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ABSTRACT

In the intellectual, political and cultural relationships between the West and Hawai‘i, there consistently have been a one-way discourse of political mythmaking. The Hawaiians get reduced demographically, culturally and morally, while the Westerner get elevated in these areas. I will posit that Hawaiian loss of land, resources and sovereignty all started when the West usurped self-representation of the Hawaiians, not when they got usurped militarily, economically nor politically. Usurpation of the Hawaiians' self-representation meant for the West a windfall profit of all of their resources. [Political myth, Western domination, Social sustainability--argument, Moral--argument, Innocence--argument, Hawai‘i, racism, colonialism, Knowledge/Power, History, Anthropology--caucasians, Representation--politics, Media--textual analysis, Cultural criticism, Natives--Hawai‘i]
1-1: A Regime's Need to Invent Others

The basic premise of this work is that all regimes need to represent an immoral, inferior, powerless, and incompetent enemy Other, an opponent—whether internal or external—in order to explain and justify their existence, empowerment, and furthermore, expansion.

I posit that a regime’s positive identity is maintained by comparison with negative identities of its opponents. Consider the following: how can an interest group justify its continued existence if its Other is a "better alternative?" How can one know his group is good and beneficial when there is no Other to compare it with? How can a regime justify its expansion to an opponent’s resources if the opponent is moral and has better social sustainability? Indeed, as Trinh has written:

The setting up of unitary opposite is a result of the well-meant intention of equating the unequal, which thereby assumes its responsibility for the constraints of equality while allowing inequality to maintain its being. Thus, invention of "needs" and the mission to "help" the needy always blossom together.  

---

1 In this thesis, I define regime as an interest group which may be distinguished from others by a list of grievances and achievements. See du Preez, 1980:4.

2 Trinh, 1989:54.
For a regime to justify its existence and expansion, it must invent an immoral, inferior and incompetent enemy Other and compare it with the moral Self to justify its "help" for the "needy" Other. In this sense, the source of a group's identity is based on representations of us against them. Elliot, however, argues:

It is important... to realise that we and they do not need to be antagonists; nor need they be made into enemies, foes or fiends (the German for enemy). Human societies can acquire feelings of interdependence and identity without being against anyone. Identity does not require xenophobia.³

Some sociologists also argue that the assumption that outgroup hostility and prejudice are natural and inevitable concomitants of the existence of human groups is "not tenable."⁴ There is another kind of argument against the notion of the invention of the immoral enemy Other. Sam Keen, the author of Faces of the Enemy, anticipated "a chorus of objections" to his theory of Homo Hostilis (hostile human):

"What do you mean, 'create' enemies? We don't make enemies. They are aggressors, evil empires, bad men, and wicked women in the real world. And they will destroy us if we don't destroy them first. They are real villains--Hitler, Stalin, Pol Pot (leader of the Cambodian Khmer Rouge, responsible for the murder of 2 million of his own people). You can't psychologize political events, or solve the problem of war by studying perceptions of the enemy."⁵

⁴ Duckitt, 1992:69
⁵ Keen, 1986:11.
In order to prove the necessity of inventing an immoral, incompetent enemy Other, one must study the makeup of human identity. Indeed, quite contrary to arguments I introduced above, it has been pointed out that identity does require xenophobia. According to du Preez, "Identity is not maintained in isolation. Identities exist in systems of relations... which maintain each other."\(^6\) Thomas Aquinas too proposed that "The soul is pleased by the comparison of one thing with another, since placing one thing in conjunction with another has an innate affinity with the way mind acts."\(^7\) Likewise, William James noted, "The first thing the intellect does with an object is to class it along with something else."\(^8\) In other words, your identity depends on what you are against; what you are not, is you. De Beauvoir has written, "no group ever sets itself up as the One without at once setting up the Other over against itself."\(^9\) She goes further: "Otherness is a fundamental category of human thought."\(^10\)

In short, representation of Self requires comparison. To understand the central historical achievement of one's own culture, one needs to invent distant and radically different Others to compare it with. Therefore:

---

\(^6\) Du Preez, 1980:3.

\(^7\) *Wills, 1991:18.

\(^8\) *Wills, 1991:18.

\(^9\) de Beauvoir, 1974:xix-xx.

\(^10\) de Beauvoir, 1974:xix.
Political ideologies often attempt to animate their agents as personae with finite and mechanical relations to one another. There is, from an ideological point of view, a well understood and predictable relation between collective identity-pairs such as Aryan/Jew; Catholic/Protestant (in Northern Ireland); white/black (in nationalist politics); Basque/Spaniard; or worker/capitalist.\(^{11}\)

However, the oldest of such either/or dichotomies--older than any racial, ethnic, class or religious divisions--is undoubtedly gender. Xenophobic men usurped women's power to represent themselves, which in turn made their control over the other sex possible. As Haunani-Kay Trask pointed out: "Man defines the Self as his own being; he defines woman as Other, as Object."\(^{12}\) To represent the female Other means to reduce women morally, demographically and culturally; in other words, women are made to seem like as if they do not exist. If the female Other does not exist, if she is inessential, and if she is evil and incapable--in short, insane--the sane, male Self must step in to save this Other from herself. Women's self-government over their bodies, minds and resources were stolen by men precisely at the time when men stole women's power to represent themselves. It comes as no surprise that women traditionally have been seen as untrustworthy and deceitful as opposed to trustworthy and honest men. De

\(^{11}\) du Preez, 1980:5.

Beauvoir has demonstrated that women are always the "inessential" and polarized Other:

In actuality the relation of the two sexes is not quite like that of two electrical poles, for man represents both the positive and neutral, as is indicated by the common use of man to designate human beings in general; whereas woman represents only the negative, defined by limiting criteria, without reciprocity.¹⁴

Feminist scholar Christina Crosby has demonstrated that in the 19th century, "history" was produced "as man's truth, the truth of a necessarily historical Humanity, which in turn requires that 'women' be outside history, above, below, or beyond properly historical and political life."¹⁵ She observed further that:

Producing "history" as the truth of man has very important social and political effects, for this project necessarily entails constituting various categories which relate to history in quite different ways. "Women" is such a category, a collectivity that is positioned outside of history proper, identified rather with the immediacy and intimacy of social life. "Savages" and all "primitive" men are another; either they stand at the threshold of history, or, like the Jews of Orientalism, are the outmoded remnants of an historical "moment" now past. "The poor," too, are like "savages," barbaric but capable of development. In these ways, "man," that generic, universal category typifying everything human, is in fact constituted through violently hierarchical differences. "Women" must be radically other to history and to men; "primitive" men must be barely human, potentially but not actually historical.¹⁶

¹³ de Beauvoir, 1974:xxxiv.
¹⁴ de Beauvoir, 1974:xviii.
Men need a "masculine" identity, and need to maintain that "masculinity" as something separate, apart, and "restrained" in order to perpetuate their ill-gotten social gains, gains which are exclusively reserved for them. If there were no gender distinctions, men's privileges would erode. Thus women and homosexuals of both sexes (who tend to violate the gender distinction) must become enemies and "Others" for that reason. Indeed, as Segal has said:

The force and power of the dominant ideals of masculinity, I argue, do no derive from any intrinsic characteristic of individuals, but from the social meanings which accrue to these ideals from their supposed superiority to that which they are not. To be "masculine" is not to be "feminine," not to be "gay," not to be tainted with any marks of "inferiority"—ethnic or otherwise.\textsuperscript{17}

Again, men have an inherent interest in usurping women's self-representation to usurp control over their bodies, minds and resources. In order to steal the Other's self-government and resources, the Self must first steal the right of self-representation from the Other. No wonder in Medieval Europe "women were associated with the devil, and seen as enemies of the Church and civilization. This went to justify the witch-hunts that tried women for sexual rapaciousness, cannibalism, consorting with evil spirits, and being generally intractable and capricious."\textsuperscript{18} But paradoxically, because women are the

\textsuperscript{17} Segal, 1990:x.

\textsuperscript{18} Kabbani, 1986:5.
Other to men, women are all that men desire and all that men do not attain:

He projects upon her what he desires and what he fears, what he loves and what he hates. And if it is so difficult to say anything specific about her, that is because man seeks the whole of himself in her and because she is All. She is All, that is, on the plane of the inessential; she is all Other.¹⁹

This same type of discourse was faithfully applied in colonial discourses which deprived self-representation of feminized racial/ethnical Others. Consider the following example of dichotomy in which the need for an immoral, incapable, feminized Other (from whom the West is "entitled" to usurp resources) is perfectly fulfilled:

Embedded in the concept of blackness was its direct opposite--whiteness. No other colors so clearly implied opposition, "beinge coloures utterlye contrary"; no others were so frequently used to denote polarization:

Everye white will have its blacke,
And everye sweete its sowre.

White and black connoted purity and filthiness, virginity and sin, virtue and baseness, beauty and ugliness, beneficence and evil, God and the devil.²⁰

Much-celebrated American founding father Thomas Jefferson reconfirmed this dichotomy with this remark of 1779: "Nature,

---

¹⁹ de Beauvoir, 1974:223.

²⁰ Jordan, 1968:7. According to Stannard, "Contrary to a notion that has become fashionable among American historians, the concept of race was not invented in the late eighteenth or nineteenth century. Indeed, systems of categorical generalization that separated groups of people according to social constructions of race (sometimes based on skin color, sometimes with reference to other attributes) and ranked them as to disposition and intelligence, were in use in Europe at least a thousand years before Columbus set off across the Atlantic." Stannard, 1992:164. See ibid:149-193 for details.
habit, opinion, has drawn indelible lines of distinction between them [black and white]."  
21 Why this either/or dichotomy? Because "we presume ourselves righteous in settling differences with others."  
22 Naturally, "it is obvious that mythical, self-flattering versions of rival groups' pasts simply serve to intensify their capacity for conflict."  
23 In this process, the righteousness of the moral, capable Self is stressed. According to McNeill, "The collective manifestations are of very great importance. Belief in the virtue and righteousness of one's cause is a necessary sort of self-delusion for human beings, singly and collectively. A corrosive version of history that emphasizes all the recurrent discrepancies between ideal and reality in a given group's behavior makes it harder for members of the group in question to act cohesively and in good conscience. That sort of history is very costly indeed. No group can afford it for long."  
24 The Other must be evil. Hence:

Sadly, the majority of tribes and nations create a sense of social solidarity and membership in part by systematically creating enemies. The corporate identity of most people depends on dividing the world into a basic antagonism:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Us</th>
<th>versus</th>
<th>Them</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Insiders</td>
<td>versus</td>
<td>Outsiders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The tribe</td>
<td>versus</td>
<td>The Enemy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In other words, paranoia, far from being an occasional individual pathology is the normal human condition. It is considered both normal and admirable, the essence of tribal loyalty and patriotism, to direct vitriolic hatred toward strangers we hardly know, and to reserve love for those familiar to us. The habit of directing our hostility outward toward those who are unknown to us is as characteristic of human beings as our capacity for reason, wonder or tool making.25

This practice of representing the immoral, incompetent enemy Other also takes the form of exoticism: "The Other becomes a pure object, a spectacle, a clown."26 This has primarily been the kuleana27 of the distinctively Western discipline of anthropology, abetted by National Geographic-type magazines,28 and, of course, Hollywood. Through these avenues the West's Others were, and are, made unfamiliar and thus dehumanized. As Iamo has pointed out:

Anthropological knowledge means to know the Other. To know the Other is to create the person's history, politics, geography, and culture, to remove power of imagination, and to make the person dependent. But to know someone else is also to presume to understand ourselves even better. Thus a differentiation and a dichotomy of "us" as the superior and "them" as the

26 Barthes, 1972:152.
28 The popular, "every-home-should-have-one" magazine most often portrays non-haole peoples as "backward, quaint, timeless and incapable of modern political discourse." Foerstel and Gilliam, 1992:273. Also, "There is another aspect to the working of the color code in National Geographic's narratives: in the history of the science of man, including anthropology and primatology, people of color were constructed as objects of knowledge as 'primitives,' more closely connected to the apes than the white 'race.'" Haraway, 1989:153.
inferior develops. And, to know of the Other is to have authority over that person, to represent, and to reproduce the person. I believe that when cultures are invented by outsiders, there is an active ingredient portrayed to their audience at home that eludes the inventor's sensibility because of their constant search for "other" in order to confirm their own "self." When beliefs about the Other are confirmed through further myths derived by their hosts, a portrait of a culture is painted with unfamiliar and startling characteristics in order to make it interesting and exciting for the home audience. 29

Arens has also demonstrated in The Man-Eating Myth that Western culture, like many others, "finds comfort in the idea of the barbarian just beyond gates. What is unique is that our type of society gives succor to specialized interpreters of this exotic image whose function condemns them to a never-ending search for the primitive in order to give meaning to the concept of civilization. [Anthropology] also depends in part on the existence of the savage, hence the cannibal." 30

The invention of the non-existent cannibal, who is supposedly out to get the civilized Westerner, in turn justified Western hostility, attack and invasion on the cannibal Other; the idea is, "They are going to eat us, so we're justified in eating them." 31 The West had to invent the Other in order to usurp


31 It hardly comes as a surprise that the hostile and invading West has been obsessed with cannibalism of its Others: "The idea of people eating their own kind has a long, if not precisely honorable, history in the intellectual and folk traditions of the West. As a prospect likely to horrify, fascinate, darkly amuse, or otherwise engage the imagination, cannibalism figures prominently in our myths, legends, and fairly tales." Brown and Tuzin, 1983:1.
self-government, land and resources. Kabbani has remarked that "The forging of racial stereotypes and the confirmation of the notions of savagery were vital to the colonialist world view."32 Indeed, the job of anthropologists was "to ensure that the white masters remained in control."33 How? According to Fabian, "by allowing Time to be resorbed by the tabular space of classification, nineteenth-century anthropology sanctioned an ideological process by which relations between the West and its Other, between anthropology and its object, were conceived not only as difference, but as distance in space and Time."34 Needless to say, such "difference" created the dichotomy of sane/insane, capable/incapable, moral/immoral and essential/inessential, which all gave the West the positional upperhand in controlling the Other’s resources. It is a discursive strategy which stipulates that the Other must be different.

In times of war and conflict, which involve systematic and massive dehumanization, the dichotomy between "a moral Self" regime and its immoral enemy Other intensifies. Dower, analyzing U.S. World War II propaganda films, observes:

In Prelude to War, the "two words" were illustrated as literally as can be imagined by drawings of two globes, one black and the other white. The narrative voice here and in all the other Orientation films drove home the same message with repeated references to the

33 Iamo, 1991:77.
34 Fabian, 1983:147. Underline in original.
irreconcilable conflict of "freedom versus slavery," "civilization against barbarism," "good against evil," the Allied "way of life" as opposed to the Axis "way of death," the historic march of democracy and freedom among allied nations... as opposed to the historic ambition for world conquest seen in Germany and Japan.\textsuperscript{35}

Note how poorer social sustainability is attributed to the Others and better social sustainability and moral superiority to the Self. Keen, observing propaganda\textsuperscript{36} literature, has reminded us: "Look carefully at the face of the enemy. The lips are curled downward. The eyes are fanatical and far away. The flesh is contorted and molded into the shape of monster or beast. Nothing suggests this man ever laughs, is torn by doubts, or shaken by tears. He feels no tenderness or pain. Clearly he is unlike us. We need have no sympathy, no guilt, when we destroy him. In all propaganda, the face of the enemy is designed to provide a focus for our hatred. He is the other. The outsider. The alien. He is not human. If we can only kill him, we will be rid of all within and without ourselves that is evil."\textsuperscript{37}

Indeed, the immoral enemy Other is represented as aggressor, faceless, evil god, barbarian, threat, criminal,

\textsuperscript{35} Dower, 1986:17. The enemies of Japan and German, too, used the either-or dichotomy to depict its enemy. Dower 1986.

\textsuperscript{36} Propaganda is defined by Evans as "the educational efforts or information used by an organized group that is made available to a selected audience, for the specific purpose of making the audience take a particular course of action or conform to a certain attitude desired by the organized group." Evans, 1992:1.

\textsuperscript{37} Keen, 1986:16.
torturer, rapist, seducer, beast, reptile, insect, germ, death, abstraction, and many other negative beings and qualities. The immoral enemy Other is indeed not human! Often, these kinds of representations often involve psychological defensive/offensive mechanisms of projection. Projection is "a process whereby inner stimulation is projected into the outer world."\textsuperscript{38} As Kabbani has stated, "The projection of evil onto marginal or powerless groups... has always been a convenient method of producing scapegoats."\textsuperscript{39} In fact:

the bad guys serve a vital purpose. They reflect the concerns and passions of our society, and we use them to vent our collective frustrations.\textsuperscript{40}

Going back further from the modern time to the past, in the conflict and relationship between the Crusaders and Islam, "Each side views the opponent's religion as spurious and false, and as an anathema to the true faith."\textsuperscript{41} In this conflict, the invading West projected its evil onto the Islamic East:

The projection of evil onto a faraway culture was also a significant aspect of medieval Europe's bulwark of bigotry... Islam was seen as the negation of Christianity; Muhammad as an imposer, an evil sensualist,

\textsuperscript{38} Elliot, 1961:26.

\textsuperscript{39} Kabbani, 1986:5.

\textsuperscript{40} *Rooney, 1989:12.

\textsuperscript{41} Nasralla, 1980:1.
an Antichrist in alliance with the Devil. The Islamic world was seen as Anti-Europe...42

Either/or dichotomies were also traditionally used against the Jewish people by the Europeans, culminating in World War II): "Medieval Europe... tried Jews for a medley of mythic crimes: poisoning wells, killing children for their blood, crucifying victims, and eating them too..."43 In fact, Jews had a long history of being seen as evil:

Hamans and Pharaohs are characterized by their view of Jews as demons. Pharaoh saw Egypt crawling with Jewish fifth columnists (Exodus 1:8-9). To Haman, the Jews were "clannish"—unassimilable aliens who should be massacred (Esther 3:8-13).44

These same Jewish people, however, themselves used similar rhetoric to exterminate the native inhabitants of Canaan and surrounding areas. Here is only one example in the Bible among vast number of others:

Only in the cities of these peoples that the Lord your God is giving you as an inheritance, you shall not leave alive anything that breathes. But you shall utterly destroy them, the Hittite and the Amorite, the Canaanite and the Perizzite, the Hivite and the Jebusite, as the Lord your God has commanded you in order that they may not teach you to do according to all their detestable things which they have done for their gods, so that you would sin against the Lord your God.45

Dichotomization between the Self and the Other is of the utmost importance in empowering the Self. No wonder, then, in

42 Kabbani, 1986:5.
43 Kabbani, 1986:5.
carrying out the Cultural Revolution, the Chinese communists constantly asked themselves, "Who are our enemies? Who are our friends?" because it was "a question of the first importance" for the revolution. Also, in the internal conflict of the Nation of Islam, a counter-hegemonic African-American religion:

the existence of similar groups in the same setting produces pressure to innovate as a means of marking social distinctiveness. Thus, breakaway groups from the Nation of Islam have tended to stress areas of difference with the Nation so as to promote their uniqueness.

Thus we see that there is no empowerment without inventing a Self, and an Other to oppose to the Self. Such representation techniques are becoming ever more common in the present time, as seen during the Gulf War in ex-President Bush's representation of Iraqi President Saddam Hussein, or during "Operation Restore Hope" in Somalia, "Operation Just Cause" in Panama (in the U.S. representation of former President Manuel Noriega), and the U.S. support for the Contras in Nicaragua. Other examples include the Indonesian occupation of West Papua, the concept of the "Evil Empire" in the Cold War period (as well as the West's new search for "Super villains" after the loss of the Soviet threat), and nasty election campaigns of "us" versus "them" to appeal to voters' fears. Examples are, as we see, countless.

47 Baer and Singer, 1992:236.
In fact, this kind of practice of inventing and representing immoral, incapable enemy Other probably has existed as long as the human beings existed. As Duckitt has said, "A great deal of human history has been a record of antagonism and conflict between groups."48 One historian has simply put it this way: "Herds need anti-heros. That... is how history is made."

In this way, once an immoral, incompetent enemy Other is invented, silenced and represented by a regime, that regimes can attain righteousness, legitimacy, support, resources and most importantly, reasons to expand over the resources of the enemy Other. Therefore, in order to expand beyond its traditional political, economical and cultural boundary, a regime must invent and represent at least one immoral, incompetent enemy Other, either internally or externally, which it seeks to usurp self-government and resources of. This representation process, I argue, is political mythmaking. As du Preez said:

Politics... is centrally concerned with maintaining or imposing an identity system... One of the consequences of the political consolidation of an identity system is that certain persons are privileged.49


1-2: Definition of Political Myth

What is myth? A simple explanation is given by White: "Myths are stories that tell why things and people are what they are." He also suggests that myth is a story that explains who one is and how he should act. In short, it is cosmology. What, then, becomes possible with political myths? Control of human and natural resources. Political myths are power-justifying cosmologies. Friedrich and Brzezinski have the following definition for such myth:

A myth is typically a tale concerned with past events, giving them a specific meaning and significance for the present and thereby reinforcing the authority of those who are wielding power in a particular community.

In other words, myth empowers--more specifically, it empowers a specific community. Tudor states:

a political myth is always the myth of a particular group. It has as its hero or protagonist, not an individual, but a tribe, a nation, a race, a class or even a chance collection of exiles and immigrants. Individuals often figure in political myths, but they figure only as the representatives of their group or as the bearers of its destiny... A political myth may, for instance, establish the claim of a certain group to hegemony, sovereign independence or an extension of territory; it may help strengthen the solidarity of the group in the face of a major challenge; it may serve to encourage the resistance of an oppressed minority; or it may supply compelling arguments for the abolition of undesirable institutions.

But exactly what is power? Lakoff noted that "Power is physical; it changes reality, it gets things done or undoes

50 White, 1991:615.
51 Friedrich and Brzezinski, 1956:99.
It is usually supported by, for example, force, violence, threat, law and established, legitimized and institutionalized "cultural norms." Nye defined power as the following:

Power is the ability to achieve one's purposes and goals. The dictionary tells us that it is the ability to do things and to control others. Robert Dahl, a leading political scientist, defines power as the ability to get others to do what they otherwise would not do... Because the ability to control others is often associated with the possession of certain resources, political leaders commonly define power as the possession of resources. These resources include population, territory, natural resources, economic size, military forces, and political stability among others.54

According to Thompson, there are two kinds of political myths: radical and conservative. Radical myths are "created and propagated by domestic or foreign opponents of a regime to discredit it and promote its downfall," whereas conservative myths are "often tales of events leading to the foundation of a state."55 Therefore, "A political myth... is one which tells the story of a political society. In many cases, it is the story of a political society that existed or was created in the past and which must now be restored or preserved."56

Political myth is created to serve as a practical argument, or to explain, justify and perpetuate the existence and the experience of the particular group it serves:

53 Lakoff, 1990:12.
55 Thompson, 1985:3-4.
For the most part, the myth-maker does not invent his facts; he interprets facts that are already given in the culture to which he belongs. What marks his account as being a myth is, not its content, but its dramatic form and the fact it serves as a practical argument. Its success as a practical argument depends on its being accepted as true, and it is generally accepted as true if it explains the experience of those to whom it is addressed and justifies the practical purposes they have in mind.\textsuperscript{57}

Furthermore, Thompson has stated that "The view of the world that we find in a myth is always a practical view. Its aim is either to advocate a certain course of action or to justify acceptance of an existing state of affairs."\textsuperscript{58}

Also, myth is "powerful enough to guide actions"\textsuperscript{59}:

[myth] becomes the exemplary model for all significant human activities.\textsuperscript{60}

No wonder "Myths are so fraught with meaning that we live and die by them."\textsuperscript{61} Here, it is important to remember that:

A people without a full quiver of relevant agreed-upon statements, accepted in advance through education or less formalized acculturation, soon finds itself in deep trouble, for, in the absence of believable myths, coherent public action becomes very difficult to improve or sustain.\textsuperscript{62}

Myth resort to people's religious feelings of destiny and fate. That is why its "guidance" is so powerful.

\textsuperscript{57} Tudor, 1972:138.

\textsuperscript{58} Thomson, 1985:20.

\textsuperscript{59} Marwil, 1991:10. Underline added.

\textsuperscript{60} Eliade, 1963:6.

\textsuperscript{61} Wright, R., 1992:5.

\textsuperscript{62} McNeill, 1986:23.
However, myth may distort facts.

A political myth... purports to be a plain account of events. It is a story told with a view to promoting some practical purpose, and it is successful only in so far as it is believed to be a true story. This does not, of course, exclude the possibility that, in advancing a mythical argument, the myth-maker either deceives himself or deliberately sets out to deceive his audience. A myth may well be believed to be true by those among whom it circulates; but this does not prevent it from being, in actual fact, a set of extravagant illusions.63

To summarize, political myth can be defined as a tale which empowers a specific group, serves as a practical argument and thus explains, justifies and perpetuates the group’s empowerment, guides actions but may distort facts. In addition, let us consider Thompson’s summary: "To sum up: Myths are an ineluctable part of human culture. Political mythologies—sets of political myths—legitimize or discredit political systems, especially state regimes in the contemporary world. They are extremely flexible. Classes which control social institutions may manipulate them and modify them to suit their changing interests. They wax and wane in intensity, and their content varies as a result of changes in the structure of local and global societies. They can accommodate a great deal of factual and scientific error; but myths that are peripheral to the ideology may disappear when dominant classes perceive that they ceased to serve their

---

63 Tudor, 1972:132-133.
interests, whereas myths that are integral to the ideology are far more tenacious."

Thus, I argue here, empowerment derives first from verbal representations, rather than through physical means such as the military or economy. Power over the Other can be gained only when the Self: [1] invents the Other; [2] surveys, examines and analyzes, to know the Other’s resources; [3] silences the Other by usurping its self-representation; [4] reduces it morally, culturally and demographically; [5] elevates the Self as moral, capable and essential; and finally, [6] obscures and clouds questions about the legitimacy of the usurping Self. Political myth is the most sophisticated form of social engineering and mind control.

Because political mythmaking is such an empowering and motivated construct, it deserves very close attention. However, Tudor observes that it rarely receives sufficient attention because of myth’s evasive nature: "Part of the reason why political myths have attracted so little attention in the academic world is that they are usually deployed together with other and more familiar kinds of discourse. They get, so to speak, lost in the wood... [because] ...[the myth-maker] incorporates his myth into the framework of a general ideology."  

64 Thompson, 1985:23.
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In fact, "Myth is an arrangement of the past, whether real or imagined, in patterns that resonate with a culture's deepest values and aspirations. Myths create and reinforce archetypes so taken for granted, so seemingly axiomatic, that they go unchallenged."^66

1-3: Political Myth Type 1--Poorer Social Sustainability and Moral Inferiority

There are at least three types of political myth I observe in various political mythmaking processes. The first type of political myth is one of poorer social sustainability and moral inferiority. This is an example of a radical myth, according to Thompson's model (see the previous section), and is essentially reductionist. The myth challenges and delegitimizes the existing social order of the Other. Its main techniques are: [1] vilification; [2] discrediting; [3] delegitimization; and often, [4] punishment of the opponent regime's [a] character and [b] ability.

The political myth of poorer social sustainability and moral inferiority always relies upon worst generalizations of the character of the opponent regime. It is the complete polarization of the Self. The Other and the Self have nothing in common. In other words, a systematic stereotyping will occur: "they" are "that." Such discourse seeks to reduce, simplify and impoverish the internally cohesive environment.

^66 Wright, R., 1992:5.
and experience of the opponent regime. There is no sense of complexity in generalized representations of the enemy Other; there is only assumption and conviction.

The sole purpose of the myth of poorer social sustainability and moral inferiority is to characterize the opponent as morally not fit to continue to hold power or control resources, by representing its ways of life and cosmology as lacking sustainability and benefits. The opponent is always portrayed as doing itself harm. Therefore, its political legitimacy is questioned morally, and morally questionable.

This kind of myth is therefore an invention of a silent, inessential Other which cannot govern itself. It is usually hostile and indifferent to the Self’s welfare. Such characterizations need not be true. In fact, "stereotypes seem to have a grain of immediate veracity and yet miss the mark and lack descriptive precision; as partial, fragmented "truths," they end up not being true at all."  

And conveniently, "Stereotypes... are rarely subjected to any kind of serious reality testing..."  

The premise of this type of myth is that the opponent regime is incapable of autonomy, and had better be kept that way for its own good; that is, since the opponent Other is incapable and immoral, the capable and

68 Foster, 1988:50.
69 Said, 1979:228.
moral Self must step in to save the Other from itself. The immoral, incompetent Other invites, even begs for, intervention. It is destiny.

If such myth and stereotypes come to be accepted by the people on the side of the mythmaker regime, the following results generally ensue: [1] start of disempowerment process of the opponent; [2] gain of positional superiority in righteousness; [3] usurpation of the authority to define right and wrong; and [4] construction of the foundation of myth of better social sustainability (laying grounds for comparison).

1-4: Political Myth Type 2--Better Social Sustainability and Moral Superiority

The logical extension of the myth of poorer social sustainability is that if the opponent is immoral and incompetent, he should be put out of power, punished, and a better alternative regime must be installed.

The second type of political myth is one of better social sustainability and moral superiority. It is a conservative myth according to Thompson's model, and essentially celebrationist and narcissistic in nature. The myth legitimizes and celebrates the existing order of the Self. Its main techniques are: [1] celebration of the superiority, benefits, morals, and sustainability of the alternative regime; [2] comparison between itself with the opponent using the terms and norms of the Self (i.e., comparing the worst characteristics of the opponent against the best
characteristics of the Self); and therefore [3] justification of its rule over the opponent’s resources. It elevates and celebrates [a] character and [b] ability of the Self.

The sole purpose of the myth of better social sustainability is to represent and characterize the alternative regime as fit to usurp self-government and resources from the imagined-enemy opponent regime. Here, too, triumphalist generalizations about the characteristics of the alternative regime can be seen: "we" are "this." As opposed to the reductionist mythmaking of moral superiority, it is structuralist. The myth of better social sustainability and moral superiority seeks to convince people to believe the "betterness" of the alternative, to convince them that the alternative can provide more self- or community-preservation than the opponent. People would be convinced that they are much better off living under the rule of the alternative regime.

In short, the myth of better social sustainability and moral superiority necessarily emphasizes its presumably better social benefits: "Specific cultural practices will always assert their own legitimacy in terms of a general notion of social benefit, social value--so we get such notions as 'We had to destroy the village in order to save it,' or 'Better dead than red,' or 'What's good for General Motors is good for the country.' And this is through such general assertions of
social benefit that the necessity of the formal criteria of sustainability is always recognized, at least implicitly."\(^{70}\)

Indeed, "Legitimacy is a function of the moral validity of the political order."\(^{71}\) However, more importantly, such myths directly aim at people's religious feelings of destiny and fate, because the characterizations of the self and the Other are represented as "truth," "reality" and "natural law." They are designed to evoke people's religious sense. In short, on the Other: "They (the Other) are meant not to be in power. That is not moral." On the self: "Because we are so good, we must spread that goodness; it's our duty and destiny. If we don't, we will suffer." Thus, political myth of better social sustainability and moral superiority employs the tactics of seduction, which is "an attempt to make people do things as if of their own impulse but really upon instigation from outside."\(^{72}\)


\(^{70}\) Wright, W., 1992:194.

\(^{71}\) Cohen and Toland, 1988:18. Legitimacy is defined by them as "the situation in which the rulers as well as the ruled share the conviction that the existing division of power and, as a consequence of this, the rules and regulations issued by the government are right." Cohen and Toland, 1988:40.

\(^{72}\) Soring, 1989:97.
desires and interests as morally neutral, selfless and benevolent, the alternative regime usurps the power and resources of the opponent.

Said has demonstrated an example of the political myths of poorer and better social sustainability and moral inferiority/superiority at work in the colonial relationship between England and Egypt:

England knows Egypt; Egypt is what England knows; England knows that Egypt cannot have self-government; England confirms that by occupying Egypt; for the Egyptians, Egypt is what England has occupied and now governs; foreign occupation therefore becomes "the very basis" of contemporary Egyptian civilization; Egypt requires, indeed insists upon, British occupation.73

In Kabbani’s words: "If it could be suggested that Eastern peoples were slothful, preoccupied with sex, violent, and incapable of self-government, then the imperialist would feel himself justified in stepping in and ruling."74 To usurp self-representation of the Other is none other than usurpation of its self-government, land, resources and cultural identity. To do so, one must first conceive of the difference between the moral, capable Self and its evil, incapable Other; second, separate the two by the alleged differences; third, invite the Self to control, contain and govern the Other.75 This whole process involves religious senses of moral, fate and destiny.

73 Said, 1979:34.
1-5: Political Myth Type 3--Innocence

When the alternative regime seeks to disempower the opponent and further expand, often on the paternalistic pretext of the opponent's "own good," its motivations are always dirty. It prefers a gain for itself to the preservation of another's life, and this preference may be viewed as reflecting the fact that it places a greater value on the pursuit of self-interest rather than on avoiding harm to the opponent regime.76

Consequently, the alternative regime inevitably violates the interests of people who live in the opponent's community when it expands and perpetuates the expansion. In fact, the main goal driving the process of political expansion and consolidation is conquest. Conquest can take various forms of violation such as war, dispossession, killing, oppression, theft, violation of treaties/contracts, discrimination, imposition of alien government and culture, etc. As VanDeVeer pointed out:

the form of "interference" is important, for example whether it involves force, threat, deception, overt lying or withholding information, physical impairment, or killing.77

Most likely, members of the opponent will suffer and members of the alternative regime will systematically benefit from those violations and dehumanizations. Then, the

76 With reference to Milo, 1984:218.

77 VanDeVeer, 1986:15.
supposedly good and righteous alternative regime could lose its credibility and moral superiority which empowered it. As Kant remarked, "An act of generosity is permissible only if it does not violate anybody's right; if it does, it is morally wrong."\(^7\) Furthermore, members of the alternative regime may suffer from guilt—that inner voice that warns, "Somebody may be looking"—because they do have their own set of moral codes which prohibit dehumanization. (Although, I argue, some of the members do commit acts they believe to be wrong because they prefer some other end—their own self-interest.) This could defeat the whole purpose of expansion. Therefore, the alternative regime must hide the nature of its gain and advantages to justify the perpetuation of its ill-gotten empowerment, to feel it has the mission and undeniable privileges to perpetuate its power.

How does it become possible? The third type of political myth is one of innocence. It is both radical and conservative according to Thompson's model; it is essentially a mixed and reinforced use of the political myths of poorer and better social sustainability and moral inferiority/superiority. Its main techniques include [1] vilification; [2] discrediting; [3] delegitimization; [4] punishment; [5] celebration; [6] comparison; and [7] justification. However, the most striking features of this third type of political myth is that it seeks to [8] cloud and obscure, and, [9] neutralize, the opponent's

\(^7\) VanDeVeer, 1986:95.
claims over the resources taken by the alternative regime, therefore [10] defend the disempowerment of the opponent regime.

The idea of the political myth of innocence is basically a systematic and deliberate public self-deception,\(^7\) based on the belief that "the ends justify the means,"\(^8\) to argue that the dispossession and demise of the opponent is a "necessary evil." The alternative regime becomes morally blind when it comes to the opponent regime. It makes dehumanization a "matter-of-fact" necessity, and makes members of the alternative regime less- or un-aware of their dehumanizing acts. Such self-deception becomes a convenient way to avoid moral responsibility.

The necessary assumption of this kind of myth is that the alternative regime is motivated by altruistic reasons and its only concern is to promote the good of the opponent. The irrational opponent is often assumed to believe what it does is right because it is ignorant of moral principles. The alternative regime, on the other hand, is rational and thus acts paternalistically toward the opponent regime, if and only

\(^7\) According to Deutsch, "Self-deception is a refusal to acknowledge who I am and what I am doing, not out of simple ignorance but from what appears to be a kind of unselfconscious willful perversity." Deutsch, 1992:33. It is most likely to occur when there is a conflict between self-interest and interest of others.

\(^8\) It is the argument that evil means can be justified on the argument that they are being pursued in order to achieve a "good" end. With reference to Hazlitt, 1972:136.
if the alternative regime's behavior indicates that it believes that:

1. its action is for the opponent's own good;
2. it is qualified to act on the opponent's behalf;
3. its action involves violating a moral rule (or will require it to do so) with regard to the opponent;
4. the opponent's good justifies the alternative regime in acting on the opponent's behalf independently of the opponent's past, present, or immediately forthcoming (free, informed) consent; and
5. the opponent believes (perhaps falsely) that it generally knows what is for its own good. 81

Therefore the alternative regime is always portrayed as a morally neutral donor, liberator and redeemer. It is selfless. The necessary result of this assumption is the belief that "the subject of the intervention... is either benefitted or protected. So, it seems that we have 'no harm done' and 'benevolent intent.'" 82 Here, it is already religiously assumed that paternalism is more than permissible; it is a duty. Also such intervention is always unilateral, one-way and not mutual nor reciprocal. Moral qualifications of the alternative regime are beyond dispute.

The results are: [1] legitimization of the alternative regime; [2] justification of its claims over contested resources; and [3] reinforcement of a positive "moral Self" identity by members of the alternative regime. The self-government and resources of the opponent regime are thus


successfully usurped. But what tactics do the members of the alternative regime use to accomplish that goal? According to Milo's model of self-deception,\textsuperscript{33} many of them completely ignore, insofar as they can, those features of their behavior that make it wrong. For example, they choose not to think about how what they do might harm someone or deceive someone.

Another thing they might do is to try to think of (or manufacture) reasons that would justify their behavior--i.e., they might engage in rationalization. For instance, as mentioned earlier, in order to justify their unwarranted conquest of a regime which stands in their way, they might construct a story that attributes certain motives and intentions to their opponent (and they may imagine that they find clues of these motives and intentions in various things their opponent regime says and does). Attributing these motives and intentions to their (imagined) opponent allows them to see their own behavior as a case of justified self-defense--for their opponent is out to ruin them in any way it can, and if they allow their opponent to be at large, they will only make themselves vulnerable to a malicious antagonist. In this way they persuade themselves that their behavior is morally acceptable.

This is a typical case of paranoid projection. Inner stimulation of the Self is projected into the Other. As Deutsch has argued, "The self-deceiver projects and transfers

\textsuperscript{33} With reference to Milo, 1984:108.
in order to keep oneself from oneself."\textsuperscript{84} And according to Freud:

The mechanism of symptom-formation in paranoia requires that internal perceptions—feelings—shall be replaced by external perceptions. Consequently the proposition "I hate him" becomes transformed by projection into another one: "He hates (persecutes) me, which will justify me in hating him." And thus the impelling unconscious feeling makes its appearance as though it were the consequence of an external perception "I do not love him—I hate him, because HE PERSECUTES ME."\textsuperscript{85}

This sort of self-deception can become habitual. It often becomes a consistent and characteristic style of the alternative regime’s behavior; patterns of deceit are constructed and become constitutive of the regime’s being.\textsuperscript{86} What is more, as a common saying goes, a lie becomes truth if one keeps saying it. Lies become truth. This is how immorality becomes morality.

Furthermore, by focusing on the imagined opponent’s evil, the alternative regime becomes able to cloud, obscure and divert attention from the unequal and unilateral power relationship it engages itself in with the opponent. Such techniques get the alternative regime off the hook in the following ways: [1] both the alternative and opponent regimes engage in immoral discourse and behavior; thus both are even in terms of immorality; and thus [2] the immoral alternative regime is innocent in comparative relation to its immoral

\textsuperscript{84} Deutsch, 1992:39.

\textsuperscript{85} Elliot, 1961:26. Underlines in original.

\textsuperscript{86} With reference to Deutsch, 1992:39.
opponent. In short, the immorality of the disempowered opponent serves as an indulgence for the positionally empowered alternative regime.

In this way, the political myth of innocence cleanses acts of dehumanization: injustice becomes justice, victims become villains, murders become a necessary evil, rape becomes consented sex, willful invasion becomes self-defense, overthrow of the opponent without the consent of its people becomes democracy, stealing becomes lawful acquisition, crime becomes misdemeanor, ill-gotten gains become legitimate, reversibility becomes irreversibility, and imposed transformation becomes progress.

The functions of the political myth of innocence are very similar to the process of money laundering. The true nature of the ill-gotten gains is concealed and "washed" by "gifts" of better social benefits so that it would appear as a legitimate, clean gain.87 As Galbraith has stated, "On many matters men sense that the underlying reasons for action are best concealed. Conscience is better served by a myth. And to persuade others one needs, first of all, to persuade one's self... The real motives, were they stated, would be altogether too uncouth, selfish and obscene. So where

87 Money laundering has been defined as the use of money derived from illegal activity by concealing the identity of the individuals who obtained the money and convert it to assets that appear to have come from a legitimate source. A simpler definition is the washing of dirty money to make it appear to be legitimate. Powis, 1992:ix.
colonization has involved people---where it has not meant merely the appropriation and settlement of unused lands--the colonialists have almost always seen themselves as the purveyors of some transcendental moral, spiritual, political or social worth. The reality has as regularly included a considerable component of pecuniary interest, real or anticipated, for important participants.\footnote{88 Galbraith, 1977:111. Underlines added.}

On this matter, African-American scholar Shelby Steele, who is accused of being an "Uncle Tom," nevertheless has a very accurate, sharp and deep observation on the nature of political mythmaking:

But the human animal almost never pursues power without first convincing himself that he is \textit{entitled} to it. And this feeling of entitlement has its own precondition: to be entitled one must first believe in one’s innocence, at least in the area where one wishes to be entitled. By innocence I mean a feeling of essential goodness in relations to others and, therefore, superiority to others. Our innocence always inflates us and deflates those we seek power over. Once inflated we are entitled; we are in fact licensed to go after the power our innocence tells us we deserve. In this sense, \textit{innocence is power}. Of course, innocence need not be genuine or real in any objective sense, as the Nazis demonstrated not long ago. Its only test is whether or not we can convince ourselves of it... Both races [black and white] instinctively understand that to lose innocence is to lose power (in relation to each other). Now to be innocent someone else must be guilty, a natural law that leads the races to forge their innocence on each other’s backs.\footnote{89 Steel, 1990:5-6. Underline in original.}
1-6: Orientalism as Political Myth

Now, let us briefly examine an actual case of political myth at work: the Western construct of Orientalism. Knowing the nature of Orientalism helps us understand other Western political mythmaking over non-Orient, non-Western Others, namely Native Americans and Hawaiians.

First of all, Orientalism is defined by Said as "the corporate institution for dealing with the Orient—dealing with it by making statements about it, authorizing views over it, describing it, by teaching it, settling it, ruling over it: in short, Orientalism as a Western style for dominating, restructuring, and having authority over the Orient." Its dogmas include:

- the absolute and systematic difference between the West, which is rational, developed, humane, superior, and the Orient, which is aberrant, undeveloped, inferior. Another dogma is that abstractions about the Orient, particularly those based on texts representing a "classical" Oriental civilization, are always preferable to direct evidence drawn from modern Orient realities.
- A third dogma is that the Orient is eternal, uniform, and incapable of defining itself; therefore it is assumed that a highly generalized and systematic vocabulary for describing the Orient from a Western standpoint is inevitable and even scientifically "objective." A forth dogma is that the Orient is at bottom something either to be feared (the Yellow Peril, the Mongol hordes, the brown dominions) or to be controlled (by pacification, research and development, outright occupation whenever possible)."90

---

90 Said, 1979:3.
91 Said, 1979:300-301.
These dogmas depend entirely on the following premise which necessarily emphasize better social sustainability of the West and poorer social sustainability of its Others:

the major component in European culture is precisely what made that culture hegemonic both in and outside Europe: the idea of European identity as a superior one in comparison with all the non-European peoples and cultures.\(^\text{92}\)

This kind of discourse necessarily requires containment--the making of incapable Other. As Said continued, "To the West... the Orient needed first to be known, then invaded and possessed, then re-created by scholars, soldiers, and judges who disinterred forgotten languages, histories, races, and cultures in order to posit them--beyond the modern Oriental's ken--as the true classical Orient that could be used to judge and rule the modern Orient."\(^\text{93}\) To know the Other is to become able to wield power over it. In fact:

Orientalism depends for its strategy on this flexible positional superiority, which puts the Westerner in a whole series of possible relationships with the Orient without ever losing him the relative upper hand.\(^\text{94}\)

In other words, the West is necessarily assumed to be capable and moral in this kind of discourse--the making of political myth of better social sustainability. In fact, "Orientalism can... express the strength of the West and the


Orient’s weakness—as seen by the West.”

For example, "We had our Newtonian revolution [which presumably brought better social benefits]; they [the Oriental Other] didn’t. ...we are better off than they are.”

Meanwhile:

the most familiar of Orientalism’s themes [is] they [the Muslims] cannot represent themselves, they must therefore be represented by others who know more about Islam than Islam knows about itself... Note that there is no question of an exchange between Islam’s views and an outsider’s: no dialogue, no discussion, no mutual recognition. There is a flat assertion of quality, which the western policy-maker, or his faithful servant, possesses by virtue of his being western [sic], white, non-Muslim. Now this, I submit, is neither science, nor knowledge, nor understanding: it is a statement of power and a claim for absolute authority.~

Note that this technique of reducing the Other is none other than political myth of poorer social sustainability. Such Others require paternalistic Western intervention for their own good because "Europe is powerful and articulate; Asia is defeated and distant." The Other is not fit to continue to hold power (control of resources). The self-government and resources of the Other thus ought to be usurped by the competent and moral West.

Knowledge empowers a regime by unilaterally imposing a singular indisputable notion of "truth." Orientalism as a cultural apparatus is "all aggression, activity, judgement,

95 Said, 1979:45. Underline added.
will-to-truth, and knowledge. In this discourse, the Oriental "belonged to the system of rule whose principle was simply to make sure that no Oriental was ever allowed to be independent and rule himself." The Orient only invites the West to intervene and rule over it.

Orientalism, a construction of knowledge, is art of exclusion, silencing and usurping authority, norm and natural truth from the Other. As Dretske said, "By making it say less we make it easier for it to say what is true." With the understanding of this Orientalist use of political myth, I would like to discuss another Western construct of "history": it is a perfect example of political myth, and is closely interwoven with the essence of Orientalism.

---


100 Said, 1979:228.

CHAPTER TWO
WESTERN POLITICAL MYTH OF HAWAI‘I

In this chapter, I would like to expose and analyze Western mythmaking over Hawai‘i—How it first usurped self-representation from Hawaiians, and then reduced them morally, demographically and culturally to seize control over their government, land, resources, and even minds. Then, I will attempt to demonstrate that such political mythmaking has continued until the present day, and that the West, to the present day, persists in taking away Hawaiians’ self-government, land and other resources, as it has ever since it came into contact with Hawai‘i in 1778.

2-1: Haole "History" of Hawai‘i as Political Myth

A clear and solid example of Western political mythmaking over Hawai‘i is its representations of Hawai‘i’s past. Stannard has commented on three Hawai‘i "history" books by haole authors which he described as "the professional historical cannon in Hawai‘i today"—the multi-volume The Hawaiian Kingdom by Ralph S. Kuykendall, Hawai‘i Pono by Lawrence H. Fuchs and Shoal of Time by Gavan Daws¹:

The year 1778 [the year of the first Western contact] appears on the first line of the first page of Daws’s book; it is at the bottom of the first page of Fuchs’s book; and it first appears on page three of Kuykendall’s

¹ Daws’s book sells about 1,000 copies a year. Personal communication with the University of Hawai‘i Press, 1991.
study—which is 1,500 pages long. To the extent that the preceding 1,800 years of human activity in Hawai‘i are mentioned at all in these works, they are treated as mere backdrop to the two centuries of white history that follows 1778. ²

Trask also has noted that "there is no value in things Hawaiian; all value comes from things haole... Westerners have told the history of Hawai‘i as an inevitable if occasionally bitter-sweet triumph of Western ways over 'primitive' Hawaiian ways. A few authors--the most sympathetic--have recorded with deep-felt sorrow the passing of our people. But in the end, we are repeatedly told, such an eclipse was for the best.³" Papua New Guinean anthropologist John Waiko has further commented on the inherent ideological motivation of Western "history":

> the undisclosed ideological motives inherent in the Western historiography tend to be carried over to the writings of the anthropologists and the historians.⁴

After all, "history" is "always culturally mediated"⁵ because "Like every other human being, historians are anmeshed in humanity. In our professional work we cannot insulate ourselves from our national and ethnic culture, our class interests, and our personal experience."⁶ It comes as no surprise that, as Canadian historian Heick has stated, "The

---
³ Trask, 1987a:172-173.
⁴ Waiko, 1992:261.
⁶ Thompson, 1985:21.
major commitment of the historian, it would seem, has been to his national group—or if we wish to widen it, let us say his cultural or linguistic group. Since he belongs to that group, that is something he probably cannot avoid. Thus, "history" is none other than political myth.

No wonder the West has systematically reduced Hawaiians with its own political myth of "history," just as it has with Native Americans. As Stannard observes, "the historical distortions that systematically reduce in demographic and cultural and moral significance the native peoples of the Americas are part of a very old and enduring political design." Thus, "Just as American history, to white Americans, begins in 1492—and South African history, to white South Africans, begins in 1652—Hawaiian history, to white historians of Hawai‘i, begins in 1778." The past of Hawaiians is ignored or, at best, treated as outside of "history"; that is, "pre-history." Such a past does not deserve a modern reader's attention. During this past Hawaiians ostensibly practiced infanticide, human sacrifice, lived under oppressive feudal ali‘i, did not know how to govern themselves, were poor and unhappy. This kind of

7 Heick, 1975:22.
10 For more detailed discussion, see Trask 1987a and Stannard 1989 and 1991.
exclusive Western "history" of Hawai'i is essentially an argument for native peoples' poorer social sustainability and moral inferiority. It glorifies the Western present and debases the native past.

Native peoples were well aware of this sort of systematic debasing of their moral, cultural and demographical significance by the West. Chief Yellow Wolf, circa 1877, reportedly remarked that "The whites told only one side. Told it to please themselves. Told much that is not true. Only his own best deeds, only the worst deeds of the Indians, has the white man told." Collingwood has suggested that historians' comments on a certain past age tell much more about themselves than the actual past itself. Representations of the past after all are a self-knowledge. For instance, "The Conquest of America stands as Europe's model for the constitution of the Other" while during the age of Western expansion, "Europeans had discovered something about the world around them, and a good deal more about themselves." For example:

the New World had replaced the ancient texts. It had become the prime metaphor for the right way to discover new facts about the world and the prime source for new

---


theories about human society. If the essential question about society and the state was how they had begun—a question no ancient text could answer—then the primitive life of the peoples newly known offered the only relevant firsthand evidence.16

This is why, as Walter Benjamin pointed out, "There is no document of civilization which is not at the same time a document of barbarism."17 Because "For Euro-Americans, ... to study the primitive brings us always back to ourselves, which we reveal in the act of defining the Other."18 In fact, the Western construct of "history" of Hawai’i tells a great deal about the West which wrote it, not about the actual indigenous past. Hawai’i "history" is Western projection of itself onto its Others. In Foucault’s terminology, the West, in telling of "history," reconstitutes itself in its own familiar grounds and repeats itself, recalls itself.19 Indeed:

A conversation of "us" with "us" about "them" is a conversation in which "them" is silenced. "Them" always stands on the other side of the hill, naked and speechless, barely present in its absence.20

The Western "history" about Hawai’i therefore is nothing more than its own perceptions based on its values, culture,

16 Grafton, Shelford and Siraisi, 1992:252.

17 Quoted in Greenblatt, 1991:128. By "barbarism," Benjamin originally means the forces that work to annihilate freedom, forces epitomized in Fascism. Greenblatt used the quote nevertheless because it is also applicable on native "barbarism." See Greenblatt, 1991:188.

18 Torgovnick, 1990:11.

19 Foucault, 1973:70.

desires, hopes, fears, passions, concerns and economic and political interests. Western "history" of its Others is none other than a "discovery" of the Self in the Other and the Other in the Self.\textsuperscript{21} Trask has simply said that Western history of indigenous people is "merely the West's story of itself."\textsuperscript{22} Torgovnick also remarked:

What is clear now is that the West's fascination with the primitive has to do with its own crisis in identity, with its own need to clearly demarcate subject and object even while flirting with other ways of experiencing the universe.\textsuperscript{23}

And it is important to note that "History seeks truth in its telling, not in what the telling is about"\textsuperscript{24} because it is an imaginary picture of the past,\textsuperscript{25} an ideology and a (less than) half-truth tale of what members of the West think ought to have happened. As Thompson has pointed out, "events are selected for inclusion in a myth, partly because they coincide with what men think ought to have happened, and partly because they are consistent with the drama as a whole."\textsuperscript{26} Therefore, as Kameʻeleihiwa argues, "if an outsider comes to modern Hawaiʻi and tries to write a history of these islands, but

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{21} With reference to Greenblatt, 1991:127.
\item \textsuperscript{22} Trask, 1987a:178.
\item \textsuperscript{23} Torgovnick, 1990:157.
\item \textsuperscript{24} Gelven, 1991:62. Underline in original.
\item \textsuperscript{25} Consider the following: "a myth is a 'collective dream'--a reconstructed, composite dream of many members of a society. Murray, 1960:316.
\item \textsuperscript{26} Thompson, 1985:20. Underline in original.
\end{itemize}
doesn't know any of the metaphors [which are understood only within that culture], then that outsider will write what he or she thinks might have happened—according to his or her understanding. Such history would be based on a model of outside, non-Native metaphors, and might include an entirely inaccurate description of what the Native meant..."27 and ultimately, "an outsider's model can never fully recapture the complexity and depth of the Native culture's metaphor..."28

In fact, as Said notes, it is "perfectly natural for the human mind to resist the assault on it of untreated strangeness; therefore cultures have always inclined to impose complete transformations on other cultures, receiving these other cultures not as they are but as, for the benefit of the receiver, they ought to be."29 In other words, the West found the comfort of placing the unfamiliar in a familiar context30 in a unilateral fashion, totally excluding the voices of the Other. For example, in the case of Hawai‘i, "By inventing feudalism in ancient Hawai‘i, Western scholars quickly transformed a spiritually-based, self-sufficient economic system of land use and occupancy into an oppressive, medieval European practice of divine right ownership, with the common people tied like serfs to the land. By claiming that a

Pacific people lived under a European system—that the Hawaiians lived under feudalism—Westerners could then degrade a successful system of shared land use with a pejorative and inaccurate Western term. Land tenure changes instituted by Americans and in line with current Western notions of private property were then made to appear beneficial to the Hawaiians. But in practice, such changes benefited the haole, who alienated the people from the land, taking it for themselves. "31

Trask describes common Western perception of Hawai‘i's past as follows: "At school, I learned that the 'pagan Hawaiians' did not read or write, were lustful cannibals, traded in slaves, and could not sing. Captain Cook had 'discovered' Hawai‘i and the ungrateful Hawaiians had killed him. In revenge, the Christian god had cursed the Hawaiians with disease and death... A primitive group, Hawaiians had been ruled by bloodthirsty priests and depostic kings who owned all the land and kept our people in feudal subjugation. The chiefs were cruel, the people poor."32 If this sounds familiar, it is not surprising. Systematic reduction of Other has been consistently practiced by the West in its representations of its Others in Africa, the Americas and Asia. Such discourse convinced members of the West that the insane, poor Others must be saved from themselves by the sane,


32 Trask, 1987a:172.
capable and moral West. In order to save them, the West had to usurp their self-government, land and resources to correctly reallocate them to itself.

To paraphrase Poulain de la Barre, All that has been written about non-Western Others by the West should be suspect, for the West is at once judge and party to the lawsuit.\textsuperscript{33} Again, "There is no fact in history which is not a judgement, no event which is not an inference."\textsuperscript{34} It then comes as no surprise that "detached" and "objective" Western "history" of Hawai‘i is a success story of the West. As Trask has stated, "Obviously, [the passing of Hawaiians] was best for Westerners, not for our dying multitudes. This is why the historian's mission has been to justify our passing by celebrating Western dominance."\textsuperscript{35} In fact, a haole Pacific historian admitted in 1971 that "One of the main problems facing the Pacific historian is the fact that... these sources were almost entirely written by Europeans and are often both ethnocentrically biased and inaccurate."\textsuperscript{36}

Haole were able to represent themselves and the Hawaiian Other while the Hawaiians did not even have such an option because the haole have usurped the power of representation

\textsuperscript{33} Here is the original comment: "All that has been written about women by men should be suspect, for the men are at once judge and party to the lawsuit." de Beauvoir, 1974:xxv.

\textsuperscript{34} Oakeshott, 1933:100.

\textsuperscript{35} Trask, 1987a:173. Parenthesis added.

\textsuperscript{36} Maude, 1971:1.
from them. For the West, naturally, what ought not have existed in Hawai‘i is a self-sufficient, competent and moral people. If such people have existed, the whole Western domination over Hawai‘i which is based on its alleged better social sustainability and moral superiority will become meaningless, immoral and thus discredited. Therefore, such moral, capable and essential people never existed in Hawai‘i, according to haole representations of the past. As Fanon remarked, "By a kind of perverted logic, [colonialism] turns to the past of the oppressed people, and distorts, disfigures, and destroys it."\(^{37}\) Desire for power and privilege necessitates reduction of the Other and celebration of the Self in representations of the past. The following comment of Thompson confirms the point: "For many white people in Europe and America as well as South America the old racist paradigm is still an extremely attractive way of explaining the world and justifying white power and privilege..."\(^{38}\) Western "history" of its Others is none other than promotion of interests—or more precisely, an effective tool for usurpation of somebody else’s self-government and resources.

Western "history" of Hawai‘i, as we have seen, in most cases presupposes the moral Western Self and its incompetent and immoral Hawaiian Other. One of the most important purposes of "history" of Hawai‘i is to embellish—to correct


\(^{38}\) Thompson, 1985:17.
or remove what is distasteful in the past, and replace it with something more acceptable, more encouraging, and more conducive to the purpose in hand.\textsuperscript{39} This kind of representation of pastness is often called "Whig history":

All cultures have myths about their origins, designed to legitimize their members' assumption of a privileged status... The myth is formed by distorting history for a particular purpose, a technique already familiar in the political arena. There each party of ideology seeks to influence the general view of the past in a way that will vindicate its own values. Modern historians call this technique "Whig history," after the political ancestors of the Liberal party in Britain who rewrote the country's history to emphasize how its social development had been shaped by their own principles. "Whig history" now refers to any historical account told from the viewpoint of those in power. Such an account distorts the past by picking out a main line of development whose inevitable end product will be the triumph of those now telling the story. Any event that does not fit into the scheme is either ignored or distorted so that it does fit.\textsuperscript{40}

Indeed, as Gelven has pointed out, "A plot, after all, is simply making the end of story follow meaningfully from the middle and the beginning; the historian does this, sometimes artfully, sometimes subtly, or sometimes with the heavy-handedness of ideological persuasion, to the extent that he evokes a sense of destiny."\textsuperscript{41} A good example of historical sense of destiny is Western domination over Egypt: "By taking Egypt, ...a modern power would naturally demonstrate its

\textsuperscript{39} With reference to Lewis, 1975:56-57.

\textsuperscript{40} Bowler, 1988:16.

\textsuperscript{41} Gelven, 1991:61. Or, to put it simpler, plot is "how the reader learns of the action." Thus, plot is the way in which events are arranged and connected according to the orderly sequence in which they were presented in the work. Zavarzadeh, 1991:9.
strength and justify history; Egypt's own destiny was to be annexed, to Europe...

42 Of course, "Egypt" is exchangeable with any other non-Western Other: the Americas, Australia, Aotearoa, and Hawai'i. Again, "history" is a regime's world view and cosmology. It is clear from textual analyses of the Western "history" of Hawai'i that such "history" is "Whig history," and that it has been lending color and force to Western conceptions of developmental destiny. "History" is Western myth of origins, sacred past, nourishment, resources, life and destiny. There is an inherent necessity and interest in Western "history" to reduce its Others demographically, culturally and morally to usurp resources of its Others to usurp self-government and resources of its Others. Trask has said, "A rich historical past became small and ignorant in the hands of Westerners."43 As a result, "Losers get destroyed or devalued or otherwise reduced in status."44 As Apter has pointed out in the following metaphorical statement:

power as negation (revision, transgression, transformation, revolution) is what makes history itself...

45

How? One major strategy is to systematically debase cosmologies of the indigenous peoples, as North American ethnologist R.H. Lowie did. He said, "I cannot attach to oral

44 Lakoff, 1990:12.
traditions any historical value whatsoever under any conditions whatsoever. As oral representations of the past are "unsystematic," "uncritical," "distorted," "tainted," "changeable," "fault-memory," and "mythical." As Trinh has said, "Story-writing becomes history-writing, and history quickly sets itself apart, consigning story [read: oral tradition] to the realm of tale, legend, myth, fiction, literature. Then, since fictional and factual have come to a point where they mutually exclude each other, fiction, not infrequently, means lies, and fact, truth." Indeed, as Wiesel has remarked:

"It's only a myth" means it is not serious. "It's history" means it is permanent, eternal. We worship facts. The moment you say, "It's a fact," all debate is closed. To be called "myth" is derogatory. History as opposed to myth has a clear advantage.

The oral cosmology of Hawaiians thus became untrustworthy and meaningless. At the same time, the impersonal, written cosmology of haole ("history") was elevated as trustworthy and meaningful because it was based on facts, was objective, and was thus the truth. Tonkin analyzed such discourse of commonly distinguished terms: truth and falsehood, "history" and memory:

In opposition to this view of

46 Lowie, 1915:598.
48 Trinh, 1989:120.
interconnectedness [between history and memory, true and falsehood] are historians' arguments that history is a phenomenon different from and superior to memory. Memory is even sometimes treated as if it is pre-historical, a distinction which sits all too neatly with traditional versus modern, primitive versus civilized and oral versus literate—all dichotomies which, in practice, are balanced unequally in favor of 'us,' not 'them.'"51

No wonder Cassirer has stated that: "The primitive man is not in need of a historical or genetic explanation of these rites [birth, death, and initiation]. He is not primarily interested in their origin; for, strictly speaking, all these things have no origin."52 Indeed, as Eliade has said, "A people without history is as if it did not exist!"53 According to him, "To have a well-established "origin" meant, when all was said and done, to have the advantage of a noble origin."54 That "noble origin" was "history," which became an unconscious part of Western culture and knowledge. It followed that the indigenous peoples were people without "history," morality and ability to self-govern. They are not fit to hold power (self-government and resources) because they did not hold "truth," but the West, which possessed the truth.

54 Eliade, 1963:182.
Such inessential, incapable and immoral peoples should not be left alone; otherwise, they will do harm to themselves. The essential, capable and moral West thus had to step in to save Hawaiians from themselves. In this way, "history" has systematically empowered haole. But now the disempowered natives stand up and ask, "Which history do Western historians desire to know? Is it to be a tale of writings by their own countrymen, individuals convinced of their 'unique' capacity for analysis, looking at us with Western eyes, thinking about us within Western philosophical contexts, categorizing us by Western indices, judging us by Judeo-Christian morals, exhorting us to capitalist achievements, and finally, leaving us an authoritative-because-Western record of their complete misunderstanding?" 55

2-2: The Haole Myth of Poorer Social Sustainability and Moral Inferiority

[1] The Making of Silent, Inessential Other

Ever since 1778, the West has successfully usurped from Hawaiians their own land, sovereignty, natural resources and even ethnic identity through materializations of its political mythmaking--"discovery," unfair trade, missionary activities,

the Mahele, plantation economy, the Bayonet Constitution, the overthrow of Queen Liliʻuokalani, the U.S. annexation, banning of the Hawaiian language, the Hawaiian Homes Act, the frantic Americanization movement, the Statehood, etc. Then, the continuing task for the living descendants of the Western usurpers (and their collaborators of color) is to justify and legitimize the present political, economical, social and cultural order—to keep the West in power and ensure that Hawaiians can never rise against it. How can this be done? By faithfully repeating what the haole forefathers have done to the Hawaiians—to reduce them morally, culturally and demographically to the "primitive" status, by silencing them, by preventing them from representing themselves. Torgovnick has put it this way: "The primitive does what we ask it to do. Voiceless, it lets us speak for it."56 Once "we" speak for the primitive Other, "we" can make the primitive voice relative, subordinating the validity and credibility of the information to "our" ability to understand it.57 Thus, "we" are automatically assumed to be the sole capable and moral party to determine how the resources of the incapable and immoral Other should be controlled. Therefore, the surest way for the West to keep its ill-gotten gains over Hawaiʻi is to keep reducing the Hawaiians. It is indeed hardly surprising that an American history textbook metaphorically indoctrinates


57 With reference to Pastor, 1992:34–35.
children with the following statement of Johann Wolfgang von Goethe: "What you have inherited from your father, earn over again for yourselves, or it will not be yours." 58

First of all, Hawaiians are assigned their appropriate place by the West: marginality. In Fanon's words, they are "consigned to the category of miscellaneous information... they inhibit the realm of the 'etc.'" 59 In Slotkin's words, their presence is "treated as if it were insignificant or marginal." 60 They are treated as if they do not exist. First, the West represented that Hawaiians had a very small, insignificant population which was already declining at the time of contact because of their immorality and pre-contact diseases. Stannard in his 1989 book Before the Horror has demonstrated that the Hawaiian population in 1778 probably well exceeded 800,000, as opposed to haole-academic standard figures of 200,000 to 300,000. The political metaphor behind this academic debate is the traditional Western concept of terrae nullis--"uninhabited territories" which according to European natural law become the possession of the first to discover them. 61 The Hawaiian population before the Western contact must not be large because [1] Hawai'i would not be

58 Bragdon and McCutchen, 1964:xiii.
59 Fanon, 1969:159.
60 Slotkin, 1985:52.
61 Greenblatt, 1991:60. This is partly why haole are obsessed with who first "discovered" Hawai'i--Spanish or British. See *Haas, 1991:B-3.
uninhabited (or sparcely populated empty land); and [2] The West becomes accountable for the subsequent massive depopulation from haole diseases. Hawaiians must be insignificant demographically in order for the West to become able to usurp their resources. As Clough has written, "The West wants to get on with making progress and hence seeks the kind of knowledge which will permit it to do so."62 Indeed, "discovery narratives do, as a matter of course, construe European action... as being in conflict with existing peoples, even though, over the years, they developed rhetorical strategies for mitigating and marginalizing this conflict..."63

Moreover, the Hawaiians became so insignificant that they had to be "discovered" by Captain James Cook. Theoretically, of course, one cannot "discover" a land which is already inhabited. Therefore, in order to newly "discover" such land (to claim it), its inhabitants must first be emptied out—or reduced demographically. Peter Hulme has noted that "The strategies of colonial discourse were directed in the first place at demonstrating a separation between the desired land and its native inhabitants."64 Such strategies made it possible for the West to empty out the existence of the Hawaiians while at the same time acknowledging that they


64 Kadir, 1992:96.
exist. Comic Dick Gregory once joked that "If Columbus could discover a country that was already occupied, I can go into the parking lot and discover your car--with you in it." As silly as it may sound, that is precisely what Columbus, Cook and their haole successors have been doing to the native peoples of the Americas, the Pacific Islands and Hawai‘i--quite seriously.

The next imperative step to continue usurpation of resources from their rightful owners is to question and discredit their ability to control these resources. According to haole representation of Hawaiian land tenure, the natives did not make the best productive use of land as sugar planters or developers. As one New England colonist has said, the Native Americans "inclose noe land, neither have any settled habytation, nor any tame Cattell to improve the Land by, and soe have noe other but a Naturall Right to those Countries, soe as if we leave them sufficient for their use, we may lawfully take the rest, there being more than enough for them and us." But as Reverand Robert Cushman said in 1621, "To us they cannot come, our land is full; to them we may go, their land is empty." This strange, one-sided argument for world communalism has derived from Christian imperialism in

which "there can be only one order of truth, an order whose universality paradoxically enables the strategy of exclusion... 'all men are brothers'... is quickly transformed into the belief that 'only my brothers are men.'" Such imperialism values egalitarian pluralism in abstract, but in practice flatly denies self-representation of the Other: use your land or lose it; but even if you use it, you lose it--but you cannot make any claims to my land. The nature of such haole discourse can be summarized as the following statement of Greenblatt: "There is almost no authentic reciprocity in the exchange of representations between Europeans and the peoples of the New World, no equality of giving and receiving." It is true in Hawai‘i, too, and is ever more true. Its unchanged foundation: emptying out of the Other, to make them less audible and less visible. Kame‘eleihiwa has explained the situation as follows: "Dispossessed of our 'Aina and our ancestral language, elements so fundamental to our culture, we Hawaiians find it very difficult to live as Hawaiians in the present Western world." The Hawaiians are [1] separated from their land and thus emptied out demographically; [2] deprived of their own language--which is the single most important medium of passing culture--hence reduced culturally (reduced to the status of minority

69 Greenblatt, 1991:139.
Hawaiian-Americans rather than independent, sovereign Hawaiian nationals). For instance, haole male attorney Richard Sybert has maintained that:

The whole notion of Hawaiian "national sovereignty" is simply an attempt to rewrite history. First of all, Hawaiians have no particular claim to be any more "native" than anyone else. Polynesian settlers, doing precisely what Europeans and Asians would later do as well, arrived in the Hawaiian Islands between 1200 and 1400 A.D.\textsuperscript{72}

Correctly stating that Hawaiians are trying to rewrite the haole "history" of Hawai‘i, Sybert reduced them from the privileged first people status to just one of the immigrants. Furthermore, he pushed down the arrival date of Hawaiians from academically-accepted 100-300 A.D. to 1200-1400 A.D. to remove weight from the Hawaiian claims to the 'Aina. Actually, this is a common attitude among non-Hawaiians. As in the case of the Americas, at best, "There may have been other people before Columbus, but when Columbus discovered the New World, it stayed discovered."\textsuperscript{73} James Cook "discovered" Hawai‘i and it stayed "discovered." Indeed, a 1966 American history textbook taught children in its prologue, on the very first page that "Your Country’s History Began in Europe."\textsuperscript{74} No wonder:

In 1978, the United Nations proclaimed L’Anse-aux-Meadows a "world heritage site," recognizing that many historians regard it as the earliest known European settlement on

\textsuperscript{72} *Sybert, 1992:A-19.
\textsuperscript{73} *Mills and Menagh, 1991:33.
\textsuperscript{74} Mackey, Tiegs and Adams, 1966:6.
the North American continent, despite the popular belief, particularly in the United States, that Columbus "discovered" the New World.75

The only worthwhile "discovery" is made by the haole. Thus, some historians call L'Anse-aux-Meadows "the greatest archaeological find in North America."76 No native sites from 30,000 years ago are called "the greatest found." But this haole attitude derives from the persistent notion that "This movement [of European immigration to the Americas is] in nearly all respects the most important event thus far in human history."77 As Oscar Wilde has said, "Of course, America had often been discovered before, but it had always been hushed up."78 Hushed up from whom? The only essential, full-human haole. In Hawai'i, the situation is exactly the same. The first arrival of Polynesians with an incredibly precise navigation skills is not important; the only important "discovery" of Hawai'i can only be made by the haole male--in this case Captain Cook.

This is how the haole keeps the Hawaiians from their ancestral land and resources. The West must continue to wipe out the demographic significance of the Hawaiians; otherwise, its ill-gotten domination over Hawai'i will look illegitimate.

77 Abbott, 1924:3. Parenthesis added.
The technique is as American as Columbus\textsuperscript{79}: to empty out the existence of the natives while at the same time officially acknowledging that they exist. Indeed, in the strangest twist of reality by a most perverted logic, the haole claims that the natives are not native to Hawai'i, but the haole is. As Trask has pointed out, "To most of these non-indigenous people who arrogantly come to think of Hawai'i as "rightfully" theirs, Hawaiians and their cultural ways were but backward-yearning obstacles in the path of "progress."\textsuperscript{80} For instance, Caroline Viola has stated, "If [Haunani-Kay Trask] were to tell me, a Hawai'i-raised haole, to 'get on a jet and go home,' I would tell her I am home."\textsuperscript{81} Charles J. Ewart, IV also has said: "I will not leave Hawai'i, as you [Trask] implored another 'haole' to do. This is my home, and neither skin color, racial origin nor date of arrival will change that."\textsuperscript{82} Now compare these comments with Paolucci's assertion that the home of Columbus is the Americas, not Europe: "In fact, he died waiting. He longed until his death to return to the lands which he had first 'revealed' to all of Europe. Columbus, in other words, was not 'at home' when he died--far from it. He longed to 'go home,' but he was prevented from

\textsuperscript{79} Paolucci has said that "Columbus... is as American as Ellis Island." Paolucci, 1990:10.

\textsuperscript{80} Trask, 1984:108-109.

\textsuperscript{81} *Viola, 1990:A-15.

\textsuperscript{82} *Ewart, 1990:4.
doing so." Therefore, "Columbus must be welcomed home. These continents are his home." Paolucci then dedicated this poem to her fellow and godfather haole, Christopher Columbus:

Columbus, listen to us: hundreds of thousands, maybe millions, of adventurous spirits must make such voyages, and take possession, and build. You have shown the way. Others must follow in great waves. And then, perhaps after some 500 years, their descendants will acknowledge that you were indeed the first of their kind, the first immigrant. And they will then celebrate what you did, identifying themselves with it. What more could you ask of history?85

The haole in Hawai‘i are faithfully following the way Columbus and Cook showed them: to "discover," take possession, and to "build" (to profit and benefit from the stolen possessions). Indeed, Goethe’s words are deeply ingraved in the haole hearts: "What you have inherited from your father, earn over again for yourselves, or it will not be yours." As Trask has observed, "There is a real problem with the idea of place. Whose place is Hawai‘i? The tourist comes here saying, 'You exist for our recreational benefit.' The capitalist comes here saying, 'You exist so that we can make money.' The missionaries came here saying, 'You exist so that we can convert souls.' The United States came here saying,

83 Paolucci, 1990:11.

84 Paolucci, 1990:15.

85 Paolucci, 1990:11-12.
'You exist because we need a military presence in the North Pacific.' I mean, really--whose place is Hawai‘i?"86

But the haole just cannot stop taking away from the Hawaiians--including the most important part of human dignity: identity. As Caroline Viola has written in 1990, "I would remind her [Haunani-Kay Trask, who spoke up on the Western domination over Hawai‘i] that Trask is a haole name."87 Flatly ignoring the unequal political-economy of colonial love and marriage relationships, and the colonial demographic factors that produced mixed-blood Hawaiians, Viola unilaterally extinguishes Trask's Hawaiian identity. Three years later, she repeats and expands the same argument: "Isn't it interesting that a lot of people crying for Hawaiian sovereignty have non-Hawaiian surnames: Trask, Hee, etc? They are claiming to be "Hawaiian," not Hawaiian Asian, or Caucasian blend. Are they, then, denying the Other ethnic groups that make them who they are?"88 Not only extinguishing Hawaiians' ethnic identity, many non-Hawaiians claim that they are "Hawaiians-at-heart"--whom Kame‘eleihiwa calls "wannabes"89--and that they are better at being Hawaiians than Hawaiians-by-blood. Even Thurston Twigg-Smith, descendant of haole male businessman Lorrin A. Thurston, who among others

conspired to overthrow the indigenous government of Hawa‘i, claims himself to be "a fifth-generation Hawaiian who loves these islands and their people every bit as much as did my grandfather." Leslie Keli‘ilauahi Stewart has reminded these people:

For those wannabes, you have stolen my land, commodified my culture, and now you want to take my identity. This theft will not be tolerated any longer.

But even the voice of righteous Hawaiian anger is reduced. The cry for their inherent possession—sovereignty—is reduced to the status of "New Year’s Eve fireworks." Gene M. Leupp has written: "Let’s put the ‘sovereignty’ activities in the category of New Year’s Eve fireworks and get on with issues that are important to all of us. The ‘all’ includes the vast majority of us who are proud to be here, proud of our islands, and who would like to spend the rest of our days here with one another in peace, harmony and progress." Needless to mention, the current order systematically benefits "proud" people like Leupp, and disadvantages the Hawaiians.

In fact, there are many other ways for the haole and his collaborators of color to reduce the significance of the Hawaiian Other. One of them is to question and discredit their ability to self-govern and sustain life. In such discourse, the incapable natives almost always are influenced

90 *Twigg-Smith, 1993:B-1.
by the capable West, rarely vice versa. Self-sufficient Hawaiians, who lived in Hawai‘i for nearly 1,800 years (which itself is a proof of social sustainability) before the haole came, are suddenly unable to live one more day without the benevolent help from the capable West: technology, democracy, modernization, industrialization, capitalism, you name it. In many cases, haole males elevate themselves to the status of demigod. As Wright has explained on the Americas:

Another of Europe’s hoariest ideas about America is the self-apotheosis known as the white god myth. According to this, the natives were so overawed by the strange white men, the guns, and the horses that they mistook the invader for gods.93

In fact, the common perception is that "The new technology... at first sight bestowed on its Western possessors something of the status of gods..."94 As for Hawai‘i, a very well-known white god myth is that of the apotheosis of Captain James Cook. According to this every-school-kid-knows story, Hawaiians were so overawed by the haole, their guns and artifacts, that came during the Makahiki period for god Lono, mistook Cook for Lono. Ever since the story was popularized in 1789, no single haole has questioned it. But this is undeniably a strange story, especially compared with the story of Japan’s first Western contact: when the first Westerners (Portuguese) with guns arrived in Tanegashima Island south of Kyushu, Japan, in 1542, the

Japanese were surprised. But they did not think the hairy white men were gods—the strangers were called "keto" (hairy barbarian) or "nambanjin" (barbarians from the south). They knew that the Portuguese were humans; the Japanese even thought they were subhumans. The Japanese immediately understood what the gun was, and began to manufacture their own version soon after contact. Of course, the Japanese and the Hawaiians had very different social, religious and technological perceptions about things. The point is that it is very difficult to accept that Hawaiians believed outright that Cook, who did not act like Lono, was actually Lono, and kept believing so throughout his stay. Were Hawaiians stupid and blind? According to the haole history, yes, they were.

However, Obeyesekere in his book The Apotheosis of Captain Cook has demonstrated in very fine detail that all the tales of Cook as Lono derived from haole males, and that all situational evidence is against Hawaiian dieification of Cook. He has pointed out that:

When the great navigator and "discoverer" of Polynesia James Cook landed on the shores of Hawai‘i on Sunday, 17 January 1779, during the festival of Makahiki, he was greeted as the returning god Lono. This is a fact; and it is incorporated into practically every history of Hawai‘i and into every biography, novel, or account of this redoubtable man... I question this "fact," which I show was created in the European imagination of the eighteenth century and after was based on antecedent "myth models" pertaining to the redoubtable explorer cum civilizer who is a god to the "natives." To put it bluntly, I doubt that the natives created their European god; the Europeans created him for them. This "European
god" is a myth of conquest, imperialism, and civilization—a triad that cannot be easily separated.⁹⁵

Indeed, the "myth models" he discussed is evident in the apotheosis of Columbus and other "discoverers." According to one children's book, written by a haole male, the natives "threw themselves to the ground and worshiped Columbus and his bearded men. The Spaniards did not mind being treated like gods by these gentle heathens to whom they had come to bring the Christian faith."⁹⁶ Mary W. Helms has suggested that geographic distance serves to invent cultural distance between non- or sub-human natives and super-human demigod haole:

the farther one moves away from the center of settled life, from the known, safe, socially ordered, civilized heartland, the more one encounters territories and peoples that are defined as markedly contrastive in qualities and/or behaviors with the heartland and its inhabitants. The contrast can emphasize characteristics that are regarded as more inhuman or nonhuman; that is, distant peoples may be more "savage" or less intelligent or less culturally evolved. Alternatively, the contrast can emphasize qualities of the superhuman, whereby foreigners are granted greater intelligence and wisdom or stronger shamanistic powers. The contrast also frequently carries a temporal dimension, such that distant land may be associated with ancestral or cosmic origins, or with still "uncivilized" or unsettled or "uncultured" forms of existence where the blessings of ancestors or culture heroes have not yet been felt.⁹⁷

In this kind of "myth models," the haole becomes the only significant actor, whereas his Others are relegated to the

⁹⁵ Obeyesekere, 1992:3. It is noteworthy that haole male scholars such as Percy Smith, Robert Langdon and Allan Hanson have argued that the Maori are of European stock because of the visit of pakeha in the sixteenth century.

⁹⁶ *Achenbach, 1991:11.

status of needy incapable peoples who must require his help.
As African anthropologist Asmarom Legasse has pointed out, "Ask him [the liberal Western intellectual] outright to name... a single example of a contribution that traditional Africa could make... He can think of nothing. Ask him what the West can contribute to Africa, however, and his imagination is ignited. He becomes expansive, grandiose: Bach, Goethe, Einstein, Marx, Christ, parliamentary democracy, justice, freedom, prosperity, technology, urbanism, taste, manners, and gourmandism." 98 In the Pacific Islands, according to Iamo, "It was the white person’s responsibility to teach those people to read, write, and think, to clothe themselves, feed and shelter each other, to practice a new economy, politics, and belief system, and moreover, to learn everything there was about white man’s civilization. Without the guiding hands of the white man and women, the native was a helpless soul, like a new born baby." 99 Therefore, haole female scholar Patricia Grimshaw in her article titled "New England Missionary Wives, Hawaiian Women and 'The Cult of True Womanhood'" stated:

On occasions Hawaiian women could express gratitude to American wives for their unswerving reform efforts. Maria Chamberlain had that experience one pleasant day in May, 1831. As an Hawaiian woman sat by Maria’s baby cradle brushing the flies off his face, she said to Maria that Hawaiians were fortunate that the missionaries had come with wives to the islands. Formerly, she said,

98 Legasse, 1973:283.
99 Iamo, 1992:79.
Hawaiians had known nothing of taking care of children; gave newborn babies to others; knew nothing of domestic happiness. "Husbands and wives quarrelled, committed adultery, drank, lied, stole... Now we wish to obey the word of God, to live together with love, to take care of our children and have them wear clothes as the children of the missionaries."100

The Hawaiian women's voices, their self-representation, are totally usurped twice, first by [1] haole female missionaries of the nineteenth century; and then [2] haole female scholar of the twentieth century. Missionary agenda are not even questioned; the haole becomes the sole best authoritative voice who can represent Hawaiians better than Hawaiians themselves. The Hawaiians in such representation only repeats haole party lines—missionary, capitalist, human rights activist, feminist, you name it. Needless to say, in Grimshaw's double-layered haole representation, the Hawaiians are reduced morally and culturally—just like most other haole representations.

It should be especially noted that there always have been a few haole who saw vice in the colonization of the Americas and Hawai'i, and attempted to correct the situation, i.e., Bartolome de Las Casas, Samuel Johnson and most recently, Kirkpatrick Sale and Keoni Dudley. But, just as in popular literature, "Where in historical reality we know that blacks and Indians were exploited and expropriated by the whites, in the mythic representation we are offered the famous couples—Natty and Chingachggok, Ishmael and Queequeg, Huck and Nigger

Jim—in which the innocent white man is symbolically allied with his victim in opposition to the advance of white civilization. Evidently the figure of the white innocent has been produced by condensation and displacement of both material and ideological elements and can be interpreted as acting either as a denial of real conditions (implying 'I wasn't one of the colonisers, I was one of the victims'), or as a recuperation of them (implying 'it wasn't a conquest at all—we were entering spiritual communion with nature')."¹⁰¹ Appropriately, the freedom which the West stole from the natives is now benevolently given back to them by the good haole, such as in the following newspaper article, which stated that, "Using the Columbus anniversary as a platform for voicing native American grievances is a basic freedom."¹⁰²

Now consider this example: "Margaret Mead, in her article 'The Rights of Primitive Peoples,' goes on patronizingly to cite how the superiority of the advanced civilizations contrasts with the stagnated and backward social life of

¹⁰¹ Clark, 1984:12. Indeed, this is a variation of political myth of innocence: "like a dream the myth inverts cause and effect, removes contradictions, and leaves us with a timeless image of concord where there was once work, economy, history, politics, and struggle." Clark, 1984:13. Moreover, in "the-innocent-haole-befriends-victims" representations, "Since the word 'innocence' implies its contrary, guilt, and since we generally find the figure of innocence associated with a representative of the white man's victims (black or red), we can deduce that foremost among these elements must be a knowledge of the facts of conquest that contradicts the dominant ideology." Clark, 1984:15.

inferior native peoples. She mentions further that 'They can, therefore, be regarded in the contemporary ethic of the mid-twentieth century, as having been treated unfairly by history, as having lacked a location on earth's surface that would have given them an opportunity to accept the culture of more advanced civilizations, and so prove their superiority, or be rejected by it and so prove their inferiority.' To summarize the technique of emptying out the Other in the form of anthropology (for that matter any other forms of Orientalistic knowledge):

Anthropological knowledge means to know the Other. To know the Other is to create the person's history, politics, geography, and culture, to remove the power of imagination, and to make the person dependent. But to know someone else is also to presume to understand ourselves even better. Thus a differentiation and a dichotomy of "us" as the superior and "them" as the inferior develops. And, to know of the Other is to have authority over that person, to represent, and to reproduce the person. Such a process will give rise to stigma, where the indigene is not seen in his or her own right but rather from what is made of that individual.

[2] The Making of Immoral Other

However, reducing Hawaiians demographically is often not enough to justify and legitimize the Western usurpation of their resources simply because the Hawaiians were physically present in their ancestral land despite massive depopulation. They still occupied the land the haole desired--both morally and legally. In order to dispossess them, the West projected

---

103 Iamo, 1992:78-79.
and attributed its own traits onto the Hawaiians: hostile, cannibalistic, violent, hateful, evil, cruel, irrational, inhumane, witch-hunters, rapists, slave-owners, etc. Such immoral people must be removed from power or they will harm themselves. But in fact, the haole had to project his evil onto them also to exorcise his own immorality without ever having to have to punish himself: Hawaiians are the one who became hostile against us first. They are evil. According to Torgovnick:

To study the primitive is... to enter an exotic world which is also a familiar world. That world is structured by sets of images and ideas that have slipped from their original metaphoric status to control perceptions of primitives... Primitives are like children... Primitives are our untamed selves, our id forces—libidinous, irrational, violent, dangerous. Primitives are mystics, in tune with nature, part of its harmonies. Primitives are free. Primitives exist at the "lowest cultural levels"; we occupy the "highest"... [the] primitivist discourse [is] a discourse fundamental to the Western sense of self and other.105

"Savage" and "primitive" are indeed terms in a Western monologue. Also, there is no doubt about the inventiveness of the haole male social construct of "savage" and "primitive." As Copans writes, "The savage is a product of Western history... The savage has been the object of the greatest repulsion—the negation of civilization, of progress, of enlightenment—and the simplest utopia, the critical mirror of our inequalities and frivolity... The savage offers the

105 Torgovnick, 1990:8. Underlines and parentheses added. Note how the Western Self and its fear, desires and hopes are projected onto the primitive Other.
advantage of being the most economical, the most different, and the most exotic form of this millennial spirit."106 Furthermore, "The savage of the West is always presented as the savage before the whites, the savage independent of whites. Now, as object of knowledge, reflection, and phantasmatic fixation, the savage exists only since the whites discovered him."107

The ultimate reason for inventing immoral and incapable Other, as I have mentioned, is that people with such qualities are less human thus have no rights should not continue to control lands and resources. They are not fit to continue to hold power; that is, to self-govern and control their own resources. This is the political myth of poorer social sustainability and moral inferiority. It relies on worst-case generalizations of the Other’s morality and ability. Captain Alfred T. Mahan made this argument easy: "the claim of an indigenous population to retain indefinitely control of territory depends not upon a natural right, but upon political fitness, shown in the political work of governing, administering, and developing, in such manner as to insure the natural right of the world at large that resources should not be left idle, but be utilized for the general good."108

108 Weinberg, 1935:93. Mahan made this statement when the United States stole the Philippines from its people in 1898.
This type of argument is deeply rooted in the traditional Western metaphor of the madman. As Iamo observed, "According to Western civilization so-called primitive and savage man has no sense of knowledge. He was, as [Anthropologist Margaret] Mead's civilization represented him, the equivalent of a Western madman or neurotic, who had no sense of time, no knowledge of how he came to be, no idea about his surroundings, and never had a chance to survey his own geography."¹⁰⁹ In other words, he is what Thomas Hobbes has described inhabitants of the Marquesas Islands (from where the Hawaiian ancestors probably originated) to be:

No place for industry, because the fruit thereof is uncertain; and consequently no culture of the earth; no navigation, nor use of the commodities that may be imported by sea; no commodious building; no instrument of moving and removing such things as require much force; no knowledge of the face of the earth; no account of time; no arts; no letters; no society; and which is worst of all, continuous fear and danger of violent death; and the life of men solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short."¹¹⁰

In 1991, Michael S. Berliner, executive director of the right-wing Ayn Rand Institute, has argued in his controversial article "Man's Best Came with Columbus":

Before 1492, what is now the United States was sparsely inhabited, unused and undeveloped. The inhabitants were primarily wandering hunter-gatherers, living hand-to-mouth and day-to-day. There was virtually no change, no

¹⁰⁹ Iamo, 1992:79-80. Parentheses and underline added. Furthermore, "According to the civilization she represented, we Pacific peoples were 'a people without history, without any theory of how we came to be, without any belief in a permanent future life, without any knowledge of geography, writing, without political forms.'" Iamo, 1992:78.

¹¹⁰ Dening, 1980:270.
growth for thousands of years. There was no wheel, no written language, little agriculture and scant permanent settlement; but there were endless, bloody wars. With rare exception, life was nasty, brutish and short.\footnote{Berliner, 1991:no page number available. The familiar myth model of Hobbes is repeatedly reminded in the West whenever it needs an excuse to usurp self-government and resources of its Others. For example, when the United States invaded Somalia in December 1992 for its "Operation Restore Hope," CBS News anchorman Dan Rather in one of his on-spot reports represented the African country as having no food, no hope, no government, no nothing and "That is why they welcome" the U.S. invaders.}

Madness, according to Sass, "is irrationality, a condition involving decline or even disappearance of the role of rational factors in the organization of human conduct and experience: this is the core idea that, in various forms but with few true exceptions, has echoed down through the ages [in Western thought]. Nearly always insanity has been seen as what one early-nineteenth-century alienist called 'the opposite to reason and good sense, as light is to darkness, straight to crooked.' And, since reason has generally been seen as the distinctive feature of human nature itself, it would seem to follow that madmen must be not merely different but somehow deficient in essential qualities of humanity or personhood. Indeed, the very word reason means both the highest intellectual faculty and the sane mind."\footnote{Sass, 1992:1.} Exploiting this culturally specific metaphor, elite haole males invented "rational" science, which was able:
a). to acquire *predictive control* over those parts of one's experience of the world which seem especially chaotic and disordered;
b). to acquire *manipulative control* over portions of one's experience so as to be able to intervene in the usual order of events so as to modify that order in particular respects;
c). to increase the *precision* of the parameters which feature as initial and boundary conditions in our explanations of natural phenomena;
d). to integrate and *simplify* the various components of our picture of the world, reducing them where possible to a common set of explanatory principles.  

Science is thus a performance-based argument of better social sustainability and moral superiority. But as Wright pointed out, this kind of comparison between the scientific Self (saneness) and its religious Others (madness) was a setup from the start:

Because of its idea of objective nature, science is good at technical prediction and control, whereas religion, because of its idea of a sacred tradition, is good at social prediction and control. But in these anthropological comparisons it is typically the technical idea of explanation that is assumed, without much argument, to be the definition of genuine or valid explanation. Thus the comparison is always something of a setup from the start: science is better at explanation than religion because science is better at being science than religion.  

In other words, "Science is fundamentally oriented toward technical proficiency (performance), and, in comparison with religious versions of knowledge, science does technology much more..."

---

113 Laudan, 1984:89. Laudan is the haole male philosophy professor of the University of Hawai‘i who in fall 1990 attempted to oust UH Hawaiian Studies director Haunani-Kay Trask, a Kanaka Maoli female, over the so-called Trask debate.

114 Wright, W., 1992:50. Underlines in original.
better. Here appears the familiar empowerment technique: comparison between the worst of the religious/insane Other and the best of the scientific/sane Self. According to such arguments, it is assumed that predictability and foreknowledge are a necessary condition for truth and morality. Now, what did these new capabilities and competence mean? An instant moral success and thus the possession of the absolute power.

As Dretske has observed:

"It isn't knowledge itself that is important, but what is implied by the possession of knowledge, the fact that one has got things right, that fact that one has got the truth, the fact that one has correctly represented conditions in one's surroundings. That, and not some fact about why you enjoy the advantage, is what gives you the competitive edge."

(Fore)knowledge means absolute intellectual superiority and is an argument of better social sustainability and moral superiority. It seeks to dazzle, confuse and silence the Other. As Gelven remarked, "Truth is that which, in confronting it, permits of no further advance." It followed that the rational, scientific West is sane, and all of its Others insane. Harootunian has explained the process of making of the madman Other in:

the opposition between East and West, dream and reality, tragic and dialectical, ourselves and Other, traditionalism and modernity, and all other pairings. Underlying all these divisions was the even more basic opposition established between reason and madness, or

\[115\] Wright, W., 1992:38.


unreason. Foucault acknowledged that this divide constituted for Western culture one of the dimensions of its originality; indeed, it differentiated the West from all other cultures, even as he came to realize that it also authorized the "disciplinization" of forms of knowledge as a condition for dominating, and even silencing, the Other.\textsuperscript{118}

Indeed, "Many Westerners... went on to assume that their technological superiority was inherently linked, not with science, but with Caucasian ethnic origins..."\textsuperscript{119} In this kind of discourse, the logical ability of the European is unquestioned, and represented as the truth. In fact, Levi-Bruhl argued that "between our own mentality and the mentality of the primitive men there is no point of contact; that the primitive man always acts according to 'mythical' principles which are contrary to all our principles of rational and empirical thought."\textsuperscript{120} In this way, the Hawaiians were unilaterally made into madmen by the West. As Sybert writes, in a column for the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, "let's put to an end once and for all this romantic nonesense about a lost island culture. Superficial charm is great for the tourist industry, but the reality is that Polynesian culture was

\textsuperscript{118} Harootunian, 1988:116. Underline added.

\textsuperscript{119} Gray, 1990:98. Consider the following statement by a haole male: "The European is a close reasoner; his statements of fact are devoid of any ambiguity; he is a natural logician, albeit he may not have studied logic; he is by nature sceptical and requires proof before he can accept the truth of any proposition; his trained intelligence works like a piece of mechanism." Cromer, \textit{Modern Egypt}, 1908. Quoted in Said, 1979:38.

\textsuperscript{120} Cassirer, 1979:249.
violent and primitive. Ancient Hawaiians were a bronze age people who practiced human sacrifice. That is not a higher spirituality, but lesser civilization."121 The Hawaiians were beasts and children—or madmen—who required benevolent help from the haole. The haole, on the other hand, is genetically rational and thus entitled to act paternalistically over the insane Hawaiians. In this thinking process, the haole must believe that:

1. his action is for the Hawaiians' own good;
2. he is qualified to act on the Hawaiians' behalf;
3. his action involves violating a moral rule (or will require it to do so) with regard to the Hawaiians;
4. the Hawaiians' good justifies the haole in acting on their behalf independently of their past, present, or immediately forthcoming (free, informed) consent; and
5. he knows what is good for Hawaiians' own good.

This last point is important, for it means that within this rhetoric the haole believes himself to be a better Hawaiian than the Hawaiians by blood. And indeed, Sybert, the one-time Hawai‘i resident, elaborates, "The integration of Hawai‘i into the modern world was inevitable, was a step forward for humanity, and was a good thing. Haoles and subsequently Asians have built a much better Hawai‘i—for everyone. They have brought the rights of the individual, the rule of law, equal opportunity and respect for women, to say nothing of a written alphabet and life expectancy past 40. Unless you like a rigid class system, strict kapus, pagan religion, and frequent violent death, how can anyone deny that

Western civilization has brought a substantially greater number of people in Hawai‘i a substantially better life?"\textsuperscript{122}

The West is always portrayed as a morally neutral donor, liberator and redeemer. It is selfless. Moral qualifications of the West is beyond dispute. Also, Twigg-Smith has written that "The overthrow of the monarchy and subsequent relationship with America are the best things that ever happened to Hawai‘i and its people."\textsuperscript{123} Only the sane, benevolent haole male can correctly determine what the happiness is for insane thus incapable therefore immoral Hawaiians and other people of color. The haole male is better at governing Hawai‘i than Hawaiians-by-blood. In this way, control of Hawaiian resources ends up in the hands of the haole and their collaborators of color. Now consider the following letter to the editor by a man named Daniel James:

> When whites came here [Hawai‘i] they found a repressive, savage society and a male-dominated culture ruled by violence. By contrast the whites came with a highly developed civilization whose open, enlightened and free culture extended open arms to the locals. That’s why the natives stampeded to accept the superior culture and civilization of the whites. That’s why the superior Western civilization still competes openly and freely here among locals and all immigrant civilizations, culture and races; and dominates all of them to this day; and will continue to rule for generations to come. That’s why seven (!) million people around the world are beating on our door trying to get into the land of

\textsuperscript{122} *Sybert, 1992:A-19.

\textsuperscript{123} *Twigg-Smith, 1993:B-1.
freedom--they want the freedoms originated, maintained, and sustained by whites.\textsuperscript{124}

For the West, to have madman Others means windfall profit of their self-government, land and other resources. No wonder rationality is an "Occidental obsession."\textsuperscript{125} The madman Other had to be invented because the haole male desire for lands and resources of the Others was too strong to be quenched. As Sass has observed, "The madman is a protean figure in the Western imagination, yet there is a sameness to his many masks. He has been thought of as a wildman and a beast, as a child and a simpleton, as a walking dreamer, and as a prophet in the grip of demonic forces. He is associated with insight and vitality but also with blindness, disease, and death; and so he evokes awe as well as contempt, fear as well as condescension and benevolent concern. But the variousness of these faces should not be allowed to obscure their underlying consistencies, for there are certain assumptions about insanity that have persisted through nearly the entire history of Western thought."\textsuperscript{126} Only if the Hawaiians are madmen, the West can usurp their autonomy to control their own land and

\textsuperscript{124} James, 1991:A-11. Exclamation mark in original. Parenthesis added. Is this opinion "extreme?" Probably. However, "deviance and difference do not exist independently, but instead are produced by cultural systems and political orders. Marginality... is the area in which we can most clearly view the workings of social regulation." Ivy, 1988:8.

\textsuperscript{125} Scholte, 1984:961.

\textsuperscript{126} Sass, 1992:1. Underline added.
resources. Now let us review what autonomy is according to the Western thought. Indeed, what is in autonomy?:

At the center of Kant's ethical theory is the claim that normal adults are capable of being fully self-governing in moral matters. In Kant's terminology, we are "autonomous." Autonomy involves two components. The first is that no authority external to ourselves is needed to constitute or inform us of the demands of morality. We can each know without being told what we ought to do because moral requirements are requirements we impose on ourselves. The second is that in self-government we can effectively control ourselves. The obligations we impose upon ourselves override all other calls for action, and frequently run counter to our desires. We nonetheless always have a sufficient motive to act as we ought. Hence no external source of motivation is needed for our self-legislation to be effective in controlling our behavior.127

[3] Fulfillment of Familiar Prophecy

In the preceding sections, we have seen how the West reduced its native Others to incompetent and irrational status in its representation thus making its empowerment against them appear legitimate. But where did it obtain such technique? And why did members of the West so enthusiastically participated in dispossession and genocide of the native peoples? The answer lies in its deliberate and skillful exploitation of familiar model of conquest. The haole, in order to legitimize its dehumanization of the Hawaiians, turned to the past and found the perfect model: the Manifest Destiny. As Merk has pointed out:

Expansionism is usually associated with crusading ideologies... in the case of the United States [the crusading ideology] was "Manifest Destiny." This was a

mixture of republicanism, democracy, freedom of religion, Anglo-Saxonism, and a number of other ingredients.128

"Other ingredients," included the fulfilled biblical prophecy and the destiny of Israel in the conquest of Canaan. In fact, religious self-fulfilling prophecy is perhaps a more important ingredient in Manifest Destiny than any other modern constructs. Indeed, fortunately for the West, there had already been the successful formula right in front of it to legitimize its genocide and dispossession of natives: in the biblical tale of the conquest of Canaan. Then, the West invented "the course of history" of Manifest Destiny and self-fulfilled that "history-in-making." Indeed, as Braudel has said, "A general history always requires an overall model, good or bad, against which events can be interpreted."129 Furthermore, as Jansen remarked:

New prophecies do appear, but revived versions of older texts are far more common, and even the "new" compositions include familiar symbols and long passages adapted from earlier pieces. Some "new" prophecies are really only new combination of old texts. What made prophecies so appealing, in truth, was not their originality but their familiarity.130

Or, "With the establishment of symbolic linkage between old and new cultural components, novel elements can be experienced as both familiar and meaningful..."131

___________


129 Quoted in Marwick, 1989:388.


has put it this way: "Since even a shattered mythology preserves elements of the cultural past, the new mythology will inevitably find connection with the old; indeed, the readiest way to renew the force of a weakened mythology is to link new ideology to the traditional imagery of existing myth."\textsuperscript{132}

In this process of mythmaking, the West has used \textit{ad populum} argument to usurp somebody else's self-government and resources. The argument, which is also called "mob appeal" or "appeal to the gallery," invites people's unthinking, uncritical acceptance of ideas and ideologies which are presented in a strong, theatrical manner. It appeals to people's lowest instincts and steers them toward a conclusion by means of passion rather than reason.\textsuperscript{133} Indeed, "nation is mission."\textsuperscript{134} As Kadir has observed, "They [Westerners] are empowered by nothing less than the conviction that the rest of the world was their own solely by dint of exercise of their rightful claims. And should the world deem otherwise, institutionally sanctioned means empowered their agents to press those claims, naturally."\textsuperscript{135} Weinberg is in agreement: "the nature of the ideology [Manifest Destiny]... permitted the American always to see his own nation's right as

\textsuperscript{132}Slotkin, 1985:25.

\textsuperscript{133}Walton, 1992:2.

\textsuperscript{134}Weinberg, 1935:485.

\textsuperscript{135}Kadir, 1992:66. Parenthesis added.
outweighing those of another."\(^{136}\) To us they cannot come, our land is full; to them we may go, their land is empty.

Kadir has also observed that the conquest of the "New World" (and its extension, Hawai‘i) preceded its discovery, and that the conquest was already under way in the minds of elite haole males before any geographical encounter.\(^{137}\) He cites the April 30, 1492 Capitulaciones de Santa Fe, the order Columbus took from the crown, as an evidence. Indeed, in the Capitulaciones, a dual-verb phrase "discobrir y ganar (discover and conquer)" occurs seven times. For example: "Forasmuch as you, Christopher Columbus, are going by our command to discover and conquer... And it is hoped that, with God's help, some of the said islands and mainland in the said Ocean sea should be discovered and conquered by your hand and labors... You, Christopher Columbus, after having discovered and conquered said islands and mainland in said Ocean sea or, any of them... You shall be... our admiral of said islands and mainland you shall thus discover and conquer, and you shall be our admiral and viceroy in them..."\(^{138}\) All the haole male "discoverers," including James Cook (who claimed Hawai‘i for Britain), were faithfully following this prophecy-myth model.

What is extremely interesting here is that as in the case of ancient Israel, the "promised land" had never been seen by

\(^{136}\) Weinberg, 1935:38.

\(^{137}\) Kadir, 1992:64.

\(^{138}\) Kadir, 1992:69.
the haole: "They [Israel]... appeared on the scence in Canaan as a nation whose roots were alleged to be in the Land, a territory that they in fact had never seen before actually invading it."\textsuperscript{139} The "promised land" concept—in its many variations for the Americas, the Pacific Islands or Hawai‘i—is based on faith, which Apostle Paul has explained as follows: "Now faith is the assurance of things hoped for, the conviction of things not seen."\textsuperscript{140} This kind of faith unilaterally gives believers what they have not seen yet—which could well be somebody else's property. Dreams of things not yet seen—desires—become faith, which powerfully materializes the intense desires of mind. Christian faith—or ideological givens—necessarily leads believers to forcibly change the existing orders and realities according to those ideological givens (which in reality the ultimate form of desires). In other words, the believers will see and change things according to their own desires; it does not matter how and what the current orders and situations are. The faith conviniently allows them to see things in a way which is beneficial for them, and further allows them to believe in their moral righteousness. As Kadir asserts:

I simply wish to maintain that Christianity and its providential rendering of human time and worldly events purvey the ideological givens that make imperial taking a natural right needing no further justification. In

\textsuperscript{139} Sicker, 1992:23. Underline added.

other words, prophetic history and its apocalyptic rhetoric serve as ideological shield for intricate and mixed motives for Europe’s project in the New World, and in the rest of the world for that matter.\(^\text{141}\)

It hardly surprises us then that "The whole experience of Europeans in America was shaped... by a particularly intense dream of possession..."\(^\text{142}\) Naturally, "The New World was... redefined, transformed, and instrumentalized to meet the demands of both the imaginary model and the European economy."\(^\text{143}\) Hawai‘i, as we shall see, was no exception. The haole had publicly admitted their desire for it, and let the desire known since well before they overthrew the indigenous government. Mob appeals, especially, carefully manufactured to instigate emotions attached to old, familiar symbols and texts, made the haole takeover of Hawai‘i possible. Indeed, prophecy always involves fundamentalistic aspects—fanaticism, return to the ideal state, fight "corruption," establish new political order, nationalism, insistence on inerrancy, etc. Manifest Destiny is none other than a fundamentalist movement, or more precisely, mob-appeal Crusades and fanatical Western jihad which continues to this day in the Americas and Hawai‘i. As Weinberg explained:

\[\text{As Weinberg explained:}\]

\[\text{\[141] Kadir, 1992:68. He continued: "This form of ideological empowerment, by the way, may not be unique to Western Europe and Christianity. But the fact is, as far as the New World is concerned, Western Europe with its dominant mythology is the particular agency involved in this historical context."}\]


The ideology of American expansion is its motley body of justificatory doctrines. It comprises metaphysical dogmas of a providential mission and quasi-scientific "laws" of national development, conceptions of national right and ideals of social duty, legal rationalizations and appeals to "the higher law," aims of extending freedom and designs of extending benevolent absolutism. 144

According to such "law," the haole right to somebody else's land is already ideologically preconditioned, patently naturalized even before they are actually taken. 145 It is noteworthy that Manifest Destiny took a familiar form of prophecy of "nature" or "natural law." The argument was that "The great Engineer of the Universe has fixed the natural limits of our country, and man cannot change them..." 146 Therefore, Alexander Hamilton could resort to prophetic rhetoric on the Oregon annexation issue: "THE SACRED RIGHTS OF MANKIND ARE NOT TO BE RUMMAGED FOR AMONG OLD PARCHMENTS OR MUSTY RECORDS. THEY ARE WRITTEN, AS WITH A SUNBEAM, IN THE WHOLE VOLUME OF HUMAN NATURE, BY THE HAND OF THE DIVINE ITSELF; AND CAN NEVER BE ERASED OR OBSCURED BY MORTAL POWER." 147 Congressman James Mullins in 1868 depicted the United States as "a burning meteor rushing on in space," a part of the movement which in five thousand years would give

144 Weinberg, 1935:2.
146 Weinberg, 1935:55.
the Anglo-Saxon race "the whole world."\textsuperscript{148} As Kadir has observed, "The territory... becomes spiritualized in ways that make it easy and expedient for the chosen people to claim that they have found and recognized, at last, their chosen land of millenarian promise, and to press those claims on patently ideological grounds."\textsuperscript{149}

It then hardly surprises us that words and phrases such as the following were frequently used when the United States "naturally" expanded\textsuperscript{150}: "natural territories," "a more natural, more distinguishable, more precise boundary," "Nature had decided the boundary as...," "to be assigned to us by nature and by reason," "nature has decreed the union of Florida with the United States," "the manifest indication of nature," "They as naturally belonging to us as the county of Cornwell does to England," "the Author of Nature has marked our limits in...," "the finger of nature," "It was impossible that centuries should elapse without finding them annexed to the United States," "the God of nature had marked... our own," "nature has given us," "comform to the order of nature," "[Cuba as] an appendage of Florida," "natural outposts" and countless others. As for Hawai‘i, for example, admiral Jeremy Belknap commented in The Boston Herald of January 31, 1893,

\textsuperscript{148} Weinberg, 1935:250.

\textsuperscript{149} Kadir, 1992:102.

\textsuperscript{150} Weinberg, 1935:43-71. The words and phrases were taken from chapter II of Weinberg's book, "Geographical Predestination."
shortly after the haole overthrow of the indigenous Hawaiian monarchy: "Indeed, it would seem that nature had established that group [Hawaiian Islands] to be ultimately occupied as an outpost, as it were, of the great Republic on its western border, and that the time had now come for the fulfillment of such a design."\textsuperscript{151}

Zanden has pointed out that "The 'natural order' position was a carry-over from the pre-Enlightenment Period. Social and economic inequalities were justified as part of the 'natural order' and God's ordained plan for the world. Human servitude, economic classes, social estates and even the differing status of men and women were explained on this ground. The position had been strongly influenced by Aristotle and other Greek thinkers who had justified slavery in logic as conforming to nature.\textsuperscript{152} Of course, "nature" is actually only a word (text), a word whose meanings can be changed at the speaker's will so that they embrace or exclude whatever categories are desired.\textsuperscript{153}

Naturally, in the 1890s, "the doctrine of the inevitable meant not merely that American expansion could not be resisted by others but that it could not be resisted by Americans themselves, caught, willing or unwilling, in the toils of an

\textsuperscript{151} Weinberg, 1935:67-68. Parenthesis added.

\textsuperscript{152} Zanden, 1991:92.

\textsuperscript{153} With reference to Clark, 1984:20.
inevitable destiny."\(^{154}\) Inevitably, President William E. McKinley’s told the Senate upon his submission of the 1897 annexation treaty of Hawai‘i that "Not only is the union of the Hawaiian territory to the United States no new scheme, but it is the inevitable consequence of the relation steadfastly maintained with that mid-Pacific domain for three-quarters of a century. Its accomplishment, despite successive denilas and postponements, has been merely a question of time... Under such circumstances annexation is not a change. It is a consummation."\(^{155}\) The Senate in turn responded in its report of 1898 advocating ratification: "Following the natural course of events in the direction of the inevitable union of Hawai‘i, by peaceable annexation to the United States, all of our relations have grown more intimate each year until the sovereignty of the islands has thus become, in effect, the sovereignty of the United States through these treaties which are founded alone in the mutual interest of the two countries."\(^{156}\) Hawaiians meanwhile simply could not represent their side of the story, namely through the media and referendum, because the haole male already has usurped their voices. The haole unilaterally represented the Hawaiians as saying they favor annexation. Kame‘eleihiwa has


metaphorically described the result: "As modern Hawaiians we are without 'Aina and without voice."\textsuperscript{157}

Of course, in the preceding days, this was true, too:
"The rising interest in the Pacific caused Secretary [of State James K.] Blain in 1881 to call attention to the 'drift' of Hawai'i toward us, and Senator [John T.] Morgan's committee report of 1894 to allude to the tendency of the island to 'gravitate toward political union with this country.' But the annexation which shortly followed Representative [Henry R.] Gibson's assertion that Hawai'i was 'gravitating' to us was due, not to nature, but to the revolution of American planters under the protective bayonets provided by an expansionist American Minister."\textsuperscript{158} However, for the desire-driven haole male, appearance did not matter. Representative Samuel M. Clark openly asserted:

Fear and greed are elementary in mankind. If either, and especially if both, or higher motives than either conspire to make an instinctive impulse of American energy to take Hawai'i, we will take it, however the logicians and good reasoners and lovers of precedent be put in despair. The truth is, the premises and predicates of this Hawaiian matter were put into our Aryan blood at the beginning, with the race instinct of migration and its pervading land hunger... Ralph Waldo Emerson said, 'Hitch your wagon to a star.' When the American flag was made we hitched our national wagon to all the stars, and we have got to go their way. We

\textsuperscript{157} Kameʻeleihiwa, 1992:321. Second underline added.

\textsuperscript{158} Weinberg, 1935:245. Parentheses added.
cannot resist them easily; there is not much American desire to resist.\footnote{Weinberg, 1935:265. Now consider the following comment of Representative Henry R. Gibson on the eve of annexation vote: "Manifest destiny says, 'Take them in.' The American people say, 'Take them.' Obedient to the voice of the people, I shall cast my vote to take them in; and to-morrow this House of Representatives will by a good round majority say, 'Take them in.' Weinberg, 1935:269.}{159} Desires necessitate "rights"; rights can be invented on the spot. In fact, Western concepts of "right" and "title," from its inception, are nothing but a cover to hide its unpleasant substances of inflated greed and desires. "Right" was invented for the haole male usurpers to take away resources from his Other, not for him to give them to the Other. "Rights" systematically benefited the haole. The "rights" discourse is another fine example of the inclusive "all men are brothers" quickly turning into exclusive "only my brothers are men." Indeed, when the West proclaimed over the Americas "the right of our manifest destiny to spread over this whole continent,"\footnote{Weinberg, 1935:143.}{160} it actually meant "our greed which create an absolute necessity (destiny) to spread over somebody else's continent." The Western discourse of "rights" continued. In 1893, U.S. Secretary of State John W. Foster spoke of "the necessary paramount rights and interests of the American people there [Hawai‘i]."\footnote{Weinberg, 1935:348. Parenthesis added.}{161}
But the most important point here is that the familiar prophecy of Manifest Destiny is still here with us today. It has merely become more subtle. The destiny of the West has not changed since the time of its own jihad of the Crusade: [1] to intensely dream of unseen and seen possessions—politically, economically, socially and culturally; [2] to ideologically give the possessions to itself in a unilateral fashion; [3] to usurp self-representation from the Other; and [4] to defend its ill-gotten gains by faithfully following the methods of its ancestors—to reduce the Other morally, culturally and demographically. In short, the West’s destiny since the time of the Crusade is to take, to take, to take. That is why the United States continues to sit on the Hawaiian Islands, militarily intervene in the Gulf and Vietnam (these are strategic policies—long term control of resources and political territories), and in Grenada, Somalia, Panama (these are tactical policies—reaffirmation of the destiny by temporary show of force). That is why the West tries to maintain its positional superiority over the Others through discourses such as human rights, "protection" of Western lives, fighting evil communists, "punishment" of invaders, etc. The West has self-appointed itself as the destiny of the Others, and the sole enforcer of such destiny. The haole has been chosen:

Since at least the medieval period, Western history has been full of claims that particular peoples were specially chosen by God... Belief in a national God-given destiny is alive and well in contemporary America.
Ronald Reagan often referred to America as a "city upon a hill," recalling the biblical passage that refers to the city on a hill as "the light of the world." In his address to the 1988 Republican National Convention, Reagan proclaimed: "I believe that God put this land between the two great oceans to be found by special people... from every corner of the world who had that extra love of freedom that prompted them to leave their homeland and come to this land to make it a brilliant light beam of freedom to the world." His successor George Bush told the nation that America is "the last best hope of man on earth." 162

And Walt Whitman had predicted that "American expansion would always 'tenderly regard human life, property and rights.'" 163 Again, the native voice was usurped by the haole male. But in fact, while the haole systematically benefited from such expansion, he brought diseases, stole lands, resources, culture and even identity. The nature is destroyed, and the natives are left with social diseases, discrimination, racism, barren lands, inequal wealth distribution, fake freedom and fake equality. Nevertheless, representation of the United States as a potentially perfect society has been popular since the time of Columbus: "From the first description of the New World by Christopher Columbus, down through the writings of the Pilgrim Fathers and such eighteenth-century works as Crevecoeur’s Letters from an American Farmer, writers had been inclined to see the American

162 McDermott, 1992:1-3. Notice the similarity in the case of South Africa: "Because the Boers succeeded against overwhelming odds in their trek from the Cape Colony into what became Transvaal and the Orange Free State (1836-40), they were convinced that God had specially elected their new nation." McDermott, 1992:2.

continent as the site where man could construct a 'City upon a Hill' or discover an earthly paradise."  

And as Slotkin notes, "Although the Myth of the Frontier is only one of the operative myth/ideological systems that form American culture, it is an extremely important and persistent one. Its ideological underpinnings are those same 'laws' of capitalist competition, of supply and demand, of Social Darwinism 'survival of the fittest' as a rationale for social order, and of 'Manifest Destiny' that have been the building blocks of our dominant historiographical tradition and political ideology."  

Hawai'i could not have evaded such destiny because the haole desire for it (as a part of his world government) was too strong to quench.

2-3: The Haole Myth of Better Social Sustainability and Moral Superiority

Now let us turn our eyes to the other side of the imperial coin: political myths of better social sustainability and moral superiority. It seeks to legitimize and ritually celebrate the order which the essential, competent and moral usurper Self has established over the inessential, incompetent and immoral Other. In order to represent the Self as fit to usurp and continue to usurp self-government and resources from the Other, the Self must elevate its "best" characteristics

164 Clark, 1984:4.

165 Slotkin, 1985:15.
while alleging the worst characteristics of the Other, and indoctrinate people to believe such representations. It is a constructionist discourse which seeks to compare, justify and celebrate the present order.

As we have seen, natives have to be silent, inessential, incompetent and immoral in order for the West to justify its usurpation of their self-government, land and resources. But that is not enough for the West to continue usurping them. Indeed, "Successful conquerers, imperialists and sundry would-be expansionists face a common problem: they take what they can get--but how do they keep what they take? Having wrestled lands and possessions from others, how do they contrive to retain them? More particularly, how do they organize and govern territories which are inhospitable and often actively hostile?" The obvious answer is, "All occupying powers... must employ mechanisms which will ensure control in some form or another" But what mechanisms? According to Carlton:

Control is usually achieved by a combination of force which induces compliance, and persuasion and/or indoctrination which generates a sense of commitment. In other words, control is either attained by compulsion which, in the end, is frequently counter-productive, or some kind of value-consensus which is often very difficult to effect, but which can pay handsome dividends in the long term.  

166 Carlton, 1992:1.


Thus, for a long-term domination, persuasion must be the way. Persuasion usually takes the forms of indoctrination (education) and media representations. For example, "In modern capitalist societies, cultural hegemony in large measure is achieved and maintained through a subtle process of education, which involves not only the schools but also the mass media and popular literature. Since these agencies of socialization are generally, even if unobtrusively, controlled by the dominant group, it is not surprising that they communicate and reinforce its image of social reality." Or, "It is through socialization that basic ideological beliefs are implanted and perpetuated. This may occur at the pre-school primary stage or more commonly at the more advanced secondary and tertiary stages through such agencies as the educational institutions, peer groups and the media. In these ways, attitudes are formed and values are refined."

Hegemony, according to Carl Boggs, "performs functions that the military and policy machinery could never carry out: it mystifies power relations, public issues, and historical events; it encourages fatalism and passivity toward political action; it justifies various types of system-serving

---

169 I treat the terms indoctrination and education as perfectly the same. AS Snook has pointed out, "Far from it being the case that 'teaching' excludes 'indoctrination,' there is a necessary or conceptual relation between them." Snook, 1972:47.


171 Carlton, 1992:2.
deprivation and sacrifice."\(^{172}\) The best way to systematically benefit a certain group is to hide its specificity and represent its interests as common in social but often deemed nonsocial constructs such as law. But since ideologies (whether dominant or dissenting) unmake hegemony, hegemony must constantly be remade, in "the assertion of control over various modes of symbolic production; over such things as educational and ritual processes, patterns of socialization, political and legal procedures, canons of style and self-representation, public communication, health and bodily discipline, and so on."\(^{173}\) Lasting usurpation requires reenactments. Therefore, "Myth and ritual traditionally integrate individuals into the social order and celebrate dominant social values"\(^{174}\) because "For to justify an institution is to justify each act it mandates, and to justify any application of a rule is to justify the rule."\(^{175}\)

Effective long-term usurpation of Others' self-government and resources often derives from political myth of better social sustainability and moral superiority. As Stannard has pointed out, "the invention of the savage and the inventorizing of his alleged traits functions precisely (albeit sometimes unconsciously) to illuminate reciprocally nothing more than

\(^{172}\) Baer and Singer, 1992:xx.

\(^{173}\) Apter, 1992:222.

\(^{174}\) Kellner, 1982:133.

\(^{175}\) Goodman, 1991:50.
the wonderous grandeur of Western civilization." The West must constantly invent and reenact such political myth of better social sustainability and moral superiority to justify and legitimize the continuation and perpetuation of its usurpation. If it does not, its domination will be seriously questioned because if the West (namely the United States) is not superior, it loses the reason to continue to occupy somebody else's land (Hawai'i). Thus, "best" Western characteristics must be something "universal"--something both the West and its Others can accept as positive virtues, regardless of whether they work or not for all.

Such myths of better social sustainability and moral superiority depend solely on technique of comparison--between the worst of the Other and the best of the Self. For example, an accompanying teacher's manual for the bicentennial "educational" television series American is Beautiful, Hawai'i teachers were required to "clarify" values with questions such as the following:

Ask the students to silently reflect on what it would be like living in an oppressed country. Have them jot down their feelings. Why is it better to be an American than some other nationality? What are the good things about the United States? What are the bad things about the United States? How does the good outweigh the bad? Complete in writing the statement, "I Am An American."  

176 Stannard, personal communication.

177 Stevens, 1975:2.
Such patriotic indoctrination works all too well. For instance, twelve brainwashed McKinley High School students of modern Hawaiian history class have written to The Honolulu Advertiser on "benefits" of annexation. One of them is Annie Lum who has stated that "It was very fortunate that Hawai'i became a part of the United States of America. This goes back to 1893 when the Hawaiian monarchy was overthrown and in 1898 Hawai'i became a territory. Back in 1893, Hawai'i was filled with many immigrants. What if for some reason Japan, China, England, or some other country had claimed Hawai'i for itself? Then we wouldn't have been American citizens. Instead, we might be living under a dictatorship, communism, another monarchy, or even another type of government. However, the American government is a democracy. Under this, we have a choice of who we want to run our government. And of course, we have freedom!"178

It is already assumed that the United States is better than any other countries and that the good outweighs the bad. Such indoctrination continues throughout the compulsory education, and often into college and graduate educations. The American indoctrination works superbly well on educated adults, too. Chomsky has explained why: "One reason that propaganda often works better on the educated than on the uneducated is that educated people read more, so they receive

178 *Lum, 1983:second editorial page. Lum and other students have written their letters after discussing the rise of Hawaiian outcries for justice.
more propaganda. Another is that they have jobs in management, media, and academia and therefore work in some capacity as agents of the propaganda system—and they believe what the system expects them to believe. By and large, they’re part of the privileged elite, and share the interests and perceptions of those in power." 179 This is why "it is essential to understand... about the political process by which some groups’ knowledge becomes ‘official knowledge.’" 180 And as Chomsky has pointed out:

In 1921 the famous American journalist Walter Lippman said that the art of democracy requires what he called the "manufacture of consent." This phrase is an Owellian euphemism for thought control. The idea is that in a state such as the U.S. where the government can’t control the people by force, it had better control what they think.... Since the voice of the people is allowed to speak out, those in power better control what that voice says—in other words, what people think. One of the ways to do it is to create political debate that appears to embrace many opinions, but actually stays within very narrow margins. You have to make sure that both sides in the debate accept certain assumptions—and that those assumptions are the basis of the propaganda system. As long as everyone accepts the propaganda system, then debate is permissible. 181

As we have already seen in the process of the American school indoctrination, the seemingly absolute truth of vox populi, vox Dei (the people’s voice is God’s voice) is carefully exploited by elite haole males to systematically benefit them—by misrepresenting their predator characters and


actions as benevolent and giving—an argument for better social sustainability and moral superiority. For example, in the 1991 bicentennial hype for the Bill of Rights, former Chief of Justice Warren E. Burger has reminded his fellow Americans that "few people in other lands have it."\footnote{Burger, 1991:4. School texts teach children that of all the nations in the West, Britain was the freest unlike France and Spain, that they came to dominate North America instead of them. At present, the United States is the freest of all: "The English and Italians and Israelis are free, but they’re not as free as Americans in speech, religion, integration, opportunity." *Lasson, 1991:B1.} And a man named West has stated:

We have come to know ourselves as inhabitants of a free world. This world is made up of the industrially developed and apparently democratic societies which also go by the name of the Western world... Its boundaries mark the limits of a form of life called by several names. It is the region of the American way; of free markets and free enterprise; of free elections and the multiparty system, of true democracy. In short, it is the region of freedom. For this ideology, which claims to be free of all ideology, the free world is also, perhaps mainly, recognized for what it is not. The free West is opposed to the ideological and totalitarian East, where freedom is suppressed, and the Third World, which cannot yet afford freedom.\footnote{West, 1990:xi. Underline added.}

Now consider the following by haole male historian Thomas Packenham in the conclusion of his much publicized 1991 book The Scramble for Africa: "Yet how many Africans would wish to turn the clock back to the 1880s? The steamers and airlines of the world now bring material benefits to the fourty-seven new states of the continent on a scale undreamt of a century ago. Best of all, Europe has given Africa the aspirations for
freedom and human dignity, the humanitarian ideals of Livingstone, even if Europe itself was seldom able to live up to them." ¹⁸⁴

Children as well as adults in Hawai‘i are thus systematically trained to always elevate the haole present and debase the Hawaiian (and other native) past. As Trask has pointed out, there is an assumption that "Euro-American culture is superior and should be adopted for that reason." ¹⁸⁵ Indeed, "where the myth is the story of a political society already in existence, it may sanctify the constitution of that society, inspire its members with confidence in their destiny and glorify their achievements." ¹⁸⁶ Now consider this story: A father visited his son’s class and heard children say, "George Washington is the father of our country. Thomas Jefferson wrote the Declaration of Independence. Abraham Lincoln freed the slaves and saved the Union." The father further wrote:

After each such vignette, the entire fifth grade said in unison, "And America goes forever." ...First, I noticed that without exception the history-makers who were named in the one-liners were white, male American

¹⁸⁴ Packenham, 1991:680. Now consider Henry M. Stanley’s How I Found Livingstone (1874). For Stanley, "What will be there after Western intervention always impinges on Stanley’s view of what is there now. His observations, made in the 1870s, reflect Victorian concerns, and he sees in Africa the two things his age valued most: opportunities for commerce and opportunities for bringing Christianity to ‘savages.’" Torgovnick, 1990:27.

¹⁸⁵ Trask, 1984:106. Underline in original.

¹⁸⁶ Tudor, 1972:139.
officeholders. My son was being taught official history of a highly selective kind. Second, the refrain, "And America goes on forever," meant that my son was being instructed in ideological history, presuming the absoluteness of a historical institution and a political idea. The two statements—history is made by white male officeholders, and the key conclusion of these one-liners is American durability—together make a very reassuring notion of historical process. The statements are not disinterested. They are an enormous cover-up in terms of what is left out and of the interests served by such a presentation of history. 187

And what are better about the West than its Others? As a U.S. textbook taught children that "The United States care of all its citizens and gives them many rights. A citizen has the right to life, liberty and happiness. He has the right to buy and sell, to have a home, and to help in making the government under which he lives a good government. These rights of citizenship must be paid for by the men who enjoy them. A true citizen pays for his rights by obeying the laws, paying his taxes, and taking his part in protecting the government of the United States." 188 The same textbook sums up: "America is another word for opportunity." 189 And as James Oliver Robertson has remarked, "What is specifically American in American nationalism is the widespread belief in the unique origins of the nation. Americans are a new people, 187 Brueggemann, 1987:50. Indeed, as Pittenger has argued in 1941, "Indoctrination for American democracy is... not only proper, but also a major necessity, business of American education. It is a plain duty of schools and teachers in this country to give vigorous support to the ideological pattern that sustains them." Pittenger, 1941:1.

189 Potter, 1980:11.
formed out of a migration of people seeking freedom in a new world. The nation was founded in a revolution which was both the first war of liberation and the first lasting overthrow of an ancien régime. That revolution created a new nation dedicated to the spread of freedom and democracy and equality. The history of that people and nation has been the struggle, physically and geographically as well as morally and ideally, to spread freedom across the continent and throughout the world.190

Also, "American civil religion imposes faith in the progress of American institutions."191 No less than Frank Sinatra shouted, on the fourth of July, 1991, "We are created equal! No one of us is better than any of us! That's the headline proclaimed in 1776 and inscribed across centuries in the truth of the ages... Happy July 4th. May today be a day of love for all Americans. May this year's celebration be the day that changes the world forever. May Independence Day, 1991, truly be a glorious holiday as every American lives the self-evident truth that all people are created equal."192

But what is excluded in this "freedom and equality" discourse is that "the myth [of opportunity] effectively denies social difference (so that everyone was an individual and was equal) and cultural difference (so that Americans were

---

190 Thompson, 1985:4.


all new men). The myth also posits a uniformitarian history while denying that particular histories made a difference that opportunity in the past was different from what opportunity is in the present; thus it denied history (so that the Golden Door, trope of opportunity, closed off everyone's past)."193 Myth of better social sustainability applies only to a limited number of people. But indoctrination denies such differences and unilaterally declares all people equal; because they are equal, no inequality complaints are valid; in this paradox, equality quickly turns into inequality. Again, "all men are brothers" is quickly turned into "only my brothers are men."

The falsity of "freedom and equality" discourse is suppressed and seldom discussed in the dominant haole discourse in the United States—and in Hawaiʻi where "freedom of speech" exists. For instance, haole male Richard Sybert has complained about the "politics of blame" on the side of the Hawaiians, and stated that:

You and I are entitled to be treated alike... If Hawaiians are serious about working on their real problems—higher rates of substance abuse, lack of education, higher disease and mortality rates—they will assimilate into a larger, color-blind society and take advantage of the equal opportunities that now exist... "National sovereignty" may be temporarily satisfying to native Hawaiians as a proud reassertion of their

193 Chock, 1990:290. Supreme Court Justice Clarence Thomas sobbingly said upon his nomination by haole President George Bush, "Only in America could this have been possible."
*Feinsilber, 1991:8 Indeed, only in America inequality is disguised as equality and that those who suffer from inequality must thank the benevolent West for rescuing them from inequality which is instituted and perpetuated by the West itself.
identity, but it will do nothing to improve their lives. Instead, it will drive them further apart from mainstream society and help to create a permanent underclass of societal losers. Who would wish that on anyone?194

Another haole male Adam "Bud" Smyser is in agreement: "Statehood was the holy grail that just about all of us sought. It made all of us more equal regardless of ethnicity..."195 In this way, the haole tries to preempt any Hawaiian attempt to take back what he has taken away from them--equality and freedom--while misrepresenting that he has already given them both. If the Hawaiians are not succeeding, then, it's all their fault. Again, the haole must exclude from this discourse their initial and continuous usurpation of the Hawaiians' self-government, land and resources (and the massive demographic and cultural decline caused by haole diseases) because those have mostly created the vicious circle of inequality, bad health and self-destructiveness. But since everybody is already equal, inclusive and communal Hawaiians must compete on the same ground according to the exclusive, competitive haole values with other advantaged ethnic groups, namely haole and Asians. As Chock has pointed out, "The stance of cultural authority is to deny even the possibility of another voice. In the extreme case, egalitarianism denies social or cultural difference and thus any grounds for


contesting its construction of a situation." The dominant voices are those which want to close the differences in human process in the interest of order and the protection of a monopoly which always needs to be guarded.

In any case, in this kind of celebratory monologue, the West tries to maintain its power to usurp self-government and resources of its Others so that they will never rise again against it. For example, former U.S. President Richard Nixon has said, "Our mission was not completed with the defeat of communism. We must now work to ensure the success of freedom... Today, only one nation can provide the leadership to achieve those goals. The United States is privileged to be that nation. Our moment of truth has arrived. We must seize the moment." However, recently, some Hawaiians started to reject such false haole argument of benevolently-given "equality" and "freedom": "If we Hawaiians are to succeed in gaining control over our lives once again, we must learn from past mistakes in dealings with foreigners. We have to learn to be critical of them, especially of those who say they love us and only want to help. We must ask, are they sincere or are they self-serving? Let us ignore their words, for words

---


float away in the Pu’ulena wind. Let us examine very carefully what in fact they do."¹⁹⁹

2-4: The Haole Myth of Innocence

Furthermore, in the unstoppable current of the Others’ reclaiming of self-representation has put the West in a defensive position. More and more, the alleged betterness of haole constructs is questioned, and the internal inconsistencies and dirty motives of the haole myths of better social sustainability and moral superiority are being exposed. The ill-gotten gains of the West are threatened. The only option the haole seems to be able to take at this stage is to [1] continue to reduce the Others morally, culturally and demographically; [2] continue to elevate the Self morally, culturally and demographically; and [3] obscure and cloud the real issue—the complicity and cultural specificities of the West. In this section, I will analyze and discuss defensive techniques the West use to obscure and cloud the real issue.

[1] Ad Hominem Arguments

First, such defenses almost always employ ad hominem techniques to neutralize and obscure the issue of Western dehumanization of natives—or more precisely, destabilize (invalidate) native claims. It is most commonly used by

¹⁹⁹ Kame’eleihiwa, 1992:325.
members of the West to give themselves an alibi. There are a few varieties of such argument. According to Walton:

In the abusive ad hominem, an arguer's character is attacked in order to discredit her argument. In the circumstantial ad hominem, an arguer's personal circumstances are said to conflict with her argument, once again with the object of discrediting her argument. In the poisoning the well variant of the ad hominem argument, an arguer is said to have shown no regard for the truth, the implication being that nothing she might say henceforth can be trusted as reliable or sincere. In the tu quoque type of ad hominem argument, a participant in the argument replies to his opponent's criticism by saying, "You're just as bad yourself," the implication being that she has no right to make this criticism, and her making it can be discredited or ignored.200

Now let us analyze tu quoque or "you, too" variation of ad hominem argument. M. Roger Goodell, who is not Hawaiian and claims himself to be a patriotic American, has maintained that "We're all just as wicked as we seem. Haoles have no monopoly on being a------. The Hawaiians just never had the immunity or the iron."201 Haole male scholars Patrick V. Kirch and Marshall Sahlins in their recent two-volume book Anahulu202 have provided perfect "evidence" for such an

200 Walton, 1992:191. Underlines in original. I am not, however, dismissing ad hominem arguments themselves here; actually, this whole thesis is an ad hominem construct. What I am against is a use of ad hominem by the empowered to keep usurping self-government and resources of the disempowered.

201 *Goodell, 1993:second editorial page.

202 The haole scholars have stated that "The modest aim of the present volume... is to bring the history of the world down into the Anahulu River valley [on north O'ahu, Hawai'i]. What we would show is how Hawai‘i’s entrance into this world history, through a series of local mediations, was realized in the cultural forms of Anahulu history." Kirch and Sahlins, 1992:2. Underlines and parenthesis added. The "world history"--which from above descend "down" onto Hawai‘i--is
argument. According to **haole** male popularizer Bob Krauss, the two **haole** males argued (in his words) that [1] Burial patterns indicate that Hawaiian chiefs in about 1100 A.D. disenfranchised the **maka’ainana** (common people) and took the land for themselves; and [2] There is strong evidence that complex irrigation systems thought to have been built in ancient times to feed a growing population were instead constructed more recently to grow food for warriors engaged in conquest.\(^{203}\) From "authoritative studies" such as this come comments such as that of Elise D. Hollingsworth's: "Before the Mahele, royalty owned everything and everybody. The ali‘i got the best of everything--slaves gathered two feathers at a time from the bird to fashion the wonderful feather capes. Then the ali‘i thanked them by giving them away to explorers and European royalty."\(^{204}\)

Consequently, on the relative scale, the Western dehumanizations of the Hawaiians is made to seem innocent. Such "scholarship" is a very sophisticated way to cloud, obscure and neutralize the true power relationship that existed between the West and its Other; the real issue here is in the unequal relationship between the two, not some other

\(^{203}\) *Krauss, 1992:A-3.*

\(^{204}\) *Hollingsworth, 1990:second editorial page.*
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unequal relations among the natives. In fact, even Columbus-defender Robert Royal has observed that:

The record of intertribal warfare should never have been used in that way. It is the moral equivalent of saying that because some Frenchmen steal from one another, it is all right for Englishmen to steal from Frenchmen. The whole exercise is a moral muddle that shows bad faith on the part of the excuse-maker.205

In any case, by the "you, too" variation of the argument, the haole [1] neutralizes his immorality; [2] divert attentions from his own immorality to immorality of his Others; and [3] gets itself off the hook. For the Hawaiians to have had a few documented depostic ali‘i is enough evidence to discredit a Hawaiian rule over Hawai‘i (never mention of great ali‘i and fair communal sharing of produces), but even if the West had Lorrin Thurston, Sanford Dole, John L. Stevenson and many documented depostic kings and queens plus Adolf Hitler, it does not even become a disqualification for the Western rule over Hawai‘i. Much more importantly, the stories of the oppressive ali‘i mostly derived from haole male representations, not Hawaiian self-representations. Of course, if the ali‘i could be portrayed oppressive, the benevolent haole male could step in to usurp their power. To deprive self-representation of the Other instantly guarantees somebody else’s resources.

Another thing the haole might do is to try to think of (or manufacture) reasons that would justify his behavior--

i.e., he might engage in rationalization. For instance, in order to justify his unwarranted conquest of Hawaiians which stands in their way, he might construct a story that attributes certain motives and intentions to the Hawaiians (and he may imagine that he finds clues of these motives and intentions in various things Hawaiians say and do). Attributing these motives and intentions to the Hawaiians allows the haole to see his own behavior as a case of justified self-defense—for the Hawaiians are out to ruin him, and if he allows them to be at large, he will only make himself vulnerable to the malicious antagonist. In this way the haole persuades himself that his behavior is morally acceptable. As Kame‘eleihiwa has said, "It's not that we were wrong or stupid or savage... The Americans wanted this land, and they hated us because it was ours." 206

The case Kame‘eleihiwa discusses is a typical case of paranoid projection. Inner stimulation of the Self ("I hate him") is projected into the Other ("He hates me"). The imagined hostility of the Other justifies the unwarranted hostility of the Self toward the Other. This sort of self-deception could become habitual and indeed became a consistent characteristic of the West; patterns of deceit are constructed and become constitutive of the regime's being. What is more, as a common saying goes, a lie becomes truth if one keeps saying it. Substantial amount of a lie, which derives from

necessitating desires, essentially becomes truth. This is how immorality becomes morality.

Indeed, political myth of innocence cleanses acts of dehumanization: injustice becomes justice, victims become villains, murders become a necessary evil, rape becomes consented sex, willful invasion becomes self-defense, overthrow of the opponent without the consent of its people becomes democracy, stealing becomes lawful acquisition, crime becomes misdemeanor, ill-gotten gains become legitimate, reversible becomes irreversible, and imposed transformation becomes progress.

And what is most striking in this kind of obscuring discourse is that the natives are told not to judge the haole usurpers of the past because they were men of their time while the natives are judged in today's moral standards of haole. Consider the following:

All conquest is violent; and conquest has been part of history since the world began. Conquest is still going on in many parts of the world; and conquest will always shift power, boundaries, economic priorities, as we all know. What the Spaniards and Columbus may have done cannot be blamed on them as though they invented conquest. As for violence, it, of course, has a long history apart from conquest. Certainly it is being dramatically carried on in our own time almost everywhere—in some cases down our very streets and into our homes. There has not been a conquest, including Indians conquering other Indians, where violence was not part of the scene. The Aztecs sacrificed thousands in their conquerors' rites. To use the occasion of the quincentenary to repeat inflammatory generalizations that can only be divisive is neither strategic or conclusive.  

In this way, the West judges the natives of the past with today's moral standards of its own, while it prohibits the Others from judging the West with today's moral standards of its own. Moreover, for the victimizer West to judge its victims is assumed to be a right, natural thing whereas it becomes inflammatory generalizations for the victim natives to judge its victimizer haole. Only the haole can represent itself and the Others. Thus, any "balanced" representations would almost always attempt to divert attention from Western atrocities against natives to internal atrocity among the natives. But the West must keep attention from its genocide of the natives and therefore must resort to the ad hominem technique to divert attention to alleged vices of the natives. Such representations are designed to give the impression that because the natives are hopelessly savage and beastly, they deserve what they have suffered. Consider the following excerpts from an essay titled "The Conquistadors were not All Bad" by haole male historian William A. Hamilton, who teaches Western civilization on the university level:

Innocent natives? The great Aztec and Mayan societies were built on the conquest of non-Aztec and non-Mayan peoples, upon the slave labor and upon the ritual murder of those slaves when they were worn out or just the ritual hell of it. Their vaunted canals and magnificent temples were built by slave labor. Force, not loyalty, held these cultures together. Internal cohesion was based on fear, the central ingredient of their religious belief. Get crosswise with the state-paid priests, and they ripped your heart out. In one ceremony, the Aztecs cut the hearts from 10,000 virgins—virgins obtained by taking all the young girls they could find in surrounding villages. Lacking Dachau-style crematoria, these pre-Columbian cultures had a victim-disposal problem. Such
massive carnage had to pollute the soil and, eventually, water supplies. The rapid rise and disappearance of a number of Meso-American cultures suggests their victims had the last laugh. If this insight into pre-Columbian culture, now the daring of the politically correct multiculturalists, comes as a revelation, it is because the grisly practices of the Aztecs and Mayas have been the subject of a cover-up while the predatory practices of the Spanish explorers are being trumpeted to the skies by those who would like to see the teaching of Western civilization banished from American colleges and universities. 208

What is interesting in Hamilton’s argument is that he found Aztecan and Mayan conquests and enslavement of other peoples immoral. In this way, he also inadvertently found his own Western conquest of natives and African slavery immoral. Now, just substitute the words Maya and Aztec with the West, ritual murder with witch hunt, Mayan and Aztec slavery with Western slavery of Africans, and one gets the perfect picture of the late medieval and early modern Europe where people constantly suffered from plague and smallpox, stagnant water, dead animals left on streets, stenches, famines, wars, social confusion, lack of adequate housing, high infant mortality rate, deportation of Jews and etc. 209 All of Western evils are projected onto its Others for the West to have a reason to hate, attack, conquer and dominate them while the Western evils are never questioned. And here is only a tiny fraction of evils that the haole have projected onto the natives:

208 *Hamilton, 1992:15A.

209 For details of social ills of late medieval and early modern Europe, see Stannard, 1992:57-67.
what Lawrence Stone has said about the typical English village... was likely true throughout Europe at this time—that is, that because of the dismal social conditions and prevailing social values, it "was a place filled with malice and hatred, its only unifying bond being the occasional episode of mass hysteria, which temporarily bound together the majority in order to harry and persecute the local witch." Indeed, as in England, there were towns on the Continent where as many as a third of the population were accused of witchcraft and where as many as ten out of every hundred people were executed for it in a single year. In one small, remote locale within reputedly peaceful Switzerland, more than 3,300 people were killed in the late sixteenth- and seventeenth-century for allegedly Satanic activities. The tiny village of Wiesensteig saw sixty-three women burned to death in one year alone, while in Obermarchtal fifty-four people—out of a total population of barely 700—died at the stake during a three-year period. Thus, while it is true that the Europeans of those days possessed the same range of emotions that we do, as Stone puts it, "it is noticeable that hate seems to have been more prominent an emotion than love." 210

Indeed, one only needs to question: "Why did so many Europeans flood into the New World? Why would any right-thinking person choose to flee 'Western civilization' as practiced across the waters?" 211 Eric Carlton questions himself and concedes: "One can, of course, always ask what the whites were doing there [in North America] in the first place. And why, after the initial trading settlement phase, did the migrations to the New World have to continue? These questions are obviously related to the conditions in Europe from which many wished to escape..." 212

212 Carlton, 1992:120. Parenthesis added.
Despite the known internal as well as external vices of the West, it must divert attention from them, project such vices onto its Others, and compare their worst features with its alleged best features. The Christian West, however, has actually had a warning on this kind of discourse centuries way before 1492. As Jesus has said, "how can you say to your brother, 'Brother, let me take out the speck that is in your eye,' when you yourself do not see the log that is in your own eye? You hypocrite, first take the log out of your own eye, and then you will see clearly to take out the speck that is in your brothers eye.'"213 Here is another familiar warning by Jesus:

"Woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! For you clean the outside of the cup and of the dish, but inside they are full of robbery and self-indulgence. You blind Pharisee, first clean the inside the cup and of the dish, so that the outside of it may become clean also. Woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! For you are like whitewashed tombs which on the outside appear beautiful, but inside they are full of dead men's [sic] bones and all uncleanness. Even so you too outwardly appear righteous to men [sic], but inwardly you are full of hypocrisy and lawlessness. Woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! For you build the tombs of the prophets and adorn the monuments of the righteous, and say, 'If we had been living in the days of our fathers,

213 Luke 6:42. New American Standard Bible, 1978:981-982. Of course, one can argue that "Just because the arguer exhibits a personal or circumstantial inconsistency in advocating his or her argument, it does not follow that the argument, in itself, is a bad one, or that the conclusion is false." Walton, 1992:203. Indeed, the accused may commit a fallacy by not taking a legitimate argument. However, the issue here is not the correctness of the argument, but the power relationship between the arguer and the accused. Does the arguer have the power to force the accused to comply with its argument? Does the accused, on the other hand, have the same power to force the arguer to comply with its own argument?
we would not have been partners with them in *shedding* the blood of the prophets.' Consequently you bear witness against yourselves, that you are sons of those who murdered the prophets."²¹⁴

Now consider the following statement of James Axtell:

we make a hash of our historical judgements because we continue to feel guilty about the real or imagined sins of our fathers and forefathers and people to whom we have no relation whatever. The dirtyness of their business somehow keeps rubbing off on us. This is perhaps understandable but it is also unnecessary and unproductive. We carry all the moral weight we can bear from our own dilemmas and conflicts; we do not need any excess baggage. Only when we perpetuate the immoral actions and attitudes of our predecessors should they be of *personal* (as opposed to historical or heuristic) concern to us. Despite the resort to universalizing labels such as "Imperialism" and "Colonialism," most of the moral battles of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries are behind us. Unless the United States military invades Quebec or Mexico in the near future and makes it the 51st state, we can stop flogging ourselves with the broad brush of "genocide." As a huge nation of law and order and increasingly refined sensibility, we are not guilty of murdering Indian women and babies, or branding slaves on the forehead, or of claiming and confiscating any real estate in the world we happen to fancy.²¹⁵

In this way, the West unilaterally gets itself off the hook by preempting self-representation of the natives. Therefore, when native past is discussed in a "balanced" manner, it is almost always the comparison between the worst features of the native and the alleged best of the haole. But when haole past is discussed, it is usually treated as an independent and different category and its worst features are almost never compared with best features of the native past.


When natives are accused of their alleged vices, they are bundled together as a group—"the natives"—but when haole are accused of their vices, they must be treated as individuals with special backgrounds. As Axtell quoted Edmund Burke, "you cannot'—or rather, should not—'indict a whole nation' for the misdeeds and crimes of a few." These haole discourses boil down to one point: If the natives were competent and moral, the West no longer can justify its continued usurpation of their self-government and resources. There is an enormous political stake in "history." Therefore, it does not surprise us that popular Newsweek magazine rhetorically presented the following hypothetical situation in front of its readers, to instigate their fears:

It's 1992 and the Aztecs stand astride the hemisphere, handsome, proud and committed to their nasty habit of human sacrifice. In Europe, mature democracies might anguish over whether they should export their ideology to an indigenous people who obey totalitarian chiefs.

For those who live in Hawai'i, this sounds familiar. As John Weil has written: "I would like to know, when native Hawaiians get their sovereignty and the monarchy returns, who

---

216 Axtell, 1992:262. Underline in original. He also stated that "To judge is human, and to judge according to the highest standards of moral judgement is humanizing. ...our judgement should be made only after we have thoroughly done our homework." Axtell, 1992:265. Underline in original.

217 *Press, 1991:55. Even the infamous Mario Vargas Llosa has said, "What would America be like in the 1990s if the dominant cultures were those of the Aztecs and Incas? The only answer, ultimately, is that there is no way to know." *Llosa, 1990:45.
is the heir apparent to the throne? Will we have a queen, a king or perhaps Larry Mehau?"\textsuperscript{218}

The Haole have an inherent interest in debasing the ability and the character of the natives to keep overrunning their lands and claiming the lands as their own. Hence, not only emphasizing the worst features of the Hawaiians, the West must also discredit the best features of the its native Others. The most contested area is better ecological sustainability of the natives. For example, "Some historians have claimed that studies of pre-Columbian management of the environment in Chaco Canyon, N[ew] M[exico], and the Valley of Mexico suggest that Indians were not always as environmentally 'correct' as their reputation would have it."\textsuperscript{219} What is never represented in this kind of discourse is that most of today's massive ecological destruction could not have happened without Western technologies and "non-social, objective" science, which emerged as an argument for better social sustainability and moral superiority. The nature has become seriously endangered only after the West set out to conquer it. The natives could not have systematically polluted air, soil and water with harmful substances because they did not have science and industries; they did not invent nuclear bombs; they did not build concrete jungles; and they did not cut down trees and develop lands to satisfy their desires. As

\textsuperscript{218} *Weil, 1993:second editorial page.

\textsuperscript{219} *Burnham, 1992:book review page.
Kame‘eleihiwa has demonstrated, "It was not our ancestors who poisoned and scarred this 'Aina, we lived in a sophisticated harmony with the 'Aina." This must not be true for the haole or he will lose moral superiority of better nature management--superior ecological sustainability. Therefore, haole scholars fanatically look for evidence of poor ecological sustainability of the Hawaiians. For example, haole male archaeologist Patrick V. Kirch has "demonstrated" that "prehistoric" Hawaiians:

not only reduced the extent of indigenous flora and fauna but they also introduced, either by design or accidentally, a variety of new and frequently highly competitive plants and animals.221

In fact, many other haole natural scientists and historians have written many papers about how the Hawaiians had already damaged the 'Aina and its lifeforms before the haole has arrived. It is very true that the Hawaiians have changed--sometimes at the cost of flora and fauna--the landscape of 'Aina. But the "fact" is always made up of precisely what it excludes. What is excluded is that the extent of massive--just massive--destruction by the haole (and their collaborators of color) through plantation agriculture, pesticide, development, toxic wastes, nature-unfriendly tourism, etc, has no comparison with that of the Hawaiians. Hence, the haole must divert people's attention from it, and

221 Kirch, 1980:44.
instead reduce the Hawaiians' ecological ability in order to protect his ill-gotten gains. Indeed, what the haole says about the Hawaiians always must be suspect, for he is both a party and the judge to the lawsuit.

[2] "Must Lose to Gain" Metaphor

Although the West continues to use ad hominem arguments and empties out the existence of the Hawaiians, they proudly survive and stick to (or return to) the ways of their ancestors. And they get under the haole skin because they assert their rightful claims to what the haole stole from them: self-government, land and resources. But of course, the haole will not give up their ill-gotten gains. Then, how does the West respond to the Hawaiian claims? To argue that the natives must lose everything in order to receive everything.

Columbus used this argument 500 years ago: "the Indians must lose everything in order to receive everything; the innocent natives will give away their gold for trash, but they will receive a treasure far more precious than gold; the wicked natives (the 'cannibals') will be enslaved in order to be freed from their own bestiality."222 This is a familiar biblical theme for the West. As Jesus of Nazareth has told Nicodemus, "Truly, truly, I say to you, unless one is born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God."223 Or, "For whoever

wishes to save his life shall lose it; but whoever loses his for My sake shall find it."\textsuperscript{224} Indeed, as Orlando Patterson has stated in the conclusion in his popular 1991 book, \textit{Freedom}:

The vision of Israel emerged from the bondage of Egypt. Redemption--spiritual freedom--was not simply liberation from slavery to sin, but as Paul saw with his fearsome vision, the suffering of sin made necessary the coming of the Christ and the promise of the cross--that central and most protean civilizational symbol of death and rebirth, estrangement and reconciliation, slavery and salvation. Less obviously, but for that very reason, more subliminally potent, in the image of the nailed, dying God, we see the permanent horror of constraint; in the image of the wooden cross--the vertical crossroad, the Pythagorean "Y"--we see the ultimate veneration of choice. Whether we choose to believe this or not, it is this strange, terrifying vision, at once moral and divine, that has fashioned the culture and genius of the West. All who have come up from the abyss of slavery and serfdom--the children of slaves as well as the children of slave mongers--must be humbled by this truth each time we celebrate our freedom.\textsuperscript{225}

Columbus and his spiritual \textit{haole} descendants--the self-appointed redeemer West--fulfilled yet another familiar model of biblical theme: "it is destruction that gives the Spanish possession of the empire" (the process of born again/renewal) and "it is destruction that gives the Spanish presence its purpose (giving eternal life)."\textsuperscript{226} The natives must be


\textsuperscript{225} Patterson, 1991:405-406.

\textsuperscript{226} Greenblatt, 1991:134. Underlines in original. Moreover, \textit{haole} conquest of natives faithfully followed familiar European models in all aspects. As Parker noted, "American justification for expropriating Indian land had its roots in European philosophy, theology, canon law, and international law derived from rhetoric of the ancestral imperial nations." Parker, 1989:1. For example, "The doctrine of 'savage war'
redeemed and rescued from themselves by the West. This kind of discourse has not changed at all since 1492; it is still here with us today. The incapable, immoral natives must be redeemed by capable, moral haole. The West has brought more good to them than bad. For instance, after admitting "great cruelty" of haole conquest, haole male columnist Charles Krauthammer stated, "The real question is, What eventually grew on this bloodied soil? The answer is, The great modern civilizations of the Americas—a new world of individual rights, an ever expanding circle of liberty and, twice in this century, a savior of the world from totalitarian barbarism." And according to another haole male:

Whatever the problems it brought, the villified Western culture also brought enormous, undreamed-of benefits, without which most of today's Indians would be infinitely poorer or not even alive... Some cultures are better than others: A free society is better than slavery; reason is better than brute force as a way to deal with other men; productivity is better than stagnation. In fact, Western civilization stands for man at his best.

[...]

[227 In fact, I argue here that the political theories of haole male usurpers are all based on this concept. For example, social contracts are made between the redeemer state and the insecure individual. The individual must lose self-government and resources to be given the so-called "rights" to property, "freedom" and "equality." The individual must lose everything to gain everything.

It stands for the values that sustain human life: reason, science, self-reliance, individualism, ambition, productive achievement. The values of Western civilization are values for all human beings; they cut across gender, ethnicity and geography. We should honor Western civilization not for the ethnocentric reason that some of us happen to have European ancestors but because it is the objectively superior culture.299

Yet another haole male has said, "The point is not to put down pre-Columbian culture. But before the politically correct multiculturalists assign Columbus to the ash heap of history, let us not dismiss the conquistadors as less civilized than the natives they encountered. They ended massive ritual human sacrifice. They brought wheat, barley, cattle, horses and sheep to peoples who had yet to make practical use of the wheel. And, yes, they brought venereal diseases, which the locals gave back in a more virulent form that almost decimated Western Europe. Montezuma's revenge. So this Columbus Day, drink your vino with pride and try not to think about what they drank at Aztec celebrations."230

Very few remind us that the massacre at Wounded Knee happened just a little over 100 years ago in 1891, and that Leonard Peltier is still in jail. In any case, the haole conquest of the natives is something to celebrate, something to drink to. Natives did suffer, but they are better off now, redeemed and resuced from themselves, thanks to the bloody haole atrocities and continued usurpation of their own self-

299 *Berliner, 1991:no page number available.

230 *Hamilton, 1992:15A.
government and resources. We already have seen this pattern of argument applied on Hawai'i. The "achievements" of the West prevails over its defects. But as Weinberg has noted:

Believing like the crusader that "God wills it," the expansionist had the joyful illusion of hitching his pioneer wagon to a star. There is, of course, the quite different question whether territorial expansion was objectively essential to freedom--the American's or any one else's.\(^{231}\)

Then, it is only natural that spiritual descendants of Columbus say: "We have had ample opportunity to undo any bad that Columbus did."\(^{232}\) But in fact, descendants of usurpers who do not return their ancestors' ill-gotten gains to rightful owners are usurpers themselves. Of course, "As we all know, it is illegal to profit from stolen goods."\(^{233}\) Nonetheless, the haole must be innocent. He fanatically denies the Western theft and colonization of Hawai'i, in the forms of political myths of [1] poorer social sustainability and moral inferiority; [2] better social sustainability and moral superiority; and finally [3] innocence. Those myths will continue to be exposed in this age of Western decline. What will be his response?


\(^{232}\) *Kandel, 1992:2A.

\(^{233}\) *Mentley, 1993"second editorial page.
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