instances, the Haole were reluctant to work for the Hawaiian government but were unable to decline. Specifically with Varigny and Kekūanā'o'a, Varigny spoke about the relationship he had with Kekūanā'o’a
in his journal (1981) (see Chapter 5 for an analysis of Varigny). There is no indication that Kekūanāo‘a was not in charge.

**Turning our attention to** the Privy Council, its members were the closest advisors to the King. Its racial makeup was eight Haole and six Kānaka Maoli, not including the King. Prior to reading the minutes of these two meetings, I had read the report of the BOE, the report of the 1860 Legislature’s Committee on Education, and the minutes of the Cabinet Council. All three of these bodies were made up of both Kānaka and Haole. The first two were almost unanimous in their support of Hawaiian as the medium of the common schools while the third body deferred the matter to the PC. None of these documents, however, indicated to me what I was about to discover in the PC minutes. I thought that there would be more dissenting voices in the PC and that it would come from the Haole contingency. As I reported earlier, this was not the case. Four of the six Kānaka were the most adamant about having English as the medium and the only members in favor of Hawaiian were Haole. **This was** the opposite of what I expected.

Nonetheless, the Hawaiian contingency’s opinion is understandable. Given the time period, 1860s, there was not as much desperation to save the Hawaiian language as there is today. Hawaiian was the main language
of the community and of most government activities. The pervasiveness of Hawaiian provided some sense of comfort in terms of its survival. And the lack of knowledge of English appeared to be of concern to the Kānaka of the PC. As the interaction with foreigners grew, especially in the context of business, it became increasingly important to be able to function in English in order to maintain economic stability, thus maintaining economic power within the country. It most likely appeared to this group that the economic decline of the Kānaka Maoli was much more likely than the decline and death of the Hawaiian language, despite the alarming rate at which the Kanaka Maoli population, and thus, the number of Hawaiian speakers, was dwindling.

However, for the situation in 1864, the motive for the Haole and a few Kānaka in government to support Hawaiian medium education is less clear. To get a better understanding, further examination of the reasons is necessary. The following table lists the different arguments put forth throughout this period. I have ordered it from the most pervasive argument throughout the documents to the least.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason *18</th>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distinct national identity (Nationalism)</td>
<td>Castle</td>
<td>1864 PC minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kekūanāo'a (Varigny)</td>
<td>1864 BOE report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good pedagogy</td>
<td>Varigny</td>
<td>1864 PC minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kekūanāo'a (Varigny)</td>
<td>1864 BOE report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English experiment failed (related to good pedagogy)</td>
<td>Robertson</td>
<td>1864 PC minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kekūanāo'a (Varigny)</td>
<td>1864 BOE report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical precedence</td>
<td>Castle</td>
<td>1864 PC minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>unidentified</td>
<td>1860 Committee on Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kekūanāo'a (Varigny)</td>
<td>1864 BOE report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.B.C.F.M. policy</td>
<td>Castle</td>
<td>1864 PC minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kekūanāo'a (Varigny)</td>
<td>1864 BOE report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inability to learn through English</td>
<td>unidentified</td>
<td>1860 Committee on Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inability to master 2 languages</td>
<td>Varigny</td>
<td>1864 PC minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kekūanāo'a</td>
<td>1864 BOE report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

18 It is important to note that in a number of instances, especially in the 1864 report of the BOE, heightened nationistic identity and the overall health of the nation have been linked to quality public education in general for which Hawaiian language medium education is thus argued as the best methodology to accomplish this. Therefore, nationalism appears, by far, to be the most pervasive reason.
Natural laws\textsuperscript{19} & Varigny & 1864 PC minutes \\
Increased intelligence\textsuperscript{20} & Kekūanāoʻa (Varigny) & 1864 BOE report \\

In a debate in which the desired outcome is to convince the opposition that a position is the better position, the strongest arguments should be the ones that have high value to the opposition. The two most prominent reasons given for the Haole-dominated side insisting on Hawaiian as the medium of the common schools were nationalism and good pedagogy.

**Nationalism in Hawaiʻi**

Varigny, Kekūanāoʻa, and the other Hawaiian-medium school supporters knew that nationalism was important to the Hawaiian subjects regardless of their race. Nationalism was of a heightened interest at this time for two major reasons: the international movement towards nationalism and Hawaiʻi’s recent admission into the Family of Nations.

\textsuperscript{19} “I do not believe in a system whose first step should be a violation of all natural laws” (Privy Council, 1864, p. 211). In this context Varigny is expressing his opinion that to first teach children in a foreign language is going against the natural way of doing things.

\textsuperscript{20} Kekūanāoʻa and Varigny are claiming that teaching Kānaka Maoli through Hawaiian language will lead to an increased intelligence more so than if they were taught through a foreign language.
In 1843, only 21 years prior to this language debate, Hawaiʻi became recognized as an Independent nation-state. This was an enormous accomplishment in international affairs as there were no non-European run countries in the Family of Nations prior to Hawaiʻi becoming a member (Sai, 2004). This was also significant for Hawaiʻi because it placed the Hawaiian government on equal footing with the other powers of the world. During this time, the large majority of nations of the world did not have this status and were thus susceptible to unilateral acts being made against it, such as being made a colony (Sai, 2004).

This recognition came after a long period of negotiations with the three great powers of the world at that time: Great Britain, France and the United States of America. During the time of negotiations abroad in the aforementioned countries, a British naval officer, Lord Paulet, forced Kamehameha III to provisionally cede Hawaiian sovereignty to the British. After Hawaiian protest and a British investigation, Admiral Thomas, on behalf of the British government, restored Hawaiian sovereignty. This event prompted Kauikeaouli to proclaim, “Ua mau ke ea o ka ʻaina i ka pono” [The sovereignty of the land is perpetuated in righteousness] (Sai, 2008), a statement conveying significant nationalism. Not long after, on
November 28, 1843, Hawai‘i became officially recognized as an independent nation-state.

No doubt, the great endeavor to negotiate for independence and the near takeover of Hawai‘i combined with the ongoing transition of the Hawaiian government into a quality constitutional monarchy developed a heightened sense of nationalistic pride in the subjects of the Kingdom. Furthermore, by the mid 1800s, Europe was well into the romantic nationalism movement (White, 2004). Romantic nationalism is a nationalistic identity based on a culture, language, religion and customs that are unique to the state. As the Hawaiian royalty and other government officials were increasingly becoming more well read in terms of political theory, they had to be influenced by the growing nationalism in Europe. In addition, one of the most ardent proponents of Hawaiian language schools over English schools, Varigny, had only recently moved to Hawai‘i from France (Varigny, 1981). His strong sense of nationalism is evidenced throughout the 1864 Board of Education Report. Therefore, the influence nationalism had in Hawai‘i is noteworthy. The supporters of Hawaiian schools used the growth of nationalism, especially romantic nationalism, in the Kingdom in an attempt to win people over to their side in the language debate.
Conclusion

The language debate of 1864 in education in Hawai‘i has demonstrated that while the Hawaiian subjects of European descent were an integral part of the Hawaiian Kingdom government, the Kānaka ultimately wielded the political power. This did not preclude the Haole subjects from expressing their ideas and influencing government. It was the will of the King to be inclusive of all ideas in order to come up with the best solution to problems. “In fact, he was grateful to us for defending our opinions and for persisting in pursuing a line of criticism or attack. He approved of men who held strong convictions and who marshaled clear and precise arguments” (Varigny, 1981, p. 139). This is not a sign of a weak sovereign. Rather, it is a sign of a confident sovereign who wishes to do what he believes is best for his country.

However, with only a cursory study of the legislative report by Kekūanāoʻa from a post-colonial framework, the language debate in education can be easily misunderstood as a hegemonic and counter-hegemonic argument—a native, Kekūanāoʻa, trying to fend off the imposition of a foreign language by foreigners. A more comprehensive investigation of the details is requisite to understanding the complexities within the Hawaiian government and the education system. With the
intermingling of Hawaiian subjects of both Kanaka and European descent in the various levels of government, from Board of Education members to Privy Council members to Legislators, it can be difficult to decipher with whom the power sat. The King’s involvement in the Board of Education, his need to further vet the arguments posited by Varigny and signed by his father, and the overall outcome of the situation highlight several key concepts. Kanaka royalty were most definitely the principal agents in the Hawaiian government. They employed Haole at their discretion to assist in accomplishing their goals. The King had the power and luxury to be very pensive, inclusive and thorough. And, the Hawaiian government was a healthy government whose main concern was the wellbeing of the citizenry.

The language debate of 1864 evoked both celebratory feelings and a feeling of disappointment. I take joy in the fact that our young government was stable enough to engage in such an emotional issue as the language medium of education. I take joy in the fact that there was such staunch support for Hawaiian as the medium of education and that the support came from both Haole and Kānaka. My disappointment is in the fact that the articulate arguments for Hawaiian and the Privy Council’s majority support of Hawaiian did not lead to any significant legislation.
codifying Hawaiian as the language of instruction in all public schools. Of course this disappointment must be tempered with an understanding that my hindsight provides me a view to which those in 1864 were not privy. I take solace knowing that many of our Ali‘i demonstrated exceptional foresight and that when Kanaka agency in education is once again achieved, we will have extraordinary models to follow to achieve educational prominence.
Chapter 5

He Lāhui Na‘auao

Thousands of years ago, Pelehonuamea’s vision for her and her family is expressed in one of their mele:

Kū mākou e hele me ku‘u mau pōki‘i aloha
Ka ʻāina a mākou i ʻike ‘ole ai ma lalo aku nei
ʻAʻe mākou me kuʻu pōkiʻi, kau i ka waʻa
Noʻiau ka hoe a Kamohoa ʻi

We stand ready to travel with my beloved siblings
To a land beyond that we have not seen
My siblings and I embark on a canoe
The paddle of Kamohoa ʻi is skillful

Similar to the vision of Pelehonuamea, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration’s (NASA) vision is “To reach for new heights and reveal the unknown so that what we do and learn will benefit all humankind” (NASA). The ability of a society to conduct the kind of large-scale exploratory work that NASA does is indicative of a society that is healthy in terms of its resources and its economy. One thousand years ago and earlier, ocean travel was the forefront of pushing the boundaries of exploration into the unknown. A society that could put its resources
into large-scale ocean exploration was also one that valued knowledge and the growth of knowledge. Those that took the challenge of exploring eastward into the Pacific Ocean from the far west Pacific had to have come from just that type of society.

Furthermore, the people from such a society who were selected and trained to carry out these explorations were some of the most knowledgeable and skilled people of that society; they were people with a drive to gain more knowledge. As the last place in the Pacific settled from the West, it can be argued that the people who settled Hawai‘i were a concentration of intellect, knowledge and skill, a people who valued seeking new knowledge and who were risk takers. Although the pathways between Hawai‘i and the closest islands to the Southwest eventually became established, even future migrations, like the Pa‘ao migration, would require people with similar faculties. These are the people who populated Hawai‘i.

This chapter is a project of claiming (Smith, 1999, p. 143). It is a project of celebrating survival (p. 145), of remembering (p. 146), connecting (p. 148), representing (p. 150) and reframing (p. 153). In

21 Pa‘ao was a priest from Kahiki who introduced new religious practices in Hawai‘i. “To him are ascribed those severities of religious observance which built up the power of chief and priest during this later period of migration from the south” (Beckwith, 1970, p. 370)
this chapter, I will present an analysis of the numerous occasions throughout the Kingdom period and into the early 20\textsuperscript{th} century where Kanaka Maoli intellectual and academic excellence is expressed and where is evinced the championing of education, especially an education in Kanaka ways of thinking.

\textit{E hoomaopopoia, he lahui kakou me ko kakou Moolelo Kahiko, i ano like loa aku me ka moolelo kahiko o ka lahui o Helene; a he mau mele kahiko hoi ka ko kakou mau kupuna i like aku a i oi aku nohoi ko lakou hiwahiwa ame ke kilakila i ko na mele kaulana loa o ua lahui Helene nei. (Poepoe, 1906, p. 1)}

\textit{[It should be known, we are a race with our ancient histories that are remarkably similar to the ancient history of the Greeks; and our ancestors had ancient poetry that was even more esteemed and majestic than the extremely famous poetry of the Greeks.]}\textit{]}

This quote from Kanaka Maoli scholar Poepoe’s work in the Hawaiian language newspaper \textit{Ka Naʻi Aupuni} speaks to the glorious intellectual past of Hawaiʻi, to a distinctly Kanaka intellect. Poepoe’s project in 1906, like this chapter, was about reconnecting our people to our potentiality. Already in the very early 20\textsuperscript{th} century, he realized the sharp decline the
Kānaka were experiencing in intellectualism, academics, and an understanding of and connection to our magnificent histories.

This decline was fueled by the sharp reduction in Kānaka in governmental positions, the eventual complete loss of sovereignty, and a decline in agency in education. This sharp decline came on the heels of what was the golden years of Kanaka education—a time when Kānaka were thriving in public education, and when literacy was at its highest. We come from a long history of intellectual advancement, of seeking new knowledge, of exploring where no man has gone before: ka ʻaina a mākou i ʻike ʻole ai\textsuperscript{22}. We come from a long history of the promotion of education, which led to Hawaiʻi being one of the first countries in the world to make formal education compulsory for all its youth.

Poepoe’s Promotion of Hawaiʻi Intellectualism

On February 1, 1906, the tagline just under the newspaper’s name Ka Nai Aupuni read, “Na Hawaii e Hooponopono ia Hawaii” (p. 1). This could be translated as “It is up to Hawaiʻi to make Hawaiʻi right”, “It is up to Hawaiians to make Hawaiʻi right” and “A Hawaiian consciousness will make Hawaiʻi right.” Poepoe, the paper’s editor, most likely intended the

\textsuperscript{22} See chant in opening of this chapter
ambiguity. However, after glancing at the content of the first page of this edition, it becomes clear that a Hawaiian consciousness is what he was promoting, perhaps as a critical step towards Hawaiians making Hawai‘i right. On the left column was printed the continuation of the serial story of Kamehameha I, the king referred to as *Ka Na‘i Aupuni*, the government conqueror. On the right column was printed the 1st installment of the serial called “*Moolelo Hawaii Kahiko*”, The Ancient History of Hawai‘i.

As Poepoe states in the first paragraph of “*Moolelo Hawaii Kahiko*”, this history comes from the songs and genealogies of the ancient people (p.1). It is these ancient songs that express the traditional worldview held by the ancestors. It is the manual for living in harmony with the natural environment of Hawai‘i. It is a consciousness that is distinctly Kanaka Maoli. Poepoe (1906) is hopeful that the youth of his time will cherish this history: “[K]e lana nei ko makou manao e lilo ana keia mahele i mea e pulamaia e na Opio Hawaii” (*We are hopeful that this section will become something that is cherished by the Hawaiian youth*) (p.1). He was proud of the brilliance of the ancestors and expressed this in the above quoted piece, boasting and comparing our poetry to those of the Greeks.
He continues, eventually providing a translation of a famous quote by the Roman philosopher, Cicero:

_Ua piha ko kakou mau mele me na hoonupanupa ana a ia mea he aloha; piha me na keha ana no na hana koa a wiwo ole a ko kakou poe ikaika o ka wa kahiko; ka lakou mau hana kaulana; ko lakou ola ana ame ko lakou make ana. Aia maloko o ko kakou Moolelo Kahiko na Mele ame na Pule Wanana, na mele ha’i kupuna a kuauhau hoi. Aia hoi maloko o na hana maa i ko kakou mau kupuna, he mau mahele ike i komo nui iloko o ke kupaianaha ame ke kamahao; a ua kapaia aku hoi ia mau mea e ka poe e noho ana i loko o ka olino ana a ka naauao, he mau hana pouli, hupo, hoomanamana a Pegana hoi. Aka nae, o ka mea oiaio, he mea pono ke malamaia kekahi oia mau ike o ke au kahiko o na kupuna o kakou, elike me ka ike kalaiwaa, kilo-hoku, ame na ike e ae he nui. A i ka hoakoakoa ana i keia mau mea apau me ka hoomaopopo ana i na olelo e hoike ana i ko lakou ano, ka lakou hana ame ko lakou waiwai i’o e loaa ai he moolelo._
‘A o ka Moolelo’ wahi a Cicero, ‘oia ka mea e hoao ai i ka manawa; oia ka malamalama o ka oiaio; ke ola o ka hoomanao; ka rula o ka hoomanao; ka elele o ka wa kahiko.’

Ma ko makou helu o ka la apopo e hoopukaia aku ai ka Helu 1, o keia Moolelo kupaianaha a kamahao o ke au o na kupuna o kakou i hala aku i ka po. He Kumulipo-Kumuhonua maoli keia.

(Poepoe, 1906)

[Our songs are filled with lush [descriptions] of that thing called love; filled with the praises for the brave and fearless deeds of our ancient powerful people; their famous deeds; their life and their death. These are found in our ancient stories, songs, prayers of prognostication, and the chants concerning ancestors and genealogy. Furthermore, found within the regular practices of our kūpuna are pieces of knowledge that are extraordinary and amazing; and they are referred to by those who dwell in the brightness of wisdom, as ignorance, stupidity, and paganism. However, the truth of the matter is that it is right to care for some of that knowledge of the ancient times of our ancestors, like canoe carving, astronomy and astrology, and many other knowledge
bases. And when you put all these things together while understanding the language that explains their nature, their function and their true value, you get history.

‘And history’ according to Cicero, ‘is the witness that testifies to the passing of time; it illumines reality; vitalizes memory; provides us guidance in daily life; and brings us tidings of antiquity.’

In tomorrow’s edition we will publish the first installment of this astonishing and amazing history of the time of our ancestors who have passed on to pō. This is a true origin of life.]

Given the time period—13 years after the overthrow and eight years after the fallacious annexation which contributed to an influx of American citizens—combined with the newspaper’s content and language, it can be assumed that Poepoe’s audience was mainly Kānaka Maoli. Therefore, his introduction is revealing in two ways. It directly lauded the great oral literary history of the Kānaka Maoli and asserted the importance of understanding this history. Indirectly, it attests to the literary prowess of his contemporary Kānaka by referencing the Greek
traditions as a comparative tool and by quoting a Roman philosopher to stress the importance of Hawaiian history.

Poepoe then begins his ancient history by examining the various chants that speak to the development of the Hawaiian Islands. Eventually, his analysis leads to the examination of the genealogical chant Kumulipo. The Kumulipo is the focus of his analysis of the ancient history of Hawai‘i and is the context in nearly every installment in the 10-month series of this daily newspaper.

**The Kumulipo: Kalākaua’s Assertion of Kanaka Maoli Intellect**

To a people who have prided themselves in their intellectual capacity and their desire to attain new understandings of the world, the Kumulipo is a manifestation of their intellectualization of the natural world. It is a prayer of consecration in honor of the birth of a high-ranking chief, Kalaninui‘īmamao also known as Lonoikamakahiki. It is a chant that connects him genealogically to his honorable ancestors, to all living creatures, and to the creation of the earth, establishing his high rank.

The Kumulipo’s subtitle, “He Pule Hoolaa Alii”, as Silva (2004) posits, “[C]an be read two ways, as consecrating a particular Ali‘i (Lonoikamakahiki) and as consecrating ‘Ali‘i’ as a system of government, which Kalākaua, Liliʻuokalani, and the lāhui were trying to preserve” (p.
98). Ruling in the time when the proponents of ending the monarchial rule were most vocal and active, Kalākaua and Liliʻuokalani relied on the Kumulipo as a compelling argument for their rule. Kalākaua, exercising agency as the head of the Hawaiian Kingdom, used the vast resources available to the throne to make sure the pule was collected in its entirety as it had never before been comprehensively documented. The significance and brilliance of this work by the Kanaka priesthood was of extreme importance to Kalākaua as his legitimacy as a king was challenged. As Liliʻuokalani (1997) states in the introduction to her translation of the Kumulipo into English, “[A]s connecting the earlier kings of ancient history with the monarchs latest upon the throne [Herself and Kalākaua] this chant is a contribution to the history of the Hawaiian Islands, and as it is the only record of its kind in existence it seemed to me worthy of preservation in convenient form.”

During a tough campaign for the throne against the dowager Queen Emma, Kalākaua’s detractors criticized him for not having a pedigree as worthy as his opponent. Nevertheless, he won the election. However, he remained concerned about the perception of him within Hawaiʻi and throughout the world. He was also concerned about the international perception of the Hawaiian Monarchy. Because of this, Kalākaua engaged
in many acts of grandeur to establish himself and his Kingdom as a force to be reckoned with. His building of the ‘Iolani Palace and his lavish coronation ceremony nine years into his reign are excellent examples.

The collection of the text of the Kumulipo, because of his genealogical connection to it, was another significant part of ameliorating his domestic reputation. The Kumulipo also contributed to the international reputation of Hawai‘i and Kalākaua himself during his trip around the world in 1881. While traveling he heard about Darwin’s theory of evolution, a relatively new concept at the time, having been published in 1859. Kalākaua remarked that Kānaka Maoli already understood the process of evolution as it is documented in the Kumulipo. Kanaka Maoli scholar Pualani Kanahele (1997) expresses this understanding in her introduction to Lili‘uokalani’s version:

The KUMULIPO is the reality of our dim past, the foundation for our present and the pathway into the future. It is a cognizant reminder of our ancestors, their intelligence, failure, conquest and defeat. This song is a gift which encourages the warrior within us to awake to the contests and challenges which constantly confront us by using intelligence and ancestral experiences. It is our genealogy connecting
mankind to earth and sky. You are the Kumulipo, know that esoteric soul inside of you and celebrate your ponahakeola.

This is the splendor with which we must view the Kumulipo. This is the splendor with which we must view the intelligence of our people, not as an archaic characteristic but as a continual quality of who we are and who we will continue to be. Kalākaua recognized this and thus ensured that the pule would be preserved in perpetuity. Because of his efforts, it continues to stand as a traditional symbol of Kanaka Maoli intellect.

**Kanaka Maoli Agency in the Proliferation of Literacy**

The introduction of literacy and literacy education is undoubtedly attributed to the first American missionaries that came to Hawaiʻi. However, to also attribute the quick dissemination of it to them is inaccurate. This section examines Kamakau’s (1868) description of the events leading to the proliferation of literacy amongst Kānaka Maoli. He provides a strong counter-narrative to the commonly held belief, which assigns agency in the spread of literacy to the missionaries.

In 1820, when the ruling chiefs allowed the American missionaries to stay in Hawaiʻi, a new opportunity presented itself. In order to effectively teach the gospel to the chiefs and eventually to the rest of the Kānaka, it was essential for the missionaries to teach the Kānaka to
read. As mentioned in Chapter Four, because a Hawaiian writing system had not been developed yet, the missionaries began teaching the chiefs to read in English. With the permission of the chiefs, the missionaries later began to preach to the non-ruling class Kānaka. They soon after developed a writing system for the Hawaiian language, which allowed for the translation of the bible and for them to more effectively spread God’s word to all the people of Hawai‘i.

This was the formal introduction of the new technology of literacy to Kānaka Maoli. It started as a new technology in which the chiefs engaged because they saw its value. They therefore used the resources at their disposal to see that literacy was taught to as many Kānaka Maoli as possible. They also used their political power to encourage the people to learn it. Although, I do not believe that the chiefs needed to do much encouraging given the Kānaka Maoli’s propensity for learning new things and learning them well. Kamakau (1868) expounds, “A ike iho la na'Lii he ike maikai ka ike palapala, a he mea maikai ka heluhelu ana i ka palapala, alaila, lawe ae la kela a me keia ali'i i mau kumu ao pi-a-pa no kela a me keia alo ali'i, a me na ohua o lakou” [The chiefs recognized that literacy was a good thing, and so too was the ability to read, then, all the chiefs took some alphabet teachers for all their court members and their retainers] (p.
Kaʻahumanu, Kamehameha I’s favorite wife, did likewise. When all of her entourage and her daughters’ entourages learned to read and write, she sent them out all over the islands to teach. And this is what the others of the ruling class did too until, in less than one year, “[U]a ike na elemakule a me na luahine i aneane aku i ke kanawalu a kanaiwa o na makahiki, ua hiki ke heluhelu i ka Baibala” [The elder men and women who were approaching 80 and 90 years of age could read the bible] (Kamakau, 1868). Kamakau then rhetorically questions, “Aia la mahea ka poe ike ole i ka heluhelu?” [Where are the people who are ignorant in reading?] He then asserts that one would be amazed to see all the people, including elders and those with glasses, reading.

Then, to be sure that the readers understood that this rapid spread of literacy was not the doing of the missionaries, Kamakau (1868) states bluntly, “Aole nae i ao maoli na misionari ia lakou i ka ike heluhelu; a pela i holo ai ka ike heluhelu i na kanaka a pau. O ka noho ana o na misionari ma na apana kuaaina, aole lakou i ao aku i ka poe oo, ua ike kahiko no lakou i ke ao ia e na kumukula o ka wa kahiko, oia hoi na kumuao pi-a-pa” (The missionaries truly did not teach them to read; and that is how reading
reached all the people. When the missionaries stayed in the rural areas, they did not teach the older people, they had already known because they were taught by the old teachers, who were known as the alphabet teachers) (p. 1).

The initial missionary stations were set up in more populated areas such as Kailua, Hawai‘i and Honolulu, O‘ahu. The missionaries were relatively small in number and, thus, focused their efforts in these towns. In this passage, Kamakau is positing that literacy quickly spread to the numerous areas that had no missionary influence. When missionaries eventually arrived in those areas, the people were already literate.

The 1820s was a period of rapid growth for literacy in Hawai‘i. This evinced the value of the new technology to the general population. The fact that it was a foreign technology was of no consequence to them. In the middle of the decade, Hawai‘i lost its King, Kamehameha II, to disease while in London. That placed a very young—ten years old—Kauikeaouli in charge of the country. Despite his age, he had the maturity and foresight to place a high value on literacy. “He opiopio kona kino a me kona helehelena, a o ka umi no ia o kona mau makahiki, aka, he mau manao

---

The initial missionary stations were only setup in more populated areas such as Kailua, Hawai‘i and Honolulu, O‘ahu. In this passage, Kamakau is positing that
kanaka makua kona, a ua pili no hoi i ka naauao, e hapai ana i kona lahui e holo mua i ka naauao, ua ko io no” (His body and his looks were youthful and he was 10 years of age, yet he possessed adult faculties in regards to education, encouraging his nation to progress in education, and it was fully accomplished) (Kamakau, 1868, p. 1).

The young Kamehameha III proclaimed:

...O Ko‘u Aupuni, He Aupuni Palapala Ko‘u.  O ke ‘Lii, o na keiki a na‘lii a me na keiki a na makaainana, e ao i ka naauao, a malama hoi i ka pono, o Ko‘u kanaka ia, a o na alii a me na keiki a na makaainana e malama ole ana i ka pono, aole Na‘u ia kanaka.  No laila, e na‘Lii a me na makaainana, e ao oukou i ka Palapala. (Kamakau, 1868) [As for my kingdom, it is a kingdom of education.  As for the chiefs, the children of the chiefs, and the children of the commoners who become learned and are righteous, they are my people, and the chiefs and the children of the commoners who are not righteous, they are not my people.  Therefore, chiefs and commoners, become educated.

Kamakau praises Kauikeaouli’s emphasis on education. “Aole oia i hoopau i kona mana o e hooikaika a e hapai i ka holo mua ana o kona lahui
a hiki kona mau la hope” (*He was a champion of the advancement of his nation until his final days*) (p.1). He then concludes his discussion on education in this section by asserting, “He mea hikiwawe ka holo o ka naauao iloko o ka lahuikanaka Hawaii” (*Education in the Hawaiian Nation spread quickly*) (Kamakau, 1868). All of these passages from Kamakau demonstrate that the Hawaiian royalty recognized great value in the new technology of literacy, enough so to send out their own attendants to teach it to the populace. A more important contribution these passages make is as a counter-narrative to the assignment of agency to the missionaries for the spread of literacy throughout Hawai‘i.

Kamakau (1869), in his description of Kapiʻolani, the child of Kekikipaʻa, explains that she studied reading and writing and became very proficient at it. In fact, she would often attend the missionary school at Kawaihaʻo to hone her skill. He later continues, “O ka manawa i holo ai ka Moi i Beritania,...o ka ike palapala, a me ke kakau, oia ka mea i manao nui ia, aole i manao ia ka hoomana ana i ke Akua” (*At the time the King traveled to Britain, literacy and writing were the passion [of the people], they were not concerned with worshiping God*) (p. 1). As it most likely was with many of the Kānaka, literacy was the popular “must have” technology. This education in palapala was so important to the Kānaka
that, like Kapiʻolani, they were willing to endure Christian education as a means to improve their reading and writing despite a lack of interest in the Christian religion. In spite of her precarious commitment to Christianity, she often listened to the teachings of the missionaries and wrote down all of their lessons (Kamakau, 1869). It appears that she did this as a means to practice her writing skills. However, she eventually converted to Christianity. The Kānaka and the missionaries were using each other through literacy. The Kānaka would indulge the missionaries in order to get access to reading and writing and the missionaries would use the lure of literacy to hook the Kānaka into their religion.

In regards to Kauikeaouli’s proclamation “He aupuni palapala koʻu”, Kamakau also posits, “Ua lilo nae i olelo mana i oi ae mamua o na olelo kanawai o keia wa” (*It became an edict that was more powerful than the laws of the time*) (1869b). He also boasts about how famous Hawaiʻi had become in terms of literacy. “Aole aupuni i oi ke kaulana e like me ke aupuni ao palapala ma Hawaiʻi nei” (*There was no nation more famous than the literate nation of Hawaii*) (1869). Of all Kauikeaouli’s accomplishments during his reign, the proliferation of literacy throughout Hawaiʻi stands as one of his greatest.
Agency in the Reports of the President of the Board of Education

Although I presented an analysis of the Board of Education’s report to the legislature of 1864 in Chapter Four, I will revisit this and other reports in this section for the purpose of extracting those pieces which speak to agency in terms of the strong promotion of education and the praise of the successes of education. In the report of 1861, the President reports on the discontinuation of the Hawaiian language newspaper the Board of Education published for nearly six years. The reason he gave for the discontinuation is because there were two large Hawaiian language newspapers in Honolulu and one would be sufficient. Furthermore, the clerk of the office could dedicate more time than was needed on other school matters (Armstrong, 1861). At the end of the section regarding the Hae newspaper, the President states, “One aim in the publication of the Hae, was the cultivation of a taste for reading among the people, and a thirst for general information such as can be furnished in a popular newspaper. This has been accomplished to such an extent, that it is not probable the people will ever again be contented without a weekly newspaper in their native language” (p. 22). Two things stand out in this passage: the government’s promotion of reading and the strong desire of
the people to read and learn new things. The Department of Instruction was to be concerned with the education of the youth of the Kingdom. However, they took on this endeavor of the *Hae* newspaper to educate the adult population with content like, “[A]gricultural topics,…local and foreign news from every quarter of the globe…. The history of the islands …, also short histories of England, United States, France, Italy and Russia…all the laws of the Kingdom including the entire Civil Code, have been given to the people through this medium” (1861, p. 22). This provides further evidence of the concern the Hawaiian government had in terms of having a country where the entire citizenry was not just literate but also educated in a fairly liberal content. It was still a government controlled mostly by Kānaka Maoli who ultimately determined its path.

One of the reasons for the government supporting the education of the entire populace is found in the subsequent 1864 report of the President of the BOE. It states that, “[*P*opular education, which the experience of the most enlightened States, in the Old World and in the New, teaches us, is the strongest protection to property and persons that can be devised!” (Kekūanāoʻa, 1864). They understood that there was a correlation between the wellbeing of a country and the education level of its citizenry. They also found scholarly support in a book by Kay (1850),
“The statistics of all countries that have provided for popular education, prove it has done more to prevent pauperism, vice and crime than all the penal laws and prisons in Europe” (cited in BOE, 1864, p. 4).

A few paragraphs later in the 1864 report, Varigny\textsuperscript{24}, attempting to impress upon the legislature the importance of increasing financial support for the schools, asserts, “Hawaii, though one of the youngest in the family of nations, stands proudly among them, as one of the few enlightened Kingdoms of the earth, whose people are all taught to read and write” (p. 4). He continues in a later section, “We must consider that Hawai‘i stands as an independent Kingdom among the states of the earth. Our people possess a full and comprehensive language, that can be read and written by almost every individual” (p. 7). Again, Varigny is using the rhetoric of how educated the Hawaiian citizenry was and how far they had come in such a short time. With more nationalistic flavor, he again boasts about Hawai‘i, this time in the context of language, repeating the fact that nearly every Hawaiian subject was literate. Although Varigny was of foreign descent, his contributions are reflective of Kanaka Maoli agency

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{footnotes}
24 Recall from Chapter 4 that I established that Varigny was the composer of the 1864 report although it is signed, as necessary, by the President of the BOE, Kekūanāo‘a.
\end{footnotes}
\end{footnotesize}
because of the Kānaka’s acumen for employing non-Kānaka who support and ardently argue for a pro-Kānaka agenda.

Varigny’s Portrayal of Kanaka Maoli Agency in Education

In my research to find out more about Varigny, I came across an invaluable resource for understanding more about the Hawaiian government during the mid 1800s: his memoirs. It provides further insight into agency in government’s promotion of education. Published in 1981 in book form, Varigny’s memoirs are about his experiences in Hawai‘i between the years of 1855 to 1868. Translated from French, his memoirs provide a perspective of someone who was neither a missionary nor American. He was a French subject and became a subject of the Hawaiian Kingdom, a country he grew to love dearly (p. 65). He worked tirelessly for the government and became close to the royal family. Although he occasionally provided criticism towards the government, Varigny often spoke highly about the government and the Kānaka Maoli.

In his memoirs, Varigny provides an informative portrayal of the significance of the board of public instruction, and thus education in the Kingdom:

The accession of the king to the throne had left a vacant place on the board of public instruction. For several years, in
fact, he had been a member of the three-man committee, in which he was joined by the chancellor of the kingdom and by the most respected of high chiefs, Kekuanaoa, his father. From these three individuals one can judge the importance of the committee’s functions. A minister is honored when he becomes an appointee to this body, and there is no official title more envied or respected in the islands than that of member of the board of public instruction. This is because there is no civic question more debated, or studied with greater concern, than that of education. In all the annals of the Hawaiian Legislature one can find not one example of the legislative houses refusing — or even reducing — an appropriation requested by the government for public education. It is as if this magic word alone seems to possess the prerogative of loosening the public purse strings.

(Varigny, 1981, p. 151)

Throughout this passage, Varigny successfully communicates the importance of education in the Kingdom by expressing the significance of its previous members, the status membership on the board had, the fervor with which people discoursed over the topic, and how freely the
legislature funded it. Given that Varigny was appointed to the board by the king, his analysis of government education is more valid than a historian writing from a position disconnected with the actual education system of that time.

According to Varigny (1981), the government had a liberal policy on teacher qualifications for schools that were not state schools. The government’s philosophy was, “It is left to the parents to assess the qualifications and skills of the persons to whom they wish to entrust their children; the proper concerns of the parents guide them in their choice” and more pertinent to and problematic in our current system, “If they do not wish to take advantage of the educational opportunities the state offers to the public in general, and if they prefer other ones better adapted to their own needs, they may do so” (p. 153). I choose to mention this in this chapter because it highlights an educational policy that is healthy for overall public education: the ability to have autonomy in the decisions of education for one’s family. In the current culture of broad-based standardization in education via the No Child Left Behind Act, there is little to no room to develop schools that are most conducive to addressing the needs of individual communities if addressing those needs precludes the schools from aligning with government standards. In fact,
the only requirement of the parents is to “[S]ee that their children go to school and learn to read, write, and master the elements of arithmetic” (p. 153). In Varigny’s assessment of the above mentioned requirement, he states, “I do not believe one would find today in the islands ten persons of twenty years of age, man or woman, who does not have a full command of these basic skills” (p. 153). This commentary suggests that the literacy rate in Hawai’i, at least amongst 20 year olds, was nearly 100%. He also alludes to the fact that, for the most part, education was equal amongst men and women, which is unlike some supposedly more advanced societies in Europe (Kay, 1850).

Varigny (1981) continues with his praises of Kânaka’s thirst for literacy and other knowledge—praises that illustrate the success Kânaka realized when Kânaka exercised political agency. “The Kanakas read a good deal, especially their newspapers, of which the number, in proportion to the population, is rather large” (p. 153). Chapin (1984) supports Varigny’s assertion, “Without a doubt, the Hawaiian language newspapers had the largest readership of any papers in the Islands” (p. 67).
In the subsequent chapter of his book, Varigny describes the events of the controversial 1864 constitutional convention. I would like to focus in on article 62 of the proposed constitution and the debate regarding voter qualifications. After ascending to the throne, following the death of his brother, Kamehameha V refused to take the oath of office, which was allowed by the current constitution. He felt the 1852 constitution was flawed and thus decided to call a constitutional convention, which eventually convened on July 7, 1864. There was much debate on a number of articles including article 62, which would require “[E]ach voter be able to give proof that he was a Hawaiian [subject] or had been a naturalized citizen for two years; that he be able to write and count; and, finally, that he own property of a minimum value of $150…or have a minimum annual income of $60” (Varigny, 1981, p. 169). The opponents of article 62 argued that it would “[D]eprive the people of a sacred right [to vote]” (Kauahi’s speech cited in Varigny, 1981, p. 170). Many of the opponents were those associated with the sugar plantations who were duplicitous in their supposed concern for the poorest of Kānaka being denied the franchise. While the proponents put forth arguments for
both the land qualification and the literacy qualification, it is Kauahi’s position on the literacy requirement that is of most relevance to this chapter.

The main reason for instituting the voting requirement, according to Varigny (1981) was to prevent the sugar planters from controlling government. They were in the process of importing laborers from countries like China, which would have given them a dominant position should those people have been allowed to vote. Opponents’ argument of the adverse effect of the reading and writing requirement on the Kanaka population was tenuous. Kauahi, in his speech made the point “[T]hat every native voter already fulfilled this condition” (Varigny, 1981, p. 171). “The only persons who can complain of being affected by this clause are certain naturalized foreigners who have become Hawaiian citizens. But who is actually to blame for their condition? We are not responsible for the ignorance into which these newcomers have sunk” (Kauahi’s speech cited in Varigny, p. 171). This was a political move on the part of the King, his cabinet and supporters using the Kānaka’s universal literacy to maintain power. Article 62 was such an important issue that after days of debate and a virtual impasse, which looked as if it could end up going against the King’s wishes, he dissolved the convention and eventually
came out with a new constitution of his own. This was an act of ultimate Kanaka agency within the limits of the law.

This passage definitely adds to the proof of the literary success the Kānaka Maoli achieved. Understanding the fact that they would be relatively unaffected by a law requiring the ability to read and write in order to participate in voting is powerful as it is often assumed that the Kānaka suffered because of this type of law. This passage is also illustrative of Kanaka agency in government. Kamehameha V was a strong leader who always had the welfare of his people and his country at heart.

Nā Moʻolelo Maopopo o Kēia Lāhui: Kanaka Agency in the Promotion of Hawaiian Intelligence

This next section will focus on Kanaka Maoli agency in the campaign to promote naʻauao Hawaiʻi, or a Hawaiian intelligence. I have established, thus far, the propensity of the Kānaka Maoli for learning new things and the pervasiveness of literacy in Hawaiʻi. While these are positive and healthy attributes for a people to possess, there was concern amongst some in the Kanaka community. The combination of the Kānaka’s voracious appetite for learning coupled with the enormous influx of new knowledge to learn from the outside world created a situation where
naʻauao Hawaiʻi was on the decline. Luckily, the early Kanaka intelligentsia like Malo and Kamakau had the foresight to write down and publish traditional Kanaka knowledge. Again, the Hawaiian language newspapers, where they published their information, were an invaluable resource. For the purpose of this paper, I have selected some prominent examples on which to concentrate aside from Poepoe, who I have discussed earlier in this chapter.

One of Malo’s contemporaries, Haleʻole, referred to as a genius in his 1866 obituary in the newspaper The Friend (Chun, 1997), possessed the same foresight: “Ina paha aole e malama ia na moolelo o keia lahui i ka wa mamua, pehea la e ike ai na hanauna hope i ke ano o ka hana a keia mau aina i kela wa. (If the past stories of this race are not cared for, how will the future generations know the accomplishments of these lands in those times)” (Chun, 1997). In an article in the June 15th, 1865 edition of Ka Nūpepa Kūʻokoʻa, Haleʻole spoke about the importance of research on traditional Kanaka literature to which he had dedicated his life, and the seriousness with which he took his research:

No ka mea, o ko makou imi ana i ka moolelo no ko Hawaiʻi Pae Aina, aole ia he mea na makou e hoolilo ai i mea lealea wale no a paani hoi, a imea paha e kaaō wale aku ai, aka, ua imi makou
Because, in our researching the history of the Hawaiian Archipelago, it is not an endeavor that we take lightly simply as play or as entertainment, we have researched things by which the esteem of our history will reach the future generations. Because, this land is almost completely devoid of people who truly know the recognized stories of this race. Therefore, the story that we will research, make public and correct slightly, it will become an important book and therefore, will be of great value to all, to this generation and the generation to come.

With this understanding of the need to preserve and disseminate traditional Kanaka knowledge, Hale‘ole decided to publish a ka‘ao entitled, “Ka Mo‘olelo O Lāʻieikawai.” However, unlike all the other similar
publications, which were published in the newspapers, Lāʻieikawai was
2), it was the first Hawaiian story to be published in book form in Hawaiʻi.
It was an act of Kanaka Maoli agency. Haleʻole’s foreword for this book
expresses the enthusiasm for education and promotion of Kanaka
knowledge that was prevalent throughout the Kingdom period.

“We already have many various types of school books, and many books supplied to
us illustrating right and wrong; but, this will be the first book
to be printed by the Hawaiian people that is a book which
illustrates, in Kaʻao form, the ancient ways of this race,
precluding one of their fascinating tales from total
He continues instructing the readers, “E lawe hoi ano, i keia wahi buke uuku, a e hoike ia ia ma ke ano o kona loaa ana mai, e heluhelu, a e malama hoi ia ia, e hoike ana i kou iini i ka naauao Hawaii, me ko makaukau mau no hoi e kokua aku ia mea, i ku mau ai [Take this little book and show it in the way it is, read it and cherish it, showing your desire for Hawaiian knowledge, being ready to support that knowledge so it may forever remain] (p. 343). In the end of the subsequent paragraph, Hale‘ole asserts:

Akahi no a haawiia i ka lahuia Hawaii, ka buke e pili ana i ka hoonanea‘ku i ka noho ana, e like me ka na Haole, he mea ia nana e hanai mai i ko kakou mau manao i ka ike a me ka naauao. Ua hiki ia kakou a pau ke hui mai ma ka malama ana a me ka hooholomua aku hoi i keia wahi buke, he kumu ia e hapai hou ia mai ai i mau buke hou na keia lahuia, ma kana olelo iho — ka olelo Hawaii. (p. 343)

[This is the first time the Hawaiian people have been given a book for leisure reading, like those of the Haole. It is a book to feed our minds with knowledge and wisdom. We can come together in caring for and forwarding this little book, as an}
impetus for bringing forth more books by this nation, in her own language — the Hawaiian language.]

The author then closes out the foreword with a plea, “A no laila e na makamaka a pau o ka naauao a me na keiki kupa no hoi o Hawai‘i nei, mai ka la hiki a ka la kau, eia mai Kawahineokaliula, ke hele aku la imua o oukou me ke aloha, a e pono hoi ke hookipa ia ia me ka [sic] aloha makamae o ka puuwai Hawaii. Aloha no!” [So, all the friends of intelligence and natives of Hawai‘i, from the rising sun to the setting sun, here is Kawahineokaliula, coming before you with love, and you should welcome her/him with the precious love of the Hawaiian heart. Aloha!] (p. 343). Throughout this foreword, Hale‘ole speaks about knowledge, wisdom and intelligence, more specifically, a Kanaka intelligence. He is forceful in an eloquent way, speaking to the Kanaka audience impressing upon them the importance of being enlightened by the intelligence that was commonplace amongst the ancestors. Hale‘ole is illustrative of Kanaka agency. Although it is not directly political agency, it is an exercise of the power he has to influence Kānaka Maoli.

Nakuina is another Kanaka Maoli researcher who was passionate about educating other Kānaka Maoli about Kanaka traditional knowledge. He collected the story of Pākaʻa a me Kūapākaʻa (1902) and published it
in book form. In the first paragraph of the introduction, he left no doubt who his intended audience was. “E ka Lahui Hawaii, mai Hawai‘i o Keawe a Kauai o Mano, a welo loa aku i Kaula, ka palena o na moku, ka iwi o kuu iwi a me ke koko o kuu koko, ke kupa, ka oiwi ponoi o ka aina, Aloha oukou” [To the Hawaiian race, from Hawai‘i of Keawe to Kaua‘i of Mano, and setting way out at Ka‘ula, the boundary of the islands, the bones of my bones, the blood of my blood, the native, the indigenous of the land, aloha to you] (Nakuina, 1902). Nakuina then explains the reason for publishing this book. “He mau makahiki i hala ae nei, ma muli o ka imi ana i na moolelo Hawaii kahiko loa, ma ka ninau ana i ka poe kahiko, ua ike ia ko lakou waiwai ina e pai buke ia, a lilo i mea hoonaauao mai i ka lahui o keia au” [For several years past, because of my researching the ancient Hawaiian stories by inquiring with the elders, their value would be recognized should it be published in book form and become a means to educate the people of this time]. Once again, there is a passion expressed for education for Kānaka Maoli on the Kanaka ways of understanding the world. Nakuina exercises agency in this promotion of Kanaka intellectualism. In a later paragraph, Nakuina counts off the valuable aspects of this story:
Akahi, ua kakau ia ma ka olelo Hawaii oiaio maoli o ke au kahiko. Alua, o na mele na paha a me na kau i nalowale kekahi a e nalowale aku ana, aole loa ia e loaa hou ina aole e pai buke ia. Akolu, ka inoa o na makani o kela a me keia mokupuni o ko Hawaii Pae Aina, a Teritore o Hawai'i i keia wa. Aha, o ka mea i oi ae ma mua o na kumu mua ekolu i hai mua ia ae nei, oia ke Aloha Alii oiaio o na kanaka Hawaii i ke au i hala a hiki loa mai no i keia au

[One, it was written in the true Hawaiian language of the old days. Two, the poems, the paha chants and the kau chants, some of which have disappeared or will disappear, there is no way it will be found again if it is not published in book form. Three, [it contains] the names of the winds of all the islands of the Hawaiian archipelago, or Territory of Hawai'i now. Four, the reason that stands above the other three uttered above is the love and loyalty to the Chiefs of the Hawaiian people of the past until today].

Finally, the author instructs the loyalists and patriots of all the islands, "[E]ia mai o PAKAA a me KUAPAKAA ke imi akula ia oukou; e ike mai ina e kiei aku ma ko oukou mau ipuka, e hea mai a e hookipa ma ko
oukou mau home” [Here come Pakaa and Kuapakaa searching for you all; recognize him should he be peering into your doorway, call to him and be host him in your homes]. In this last passage, Nakuina uses the tool of personification to appeal deeper to Kānaka. He personifies the story and tells the audience assertively that this “person” will be coming to their home appealing to the cultural requisite of calling out and hosting someone should you see them outside your home. Nakuina’s introduction is one of the most impassioned cries that I have seen to Hawaiians to seek the knowledge of the ancestors before it is lost—a true expression of Kanaka agency.

Kalākaua, Hale Nauā, and Research

The Hale Nauā, as briefly mentioned in chapter 3, was founded by Kalākaua as the Temple of Science in 1886. “The object of this Society is the revival of Ancient Sciences of Hawai‘i in combination with the promotion and advancement of Modern Sciences, Art, Literature and Philanthropy” (Hale Nauā, 1886, p. 6). Modeled after Masonic societies, the foundation of the Hale Nauā was genealogical studies as it was for the original Hale Nauā under Kamehameha I. They also focused on

---

25 Kalākaua was a Freemason and attained the 33rd degree of the Scottish Rite.
“[A]strology, divination and science” (Karpiel, 1999). It was also indicated that the “Society was propagating knowledge held by kahunas (priests and experts) of every specialty” (Karpiel, 1999).

Silva (2004) examines the Hale Naua as a political institution. While I agree with that function, essentially, the Hale Naua was an institution of research—which is political in nature. It was analogous to a university and was another means to exercise Kanaka Maoli agency, politically and intellectually. It took over the genealogical research work of the Kingdom’s Board of Genealogy. It also researched science and spiritual and cultural traditions of Hawai‘i. Although this research institution was fashioned after Masonic societies, its activities were based on Kanaka traditions. The regalia provision every member received prior to induction into the Society was a “[M]oena makaloa, laau kauwila, kalo lauloa, elua iliili, hookahi ia maka-a, hookahi ia akilolo, hookahi popo aho, hookahi koi pohaku, hookahi hokeo, hookahi lei mano, hookahi makau palaoa, hookahi makau ea” (Makaloa mat, kauwila wood staff, lauloa taro, two stones, one maka‘ā fish, one ‘akilolo fish, one ball of twine, one stone adze, one calabash, a shark tooth club, one ivory hook, and one turtle shell hook) (Silva C. L., 1999). The days on which they chose to meet were also guided by Kanaka traditional beliefs. “E noho ana ka Hale Nua i kela ame
keia malama o ka makahiki puni, ma ka po i o Kane, ke ole e hoomalolo ia no kahi wa aku, a ma keia mau po wale no e noho ai ka Hale. O Hua, o Akua, o Hoku, o Mahealani ame Lono. No na Hale Nauā kuikawa, aia iloko o na po i o Hilo, Hoaka, na Ku Eha, o Huna, o Mohalu, na Laau a me na Kaloa” (*The Hale Nauā is to convene each month throughout the even-numbered years on the night of Kāne if not temporarily recessed for a time. The particular nights on which the Society is to meet are Hua, Akua, Hoku, Māhealani and Lono. Special meetings of the Society are to be scheduled for the nights of Hilo, Hoaka, the four Kū nights, Huna, Mohalu, the Lāʻau nights and the Kāloa nights — translation by Hale Nauā*) (Hale Nauā, 1886, p. 3).

The Hale Nauā dealt with research from a Hawaiian perspective. In conducting their research, they “[E]mbraced matters of science recognized by the priests of the ancient times” (Liliʻuokalani, 1990, p. 114). According to Moʻokini, the “Hale Nauā picked up the work of the government agency called the Board of Genealogy [Papa Kūʻauhau o Nā Aliʻi]” (Moʻokini, p. 2). One of the Board’s philosophies was to not deal with foreign sources regarding verification of genealogies and histories. Rather they relied on Kanaka-produced genealogies and ancient histories found in the traditional mele (Silva, 2004, p. 95)—an assertion of Kanaka
Maoli agency. No doubt, the Hale Nauā adopted this practice within the contexts of Kanaka genealogies and histories.

While the Hale Nauā was very political, its politicization was due to its commitment to researching and reviving traditional ways of understanding and interacting with the environment — the various branches of traditional sciences. Despite the many criticisms the society received, mainly from missionary extremists (see Moʻokini, pp. 12-15), they remained steadfast in their work, understanding the significance of their work for the perpetuation of Kanaka intelligence and for renewing a sense of pride amongst the Kānaka Maoli. I believe that the Hale Nauā was a Kanaka institution of higher learning, a semblance of a university focusing on Hawaiian Arts and Sciences. While it seems that the Hale Nauā was, intellectually, the highest educational institution created by Kanaka Maoli, it was surely the last great educational endeavor by Kānaka Maoli during the period in which political agency rested with the Kānaka.

The perspective from which I chose to present this chapter purposefully disregards the struggles of Kānaka Maoli during the Kingdom period. There is a plethora of literature that laments the problems of the period. My goal here is to acknowledge and celebrate the numerous accomplishments in education and the promotion of education and
intellectualism. Kānaka Maoli come from a long tradition of intellectualism and the pursuit of knowledge, as evidenced simply by the fact that our ancestors chose to travel the expansive ocean to a land they had not seen before: ka ‘āina a mākou i ‘ike ‘ole ai ma lalo aku nei\textsuperscript{26}. Our Ali‘i recognized this. In response to someone’s praise of his wisdom, Kamehameha II said, “Na wai ho‘i ka ‘ole o ke akamai, he alanui i ma‘a i ka hele ‘ia e o‘u mau mākua?” \footnote{Why should not I know \textit{[be intellectual]}, \textit{when it is a road often traveled by my parents \textit{[ancestors]}?} — Pūku‘i} (Pūku‘i, 1983, p. 251).

We know that the missionaries formally introduced Western-style schools and the technology of literacy. We know that they did \textit{not} introduce indigenous intellectualism. This chapter examined some prominent examples of traditional brilliance like the Kumulipo, the works of Poepoe, Hale‘ole and Nakuina, and the Hale Nauā. It also looked at the positive outcomes that are possible when new technology meets a passion for learning and intellectualism. It is my hope that, as a people, we can rekindle that ancestral fire within us to crave knowledge. It is my hope that we can connect to and find inspiration in the achievements of

\footnote{26 See chant at opening of this chapter}
our ancestors of the Kingdom period. It is my hope that this chapter can contribute to making the connection.
“One of the major problems I often point out...in the area of education, is that we have a situation where the educational psychology that’s taught to teachers and others who are in charge of our children is a psychology based on the history and experience of another people, and despite the best intentions of these educators they will miseducate our children in terms of that psychology....We are trying to educate our children in that system; they are bound to fail” (Wilson, 1993, p. 21).

The school system in Hawai‘i has a number of well-intentioned people in terms of wanting to see Kanaka Maoli students succeed. Despite this, Kānaka Maoli, as a group, are continuing to fail (Kana‘iaupuni, Malone & Ishibashi, 2005). According to Kana‘iaupuni et al. (2005), “On the whole, educational measures such as standardized tests, special education enrollment, high school graduation, and college completion reflect substantially lower achievement among Native Hawaiians compared with statewide norms” (p. 3). The good intention has not been effectual in improving the performance in education. Over the past few decades, a
plethora of programs purporting to improve Kanaka Maoli educational attainment have been established with very limited success, if any, in changing the outcome of Kānaka Maoli in education (e.g., Kamehameha Early Education Program, Nā Pua Noʻeau, Kamehameha Extention Education). They failed to fully consider a comprehensive historical perspective of Kanaka Maoli education in the development of their program. In this chapter, I will elucidate the importance of understanding the history of Kanaka Maoli agency in government and, specifically, education. Within this is included the purported incorporation of the Hawaiian Kingdom into the United States, the success of Kānaka Maoli in education prior to that incorporation, and the effect the incorporation has had on Kānaka Maoli’s perspectives on education. I will also explain how a program at the University of Hawai‘i at Hilo was successfully developed considering this historical perspective.

**Revisiting the Incorporation of Hawai‘i into the U.S.**

When the United States, Great Britain, and France recognized Hawai‘i as an independent nation-state and a member of the Family of Nations in 1843, Hawai‘i was on equal footing with all other members of the Family. Hawai‘i declared itself a neutral country, became very active internationally and developed good relationships with many nation-states.
Although Hawaiʻi and its government were multi-ethnic, the ruling class of the Kānaka Maoli controlled the government and its educational system. Kanaka controlled education flourished during this time.

However, in 1893, the Hawaiian Kingdom government was overthrown putting the education system in the hands of treasonous pro-American oligarchy calling themselves the Provisional Government and subsequently the Republic of Hawaiʻi. After two failed attempts to execute a treaty of annexation with Hawaiʻi, the U.S. purported to annex Hawaiʻi on August 12, 1898 through unilateral action: a joint resolution of Congress. This was the beginning of the so-called incorporation of the Kānaka Maoli (along with the other Hawaiian nationals) into the United States.

Loss of Kanaka Agency, Ogbu and Acting Haole

After the overthrow, when Kānaka no longer controlled government, education changed. It became more foreign. One salient example of this change is the 1896 law that made English the only legal medium of education (Republic of Hawaii, 1896). Besides language, the content of the curriculum became more and more American. Quickly and continually, the difference in culture between the school and home became significant for nearly all Kānaka Maoli.
The rapidly growing gap between home and school cultures had serious consequences for Kānaka Maoli. According to Ogbu’s research (1992), involuntary minorities have a different frame of reference to the difference in culture than voluntary minorities who view it as an obstacle to overcome in order to have a better life. Some Kānaka Maoli have viewed education not only as foreign but also as a direct imposition of foreign ideology, more specifically Haole ideology. Therefore, to achieve academic success in school is to succumb to that imposition and support the further subjugation of Kānaka Maoli through the promotion of a Haole
ideology. Ogbu (1992) has suggested that this makes it difficult for involuntary minorities to accept and follow school rules of behavior and to persevere at their academic tasks. Furthermore, those that find it difficult tend to interpret the learning of the dominant group’s ideology and frame of reference as detrimental to the survival of their own culture, language, and identity. This leads to a conscious or subconscious opposition or ambivalence toward school learning in order to protect the group’s ideology and survival of its culture. The more threatened the minority perceives its culture to be, the more profound the opposition to school.

The Importance of Program Identity

Considering the perspective of some Kānaka Maoli towards education, it is critical for any educational program whose goal is the academic success of Kānaka Maoli to develop an identity amongst its students as a Hawaiian program. There are a number of ways to accomplish this and varying degrees to which it can be achieved. I have identified four major components of any Kanaka Maoli educational program that must be considered when developing the identity of the program: student composition, staff composition, curriculum/content and pedagogy.
As I expound on these key components in this chapter, I will analyze the Uluākea faculty development program at the University of Hawai‘i at Hilo (UHH) for its success or lack thereof for each component. I will also examine these components within other Hawaiian programs to assist me in elucidating their complexities.

Uluākea Faculty Development

The Uluākea program at the University of Hawai‘i at Hilo began in 2005 and was developed in the Kīpuka Native Hawaiian Student Center (Kīpuka). The Center’s mission is to promote Native Hawaiian Success at UHH. Over its first four years, the Center had realized success in increasing the educational attainment of Kanaka Maoli students as measured by common measurements of institutions of higher learning (e.g. graduation rates and persistency rates) through various student affairs support efforts and by the creation of a location on campus that was identified as a very Hawaiian place for Kanaka Maoli students and faculty. However, outside of Kīpuka and Ka Haka ʻUla o Keʻelikōlani, the Hawaiian Language College, there was no sense of the University of Hawaiʻi at Hilo having a Hawaiian identity to where Kanaka Maoli students would feel like their success in the institution (outside the two aforementioned programs) was a Hawaiian success. To the staff of
Kīpuka, including myself, the core of the institution, where the institution’s philosophy and ideology is developed, is its curriculum. Kīpuka applied for and was awarded a U.S. Department of Education grant to develop a program whose focus is to make UHH more of a Hawaiian place of learning. This was directly addressing the institution’s identity. Trying to drastically change the identity of an institution that, for many people, represented the hegemonic establishment in Hawai‘i was necessarily going to be a slow process.

The program was designed to help faculty develop more of a Hawaiian cultural worldview through the continued participation in authentic Hawaiian experiences. These faculty members would eventually modify courses they already teach or develop new courses in which they would incorporate more of a Hawaiian worldview through two main areas: content and pedagogy.

Perceptions of the Student Body

Of course, with the focus on Kanaka Maoli academic success, it is presumed that the students of a particular program are of Kanaka Maoli descent. This component alone as the one Hawaiian component of a program does have an impact on the perception of the program as a Hawaiian program but does very little to affect the Hawaiian-ness of the
other components. The Kamehameha Schools, whose student body is nearly 100% Kanaka Maoli, has long been an example of this phenomenon. Critics of the school often rhetorically ask the question, “Is Kamehameha a Hawaiian school or a school for Hawaiians?” This is really a critique of their lack of “Hawaiian-ness” of the other critical components: staff, curriculum and pedagogy. The majority of the staff is non-Kanaka, the curriculum emphasizes Western ideology and the pedagogy is typically Western. This institution has also counseled students away from focusing on Hawaiian studies and language courses. 

Ironically, for people less familiar with the institution, there is a perception, based on assumptions, that the other components of the school are Hawaiian. For example, on a number of occasions, when strangers hear my family conversing in Hawaiian, our family’s primary language, they often ask, “So, your kids go to Kamehameha?” My retort has usually been, “No. They would not get Hawaiian fluency there.” Their assumption is primarily based on the fact that the student body is Kanaka Maoli and some of their extracurricular activities, especially the more public ones like Song Contest, tend to be more Hawaiian culture focused.

As a program within ʻIpuka, Uluākea’s goals are in line with the Center’s mission - to promote Native Hawaiian Success at UHH. However,
because Uluākea is working to infiltrate the mainstream curriculum at the institution, it does not pick the students who enroll in the courses.

Rather the students are the regular students who normally register for their respective courses, most often without the knowledge that the course in which they are enrolling is under Uluākea. Therefore, if the campus Kanaka Maoli enrollment is about 23% (University of Hawai‘i), we can assume that there is about that same percentage in these courses combined. For the other 67% in these Uluākea classes, the data collected for the program indicates that they have had an improved educational experience along with the Kanaka Maoli students. This includes quantitative (i.e. g.p.a, persistency rates & evaluation responses) and qualitative (i.e. evaluation responses & anecdotes) data. One salient example is a story related to me by a non-Kanaka student. Here is a paraphrase of what she expressed to me. “I was previously in a Marine Science course that I failed. I retook the same course. The second time, the course was a part of Uluākea with an Uluākea faculty and I found myself more engaged in the course. I ended up doing really well.”

Perceptions of the Staff

The ethnic make-up of the staff is more likely to influence the curriculum and pedagogy of an educational program. However, in the
the staff have been educated and trained for many years in Western institutions. Even though they may be culturally more Hawaiian than Western, it is normal for people, when placed in a formal educational institution, to teach in the way they were taught in a similar context. In other words, unless Kanaka educators are making a conscious effort to teach contrarily, they would normally default to using Western pedagogical methods.

Furthermore, even if a program employs Kanaka, they may be Kanaka who are very disconnected from their culture and culturally appropriate behavior. Therefore, if the goal of the program is to increase Kanaka Maoli student success through a curriculum and pedagogical methods that are founded on Hawaiian ways of knowing, then I would argue that the cultural and spiritual connectedness of the staff is more important than simply their ethnicity. There is a lot to be said, however, for the positive effect Kanaka teachers can have as role models for Kanaka students. So, the selection of staff needs to consider, among other things, what the individuals bring to the program in terms of their ability to teach from a cultural perspective and their influence as role models.
The context in which Uluākea was developed leaves little choice in terms of Kanaka vs. non-Kanaka professors. At UHH, only 8.6% of the teaching faculty is Kanaka (University of Hawai‘i at Hilo), the large majority of who are in the Hawaiian Language College. This college is not a focus of the Uluākea program. Therefore, of the 27 faculty members who have entered the Uluākea program, only 2 are Kānaka Maoli. Both of these Kanaka professors have since taken positions at other institutions. So, Uluākea is administered by two full-time staff (including myself) that are Kānaka who teach the professors and we have recruited 25 professors of various levels all of whom are non-Kanaka.

Although this is not the ideal situation for establishing a strong Hawaiian identity as a program, it is extremely difficult to get a large core of Kanaka teaching faculty in various disciplines outside Hawaiian Studies. We felt the larger mission of Uluākea was too important to postpone the program until UHH has recruited more Kanaka faculty. While Kīpuka, as a program, has been promoting efforts to recruit and retain more Kanaka faculty, we began our program with non-Kānaka whom we felt would be willing to delve into Hawaiian worldviews and make it a part of who they are and modify their teaching to prioritize and honor the indigenous ways of understanding the world.
As we were planning this program, I struggled a little with the idea of trying to get non-Kanaka to teach from Hawaiian worldviews. I have heard it expressed on a number of occasions that a non-Kanaka cannot have a Kanaka perspective. I knew, however, that the converse was true; that there are Kanaka who can teach from Western cultural worldviews. Therefore, we were willing to put in the effort to work with appropriate UHH faculty to make our campus more of a Hawaiian place of learning.

Because this situation does negatively affect our ability to increase the perception of our program as a Hawaiian program, we do our best to assure students in these classes that the effort of their professor to incorporate Hawaiian worldviews into their course is supported and promoted by Kūpuka, a program with a strong Hawaiian identity on campus. This situation also provides us extra motivation to ensure that the other two components — curriculum and pedagogy — are firmly grounded in Hawaiian worldviews.

The Curriculum

An educational organization’s philosophy is evinced by its curriculum. It is the core of who they are and what they represent. Curriculum and pedagogy are the most significant components of an educational organization’s identity. Because of this, to better ensure
Kanaka students perceive the program as a Hawaiian program, the most concentrated efforts must be made in these two areas. Sometimes, public perception somewhat differs from reality in terms of the Hawaiian-ness of curriculum. One example of where I believe this to be true is in many of the Kula Kaiapuni Hawai‘i (Hawaiian Immersion Schools). Because the language of instruction is Hawaiian and some of the themes through which the content is taught is related to Hawaiian culture, there is a strong perception that the Kula Kaiapuni are very Hawaiian schools. This identity is strengthened by the fact that most of the staff are Kānaka Maoli and nearly all the students are Kānaka Maoli. Hawaiian performing arts (the public exhibition of their Hawaiianess) is also a key component of most of the schools which often gives it a Kanaka cultural face in public. This combination presents a compelling image of a Hawaiian program.

The reality may be slightly different. While there is some promotion of Hawaiian ideology through some of the curriculum and teaching methods, in some schools, the promotion of Western ideology is relatively significant in the content of much of the translated literature and the content of the curriculum. There needs to be more research done to bring this to light.
Fortunately for the idea of identity, reality is not important. Perception is. The identity as a Hawaiian institution has helped the Kula Kaiapuni, like Kamehameha to some degree, to promote the idea that succeeding academically at their institution is a Kanaka thing to do, as opposed to a foreign thing to do. Succeeding at the institution is in promotion of the survival of Hawaiian ideology and of Kanaka Maoli as a people. It can also be said that in the promotion of the perceptions of the respective schools, both are contributing to a new reality of Hawaiian education.

The danger in the mismatch between perception and reality, especially where the mismatch is salient, is that the ideology Kanaka have been resisting in mainstream public school by not acquiescing, is now being internalized as Hawaiian through the Hawaiian language and educational themes. It is neo-hegemonic in nature. It promotes the ideology of the occupier through what appears to be a more Kanaka Maoli process; sort of a wolf in sheep’s clothing syndrome. So while you create a situation where Kanaka Maoli academic success is more likely, what they are learning is problematic for their liberation.

This has been my quandary with my position at UHH prior to the development of Uluākea. My job was to increase Kanaka Maoli “success”
at UHH by ensuring they make it through the (hegemonic) curriculum and the (hegemonic) system that has been in place for a long time. Working on Uluākea now, has allowed me to positively influence the curriculum across the various disciplines with the help of the professors within those disciplines.

Another area of contention within our efforts at Uluākea is the idea that Hawaiian content does not belong in any discipline outside Hawaiian Studies or in an institution of higher learning at all. This was expressed on a couple of occasions on course evaluations for an Uluākea course, even by a Kanaka Maoli student. This perspective can lead to the ghetto-izing of Kanaka ways of knowing and thus its continued marginalization. In other words, as Western ways of knowing permeate every discipline in the institution, even Hawaiian Studies, these detractors want to keep Kanaka ways of knowing within one discipline making it easier to control. Furthermore, it promotes the idea that Kanaka worldview is not as worthy and perhaps unable to express the high level concepts at an institution of higher learning. These detractors have not argued that American ideology and ways of knowing should be used and promoted only within the discipline of American Studies. Even our own Hawaiian language college, Ka Haka ʻUla o Keʻelikōlani, is susceptible to this way of thinking.
In trying to control the use of and teaching of Hawaiian language and perspective, they have developed a philosophy that any course that engages in this should be contained within their college. This stifles the growth of things Hawaiian in the mainstream of our institution and promotes the continued marginalization as the college itself continues to function within the margins of the institution.

The Perception of the Pedagogy

The pedagogy component is just as critical as the curriculum in terms of program identity. Here, I use a broad definition of the term pedagogy. Beyond the strategies and methods used to teach, I define it also as the behaviors exhibited by the teacher in the classroom that affect learning. Perhaps the terms strategies, methods and behaviors are really close to each other in meaning. But I differentiate between the first two and the latter to emphasize that there are strategies we employ to maximize learning and there are unconscious behaviors that impact learning to which teachers do not pay enough attention.

It could be assumed that those who are more connected to Hawaiian cultural ways of behaving would exhibit behavior that is more culturally appropriate in their class. However, as I mentioned in the section on staff, the years Kānaka Maoli have spent in Western-focused
classrooms from their first day in kindergarten until they graduate from college has been a long-term training for their own teaching. Even though their default cultural behavior may be more Hawaiian in most contexts, they tend to step out of that norm and behave in the more traditional Western culture found in U.S. schools.

Kanaka Maoli educational programs that claim to be culturally Hawaiian often focus on curriculum rather than pedagogy. Hawaiianizing the curriculum has been effective for many schools in establishing a sound Hawaiian identity. But Hawaiianizing the pedagogy is the key to realizing the most effective Hawaiian identity. However, understanding Hawaiian pedagogical practices within the context of formal education and articulating them, especially to relative newcomers to Hawaiian ways of understanding the world, has proven much more difficult than articulating a Hawaiian curriculum.

In the beginning stages of Ulua Kea, there was a lot of discussion on increasing Hawaiian content in courses. As an example, we worked with a history teacher that taught World History, Hawaiian History and European History. Much of the initial discussions were on improving the content of the Hawaiian History courses and bringing in more Hawaiian content to the World History course. To do this would be an important and
significant improvement. However, I posed the question, “How do we Hawaiianize courses like European History beyond modifying the curriculum?” This focused the discussion on how to Hawaiianize pedagogy in order to give the students a better educational experience that was relevant to the worldview indigenous to Hilo. What we realized is that some of the concepts that were conducive to a quality Hawaiian pedagogy, such as multi-sensory learning, place-based learning, service learning and an emphasis on group learning, were considered good pedagogical practices in contemporary Western education theory. Ideas like multiple intelligences (Gardner, 1983) are newly developed Western educational concepts that are a regular part of Kānaka Maoli worldview.

**Inspiration — Knowing Our Kūpuna Did It and Chose to Do It**

Another important reason for a comprehensive and accurate understanding of the history of education during the Kingdom period in Hawai‘i is to inspire and motivate those Kānaka Maoli who express their resistance to the imposition of Western ideology through behavior detrimental to success in school. No matter what the content or pedagogical practices of a school, the most doctrinaire resisters will not want to fully participate or succeed because of the assumption that public compulsory education as an institution is very Western and Kānaka
Maoli never fully engaged in it. If they did engage, it was because they were forced to and acquiesced.

The study of agency within public education and the successes of public education during the Kingdom period will debunk the above assumption made by numerous people today. It will provide a counter narrative to the literature on public education, which erroneously places the control of the development and administration of public education with non-Kānaka Maoli. It is invaluable for our young Kānaka today to realize that their kupuna saw the value of literacy, decided that they were going to teach all Kānaka throughout Hawai‘i through schools, employed the missionaries they thought would best help them achieve this and were extremely successful at doing so.

A further understanding deeper into the historical roots of our people’s orientation towards intellectual progress and propensity for technological advancement as expressed in chapter five can only serve to amplify the potential for inspiring our people to develop and maintain our own contemporary orientation towards high intellectualism and educational advancement.
Ending Occupation

The understanding that we gain from the study of the Kingdom period, the concept of Kanaka Maoli agency, the loss of control, and its impact on Kanaka education can facilitate the development of quality education programs that promote Kanaka psychological liberation and the tradition of Kanaka intellectualism. However, if we know that the most consequential phenomenon to affect our educational liberation is Kanaka agency, or Kanaka self-determination, it behooves us to simultaneously focus energy on our political liberation. Without this political liberation, our educational programming is limited to the structures imposed upon us by the occupier: the United States.

Ogbu’s emphasis on a historical perspective is critical in understanding Kanaka Maoli school failure. It is especially important within the Kanaka context because of the unprecedented success our kūpuna realized in education during most of the 19th century. Applying Ogbu’s theory on “acting White” to the Hawai‘i context sheds light on a principal reason Kānaka Maoli are not doing well in school today. Making the connection that the failure of our youth in mainstream schools is their successful resistance to the indoctrination into the occupier’s ideology promoted by those schools provides the insight necessary to begin to
conceive liberating education programs. Being cognizant that the perspective many of our youth have toward education in which the nature of the education system as a system of the occupier is debilitating to the positive productivity of Kanaka Maoli youth is crucial. Programs aimed at improving the station of Kanaka Maoli through formal education must understand and consider the historical complexity of the current situation in order to truly liberate them. In the 1800s, we made the choice to educate all of Hawai‘i through compulsory education. After the overthrow of the government and subsequent military occupation by the U.S., we made the choice to resist indoctrination through compulsory education. Today, we must make the choice of education again. But we must make our education an education for liberation again.
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